



**MONASH**

Institute for the Study of Global Movements

**BRAIN DRAIN OR MIND-SHIFT?:  
Reconsidering Policies on Researcher Mobility**

Policy considerations from the conference *Moving Ideas and Research Policies:  
Australian Intellectuals in the Global Context* conference, Melbourne, July  
2008

Johannah Fahey

Jane Kenway

Copies of this publication may be obtained from:  
[www.globalmovements.monash.edu.au](http://www.globalmovements.monash.edu.au)

© Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway, 2009

This work is copyright. Apart from any uses as permitted under The Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 0 909931 51 8

First published in 2009

Printed by Monash Print Services

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ii
Introduction	1
Part One: Background paper	4
Part Two: Policy Considerations	10
<i>Biographies</i>	28
<i>Appendices</i>	
<i>Conference program</i>	34
<i>Incidences of international collaboration in current ARC projects allocation years 2004-2008</i>	36
<i>ARC Linkage International Fellowships funded 2004-2007 by discipline group</i>	37
<i>References</i>	38

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We benefited greatly from the generous participation of all the people who gave papers and those others in attendance at the *Moving Ideas* conference and would like to extend our sincere gratitude to them. We wish to thank the Australian Research Council, which is funding the four-year Discovery-Project study, *Moving Ideas: Mobile Policies, Researchers and Connections in the Social Sciences and Humanities — Australia in the Global Context*. We also thank the Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements, in particular Professor John Nieuwenhuysen, for providing the major funding support for the conference. We also appreciate the additional sponsorship provided by the Australian Academy of the Humanities and the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research. As well we thank the Council for the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences and the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia for endorsing the event. We are also grateful to the Faculty of Education at Monash University for providing us with the institutional base from which to conduct this project.

## INTRODUCTION

This report arises from the *Moving Ideas and Research Policies: Australian Intellectuals in the Global Context* invitational conference held in July 2008 in Melbourne (for the full program see **Appendix 1**)<sup>1</sup>. The conference discussed and debated the diverse benefits and difficulties of the international mobility of researchers and explored how research related policies, networks, institutions and bodies could best support and harness the benefits. Participants raised a number of considerations for policy and for mobile researchers themselves.

This report's main purpose is to provide a collation of the policy considerations that emerged from the conference and some of the thinking that lay behind them. Its other purpose is to share our background ideas that inspired the conference. Selected full papers are available in the journal *Around the Globe*, Vol 5, No 1, 2009.

Diverse stakeholders and commentators were brought together at the conference. Presenting papers were eminent mobile intellectuals in the social sciences and humanities. Also present were university researchers from various disciplines and levels of seniority, representatives from the Australian Learned Academies, the Australian Research Council and state and commonwealth governments.

This conference stemmed directly from our current ARC Discovery project called *Moving Ideas: Mobile Policies, Researchers and Connections in the Social Sciences and Humanities - Australia in the global context* (2006-2009). The study explores the ways that ideas travel and how knowledge transforms through travel. One aspect of the study is the critical examination of various research policies around the world that are associated with moving ideas and moving researchers. These are often coupled with notions of 'brain drain-gain/mobility' and 'diaspora'. A second focus is on the mobility biographies of globally mobile intellectuals with various links to Australia and on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the conference, the terms researcher, intellectual and scholar were used interchangeably. Debating the differences in meanings of such terms was not part of the discussion.

implications of their mobility for their ideas, politics and national and transnational identifications. It is our view that the actual experiences and insights of such people have the potential to enhance researcher mobility policies.

Many of Australia's most inventive researchers are on the move around the globe and in the future their numbers will grow. The questions thus arise: is our national interest best served by trying to attract them back or, is it better served if we think more creatively and generously about this issue?

In relation to these questions, Australia is missing the mark – not because many of our high calibre researchers are on the move, but because our institutions are often rather unimaginative in dealing with researcher mobility. As researchers increasingly address the big global issues of our times, their mobility is crucial. So too is challenging narrow versions of 'the national interest'.

The perspectives evident in this report on researchers' international mobility involve a mind-shift away from simple equations of loss and gain and territory and identity – notions still perpetuated in policy conceptions of 'brain drain-gain/mobility' and 'diaspora'. Further, this report goes beyond narrowly defined understandings of national and regional interests. It moves the mind towards a more nuanced, generative and generous perception with regard to national reputation and relationships and considers the ways in which researchers might contribute to such a perception. It understands reputation in a cooperative as well as a competitive sense that includes inviting a genuine concern for the interests of other nations and regions and for the 'global public good'.

Social science and humanities researchers are well placed to address these issues. This therefore means the nation-state engaging specifically with the content of social science and humanities knowledge and research practices, rather than remaining content with the focus on techno-scientific knowledge that dominates brain drain-gain/mobility /diaspora policy discourse.

Part One of the report is our background paper on researcher mobility policies. This asks if current paradigms yield sufficient interpretive power with regard to the global movement of researchers and knowledge and also if they offer the best basis for Australian researcher mobility

policy development in the global context. Part Two brings together the considerations for policy generated throughout the conference with some brief contextual comments.

Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway

**Part One:**

**BACKGROUND PAPER**

Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway

How is the international mobility of researchers understood and are such understandings adequate for contemporary conditions? Why does such mobility matter, and does it matter differently in different nation-states around the globe and at different times in a nation's development? Do current paradigms yield sufficient interpretive power with regard to the global movement of researchers and knowledge? Do they offer the best basis for Australian research policy development in the global context? These are the questions we address in this background paper.

One of our broad arguments is that research policies on brain drain-gain and diaspora do not sufficiently consider the epistemological, ontological and ethical issues associated with internationally mobile researchers. A second main argument is that although ideas are immaterial (i.e. not made of matter) they do not float free of the material realities of global and regional power/knowledge geometries. A sympathy with the issues associated with such geometries needs to figure more prominently in the researcher mobility policies of nation-states and regions.

*Brain drain-gain*

Research policies framed by the notion of the knowledge economy (OECD 1996; Kenway, Bullen, Fahey with Robb 2006) have led most nations and regions into an intensifying competition for high calibre researchers (for example, the European Union's Seventh Research Framework Programme [FP7] 2007-2013). Concern is partly about 'brain drain' or 'gain' and the implications for the nation state's techno-scientific knowledge and innovation capacity and many individual countries show that this concern is linked to the increasing international mobility of the 'highly skilled' (Khadria 2004). The extent to which a nation-state is seriously affected by the global movement of the highly skilled depends on its position within global geometries of power and knowledge. There is in fact a 'brain drain' from many 'developing to developed' nations with little compensating 'regain' in terms of

people and knowledge for the so called 'sending' country. How such countries might benefit from the links with 'home' of those who have left and have not returned is thus a particularly pressing issue.

Much government 'brain drain-gain' policy arises from research on migration (Hugo 2007), labour mobility and markets, and on 'development' issues in the 'global South'. The bulk of the research is from the fields of economics and demography. The entry point is national economic growth and competitiveness and the reasoning is derived from 'human capital' theory. But underlying this dominant logic are less visible assumptions. The first is a form of zero-sum thinking in which one nation-state's loss is another's gain and this in turn is based on a view that relationships between nation-states are inevitably competitive. The 'brains' involved are not only a resource for the nation-state but in a sense they belong to it and can thus be lost to or gained by it. Here a definite relationship between social identities and the nation-state is claimed. This discourse also sees knowledge as embodied and territorial. Knowledge is contained within the brain, therefore when the body and brain leave a particular territory the knowledge leaves too. Within this rhetoric, relations therefore tend to be conceived in individualistic, instrumental, almost nationalistic ways.

