
Anthropology in No Man's Land¹: Methodological challenges in the study of international educational cooperation

MARIT SUNDET

PhD in Cultural Anthropology

Professor of Sociology, Nord University, Norway

A member of the Academic Leadership Team at the University of the Arctic

ABSTRACT

This article addresses the challenges of being a participant observer in a non-established culture. The traditional method assumes that the anthropologist will learn to understand the other from the social and cultural assumptions the other is born into. In what I define here as No Man's Land, such conditions exist only to a limited extent. This text discusses the complexities in such a research situation.

INTRODUCTION

As Geertz (1973) defines culture, he includes both the procedural and structural aspects in demonstrating how we spin a web of meanings while simultaneously getting caught up in the web we spin ourselves. But is it possible to imagine a place, a context, or a sphere where such a web does not exist? In this article, I endeavour to describe such a context; where there is no common culture surrounding foundational perceptions and regulatory ideas and norms that are shared by a cooperating fellowship. The article is an attempt to illustrate some of the methodological challenges I face as a participant observer, when the people I'm studying have got caught in their own particular webs while the cooperation mandates that we spin something together that will have regulatory power over the choices and actions that concern the fellowship's goals and intentions. First and foremost, the depiction of this context aims to focus

on structures rather than processes. The context, more specifically, is set in a cooperation led by me of higher education institutions in Russia and Norway.

This context is distinguished by the fact that, as a researcher, I'm continuously faced with peculiar methodological challenges. On their own, they are not unfamiliar to anyone who has read about or taken on the role of participant observer. It is nevertheless difficult to find literature that helps to clarify the choices one should make when the prerequisites for field work, in many contexts, only correspond to a limited degree with method-book theorems. The intention of this article, therefore, is to describe and query some of the methodological dilemmas I have been confronted with as both participant observer and policy advisor in and for a context where the core elements of the culture lack essential content.

This question is much more significant and touches on far more aspects of internationalization than may initially appear as an empirical foundation with strange and unusual characteristics. First and rightly so, it relates to undefined methodological research questions. However, it also elucidates a series of unanswered questions that come to the surface when internationalization of higher education must be translated from an initiative set by nationally and institutionally political agencies and, subsequently, dropped into an untried practice. The initiatives refer to wishes and intentions, but practice has to do with finding out how – trying out ways of taking action that realize the wishes and intentions. The study of practice requires a distanced proximity, while my standpoint is right in the middle, as the individual who substantially formulates practice along with others, who have diverging motives, represent other values and norms, and look at their mission with different eyes than I do.

In the following, I will first clarify why “No Man’s Land” is a fitting and valid metaphor. Thereafter, I will more closely address the methodological challenges confronting me. I will then illustrate how the challenges appear and why they are not so easily managed. Lastly, I will come back to the more general implications of these methodological challenges.

MY NO MAN'S LAND

The first objections to the title of this article arose at a seminar where I presented a particularly incomplete version of a paper on conducting studies in an arena that metaphorically lies between the national regulations and cultural domains of two

countries. At the time, it was argued that “No Man’s Land” referred to the front lines between opposing armies and that, therefore, it was both an inappropriate and directly incorrect term to portray the relation between the countries studied. I would have agreed if not for the fact that the military definition of “No Man’s Land” is neither the only nor the original one. Many people immediately associate the term with a war zone, mostly because it symbolizes the hideous space between trenches and because it has developed a hegemonic definition through extensive literature and film production on the topic.

My empirical standpoint is not located between opposing parties but rather between different cultures. In this case, “No Man’s Land” must be understood in the way the term was first used to characterize an area outside of London with no incontrovertible claims of ownership. This both gives No Man’s Land an unambiguous and concrete meaning, and points to the ambiguity that occurs when it is unclear what is possible and impossible to undertake within a certain area. In this regard, No Man’s Land also refers to the abstract and the undefined that lies between categories such as lawlessness and judicial regulation, what we presume to be moral and immoral, what we see as negotiation and aggression, noise and signals, and what is considered humorous versus vulgar.² No Man’s Land, in this definition, does not refer to a landscape but to situations and circumstances in which traditions, opinion structures, laws, and regulations do not help to clarify uncertainty and ambiguity.

