



Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Inc

Research and Development in Higher Education: Higher Education in a Globalized World

Volume 37

Refereed papers from the
37th HERDSA Annual International Conference

7 - 10 July 2014
Hong Kong Baptist University
Hong Kong SAR, Peoples Republic of China

Geerlings, L. R. C. & Lundberg, A. (2014). Globalisation and deterritorialisation: An example of an academic discipline in the Malay Archipelago. In A. Kwan, E. Wong, T. Kwong, P. Lau & A. Goody (Eds.), *Research and Development in Higher Education: Higher Education in a Globalized World*, 37 (pp 137 – 146). Hong Kong, 7 – 10 July 2014.

Published 2014 by the
Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Inc
PO Box 27, MILPERRA NSW 2214, Australia
www.herdsa.org.au

ISSN 1441 001X
ISBN 978-0-908557-96-7

This research paper was reviewed using a double blind peer review process that meets DIISR requirements. Two reviewers were appointed on the basis of their independence and they reviewed the full paper devoid of the authors' names and institutions in order to ensure objectivity and anonymity. Papers were reviewed according to specified criteria, including relevance to the conference theme and sub-themes, originality, quality and presentation. Following review and acceptance, this full paper was presented at the international conference.

Copyright © 2014 HERDSA and the authors. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act, 2005, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers at the address above.

Globalisation and deterritorialisation: An example of an academic discipline in the Malay Archipelago.

Lennie R. C. Geerlings

James Cook University Singapore
lennie.geerlings@my.jcu.edu.au

Anita Lundberg

James Cook University, Singapore
anita.lundberg@jcu.edu.au

Understanding the cultural effects of the globalisation of knowledge is of central concern in higher education research. This reading maps an analytical space for research on cultural negotiations in academic disciplines. It re-reads Appadurai's theory of global imaginaries (1996) through Deleuze and Guattari's notion of deterritorialisation (1983; 1994; 2005), and applies it to the study of clinical psychology education in the Malay Archipelago. Deleuze and Guattari's deterritorialisation concept provides insights into the cultural subtleties of transnational education and the dynamics of change in academic disciplines. The case study illustrates that disciplines are themselves territories, changing from within, as well as with geographical movement. This analytic inquiry provides a preliminary mapping of clinical psychology territories in the Malay Archipelago through an anthropological approach, it concludes with directions for further research.

Keywords: Globalisation of knowledge, social imaginary, de/reterritorialisation

Introduction: A knowledge perspective

Higher education is of central importance in today's globalising world. It has become an important instrument for economic competition on a global scale, especially as newly industrialised countries are changing their production-based economies into knowledge-based ones (Sidhu, 2009). Consequently, in addition to their traditional roles as providers for knowledge and pedagogical needs, universities are expected to cater to the economic and nation-building requirements of newly industrialised countries (Luke, 2006). Universities are expected to educate the future workforce, to attract foreign talent and investments, and to generate international prestige. This is especially evident in the move towards world-class education (Knight, 2011).

The global marketplace of education brings new opportunities and challenges. A consequence of globalisation is that higher education programmes are increasingly commercialised, internationalised and standardised (Findlay & Tierney, 2010). To reach their commercial goals, universities intensify international collaborations in research and teaching, promote their degrees transnationally and try to attract large numbers of international students (Knight, 2011). This market-driven environment provides fertile soil for the internationalisation of education, driven by the rationale that students should be prepared for global citizenship and for working in transnational environments (Bourn, 2011). This has resulted in a need for global knowledge and skills that are deemed universally applicable, and has spurred the development of standardised accreditation for university degrees. The drive towards generic

global curricula, however, is at the expense of local specialism and knowledge (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). The intersection of internationalisation and standardisation of knowledge may problematically result in educational homogenisation (Chan & Lo, 2008; Luke, 2006).