### *Multifarious mobilities*

As the negative implications and inadequacies of the drain-gain equation are more fully realised, such notions are gradually being superseded, at least in the most developed countries. In an attempt to better grasp the movement of highly skilled individuals, in policy and research circles it has been argued that the term 'brain mobility' is a more appropriate concept. It is viewed as a more neutral term.

In terms of university researchers more specifically, those who adopt a brain mobility perspective recognise that there are different types of mobility. It is understood that researchers are on the move in many different ways and according to assorted durations. It is the longitudinal contextual factors that mark the differences between these forms of mobility. Some researchers are mobile some of the time, whilst for others, travel has become a routine part of their life: going backwards and forwards they are constantly mobile around the world. Here, the nation state is not seen as

either losing or attracting mobile researchers. Neither is the mobile researcher positioned as being either settled or on the move. Such either/or categorisations are seen as inadequate, for they fail to see that understandings of ‘home and away’ have become increasingly more complex and that many researchers are at home in motion.

Different understandings of the links between mobility and knowledge have also added complexity to this shifting ethno-scape (see Kenway and Fahey 2008). There has been a movement beyond the perception that knowledge, embodied in the brain of the mobile researcher, is either lost or gained.

Nation-states now typically try to maximise the benefits to knowledge of researcher mobility through such things as ‘knowledge transfer’, ‘exchange’ and ‘networks’. While, again, the main purposes of this are economic benefit, mobility is also promoted as a means to construct new spatialities and identities which, in turn, feed back into economic policies. Overall then, while it

***There are also other models, besides the sending and receiving model of migration: where people are not born in Australia, they come to Australia and are given opportunities here or they create opportunities here that they may not have been given where they came from, and then they go somewhere else. I mean the reason I came to Australia from the UK was to be closer to China, which worked. And when I go back to the UK I have a different professional status than I would have done had I not come here, and I have a particular professional status in China that I would not have if I were not an Australian. So people like me might have more – or different anyway - loyalty than people who were born here.***

**Stephanie H. Donald**, Professor of Chinese Media Studies, University of Sydney and Chair, College of Experts, Humanities and Creative Arts, Australian Research Council.

might be argued that these approaches are an advancement on those they have superseded, they nonetheless still tend to lack an adequate appreciation of the epistemological, ontological and ethical dimensions of the mobility process.

### *Deconstructing diaspora*

Researcher mobility policies also seek to exploit the ‘diaspora’. In general terms, the nation state’s perspective on brain drain is dependent upon its understanding of the term ‘diaspora’. Obviously the ways in which this term is understood have different inflections in the different discourses under discussion. Two Australian policy documents, *Diaspora: the world wide web of Australians* (2004) a Lowy Institute for International Policy report and *They Still Call Australia Home* (2005)

the Senate's inquiry report into expatriates, offer an understanding of diaspora based on the notion that expatriate communities who are living outside their home country continue to feel a strong attachment to it. This understanding implies that each person's cultural identity is primarily linked to one nation. Policy discourse is then exhorted to mobilise the loyalty that expatriates may feel towards their home nation as a means to project a contemporary national image offshore and as a way to sell the branded nation abroad. Both policy documents consider the issue of how to best tap into the Australian diaspora from numerous perspectives ranging across demographics, economics and public opinion and provide some suggestions as to how Australian institutions can use talent rich, asset rich and well networked expatriates to further national interests.

***Most expats I know have feelings that range from ambivalence via resentment to contempt for Australia. (I would put myself at the ambivalence end of the scale.) Of course one finds true-blue patriots abroad, but they are rarely true expats. They are long term tourists keeping their return tickets warm. They are rarely all that deeply embedded in their lives 'overseas'. But for the rest of us, it's not at all clear that we relish being regarded alternately as traitors to the homeland or as a potential 'resource' for advancing Australian interests. Perhaps we are neither. We are, simply, if only in part, Australians—a concept that must now be thought independently of the territory of the Commonwealth. It doesn't matter which side of the border one is on. It's neither here nor there. What matters is the tissue of relations connecting one side to the other.***

**McKenzie Wark**, Associate Professor of Media and Cultural Studies at Eugene Lang College and of Sociology at the New School for Social Research, New York.

How home is perceived and lived in relation to coming and going may not involve a diasporic sensibility. Practices of movement and displacement may reconstitute identifications in relation to home and elsewhere. In more specific terms, this restricted concept of diaspora ignores not only the heated debates over its meaning, but also the 'cartographies of diaspora' as discussed by Avtar Brah (1996). Those who subscribe to this narrow way of thinking about diaspora remain somewhat locked into a form

of methodological nationalism that shades into national self-absorption or even national narcissism. A somewhat parochial sensibility emerges in this context which imagines that the researcher diaspora can be conscripted in the interests of the home nation. But the extent to which mobile researchers can and will take on the role of enhancing the reputation abroad of their home countries and, in so doing, contribute to its national interests is an open question.

In our own research we have encountered another notion of diaspora, where researchers have left Australia because they felt, in effect, pushed out by bad institutional conditions in the universities. They therefore have mixed feelings about the nation, including anger and ambivalence. Thus there are no guarantees that the nation is, in fact, a primary source of identity and loyalty, and certainly researchers and research cannot necessarily be scripted accordingly. Such policy discourse needs to begin to understand the profound ambiguity some researchers may feel towards the nation and its institutional structures. It also needs to take into account the interests of other nations and other regions as well as the wider optics of the ‘*global public good*’ – complex as this notion is.

### *Ambivalent Australian-ness*

The assumption that there is a one-to-one relationship between territory, identity, identification and citizenship can no longer be sustained. The twenty-four Professors that we are interviewing in our study of Australia’s mobile researchers illustrate this. It is difficult to generalise about them as they are involved in various forms of mobility, but we might categorise their movements as follows: always on the move, going away and coming back, going and staying away, being away for short periods and going back and forth with shared international and Australian appointments. But it is usually the case that feelings of Australian-ness, un-Australian-ness or even anti-Australian-ness, are fluid and vary over time and place. People shade in and out of attachment and/or of feeling any sense of loyalty and responsibility to Australia and Australians. A snap shot at a point in time only tells part of a longer unfolding story. If, as in the cases of those who live overseas, there is a sense of distant attachment, or ambivalent Australian-ness this may be linked to such things as family, friends or landscape.

Indeed, most do not like to make a link between their nationality and their intellectual work, and most do not think of themselves as current or even erstwhile *Australian* intellectuals, academics or researchers – unless Australia is a specific object of inquiry as in the case, for example, of Australian history. One obvious question then is: ‘What is the link between their mobility, their research and their national or other identifications?’ Again, it is difficult to generalise but it is probably fair to say that most do not feel a diaspora-like loyalty and attachment to Australian

research per se or to the ‘national interest’ research agenda of Australia as a nation-state. Indeed, as indicated, some have felt pushed from behind by the directions taken by Australia’s university system. But most do feel a connection of some sort with their own epistemic community as it exists in Australia and overseas and many would be willing to make more of a contribution to that community there and here. Further, some feel a global sense of responsibility on such questions as migration, refugees, transport, education, Australia/Asia relationships, the social effects of neoliberalism and much more.

***It just seems to me that the end of expatriation may be an idea that operates for the extremely prominent Australianist Australians that live in the UK, but it doesn’t work for people such as Ien Ang and myself. And it doesn’t work because our generation still has many of us who left young enough to be only able to go back to that ‘leaving space’, –I don’t know what to call it any more, ‘motherland’ sounds ridiculous, to ‘home country’, well it hasn’t been home for so long— to be able to return to that space, only as a child and not as a professional. So, for Ien and myself, we are only professionals to the extent that we are expats, and we are only children when we go back to our own homes, for me that is India. So ‘expatriatism’, is a condition on which our international work is based, and this is still true of a very large number of people.***

**Krishna Sen**, Professor of Indonesian media and culture and Executive Director for Humanities and Creative Arts, Australian Research Council.

