



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

A Neo-Bourdieuian Analysis of Neoliberal Domination through Education

- **A Study of Chinese International PhD Students**

Yi Huang

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education

the University of Auckland

2018

Abstract

The rise of neoliberalism has produced a fundamental shift in the way people define and justify their existence. This study uses a neo-Bourdiesian approach to analyse both the *reproduction* and *transformation* of neoliberal domination over¹ Chinese young people through education. I argue that while neoliberal domination appears to be pervasive across contemporary societies, the means to transform its domination still exists within the larger intellectual community. For this reason, a cyclic reproduction of neoliberal domination may not necessarily become a reality. This neo-Bourdiesian analysis of the ‘doctoral becoming’ of a group of Chinese international doctoral students studying at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, is an attempt to challenge the taken-for-granted cyclic reproduction of neoliberal domination.

The research object - ‘doctoral becoming’ - serves as a thread connecting the individuals’ subjective changes occurring during doctoral study. ‘Doctoral becoming’ also suggests a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination through transforming individual habitus. I define individual habitus as a hybrid of collective conformity and individual resistance to dominant social structures. I argue that individual habitus functions as both the mechanism of reproduction and the dynamism of transformation. For this reason, the individuals’ doctoral becoming is both within and beyond neoliberal domination.

In *the present* of ‘doctoral becoming’, I explain how neoliberal domination over Chinese international doctoral students is realised through the embodiment of *the neoliberal*

¹ Though this thesis, I intentionally use the preposition ‘over’ rather than ‘of’ in order to indicate that neoliberalism dominates not only Chinese young people’s mind but also their bodies.

publication habitus, *the native-like academic English habitus*, and *the cleft cultural habitus*. I also explain how the embodiment of *the humanising publication habitus*, *the academic 'Chinglish' habitus*, and *the 'bridging' cultural habitus* shows the potential to transform neoliberal domination over Chinese international doctoral students. In *the past* of doctoral becoming, I explain how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is realised through the embodiment of *the examination habitus*, *the neo-conservative habitus*, and *the neoliberal scholarship habitus*. I argue that contemporary China's² society is in a phase of "neo-conservative reconstruction" (Bourdieu, 1998c, p. 125). I also discuss how the practice of a humanising pedagogy by the moral intellectuals show the potential to transform neoliberal domination over Chinese university students.

Given that both New Zealand and China are at the frontiers of neoliberalising their education, the study of the subjective changes emerging in a group of Chinese students through the educational experiences in both countries explicates in dialogue the inner contradiction of neoliberal domination. In *the future* of the 'doctoral becoming', I propose a 'moral education' to counter neoliberal education. I argue that education can be a moral practice which orients young people towards humanising ends.

² In some cases, I intentionally use the notion 'China's society' instead of 'Chinese society' to refer to 'the society of China'.

To my son Runyu (Tommy) Gong

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my sincere appreciations to my supervisors, Professor Elizabeth Rata and Dr. Frances Kelly. Without their encouragement and enlightening guidance, I could not have worked out a neo-Bourdieuian approach to analyse neoliberal domination over Chinese young people through education. Their encouragement and guidance allow me to think with and beyond Bourdieu. Their generous efforts on supervising my research include but do not limit to offering me the numerous intellectual talks and giving detailed feedback on my writing.

Also, I would like to give my thanks to my husband, Xiaofei Gong and my son Runyu Gong for their support throughout this intellectual journey. Without their love and understanding, I could not have devoted myself to academic reading and writing for such a long term. No acknowledgements could be complete without mentioning the love and generous support of my father, Xinhua Huang, my mother, Su'e Zeng, my older sister, Li Huang, and all my friends in this journey.

I would like to thank my employer, the School of English and Education, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China, for granting me this doctoral research leave from my lecturer position. My final thanks go to the participants for their willingness to share their inner world with such openness and courage.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Dedication.....	III
Acknowledgements.....	IV
Table of Contents	V
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Research Context	3
Research Methods.....	4
Qualitative Case Study.....	4
Data Collection.....	5
Data Analysis.....	9
A Neo-Bourdieuian Approach.....	11
Four ‘Necessities’.....	11
Constructionist Structuralism.....	20
Social Sufferings and Social Gains.....	23
The Individual and the Social	24
Underpinning Assumptions	25
Research Arguments.....	29
Conclusion	30
Chapter Outline.....	30
Part I: Setting the Scene and Constructing A Thinking Tool.....	37
Chapter Two: Doctoral Becoming Within and Beyond Neoliberal Domination...38	
Introduction – Doctoral Becoming.....	38
Neoliberalism and Neoliberalisation.....	39
Neoliberalisation of Higher Education	42
Neoliberalisation of Higher Education in New Zealand.....	44
Internationalisation of PhD Education.....	46
Doctoral Becoming of the Enterprising Self	48
Other Doctoral Becomings	49

Conclusion.....	54
Chapter Three: A Progressively Transforming Individual Habitus.....	55
Introduction.....	55
Habitus – a Way of Thinking.....	55
Individual Habitus - a Hybrid of Collective Conformity and Individual Resistance.....	58
The Changeability of Individual Habitus.....	61
The Rationale of Progressive Transformation of Individual Habitus.....	62
Creating New Space through Educational Mobility.....	65
Three Ways of Explaining Subjective Changes.....	66
Four Causal Effects.....	68
Conclusion.....	70
Part II: The Present of the Doctoral Becoming	71
Chapter Four: Writing for Publication.....	72
Introduction.....	72
A Neoliberal Publication Habitus.....	73
Writing for Publication within a Doctoral Thesis	75
Writing for Publication outside a Doctoral Thesis.....	84
A Humanising Publication Habitus.....	86
Conclusion.....	89
Chapter Five: Immersion in the English-speaking University.....	90
Introduction.....	90
The Domination of Native Academic English	91
A Chinese <i>Illusio</i>	95
The Symbolic Violence Produced by the Domination of Native Academic English.....	97
Transformation, Disillusionment and Submission.....	104
The Emergence of ‘Academic Chinglish’.....	107
Conclusion.....	111
Chapter Six: Double Distancing and Constructing a ‘Third Space’.....	113
Introduction.....	113

A Thought about Distancing from the New Zealand Society.....	113
A Thought about Distancing from the Home Society.....	120
A Thought about Distancing from the Home Chinese Academia.....	122
The Brain Drain and the Brain Gain.....	128
The Emergence of a ‘Bridging’ Cultural Habitus.....	133
Conclusion.....	135
Part III: The Past of the Doctoral Becoming	137
Chapter Seven: The Examination-driven School Education and the Examination Habitus.....	139
Introduction.....	139
A Chinese Belief	139
The Establishment of the <i>Key</i> and <i>Non-key</i> School Education System.....	140
The Arbitrariness of the Binary Streaming System.....	143
The Education for the <i>Gaokao</i>	144
The Examination-driven School Education	146
The Examination Habitus.....	152
A Utilitarian Education.....	154
Conclusion.....	157
Chapter Eight: Higher Education Choice-making and Formation of the Neo-Conservative Habitus.....	159
Introduction.....	159
Market-driven Higher Education and the Higher Education Choice-making.....	160
‘Groupthinking’ and Higher Education Choice-making	164
Familial Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making	166
Gender Stereotypes and Higher Education Choice-making	172
Gendered Familial Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making.....	173
Gendered Pedagogic Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making	175
Conclusion: The Formation of the Neo-Conservative Habitus.....	176
Chapter Nine: Neoliberalised Higher Education and Humanising Pedagogy.....	179
Introduction.....	179

The Belief in Precariousness of Employment Prospects.....	179
A Sense of ‘Liberation’ through Chasing Material Success.....	185
The Neoliberal Scholarship Habitus.....	186
The Market-driven Higher Education Programmes.....	188
A Humanising Pedagogy.....	190
Conclusion.....	194
Part IV: The Future of Doctoral Becoming	196
Chapter Ten: Moral Education.....	197
Introduction.....	197
The Revival of Morality – a Combat against Neoliberal Domination.....	197
Education as a Moral Practice.....	199
Education as Nurturing Moral Being.....	201
Education as Nurturing a Collective Mind	202
Education as Nurturing a Humanising Nationalism	204
Education as Nurturing an Ideal of Human Society as a Community.....	206
Education as Nurturing Moral Intellectual.....	207
Conclusion.....	209
The Closing Reflections.....	211
Appendix A.....	214
Appendix B.....	216
Appendix C.....	218
Appendix D.....	219
Appendix E.....	221
References.....	222

Chapter One: Introduction

The initial intention of my study was to explore the transformative learning (Mezirow, 1990; 2000) experience of a group of Chinese international PhD students at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. According to Mezirow, transformative learning refers to:

The process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference (including meaning perspectives, habits of mind, mind-sets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove truer or justified to guide action (2000, pp. 7-8).

Encountering transformative learning theory motivated me to examine whether overseas PhD study is a transformative learning experience for this group of Chinese students, what taken-for-granted frames of reference are transformed, and how and why such a transformation occurs. From a comprehensive reading on transformative learning theory, I found that it was developed mainly “to establish an idealised model” (Mezirow, 2009, p. 21) of transformative education for adult learners. This is to say, the theory is more applicable for an intervention study than for the exploratory study which interests me. However, engaging with transformative learning theory helped me to elicit the questions which I really wanted to investigate:

1. What changes are emerging in the individuals’ subjectivities during the overseas PhD education?
2. How and why do these changes occur?

These questions worked as the entry points for the inquiry into the PhD education in the research context.

I use the notion ‘doctoral becoming’ to denote the subjective changes in my research participants during the overseas PhD education. The use of the notion ‘doctoral becoming’ is also intended to suggest that these changes constitute a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination over the doctoral students. In order to explain how and why a subjective change occurs, I needed an alternative social theory of education to that of transformative learning theory. At this point, I was introduced to the theory of habitus (Bourdieu, 1990, 2000b), the core of Bourdieu’s sociological *oeuvre*. Bourdieu (1990) defines habitus as a “system of dispositions” (p. 52), which are both “structured and structuring” (p. 52) from the experience of socialisation. Habitus generates social practice³ including “thoughts, perceptions, [feelings], expressions, and actions” (p. 55). The theory of habitus explains social practice as the result of inner negotiation between agency and internalised social structures. The theory on the one hand links the internal to the external, thus making the internal visible to be explained; on the other hand, the theory connects the individual to the social, thus revealing the social through individuals’ practice. Hence, the theory of habitus can be applied to explain how and why subjective changes emerge in individuals during the overseas PhD education from a social perspective, which serves the purpose of a sociological study of PhD education. Thus, the questions for my research have become:

1. What changes are emerging in the individuals’ subjectivities during their overseas PhD education?
2. What social domination can be revealed by using the theory of habitus?

³ Through this thesis, I use the notion ‘social practices’ to include thoughts, perceptions, feelings, expressions, and actions that individuals generate in socialisation experiences.

Research Context

The research has been conducted during 2016-2017 in five faculties: arts, education, geography, business and medical science, at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. New Zealand is an island country in the southwestern Pacific Ocean. The country geographically comprises two main landmasses, the North Island and the South Island, and around 600 smaller islands. While Wellington is the capital city of New Zealand, its largest city is Auckland with a population of around 1.6 million⁴. Auckland is the country's centre of commerce, arts, and education. The University of Auckland is the largest university in New Zealand. Founded in 1883, it consists of eight faculties across six campuses with over 40,000 students and nearly 10,000 graduating annually⁵.

The University of Auckland is a research-led university with the highest ranking in the country. It is ranked 82nd in the 2018 QS World University Rankings with 18 subjects offered within the top 50 worldwide. In the 2018 QS Stars Rating, the University of Auckland is rated as a Five Stars Plus institution for excellence in the categories: Research, Employability, Teaching, Facilities, Internationalisation, Innovation and Inclusiveness. In the Reuters Top 75: Asia-Pacific's Most Innovative Universities rankings 2017, the University of Auckland has been ranked as the most innovative university in New Zealand. It is also recognised by the MIT Skoltech Initiative as one of five emerging world-leading universities in entrepreneurship⁶. These figures show that the University of Auckland has

⁴ Retrieved on 30 May 2017, from <https://www.stats.govt.nz/reports/aucklands-future-population-under-alternative-migration-scenarios> published in 29 June 2017.

⁵ Retrieved on 30 May 2017, from <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/about-us/about-the-university.html>.

⁶ Retrieved on 30 May 2017, from <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/about-us/about-the-university/our-ranking-and-reputation/New-Zealands-world-ranked-University.html>.

occupied a leading position in the neoliberalisation of higher education in New Zealand (see the discussion of the neoliberalisation of the higher education in New Zealand in Chapter Two; and the adoption of the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) system in public universities in New Zealand in Chapter Four).

Research Methods

Qualitative Case Study

The research uses a qualitative approach in relation to a case study involving seven individuals from one institution. According to Newby (2010), qualitative research is concerned with “understanding how people choose to live their lives, the meanings they give to their experiences and their feelings about their condition” (p. 115). It can include approaches such as: ethnography, action research, and case study. Bourdieu (1988) contends that qualitative methods have a distinctive value in accessing the complexities and nuances which are rendered otherwise invisible. Creswell (2013) defines case study as the method by which “the researcher explores in depth a program, an event, an activity” of one or more individuals through the use of “a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time” (p. 15). The case study in this research refers to the study of a particular group of Chinese international doctoral students studying at one of the research-intensive universities in New Zealand. They are identified as the recipients of either the China Doctoral Research Scholarships (CDRS) or the New Zealand China Doctoral Research Scholarships (NZCDRS) and contracted to return to China” (This status will be discussed in detail in the following section: Data Collection). The study employs Gardner’s (2008) suggestion that investigations into doctoral education need to consider the specific

institutional context in which such education is situated. Recent research into doctoral education shows that distinctive disciplines provide pivotal contextual dynamics to knowledge production and to the employment trajectory of doctoral students (Mendoza, 2007; Picciano, Rudd, Morrison & Nerad, 2007; Smallwood, 2004). By focusing on a single university, I am able to examine: (a) the implicit relations between the individuals' doctoral becoming and the research culture of the institution; and (b) the significance of the disciplines in shaping the individuals' doctoral becoming.

Data Collection

The recruitment of the interviewees was conducted through an email request in November of 2015. The request was sent by the university Graduate Centre to all doctoral students who were undertaking PhD study. There were ten potential interviewees who expressed interest in taking part in the research. The Interviewee Information Sheet (see Appendix A. & B.) and the Consent Form in both Chinese and English language (see Appendix C. & D.) were sent to the potential interviewees via emails. Specific times and venues were arranged according to the preferences of the potential interviewees for expressing any concerns and requests for additional information, and signing the Consent Forms. The ten interviewees were from five disciplines, namely education (four interviewees), linguistics (one interviewee), literature (one interviewee), pharmacology (one interviewee), biometrics (one interviewee), geography (one interviewee) and information technology (one interviewee). The personal information of the ten interviewees collected during the first interview is as shown in the profile below:

The Profile of the Interviewees (n = 10)

Pseudonym	Gender	Age & Marital Status	Discipline	Length of PhD Study in the first interview	Enrolment Status	Pre-enrolment Status
Zhao	Male	20s Single	Biometrics	30 months (final-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	Graduate with master's degree
Hong	Female	30s Married	Linguistics	24 months (middle-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	University lecturer
Ying	Female	30s Married	Education	42 months (final-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	Senior high school teacher
Mei	Female	30s Single	Education	23 months (middle-stage)	Recipient of NZCDRS	University lecturer
Juan	Female	20s Single	Literature	52 months (final-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	Graduate with master's degree
Ming	Male	20s Single	Pharmacology	36 months (middle-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	Graduate with master's degree
Feng	Male	30s Married	Education	38 months (final-stage)	Recipient of CDRS	University lecturer
Hai	Male	30s Married	Education	44 months (final-stage)	Recipient of the UADS	University lecturer
Wang	Male	30s Single	Geography	29 months (middle-stage)	Full-fee payer	Graduate with master's degree
He	Male	20s Single	Information Technology	17 months (middle-stage)	Full-fee payer	Graduate with master's degree

CDRS: China Doctoral Research Scholarships
 NZCDRS: New Zealand China Doctoral Research Scholarships
 UADS: University of Auckland Doctoral Scholarships

The data were collected from four semi-structured in-depth interviews over a time span of 12 months. Following Brinkmann (2014), in these semi-structured interviews, I provided some structure based on my research interests and interview schedule but worked flexibly with the schedule in order to allow room for the interviewees' more spontaneous descriptions and narratives. The interviews focused on investigating the changes emerging in the interviewees' perceptions of their doctoral study, career aspirations, and the self. Naidoo (2004) argues that individual perceptions can be conceptualised as "ideologically constructed products", which embody many "contradictory and contesting social and political forces" (p. 467). The first interview focused on the changes emerging in the

interviewees' perceptions of their doctoral study, academic identity, and career expectations. The second interview focused on the changes emerging in their perceptions of the broader social world. These two interviews were intended to identify subjective changes recognised by the interviewees. The third interview invited the interviewees to imagine that they could transcend time and space, and reach the critical moments in the past when they were facing educational choices. This interview is intended to examine whether or not the interviewees would have made an alternative choice and why, thus identifying the subjective changes that are unrecognised by the interviewees. The fourth interview used "the life history interview" (Brinkmann, 2014, p. 1008), which had very little pre-set structure and was operated with just a single opening question, inviting the interviewees to recount her/his life story. With the consideration that the subjective changes emerging at the present cannot be explained without examining the experience of the past, this interview explored the pre-doctoral educational experience of the interviewees, in particular. (See Appendix E. for the interview questions).

The four interviews were conducted over a time span of twelve months with each interview lasting approximately 60 minutes. The purpose in using longitudinal multiple interviews was to identify the dispositions which can point to habitus, and to capture the subjective changes emerging in the shifts of candidature status. For example, during the intervals of two interviews, some interviewees moved from the mid-stage of PhD study to the thesis submission, and some moved from the submission stage to graduation. In the first interview, seven out of ten interviewees were identified as the recipients of either the China Doctoral Research Scholarships (CDRS) or the New Zealand China Doctoral Research Scholarships (NZCDRS). A condition for receiving either of these scholarships is that the recipients must return to China upon completing their doctoral study. Gardner (2008) and Gopaul (2011)

find that the enrolment status of doctoral students does affect their socialisation experience. I consider that the enrolment status of the recipients of the government scholarships of the seven interviewees may have affected and differentiated the changes occurring in their subjectivities from those of the other three doctoral students. In the second interview, a tension relating to having to return to China upon completing their doctoral study constantly emerged in their talks. This tension seems to implicitly shape their subjective changes. This tension raises my interest in focusing the study on these seven interviewees as a discrete social group.

All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. Then, the transcripts were provided to the interviewees for assessing the accuracy and for raising any concerns and/or clarification before the data analysis. The interviews were conducted in either Chinese or English according to what each interviewee preferred. I translated the Chinese quotations into English. When translating the quotations, I tried to keep their original Chinese flavour while expressing their meanings in English as precisely as possible. I also tried to use conversational language in order to avoid imposing academic language in the translations. The meaning accuracy of the translated quotes was carefully checked. Following sociological tradition, I consider the transcription text as “a proxy for experience” (Guest, 2012, p. 8) in which the social practices of the interviewees are represented.

The fourth interview used the narrative approach. Bourdieu (1996) notes that narratives of life history (including educational history) express “the most personal difficulties, the apparently most strictly subjective tensions and contradictions and frequently articulate the deepest structures of the social world and their contradictions” (p. 511). Bourdieu and Accardo (1999) use the interview-based narratives of educational experiences to unveil the

‘social sufferings’ resulting from neoliberal education in France. They propose the notion of ‘social trajectory’ as an alternative to ‘life history’ and assert that any social trajectory must be understood as a “unique manner of travelling through social space, where the dispositions of the habitus are expressed” (p. 258). Situated within the neoliberal education in contemporary China, the educational trajectory of my interviewees reflects a “collective history” (Reed-Danahay, 2005, p. 129) of Chinese young people “engaged in the same field” (Bourdieu & Turner, 2005, p. 304). Thus, the analysis of their educational history “elucidate[s] the invisible weightiness” of neoliberal structures embedded in China’s education against which they “lived and narrated” (Barrett, 2015, p. 4). The prominent properties emerging “in a consistent tendency” (Reed-Danahay, 2005, p. 132) from their narratives indicate the weightiness of the neoliberal structures. Their narrations of their social practice show on the one hand how neoliberal domination is naturalised through imposing certain ways of vision and division; on the other hand, their narrations show how agency negotiates with the neoliberal structures. As such, the narratives which bind structure and agency can be used to examine how the neoliberal structures and agency work against each other (Burke, 2011).

Data Analysis

The data analysis draws on the category of explanation and conceptualisation although it does not exclude the exploratory and confirmatory elements. Within this category, deductive reasoning is applied to the data analysis and representation. For example, the selection of quotations is based on how they exemplify the intended themes and concepts (Secker, Wimbush, Watson & Milburn, 1995). The data analysis has an overarching emphasis on the illustration of conceptual interpretation while allowing “the mediation between the

contradictory categories of the particular and general” (Rata,1996, p. 15), as well as the individual and the social.

Thematic content analysis is used to elicit and categorise the empirical data. Thematic content analysis is the most common method of data analysis used in qualitative research (Guest, 2012; Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000; Ritchie, Spencer & O’ Connor, 2003). It begins with reading and making a judgement about the data contained in the refined transcripts. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) argue that thematic content analysis focuses on “identifying both implicit and explicit ideas” (p. 9) within the data and “capturing the complexities of meaning” (p. 10) within a textual data set. The themes elicited are represented in three parts: the doctoral becoming of the present, the doctoral becoming of the past, and the doctoral becoming of the future.

The method of comparisons and contrast is applied to data analysis and representation. Krueger (1994) argues that “the most useful strategy in qualitative analysis is making comparisons and contrasting one set of data with another” (p. 17). Mills (2008) asserts that comparisons and contrast are fundamental to the data analysis process and the representation of findings. Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that the method of comparison and contrast deepens the understanding and explanation of a particular phenomenon. For example, in Chapter Four, comparisons are used to explain the strategies that the interviewees applied in doctoral writing for publication while contrast is used to explain the structural effects produced by the neoliberal publication habitus and the humanising publication habitus.

A Neo-Bourdieuian Approach

Reviewing the literature on applying the theory of habitus to educational research, I find that there is a tendency to reduce the theory to explaining the reproduction of social domination through education, which results in the theory often being misrecognised as deterministic. As my reading on Bourdieu deepened, I found that although Bourdieu's social analysis of education has an apparent emphasis on social reproduction, the purpose of the analysis is to elicit the means of resistance and eventually transformation of the dominant social structures. In order to theorise this finding, I construct a neo-Bourdieuian approach of analysis with four dimensions: 1) four 'necessities', 2) constructionist structuralism, 3) social sufferings and social gains, and 4) the individual and the social. This approach is constructed with the intention of explaining both the *reproduction* and *transformation* of neoliberal domination over Chinese young people through education.

Four 'Necessities'

In the first place, my neo-Bourdieuian approach draws on the four "necessities" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 35) of the Bourdieusian methodology of social analysis. The four necessities refer to relational thinking, radical doubt, field analysis, and reflexivity.

A Relational Thinking

Bourdieu (1987) argues that "the real is the relational" because "reality is nothing other than structure, a set of relationships, obscured by the realities of ordinary sense experience, and by individuals in particular" (p. 3). Thinking relationally is to have "analogical reasoning"

(Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 233) of a particular case in relation to a broader social context when there exist structural homologies between the particular case and the broader context. Hence, relational thinking allows researchers to “immerse completely in the particularity of the case at hand without drowning in it” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 233). Grenfell (2014) argues that analogical reasoning assembles the individual facts into “models of broader sets of relations” (p. 21), thus making generalisation possible. Swartz (1997) comments that relational thinking reflects Bourdieu’s core assumption that contemporary society is of “competitive distinction, domination, and misperception” (p. 63). In other words, Bourdieusian relational analysis has more to do with the social relations of the competitive than the cooperative, the hierarchical than the egalitarian, and the unconscious than the conscious. The analysis intends to reveal the unequal power relations, thus making possible the critique of the dominant. However, this does not mean that relational analysis ignores the cooperation, consciousness, and equity which exist within a sub-field of life, such as in an intellectual community. My neo-Bourdiesian approach explores both the competitive and the cooperative, the hierarchical and the egalitarian, and the unconscious and the conscious social relations.

Bourdieu’s relational analysis has been criticised for relying too heavily on ‘relations to’ and for this reason it is relatively weak in analysing “relations within” (Bernstein, 2009, p. 178), and therefore it lacks the “inside voice” (Moore, 2013, p. 94) and “inner logic” (p. 165). By problematising individual habitus in overseas educational mobility, and bringing agency, consciousness, and reflexivity into social practice, my neo-Bourdiesian approach explores not only ‘relations to’, that is, how the external structures internalise, but also ‘relations within’, that is, the “dialectical interaction of agency and [internalised] structures” (Rata, 1996, p. 6), which is the “reconstituting and shaping mechanism of change” (p. 6).

A Radical Doubt

Bourdieuian social analysis emphasises the break with everyday understandings and representations of social life in order to reach a genuinely scientific explanation. Bourdieu argues in order to construct a scientific research object, researchers need “a new gaze” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 251), “a mental revolution” (p. 251), or “an epistemological rupture” (p. 252) that are preconstructed in social life. Bourdieu (1992) argues that “the power of thinking never manifests itself more clearly than to approach a major socially significant object from an unexpected angle” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 221). Jenkins (2002) explains that Bourdieuian social analysis is an effort of having “a radical break from the academic past and a freeing up the object for a new level of analysis” (p. 177). The most recent Bourdieuian scholars (Abrahams & Ingram, 2013; Grenfell, 2012, 2014; Horvat & Davis, 2011; Ingram & Abrahams, 2016; Maton, 2012; Murphy & Costa, 2015; Wacquant, 2014b) extend Bourdieu’s thinking to explore the creativity of habitus in response to current social changes. Their research represents new ways of thinking which draw on Bourdieu’s ideas about perennial social concerns, new challenges and changes in the social life of modern society. I argue that the effort to break with the preconstructed in social analysis creates a space for manifesting the power of thinking itself, that is, creativity. My construction and application of a neo-Bourdieuian approach is the practice of this effort.

Field Analysis

For Bourdieu, the concept of ‘field’ is applied in fact as that of ‘space’, both of which are constructed without clear boundaries. Swartz (1997) interprets Bourdieu’s purposes in developing the concept of field as being: firstly, to allow “the broadest possible range of factors that shape behaviour rather than delimit a precise area of activity” (p. 121); and secondly, to emphasise the “conflictual character” of social life (p. 121), where practices are

only “implicitly institutionalised” (p. 121). Swartz criticises that Bourdieu’s field analysis over emphasises the “struggle within the logic of reproduction” (p. 120) and seldom addresses social transformation. In fact, Bourdieu (1992) did recognise the potential of transformation in field analysis when he asserted that “the field designates an arena of struggle where there is *resistance* to the dominant power” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 102). Through field analysis, Bourdieu identifies three types of strategies that social agents apply to maximise their own interests. They are “conservation, succession, and subversion” (as cited in Swartz, 1997, p. 125). The conservation strategy is applied by those who occupy dominant positions in a field with the intention of preserving the “*doxa*” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 378) of the field, that is, the rules of the game played in the field. The succession strategy, which represents conformity with the *doxa*, is generally applied by the new entrants who attempt to gain access to the dominant positions. By applying these two strategies, the social agents unwittingly reproduce the *doxa* of the field. The subversion strategy is applied to transform the *doxa* by those who expect to gain little from the dominant. This strategy is applied in the form of a more or less radical rupture with the *doxa* by challenging its legitimacy to define the awards in the field.

Academics, including new entrants such as doctoral students, occupy positions of the “dominated dominant” (Bourdieu, Sapiro & McHale, 1991, p. 655) in social life, given that they enjoy the relative autonomy to political and economic power in legitimating cultural capital (see also the discussion in Chapter Two). Hence their social practices are often found as both succession and subversion to political and economic power. Their practices represent the most contradictory aspect of social life. This contradiction implicitly shapes the doctoral becoming of my interviewees. The purpose of applying field analysis to contemporary academic field, specifically PhD education, is to elicit the means to transform

neoliberal *doxa* which appears dominant from this most contradictory aspect of academic life. This purpose characterises my neo-Bourdieuian approach of social analysis.

Despite the opposite position-taking, both the dominant and the dominated share an implicit belief in the game itself and a common interest in preserving the field itself. Bourdieu defines this shared interest as '*illusio*' (Bourdieu, 1998c, 2000b) - a fundamental belief that a game is worth playing. In my neo-Bourdieuian approach, I explain that both the formation of the Chinese *illusio* of acquiring native-like academic English through immersion in the English academy and the disillusionment of my interviewees with this *illusio* (see the discussion in Chapter Five).

In field analysis, the concept of "*homology*" is often used to explain the reproduction of social stratifications across various domains (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 106). First, there are homologies of position among individuals and groups in different fields. Those who find themselves in dominated positions in the struggle for legitimation in one field also tend to find themselves in subordinate positions in other fields. Second, there are homologies in the strategies applied by the social agents in similar positions across different fields. Third, the struggles in one field produce homologous effects in other fields. For example, the struggles in cultural fields produce cultural distinctions which are simultaneously social distinctions. Field homologies reinforce social conflicts across different fields. The result is the "reproduction of common patterns of hierarchy and conflict from one field to another" (Swartz, 1997, p. 132). For example, China's highly stratifying school education system reproduces the social hierarchy and reinforces the social conflicts (see the discussion in Chapter Seven).

Bourdieu builds on the idea of field homology by regarding the legitimation of social inequality as not the product of conscious intention but as stemming from a *structural correspondence* between different fields. Actors unwittingly reproduce social distinctions by pursuing their own interests within the sets of constraints and opportunities available to them (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). For example, when cultural producers pursue their own specific interests by competing for recognition in cultural fields, they unwittingly legitimate the established social order and reproduce the hierarchical social structures. As Swartz (1997) argues, “in serving the interests of their particular fields, intellectuals also serve the interests of the class structure” (p. 134).

Although homologies exist between fields, they are not automatic reproductions independent of practice. In the final analysis, Bourdieu (1977) falls back on the theory of habitus to explain homologies across fields by asserting that habitus is the “unifying principle of practice in different domains” (p. 83). It is habitus that generates homogenous practices across a broad range of social domains. Habitus is the practical logic that makes the underlying connection between fields. Hence, habitus is “the real principle of the structural homologies objectively established between [fields]” (p. 84). The operation of a field requires the engagement of social agents with the appropriate habitus willing to invest in a field in the ways of struggling for the capital valued in the field or subverting the legitimation of what is valued in the field (Swartz, 1997). I argue that all the arguments Bourdieu has made by using field analysis eventually point to habitus. Without habitus, field, capital, and Bourdieu’s other thinking tools lose agency to explain social practices. The efficacy of field analysis depends eventually on how efficient habitus is applied “as [a] mechanism through which social agents’ dispositional schemes can be identified within the fields in which they originate or transform” (Murphy & Costa, 2015, p. 9). For this reason,

my neo-Bourdieuian approach of social analysis focuses on the application and development of the theory of habitus.

Furthermore, I focus on using habitus because it explains my research questions: ‘what changes emerging in the interviewees’ subjectivities’, and ‘what social domination can be revealed’. This focus does not exclude the discussion of interrelation of habitus with field and capital. Chapter two: ‘Doctoral Becoming Within and Beyond Neoliberal Domination’ discusses this inter-relation, in particular. In this chapter, I conceptualise neoliberal domination as a field of power, producing the structural effects in the interviewees. Also, the writing of each theme chapter involves the discussion of the specific educational fields, the forms of capitals at stake, and the structures internalised, that is, habitus. The forms of habitus developed are discussed as the interplay of agency and neoliberal structures and the results of internalising the neoliberal structures of the fields.

When asked by Wacquant about how to carry out field analysis, Bourdieu speaks of three “necessary and internally connected moments” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 104). First, one must “analyse the position of the field vis-à-vis the field of power” (p. 104). Second, one must “map out the objective structure of relations between the positions occupied by social agents who compete for the legitimate forms of specific authority of which the field is a site” (p. 104). Third, one must “analyse the habitus of social agents and the systems of dispositions they have acquired by internalising a deterministic type of social and economic condition” (p. 105).

For ‘moment’ one, I analyse the position taking of higher education in particular PhD education within the field of power of neoliberal domination (see the discussion in Chapter

Two). For ‘moment’ two, I analyse the *doxa* of contemporary neoliberalised PhD education, the position-takings of doctoral students within it, and their struggles for accumulating the cultural capital at stake (see the discussion in Chapter Two). For ‘moment’ three, I analyse the habitus that my interviewees have acquired through the PhD education in New Zealand, the school education and the higher education in China (see the discussions in Part II and Part III). Grenfell (2014) points out that the most important in field analysis is the playing back and forth between field and habitus. He furthermore points out that this interplay needs to be connected to the analysis of relations between the field and its position in the field of power. In my neo-Bourdieuian account, education and habitus are always interactive with each other, and are always connected to neoliberal domination.

Reflexivity

By reflexivity, Bourdieu means that “researcher needs to see their own research field in terms of habitus, field and capital and to objectify their own position within it” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 230). In other words, it is not only the object of research that needs to be examined and reflected upon, but it is also the very elaboration of the research object itself and the conditions of its elaboration. Bourdieu defines this process as the “objectification of participation” (p. 260). Deer (2012) argues that Bourdieu’s reflexivity can be understood as a critical epistemological approach that “consists of objectifying the very conceptualisation and the process of scientific objectification” (p. 196). Wacquant (2004) buttresses Deer’s argument by claiming Bourdieu’s reflexivity as “epistemic reflexivity” (p. 387).

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) emphasises that all knowledge producers should strive to recognise their own position within the intellectual and academic field. Sociologists

should strive to objectify their practice by engaging in a sociology of sociology which would account both for what is at stake for them and for the implicit conditions and structures of their practice. In Bourdieu's view, reflexivity aims at rethinking the 'unthought' categories, perceptions, theories and structures that underpin any pre-reflexive grasp of social conditions. Murphy and Costa (2015) argue that the ultimate purpose of Bourdieusian reflexivity is to enable researchers to "objectify their or others' subjectivities through understanding the interplay between structures and agency" (p. 6), such that it is possible to break with the *doxa* of a field.

Bourdieu (2004) refers to his own social trajectory to illustrate how the reflexive approach can be used to objectivise a researcher's relations to the object of study, and her/his position and action within a field. Bourdieu enters the French intellectual world of elites as "an upwardly mobile cultural accumulator" rather than as "a cultural inheritor" (Swartz, 1997, p. 282). Consequently, his self-consciousness is always raised to examine the taken-for-granted assumptions of the world he enters. The emphasis he places on the need to break with taken-for-granted assumptions in order to construct a scientific object and discourse resonates with his own status of being "a cultural outsider" (Swartz, 1997, p. 282) inside the French intellectual world. Echoing Bourdieu's status, both the interviewees and I are actually positioned as cultural outsiders inside the New Zealand academia. Our points of view are inclined to be generated from consciousness and reflexivity. As the researcher, my points of view on the interviewees' points of view are the expressions of my reflexivity on their reflexivity. Hence, I am actually in a position of *dual reflexivity*.

However, "there is no object that does not imply a viewpoint" (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 6), and as such, "reflexivity can only be carried out by degree[s]" (Swartz, 1997, p. 276). In the final

explication of reflexivity as a methodological necessity, Bourdieu (1990b) returns to habitus by arguing that the purpose of reflexivity is to “develop a habitus of the academic in a specific position in the social space to objectify her/his relationship to the objectified subject of the study” (p. 34). In this sense, reflexivity can be considered as a particular kind of academic habitus. Once reflexivity is embodied, academics are inclined to objectify themselves and their research in practice.

Collins (1986) argues that the social researcher who positions himself/herself in a research context that s/he does not originally belong to occupies an ‘outsider within’ position. This position can be considered, at least potentially, as a sociological resource which can be drawn upon to break the *doxa* of the field of research. Reed-Danahay (2005) argues that the informants who are caught between “two worlds” (p. 150) seem to have a methodological preference. Bourdieu (2001) recognises that social researchers, who are in a world which they originally do not belong to, occupy an ‘advantageous’ position in revealing “the invisibility of [the] habituated assumptions” (p. 117) of that world. By entering a new world to explore the educational experience of my own social group, I in fact position myself as a cultural outsider within. This position makes me become conscious of the taken-for-granted assumptions in both the new world and the world I originally came from. This raised consciousness increases my reflexivity when interpreting the social practice of my interviewees. Such critical reflexivity enables me to achieve a desirable degree of objectivity.

Constructionist Structuralism

In addition to the four necessities discussed above, this neo-Bourdieuian approach takes the philosophical framing of the Bourdieusian epistemological stance of “constructionist

structuralism” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 14). In terms of structuralism, Bourdieu means that “there exists, within the social world itself, objective structures independent of the consciousness and [the] will of social agents, which are capable of guiding and constraining their practices and their representations” (p. 14). In terms of constructivism, he means that “there is a two-fold social genesis” (p. 14), one is the schemes of perception, thought and action which are constitutive of what he calls habitus, and the other is social structures, what he calls fields, groups or social classes. Grenfell (2012) argues that Bourdieu’s social analysis focuses on the:

changing structures and institutions of world (as external objective readings) whereas analysing the nature and the extent of the individuals’ participation in it (as internal subjective reading). These two distinct social logics are inter-penetrating and mutually generating, giving rise to the ‘structured’ and ‘structuring structures’ (Grenfell, 2012, p. 212).

With this ‘constructionist structuralism’, I consider that the two structures of the external (social) and the internal (habitus) co-exist and co-construct. They are basically homogeneous and stable, but not static nor fixed. By applying the constructionist structuralism to explain social practices, firstly, I think with structures and the dialectical relations between agency and structures. Secondly, I think how agency can operate through structures, thus enabling the structures to be progressively transformed.

Specifically, my neo-Bourdieuian approach takes a historical, relational, dialectical, progressive, and critical stance to explain the doctoral becoming of my interviewees. Being historical means my explanation of the interviewees’ doctoral becoming is situated in the examination of the history of China’s education system. Being relational means that the

explanation of the individuals' social practice is connected to an examination of current and broader social conditions. Being dialectical means that the individuals' social practices are explained as a contradictory dialectical process of both conformity and resistance to the dominant structures. Being progressive, my explanation of the doctoral becoming is oriented towards a progressive transformation of the dominant structures while recognising the moments of temporary retrogression and division. Being critical, my accounts of the doctoral becoming "disenchant" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 10) neoliberal domination by revealing the "hidden and repressed" (p. 9) and exploring the means to transform this domination.

According to Bourdieu (1979a), social domination effectuates through *misrecognition* that transfigures the violence of force into a symbolic power without visible expenditure of energy. I argue as an "instrument of struggle" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 10), Bourdieusian social analysis is, in ultimate sense, intended to raise the consciousness of social agents to recognise social domination, and enabling the researcher to find the means to transform this domination. Taking a critical stance, my neo-Bourdiesian account reveals the mechanisms of neoliberal domination through education and explores the means to transform this domination. As Wright (1998) argues, no domination "however hegemonic and entrenched in institutions and everyday life is beyond contest" (p. 10). My neo-Bourdiesian analysis accounts for the transformative potentiality of scientific knowledge towards neoliberal domination through doctoral education. My analysis responds to the critique that the inadequate account of knowledge itself leads to the "inability to impact on inequality via education" (Yates, Woelert, Millar & O'Connor, 2016, p. 27) in the dominant stream of the sociology of education.

In my neo-Bourdieuian account, neoliberal reproduction is explained not as a smooth process but one accompanied by constant interruptions and potential transformations. For this purpose, on the one hand, I explain how my interviewees incorporate a neoliberal publication habitus (see Chapter Four), a native-like academic English habitus (see Chapter Five), an examination habitus (see Chapter Seven) and a neo-conservative habitus, which reproduce neoliberal domination; on the other hand, I explain the embodiment of a humanising publication habitus (see Chapter Four), an academic ‘Chinglish’ habitus (see Chapter Five), and a ‘bridging’ cultural habitus (see Chapter Six), which show the means to transform neoliberal domination. My neo-Bourdieuian account juxtaposes the postcolonial perspective of transformational resistance to neoliberal domination in terms of creating “new ways of being, knowing and doing” (Shahjahan, 2014, p. 219). My neo-Bourdieuian account intends to show that transforming neoliberal domination is possible because “power is never total or absolute” (Shahjahan, 2014, p. 224).

Social Sufferings and Social Gains

My neo-Bourdieuian analysis focuses on analysing the internal effects (re)produced after the embodiment of the habitus. It is an approach which integrates the analysis of the social with that of the psyche. As Reay (2015) notes the strong links between the psychosocial and Bourdieu’s concept of habitus by arguing that “a psychosocial understanding of habitus allows for a better and richer understanding of how the exterior – wider social structures – is experienced and mediated by the interior, the psyche” (p. 9). Steinmetz (2006) affirms Reay’s argument by stating that habitus will remain “enigmatic until their psychic foundations are revealed’ (p. 449).

My neo-Bourdieuian social analysis reveals the ‘social sufferings’ (Bourdieu & Accardo, 1999) of Chinese young people resulted from neoliberal oppression through education. The analysis also identifies the ‘social gains’ of my interviewees from internalising the virtues of morality and humanity through the PhD education in New Zealand and higher education in China, given that these virtues still exist in the larger intellectual community. ‘Social sufferings’ refer to the inner pains (anxiety, shame, depression, precariousness) that Chinese young people suffer from contemporary neoliberal education. These social sufferings are caused by the neoliberal stress of performativity, competition, and profit-making through education. ‘Social gains’ refer to the sense of liberation, enlightenment, and contribution to scientific progress and public good from internalising the virtues of humanity and morality through education. Whereas ‘social sufferings’ reveal the effects of neoliberal domination, ‘social gains’ suggest the effects of transforming this domination.

The Individual and the Social

This neo-Bourdieuian approach takes the individuals’ subjective changes as the entry points to the examination of neoliberal domination and transformation. The individual is social and enables the social to be visible, given that social practices (including thoughts, perceptions, feelings and actions) are generated from internalised social conditions. They have the valid properties for a whole social class or group. In this sense, they are collective and trans-individual. As Bourdieu (2000a) argues, the social is “instituted in biological individuals, there is, in each biological individual, something of the collective” (p. 297). However, I agree more with the argument made by Dubet and Jager (1994) that the social agent is “neither the individual in the outside world who only realises his individuality in ascetism, nor the social actor fully defined by his roles. He is the tension between these two

elements” (pp. 22-23). Following this logic, I argue that the individual’s social practice is the result of internal negotiation between agency and internalised social structures. Hence, the examination of the individuals’ social practice can reveal the mechanism of social domination as well as the dynamism of social transformation. My neo-Bourdieuian accounts of the individuals’ social practices seeks to understand the social as well as to challenge the common sense of the social as always being individual constraints.

From individual sufferings and individual gains to social sufferings and social gains, my neo-Bourdieuian approach echoes Durkheim’s practice of revealing the social from “the very heart of the most subjective experience” (Swartz, 1997, p. 46) of the individual. Whereas Bourdieuian approach tends to concentrate on social suffering and thus social domination rather than social gains and social transformation, my neo-Bourdieuian approach allows the explanation of both by taking a real constructionist structuralism stance and by introducing the virtues of morality and humanity to counter neoliberal domination.

Underpinning Assumptions

My neo-Bourdieuian approach is underpinned by the assumptions that draw on transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 1990, 2000), the theory of habitus (Bourdieu, 1988, 1990, 2000b), and the theory of modernity (Durkheim, 1977; Friedman & Friedman, 2008).

The Assumption of Transformative Learning

According to Mezirow (2000), what and how we feel and think of the social world and our self are shaped by our cultural paradigms and our personal perspectives derived from “the

idiosyncrasies of [our] primary caregivers” (p. 17). We are usually unaware of them until we confront a situation in which we cannot make sense of our experience or our sense making is not congruent with our expectations. At this point, we may become conscious of them and may try to make them “more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective” (p. 8) in order to make sense of our experience. This process is considered to be a transformative learning process. I assume that overseas PhD study within the research context can be a transformative learning process.

The Assumption of Disorientation in Overseas Education Mobility

Bourdieu (2000b) argues that “common sense is to a large extent national” (p. 98) because of the inculcation of the principles of division through the national educational institutions. National educational institutions construct the nation as a population endowed with the same categories and therefore possess the same common sense. All my interviewees completed their formal school education, and their undergraduate and Master’s study in China before undertaking a PhD abroad. They have formed their common sense within China’s national education institutions. Therefore, it is likely that the PhD study within another nation’s educational institution calls their common sense into question, and thus, disorientation may occur. The disorientation “stems largely from the countless little discrepancies between the world as it represents itself at each moment and the system of dispositions and expectations constituting common sense” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 98). The experience of disorientation is reported by some of the interviewees.

