ASEM: Regionalisation and Higher Education
‘Policy Travel’ between Europe and Asia

Introduction

The Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) was constituted in 1996 as an informal inter-regional forum for developing dialogue and cooperation, and fostering understanding between the European Union (EU) and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). The end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the dominance of North America, the EU’s increasing power and the raising importance of Asia in the new world order all contributed to the genesis of ASEM connecting the two ‘old world’ continents of Asia and Europe (Yeo 2002, 2003). After almost two decades ASEM has expanded rapidly from 25 to 51 members consisting of 27 EU, 2 EEC member states and 10 ASEAN, 3 ASEAN+3 countries and 7 other Asian countries, the European Commission and ASEAN Secretariat. Beside political and economic issues, education has received increasing attention since the 2000s and has become an important and strategic act of cooperation by ASEM Education Ministers (Dang 2013). ASEM has also developed from summit meetings and policy talks at rhetorical level into processes, such as the ASEM education process involving different actors ranging from ministers, senior officials and technical experts to university rectors, academics and students, encompassing a wide range of concrete initiatives. Central to this ASEM Education Process is the exchange of ideas for higher education (HE) reform policies and collaborative projects at regional level. (see diagram 1: ASEM Architecture).

The European Union is interested in Asia as a strategic region within which to realise its Lisbon competitiveness agenda by winning ‘minds and markets’, namely recruiting talented students, developing joint curriculum, funding joint research, as well as synchronising Asian higher education systems with the Bologna Process (Robertson 2008). Emphasising that ASEM is a forum for dialogue and open exchange, the EU presents the Bologna Process, not as a ready-made model for transfer to Asia, but as a work-in-progress in Europe whose relevance to Asia is up for discussion; ideas are floated, good practices are shared, and all voluntarily engage in shaping the outcomes.

Many Asian countries have also been monitoring the Bologna Process closely and become partners in the Bologna Policy Forums. But there is little known about Asia’s agendas. It appears that the ten core ASEAN countries are inspired by the EU’s model of common market and harmonised regional HE area to build its ASEAN Economic Community by 2015. One of the blueprints is free movement of skilled labour, which requires better understanding national...
education and qualifications systems across the region. It seems that ASEAN looks for a way to increase convergence and build regional identity while retaining the distinctiveness of each country’s HE sector. As this ASEAN regional project evolves, the newly adopted linguistic jargons of higher education in Asia may strongly resemble the Bologna Process but also mask quite substantial differences. Furthermore, although ASEAN ministerial officials and rectors participate in ASEM meetings in their national and individual capacity, in practice they often act along regional lines and share issues of common interest. This raise important question on how policy transfer takes place trans-regionally in the globalising world.

Problem Formulation and Research Aims

Most discourses about ‘globalisation and education’ in Western literature often describe ‘education policy transfer’ between European and Asian systems as asymmetric power relations, neo-colonialism or economic imperialism with reference to the conquest and submission in the past (Clarke 1997; Robertson 2008). Such models of policy transfer focus narrowly on economic terms and omit cultural, intellectual and academic exchanges. They are abstract, aggregate and unable to take into account the actual style and substance of dialogue, mutual influence in the ASEM education meetings. Obtaining an in-depth understanding of the processes of multi-layer interactions at regional, national (ministry) and institutional (university) levels and other key actors (regional organisations and individuals) is vital for theorising policy travel.

This study aims to contribute to the current debates on policy travel and advance understandings of processes of policy transfer by identifying European and Asian key actors, exploring ethnographically how ASEM meetings serve as forum for discussing and extending the Bologna Process trans-regionally, examining the relationship between the exchange of cultural ideas and economic interests, and the interrelationship between ASEAN group’s engagement in the ASEM education agendas and their negotiations in their changing regional context.

Literature Review and Theoretical Approach

The three schools of thought about policy travel underpinning this study are: Educational Policy Borrowing and Lending; Common World Society, and Critical Grammar of Education Policy Movements. Each of these has some strengths, which will be drawn upon in formulating the theoretical foundation for this study, but they also reveal weaknesses that have to be addressed.