It is in just such a context that I have taken on a double role as active participant and observing researcher. The participant role is connected to an educational cooperation between one Norwegian and several Russian universities. In the researcher’s role, I’m meant to analyse and explain what characterizes the processes that exist within this cooperation. And because a large part of these processes arise in the midst of a No Man’s Land, I also come across methodological challenges that have the same ambiguities as the phenomena I’m meant to study. As participant I need to take positions on questions of right and wrong that are not easily clarified by referencing the norms and regulations of the two countries, because each one holds perceptions of right and wrong that often do not coincide. As researcher, I should not only be an observer and keep a distance from my own and others’ actions. At the same time, from a Goffman perspective, I need to go backstage as much with myself as I do with the other participants. Contrary to the ideal for participant observation, I’m an active policy advisor in the endeavour to transform our cooperative field from being a No Man’s Land to becoming an arena with more unambiguous and clarified prerequisites for mutual action. Hindsight is not only

a ghost that quietly sneaks its way into reasoning as often as it sits on the tongue and the pen. When the context is unsettled, the terms and conditions are diffuse, the goals are fluctuating, the routines are few, the experiences lacking, the speaking skills limited, and “yes” and “no” are dichotomies; it is not possible to be sure of the underlying intentions and reasons for the choices and actions of others.

With experience from many field studies in which the purpose has been to uncover cultural and social patterns and frameworks that I knew existed, I found that the same project offers other methodological challenges in which these patterns and frameworks are largely not established – in which I, as researcher, am also the one meant to formulate such opinion- and behaviour-regulating structures. My concern, therefore, touches not only on the question of what the most important methodological differences and challenges are between a traditional cultural study and a study of life in No Man's Land. It also encompasses the question of whether it is possible and responsible to study oneself in the role of working so concretely with others to construct the reality in which the study takes place.

Since 2008, I have been leader for the Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies (BCS), a degree programme shared between one Norwegian (Nord University 2016) and seven Russian universities. The practical cooperative work required to run the programme occurs within a network consisting of coordinators in Russia, and teachers and study leadership at the Norwegian university. These higher education institutions (HEIs) got connected through the programme at the beginning of the 2000s, and the BCS network has been described and discussed in many places since (Sundet 2015, 2016a, 2016b, and 2016c).

THREE METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

According to Hammersley and Atkinson (2005), field research exploits the ability every social actor possesses to learn from new cultures. They point out that, even when researching a society they are relatively familiar with, there is a prerequisite for participatory observers to treat this environment as “anthropologically foreign” in their efforts to illuminate the implicit conditions of the cultural circle in which they themselves are rooted (Hammersley and Atkinson 2005, 29). These references are based on the idea that researchers find themselves either in a “new” and unknown culture or in a culture that they are a part of. In other words, both cases require that the field research take place in an already existing and established culture.

My current research field, however, is not distinguished by such characteristics. It does not exist in an established culture and lacks the type of structures that are manifested and take place as intuitive truisms and classifications in people, such as those that regulate their behaviour and interpretations of contexts while simultaneously generating collective cultural references. On the contrary, all of those involved in my research field appear, first and foremost, as representations of different cultures and institutions while standing for values, norms, ideas, and rationales that are often incompatible. They are brought together for the purpose of making an international educational cooperation work. They know why they come together but, as a fellowship, they do not know for certain how they should move forward, what may be undoubtedly considered as important or insignificant, desirable and acceptable, or what is always right and wrong. Nobody has ownership of the field, nobody owns the situation, and it is unclear what one can or cannot do, should or should not take on. The field is a meeting place in No Man's Land, in the original definition of the term.

A natural objection to my perspective could be that I do not need to be concerned about what is not there, but rather should direct my gaze towards processes in which the actors eventually fill this pre-cultural field and episodic forum with content. The alternative, in other words, would be to study how this No Man's Land was populated and socialized and how the same core elements that make up every culture grew and reflected, over time, the field's context-specific opinions, norms, and values. Such a study would describe how the field gained owners and was regulated by their own rules that were formulated by their own regime.

