

Quality Care? Export Education Policies in New Zealand from 1999 to 2002 ¹

Andrew Butcher

This paper critically examines export education policies between 1999 and 2002, which is a period of a significant shift toward quality control of the export education industry. It argues that while this shift is at one level concerned with the pastoral care of international students in New Zealand, it more significantly indicates the role of the State in both the funding of, and responsibility for the export education industry. It argues that while there is good reason to examine the policies in this period separately, in that quality issues are brought to the fore for the first time, there are echoes of the educational reforms of the 1980s. This paper uses key official documents to illustrate firstly the official discourse, secondly the underlying assumptions of that discourse, and thirdly, the inherent contradictions in these policies. It also argues that the vague notions of quality are less to do with the provision of pastoral care of international students and more to do with marketing a particular image of New Zealand, at once auditing a disparate industry and protecting a national reputation.

Introduction

Export education is amongst New Zealand's five biggest export industries, currently contributing over two billion dollars to the New Zealand economy. Neither the phenomenal growth in the numbers of international students nor their economic significance occurred over night: there are historical, political and philosophical antecedents. Nevertheless, policies affecting export education since 1999 deserve particular attention. Unlike previous Governments, the Labour-led Government elected that year (and re-elected in 2002) proposed significant reforms not only to the tertiary sector (which was not that unique), but also brought to the foreground export education policies, with a particular concern for 'quality'.

After providing a background of key contemporary concerns about New Zealand's export education industry, this paper critically examines the key 'quality' document, the mandatory *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students* (2001, revised 2002, 2003 and 2004), identifying its legislative framework, its key elements, effects and shortcomings, particularly concerning its role as an arbitrator of quality and its expectations on the various stakeholders in the export education industry.

This paper then examines the recent overtures toward 'quality' in light of the four reports by the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission (the first published in 2000 and the final three published in 2001). It argues that the absence of international students from the substantive parts of these reports is significant and highlights key problems in the Government's approach to the export education industry, such as its relationship to the General Agreement for Trade and Services (GATS) and funding of domestic education. Two other official documents reinforce these concerns, namely the Tertiary Education Strategy and the Export Education Strategy. These documents are summarised and critiqued. They also form the background to the Tertiary Education Reform Bill 2002 and, more particularly, the various Supplementary Order Papers to that Bill.

The result of these Supplementary Order Papers was a levy imposed upon providers of export education. This levy is significant: not only does it indicate that the industry must fund itself, but, more substantially

and significantly, it shifts the risks and responsibilities inherent in the volatile export education industry away from the State and onto providers. This neo-liberal strategy echoes educational reforms made in the late 1980s in New Zealand (*viz.* the liberalisation and privatisation of education), but – in tandem with the Code of Practice – it also makes visible, and therefore auditable, the export education industry.

Contemporary concerns

In early 2003, New Zealand's Race Relations Commissioner, Joris de Bres (2003: 9) made the following comments:

The international education industry is a separate matter ... The speed of growth of this industry has placed significant pressures on our educational institutions ... An industry such as this needs co-ordination and planning for it to be sustainable in the longer term. That means strategy, standards, regard for the social and educational environment and care for the students involved. We must ensure it enhances and does not detract from our community – whether in the schools, the colleges, the universities, or on the streets. Although the additional income for educational students has been welcomed, there are grumblings from our teachers and lecturers, our students and our citizens that we cannot afford to ignore. The challenge to the export education industry is ... get organized and get on top of this issue or you will lose your customers and the support of New Zealanders and potentially do damage to both our race relations and our international reputation.

Joris de Bres identifies a crucial challenge. My concern, however, is that similar comments have been made in years past by similar leaders in export education and foreign policy (Bennett, 1996; Groser, 2001; Taylor, 2001, 2002). The issue is not whether we are all singing from the same hymnbook; the issue is whether we know any other song.

Other contemporary concerns include a volatile international political landscape, a rising New Zealand dollar, change in immigration policy in the United Kingdom easing student entry, the effects of SARS, and a slow-down in the growth of the numbers of international students in New Zealand, particularly considering some universities have had upwards of a forty per cent increase in the number of international students during the first semester of 2003 (Evans, 2003a).

