



TERHI NOKKALA

Constructing the Ideal University

- The internationalisation of higher education
in the competitive knowledge society



ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission
of the Faculty of Economics and Administration
of the University of Tampere, for public discussion in Pinni B1096 Auditorium
(Kanslerinrinne 1, Tampere), on December 7th , 2007, at 12 o'clock.

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPERE

TERHI NOKKALA

Constructing the Ideal University

– The internationalisation of higher education
in the competitive knowledge society



Electronic dissertation
Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 681
ISBN 978-951-44-7173-5
ISSN 1456-954X
<http://acta.uta.fi>

© Tampere University Press, and the author

Higher Education Group (HEG)
Department of Management Studies
University of Tampere
Finland



Higher Education Finance and Management Series

Editorial Board:

Professor Seppo Hölttä (chair, University of Tampere)
Research Director Timo Aarrevaara (University of Tampere)
Professor Peter Maassen (University of Oslo)
Docent Antti Moisio (Government Institute for Economic Research)
Professor Jari Stenvall (University of Lapland)
Professor Jarmo Vakkuri (University of Vaasa)

Series Editor: Research Director Timo Aarrevaara
Assistant Editor: Assistant Professor Jussi Kivistö

Sales
Bookshop Taju
P.O. Box 617, FIN-33014 University of Tampere, Finland
tel. +358 3 3551 6055
fax +358 3 3551 7685
taju@uta.fi
www.uta.fi/taju
<http://granum.uta.fi>

Layout Maaret Kihlakaski
Cover Iris Puusti

ISBN 978-951-44-7171-1
Tampereen Yliopistopaino Oy – Juvenes Print
Tampere 2007

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	9
Abstract.....	11
Tiivistelmä	12

Part I

Perspectives of internationalisation, university and the knowledge society	13
---	-----------

1. Background and introduction	13
1.1 The internationalisation of higher education in prior research	13
1.2 The research approach and research questions	19
1.3 The structure of the thesis	21
2. The Finnish and European Context.....	24
2.1 The Finnish higher education system	24
2.2 The internationalisation of higher education in Finland	26
2.3 Finland's survival history and higher education	30
2.4 The Finnish knowledge society	35
2.5 Higher education policy in Europe	39
3. The changing social institution of University	42
3.1 Introduction	42
3.2 Institutions and institutional theory	45
3.3 The University as an institution	48
3.3.1 The traditional tasks of the University	50
3.3.2 The legitimation of the University.....	52
3.4 Changes in teaching and learning.....	55
3.5 Changes in knowledge production	57
3.6 Changes in governance of higher education and universities.....	60
3.7 Globalisation and the entrepreneurial university.....	61
3.8 The new role of higher education	64

4. Globalisation, knowledge society and the government of individuals and universities	66
4.1 Introduction.....	66
4.2 Globalisation and the competitive knowledge society	67
4.2.1 Globalisation.....	67
4.2.2 The knowledge society	70
4.2.3 The knowledge society as a meta-narrative	74
4.3 Governmentality theory	76
4.3.1 Government and governmentality.....	76
4.3.2 Government in the knowledge society	79
4.3.3 The ideal citizen and ideal university in the knowledge society	81

Part II

Discourses of internationalisation and the legitimating ideas of the University

5. The methodology and method: conducting the analysis	88
5.1 Introduction	88
5.2 Discourse analysis as methodology and method.....	90
5.2.1 The definitions of discourse	95
5.3 Reflexivity in discourse analysis	97
5.3.1 The reflexivity tools used	99
5.3.2 Personal background	102
5.4 Empirical data and the analysis	104
5.4.1 Empirical data	104
5.4.2 The data analysis.....	108
5.5 Discourses and practices of internationalisation.....	117
6. The discourses arguing for internationalisation	118
6.1 Introduction	118
6.2 The internationalisation as individual growth -discourse	119
6.2.1 The philosophical sub-discourse: creating a civilised person ..	120
6.2.2 The instrumental sub-discourse: creating a skilful person	123
6.3 The internationalisation as rethinking of the university -discourse ..	126
6.3.1 Quality and attractiveness	127
6.3.2 Rethinking university functions and strategies	131
6.3.3 Internationalisation as change	135

6.3.4	Old and new internationalisation	137
6.4	The internationalisation as opening up of the country -discourse ...	138
6.4.1	The sub-discourse of opening up as a metaphor	138
6.4.2	The sub-discourse of opening up as a concrete process	141
6.4.3	The image sub-discourse	147
7.	The discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University	152
7.1	Introduction	152
7.2	The science and knowledge -discourse	153
7.2.1	The inherent internationality of science	153
7.2.2	The development of science	156
7.2.3	Reputation and the inherent competition of science.....	157
7.2.4	The University as an institution	158
7.2.5	The strategic use of science and knowledge -discourse on the European level	160
7.3	The civilisation and wellbeing -discourse	164
7.3.1	The traditional sub-discourse	165
7.3.2	The global sub-discourse	172
7.3.3	The instrumental sub-discourse.....	175
7.4	The competition and competitiveness -discourse	184
7.4.1	The competition, competitiveness and attractiveness.....	184
7.4.2	Competitiveness and commitment of a university	189
7.4.3	Higher education markets and tuition fees	196
7.4.4	Research and innovation	199
7.4.5	Constituting the competitive knowledge society's ideal university and ideal citizen.....	202

Part III

University, discourses and the knowledge society 206

8.	Conclusions and discussion	206
8.1	Research results	206
8.1.1	Discourses of Internationalisation and the University	207
8.1.2	The commonness, overlap and temporal evolution of the discourses	211
8.1.3	The strategic and token usage of the discourses	216
8.2	The change of the University institution	221
8.2.1	The national tasks of higher education and the survival of small Finland	224