Such an objection would be the natural choice if it also helped to resolve the three methodological challenges this article deals with. Two of these challenges are tied to my roles as participant and observer. The third is connected to the peculiar structures in which this educational cooperation is embedded. I share the assessment by Hammersley and Atkinson (2005) that it is not possible to isolate a set of data that is "untainted" by the researcher, and that the reflexive character of societal research has its origins in the awareness that we participate in the social world we are studying. Nonetheless, I would face greater methodological challenges if the role as participant were to overshadow that of researcher. With a research field set in an established culture, one of my problems is therefore that the researcher will not be able to influence the deep structures of the culture. Where such deep structures do not exist, or at least can be said to have little regulatory power, the researcher's participation will be a methodological challenge. More pointedly, it may be asserted that while a participant observer is normally subor-

dinate and must unconditionally integrate him/herself into the culture being studied, in my case there is a participant observer who unavoidably influences and even helps to form the core elements of the culture.

The second challenge also corresponds to the participant role and should perhaps be considered more as a reinforcement of the first. While an observer can try to minimize his or her own influence on situations and contexts in order to emphasize the role of researcher as much as possible, in my case this is an option that is difficult to choose. The reason is that I'm the leader of the very network I study, which means that I cannot just abdicate the role whenever necessary and switch over to the role of observer. It would be possible if there were collective regulatory ideas, an established set of norms, integrated routines, and standard procedures for action that prescribed what should be done. Such elements could provide guidance on how problems should be handled, and what is right and wrong, desirable and necessary.

It may still seem natural to exchange the metaphor No Man's Land for the term "limbo", and rather view my research field as a transitional phase between some type of newborn social context and a more developed and rational system for international cooperation. However, that viewpoint deals with processes that I have thoroughly described elsewhere (Sundet 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c). On the contrary, what I'm concerned with here is something that gives rise to a third challenge. It has to do with the structures that create and maintain the situation I characterize with the metaphor of No Man's Land, which cannot be considered as a transitional phase. This is a stable condition without limbo, and the prerequisites for it to change are not present. Because this needs to be illuminated, I will turn to a description of practice, doing so with the use of yet another metaphor.

THE REGULATORY POWER OF A SPEED LIMIT SIGN

It is not possible to offer a precise explanation for how motorists respond to a speed limit sign warning that the speed may not exceed 50 km per hour. One explanation could be connected to the idea that motorists are just as diverse as everyone else and that there will always be some who care less than others about obeying this type of rule. Another could be based on situational conditions, whereby the motorist's assessment is that there is a small probability of meeting the police or other dangers at night or when driving through deserted stretches of road. A third explanation could be that, while in one place there may be a general perception that only inconsiderate

motorists exceed the speed limit, the same sign in another place could be perceived as a suggestion for how much over the speed limit one should beware to drive.

In my double role as participant observer and leader for an international network in higher education, one alternative could be to try not to wield influence by minimizing the regulatory tasks assigned to the leadership role. In other words, I should not put up any speed limit signs but rather observe what has happened and how the situation develops. When putting this into practice, the result was a strong demand for clearer guidelines from the leader (meaning me) and a growing scepticism to a leader (me) who, in the long run, could end up being catastrophic for the future of the cooperation. Metaphorically speaking, my cooperating partners demanded universal and obvious signage.

Alternative two was to put up the sign and just observe how the rest of the network responded to it; again, with the idea of influencing the circumstances as little as possible. However, I was still perceived as a dubious leader. Electronic messages and telephone calls streamed in from individuals in the network who wanted clear explanations and fundamental answers. They wanted to know if 50 km per hour meant 50 km per hour and what the consequences would be if they drove under or over the limit.