There is a need to understand the cultural effects of globalisation of knowledge, especially in relation to cultural imperialism. Higher education programs have always been instruments for establishing 'truths' and impressing cultural values (Bourn, 2011). Under conditions of globalisation, the effects of academic programs are more extensive than ever. Globalised education produces effects of epistemic hegemonies across countries and cultures (Rizvi, 2007), influences our imaginaries of the world, and shapes our alliances and relationships to it (Bourn, 2011). Theoretically, internationalisation of academic disciplines can provide space for cultural negotiation (Yang, 2010), at the same time, however, disciplines can become vehicles for cultural imperialism. This may be the case where Anglo-American academic traditions are taking a leading role in defining knowledge and research practices (Ng, 2012; Yang, 2005). Cultural imperialism represents a central challenge in today's education landscape.

This paper aims to advance our understanding of the tension between cultural negotiation and imperialism, by mapping cultural impacts on academic disciplines. It provides an example of clinical psychology education in the Malay Archipelago. Clinical psychology is the specialist field of psychology, taught as a postgraduate degree, that focuses on mental health and illness (American Psychological Association [APA], n.d.). Clinical psychology is an especially relevant case study of the cultural effects of globalisation of education as it explicitly prescribes cultural norms for behaviour and mental processes. Clinical psychology was introduced in the Malay Archipelago, a region between South-East Asia and Australia, including Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore, during colonialism (Geerlings, Lundberg & Thompson, 2013). Over the last two decades, clinical psychology has increasingly been criticised for being a 'western' ethnocentric discipline and of limited relevance outside the 'western' world (e.g. Arnett, 2008; Fernando, 2003; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Thakker & Ward, 1998). Clinical psychology thus represents a 'western' cultural influence, that potentially has imperialist effects. Regardless, clinical psychology is of growing popularity in the Malay Archipelago, and further outside the 'western' world.

Through Appadurai's theory of global imaginaries (1996) and Deleuze and Guattari's notion of deterritorialisation (1983; 1994; 2005), this paper analyses the cultural effects on globalisation of education. It is divided into six sections. The first two sections outline Appadurai's (1996) theory, and argue that although it greatly contributes to understanding globalised knowledge, it paradoxically risks portraying academic disciplines and cultures as fixed and homogenous due to an implicit reliance on a geographical notion of deterritorialisation. The third section argues that cultural change can take place intrinsically, without the proviso of geographical movement. It is argued that Deleuze and Guattari's (1983; 1994; 2005) notion of what we call *abstract deterritorialisation* may advance insights into the cultural complexity and dynamics of change within academic disciplines. The fourth and fifth sections apply a re-reading of Appadurai (1996) through Deleuze and Guattari (1983; 1994; 2005) to the study of academic disciplines and to the example, indicating that clinical psychology has mapped different territories in the Malay Archipelago. The paper concludes with directions for further anthropological inquiry.

Appadurai's global flows and imaginaries

Appadurai (1996) analysed globalisation through a cultural lens (Marginson & Sawir, 2006; Yang, 2006); his theory provides an important anthropological perspective on cultural changes in the modern world. Appadurai argues that in the current “global cultural economy”, America is no longer the single navigator of globalisation, but has become a mere “node of a complex transnational construction of imaginary landscapes” (1996, p. 27, 31). In other words, globalisation does not just entail Americanisation or McDonaldisation (e.g. Ritzer, 2007), but encompasses cultural homogenising and diversifying forces simultaneously. Globalisation processes thus have more complex effects than one-way cultural imperialism. As he theorises, the current world is characterised by social imaginaries – ‘landscapes’ that depend upon people’s interpretation of encounters with global flows which are always perspectival and dynamic. Imaginary worlds create worldviews, meaning and aspirations, and their tangible and intangible effects are felt when people act upon them. Globalisation thus provides people with power to act or “to imagine otherwise”, to shape their worlds, and to counter imperialism (Yang, 2006, p.208). In brief, global flows are locally articulated, and local imaginaries can have global effects. Cultural homogenisation and heterogenisation occur simultaneously.