8.2.2 The University role in knowledge society, civil society and sustainable development	227
8.3 Power, discourse and the competitive knowledge society	231
9. References	237
9.1 Literature	237
9.2 Empirical document data	254
9.2.1 University documents	254
9.2.2 National policy documents	255
9.2.3 European documents	257
Appendix one: Interview themes and questions	260
Appendix two: Translation conventions	265
Appendix three: Original Finnish interview and document quotes	269
Appendix four: Discourses in quotes	290
Appendix five: Analysis sceme	291
Appendix six: Use of discourses in empirical data	307
 List of Tables	
Table 1: Discursive order of internationalisation and University	116
Table 2: The use of discourses in different categories of data.....	213

Acknowledgements

“Tell me about snow”, Moomintroll said and seated himself in Moominpappa’s sun-bleached garden chair. “I don’t understand it.” “I don’t either”, said Too-ticky. “You believe it’s cold, but if you build yourself a snow house it’s warm. You think it’s white, but at times it looks like pink, and at other times it’s blue. It can be softer than anything; and then again harder than stone. Nothing is certain.”

Tove Janson: Moominland Midwinter, 1957

Just like Moomintroll, who suddenly wakes up in a middle of the winter to find his familiar world completely changed, and covered in a white blanket of snow, a researcher is faced with unfamiliar territory, which seems to provide so many different angles, perspectives and possibilities, that nothing, indeed, is certain. And, just like Moomintroll, after fears, trepidation and hardships, one eventually learns to enjoy it.

A PhD is just the first step in this often scary and elating adventure, but even that would have been unattainable without the support of many others, whom I want to thank for their kindness, friendship and help.

First, I want to thank my supervisor Professor Seppo Hölttä, whose continuing support and encouragement steered me through the process. Seppo gave me free reign for choosing my topic, theory and methodology, and he encouraged me in becoming ‘international’. He allowed me to make my own mistakes, and to hit my head against the wall until I was able to find my way around each problem. By believing in me and by making me believe in myself, he made me into a researcher.

Thanks are due also for Assistant Professor Timo Keski-Petäjä, whose optimism never failed, and whose valuable comments on methodology and theory greatly helped to shape the report in the final phases of the work. Discussions with him were a continuous source of inspiration.

A great part of the joy of PhD research comes from sharing the toil with others, especially my Higher Education Group colleagues Dr Timo Aarrevaara, Dr Jussi Kivistö, Vuokko Kohtamäki, Kari Kuoppala, Dr Yuzhuo Cai and other people at HEG and at the Department of Management Studies. Professor Jim Fairweather from the Michigan State University kindly offered his comments during his annual visits to HEG. Nordic walking on Pyynikki hills with friend and colleague Anu Lyytinen provided an invaluable opportunity to vent my feelings about work as well as life. Thanks are

also due to colleagues from FINHERT, especially the members of the Seili Midnight Rowing Club, with whom plenty of sweet cider was shared.

During my research I had an opportunity to spend time at the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) University of Twente and at the Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies (GES), Graduate School of Education at the University of Bristol, whom I thank for their hospitality. These two visits were invaluable for the development of my theoretical thinking, the quality of my work, and integrating into the international academic community. I would like to thank colleagues from CHEPS, especially my supervisor Professor Jeroen Huisman, Professors Marijk van der Wende, Leo Goedegebuure, Jürgen Enders and Guy Neave for their comments, and my fellow PhD students Liudvika Leisyte, Mark Kaulisch and Johanna Witte for tea, support and sympathy. In Bristol, my supervisor Professor Susan Robertson, always seemed to see one step further in my research than I did, and she encouraged me to take upon the final formulation of the research task. Thanks are also due to Professor Roger Dale and fellow PhD student Peter Jones for interesting and useful discussions.

My research would not have come about without those Finnish and European higher education actors and researchers, too numerous to name here, who generously gave their time, effort and advice as interviewees and commentators on my work. My extended foreign visits were made possible in part by the generosity of the Department of Management Studies, the University of Tampere travel grant and the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic) Huygens Scholarship.

I would also like to thank my two external reviewers, Professor John Taylor and Professor Emeritus Yrjö-Paavo Häyrynen for their valuable comments on the manuscript. Thanks are also due to those people, whose help was invaluable in finalising the book. Dr Ian Dobson and Mrs Virginia Mattila edited the English expression, Ms Maaret Kihlakaski did the layout and Ms Iris Puusti designed the cover, and Dr Timo Aarrevaara and Dr Jussi Kivistö helped with many practicalities concerning the printing process.

My thanks also go to my friends and colleagues at the ESU – the European Students' Union, who originally gave me the inspiration for this thesis, and with whom discussions on European higher education were both work and leisure. Bastian, Klemen, James, Francesca, Kristina, Stefan, Martina, Vanja, Katja, Alex, Paulo and the rest of you: there were many times when you kept me sane whilst doing this work.

My greatest gratitude goes to my loving family: to my father Arto, my mother Liisa and my brother Tuukka, who supported me tirelessly, loved me and carried me throughout the often heavy research work, and believed in me when my own faith faltered. To you I dedicate this thesis.

Terhi Nokkala

Guildford, 5th November 2007

Abstract

This doctoral thesis discusses the Finnish and European discourses on the internationalisation of higher education and the roles of the University. The thesis aims to understand the ways in which the roles and tasks of the University are played out in the competitive knowledge society in Finland and the European Higher Education Arena. The competitive knowledge society is seen as a dominant political rationality within which changes in the University as a social institution can be evaluated and discussed.