First, the Educational Policy Borrowing and Lending approach (Cowen 2000, 2006, 2007; Phillips 2004, 2006; Steiner-Khamsi 2002, 2004, 2012) claims that nation states borrow from each other multiple models of education – in a process variously termed policy borrowing, policy lending, policy transfer, policy learning, policy diffusion, policy attraction. Although terminology and focus
may vary, these studies are concerned with the process by which policies and ideas in one political system are used to develop policies in another system. This approach views policy as a broadly rational process linking problems and solutions, where policy makers draw positive and negative lessons across time and space between states. The scholars of this approach often describe policy borrowing as processes of transfer (space-gate moment with politics of attraction), translation (shape-shifting), and transformation (involving resistance and re-appropriation, as well as accommodation) (Cowen 2006) with reference to cases in post-colonial perspective (Philips 2006). Recently more work has been done to show that policy borrowing could also be a transient process subject to external funding, for example the import of a particular reform package as the conditionality for receiving grants or loans (Steiner—Khamsi 2012). Although this body of literature touches upon the political and economic reasons for policy borrowing and lending, it still limits to the view that sees policies are transferred from the wealthy to the developing world, policy borrowing in developing countries are coercive. The economic gains that drive policy lending and borrowing have been neglected. It also operates at a high level of aggregation and generality, which is insufficient to examine details on what is happening in ASEM, which members are ‘developing’ and ‘developed’, who ‘borrows’ what and why. Such developments – for example the establishment of consortia of ASEAN+3 universities in Campus Asia coordinated by Japan (Mori, 2012) and the EU Window Scholarship scheme offered by the Chinese Government to students and scholars of EU member countries (MoE, 2013) – are new policies. Hence, the ASEM meetings actually produce new policies and do not just ‘transfer’ or ‘borrow’ policies from elsewhere.

Second, the Common World Society approach (Meyer et al., 1992, 1997, 2000) argues that worldwide cultural and associational processes spread Western educational models and curricula rapidly and homogeneously across societies, irrespective of a country’s location, level of development, religious or other traditions. In this view, education policies and even the formation of states are shaped by supranational sets of norms, values, ideology and culture. Nation states are embedded in this environment and, consequently, strive for world-level legitimisation (Schriewer, 2012). The actors in the society – individuals, organisations and nation states alike – have to be seen both as embedded in a world-level cultural environment and as scripted by the models of reality and the universal rules. This approach argues that it is not individual actors who make up society, but it is the cultural environment that constitutes those actors who are considered legitimate. Hence, the World Society scholars highlight the global institutionalisation of ‘myth’ and ‘model’ through intensifying diffusion processes and multi-level communicative networks. This approach might be helpful in explaining the convergence and harmonisation of HE systems in the Bologna signatory countries. However, it does not explain whether convergence is an end of policy transfer or a means to other political outcomes (e.g. creating a common market of HE).
Furthermore, the concentration on convergence would mean that other forms and outcomes of the relationship between globalisation and higher education are neglected (Dale and Robertson, 2012). This point will be elaborated further in the next section.

Yet, with their focus on how features of a world polity are forged in international forums, the World Society scholars do not pay attention to local factors. If this approach is applied to ASEM, it raises questions about how to establish the precise effects of a common Bologna HE model or set of norms in a particular country in ASEM, especially in Asian non-Bologna countries (except Russia- the only Asian country in ASEM has the Bologna membership) and how the constructed actors (e.g. nation-state) whose legitimisation derives from being embedded in a universalist cultural environment negotiate with their own value system in their local context.

The World Society scholars see both nation state and education as intrinsic features of the world polity that undermine national needs and problems. This theoretical approach can only partly explain ASEM because on the one hand ASEM promotes interest convergence among member countries, while on the other hand it recognises the differences between them. However, more efforts have been put into demonstrating institutional socialisation on at regional and inter-regional levels in ASEM.