They may thus be likely to be willing to contribute to an agenda that speaks to Australia’s role as a national global citizen.

**Part Two:**  
**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

Australia invests a lot in training and developing researchers. Although it cannot stop them leaving, it can more creatively and generously consider how best to benefit from the researchers who leave for good, those who return and those who move back and forth

These times are characterised by growing sensitivity to cultural, social and political issues in the region and globe. Internationally mobile researchers in the social sciences and humanities are centrally involved in contributing to Australia's image abroad through their research on economics, society, culture, politics and human behaviour. Crucially, such researchers are also involved in interpreting the rest of the world to Australia. Researchers' interpretations are mediated through the cross border and cross sector connections they foster.

The effects of their mobility on them, on the knowledge they produce and distribute, the connections they sustain, and the ways these connections operate in such places as Singapore, Hong Kong, USA and UK are of interest to a wide range of communities within Australia and internationally.

These interests coalesce in the research policies Australia adopts. The Australian government needs to be well informed about researcher mobility issues around the world, and, given its geopolitical location, at the forefront of researcher mobility policy inventiveness in the global context.

## 1. Mobile Researchers

**1.1 Acknowledge that as international mobility increases, mobile researchers with various links to Australia do not necessarily see themselves as ‘Australian’ researchers. Policy makers might recognise this and explore the benefits of having ‘mobile scholars’ associated with Australia.**

‘Let me clarify the difference between a travelling Australian researcher and a migrant scholar who happens to work in Australia. For the former, Australia is the stable point of departure, from where international travel is envisaged as going ‘abroad’ or ‘overseas’, away from (and back to) the national home. For the migrant scholar however, mobility is a way of life, in spirit if not necessarily in physical reality, because there is no such thing as coming home. So, although I work *in* Australia, I don’t consider myself as *of* Australia. This isn’t because I am of or from a specific place elsewhere, but because my circulation through a number of places has made me define myself through a relatively autonomous stand towards place as such.’ *Ien Ang*

**1.2 Use mobility programs to contribute to Australia’s role as a global citizen.**

‘The notions of brain drain-gain, mobility and diaspora are simply not adequate for contemporary conditions where so many problems are manifest globally as well as regionally and cannot be addressed within the restricted logics of ‘national interest’. Singer’s and Gregg’s (2004: 15) discussion of the nation as a global citizen is particularly critical of narrow notions of the national interest and urges Australia to “take a broader and long term view” that fosters “an ethical framework for international relations and global cooperation”. This suggests a role for mobile researchers out side of universities themselves.

There is the potential for overseas and highly mobile researchers in the social sciences and humanities to play a state-sponsored advisory role to Australian governments. They would advise in their areas of competence particularly when it comes to such big global issues of the day as the environment, war and violence, poverty and refugees. Many are well placed to translate overseas cultural, social and political perspectives about such matters to Australians. If national reputation and being a good global citizen are important, then surely interpreting the rest of the world to

Australia is crucial. Not being immersed in the everyday of Australian politics, such people may not feel constrained about speaking critically of current Australian policies and practices.

An example from the UK points to one possible way such an exchange might occur. Called the 'Education Dialogues' (from the Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education – April 2006-11) these involve a series of high-level dialogues taking place in key regions around the world focusing on a specific area and bringing together groups of policy makers, senior managers and practitioners from the UK and overseas. Each dialogue is followed up by a jointly agreed action plan including research or other appropriate collaborations. Mobile Australian researchers could certainly be part of an ongoing program of forums modelled on the UK's Education Dialogues that are of significance to Australia's role as a good global citizen.' *Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway*

### **1.3 Generate more South-South research dialogues by encouraging regional researcher remits and mobilities.**

'From the perspectives of the brain drain-gain, brain mobility and diaspora discourses, the consequences of high skills mobility for nation-states or regions are understood largely in terms of narrow national economic self-interest. They are not usually considered in terms of the interests of other nation-states, regions, the 'global public good'; nor, indeed, other configurations of sociality such as the global power relationships between capital and labour, the global elite and their Others, the mobile and the immobile. This is not to say that all wealthy nation-states and regional blocs ignore the issue of brain drain or diaspora from the point of view of those nations or regions that suffer most from the loss of high skills and talent. Such losses do evoke expressions of concern.

But, the 'concerns' of such bodies as the European Union about the 'brain drain' from the South to the North have an aura of *noblesse oblige*. Their methods of responding usually gesture feebly to the problems associated with the global asymmetries of knowledge and power between and within the North and the South. Meanwhile as Tanner (2005: 4) indicates, 'brain drain' threatens 'the stability of entire countries'. It restricts the wellbeing and growth of many 'developing' nations, and their ability to sustain themselves as well as to compete with (over) developed nations. Such gestural concern can be read as self interested in global geopolitical terms. It can be seen as associated with

the privileged receiving nation-states' or regions' concern about counteracting the bad press of 'brain drain', about a concern for their reputation and security in a context of global instability and hostility. No nation-state benefits from being regarded as globally selfish. And it might be argued that peripheral but rich countries such as Australia need to be particularly concerned about their reputations in this regard and that they might do well to seriously consider the links between mobile researchers and national generosity towards those places from which they attract and keep research talent. But what might this entail?

Canada's Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) funding programs include the International Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) in Partnership with the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The program supports "the creation of alliances between community organizations and postsecondary institutions which will foster comparative research, training and the creation of new knowledge in areas of shared importance for the social, cultural or economic development of communities in Canada and in low- and middle-income countries" (2008 online). These research alliances are not just about economic profit; they do not involve a *noblesse oblige* mentality and neither are they 'aid'. They respectfully take into account economic disadvantage and in so doing engage the matter of unequal geographies of power/knowledge. They asks how mobility programs may be of real benefit to other low- and middle-income nation-states and how such non-state actors as transnational and national non-government organisations and civil society movements might also be involved.

As Raewyn Connell has argued in her book *Southern Theory* (2007), Australia needs to start to understand itself much more as part of the global South and to consider what this means intellectually. South-South research dialogues are crucial.

This points to the need to specifically encourage regional researcher remits and mobilities both of Australian researchers to Asia and of Asian researchers to Australia. Further, those Australian researchers who live and work in Asia and those who regularly travel to Asia for research purposes are well placed to help to generate such dialogues and to help interpret parts of Asia to Australian researchers and vice versa. But it also requires an acknowledgement that many countries in the

global South do suffer a ‘brain drain’ and that South-South dialogues would need to acknowledge this in very practical ways.’ *Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway*

#### **1.4 Develop ways whereby Australians can better contribute to Asian scholarly debates.**

‘New formations are possible in which Asian scholars familiar with Western debates and traditions of thought but firmly grounded in their own scholarly cultures and national education systems begin to formulate research agendas to which we can contribute as Australians.’ *Meaghan Morris*

#### **1.5 Better integrate resident Australian researchers into international research communities through the work of mobile scholars.**

‘Opinions vary on this but overall it seems Australian-based researchers would benefit from more integration but not assimilation in various international research circles. They would also benefit from gaining a better sense of how Australian research is regarded abroad. Equally it is important to illustrate to other countries around the world the possible research advantages of being on global peripheries of power/knowledge. It is possible that such positioning means that knowledge is either weighed down by the force of the powerful centres of knowledge or is regarded as irrelevant to them. However, it is equally possible that standpoints from the ‘edge’ may also have their own edginess – a fresh and energetic quality that arises from their distance.