Global cultural flows take place within five dimensions: people, information and images, technologies, capital and ideologies. These are called “ethnoscapes”, “mediascapes”, “technoscapes”, “financescapes” and “ideoscapes” respectively (Appadurai, 1996, p. 33). The suffix -scape underlines the subjectivity, irregularity and fluidity of the flows. Scapes are open, ambiguous and fluid-like thought processes that create new and unpredictable perspectives or imaginary worlds (Marginson & Sawir, 2006). Although their structural logic is placeless (Kynäslähti, 1998), global flows can have localised effects. For example, when academics travel across borders to attend conferences, read internationally reviewed publications and collaborate in transnational research networks they encounter each of these scapes which shape an imaginary world of cosmopolitanism, global knowledge, and world-class universities. Universities’ imaginary global settings affect how they are redesigned by policymakers, university management, teachers, and students (Powell & Steel, 2011).

Specifically relevant to the study of globalisation of education is the extension of Appadurai’s theory with the notion of eduscapes (Caluya, Probyn & Byas, 2011; Forstorp & Mellström, 2013; Kynäslähti, 1998; Luke, 2006). Eduscapes create a “horizontal integrative landscape in the field of education” (Kynäslähti, 1998, p. 154). Flows of ideas, ideologies about education, and nodes of epistemic, ethnic and learning communities, technologies and knowledge centres create world-wide networks of eduscapes, which constitute a realm of cultural imaginary (Forstorp & Mellström, 2013). Similar to Appadurai’s five dimensions of scapes, encounters with eduscapes create imaginaries that shape actions of individuals and collectives. Eduscapes allow people to imagine and redesign higher education.

Deterritorialisation of global flows

According to Appadurai, globalisation involves increasing *deterritorialisation* of global flows. This term, originally coined by Deleuze and Guattari (1983), becomes in Appadurai’s use a description in terms of “overseas movement”, “chasing around the world”, “travel”, and “displacement” (1996, p. 38). In this articulation, deterritorialisation takes place when flows of people, technologies, information, money and ideas cross geographical territories – invoking images of water, flooding or soaking (Marginson & Sawir, 2006). Flows are imagined to be unstoppable fluid processes; the opposite of static and delineated geographical

territories. Briefly, Appadurai's notion of deterritorialisation rests upon the crossing of territorial boundaries, and suggests that globalisation is tied to geographical movement.

A risk of this geographical use of the term is that it may unwillingly pivot around essentialisms. Geographical deterritorialisation is assumed to obscure borders; however, paradoxically, in order to become borderless, territories need to be at first bordered. The notion of borderlessness thus inadvertently invokes an imaginary of original homogenised bordered territories, which may problematically reify national borders and geographical boundaries (Lundberg, Stasiewicz-Bieńkowska, & Enhörning Singhateh, 2012). A similar process may occur in the study of cultures. Appadurai (1996) rejects the idea of culture as being fixed, homogenous and spatially bounded; instead he regards culture as a dynamic result of the interplay of local and global forces. According to this glocalisation thesis, globalisation creates hybrid and translocal cultural forms. However, in order to become translocal, cultural forms have to be tied to geographical places at some stage. This poses a central problem in the study of culture. In this conceptualisation, cultures are located as the place "from which *something begins its presencing*" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5, italics in original) and they are described by their margins and borders – ever incommensurable. In summary, spatial metaphors of flow implicitly rely on stasis and fixed territories, and may indirectly reify geographical boundaries and localised culture.