This socialisation process is defined by the constructivist literature as the process by which actors acquire different identities, leading to new interests though regular interactions within broader social contexts and structures (Bearce and Bondanella, 2007). In their studies of international socialisation theory, Bearce and Bondanella (2007) identified ‘joint structured inter-governmental organisation membership’ as a key factor for associational process among member countries. This process often takes time and has two types of socialisation. The first type is relatively shallow and describes the situation in which an actor simply learns to play by the rules of a new social context and does not necessarily change their interests. ASEAN is a good example of this type. The second type of socialisation is deeper and refers to the situation in which actors take on a new identity leading to a demonstrable change in their interests over time. This type is reflected in the EU. The trend of European countries becoming more convergent in many fields or sectors is due to the fact that the EU sets norms, invests money, gives benchmarks, and creates a certain impetus to develop similarities. In the inter-regional context of ASEM, at a macro level the socialisation process is affected by not only membership but also other factors, such as bilateral trade, relative economic development, size, geographical distance and colonial relationship. One important feature of the informal ASEM process is that socialisation effects emerge not always at the state level, rather at individual actor level. This especially holds true in the ASEM education process because, when working together, scientists and professionals have the authority to assimilate, develop common understanding, and produce rationalised and universalistic
knowledge. For example, the ASEM rectors convene to share knowledge on governance and management of universities, new accountability culture, quality assurance in HE, the role of the university in educating the global citizen, and the contribution of ASEM universities to the global knowledge society through research cooperation (ASEM Rectors 2008, 2010, 2012). The ASEM Lifelong Learning Hub’s university researchers work together to produce and disseminate new knowledge on lifelong learning, to advance scholarship through sharing perspectives, to enhance the research capacity of partner universities and to increase mutual understanding. In this sense, the process of assimilation and planetary fusion is exceptionally well facilitated by ASEM’s various expert groups, which are devoted to specific bodies of knowledge, but its ultimate aims include the broad development of societies. Such honourable aims also give ASEM the power to convince countries and people to be associated.

Third, the Critical Grammar of Education Policy Movement approach (Dale and Robertson, 2012; Robertson and Dale, 2014), based on the example of the Bologna Process going global, sees the concept of policy transfer in wider globalising contexts and social relations that frame, construct, circulate, receive, contextualise, materialise and institutionalise political projects in education.

The authors pointed out that the majority of studies on policy transfer appear to focus narrowly on the idea of convergence as the end result of a process of policy change over a period of time with little attention to wider consequences or other forms and outcomes of the relationship between globalisation and education. For instance the nature and bases of education policy in an era of globalisation. Therefore the Critical Grammar of policy movement approach examines the “relational, dialectical and co-constitutive nature [of policy transfer]. This means placing education policies into a series of contexts - from the production of the policy to its movement and new point of fixity - and that these contexts are themselves understood, not as neutral backdrops or convenient launch and landing places, but as co-constitutive….The question that needs posing here is: what kind of work does ‘policy transfer’ do in constituting social relations and in realising powerful political projects”. (original emphases, Dale and Robertson, 2012:13).

The Bologna Process is a good example of such political project which was able to move across cultural, political and economic contexts and was institutionalised in a new space by a number of key actors and scales of action. This sets a task for this study to find out what political projects are powerful and influential behind the ASEM Education Process. Seen from this critical approach, ASEM seems not to aim for convergence of policy between Asia and Europe given the complex diversity of 49 members, although three out four items on the agenda look as if they are taken directly from the Bologna: 1) Quality assurance and recognition; 2) Engaging business and
industry in education; 3) Balanced mobility. Perhaps new dynamics of regionalism may emerge and co-constitute new policies.

In contrast with the ‘policy diffusion’ concept of the Common World Society approach, that neglects the role of agent, Critical Grammar argues that “globalisation’s relationship with national education systems do not just ‘happen’ [as the word ‘diffusion’ suggests]… It has to be actively brought about” (ibid:11). Clearly this approach not only highlights the role of agency but also looks deeper into the question of how global changes created opportunity structures for intervention in national education policy making, what practical and theoretical means that made policy travel. The authors name it as ‘logics of intervention’ and ‘means of intervention’ or in other words, the ‘underlying reasons and resources’ offered to the subjects that generate change. They also point out that the logics of the Bologna Process as an intervention are enhancing competitiveness and increasing mobility of labour and the attractiveness of European higher education. The underlining reason is to improve Europe economically. Furthermore the Bologna Process could also be seen as a means of intervention for its mode of implementation operates “through a form of ‘soft law’ offering its members reasons and resources that will enable them to generate change in individually distinct but collectively mutually attuned ways” (ibid:11), which in turn will contribute to the process of regionalisation. In their various publications (Dale and Robertson, 2002; Dale, 2005; Robertson and Keeling, 2007; Robertson, 2008), Dale and Robertson have argued that regions are shaped and reshaped through the process of interventions. Such formation of global regions could be seen as a tools for facilitating students mobility as well as a mechanism for creating global trade in HE.