The Assumption of Permanent Revision of Habitus

According to Bourdieu (2000b), habitus constantly corresponds to new experience and crystallises the status and position that the social agent occupies. Therefore, habitus is

subject to a kind of “permanent revision” (p. 156) though never being radical, given that it works upon its pre-established premise. The constancy of revision varies according to an individual’s flexibility or rigidity.

The Assumption of Partial Dysfunction and Temporary Suspension of Habitus

However, habitus is not necessarily “adaptive to its situation nor coherent” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 160). An individual’s habitus may become partially dysfunctional or temporarily “suspended” (p. 162) when there is a radical shift in the social conditions of existence. The greater the disparity between the original habitus and the position that the social agent newly occupies, the higher the degree of consciousness brought to social practices. Undertaking the PhD study from mainland China to New Zealand, my interviewees experience a radical shift in the social conditions of existence. This shift involves cross-political, economic, and cultural complexities. During this process, their original habitus is inclined to become temporarily suspended or partially dysfunctional. Their consciousness is likely to be raised to varying degrees and impact directly upon their social practices. Their original habitus is constantly revised, and new dispositions are developed through the continuous participation in the field.

The Assumption of Transformation of Habitus

The confrontation between individual habitus and an event can exercise a pertinent incitement on habitus “if the latter snatches it from the contingency of the accidental and constitutes it as a problem by applying to it the very principles of its solution” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 55). In other words, the transformation of habitus can occur under the condition of “a prior or concomitant transformation of the objective structures of which they are the product and which they can survive” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 122) along with the awakening of

consciousness. I assume that, for some interviewees, their overseas PhD education can be this ‘event’, given that doing their PhDs abroad involves shifts in the political, economic, and cultural norms of existence. Furthermore, the reforms of fast neoliberalisation have transformed the social structures of China as well as those of the rest of the world. The shifts in overseas PhD education with the concomitant transformation of social structures are internalised and tend to transform the individual habitus.

The Assumption of Modernity

Durkheim (1977) argues that, in contrast to cultures and traditions, we are vividly aware of the most recent acquisitions of modernity which “have not had time to be assimilated into our collective unconscious” (p. 11). Friedman and Friedman (2008) affirm Durkheim’s understanding of modernity by arguing that modernity includes major conscious processes such as individualisation and critical rationalisation. Undertaking PhD study in a Western developed country transforms my interviewees in a profound way. The very nature of the modern university is supposed to develop a modern identity, an autonomous and critical thinker. This identity is articulated as the expected attributes of the doctoral graduate in the Doctoral Graduate Profile of the University of Auckland⁷ (30, March, 2009). Even though contemporary universities are becoming increasingly entrepreneurial and instrumental, there still exist the older humanising traditions of an Enlightenment informed modernity which enable my interviewees to engage in a profoundly progressive modern becoming.

⁷ Retrieved from: <https://cdn.uoa.ac.nz/assets/central/about/teaching-and-learning/teaching-and-learning-principles/documents/2009-graduate-profiles-doctoral.pdf>.

Research Arguments

Two arguments are fundamental to this neo-Bourdieuian account. Firstly, I argue that individual habitus does not mechanically reproduce neoliberal domination (Bourdieu, 2000b; Grenfell, 2012; Maton, 2012; Swartz, 1997). The reproduction is always partial and accompanied by constant negotiations between agency and neoliberal structures, and interruptions of established structures, and hybridisations of new structures. These negotiations, interruptions and hybridisations function as the impetus for social transformation. The partial reproduction of neoliberal domination develops into the dispositions of “partial loyalty” (Rata, 2017a, p. 20) to neoliberal structures. The dispositions of partial loyalty contribute to an unstable and contradictory individualisation-socialisation process (Rata, 2017a). These dispositions generate contradictory logical-conformity to neoliberal domination.

Bourdieu’s early conceptualisation of habitus is often critiqued for its over-emphasis on structural constraints, while not giving enough weight to agency for explaining change. In the recent writings on habitus by Bourdieu and Bourdieusian scholars, habitus is conceptualised as changing “constantly in response to new experience” [in] “a kind of permanent but never radical revision” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 161). However, these writings do not further explain how this change happens. I propose a thinking tool - *the progressively transforming individual habitus* - to explain how this change happens (see the discussion in Chapter Three). I define habitus as a synthesis of structure and agency which entails the capacity to transform itself when adapting to social changes.

Secondly, I argue that consciousness tends to become constantly involved in generating social practice when my interviewees experience the overseas educational mobility. With

increasing reflexivity, their individual habitus evolve over time towards a subconscious state. This argument echoes Bourdieu's assertion that "between the social agents and the social world there is a relationship of infra-conscious" (1998a, p. 79). Jenkins (2002) considers that this area "in between the conscious thought and the unconscious mind" (p. 178) has sociological importance. By integrating psychoanalysis, this area is increasingly recognised by recent Bourdieusian scholars (for example, Steinetz, 2006, 2009, 2013).

Conclusion

As Moore (2013) argues, "reality is always more complex than theory and it is the inevitable shortfall between theory and the world which drives theory forward" (p. 4). Following Moore, I consider that there always exists the dissonance between Bourdieusian explanation of education and the empirical data. This dissonance provides me with a space for developing a neo-Bourdieusian approach to analyse neoliberal domination through education. While neoliberal domination seems to be pervasive in contemporary society, the means to transform it still exists in the larger intellectual community. For this reason, a cyclic reproduction of neoliberal domination cannot become a reality. This neo-Bourdieusian analysis of the doctoral becoming of a group of Chinese international doctoral students is intended to break the taken-for-granted cyclic reproduction of neoliberal domination.

Chapter Outline

In **Chapter Two**, I construct the research object - doctoral becoming - within and beyond neoliberal domination in contemporary PhD education. I argue that the structural effect that

neoliberal domination produces on PhD students is re/producing the class of ‘entrepreneur’ (Harvey, 2005). However, there still exist other doctoral becomings beyond “the enterprising self” (Shore, 2010a, p. 28), including ‘the pursuer of symbolic power’; ‘the lover of wisdom’; ‘the border-crosser’; ‘the unsettled self’; and ‘the transformed self’. These other becomings can converge and form ‘the other’ social force which progressively transforms neoliberal domination over doctoral students. This argument sets an epistemological basis for my construction of the thinking tool - *the progressively transforming individual habitus* - through overseas doctoral education in the next chapter.

In **Chapter Three**, I construct a thinking tool: the progressively transforming individual habitus through overseas PhD study. This tool is applied to analyse subjective changes emerging in my interviewees during their PhD study. I differentiate *individual habitus* from *collective habitus* by defining individual habitus as a hybrid of collective conformity and individual resistance to dominant social structures. I argue that whereas the dispositions of conformity (re)produce homogenous practices to dominant structures, the dispositions of resistance generate practices which tend to transform dominant structures. I define individual habitus as an ever-structuring process in adapting to new conditions. Individual habitus tends to transform itself through overseas educational mobility. Individual habitus functions as a mechanism of reproduction as well as a dynamism of transformation of social domination.

I explain the subjective changes that emerge in my interviewees in three ways as: 1) the strategies individual habitus generates in adapting to new social conditions; 2) the result of an interrupted/cleft habitus; and 3) the result of the internalisation of new dispositions. I propose that individual habitus generally undergoes four stages of transformation: stability,

interruption/cleft, hybridity, and transformation. Each stage can be identified with the “causal effect[s]” (Popper, 1978, p. 150) that individual habitus produces on social practices. The four causal effects are repetition, contradiction, integration, and subversion, which are aligned with the four aforementioned stages. Overarching this thesis, I argue that individual habitus generates the ever-becoming self from the interplay of the past, the present, and the future.

In **Chapter Four**, I develop two counter concepts: the neoliberal publication habitus and the humanising publication habitus with the intention of capturing the moments of internal negotiation of two competing forces in my interviewees’ doctoral writing. One is the market force of knowledge production as a commodity for sale. The other is the humanising ideal of knowledge creation for its own sake and public good. I argue that doctoral becoming in writing exists in both senses. While the incorporation of the neoliberal publication habitus generates the thought that doctoral publication is for market exchange, the embodiment of the humanising publication habitus generates the thought that doctoral publication is for knowledge creation for its own sake and public good. Thinking with both concepts enables an explanation of the contradictory doctoral becomings in writing and an examination of interruption and cleft occurring in individual habitus.

Chapter Five is situated in the broader context of global mobility of higher education students from non-English-speaking countries to the developed English-speaking countries, mainly the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. I explain how the doctoral becoming of my interviewees is shaped and reshaped by this ‘internationalisation’ force. In the first section, by deploying Bourdieu’s concept of ‘symbolic domination’ (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991), I explain how native academic

English (i.e. British and American English) is used as an instrument with which the developed English-speaking countries dominate the global international higher education market. In the second section, by applying Bourdieu's conceptual tool of '*illusio*' (1998a, 2000a), I explain the Chinese *illusio* of acquiring a native-like academic English proficiency through immersion in English-speaking universities. In the third section, by applying Bourdieu's conceptual tools of 'linguistic habitus' and 'symbolic violence' (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991), I explain the symbolic violence that the domination of native academic English exerts on international students who are non-native English speakers studying in Anglophone universities. In the final section, I discuss how the emergence of 'academic Chinglish' reduces the symbolic violence that the domination of native academic English exerts on Chinese doctoral students. I argue that only the diversity of academic 'Englishes' can transform the domination of native academic English in international higher education and serve a real internationalisation of higher education.

In **Chapter Six**, I explain how my interviewees' doctoral becoming is a dual exclusion from both China and New Zealand societies by applying the concept of 'cultural habitus'. I define 'cultural habitus' as a set of dispositions structured from socialising in a particular culture. Cultural habitus generates a thought about distancing ourselves from the society which we do not originally belong to. When my interviewees moved to New Zealand, their Chinese cultural habitus generates a thought about distancing themselves from New Zealand society. During the long-term doctoral study, their Chinese cultural habitus is transformed through internalising the Western cultural dispositions embedded in New Zealand society. Their transformed individual cultural habitus in turn generates a thought about distancing themselves from their home society. I call this phenomenon *cultural double distancing*. The cultural double distancing leads to the dual exclusion of my interviewees from both societies.

This is a social suffering resulted from neoliberal education mobility. The cultural double distancing leads to an ‘in-between’ (Bhabha, 1996) positioning. This positioning can develop into a ‘bridging’ cultural habitus which generates a new space connecting the two worlds and a new sense of social belonging.

In **Chapter Seven**, I explain that there exists a strong belief in China’s society that completing one’s formal school education, participating in the national entrance examination, and entering university comprise the orthodox route for individual and familial upward social mobility. Over time, this belief has formed a *doxa* in China’s society and has led to an examination-driven education. This *doxa* is internalised as a collective habitus, which I call *the examination habitus*. The examination habitus consecrates high scores achieved in examinations and generates homogenous practices in social agents. I argue that the examination habitus functions as the mechanism by which neoliberalism dominates Chinese young people. The embodiment of the examination habitus causes Chinese young people to struggle to achieve high examination scores, and results in their ‘social sufferings’ of anxiety, shame, and oppression.

In **Chapter Eight**, by extending Bourdieu’s argument that neoliberalism is a conservative ideology, I explain how neoliberal domination is realised through *reviving* the older conservative forces including groupthinking, gendered pedagogic authoritarianism, and gendered familial authoritarianism. These older conservative forces are revived on the condition that they submit to the logic of the market. Over time, a neo-conservative force is formed and internalised as a collective habitus, which I call *the neo-conservative habitus*. The neo-conservative habitus tightly binds higher education choice-making of Chinese young people and their families to economic imperatives. The neo-conservative habitus

contradicts and cleaves against itself, generating an ever-growing sense of uncertainty, anxiety, and depression. I argue that the neo-conservative habitus functions as a new mode of neoliberal domination of contemporary China's society. Its conservative efficacy can be judged by the preserved older social orders and the neoliberal misery of insecurity and distress (Bourdieu, 1998b). Accordingly, I further argue that contemporary China's society is in a "neo-conservative reconstruction" (Bourdieu, 1998c, p. 125), which is disguised by economic rationality and market freedom. This argument partly explains why neoliberalism functions effectively in contemporary China's society.

In **Chapter Nine**, I explain how neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised through the application of four mechanisms: the belief in precariousness of employment prospects; the sense of 'liberation' through chasing material success; the neoliberal scholarship habitus, and the market-driven education programmes. Then I explain how the practice of a humanising pedagogy, including nurturing emotional empathy, role modelling, encouraging initiative and intellectual communication, shows a potential to transform the thinking and practice of Chinese university students that the purpose of having higher education is solely for economic returns.

In **Chapter Ten**, linking Bourdieu's ideas about countering neoliberalism (1998b, 2003) to Durkheim's thoughts on morality of education (2006a, 2006b), I propose a 'moral education' to counter neoliberal domination through education. I argue that the revival of morality through education is the only means to transform neoliberal domination over young people. I define a moral education as the practice of humanising pedagogy which orients young people towards humanising ends through nurturing the moral self, a collective mind for

social responsibility, a humanising nationalism, an ideal of human society as a community, and moral intellectual.

Part I: Setting the Scene and Constructing a Thinking Tool

Part I is composed of two chapters, Chapter Two and Three. In Chapter Two, I set the scene of the ‘doctoral becoming’ of my interviewees in the context of neoliberal domination of contemporary higher education, specifically, PhD education. I explain the doctoral becomings as being within and beyond neoliberal domination by reviewing the literature and making a logical argumentation. As such, I address the question of what subjective changes are likely to emerge in social agents through overseas PhD education. The arguments made in this chapter will echo those made in Part II: the doctoral becoming of the present. In order to explain how and why these subjective changes occur, in Chapter Three, I construct a thinking tool of the progressively transforming individual habitus. This construction is achieved by eliciting the most malleable elements from the conceptualisation of ‘habitus’ by Bourdieu himself (1977, 1990, 1992, 2000b, 2002) and the Bourdieusian scholars (including Burke, Thatcher, Ingram & Abraham, 2016; Maton, 2012; Reay, 2004; Steinmetz, 2011; Wacquant, 2011, 2014b).

Chapter Two: Doctoral Becoming Within and Beyond Neoliberal Domination

Introduction – Doctoral Becoming

Becoming suggests a transformation over time: a becoming other than what one is already. Becoming involves a movement or orientation from one state of being to another, where the latter is usually conceived [of] as somehow better than the former. [Thus] becoming implies progression (Barnacle, 2005, p. 179).

Barnacle's assumption that 'becoming' implies progression embodies the spirit of modernity. Following Barnacle, my explanation of the interviewees' 'doctoral becoming' is oriented towards a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination - a movement towards the better.

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) argues that the construction of the research object is an attempt to break with the pre-given and common sense, and to re-think the research object in a new way. Grenfell (1996) explicates that this requires a re-thinking and re-conceptualisation of the research object as 'a field'. Elsewhere, Bourdieu (1998a) asserts that there exists a "field of power" (p. 32), which is not a specific field but a structuring force connecting all fields. In other words, a field of power does not exist as a specific field but as the "structural effects" (p. 32) produced in social agents across fields. Following Bourdieu, I conceptualise neoliberalism as a field of power which produces the structural effects of the market in doctoral students. Following Grenfell, I re-think the research object - 'doctoral becoming' - as a field, structured and structuring within and beyond neoliberal domination. I argue that within neoliberal domination, the doctoral becoming is destined to be the becoming of "the enterprising self" (Shore, 2010a, p. 28), and beyond neoliberal

domination, the doctoral becoming is the becoming of the pursuer of symbolic power, the lover of knowledge, the border-crosser, the unsettled self, and the transformed self. These alternative becomings to the enterprising self converges to form 'the other' social force transforming neoliberal domination over doctoral students.

Neoliberalism and Neoliberalisation

Neoliberalism as an ideology for new capitalist accumulation and social organisation is inspired by writers such as Friedrich Hayek (1976) and Milton Friedman (1982). Emerging in the late 1970s as an alternative to Keynesian economics of the welfare state, neoliberalism naturalises a social Darwinism of the survival of the fittest (Brown & Lauder, 2001). By reducing the direct role of the state in national economic development, neoliberalism seeks to increase the role of the market and the market-like mechanisms in determining social order (Novelli, 2016). Broadly, neoliberalism has been interpreted as a Western ideological paradigm which prioritises such goals as economic efficiency, consumer choice, and individual autonomy (Wu, 2010). It shifts social responsibility from governments and corporations onto individuals. Neoliberalism takes a market-driven approach to economic and social policy-making and maximises the role of private business sectors in determining the political and economic priorities of state (Wu, 2010). It presumes that the market and market signals can best determine all allocative decisions, hence everything can be priced and traded as a commodity subject to legal contract (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism values market exchange as “an ethic in itself, capable of guiding all human action” (Harvey, 2005, p. 13), social integration, and governance regardless of the differences in concrete state policies (Ong, 2007).

Bourdieu (1998a) sees neoliberalism as a powerful economic theory which combines “symbolic strength” with “the effect of theory”, thus redoubling the force of “economic realities” (p. 126) it is supposed to express. With the aid of economic theory, neoliberalism expresses itself as a “scientific description of reality” (p. 1), and functions as a sort of “logical machine” (p. 2) regulating social agents. In the name of economic efficiency, neoliberalism “sanctifies the power of markets” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 3), and turns the maximisation of individual profits into “a mode of rationality” (p. 3). By imposing a sort of “moral Darwinism” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 4), neoliberalism sweeps away all guarantees of employment in favour of casualisation, short-term hiring, corporate conformism, and individual responsabilisation. In this way, a Darwinian world of all against all emerges, one in which everyone clings to their jobs by a permanent threat of unemployment (Doogan, 2009). As such, neoliberalism produces the “structural violence” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 2) - a sense of precariousness - on social agents, which in effect produces docile employees. Bourdieu (1998c) argues that neoliberalism, in essence, is a reactionary ideology - a new type of conservatism which restores the most archaic forms of economic relation disguised by progress, reason and science. It is in fact “a return to a sort of radical capitalism” (1998c, p. 125) operating according to the law of financial market. In the case of China, I argue that neoliberal domination over Chinese people is reinforced by reviving the older conservative forces such as “groupthinking” (Burke, 1968, as cited in O’Hara, 2011, p. 25), gender stereotypes, pedagogic authoritarianism, and familial authoritarianism. This argument is illustrated with the higher education choice-making of my interviewees in Chapter Eight.

However, neoliberalism never exists as a “monolithic structure” but is “repeatedly made and remade” as a “flexible credo” (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012, p. 273). There is no simple “export of neoliberalism from one hegemonic centre”, but “a decentred and unstable

evolutionary process” (Harvey, 2006, p. 41). Therefore, there is a need to distinguish between neoliberalism as an ideology and a neoliberalisation process that actually exists in the social realm (Brenner & Theodore, 2002). Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) conceptualise neoliberalisation as a market disciplinary process that is historically specific and geo-unevenly developed. This process is intrinsically contradictory because the regulatory strategies it employs frequently undermine the very socio-institutional and political economic conditions necessary for their successful implementation. This intrinsic contradiction often leads to policy failure, which in turn provides “a powerful impetus for their accelerating proliferation and reinvention across sites and scales” (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012, p. 273). Neoliberalisation as a process is frequently “lopsided and partial” (Harvey, 2005, p. 13) lurching from one state and social formation to another. The utopian construction of a ‘free’ economy and thus a ‘free’ society in neoliberalism is ultimately unrealisable because it engenders new rounds of experimentation which are oriented towards the same market-disciplinary agendas underpinning the earlier policies. Hence, neoliberalisation process is characterised as a kind of “permanent revolution” (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012, p. 274) of market-oriented reform and policy experimentation. As such, neoliberalisation turns to be a self-contradictory process with an ever-intensifying tendency. I argue that as neoliberalisation process advances, it tends to generate a “fissure” (Rata, 2017a, p. 23) – a new space which progressively transforms its domination.

Harvey (2005) points out that in the end neoliberalisation is a political project of class restoration. In order to establish “a pro-corporate, freer-trading market order” (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012, p. 277), neoliberalisation process needs to capture and reuse the state. If markets do not exist, they can be created through state action. This results in increasingly authoritarian governance and the rise of a new elite class of entrepreneurs

(Harvey, 2005). Echoing Harvey's argument, Bourdieu (1998b) considers neoliberalisation as a political project which proceeds through destroying all collective structures capable of impeding pure market logic and dissolving "all of the universal values associated with the idea of the public realm (p. 4). Elsewhere, he (1998c) argues that the neoliberalisation process is "against all the forms of civilisation associated with the social state" (p. 127). And this political intention of neoliberalisation is often misrecognised as an "economic inevitability" (Grenfell, 2004, p. 130).

I argue that neoliberalisation, in essence, is a symbolisation process. It presents itself as a common sense, a common norm, and a common statement, enabling it to pass into public discourse as an evident truth. This symbolisation process is realised through making the languages used in economics such as free exchange, free circulation, and free competition regulate what is 'thinkable' and 'unthinkable' in our daily practices. Education is taken for granted for producing "the producers themselves" (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 1). The introduction of market regulation to PhD education has resulted the production of both knowledge commodities and knowledge producers themselves. In the following sections, I explain how neoliberalisation produces the structural effects of the market on PhD education globally and specifically in New Zealand, and shapes the doctoral becoming of my research interviewees.

Neoliberalisation of Higher Education

Bourdieu (1990) conceptualises contemporary educational system as a major means of reproducing social domination (see also, Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Elsewhere, Bourdieu (1996) points out particularly that higher education system functions as a "screen" (p. 36),

permitting the realisation of social domination. Through reproducing the structural effects of the market on educational institutions, neoliberalism realises domination over young people. The main structural effects of the market that neoliberalisation produces on higher education include bringing it tightly to the global knowledge economy (Brown & Lauder, 2006; Kamat, Mir & Mathew, 2004), regulating it with economic efficiency and enterprising productivity, and reducing its autonomy in defining its values as a public good. A global project of “educational capitalism” (Santos, 2009, p. 276) is underway through the disinvestment of state in public universities and the commercialisation of higher education. The emergence of the “enterprise university” and the “exchange university” (Fisher, Metcalfe & Field, 2016, p. 64) illustrates the structural effects of the market. Within neoliberal domination, higher education not only reproduces the market but also it itself is reproduced as a market.

Amsler and Shore (2017) argue that contemporary higher education has entered a stage of “post-neoliberal” (p. 132) governance, which, in their sense, marks a further entrenchment and institutional centralisation of the market. This is achieved through intensifying the authoritarian governance which produces a “coercive, non-democratically developed matrix of standards, strategies, and objectives that determine what is [a] ‘recognisable’ academic activity” (p. 135). Commercialisation of knowledge gives rise to money-making initiatives and provides the opportunities for turning specialised knowledge into profits (Shore, 2010a). The instrumentalisation of knowledge that serves the economy orients higher education to benchmarking, testing, research metrics, and prioritises the sort of knowledge that is economically potent. In short, the structural effect that neoliberalisation produces on higher education can be seen as transferring the market rationale into the politics of university. The

consequences of this transference are the managerial regulation of teaching and learning, and the commodification of knowledge and knowledge creation.

Neoliberalisation of Higher Education in New Zealand

New Zealand is often seen as an ‘experimental laboratory’ for neoliberal ideas and governance (Apple, 2004; Shore, 2008, 2010b). By adopting a series of radical economic reforms between 1984 and 1993 (Kelsey, 1995; Lauder, Brown, Dillabough & Halsey, 2006; Robertson & Dale, 2002), New Zealand shifted from a “protected, regulated and state-dominated system of capitalist democracy” to an “open, competitive, free-market society” (Nagel, 1998, p. 223). In 1980s, New Zealand pioneered the new public management processes in the introduction of techniques associated with New Public Management (‘NPM’), which commercialise academic teaching and research (Bruneau & Savage, 2002; Robertson & Dale, 2002). In 1990, the restructuring in education turns New Zealand higher education into a ‘laboratory’ for testing neoliberal governance (Robertson & Dale, 2002).

In pursuit of this neoliberal vision, successive governments in New Zealand have introduced new funding mechanisms and auditing systems designed to render universities more economical, accountable, flexible and more responsive both to industry and entrepreneur (Brenneis, Shore & Wright, 2005; Shore, 2010a). Its ‘Tertiary Educations Strategy 2007–12’ (‘TES’) has aimed at aligning ‘New Zealand’s national goals’ with those of enterprise, including ‘creating a highly skilled workforce’, ‘economic transformation’ and ‘developing leaders with entrepreneurial and business management skills to underpin innovation’ (MoE, 2007, pp. 8–9)”. According to the economic agenda of the Government during this period, the public universities in New Zealand came to be increasingly defined by their “commercial

interests and entrepreneurial output[s]” (Shore, 2010b, p. 26). ‘Performance management’ and ‘international benchmarking’ dominate the way universities operate (Shore & Wright, 2000; Robertson & Dale, 2002; Crook, Gross & Dymott, 2006).

Under neoliberal governance, the prevailing discourses locate research education as a ready source of labour and commodities for a new economy, which principally trades in knowledge (Barnacle, 2005). The incorporation of research education into the knowledge economy means that much research is no longer disinterested but rather becomes closely “bound to the fortunes of corporations” (Lauder, Brown, Dillabough & Halsey, 2006, p. 41) such that knowledge is produced for sale (Lyotard, 1984). Doctoral education has been put to the forefront of serving the new economy and has been naturalised as a main way of producing knowledge workers and knowledge commodities. Instead of making philosophical inquiry for the sake of knowledge itself as it is traditionally thought of, the contemporary PhD education in New Zealand has been increasingly implemented with a view of serving the national economy (Burford, 2016). The introduction of new knowledge production techniques has changed the discourse of why knowledge should be created. Such notions as ‘strategic’ research and ‘innovative’ research’ emerge, and there is an upsurge of interest in ‘interdisciplinarity’ in doctoral training and research. Many PhD programs explicitly encourage the innovative and cross-disciplinary work, and the development of non-disciplinary-based attributes (Yates, Woelert, Millar & O’Connor, 2016). Research questions have been increasingly built upon the economic priorities of the nation and collaborations with industry rather than around a self-contained academic discourse. Knowledge creation in PhD education has been increasingly “mediated by political agendas and various interest groups” (Yates, Woelert, Millar & O’Connor, 2016, p. 27). What form of knowledge and for what knowledge is created have been left to the decisions of politicians

(Young, 2008) and elite entrepreneurs. Knowledge itself is losing its voice (Yates, Woelert, Millar & O'Connor, 2016).

Internationalisation of PhD Education

Furthermore, the neoliberalisation of higher education proceeds through internationalisation of higher education. In fact, internationalisation has become an effective means by which the developed countries, in particular, the developed English-speaking countries, have been able to rapidly expand their education markets and maximise their economic profits. Public universities in these countries compete for international doctoral students in order to secure their financial viability and to build their research capacity, which in turn serves their national economy (Yates, Woelert, Millar & O'Connor, 2016). Given that the PhD cohort in these universities is made up of a much higher percentage of international PhD students than that of domestic students, many of these universities are labelled and label themselves as the 'Global Research Universities' (Shen, Wang & Jin, 2016).

The rapid expansion of the PhD education through internationalisation in these countries results in less time for supervision, stricter completion deadlines, and a greater focus on research efficiency and productivity. It also leads to the oversupply of doctoral graduates to academic job market and hence the intensified competition for academic jobs (Neumann & Tan, 2011). Bernstein and his colleagues (2014) note that the last two decades have seen an increase in the number of PhDs awarded and a decreasing demand for traditional academic researchers. The reduction in secure academic positions in public universities globally worsens the employment prospect for PhD students who have trained to be academics. PhD graduates who want to work in academia face a tough job climate (Gemme & Gingras, 2012),

given that the global academic market is plagued by “growing contractualisation and dwindling permanent positions” (Walker & Yoon, 2016, p. 2). To secure an academic position, an increasingly visible profile of academic publications, external funding, grants and leadership on research projects is expected (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel & Hutchings, 2008). Many PhD graduates never attain a permanent position or reach it only after years’ working in temporary positions. For members of equity-seeking groups who have sacrificed a great deal to afford a prolonged period of doctoral study, the situation is “all the more poignant” (Morrison, Rudd & Nerad, 2011, p. 538). The market effect of precarious employment prospect that neoliberalisation produces on PhD students is prominent (see also the discussion in Chapter Four).

Although New Zealand shares the same language advantage of English as its neighbour Australia, it lags behind Australia in attracting international students owing to its geographical location. Also, with a small population, New Zealand’s membership of academic disciplines is tiny by world standards (Middleton, 2007). Under such circumstances, rapid expansion of PhD education through internationalisation turns out to be an effective strategy for the New Zealand Government to enhance its external renown in order to attract international students and to occupy a competitive position in the global knowledge economy competition.

In 2011, the New Zealand Government released ‘the Leadership Statement for International Education’. The Statement sets a “bold aspiration” to “double its economic value of international education to \$5 billion over the next 15 years”, which is expected to be realised though “doubl[ing] the number of international postgraduate students, particularly those at

PhD level, from 10,000 to 20,000”⁸. The Statement shows a strong economic rationale underpinning the internationalisation of its higher education. In particular, the statement emphasises that the educational link between New Zealand and China is essential for maintaining and growing the mutual beneficial relationship given that China was ranked the first among the top 5 source countries of international students in 2010 in New Zealand. In 2014, the New Zealand Government launched ‘the Leadership Statement for International Education - Progress Update’, which identifies education collaboration between New Zealand and China as an important “development strategy” (p. 12). It is clearly articulated in this Statement that the internationalisation of higher education is an important ‘economic strategy’ for strengthening New Zealand’s global competitiveness, and that educational cooperation with China is crucial for the successful implementation of this strategy. This Statement actually legitimates neoliberal governance over New Zealand’s higher education in the service of the national economy. This Statement powerfully shapes the “vision, motivation and action” (Wright & Reinhold, 2011, p. 101) of New Zealand’s public universities, not to mention knowledge transmission and creation in these universities. This Statement also shapes the doctoral becoming of international students studying in these universities.

Doctoral Becoming of the Enterprising Self

While the structural effect that neoliberalisation produces on PhD education is orienting PhD education towards economic ends, it produces the homogenous effect in PhD students by orienting their doctoral becoming towards “the enterprising self” (Shore, 2010a, p. 28).

⁸ Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/overall-strategies-and-policies/leadership-statement-for-international-education>.

In the struggle to accumulate ‘PhD capital’ including scholarships, research funding, and academic publications for future economic exchange (Acker & Haque, 2010; Gopaul, 2011, 2012; Walker & Yoon, 2016), doctoral students tend to lose sight of the other reasons for undertaking doctoral research (Roberts, 2007). Over time, a strong economic ethic has been incorporated, which motivates doctoral students to effectively market themselves in the academic job market. Over time, the “ontological status” (Roberts, 2007, p. 359) of becoming “the enterprising self” (Shore, 2010a, p. 28) tends to be habituated. This tendency is illustrated with the doctoral writing practices of my interviewees in Chapter Four. In that chapter, I identify the embodiment of a neoliberal publication habitus as one of the characteristics of the doctoral becoming of the enterprising self.

Other Doctoral Becomings

However, thinking beyond neoliberal domination, there still exist other doctoral becomings, including the pursuer of symbolic power, the lover of wisdom, the border-crosser, the unsettled self, and the transformed self.

The Pursuer of Symbolic Distinction

While emphasising that higher education reproduces social domination, Bourdieu (1998a) defines academic worlds as the “sites par excellence of disinterestedness” (p. 75) and academic exercise as “a gratuitous game, a mental experience that is an end in and of itself” (p. 128). Academics, within their specific research disciplines, are more or less defined as a group with the most disinterested interest. This most disinterested interest enables them to pursue symbolic distinction - the ‘profit’ of “seeing themselves and being seen as totally

disinterested” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 1). With this most disinterested interest, academics endeavour to reveal the ‘truth’ of the natural and social worlds, and to “bring [this truth] into existence” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 146). I argue that this most disinterested interest is generated upon the “recognition and consecration” (p. 141) of the ‘symbolic power’ (Bourdieu, 1989) present in intellectual communication. This disinterested interest can only occur between the academics endowed with the same cognitive schemes; academics who are inclined to recognise each other as legitimate interlocutors, equal in honour and agreeing to talk on the same speaking terms. The “devotion, piety or love” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 199) they show for symbolic power is internalised as a disposition – a sort of intellectual rationality which transcends economic rationality. The internalisation of intellectual rationality which generates the most disinterested interest suggests the doctoral becoming of the pursuer of symbolic distinction.

The Lover of Wisdom

Alternatively, there exists another doctoral becoming recognisable through tracing the origin of the notion ‘PhD’ (Doctor of Philosophy). In ancient Greek, ‘philos’ refers to a form of love, and ‘sophia’ means wisdom. Thus, the word ‘philosophy’ denotes “the love of wisdom” (Barnacle, 2005, p. 182). Becoming a PhD suggests a movement towards the lover of wisdom through knowledge assimilation and creation (Kelly, 2017; Lovitts, 2007). “Knowledge as liberator” (Rata, 1996, p. 60) enables the doctoral becoming of “personal insight and transcendence” (p. 60).

The pedagogy of “privatised, master–apprenticeship supervision” (Morley, Leonard & David, 2002, p. 263) that the traditional model of PhD education practises is criticised for

being overly implicit. Some researchers call for changing this implicit pedagogy by introducing formal courses, in particular the courses for academic publication (Park, 2005; Pilbeam & Denyer, 2009; Servage, 2009). Conversely, I argue that the implicit pedagogy practised in the traditional model of PhD education provides the greatest possibility for maintaining the old scholarly values of knowledge exploration and creation for the sake of knowledge itself, and of nurturing the disposition of the love of wisdom. According to Bourdieu (1990b), the practice of the most implicit pedagogy can most fully realise the “self-reproductive tendency” (p. 61) of knowledge. The practice of the implicit pedagogy in the traditional model of PhD education most fully ensures the self-reproduction of knowledge for its own sake, or at least creates a tension between knowledge creation for its own sake and knowledge production for individual profits in doctoral students. The pedagogy of privatised master-apprenticeship supervision that the traditional model of PhD education is distinctive from the measurable and countable pedagogy of credits completion and academic publications, which imposes on doctoral students the “discontinuous and extraordinary actions of symbolic violence” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 32). In this sense, the traditional model of PhD education maintains the ‘Humboldtian philosophy’ of education as a means of pure intellectual development and personal transformation (Côté & Furlong, 2016). In this sense, the doctoral becoming of the lover of wisdom is in fact the doctoral becoming of a knowledge explorer-in-self.

The Border-Crosser

The doctoral becoming of the ‘border-crosser’ emerges from the global internationalisation of PhD education. Costa (2016) and Bathmaker (2015) argue that long-term overseas study often produces ‘cross-field’ effects in individuals’ subjectivities as they move into a foreign

world. When the *doxas* of two worlds (home and abroad) compete, the cross-field effects of disorientation and contradiction are produced. Over time, these effects can lead to a cleft in individual habitus. This cleft has the potential of developing into a new space which hybridises the competing *doxas* of both worlds. The doctoral becoming of the border-crosser tends to form a highly reflexive subjectivity “attuned to the challenges of the complexity” (Green, 2009, p. 241) of border crossing. The doctoral becoming of the border-crosser is reminiscent in Marginson’s (2010) argument of “a more cosmopolitan higher education” (p. 6978) which results from the greater mobility and pluralisation that accompanies contemporary higher education. This tendency is illustrated with the doctoral becoming of one of my interviewees, Zhao, in Chapter Six.

The Unsettled Self

In his early writing, Bourdieu (1988) highlights the paradoxical nature of university on account of it being organised according to “two antagonistic principles of hierarchisation” (p. 48) of the social and the cultural. The social hierarchy, determined by the economic and political capital that individuals hold, is in opposition to the cultural hierarchy, which corresponds to the capital of “scientific authority or intellectual renown” (p. 48). Therefore, university occupies “a dominant fraction of the dominated fields” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 145). While dominated by economic and political power, university possesses the privileges of legitimating cultural capital. Academics hence occupy the positions of the “dominated dominants” (Bourdieu, Sapiro & McHale, 1991, p. 655) in social world. They are dominants in that they enjoy the power of “provid[ing] or withdraw[ing] legitimation of the social order” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 145) through mobilising the valued cultural capital that they possess. Yet, they are also dominated in their relations to the holders of

political and economic power. This “relative autonomy” (p. 145) contradicts their logic of practice in which there is both conforming and resistance to economic and political power - an object of the eternal conflict. Hence, academics are born “paradoxical” and “bi-dimensional” beings with “something unstable and unsettled” (Bourdieu, Sapiro & McHale, 1991, p. 656). This “idealistic-economic contradiction” (Rata, 1996, p. 60) is experienced as a “goodness and power paradox” (p. 60; see also, Goudner, 1979). This innate contradiction of being academic suggests the doctoral becoming of the unsettled self, which implicitly shapes the doctoral becoming of all my interviewees.

The Transformed Self

In post-modern discourse, doctoral becoming is often considered fragmented by uncertainty. Bernstein and his colleagues (Bernstein, Evans, Fyffe, Halai, Hall & Jensen, 2014) found that when confronting, absorbing and accommodating global forces, changes accompany subjectivity formation of doctoral students. Some of their respondents reported that changes occurred in their employment prospects. Some reported that changes occurred in their values and attitudes towards becoming an expert in their research fields. Other researchers argue that what takes place in and between different stages of PhD study is frequently ambiguous and open to numerous possibilities and amendments (Elliot, Baumfield, Reid & Makara, 2016; Gardner, 2007). The individual trajectory of doctoral becoming diversifies, and there exist numerous alternative becomings to the neoliberal becoming, even if they may turn to be episodic. For example, doctoral becoming can be a process of forming “a scholastic view of the world” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 98) transcending national borders, or a process of constructing a ‘third space’ for a unique social existence of doctoral students. Doctoral becoming can be a process of acquiring the courage to use one’s own reason to make

autonomous judgements (Kant, 1995), or a process of developing the ‘passion’ for truth-seeking and knowledge creation. Or, doctoral becoming can be a process involving epistemological breaks and intellectual reorientation towards the social world and the self. All these alternative becomings can converge to form ‘the other’ social force, progressively transforming neoliberal domination over doctoral students. Affirming Barnacle’s (2005) argument, I consider that while doctoral becoming appears to be dominated by the discourse of the knowledge economy, it fully engages with the potential of the alternative becomings. The account that reduces doctoral becoming to ‘the enterprising self’ is “impoverished and misses the real import of the learning experience: that is transformative” (Barnacle, 2005, p.187).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have conceptualised contemporary doctoral becoming as a field of being within and beyond neoliberal domination. I have argued that the doctoral becoming within neoliberal domination is the becoming of ‘the enterprising self’ while the alternative becomings of the pursuer of symbolic power, the lover of wisdom, the border-crosser, the unsettled self, and the transformed self suggest the becomings beyond neoliberal domination. These doctoral becomings can converge to form ‘the other’ social force, progressively transforming neoliberal domination over doctoral students. This argument sets the epistemological basis for constructing a thinking tool - a *progressively transforming individual habitus* - in the next chapter.

Chapter Three: A Progressively Transforming Individual Habitus

Introduction

In this chapter, I construct the thinking tool - ‘a progressively transforming individual habitus’ - to explain the subjective changes of my interviewees through overseas doctoral education. This thinking tool is constructed by eliciting the most malleable elements of conceptualising ‘habitus’ by both Bourdieu himself (1977, 1990, 1992, 2000b, 2002) and the Bourdieusian scholars (including Burke, Thatcher, Ingram & Abraham, 2016; Maton, 2012; Reay, 2004; Steinmetz, 2011; Swartz, 1997; Wacquant, 2011, 2014b).

Habitus – A Way of Thinking

‘Habitus’ is the locus of the Bourdieusian *milieu* of social analysis. Bourdieu (1990) conceptualises habitus as a “system of dispositions” (p. 52) of the internalised social structures. Bourdieu explains that habitus is developed with the purpose of revealing the mechanism of social reproduction. He argues that habitus is “structured and structuring” (p. 52) homogeneously to the structures of dominant social forces. Habitus is predisposed to “consecrate” (2000b, p. 242) a dominant social force, perceiving it as “a sign of importance” (p. 242). As such, habitus reproduces the dominant social force by “transfiguring the power relation [that dominates] into a sense relation” (p. 242) and by incorporating the dominant force as the logic of practice.

Bourdieu (1985) emphasises that the notion habitus is developed as a way of thinking, or a method of inquiry for social research. Wacquant (2011) explains that habitus “is not an

answer to a research question but rather an organised manner of asking questions about the social world” (p. 91). Reay (2004) explicates that Bourdieu in fact conceptualises habitus “in a very elastic sense” (p. 439; see also, Wacquant, 2014b). For example, Bourdieu writes that habitus is “a virtue made of necessity” (1990, p. 54) and needs to be practised as “an art” (2002, p. 33). These conceptualisations allow habitus the greatest malleability in explaining “the power of thinking itself” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 221). By conceptualising habitus as a virtual necessity and its practice as an art, Bourdieu persistently challenges the mechanical interpretation of habitus that reduces habitus to a mechanism for social reproduction.

In fact, in his early conceptualisation of habitus, Bourdieu (1977) explains that the choice of the term ‘habitus’ stems from “the wish to set aside the common conception of ‘habit’ as a mechanical assembly or performed programme” (p. 218). This intention is seen in his earliest work on Algeria (1960), which first introduced the idea of habitus in order to understand not the reproductive harmony but the nonalignment between the Algerian peasants’ dispositions and the radically changed economic conditions of the late-colonialised Algerian society (Bourdieu, 1979b). Steinmetz (2011) comments that in Bourdieu’s second major work on the crisis of masculine marriageability in rural Béarn (Bourdieu, 2008), habitus is employed to explain “a failure of social reproduction” (p. 52). In other writings, Bourdieu repeatedly emphasises that instead of mechanically reproducing dominant social structures, habitus acts as the “mediation” (1977, p. 72) between structures and practice. Habitus is dialectical to “an external causality” (2000b, p. 210). Using a “synthetic view” (1992, p. viii), Bourdieu conceptualises habitus as a way of re-introducing agency into practice without compromising consciousness of social constraints. This enables a dialectical explanation of practice which holds together social structures and

agency. In his later writing, Bourdieu further broadens the conceptualisation of habitus by stressing the creativity of habitus in generating the inventive forms of practice, which gives full weight to the active aspect of social practice (Swartz, 1997). In his latest conceptualisation, Bourdieu (2000b) emphasises that habitus enables social agents to generate *infinite* strategies in response to rapid changes in modern society. Reay (2004) highlights the infinite generative capacity of habitus by arguing that habitus offers the only durable form of *freedom* to practice. Maton (2012) considers Bourdieu's conceptualisation of habitus as an effort to embrace the dual nature of practice by dialectically explaining "how social structure and individual agency can be reconciled, and how the 'outer' social and 'inner' self help to shape each other" (p. 49). Maton's understanding of habitus echoes the argument made by Burke, Thatcher, Ingram and Abraham (2016) that habitus explains the "interpenetrative relationship between structure and agency" (p. 2).

These malleable conceptualisations of habitus by Bourdieu and the Bourdieusian scholars have enabled me to work beyond a reproductive explanation of the doctoral becoming of my interviewees. In particular, building on Bourdieu's later conceptualisation of the generative capacity of habitus, I theorise the disturbances which the interviewees experienced during their overseas doctoral study and the dialectic interaction between agency and neoliberal structures as the sources of a generative 'doctoral becoming'. I argue that although neoliberal performativity appears to dominate the doctoral becoming of the interviewees, the virtues of humanity and morality embedded in scientific knowledge progressively transform this domination. The thinking tool of a progressively transforming individual habitus is constructed to explain this tendency. This construction is an effort to move beyond the habitual use of habitus, which is reduced to explaining a 'one way' process of social reproduction in which the dominant social structures determine individual practice.

Moving beyond this habitual use of habitus, the thinking tool of a progressively transforming individual habitus explains a discursive process of social transformation accompanied by constant negotiations between agency and structures. In the following sections, I construct the thinking tool of a progressively transforming individual habitus: firstly, by redefining individual habitus as a hybrid of collective conformity and individual resistance; secondly, by explicating the changeability of individual habitus; and thirdly, by explaining the rationale of the progressive transformation of individual habitus.