Another significant factor is the equalled increase in immigration to New Zealand, particularly where this leads to a large number of permanent resident students at tertiary level who have not been required to go through the same application procedures as those enrolling as international students. These migrant students present particular issues and challenges for tertiary institutions (Lim, 2002).

These issues are particularly paramount in Auckland where things in general are done *in extremis*. As the Asia2000 Foundation (2003) note in their occasional paper on the export education industry, conservative estimates suggest that forty per cent of all international students are in Auckland; there are estimates that education facilities will occupy twenty per cent of Auckland's CBD by 2004, and \$450 million dollars alone was injected into Auckland's economy in 2001. Understating the issue, the Asia2000 Foundation notes that: "there is scope to attract international students to centres outside Auckland also, where the demand is less and there is spare capacity" (Asia2000 Foundation, 2003: 15).

These salient issues have potentially long-term significance. With New Zealand ostensibly using its regulatory mechanisms for quality as a key marketing tool, it is thus important to consider whether these mechanisms are (a) what they appear to be at face-value and (b) what signal they send about the Government's involvement in this significant export education industry. The foremost document concerned with quality – and, partially at least, the document from which all other documents derive – is the Ministry of Education *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students*.

The Code of Practice

A trait of New Zealand's export education policy is that it has tended to be reactive to circumstances rather than proactive to possibilities (for a detailed support for this point see Tarling, 2004). Bearing that in mind, therefore, let us lay aside for the moment the fact that the Code of Practice has arrived a bit late to the party and embrace the fact that it has turned up at all. As a document, as a form of governmentality and quality control, and as an evaluation of the export education industry, the Code can be discussed in and of itself (Lewis, 2003; Peddie, 2003) and, even though it has only been mandatory since September 2001, is undergoing significant revisions (Ministry of Education, 2003). For the purposes here however, I wish to use it as a marker to illustrate the shifting allegiances of export education policies in New Zealand *vis-à-vis* the tertiary education sector in particular.

Codes of practice are nothing new to export industries, nor are quality control mechanisms uncommon in the tertiary education sector. Nevertheless, unlike Australia and elsewhere, no *mandatory* Code of Practice was in place in New Zealand for international students until that enacted in the *Education Standards Act* in 2001. In brief, the Code of Practice places particular obligations upon educational institutions that enrol international students, which also affects their accreditation with New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). The legislation also puts into place provisions for sanctions, as governed under the International Education Advisory Authority (IEAA).

Whilst initiated in September 2001, the Code took formal effect from March 2002, after which time education providers had six months to comply with its guidelines. It is divided into eight sections: marketing, recruitment, and enrolment of international students; contracted agents; contracts and indemnity; welfare; students aged under eighteen; grievance procedures; applications and monitoring; and administration (Ministry of Education, 2002a).

Section 13 of the Code states that signatories must provide support services to international students, which include: An orientation programme appropriate to the type of institution, assistance to students facing difficulties, and advocacy procedures. Furthermore, they should provide advice and information on accommodation, driving laws and road safety, courses, and welfare facilities.

This Code is not particular to the tertiary sector, nor is it, in itself, new: a voluntary code was put in place (by the then National-led Government) in 1996. However, its regulatory powers and wide-sweeping mandate are new. Significantly, in the six months since its formalisation, the number of signatories to the Code increased from 250 to over 1000 (Taylor, 2003). There are two notable aspects about the timing of the Code. The first is that it has taken several decades to have a mandatory code enacted. When international student numbers were smaller, and when the dominant provider was a unified state, it was not necessary to have a code: fewer students meant that there were fewer needs to be addressed. The second noteworthy aspect is that the Code, under a business model, takes on an agenda that is different from what it appears. At face value, it is designed with the welfare of the students in mind. However, while the welfare of students *is* an aspect of the Code, that is arguably not its primary purpose. Nor is its primary purpose to regulate an industry. It is a code designed to retain and attract the *business* of international students. It is useful as a marketing tool. It is a tool for quality assurance, but a tool not so much for the benefits of students as for the benefit of those in the industry. This is evident from the following points.