The research's starting point is the representation of internationalisation as a change in the University and as an indication of its responsiveness. Discourse analytical strategies were used to analyse the empirical data used in the research. Institutional theory and governmentality theory were utilised to make sense of the University as a social institution and the competitive knowledge society as a dominant political rationality, and the way these two framework conditions relate to the discourses.

Six discourses were identified in the empirical analysis. The three Internationalisation discourses were named the internationalisation as individual growth -discourse, the internationalisation as rethinking the university -discourse and the internationalisation as opening up the country -discourse. They provided answers to the questions about what higher education internationalisation is and what its consequences are, from the perspective of the individual, the university and the nation.

The three University discourses were named the science and knowledge -discourse, the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse and the competition and competitiveness -discourse. The University discourses represent legitimations of the University in the knowledge society. They describe the reasons why the University is needed in society, what the University contributes to it, and what a "true" University is like.

The representations of internationalisation, or the roles and tasks of the University and its identity as an institution in a competitive knowledge society, are not singular or homogenous. Instead they are constructed of several different co-existing and complementary discourses. Although the University contribution to competition and competitiveness makes a strong constitutive and legitimating discourse, other discourses and other legitimations live side by side with it.

Key words: internationalisation, university, knowledge society, discourse analysis, institution

Tiivistelmä

Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan korkeakoulutuksen kansainvälistymistä ja yliopiston rooleja kuvaavia suomalaisia ja eurooppalaisia diskursseja. Diskurssien kautta pyritään ymmärtämään yliopiston roolien ja tehtävien rakentumista laajemmassa kilpailullisessa tietoyhteiskunnassa suomalaisella ja eurooppalaisella korkeakoulutusarenalla. Kilpailullinen tietoyhteiskunta nähdään vallitsevana poliittisena rationaliteettina jonka viitekehyksessä yliopiston muutosta sosiaalisena instituutioon voidaan tarkastella.

Tutkimuksen lähtökohtana on usein esitetty ajatus kansainvälistymisestä yliopiston muutoksena ja sopeutumisenä muuttuviin toimintaympäristöihin. Yliopisto määritellään sosiaalisena instituutioon institutionaalisen teorian kautta, ja kilpailullinen tietoyhteiskunta vallitsevana poliittisena rationaliteettina Michel Foucault'n luoman hallinnan teorian (governmentality) kautta. Näiden teorioiden kautta myös määritellään institutionaalisen ja yhteiskunnallisen kontekstin suhdetta analysoituihin kansainvälistymisen ja korkeakoulutuksen diskursseihin. Tutkimuksen empiirisen aineiston analyysissä käytetään erilaisia diskurssianalyttisiä strategioita.

Empiirisen aineiston analyysin perusteella tunnistetaan ja muotoillaan kuusi diskurssia, joista kolme kuvaavat kansainvälistymistä ja toiset kolme yleisemmin niitä ideoita jotka legitimoivat yliopiston roolia yhteiskunnassa. Kolme kansainvälistymisdiskurssia ovat nimeltään kansainvälistyminen yksilön kasvuna -diskurssi, kansainvälistyminen yliopiston uudelleenmäärittelynä -diskurssi ja kansainvälistyminen maan avautumisena -diskurssi. Kansainvälistymisdiskurssit vastaavat kysymykseen, mitä korkeakoulutuksen kansainvälistyminen on, ja mitkä sen seuraukset yksilön, yliopiston ja maan kannalta ovat.

Kolme yliopistodiskurssia ovat nimeltään tiede ja tieto -diskurssi, sivilisaatio ja hyvinvointi -diskurssi sekä kilpailu ja kilpailukyky -diskurssi. Yliopistodiskurssit esittävät yliopiston legitimaatioita tietoyhteiskunnassa ja kuvaavat kansainvälistymistä keskeisenä osana tätä tehtävää. Ne kuvaavat, miksi yliopistoa tarvitaan yhteiskunnassa, millainen ”oikea” yliopisto on, ja mihin yliopiston panos yhteiskunnassa perustuu.

Kansainvälisyyden esitystavat, yliopiston roolit ja tehtävät, sekä sen identiteetti sosiaalisena instituutioon kilpailullisessa tietoyhteiskunnassa eivät ole homogeenisia, vaan rakentuvat useista diskursseista. Nämä eivät näytä kilpailevan keskenään vaan pikemminkin täydentävät toisiaan. Vaikka kilpailu ja kilpailukyky -diskurssi on vahva yliopistoa rakentava ja legitimoiva diskurssi, sen rinnalla elävät myös muut diskurssit ja legitimaatiot. Yliopiston rooli yhteiskunnassa määrittyy useiden roolien ja tehtävien kautta ja siltä odotetaan moninaista panosta yhteiskunnan toimintaan.

Asiasanat: kansainvälistyminen, yliopisto, tietoyhteiskunta, diskurssianalyysi, instituutio

Part I

Perspectives of internationalisation, university and the knowledge society

– Chapter I – Background and introduction

I.1 The internationalisation of higher education in prior research

“Hence, the University is reckoned as a key actor in spreading the new faith of the Knowledge Society, as one of the High Priests of the Knowledge Economy – not always the same thing – and to be the very Tabernacle of ‘Internationalization.’”