The third option was to ask my cooperating partners how they felt we should react to the sign. Aside from the fact that this alternative could, at the very least, reduce my influence somewhat, it also encouraged broader participation and a more democratic process. Additionally it included the opportunity for a learning process in which we, as a fellowship, could develop important and governing understandings and principles. The partners would be able to make meaningful contributions to our otherwise-extinguished mutual cultural chest of drawers. In many ways and in several cases, we have succeeded as a fellowship with this tactic. Nonetheless, for the most part, it seems that what we are able to produce through the joint cultural core elements of this chest of drawers tends to remain there. They contribute to the harmonizing of thoughts and perceptions, norms, values, and visions when we meet and get together. However, when we then part ways, we change back into our civilian clothes and hang up the network uniforms in the closet. Once home again, some of us drive 20 kph while others go 70 kph. Others leave the car in the garage.

Therefore, when I have to use a fourth alternative, out of consideration for the future existence of the educational cooperation, my participant role as leader is further

overshadowed by my task of being an observer. Interestingly enough, I then make my observations as well, and place considerable weight on watching and registering what reactions are caused by me, as acting leader, whether that be in the form of actions or attitudes. This happens when it becomes clear to me that the speed limit is not being followed and that some are driving hazardously while others hold a tempo that causes congested traffic and hinders the progress of the processes. Nobody protests when I subdue some and chase after others while clarifying the message of the speed limit sign. I point to what we have agreed on and the principles we have set for ourselves. My cooperating partners then offer their full support, without exception, to the signs we have put up. At the same time, though, they let me know that some of these signs are unfortunately impossible to employ and live by. Some argue, for example, that a sign cannot be an obstacle to driving fast when they are in a hurry. Others explain that the roads they drive do not make it possible to follow the speed limit and that, therefore, the sign can seem provocative.

THE NETWORK AS A NO MAN'S LAND

The speed limit sign metaphor may be rendered concrete with substantial examples of how those of us in the network are able to agree on guidelines for routines and procedures, what types of information need to be exchanged, and, in particular, why we are meant to cooperate, according to what premises and ideas we must cooperate, and what goals and results we should strive to achieve. Each example will demonstrate that most challenges we face are connected to practical problems and often to insufficient resources such as money, time, attention, and professional competence. In this context, however, it is the causes of the problems that are of interest rather than the problems themselves or the solutions that could be prescribed. For example, an identical question could be asked each member of the network about an agreement or a decision that had just been made. The wording could pertain to what each person felt the agreement was about, how binding the agreement seemed to be, what tasks it involved, and so on. If the questions were asked while we were still physically gathered together, the answers would unanimously concur. However, a while after each member went back to their respective institutions, the questions could be asked again, and the answers would no longer be as uniform and concurrent.

It is not about unreliability and lack of credibility. Nor does it mean that the senior leaders of the HEIs notoriously lay down obstacles for the network members, or otherwise make it difficult for them to live up to the deal that has been entered into. Even though it

can cause problems at times, the explanation is first and foremost systematic. When the agreement is to be implemented back at the home institution, it is translated and adjusted to fit local contextual conditions. In anthropological literature there are infinite empirical examples and theoretical interpretations on such transformational processes (e.g. Bohannan 1966; Rosaldo 1989; Douglas 1991 and 1996; Geertz 1994). Viewed as such, it is elementary that local interpretations of the agreement entered into change the mutual understanding we originally had of what the deal entailed. Thus, initiatives that are taken at the network's annual meetings are considered as abstracts; it is only when they are to be put into practice that the content gains concrete and definitive meaning. It becomes unavoidably characterized by the local context and thereby takes on varied significance and effect, along the same lines as the speed limit sign, depending on where the attempt to implement the initiative occurs.

To varying degrees, the way in which agreements are translated and initiatives coded depends on at least five different types of contextual and substantial characteristics. First, it depends on what the agreements are about and what tasks and resources the initiatives may require. Secondly, it also corresponds with the characteristics of each individual HEI and, among other things, what significance is placed on the educational cooperation, how distinctive institutional features create guidelines, to what degree and in what ways agreements and initiatives are integrated, and how they are interpreted within specific organizationally cultural frameworks. Thirdly, agreements, decisions, and tasks have to be integrated into the respective national educational systems' own logic, different educationally-specific ordinances and general legal conditions. Fourthly, the differences between Russian and Norwegian culture, rooted in norms, values, and fundamental understandings, contribute to the fact that practice often follows what traditions, perceptions, and common sense dictate as reasonable. And fifth, it seems that the fate of agreements is also dependent on the implementation power of local influence, and the amount of energy, competence, and ambition the network participants are capable of putting into their work. All of these circumstances require that practice often takes on a different form and content than was originally agreed to when the network gathered and everyone concurred on all questions that began with what and who, why and how, and which and when.