The new Code of Practice has more impact on primary and secondary schools and private institutions than on tertiary education providers, particularly with regard to ensuring appropriate accommodation standards and in other areas of pastoral care. While the Code of Practice looks good on paper, it may be less effective in practice. The most significant concern is that it assumes too much on the part of the

international student, in particular that they will choose to make a complaint if they feel there is due cause. It places the responsibility of complaint – and, by implication, restitution – on the student. It makes several significant and arguably incorrect assumptions about international students; assumptions, however, underpinned by conceptualising the student as a rational and fully informed consumer/economic unit (Lewis, 2003; Rose, 1999). However, some of these concerns are addressed in a recent discussion document on the Code by the Ministry (Ministry of Education, 2003).

The Code may be a form of quality assurance for the industry, but with no peer assessment or external measurement (that is, outside government regulation), the responsibility for this quality assurance falls to the international students themselves. In so doing, it assumes (a) that the students will correctly identify areas of poor quality; (b) that they will articulate clearly and to the appropriate individuals their concerns; (c) that they will be listened to and their concerns will be acted upon; (d) that they have an understanding of the mechanisms and structures within an educational institution (i.e. those who govern and establish quality control procedures); and (e) that they will use the time and energy to make a complaint despite the fact that their primary purpose in New Zealand is to study. Students may also be reluctant to make these complaints for reasons ranging from not wanting to ‘make a fuss’, to being afraid that their visa may be repealed, to not having sufficient language competency.

In principle, if not also in practice, the Code does address significant pastoral care needs; needs, it bears pointing out, that were identified with foresight some twenty years ago and promptly ignored (cf. Cook, 1995). It is, however, too early to say whether the Code will have a significant long-term impact on the industry, particularly when it has the difficult and unenviable task akin to putting a freed bird back in a cage.

In addition, the demands placed on education providers by this Code are significant. Effectively, the Code is asking providers to exercise services for which many have insufficient resources. Those in the international offices in institutions have been given the responsibility – and therefore also its attendant risk – to set and administer policies in ensuring that they comply with the Code; as Lewis (2003: 31, my emphasis) argues, this “increases the levels of managerialism and *encourages ritual performance over professional judgment*”.

Resources and their distribution and use have featured strongly in reviews of the tertiary sector in New Zealand. Between 1987 and 1999 there were five major reviews of the tertiary sector in New Zealand (Boston, 1999) and the Labour-led Governments since that time have done nothing to stem the flow. The Tertiary Education Advisory Commission contributed to this mound of paperwork in publishing four reports over three years concerned with issues particular to the vision, system, strategy and funding framework of the tertiary education system in New Zealand.

The Tertiary Education Advisory Commission

Space does not permit a detailed discussion of the contents of the four separate reports of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission (TEAC) and, in any case, it is the philosophical and conceptual notions of those reports, rather than their detail, which is significant here. In the four TEAC reports (TEAC, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c), international students are mentioned in two paragraphs in total. This absence is both notable and concerning. It is indicative of the complicated relationship between the export education industry as trade on one hand, and the tertiary education sector as a public good and contributor to the ‘knowledge wave’ on the other hand (cf. Eagle and de Bruin, 2000); it also highlights the fiscal objectives of institutions, matters of quality and student support, the Government’s need to placate competing constituencies and issues surrounding the General Agreement for Trade and Services (GATS) (Kelsey, 2002a, 2003a, 2003b).

There has been international caution against placing higher education under GATS (Rosenberg, 2002) and the AUS president Bill Rosenberg has argued that “New Zealand does have an interest in offering education to international students, but international trade agreements are unnecessary to attract them. Rather, the most urgent need is to ensure that these students are treated as people, not merely sources of income” (Rosenberg, 2002: 10). In a vitriolic attack on TEAC, Jane Kelsey argued that: “TEAC’s reports did nothing to inspire confidence that it had a clear vision, let alone a strategy to implement one” (Kelsey, 2002b: 109) and arguably its vision is a reworking if not an echoing of recommendations made by Treasury in its briefing to the 1987 incoming Government (Treasury, 1987).