Individual Habitus - a Hybrid of Collective Conformity and Individual Resistance

In his conceptualisation of habitus, Bourdieu differentiates collective habitus from individual habitus by arguing that for a particular social group, the “homogeneity of conditions of existence” (1990, p. 58) results in a “collective habitus” (p. 58). A collective habitus produces “a common-sense world by providing the consensus on the meaning of practices” (p. 58) among group members. A collective habitus tends to generate the behaviours that are anticipatory and compatible with the objective conditions and the logic of the particular field within which a collective habitus has been formed (Bourdieu, 2000b). A collective habitus enables an institution to “attain full realisation through its capacity of incorporation” of “durable dispositions [in social agents] to recognise and comply with the demands immanent in a field” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 57). For example, the collective habitus structured through educational experience enables an educational system to realise its full domination in terms of generating conformity in social practice (Bourdieu, 1977). This is particularly true for the Chinese education system. Because the Chinese education system is highly centralised and homogenous, the collective habitus formed from educational experience secures the full domination of the system through generating a high degree of

conformity in social practice. “Some unity” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 29) is identified in the practices of my research interviewees, which can be explained partly as the embodiment of the collective education habitus from their homogenous school experience in China (see the discussion in Chapter Seven).

In contrast to the conceptualisation of collective habitus, Bourdieu (1990) defines individual habitus as the “accumulated capital of all past” (p. 56), providing relative autonomy to the present and assimilating the present to be the past of the next present, thus ensuring “permanent change” (p. 56). In other words, individual habitus integrates new experience at every moment into the structures formed by past experience, resulting in a continuous modification and unique structuring of individual habitus.

Bourdieu (1990) defines individual habitus as being composed of primary habitus that is formed from early socialisation experiences (mainly family socialisation experience) and secondary habitus which is acquired at a later stage in more specialised contexts, such as at school and in workplace. He argues that primary habitus “tends to ensure its own constancy and its defense against change” (1990, p. 60) whereas secondary habitus is more likely to encourage changes. In difference to Bourdieu’s argument, Berger and Luckmann (1991) see the success of both primary and secondary socialisation as “problematic” (p. 164). This argument echoes the socialisation experiences of the interviewees. They describe the experiences of contradictions and conflicts in both their early familial and later school socialisation. These experiences suggest the occurrence of resistance in the formation of both primary and secondary habitus. A growing body of research in cognitive psychology (see for example, O’Gorman, 1986) suggests that individuals persistently misperceive the sentiments, thoughts, and actions of their peers.

Affirming these findings, I assert that resistance accompanies the formation of both primary and secondary habitus, and that dispositions of resistance are constituents of individual habitus. The dispositions of resistance make individual habitus not a full reproduction of dominant social structures, which collective habitus is conceptualised to be. I define individual habitus as a hybrid of collective conformity with individual resistance to dominant social structures. Whereas the dispositions of conformity generate social practices which are in homogeneity with dominant social structures, the dispositions of resistance generate social practices which represent resistance to dominant social structures at varying degrees and in varying ways, depending on the social conditions in which individual habitus functions. My way of defining individual habitus echoes Wacquant's (2011) argument that individual habitus suggests a set of dispositions that vary according to the individual's "social location and trajectory" (p. 86). In this sense, individual habitus can also be understood as a process in which the dispositions of collective conformity and individual resistance are structuring with experiences to justify social practice at every moment.

Hence, individual habitus can also be understood as a generative system in alternative to being understood as a control system. Individual habitus always functions in a socially embedded state of improvisational flexibility (Bourdieu, 1990). Rather than being permanently structured, individual habitus evolves "from restructuring to restructuring" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 134) as social agents interact continuously with the outside world. It can be considered as much "a force of change" (Murphy & Costa, 2015, p. 4) as a continuity of tradition and history. Thus, individual habitus functions as both a mechanism for social reproduction and a dynamism for social transformation. This argument serves as the rationale with which I construct the thinking tool of a progressively transforming individual habitus.

The Changeability of Individual Habitus

Bourdieu's theorisation and application of habitus shifts from the early explanation of regulated behaviours to the more recent explication of the deviations from orthodox social practice (1999a, 2000b, 2002, 2004). This shift can be considered to be the result of Bourdieu's continuous reflections on the "complexity and ambiguity of individual perceptions to the external" (Swartz, 1997, p. 111). In order to increase the malleability of habitus in explaining social practice, Bourdieu (2000b) writes that rather than being always adaptive and consistent, habitus can be "divided and contradictory, fluctuating and variable, depending on the social conditions of its formation and exercise" (p. 64). Habitus is "a combination of constancy and variation according to individual flexibility or rigidity" (p. 64). Habitus changes constantly in response to new experiences within certain bounds of continuity (2000b, 2002). Habitus is "subject to a kind of permanent but not radical revision" (2000b, p. 161). Habitus is "an open system to the very structures of the world" (2000b, p. 141). From the exposed to the disposed, habitus is open to change, which "either reinforces or modifies external structures" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 133).

Recent Bourdieusian scholars also recognise that both primary and secondary habitus can change, albeit not without significant difficulty (for example, Baxter & Britton 2001; Horvat & Davis, 2011; Lee & Kramer, 2013). In his final writings, Bourdieu (2002) notes that habitus, being "partially conscious and explicit, may be changed through the process of awareness and pedagogic effort" (p. 31). The changing linguistic habitus of one of my interviewees, Hong, illustrates this argument (see the discussion in Chapter Five). Against the deterministic understanding of habitus, Bourdieu argues that "habitus is not a fate, not a destiny" (2000b, p. 29). These ideas on the changeability of individual habitus provide valid

foundations for the construction of the thinking tool *a progressively transforming individual habitus*.

The Rationale of Progressive Transformation of Individual Habitus

McNay (2001) observes an increasing emphasis on the moments of “misalignment and tension between habitus and field” (p. 146) in Bourdieu’s most recent work. For example, Bourdieu (2000b) writes that the “perfect coincidence of perceptive schemes and objective structures is only possible in the ordinary experience of the familiar world as opposed to foreign or exotic world” (p. 147). There is a dialectical confrontation between the individual habitus and the objective structures which are different from those in which the individual habitus was formed (Bourdieu, 2002). Habitus tends to transform itself if the objective structures are striking and work to counter habitus over a sustained period of time.

Furthermore, “the gap between expectations and experience” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 141) can precipitate the transformation process. Bourdieu (1984) writes that higher education expansion without parallel expansion in the labour market is bound to lead to a diploma inflation, which in turn generates a “structural disparity between aspirations and real probabilities” (p. 144). The disparity between the aspiration for academic position and the real academic job possibilities has become increasingly prominent as a consequence of the rapid global expansion of PhD education (see the discussion in Chapter Two). This rapid expansion leads to an over-supply of doctoral graduates to the labour market. The prominent disparity between the doctoral aspiration for academic position and the real possibilities of obtaining an academic job can lead to “collective disillusionment” (Bourdieu & Passeron,

1990, p. 144) among doctoral students and as a consequence precipitate the transformation of their individual habitus.

For my interviewees, the confrontation between their home habitus and the foreign social conditions, and the gap between their aspiration for academic career and the real probabilities of realising such a career can cause temporarily “misfires” or “blips” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 159) in their individual habitus. Under such conditions, consciousness will be raised, and agency will get involved in generating social practice. Some of the interviewees talk about the crisis they experienced in the doctoral study - feeling disorientated, getting stuck, and thinking of quitting their doctoral research. These crisis experiences suggest that their individual habitus were likely to become temporarily misfired, and consciousness was likely to be raised, and agency was involved in generating practice. This can lead to an increasing reflexivity in individual habitus.

However, Bourdieu (2000b) also writes, instead of transforming either itself or external conditions, the individual habitus is inclined to be in a continuous and prolonged confrontation with external conditions because of the “*inertia or hysteresis*” (p. 160) that exists in habitus. *Inertia* has a spontaneous tendency to “perpetuate the structures corresponding to the conditions of their production” (p. 160). As a result, it is more likely that a “cleft habitus” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 160; see also, 1999a, 2002, 2004) will occur. A cleft habitus is “destabilised, torn by internal division” (2000b, p. 160) against itself and doomed to generate a “double perception of the self” (1999a, p. 511). Reay (2015) characterises cleft habitus as comprising “ambivalence and compromise with competing loyalties, ambiguity and conflict” (p. 11). Bourdieu (2000b, 2002) talks about his own experience of cleft habitus when he enters the French elite intellectual world - the experience

that contradicts his original habitus formed in working-class conditions. The PhD experience of the Chinese international students in the Western world shares some resonances with Bourdieu's experience in that their original habitus encounters foreign conditions of existence (see the discussion in Chapter Six). When their original habitus has been in a constant confrontation with the foreign world, a cleft can occur in their habitus over time. A cleft ever occurred in some interviewees' habitus, which generated the particular contradictory perceptions towards the social world and the self (see the discussions in Chapter Four, Five and Six).

Bourdieu (1990) argues that, in certain instances, habitus can be built on “contradictions, upon tensions, even upon instability” (p. 116). For example, academic habitus can be characterised as being extremely contradictory and cleft, which generates both submission and resistance to the economic and political forces. This is because academics occupy a dominated dominant position in social world (see also, the discussion of *the Unsettled Self* in Chapter Two). Academics experience constant inner negotiations between agency and the internalised dominant economic and political structures – a process that is painful and yet creative when generating social practice. As Sayer (2004) argues, “the resulting striving, resistance and new awareness indeed can be constitutive of habitus” (as cited in Reay, 2004, p. 438). I argue that these elements constitute the dynamism for transforming individual habitus. Given that PhD study lasts three to four years, my interviewees are likely to have acquired academic dispositions that are contradictory and divide against themselves, and yet are creative and inclined towards transforming individual habitus.

Thinking beyond Bourdieu, I argue a cleft habitus does not remain static but evolves from hybridising conflicting social forces. My argument for evolving individual habitus resonates

with Bourdieu's (1993) assertion that social practice is "the meeting of two evolving logics or histories" (p. 46). In my understanding, the 'two logics or histories' refer to the external social structures and the internal structures, that is habitus. The evolution of individual habitus can be considered as comprising a process of progressive transformation of individual habitus resulted from "many modifying experiences over time" (Lee & Kramer, 2013, p. 21).

Creating New Space through Educational Mobility

Ingram and Abrahams (2016) argue that when social agents shift between two different fields, individual habitus enters a state of "habitus tug" (p. 146), where the individual habitus is pulled by the competing forces of two different fields. They identify that the individual habitus which experiences such a tug generates both "distancing from both fields" and "adapting to both fields" (Abrahams & Ingram, 2013, p. 3). Their finding resonates with my findings of the 'double distancing' from and the 'dual adapting' to both home and host societies that some of my interviewees experienced (see the discussion in Chapter Six). Being in "neither the One place nor the Other" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 28), the habitus in the tug creates a new space as it shifts between two misaligning fields. In this new space, my interviewees form their own "structures of authority" (Ingram & Abrahams, 2016, p. 153) which "contest the boundaries" (p. 152) of both worlds. Being in this new space enables my interviewees to acquire a unique, privileged and highly reflexive position for social existence.

Moving from a Chinese university to a New Zealand university, the home cultural habitus of my interviewees often prevents them from feeling as being complete insiders of the host

academic world, and their home cultural habitus renders a sense of being the “outsiders within” (Collins, 1986, p. 29). Being the outsiders within, the interviewees are likely to perceive the *doxa* of the New Zealand academia as an anomaly. This de-naturalisation of the *doxa* of the host academia in fact enables them to generate creativity in their practice. Recent Bourdieusian scholars (for example, Horvat & Davis, 2011; Ingram & Abrahams, 2016; Li, 2015; Murphy & Costa, 2015; Wacquant, 2014a, 2014b) recognise that educational mobility can lead to greater creativity in social practice. Murphy and Costa (2015) find that educational mobility provides individual habitus with a “unlimited scope” (p. 7) to produce new ideas and approaches. Li’s (2015) research on a group of rural Chinese students who successfully entered a Chinese elite university finds that the rural habitus of the respondents underwent a process of “conscious adjustment” and “reflexive transformation” (p. 141) on account of this educational mobility. I argue that the creation of a new space for social existence and the increasing creativity resulted from educational mobility are the potential social resources that enable the progressive transformation of individual habitus.

Three Ways of Explaining Subjective Changes

By applying the thinking tool of the progressively transforming individual habitus, I explain the subjective changes (thoughts, perceptions, feelings) occurring in my interviewees in three ways:

(1) *A change can be explained as the strategy that the individual habitus generates in adapting to new social conditions.* With “infinite creativity” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 55), the individual habitus can generate “appropriate and endless renewed strategies” (Bourdieu,

2000b, p. 138) in order to adapt to new circumstances (see the discussions on the strategies applied by my interviewees in Chapter Four, Five and Six).

(2) A change can be explained as the result of an interrupted/cleft habitus. When my interviewees moved to New Zealand, their habitus was in constant disjunction and confrontation with what to them was a foreign world. Their individual habitus were constantly interrupted and even cleft as a result, making them enter an ‘in-between’ (Bhabha, 1996) state or a ‘liminal space’ (Meyer & Land, 2006). The thoughts, perceptions and feelings generated from an interrupted or cleft habitus are particularly unstable and contradictory (see the relevant discussions in Chapter Four and Six).

(3) The change can be explained as the result of the internalisation of new dispositions. Through long-term and continuous participation in the new academic field, the interviewees internalise new dispositions which results in subjective changes. The research by Horvat and Davis (2011) shows that educational mobility can and does reshape subjectivities although this reshaping is not total because the dispositions formed from the previous experiences are not “washed away” (p. 166). Instead, new dispositions are likely to be integrated into the original habitus, and thus a hybrid habitus is likely to be formed. A hybrid habitus is characterised as being highly reflexive and functions with partial consciousness (see also, the discussions in Chapter Five and Six).

The explanations of a subjective change are not constrained in one of the three ways on account of the dual complexity and contradictions of social practice.

Four Causal Effects

I propose that individual habitus generally undergoes four stages of transformation: stability, interruption/cleft, hybridity, and transformation. The process is not lineal but discursive with stagnations and retrogressions, and there is no clear boundary between any two stages. Being a way of explaining how the external is internalised and the internal is externalised, habitus exists virtually in the form of producing “causal effect[s]” (Popper, 1978, p. 150) upon social practice. In other words, although we cannot ‘see’ habitus, we can ‘see’ the effects that habitus produces on social practice. Habitus in a specific stage produces a particular causal effect on social practice. By ‘seeing’ the effect, we can identify the stage that individual habitus is undergoing. I propose four typical effects which habitus produces in the aligning four stages: repetition, contradiction, integration, and subversion.

(1) Repetition

Individual habitus in the stable stage produces an effect of repetition upon social practice. Repeated social practices function as the “successive manifestations” (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 3) of a stable habitus. For example, Ming, one of my interviewees, repeatedly expressed the perception, during two interviews, that funding is of paramount importance for conducting academic research. This repeated perception successively manifests a stable habitus dominated by economic force (See the discussion in Chapter Four).

(2) Contradiction

Individual habitus in the interrupted or cleft stage produces an effect of contradiction upon social practice. In other words, contradictory social practices can point to an interrupted or cleft habitus. One of my interviewees, Mei, expressed particular contradictory perceptions

towards academic research in two separate interviews, which suggests the occurrence of a cleft in her habitus (See the discussion in Chapter Four).

(3) Integration

Individual habitus in the hybrid stage produces an effect of integrating competing and conflicting forces on social practices. In other words, social practices which integrate competing and conflicting forces can point to a hybrid habitus. For example, in an early interview, Zhao, one of my interviewees, expressed a thought of distancing himself from both his home academia and Western academia, which suggests the occurrence of a cleft in his habitus. In a later interview, he expressed his intention to work as a ‘bridge’ connecting the two worlds, which suggests the occurrence of a hybrid in his habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Six).

(4) Subversion

Individual habitus in the transformed stage produces an effect of subversion to the taken-for-granted social practice. In other words, social practices which subvert the taken-for-granted assumptions can point to a transformed habitus. For example, Hong, one of my interviewees, perceived acquiring scientific knowledge and producing creative ideas in her doctoral research as being more important than earning money. This perception is a total subversion of the prior taken-for-granted thought that earning money was of paramount importance. This subverted perception to economic and knowledge power relation suggests the occurrence of a transformation in her habitus.

Conclusion

Whereas habitus is often thought of as an embodied place in which social agents struggle for social existence (Hillier & Booksby, 2002, p. 3), sensing one's place and the other's place becomes increasingly contested in contemporary highly hybrid and mobile modern society. Habitus can function not only as a mechanism for (re)producing dominant social structures but also as a dynamism for generating creative practices (Murphy & Costa, 2015). The thinking tool of the progressively transforming individual habitus is constructed to explain this tendency.

If the task of sociologists is to “uncover the structures of the various social worlds and the mechanisms which tend to ensure their reproduction or their transformation by using habitus” (Bourdieu, 1989, as cited in Wacquant, 2014a, p. 7), the thinking tool of the progressively transforming individual habitus can be applied to achieve this task. This thinking tool allows the greatest malleability for explaining dual complexity and contradiction of social practice. The idea of the progressively transforming individual habitus echoes Adams' (2006) argument that habitus “tempered by an ambiguous, complex and contradictory reflexivity suggests how social categorisations can be not only reproduced but also challenged, overturned in uneven and ‘piecemeal’ ways” (p. 511). Under such circumstances, habitus is not wholly structured, but “dynamic and generative of its own possibilities” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 448). In Part II and Part III, the thinking tool of the progressively transforming individual habitus will be applied to explain how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is both *reproduced* and *transformed* through education.

Part II: The Present of the Doctoral Becoming

In this part, I situate the explanation of my interviewees' 'present' doctoral becomings in their overseas PhD study. Three themes are elicited: writing for publication, immersion in the English-speaking university, and the double distancing. Within these three themes, I explain the mechanisms by which neoliberal domination over Chinese international doctoral students through overseas PhD education are realised and the means to transform these dominations.

Chapter Four: Writing for Publication

Introduction

Doctoral becoming is indispensable to doctoral writing (Barnacle, 2005). It is in doctoral writing that doctoral candidates construct a sense of existence for their doctoral research. One of the interviewees, Mei's words illustrated this viewpoint, '*only in writing my thought finds its place*'. Doctoral writing produces a sense of habituating the ideas and thoughts generated from doctoral research. It is through doctoral writing that doctoral candidates develop over time an academic identity. Doctoral writing is also an "institutionally constrained social practice" (Kamler & Thomson, 2006, p. 7). Given that neoliberal governance over academic research activity has been institutionalised in public universities, including those in New Zealand (see also, the discussion in Chapter Two), doctoral writing has undergone a shift from a 'backstage' practice of writing a thesis to a 'frontstage' practice of writing for publication (Kelly, 2017).

In this chapter, I develop two counter ideas with the intention of explaining two contradictory doctoral becomings through doctoral writing. One becoming is the knowledge producer who produces knowledge for sale in the academic market. I develop the idea of *the neoliberal publication habitus* to explain this becoming. The other becoming is the lover of wisdom who creates knowledge for knowledge's own sake and public good. I develop the idea of *the humanising publication habitus* to explain this becoming. I argue that no one interviewee could fit into a binary division that these two counter ideas explain, and the doctoral becoming of my interviewees through doctoral writing engages both ideas. Thinking with both ideas makes possible the explanation of the complex and contradictory process of the doctoral becoming through doctoral writing. Whereas the embodiment of the

neoliberal publication habitus generates the perception that doctoral writing and publication are for making individual profits in the academic market, which appears to be dominating contemporary doctoral becoming, the incorporation of the humanising publication habitus has the potential to transform this domination. Engaging with both ideas enables an account of inner negotiation of the two becomings, which functions as the impetus for a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination.

A Neoliberal Publication Habitus

Neoliberal domination is a form of symbolic domination which draws on “powerful economic theory” (Bourdieu, 1998d, p. 126). As I have argued in Chapter Two, neoliberal global domination of public universities is realised through institutionalising the market effects in academic activities, including teaching and research. For example, in many countries, governments distribute research funding according to the visible and measurable research outputs produced by the individual university. In New Zealand, the market effects of visibility and measurability have been institutionalised in the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) system since 1999 (Roberts, 2007).

The ‘PBRF’ is “a peer-review system designed to assess the performance of researchers and assign scores based on an individual’s publications, contribution to the research environment, peer-esteem, external research income obtained and number of PhD student completions” (Shore, 2010a, p. 25). PBRF continues “the culture of performativity” (Roberts, 2007, p. 349) already established in New Zealand universities. The PBRF, “by reducing intellectual life to a series of measurable “outputs”, will continue to play a key role in reshaping both research and researchers in New Zealand tertiary education institutions” (Roberts, 2007, p.

353). Shore's research (2010a) find that the introduction of PBRF has encouraged "a short-term approach to research" (p. 25), with an emphasis on journal articles rather than on longer-term book projects. Also, the PBRF has devalued New Zealand-based publications and consecrated publications in American, British or Australian journals.

The implementation of the PBRF system reduces academic research including doctoral research to a series of visible and measurable outputs (Roberts, 2007). Naturally, the research outputs produced by doctoral students help enhance Government funding of the public university (Connor, 2016; Cuthbert & Spark, 2008; Jackson, 2013; Park 2005; Robins & Kanowski, 2008). This funding system renders public universities in New Zealand economic, accountable, flexible, and responsive to industry and the market (Shore, 2010a).

Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) argue that neoliberal domination is realised through ideological domination which prioritises the market exchange and profit-making in social practices. When this ideology dominates doctoral writing, it generates the perception that doctoral writing is producing knowledge commodities, and the value of any of these products in the academic market is determined by its visibility from being published. Over time, this economic drive to get doctoral writing published for profit-making has been internalised and structured as a collective habitus, which I refer to as *the neoliberal publication habitus*.

The neoliberal publication habitus generates the perception that doctoral writing is producing knowledge commodities for sale. The neoliberal publication habitus consecrates the visible and measurable outputs produced from doctoral writing, given that visibility and measurability determine market values of academic products and their producers. The

embodiment of the neoliberal publication habitus reduces doctoral writing for publication to a social struggle of self-marketing and profit-making. Once embodied, the neoliberal publication habitus generates varying strategies for securing maximum quantities and degrees of visibility for academic publications from doctoral writing, either within or outside a doctoral thesis, whether through doing a *PhD by Publication* or a *PhD by Thesis*, either as sole author or joint author.

Writing for Publication within a Doctoral Thesis

One way by which the market effects of visibility and measurability have been institutionalised in doctoral education in New Zealand is through introducing the programme of *PhD by Publication* (Robins, 2008). While based largely on a supervised research project, as is the traditional model of *PhD by Thesis*, the *PhD by Publication* is examined on a collaged writing of several peer-reviewed academic papers with an overarching introduction and conclusion. These papers are required to have been published or accepted for publication during PhD candidature (Park, 2007; Robins & Kanowski, 2008). Zhao, one of my interviewees, undertook the programme of *PhD by Publication*. Zhao said, ‘with five papers published or accepted for publication, I could complete my doctoral thesis’.

The programme of *PhD by Publication* effectively stratifies doctoral writers when valued by the academic market with their doctorate. Those who undertake a *PhD by Publication* occupy an exclusively advantageous position over those who undertake a *PhD by Thesis* in the market exchange and profit-making. Undertaking a *PhD by Publication* can be considered as an explicit strategy that the neoliberal publication habitus applies to maximise the visible and measurable research outputs from a doctoral thesis. Zhao’s decision to

undertake a *PhD by Publication* suggests that the neoliberal publication habitus was embodied before he initiated his PhD study. This is affirmed by Zhao when he explained that:

Before undertaking my PhD study, I published an article in an internationally peer-reviewed journal. From that publication, I acquired a sense of how to write a journal article and get it published.

Zhao's sense of writing for academic publication resonates with Bourdieu's (2000b) conceptualisation of "field habitus" as "a sense of the game" (p. 11). The neoliberal publication habitus generates a perception that academic publication is a game in which players compete against each other in order to get their writing published. The players who have the greatest number of publications in the most prestigious journals win the game. They are rewarded most, including acquiring the highest academic position, the fastest professional promotion, abundant funding, and scholarships.

The neoliberal publication habitus generates the perception that academic publication is an 'instrument' (Archer, 2008a, 2008b; Collyer, 2015; Gill, 2009; Rowlands, 2013) for the effective "marketing oneself" (Gopaul, 2015, p. 85). Academic publications bring obvious benefits to the post-PhD career. They open doors and present opportunities, some of which may otherwise not have arisen without academic publications (Robins & Kanowski, 2008). The stratifying effect produced by academic publication is seen at the time of Zhao's graduation. Zhao received three post-doctoral research offers. When asked the reason why he received three offers in the intense competition for academic positions, Zhao replied, '*what really matters is that I have enough publications*'.

Once embodied, the neoliberal publication habitus effectively turns both doctoral writers

and the knowledge they create into commodities for sale in the academic market. Although Hong chose to undertake the programme of *PhD by Thesis*, she intentionally developed her response to each research question into a journal article suitable for publication. This can be considered as an implicit neoliberal publication strategy that is applied to maximise research outputs from doctoral thesis writing. When asked the reason for undertaking a *PhD by Thesis*, Hong responded, '*there is no difference between doing a PhD by Publication and by Thesis. We all need publications at the completion of our PhD study*'. This response affirms Hong's embodiment of the neoliberal publication habitus which generates the perception that there is no difference between doing a *PhD by Publication* and a *PhD by Thesis*, both of which are taken-for-granted for market exchange.

Once embodied, the neoliberal publication habitus dominates doctoral students' sense-making of writing a doctoral thesis. This domination is seen in Ming when he said, '*I will have a great sense of achievement if I can get my doctoral writing published in an international peer-reviewed journal*'. This domination over Zhao is overwhelming as he said, '*I have more SCI publications in shorter period of time than my PhD peers do, which makes me feel fulfilled*'. The neoliberal publication habitus generates a strong sense of fulfilment in Zhao in that it provides him an advantage over his doctoral peers in the academic publication competition. The sense of fulfilment pushes Zhao to write for more publications in more visible journals, which turns his doctoral writing into a cycle of capital accumulation. Within this cycle, academic publication functions as the cultural capital at stake which begets more publications and is converted into social capital, such as academic job opportunities, and economic capital, such as funding and scholarships (Gopaul, 2011). This cycle is a "cycle of capital accumulation and conversion" (Walker & Yoon, 2016, p. 12), which in the end reproduces market domination.

With the intensification of competition in the academic job market, the exchange value of an academic publication is increasingly determined by the visibility of the publication, which in turn is determined by the visibility of the academic journal. The visibility of an academic journal is often measured with an impact factor. The Impact Factor (IF) or Journal Impact Factor (JIF) is a measurement which reflects the yearly average number of citations of articles published in an academic journal. The IF or JIF is frequently used as a proxy to measure the relative importance of a journal within its research field. Journals with higher IFs are often deemed to be more important than those with lower IFs. High IF means there is a great number of citations, and hence that the publication and its authors have a high degree of visibility in the academic market (Bordons, Fernández & Gómez, 2002). Thus, the term ‘impact factor’ has gradually come to be taken for granted to describe the impact of both the journal and the author who gets published in this journal (Garfield, 2006).

In many universities, the impact factor of the academic journals in which the article gets published has been applied as the measurement for deciding whether or not the author should be promoted or get tenure, whether or not s/he be awarded with research grants or be offered a position in a department. In many countries, the allocation of government funding is allocated with priority to elite universities that produce research outputs in the journals with high impact factors (PLoS Medicine Editors, 2006).

The domination of visibility over academic research produces a homogenous effect in doctoral writers in that it dominates their sense making of getting published. This effect is seen in Zhao (who studies medical statistics) when he said:

I do not get a great sense of achievement from our [referring to his doctoral research team] publications. Our research has not been published in the journals with high

impact factors. All our publications are in the journals with an impact factor of 3 to 4.

When visibility dominates academic research, the neoliberal publication habitus produces a sense of unfulfillment from publishing in the journals with relatively low IFs.

The neoliberal publication habitus also dominates the scholarly identity formation of doctoral writers in that only through publication a scholarly identity can be formed. This domination is seen in Zhao when he expressed, *'I've already had publications. I consider myself as an emerging scholar'*. Reminiscent of Zhao's self-perception, Mei said, *'I perceive myself as an emerging scholar when I had a paper published in a SSCI journal'*. The Science Citation Index (SCI) and the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) are two major internationally recognised citation indexes. They were originally produced by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) of United State of American. They are now owned by a commercial company named Clarivate Analytics⁹. A publication in a journal indexed by SCI or SSCI brings a publication as well as its author international visibility.

To engage with the global knowledge economy and occupy a competitive position in the international knowledge market, the Chinese Government relies heavily, when allocating research funding, on the publication outputs of public universities in SCI and SSCI indexed journals. This funding system reproduces the domination of the academia of the English world over the non-English world, given that both SCI and SSCI indexes generally favour English-language journals, in particular American journals, and obviously under-represent journals in non-English languages (Altbach, 2007). The fact that English-language journals dominate SCI and SSCI indexed journals leads to an under-valuation of the scientific work

⁹ Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Science_Citation_Index.

carried out and published in languages other than English, and in non-SCI nor SSCI indexed journals, which, in turn, hampers knowledge transmission from the non-English world to the rest of the world. The over reliance on SCI and SSCI publication outputs “distorts” the academic development in China when the Chinese Government seeks to engage in the research at the highest level (Altbach, 2007, p. 142; see also, Mok, 2003; Rhoads, Shi & Chang, 2014; Yang, 2005).

Over time, this over reliance on SCI/SSCI publications has been internalised and structured as a *SCI/SSCI publication disposition*. The SCI/SSCI publication disposition characterises the neoliberal publication habitus of many Chinese doctoral writers. This disposition generates a strong motivation for many Chinese graduates and university staff to undertake PhD study in the English-speaking world. This disposition consecrates the academic publications in SCI/SSCI journals. This disposition is identified in Ming when he said, ‘*a SCI publication has a much higher recognition than a Chinese publication. A SCI publication can bring me high academic reputation and promising job prospect*’.

To win an edge in the increasingly intensified academic publication competition, the neoliberal publication habitus generates an upgraded strategy of co-authoring and joint-authoring doctoral thesis writing for publication. This strategy mobilises the social capital that doctoral writers accumulate in academia to get co-authored or joint-authored publications in order to maximise individual publication outputs and thus individual profits. This strategy is applied extensively across disciplines although there exists a disciplinary unevenness. For doctoral writers in laboratory science, materials sciences, and engineering, co-authoring with supervisors and other research team members is a taken-for-granted rule

of play (Kamler, 2008; Mendoza, Kuntz & Berger, 2012; Robins & Kanowski, 2008). This rule of play is confirmed by Zhao (who studies laboratory science) when he said:

Each publication within my doctoral thesis is a team work. I am the principal author with at least an 80% contribution while my supervisors are co-authors. My main supervisor is also the corresponding author. It is impossible to get my doctoral research published without teamwork.

This rule of play is internalised and structured as a disposition which generates the perception that doctoral publication is impossible without team work. Zhao also applies the strategy of co-authoring publications outside his doctoral research project. Zhao co-authored other two journal articles with his former supervisor and a peer in China. Other strategies such as presenting and networking at national and international conferences are increasingly applied by doctoral students in order to accumulate the social capital that is crucial for gaining co-authoring opportunities.

While the neoliberal publication habitus turns doctoral writing into an anticipated profit-making practice, it discourages doctoral writers from writing their doctoral theses when publication opportunities are stifled for lack of funding. Ming, in laboratory science, said that his thesis writing for publication was delayed because of the funding restraints related to the need to obtain experiment samples. Ming said:

The samples are provided for free by a research team from another university. We can only get our findings published after they get their findings published. This is the condition for us to use their samples at no cost to us.

When the publication was postponed indefinitely, the neoliberal publication habitus generated a sense of doubt about both his PhD research project and academic career, as Ming expressed:

When I started PhD study, I took for granted that I would get an academic position and continue my doctoral research after graduation. Now I am not so sure that I can continue to take this route: doing laboratory experiments requires a lot of funding; to be successful in getting research funding requires publications; to have publications, I need samples to do experiments. I do not really like this way of life.

Ming mentioned ‘funding’ over twenty times during the two separate interviews which I did with him. This highly repeated word suggests that the perception that doctoral research and publication are for making economic profits is internalised and structured in Ming. When economic profit-making becomes problematic from doctoral research and writing, the neoliberal publication habitus dispossesses doctoral writers of the sense-making of undertaking a PhD study and pursuing an academic career.

The neoliberal publication habitus also generates a sense of anxiety and pressure in those with ‘zero’ publications. Hong spoke of a deep sense of anxiety on account of not having published from her thesis during two years of her PhD study. Hong said, ‘*I spent so much time reading and writing, and I have not had any of my writing published. Most of the time I feel very anxious*’. Another interviewee, Juan, was preparing for her doctoral oral examination when we had the first interview. Juan said, ‘*although I have completed my thesis, I have little sense of achievement. I haven’t had any academic publications. I feel as anxious and as pressured as before*’.

The neoliberal publication habitus not only produced a sense of anxiety and pressure in Juan on account of her having no publications but it also prevented her from having any sense of achievement on completing her doctoral thesis. She remarked at the end of our final interview that *'I feel life is so hard. The future cannot be seen'*. Juan's poignant remarks illustrate the symbolic violence that the domination of research visibility and measurability exerts on doctoral students who publish nothing. This symbolic violence results in doctoral students' lost interest in academic research, drains their energy for knowledge exploration and creation, deprives their sense of achievement on completing their doctoral thesis, and produces a sense of being disadvantaged in academic job competition. They are social sufferings resulted from neoliberal domination of PhD education.

This domination also leads to the inequality of publication and hence job opportunities between qualitative and quantitative doctoral research (Robins & Kanowski, 2008). Qualitative and longitudinal studies are in nature less suited to timely publications during doctoral research, neither suited to be separated for journal article publications after completing doctoral research (Jackson, 2013). Koro-Ljungberg (2015) notes that "qualitative research methods may be personally favoured but socially marginalised" (p. 142), given that neoliberal domination is the domination of economic theory "through the weapon of mathematics" (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 126). Thus, the neoliberal publication habitus which applies the logic of mathematics produces a homogenous effect in doctoral writers who employ a qualitative approach - a sense of regret about choosing to take a qualitative approach. This effect is seen in Juan when she said,

My thesis makes sense when read as a single piece. It cannot be separated into several parts for journal publication. If I could restart my PhD study, I would not have written

a coherent thesis, but several articles suitable for journal publication. Then I could combine them into a thesis.

The neoliberal publication habitus consecrates the doctoral thesis which is completed as a collation of the published pieces whereas it devalues the thesis which is completed as an integrated and coherent argument. Another interviewee, Ying, made the similar comments to Juan's about her PhD thesis:

My thesis is a coherent narrative and is unlikely to be separated into several pieces for publication. If I could restart my PhD research, I would have employed a mixed method. Then I would have had two separate parts that would have been suitable for publication.

The decline of a coherent and integrated thesis pushes many students to 'salami slicing' qualitative data (Robins & Kanowski, 2008; Webb, 2008) for journal publication. The decline of the integrated thesis resonates with the decline of a book in academy (Kelly, 2017). The decline of both illustrates the market effect that neoliberal domination produces in academy.

Writing for Publication outside a Doctoral Thesis

Under certain circumstances, the neoliberal publication habitus turns to generate an alternative strategy - writing for publication outside a doctoral thesis when initial attempts of getting doctoral thesis published fail. Mei, in the second year of PhD study, shifted from trying to get published from her doctoral thesis to writing for publication from the research done outside her doctoral research project. Mei said, '*I have tried to get my writing in relation to doctoral research published but failed. It does not interest journal reviewers. I*

feel very anxious about this. I need publications'. When the initial attempt to get her doctoral research published failed, Mei shifted to write about more 'interesting' research project for publication. Gradually, her interest in her doctoral research has declined. Mei said that *'I have no interest in my doctoral research any more. I just want to complete it'*. For doctoral candidates, there is no crueller dispossession than that of the interest in their doctoral research, given that interest and wonder are the origins of creativity (Kelly, 2017).

There is a common concern that writing for publication during the early period of the doctoral study can distract doctoral students from writing their theses. With an instrumental motivation to get published, doctoral writers tend to "avoid taking risk[s] - to be creative but failed to be published" (Paré, 2010, p. 33). This instrumental writing for publication hinders doctoral writers from developing creativity through writing, a critical attribute that PhD education is supposed to nurture. The inclination to avoid risk in doctoral writing in order to get published illustrates Bourdieu's (1998d) argument that neoliberalism is a "supreme form of the conservative counterattack" (p. 126). It conserves everything that secures market productivity and profits. It turns doctoral writing from an intellectual exploration of the unknown and unthinkable (Kelly, 2017) into a preservation of market productivity. Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) make a similar argument stating that global neoliberalisation in the aftermath of the Great Recession of 2008-2009 represents a "conservative resurgence" (p. 266).

The cruellest effect that the domination of market productivity produces on doctoral writers is dispossessing of their sense-making of writing a doctoral thesis. This effect can be seen in Mei when she said, *'with no publication, there is little meaning to writing a thesis'*. The domination of market productivity in PhD education turns doctoral writing into "a

competitive, self-interested, instrumental and outputs-oriented process” (Roberts, 2007, p. 362).

A Humanising Publication Habitus

However, as Peck and Tickell (2002) argue, neoliberal domination should not be understood as “an end-state” (p. 383) but a contradictory process that tends to “provoke counter tendencies” (p. 383). When neoliberal domination turns doctoral writing into a market activity, it also provokes a counter tendency that perceives and practises doctoral writing for publication as knowledge sharing for its own sake and for public good. This counter tendency is generated from the virtues of humanity and morality which are deeply embedded in the intellectual communities that persist in the Enlightenment tradition. These virtues are internalised in some doctoral writers through the publication experiences.

Zhao, who was originally motivated to publish his doctoral research for academic competition, acknowledges that, from each publication experience, he has acquired a sense of contribution to scientific progress. Zhao said, ‘*with each publication, I feel I have contributed to the knowledge building and progress in this field of research*’. Over time, the sense of contributing to scientific progress from academic publication has been internalised and has formed, as I have already noted, *a humanising publication habitus*. The humanising publication habitus generates the perception that academic publication is a form of open and equal intellectual communication for knowledge’s own sake and public good.

The humanising publication habitus is characterised by embodiment of the moral dispositions related to academic research, such as the scholarly “altruism in the form of the

moral character of the social agent” (Peters & Roberts, 2012, p. 1). Hong talked about the scholarly altruism practised by the journal reviewers in reviewing her article. Hong said,

Reading the comments from the reviewers, I was deeply moved. There were over ten pages of detailed suggestions for revision. For the reviewers, I am just an author whom they have never met. But they devoted so much time and effort to giving me comments on my writing. They contributed their ideas to improving my writing, not thinking there should be anything in return. They take it for granted that this should be their practice. There must be a virtue embodied in them.

What Hong perceives as an embodied virtue in the reviewers is the scholarly altruism generated by the humanising publication habitus. The humanising publication habitus generates a sense of commitment to rational and equal intellectual communication within and beyond intellectual community.

Whereas the neoliberal publication habitus generates the perception that peer-review is “a system of institutionalised vigilance” (Merton, 1973, p. 339) on publication practice, the humanising publication habitus generates the perception that peer-review is a form of equal and open intellectual communication. This view arises from the humanising ideal of seeking truth and wisdom through rational communication (Habermas, 1984). This humanising ideal has been sustained within the intellectual community despite of the neoliberal shift in the contemporary academy. This humanising ideal exists as an implicit resistance to neoliberal domination over academics. Once embodied, this disposition shows the potential to transform neoliberal domination over doctoral writers. This can be seen in Hong when she said,

The value of getting academic research published cannot be measured in economic returns if one considers the time and efforts an author contributes to an academic

publication. The findings published from one's research may become out of date in a few years. But through academic publication, the author is transmitting a virtue which transcends time. In the past, I did not have a clear idea about the purpose of undertaking academic research. This publication experience enabled me to recognise that undertaking academic research is actually about transmitting the virtue of scholarly altruism. If I were in another field, nobody would help me in such a way.

In the experience of doctoral writing for publication, the scholarly altruism, a virtue of commitment to intellectual communication has been internalised in Hong, transforming her practice of writing for publication in order to make economic profits. This transformation is seen in Hong when she reflected,

In the past, I cared a lot about how much I earned from lecturing and academic publication. Now I consider acquiring scientific knowledge as being more important. I feel happier when I have a good idea about my research than I do when I earn some money.

The embodied humanising publication habitus is transforming the neoliberal disposition which consecrates economic power. The moral essence that the humanising publication habitus contains constructs a sacred space for the doctoral becoming of Hong that takes her beyond the neoliberal struggle. For Hong, the doctoral writing for publication is no longer “narrowly and ruthlessly connected to productivity” (Kamler, 2008, p. 293).

The neoliberal publication habitus generates a sense of fulfilment and achievement from publishing doctoral research, which, in turn, functions as the ‘emotional energy’ responsive to the profits made in academic market. By contrast, the humanising publication habitus generates a sense of being enlightened and renewed from contributing to knowledge sharing

and scientific progress through publishing doctoral research, which generates ‘moral energy’ sustainable over time. This moral energy nurtures the intrinsic interest and durable devotion of doctoral writers to academic research, transforming the thinking that doctoral writing and publication is all for making economic profits.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explained how neoliberal visibility and measurability dominate doctoral writing for publication. I developed a concept of the neoliberal publication habitus to explain the mechanism by which neoliberalism dominates doctoral writing and doctoral writers. I also explained how this neoliberal domination can be progressively transformed by internalising a humanising publication habitus. The humanising publication habitus which shows a transformative potential to neoliberal domination is structured in the Enlightenment tradition which values knowledge as being both individual and social. This dual attribute transcends the binary vision and division of knowledge as being private or public. The existence of the humanising publication habitus enables me to argue that not all habitus reproduce social domination. This argument echoes my theorisation of habitus as both a mechanism for social *reproduction* and a dynamism for social *transformation* (see the discussion in Chapter Three). For this reason, neoliberal domination can be “neither as smooth nor as hegemonic as it seems” (Kelly, 2017, pp. 42-43).

Chapter Five: Immersion in the English-speaking University

Introduction

The past few decades have witnessed a global internationalisation of higher education. This movement is seen in the flow of the students from the non English-speaking countries to the developed English-speaking countries (Altbach, 2007; Shen, Wang & Jin, 2016). Internationalisation of higher education has become an effective means by which the developed English-speaking countries have been able to rapidly expand their higher education market and maximise economic profits.

In Chapter Two, I explained how neoliberalisation of higher education in these countries is realised through the internationalisation of higher education, specifically, the internationalisation of the PhD education in New Zealand. In this chapter, I will explain how the developed English-speaking countries dominate international higher education through ‘linguistic domination’ (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) of native academic English. In the first section, deploying the concept symbolic domination, I explain how native academic English (i.e. British and American English for academic purposes) is used as an instrument by the developed English-speaking countries to dominate international higher education. In the second section, extending the concept of ‘*illusio*’ (Bourdieu, 1998a, 2000b), I explain that the Chinese ambition of global reach is governed by an *illusio* of acquiring native-like academic English proficiency through immersion in English-speaking academies, and how this *illusio* has been internalised and structured as a linguistic habitus, which I denote as *the native-like academic English habitus*. The native-like academic English habitus reproduces the symbolic domination of native academic English by generating conformity in

international students who are non-native English speakers to the taken-for-granted norms of native English speakers. These norms secure the domination of native academic English in the international higher education market, hence the profits of native English speaking countries. In the third section, deploying the concepts of ‘linguistic habitus’ and ‘symbolic violence’ (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991), I explain how the domination of native academic English produces the symbolic violence of uncertainty and precariousness in international students who are non-native English speakers doing their doctoral theses in Anglophone universities. In the final section, I discuss how the emergence of ‘academic Chinglish’ weakens the domination of native academic English over Chinese international doctoral students in doctoral thesis writing. I argue that only the diversification of academic ‘Englishes’ can transform the domination of native academic English over students who are non-native English speakers and serves a real internationalisation of higher education.

The Domination of Native Academic English

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) argues that language is never exclusively a neutral medium for the progressive discernment of ‘truth’ but rather an instrument for economic and political domination within and beyond a society. Through imposing a universal recognition of a particular use of a language by a singular linguistic group in the form of systems, institutions, objects and dispositions, the economic and political domination of this group over other groups is achieved. In other words, those with this linguistic power (i.e. native speakers and native-like speakers) establish economic and political domination, and hence social domination over those who do not possess this linguistic power (i.e. non-native speakers). This form of domination is conceptualised by Bourdieu as ‘linguistic domination’ (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) - a central means of symbolic domination.