This makes it clear that the network itself constitutes a No Man's Land. We arrive from each of our corners of the world to discuss our challenges and frustrations, exchange experiences, talk about the future, and make attempts to render ideas and plans concrete. In particular, we try to demonstrate personal interest in one another and in what

each of us is struggling with in our daily lives and work. As such, No Man's Land is a meeting place and an arena for interaction where the participants have different personal as well as institution-dependent prerequisites for their commitment. It is primarily here, where we all physically meet, or just one-on-one electronically, that I'm to take on the role of participant observer. The intention is to study interactive processes up close in order to fill the term, internationalization of higher education, with practice-based inferential content. First and foremost, the identities and loyalties of the Bachelor of Circumpolar Studies network members are tied to their countries, their institutions, and their professional and social networks at home. They come to the BCS network as delegates from independent HEIs and bring along demands, expectations, hopes, and convictions that are not necessarily concurrent with what the other delegates have brought to the table. This means that, aside from their own skills and qualifications, they also participate based on the positions they hold at their respective HEIs and the concessions their leaders allow them to negotiate and enter into agreements.

The task of the individuals in the network is no more concrete than that of being responsible for an international education programme on societal relations in circumpolar regions, having an open discussion about what this should encompass, and coming to agreement on what we will do and how it will happen. We are initially meant to do this with a limited mutual idiomatic repertoire and the help of a foreign language, words and terms that often refer to inconsistently inferred meaning. In other words, the characteristics of this No Man's Land are quite like those associated with the origin of the term; this land is characterized by a lack of clarity and reference to regulatory ideas and norms for how problems and tasks should be understood, what is desirable, possible and right, and how the consequences of choices and actions should be judged.

Secondly, each time we come to an agreement on what should be done and how it should be implemented, the abstract understanding of decisions and agreements is transformed when translated and adjusted to national, institutional, and local contextual prerequisites. Thirdly, a stream of messages, primarily in the form of demands and expectations for what the network should work with characterizes the conversations and, of course, also limits possible decisions taken by the network. More specifically, these are usually directed towards what I must, should, or could consider, facilitate, or do differently as leader. The response, however, is most often positive and certainly appears as an appeal to understand that what we had decided to do as a fellowship did not end up being in line with what we had agreed upon when it was subsequently put into practice. Last but not least, the No Man's Land metaphor is meant as a reminder that

the network's systemic characteristics are relatively static. Because the members of the network are primarily the same individuals who are responsible for implementation of agreements and decisions, that also marks their participation in the network. Even if the social relations between us develop and instil a sense of security and community, this applies first and foremost at the personal level. We still represent different cultures and different institutions and, realistically viewed, our conceptual perception of what we are doing refers constantly to varied contexts. That all exchange of opinions and information occurs in English also means that communication between us is hindered, limited, more superficial than if we could converse in our own languages, and often results in misinterpretations and misunderstandings. Language barriers lead to fewer questions being asked, as little of the ambiguity is clarified and that which is obvious is placed in doubt. The latter is particularly important: the obvious does not have a mutual reference for all of us, and we all go our separate ways thinking that we concur on what to do when we get home.

The only key words that have changed character and content over time are “lack of tradition”, primarily only because the network has established a tradition that helps to maintain its characteristics as a No Man's Land.