Deleuze and Guattari's deterritorialisation

Deterritorialisation was first coined by Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus* (1983 [1972]) to describe processes of making and remaking. In their more recent collaboration, *A Thousand Plateaus* (2005 [1980]), the authors defined the term as "the movement by which 'one' leaves the territory" (p. 508). Through "lines of flight", deterritorialisation sets free movements of change that are immanent in territories (2005, p. 9). In other words, this process decontextualises seemingly stable relations, patterns or notions of 'things' to prepare them for different or more distant actualisation (Parr, 2010). Deterritorialisation thus makes things or relations virtual. Here the term virtuality, rather than referring to virtual-reality or computer technology, should be understood as a realm of potentialities that may become materialised. When things are (re)materialised they become part of the actual realm, and can be witnessed in the world around us (Hillier & Abrahams, 2013). The virtual represents a domain of "*becoming without being*" (Delanda, 2002, p. 84, emphasis in original), and deterritorialisation represents an inherent virtualising process.

According to Deleuze and Guattari, deterritorialisation is not confined to geographical territories but can take place in any physical, mental or spiritual domain (1994). For example, an academic discipline could be a territory, consisting of domains of knowledge, rules and products that are maintained, defined and utilised differently by collectives. Other examples provided in *What is philosophy* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994 [1991]) do include territories of earth, geology and geography, states and cities, but also art, capitalism, property, people, language, dreams, music, fetishisms and philosophy. In our paper, the processes of deterritorialisation of these diverse domains is referred to as *abstract deterritorialisation*. This represents a more inclusive conceptualisation of deterritorialisation in comparison to Appadurai's (1996) geographical use of the term. Abstract deterritorialisation does not depend on geographical movement, but represents inherent movement and change.

Deterritorialisation is always intertwined with processes of *reterritorialisation*. This does not simply refer to a return of loose movements or relations to the same or to a different

geographical territory. It is better understood as a process of recombining elements and of remaking relations. This process of change requires interpretation, recoding and reactualisation. Reterritorialisation takes place continuously– often simultaneously– with processes of deterritorialisation. For example, academic disciplines are reterritorialised each time disciplinary knowledge is interpreted and applied in publications or classrooms. De- and reterritorialisation are continuous processes of inherent change.

Re-reading Appadurai in the study of academic disciplines

When Appadurai's theory of global imaginaries is re-read through a Deleuze-Guattarian notion of abstract deterritorialisation and applied to the study of academic disciplines it sets up an understanding that academic disciplines are themselves territories, changing inherently – as well as with movement across territories. De- and reterritorialisations of disciplines are influenced by the social imaginary of global flows and knowledge, and they become part of illusory eduscapes. This re-reading provides insights into change in academic disciplines, which leads to a more nuanced understanding of cultural impacts. This demonstrates that the notion of imperialism relies on unidirectional change, or linear development, while, in fact, change is immanent and omnipresent. These insights open up an analytical space for anthropological inquiry into the cultural effects of globalisation of knowledge in which cultures are not essentialised or territorialised but are loosely defined as influences on de- and reterritorialisation.

The re-reading of the global imaginaries theory through abstract deterritorialisation highlights plasticity in academic disciplines. Academic disciplines are continuously virtualised and reactualised; they are constructed and deconstructed by different persons, in different times, contexts, situations and places. Virtualisation processes are influenced by the social imaginary and eduscapes, and lead to a variety of actualisations. As a result, development of academic disciplines is not linear, but instead pushes and pulls in multiple directions. Analytically, it is therefore fruitful to define academic disciplines as territories that change internally. Disciplines hold the potential for various actualisations. This allows a shift in understanding – the discipline of clinical psychology is no longer regarded as homogenous and with a linear development, but is instead perceived as constantly becoming.

This re-reading invites a more nuanced understanding of potential cultural impacts on academic disciplines. Because abstract deterritorialisation does not depend on geographical movement, cultural impacts on academic disciplines are also freed from territoriality. This opens a critical anthropological space for inquiry in which cultures are bound to imaginaries rather than geographies. It brings depth to an analysis of the tensions between cultural negotiation and imperialism in higher education. A concept such as 'western' does not refer to a cultural essence, although it may refer to an imaginary part of the world that is divided into 'east' and 'west'. Importantly, academic disciplines can have different actualisations in one region, country, group or even in one individual. Therefore, cultural impacts are subtle and dynamic, making cultures difficult to delineate or define. The result is a diverse landscape of cultural negotiations in academic disciplines.