Guy Neave in CHEPS Unplugged 1/2006)

Discussing the forms and interests of research focussing on internationalisation of higher education, Ulrich Teichler (2004, 1) has noted that “as a rule, the public debate on higher education focuses on a single or possibly two or three issues at a certain point in time. Concerns, hope and actions concentrate on selected issues, and this priority might persist for about five years to at most a decade”. With conviction it can be said that the past decade has been the decade of the internationalisation of higher education. It has evoked numerous discussions among universities and national- and international-level policy makers, as well as higher education researchers. Various internationalisation policies and strategies have been drafted and implemented, and various research projects relating to definitions, quantity and quality of internationalisation have been conducted.

However, the internationalisation of higher education can hardly be said to be a clear-cut phenomenon evolving along a linear chronological continuum. The notions of “University”¹, “science” and “research” are often described as international by their very nature, dating back nearly a thousand years to the early days of the Universities of Bologna and Paris, and to the wandering scholar Erasmus of Rotterdam, who later gave his name to the Erasmus European higher education mobility programme. Against this admittedly idealistic and story-like context, it might sound surprising to argue that universities are internationalising or that internationalisation is a new

1. The word University is spelled with an upper case U when referring to the institution of University, or when the grammar calls for it. Otherwise university is spelled with a lower case u.

development which the universities should be embracing, especially considering that the intra-European international mobility, which has now achieved a level of a few percent of the student population, was ten percent in the 17th century (Neave 2002a). Teichler (2004) has, therefore, argued that it might be more fitting to call the process re-internationalisation. On the other hand, these notions of the inherently international University also serve as a mystification of the past. They might obscure the nature of higher education as a highly national project, connected to nation building, education of the national elites and reproduction of the dominant ideology, and highly dependent on the nation states for their purpose, student and scholar base, funding and governance, (Enders 2004, Castells 1991, 206–208.)

Today, the new forms of internationalisation may be said to bear only a distant resemblance to the old community of scholars and to a growing extent to be transforming the institutions of higher education and contributing to redefinition of the relationship between the state, society and higher education. In the following I will conceptualise the evolution of the internationalisation of higher education in terms of certain dichotomies, which, while not doing complete justice to the complexity of the phenomenon, do shed light on the profound and radical change of internationalisation of higher education.

Traditionally, the international activities in higher education consisted of international contacts between individual academics, students, universities and states, and individual aspirations for international experience and knowledge. International co-operation mainly took place between individual countries, rather than being based on wider networks or shared policies, and there were hardly any competitive factors. The traditional internationalisation was not institutionalised in the practices at the organisational level, but, rather, it was based on the voluntary activities of individual actors. Thus, the autonomy of the nation-state or the higher education institutions was not touched by this type of internationalisation. (Trondal et al 2001.)

Such early forms of international cooperation in higher education included the establishment of unilateral or bilateral scholarships to promote international mobility in the name of forging links and thus increasing the understanding between nations. The early organised attempts included the establishment of the British Council in 1934 and the American Fulbright scholarship programme in 1946. Named after its initiator, Senator J. William Fulbright, the programme was established by the United States Congress to “enable the government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries.” (Fulbright Programme 2007). The Fulbright programme awards scholarships for US citizens to study overseas, and for foreign citizens to study in US. The British Council had a wider mandate to support British institutions and societies, and English schools in other countries, to support English teachers and students abroad and to organise various cultural activities and resources which would present Britain around the world. According to its royal charter granted in 1940, it was established “for the

purpose of promoting a wider knowledge of Our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the English language abroad and developing closer cultural relations between Our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and other countries for the purpose of benefiting the British Commonwealth of Nations". (British Council 2007.)

A more structured, multinational approach to internationalisation of higher education was gradually introduced to the European higher education arena in the 1970s as part of the activities of the European Economic Community, the predecessor of the European Union (EU). Before the 1970s the ECC had addressed educational issues related only to vocational education and professional recognition of qualifications, leaving most of the issues pertaining to education to the mandate of the member states. A network for exchanging information on educational systems was established in 1976, as were the first Joint Study Programmes. These later lead to more formal cooperation in the form of the Eurydice network, which was established in 1980, and the ERASMUS programme, established in 1987. These joint activities were initially aimed at fostering cooperation, mobility and the sharing of information between national higher education institutions and authorities, but later on developed to become one of the important elements of fostering the European integration and the creation of the EU as a single market. The ERASMUS Programme, which in 1997 was integrated into SOCRATES, the umbrella programme for general and higher education, proved to be a great success, and celebrated reaching the one million participants mark in 2002. (Van der Wende & Huisman 2004, 17–20).

During the last decade or so, a new phase of internationalisation has emerged, a result partly of these programmes and more structured cooperation, partly of the changing context of closer international cooperation and interdependencies in all sections of society. International activities have "institutionalised" into the organisational as well as national higher education system level reality to such an extent, that it changes the national administrative, judicial and financial sovereignty over higher education and institutionalising into the organisational cultures, structures and policies of higher education institutions. With these well-integrated exchange programmes, international degree programmes offered within the institutions as well as overseas, and increasingly multinational research cooperation and funding structures, internationalisation has shifted from being an add-on, based on temporary and short term project funding and being disconnected from the general planning and regulation structures, into being closely integrated with general higher education policy and its goals. (Trondal et al. 2001, van der Wende 2001). Definitions of internationalisation emphasise the institutionalisation of internationalisation in the everyday, organisational reality of higher education. Such definitions include "the process of integrating an international or intercultural dimension into the research, teaching and services functions of higher education" (Knight 1994, 7); "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary

education” (Knight 2004, 11); or ”a change process from a national higher education institution into an international higher education institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and research and to achieve the decided competencies” (Söderqvist 2002, 201) Furthermore, countries are no longer pursuing internationalisation as a solitary action, but as part of a larger political, social and economic international entity, both co-operative and competitive. Internationalisation is seen as an instrument for increased competitiveness and capacity building, for finding new ways to manage higher education, for testing practices and as a general means to improve higher education. It is both an end in itself, and a means to achieve various other aims in higher education and society at large. Instead of political, cultural and academic rationales, the economic rationales have become a driving force in internationalisation. (van der Wende 2001.) This is nowhere demonstrated so vividly as in the burgeoning markets for cross-border students, including not just traditional student mobility of, but also the establishment of overseas campuses and online distance education (see e.g. Marginson & van der Wende 2007).