A possible role for Australia’s overseas researchers in the social sciences and humanities might be to help to deepen the conversations and connections between those Australian researchers who continue to live in Australia and their international epistemological communities. An associated role might be to feed back to such Australian-based researchers, international views of research in Australia. Currently these roles tend to be undertaken on an informal one-to-one basis. The people we interviewed understood well the complex contours of ways of thinking in Australia and were similarly insightful with regard to the parts of the world they are currently living in. Australian research communities can always benefit from ‘insider-outside’ perspectives. Their important role as intellectual mediators and translators could be made more systematic. But this potential is not tapped as much as it might be. Several of those we interviewed indicated their surprise that they

have not been drawn upon more and also their willingness to be so. It is possible that a database of expertise could be developed of Australian researchers living overseas. From here, there are many possible ways of tapping their role as intellectual mediators and translators including return-visiting roles.' *Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway*

**1.6 Encourage those researchers who were originally from Australia but who now work in 'the global metropolises' to address questions associated with the unfair geopolitics of knowledge. Some questions are as follows.**

'How might a diasporic elite, or for that matter any dislocated individual or group, use their very dislocation to think about, and think into, peripheral spaces from the metropole in ways that avoid the current hegemony of talent wars or the baggage of past cosmopolitanism, and reveal, instead, the geopolitics of knowledges?'

How might our distant past places of location, and the inevitable dislocations that come with new places, reshape the way we think about and contribute to, the worlds where we are, and the worlds through which we have travelled?'

Is it possible to develop an ethic of place that is not reducible to nationalism, not susceptible to patriotism, not romanced as undivided global or local community, and not leveraged as 'talent'?'  
*Susan Robertson*

## **2. Networks and collaboration**

**2.1 Model mobility schemes on the specificities of social science and humanities research not on the sciences.**

'Why are sciences so much more prevalent and privileged in ARC figures on international research project than the social sciences and humanities? I think it is partly because the social sciences and humanities are so diffuse. We can't put in a fellowship application for someone who is going to go and work in X person's lab in Europe or the US. We need similar bridges in the social sciences

and humanities. These bridges are more than individual relationships. They are some kind of institutionalised structure, like a lab, which supports relationships and communication across space-time, which extends beyond the life of an individual researcher. We need to think about the kind of structures and cultures – perhaps conferences, projects, book collaborations – that can support

relationships and dialogical strategies that are used in our fields.’ *Terri Seddon*

***How can we best bring together researchers from different countries and backgrounds to work together on collaborative research projects? This should be answered in institutional terms – what institutional arrangements will give the best conditions for international research networks to flourish?***

**Gavin Jones**, Professor, Asia Research Centre, National University of Singapore

**2.2 Question assumptions about what ‘counts’ as academic research and collaboration and find ways to encourage researchers to work more with communities and social movements.**

‘Working with communities and social movements, doing politics, not just writing about politics from a

distance, is a legitimate research activity that has no place in current evaluations of academic outputs. Academics have the luxury and resources to work with ideas, to read articles and books, to access a whole range of possibilities that most people in community organisations or development organisations don’t have, and that gives us a reciprocal obligation. There is a whole set of new possibilities, that cut across national boundaries, across disciplines, across all the assumptions about what it is that academic research is about. There are new ways in which we can think about the sort of work we do and the contributions that we as academics can make to understanding and practice.’

*Dennis Altman*

**2.3 Redefine, support and encourage substantial collaboration and networks.**

‘Global forums, conferences and networks are good for meeting people and having great discussions in exotic places. And it should be said that sometimes, deeper research collaborations can come out of such networking. However, the effect of serial-superficial networking becoming the dominant form of global engagement and increasingly framing conferences and forums is that globalised networking tends no longer to ground research in face-to-face collaboration, anymore than it might be done via the Internet or reading other people’s work online. In this context,

networking and constantly moving between various global forums can become another version of fetishised mediated *interaction* and scholarly tourism rather than substantial *integration* with your fellow researchers in other places. In other words, globalising forums can be good, but only if they are conceived as developing something beyond networking for its own sake.

The ARC places a great emphasis on networking and it has put grants procedures in place to support this activity. To the extent that

we, as academics, are bound up with the status orientation of networking, travelling the global circuit becomes empty. Networking should be a background platform for doing something substantial and on the ground. We thus need a deepening of our processes of collaboration that cross spatial distance but also are sustained across time. We need to get beyond one-to-one self-oriented collaboration. This is not to argue against strong personal connections, but it is to suggest, using Meaghan

Speaking about international collaboration on ARC projects, Krishna Sen says:

***Collaboration with Asia is still relatively small. And Europe and North America, as you would expect, are the highest. So although we say a lot about the ways in which Australia's engagement with China is becoming more important, whilst it is becoming more important, it is still relatively low. And our engagement with the United States remains at the top of the range. The other issue here is the issue of language, and most of that collaboration is with countries where English is the predominant language. I wonder if this means in a changed global dynamic whether anglophonism is actually going to be a weakness in terms of collaboration*** (for ARC details on incidences of international collaboration in current projects allocation years 2004-2008 see **Appendix 2**).

**Krishna Sen**, Professor of Indonesian media and culture and Executive Director for Humanities and Creative Arts, Australian Research Council.

Morris' expression, that "seriously deep relations" need to be institutionalised and grounded, beyond one-to-one or self-projecting collaboration.' *Paul James*

#### **2.4 Help build knowledge capacity in emerging nations and institutions.**

'Australian universities could form long-term capacity building partnerships with research universities in neighbouring countries, e.g. Indonesia, the world's fourth largest nation with 220 million people, whose universities fall largely outside the fecund potentials of open source knowledge flows.' *Simon Marginson*

## 2.5 Develop mobility schemes that are more flexible.

‘There are numerous schemes that seem designed to get people to come back permanently – or at least semi-permanently, the schemes usually only last for four or five years. In the humanities at least it seems more fruitful to look for a more flexible approach, bringing people back for one to three months per year. The most valuable thing might be an ongoing network that can sponsor both people and ideas as they move in both directions, rather than head hunting certain big names whose heads might adorn the walls of Australian universities.’ *McKenzie Wark*

## 3 Institutional practices

***My argument is that if we are interested in moving ideas then we have to think about the bridges, and the kind of social, cultural, technological, organisational, institutional infrastructures which support those movements and on which they occur.***

**Terri Seddon**, Professor of Education, Faculty of Education, Monash University

### 3.1 Consider how the Learned Academies might internationalise.

‘The Australian Academy of the Humanities at present has about a tenth (forty in number out of a total Fellowship of 400 plus) of its Fellows who we call Overseas Fellows, members who give their main residential address as somewhere outside Australia. I believe that the Academy, like Australian universities generally, ought to be making much fuller use of all of

its overseas scholars, because the reality is that they are with us in some way, they are virtually with us. We shouldn’t treat them as expatriates, a word that I’d like to take right out of the lexicon.

More radically, I wonder how well the time honoured tradition of maintaining *national* Learned Academies actually matches up to the present realities of the global availability and interchange of knowledge in 2008. These national Academies for Sweden and Japan and China and Britain and America and Australia, on the whole, judging from the oldest of them, are products of nineteenth century nationalist thinking. But knowledge is not restricted to national boundaries, in the way that the Academies themselves still are. And I sometimes wonder if we should be thinking of ourselves much more as international bodies.

Interestingly the British government just last month has announced a thirteen million pound investment in a new scheme which it is administering through the British Academy, the Royal Society, and the Royal Academy of Engineering to create a new body of Newton Post Doctoral Research Fellowships which are available internationally, and we're encouraged to apply from this side of the world for Fellowships of that kind. The British Academy, I know, and the other Academies too, are beginning to think of themselves not necessarily as British bodies but as international bodies. In the same way that the British Museum now presents itself not as the British Museum but as the world's Museum, not only in the resources that it has but in the accessibility that it has for visitors from every part of the world. I hope that other national governments, including our own, will see this as a step worth following, I think that would be indeed a moving idea.'