Cultural impacts can be found in any de/reterritorialisation of clinical psychology. For example, the American Psychological Association (APA) tries, through standardisation of training and practice, to pin down lines of flight through which clinical psychology diversifies. Standardisation should be understood as a specific actualisation of clinical psychology, and as a way through which the APA exerts cultural influence on the discipline. The APA's closing

of the clinical psychology territory is materialised through, among other processes, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), standardised curricula, and guidelines for practice. These canonical bodies of knowledge and skill become “fixed spaces of enclosure”, or manifestations of dominant discourses that are considered universally applicable and appropriate (Edwards & Usher, 2000, p. 66). They become part of the eduscape of clinical psychology. In addition to the APA, other actors, such as states or regional governments, universities, lecturers, supervisors, students, and clients de- and reterritorialise clinical psychology. Each reactualisation represents a cultural negotiation.

Tracing and mapping clinical psychology

Geographical and abstract deterritorialisation each offer a distinct way of analysing clinical psychology. In this section we undertake a geographical tracing and deterritorialised mapping of clinical psychology in the Malay Archipelago – Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia.

Read as geographical deterritorialisation, clinical psychology in the Malay Archipelago is analysed as an appropriation of externally originating knowledge flows. According to such an analysis, the origins of clinical psychology would be traced to Europe and the United States of America. From the late 19th century onwards, knowledge flows in psychology were exchanged between these regions in conjunction with movements of scholars, academic publications, scientific technologies, research budgets, and scholarships. In the early 20th century when scholars and their concomitant knowledge practices travelled to Australia and the Malay Archipelago under colonial rule, EuroAmerican clinical psychology was deterritorialised and reterritorialised in Australia and the Malay Archipelago (Geerlings, Thompson & Lundberg, forthcoming). According to this analysis, when these new education programs in clinical psychology were established at the end of the 20th century, they remained highly dependent upon foreign expertise up to at least the turn of the century (Geerlings, Lundberg & Thompson, 2013).

The above history represents a *tracing* of geographical deterritorialisation of clinical psychology. A tracing seeks to document activities or objects in time, in a search for origins and structures (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005). To understand how an academic discipline has geographically deterritorialised, a linear trajectory of its physical journey is outlined. From a cultural perspective, a geographical tracing invokes the idea of an imperialistic knowledge flow of clinical psychology from ‘west’ to ‘east’. This return to cultural imperialism, or even to the Occident influencing the Orient (Said, 1978), may inspire unrealistic notions of homogenous history, politics, identity and culture that fail to recognise the plural, multivocal and intertwined nature of cultures, countries and regions (Spivak, 2008). This simplification intrinsic in tracings may be greatly advanced when complemented by mappings. Mapping is “oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real”, has “multiple entryways”, is changeable, and is subject to multiple interpretations (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 12). Consequently, cartography may better represent nuances of cultural influence and dynamics of change than tracings. In addition, cartography moves away from essentialised territories and identities, and underlines the interplay between geographic and abstract deterritorialisation.

A mapping of clinical psychology education in the Malay Archipelago illustrates that regardless of the discipline’s ability to transverse domains while retaining some scientific ‘essence’, clinical psychology’s knowledge and practices are changing immanently when they are subject to interpretation and reactualisation. Although abstract deterritorialisation is not

bound to country borders, for readability purposes this section is divided into three parts: Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia. This preliminary cartography of clinical psychology territories opens up to different interpretations and readings. It should be noted that the reality is far more complex: clinical psychology territories are numerous, intertwined, always in becoming stasis *and* flow. However, in practice, as investigations of the movement of academic disciplines rely on data that traces ‘developments’ in disciplines, it becomes clear that mappings require different and more nuanced data.