Linguistic domination is usually achieved through the process of standardisation of a language use. It is a process that the particular use of a language by a singular linguistic group is inculcated and imposed through education and the exemplification of original cultural products, such as dictionaries, books, and audio/video products. Over time, the standardised use of a language, which is in fact the native use of a language, has been universally recognised and has become the taken-for-granted norms and regularities. For example, English, which was originally used by a singular linguistic group who inhabited the British and North American territories, has developed into many varieties by speakers across the world who use English as a second language for communication. The domination of native English in the English language market is realised through the standardisation of English language use (i.e. British and American English) across the world according to the norms of native speakers. Original cultural products, including dictionaries, books, audio and video products are introduced from native English-speaking countries, mainly the UK and the USA to the rest of the world, exemplifying a standard use of English. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary exemplifies the norms of standard use of British English. the Merriam-Webster Dictionary exemplifies the norms of standard use of American English. These norms are imposed and inculcated through teaching practice, and are institutionalised through examination and qualification systems. For example, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) institutionalises the norms of standard use of British English, and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) system institutionalises the norms of standard use of American English. As such, the use of English language worldwide has gradually conformed to the norms of the British and American English. The English language proficiency of non-native English speakers is naturally evaluated by the degree of the ‘nativeness’ of its use.

Because international higher education demands a unified market, the standardised use of English, which is in fact the use of the British and American English, helps to unify the international higher education market. Along with the rapid expansion of higher education around the world (Altbach & Knight, 2007), the standard use of the English language for academic purpose has rapidly become a global academic '*lingua franca*'. Standard academic English entrenches global knowledge creation and transmission (Crystal, 2003) and has entered a "self-reinforcing" stage (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999, p. 346) of the "monopoly in the large-scale production of consumers" (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 57).

Native academic English as the medium for academic instruction gives an exclusive advantage to the developed English-speaking countries in attracting international students (Altbach, 2007). International higher education has become a "niche market" for these countries (Altbach, 2007, p. 140). While the standardised use of academic English "relativises" (Marginson, 2010, p. 6973) all higher education institutions around the world, it increases the inequality of linguistic power between native English-speaking countries and non-native English-speaking countries. As such, the standard use of academic English results in the domination of the developed native English-speaking countries that possess the "global language power" (Marginson, 2010, p. 6973) in the international higher education market.

In Anglophone universities, the domination of native academic English involves a process of "objectification" through formally defining credentials and qualifications (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 25). This process provides a practical justification for the domination of native academic English in Anglophone universities, enabling those who benefit most to

“convince themselves of their own intrinsic worthiness and prevent those who benefit least from grasping the basis of their own derivation” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 25).

Anglophone universities apply examination system as the “mechanism of censorship” (Bourdieu, Chamboredon, Passeron & Kraus, 1991, p. 21) to ensure the domination of native academic English. International students who are non-native English speakers risk failing examination if they are ‘creative’ beyond the norms of standard use of English in academic writing. As a result, students who are non-native English speakers usually conform to the norms of standard use of English and defer their creativity. This conformity illustrates the conservative effect that linguistic domination produces in the dominated, that is, preserving the established order in the international higher education market. By contrast, students who are native English speakers can “safely diverge from each other’s varieties without arousing negative views of their English” (Jenkins, 2014, p. 78). As a result, an inequality has been produced in the freedom of expressing ideas in academic English writing between students who are native English speakers and students who are non-native English speakers.

Anglophone universities usually legitimate native use of academic English and sees non-native use as a “problem” which needs “remediation” (Jenkins, 2014, p. 77). Henderson (2011) notes that in UK universities, Anglo-English occupies an ideological position in assessment criteria, whereas the validity of different ‘Englishes’ used by non-native English speakers is not formally acknowledged. Native academic English functions as a monolingual ethos of higher education in Anglophone contexts (Gibbs, 2010; Jenkins, 2014; Preece & Martin, 2009). The domination of native academic English turns ‘international’ into a euphemism of ‘non-native’ (Jenkins, 2014) and ‘international students’ into implicitly labelled non-native English speaker. Jenkins (2014) notes that this ideology prevails

throughout the higher education of the entire English world and will continue to dominate international higher education policies and practices around the world.

The domination of native academic English is lucrative to university pre-sessional courses, proofreading companies, international publishers, and the like (Jenkins, 2014). Its domination functions as a form of symbolic exploitation of cultural capitalism. This form of exploitation is subtle and elusive in contrast to nascent capitalism (Swartz, 1997), and hence is unrecognised. This exploitation functions through distributing unequal values to the linguistic products produced by native English speakers and non-native English speakers in the academic English market. The academic products produced by native English speaker are the norms against which the prices of the academic products of non-native English speakers are defined (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Students who are native English speakers possess an exclusive linguistic power and are able to exploit this power to secure a profit of distinction (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991). By contrast, students who are non-native English speakers run a risk of “ending up with a devalued degree” (Reay, Crozier & Clayton, 2010, p. 121). For PhD education in Anglophone universities, the nativeness of academic English writing immediately disadvantages most international students who are non-native English speaker given that their academic writings are valued by the norms which are against them.

A Chinese *Illusio*

An *illusio* refers to a “fundamental belief” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 11) that social agents hold when participating in a social game that contains the implicit meaning that “playing is worth the effort” (1988, p. 77). An *illusio* is not an idea “put forward and defended” (2000b, p.

12), but a taken-for-granted conviction put into practice. An *illusio* effectively forbids social agents from questioning the rationale of participating in a social game, which would “threaten the very existence of a field” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 102). An *illusio* attributes the paramount importance to a social game without critiquing its risk and side-effects. In other words, an *illusio* causes social agents to misrecognise the arbitrariness of every social game and to participate continuously in the game without need of “any physical contact or even any symbolic interaction” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 135). An *illusio* “gives sense to a game” by sustaining the investment of social agents in the game and “offering chances to those who are caught up in the game and expect something from it” (p. 207).

Considering the dominant position that native academic English occupies in the global knowledge market, the Chinese Government and Chinese people strongly believe that acquiring native-like academic English proficiency is a necessity for engaging with the global knowledge economy (Chang, 2006). The Government believes that with native-like academic English proficiency China can effectively occupy a competitive position in the global knowledge market. This belief directs China’s educational policy making, professional certification and promotion. For individuals, the capacity to produce native-like academic English products has been regarded as a valued personal asset (Hu, 2005) and capital for the potential and actual exploitation of profits.

Immersion in native and natural linguistic environments (Lee & Kramer, 2013) has been well explored by linguists and thus taken-for-granted by Chinese people as the most effective way of acquiring native-like English proficiency. Over time, acquiring native-like academic English proficiency through immersion in natural and native academic English environment has become a Chinese *illusio* for engaging with the global knowledge economy

and a “thing that has always been done that way” (Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 102) without critical examination of its arbitrariness. This *illusio* directs the Government’s policy-making on internationalisation of higher education and higher education mobility of Chinese people. Each year, the Chinese Government sends a great number of postgraduates and university staff to undertake advanced level of study and research in the most developed English-speaking countries. According to the British Council review (2014), China will be the largest source of international postgraduate students in UK by 2024. The statistics from the New Zealand Immigration Service indicate that Chinese students have become the largest group of international students studying in New Zealand; many of whom are postgraduate and doctoral students (Zhang & Brunton, 2007). Over time, this *illusio* has been internalised and structured as a collective habitus, generating a homogenous practice among Chinese people. As such, the domination of native academic English over Chinese people is realised.

The Symbolic Violence Produced by the Domination of Native Academic English

Symbolic violence is the power to make the world by imposing the “instruments for the cognitive construction of the world” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 170) and the “particular modes of vision and division” (p. 1). Symbolic violence is a necessary and effective means of exercising power because it enables social domination to be established and maintained through the “softened and disguised” means “beneath the veil of an enchanted relation” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 24). Symbolic violence is most pernicious in its tendency for structuring the conforming dispositions of subordinate groups. Symbolic violence effectuated through a specific language needs to meet two conditions. One is “the structures of the linguistic market”, which “impose themselves as a system of sanctions and censorships” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 37). The structures of native academic

English, which form the structures of the academic English market, impose themselves as a system of sanctions on and censorships of all academic English products. The other is the “linguistic habitus – the linguistic capacity to generate infinite grammatically correct discourses, and the social capacity to use this competence adequately in a determinate situation” (p. 37). The native academic English habitus enables native English speakers to generate grammatically correct discourses and to use this capacity to benefit themselves in academic English market. This capacity of native English speakers effectuates the symbolic violence exerting upon non-native English speakers. This violence is implicit and invisible, and hence misrecognised. This violence is exercised by non-native English speakers themselves in terms of devaluing or denying the merit of their own academic English products. In the following paragraphs, I illustrate how the domination of native academic English exerts symbolic violence on my interviewees during their doctoral theses writing process.

While most of my interviewees consider themselves as becoming more ‘internationalised’ in terms of improved proficiency in academic English writing, the inability to write in native-like academic English often generates a sense of shame, regret, and frustration. This sense is identified in Zhao when he said,

I have become more internationalised as my academic English writing has improved. In the past, my writing needed to be proofread many times. At present, there are few grammatical mistakes in my writing. But I have not been able to write in native-like academic English despite such a long period of study. I think this is the most serious constraint for me to develop my career in international academia.

While Zhao considers himself as becoming more ‘internationalised’ with an improved proficiency in academic English writing, a sense of shame and frustration is generated from

the taken-for-granted belief that acquiring native-like academic English proficiency is a must for career development in international academia.

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) argues that symbolic violence operates through incorporating the established hierarchical system into the cognitive structures of the dominated group to the extent that they share the values that structure this hierarchical system. The domination of native academic English operates through incorporating the hierarchical system of native, native-like and non-native academic English proficiency into the cognitive structures of Chinese doctoral students, and hence generates a sense of shame, regret and frustration for not being able to acquire native-like academic English proficiency. This sense illustrates the symbolic violence produced by the domination of native academic English in doctoral thesis writing upon students who are non-native English speakers. This violence is the side-effect produced by the unification of the international higher education market.

Linguistic domination operates through the struggles of non-native speakers to rectify their linguistic practices (speech and writing) in order to concur with the norms of native speakers (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991). These struggles are often accompanied with a sense of tension and anxiety. The domination of native academic English in doctoral writing is usually institutionalised and legitimated through the doctoral regulations, the statutes, and the guidelines of doctoral theses in Anglophone universities. This domination often results in the “hyper-correction” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 21) by doctoral students who are non-native English speakers of their doctoral theses. This hyper-correction often causes an inner suffering of self-devaluing and self-denial of the value of their writing. This suffering was experienced by Juan, who said, *‘I always feel I cannot write an authentic*

English sentence'. The 'authenticity' of English language use, echoing with the nativeness of academic English language use, works in fact against Juan, and deprives her of the sense making of writing her doctoral thesis. Bourdieu notes this mechanism of domination as "a form of complicity" (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 51).

With a strong inclination to comply with the norms of native academic English, many doctoral students who are non-native English speakers are always seeking to produce expressions which bear the marks of a linguistic habitus other than their own through multiple rewrites and corrections of their theses. This practice, in turn, leads to a sense of uncertainty and a lack of confidence when writing their theses. These were experienced by Ying as she said,

I do not remember how many revisions I have done of my thesis. Each revision is in fact a kind of rewriting. In each revision, I felt clearer about what I want to write but less confident in what I had written. Yet, I haven't found the sense of writing in native-like academic English.

Multiple rewrites and over-corrections often cause anxiety, shame, humiliation, and frustration in these doctoral writers and can lead to a state of "paroxysm" (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 83). This state occurred in Mei when she vented: '*sometimes, I just want to crack the computer*'. Over time, these practices result in the loss of interest and the lack of confidence in writing their doctoral theses and doing academic research. These results can be seen in Juan when she reflected that '*the writing of my thesis has gradually become a psychological barrier. I delayed writing each chapter till the deadline for submission to my supervisors. I felt I had no talent for academic research*'.

Symbolic violence seems to be “gentler” than physical violence, but in fact, it is a “more brutal means of oppression” (Bourdieu, in Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 115) given that the inner suffering experienced by the dominated is often misrecognised and sustained over time. This “invisible, silent [and durable] violence is never more manifest than in all the corrections for which non-native speakers strive desperately” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 52) as if they were suddenly dispossessed of their linguistic capacity.

The efficacy of all forms of symbolic domination rests on two conditions: the misrecognition of the arbitrariness of the established norms by the dominant; and the conformity of the dominated to these norms. These two conditions are illustrated by Mei’s remarks:

I wrote a chapter for a book. The reviewer commented on the inappropriate use, in some cases, of modal auxiliary verbs, such as can, could, may, and might. The modality boundary that distinguishes these modals verbs, one from another, is so subtle that it is like distinguishing the boundaries in the colour spectrum that I cannot locate precisely when I use them.

Mei misrecognises the arbitrariness of the norms for the ‘proper’ use of the modals and conforms to these norms although she realises that the modality boundary that separates these modals is often too subtle to be precisely located. Altbach (2007) notes that the peer review system of many English academic journals is usually dominated by native English speakers. The article selection criteria of these journals, with regards to the proper use of academic English, are often based on the norms prevailing in the North America. These norms immediately disadvantage scholars and doctoral students who are non-native English speakers from getting their research published. Jenkins (2014) considers that English as an academic *lingua franca* is a “deficit by nature” (p. 40). Woolard (2005) argues that there

exists an ideology of “authenticity” (p. 2) in the field of academic publishing in English. To get published, one must “capture the tones and nuances” (p. 3) of the expressions according to the norms adhered by native English speakers, and must ‘sound’ as natural and authentic as native speakers.

Bourdieu (1991) argues that formal language market which imposes appropriate forms of language “is absolutely imperative and detrimental to communicative function” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 85). A high degree of formality is taken-for-granted as being fundamental to doctoral thesis writing. This high degree of formality is often achieved through strict compliance with the norms of native English speakers. These norms are legitimated by university management, expected by faculty staff and conformed to by students who are non-native English speakers (Jenkins, 2014). These norms, which are the taken-for-granted modes of expressions of native English speakers, often function as ‘thresholds’ (Kiley & Wisker, 2009) to doctoral students who are non-native English speakers. The domination of these norms often turn doctoral writing into “a site of struggle for students drawing on diverse linguistic resource” (Lee & Aitchison, 2009, p. 88).

In the struggle to conform to the norms of native academic English, many doctoral students who are non-native English speakers resort to “mimicry” (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 376) in their writing - a way of writing that involves mimicking the expressions used by native speakers. In order to conform to the norms of native academic English, Ying resorted to using mimicry during the multiple rewrites and revisions of her thesis. Ying said, *‘I revised my writing by mimicking the way in which native speakers author journal articles, for example, the sentence patterns they use’*. Given that thinking cannot be separated from the use of language, the use of mimicry when writing restrains non-native doctoral students

from freely expressing their ideas. Ying said, *'I always feel there is a gap between what I really want to express and the way I write'*. Ying's feeling illustrates the critique made by Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) that "the purist doctrines of linguistic correctness close off the non-native sources of innovation" (p. 64).

Bourdieu (2000b) notes that the dominated often "unwittingly contribute to" their being dominated "by tacitly accepting, in advance, the limits imposed on them" in the form of "bodily emotion, such as shame, timidity, anxiety and guilt" (p. 169). Hong highlighted a sense of shame when communicating with academics who are native English speakers. Hong said, *'I feel ashamed of my accent when delivering a speech. I usually remain silent when attending seminars and group meetings'*. In illustrating the symbolic violence that the domination of native English exerts on non-native English speakers, Bourdieu describes his own feeling of shyness and anxiety when expressing his thoughts in English in front of native English speakers (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991). Hong's sense of shame and timidity when engaging in academic communication with native English speakers also illustrates the effects of the symbolic violence that the domination of native academic English produces in doctoral students who are non-native English speakers. This sense of shame and timidity leads to Hong's self-exclusion from academic communication by silencing herself. Such self-exclusion by self-silencing reinforces the dominated position of doctoral students who are non-native English speakers in academic communication in English. Eagleton (1992) asserts that "what matters in talk, in discourse, is not some power inherent in language itself, but the kind of authority or legitimacy with which it is backed" (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 111). The authority and legitimacy that back native academic English is so dominant that they silence doctoral students who are non-native English speakers and who feel no authority and legitimacy when speaking in front of native English speakers. And silence, in

turn, provides “an apparent justification for the sanction” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 77) on the nativeness and the authenticity of using English.

Woolard (2005) argues that a dominant language often rests its authority on a conception of “anonymity of sounding like it is from nowhere and of no accent” (p. 5). It causes a ‘stigma’ (Goffman, 1963) – a “relentlessly remedial representation of language issues” (Turner, 2011, p. 3) in Anglophone universities. Whereas the ideology of authenticity identifies native English as the only genuine and valued language, the ideology of anonymity presents local varieties as the unmarked and universal. Jenkins (2014) argues that despite their apparently opposite orientation, authenticity and anonymity come together in a way that has “a doubly pernicious effect” (p. 78) on non-native English speakers. Although ‘English’ is taken for granted as the *lingua franca*, it is only ‘internationally’ acceptable if it is used in accordance with “the marked, but supposedly unmarked” (p. 78) preferences of the two groups of British and North American English speakers.

Transformation, Disillusionment and Submission

The long-term immersion in native academic English reading and writing puts the non-native English habitus of my interviewees in constant confrontation with the native academic English context. For some interviewees, this confrontation results in a progressive transformation of their non-native English habitus towards the nativeness as a result of their continuous attempts to conform to the norms of native academic English writing. Hong said,

Every day I am involved in intensive reading and writing. I do not realise how long I spent in reading and writing. It is a very slow process. Gradually I have some sense of writing in native-like academic English.

Hong's transforming non-native English habitus towards the native English habitus illustrates the argument made by Bourdieu (2000b) that "only a thoroughgoing process of counter-training, involving repeated exercises, like an athlete's training, can durably transform habitus" (p. 172).

For Hong, the progressive transformation of the non-native academic English habitus also depends on two external conditions. One is the native English academic context which contradicts her original non-native academic English habitus. The other is the feedback provided by her supervisors and the suggestions made by the journal reviewers for revising her article (see also the discussion of scholarly altruism in Chapter Four). Hong said,

My supervisors say they feel it is easier to understand my writing now than it was previously. I especially appreciate the reviewers of my journal article. They gave detailed suggestions on how to revise my paper. These suggestions helped me a lot in learning how to write in native-like academic English.

By contrast, for some other interviewees, the constant and long-term confrontation between their non-native academic English habitus and the native academic English context raises their consciousness of the oppression. This raised consciousness was seen in Zhao when he said, *'I have gradually come to realise that I am in a passive position during group discussions with native English speakers. I feel uncomfortable about this'*. The raised consciousness of the oppression from the domination of native academic English can generate resistance to this domination and lead to the disenchantment with acquiring native-like academic English capacity. This tendency was seen in Feng when he said,

I had thought about doing post-doctoral research after completing my doctoral study.

Through writing my thesis, I have gradually realised that I'm not good at academic English writing. I'm thinking about doing something else after graduation instead of continuing academic research.

Feng's disillusionment with acquiring native-like academic English writing capacity generates the thought about not involving in academic English anymore.

This disillusionment is also seen in Juan when she said, *'if I had another choice, I would not have chosen undertaking overseas doctoral study. The thesis writing is too hard. I have never felt I wrote an authentic English sentence'*. For Juan, the feeling of oppression experienced in writing her thesis in native-like academic English is so overwhelming that it ruptures the *illusio* of acquiring a native-like academic English writing proficiency through immersion in an English-speaking university. This disillusionment produces a sense of regret for having undertaken PhD study in an English-speaking university.

While the disillusionment with acquiring native-like academic English proficiency is prevalent among Chinese international doctoral students studying in English-speaking countries, most of my interviewees show a submission to the domination of native academic English over their educational choice and career choice. Ying expressed that she would still choose to undertake doctoral study in an English-speaking country if she had this opportunity again. Once an *illusio* has been structured as a habitus, it "discourages any attempt to quit" (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 122) the game. Ying's persistence illustrates this tendency. While Juan firmly expressed that she would not have undertaken doctoral study in an English-speaking country if she had another chance to make a choice, she considers that she has no other choice but to continue to engage with academic English after graduation. Juan said, *'what else I can do after graduation if I do not pursue an*

academic position in English at university?' Juan's disillusionment with acquiring native-like academic English capacity and inclination to continuously engage with academic English illustrates the contradiction of the doctoral becoming of many Chinese international doctoral students studying in English-speaking countries.

The remarks made by Feng, who expressed a desire to quit academia, are reminiscent of Juan's expression. Feng said, *'I'm still inclined after graduation to resume my lecturing position in English at my home university'*. The *illusio* of acquiring native-like academic English capacity through immersion in an English-speaking university has been internalised and structured as a habitus, to which I refer as *the native-like academic English habitus*. The native-like academic English habitus generates a durable inclination to engage in academic English and continuously functions against Chinese doctoral students in that it discourages them from making an alternative career choice. As such, the domination of native academic English produces the most "gentle, imperceptible and invisible" (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 1) form of violence on Chinese doctoral students studying in English-speaking universities.

The Emergence of 'Academic Chinglish'

John (2009) argues that non-native English speakers have to undergo an identity transformation when writing in academic English. This is reminiscent of Schmitt's (2005) argument that non-native English speakers need to learn to be "appropriate others" (p. 71) in order to gain the membership in the native English world. I argue that the identity transformation of being others in fact contradicts the essence of doctoral writing as a form of free expression of thinking for its own sake. Because of the domination of native academic English in doctoral thesis writing in English-speaking universities, doctoral

writers who are non-native English speakers often find themselves in an irresolvable dilemma of conforming to the norms of native academic English and writing freely following their own intellectual inclinations. Over time, this irresolvable dilemma can develop into a “fissure” (Rata, 2017a, p. 23), in which doctoral students who are non-native English speakers construct a hybrid space in which they do their doctoral thesis writing. The emergence of ‘academic Chinglish’ in Chinese academics’ writing illustrates this tendency.

With the increase in number of international academic publications by Chinese scholars, ‘academic Chinglish’ is gradually emerging and becoming recognised by international academia as an intelligible variety of academic Englishes (Fang, 2011). ‘Englishes’ (Pennycook 2007), such as Asian, European and Arabic Englishes, which “represent the regional acrolectal Englishes”, are the varieties of English “intelligible to communicators outside the regions in international settings” (Murata & Jenkins, 2009, p. 4). ‘Academic Englishes’, the varieties of academic English, integrate the local scholars’ thinking with highly intelligible academic English expressions. As a new variety of academic Englishes, academic Chinglish incorporates Chinese identity and cultural values while maintaining a high level of intelligibility (Fang, 2011; Gil & Adamson, 2011; Hu, 2005; Pinkham, 2000). Mauranen (2010) finds that these Chinese scholars creatively transfer Chinese language text organisations and rhetorical preferences to their academic English writing. Their writing adds innovative features to conventional English language forms. ‘Academic Chinglish’ enables Chinese ideas to be phrased and regenerated through the English medium. The emergence of ‘academic Chinglish’ benefits both China and the rest of the world. It facilitates Chinese academics’ free expression of their ideas while enabling the rest of the world to learn about Chinese cultures and China-related issues. Academic Chinglish constructs a third space for intercultural communication between Chinese scholars and the

scholars of the rest of world. I argue the emergence of ‘academic Chinglish’ shows a means of localising English language without deforming it, which serves a real globalisation of English language.

Writing in ‘academic Chinglish’ creatively reduces the symbolic violence that the domination of native academic English produces on Chinese academics and Chinese international doctoral students, and enable them to assert the “power of discourse” (Fang, 2011, p. 379). Over time, *the academic Chinglish habitus* has been formed, which enables Chinese doctoral students to “project [their] own identity and preferred social meanings” (Jenkins, 2014, p. 48) in thesis writing. The embodiment of the academic Chinglish habitus is seen in Ying when she said, *‘I form a habit of writing in English while thinking in a Chinese way’*. As Jenkins (2014) argues, after all, academic language is “nobody’s mother tongue” (p. 11). Academic language does not belong to some more than to others (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991).

The emergence of ‘academic Chinglish’ calls for a redefinition of contemporary academic discourse. As Mufwene (2001) argues, “the agency of language use lies [more] in communicating effectively than in preserving language boundaries” (p. 24). Languages continually develop as speakers reshape them in innovative ways. As the majority of English users, non-native English speakers need to share the ownership of English language on the basis of respecting intelligibility when using English. Jenkins (2014) predicts that the “non-native led transformation of English language is inevitable” (p. 10). I argue that this transformation works as a precipitated counter force to the neoliberal domination of international higher education through unifying the linguistic market. If English is to work as a real international *lingua franca*, then there needs to be an accommodation to other valid,

creative and intelligible varieties. The hybrid forms of academic Englishes, such as ‘academic Chinglish’, weaken the symbolic violence of native academic English exerting on academics and students who are non-native English speakers and enables thinking for knowledge creation of and for all human beings. As Grenfell (2012) argues, “resistance to symbolic domination is only possible in the form of heterodoxy” (p. 219).

Academic Englishes work as the media for successful intercultural communication in larger international intellectual community, “whose centre would be nowhere” (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991, p. 667). A true international doctoral becoming involves pushing scientific research to cross language boundaries, and enable thinking for knowledge creation and sharing for all human beings. Feng’s perception of becoming internationalised resonates with this argument. Feng said, *‘becoming internationalised is to become open to learning, not only in developed English-speaking countries but also in developing and under-developed non-English speaking countries’*. Feng’s perception of becoming internationalised transforms the *illusio* of acquiring native-like academic English through immersion in the developed English-speaking countries.

Without the diversity of academic Englishes, internationalisation of higher education will remain the rhetoric of westernisation and neoliberalisation that serves the unification of the global market. In order to practise a true internationalism in higher education, universities across the world need to establish educational institutions which are open to academic English varieties for nurturing intellectual freedom and knowledge creation of and for all human beings.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that linguistic domination is an effective means by which neoliberalism realises its domination. Linguistic domination operates through the compliance of non-native speakers to the norms of native speakers. As such, a unified linguistic market is produced in order to maximise the profits of native English speakers. The standardisation of academic English use results in the domination of native academic English in international higher education, which serves the unification of the international higher education market. The standardisation of academic English use in international higher education functions as the implicit sanction against any non-native English varieties, given that diversification of 'Englishes' impedes the unification of the global linguistic market for fast profit-making. This domination operates through enforcing the oppressions on non-native speakers when their use of English does not comply with the norms of native English speakers. This form of domination produces the symbolic violence in non-native speakers - the suffering of uncertainty and precariousness.

However, this domination also raises a counter tendency - the emergence of other academic Englishes, for example, 'academic Chinglish'. Academic Englishes show the potential to transform the linguistic domination of native academic English in international higher education. Academic Englishes allow doctoral students who are non-native English speakers the freedom to think and express ideas. The doctoral becoming within the domination of native academic English is the becoming of anxious and precarious knowledge workers conforming to the norms of native academic English. The doctoral becoming beyond the domination of native academic English is the becoming of free thinker liberated from the coercion and oppression of the supposed authenticity and nativeness of

academic English. In the next chapter, the doctoral becoming of my interviewees will be discussed in relation to the theme of ‘double distancing’, which further opens up the “fissure” (Rata, 2017a, p. 23) for creating a new space for my interviewees’ social existence.

Chapter Six: Double Distancing and Constructing a ‘Third Space’

Introduction

In this chapter, I explain my interviewees’ doctoral becoming of dual exclusion from both the host and home societies by applying the concept of ‘cultural habitus’. I define cultural habitus as the dispositions structured from socialisation experience in a particular culture – meaning, in my case study, Chinese culture. While the original Chinese cultural habitus of my interviewees generates a thought about distancing themselves from the host New Zealand society, this Chinese cultural habitus is transforming progressively through long-term immersion in Western culture of New Zealand society. The transforming cultural habitus generates a thought in the interviewees about distancing themselves from the home society. I refer to this phenomenon as ‘*double distancing*’. Double distancing leads to a dual exclusion of my interviewees from both societies. Double distancing is a ‘social suffering’ (Bourdieu & Accardo, 1999) resulted from neoliberal overseas education mobility. However, double distancing also leads to an ‘in-between’ (Bhabha, 1996) positioning. This ‘in-between’ positioning opens up a “fissure” (Rata, 2017a, p. 23) for my interviewees to construct a new space which bridges the two worlds and generates a new sense of social belonging.

A Thought about Distancing from the New Zealand Society

Bourdieu (1989) argues that “class habitus” generates a “sense of one’s place and the other’s place” (p. 17) among people from different social classes. As a result, people from different social classes maintain a distance from each other. In other words, class habitus produces a

social distance between people from different social classes. The logic in this argument is applicable to ‘cultural habitus’. I define cultural habitus as a set of dispositions structured in social agents living in a homogenous culture. These dispositions direct social practices in certain ways. When social agents move into a society with a different culture, their original cultural habitus will generate a sense of being in other’s place and a sense of not belonging to the host society. These senses can lead social agents to distance themselves from the people who are local to the area. The original cultural habitus of my interviewees is formed in China’s society where Chinese culture dominates. When these social agents moved in New Zealand where Western culture dominates, their Chinese cultural habitus encountered a different cultural context. As a result, their Chinese cultural habitus came into a “dialectical confrontation” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 31) with the Western cultural structures of New Zealand and generated an inevitable feeling of not belonging.

The sense of not belonging to a society echoes with the feeling of “not fitting in” (Nairz-Wirth, Feldmann & Spiegl, 2017, p. 17) with a society and a sense of being the “cultural outsider” (p. 17) in a society. Lehmann (2007) finds that the experience of the ‘cultural outsider’ is prevalent among the students from Asian countries studying in Western universities. The experience of the cultural outsider can be explained as the result of the functioning of the home cultural habitus when social agents enter a society with a different culture. Whereas the sense of belonging to a society links the personal to the social (May, 2011), the sense of not belonging to a society leads to social isolation and a loss of social identity (Fotovatian & Miller, 2014). These feelings were experienced by Zhao when he said, *‘we are just passers-by’*.

When moving from China into New Zealand, the interviewees experienced not only “geographic dislocation” (Li, 2015, p. 137) but also cultural dislocation. The sense of being in other’s place, not belonging, not fitting in, and that of being an ‘outsider within’ can hinder them from integrating with local students. When asked whether she often communicated with the local students in her doctoral hub, Mei responded, ‘*we have little communication*’. This lack of communication between Chinese international doctoral students and local doctoral students is also the result of local students’ distancing themselves from Chinese students because the cultural habitus of local students generates a sense of this being ‘our’ place. Brown (2009) find that British local students withdraw into “a segregated group in an attempt to avoid cross-national interaction” (p. 444). Holmes (2005) finds that the Chinese international students’ “communication and co-operation with New Zealand students, although desired, often remained elusive” (p. 289). Zhang and Brunton (2007) find that the Chinese students studying in New Zealand tend to bond with co-nationals because they felt less welcome by host nationals to participate in local community events as well as to share in leisure activities and the “quality interaction with host nationals was difficult” (p. 135). Ward and his colleagues (2005) find that New Zealand local students demonstrate a low inclination to interact with their international peers. These findings also resonate with Mei’s perception as she said, ‘*we are not in the discourse realm of the local students*’.

This air of disinterest on the part of local students acts as a powerful deterrent for intercultural communication between Chinese and local doctoral students. It is often felt by Chinese students that they are being distanced. For example, Zhao said, ‘*I feel that local students always keep a distance from us*’. Zhang and Brunton’s (2007) survey of 140 Chinese students in New Zealand shows that 55% of the respondents were dissatisfied with the availability of opportunities to make New Zealand friends. Chinese international

students often sense unwillingness from local students to connect. Brown (2009) argues that a lack of contact between international and local students causes international students to perceive local students as ignoring their presence. Ying experienced a feeling of being ignored by the local students whom she worked with in the same doctoral hub. Ying said, *'I feel our presence is often ignored by local students'*.

Brown (2009) argues that Western cultures are individualist-oriented whereas Eastern cultures are collective-oriented, which might be responsible for this felt sense of indifference. Bennett (2001) considers that self-interest is on the increase in individualist societies where the pressures on people's time and energy resources are increasing. I argue that while cultural habitus generates a durable sense of alienation between international students and local students, the thought about higher education as market competition intensifies the politics of differences (Rata & Openshaw, 2007) between international students and local students. Ward (2001) asserts that the benefits of 'international' campus in Anglophone universities are hypothesised and empirically untested. Echoing Ward's critique, Vita (2005) comments that "the ideal of transforming a culturally diverse student population into a valued resource for international connectivity, social cohesion and intercultural learning is still very much an ideal" (p. 75) in these universities. Instead, a pattern of 'ghettoisation' has long been observed in Anglophone university campuses where interactions mainly take place within conational groups (Gudykunst, 1998; Kim, 1988; Ward, 2001; Ward & Chang, 1997). The mere presence of international students in Anglophone university campuses does not necessarily lead to interactions and intercultural understanding between local and international students (Guo & Guo, 2017).

The absence of host contact often leads to a sense of disenchantment in international students from the East with the host society and Western culture. This social phenomenon is noted by Guthrie as “cultural fatigue” (1979, p. 90). Cultural fatigue was experienced by Zhao when he said, *‘even if this [New Zealand] is really a good place, I feel uncomfortable staying here’*. Brown (2009) asserts that cultural fatigue often results in international students assuming a negative and even a distorted perception of the Western host society. Guo and Guo (2017) note that Anglophone universities appear to be “unprepared” (p. 863) for handling cultural fatigue. Khoo (2011) argues that financial pressures push these universities to a marketised interpretation of the internationalisation of higher education while the policies for ethical development and programmes for mutual learning and benefit between international students and local students have eroded.

In Chapter Five, I discussed how the Chinese *illutio* of acquiring native-like academic English proficiency through immersion in English-speaking universities motivates many Chinese graduates and university staff to undertake PhD study in the developed English-speaking countries. This *illutio* has been internalised as a taken-for-granted “form of knowing” (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1986, p. 159) that privileges Western culture and Western society over Chinese culture and Chinese society. Zhao’s remarks illustrate this tendency. Zhao said, *‘before studying abroad, I thought everything in the West was better than that in our country’*.

Since the interviewees moved into New Zealand, their Chinese cultural habitus has been in a long-term confrontation with Western cultural structures. This long-term confrontation can lead to the occurrence of a cleft in individual habitus. With dual reflexivity, the cleft individual habitus evolves into a hybrid habitus that integrates competing social structures

(see also the discussion of the four stages of habitus transformation in Chapter Three). Zhao's individual habitus was evolving into the stage of hybridity, which generated a critical perception towards both home and Western societies. He said, *'now I am used to comparing the two worlds- home and abroad. I think both sides have their advantages and disadvantages'*. With increasing reflexivity, Zhao became disenchanted with the *illusio* that everything in the West was superior to that of China.

The increasing reflexivity is also shown in Ying when she said, *'before undertaking doctoral study abroad, I perceived Chinese pedagogy was inferior to the Western one. Now I consider that many Chinese teaching methods are preferable to those of the Western'*. For Ying, the *illusio* that everything in the West was superior to that of China led to a denial of the value of Chinese pedagogy. The increasing reflexivity enabled her to perceive Chinese pedagogy and Western pedagogy more critically. An increase in reflexivity was also found in Hong when she said, *'I don't easily follow others' opinions anymore when making judgements as I did in the past'*.

The long-term confrontation of the Chinese cultural habitus with the Western cultural structures of the host society led to the "ethnic identity salience" (Ting-Toomey, et al., 2000, p. 49) in some interviewees. Social agents with ethnic identity salience identify themselves as the members of their ethnic group and "evaluate their group positively" (Phinney, 1991, p. 194). Ethnic identity salience was seen in Ying when she said, *'I'm more inclined to identify myself as a Chinese than before'*. The remarks made by Zhao explain some of the reasons for the occurrence of ethnic identity salience in Chinese international doctoral students. Zhao said,

I realise that a sense of belonging to a Chinese group is very important. We began studying in the West at a mature age. It is too difficult at this age to adapt ourselves to the rules of Western academia, even for such a long period of study. Western students are more adaptive to these rules than we are. We need turn to our country. China is getting stronger and the Government provides us with sufficient funding to do scientific research.

In the long-term confrontation with Western cultural structures, the Chinese cultural habitus generated a sense of being disadvantaged in Zhao when competing against Western students in New Zealand academia. As a result, his individual habitus adjusted to generate a reinforced sense of belonging to Chinese group. I argue that ethnic identity salience can be explained as a *strategic retreat* that individual habitus produces to reposition social agents in academic competition. The confrontation of the Chinese cultural habitus with Western cultural structures can also lead to national identity salience. Coelho (2014) argues that the experience of studying abroad causes international students to strongly identify themselves with their home countries. Hail (2015) finds that the Chinese sojourners living in the United States commonly report that they feel more attached to China and look at China in a more positive way than they did before. I argue that cultural habitus when reinforced by market competition, explains why ethnic and national identity salience is prevalent among Chinese international students studying in Western universities. However, ethnic and national identity salience does not necessarily draw Chinese international doctoral students closer to their home society. Conversely, a sense of not fitting in anymore with their home communities was felt when my interviewees paid a short visit home during their PhD studies.

A Thought about Distancing from the Home Society

As a consequence of their long-term immersion in a Western university, my interviewees have internalised some Western cultural dispositions, which have, in turn, progressively transforming their original Chinese cultural habitus. This transforming cultural habitus generated a sense of not fitting in with their home society, which is felt in the form of a difficulty or a loss of interest in communicating with friends and family members whom my interviewees left behind at home. Hong mentioned her loss of interest in chatting with her friends at home. Hong said, *'I do not feel as engaged in chatting with my friends as I did before'*. The transforming cultural habitus shifted Hong's conversational repertoires and generated a sense of estrangement from her home community. Juan highlighted a sense of being a misfit when communicating with her family members and friends at home. Juan said, *'there are only a few topics that I can share with my parents and friends. My viewpoints are totally different from theirs. To them, I'm a misfit'*. Schütz (1944, 1945) argues that a sense of being 'the insider as outsider' commonly occurs to a home-visitor or homecomer who has been away from home for a prolonged period of time. I argue that when the internalised Western cultural dispositions are unable to integrate with the original Chinese cultural habitus, this resulted in a *cultural cleft* in my interviewees' individual habitus. A *cleft cultural habitus* generated the sense of 'the insider as outsider' when my interviewees paid a visit to their home communities after leaving home for a long period of time.

In contrast to Juan's explicit sense of not fitting in anymore with her home community, Mei's feeling of not fitting in is implicit. Mei said, *'very subtle things make me feel that I don't fit in there anymore'*. Mei's feeling echoes the argument made by Lee and Kramer (2013) that habitus is "cultural in nature", which encompasses even "the most mundane

aspects of life” (p. 26). Even a seemingly safe conversational topic can become “an area of contention or misunderstanding” (p. 26) across two incompatible cultural habitus. Ying expressed a feeling of division when talking with her parents and friends she left at home. Ying said, *‘talking with my parents becomes conflicting. It seems we are not talking about the same thing in a same way anymore’*. I argue that the contradictory feeling of ‘the insider as outsider’ is a cultural as well as social suffering because this suffering leads to a self-exclusion and hence the social exclusion of my interviewees from their home communities. This cultural cleft breaks Chinese international doctoral students’ connection with their home communities (Lee & Kramer, 2013, p. 31). Zhao talked about paying a short visit to his home university where he spent three years doing his Master’s degree. Zhao said,

I still have some sense of belonging to my home university because my former supervisor is still working there. He provided me with a lot opportunities during my Master’s study. But I feel that I don’t fit in there anymore. After all, I left there three years ago and during my time away I haven’t kept any position.

Zhao’s words are tinged with a sense of regret and loss as a consequence of leaving his home university, which belies the taken-for-granted perception that Chinese people hold that overseas educational mobility is a seamlessly beneficial process. Mei mentioned a sense of *‘being estranged and dislocated’* in her home university where she has kept an academic position during her PhD study leave, and *‘a sense of isolation’* when she was paying a visit there and was with her colleagues. These feelings are unvoiced sufferings resulted from overseas doctoral educational mobility. Whereas the doctoral educational mobility from the East to the West is taken-for-granted as a process of upward social mobility, the occurrence of a cultural cleft in individual habitus suggests that this process is often accompanied with an inner suffering of dual exclusion from both worlds.

A Thought about Distancing from the Home Academia

Whereas the thought about distancing themselves from their home communities can be explained as the result of a cleft in the cultural habitus, the interviewees' thought about distancing themselves from their home academia needs to be explained in relation to the localisation of global internationalisation of higher education.

The global internationalisation of higher education is, in practice, localised according to cultural differences. As Appadurai (1996) argues, exploring “culture as difference” (p. 13) allows for the development of a “contextual, heuristic and comparative” (p. 13) explanation of the global internationalisation of higher education. Schulte (2012) argues that China's internationalisation of higher education takes place at the interface of global ideas and local strategies. According to Cai (2014), China's internationalisation of higher education is actually governed by the rationale of ‘*zhong ti xi yong*’, which means “preserv[ing] the Chinese essence whereas adopting the Western means” (p. 175; also see, Cai, 2012). In other words, China's internationalisation of higher education is constrained by ideological and cultural considerations (Cai, 2004), hence is highly selective and instrumental in serving its national economy (Jokila, 2015; Huang, 2003) (see also the discussion in Chapter Nine).

According to this rationale, the Chinese Government has adopted an unequal research funding policy which privileges the overseas research study in the ‘hard’ science (i.e. science and engineering) and the applied social science, such as pedagogy and curriculum design, and language testing, over the study in the ‘soft’ sciences (i.e. social sciences and humanities) (Yang, 2002). This inequality in research funding allocation leads to a highly uneven international publication outputs between the research in the ‘hard’ sciences and the

‘soft’ sciences. China is now the world’s third-largest producer of international peer-reviewed research articles in the ‘hard’ sciences after the European Union and USA (Yang, 2014, 2015) whereas the number of international academic publications in the ‘soft’ sciences lags far behind that of the international publications in the ‘hard’ sciences. This inequality also results in a much lower research achievement of doctoral returnees in the ‘soft’ sciences and a restricted career development in contrast to those in the ‘hard’ sciences.

Bernstein and his colleagues (2014) note that the governments of many developing countries often use scholarships as the inducements to encourage their brightest graduates and university staff to undertake doctoral study in developed countries as a way of “plug[ing] themselves into the latest thinking in the West” (p. 8). These scholarships are usually offered on the condition that the recipients return to serve their home countries after completing their study. These scholarships are actually applied as the instruments for controlling talented students. China provides a typical example. The Chinese Government provides overseas doctoral scholarships to graduates and university staff to study in most of the developed Western countries on the condition that scholarship recipients are contracted to return to China to work for at least two years after graduation¹⁰. The number of contracted doctoral scholarship recipients has grown rapidly as the Chinese Government grants an increasing number of overseas doctoral scholarships each year.

Although granting overseas doctoral scholarship in the ‘soft’ sciences shows the openness of the Chinese Government to Western values and beliefs, the tensions that come with integrating Western values and beliefs into China’s academia are still unresolved. There still

¹⁰ <http://www.csc.edu.cn/chuguo/s/586>.

exist many restrictions and taboos in research and publication in the ‘soft’ sciences in Chinese academia (Cao, 2008). Research findings in the ‘soft’ sciences by overseas Chinese academics still receive low recognition and publication opportunities in local academic journals. This reality suggests that the Government is implicitly marginalising overseas research in the ‘soft’ sciences. The interviewees in the ‘soft’ sciences commonly express a concern about the acceptability of their doctoral research by Chinese academia. Mei, who studied education, said, *‘it is very difficult to get my doctoral research findings published in the local academic journals. Few of them accept the research I have done. My research is not home-grounded’*. Given that Mei’s doctoral research involved in a critical study of the values and beliefs of the Chinese university teachers, it is limitedly recognised by the local academic journals. The marginalised recognition and the limited opportunities of publication in the local academia created a dilemma in Mei given that becoming ‘internationalised’ through internalising Western values and beliefs has resulted in her being locally marginalised. Mei’s dilemma illustrates that China’s internationalisation of higher education is not comprehensive but is highly selective in the way of serving the economy.

Juan’s concern, after returning to China, about her doctoral research echoes Mei’s dilemma.

Juan said,

My research is a comparative study of Chinese and American criminal fictions. The research is sensitive and provocative because it reveals the ‘dark’ side of both societies. It is difficult to get funded by the Chinese Government. I need to shift my research direction to another field after returning to China.

The concern about the sensitivity and provocativeness of her doctoral research and the difficulty in getting Chinese Government funding immediately excludes Juan from continuing her doctoral research after returning to China. Thus, the transition of her doctoral

research to future academic work becomes problematic. This unresolved dilemma, as Juan said, has developed into a *'fear of return'*.