Beside this economic motivation, the authors of this critical approach also suggest to examine a wider range of the logics of intervention that drive education policy movement. For instance, region-building, foreign policy and cultural exchange are seen as avenue for educational interventions. They also offer useful concepts to distinguish between process, outputs and outcomes of such interventions. Process is a means through which intended or unintended outputs may or may not be effectively produced. Outcomes are the intended or unintended achievements of outputs, whereas output is a specific intended goal of a policy, for example to improve school performance in Mathematics or to increase number of foreign students recruited to a local university. Outcomes are often wider and longer term goals of a policy. From this explanation, Bologna process leads towards a set of outcomes: a stronger Europe, a more united Europe, a bigger share of the international HE market, a global presence of Europe. Therefore the logics of interventions apply essentially to outcomes rather than outputs. To gain a deeper understanding of this logic of intervention, this study will investigate how the idea of using educational exchanges as foreign policy tool in ASEM by examining the concepts and practices of ‘Normative Power Europe’
(Haugen 2013, Manners 2002, 2006) and ‘Soft Power China’ in shaping people’s preferences and affinity. As Figueroa (2010) observes the Bologna Process was used a hegemonic tool of Normative Power Europe in Chilean and Mexican higher education. Referring to the work of Gramsci in analysing Western capitalism and revolutionary strategy in Western Europe, Fairclough (1995:76) explain the concept of hegemony as “leadership as well as domination across the economic, political, cultural and ideological domains”. He further points out that hegemony is about “constructing alliances and integrating rather than simply dominating”. This technology of power could be seen in the style of interactions at the ASEM rectors conference when different universities (older and newer) discuss issue of governance (including autonomy and quality assurance) and seek their partners. In the Bologna and now ASEM there seems to be a process to restructure hegemony with the breakdown of divisions between institutional types as a social practice that continue to persist. This issue is more acute in Asian part of the ASEM where the distinction/division of new and old or private and public universities is ambiguous.

For region-building project in Europe education especially the Bologna Process plays an important part, evidently with the establishment of European Higher Education Area, European Research Area and European Qualifications Framework. The ASEAN has been making attempt to ‘borrow’ this regional policy and at the same is in the flux of different influences and ideas. While Europe offers its expert knowledge and raise ASEAN’s interest in the Bologna ideas as a way to organise their HE systems along European lines, Australia and New Zealand, which have now joined ASEM as Asian partners, have begun various concrete projects in developing an ASEAN regional qualifications framework as part of the broader ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Area (AANZFTA) project ‘Education and Training Governance: Capacity Building for National Qualifications Frameworks for ASEAN’. This well-resourced project aims to harmonise regulatory arrangements between participating countries, which underpin the recognition of qualifications and quality of assurance of education provision through the development of mutually comparable national qualifications frameworks (NQFs) based on a common reference framework (ASEAN, 2012). In essence, this project is an attempt to reduce constraints on market access for service providers and increase educational sector investment, and to enhance the cross-border flows of natural persons and services in the region. Furthermore, this project is also an act to synchronise the education systems of ASEAN member countries in preparation for the ASEAN Economic Community. In order words, education is used as an instrument for regionalism.

The European Commission’s motivation has always been to create inter-regional or group-to-group dialogues with Asia, for example ASEAN, ASEAN +3 (Japan, China and South Korea), because it has a mandate to act as a supranational entity and on behalf of the EU’s member states. Hence the EU’s inter-regionalism is driven mainly by institutional cooperation as a way to
manage complex interdependence and to promote its political–institutional influence around the world. On the contrary, the ASEAN’s inter-regional dialogues tend to be less institutionalised and more flexible, and the ASEAN’s growth as a regional organisation proceeded at a very slow pace. Therefore through its long-standing cooperation programmes, the European Commission has tried to engender certain change and to promote cooperation at the regional level (Yeo, 2008). After 12 years of ASEM inter-regional dialogue, and after 41 years of its establishment, the ASEAN Charter entered into force in 2008 to affirm the ASEAN leaders’ commitment to accelerate the establishment of an ASEAN Community by 2015. The Charter became a legally binding agreement among the ten member countries, which since then operate under a new legal framework. The Charter also codifies ASEAN norms, rules and values, sets clear targets for ASEAN, and presents an increasing degree of compliance.