For instance, clinical psychology education in Singapore appears as a relatively homogenous construct that developed in conjunction with the spread of EuroAmerican and Australian clinical psychology. Psychology education was introduced in Australia by the British as early as 1890, and developed rapidly after World War II. In 1952, a visiting Colombo Plan lecturer from Australia introduced clinical psychology at the National University of Singapore (NUS) (Long, 1987). Today, this university provides a Singapore-based clinical psychology program, plus a joint program with the University of Melbourne, in which students undertake half of their studies in Australia (NUS, 2013). The second university in Singapore that offers clinical psychology education is Australian-owned, and teaches a standardised and accredited Australian curriculum (JCU Singapore, 2014). The clinical psychology curricula taught at the two universities in Singapore show striking resemblances. Both curricula consist of similar coursework, practical and research components, and some courses carry the same name. In other words, Singapore’s reterritorialisation of clinical psychology closely resembles Australian territories, which appropriated EuroAmerican territories. However, as argued previously, cultural negotiation takes place on multiple levels. A nuanced investigation of ways of teaching and practicing clinical psychology is required in order to understand and map various de/reterritorialisations of clinical psychology in Singapore.

Clinical psychology has mapped different territories in Malaysia. When the government called for more Malaysian psychologists in the 1970s (Ward, 1987; Khan, Verna & Subba, 2012), it created multiple movements of change in which clinical psychology was reterritorialised into Malaysian actualisations. One of the aims of the Psychology Department at the National University of Malaysia was to study psychological processes related to “local society and cultures” (Ward, 1987, p. 206). This reconstruction of clinical psychology can also be witnessed in the second university that offers clinical psychology, HELP University. This private university teaches coursework on socio-cultural integration of clinical psychology (HELP University, 2012). Clinical psychology has thus been reactualised to better serve socio-cultural needs that were identified by the Malaysian government. There is room for inquiry about how these socio-cultural needs were imagined and reconstructed in curricula, practices and policies. In addition, it is likely that needs for ‘Malaysianness’ were understood and actualised in variable ways.

In Indonesia, clinical psychology has created multiple territories. After independence in 1945, the assessment clinics and the Army Center of Psychology that were established by Dutch experts were handed over to the Indonesian state. Clinical psychology has since been in service of nation-building (Munandar & Munandar, 1987). The need for nationally trained psychologists was met with the official establishment of the Faculty of Psychology at the University of Padjadjaran in 1961 (Munandar & Munandar, 1978) after which other universities followed. Although Indonesian clinical psychology programs strongly resembled Dutch ones and are still connected to Dutch universities today (Satiadarma, 2012), they were gradually aligned with state ideology and the Indonesian language. However, in addition, other clinical psychology territories have developed in Indonesia based on Islam and

Christianity. These religiously inspired clinical psychology programs are constructed and deconstructed in five private universities. There is room for inquiry about the various ways in which ‘Indonesianness’, ‘Muslimness’, and ‘Christianness’ are interpreted and actualised.

Conclusion: New spaces in the study of higher education

Globalisation of education involves processes of de/reterritorialisation of academic disciplines that are influenced by the social imaginary and take place both intrinsically as well as with geographical movement. This paper theorises how clinical psychology changes as it moves across geographical territories as well as in its daily applications. Academic disciplines are in continuous change; they are themselves territories, mapping their terrains. Movements of change are pinned down by various entities who create fixed spaces of enclosure, such as curricula and books, that generate the imaginary of global knowledge flows and globalised education. Fixed spaces of enclosure, however, are also subject to continuous deconstruction and reconstruction. In conclusion, deterritorialising entities create complex landscapes of cultural impacts on academic disciplines, while change is inherent in academic disciplines.