Kelsey (2003b: 43) recently argued that “in practice, the income received by education providers [from export education] has allowed the Government to reduce real levels of public funding to education, while the ‘freed up’ resources have largely flowed to the private sector”; fees from international students, therefore, are not complementing Government revenue, they are supplementing and in some cases replacing that revenue. The role of international students within the recommended new funding framework is only as a further source of funds. There is no mention in any of the TEAC reports of the financial costs of international students, nor secondary costs related to issues of specific quality control and welfare issues of international students. Indeed, it would seem that the report detailing the funding framework recommends, albeit implicitly, that in order to resolve their difficult financial situations, universities should “active[ly] pursu[e] ... *alternative sources of funding*” (TEAC, 2001c: 154, my emphasis), a pursuit, I might suggest, universities have undertaken with some vigour. (Paralleling these shifts in the secondary school sector, it may be argued, anecdotally if not empirically, that some schools have replaced the significant resources of bulk funding with the equally significant, if not greater, resources via international students.)

If the noticeable absence of international students from the TEAC reports is not enough to demonstrate the separation of export education and tertiary education policies, then one need only look at two strategies published separately by the Ministry of Education, one for tertiary education (Ministry of Education, 2002) and the other, of course, for export education (Ministry of Education, 2001).

Tertiary Education and Export Education ‘Strategies’

In 2002, the Ministry of Education released its five-year *Tertiary Education Strategy* based, in part, on the TEAC reports. The Strategy identifies export education as one of New Zealand’s economic strengths, (Ministry of Education, 2002b: 11) and its sustainable growth centred on a reputation for quality teaching and pastoral care as one of its objectives (24). However, the *Tertiary Education Strategy* fails to address *in any detail* how international students fit into that strategy, nor how the sustainability or quality of the export education industry will be measured and regulated. Instead, it addresses the reader to look at a separate document, *Export Education in New Zealand* (Ministry of Education, 2001), published a few months earlier.

After identifying recent growth trends in the export education industry, both in terms of the numbers of students and of their economic impact exceeding expectations, the *Export Education Strategy* report perceptively comments that:

Put in stark terms, New Zealand could take a mass recruitment approach to export education with low coordination in terms of policy, planning or skill development. This approach would stretch our capacity and risk damaging the positive features which we are building our reputation on. Or we could take an approach pitched at providing quality services, underpinned by systems and principles which support sustainability and ongoing improvement, and which help us to increase the value derived from our activity across a number of areas (Ministry of Education, 2001: 12).

The strategy identifies that the expressed vision of the industry is: “A sector providing sustainable, high quality international education and support services, thereby producing a range of economic, educational and cultural benefits for New Zealand” (Ministry of Education, 2001: 13). This all sounds very positive, but where it is long on ideals it is short on details.

There is no comment, for example, on *how* the indicators will be measured, *what* areas will be specifically researched (excepting the student satisfaction survey), *what* outcomes (if any) will come of this research, and *how* the industry will maintain *sustainable* growth. These intangible variables illustrate the problematic nature of the contract that the state is employing in the Code of Practice; with monitoring being both costly and problematic, autonomy and self-responsibility disperse the risk and associated costs (Lewis, 2003). The government has divested its fiscal responsibility back onto the public education system and these institutions now bear the risk of capital investment and uncertain revenue flows (Kelsey, 2003b).

Furthermore, these ‘costs’ may not take into account definable costs to the institution, nor do they address the impact on individual teachers, some of whom spend disproportionate amounts of time on assisting international students with no additional recompense (Kelsey, 2002a; McGrath and Butcher, 2001; PPTA, 2002). The ‘benefits’ of international students may also be simplistic, and may not reflect actual operations in schools of different deciles, locations, size of international student intake, and competing demands and so forth. Nor is there any mention in the *Tertiary Education Strategy*, of what role or significance (if any) international students will have in a university’s profile and charter. In addition, despite it being termed a strategy, there is no clear guideline as to where the industry might be in, say, five years time. There is a strategy, but there appears to be an absence of strategic *direction*.

Notwithstanding the absence of direction, the TEAC reports, and the *Tertiary Education Strategy* in particular, formed the background and ideas presented in the 2002 Tertiary Education Reform Bill. This Bill went through various changes before finally being passed into law as the Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment (E(TR)A) Act 2002 and the Industry Training Amendment Act 2002.