In sum, the three theoretical approaches provide different perspectives for analysing the ASEM education process. However, either they neglect the role of key actors and omit cultural interactions or their explanations of travelling policies are inefficient to understand the informality and mutual influence in ASEM. This study will examine the ASEM process with a focus on multi-level interactions between politicians, officials and academics, and on the operational modality of the meetings themselves to see how ASEM works as a platform for policy travel and region building by asking the following questions:

**Research questions**

1. **How does ASEM facilitate the refinement and movement of the Bologna Process to Asia?**
2. **How does ASEAN engage in the ASEM process and contextualise HE policy changes in their regional setting? How does HE contribute to ASEAN’s region-building project?**
3. **To what extent is ASEM’s focus on HE reform as intellectual and cultural exchange balanced with commercial development?**

*(note: question 3 may be omitted at a later stage)*

**Methodology**

**Empirical Data**

To pursue this study I will collect the following types of data:

- Key ASEM policy documents and reports
- Participant observations at ASEM events and job shadow at ASEM Education Secretariat as an overarching case study with multi-level interactions as unit of analysis to understand how policies travel
- Interviews with ASEM actors at different levels
- ASEAN history and current developments, with concrete examples of regional projects as a smaller case study to explore regionalism in ASEAN

Research Strategies

To pursue this thesis I will use multi-methodological approaches which combine several qualitative methods consisting of an ethnographic study of ASEM conferences over the next two years, an analysis of key documents and a case study of ASEAN.

To answer Question 1, a corpus of ASEM documents and its actual mode of operation will be studied in detail to generate a grounded understanding of how regional and inter-regional relationships are forged and how ASEM dialogues take place.

The document analysis will focus on the EU’s strategies towards Asia, ASEAN-EU dialogue relations, the ASEAN Charter, key statements and reports of ASEM Summits of Heads of State, the Chair’s Conclusions and stock-taking Reports of 5 ASEM Education Ministers meetings and Senior Officials Meetings from 2008, 4 ASEM Rectors Conferences including ASEM Student Forums, Expert Group meetings; ASEM Qualifications Recognition Declaration, Bologna Policy Forums’ statements, Erasmus Mundus, EU-Asia Higher Education Platform, ASEMundus. This process tracing exercise will provide solid background knowledge on how a common ASEM stance on HE reform was generated.

My research sites are mainly ASEM conferences and meetings, which truly reflect the nature of this unconventional organisation. The ethnographic study will focus on the substance and style of interactions between different groups of actors. Substantive issues in the ASEM education agenda concern four main areas: 1) quality assurance and recognition, 2) engaging business and industry in education, 3) balanced mobility, and 4) lifelong learning including technical and vocational education and training. These key areas entail the establishment of various expert groups, (inter)regional projects and initiatives, knowledge bases and long-term programmes to shape ASEM education dialogues.(See diagram 2).

The ethnographic observations and event analysis will be informed by Riles’ (2001) anthropological study of the UN World Conference on Women in Beijing. Her method is useful, as she combined the analysis of documents, interactions at meetings and institutional procedures.

Fairclough’s (2003, 2010) three-dimensional framework for studying discourse will be used to analyse spoken and written language across a range of texts, speeches and discussions. The complex of three dimensions encompasses social practice, discoursal practice (text production,
distribution and consumption) and text (2010:59). The method of analysing each of the three dimensions and their interrelations is particularly useful to analyse the dialectical relation inherent in discourses shaped by ASEM over time, and to examine discursive events as an interactive way of meaning-making since textual analysis is best framed within ethnography. The analysis of both events and discourses, as Danemark et al. (2002:79-80, 96) assert, will give meanings to concrete phenomena and enable researcher to interpret the particular in a context and draw conclusions about the general concepts from empirical observations of events. That is a process of constructing fundamental preconditions for knowledge development.