This paper problematised cultural imperialism through globalisation of education, and has looked for ways in which imperialism is undermined. Resistance towards powerful disciplines is omnipresent and takes place each time disciplinary knowledge and practices are interpreted and applied. Nevertheless, some disciplinary territories remain more powerful than others – such as the dominance of EuroAmerican clinical psychology scholarship in Australia and Singapore illustrated. On the one hand, this paper suggested that people resist cultural influence through the power to imagine, and to change and redesign academic scholarship and practices. On the other hand, the social imaginary of what is considered adequate science, knowledge and practices is not unrestricted, causing some knowledges and practices to be more powerful than others (Yang, 2006). Entities such as the APA, governments, academic journals, teachers, students and therapists control the imaginary of what ‘counts’ as clinical psychology, restricting certain actualisations of the discipline. A challenge in today’s globalised education is to resist cultural homogenisation of knowledge and to nurture diverse and inclusive educational imaginaries.

With a re-reading of Appadurai’s social imaginary through Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of abstract deterritorialisation, this paper has mapped analytical spaces of cultural negotiation at the territories of academic disciplines. These analytical spaces open up further study of the cultural effects on globalisation of knowledge. Anthropology provides a unique vantage point from which these effects can be studied. Anthropology has dedicated itself to the study of culture from postcolonial and anti-imperialist perspectives, and it is the discipline that has established a sustained critique of its own colonial origins (Eriksen, 2001). In line with developments in anthropology that argue against cultural essentialism, a research focus on the subjective and lived experiences of teaching, learning and practicing clinical psychology in the Malay Archipelago would help understand how fixed spaces of enclosure are re/deterritorialised in daily practices, and how people resist cultural imperialism through education.

References

- American Psychological Association (n.d.). *About clinical psychology*. Retrieved December 12, 2013, from <http://www.apa.org/divisions/div12/aboutcp.html>
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large. Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN; London, United Kingdom: University of Minnesota Press.

- Arnett, J.J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602-14.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Routledge
- Bourn, D. (2011). From internationalisation to global perspectives. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 559-571.
- Caluya, G., Probyn, E., & Vyas, S. (2011). 'Affective eduscapes': The case of Indian students within Australian international higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 41(1), 85-99.
- Chan, D., & Lo, W. (2008). University restructuring in East Asia: Trends, challenges and prospects. *Policy Futures in Education*, 6(5), 641-652.
- Delanda, M. (2002). *Intensive science and virtual philosophy*. London, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H.R. Lane, Trans.). London, United Kingdom; Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1972).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson, & G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1991).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005). *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). London, United Kingdom; Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980).
- Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2000). *Globalization and pedagogy: Space, place and identity*. London, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Routledge/Falmer.
- Eriksen, T.H. (2001). *Small places, large issues. An introduction to social and cultural anthropology*. London, United Kingdom: Pluto Press.
- Fernando, S. (2003). *Cultural diversity, mental health and psychiatry: The struggle against racism*. Hove, United Kingdom; New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Findlay, C., & Tierney W.G. (Eds.) (2010). *Globalisation and tertiary education in the Asia-Pacific: The changing nature of a dynamic market*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
- Forstorp, P.A., & Mellström, U. (2013). Eduscapes: Interpreting transnational flows of higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 11(3), 335-358.
- Geerlings, L.R.C., Thompson, C., & Lundberg, A. (forthcoming). Educating the tropics? A case of clinical psychology in Australia and the Malay Archipelago. *Journal of Tropical Psychology*.
- Geerlings, L.R.C., Lundberg, A., & Thompson, C. (2013). Transnational psychology: A case study of South East Asia. In: P. Mandal (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Managing the Asian Century* (pp. 73-79). Singapore: Springer.
- HELP University (2012). *Master of clinical psychology*. Retrieved January 26, 2014 from: <http://www.help.edu.my/psychology/programmes/master-of-clinical-psychology.html>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S.J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83.
- Hillier, J., & Abrahams, G. (2013). *Deleuze and Guattari. Jean Hillier in conversation with Gareth Abrahams*. Exploring Foundations for Planning Theory. Retrieved December 23, 2013, from http://www.aesop-planning.eu/downloads/Other/en_GB/aesop-ya-booklet-series-a-vol-1-deluze-and-guattari-jean-hillier-in-conversation-with-gareth-abrahams.
- JCU Singapore (2014). *Master of Psychology (Clinical)*. Retrieved January 26, 2014 from <http://www.jcu.edu.sg/Home/Courses/tabid/70/CourseID/67/Default.aspx>
- Khan, A., Verma, S. & Subba, U.K. (2012). History, development and current status of psychology in Malaysia. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47(suppl.1), 459-466.
- Knight, J. (2011). Education hubs: A fad, a brand, an innovation? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(3), 221-240.
- Kynäslähti, H. (1998). *Considerations on eduscapes*. Department of Teacher Education, Media Education Centre, University of Helsinki. Retrieved January 24, 2014, from <http://hrast.pef.uni-lj.si/~joze/podiplomci/FRI/mep8/Kynaslahti.pdf>.
- Luke, C. (2006). Eduscapes: Knowledge capital and cultures. *Studies in Language and Capitalism*, 1: 97-120.
- Long, F.Y. (1987). Psychology in Singapore: Its roots, context and growth. In: G.H. Blowers & A.M. Turtle (Eds.), *Psychology Moving East. The status of western psychology in Asia and Oceania* (pp. 223-248). London, United Kingdom: Westview Press.
- Lundberg, A., Stasiewicz-Bieńkowska, A., & Enhörning Singhateh, A. (2012). Border crossing networks: Virtual reality. In S. Fan, T. Le, Q. Le, & Y. Yue (Eds.) *Innovative research in a changing and challenging world* Conference Proceedings.
- Marginson S., & Sawir, E. (2006). Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 3(3), 281-309.