Western beliefs and values that doctoral returnees in the 'soft' sciences have absorbed through their overseas doctoral study are often contested in the local academia. Their efforts of practising these beliefs and values when lecturing and doing research are often resisted by local academics. As a result, their construction of academic space after returning to China, with the research they had done during their doctorates, is somewhat stifled when this reality is taken into account. This reality puts many doctoral graduates in the 'soft' sciences in a dilemma of holding Western beliefs and values while conforming to the Chinese local culture and ideology. This unresolved dilemma permeates the overseas doctoral study of the contracted recipients of the government scholarships in 'soft' sciences. Over time, a thought about strategically distancing themselves from their home academia is generated.

The thought about strategically distancing themselves from their home Chinese academia is also in fact prevalent among contracted overseas Chinese doctoral students. This tendency is illustrated by Mei's remarks, *'a contract can never bind a person. I am wondering how many students [referring to the contracted Chinese doctoral students] are thinking about not returning to China'*. The prevalence of the thought about strategically distancing themselves from the home academia among Chinese international doctoral students is resulted from the concern about the functioning of complex social networks known as *guanxi* in the home academia. *Guanxi* comprises another cultural and hence local dimension of the internationalisation of higher education in China. *Guanxi* in Mandarin refers to the "overlapping networks of people that are linked together through differentially categorised social relationships" (Hamilton & Wang, 1992, p. 20). The meaning of *guanxi* echoes with

Bourdieu's conceptualisation of 'social capital' as an "aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network" (1986, p. 249). As a particular form of social capital existing in contemporary China's society, *guanxi* is often mobilised to gain individual favours and benefits (Bian, 1997; Liu & Morgan, 2016). Pye (1968) argues that every Chinese understanding of the world is in the 'web' of relationships in which he or she is embedded. Mobilising *guanxi* in Chinese society is usually taken-for-granted as practising the social norms of trust (*xinyong*), face-saving (*mianzi*), and reciprocity (*renqing*) (Qi, 2013; see also, Barbalet, 2014). *Guanxi* exchange is often practised out of a sense of social obligation (Qi, 2017), which resonates with Bourdieu's (1986) conceptualisation of social capital as being "made up of social obligations" (p. 242). Thus, mobilising *guanxi* to attain individual benefits and favours becomes naturalised.

Qi (2017) argues that the market transition of China's higher education has not eliminated but strengthened *guanxi* for reason that social agents intensively mobilise *guanxi* to make individual profits (see also, Guthrie, 1998). According to Boisot and Child (1996), the embrace of the market economy in China results in the society being structured in three layers: the state, the market, and the *guanxi* networks. *Guanxi* remains an important "social fabric" (Qi, 2017, p. 114) of contemporary China's society. Naturally, mobilising *guanxi* is often considered and practised as a must in Chinese academia in order to attain individual benefits. Feng talked about his experience of mobilising *guanxi* to facilitate data collection for his doctoral research. Feng said,

Guanxi is very important for conducting academic research in Chinese academia. I planned to collect 300 samples from several home universities. Mobilising all my guanxi I built up within these universities, I eventually collected 200 samples.

Feng had been teaching at a local Chinese university for several years before undertaking PhD study abroad. He mobilised all the *guanxi* that he had built up in his local universities in order to collect his research data.

Bourdieu (1986) notes that social capital cannot be mobilised instantaneously unless it has been “established and maintained for a long time” (p. 251). Doctoral students usually stay abroad for three to four years before returning to China. Therefore, it is hard for them to build up a strong *guanxi* within their home academia during their overseas doctoral studies. Conversely, it is likely that the *guanxi* that they built up before studying abroad has been weakened because of the long leave. Given that *guanxi* plays an important role in career development in Chinese academia, the opportunity cost of long-term overseas study turns out to be high for doctoral returnees. The concern about their career prospects after returning to China was prominent among the interviewees. For example, Ying said, *‘I’m not sure about my job future. I do not have guanxi built up in any home university’*. This thought in turns generated the thought about strategically distancing themselves from their home academia. Zhao said,

If I return to China, I may get a position at a prestigious university, say in Shanghai [Shanghai is a large international city]. But it is highly likely that I will be marginalised because I have no guanxi built up there. It will be hard for me to get support from local colleagues when conducting research and competing against local doctoral graduates. At a prestigious Chinese university, the local doctoral graduates who secured the academic positions upon graduation usually get support from their supervisors when applying for research funding and conducting research. As a new returnee with no guanxi built up in the home academia, it is very difficult for me to develop career at a home university.

As China is still a *guanxi*-based society, local doctoral graduates can easily mobilise the *guanxi* that they have built up in local academia, in particular the *guanxi* built up with their supervisors. This gives them an advantage over doctoral returnees from abroad when competing for research funding, academic promotions, and other profit-making opportunities. Cao (2008) argues that academic career advancement in China to some extent still depends, to some extent, on *guanxi* and “political affiliation rather than pure merit” (p. 343). According to Shen (2009) and Cao (2008), rampant academic corruption has deeply penetrated the Chinese academy. For example, the success in applying for research funding still more or less depends on who the applicant knows rather than how s/he performs. Xiao (2014) points out that academic cronyism has been widespread in Chinese academy. Yang (2015) comments that *guanxi* results in preferential treatment and restricts the free movement of staff, students, and resources in Chinese academy.

The Brain Drain and the Brain Gain

In order to engage with the global knowledge economy, the Chinese Government launched the ‘Project 985’ in 1998, which funds 39 prominent universities to strive for world-class status (Hayhoe & Liu, 2010). These universities are selected from the list of the ‘Project 211’. The ‘Project 211’ was initiated in 1995 when the Government began funding 100 Chinese universities in order to develop these institutions into prestigious universities (Fang, 2012; Rhoads, Wang, Shi & Chang, 2014). The ‘Project 211’ divides Chinese universities into prestigious universities and non-prestigious universities. The ‘Project 985’ further stratifies the prestigious universities. The universities in the list of the ‘Project 985’ are provided with ‘world-class’ infrastructures, professionals, and abundant funding. These universities are considered to be the “centres of excellence” (Huang, 2003, p. 232) with the

purpose of extending China's global reach (Mohrman, Ma & Baker, 2008; Mok & Chan, 2008; Yang & Welch, 2012).

With the purpose of attracting the brightest overseas Chinese researchers (including doctoral graduates and post-doctoral researchers) to return to work in these elite universities, the Chinese Government has initiated a series of programmes that offer an elevated level of financial rewarding to their recipients. These programmes include: the Programme of Global Experts (Thousands of Talents Programme); the Changjiang Scholars Programme; the Chunhui Programme of the Education Ministry (a Project supported by the National Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars of China); and the Hundred Talents Programme of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Kai, 2014). The returning researchers of distinction who work in these elite universities are provided with a high salary, advanced research equipment, and abundant research funding. As a result, the number of returning researchers, including doctoral and post-doctoral graduates, continues to grow by tens of thousands each year.

However, the function of *guanxi* and the deeply rooted bureaucratic and hierarchical institutions in these elite universities make it difficult for the 'home grounding' of returning researchers. Hong talked about the experience of a doctoral returnee whom she met at a local academic conference in China. Hong said, *'he initially worked at a '985' university. He resigned from that university after a period of time because he felt he was being marginalised at the university'*. Without already existing *guanxi* and a sense of being able to build new *guanxi*, doctoral returnees often find it difficult, in local academic research activities, to apply their ideas and practise the values that they absorbed in Western academies (Altbach, 2007).

Furthermore, because many local academics are not engaged in the research at the international frontiers of knowledge, the returnees are likely to experience “another cultural shock” (Cao, 2008, p. 343) in work. They often find they do not share the same research paradigms that their local colleges are using. Cao (2008) notes that longer-term vision is often not part of the local research culture, and that the preferences for funding are usually given to the research projects which can provide quick or instant results. This local research culture is in conflict with the Western research culture that the returnees have internalised during their doctoral research abroad. The Western research culture values more a significant breakthrough through the incremental improvements. While the Chinese Government calls for the return of the best and the brightest scientific researchers, the leaders of local research institutes may not necessarily welcome returning researchers who are more capable than them (Cao, 2008). They often view returning researchers as threats to their positions and leadership. For this reason, the research undertaking by the returnees may not be judged on an equal footing with that of their local colleagues. Hence, a sense of being marginalised is often felt by returning researchers. The experience of Chinese academic returnees in their home academies illustrates how “local circumstances resist the global” (Yang, 2003, p. 287).

Under such circumstances, the individual habitus of doctoral students tends to generate a strategic distancing themselves from elite universities. Many returning doctoral graduates chose to work in non-elite universities which are located in the developed coastal regions of China, such as Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Fuzhou and Xiamen. The young returning scholar whom Hong met at a local conference (see also the discussion in the previous section) shifted from working at an elite university to a non-elite university located in Guangzhou. Hong said,

He shifted to do a post-doctoral project at a non-elite university in Guangzhou. With extraordinary academic achievements at the completion of the post-doctoral project, he was rewarded an exceptional promotion to that of professor. The open and equal research environment is the most important factor that I take into consideration when applying for a position to home universities.

The non-elite universities in the developed coastal regions of China are not funded nor administered by central Government. They therefore, enjoy more autonomy than elite universities do. More importantly, these peripheral non-elite universities are located in the cities where the open-up policies have been initially adopted. Hence, these universities have formed a more open and inclusive research culture, and are administered in less bureaucratic and hierarchical ways than central elite universities are. They provide more open and equal opportunities to staff for career development than central elite universities do. For this reason, they are preferred by many doctoral returnees. Most of my interviewees expressed an aspiration of working at one of these universities after returning to China. For example, Ming said, *'I want to work at a university in the south coastal region, where there is no deeply rooted bureaucratic system, and where the research culture is more open than that of the inland and prestigious universities'*. Ming's thought resonates with the finding of Zhao and Deng (2011) that there is "a strong tendency of regional aggregation" (p. 110) in the eastern and southern coastal regions of China in occupational orientations among doctoral returnees. This tendency suggests that how heterogeneous, non-hierarchical, and open research environments are desired by returning doctoral graduates.

The highly instrumental and selective research funding policies, the functioning of *guanxi*, and the deep-rooted hierarchical and bureaucratic institutions localise China's

internationalisation of higher education. This localised internationalisation of higher education in China marginalises returning doctoral graduates in local academia. Some returnees leave China again. In recently years, the Chinese Government seems to adopt a looser control policy over the re-leavers than it did in the past. The adoption of a looser policy to control the movements of returnees suggests that the Chinese Government has shifted from perceiving non-returnees and re-leavers as the factors causing China's 'brain drain' to considering that, in a long run, China benefits from the diaspora of Chinese researchers.

The notion of 'brain drain' was originally developed to describe the situation that the "skilled professionals who leave their native lands to seek more promising opportunities elsewhere" (Kwok & Leland, 1982, p. 91). There has a 'brain drain' in China as a result of the ever-increasing number of Chinese scientific researchers who continue to live and work abroad after completing their research projects (Mok & Han, 2016). However, there is an alternative argument that China has in fact experienced a 'brain gain' (for example, Cao, 2008) from the diaspora of Chinese researchers. The fact that these researchers remain in overseas universities, research laboratories, and corporations does not mean China lose them permanently. Instead, they are seen creating new transnational resources conducive to China's development. They are the bridging social capital (Putnam, 1995) for China. They connect China to the outside world, spreading new information and circulating innovations (Burt, 2004).

The Emergence of a ‘Bridging’ Cultural Habitus

The contradiction and tension of being ‘the insider as outsider’ of both home and Western academia shape the doctoral becoming of Chinese doctoral students who have spent a prolonged period overseas and are contracted to return to China. Over time, a thought about distancing themselves from both worlds has been formed - a phenomenon which I have denoted as *double distancing*. Double distancing (re)produces a dual exclusion of these doctoral students from both worlds. This dual exclusion is both implicit and ‘soft’, and hence often misrecognised. But it is no less cruel than a physical exclusion for reasons that it causes an inner pain (Bourdieu, 1992) of ‘in-between’ (Bhabha, 1996) alienation. I call this phenomenon *the cultural cleft* emerging in individual habitus.

Double distancing also fosters “double consciousness” (Li, 2002, p. 138) and dual reflexivity. With double consciousness and dual reflexivity, the cultural cleft habitus tends to develop into an individualised space where an “invention of the self” (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997, p. 304) emerges. This tendency was seen in Ying when she said, *‘I do not feel that I belong to either side. I feel a kind of in-between alienation. But I do not care about it so much as I did before. I just focus on what I want to do’*. With double consciousness and dual reflexivity, the cleft cultural habitus tends to evolve into the bridging cultural habitus, reconciling the conflicting cultural structures of both worlds. The formation of a bridging cultural habitus was seen in Hong when she said, *‘I networked extensively with Western scholars as well as Chinese scholars’*. A bridging cultural habitus generates social practices which transcend the binary vision and division of the relations between the East and the West, home and abroad, “foreign and national” (Marginson, 2014, p. 173), the insider and the outsider (McNess, Arthur & Crossley, 2016).

Although Zhao has a number of publications in international academic journals (see the discussion in Chapter Four), he anticipated that he would be disadvantaged in academic competition if he returned to China to work at an elite university. Over time, this anticipation developed into a thought about strategically distancing himself from home academia by working as a ‘bridge’ after graduation for a cooperative research project between a home research team and an American research team. Zhao said, *‘working as a bridge, connecting the two worlds, and integrating the strong points of both sides is the best way of facilitating my career development. I’m also seeking to create the cooperation between Chinese and foreign academia’*. Zhao’s creative distancing himself from both worlds enables him to create a bridging space for the career development. This bridging space traverses the “different geographical and cultural spaces” (Sleeman, Lang & Lemon, 2016, p. 397) and presents a new mode of academic identity formation. Over time, a *bridging cultural habitus* has been formed, which generates connective and mutually beneficial social practices for both worlds.

The bridging cultural habitus enables Zhao to work as a “middle person” (Gomes, Berry, Alzougool & Chang, 2014, p. 9), shuttling between the two cultures (Canagarajah, 2006) with greater creativity and new wisdom. Zhao’s doctoral becoming of constructing a bridging space connecting home academia and Western academia echoes Marginson’s (2014) argument that international higher education can be a self-formation process for international students. Whereas the cultural habitus reinforces neoliberal domination by distancing people within different cultures from each other and having them compete against each other, the emergence of the bridging cultural habitus suggests the potential to transform this neoliberal domination through generating mutually beneficial social practices.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explain that doctoral education mobility from the East to the West leads to a cleft in my interviewees' cultural habitus. The cleft cultural habitus generates a thought in my interviewees about distancing themselves from both the host New Zealand society and their home society. While double distancing dually excludes the interviewees from both societies, it also fosters "double consciousness" (Li, 2002, p. 138) and dual reflexivity, which enable my interviewees to reconcile the conflicting cultural structures of the two worlds, constructing a bridging space connecting the two worlds. Over time, a bridging cultural habitus has been formed. In this sense, the overseas doctoral study of my interviewees is a 'transformative learning' (Mezirow, 2000) experience, through which the "more inclusive, open and ...reflective" (p. 8) social practices are generated. From double distancing to constructing a bridging space connecting the two worlds, the doctoral becoming of my interviewees is the becoming of the border crosser.

Throughout Chapter Four, Five and Six of Part II, I explained how neoliberal forces, including the research visibility and measurability, the nativeness of academic English, and China's selective internationalisation of higher education, dominate *the present* of my interviewees' doctoral becoming. I also explained how the embodiment of scholarly altruism, the 'academic Chinglish', and the bridging cultural habitus show the potential to transform the neoliberal doctoral becomings. Throughout Chapter Seven, Eight and Nine of Part III, I will explain how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is reproduced through the examination-driven school education, the neo-conservative higher education choice-making, and the marketised higher education. I will also explain how the practice of a humanising pedagogy shows the potential to transform neoliberal domination of Chinese

university students. From *the present* back to *the past*, this neo-Bourdieuian analysis accounts for a discursive but progressive transformation of neoliberal domination. These accounts illuminate *the future* of doctoral becoming. In the final chapter, I propose a *moral education* to really combat neoliberal domination over young people.

Part III: The Past of the Doctoral Becoming

Deleuze (1997) argues that “becoming is not history [because] history designates only the collection of conditions, as recent as they may be, that need to be overcome in order ‘to become’, to create something new” (as cited in Rabinow, 2009, p. 29). For Deleuze, becoming needs to be freed from history (i.e. the collective conditions) to be new. Alternatively, Hegel (1963) argues that “the course of history does not show us the Becoming of things foreign to us, but the Becoming of ourselves and of our own knowledge (as cited in Bourdieu, 2000b, p. 46). Following Hegel, I argue that, in order to illuminate the Becoming of human beings, history needs to be examined, given that “history is the unconscious” (Durkheim, as cited in Bourdieu, 2004, p. 96). Echoing Durkheim, Bourdieu conceptualises habitus as “something historical” (1993, p. 86), which is intended to raise our consciousness of history and to examine the structuring force of history.

The educational history of an individual can be considered as a “social trajectory” (Bourdieu (1993, p. 162; see also, Collins, 1998, p. 728), a particular historically situated field that an individual encounters and “the system of positions in which the events in a social agent’s life take place” (Speller, 2011, p. 59). Reed-Danahay (2005) asserts that educational experience of an individual reflects “a collective history” (p. 129) - “a collection of other social agents engaged in the same field and facing the same realm of possibilities” (Bourdieu & Turner, 2005, p. 304). I argue that the purpose of analysing the educational history of individuals is to examine the structural effects that broader social forces produce on educational institutions and individuals, and to examine how agency and structures interact with each other. Based on this logic, the analysis of my interviewees’ educational history involves examining the structuring effects that neoliberalisation produces on Chinese

educational institutions and hence on Chinese young people. Furthermore, by examining the most “subjective tensions and contradictions” (Bourdieu, 1999a, p. 511) that my interviewees have experienced in China’s neoliberalised education, I intend to reveal the “deepest structures” (p. 511) of neoliberalism and its contradictions.

The chart below contains some background information on the interviewees, including their family backgrounds, the periods in which they completed school education, undergraduate and postgraduate education in China, and their work experience in China. When describing some historical facts, I use the past tense with the intention of indicating the situations in the present are changing.

Pseudonym	Year of birth	Family Background	Primary School	Junior High School	Senior High School	Higher Education (Undergraduate)	Higher Education (Graduate)	Work Experience
Zhao	1988	Suburban Working-class (Peasant immigrant)	1994-2000	2000-2003	2003-2006	2006-2010	2010-2013	None
Hong	1982	Suburban Working-class (Peasant immigrant)	1988-1994	1994-1997	1997-2000	2000-2004	2005-2007	2004-2014 university lecturer
Ying	1981	Urban Working-class (Worker)	1987-1993	1993-1996	1996-1999	1999-2003	2011-2012 (abroad)	2003-2011 senior high school teacher
Mei	1984	Urban Working-class (Worker)	1990-1996	1996-1999	1999-2002	2002-2006	2006-2009	2009-2014 university lecturer
Juan	1987	Urban Middle-class (School Teacher)	1993-1999	1999-2002	2002-2005	2005-2009	2009-2012	None
Ming	1987	Urban Middle-class (Public Servant)	1993-1999	1999-2002	2002-2005	2005-2009	2009-2012	None
Feng	1981	Rural Working-class Peasant	1988-1994	1994-1997	1997-2000	2000-2004	2004-2007	2007-2013 university lecturer

Chapter Seven:

Examination-driven School Education and the Examination Habitus

Introduction

There exists a strong belief in China's society that completing formal school education, participating in the national entrance examination, and entering university is the orthodox means for upward social mobility (Davey, Lian, & Higgins, 2007; Liu, 1994). This belief functions as a *doxa* in China's society and forms an examination-driven education system. This *doxa* is internalised and structured as a collective habitus, which I refer to as *the examination habitus*. The examination habitus consecrates high scores achieved in examinations and ensures that Chinese young people struggle to achieve high examination scores. I argue that the examination habitus reproduces the market competition and exclusion, and functions as the mechanism by which neoliberalism dominates Chinese young people. The embodiment of the examination habitus causes Chinese young people to misrecognise the arbitrariness of the examination-driven education and to suffer from anxiety, shame, and oppression in struggling to achieve high examination scores.

A Chinese Belief

There is a strong belief in China's society that entering university is the only orthodox means for upward social mobility. This belief originates in the Confucian tradition that purports that university education symbolises success and high social status (Huang & Gove, 2012). In contemporary China's society, most parents believe that having a degree in higher education markedly increases their children's life chances in, for example, getting a good

job and securing an advantageous marriage (Hildebrand, Phenice, Gray & Hines, 2008; Lien, 2006; Liu & Morgan, 2016; Louie, 2004).

The origin of the Chinese national examination system can be traced back to the Han Dynasty. *Keju*, the Civil Service exam system was introduced in the 7th century during the Sui and Tang dynasties (Yu & Suen, 2005). It is a system developed for institutionalising the meritocratic tradition of selecting officials from all social classes for over two thousand years (Thogersen,1989). Throughout Chinese history, the centralised examination system has been believed to be the most explicit and equitable means of selecting talented people from all social classes to enter the class of bureaucrats (Thogersen,1989). The national entrance examination for higher education, known as *Gaokao* in Mandarin, was officially set up in 1952 (Davey, Lian & Higgins, 2007) and has been held annually till this day. Although the *Gaokao* had been suspended for ten-years throughout Cultural Revolution - a political movement between 1966 and 1976, it was immediately resumed in October 1977 (Thogersen,1989). To be eligible to take part in the *Gaokao*, Chinese young people must complete year-twelve formal school education.

The Establishment of the *Key* and *Non-key* School Education System

China's twelve-year formal school education is structured in three hierarchical levels: pre-school education, school education, and higher/tertiary education (Sheng, 2014). The school education is composed of primary and secondary education. Primary education is completed in year-six primary school, and secondary education is completed for three-year junior high school and three-year senior high school. There are two tracks for senior high school. One track is the higher education track, which prepares students for the *Gaokao*. The other track

is the vocational track, which trains students to be skilled workers. To be eligible for taking part in the *Gaokao*, students are required to take the higher education track.

In 1978, the Chinese Government initiated a series of economic reform policies which transformed China's society from one of being a planned economic system to a market economic system (Wu, 2010). The Chinese Government believes that education should nurture a number of top-level scientists to serve the nation's fast economic growth. In order to serve the economy, a series of educational reforms have been adopted (Thogersen, 1987, 1989). In order to implement a "fast policy" (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012, p. 268) for the purpose of securing economic efficiency, the Government believes that valuable educational resources need to be allocated with priority to prestigious schools. In February 1978, the Ministry of Education initiated the policy of "Setting Up 20 *Key* Primary Schools Across the Country" (as cited in Chai & Cheng, 2011, p. 133). In October 1980, the Ministry of Education, with the approval of the State Council, issued "Guanyu Fengqi Fengpi Banhao Zhongdian Zhongxue de Jueding" (The Decisions on Establishing the *Key* High Schools by Stages and Groups) (as cited in Chai & Cheng, 2011, p. 134). As such, a *key* and *non-key* school education system has been established and valuable education resources have been allocated with priority to *key* schools.

In the 1990s, as a strengthened effort to give priority to economic efficiency, the Ministry of Education issued "Guanyu Banhao Yipi Zhongdian Zhongxiaoxue de Shixin Fan'an" (The Trial Plan for Upgrading a Number of *Key* Primary and High Schools) and "Guanyu Jinyibu Banhao Zhongdian Zhongxiaoxue de Jidian Yijian" (The Advice on Further Improving *Key* Primary and High Schools) (as cited in Chai & Cheng, 2011, p. 134). These two policies set up China's school education system in "a pyramid structure" (p. 134). While

all *non-key* schools are set at the bottom of the pyramid, all *key* schools are hierarchically categorised into district, municipal, provincial, and national *key* schools. Thus, a highly hierarchical school education system has been formed. The higher position a school occupies, the more valued educational resources including funding, infrastructures, and the best qualified teachers the school possesses. The higher the position a school occupies, the greater opportunity for entering higher-level schools or universities that are offered to its graduates. As a result, students in top *key* schools are often taken-for-granted as “the university students of tomorrow” (Thogersen, 1989, p. 41). Most of the graduates from top *key* senior high schools enter top universities. By contrast, in *non-key* schools, especially the schools located in poor rural and suburban areas, the rate of graduates entering higher-level schools or universities is very low. Zhao graduated from a *non-key* junior high school located in a poor suburban area. His experience illustrates this inequality. Zhao said, *‘few graduates from my school were qualified to enter senior high school’*. Bourdieu and Champagne (1999) argue that a simple and clearly identifiable hierarchical education system in fact maintains “a close, homogeneous relationship with the social hierarchy” (p. 421). As such, the pyramid-structured school education system reproduces the domination of economic efficiency in China’s society through strict stratification and hierarchisation.

Within the *key* and *non-key* school education system, valued educational resources have been allocated to *key* schools when they contain the minority of students in China. By contrast, *non-key* schools which contain the majority of students receive the minority of the valued educational resources. Thus, *non-key* schools have gradually become the places where academically unsuitable students are concentrated. These students are marginalised from higher education track. The *key* and *non-key* school education system reproduces the class of entrepreneur by giving priority to economic efficiency. In this way, this school

education system reproduces the neoliberal domination of contemporary China's society just as the French school system did (Bourdieu & Champagne, 1999).

The Arbitrariness of the Binary Streaming System

At the beginning of the second year of senior high school, students were streamed into either the science track or the liberal arts tracks, upon their choice (Li, 2008). In addition to the main subjects of mathematics, Chinese and English, the students in the arts track were required to study history, politics, and geography whereas the students in the science track were required to study chemistry, physics, and biology. Upon the successful completion of the three-year senior high school programme, students are eligible to sit the *Gaokao* in either the science track or the arts track.

The binary streaming of students into either the science track or the arts track is an arbitrary way of forcing students to fit in the one or the other track. Feng talked about the dilemma he faced when making the choice between the science track and the arts track. Recalling this experience, Feng said, '*I was in a dilemma when choosing to take the science track or the arts track. I am poor at physics and Chinese, but good at history and mathematics*'. No matter whether Feng chooses the science track or the arts track, he is disadvantaged by having to study one subject which he is not good at. Juan faced the same situation. Juan said, '*I don't like politics nor physics. But I'm good at chemistry and English*'. For the students who have talent in a single subject but are poor at other subjects, the binary streaming immediately excludes them from entering university.

The binary streaming system prevents all students from all-round development. Ying said, ‘*I performed evenly in all subjects. I didn’t really want to make a choice between the science track and the arts track*’. The arbitrary binary streaming system deprives students of the opportunity of developing into a whole-person (Hulbert, 2007) with real capabilities and a quality of life (Nussbaum, 2011).

The Education for the *Gaokao*

Upon receiving the *Gaokao* score report, the candidates filled in an application form for their intended Chinese universities. Each year after the *Gaokao*, the Ministry of Education publishes a list of universities which are stratified into four categories according to a hierarchical entry score requirement. Applicants can apply for the universities in one to four categories depending on whether their scores reach the entry levels of the intended universities. The army and police academies are in the first category. To be qualified to be enrolled in these academies, applicants need to meet the additional entry requirements, including the required physical conditions and political status. The second category is national and provincial *key* universities, such as Qinghua University, Beijing University, and Fudan University. National *key* universities are funded by the central Government and are on the Project 211 list and the Project 985 list (see also the discussion in Chapter Six). Provincial *key* universities are funded by provincial governments. The third category is *non-key* universities funded by local governments (see also the discussion in Chapter Six). The fourth category is colleges which offer three-year undergraduate diplomas.

Every applicant is permitted to fill in each section with two to five universities in the same category. Within each selected university, the applicant is allowed to apply for one to six

disciplines in the order of her/his preference. The more popular the university or discipline is, the higher the entry score required for securing a place. Universities tend to give preference to applicants who apply for that university as their first choice. With the applicant's prior agreement, s/he may be offered a place in another university or discipline which s/he does not apply for if s/he has not been offered a place at the university s/he applied for. Alternatively, the applicant may choose to re-sit the *Gaokao* and re-apply to enter the university in the following year (Davey, Lian & Higgins, 2007).

The applicants who live in the same city where a university is located can be offered a place with a lower score than that which is required for applicants residing outside the city. This means that the applicants living in major cities, such as Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou, where most of the prestigious universities are located, have greater chances of entering prestigious universities than the students living in rural areas (Kipnis, 2001). This has been critiqued as representing the "regional discrimination" against rural students (People's Daily, 4 June 2007, as cited in Li, 2008, p. 118). It raises the concerns about the fairness of the *Gaokao* in providing equal opportunity to all applicants when entering universities, in particular, elite universities.

Despite the massification of higher education (known as the *Kuozhao* in Mandarin) since the mid-1990s (Ngok, 2008), the number of applicants still far exceeds the places that public universities can offer each year due to the huge population base in China. The population in China reached 1.33 billion in 2010 and 1.375 billion in 2015 (Feng, 2010). Competition to enter universities, especially prestigious universities, is always fierce. This causes schools both implicitly and explicitly prepare students for the *Gaokao*. The preparation often begins at primary school (Thogersen, 1989). The *Gaokao* functions as "the baton of education"

(Dello-Iacovo, 2009, p. 247), directing teaching and learning activities (Davey, Lian & Higgins, 2007; Hang, 1988; Zhang, 1995). Teaching and learning for the *Gaokao* has become a *doxa* (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992), that is, the logic of practice, of China's school education. Over time, an examination-driven school education system has been formed.

The Examination-driven School Education

The examination-driven school education system uses examinations and examination scores as the means of evaluating and selecting students, teachers and schools. For a student, the examination score decides whether s/he can enter a higher-level school or university. For a teacher, the average examination score of the class(es) that s/he teaches decides her/his career prospects. For a school, the average examination score of its graduates decides its reputation and funding from the government. As Lewin and Hui (1989) argue, the reputations of schools and teachers ultimately hinge on the number of the graduates entering higher-level schools or universities. Thus, struggling for higher examination score becomes the *doxa* of each school. Examination score functions as the iron chains binding all players, including school administrators, teachers, students, and parents. The players occupying the same position compete against each other by applying similar and/or different strategies.

In order to maintain and improve the rate of graduates entering higher-level schools or universities, most schools apply a ranking strategy to their students. Every student is ranked according to the average examination score s/he achieved each term. Such intensive ranking practice produces constant pressure and anxiety in students. The students who have high rankings face greater competition from their peers when they enter higher-level schools,

which can in turn lead to a greater incidence of depression and anxiety. Feng's experience illustrates this situation. Feng recalled,

In my junior high school, only the graduates whose score rankings are within the top 30% have the opportunity to enter senior high schools. Those who successfully enter senior high schools are re-ranked. I felt very depressed because my ranking fell significantly when I entered senior high school.

At the very heart of this highly stratified education system, a deep and real misery is accompanied by the fact that "everything is as if designed to remind [a student] that the position he occupies in it is a low one" (Bourdieu & Champagne, 1999, p. 424).

Coupled with the ranking strategy, many schools apply a highly flexible streaming strategy to their students. The students are flexibly streamed into *fast* (elite) classes or *general* classes (indicating the students are *slow* when their performances are compared with those of students in *fast* classes) according to their score rankings each term. Ming entered a *key* senior high school, where the students are streamed into *fast* and *general* classes. Ming recalled, '*the students in the fast class whose examination scores are ranked outside the top 50 at the end of each term are sent back to the general class*'. This highly flexible streaming system produces huge pressure on students in *fast* classes. They are pushed harder through being allowed less leisure time, being assigned more homework, and sitting more exams and tests than students in *general* classes. Ming said, '*the students in the fast classes resume studying immediately after having lunch*'. Such intensive involving in study can do harm to the physical and mental health of students in *fast* classes. The existence of *fast* class reminds the students in *general* classes on a daily basis of their inadequacy (Thogersen, 1989).

This streaming system also leads to the inequality in allocating valued educational resources. The students in the *fast* class are usually taught by the best qualified teachers and are prioritised to use the educational resources. In some *non-key* schools, the ‘slowest’ students are often considered to have no hope of entering higher level schools or universities, and as a result, schools and teachers give up on these students, giving them the least attention possible or ignore them altogether. These students who have been given up on often feel ashamed and rejected, and are gradually marginalised and eventually self-excluded from the higher education track. As such, the streaming system reproduces the selection and exclusion functions of the market.

Many *key* schools even apply the ranking strategy to the teachers. Ying, who taught at a *key* senior high school, said, *‘by the end of each term, the teachers are ranked according to the average examination score achieved by the class which they taught’*. Many schools decide their salary scales (including bonuses) and promotion opportunities for teachers according to their teaching performance, which is dominantly decided by the average score achieved by the students whom they teach (Marton, 2006). The application of this ranking strategy leads the teachers to competing against each other through pushing their students harder to achieve higher scores. Ying said, *‘many students study just because they fear their teachers’*. Behind chasing high scores is teachers’ struggle for survival and/or thriving.

For maintaining and improving the rate of their graduates’ entering higher-level schools or universities, many schools adopt a compulsory boarding system which requires all students to board at the schools. Juan talked about her experience of being forced to board at her senior high school, *‘I did not want to board at the school. But the teacher told me that every student was required to board at the school and as such every student could spend more*

time studying than they would if they were living at home'. In some rural schools, poor accommodation conditions and the heavy study burden make the boarding experience a form of torture for the students. Feng's boarding experience at a senior high school in a small town illustrates this suffering. Feng said,

The accommodation conditions in my senior high school were the worst in the town. Fifty students lived in a big room. It was very hot in summer and cold in winter. The food was simple. We needed to queue in a long line to get food. The school applied militarised management. The dining period allowed for each meal was twenty minutes. The time duration of having classes and self-study each week day was over ten hours.

With a militarised boarding system, these schools impose strict control and intense surveillance of the students. This boarding system severely refrained the students from free and all-round development towards becoming a whole-person.

In China, the success of young people in higher education is considered a family glory (Huang & Gove, 2012). Most Chinese parents consider that they have responsibility to support their children to enter university. Immediately after the *key* and *non-key* school system had been established, many families try their best to help their children enter a *key* school, given that *key* schools secure a much higher percentage of their graduates' entering university. However, given that China has a huge population, the places offered by *key* schools can only meet the expectations of a comparatively small portion of Chinese families. The competition for entering *key* schools is fierce. For students from medium and low-income families who cannot pay the expensive school selection fees, the scores achieved in the entrance examination are decisive to succeeding in entering a *key* school. Therefore, the struggle for high examination scores among these families is intense. Many parents push their children to study harder in order to achieve higher examination score.

The rapid growth in the national economy has brought about an increase in the average family income, which makes it possible for more Chinese families economically support their children's education than before. Furthermore, the introduction of the 'one-child' policy in 1979 (Hesketh, Lu & Xing, 2005) centred the hope for family glory on the only child – this child becoming the 'only hope' (Fong, 2006). This only child often has to carry the aspirations of two generations of a family - parents and grandparents. In the cities, many parents pay school teachers and/or private education agencies for private tutoring. Ming moved to a provincial city to begin the second year of primary school. From that time on, his parents paid for Ming's after-school tutoring, just as many other parents do.

Pushed by both teachers and parents, Chinese children and young people spend most of their time studying. Many of them suffer from depression and school sickness – in that the students feel bored with learning. Bourdieu writes about the "high school malaise" (Bourdieu & Champagne, 1999, p. 421) brought on by the neoliberal education in contemporary France. Bourdieu's writing has many resonances with the situation in contemporary China. The school sickness experienced by Chinese young people has many resonances with the school malaise experienced by French young people.

Ming's reflection on the changes that were occurring in his personality during the schooling, illustrates this phenomenon. Ming said, *'when I just started the primary school, I was very lively in class. But gradually I felt bored at school. Since entering junior high school, I seldom spoke in class, feeling bored and depressed'*. Juan's reflection on her changing personality during her schooling echoes Ming's experience. Juan said, *'I was lively and happy when I was in the primary school. However, since the time I entered junior high school, I gradually become less communicative because of the study pressure'*. A number

of studies have found that psychological problems caused by study pressure are prevalent among Chinese school students (Davey & Higgins, 2005; Dai, Chen & Davey, 2007; Dong, Yang & Ollendick, 1994). Because the performance in the *Gaokao* determines a student's success or failure in entering university, failure in the *Gaokao* often leads to a psychological breakdown. Cases of committing suicide among the students who failed the *Gaokao* are frequently reported in the media.

The examination-driven education system oppresses the curiosity and creativity of Chinese young people in learning. Because most examinations are designed to test students' ability to memorise written knowledge (Pepper, 1996; Thogersen, 1989), the examination-driven education leads to *rote learning* – knowledge memorising through mechanical repetitions. Ying highlighted her experience of rote-learning subjects in arts and social sciences. Ying said,

We learn Chinese, English, history, and politics mainly through memorising the written knowledges. The teachers direct us to highlight the important knowledges in textbook, and then we memorise this knowledge through mechanical repetition. When doing written exercises, many students copy the answers and then memorise them before exams.

Whereas learning subjects in arts and social sciences is mainly done through memorising knowledge written in textbooks, learning of science subjects depends heavily upon doing numerous problem-solving exercises, which is known in Mandarin as the *Tihai* strategy. The *Tihai* strategy refers to a teaching method that involves immersing students in numerous problem-solving exercises as if they were immersing students in the sea. Zhao talked about his experience in doing intensive problem-solving exercises and memorising the

knowledges written in the textbooks when he was in senior high school, *'the learning in senior high school was mainly done with a lot of repetitive problem-solving exercises and memorising the written knowledge'*. Rote-learning and the *Tihai* strategy are the products of the examination-driven education. Rote-learning and the application of *Tihai* strategy cause many students to lose interest in learning and result in a widespread school sickness.

The Examination Habitus

The blind chasing of higher examination score is endemic within China's school education. Over time, this *doxa* has been internalised and structured as a collective habitus, which I call *the examination habitus*. The examination habitus naturalises the arbitrariness of evaluating the capacity of students using examination scores, assuming that examination scores are the only equal means for allocating educational resources. The examination habitus begets a student who achieves high examination scores a "symbolic power" (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 14) – being considered as a success and gaining attention, praise, and admiration from other people. This symbolic power is convertible into cultural capital (certificates), economic capital (monetary/material rewards), and social capital (popularity among teachers and peers). Hong talked about her experience of becoming the centre of teachers' attention because she achieved the highest score in an end-of-year examination at her junior high school. Hong said, *'when I was in the third year of junior high school, my examination scores ranked me as the top student for the year. I suddenly became the centre of the teachers' attention. I became highly motivated to study'*. The examination habitus generates the perception that learning is for attaining a high score and that the sense of fulfilment experienced by those who achieved high scores.

Whereas the students who achieved high scores survive and thrive, the students who fail exams are gradually excluded from higher education track. This mechanism of exclusion is implicit and often misrecognised because the examination habitus often generates a sense of guilt and shame in the students who failed exams. For example, Feng said, *'I felt guilty before my parents on account of failing an exam'*. The examination habitus also generates a sense of shame in the parents whose children failed an exam. When the failure in an exam led to the lowered ranking of a class or a school, the examination habitus generates a collective sense of shame in all its members (Davey, Lian & Higgins, 2007). Feng recalled a collective sense of shame felt by all members of his junior high school on account of being ranked, in the entrance examination for senior high school, as the lowest junior high school in the town. This lowest ranking resulted in the resignation of the Principal. Feng said, *'the average score of the graduates from my junior school was ranked the lowest in the town in the entrance examination for senior high school. What a shame for the whole school! The principal resigned'*.

By generating a sense of honour and fulfilment in high score achievers and a sense of guilt and shame in exam failures, the examination habitus functions as “the mechanism of [neoliberal] domination through the unconscious manipulation of the body” (Bourdieu, in Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992, p. 115). As such, the examination habitus naturalises social hierarchisations and divisions resulted from the arbitrary examination-driven education. Over time, a utilitarian education has emerged, in which teaching and learning are taken-for-granted for achieving a high examination score in order to make individual profits.

A Utilitarian Education

A utilitarian education takes an instrumental view of education. A utilitarian education reduces education to a means of profit-making and upward social mobility. A utilitarian education produces self-interested calculators with little moral awareness because it fails to provide its subjects with the opportunity and means to “feel for the situation of others” (Tarrant, 1991, p. 60). Within a utilitarian education, every social agent struggles to maximise individual profits from examinations. Behind every strategy applied to achieve a higher score is an economic rationale. Feng talked about the monetary rewarding policy adopted by his teacher when he was in the primary school. Feng said,

Before every term exam, the teacher required that every student donate one Yuan¹¹. After the exam, the money was rewarded to the students whose scores in the ranked top ten. At that time, one Yuan meant a lot for a rural family. This policy simulated all of us to study hard.

While this monetary rewarding policy provided the students with a stimulus to study hard, it also caused the students to perceive learning as a means of making economic profits. Similarly, many parents apply the strategy of material rewards, including money, to stimulate their children to achieve higher scores.

In some senior high schools, in order to maintain a high rate of their graduates entering university, some teachers apply a strategy of selective teaching within a classroom in the way of giving prioritised guidance and assistance to the students whose score rankings are within the realm of possibility of entering university. Feng said,

¹¹ Yuan, Chinese monetary unit, 1 US\$ equals 4.8 Yuan in 1990.

In my senior high school, the percentage of graduates entering university was generally 30%. The teachers only tutored the students whose score rankings were within the top 30% in a classroom. These students were seated in the rows at the front of the classroom. Once a student's ranking dropped out of the top 30%, s/he was re-seated to the rows at the back of the classroom. The teacher only checked the homework done by the students in top 30%.

This selective pedagogy explicitly practised the principle of a utilitarian education, which has been internalised by the students when they perceive teacher-student relations. Ying's comment illustrates this tendency. Ying said, *'the teacher-student relationship does not rest on respect any more but on profit'*. Maximising individual profits through education characterises a utilitarian education, reproducing neoliberal domination through having young people conform to economic forces. The utilitarian education in China involves a shift from the Confucian tradition of education in which students revere their teachers as they do to their parents (Liu & Morgan, 2016) to the market logic which frames teacher-student relations as those of the seller and the buyer of knowledge commodities.

The practice of the utilitarian education is also seen in the charge for school-selection fees. Because *key* schools and local education departments have the power to control student quotas, they apply a strategy of charging school-selection fees to increase the income of schools and local governments. Chai and Cheng (2011) argue that school-selection fees have become the "major sources" (p. 137) of school funding. The students whose examination scores do not reach the entry level of a *key* school need to pay school-selection fees in order to enter the school. In the late 1980s, the practice of charging school-selection fees was publicised. In the mid-1990s, a dual-track system was adopted in some cities. Many schools enrolled both the public-funded students whose entrance examination scores reached the

entrance level and the self-funded students whose scores did not reach the entrance level.

On December 16, 1996, the State Education Committee issued “Putong Gaoji Zhongxue Shoufei Guanli Zhanxing Banfa (No. 101, 1996)” (The Interim Measures of Regulations on Charging Selection Fees by Senior High Schools) (as cited in Chai & Cheng, 2011, p. 136). This policy specifies that school-selection fees charged by a senior high school should be justified in relation to the actual costs of the school. The schools in different areas could charge different school-selection fees upon the approval of their provincial government. The enrolment number of students who pay school-selection fees should not exceed the threshold stipulated by provincial government. In addition, the school-selection fees that each school proposes to charge should be publicised. In 1997, the State Education Committee clarified this situation by stating that “only a small number of public schools are allowed to recruit students who select schools” (Chai & Cheng, 2011, p. 134). This clarification, in fact, legitimises the charge of school-selection fees. Because the schools that are eligible to charge school-selection fees are all *key* schools, this clarification intensifies the already fierce competition for entering *key* schools among the majority of families who cannot afford the high school-selection fees. The enrolment of the students who pay school-selection fees reduces the available places for the students who have qualified through entrance examinations. Charging school-selection fees increases the inequality of the opportunity to enter prestigious *key* schools between the students from rich families and the students from average and low income families.

As provincial governments restrict the charge level and the number of school-selection fee-paying students, many parents with economic power turn to apply such strategies as donation and *guanxi* (a particular form of social capital, see also the discussion in Chapter

Six) to help their children enter *key* schools. Ying's remarks illustrate this situation. Ying said, '*many parents who succeed in sending their children to key schools not only paid the high school-selection fees, but also mobilised the guanxi*'. As a result, '*Pindie*' (in Mandarin) becomes a prevalent social phenomenon. *Pindie* refers to the fact that Chinese young people whose fathers possess privileged economic and/or political power enjoy privileged rights, such as entering elite schools and getting a good job. The legitimization of charging school-selection fees and the mobilisation of *guanxi* widen the educational inequality in China's society. This leads to conflict and division between the students who entered *key* schools with requisite examination scores and who entered *key* schools by paying school-selection fees. Ying talked about the division between these two groups of students within her classroom. Ying said,

The students whose parents paid the school the high school-selection fees often show off in the classroom. The students who entered the school with the requisite scores feel that they are being treated unfairly. There is an obvious division between these two groups of students.