*Ian Donaldson*

Commenting on Australian Studies Centres in Denmark and also talking about German scholars who study Australia, Ien Ang says:

***I found it a very rarefied experience to have these German, Danish and other European scholars talking about Australia. They are interested in Australia, so they do research on Australia, and sometimes Australians are invited to their conferences. And when they invite me I become an Australian (although I'm one of those people who doesn't want to identify as 'Australian' as such, I can still speak about Australia or from the point of view of some familiarity with Australia). The strange thing is that although their object of study is Australia, I did not get a sense of why they were interested in Australia, what I think would have to be the purpose of Australian Studies Centres and Initiatives. In my view Australian Studies abroad would have to lead to international exchange, and a much more dialogic engagement between Australian and European perspectives, or with Chinese and Indonesian perspectives in Asia. I have the impression that with a lot of those Australian Studies Initiatives, Australia becomes this exotic object of study looked at by people from other countries but with no sense of how that is placed in a broader multicultural, transnational context.***

**Ien Ang**, Distinguished Professor of Cultural Studies and founding Director of the Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney.

### **3.2 Reconsider the functioning and purposes of Australian Studies Centres.**

'Australia is now at a different time in its geopolitical history from that which, in the late 1970s, 80s and early 1990s, led to the flowering of such Australian Studies Centres as the Institute of Commonwealth Studies Centre in London. Australia is increasingly recognising its place in that

complex regional configuration known as the Asia-Pacific. This is, to some extent, reflected in the considerable number of Australia Studies Centres in the region<sup>2</sup>.

This raises questions about how Australia interprets itself to Asia, about the extent to which more Euro-centric traditions should continue to dominate Australian Studies. For as Hassam (2005) observes, Australian Studies “spring out of European philosophical and cultural traditions”. They “have shared and known starting points” with many places in Europe. He notes further that Australian Studies is stronger in the UK than on continental Europe due to the specificities of the shared history of Britain and Australia with regard to such activities as the export of convicts, migration and imperial history. But how does Australian Studies offer knowledge of Australia that is not dominated by colonial or post-colonial logics or, indeed, a colonising logic in the immediate region? Is Australian Studies sufficiently cognisant of Australia’s historical, cultural, political and social relationships with the various countries of Asia? What are the most suitable intellectual and cultural lineages and alliances for further exploring such matters?

Australian Studies Centres should explore new possible links to Asian Studies Centres. Significant Australian Studies Centres in parts of Asia could play a similar role and attract similar levels of government and other support to that of the Menzies Centre in Europe. Or a new kind of institution could be developed. More broadly, Australian Studies Centres around the globe need to have more than a ‘symbolic’ presence. They all need to have a ‘substantial’ presence. We must avoid the propensity to merely position Australia as an object of study within Australian Studies Centres. Rather, these Centres should have a more dialogic engagement between Australian perspectives and other nation-based perspectives. However, we also need to create dialogic engagement based not on national, but rather on transnational and comparative parameters.’

*Johannah Fahey and Jane Kenway*

---

<sup>2</sup> We acknowledge the need to question the whether such Centres have a substantial or merely symbolic role with regard to Australian Studies.

### **3.3 Support research centres in places where Australia has been involved as a regional nation.**

‘The Menzies Centre in London is an elite institution for making elite connections around an outmoded idea of national projection. We need to think about supporting centres in other places, for example, in Denpasar, Dili or Port Moresby – places that have no status in the knowledge economy whatsoever; places where we as Australians have been involved as a regional nation, but more than that places where we could actually see ourselves engaging with people as partners in the long term. For example, a cross-disciplinary Menzies Research Centre in Port Moresby for Local-Global Studies would have a very different complexion of intellectual collaboration than the current regime of providing aid money to our ‘failing neighbour’. We might also consider having a Centre that is located in Lake Condah (Australia) rather than Lake Como (Bellagio, Italy). Developing a knowledge centre for visiting scholars outside of the capital cities of Australia at say Yirrakala, Hamilton or Derby becomes important because part of the process of knowledge exchange involves concentrating on the local in the global and vice versa. Unless you are engaging locally as well as internationally, you are simply treating the Other as an exotica.’ *Paul James*

### **3.4 Better recognise the work of researchers on international research projects.**

‘A project like *Crosslife*<sup>3</sup> exists between established institutional spaces. Yet the complexity of that work basically means that the level of between-ness doesn’t get acknowledged or understood. The costs of that between-ness are intense, they include enormous workloads, they also include a whole set of problems in one’s home university about things like sociability: if you are there you can’t be here; if you are not here at Monash, in the workplace, you are not visible. Therefore there are social and academic/workload consequences. So some of the issues around this project work are really complex and there is a set of concerns that I have about the way this kind of mobility hollows out existing organisations and institutional spaces – and here, ‘existing’ means the place I depart from. I am referring to the hollowing out of my workplace, my university and research community in Australia.

---

<sup>3</sup> The aim of *Crosslife* is to consider Doctoral research training in a borderless higher education and research space. The key research question is: how can ‘academic apprenticeship’ be revitalised for transnational times? Five European universities and Monash have planned and recruited research students in a learning pathway, which includes three cross-national workshops: London, October 2007; Tampere, Finland, March 2008; and Malta, September 2008.

What would make a difference in the home university with regard to projects, which exist ‘between’ established institutional spaces? How does a university manage its ‘routine work’ (its budget, etc) with the dissipation and all-over-the-placeness of mobile work? The lack of recognition of any of this mobile work, the fact that it is absolutely invisible, is a major problem. Unless there is big funding or unless it brings in big student numbers, it doesn’t actually register in the university at all. There is a set of questions that needs to be considered about how within a project, but also how within a university, one might construct institutional arrangements to support ‘we’ building.’ *Terri Seddon*

### 3.5 Consider how, despite their differences, Australian universities might emulate the best aspects of the USA’s ‘distinctive graduate student culture’

‘In the US I became part of a distinctive graduate student culture – doing something that was

***I don't believe you can reform the 'status economy' from within just through a different metric system, research assessment exercise, or the like. Such exercises are simply messing around at the edges with what is a profound and framing, constitutive culture of intellectual practice at the moment. The status economy is not just concerned with the framing of status; it is tied into the contemporary framing of codification systems, rationalisation systems, and commodification systems.***

**Paul James**, Professor of Globalization and Director of the Globalism Institute (RMIT).

recognised by families, friendship networks, government, popular culture, and valued as a result. The energy was different from anything I had hitherto experienced – it was a completely unique habitus – to be excited by ideas was okay, to talk about ideas was okay, to ask questions about ideas was okay, to be an intellectual woman was okay.’ *Katherine Gibson*

#### 4. Institutional indicators, metrics & funding

4.1 Social science and humanities researchers should become better acquainted with the funding that is available and make better use of it.

‘The ARC's position is that it permits international collaboration under every one of its schemes. In the last eighteen months or so the ARC has been particularly focussed on removing from its funding rules any perceived impediments to international collaboration. The program called *Linkage International Fellowships* is specifically designed for scholarly exchange, it allows Australians to spend time abroad and allows foreign/overseas academics to spend up to a year in Australia. It may not be long enough to do the work that you need them to do, but it is there. In terms of disciplines, the humanities and social sciences (which reside in the Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences [SBE] and Humanities and Creative Arts [HCA] panels) are in the minority in the *Linkage International Fellowships* scheme. Australian social science and humanities academics are taking little advantage of this particular programme, which explicitly supports and pays for international mobility<sup>4</sup>.