The recent triumph of internationalisation has been accelerated by many other changes in the context and conduct of higher education. Some of the identified changes include e.g. the emergence of the knowledge-based economy and development of the new, information technology-based delivery modes², new pressures for higher education institutions to prepare graduates for life and work in an international context, decreasing public funding for higher education and related demands for diversifying funding sources. Also important are the information technology “revolution”, overall globalisation of the world economy and growing interdependence between countries and regions of the world, and the changing of the role of the nation-states on all policy fields. (Castells 2000a.)

The new internationalisation of higher education is based on competitive and cooperative approaches (van der Wende 2001). Competitive internationalisation stems from financial scarcity in higher education, which has led to deregulation of higher education institutions and related aspirations of higher education institutions turning into entrepreneurial organisations (Clark 1998, Marginson & Considine 2000) looking for additional funding streams from the market e.g. by attracting foreign students paying tuition fees or competing for research funding. The social shift into what is commonly called knowledge society has led to an emphasis on knowledge and therefore education, research and innovation as the building blocks of the national competitiveness, which has created tensions and competition between the three largest economies in the world, namely EU, USA and Japan, as well as the emerging economic powers such as China and India. The response of the European Union has been the introduction of the Lisbon objectives, aiming to make the EU the most competitive knowledge economy in the world by 2010. On this agenda, education and research

2. For an example, see e.g. Vossensteyn et al 2007.

are at a central stage. Competition in higher education therefore exists at several levels: between regions of the world, between national states as well as between individual higher education institutions. The markets for higher education have become global. (van der Wende 2001.)

Cooperation at organisational, national and regional levels has been seen as a response to the increasing competition. At the organisational level, various partnerships and consortia have been established to increase the competitiveness of the partners (Beerkens 2004), on the national level marketing strategies have been designed (Luijten-Lub et al. 2004) and at the European level the establishment of the European Higher Education Area and the Bologna process is an attempt to increase the competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education, especially vis-à-vis the United States (van der Wende 2001, Huisman & van der Wende 2004a, Nokkala & Uppström 2003).

Traditionally, the rationalisations of internationalisation have been argued to consist of several rationales: social or cultural, political, economic and academic. Knight (2004, 22–23) has argued that while these rationales give a basic understanding of the rationales for internationalisation, they nevertheless fail to capture either the increasing importance assigned to international recognition and reputation of universities, be it for academic, economic or political purposes, or many of the new rationales which do not fit neatly into these four categories. She argues such new rationales include national cultural identity, intercultural understanding, citizenship development, social and community development, foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, peace and mutual understanding, national and regional identity, economic growth and competitiveness, the labour market, financial incentives, an international dimension to research and teaching, extension of the academic horizon, institution building, profile and status, and the enhancement of quality and international academic standards. Additionally, she recognises newly emerging rationales at the national or institutional levels. These include human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building and social or cultural development at the national level, and international branding and profile, income generation, student and staff development, strategic alliances and knowledge production on the institutional level.

The burgeoning research on internationalisation has most commonly concentrated on classifying, describing and analysing five dimensions or policy areas of internationalisation: the knowledge dimension, or the matters related to the border-crossing movement of knowledge, the validation and recognition of teaching, learning and research results; the international homogeneity or heterogeneity of structural elements of higher education, such as degrees, organisational forms or funding structures; the scope of national and international actors' policies; and the steering of higher education as a whole (Teichler 2004). Much attention has also been paid to trying to elaborate the conceptualisations of elusive processes of internationalisation, Europeanisation or globalisation and their effects on universities or national higher education systems

(Enders 2004, Huisman & van der Wende 2004a), or the development of these definitions (Knight 2004).

Summarising briefly the elements of the internationalisation of higher education, it is possible to distinguish several features. First of all, internationalisation seems to be both something old and something new. There has been an increase in the quantity of streams of students and research across borders, an increase in numbers of international academic conferences and publications, and international cooperation agreements between universities or countries. Internationalisation is much more strongly present in policy documents compared with just a decade and a half ago. Internationalisation takes the form of both competition and cooperation at various levels of the higher education system, and seems to be related to the re-conceptualisation of the task of higher education and higher education organisations in the society, and closely related to the legitimacy of higher education (Meyer & Rowan 1991, Gumpert 2000).