The subject of this study is not an organisation situated in a fixed location, rather it is a network-like community of multi-level actors. The subject cannot be defined by a sense of a specific geographical place since much of the activity takes place at meetings in different host countries in Asia and Europe, or over electronic communications, such as websites and e-publications. Even the ASEM Education Secretariat, which has a physical office, is a rotating secretariat. Therefore the contribution of this ethnographic study of ASEM education process lies in the resonances that seem to be fragmentary at times, but strongly interconnected and structured in an overarching agenda (see diagram 2).

The expert groups are voluntarily formed to deal with sub-topics, such as quality assurance, mobility, credit transfer systems, pilot projects, learning outcomes, inventory of national qualifications frameworks, exchange of best practices. These policy tools, using standards setting, peer pressure and voluntary engagement and commitment – known as the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) – play an important role in most European-wide education projects. The European partners (through its first Secretariat led by DAAD and based in Bonn, Germany) attempt to ‘export’ the OMC by using similar working modalities in ASEM, namely setting up expert groups for specific topics, but the informality of ASEM has not yet created binding commitments, hence the OMC’s technologies do not always work in the same way with all ASEM partners. Therefore, I will study the style of interactions through participant observation at meetings and interviews to see why countries get involved, how self-proclaimed ‘open and equal participation’ is created, and what collective aspirations, reflection and mutual learning take place. The analysis will focus on the key features, such as the feeling of openness, the sense of mutual trust, the principle of sharing through dialogues. One way of analysing this policy technology is to explore the concept and practice of ‘Normative Power Europe’ (Figueroa 2010; Manners 2002, 2006; Haugen, 2013).

To answer **Question 2**, I will study the case of ASEAN and explore which regional strategies it bring to the ASEM dialogues, how this group of countries engage in ASEM and act along regional interests based on their incipient collective identities and how they contextualise ASEM-Bologna agendas in the regional context. I will study the architecture of ASEAN (see
diagram 3), its regional dynamics and the effects of HE on its region-building project. Specifically, I will follow the developments of the substantial regional initiatives which emerged in the last five years, namely the ASEAN student exchange scheme with ASEAN Credit and Transfer System (ACTS), ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN), ASEAN Regional Qualifications and Mutual Recognition Framework, ASEAN University Network and Campus Asia.

The case study will be informed by the Extended Case Method (ECM) proposed by Michael Burawoy's (1998) for ethnography. The ECM emulates a reflexive model of science, that places the researcher (observer) in the world of the participant (subject of study) via four stages: intervention (to interview participant is an act of intervention); process (to observe participants by moving with them through their space and time in order to gain situational knowledge); structuration (external social forces and structures, such as political, economic and cultural power that effect the ethnographic locale where research occurs); reconstruction (to look for refutations and reconstruct theory). Using this method I will explore the perspectives of ASEAN senior officials, university leaders and regional advocacy organisations and investigate how HE contributes to ASEAN region-building project.

Question 3 will be handled through synthesised analysis of materials and case collected for the first two questions.

**Project Timetable**

**October- December 2013**

- To participate in UNIKE seminar in Copenhagen in October;
- To take two PhD courses at Bristol University;
- To discuss research plan with supervisor;
- To systematically collect key documents;
- To select and review literature.

**January – December 2014**

**First quarter:**

- To write extended proposal (UNIKE 15-page proposal);
- To attend PhD Course at Bristol ‘Narrative Enquiry’ in January;
- To participate in UNIKE workshop in Bristol in February;
- To take PhD course at Bristol ‘Philosophy of Science and Research Design’ in February;
- To begin the book project “Higher Education and Global Regionalism”;
- To start writing the Bristol qualifying proposal - UGRAGE document (approx.15 000 words);
• To consolidate field notes and classify all data/interviews I have collected from previous three ASEM ministerial meetings, two Rectors conferences and experts meetings since 2008.