I do think that academics and researchers in the humanities and social sciences need to think about what they are doing with the opportunities currently available to them through ARC funding and whether they are taking full advantage of it. And if they are taking advantage of it, are they managing their collaboration in ways that are fair and equitable, and in ways that best benefit international creation, innovation, creativity and international building of connections? And as far as I can tell from the figures (for ARC details on *Linkage International Fellowships* funded 2004-2007 by discipline group see **Appendix 3**), the humanities and social sciences are not doing the best job that they are capable of, and if we are not taking the best advantage of the current programs, it is very difficult to make an argument for special support for humanities and social sciences in these kinds of areas.’ *Krishna Sen*

---

<sup>4</sup> The Linkage International program is to be terminated and its functions incorporated into the ARC's larger scheme, such as Discovery and Linkage Projects.

#### **4.2 Consider global intellectual mobility as a subsidised right, not just as a possession of those privileged in the status economy.**

‘My argument is that knowledge flows are vectored by *status*. In the face of the novelty, contingency and complexity of open source, strong nations and institutions have devised *systems* that apply definition, simplification and closure. These are systems for making and distributing status. They create bordered fields, a scale of order and a standard of value. These systems are university rankings, citation metrics, journal hierarchies, the whole kit and caboodle of formal knowledge. In turn the rankings by whole-of-university and discipline area, and the array of publication and citation metrics, are now sliding almost seamlessly into government policies and their trajectories, the strategies of university managers, and the funding decisions of corporations, philanthropists and donors.

The status economy shapes research funding, general university funding, stratification between institutions, mergers and alliances, behavioural incentives and the determination of careers. With past performance and track record installed at the centre of these systems, stable reproduction is established. In sum, these systems superimpose a *status economy* across both the open source ecology and the IP markets and commercial knowledge goods. This status economy could never constitute a complete blanket. There are spaces for varied and alternative communities of practice. But there’s no denying it has reach.’ *Simon Marginson*

#### **4.3 Develop fair metrics and alternative indicators that reward open source knowledge.**

‘How can institutions *best* harness researcher mobility? In order to answer this question we have to also ask: in whose interests? For example, is it in the interests of researchers, local institutions, the global South or the global public good? I don’t have good new ideas here but various different moves are already in people’s minds, including the following.

We need to institute the fairest possible metrics of official science, controlling for different citation patterns and varying institutional size. Leiden University in the Netherlands is already doing this. We also need alternate indicators of status that open a broader range of knowledge goods to view

and to value. We need research and publication counts that include work done in languages other than English; higher valuation of non-science disciplines; and inclusion of monographs. All publication and citation metrics can be subjected to the question, “How well do they value path-breaking innovations?” Of course, there is no doubt that defining that is tricky.’ *Simon Marginson*

#### **4.4 Establish a series of qualitative indicators that recognise and reward long term international collaboration.**

‘I am arguing for engaged social theory: crossing both abstract and embodied processes. An ethics of engagement underpins these processes. Firstly, while short-term collaboration is always and should always be possible, engagement needs to shift its orientation back to the long-term. It needs to allow time for all the pain associated with a stickiness and consequence of being there; pain associated with the fact that your collaborators in other countries come to depend upon you, make claims against you, cause problems for you. Without a cultural re-orientation, such issues cannot adequately be supported by a staccato three-year funding model or within the dominant idea of the current university system that says ‘write the book and move on’.

Secondly, engagement should be dialogical. It should take the form of discussion-between; that is, of mutual development and exchange of knowledge – not knowledge about, ‘knowledge transfer’, or knowledge mining; not simply taking data from places and re-presenting it for the scholarly market as accredited publications. This alternative involves exchange of the kind we used to call ‘reciprocity’ or ‘gifting’. It needs to be negotiated. It needs to be negotiated in all sorts of ways across many boundaries, with those boundaries considered in their full complexity, ontologically and epistemologically. The boundaries will be complex because knowledge dialogue means actually talking about the nature of knowledge, rather than just treating it as data that can be moved around at will.

Thirdly, by the same argument, rather than treating scholars as people who can just move and be moved around, we (the scholarly entrepreneurs that we have turned ourselves into as part of the new world of the status economy) need to move carefully and with consideration of those with

whom we interact and integrate. Movement opens up many fine possibilities but it is not a good in itself.

We thus need to make different qualitative judgements about what the ARC is going to fund in the area of networking, centre development and ‘internationalisation’. In the extension of our global reach we need a funding regime that exists alongside elite funding regimes with different tests for providing support: Has the research been long-term and are the negotiations and relationships with the research partners real? Have there been visible signs of collaboration which goes beyond the public expression of publications by the Australian chief investigator? Has the research had consequences for what happens in places from local cultural communities to national governments and their policies? In short, it would be worth considering setting up a series of qualitative indicators to make a claim about the nature of engaged research and decide that instead of supporting only Centres of Excellence confined to Australia the ARC would support Centres of Long-term Collaboration.’ *Paul James*

#### **4.5 Properly acknowledge funding regimes and researchers’ working conditions in poorer countries.**

‘Funding institutions in wealthy countries need to begin to understand the constraints facing poorly-paid researchers in countries such as Indonesia, where without an honorarium to the university researcher, the project will likely be dropped in favour of another consultancy or commissioned research endeavour that will contribute to the researcher’s efforts to build a living wage by supplementing a highly inadequate basic salary.’ *Gavin Jones*

#### **4.6 Through funding, take seriously the intellectual value of trust, risk and uncertainty.**

‘If they are ever to be realistic in their own necessarily stringent managerial terms, mobility policies for Australian research in the humanities need now more than ever to keep in sight the productive intellectual value of such forces as trust, risk and uncertainty; we need practical ways to sustain them in intellectual life, and to keep cynicism at bay – in particular, for students and new researchers.’ *Meaghan Morris*

#### **4.7 Fund international research collaborations to enable them to be deep and consequential for all parties.**

‘Precisely in order to be accountable now, as well as for future generations, we need more flexible funding schemes, less insular in their institutional assumptions and their sense of what counts as a worthwhile outcome. We need more ways to fund real collaboration over time periods and at scales which are credible and *useful* for humanities researchers. By ‘real’ collaboration, I mean a relationship in which there is sustained movement back-and-forth, rather than a series of short-term or formalistic ‘links’. From such movement, new projects arise that would not have been imaginable before the collaboration began.’ *Meaghan Morris*

#### **4.8 Fund and support rich international experience for early career researchers (ECRs).**

‘We need to give new generations of ECRs much more time to learn in depth with their peers from other countries – in particular, time to get involved in the un-Australian everyday life of that large, intellectually ‘multicultural’ formation taking shape around us now. More scope for developing semester-long exchange systems would help with this, and so would giving ECRs encouragement and serious credit for longer-term, research capacity-building activities that do not immediately earn ‘points’ in the existing Australian system. Come to think of it, we older drained brains could also use a bit more of that.’ *Meaghan Morris*

## BIOGRAPHIES

**Dennis Altman** is Professor of Politics at La Trobe University. He first came to attention with the publication of his book *Homosexual: Oppression & Liberation* in 1972. This book, which has often been compared to Greer's *Female Eunuch* and Singer's *Animal Liberation* was the first serious analysis to emerge from the gay liberation movement, and was published in seven countries, with a readership which continues today. Since then Altman has written eleven books, exploring sexuality, politics and their inter-relationship in Australia, the United States and now globally. He was President of the AIDS Society of Asia and the Pacific (2001-5), and has been invited to lecture on AIDS and sexuality in countries across the world, including periods as a Visiting Professor at the University of Chicago and New York University. In 2005 he was Visiting Professor of Australian Studies at Harvard, and is a member of the Governing Council of the International AIDS Society and the Board of Oxfam Australia. He was made a Member of the Order of Australia in 2008. His recent books include: *51st State?* and *Gore Vidal's America*.