The many definitions and classifications of internationalisation (Källemark & van der Wende 1997, van der Wende 2001, Huisman & van der Wende 2004a, Trondal et al. 2001, Knight 1994, Knight 2004, Söderqvist 2002, Teichler 2004) seem to share two characteristics: they equate internationalisation with a change process, most typically a change of the university as an organisation, and the responsiveness of the university and higher education policy to the changing context of higher education. As Teichler (2004, 22) has noted, “internationalisation can best be defined as the totality of substantial changes in the context and inner life of higher education relative to an increasing frequency of border-crossing activities amidst a persistence of national systems”. Söderqvist (2002) has pointed out the trends of institutionalisation of internationalisation into the everyday activities and self-understanding of the higher education institutions, as well as the connection of internationalisation and international competitiveness and of the higher education institution on the discursive level. She has identified three discourses on internationalisation of university and non-university sector higher education institutions in Finland and Belgium. The first discourse, which she calls “Basic processes to be financed by internationalisation” is interwoven with the basic activities of higher education institutions, that is, teaching, learning and research, emphasising cooperation, the EU context and the Bologna process. The second discourse “The higher education institution as a competitive and appreciated actor” is connected to the reputation and appreciation of the higher education institution, emphasising the need to connect to international networks. These two discourses were found to be dominant. In addition, a third, emerging discourse was identified “Towards a multicultural and more equal world”, connecting to the emerging global society in the spirit of the United Nations and emphasising the need for developing practices for internationalisation at home. While identifying these discursive themes, Söderqvist, however, does little in the way of embedding her discourses of the internationalisation of higher education institution into the societal or institutional context in which they take place, nor does she analyse their conse-

quences for the re-construction of the role of higher education in society, or for the institution of the University.

Previous research has pointed out that the role of universities and higher education as social institutions has been complicated by the fragmentation of society: “there seems no longer to be a single society to which a university can now be expected to respond. There are only governments, academics and students, labour markets and industries, professions and occupations, status groups and reference groups, communities and localities, and the dis-localities of the global.” (Enders 2004, 363.) This requires new modes of higher education governance, many of those related to the tighter connection between various local-, national- and international-level stakeholders on into higher education (Enders 2004, Neave 2002b). As a result of the growing influence of international stakeholders such as intergovernmental organisations and international business on higher education, there is a growing convergence in higher education policy around the world, often carried by the global discourse disseminated by experts and organisations (Ball 1998, Dale 1999). Carter and O’Neill (1995, 9) argue that a new, nearly global orthodoxy of education policy can be identified, based on the connection between competitiveness and trade, and reducing government responsibility combined with increasing private contributions and involvement in education. Higher education policy discourse is influenced by ideas and theories such as neoliberalism, new institutional economics based on devolution of authority, incentives and self-management, performance-based steering, based on target setting and accountability, public choice theory and finally the new managerialism inserting the ideas and techniques of business management into higher education (Ball 1998). It is this context of the changing institution of the University, and the changing legitimisation of the role of University in the knowledge society, that I take as the starting point of my research.

1.2. The research approach and research questions

My research is based on a notion of the socially constructed nature of social reality, and on adhering to the premises of the narrative, story-like nature of institutions, ideal images or historical facts. The actual object of my study are discourses, by which I refer to different albeit simultaneous ways of constructing the meanings of something, in this case the meanings of internationalisation of higher education and institution of the University in the competitive knowledge society.

As a discourse analyst, I subscribe to the premises of social constructionism, namely that language constructs social reality, that there are several competing systems of meaning which are invoked in different contexts, that actors are attached to systems of meaning and that the use of language is consequential. By using language, we construct or make meaningful, the “objects” of our speech/writing. Social reality

being socially constructed means that human beings in interaction give meaning to all social phenomena. This construction of meaning is repeated over and over again, until those meanings are reified into being taken for granted normative or cognitive interpretations of the world, defining what we see of the world and explaining why things are as they are. (Berger & Luckmann 1987, 33–34.)

According to social constructionism, we do not have the option to encounter the reality we study as “pure” but only conceptualised from some perspective or other. Although human reality is not solely dependent on language, the only way for us to reach those phenomena is through language. For instance physical or geological phenomena exist regardless of whether we name them in language or not. We might have extra-lingual experiences about the world, such as physical phenomena. We do not, however, have non-lingual knowledge about the world. Knowledge is only possible through meaning-making which takes place through the use of language. Things, objects, feelings, institutions etc come to be the objects of our study as “named” with some “name”. This applies also to non-verbal objects, such as pictures or infrastructure; they too can only be approached through those symbols and meanings that are culturally possible. On the other hand, although language or language-based meanings are not pictures of the reality, they are not totally independent of it either. The reality is reflected in the linguistic meanings which are brought about by certain phenomena in the natural world. (Wetherell & Potter 1992, 62–63.) Similarly, neither meaning nor truth can be described as completely objective or subjective. Instead, meaning is constructed in the interaction between people. (Crotty, 1998, 42–43.)

My research focuses on the different ways in which the meanings of “internationalisation” and “university” have been constructed in a set of texts: interviews and documents. More specifically, my research task in this thesis is to discover the kinds of discourse used to describe the internationalisation of higher education in European, Finnish and university-level policy documents, as well as by central Finnish higher education actors. Through this specific example, the aim is to provide further insights into the way in which the understandings about the tasks of the University as a social institution are played out in the wider context of the competitive knowledge society in Finland and in the European higher education arena. This general research task is to be accomplished by answering the following three research questions.

1. What kinds of discourse are used to describe the internationalisation of higher education and the role of the University in the Finnish and European Union higher education arena?
2. Is there one dominant discourse, or do several equally strong discourses exist?
3. How do the discourses of internationalisation constitute the changing University institution in the competitive knowledge society?

The study is embedded in a multiple framework consisting of the institutions of the University, and the dominant political rationality of the knowledge society, as well as the specific Finnish knowledge society project, stemming from Finland's unique history and experience of survival under hardship. The internationalisation of higher education discourse constitutes an example through which the understandings of the University institution and its legitimacy, or the specific narrative of Finland and its survival and success through investment in knowledge society and higher education, are reflected. As the various policy documents and strategies constitute the central part of my empirical data, they inevitably have an element of ideality in them: they reflect and constitute an image of the ideal university, and the ideal world.