In April 2002, a Supplementary Order Paper (No. 264) was added to the Tertiary Reform Bill which placed a levy on the export education industry. A few months later it was revised, and further supplementary order papers (SOP No. 21 and No. 25) were added which were concerned with the classification of permanent resident students and the definition of international students on a three-month or shorter course. These changes all made it through the legislation. The levy warrants particular comment.

Tertiary Education Reform Bill 2002

The levy, of \$185.00 per institution and 0.45 per cent of the gross tuition fee income from foreign-fee paying students (Evans, 2003b) was first proposed in Supplementary Order Paper No. 264, later in SOP 25, and finally legislated in the Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act 2002, to be paid by “education providers who receive tuition fees from international students enrolled with them” (E(TR)A Act 2002, s.238H(a)). It met with strong opposition from the export education industry (e.g. International Students’ Advisors’ Network of Australia (ISANA) (New Zealand), 2002; Education New Zealand Trust, 2002). In short, the purposes of the levy are to facilitate the development, quality assurance and promotion of export education, marketing, scholarships, research and development, and the administration of the Code (Lewis, 2003; Taylor, 2002). After spending so long in the space between foreign policy, trade policy, and education policy, it seemed that export education had finally found a home in a reformed tertiary education sector. Or had it?

The levy is significant. It specifically devotes a levy to the international education industry, which is notably (and contentiously within the industry), paid for solely *by* the industry. As noted in the submission

by the Education New Zealand Trust to the Bill, the country received, in 2002, a gross total of \$1.14 billion in international education fees, only \$400 million of which was in the form of tuition fees (Education New Zealand Trust, 2002).

Here the Government has legislated *inter alia* for measures of quality assurance, yet is not prepared to directly fund quality assurance mechanisms. In one respect, it has recognised an issue that needs to be addressed and then given it to the industry to solve. This, however, fits with the neo-liberal strategy of distributing social risks by devolving the costs associated with them; in this case of international education providers insuring themselves (the industry) against malpractice. In this sense then, export education is no more at home in an education policy than it was before; any change is largely cosmetic. The Code of Practice, amongst the other audits that institutions must undergo, demonstrates the “remanagerialism of risk” in the neo-liberal environment: “In this process, the entities to be audited are transformed: they have to be made “auditable”, producing a new grid of visibilities for the conduct of organizations and those who inhabit them” (Rose, 1996: 55). Furthermore, these ‘audits’ demonstrate the privatisation of risk. As Rose (1999: 174-175) argues:

Organizations and other actors that were once enmeshed in the complex and bureaucratic lines of force of the social state are to be set free to find their own destiny. Yet, at the same time, they are to be made responsible for that destiny, and for the destiny of society as a whole, in new ways. Politics is to be returned to society itself, but no longer in a social form: in the form of individual morality, organizational responsibility and ethical community.

Under this politics, variously called “advanced liberalism” (Rose, 1996), “neoliberalism”, or “post-Keynesianism” (O’Malley and Palmer, 1996), the rationale of the government is no longer to spread risk/loss over larger pools of people, as it was in the social welfare era, but instead now it emphasises disaggregating risk and placing more responsibility on individuals and companies for bearing risk (Simon, 2002). In this context, the educational institutions are bearing the risks of the economy of export education; the Government has made clear that it expects the industry, as an entity, to take control of the sector (Clark, 2002; Mallard, 2002). Risk management here, then, is a form of governance, and a form presented to the sector, and educationalists in a *positive* manner. As O’Malley (2000: 27, emphasis in original) argues:

Everyone now is to make an enterprise of their lives. This new credo goes beyond the belief of classical liberalism that people be exposed to risk in order to generate greater independence and responsibility ... Risk, now, is not *the problem*, as under the welfare state. Risk now is the *solution* to all manner of problems from ‘welfare dependency’ and bureaucratic unresponsiveness, to national economic inefficiency and the scale of state expenditure.

But this risk may be a Clayton’s solution and a solution that puts risk, responsibility and ultimately blame on the industry itself, an industry that is not at all cohesive, coordinated, working for the same aims or with the same strategies. In this sense then, the Government could be said to be *creating* the export education industry (Lewis, 2003). Not only does the levy devolve risk and responsibility at a financial level; the Code of Practice also shifts the risk from the state to institutions through its indemnity clause, while the International Education Appeal Authority (IEAA) and the eventual administration of the Code by an industry body shifts it even further away from the state (Lewis, 2003).