**Ien Ang** is the founding Director of the Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney. She has had the title of Distinguished Professor conferred on her by the University of Western Sydney in recognition of her outstanding research record and eminence. She is currently an ARC Professorial Fellow and is one of the leaders in cultural studies worldwide, with interdisciplinary work spanning many areas of the humanities and social sciences. Her books, including *Watching Dallas; Desperately Seeking the Audience* and *On Not Speaking Chinese*, are recognised as classics in the field and her work has been translated into many languages, including German, Korean, and Spanish. Her most recent publication is *The SBS Story: The Challenge of Cultural Diversity* (UNSW Press, 2008), with Gay Hawkins and Lamia Dabboussy.

**Stephanie Hemelryk Donald** is Professor of Chinese Media Studies at the University of Sydney. She also sits on the Australian Research Council's College of Experts as the Chair of the Humanities and Creative Arts Panel (2008). Her research focuses on the social and political impact and import of visual politics, with specific interests in film, children's media, gendered experience,

China and internationalisation. She is the author of *Public Secrets, Public Spaces: Cinema and Civility in China* (2000); co-author of *The State of China Atlas* (second edition, 2005). Her book on children's film culture, *Little Friends: Children's Film and Media Culture in China*, was also published in 2005. She edited *Media in China: Consumption, Content and Crisis* (with Michael Keane and Yin Hong, 2002) and is the foundation editor of the Routledge-Curzon book series *Media, Culture and Social Change in Asia*. Her current work examines the articulation of new class structures in global contexts (particularly urban China), organisational histories of Australian Muslim women, and grounded cosmopolitanism in the Asia Pacific. Her most recent books are *Tourism and the Branded City: Film and Identity on the Pacific Rim*; *Global Media Studies: Theories and Approaches*; *Branding Cities: Cosmopolitanism, Parochialism, and Social Change* and *Pocket China Atlas*.

**Ian Donaldson** is President of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. He was Professor of English at the ANU from 1969 to 1991, and also served as the first Director of the Humanities Research Centre (HRC) at the Australian National University (ANU) from 1974 to 1990 and had a return stint there from 2004 to 2007. He has been Regius Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature at the University of Edinburgh (1991-5), Grace 1 Professor of English Literature (1995-2002), Fellow of King's College (1995-), and foundation Director of the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities (2001-3) at the University of Cambridge. His books include studies of Jonson and Shakespeare, Renaissance comedy, modern European drama, the practice of biography, the rape of Lucretia, and early views of the Australian Aborigines. With David Bevington and Martin Butler, he is a General Editor of *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, to be published by Cambridge University Press in 25 volumes in 2009. He is a Consultant Editor (literature 1500-1779) for *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, and is completing a book on the life of Ben Jonson, to be published by Oxford University Press in 2009.

**Johannah Fahey** is a Research Fellow at Monash University. She has a PhD in cultural studies from Macquarie University. She is interested in poststructuralist theories of language and textuality; postcolonial models of subjectivity, corporeality and ethnicity; mobility and globalisation; and contemporary Australian visual arts. Her latest co-authored book is *Haunting the Knowledge*

*Economy*. Her earlier book is *David Noonan: Before and Now*. Her new co-edited book is *Globalizing the Research Imagination*.

**Katherine Gibson** is a Professor of Human Geography in the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at the Australian National University. Her research involves rethinking economic concepts in the light of feminist, poststructuralist and class process theory. She has a strong commitment to action research with communities interested in reconstituting economic practices in place. She shares a collective authorial presence as J.K. Gibson-Graham with her long-term collaborator Professor Julie Graham. Books include: *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy* and *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Her coedited books include *Class and Its Others; Re/presenting Class: Essays in Postmodern Marxism; Postmodern Cities and Spaces*.

**Paul James** is Director of the Global Cities Institute (RMIT), an editor of *Arena Journal*, and on the Council of the Institute of Postcolonial Studies. He has received a number of awards including the Japan-Australia Foundation Fellowship, an Australian Research Council Fellowship, and the Crisp Medal by the Australasian Political Studies Association for the best book in the field of political studies. He is the author or editor of 19 books including with Tom Nairn, *Global Matrix: Nationalism, Globalism and State-Terror* (2005) and *Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism: Bringing Theory Back In*, published by Sage Publications in 2006.

**Gavin Jones** is Professor at the Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore. He was previously Head of the Division of Demography and Sociology, Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University. His research interests cover a wide field, focusing particularly on population policy, the relationships between population growth and economic development, urbanization, marriage and divorce, fertility determinants, and the demographic aspects of educational trends and labour markets. His geographic focus is on Southeast and East Asia, particularly Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand.

**Jane Kenway** is Professor of Education at Monash University and is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Social Sciences. Her research expertise is in the politics and sociology of educational change in the context of wider social, cultural and political change. Her more recent jointly written books are *Masculinity Beyond the Metropolis* (Palgrave, 2006), *Haunting the Knowledge Economy* (Routledge, 2006) and *Consuming Children: Education-Advertising-Entertainment*, (Open University Press, 2001). Her more recent jointly edited books include *Globalizing the Research Imagination* (Routledge, 2008), *Innovation and Tradition: the Arts and Humanities in the Knowledge Economy* (2004) and *Globalising Education: policies, pedagogies and politics* (2005) (both Peter Lang).

**Simon Marginson** is a Professor of Higher Education in the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne. He is Fellow of the Australian College of Education (FACE) and a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences Australia. He works in two domains: higher education studies with emphasis on policy and history, and comparative and international education. Currently he is working largely on issues of globalisation and higher education, with reference to political theory and global sociology and political economy. His most recent book is the edited collection *Prospects of Higher Education: Globalization, market competition, public goods and the future of the university*.

**Meaghan Morris** is a figure of world stature in the field of Cultural Studies and she has just completed a four-year term as Chair of the international Association of Cultural Studies (ACS). A Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities and a former ARC Senior Fellow, she divides her time between the Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney and Lingnan University, Hong Kong, where she has been Chair Professor of Cultural Studies since 2000, coordinating the Kwan Fong Cultural Research and Development Program there since 2003. Her books, including *The Pirate's Fiancée: Feminism, Reading, Postmodernism*; *Too Soon Too Late: History in Popular Culture*, and *Identity Anecdotes: Translation and Media Culture*, focus on the role of the media and popular history in forming public cultures.

**Susan Robertson** is a Professor of Sociology of Education in the Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol. Susan's academic career has spanned four countries - Australia, Canada, New Zealand and England. In 1999 Susan took up a post at the University of Bristol where she also set up the first centre of its kind in the UK - the Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies (GES). Along with her colleague Roger Dale, she is founding editor for the journal *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. Susan has held major competitive grants from the ESRC and the European Commission around knowledge and the new economy. She is a senior researcher in the recently established ESRC Research Centre, Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies (2008-2012), senior policy advisor on the social aspects of education for the European Commission, advisor to the UK Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills, the Department for International Development, and expert advisor to UNESCO and UNDP. Her current area of research and publishing is on globalisation, global governance, state formation, and the development of knowledge-based economies.

**Terri Seddon** is a Professor of Education, Monash University. Her research in politics of education and educational work is anchored in Australian and European networks. She is a founding convenor in Policy Studies and Politics of Education network at European Conference on Education Research and coordinator of Crosslife (SOCRATES). She is currently examining globalisation, working life and politics in human services work with colleagues from Finland and Germany. Recent books include: *Education Research and Policy: Steering the Knowledge-Based Economy* (with J.Ozga and T.Popkewitz), *Reshaping Australian Education* (with L.Angus). She is series editor of *World Yearbook of Education* with Professors Jenny Ozga (Edinburgh), Agn s van Zanten (CNRS, Paris) and Gita Steiner-Khamsi (Teachers College Columbia). Terri has been research assessor for the European FP6 and ARC, and is Fellow of the Australian College of Education.