NO WAY OUT OF THE PREDICAMENT

A dilemma is usually defined as a choice between two possibilities that will both lead to unwanted or desired results that completely or partially mutually exclude one another. The two methodological dilemmas I face refer to unwanted or uncomfortable choices I need to make when I need to attend to my tasks as leader while also living up to the principles of the scientific use of participant observation. As shown, I have played a strong part in establishing the regulatory norms and guiding values within this context, in addition to having contributed my opinion, to an equally substantial degree, to both the work and the cooperation we are running. This influence I wield is a continuous and decisive part of my responsibility as leader. What is unique with my situation is, thus, that I'm simultaneously meant to be a researcher and observing participant; something that demands, in practice, that I observe myself and the structures and processes I'm not only involved in but which can also be traced back to my own ideas and actions as leader.

It is important to emphasize that this touches little on academic discussions of methodological implications such as “anthropology at home” (Peirano 1998; Lien and Melhus

2011) or “go native” (Pratt 1986, 38; Hastrup 1995, 182). Although the latter is directed towards the relationship between participation, observation, and distance – which are also key terms in this article – the prerequisites for performing “anthropology at home” or “going native” are almost not present. My research field and empirical location are not “at home”, even when I’m at home. And above all, I cannot “go native”, since there are no “natives” (in the original definition of the word) among those I observe. We find ourselves in a No Man’s Land, where rules and frameworks for the interaction I should observe are not established but are rather created during our interaction. This is the core point of my methodological challenges.

Inasmuch as there are no clear methodological rules and guidelines to counsel me in dealing with these professional challenges, the use of academic literature and critical assessment of alternative ways of behaving remains. I have attempted to discover pragmatic solutions, even though compromise may appear as a betrayal of research-based principles and I may seem acquiescent as a leader. The research-based treachery naturally refers to the fact that I’m forced to break with central methodological theorems. Acquiescence points to the network’s practical tasks and strategic objectives; out of consideration for my own research, the fear of being too norm-setting and regulatory can produce dysfunctional repercussions in relation to the network’s core operations. In both areas this may bring to mind the distinction between unexpressed and unapplied rules and theories (Argyris and Schön 1978), whereby that which is unexpressed usually points to what is prescribed and normatively correct, while that which is unapplied characterizes a practice that deviates in important areas from what remains unexpressed. And while the unexpressed issues mirror what we consciously and gladly hold up as important, what is applied is an expression of what is possible or that which contextual conditions dictate as necessary. The dilemma that Argyris and Schön draw on with the term of “expressed and applied” is similar to the confusion of my methodological dilemma. There are no obvious solutions for this, just various ways of handling such dilemmas. What may be the best way of handling it depends on situational circumstances, which are fluctuating and therefore generally unpredictable. For such reasons, I have been least concerned with providing answers and good advice and have been prepared instead to elaborate on my somewhat peculiar methodological research problems.

Having been schooled and trained in a scientific field that places strict requirements on credibility and living in accordance with guidelines for research methodology, I feel that my current research mission encourages, above all, empirical transparency and

open-heartedness about my methodological doubts and dilemmas, while also allowing room for a few self-forgiving arguments. Apropos academic schooling on the narrow path from a methodological viewpoint, there is some comfort in the words of Oscar Wilde (1997): “Having had a good upbringing nowadays is a great disadvantage as it excludes you from so many things.”

CONCLUSION: THE SPECIFICS AND THE GENERALITIES

The presentation of my research field and the metaphor of No Man’s Land is an attempt to explain circumstances that leave me, as a researcher, facing methodological challenges through which I need to manoeuvre with the help of trial and error more than by turning to textbooks for advice. Participant observation in a non-established culture is perhaps no peculiar situation for a researcher to find herself in; among other things, newly-established multicultural environments and the development of cultural heterogenic arenas of researchers from many academic disciplines throughout large parts of Europe are studied. However, my context consists of a periodic cooperation and decision-making arena in which unbiased and rational issues should take precedence and where the social relations primarily take a back seat but are, nevertheless, necessary prerequisites for the successful operation of the network. My main concern is to lead this network. My secondary concern, a power-incumbent task all the same, is to research what we are doing within the same network.