The Supplementary Order Papers (SOPs), noted above, are significant for a further reason. Namely, they demonstrate that the export education industry continues to be treated separately from the education industry in general in New Zealand. The very fact that these SOPs deal specifically with international students is commendable in itself, but it does bear asking why something specific to international students is not in the original Tertiary Education Reform Bill (TERB). While it could be argued that

pressure from industry groups was a factor in their late inclusion into legislation, it can also be argued that it was a further step toward shifting the risk *and* responsibility of international students onto the institutions. The Government recognised the tricky political questions inherent in export education, as well as the apparent contradiction between the fiscal questions of export education and the official discourse of a 'knowledge economy', where, it is implied, knowledge has a value beyond (but including) economic growth. As Jane Kelsey argues (2002a; personal correspondence):

There is no educational philosophy in the internationalisation strategy at all – which is where the conflict between the nation building role of education espoused by the current [Labour-led] government [in 2002] and the export industry come into direct conflict. This conflict is a primary reason why there is no debate.

Peters (2001) argues that this discourse of a 'knowledge economy' is part of the greater discourse of 'postmodernity'. Further, he explains:

Postmodernity as a neoliberal project is anchored in ... individualism ... [I]t represents an extreme form of economic rationalism that restructures science, technology, and education as the future leading economic sectors and basis for national competitive advantage in the global economy. (129)

Effectively, therefore, recent changes toward quality and so forth by the Labour-led Government are largely (although not entirely) superficial. The substance of *export* education policy in New Zealand remains: the *trading* of international education, the absence (in substance) of the Government in the sector, and the distribution of attendant risks (and responsibilities) placed on the industry by the Government.

Discussion: Whither quality?

The ideological and economic environment into which recent international students have arrived, are being recruited, taught, and given pastoral support, is one in which they are valued primarily for their economic benefits and notably ignored from broader reforms in education policy. But even their true economic value is not really being appreciated, otherwise one would expect that attention might be given much earlier to issues such as their pastoral care. There appears to be an assumption that New Zealand can get away without appreciating international students beyond their dollar value.

One possible explanation is that neo-liberalism has become such a pervasive interpretative framework – an economically-oriented version of methodological individualism – that it seems 'right' to appraise people primarily in terms of their dollar value. Non-economic dimensions of international students are then not taken into account even where this becomes an economic imperative in order to retain international students as a source of foreign exchange. The neo-liberal undertones of the codes and supplementary order papers, particularly where they indicate quite clearly that the Government *wishes* to remain absent from the export education industry, would tend to support this view.

The Code of Practice and other mechanisms for quality control are more an indication of the philosophies of the Labour-led Government (1999-2002) than recognition of a pressing need for quality control at this present moment. In line with its different policy positions, this Labour-led Government is, at least compared to a National-led Government, simultaneously letting the market control the industry, while retaining nominal control over the industry by putting in place broad regulatory guidelines that it should follow. One of its key control mechanisms, as highlighted in the final TEAC report (2001c) and in the TERB, is funding: effectively, the Government will withhold funding from education providers who do not broadly adhere to its philosophies toward education (such as, for example, a shift toward greater cooperation in the industry and less competition).

The foregrounding of the discourse of quality by the current Labour-led Government is really an indication of its philosophy, rather than a form of practice *per se*. Quality here is a philosophical precept. Ill-defined as a concept, it is primarily used as a marketing tool and can be easily re-defined in response to varying market currents. Three questions can be asked of this quality to demonstrate its amorphous nature: How do we identify quality? How do we measure quality? And what is the involvement of students (i.e., the clients) in the measurement of day-to-day quality? The answers to these questions could be sought in the aforementioned policy documents, but even in these, quality is ill defined. While Quality might be manifested in a policy document (whether that be the policy of a Government or the policy of an institution) it still may bear no relationship with what *actually* occurs.