- Munandar, S.C.U., & Munandar, A.S. (1987). Psychology in Indonesia: Its past, present and future. In: G.H. Blowers & A.M. Turtle (Eds.) (pp. 249-263), *Psychology moving east. The status of western psychology in Asia and Oceania*. Boulder, CO, and London, England: Westview Press.
- National University of Singapore (2013). *Department of psychology. Programmes*. Retrieved January 20, 2014 from http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/psy/_clinical/prog.htm.
- Ng, S.W. (2012). Rethinking the mission of internationalization of higher education in the Asia-Pacific region. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 42(3), 439-459.
- Parr, A. (2010). *The Deleuze dictionary*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Powell J.L., & Steel, R. (2011). Revisiting Appadurai: Globalizing scapes in a global world – the pervasiveness of economic and cultural power. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research*, 1: 74-80.
- Rizvi, F. (2007). Postcolonialism and Globalization in Education. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 256-263.
- Said, E.W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Satiadarma, M.P. (2012). Indonesian Clinical Psychologists in Brief History. *International Association of Applied Psychology*, 1(1), 9-10.
- Sidhu, R. (2009). Running to stay still in the knowledge economy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(3), 237-253.
- Spivak, G.C. (2008). *Other Asias*. Malden, MA; Oxford, United Kingdom; Victoria, Canada: Blackwell Publishing.
- Svensson, L., & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education*, 60: 595-613.
- Thakker, J., & Ward, T. (1998). Culture and classification: The cross-cultural application of the DSM-IV. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 18 (5), 501-529.
- Ward, C. (1987). The historical development and current status of psychology in Malaysia. In: G.H. Blowers & A.M. Turtle (Eds.), *Psychology moving east. The status of western psychology in Asia and Oceania* (pp. 201-222). London, United Kingdom: Westview Press.
- Yang, R. (2005). Internationalisation, indigenisation and educational research in China. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49: 66-88.
- Yang, R. (2006). What counts as 'scholarship'? Problematizing education policy research in China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 207-221.
- Yang, R. (2010). University internationalisation: Its meanings, rationales and implications. *Intercultural Education*, 13(1), 81-95.

Copyright © 2014 Lennie R. C. Geerlings and Anita Lundberg. The authors assign to HERDSA and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive license to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive license to HERDSA to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime site and mirrors) and within the portable electronic format HERDSA 2014 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.