**Second quarter:**
• To review literature, develop chapter outlines and discuss with supervisor;
• To draft one chapter and participate in editing and publishing an edited volume “Higher Education and Global Regionalism” with supervisors;
• To participate in ASEM Education Senior Official Meeting in China on 7-9 May, collect data (observations) and conduct interviews;
• To attend the Conference ‘Education, Equality and Social Harmony: Asian Experiences in Comparative Perspective’ organised by the Comparative education society of Asia on 16-18 May in Hangzhou, China.
• To conduct a secondment in May at the Sino-Danish Centre in Beijing to explore the ‘mobility’ and ‘quality assurance’ aspects of their joint masters and PhD programmes;
• To prepare for and participate in UNIKE summer school at Ljubljana University, Slovenia on 7-11 July.

**Third quarter:**
• To present a paper at the Emerging researcher seminar in conjunction with the European Conference on Educational Research 2014 (ECER) on 1-5 September, University of Porto, Portugal;
• To attend ASEM Rectors Conference and Student Forum at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok on 22-26 September and conduct interviews;
• To consolidate and systematically organise data collected (transcribe interviews, collate and categorise information, write up field notes, plan follow-up interviews, etc.).

**Fourth quarter:**
• To pay a research visit to the European Commission’s External Action Service Department in Brussels, which coordinates and hosts the 10th ASEM Summit scheduled in Milan, Italy in October and conduct interviews;
• To attend the ASEM Peer Learning Meeting on “New Approaches to Quality Assurance in Higher Education”, 23-24 October in Brussels.
• To finalise the chapter and complete the book project;
• To read literature and build up arguments to form parts of chapters.

**January – December 2015**

**First quarter:**
• To attend the ASEM Education Senior Officials Meeting in Jan/Feb 2015 in Riga, Latvia and conduct interviews;
• To participate in the UNIKE winter school in Auckland, New Zealand in February;
• To pay a research visit to the ASEM Education Secretariat at the Ministry of Education and Culture in Jakarta and conduct interviews;
• To pay a research visit to ASEAN office in Jakarta for interview with the ASEAN Secretary General on ASEAN Community 2015.

Second quarter:
• To write up chapters and discuss with supervisor;
• To attend ASEM Education Ministers Meeting in May in Riga, Latvia and conduct interviews;
• To attend the Bologna Policy Forum on 14-15 May in Yerevan, Armenia and conduct interviews;
• To prepare and participate in UNIKE summer school in June in Porto, Portugal;

Third and fourth quarters:
• To write an article for a peer-review journal (co-author with Janja Komljenovic);
• To prepare and participate in UNIKE winter school in October in Lyon, France;
• To consolidate data, read and write chapters.

January – September 2016
• To read and write up chapters;
• To participate in one conference in Europe;
• To attend UNIKE final conference in June;
• To write up and revise the dissertation and work with supervisor;
• To submit dissertation.

Access:
I am assured access to events and documents through the ASEM Education Secretariat and Asia-Europe Foundation which coordinate and co-organise the events. In addition, I also have access to meetings through previous contacts at several ASEM universities and ministries with whom I have forged the relationships in my previous job. Furthermore, all ASEM events, documents and interviews are in English. For secondment and some fieldwork I will be affiliated to Sino-Danish Centre and Beijing Normal University in Beijing. These institutions are UNIKE’s associated partners.
Ethics:
I will follow the ethical code of conduct in research set by the University of Bristol and consultation with my supervisor in sensitive case.

Overview of Interviews:
I plan to conduct 38 interviews as follows (a detailed list to be developed):
- 2 interviews with Ministers
- 8 semi-structured interviews with senior ministerial officials who set ASEM HE agendas;
- 3 interviews with senior representative(s) from the European Commission and the ASEAN Secretariat;
- 4 interviews with the ASEM Education Secretariat, including two interviews with the former secretariat (2009-2013) at German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and two interviews with the current secretariat at Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (2013-2017);
- 6 interviews with rectors and academics/expert group members; and follow-up in-depth interviews with one or two key actors per event who express their views at meetings or in subsequent publications;
- 4 interviews with students at ASEM student Forum in conjunction with Rector Conference
- 6 interviews with expert groups
- 5 interviews with regional advocacy (lobbying) agencies