If quality were to be measured, for example, by the number of complaints (or lack thereof) laid with the IEAA, the response could be an indication of good quality pastoral care and provisions, when in fact it may simply represent a reluctance on the part of students to lay complaints, for the reasons outlined above. If the measurement of quality is solely on the basis of documentation (such as policy documents, audits of documents, 'official' statistics), then this is not measuring *quality* of services at all; it is merely measuring quality of record keeping and procedure.

Furthermore, quality, as a marketing tool in the export education industry is not primarily to do with the *quality of the delivery of education*, rather it is to do with *quality of lifestyle*, namely that New Zealand is free from terrorism, clean and green, slow pace of life, peaceful and so forth. Marketing slogans and images (such as on the industry web-site www.mynzed.com as well as web-based individual marketing campaigns of education providers for the international market; cf. Lewis and Butcher, 2003) generally illustrate these positive lifestyle traits. Any mention of grade point averages, pass rates, and career success stories of graduates is secondary. The notion of a 'world class in New Zealand' degree (to use the official marketing slogan) is not an attempt at competing against the 'quality' providers of the Ivy League or Oxbridge Colleges; rather, it is an attempt at marketing a lifestyle as an idea of quality. Here, then, is not so much the policy and practice of quality, as the propagation and promotion of *perceptions* of quality. This is more about caring about quality than quality care.

Abbreviations

E(TR)A	Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act
GATS	General Agreement for Trade and Services
IEAA	International Education Appeal Authority
ISANA	International Students' Advisors' Network of Australia
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
SOP	Supplementary Order Paper
TEAC	Tertiary Education Advisory Commission
TERB	Tertiary Education Reform Bill (2002)

References

- Asia2000 Foundation (2003). *The Export Education Industry: Challenges for New Zealand*. Wellington: Asia2000 Foundation.
- Bennett, N. (1996). *Asian Students in New Zealand*. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Boston, J. (1999). The Funding of Tertiary Education: Enduring Issues and Dilemmas. In J. Boston, P. Dalziel & S. St. John (Eds.), *Redesigning the Welfare State in New Zealand: Problems, policies, prospects* (pp. 197-217). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, W. M. (1995). *The 'Export' of Education: The development of overseas student policy in New Zealand*. Unpublished MA thesis, Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Clark, H. (2002). *Prime Minister's Address to the Education New Zealand Conference*, The Beehive, Wellington.
- de Bres, J. (2003). *Current Issues in Race Relations in New Zealand*. Lecture delivered at the Public Law Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, Thursday March 20. Wellington: Human Rights Commission.