What may appear as unique with my research mission, and the methodological dilemma it places me in, however, is also relevant far beyond my own case. It will be able to serve as an example of challenges that are more broadly widespread and that occur in the wake of an increasing degree of internationalization in various areas. Quite naturally, since studies of networks expand in line with the growth of international cooperation projects, others may also find themselves in correspondingly problematic double roles when having to work as both active participants and researching observers. Additionally, leaders of international networks have to handle many of the same such problems and dilemmas. Any cooperation across borders must constitute and establish rules, routines, and ways of distributing work, sharing responsibility and authority, and developing some type of check and evaluation system. In particular, objectives must be formulated such that they may be shared by participants who represent conflicting values, norms, and perceptions of reality. If power structures, hegemony, and sanctioning tools are not already established as mandatory conditions in such a network, the participants meet in a No Man’s Land where many of the most definitive

regulatory ideas, norms, and values can be lacking or are at least not collective, but rather fractioned and individualized. Even if none of the participants are performing research within this network, they may nonetheless come across some of the same challenges that I face. In No Man's Land, the expressed rules and theories are formulated, while it is the participants' home contexts that direct how they will be applied. Since method is about how we get at the truth and what we set as the foundation for our assumptions, the question of which methods make up the foundation for the network leader's analyses and syntheses must be a highly appropriate topic of research.

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. and Schön, D. A., 1978. *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.
- Bohannan, L., 1966. "Shakespeare in the bush. An American anthropologist set out to study the Tiv of West Africa and was taught the true meaning of Hamlet." *North Carolina: Natural History*, 75, pp. 28–33.
- Douglas, M., 1991. *Implicit meanings. Essays in anthropology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Douglas, M., 1996. *Natural symbols. Explorations in cosmology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Encyclopædia Britannica, 2015. Full definition of "No Man's Land". Available at <http://www.britannica.com/>
- Geertz, C., 1973. *Interpretation of culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C., 1994. The uses of diversity. In: R. Borofsky, ed., *Assessing cultural anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., pp. 454–466.
- Goffman, E., 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P., 2005. *Ethnography: Principle in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hastrup, K., 1995. *A passage to anthropology: Between experience and theory*. London: Routledge.
- Lien, M. and Melhuus, M., 2011. Overcoming the division between anthropology "at home" and "abroad" – Marianne Gullestad intervjuet av Marianne Lien og Marit Melhuus. *Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift*, 2, 22, 134–143.
- Oxford Dictionaries, 2015. Definition of "No man's land". Available at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/no-man's-land>
- Peirano, M. G. S., 1998. When anthropology is at home: The different contexts of a single discipline. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27, 105–128.
- Pratt, M. L., 1986. Fieldwork in common places. In: J. Clifford and G. E. Marcus, eds., *Writing culture. The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 27–50.
- Rosaldo, R., 1989. *Culture and truth. The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sundet, M., 2015. The ties that bind – the roles and mundane practices of networks in constructing educational internationalisation in the High North. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 14, 4, pp. 513–527.
- Sundet, M., 2016a. Good friends and faceless partners: Educational cooperation for community building in the Barents Region. In: S. Robertson and R. Dale, eds., *Global regionalisms and higher education: Projects and politics*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 191–210.

Sundet, M., 2016b. Introduction. In: M. Sundet, A. Örtenblad, and P.-A. Forstorp, eds., *Higher education in the High North: Academic exchanges between Norway and Russia*. London: Springer Publishing, pp. 1–17.

Sundet, M., 2016c. Walking the talk: Putting internationalization into practice. In: M. Sundet, A. Örtenblad, and P.-A. Forstorp, eds., *Higher*

education in the High North: Academic exchanges between Norway and Russia. London: Springer Publishing, pp. 67–88.

Wilde, O., 1997. *Collected works of Oscar Wilde. The plays, the poems, the stories and the essays including De Profundis*. Hertfordshire, UK: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The data used in this article is connected to a larger research project on Higher education in the High North: Regional restructuring through educational exchanges and student mobility. The project was financed by the Research Council of Norway's NORRUSS programme, initiated in 2012 and with a final report submitted in March 2016.

² For a more detailed explanation of the term No Man's Land, see Encyclopædia Britannica (2015) and Oxford Dictionaries (2015).