This division and conflict within classrooms and schools in the end lead to social division and conflict. As such, the utilitarian education reproduces neoliberal domination in China's society.

Conclusion

The examination-driven school education produces an *examination economy* (Zhou, 2007), which functions as an industrial chain. This chain consists of publishers, schools, school teachers, and private tutoring agencies. The agents in this chain profit from selling examination products (including books, audios and videos) and providing tutoring services

to students. Instead of providing a taken-for-granted equal education opportunity to every young person, the examination-driven education, underpinned by an economic logic actually (re)produces neoliberal domination over China's society. Although heterogeneous forces continuously emerge in China's school education, such as 'quality education' (Della-Iacovo, 2009; Zhou, 2007) which aims at fostering whole-persons, 'moral education' (Lu & Wang, 2000; Rosen, 2004), and 'student-centred education' (Wang, 2011), the highly centralised examination system, in which examination score remains the 'law of selection', still dominates the educational mobility of most Chinese young people.

Chapter Eight:

Higher Education Choice-making and the Formation of a Neo-Conservative Habitus

Introduction

Bourdieu (1998c) writes that neoliberalism is “a new type of conservative revolution” which claims its “connection with progress, reason and science” but while its real intentions are actually to “justify its own re-establishment” through “economics” (p. 125). Neoliberalism is in fact a sort of ideology which looks to conserve the market logic against all other logics. Neoliberalism is a “supreme form of conservative counterattack in economic language” (p. 126). Neoliberal domination is realised through operating “a sort of logical machine that presents itself as a chain of constraints regulating economic social agents” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 3).

Since the market transition in 1978, China’s society has gradually come to be dominated by neoliberalism just as have many other societies which adopted neoliberal policies in the late 1970 and early 1980s (Harvey, 2005). Extending Bourdieu’s idea about neoliberalism as a new type of conservative ideology, I argue that neoliberal domination in China’s society is often realised and reinforced through *reviving* the older conservative forces such as “groupthinking” (Burke, 1968, as cited in O’Hara, 2011, p. 27), gender stereotypes, pedagogic and familial authoritarianism, on the condition that these older conservative forces submit to the logic of the market. As such, these older conservative forces evolve into the neo-conservative forces that reinforce neoliberal domination in contemporary China’s society. In this chapter, I explain how neoliberalism dominates the higher education choice-making of Chinese young people and their families through reviving these older

conservative forces. The ‘higher education choice-making’ refers to the two stage choice-making that Chinese young people and their families experience before entering Chinese universities. The first stage involves the choice-making of the science track or the arts track at the beginning of the second year of senior high school. The second stage involves the choice-making of universities, disciplines, and degree subjects of higher education at the completion of the *Gaokao* (see also the discussion in Chapter Seven).

Market-driven Higher Education and Higher Education Choice-making

In parallel with the market transition of the economy, the market transition of the higher education in China was completed through a series of reforms in two stages. The reforms in the first stage were completed during the 1980s and in the early 1990s. These reforms assigned a high value to knowledge of innovation and application, and introduced tuition fees (Law, 1995; Rosen, 2004) and internationalisation of higher education. The reforms in the second stage began in late 1990s and continued through to 2010 (Wu & Morgan, 2016), which include the initiation of the ‘Project 211’ and the ‘Project 985’, both of which aim at developing a number of ‘world class’ universities through centralising state funding (see also the discussion in Chapter Six), the establishment of a strict ranking system, the establishment of the graduate labour market, and the introduction of a new funding system based on the enrolment size of public universities (Wu & Morgan, 2016).

All these reforms give priority to “economic efficiency, consumer choice, and individual autonomy” (Wu, 2010, p. 619). The reforms shifted the role of higher education from one of serving the public to one of serving the economy. Underpinned by the rationale of the knowledge economy, disciplinary knowledge is measured by its convertibility to economic

profits, in other words, its marketability. The introduction of tuition fees leads to the perception that higher education choice-making is an investment made upon the calculation of economic return. As a result, many disciplinary choices are the preferences of the most 'marketable' disciplines, such as tourism studies, media studies, and business studies. However, these "sense[s] of investment" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 142) are, in fact, unaccountable for securing economic return, given that flexibility and unpredictability are the real 'ethics' of the market. They result in the uncertainty and contradiction of many young people and their families when making higher education choices.

The policy of constructing a number of 'world-class' universities through centring state funding on a number of prestigious universities is governed by the rationale that prioritises the allocation of valued resources to the best and the strongest for the sake of economic efficiency. This policy divides public universities into elite and non-elite universities. The establishment of a strict ranking system in the public universities is further stratified through the introduction of market competition and corporate management. The establishment of the graduate labour market transfers the Government's responsibility for graduate job assignment (Mok, 2005; Rosen, 2004) to individual responsibility. Over time, the implementation of these reforms has produced and accumulated a sense of precariousness in Chinese young people and their families when making higher education choices.

The introduction of the new funding system based on the enrolment scale is governed by the rationale that the expansion of the higher education market will stimulate education consumption and eventually promote economic growth. The expansion of higher education has resulted in a rapid increase in the graduate supply to the labour market. According to Liu and Hong (2016), there were "1.88 million graduates" (p. 66) entering the labour market

in 2003, and this figure jumped to “6.99 million by 2013” (p. 66). While the rapid expansion of higher education is considered to facilitate the inclusion of the minorities into higher education (McDonough & Miller, 2016), it in fact solidifies the “status hierarchy” (Roska & Robinson, 2016, p. 113) of public universities. The over-supply of graduates to the labour market has led to inflation in higher education credentials and fierce competition for job. The number of returning graduates from abroad increases each year, which further intensifies job competition. Harvey (2005) argues that capital accumulation in neoliberal regimes is realised through dispossessing the security of employment disguised by the flexibility of the market. This argument has strong echoes in China’s higher education labour market.

Over time, higher education has been taken for granted as a precarious investment. Securing a job has become a prioritised consideration in making higher education choices, in particular, for working-class families. Zhao is from a rural with low income, whose remarks affirms this tendency, *‘for a family like mine, completing university is a huge investment. I cannot graduate without a job’*. With the advancement of the market economy, the tuition fees charged for higher education in China have increased dramatically (Rosen, 2004; Sheng, 2014). The soaring tuition fees have made higher education unaffordable for many low-income families. The increasing investment in tuition fees and the reality of a mass of unemployed graduates has led to an increasing sense of the precariousness in young people and their families when they are making higher education choices. This scenario echoes Bourdieu’s (1998b) argument that neoliberal domination is “an ideological offensive, a mode of domination that seeks to create uncertainty, anxiety and fear on the side of labour to guarantee its compliance” (as cited in Doogan, 2009, p. 214).

Harvey (2005) argues that neoliberalism presumes “no asymmetries of power or of information that interferes with the capacity of individuals to make rational economic decisions in their own interests” (p. 79). The neoliberal higher education system presumes that all players acting in the higher education market have an equal access to the valued information when making higher education choices. In reality, there do exist prominent asymmetries across classes in accessing the valued information which enables the choice-making in one’s greatest interest. Upper and middle-class families usually mobilise their economic, cultural, and social capital to access to the valued information when making higher education choices (Sheng, 2014). As a result, they turn out to be both better informed and more capable choice-makers than working-class families are. Working-class families, in particular low-income rural families, are extremely limited when it comes to mobilising any form of capital to access the valued information in the moment of making higher education choices. Their higher education choice-making is often subsumed to older conservative forces such as “groupthinking” (Burke, 1968, as cited in O’Hara, 2011, p. 27), gender stereotypes, familial authoritarianism, and pedagogic authoritarianism.

According to Huntington (1957), conservatism is “the system of ideas employed to justify any established social order” (p. 455) and to maintain “a form of life” (Wittgenstein, as cited in O’Hara, 2011, p. 91). It is a “positional ideology” (O’Hara, 2011, p. 91), which may “acquiesce in change on secondary issues” if necessary to “preserve the fundamental elements” of a society (Huntington, 1957, p. 455). Echoing Huntington’s view on conservatism, I argue that neoliberal domination is in fact the domination of a neo-conservative ideology that can accommodate itself to older conservative forces on the condition that these older conservative forces preserve the fundamental elements of the market. In the following sections, I will explain how neoliberalism dominates the higher

education choice-making of Chinese young people and their families through accommodating itself to the older conservative forces including ‘groupthinking’, gender stereotypes, familial authoritarianism, and pedagogic authoritarianism.

‘Groupthinking’ and Higher Education Choice-making

Burke (1968) argues that conservatism dominates social agents by “immersing them in their society, allowing convention and habit rather than choice and deliberation to determine their actions” (as cited in O’Hara, 2011, p. 25). One essence of Burkeian conservatism is “groupthinking” (p. 33). ‘Groupthinking’ is considered to be “laid down and aggregated through time” (p. 27), and therefore “superior to that of the few” (p. 27). Groupthinking dominates practice with the logic that because a thinking is the thinking of the group, this thinking is the principle of practice. ‘Groupthinking’ is a deep-rooted ideology in traditional Chinese society that remains strong echoes in contemporary China’s society. Because working-class families do not possess the economic, cultural and social capital to mobilise in order to access the valued information, such as data issued by a reliable authority, when making higher education choices, they have no choice but to turn to the thinking of their groups to reach a higher education decision.

Zhao’s choice of the degree subject of engineering for undergraduate study is the result of the thinking of the people around him. My dialogue with Zhao illustrates this process.

Researcher: *What discipline did you apply for?*

Zhao: *I applied for civil engineering.*

Researcher: *Are you interested in it?*

Zhao: *Not at all.*

Researcher: *Then why did you apply to study in this discipline?*

Zhao: *Obviously, if I study civil engineering it is easy to find a job after graduation.*

There were civil construction sites everywhere in those years. I often heard those working on construction sites made a big fortune.

Zhao's disciplinary choice was made upon the rationale that choosing "the most marketable" (Reay, 1998, p. 521) subject would maximise his economic return. Having no access to the valued information, such as data issued by a reliable authority, Zhao made the 'most marketable' subject choice of civil engineering through referring to the thinking of his group. This reference is captured by Zhao's words '*I often heard*'. This choice-making process illustrates O'Hara's (2011) argument that "prejudices tend to have value for a community, even if their purpose is implicit and unintended" (p. 26). When neoliberal thinking is reinforced by a groupthinking, it mutates into a neo-conservative force. This neo-conservative force totally subjugates higher education choice to the benefit of economic forces, and while in the same manoeuvre repressing young people's intrinsic interest in learning. This tendency is illustrated by Zhao's choice-making of the science track. Zhao said, '*my academic performance in physics was very poor. I never passed the exams. I am interested in history, but I took the science track*'.

Zhao's poor performance in physics disadvantaged him in the science track. The scores he achieved in the *Gaokao* did not reach the entry level of studying civil engineering. Zhao suffered from depression for a long time because of this failure. Zhao said, '*I was very depressed after knowing that I failed to get into the applied university to study civil engineering*'. Neoliberal thinking about higher education, which is reinforced by the groupthinking, not only prevented many young people from entering university, but also

produced the inner suffering of depression. The oppression generated by this neo-conservative force is often misrecognised by Chinese young people and their families, who blame themselves for the failure.

Feng is also from a low-income rural family. His choice of taking the arts track was governed by the thinking that entering university and completing higher education is about securing a comfortable life. Feng said,

I often heard that those who study in the arts work comfortably in offices and those study in the sciences work hard on construction sites after graduation. I was raised in the countryside, seeing my parents labouring all day in fields. I did not want to make a living as they did. So, I chose the arts track.

Feng's choice of taking the arts track for the purpose of securing a comfortable life is reinforced by the thinking of the rural people around him as he said, '*I often heard...*'. Although this thinking is misleading and absurd, it is taken-for-granted by Feng, given that it is the 'wisdom' of many, and thus its absurdity is misrecognised.

Familial Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making

A growing body of research conducted in the West finds that parental involvement plays an important role in young people's higher education choice-making process (Brooks, 2003; Ball, Davies, David & Reay, 2002; Hutchings & Archer, 2001; Pugsley, 1998; Reay, 1998; Roberts & Allen, 1997; Scott, 2009). Sheng (2014) finds that there are salient class differentiations in terms of parental involvement in the higher education choice-making of Chinese young people. Her research focuses on the capital (economic, cultural, and social) that middle-class families mobilise to make the decisions to apply for elite universities and

to study the prestigious subjects, such as law and medicine, and the most marketable subjects, such as computer science and business management. By contrast, working-class families are constrained with the capital to mobilise to reach these decisions. The function of the older conservative forces such as that of groupthinking suggests that much choice-making is dispositional rather than rational, especially the choice-making of low income families who do not possess the capital to mobilise to access the valued information and hence to make calculations that enable them to reach a rational choice. Therefore, I consider that habitus needs to be applied to explain this inequality.

Furthermore, I argue that higher education choice-making across classes in contemporary China's society is governed by the thinking about higher education as an investment for profit-making and upward mobility. This thinking is often reinforced by familial authoritarianism, an older conservative force rooted in Chinese society. Chinese familial authoritarianism originates from "Confucian filial piety" (Ho & Lee, 1974, p. 305). The Confucian filial piety refers to a series of "culturally defined intergenerational authority relationships" (Ho, 1994, p. 349), such as, obedience. With Chinese familial authoritarianism, parents possess absolute authority within a family, and this authority serves as "a guiding principle of Chinese patterns of socialisation" (p. 350). The Chinese familial authoritarianism includes authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. Under certain circumstances, the familial authority can be extended and shifted from parents to grandparents, relatives, and the elder sons or daughters of a family. The Chinese familial authoritarianism generates a hierarchical family structure in which every family member has a hierarchical authority depending on the position s/he occupies. The members of older generation in a family possess an authority over the members of younger generation.

This familial authority is often used by Chinese parents to reach a neoliberal higher education decision. Ming is the only child in his family due to the ‘one-child’ policy adopted in urban China between 1980 and 2015. His father is an officer serving in the army and his mother is a store salesperson. Ming’s family is a typical patriarchal middle-class family in which his father has the absolute authority over Ming’s higher education choice-making. Ming said, *‘I applied to study medicine. My father wanted me to be a doctor’*. Ming’s ‘choice’ of medicine is a total submission to his father’s authority. The parents of a middle-class family with only one child often consider the higher education of their only child as the only opportunity for upgrading the social status of the family (Sheng, 2014). When this thinking is reinforced by familial authoritarianism, its efficacy of oppression doubles.

Such arbitrary subject choice-making suppressed Ming’s intrinsic interest in mechanics and has caused the lasting depression since he began studying medicine at university. Ming said, *‘I felt bored with those medical terminologies. I am not really interested in medicine’*. Bourdieu (1999a) argues that family is the party “principally responsible” (p. 511) for the neoliberal sufferings because the most fundamental neoliberal structures are “inscribed at the very heart of family” (p. 511). Although middle-class families can mobilise all forms of capital to reach a prestigious decision, their higher education choice-making is not “smooth nor unproblematic” (Sheng, 2014, p. 145), but is as “conflictual and painful” (p. 145) as that of many working-class families. Bourdieu (1999b) turns to the contradiction of familial inheritance as “a total revelation of an internal break” (p. 383) to explain this social suffering. Alternatively, I argue that this suffering is caused more by the contradiction of neoliberalism itself than by that of familial inheritance. When neoliberalism presupposes to provide freedom of choice to social agents, it, in fact, locks them into an economic chain.

Both patriarchal and matriarchal familial structures exist in Chinese middle-class families, where one parent of the family possesses privileged economic, cultural and/or social capital over the other parent. Both patriarchy and matriarchy are the products of familial authoritarianism. Patriarchy and matriarchy result in parent(s)' arbitrary involvement and control over the higher education choice-making of their children. Like Ming, Ying is the only child in her family. Her mother is a university administrative staff member and her father is a factory worker. Ying's family is a typical matriarchal middle-class family where her mother possesses advantageous social and cultural capital over her father, and hence has absolute authority over Ying's higher education choice-making. This matriarchal family structure is illustrated by Ying's remarks that *'my mum wanted me to take the science track. She wanted me to enter the university where she is working. It is a university of science and technology'*.

Neoliberalism dominates contemporary China's society through naturalising the idea that the purpose of entering university is to secure a stable job, a secure income, and a privileged social status, all of which have become increasingly precarious in the job market. Dominated by these thoughts, many middle-class parents often mobilise all the capital (economic, cultural, and social) that they have accumulated within their professional fields to make their children's higher education choice-making as secure as possible in terms of maintaining and upgrading their familial social status. These thoughts led Ying's mother to mobilise all the capital she has accumulated during working at university to control Ying's higher education choices which secure a stable future for her. Ying said, *'my mum wanted me to lecture at her university after graduation'*.

By contrast, working-class parents do not possess any form of capital to mobilise when involving in their children's higher education choice-making. Hence, the familial authority over their children's higher education choice-making is often shifted from the parents to a relative or an elder child who has already succeeded in entering university. Zhao's parents are migrant workers, who did not attend school. His elder sister succeeded in entering university when Zhao was making up his mind as to whether he should take the arts track or the science track. Hence, the familial authority over this decision was shifted from his parents to his elder sister. Zhao said,

I am interested in history and performed better in arts subjects. But my elder sister who studied arts advised me to take the science track. She told me that the knowledge in arts and social sciences is not applicable. I thought this over and decided to take the science track.

I have argued in the first section that neoliberal higher education reforms in China have assigned a high value to knowledge innovation and applicability in the service of the national economy. As a result, the applicable 'hard' sciences are preferred to the pure 'soft' sciences (Biglan,1973) when many young people and their families make disciplinary choices. This tendency explains why Zhao's elder sister felt being disadvantaged in studying the arts and advised Zhao to take the science track. In this case, the thought about the applicability of disciplinary knowledge to make economic profits is reinforced by familial authoritarianism, resulting in Zhao's choice of taking the science track. This choice-making suppressed Zhao's intrinsic interest in history and caused an inner suffering of self-oppression. Zhao said, '*since taking the science track, I felt learning was very hard. I forced myself to study science subjects till completing the Gaokao*'. By taking the science track,

Zhao was eventually excluded from entering the prestigious university he applied for. Zhao said, *'the score I achieved in the Gaokao did not reach entry level of the applied university'*.

Feng is also from a rural working-class family, where both his parents are peasants. His elder sister studied English language at college and became an English teacher in a senior high school in his hometown after graduation. Naturally, the familial authority over his subject choice-making shifted from his parents to his elder sister. This is shown in our dialogue.

Feng: *I only applied to study English. I had no idea about studying other subjects.*

Researcher: *Did you consult the class teacher?*

Feng: *The class teacher was usually unwilling to give specific advice. He suggested that we make our own choices. My elder sister studied English in college and after graduation she began to teach English in the senior high school in my hometown. So, I chose to study English.*

The complexity of filling in the application form for universities and of selecting subjects (see also the discussion in Chapter Seven) disadvantages most working-class families, in particular rural working-class families. Young people from working-class families usually have to fill in the application form by themselves in the absence of the valued information and the assistance they might have otherwise received from those 'in the know'. With the neoliberal rationale of self-responsibility, both schools and school teachers are quick to shift the responsibility for guiding students through the application procedure to students and their families.

The thought that entering university is to secure a job is reinforced by familial authoritarianism. This thought resulted in Feng's self-exclusion from making other choices. The sole subject 'choice' of English greatly reduced Feng's opportunity of entering a more prestigious university. Feng said, *'I was offered a place by a university which was newly upgraded from a college'*. In the first section, I described how the new funding system based on the enrolment scale of a university has led to a mushrooming of new universities which have been upgraded from colleges through rapid expansion. Although the enrolment scale of these new universities has reached university level, the educational resources they possess and the quality of the service they provide often do not meet university level.

Gender Stereotypes and Higher Education Choice-making

Brooks (2003) argues that the decision-making process of adolescents is often "patterned by their gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status" (p. 287). Recent research claims that the traditional gendered socialisation process and the formation of socially accepted sex-appropriate roles continuously affect the career choices of boys and girls (Dryler, 1998; Egerton, Roberts & Peters, 2013). Francis (2000) considers that the gender dichotomy has a significant influence on the occupational choice-making of young people. Bourdieu (1984) argues that gender as a "social order" is "progressively inscribed in an individual's mind through language, the judgements of others, and the interactions of everyday life" (p. 471).

The influence of gender stereotypes in higher education choice-making of young people has drawn the extensive research interest in both Western and Chinese academia. The studies in the Western contexts find that there is a significant gender segregation in the students' subject choice-making (David, Ball, Davies & Reay, 2003; Ferreira, 2003; Snyder & Dillow,

2012; Stake & Nickens, 2005). These authors find that boys prefer mathematics, computer, and information science, whereas most girls chose to study humanities and social sciences. This finding resonates with the findings in contemporary China's society (for example, Guo, Tsang & Ding, 2010; Sheng, 2014, 2015). Xu (2007) finds that there exists a significant gender disparity in the distribution of undergraduate students by subject. Sheng (2014) finds that the gender stereotype is salient in Chinese undergraduates' degree subject choice-making. Elsewhere, Sheng's research (2015), conducted in Beijing, suggests that there is a "statistically significant sex segregation" (p. 230) in the degree subject choice among the undergraduates. Sheng predicts that degree subject choice will keep a "strongly gender differentiated" (p. 235) tendency in Chinese universities over a long period of time. I argue that gender stereotype, which is a deeply rooted conservative force in China's society, often interacts with other older conservative forces, such as familial authoritarianism and pedagogic authoritarianism to reinforce neoliberal domination over Chinese young people.

Gendered Familial Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making

The gendered familial authoritarianism in China's society originates from Confucianism which is 'rigidly authoritarian and bolstered by a social matrix that was essentially totalitarian' (Slote, 1998, p. 37). The Confucian family traditionally has been defined by its value system, including "age grading; the generational sequence; the dutiful bonding between parents and siblings" (Slote, 1998, p. 38). They are deeply rooted in Chinese families and often result in the 'controlling' parenting, in particular when involving in children's education (Chao, 1994). The neoliberal thinking that entering university is to secure a comfortable life is reinforced by the gendered familial authoritarianism. As a result,

the symbolic violence of this thinking exerted on Chinese young people is tripled. Mei's undergraduate degree subject choice-making illustrates this argument. Mei said,

I was interested in medicine. But my parents suggested to me that I study English. They said studying medicine was too hard for girls. Being a girl, I did not have to study too hard and studying English and becoming an English teacher was more suitable for girls than studying medicine and becoming a doctor.

The thinking that the purpose of entering university is to secure a comfortable life is reinforced by Mei's parents' gender stereotyped belief and led to Mei's gendered subject choice of studying English. This choice deprived Mei of the right to choose to study medicine – a choice that would have reflected her intrinsic interest. In contemporary China's society, the gender stereotyped career expectation is still dominant, leading to the gender stereotyped subject choice-making. For example, females are more socially expected to work as language teachers than males are. As a result, language subjects have always been perceived as feminine subjects, given that girls have always greatly outnumbered boys in studying languages in Chinese universities (Sheng, 2015).

Hong is from a rural working-class family. Naturally, the familial authority over her undergraduate degree subject choice-making shifted from her parents to her uncle who went to university. Hong said, *'my uncle suggested to me that I study English. He said that it is easy for girls studying English to find a job, especially a job teaching English'*. The thinking that higher education is instrumental for securing a job is reinforced by the gendered familial authoritarianism. As such, the oppression exerted on young people is tripled. As a result, Hong's 'choice' to study English turned out to be a taken-for-granted 'choice'.

Gendered Pedagogic Authoritarianism and Higher Education Choice-making

The origin of Chinese pedagogic authoritarianism can be traced back to Confucian tradition of pedagogical relationship between teachers and students – a relationship in which teachers possess the absolute ‘pedagogic authority’ (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) over students. The gender stereotype interacts with the pedagogic authoritarianism to reinforce the neoliberal thinking about higher education. As a result, the symbolic violence exerted on Chinese young people is tripled. Hong’s choice of the arts track illustrates this tendency. Hong said,

I was interested in science and performed better in the science subjects than I did in arts subjects. But the class teacher told us that for girls it would be easier to find a job if they studied the arts rather than studying the sciences. So, I chose to take the arts track.

The gender stereotyped belief in the relation between subject choice and career prospects has been revived to reinforce the neoliberal thinking that the purpose of entering university is to secure a job. As a result, the symbolic violence of oppression exerted on Hong was tripled. The gendered belief that girls are better suited to studying arts and that boys are suited to study science has remained prevalent among Chinese people, including some highly educated people, such as Hong’s school teacher and uncle.

Echoing with Hong’s decision to choose the arts track, Ying’s decision to choose the arts track is dominated by the gendered belief of her class teacher. Ying said, ‘*when I was in junior high school, the class teacher often reminded us that girls who studied the sciences would lag behind boys in an advanced stage even though girls may perform better in the initial stages*’. Ying’s class teacher has a gendered belief in relation to the disparity of academic achievement between girls and boys in science subjects, which exerted a

pedagogical authority over Ying and led to her gradually distancing herself from the science track although she was interested in sciences and performed well in science subjects.

The neoliberal thinking about higher education is reinforced by gendered pedagogic authoritarianism. As a result, the oppression exerted on Chinese young people is tripled. This thinking deprived many Chinese young people of the right to make real choices that reflect their own intrinsic interests and causes a long-lasting depression. Hong talked about her experience of the long-term disorientation and depression since she studied in the arts track. Hong said,

Since taking the arts track, I no longer felt as energetic in learning. I became disorientated and was in a dilemma for a whole year. I even thought of shifting back to the science track, but this would have meant that I would have had to spend one extra year in senior high school. My family could not afford this. I gave up this thought and forced myself to stay in the arts track.

For working-class families, the cost and risk of making another higher education choice are unbearably high. The choice is usually made once and for all. Hong said, *'I kept studying as hard as before. But I never performed in arts subjects as well as I did in science subjects'*. The decision to take the arts track in the end disadvantaged Hong in the *Gaokao*. She failed in entering the prestigious university that she applied to.

Conclusion: Formation of the Neo-Conservative Habitus

The marketisation of higher education is in effect a form of “symbolic inculcation” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 29) through which neoliberalism realises its domination of both Chinese young people and their families. The thought that the purpose of entering university

is to secure a job, a stable income, a comfortable life, and individual and familial upward mobility dominates higher education decision-making across classes in contemporary China's society. This thought is often reinforced by such older conservative forces as groupthinking, gendered familial authoritarianism, and gendered pedagogic authoritarianism. Over time, a neo-conservative force has been formed and internalised as a collective habitus, which I call *a neo-conservative habitus*.

The neo-conservative habitus confines the higher education choice-making of many Chinese young people and their families within an economic enclosure, which both results in the social cost of mobilising capital and the social suffering of oppression. Thus, the neo-conservative habitus contradicts itself through generating an ever-growing sense of precariousness. I argue that the neo-conservative habitus functions as a new mode of neoliberal domination in contemporary China's society. Its conservative efficacy is seen in its preservation of the older social orders and the neoliberal misery of insecurity and distress (Bourdieu, 1998b). The function of the neo-conservative habitus suggests that the process of higher education choice-making in contemporary China's society is more 'dispositional' than 'rational' when some research argues for the rationality of higher education choice-making (for example, Obermeit, 2012; Smyth & Banks, 2012). I argue that the higher education choice-making of Chinese young people and their families is both an expression of class dispositions (Ball, 2003; Pugsley, 1998; Reay, 2000; Roberts & Allen, 1997; Sheng, 2014) and market dispositions which are reinforced by some older conservative forces. Accordingly, I further argue that China's society is currently undergoing a "neo-conservative reconstruction" (Bourdieu, 1998c, p. 125), in which the older authoritarian and gendered social orders are conserved beneath the disguise of economic rationality and

market freedom. This argument partly explains why neoliberalism can function effectively in contemporary China's society.

Chapter Nine: Neoliberalised Higher Education and Humanising Pedagogy

Introduction

In Chapter Eight, I explained how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is realised through reviving some older conservative forces in their higher education choice-making. In this chapter, I will explain four mechanisms through which neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised. These mechanisms are: the belief in precariousness of employment prospects, the sense of ‘liberation’ through chasing material success, the neoliberal scholarship habitus, and the market-driven education programmes. I will also discuss that the practice of a humanising pedagogy by some moral intellectuals shows the potential to transform neoliberal domination over Chinese university students. The principles of a humanising pedagogy include: nurturing emotional empathy, role modelling, encouraging research initiatives, and facilitating intellectual communication.

The Belief in Precariousness of Employment Prospects

In the first place, neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised through generating a strong belief that the employment prospects upon graduation are precarious. In Chapter Eight, I explained how neoliberal reforms of higher education in China have made both Chinese young people and their families perceive higher education as an expensive and risky investment for which high tuition fees are paid and employment cannot be secured. The rapid and massive expansion of higher education without parallel growth in the labour market has led to the inflation in degree qualifications (Marginson, 2010). The employers usually require university graduate applicants to obtain professional credentials in addition

to degree qualifications when applying for a job position (Andres, 2016). Therefore, once Chinese young people enter university, they struggle to obtain all sorts of professional qualifications and credentials that are recognisable in the job market. This in turn has led to further inflation of professional credentials. Employers constantly upgrade the quantity and quality of professional qualifications required for university graduate applicants. Hence, obtaining more and highly recognised professional qualifications is considered by university students a necessity for increasing job opportunities when engaging in the fierce competition in the job market after graduation (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1986). Hence, instead of exploring disciplinary knowledge, university students struggle to obtain a varying array of professional qualifications, such as the Certificate of Certified Public Accountant, the Business English Certificates, Microsoft Certificates, among others. As such, an irrational and wasteful credentialing society has been formed, which is detrimental to higher education (Collins, 2002).

Because job prospects are perceived as becoming increasingly precarious, working in a government department provides a sense of stability and security for many university graduates. In China, working for the government (central or local government) in a permanent position is generally considered as occupying a 'gold-bowl'. This 'gold-bowl' provides the occupiers with a stable income and fringe benefits, such as free healthcare, and guaranteed placements for their offspring in prestigious schools. As a result, government departments are swamped with university graduate applicants every year. To work in any local or national government department, the applicants are required to sit the National Examinations for Admission to the Civil Service (known as the 'Civil Service Exam'). The Civil Service Exam is held once a year. In 2017, one million people sat the Exam with a

ratio of the applicants to the available places of 39:1¹². The applicants whose exam scores are above the entry level are qualified to attend the interview.

In Chapter Eight, I explained how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is reinforced by ‘groupthinking’. The belief that their employment prospects are precarious is reinforced by the thinking of the larger society, which has resulted in the taking part in the Civil Service Exam a taken-for-granted practice among university students. When being asked why taking part in the Civil Service Exam, Juan responded without thinking, *‘everyone takes part in it’*.

Despite the extremely low admission rate, the belief in precarious employment prospects reinforced by the groupthinking of larger society has led to an increase every year in the number of university students taking part in the Civil Service Exam. The fierce competition resulted and the rare chance of admission push many students to start preparing for the Exam in the early phase of their university life. Juan’s practice illustrates this tendency. Juan said, *‘I began to prepare for the Exam in my first year. I took part in the Exam every year in order to achieve a best result in the final year’*. Although Juan has no interest in working in a government department, a strong belief in the precariousness of her job prospects after graduation, which is reinforced by the thinking of her peer groups, led to her early participation in the Civil Service Exam.

The early participation in the Civil Service Exam distracts many students from knowledge exploration. The practice of Juan and her classmates illustrates this tendency. Juan said,

I attended the training courses and did a lot of sample exam papers as my classmates

¹² Retrieved from http://www.xinhuanet.com/video/2017-12/11/c_129762213.htm.

did. Yet, I did not prepare well enough. Many of my classmates achieved a higher score than I did.

Juan misrecognises the arbitrariness and oppression of this highly selective exam and blames herself for not achieving a higher score than her classmates. The multiple participations in the Civil Service Exam and the failure in securing a position in government in turn strengthen the belief in the precariousness of employment prospects.

Fierce competition and the rare chance of being employed by government departments push many students to use other strategies to obtain an edge over their competitors. The applicants with the political status of Chinese Communist Party membership usually possess an advantage in the interview. Naturally, many students join the Chinese Communist Party with the purpose of winning a political edge in the competition for government job position (Li & Lowe, 2016; Rosen, 2004). Juan expressed explicitly this instrumental motivation of joining the Party. Juan said, *'I joined the Party because I applied for working in a government department'*. I argue that the prevalence of instrumental motivation of joining the Party will erode the solidarity of the Party, given that it is ideology that unites a party. The erosion of the solidarity of the governing party can in turn lead to a decline in the social solidarity. This argument resonates with the claim made by Bourdieu (1998a, 1998b, 2003) and Harvey (2005) that neoliberalism deconstructs social solidarity.

The strong belief that her employment prospects are precarious pushed Juan to seize on as many job opportunities as possible. This 'over-preparation' for employment produced enormous anxiety in Juan. It is a social suffering resulted from the neoliberal domination of China's higher education. My dialogue with Juan illustrates this tendency.

Juan: *I took part in the TOFEL and the GRE exams, applied for the overseas doctoral study, and took part in the national entrance exams for doctoral study, and looked for jobs.*

Researcher: *Why did you engage in so many activities?*

Juan: *I was not sure which one could be secured. I did not want to miss any opportunity.*

The strong belief that employment prospects are precarious, a belief that exists in the larger society causes many university graduates to submit to market forces when making their career 'choices'. This tendency is seen in Hong's career 'choice'-making. Hong said, 'everybody considers that teaching is a secure job with a stable income. I only applied for teaching positions'. The consideration of job security and income stability has governed Hong's career choice-making. This consideration is reinforced by the thinking of the people around her, which resulted in Hong's singular 'choice' to become an English teacher.

The belief in the precariousness of their employment prospects pushes many graduates to upgrade their degree qualifications, such as taking part in the entrance exams for postgraduate study. In order to be admitted to undertake postgraduate study in China, the applicants are required to sit the National Entrance Examination for Postgraduate Study (NEEP). As a result, sitting the NEEP becomes a collective and taken-for-granted practice of many undergraduates. This practice has caused many students to give up their career ideals. Feng's experience illustrates this tendency. Feng said,

Before entering university, I thought about becoming an English teacher in my hometown school. After entering university, I saw many peers were busy preparing for the entrance exams for postgraduate study. I started to prepare for the exams as well. I undertook postgraduate study after graduation instead of returning to my

hometown to be an English teacher in school.

The collective practice of preparing for the NEEP pushed Feng to join the exam competition for postgraduate study and to give up his career ideal of becoming a school teacher in his hometown. By applying the market competition to postgraduate education, neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is extended, and the failures in the NEEP resulted in more social sufferings.

Ying's career ideal was to lecture at university. However, the belief in the precariousness of job prospects and her initial failure in the NEEP forced her to give up this career ideal and submit to economic forces. This is illustrated in our dialogue.

Researcher: *You longed to be a lecturer at university. Why did you choose to teach in a senior high school?*

Ying: *Lecturing at university requires a postgraduate qualification. I took part in the exam once but failed. At that time, the employment prospects have already become precarious, and I had to secure a job first. So, I accepted the job offer from a key senior high school.*

I have explained in Chapter Eight that neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is often realised through reviving the older conservative forces, such as patriarchal authoritarianism. Ming's decision to undertaking postgraduate study is the total submission to patriarchal authority as he said,

My father wanted me to be a doctor. My score in the Gaokao did not reach the entry level for studying human medicine. I was offered a place to study veterinary medicine. I had to do postgraduate study to reorient my career path back to human life science.

The inflation of domestic degree qualifications has led many postgraduates to pursue a doctoral degree overseas in order to obtain a positional edge in competing for the prestigious job positions, such as doctor and lawyer. The fierce competition for a position as a doctor pushed Ming to pursue an overseas doctoral degree after completing his Master's study.

Neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised through incorporating the belief in the precariousness of employment prospects, a belief which has kept university students struggling to acquire various domestic and/or international professional qualifications, domestic and/or overseas postgraduate degree qualifications, and competing against each other. This form of domination dispossessed many university students of the freedom to explore disciplinary knowledge out of their own intrinsic interests for the knowledge's own sake.

A Sense of 'Liberation' through Chasing Material Success

In addition to the belief in the precariousness of employment prospects, neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised through generating a sense of 'liberation' through chasing material success in university students. Once liberated from the oppression of the examination-driven school education, many university students turn to chase material success through taking part in various part-time jobs and socialising activities. Some female undergraduates use the status of university student to marry wealthy men (Sheng, 2014). The chase of material success generates a sense of 'liberation' from the oppression of the examination-driven school education. Many university students study only for a passing score of 60. The phenomenon of 'long live 60' has become prevalent in university campus in China (Cao, 1992; Gan, 1990; Guan, 1986; Wu & Liu, 1986). Many

students experienced a shift from the ‘study-hard-for-high-score’ school student to the ‘long live 60’ university student. Hong’s remarks illustrates this tendency,

In university, nobody takes study as seriously as s/he did in high school. Passing exam is fine. Many students are busy with taking part in various part-time jobs. Like me, the students majoring in English are usually busy doing private tutoring.

The shift from studying hard for a high score to chasing material success does not lead to a humanising liberation and freedom. Conversely, this shift indicates a tightened binding of Chinese young people to economic forces. The advancement of marketisation of higher education leads to an ever-growing sense of uncertainty and precariousness about their future employment in university students. The material success has become the primary concern of many students. Some students left university to chase immediate economic benefits. Rosen (2004) comments that whereas the Chinese young people of the 1980s were “searching for life’s meaning” (p. 27), those of the 1990s and the 2000s seek “the good life” (p. 27). Zhao’s comments illustrate this tendency as he said, ‘*my peers often talk favourably about who made a big fortune and who bought a luxury car*’. Rosen’s survey (2004) on the Chinese university students shows that most respondents consider the ability to make money “a determining factor of a person’s value” (p. 32). This finding indicates the rise of moneyism and hedonism resulted from the neoliberalisation of higher education in China.

The Neoliberal Scholarship Habitus

The third mechanism by which neoliberalism dominates Chinese university students is through internalising a meritocratic scholarship system, which I call the *neoliberal scholarship habitus*. Meritocracy applies Darwinian evolution rationale to justify the idea

that the most capable individuals win power and money while the weakest are marginalised and excluded (Rose, 1999). Bourdieu (2003) argues that this neo-Darwinism postulates the rationale of natural selection with economic rationality to “provide the most incontestable epistemocratic justification” (p. 34) for the new capitalist order. The meritocratic scholarship system adopted by Chinese universities is mainly based on students’ examination scores. The students who achieve high scores in exams receive scholarships and are recognised as ‘the best and brightest’. They flourish in Chinese universities in terms of being materially and symbolically rewarded. By contrast, those who cannot achieve high scores are considered to be less intelligent and capable, and hence are excluded from the scholarship system. This meritocratic scholarship system is an extension of the examination-driven school education system.

Zhao had been not able to achieve a high score in the exams during his school education, and therefore was excluded from entering a prestigious university (see also the discussion in Chapter Seven). Although he kept studying hard in the university, he had never achieved a high score. As a result, he was ineligible to apply for a scholarship. Zhao said,

One of my peers achieved a high score in each exam and was always rewarded with scholarships. I studied as hard as he did but was rewarded with nothing. For a long period of time, I felt really depressed and doubted my capability. My classmates said that study was meaningless to me because I studied really hard, but cannot achieve a high score.

The meritocratic scholarship system reproduces market selection and exclusion by rewarding students who achieve high examination scores and excludes those who cannot.

Hong’s examination scores ranked her the first once in her senior higher school (see the

discussion in Chapter Seven), which suggests that she have acquired a sense of how to achieve high scores in exams. This sense enabled her to win the scholarships in university. Hong said, *'for me, it is usually not a question of achieving a high score and getting a scholarship'*. The scholarship system that hinges on examination scores strengthened the students' instrumental perception of learning in university. This system reinforces the neoliberal thinking that having higher education is solely for economic return given that academic success is measured by economic rewards.

In China's elite universities, the meritocratic scholarship system produces fierce competition, and thus tension and division among students. Ying completed her undergraduate study at an elite university. She recalled, *'all my roommates studied very hard in order to obtain scholarships. I felt guilty if I did not study for even one day when my roommates continued to study'*. Over time, this scholarship system has been structured internally as a collective habitus, which I call *the neoliberal scholarship habitus*. The neoliberal scholarship habitus reproduces neoliberal domination over Chinese university students through orienting their higher education practice towards economic ends.

The Market-driven Higher Education Programmes

The fourth mechanism by which neoliberalism dominates Chinese university students is through introducing the education programmes which serve the local and international labour markets. These programmes include the dual degree track, the courses and majors of English for special purposes (Huang, 2006), such as the Major of Economy and Trade English, Marketing English, and bilingual curricula. These programmes have been introduced to meet the market demands for the cross-disciplinary and bilingual labour forces.

The dual degree track has been introduced to Chinese universities from the United States. Within this track, students can complete two degrees during their undergraduate study. In order to attract students to take the dual degree track, some universities use a cooperative strategy with other universities. Students can choose to study for a second degree in an aligned university while studying for the first degree in the base university. Zhao studied for his first degree in biometrics in his base university while undertaking a second degree in business management in an aligned university. In order to obtain an edge in the job competition, many students majoring in arts, social sciences and the ‘hard’ sciences pay additional tuition fees to study a marketable second degree, such as business management, financial management, and economics.

Having a marketable second degree privileges some students in the job competition. Hong, who majored in English, expressed a sense of regret of having not studied for a second degree. Hong said,

I applied for a position of translator at a company. The company required the applicants to have a first degree in English and a second degree in economics. I did not study for a second degree, so, I was disqualified.

Not having a marketable second degree excluded many students from job opportunities. Juan, who also majored in English, expressed a sense of ‘being disadvantaged’ in the job market for having not obtained a marketable second degree as many of her classmates had. The value of disciplinary knowledge such as economics, business managements and finance which can be applied immediately to make profits in the market has soared. For example, an MBA (Master of Business Administration) with its promise of a high job position and good salary has become the most popular degree in the most marketable discipline in China (Rosen, 2004). By contrast, the disciplines in arts, humanities, and social sciences have

declined in the market. The decline of the disciplines in arts, humanities, social sciences, and the flourishing of the marketable disciplines signify a ‘knowledge economy turn’, a turn which characterises neoliberal domination of higher education (Kelly, 2017).

In order to engage in the global knowledge economy, the Chinese Government in 1990s brought in internationalisation policies for higher education (see the discussion in Chapter Five). These policies include the introduction of courses and majors in English for Special Purposes, such as Business English, Economic and Trade English, Marketing English, and other bilingual (Mandarin and English) courses. ‘Nurturing the compound professionals with foreign language (English dominates) proficiency and the subject competence’ has become a *doxa* in many universities. Ying majored in Economy and Trade English in an elite university. She recalled, ‘*we did courses in English, economics, and trade. We often had classes from 8am to 7pm. The pressure to complete all these courses was huge*’. This cross-disciplinary education model unavoidably causes the lecturing and supervising hours for each course to be very limited. Many subject courses are constrained by the lack of qualified teachers with both English language and subject competency. The constraints of course hours and qualified teachers lead to superficial learning, while deep learning within each discipline is itself a necessity for a good command of disciplinary knowledge. Ying’s remarks illustrate this superficial learning, ‘*I’ve already forgotten the knowledge in economics and trade that I learned in my undergraduate study*’.

A Humanising Pedagogy

In his early writing, Bourdieu argues that pedagogic action reproduces social domination through pedagogic inculcation and authority (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). In his later writing, Bourdieu (1999c) notes that pedagogic action can also “open the possibility of

emancipation” (p. 340). This occurs through raising students’ consciousness (Freire, 2013) about the conditions that lead to reproduction of social domination and through creating the new conditions which can durably counter neoliberal reproduction. I argue that these new conditions can be created through practising a humanising pedagogy. A humanising pedagogy liberates students rather than exerts pedagogic authority over them by practising the virtues of equality and openness to knowledge sharing (Peters & Roberts, 2012), as well as by encouraging critical and dialogical reflection. As Roberts argues in the exploration of Freire’s philosophy of education that “the essence of humanization lies in the concept of praxis: critical and action on the world to transform it” (2000, p. 18).