Due to the formulation of the research question, this study will not make an explicit distinction between the internationalisation of education functions and the internationalisation of research functions of the university, nor will it specifically focus on either of them. Although the concept "internationalisation of higher education" in many studies and policy documents seems to point towards the internationalisation of the education function rather than of the research function, many of the documents chosen as empirical data address both of these functions. However, issues and data specifically focussing on internationalisation of research are beyond the scope of this study.

1.3 The structure of the thesis

This study has been written so as to form a linear and logical structure, even though conducting the study was far from being a linear exercise. This is typical for social constructionist research. Adapting Fairclough's (1989, 26) understanding of the analysis of discourse as consisting of three interwoven processes, also this research process may be said to consist of three interwoven levels: 1) the description of the discourses, 2) the understanding of the conditions for the production and analysis of the discourses, and 3) the discussion of the discourses as social practices. These three processes are constantly intertwined and the different levels of the discourse revisited. However, for the purposes of readability, they have been laid out here as a linear structure consisting of three parts.

Part one, representing the second of the aforementioned processes, includes chapters one, two, three, and four of the dissertation, and it focuses on introducing the theoretical and historical context in which the formulation of the discourses of internationalisation take place.

Part two, representing the first process and consisting of chapters five, six and seven, outlines the methodological approach of the study, introduces the empirical

data and the method used in its analysis, and presents the discourses constructed as a result of the analysis.

Part three, representing the third process and consisting of chapter eight, revisits the theoretical framework of the thesis and discusses the kind of University and knowledge society the discourses constitute.

I will now briefly present the structure of each of the chapters. They form a continuum describing the national, institutional and societal contexts and the theoretical perspectives selected for the study, outlining the empirical data and methodological choices made, and progressing, through detailed analysis of the data, into a wider discussion on the research results and the phenomena surrounding the internationalisation of higher education and the change of the University institution in the context of a competitive knowledge society.

In Chapter one I have discussed previous research on the internationalisation of higher education, and have outlined my research task and specific research questions, as well as outlining the structure of the study. This study is founded on the notions of discourses as being constituted by, and constitutive of, social reality. A discourse can be defined as a particular way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective and can be distinguished from other discourses. In Chapter one I have therefore also introduced the different strands of discourse analysis and their philosophical, ontological and epistemological premises.

Besides being embedded in the international, especially European, higher education discourse, the Finnish discourse of internationalisation of higher education and its link to the redefinition of the role of higher education in a competitive knowledge society are embedded in the general characteristics of the Finnish higher education system, the emergence of internationalisation in the Finnish higher education policy agenda, in Finnish history, and in the emergence of the knowledge society as a new survival project for Finland. In Chapter two I will therefore briefly introduce some of the characteristics of the higher education system and internationalisation in Finland, as well as describing briefly Finnish history and the economic depression at the beginning of the 1990s. These have been definitive in the creation of the Finnish knowledge society, and its construction as a survival strategy for Finland. Some issues will be revisited from a more theoretical perspective in the later chapters.

Each university is an independent organisation, but also part of a larger institution of the University, consisting of a set of norms, values, practices, procedures, and ways of thinking and acting. Although the first universities, such as the Universities of Bologna or Paris, were very different organisations hundreds of years ago, there is certain continuity in the institution of the University, which allows us to recognise that the ancient and the contemporary organisations belong to the same continuum of the University institution. In Chapter three, I will lay out the institutional theory which explains the continuity and change of institutions, and discuss some of the changes faced by university organisations and the University institution in past decades.

Much of the change in the university organisations and institution can be attributed to increasing international economic integration and globalisation, and the emergence of the knowledge-based economy or the knowledge society. The knowledge society has become the new political rationality, containing shared idealised identities. Organisations as well as individuals are governed through their internalisation of these ideal identities, which are carried e.g. by discourses of the competitive knowledge society. In Chapter four I will explore the context and rationality of globalisation and the knowledge society as well as the governmentality theory which has been used in discussing the forms of power and governing of individuals and organisations in the knowledge society.

The cultural and personal contexts of the researcher are significant both for the analysis itself and for the reflexivity of the analysis in discourse analytical research. In Chapter five I will discuss the issue of reflexivity and account for the cultural resources influencing me in my analysis. I will also describe the empirical data I have used in my study and the steps I have taken in the analysis of the empirical data.

In Chapters six and seven I will present the three discourses arguing for the importance of internationalisation and three discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University, constructed based on the analysis of the empirical data. The “internationalisation discourses” describe the content and consequences of internationalisation of higher education, presenting internationalisation alternatively as the opening up of the country, as rethinking the University or as empowerment of the individual. The “University discourses” constitute the legitimating idea of the University in society in general and internationalisation as part of it either through their contribution to science and knowledge, to civilisation and wellbeing or to competition and competitiveness.

In Chapter eight I aim to construct a wider theoretical understanding of discourses, the change of the University institution and the rationality of the competitive knowledge society. I will briefly summarise each of the discourses, the way they have changed throughout the years, and the strategic use of the discourses by the higher education policy actors. I will discuss the implications and links these discourses have for the change of the University institution, for the role of the university in the knowledge society and in the civil society, and for the survival of “Finland as a small country”³. Finally I will discuss power and discourse in the context of competitive knowledge society.

3. The notion of Finland as a small country is marked by inverted commas when I have wanted to emphasise the narrative nature of the expression.