- Eagle, L., & de Bruin, A. (2000). Ideological and Theoretical Underpinnings of the New Zealand Education Reforms. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives in Cultural and Policy Studies in Education*, 19 (1), 1-17.
- Education New Zealand Trust (2002). *Submission to the Education and Science Select Committee on the Supplementary Order Paper No.264 to the Tertiary Education Reform Bill*. Unpublished Paper.
- Education New Zealand Trust (2003). *Statistical Analysis of International Students 2002*. Wellington: Education New Zealand.
- Evans, S. (2003a). 2003 shaping up to be varied year for domestic enrolments. *New Zealand Education Review*, 8 (10), 1.
- Evans, S. (2003b). Ministry of Education poised to collect new international Levy. *New Zealand Education Review*, 8 (11), 4.
- Groser, T. (2001). *Exporting NZ's Education: Quality matters*. Address to the Education New Zealand International Education Conference, Wellington, 8 August, 2001. Wellington: Asia2000 Foundation.
- House of Representatives [NZ] (2001). *Education Standards Act*.
- House of Representatives [NZ] (Tuesday, 23 April 2002). *Supplementary Order Paper, Tertiary Education Reform Bill (No.264)*.
- House of Representatives [NZ] (Thursday, 10 October 2002). *Supplementary Order Paper, Tertiary Education Reform Bill (No. 21)*.
- House of Representatives [NZ] (Monday 14 October 2002). *Supplementary Order Paper, Tertiary Education Reform Bill (No.25)*.
- House of Representatives [NZ] (2002). *Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act*.
- International Students' Advisors' Network of Australia (ISANA) (New Zealand) (2002). *Submission to the Education and Science Committee on Supplementary Order Paper No. 264*. Unpublished Paper.
- Kelsey, J. (2002a). Personal Correspondence with author. September.
- Kelsey, J. (2002b). *At the Crossroads: Three essays*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Kelsey, J. (2003a). Serving (Up) the Nation. *Listener*, 188 (3281), 32-33.
- Kelsey, J. (2003b). *Serving Whose Interests? A guide to NZ's commitments under the WTO agreement on trade in services*. Christchurch: Arena.
- Lewis, N. (2003). *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students: Making a globalising industry for New Zealand*. Paper presented at American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting, New Orleans. Unpublished Paper.
- Lewis, N., & Butcher, A. (2003). *Export Education in New Zealand: Place and representations of quality*. Paper for the New Zealand Geographical Society Conference, Auckland, July 2003
- Lim, L. H. (2002). *The Impact of Mainland Chinese Immigrant Students on New Zealand Tertiary Learning Environment*. School of Social and Cultural Studies, Massey University. Unpublished Paper.
- Mallard, T. (2002). Address to the Education New Zealand Conference, Wellington.
- McGrath, T. & Butcher, A. (2001). *The Governance of Services for International Students within the Tertiary Education System*. Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. Unpublished Paper.
- Ministry of Education (2001). *Export Education in New Zealand: A Strategic approach to developing the sector*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2002a). *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2002b). *Tertiary Education Strategy*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2003). *Review of the Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students. Discussion Document*. Wellington: International Policy and Development Unit, Ministry of Education.
- O'Malley, P. (2000). Risk societies and the government of crime. In M. Brown and J. Pratt (Eds.). *Dangerous Offenders: Punishment and social order* (pp.17-34). London: Routledge.
- O'Malley, P., & Palmer, D. (1996). Post-Keynesian Policing. *Economy and Society*, 25, 137-53.
- Peddie, R. (2003). *Evaluation of the New Zealand Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Peters, M. (2001). *Post-structuralism, Marxism and Neo-liberalism: Between theory and politics*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Post Primary Teachers' Association [PPTA] (2002). Submission on Discussion Document *Developing Export Education – The Export Education Fund and Levy*. Retrieved December 1, 2002, from the World Wide Web: www.ppta.org.nz
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing "Advanced" Liberal Democracies. In A. Barry & T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo liberalism, and rationalities of government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenberg, W. (2002). A global trade in education. *Off Campus: The Magazine of Massey University's Extramural Students' Society*, 7 (4), 10-11.
- Simon, J. (2002). Taking Risks: Extreme sports and the embrace of risk in advanced liberal societies. In T. Baker & J. Simon (Eds.), *Embracing Risk: The changing culture of insurance and responsibility* (pp.177-208). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tarling, N. (2004). *International Students in New Zealand: The making of policy since 1950*. Auckland: New Zealand Asia Institute, University of Auckland.
- Taylor, L. (2001). *Closing Remarks*. Education New Zealand Conference, Wellington. Retrieved September 30, 2001, from the World Wide Web: www.educationnz.org.nz
- Taylor, L. (2002). *Closing Remarks*. Education New Zealand Conference, Wellington. Retrieved October 5, 2002, from the World Wide Web: www.educationnz.org.nz
- Taylor, L. (2003, March). Lester's Desk. *Ed News: International Education Market News*, p.1
- TEAC [Tertiary Education Advisory Commission] (2000). *Shaping a Shared Vision: Initial Report of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.
- TEAC [Tertiary Education Advisory Commission] (2001a). *Shaping the System: Second Report of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.
- TEAC [Tertiary Education Advisory Commission] (2001b). *Shaping the Strategy: Third Report of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.
- TEAC [Tertiary Education Advisory Commission] (2001c). *Shaping the Funding Framework: Fourth Report of the Tertiary Education Advisory Commission*. Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission.
- Treasury (1987). *Government Management, Vol. 2. Brief to the Incoming Government 1987*. Wellington: The Treasury.

Notes

- 1 Based on a paper presented at the New Directions: New Settlers: New Challenges Conference, Victoria University Law School, April 14, 2003.

The author thanks Warwick Tie, Paul Spoonley, the co-editors, and the two anonymous reviewers, for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.