The practice of a humanising pedagogy produces a durable counter-effect upon neoliberal domination over Chinese university students. Juan talked about how the way her teacher lectures English literature has nurtured her intrinsic interest in literature. Juan said, *‘I am deeply moved by the passion and love for literature that my teacher showed when lecturing. I have gradually become longing to enjoy literature as she did’*. Juan’s teacher lectured by sharing her intrinsic appreciation and passion for literature with her students, which nurtured “emotional empathy” in Juan (Brewer, Hayes, Dudgeon, Mueller-Hirth, Teeney & Wijesinghe, 2016, p. 37). Brewer and his colleagues (2016) argue that emotional empathy is a virtue of humanism. Emotional empathy can be nurtured in young people by practising “rational passions” (Peters, 1970, as cited in Cuypers, 2017, p. 21) in teaching. Emotional empathy has been nurtured in Juan through her teacher’s rational and passionate lecturing, which in turn nurtured her intrinsic interest in literature and transformed her thinking that higher education was all for securing a job and a stable income. With this transformation, Juan followed her interest after completing undergraduate study to take graduate study in British and American literature.

Rather than imposing pedagogic authority through pedagogic inculcation, a humanising pedagogy nurtures students' intrinsic interest in pursuing knowledge for its own sake through teacher's role modelling. Zhao talked about how the role modelling of his teacher nurtured his aspiration to acquire knowledge for its own sake. This aspiration transformed his thinking that the purpose of higher education is solely for making economic profits. Zhao said,

The teacher was very knowledgeable about the subject he lectured and is highly respected by the students and other teachers. He received his doctorate from a prestigious university before becoming a lecturer. I gradually longed to become a person like him, someone who is knowledgeable and respected.

In Chapter Eight, I explained that Zhao's higher education choice-making was a total submission to economic forces. The distinction of his teacher in disciplinary knowledge and hence being respected by the students and other teachers generated an effect of role modelling in Zhao, which nurtured his desire to acquire knowledge for its own intrinsic value and to gain the respect that such knowledgeable people receive from others. Brewer and his colleagues (2016) argue that being respected is a virtue of humanism (see also, Barnett, 2016). Being respected for the distinction of one's acquisition of a disciplinary knowledge shows the value of the knowledge in creating humane social relations. The role modelling of Zhao's teacher transformed his thinking about higher education as an economic investment and led him to perceive higher education as involving the pursuit of academic distinction. This pursuit is a pursuit of humanising dignity that can be found in the Enlightenment tradition that privileges reason and knowledge (Kant, 1995).

With this transformation, Zhao focused on his scientific research rather than on the economic return that he could make from his postgraduate study. Zhao said,

Many of my classmates often talked favourably about those who made a big fortune and who bought luxury cars. I do not have any sense to these things. I long for achieving something in my research.

The role modelling of his teacher produces a durable effect on Zhao by sustaining his desire to contribute to scientific progress.

A humanising pedagogy nurtures initiative and creativity in research students. This effect can be seen in Zhao when he said,

I have become distinguished in conducting research since the second year of my Master's study. My supervisor often encourages me to take the initiative when undertaking research projects. I have gradually dared to think and have become able to work out my own way of approaching a research project.

Zhao's 'dared to think' echoes the Enlightenment virtue of having "the courage to make use of [one's] own intellect" (Kant, 1995, p. 4), the virtue that Zhao's supervisor nurtured in him through encouraging his research initiative. This supervising practice cultivated the power of thinking itself in Zhao and enabled him to become an independent researcher. Zhao's comments illustrate this 'becoming', *'I am used to forming a big picture in my mind, knowing what I want and how to reach it when starting a research project'*.

A humanising pedagogy in postgraduate education invites young scholars to engage in intellectual communication and knowledge sharing, a practice which nurtures the virtue of scholarly altruism (see also the discussion about 'scholarly altruism' in Chapter Four). This

virtue transformed many students' thinking and practice that undertaking scientific research is for making economic profits. This pedagogy is practised by Hong's supervisor as Hong said,

My supervisor often organises seminars and encourages us to share readings and exchange ideas about our research. I often feel enlightened from communicating with other scholars. I look forward to contributing to this community with my doctoral research.

The virtue of scholarly altruism has been nurtured in Hong through the intellectual communication facilitated by her supervisor. This virtue has transformed her thinking that undertaking academic research is simply for securing a job and a stable income, and has generated an aspiration to contribute to her intellectual community. The practice of a humanising pedagogy in postgraduate education enables the intellectual community to exist as an organisational base "capable of really combating neoliberal domination" (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 42).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explained the four mechanisms through which neoliberal domination over Chinese university students is realised. These mechanisms are: the belief in precariousness of employment prospects; the sense of 'liberation' through chasing material success; the neoliberal scholarship habitus, and the market-driven education programmes. Then, I conceptualised a humanising pedagogy with the principles of nurturing emotional empathy, role modelling, encouraging research initiative, and facilitating intellectual communication. The practice of this humanising pedagogy nurtured the intrinsic interest in pursuing knowledge for its own sake in my interviewees and has transformed their thinking that

higher education is simply for making economic profits.

Bourdieu (2003) argues that neoliberal domination is a mode of domination based on the “institution of insecurity” (p. 29). In Part III, I explained how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is realised through the educational systems which (re)produce the sense of insecurity. These systems include the examination-driven school education system and the marketised higher education system. Both systems reproduce neoliberal domination by mobilising market competition and as such (re)producing a sense of precariousness in Chinese young people.

The individual is “the product of history” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 136). Only by examining both the present and the past of the individual can we better understand history, and how history can illuminate the future. I take up this idea in the next and concluding chapter.

Part IV: The Future of the Doctoral Becoming

The purpose of explaining the past and the present is to illuminate the future. Following Barnacle (2005), my explanation of the interviewees' doctoral becoming implies a "progression" (p. 179) towards a better future through a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination. This future of the doctoral becoming can only be realised through an alternative education to the neoliberal education. By linking Bourdieu's thoughts on countering neoliberalism (1998a, 2003) to Durkheim's ideas about the morality of education (2006a, 2006b, 2012), I propose an alternative education – a 'moral education' which counters the neoliberal education through nurturing human nature in young people and orienting them towards humanising ends.

Chapter Ten: A Moral Education

Introduction

Bourdieu (1998a) argues that in order to combat neoliberal domination, social researchers should first analyse how it is produced and circulated. Then, they need to find ways to “counter” (p. 31) it. Throughout Part II and III, I explained how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is realised through internalising a market way of thinking about education. I also identified the transformative potential of the embodiment of the virtues of morality and humanity to neoliberal domination. Reflecting on these writings, I have come to realise that to really counter neoliberal domination through education, we need a moral thinking about education which oppose the market thinking about education. This insight forms my intention to conceptualise a moral education to counter neoliberal education. With this intention in mind, I read Durkheim’s writings about the morality of education (2006a, 2006b, 2012) and find that Durkheim ‘talks’ to Bourdieu about how to counter neoliberal domination through education. This finding has enabled me to link the thinking of these two sociologists to conceptualise a moral education.

The Revival of Morality – a Combat against Neoliberal Domination

Neoliberalism as “the ideology without ideology” (Fischman, 2009, p. 3) dominates social agents through dispossessing them of their beliefs in the social regularities and rules, and by enchanting them with the market freedom for profit-making. This form of domination has led to an evacuation of moral restraints and regulations from people’s minds and thus an unconstrained individualism unhinged from moral engagement (Harvey, 2005). Market

freedom and individualism produce alienation, anomie, marginalisation, and exclusion, which gradually dissolves human society (Lee & Ho, 2005). The moral values that consolidate human society have faced a massive challenge from market freedom and instability. As Durkheim (2012) argues, “an indeterminate situation, a state of endless instability is the origin of moral defectiveness” (p. 27). The market rule of ‘without rules’ suppresses the ethical dispositions of everyday life and encourages materialism (Zipin & Brennan, 2003). The “anarchy of market, of competition, and of unbridled individualism” becomes increasingly “ungovernable”, which has led to a “breakdown of all bonds of [social]solidarity and a condition verging on social anarchy and nihilism” (Harvey, 2005, p. 94).

In China, the fast track to market economy since 1978 has created a wide disparity between the rich and the poor. The afterwards full engagement in the global market has gradually eroded the orthodox socialist ethics which contain the sentiments of anti-capitalist and anti-consumerism (Lee & Ho, 2005). The consequent changes in family structure and family life make it difficult to develop a familial ethic. In tandem with the market transit of the economic system, China’s education system has shifted its emphasis from on socialist ethics to on “global awareness” (Lee & Ho, 2005, p. 426). This shift, in fact, depoliticises education and dissolves the socialist ethics which consolidate China’s society. A rampant consumerism has led to money worship and a moral vacuum in contemporary China’s society (Qi & Tang, 2004).

For Bourdieu (2003), the only efficacious response to neoliberalism is raising “a critical force of contestation backed by a similar mobilisation but directed towards entirely other ends” (p. 12). Following Bourdieu, I argue that in order to combat neoliberal domination

through education, we need a counter faith which re-orientes education towards humanising ends opposing economic ends. Durkheim's writing on the morality of education provides me with the ideas about constructing an education that is towards humanising ends. I conceptualise a moral education as the education which nurtures in young people a collective mind for taking social responsibility, a humanising nationalism, an ideal of human society as a community, and moral intellectual.

Education as a Moral Practice

No one seriously doubts that teaching is educational only in as far as, by its very nature, it has the capacity of exerting *a moral influence* on the way we are and the way we think; in other words, in as far as it effects a transformation in our ideas, our beliefs and our feelings (Durkheim, 2006b, p. 336).

Durkheim's *oeuvre* on education is "a moral prescription for the ills of modern individualist society" (Riley, 2015, p. 88). Durkheim considers that the aim of education is to offer society a "moral consolation" (Durkheim, 2006b, p. 21), that is, to express, convey and reinforce the moral values and awareness of social life itself. For Durkheim, education needs to be a moral practice in itself, which nurtures the seeds of humanity in children and fosters "a truly human manner of feeling and thinking" (p. 30) in them.

In contrast to Durkheimian education, neoliberal education naturalises the market competition and selection by commodifying education (Apple, 2004). Neoliberal education (re)produces a homogeneous disposition in young people which directs them towards economic ends (Bourdieu, 2003). In China, this homogeneous disposition is (re)produced through an examination-driven education system, which applies examinations and

examination scores as the mechanisms for market competition, selection, and exclusion. This argument echoes Feng's comment on China's school education, '*the education which measures human beings with a 'yardstick' is a failure*'. The education which utilises the 'yardstick' of examination score to measure and select human beings is not only a failure but also an unethical education in the way of forcing young people to fit in with a same frame.

Neoliberal education pits students and teachers against each other through applying a competitive *ethos* to teaching and learning. Opposing neoliberal education, Durkheim (2006b) considers that education should not use pedagogy to exploit competitive spirit, given that competition unavoidably leads to selection and exclusion. Instead, education needs to nurture the human nature of being good and peaceful; the virtues which consolidate human society. For Durkheim, the essence of education is to nurture a universal idea of human beings as he argues that "despite our apparent difference, all members of the society share a common humanity and all are entitled to dignity, respect and social justice" (1961, p. 116). The universal idea of human beings does not refer to the biological characters of human beings, but the social capacities human beings possess, including a profound respect for all human beings, an empathy for the suffering of all human beings, and "a desire to undo the forces that cause humans to be dominated or abused in any way" (Riley, 2015, p. 32). Durkheimian education contains a humanising belief in the nature of human beings of being good, altruistic, and peaceful. The essence of Durkheimian education is to nurture human natures in young people by consolidating a human society with shared interests.

Education as Nurturing Moral Being

For Bourdieu, the most effective means to combat a social domination is to unveil how it is (re)produced. For this purpose, he developed the theory of habitus to reveal the mechanisms of social reproduction. Applying the theory of habitus, I explained how neoliberal domination is reproduced through education by structuring internally as the habitus in Chinese young people, including the neoliberal publication habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Four), the examination habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Seven), the neo-conservative habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Eight), and the neoliberal scholarship habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Nine). Thinking beyond Bourdieu, I argue that the habitus can also function as dynamism for social transformation (see the discussion in Chapter Three), including the humanising publication habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Four), the academic ‘Chinglish’ habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Five), and the ‘bridging’ cultural habitus (see the discussion in Chapter Six). These habitus, which show the potential to transform neoliberal domination, can be nurtured through a moral education in Durkheimian sense. For Durkheim (1961), in the tradition of Enlightenment writers such as Kant, education, in an ultimate meaning, is to nurture “a certain habitus of moral being” (p. 29), in other words, a certain kind of person (Carr, 1991) with the dispositions enabling her/him to make consistent and continuous judgements and to act out of conscience and natural goodness (Wang, 2004).

The moral being of young people can only be nurtured through the moral being of teachers. The moral being of teachers exists in the old ideal of “teaching as a service or vocation” (Rata, 2017b, p. 1014) for knowledge’s own sake and public good. This ideal counters the neoliberal thinking and practice of teaching as ‘a job’ for economic return. This ideal still

exists in broader intellectual community and is practised by moral intellectuals (see the discussion in Chapter Nine). The moral being of teachers is practised through role modelling, which nurtures the moral being in young people.

Durkheim (2012) argues that a teacher is an “interpreter of the great moral ideas in the eyes of children” (p. 155). A teacher is primarily responsible for “the moral welfare of his charges no matter what his particular academic specialism” (p. 158) is. Feng’s view of a good teacher echoes this idea,

A good teacher is primarily a teacher with high moral standing regardless of her/his competence. The dispositions of a teacher unconsciously influence the forming of the dispositions of her/his students. If a teacher loses moral conscience, her/his teaching will never reach a moral end.

A good teacher is primarily a teacher with a moral conscience, which is generated by the moral virtues embodied in her/him. Through her/his teaching practice, these moral dispositions are gradually internalised in young people, nurturing their moral being. For Durkheim, these virtues are grounded in the development of “forms and contents of disciplinary knowledge”, the methods of inquiry, and ongoing reflections by teachers (Slonimsky, 2018, p. 129).

Education as Nurturing a Collective Mind for Social Responsibility

Bourdieu (1998a) regards neoliberal individualism as a kind of “self-fulfilling prophecy” (p. 7), which tends to deplete empathy for others from our mind. Therefore, we need to reconstruct a “collective mind” (Durkheim, 2006b, p. 302) through education to combat neoliberal individualism. In other words, education needs to nurture a collective sense of

social responsibility in young people. In order to achieve this, I argue that schools need to be constructed and work as guild-like communities. Guilds function by integrating individual members into social projects larger than themselves and infusing the members with a spirit of working towards a harmonious society (Durkheim, 2006b). In the same way, a guild-like school nurtures a collective mind in young people through integrating them into the social projects that work for public good.

While emphasising the ‘collective representation’ of society (Durkheim, 2001), Durkheim’s conceptualisation of education does not exclude individual freedom. According to Slonimsky (2018), Durkheimian morality is “an emergent property of the relations between individuals in collective life” (p. 126). In contrast to the neoliberal individualism which is based on market freedom and self-interest, Durkheim proposes a “moral individualism” (1973, as cited in Cladis, 2005, p. 385), which “socialises individual interests” (Durkheim, 1962, p. 88) and frees individuals from utilitarian motivation and instrumental orientation (Ceri, 1993). The moral individualism does not end with the individual herself/himself, but with a collective ideal of a “fully harmonised society” (as cited in Riley, 2015, p. 35). It enables individual freedom in the pursuit of a “common humanity” (p. 31). In this sense, moral individualism is both individualist and collectivist at once. Moral individualism recognises both individual autonomy and individual sociality. It is an individualising sociality (Rata, 2017a). In order to counter market individualism, education needs to nurture a ‘moral individualism’ in young people.

Education as Nurturing a Humanising Nationalism

Bourdieu (1998b) argues that nation-state exists in two forms. One exists in an objective form, that is, in the “organising infrastructure of the nation including institutions, laws, systems, policies, and practice of government” (Rata, 2008, p. 58). The other exists in a subjective form, that is, “in people’s minds” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 33). Neoliberal movement links the market freedom to political freedom (Friedman, 2002). Neoliberalisation is in fact a political process of ‘depoliticisation’ which deprives social agents of thinking about nation-state, making them feel no commitment to their nation, and treating their nation as “an alien power” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 4). Hence, in order to counter neoliberal domination through depoliticisation, we need to revive the thinking of nation-state. For Durkheim, nation-state is conceived of as an “organ of moral discipline” (1956, p. 69), a regulative agency through which humanity is realised. He argues that human society exists, in an ultimate sense, in a “national morality” (2012, p. 79), that is, in a strong sense of duty and love for one’s country. Durkheim (2012) argues that

If one loves his country or humanity in general, he cannot see the suffering of his compatriots – or more generally, of any human being – without suffering himself and without demonstrating, consequently, the impulse to relieve it (Durkheim, 2012, p. 83).

Following Durkheim, I argue that education needs to nurture a humanising nationalism in young people in order to counter neoliberal depoliticisation. Within a humanising nationalism, the individual nation-state pursues the status of “being the most just” (Durkheim, 2012, p. 75) and aligns its aims to universal ones for all human beings. Humanising nationalism orients itself towards “a genuine critical internationalism”

(Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 42) - a “rational pursuit of collectively defined and approved ends” (p. 105) of the larger human society. This is a humanisation process realised through ‘rational dialogue’. As Roberts (2000) argues, “we humanize ourselves through dialogue with others” (p. 43), and “this dialogical communication must involve a ‘love’ of the world and of other human beings” (p. 44).

An expression of the humanising nationalism can be seen in the current rising narrative of the ‘China Dream’. The theme expressed in this narrative is a collective ideal of the renaissance of nation-state as a “wealthy, democratic, civilised, and harmonious socialist modernised nation” (Xi, as cited in Fewsmith, 2013, p. 3; see also, Wang, 2014). In contrast to the ‘American Dream’ which encourages individual endeavour to pursue self-interest (Fewsmith, 2013), the ‘China Dream’ is expressed with a strong *ethos* of collective representation (Kallio, 2015) to function as a social glue to unite Chinese people (Wang, 2014). The ‘China Dream’ is a political narrative, which suggests the intention of the Chinese Government to revive the ‘national morality’ in order to counter the depoliticisation resulted from the implementation of the fast neoliberalisation policies.

The revival of a ‘national morality’ in China is also seen in the revival of Confucian ethics. In order to tackle the “moral vacuity” (Rata, 2002, p. 4) in contemporary China’s market-driven society, a group of Confucian scholars known as New Confucians are calling for a restoration of Confucian ethics to contemporary China’s society. In China’s long history, the five principles of ‘*ren* (benevolence), *yi* (righteousness), *li* (courtesy), *zhi* (reason), *xing* (integrity)’ are fundamental ethics which consolidated China’s society as Christianity ever did for the Western world. The Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), in particular the movement of destroying the Four Olds: old thoughts, old culture, old habits, and old customs, disrupted

Chinese people's belief in Confucian ethics. The shift to the market economy in 1978 and the full involvement in the global market resulted in the replacement of Confucian ethics with market ethics in contemporary China's society. This argument echoes Feng's perception that *'we once had a solid moral system, that is, Confucian ethics. But we abandoned this system of ethics. We lost our moral faith; thus our society has gradually become utilitarian'*.

The Confucian ethics of *'xiushen, qijia, zhiguo, ping tianxia'* consider nurturing the moral self to be the foundation of peace and prosperity of a family, a nation and the world. Echoing Durkheim's idea that national morality is fundamental to consolidating larger human society, Confucian ethics regards fulfilling one's responsibility to one's society as fundamental to constructing a larger civic society (Tu, 1996a, 1996b). In this sense, the restoration of Confucian ethics to contemporary China's society revives a humanising nationalism. This restoration needs to reconstruct China's education with the Confucian tradition by nurturing social responsibility in young people and preparing them to take part in the social projects larger than themselves.

Education as Nurturing an Ideal of Human Society as a Community

One means by which neoliberalism realises its domination is through circulating a thinking of the world as a market. In order to counter this domination, we need an alternative thinking of the world which opposes to the thinking of the world as a market. Thinking the world as a community counters thinking the world as a market. Mill (1960) argues that "ultimately, the end-of-ideology is based upon a disillusionment with any real commitment to socialism" (as cited in Jacoby, 1999, p. 6). Neoliberalism which dominates as "an ideology without

ideology” (Fischman, 2009, p. 3) is the domination through an end-of-ideology of the social. To counter this, we need to revive the belief in the social. Harvey (2005) notes that the “ideals of moral community are not foreign to progressive movements historically” (p. 220). Durkheim’s vision of an ideal of “a global moral community” (2012, p. 88) and Bourdieu’s imagination of “an international utopia” (1998a, p. 105), both contain a utopian spirit of the “rational pursuit of collectively defined and approved ends” (p. 105) for all human beings. To counter thinking the world as a market, education needs to nurture in young people an ideal of the world as a community with shared future.

Education as Nurturing Moral Intellectual

Bourdieu (1998a) notes that intellectuals’ relative autonomy of criticising social domination is threatened by insidious force of the market, and a class of “new intellectuals” (p. 6) submitting to the market forces is emerging. In order to counter the doctoral becoming of ‘new intellectuals’, I argue that education needs to nurture the virtues of moral intellectual in young scholars. The virtues of moral intellectual, such as the love of knowledge “in itself and for itself” (Durkheim, 2012, p. 209) and ‘scholarly altruism’ (see also the discussion in Chapter Four), are illustrated by Hong, *‘the master scholars whom I have known enjoy undertaking academic research for itself. They are willing to contribute their time and ideas to young scholars without asking anything in return’*. Opposing the neoliberal being of the knowledge producer and the enterprising self, these ‘master scholars’ undertake academic research with an intrinsic interest in knowing and understanding the natural and social world.

The becoming of moral intellectual is seen in Feng when he said,

I realise moral virtues are the most important dispositions for human beings, no matter their competencies are. I will try to help others in need not for return but for nurturing moral virtues in myself.

The becoming of moral intellectual transforms Feng's thinking that doctoral study is for money-making. Feng said, *'now I think it is fine if I can only afford to 'eat bread' while others can afford to 'eat meat''*. The internalisation of moral virtues freed Feng from economic chain.

The embodied scholarly altruism is seen in Hong when she said,

In the past, I was not sure why I undertook doctoral research. At present, I realise it is for the virtue of scholarly altruism. Undertaking academic research is not for profit-making but for transmitting this virtue. I feel happier when I have a creative idea in my research than when I make some money.

This embodied scholarly altruism transformed Hong's thought that undertaking academic research is simply for making economic profits. The doctoral becoming of moral intellectual is a process of (re)constructing of the 'moral self' (Dewey, 1980), and of being capable of obstructing the logic of the knowledge economy.

Echoing with my findings on the interviewees' doctoral becoming of moral intellectual through academic publication (see the discussion in Chapter Four), Barnett (2000) calls for the expansion of intellectual communication to reconstruct morality in society. He argues that, when knowledge, interaction, and communication meet, "the pieces of the mosaic" (p. 128) can develop into "a collective energy" (p. 128). Barnett's argument resonates with Bourdieu's (1998a) ideal of constructing "a reasoned/rational utopia" (p. 125) in order to

combat “economic fatalism” (p. 125) and to prevent intellectuals from “becoming demoralised” (p. 127). Elsewhere, Bourdieu (2003) argues that through expansive rational communication and interaction, “an autonomous intellectual collective” (p. 20) can be constructed to “produce and disseminate the [symbolic] instruments of defense against the symbolic domination [of neoliberalism] which relies increasingly on the authority of economics” (p. 21). Doctoral education needs to be a central space of facilitating this intellectual and rational communication.

Conclusion

This chapter involves a conversation with both Bourdieu and Durkheim. This conversation enables me to argue that an effective way to fight against neoliberal domination through education is by “confronting it with a knowledge [that is] respectful of human beings” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 28). This knowledge exists in the moral education I have argued for throughout this chapter. I conceptualise moral education as an education enabling young people to think, to judge, and to reason consistently as human beings, and as such to construct a society in which every human being is free to “manifest his[/her] nature as it truly is” (Durkheim, 2006b, p. 322). Through moral education, the ‘moral facts’ (Durkheim, 2006b) of human society can be revived to really combat neoliberal domination.

I argue that neoliberal domination is in fact the domination of a *rationalised capitalism*. Therefore, we need a *rationalised socialism* to counter this domination. The conceptualisation of a moral education is underlaid with an ideal of a rationalised socialism. The economism upon which neoliberal domination relies separates the economic and the social. This separation is the source of the failure of any policy that has no other end but

safeguards an “economic order” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 51). In order to counter the effect of the economism, we need a thinking that places the economic in the service of the social. In other words, any economic policy needs to be made with the consideration of consolidating ‘social order’ and human society rather than economic order and the market. The conceptualisation of a moral education provides a theoretical means for nurturing this thinking.

I argue that neoliberal domination is in fact a symbolic domination based on the myth of economy and the market to justify the “restoration to an unrestrained, but rationalised and cynical capitalism” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 36). The conceptualisation of a ‘moral education’ serves as a “symbolic weapon” (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 36) capable of both demystifying the economic scheme of cognition and reconstructing a social scheme of cognition. As Durkheim (1992) argues, “there is no miraculous ‘free hand of the market’ to mysteriously and automatically bring order, only a moral system can do that” (p. 12). I argue that this moral system can only be constructed through a ‘moral education’.

The Closing Reflections

To understand neoliberal domination, in a final sense, is to understand an “ideological offensive” (Doogan, 2009, p. 214), a new mode of capitalist domination which “seeks to create uncertainty, anxiety and fear on the side of labour to guarantee their compliance” (p. 214) to the established market order. For neoliberal domination, “the ideology is more important than the material reality” (Dawson, 2009, p. 292), given that a ‘risk society’ (Beck, 1992) has been presupposed. The embodiment of these presupposed ‘realities’ secures a durable compliance of labour to neoliberal governance.

However, neoliberal domination should not be understood as “an end-state” but a “process” in which its contradictory nature “tends to provoke counter tendencies” (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p. 383). My thesis in effect involves an effort to explain this contradictory process from the most subjective experience of individuals. Thinking with Bourdieu, I explained how neoliberal domination over Chinese young people is realised through the embodiment of the habitus that reproduces neoliberal structures. Thinking beyond Bourdieu, I explain how agency negotiates with neoliberal structures, the resulted interruption and cleft of individual habitus, the creative strategies that the individual habitus generates to resist neoliberal domination, and the internalisation of the virtues of morality and humanity which suggests the potential to transform neoliberal domination.

My study contributes both theoretically and methodologically to the analysis of neoliberal domination through education in contemporary society. Theoretically, the study reveals the mechanisms of neoliberal domination through education by conceptualising five kinds of neoliberal habitus: the neoliberal publication habitus, the native-like academic English

habitus, the examination habitus, the neo-conservative habitus, and the neoliberal scholarship habitus. The study also develops the theory of habitus by conceptualising the alternative habitus which show potentialities of transforming neoliberal domination. They are the humanising publication habitus, the academic ‘Chinglish’ habitus, and the ‘bridging’ cultural habitus.

Methodologically, my study develops a neo-Bourdieuian approach which expands the Bourdieusian methodology of explaining the *reproduction* of social domination through education to exploring the *transformation* of neoliberal domination through education. Overall, my study suggests whereas neoliberal domination appears to be hegemonic, it has also been contested and resisted in the larger intellectual community, and that there always exists the means to transform this domination. I argue that, while neoliberal domination is always being countered by the contradiction and inconsistencies which lie within it, the transformation of neoliberal domination, in the end, lies in practising a moral education.

From the incorporation of the examination habitus, the neo-conservative habitus, the neoliberal scholarship habitus, the native-like academic English habitus, and the neoliberal publication habitus to the internalisation of the academic ‘Chinglish’ habitus, the ‘bridging’ cultural habitus, and the humanising publication habitus, the doctoral becoming of my interviewees suggests a progressive transformation of neoliberal domination.

The study is restricted with time and the documentary resources available for analysis. The study made a succinct analysis of the New Zealand’s policies of internationalisation of higher education in Chapter Two. The study could present more clearly the ‘big picture’ of how neoliberalism has been structured in contemporary China’s education through a critical

discourse analysis of the policies of China's education reforms adopted since 1980s. This could be my recommendation to other researchers who are interested in this topic.

After returning to China, my becoming of the 'outsider within' my home university provides me with a sociological advantage in examining the neoliberal *doxa* and *illusio* that exist in Chinese universities. I intend to apply the neo-Bourdieuian approach I have developed in this thesis to reveal other mechanisms through which neoliberal domination over Chinese university students and academics is realised, and to explore the means to transform these dominations. This research direction continues my ideal of constructing a humanising higher education through the moral intellectuals' collective effort made within and beyond universities.

Appendix A.

School of Critical Studies in Education
教育批判研究系



THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Te Kura Akoranga o Tamaki Makaurau
INCORPORATING THE AUCKLAND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

新西兰 奥克兰
奥克兰大学 教育学院
Epsom 校区
Epsom 大道 74 号 3 号门
电话：64 9 623 8899
传真：64 9 623 8898
网址：www.education.auckland.ac.nz

研究参与人知情书

项目名称：中国博士留学生在新西兰的转化学习研究：个案研究

研究者：黄艺

我的名字叫黄艺，我目前在奥克兰大学教育学院攻读博士学位。我的导师是伊丽莎白·怀塔副教授。我的研究方向是来自中国大陆的博士留学生在新西兰留学期间发生的变化。我诚挚邀请您参与这项研究。您的决定完全出于自愿。研究涉及 4 至 6 次半开发式访谈，时间跨度为 7 至 12 个月，每次访谈时间约为 60 分钟。访谈中您可根据需要使用中文或英文或两种语言交替使用进行表述。第一次访谈将在一个公共场所进行，如咖啡馆或图书馆。后续的访谈您可以选择在您的住所进行。每次访谈结束后，我将馈赠您一张 20 新元购物券作为补贴。同时，您可自愿写一些反思性的日记作为访谈的补充材料。

经您同意，我将对访谈内容进行录音，并根据录音逐字记录整理成文字材料。如您要求，录音将随时停止。您有权随时退出研究，但如您需要撤回您的访谈资料，您需要在第一次访谈结束后一周内提出，因为之后录音将已被整理为文字材料。我将在每次访谈结束后将文字资料副本给您核准，评价和澄清。录音文件和文字资料将锁在我导师的办公室里保存六年。同意书将分开存放在大学内指定处所。六年后，所有信息将被销毁。

研究发现将用于我的论文写作，会议发言和论文发表。我也将继续使用这些发现进行后续的学术论文写作和发言。我将尽一切可能保密您的真实身份，但不能保证百分百严密。

反思活动可能对您的情绪产生影响。如果此种情况发生，我将协助您联系大学的心理咨询服务。大学心理咨询服务的电话是：3737599 转 87681。但我相信此项研究发现将有助您深入了解您在奥大的研究经历对您所产生的影响。

如您对此项研究感兴趣并且能够参与，请您填写所附的同意书。非常感谢您所投入的时间和帮助，使得这项研究成为可能。

此致，

研究者：黄艺

奥克兰大学教育学院

邮政信箱 92 601, 西蒙兹大街, 奥克兰 1035

电子邮箱: yi.huang@auckland.ac.nz

导师: 副教授伊丽莎白·怀塔

奥克兰大学教育学院教育批判研究系
邮政信箱 92 601, 西蒙兹大街, 奥克兰 1035
电话 : (09) 373 7599 x 46315
电子邮箱: e.rata@auckland.ac.nz

副导师: 弗朗西斯·凯利博士

奥克兰大学教育学院教育批判研究系
邮政信箱 92 601, 西蒙兹大街, 奥克兰 1035
电话 : (09) 373 7599 x 48669
电子邮箱 : f.kelly@auckland.ac.nz

系主任: 卡洛·穆弛副教授

奥克兰大学教育学院教育批判研究系
邮政信箱 92 601, 西蒙兹大街, 奥克兰 1035
电话 : (09) 373 7599 x48257
电子邮箱 : c.mutch@auckland.ac.nz

如有任何疑问, 可联系奥克兰大学研究参与人道德委员会主席, 副校长办公室, 邮政信箱 92019, 奥克兰 1142 电话 09373-7599 转 83711,
电子邮箱 : ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

**APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN INTERVIEWEES ETHICS COMMITTEE ON
for 3 years until, Reference Number 014630.**

该研究项目由奥克兰大学研究参与人道德委员会于 2015 年 6 月 4 日批准, 为期 3 年至
2018 年 6 月 4 日, 参考编号 014630.

Appendix B.

School of Critical Studies in Education



Epsom Campus
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue
Auckland, New Zealand
Telephone 64 9 623 8899
Facsimile 64 9 623 8898
www.education.auckland.ac.nz

INTERVIEWEE INFORMATION SHEET:

Project Title: Exploring Chinese PhD Candidates' Transformative Learning Experiences in New Zealand: A Case Study

Researcher: Yi Huang

My name is Yi Huang and I am currently studying for a Doctoral Degree in Education at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. My supervisor is Associate Professor Elizabeth Rata. My research aims to explore the learning experiences of Mainland Chinese PhD students that lead to change. I would like to invite you to take part in the research. I assure you that your decision to participate or not to participate is completely voluntary. The research involves four-six semi-structured interviews over a time span of 7 to 12 months, each lasting approximately 60 minutes. You may use Chinese or English or both languages as you wish. The first interview will be held in a public place such as a café or library. If you wish, subsequent interviews can be held at your place. I will reimburse you with a \$20 voucher for each interview. You are also invited to keep a reflective journal.

With your permission, I will record the interviews using an audio device and then transcribe the interviews verbatim. Recording will be stopped at any time at your request. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, but you may only withdraw your data one week following the first interview as the data will have been transcribed. I will provide you with a copy of the transcripts at each interview, so you can check for accuracy and make any additional comments or clarifications. The audio recording file and transcripts will be locked in my supervisor's office for a period of six years. The Consent Forms will be stored separately on university premises. After a six-year period all information will be destroyed.

The findings will be used to complete my doctoral thesis. I will also use them in subsequent academic articles and presentations. Although all steps will be taken to ensure that you cannot be identified, I cannot guarantee this completely.

It is possible that the self-reflection you are engaged in may affect you emotionally. If that happens I will assist you to contact the university's counselling services. You may contact the Health and Counselling Services at Ph 3737599, extn 87681. However, I envisage that you might benefit from the study's findings by developing greater understanding of how your experiences at University of Auckland have affected you.

If you are interested and able to participate in this research, I would appreciate it if you could fill in the consent form (attached). Thank you very much for your time and help in making this research possible.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Yi Huang

School of Critical Studies Education
Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland
Private Bag 92 601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1035
Email: yi.huang@auckland.ac.nz

Supervisor: Associate Professor Elizabeth Rata

School of Critical Studies Education
Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland,
Private Bag 92 601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1035
Ph: (09) 373 7599 x 46315
Email: e.rata@auckland.ac.nz

Co-supervisor: Dr Frances Kelly

School of Critical Studies Education
Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland,
Private Bag 92 601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1035
Ph: (09) 373 7599 x48669
Email: f.kelly@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School: Associate Professor Carol Mutch

School of Critical Studies Education
Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland,
Private Bag 92 601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1035
Ph: (09) 373 7599 x 48257
Email: c.mutch@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Interviewees Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Office of the Vice Chancellor, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 83711. Email: ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN INTERVIEWEES ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 04-06-2015 for 3 years until 04-Jun-2018, Reference Number 014630.

Appendix C.

School of Critical Studies in Education
教育批判研究系



THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Te Kura Akoranga o Tamaki Makaurau
INCORPORATING THE AUCKLAND COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

新西兰 奥克兰
奥克兰大学 教育学院
Epsom 校区
Epsom 大道 74 号 3 号门
电话：64 9 623 8899
传真：64 9 623 8898
网址：www.education.auckland.ac.nz

新西兰 奥克兰
奥克兰大学
西蒙兹大街 邮政信箱 92601
1035

同意书:

(本同意书将保存六年)

名称：中国博士留学生在新西兰的转化学习研究：个案研究

研究者: 黄艺

我已阅读研究参与者信息表并已了解该研究的性质。我已对所关注事项提出问题并且得到了满意解答。

我知道：

- 我同意接受四至六次的访谈，时间跨度为七至十二个月，每次访谈时间约为 60 分钟，访谈内容会被录音。
- 每次访谈后我将得到一张价值 20 新西兰元的购物券作为补贴。
- 访谈期间，我可以拒绝回答任何问题，或在任何时间要求停止录音。
- 录音由研究者本人负责整理成文字材料。
- 我将在下一次访谈时核准上一次访谈的书面材料。
- 我可以在任何时候退出研究，但只能在第一次访谈后撤回我的访谈资料，因为之后录音将已被整理成文字材料。
- 第一次访谈将在公共场所进行。如果我要求，后续访谈可以在我的住所进行。
- 在访谈期间，我可以选择使用中文或英文或两种语言交替使用。
- 研究是匿名的，但我了解我的真实身份有可能在论文中被识别。
- 研究发现将用于研究者的论文写作，会议发言和论文发表。
- 所收集到的我的个人资料将存放在大学内指定处所，为期六年，期满后将销毁。
- 我已得到大学心理咨询服务的联系方式。
- 我需要/不需要论文终稿内容摘要（二选一，打圈）。如需要，摘要可发至我的邮箱：
或邮寄至：

我在完全知情的情况下，同意参加题为：“中国博士留学生在新西兰的转化学习研究：个案研究”的项目。

签名: _____

日期: _____

如有任何疑问，可联系奥克兰大学研究参与人道德委员会主席，副校长办公室，邮政信箱 92019，奥克兰 1142 电话 09373-7599 转 83711，
电子邮箱：ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

该研究项目由奥克兰大学研究参与人道德委员会于 2015 年 6 月 4 日批准，为期 3 年至 2018 年 6 月 4 日，参考编号 014630

School of Critical Studies in Education

Epsom Campus
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue
Auckland, New Zealand
Telephone 64 9 623 8899
Facsimile 64 9 623 8898
www.education.auckland.ac.nz

The University of Auckland
Private Bag 92601, Symonds Street
Auckland 1035, New Zealand

CONSENT FORM:

(THIS CONSENT FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF SIX YEARS)

Title: Exploring Chinese PhD Candidates' Transformative Learning Experiences in New Zealand: A Case Study

Researcher: Yi Huang

I have read the Interviewee Information Sheet and I understand the nature of this research. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that:

- I agree to take part in four to six interviews over a time span of 7 to 12 months, each lasting approximately 60 minutes that will be audio recorded.
- I will be reimbursed with a \$20 voucher for each interview.
- During the interview, I can refuse to answer any questions, stop the audio recording at any time.
- The recordings will be transcribed by the researcher.
- I will check the transcripts of the interviews at subsequent interviews.
- I may withdraw from the study at any time but can only withdraw my data one week after the first interview as the data will have been transcribed.
- The first interview will be held in a public place. If I request, subsequent interviews may be held at my place.
- I may use Chinese, English or a mixture of the two languages in the interviews.
- My identity will not be disclosed in the thesis or research documents, but because there is a small chance that others may guess my identity in the thesis, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.
- The findings will be used in the researcher's thesis, conference presentations and journal publications.
- The data will be securely stored at university premises for a period of six years and then destroyed.
- I have been provided with the university counselling service contact details.
- I request/ do not request a summary of the completed research. (Circle one).

Please send the summary to my email or postal address:

_____.

I hereby give my informed consent to participate in the research project *Exploring Chinese PhD Candidates' Transformative Learning Experiences in New Zealand: A Case Study*

Signed: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Interviewees Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Office of the Vice Chancellor, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 83711. Email: ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN INTERVIEWEES ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 04-06-2015 for 3 years until 04-06-2-18, Reference Number 014630.

Appendix E.

Interview Questions

Interview One

- 1) What major changes occurred in your doctoral research?
- 2) Since undertaking PhD study,
 - What experience did /do you feel especially troublesome or struggling?
(follow up)-What do you think of English as the language of conducting your doctoral research?
 - What experience makes you feel a sense of fulfilment and/or achievement?
- 3) What did you think of undertaking PhD study overseas and what do you think of it now?
- 4) What did you expect to do after graduation when you initiated the PhD study? What do you think of it now?
- 5) Is there any change in your perception to yourself as an academic researcher?

Interview Two

- 6) What bothered you most before/when initiating PhD study and now does not bother you anymore? Or vice versa. And why?
- 7) What did you take for granted before/when initiating PhD study and now you doubt or give more reason about? And why?
- 8) What did you consider important before/when initiating PhD study and now you do not think so? Or vice versa. And why?
- 9) What changes occurred in your perceptions to your original world when you returned to China during the doctoral study?

Interview Three

- 10) Imagine you restarted your doctoral research, what different approaches you would like to take?
- 11) Imagine you restarted your educational life, what different choices you would like to make regarding the critical educational stages?

Interview Four

- 12) Could you talk about life history, in particular, your former education experiences before undertaking the PhD study? Are there any experiences, in particular related to your education, which you think had important influence on your life?

References

- Abrahams, J., & Ingram, N. (2013). The chameleon habitus: Exploring local students' negotiations of multiple fields. *Sociological Research Online*, 18(4), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/4/21.html>.
- Acker, S., & Haque, E. (2010). Doctoral students and a future in academe. In L. McAlpine, & G. Åkerlind (Eds.), *Becoming an academic: International perspectives* (pp. 96-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing habitus and reflexivity: Towards an understanding of contemporary identity? *Sociology*, 40(3), 511-528.
- Altbach, P. G. (2007). *Tradition and transition: The international imperative in higher education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Amsler, M., & Shore, C. (2017). Responsibilisation and leadership in the neoliberal university: A New Zealand perspective. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(1), 123-137.
- Andres, L. (2016). Theories of the sociology of higher education access and participation. In J. E. Côté, & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 29-38). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY, GB: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 12-44.
- Archer, L. (2008a). The new neoliberal subjects? young/er academics' constructions of professional identity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3), 265-285.
- Archer, L. (2008b). Younger academics' constructions of 'authenticity', 'success' and professional identity. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 385-403.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1986). *Education under siege: The conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Atkinson, P., & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's 'immortality': The interview society and the invention of the self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3), 304-325.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). *Class strategies and the education market: The middle classes and social advantage*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Ball, S. J., Davies, J., David, M., & Reay, D. (2002). 'Classification' and 'judgement': Social class and the 'cognitive structures' of choice of higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(1), 51-72.
- Barbalet, J. (2014). The structure of guanxi: Resolving problems of network assurance. *Theory and Society*, 43(1), 51-69.
- Barnacle, R. (2005). Research education ontologies: Exploring doctoral becoming. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(2), 179-188.
- Barnett, M. (2016). The humanitarian act: How humanitarian? *International Social Science Journal*, 65(215-216), 13-24.
- Barnett, R. (2000). Reconfiguring the university. In P. E. Scott (Ed.), *Higher education reformed* (pp. 114-131). London; New York: Falmer Press.
- Barrett, T. (2015). Storying Bourdieu: Fragments towards a Bourdieusian approach to "Life histories". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(5), 1-10.
- Bathmaker, A. (2015). Thinking with Bourdieu: Thinking after Bourdieu. using 'field' to consider in/equalities in the changing field of English higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(1), 61-80.
- Baxter, A., & Britton, C. (2001). Risk, identity and change: Becoming a mature student. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 11(1), 87-104.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bennett, O. (2001). *Cultural pessimism narratives of decline in the postmodern world*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bernstein, B. (2009). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes and control (volume four)*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. L., Evans, B., Fyffe, J., Halai, N., Hall, F. L., & Jensen, H. S. (2014). The continuing evolution of the research doctorate. In M. Nerad, & B. K. Evans (Eds.), *Globalization and its impacts on the quality of PhD education* (pp.5-30). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Brenneis, D., Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2005). Getting the measure of academia: universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropology in Action*, 12(1), 1-10.
- Brinkmann, S. (2014). Interview. In *Encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 1008-1010). New York: Springer.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Bhabha, H. K. (1996). Culture's in-between. In S. Hall, & P. d. Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 53-60). London: Sage.
- Bian, Y. (1997). Bringing strong ties back in: Indirect ties, network bridges, and job searches in China. *American Sociological Review*, 62(3), 366-385.
- Biglan, A. (1973). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 204.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and practice* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boisot, M., & Child, J. (1996). From fiefs to clans and network capitalism: Explaining China's emerging economic order. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 600-628.
- Bordons, M., Fernández, M., & Gómez, I. (2002). Advantages and limitations in the use of impact factor measures for the assessment of research performance. *Scientometrics*, 53(2), 195-206.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979a). Symbolic power. *Critique of Anthropology*, 4(13-14), 77-85.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979b). *Algeria 1960: The disenchantment of the world: The sense of honour: The Kabyle house or the world reversed: Essays*. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The genesis of the concepts of habitus and of field. *Sociocriticism*, 2(2), 11-24.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? on the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32(1 January), 1-17.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus* (P. Collier Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Original work published in 1984).
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14-25. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/202060>.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Stanford University Press. (Original work published in 1980).