**Krishna Sen** became Executive Director for Humanities and Creative Arts at the ARC in March 2007. She will take up the position of Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Western Australia in January 2009. A fellow of the Academy of Humanities, Sen is internationally recognised as one of the most significant scholars of Indonesian media and culture.

Her works include *Indonesian Cinema: Framing the New Order* (1994), *Gender and Power in Affluent Asia* (co-edited with Maila Stivens, 1998), *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia* and *The Internet in Indonesia's New Democracy* (co-authored with David Hill 2000 and 2005).

**McKenzie Wark** is Associate Professor of Media and Cultural Studies at Eugene Lang College and of Sociology at the New School for Social Research, New York. His research interests include media theory, new media, critical theory, cinema, music, and visual art. He has authored a number of books, including *A Hacker Manifesto* and *Gamer Theory*.

## APPENDIX 1:

### Conference Program

#### **Tuesday 22 July**

6:00-6:15pm Conference to be opened by Professor Ian Donaldson, President of the Australian Academy of the Humanities.

#### 6:15-7:00pm **Session one: Opening Address**

*I hear motion', but what's moving?': Sceptical notes on academic mobility in the Asia-Pacific region*

Meaghan Morris (University of Western Sydney/Lingnan University, Hong Kong)

#### **Wednesday 23 July**

#### **Session two: International Policies on Researcher Mobility**

This session involves an overview of and commentary on government policies on international researcher mobility.

9:00- 9:30 *Brain drain or mind-shift?': reconsidering policies on researcher mobility*

Jane Kenway and Johannah Fahey (Monash University)

9:30-9:45 Krishna Sen, Executive Director of the Humanities and Creative Arts at the Australian Research Council will respond.

9:45-10:00 Open discussion about government policies.

#### **Session three: Institutional Practices**

This session considers the ways in which institutions (universities, research centres) do and can best harness researcher mobility.

10:00-10:20 *The sticky fluidity of knowledge work*  
Simon Marginson (University of Melbourne)

10:20-10:40 *Instituting Local-Global Research in a World of Destabilizing Mobility*  
Paul James (RMIT)

10:40-11:00 Open discussion about ideas and suggestions for institutions.

**11:00-11:30 *Morning tea***

#### **Session four: Research Networks**

This session considers how researcher networks operate in practice and are framed in relation to broader institutional and governmental policies.

11:30-11:50 *Research networks in Asia, Australia and beyond: do institutional practices help or hinder?'*  
Gavin Jones (National University of Singapore)

11:50-12:10 *EU researcher networks and mobility: cross-border challenges and institutional practices*  
Terri Seddon (Monash University)

12:10-12:30 Open discussion about ideas and suggestions for research networks  
**12:30-1:30 Lunch**

**Session five: Researcher Mobility from Disciplinary Perspective**

Panel members consider the implications of researcher mobility for themselves and their particular disciplines.

1:30-2:50 *The Geographies of Global Sex*  
Dennis Altman (La Trobe University)

*Mobilising Hybridity*  
Ien Ang (University of Western Sydney)

*Deconstructing core-periphery relations in Human Geography: J.K. Gibson-Graham's place-based internationalism*  
Katherine Gibson (Australian National University)

*Austropolians*  
McKenzie Wark (Eugene Lang College and the New School for Social Research, New York City)

2:50-3:15 Open discussion  
**3:15-3:30 Afternoon tea**

**3:30-4:30 Session six: Plenary Address**

*'Moving Ideas, Sticky Places': Stories of Centres and Margins, Projects and Power*  
Susan Robertson (University of Bristol)

4:30-5:00 Open discussion and closing remarks

## APPENDIX 2:

**Figure 1.1**

Incidences of international collaboration in current ARC projects allocation years 2004-2008: Top 12

Note: Collaboration does not indicate mobility per se.

<b>Country</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Share in 2007</b>
<b>United States</b>	1054	1273	1391	1446	1321	23.9%
<b>United Kingdom</b>	626	793	874	914	833	15.1%
<b>Germany</b>	376	428	470	473	422	7.8%
<b>France</b>	276	300	324	319	291	5.3%
<b>Canada</b>	231	291	333	339	323	5.6%
<b>Japan</b>	240	290	312	310	265	5.1%
<b>China (PR)</b>	147	169	195	214	196	3.5%
<b>New Zealand</b>	121	160	182	191	166	3.2%
<b>Italy</b>	116	156	172	162	142	2.7%
<b>Netherlands</b>	126	132	157	152	134	2.5%

Source: Australian Research Council (2008)

## APPENDIX 3:

**Figure 1.2**

*ARC Linkage International Fellowships* funded 2004-2007 by discipline group

The ARC discipline clusters are: Humanities and Creative Arts [HCA]; Engineering and Environmental Science [EES]; Social, Behavioural and Economic Science [SBE]; Biological Sciences and Biotechnology [BSB]; Physics, Chemistry and Geoscience [PCG]; Mathematics, Information and Communication Science [MIC].

<b>Discipline Group</b>	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>BSB</b>	1	2	4	6
<b>EES</b>	2	6	4	13
<b>HCA</b>	1	2	1	3
<b>MIC</b>	2	3	3	9
<b>PCG</b>	4	5	6	20
<b>SBE</b>	1	1	2	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	11	19	20	58

Source: Australian Research Council (2008)

## REFERENCES

- Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, London and New York: Routledge.
- British Council (2008) *Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education – April 2006-11*, [available at <http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-pmi2-policy-dialogues.htm>] – last accessed 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2008.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2005) *They still call Australia home: Inquiry into Australian Expatriates*, 8 March, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory: the Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*, Cambridge: Polity.
- European Union (2008) *Seventh Research Framework Programme [FP7] 2007-2013*, [available at [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html)] – last accessed 8<sup>th</sup> September, 2008).
- Fullilove, M. & Flutter, C. 2004 *Diaspora: the world wide web of Australians*, Lowy Institute for International Policy, NSW Australia, Longueville Media.
- Hassam, A. (2005) *Australian Studies in Europe*, [available at <http://www.inasa-home.net/>] – last accessed 29<sup>th</sup> August, 2008.
- Hugo, G. (2007) *Issues and Options for Enhancing the International Mobility of Researchers –an Australian perspective*, paper prepared for OECD Committee for Scientific and Technological Policy (CSTP) and Steering and Funding of Research Institutions (SFRI) Workshop on *The International Mobility of Researchers*, IEA, Paris, 28th March.
- Kenway, J. & Fahey, J. (Eds) (2008) *Globalizing the Research Imagination*, London: Routledge.
- Kenway, J., Bullen, E., Fahey, J. with Robb, S. (2006) *Haunting the Knowledge Economy*, International Library of Sociology, London: Routledge.
- Khadria, B. (2004) 'Human Resources in Science and Technology in India and the International Mobility of Highly Skilled Indians', *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers*, 2004/7, OECD Publishing.
- OECD 1996 *The Knowledge Economy. Science, Technology and Industry Outlook*, Paris, OECD.
- Singer, P. & Gregg, T. (2004) *How Ethical is Australia? An examination of Australia's record as a global citizen*, Melbourne: Black Inc.
- Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 2008, *International Community-University Research Alliances (CURA)—in Partnership with the International Development Research Centre (IDRC)*, [available at: [http://www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program\\_descriptions/cura\\_idrc\\_e.asp](http://www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program_descriptions/cura_idrc_e.asp)] - last accessed 29<sup>th</sup> August, 2008).
- Tanner, A. (2005) *Brain drain and beyond: returns and remittances of highly skilled migrants*. Global Migration Perspectives No. 24 (Geneva, Global Commission on International Migration)