Budget:
Since my ethnographic observations and interviews are the major parts of my research methods, the costs to conduct secondment and research visits, and participate in ASEM events in Asia and Europe in 2014 and 2015 are estimated to be € 9800. Detailed breakdown is in the table below. There may be a shortage of €2300, which might be partly covered by the UNIKE pool and by some host organisations in the form of free accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Secondment, conferences or research visits</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Flight (estimated)</th>
<th>Accommodation (estimated)</th>
<th>Local expenses (transport, visa, conf.registration fees, etc.)</th>
<th>Sub total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Secondment at Sino-Danish Centre, attend ASEM Senior Official Meeting in China</td>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>€ 900.00</td>
<td>€ 600.00</td>
<td>€ 500.00</td>
<td>€ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Asia Comparative Edu Conference 16-18 May</td>
<td>Hangzhou, China</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>European Edu research conference 1-5 Sep</td>
<td>Porto, Portugal</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 100.00</td>
<td>€ 700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>ASEM Rectors conference 23-26 Sep</td>
<td>Bangkok Thailand</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>€ 700.00</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Visit to EU external action service department and ASEM seminar on Quality Assurance.</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 400.00</td>
<td>€ 150.00</td>
<td>€ 750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>ASEM Summit 10</td>
<td>Milan, Italy</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 250.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>ASEM Senior Official Meeting (SOM)</td>
<td>Riga Latvia</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 150.00</td>
<td>€ 150.00</td>
<td>€ 600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Research visit at ASEM Edu Secretariat (from UNIKE winter school in New Zealand)</td>
<td>Jakarta, Indonesia</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>€ 400.00</td>
<td>€ 350.00</td>
<td>€ 150.00</td>
<td>€ 900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>ASEM Education Ministers Meeting</td>
<td>Riga, Latvia</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Bologna Policy Forum</td>
<td>Yerevan, Armenia</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>€ 500.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>A conference in Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>€ 300.00</td>
<td>€ 200.00</td>
<td>€ 100.00</td>
<td>€ 600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL € 9,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dissemination plan:
I envision the audience of my research project consists of people in research communities concerning higher education, regionalization, international relations and policy makers and professionals in the field of policy transfer and globalisation.

Anticipated publications:
- Two academic articles in international peer-reviewed journals.
  - The first article will be co-authored with Janja Komljenovic (Workgroup 2: Trends and Development) in 2015 and will explore the common theme in our PhD projects under the tentative working title “Regionalisation and Marketisation of Higher Education in the EHEA and ASEAN”.
  - The second article planned for 2016 will be looking at policy travel between Europe and Asia and a working title is “ASEM Education Policy: ‘Soft Power’ and ‘Hard Currencies’ in Asia and Europe.
- Possibly a book chapter on ASEM higher education is planned for 2016 when ASEM will celebrate its 20th anniversary. A proposal is being negotiated with relevant publishing partners.
- approx. 4 to 5 journalistic articles and/ or commentaries on different aspects of ASEM Higher Education Agenda for any of the following forums/distributors:
  - ASEM Education Secretariat (asem-education-secretariat.kemdikbud.go.id)
  - University World News (www.universityworldnews.com/)
  - Times Higher Education (www.timeshighereducation.co.uk)
  - EURAXESSASEAN (http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/links/eurRes/asean)
  - Europe’s World (http://europesworld.org) or ASEAN Secretariat (http://www.asean.org)
  - Erasmus Mundus Alumni Association (http://www.em-a.eu) or
  - Friends of Europe (http://www.friendsofeurope.org)

Career Development Plan
Upon the completion of the PhD I plan to look for academic employment at university in Asia or International organisations specialising in education policy and development, ideally education cooperation between Asia and Europe. To achieve this long – term plan I will deepen my knowledge and theoretical understanding of education and globalisation, enhance my research and writing skills, and intensify and further develop my networks with scholars in academia as
well as professionals in international agencies. The training programme in UNIKE over the next three years and learning environment at Bristol University, my supervisors and the UNIKE fellows will challenge and help me to develop such necessary skills. The UNIKE’s friendly and supportive and safe environment is an ideal incubator for me to test new ideas and receive feedback as well as share my knowledge. The diverse range of expertise of UNIKE partners and associated partners is also a rich source of knowledge for my personal and professional development. The pursuit of my PhD study will give me opportunities to keep updated with the latest development and debates on education policies and expose to different target groups of policy makers, academics and professionals in Asia and Europe.
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