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). Epilogue: On the possibility of a field of world sociology. In P. Bourdieu, & J. S. Coleman (Eds.), *Social theory for a changing society* (pp. 373-387). Boulder, USA: Westview Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). Language and symbolic power. In Thompson, J. B. (Ed.), *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (R. Nice Trans.). London; Thousand Oaks, California; New Delhi, India: Sage (Original work published in 1984).
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998a). *Acts of resistance: Against the new myths of our time* (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998b). The essence of neoliberalism (J. Shapiro Trans.). *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Retrieved from <http://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08Bourdieu>.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998c). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998d). *A reasoned utopia and economic fatalism*. *New Left Review*, Jan-Feb (227), 125-130.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999a). The contradictions of inheritance. In P. Bourdieu, A. Accardo, G. Balazs, S. Beaud, F. Bonvin, E. Bourdieu, P. Bourgois, S. Broccolichi, P. Champagne, R. Christin, J.- P. Faguer, S. Garcia, R. Lenoir, F. Oeuvarard, M. Pialoux, L. Pinto, D. Podalydes, A. Sayad, C. Soulie Loic & J. D. Wacquant (Eds.), *Weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society*. (P. P. Ferguson, S. Emanuel, J. Johnson, & S. T. Waryn, Trans.). (pp. 507-513). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999b). A life lost. In P. Bourdieu, A. Accardo, G. Balazs, S. Beaud, F. Bonvin, E. Bourdieu, P. Bourgois, S. Broccolichi, P. Champagne, R. Christin, J.- P. Faguer, S. Garcia, R. Lenoir, F. Oeuvarard, M. Pialoux, L. Pinto, D. Podalydes, A. Sayad, C. Soulie Loic & J. D. Wacquant (Eds.), *Weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. P. Ferguson, S. Emanuel, J. Johnson, & S. T. Waryn, Trans.). (pp. 381-391). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000a). The biographical illusion. In a. P. du Gay, J. Evans & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reade* (pp. 297-303). London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000b). *Pascalian meditations* (R. Nice Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press (Original work published in 1997).
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). Habitus. In J. Hillier, & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 27-34). Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Firing back: Against the tyranny of the market 2* (L. Wacquant Trans.). London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity* (R. Nice Trans.). Chicago, GB: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 2001).
- Bourdieu, P., & Accardo, A. (1999). *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Champagne, P. (1999). Outcasts on the inside. In P. Bourdieu, A. Accardo, G. Balazs, S. Beaud, F. Bonvin, E. Bourdieu, P. Bourgois, S. Broccolichi, P. Champagne, R. Christin, J.- P. Faguer, S. Garcia, R. Lenoir, F. Oeuvarard, M. Pialoux, L. Pinto, D. Podalydes, A. Sayad, C. Soulie Loic & J. D. Wacquant (Eds.), *Weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. P. Ferguson, S. Emanuel & J. Johnson, & S. T. Waryn, Trans.). (pp. 421-426). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J., Passeron, J. C. & Krais B. (1991). *The craft of sociology: Epistemological preliminaries* (R. Nice Trans.). Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P., & Eagleton, T. (1992). Doxa and common life. *New Left Review, Jan-Feb* (191), 111-121.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture* (R. Nice Trans.). London, UK; California, USA; New Delhi, India: Sage. (Original work published in 1970).
- Bourdieu, P., Sapiro, G., & McHale, B. (1991). Fourth lecture. universal corporatism: The role of intellectuals in the modern world. *Poetics Today, 12*(4), 655-669. doi:10.2307/1772708.
- Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Original work published in 1973).
- Bourdieu, P., & Turner C. (2005). *The social structures of the economy*. Cambridge, U.K.; Malden, MA: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of “actually existing neoliberalism”. *Antipode, 34*(3), 349-379.
- Brewer, J. D., Hayes, B. C., Dudgeon, K., Mueller-Hirth, N., Teeney, F., & Wijesinghe, S. (2016). Victims as moral beacons of humanitarianism in post-conflict societies. *International Social Science Journal, 65*(215-216), 37-47.

- British Council. (2014). *Postgraduate student mobility trends to 2024*. Retrieved from [http:// www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/global-landscape/report-postgraduate-mobility-2024](http://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/global-landscape/report-postgraduate-mobility-2024).
- Brooks, R. (2003). Young people's higher education choices: The role of family and friends. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24(3), 283-297.
- Brown, L. (2009). A failure of communication on the cross-cultural campus. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(4), 439-454.
- Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2001). *Capitalism and social progress: The future of society in a global economy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave.
- Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2006). Globalisation, knowledge and the myth of the magnet economy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(1), 25-57.
- Bruneau, W., & Savage, D. C. (2002). *Counting out the scholars: The case against performance indicators in higher education*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Burford, J. (2016). Uneasy feelings: Queer (y) ing the affective-politics of doctoral education. Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Burke, C. (2011). The biographical illumination: A Bourdieusian analysis of the role of theory in educational research. *Sociological Research Online*, 16(2), 1-9.
- Burke, C., Thatcher, J., & Ingram, N., & Abrahams J. (2016). Introduction: The development of Bourdieu's intellectual heritage in contemporary UK sociology. In J. Thatcher, N. Ingram, C. Burke & J. Abrahams (Eds.), *Bourdieu: The next generation: The development of Bourdieu's intellectual heritage in contemporary UK sociology* (pp. 1-7). London; New York: Routledge.
- Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349-399.
- Cai, Y. Z. (2004). Confronting the global and the local: A case study of Chinese higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(2), 157-169. doi: 10.1023/B:TEAM.0000023840.93857.70.
- Cai, Y. (2012). Traditional reform philosophy and challenges of higher education reforms in China. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(6), 60-69.
- Cai, Y. (2014). Responses to Yang Rui's "China's strategy for internationalization of higher education: An overview". *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 175-180.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Towards a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.
- Cao, C. (2008). China's brain drain at the high end: Why government policies have failed to attract first-rate academics to return. *Asian Population Studies*, 4(3), 331-345.

- Cao, X. S. (1992). Dui xuefenzhi de zairenshi ji wanshan xuefenzhi de jianyi (Re-examination of the credit system and suggestions to perfect it). *Hebei Caijin Xueyuan Xuebao (Hebei Financial and Economics College Journal)*, (2), 34-39.
- Carr, D. (1991). *Educating the virtues: An essay on the philosophical psychology of moral development and education*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Ceri, P. (1993). Durkheim on social action In S. Turner (Ed.), *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and moralist* (pp.135-162). Florence: Taylor and Francis.
- Chai C., & Cheng, G. (2011). Policies on China's basic education over the last thirty years. In X. Zhang (Ed.), *China's education development and policy, 1978-2008*. (pp.111-164). Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Chang, J. (2006). Globalization and English in Chinese higher education. *World Englishes*, 25(3-4), 513-525.
- Cladis, M. S. (2005). Beyond solidarity? Durkheim and twenty-first century democracy in a global age. In J. C. Alexander, & P. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Durkheim* (pp. 383-392). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coelho, G. V. (2014). *Changing images of America: A study of Indian students' perceptions*. Cambridge, Mass: Centre for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge Falmer.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33(6), 14-32. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/800672>.
- Collins, R. (1998). *The sociology of philosophies: A global theory of intellectual change* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, USA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Collins, R. (2002). Credential inflation and the future of universities. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 23-46). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Collyer, F. M. (2015). Practices of conformity and resistance in the marketisation of the academy: Bourdieu, professionalism and academic capitalism. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(3), 315-331.
- Connor, T. (2016). PhD by publication. In C. Ashford, & J. Guth (Eds.), *The legal academic's handbook* (pp. 28-30). London; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Costa, C. (2016). Double gamers: Academics between fields. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(7), 993-1013.

- Côté, J. E., & Furlong, A. (2016). Introduction. In J. E. Côté, & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 1-16). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Crook, C., Gross, H., & Dymott, R. (2006). Assessment relationships in higher education: The tension of process and practice. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 95-114.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuypers, S. E. (2017). RS Peters' comprehensive theory of moral education. *Pedagogical Culture*, 1(1), 11-27.
- Cuthbert, D., & Spark, C. (2008). Getting a GRiP: Examining the outcomes of a pilot program to support graduate research students in writing for publication. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(1), 77-88.
- Dai, M., Chen, Z., & Davey, G. (July, 2007). Mental health implications of the Chinese university entrance exam. *Psychology in Mental Health: Prospects and Challenges*, Bangalore.
- Davey, G., & Higgins, L. (2005). Fear in China. *China Review*, 33, 30-33.
- Davey, G., Lian, C. D., & Higgins, L. (2007). The university entrance examination system in China. *Journal of further and Higher Education*, 31(4), 385-396.
- David, M. E., Ball, S. J., Davies, J., & Reay, D. (2003). Gender issues in parental involvement in student choices of higher education. *Gender and Education*, 15(1), 21-36.
- Dawson, M (2009). Book Review: Kevin Doogan, *New Capitalism? The Transformation of Work*. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13 (2), 290-295.
- Deer, C. (2012). Reflexivity. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts* (2) (pp. 195-208). Durham: Acumen.
- Dello-Iacovo, B. (2009). Curriculum reform and 'quality education' in China: An overview. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(3), 241-249.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *Theory of the moral life* (1st ed.). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Dong, Q., Yang, B., & Ollendick, T. H. (1994). Fears in Chinese children and adolescents and their relations to anxiety and depression. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35(2), 351-363.

- Doogan, K. (2009). *New capitalism?: The transformation of work*. Cambridge, U.K.; Malden, Mass.: Polity.
- Dryler, H. (1998). Parental role models, gender and educational choice. *British Journal of Sociology*, 49(3), 375-398.
- Dubet, F., & Jager, M. (1994). The system, the actor, and the social subject. *Thesis Eleven*, 38(1), 16-35.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and sociology* (S. D. Fox Trans.). Glencoe: Free Press (Original work published in 1922).
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education a study in the theory and application of the sociology of education* (E. Wilson, H. Schnurer Trans.). New York: Free Press of Glencoe (Original work published in 1925).
- Durkheim, E. (1962). *Socialism (le socialisme)* (C. Sattler Trans.). New York: Collier Books (Original work published in 1928).
- Durkheim, E. (1973). Individualism and the intellectuals.
In R. N. Bellah (Ed.), *Emily Durkheim on morality and society* (pp. 43-57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Original work published in 1898).
- Durkheim, E. (1977). *The evolution of educational thought*. London: Routledge.
- Durkheim, E. (1992). *Professional ethics and civic morals* (C. Brookfield Trans.). London; New York: Routledge (Original work published in 1950).
- Durkheim, E. (2001). *The elementary forms of religious life*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press (Original work published in 1912).
- Durkheim, E. (2006a). *The evolution of educational thought: Lectures on the formation and development of secondary education in France*. (P. Collins Trans.). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work published in 1938).
- Durkheim, E. (2006b). *Selected writings on education*. London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work published in 1977).
- Durkheim, E. (2012). *Moral education* (E. K. Wilson, H. Schnurer Trans.). New York: Dover Publications.
- Edgerton, J. D., Roberts, L. W. & Peters, T. (2013). Disparities in academic achievement: Assessing the role of habitus and practice. *Social Indicators Research*, 114(2), 303-322.
- Elliot, D., Baumfield, V., Reid, K. & Makara, K. (2016). Hidden treasure: Successful international doctoral students who found and harnessed the hidden curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education*, 42(6), 733-748. doi:10.1080/03054985.2016.1229664.

- Fang, W. (2012). The development of transnational higher education in China: A comparative study of research universities and teaching universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(1), 5-23.
- Fang, X. (2011). Glocalizing ELT: From Chinglish to China English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(2), 377-381.
- Feng, W. (2010). China's population destiny: The looming crisis. *Current History*, 109(728), 244-251.
- Ferreira, M. (2003). Gender issues related to graduate student attrition in two science departments. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(8), 969-989.
- Fewsmith, J. (2013). Xi Jinping's fast start. *China Leadership Monitor*, 41, 1-7.
- Fischman, G. (2009). Introduction. In D. Hill (Ed.), *Contesting neoliberal education: Public resistance and collective advance* (pp. 1-8). New York: Routledge.
- Fisher, D., & Metcalfe S. A. & Field C. (2016). The structural force of exerted by marketization on higher education systems, research universities and academic researchers. In J. E. Côté & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 63-73). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Fong, V. L. (2006). *Only hope: Coming of age under China's one-child policy*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Fotovatian, S., & Miller, J. (2014). Constructing an institutional identity in university tea rooms: The international PhD student experience. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(2), 286-297.
- Francis, B. (2000). The gendered subject: Students' subject preferences and discussions of gender and subject ability. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26(1), 35-48.
- Friedman, K. E., & Friedman, J. (2008). Introduction. In J. Friedman (Ed.), *Modernities, class, and the contradictions of globalization: The anthropology of global systems* (pp. 1-23). New York: AltaMira Press.
- Friedman, M. (2002). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Original work published in 1962).
- Gan, L. S. (1990). Tansuo woguo xuefenzhi de tese (Quest for characteristics of credit system in our country). *Gaodeng Gongcheng Jiaoyu Yanjiu (Higher Engineering Education Research)*, 1, 65-67.
- Gardner, S. K. (2007). "I heard it through the grapevine": Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education*, 54(5), 723-740.
- Gardner, S. K. (2008). Fitting the mode of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(2), 125-138.

- Garfield, E. (2006). The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. *Jama*, 295(1), 90-93.
- Gemme, B., & Gingras, Y. (2012). Academic careers for graduate students: A strong attractor in a changed environment. *Higher Education*, 63(6), 667-683.
- Gibbs, P. (2010). The commoditization and standardization of higher education. In N. Foskett & F. Maringe (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 241-253). New York: Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Gil, J., & Adamson, B. (2011). The English language in mainland China: A sociolinguistic profile. In A. Feng (Ed.), *English language education across greater China* (pp. 23-45). Bristol, U.K.; Tonawanda, N.Y: Multilingual Matters.
- Gill, R. (2009). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia. In R. Ryan-Flood, & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (pp. 228-244). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gomes, C., Berry, M., Alzougool, B., & Chang, S. (2014). Home away from home: International students and their identity-based social networks in Australia. *Journal of International Students*, 4(1), 2-15.
- Gopaul, B. (2011). Distinction in doctoral education: Using Bourdieu's tools to assess the socialization of doctoral students. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1), 10-21.
- Gopaul, B. (2012). The practice of doctoral education: A Bourdieusian analysis of the socialisation of doctoral students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).
- Gopaul, B. (2015). Inequality and doctoral education: Exploring the "rules" of doctoral study through Bourdieu's notion of field. *Higher Education*, 70(1), 73-88.
- Gouldner, A. (1979). *The rise of the intellectuals and the future of the new class*. London: Macmillan.
- Green, B. (2009). Challenging perspectives, changing practices: Doctoral education in transition. In D. Boud, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Changing practices in doctoral education* (pp. 239-248). London; New York: Routledge.
- Grenfell, M. (1996). Bourdieu and initial teacher education-a post-structuralist approach. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(3), 287-303.
- Grenfell, M. (2004). *Pierre Bourdieu, agent provocateur*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Grenfell, M. (2012). Methodology. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts* (Second ed., pp. 212-228). Durham: Acumen.

- Grenfell, M. (2014). Bourdieu and data analysis. In M. Grenfell, & F. Lebaron (Eds.), *Bourdieu and data analysis: Methodological principles and practice* (pp. 7-34). Oxford: Peter Lang AG.
- Guan, F. G. (1986). Qiantan xuefengzhi de jige wenti (A preliminary discussion of some questions concerning the credit system). *Heilongjiang Jiaoyu Yanjiu (Heilongjiang Higher Education Journal)*, (2), 34-41.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication*. London: Sage.
- Guest, G. (2012). *Applied thematic analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Guo, C., Tsang, M. C., & Ding, X. (2010). Gender disparities in science and engineering in Chinese universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 29(2), 225-235.
- Guo, Y., & Guo, S. (2017). Internationalization of Canadian higher education: Discrepancies between policies and international student experiences. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(5), 851-868.
- Guthrie, D. (1998). The declining significance of guanxi in China's economic transition. *The China Quarterly*, 154, 254-282.
- Guthrie, G. M. (1979). A cross-cultural odyssey: Some personal reflections. In A. Marsella, R. Tharp, & T. Ciborowski (Eds.), *Perspectives on cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 88-102). New York: Academic Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, volume one: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hail, H. C. (2015). Patriotism abroad: Overseas Chinese students' encounters with criticisms of China. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19(4), 311-326.
- Hamilton, G., & Wang, Z. (1992). Introduction: Fei Xiaotong and the beginnings of a Chinese sociology. In X. Fei, G. G. Hamilton & W. Zheng (Eds.), *From the soil: The foundations of Chinese society* (pp. 1-34). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hang, M. Z. (1988). The place of physics in Chinese middle schools. *Physics Education*, 23(1), 24-25. doi:10.1088/0031-9120/23/1/001.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of global capitalism*. London; New York: Verso.
- Hayhoe, R., & Liu, J. (2010). China's universities, cross-border education, and dialogue among civilizations. In D. W. Chapman (Ed.), *Crossing borders in east Asian higher education* (pp. 77-100). New York: Springer.

- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Henderson, J. (2011). New and not so new horizons: Brief encounters between UK undergraduate native-speaker and non-native-speaker Englishes. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 270-284.
- Hesketh, T., Lu, L., & Xing, Z. W. (2005). The effect of China's one-child family policy after 25 years. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 353(11), 1171-1176. doi:10.1056/NEJMp051833.
- Hildebrand, V., Phenice, L. A., Gray, M. M., & Hines, R. P. (2008). *Knowing and serving diverse families* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Hillier, J., & Rooksby, E. (2002). Introduction. In J. Hillier, & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 3-25). Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Ho, D. Y. (1994). Filial piety, authoritarian moralism, and cognitive conservatism in Chinese societies. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 120(3), 349-365.
- Ho, Y., & Lee, L. (1974). Authoritarianism and attitude towards filial piety in Chinese teachers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 92(2), 305-306.
- Horvat, E., & Davis, J. (2011). Schools as sites for transformation: Exploring the contribution of habitus. *Youth & Society*, 43(1), 142-170. doi:10.1177/0044118X09358846.
- Hu, X. (2005). China English, at home and in the world. *English Today*, 21(3), 27-38.
- Huang, F. T. (2006). Internationalization of higher education in China. *The International Symposium on Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities*, Osaka, Japan.
- Huang, F. (2003). Policy and practice of the internationalization of higher education in China. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(3), 225-240.
- Huang, G. H., & Gove, M. (2012). Confucianism and Chinese families: Values and practices in education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(3), 10-14.
- Hulbert, A. (2007). Re-education. *New York Times*, 1.
- Huntington, S. P. (1957). Conservatism as an ideology. *American Political Science Review*, 51(2), 454-473.
- Hutchings, M., & Archer, L. (2001). 'Higher than Einstein': Constructions of going to university among working-class non-participants. *Research Papers in Education*, 16(1), 69-91.

- Ingram, N., & Abrahams, J. (2016). Stepping outside of oneself: How a cleft-habitus can lead to greater reflexivity through occupying “the third space”. In J. Thatcher, N. Ingram, C. Burke & J. Abrahams (Eds.), *Bourdieu: The next generation: The development of Bourdieu’s intellectual heritage in contemporary UK sociology* (pp. 140-156). London; New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, D. (2013). Completing a PhD by publication: A review of Australian policy and implications for practice. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(3), 355-368.
- Jacoby, R. (1999). *The end of utopia: Politics and culture in an age of apathy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Jenkins, R. (2002). *Pierre Bourdieu* (Rev. ed.). London; New York: Routledge.
- John, S. (2009). Using the revision process to help international students understand the linguistic construction of the academic identity. In M. Charles, D. Pecorari & S. Hunston (Eds.), *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse* (pp. 272-290). London: Continuum.
- Jokila, S. (2015). The internationalization of higher education with Chinese characteristics: Appadurai’s ideas explored. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(1), 125-139.
- Kai, J. (2014). Inequality in internationalization of higher education *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 182-187.
- Kallio, J. (2015). Dreaming of the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 521-532.
- Kamat, S., Mir, A., & Mathew, B. (2004). Producing hi-tech: Globalization, the state and migrant subjects. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1), 1-39.
- Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 283-294.
- Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2006). Doctoral writing: Pedagogies for work with literatures. *AERA Annual Meeting*, San Francisco. pp. 7-11.
- Kant, I. (1995). What is Enlightenment? In I. Kramnick (Ed.), *The portable enlightenment reader* (pp. 1-7). New York: Penguin Books.
- Kelly, F. (2017). *The idea of the PhD the doctorate in the twenty-first-century imagination*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kelsey, J. (1995). *The New Zealand experiment*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

- Khoo, S. (2011). Ethical globalisation or privileged internationalisation? exploring global citizenship and internationalisation in Irish and Canadian universities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 337-353.
- Kiley, M., & Wisker, G. (2009). Threshold concepts in research education and evidence of threshold crossing. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(4), 431-441.
- Kim, Y. Y. (1988). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kipnis, A. (2001). The disturbing educational discipline of “peasants”. *The China Journal*, 46(July), 1-24.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2015). *Reconceptualizing qualitative research: Methodologies without methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Kwok, V., & Leland, H. (1982). An economic model of the brain drain. *The American Economic Review*, 72(1), 91-100.
- Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J. & Halsey, A.H. (2006). Introduction: The prospects for education: Individualisation, globalisation, and social change. In H. Lauder, P. Brown & J. Dillabough & A.H. Halsey (Eds.), *Education, globalization, and social change* (1st ed., pp. 1-70). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Law, W. (1995). The role of the state in higher education reform: Mainland China and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, 39(3), 322-355.
- Lee, A., & Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing for the doctorate and beyond. In D. Boud, & A. Lee (Eds.), *Changing practices of doctoral education* (pp. 87-99). London: Routledge.
- Lee, E. M., & Kramer, R. (2013). Out with the old, in with the new? habitus and social mobility at selective colleges. *Sociology of Education*, 86(1), 18-35.
- Lee, W. O., & Ho, C. H. (2005). Ideopolitical shifts and changes in moral education policy in China. *Journal of Moral Education*, 34(4), 413-431.
- Lehmann, W. (2007). “I just didn’t feel like I fit in”: The role of habitus in university dropout decisions. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37(2), 89-110.
- Lewin, K., & Hui, X. (1989). Rethinking revolution; reflections on China’s 1985 educational reforms. *Comparative Education*, 25(1), 7-17.
- Li, H. (2002). From alterity to hybridity: A query of double consciousness. *Philosophy of Education Archive*, 138-146.

- Li, H. (2015). Moving to the city: Educational trajectories of rural Chinese students in an elite university. *Bourdieu, habitus and social research* (pp. 126-147). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Li, W. (2008). Education inequality in China: Problems of policies on access to higher education. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 1(1), 115-123.
- Li, Z., & Lowe, J. (2016). Social justice and Chinese higher education. In B. Wu, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Chinese higher education reform and social justice* (pp. 14-32). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Lien, L. Y. (2006). Creating a successful educational path for children: The experience of Taiwanese mothers. *Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations*, Minneapolis, MN.
- Liu, D., & Morgan, W. J. (2016). Students' decision-making about postgraduate education at G university in China: The main factors and the role of family and of teachers. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(2), 325-335.
- Liu, D., & Hong, Y. (2016). The career prospects of university graduates from urban families. In B. Wu, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Chinese higher education reform and social justice* (pp. 66-79). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Liu, X. (1994). *Brief introduction of the college enrolling examination on behalf of the examination reform, the psychological testing in Chinese community*. China testing commission. Beijing: Psychology Public Company.
- Louie, V. S. (2004). *Compelled to excel: Immigration, education, and opportunity among Chinese Americans*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2007). *Making the implicit explicit: Creating performance expectations for the dissertation*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus Pub.
- Lu, J., & Wang, X. (2000). Deyu lilun: Zouxiang kexuehua he renxinghua de zhenghe [theories of moral education: Towards an integration of scientific and humanistic research]. In X. Zhu (Ed.), *Daode jiaoyu luncong [collected articles on moral education]* (pp. 25-41). Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University Press.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marginson, S. (2010). Higher education in the global knowledge economy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2(5), 6962-6980.
- Marginson, S. (2014). Responses to Yang Rui's "China's strategy for internationalization of higher education: An overview". *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 169-174.
- Marton, A. M. (2006). The cultural politics of curricular reform in China: A case study of geographical education in shanghai. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 15(47), 244-245.

- Maton, K. (2012). Habitus. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Key concepts: Pierre Bourdieu (2)* (pp. 48-64). Durham: Acumen.
- Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, 6, 6-28.
- May, V. (2011). Self, belonging and social change. *Sociology*, 45(3), 363-378.
- McDonough, P. M., & Miller, C. E. (2016). The forces of persistent inequality: Minority statuses in higher education. In J. E. Côté, & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 153-164). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- McNay, L. (2001). Meditations on Pascalian meditations. *Economy and Society*, 30(1), 139-154.
- McNess, E., Arthur, L., & Crossley, M. (2016). Ethnographic ‘dazzle’ and the construction of the ‘other’: Shifting boundaries between the insider and outsider. In M. Crossley, L. Arthur & E. McNess (Eds.), *Revisiting insider/outsider research in comparative and international education* (pp. 21-38). Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Mendoza, P. (2007). Academic capitalism and doctoral student socialization: A case study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(1), 71-96.
- Mendoza, P., Kuntz, A. M., & Berger, J. B. (2012). Bourdieu and academic capitalism: Faculty “habitus” in materials science and engineering. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(4), 558-581.
- Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education; the International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 49(3), 373-388. doi:10.1007/s10734-004-6779-5.
- Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow and Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2009). Transformative learning theory. In J. Mezirow and E. W. Taylor (Eds.), *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education* (1st ed.) (pp. 18-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Middleton, S. (2007). The place of theory: Locating the New Zealand 'education' Ph. D. experience, 1948–1998. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(1), 69-87.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mills, C. (2008). Reproduction and transformation of inequalities in schooling: The transformative potential of the theoretical constructs of Bourdieu. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(1), 79-89.
- Ministry of Education (MoE) (2007). *Tertiary education strategy, 2007–12*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1), 5-27.
- Mok, K. H., & Chan, Y. (2008). International benchmarking with the best universities: Policy and practice in mainland China and Taiwan. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(4), 469-486.
- Mok, K. H., & Han, X. (2016). From 'brain drain' to 'brain bridging': Transnational higher education development and graduate employment in China. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38(3), 369-389.
- Mok, K. H. (2003). Globalisation and higher education restructuring in Hong Kong, Taiwan and mainland China. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(2), 117-129.
- Mok, K. H. (2005). Globalization and educational restructuring: University merging and changing governance in China. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 57-88.
- Moore, R. (2013). *Basil Bernstein: The thinker and the field*. New York: Routledge.
- Morley, L., Leonard, D., & David, M. (2002). Variations in vivas: Quality and equality in British PhD assessments. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 263-273.
- Morrison, E., Rudd, E., & Nerad, M. (2011). Onto, up, off the academic faculty ladder: The gendered effects of family on career transitions for a cohort of social science PhDs. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(4), 525-553.
- Mufwene, S. S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murata, K., & Jenkins, J. (2009). Introduction: Global Englishes from global perspectives. In *Global Englishes in Asian contexts* (pp. 1-13). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Murphy, M., & Costa, C. (2015). Bourdieu and the application of habitus across the social sciences. In C. Costa, M. Murphy & R. Martin (Eds.), *Bourdieu, habitus and social research: The art of application* (pp. 3-17). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Nagel, J. H. (1998). Social choice in a pluralitarian democracy: The politics of market liberalization in New Zealand. *British Journal of Political Science*, 28(2), 223-267.
- Naidoo, R. (2004). Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 457-471. doi:10.1080/0142569042000236952.
- Nairz-Wirth, E., Feldmann, K., & Spiegl, J. (2017). Habitus conflicts and experiences of symbolic violence as obstacles for non-traditional students. *European Educational Research Journal*, 16(1), 12-29.
- Neumann, R., & Tan, K. K. (2011). From PhD to initial employment: The doctorate in a knowledge economy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(5), 601-614.
- New Zealand Government. (2011). *Leadership statement for international education*. Retrieved , July 9, 2015, from <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/overall-strategies-and-policies/leadership-statement-for-international-education/>.
- New Zealand Government. (2014). *Leadership statement for international education - progress update*. Retrieved , July 9, 2015, from <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/overall-strategies-and-policies/leadership-statement-for-international-education/>.
- Newby, P. (2010). *Research methods for education*. Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ngok, K. (2008). Massification, bureaucratization and questing for “world-class” status: Higher education in China since the mid-1990s. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(6), 547-564.
- Novelli, M. (2016). Capital, inequality and education in conflict-affected contexts. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(6), 848-860.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: the human development approach*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Obermeit, K. (2012). Students’ choice of universities in Germany: Structure, factors and information sources used. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 22(2), 206-230.
- O’Gorman, H. J. (1986). The discovery of pluralistic ignorance: An ironic lesson. *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences*, 22(4), 333-347.
- O’Hara, K. (2011). *Conservatism*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Ong, A. (2007). Neoliberalism as a mobile technology. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(1), 3-8.

- Paré, A. (2010). Slow the presses: Concerns about premature publication. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler & A. Lee (Eds.), *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond* (pp. 30-46). New York: Routledge.
- Park, C. (2005). New variant PhD: The changing nature of the doctorate in the UK. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), 189-207.
- Park, C. (2007). *Redefining the doctorate*. York, UK: Higher Education Academy.
- Peck, J., Theodore, N., & Brenner, N. (2012). Neoliberalism resurgent? market rule after the great recession. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111(2), 265-288.
- Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalising space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380-404.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*, 90-115.
- Pepper, S. (1996). *Radicalism and education reform in twentieth-century China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, M., & Roberts, P. (2012). *The virtues of openness: Education, science, and scholarship in the digital age*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Phinney, J. S. (1991). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: A review and integration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 13(2), 193-208.
- Picciano, J., Rudd, E., Morrison, E., & Nerad, M. (2007). *Social science PhDs—five years out: Survey methods*. Seattle: Cirge.
- Pilbeam, C., & Denyer, D. (2009). Lone scholar or community member? the role of student networks in doctoral education in a UK management school. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(3), 301-318.
- Pinkham, J. (2000). *The translator's guide to Chinglish*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- PLoS Medicine Editors. (2006). The impact factor game. *PLoS Medicine*, 3(6), e291.
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Analysing qualitative data. *British Medical Journal*, 320(7227), 114-116.
- Popper, K. (1978). Three worlds: The Tanner lecture on human values: Delivered at the university of Michigan. *The Tanner Lectures, Humanities Centre, University of Utah*-[Http://Tinyurl.Com/yjf7n3x](http://Tinyurl.Com/yjf7n3x). 141-167.
- Preece, S., & Martin, P. (2009). Imagining higher education as a multilingual space. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 3-8.
- Pugsley, L. (1998). Throwing your brains at it: Higher education, markets and choice. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 71-92.

- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28(4), 664-684.
- Pye, L. W. (1968). *The spirit of Chinese politics; a psychocultural study of the authority crisis in political development*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Qi, W., & Tang, H. (2004). The social and cultural background of contemporary moral education in China. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(4), 465-480.
- Qi, X. (2013). Guanxi, social capital theory and beyond: Towards a globalized social science. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64(2), 308-324.
- Qi, X. (2017). Social movements in China: Augmenting mainstream theory with guanxi. *Sociology*, 51(1), 111-126.
- Rabinow, P. (2009). Foucault's untimely struggle towards a form of spirituality. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(6), 25-44.
- Rata, E. (1996). *Global capitalism and the revival of ethnic traditionalism in New Zealand: The emergence of tribal-capitalism*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland).
- Rata, E. (2002). *Democratic principles in teaching and learning: A Kantian approach*. Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland College of Education.
- Rata, E. (2008). Educating for Citizenship in a Bicultural Society. In St. George, A., Brown, S., & O'Neill, J. (Eds.). *Facing the big questions in teaching: Purpose, power and learning*. (pp. 51-62). Melbourne, Vic.: Cengage Learning.
- Rata, E. (2017a). Connecting knowledge to democracy. In B. Barrett, U. Hoadley & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Knowledge, curriculum and equity: Social realist perspectives* (pp. 19-32). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Rata, E. (2017b). Knowledge and teaching. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(5), 1003-1017.
- Rata, E., & Openshaw, R. (2007). In E. Rata, R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reay, D. (1998). 'Always knowing' and 'never being sure': Familial and institutional habituses and higher education choice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(4), 519-529.
- Reay, D. (2000). A useful extension of Bourdieu's conceptual framework?: Emotional capital as a way of understanding mothers' involvement in their children's education? *The Sociological Review*, 48(4), 568-585.
- Reay, D. (2004). 'It's all becoming a habitus': Beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431-444.

- Reay, D. (2015). Habitus and the psychosocial: Bourdieu with feelings. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(1), 9-23.
- Reay, D., Crozier, G., & Clayton, J. (2010). 'Fitting in' or 'standing out': Working-class students in UK higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(1), 107-124.
- Reed-Danahay, D. (2005). *Locating Bourdieu*. Bloomington, India: Indiana University Press.
- Rhoads, R. A., Wang, X., Shi, X., & Chang, Y. (2014). *China's rising research universities: A new era of global ambition*. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.
- Riley, A. (2015). *The social thought of Emile Durkheim*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out qualitative analysis. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 219-262). London: SAGE.
- Roberts, D., & Allen, A. (1997). *Young applicants perceptions of higher education*. Leeds, UK: Heist.
- Roberts, P. (2007). Neoliberalism, performativity and research. *International Review of Education*, 53(4), 349-365.
- Robertson, S., & Dale, R. (2002). Local states of emergency: The contradictions of neo-liberal governance in education in New Zealand. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(3), 463-482.
- Robins, L. M., & Kanowski, P. J. (2008). PhD by publication: A student's perspective. *Journal of Research Practice*, 4(2), Article M3. Retrieved from <http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/136/154>.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Rosen, S. (2004). The victory of materialism: Aspirations to join China's urban moneyed classes and the commercialization of education. *The China Journal*, 51(Jan), 27-51.
- Roska, J., & Robinson, J. K. (2016). From in loco parentis to consumer choice: Patterns and consequences of the changing relationship between students and institutions. In J. E. Côté, & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 106-115). Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Rowlands, J. (2013). Academic boards: Less intellectual and more academic capital in higher education governance? *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(9), 1274-1289.
- Santos, B. S. (2009). The university in the twenty-first century: Towards a democratic and emancipatory university reform. In M. W. Apple, S. J. Ball & L. A. Gandin (Eds.),

The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education (pp. 274-282). London; New York: Taylor and Francis.

- Schmitt, D. (2005). Writing in international classroom. In J. Carroll, & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all* (pp. 63-74). London; New York: Routledge.
- Schulte, B. (2012). World culture with Chinese characteristics: When global models go native. *Comparative Education*, 48(4), 473-486.
- Schütz, A. (1944). The stranger: An essay in social psychology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 49(6), 499-507.
- Schütz, A. (1945). The homecomer. *American Journal of Sociology*, 50(5), 369-376.
- Scott, I. (2009). *First-year experience as terrain of failure or platform for development? critical choices for higher education*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Secker, J., Wimbush, E., Watson, J., & Milburn, K. (1995). Qualitative methods in health promotion research: Some criteria for quality. *Health Education Journal*, 54(1), 74-87.
- Servage, L. (2009). Alternative and professional doctoral programs: What is driving the demand? *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(7), 765-779.
- Shahjahan, R. A. (2014). From 'no' to 'yes': Postcolonial perspectives on resistance to neoliberal higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 35(2), 219-232.
- Shen, M. H. (2009, 26 October,). Renmin university president Ji Baocheng: China's largest group of doctorates in government. Qianjiang evening news. retrieved from http://Big5.xinhuanet.com/gate/big5/news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2009-10/27/content_12338668_1.htm.
- Shen, W., Wang, C., & Jin, W. (2016). International mobility of PhD students since the 1990s and its effect on China: A cross-national analysis. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38(3), 333-353.
- Sheng, X. (2014). *Higher education choice in China: Social stratification, gender and educational inequality*. Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Sheng, X. (2015). Gender and habitus: Parental involvement in students' subject choices in China. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 24(2), 227-238.
- Shore, C. (2008). Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory*, 8(3), 278-298.
- Shore, C. (2010a). Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. *Social Anthropology*, 18(1), 15-29.

- Shore, C. (2010b). The reform of New Zealand's university system: 'After neoliberalism'. *Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 1-31.
- Sleeman, J., Lang, C., & Lemon, N. (2016). Social media challenges and affordances for international students: Bridges, boundaries, and hybrid spaces. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(5), 391-415.
- Slonimsky, L. (2018). Teacher change in a changing moral order: Learning from Durkheim. In Barrett, B., Hoadley, U., & Morgan, J. (Eds). *Knowledge, curriculum and equity: Social realist perspectives*. (pp.119-133). London: Routledge.
- Smallwood, S. (2004). Doctor dropout. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(19), Academic OneFile, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A147117054/AONE?u=learn&sid=AONE&xid=e a55260f>.
- Smyth, E., & Banks, J. (2012). 'There was never really any question of anything else': Young people's agency, institutional habitus and the transition to higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33(2), 263-281.
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2012). *Digest of education statistics, 2011. NCES 2012-001*. Washington, DC: National Centre for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Speller, J. R. W. (2011). *Bourdieu and literature*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Stake, J. E., & Nickens, S. D. (2005). Adolescent girls' and boys' science peer relationships and perceptions of the possible self as scientist. *Sex Roles*, 52(1-2), 1-11.
- Steinmetz, G. (2006). Bourdieu's disavowal of Lacan: Psychoanalytic theory and the concepts of "habitus" and "symbolic capital". *Constellations*, 13(4), 445-464.
- Steinmetz, G. (2009). Neo-Bourdieuian theory and the question of scientific autonomy: German sociologists and empire, 1890s–1940s. *Political Power and Social Theory*, 20, 71-131.
- Steinmetz, G. (2011). Bourdieu, historicity, and historical sociology. *Cultural Sociology*, 5(1), 45-66.
- Steinmetz, G. (2013). Towards socioanalysis: The "traumatic kernel" of psychoanalysis and neo-Bourdieuian theory. In Philip S Gorski (Ed.), *Bourdieu and historical analysis* (pp. 108-130). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture & power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Swartz, D. (2013). Metaprinciples for sociological research in a Bourdieuian perspective. In P. S. Gorski (Ed.), *Bourdieu and historical analysis* (pp. 19-35). Durham, USA: Duke University Press.

- Tarrant, J. (1991). Utilitarianism, education and the philosophy of moral insignificance. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 25(1), 59-67.
- Thogersen, S. (1987). China's senior middle schools in a social perspective: A survey of Yantai district, Shandong province. *The China Quarterly*, 109, 72-100.
- Thogersen, S. (1989). Through the sheep's intestines--selection and elitism in Chinese schools. *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, 01 January (21), 29-56.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1), 47-81.
- Tu, W. (1996a). Confucian traditions in east Asian modernity. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 50(2), 12-39.
- Tu, W. (1996b). Introduction. In W. Tu (Ed.), *Confucian traditions in east Asian modernity: Moral education and economic culture in Japan and the four mini-dragons*. (pp. 1-10). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Turner, J. (2011). *Language in the academy: Cultural reflexivity and intercultural dynamics*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual matters.
- Vita, G. D. (2005). Fostering intercultural learning through multicultural group work. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all* (pp. 75-83). London: Routledge.
- Wacquant, L. (2004). Following Pierre Bourdieu into the field. *Ethnography*, 5(4), 387-414.
- Wacquant, L. (2011). Habitus as topic and tool: Reflections on becoming a prize fighter. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 8(1), 81-92.
- Wacquant, L. (2014a). Homines in extremis: What fighting scholars teach us about habitus. *Body & Society*, 20(2), 3-17.
- Wacquant, L. (2014b). Putting habitus in its place: Rejoinder to the symposium. *Body & Society*, 20(2), 118-139.
- Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, J., & Yoon, E. (2016). Becoming an academic: The role of doctoral capital in the field of education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 1-15. doi:10.1080/07294360.2016.1207616.
- Wang, D. (2011). The dilemma of time: Student-centered teaching in the rural classroom in China. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 157-164.

- Wang, F. (2004). Confucian thinking in traditional moral education: Key ideas and fundamental features. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(4), 429-447.
- Wang, Z. (2014). The Chinese dream: Concept and context. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 19(1), 1-13.
- Ward, C. (2001). *The impact of international students on domestic students and host institutions: A literature review*. Wellington, New Zealand: Export Education Policy Project, Ministry of Education.
- Ward, C., & Chang, W. C. (1997). "Cultural fit": A new perspective on personality and sojourner adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21(4), 525-533.
- Ward, C., Masgoret, A. M., Ho, E., Holmes, P., Cooper, J., Newton, J., et al. (2005). *Interactions with international students: Report prepared for education New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Research, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Webb, C. (2008). *Writing for publication: An easy-to-follow guide for any nurse thinking of publishing their work*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Woolard, K. (2005). Language and identity choice in Catalonia: The interplay of contrasting ideologies of linguistic authority. *Paper Presented at the Workshop on Language Ideology and Change in Multilingual Communities, UC San Diego*, Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/47m938c>.
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55-82.
- Wright, S. (1998). The politicization of 'culture'. *Anthropology Today*, 14(1), 7-15. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2783092>.
- Wright, S., & Reinhold, S. (2011). 'Studying through': A strategy for studying political transformation. or sex, lies and British politics. In C. Shore, S. Wright & D. Però (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 86-104). New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Wright, S., & Shore, C. (2003). Coercive accountability: The rise of audit culture in higher education. *Audit cultures* (pp. 69-101) Routledge.
- Wu, B., & Morgan., J. (2016). *Chinese higher education reform and social justice*. Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Wu, F. (2010). How neoliberal is China's reform? the origins of change during transition. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 51(5), 619-631.
- Wu, Y. Q., & Liu, H. Y. (1986). Chuangjian juyou zhongquo tese de xuefenzhi qiantan (Tentative search for the construction of credit system with Chinese characteristics). *Wuhan Daxue Xuebao (Wuhan University Journal)*, (4), 30-36.

- Xiao, H. W. (2014). Chinese universities: Beware cronyism. *Nature*, 515(7528), 492.
- Xu, P. (2007). Analysis of gender differences of students' subject choices (in Chinese). *Journal of Changchun University of Technology* (Higher Education Study Edition), (1), 17-19.
- Yang, R. (2002). University internationalisation: Its meanings, rationales and implications. *Intercultural Education*, 13(1), 81-95.
- Yang, R. (2003). Internationalised while provincialised? A case study of South China Normal University. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 33(3), 287-300.
- Yang, R. (2005). Internationalisation, indigenisation and educational research in China. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(1), 66-88.
- Yang, R. (2014). China's strategy for the internationalization of higher education: An overview. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 151-162.
- Yang, R. (2015). Reassessing China's higher education development: A focus on academic culture. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 16(4), 527-535.
- Yang, R., & Welch, A. (2012). A world-class university in China? the case of Tsinghua. *Higher Education*, 63(5), 645-666.
- Yates, L., Woelert, P., Millar, V., & O'Connor, K. (2016). Knowledge and education in the 21st century. *Knowledge at the crossroads? physics and history in the changing world of schools and universities* (pp. 15-33). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Young, M. F. D. (2008). Bringing knowledge back in: From social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education. London; New York: Routledge.
- Yu, L., & Suen, H. K. (2005). Historical and contemporary exam-driven education fever in China. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 2(1), 17-33.
- Zembylas, M. (2007). Emotional capital and education: Theoretical insights from Bourdieu. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(4), 443-463.
- Zhang, C. (1995). The national university entrance examination and its influence on secondary school physics teaching in China. *Physics Education*, 30(2), 104-108.
- Zhang, Z., & Brunton, M. (2007). Differences in living and learning: Chinese international students in New Zealand. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 124-140.
- Zhao, Y. D., & Deng, D. S. (2011). The occupational orientation of doctoral graduates in China. In W. J. Morgan, & B. Wu (Eds.), *Higher education reform in China: Beyond the expansion* (pp. 109-118). London: Routledge.

- Zhou, J. (2015). International students' motivation to pursue and complete a PhD in the US. *Higher Education*, 69(5), 719-733.
- Zhou, Q. (2007). Some thoughts on "examination economy". *Journal of Changshu Institute of Technology*, 6(6), 23-25.
- Zipin, L., & Brennan, M. (2003). The suppression of ethical dispositions through managerial governmentality: A habitus crisis in Australian higher education. *Int. J. Leadership in Education*, 6(4), 351-370.