– Chapter 2 – The Finnish and European Context

The Finnish state, society, economy and culture are embedded in the European context. In the world of increasing economic and political interdependence, cultural interaction, increased mobility and, to a great extent, a limitless flow of information especially in the developed world, it would be impossible to think that any section of society or policy would not be affected by interaction in cross-border communication and interaction. Finland is a small country with shared religion, values and a culture developed over a thousand years of cultural interaction with the rest of Europe. However, due its scarce resources and having a small economy which is incapable of self-sufficiency, it joined one of the largest political organisations in the world, the European Union. Finland is not an island therefore, but is inescapably part of Europe or even of wider world. As such it is influenced by external values, fashions, practices, policies, economic trends and discourses. The University is not solely Finnish, nor is the knowledge society. Internationalisation of higher education by name connotes the crossing of borders. Although the focus of this study and majority of the empirical data is centred on the Finnish context, there can be no understanding of the Finnish context without an understanding of the European context.

2.1 The Finnish higher education system

The Finnish higher education system is a binary system of 20 universities and 29 non-university higher education institutions or polytechnics (*ammattikorkeakoulu*). The network of universities and polytechnics is geographically dispersed and covers the entire country. The universities have always had a strong regional role, and the regional development aspect of higher education was further emphasised with the establishment of the polytechnic sector at the beginning of 1990s (Hölttä 1999).

Both sectors are regulated by their respective legislation. The University Act of 1998 increased university autonomy by delegating various governance issues to the universities themselves. However, the Ministry of Education retains the authority to distribute educational responsibilities between universities. In the past decade the focus of steering has changed from budgetary control to a requirement for performance-based accountability. The key element in the steering system is a joint annual consultation process between the ministry and each higher education institution in which the main targets and funding levels are agreed upon. During the past decade the control exercised by the Ministry of Education over the universities has been reduced and the universities have been granted extensive autonomy. This development, along with the streamlining of the internal university administration, has aimed at achieving

greater flexibility and efficiency. (Hölttä 2000.) However, the ‘management by results’ system has not necessarily been received with enthusiasm by the institutional leaders or the actors at the grass-roots level of universities (Hölttä & Rekilä 2006; Treuthardt, Huusko & Saarinen 2006; Kuoppala 2004).

The role of the Ministry of Education is now restricted to strategic plans, general target-setting and monitoring the performance of universities. The Government decides upon a six year development plan for education and university research. In the development plan for 2003–2008 some of the key policy objectives include securing the possibility for educational attainment by all social and age groups around the country, developing education and learning environments to improve quality, to support lifelong learning and entrepreneurialism, to increase the interaction between education, research and working life, to strengthen the basis of the national innovation system, to develop the funding system for education and research in order to secure the availability and international competitiveness of education and research services, and to increase and secure the quality of education and research. (Opetusministeriö 2004) The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council operating administratively under the Ministry of Education, assists the universities and polytechnics in evaluation and quality assurance.

University funding is based on sums allocated by the Ministry of Education, and on external research funding from governmental and non-governmental sources. Between 1998 and 2003 the principles of state funding were gradually changed from an incremental input-based mechanism to an output-based funding formula. The state funding currently includes lump-sum core funding and funding to meet national tasks and universities’ own profiling, as well as funding based on outstanding performance. The funding allocation is based on performance target negotiations between the Ministry and the universities. Education is tuition fee-free for both national EU and non-EU students, although tuition fees for non-EU students have been contemplated from time to time. (Opetusministeriö 2005a, Ministry of Education 2004a, 2005.) Recent developments in Finland include the implementation of a two tier degree structure and the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) as the credit accumulation system, and reducing the period of students’ ‘study right’ in order to shorten the completion times for degrees. There have also been changes to the University Act to allow universities to grant degrees in languages other than Finnish and Swedish. The annual intake to higher education programmes is equivalent to approximately 65% of the relevant age group, with the combined undergraduate and postgraduate degree student population in 2004 totalling 174 000 in universities and 131 000 in polytechnics. In 2004 students completed 2 717 bachelor degrees, 12 588 master degrees and 1399 doctoral degrees in universities, and 20 670 polytechnic degrees in polytechnics. (Opetusministeriö 2005b, 2005c, Ministry of Education 2005, 2006.)

2.2 The internationalisation of higher education in Finland

The general internationalisation of societies and the increasing international interaction has had an effect on Finnish higher education. The structures of Finnish education have been re-modelled to fit international degree structures. The international exchange of teachers, students and researchers has been increased, and the teaching of foreign languages emphasised. Today, internationalisation of higher education is one of the key policy areas in the Finnish higher education policy and there is wide national consensus on the importance of international co-operation and internationalisation of higher education. Finland's strategy for internationalisation and the model for international activities for universities has had to take into account the unique national language and culture, in contrast with countries operating under major world languages (Dobson & Hölttä 2001).

The development of internationalisation has been a slow process, though. Compared to their Nordic neighbours, the scope of internationalisation in Finnish higher education institutions and companies was very limited in the 1980s (Hölttä & Malkki 2000). While the first internationalisation plan was prepared by the Ministry of Education in 1987, the development plans for education and research barely mentioned internationalisation before 1993, and what little attention was paid to it, was focussed rather on research and scientific cooperation than on the internationalisation of education. The aim was to ensure the creation of facilities for international co-operation and the connection of Finnish higher education institutions with international information networks. Increased ability to perform international tasks given by higher education, opportunities for international co-operation in arranging studies; studying abroad; and courses in foreign languages, were also mentioned. (Ministry of Education 1987, Opetusministeriö 1987, 1991, 1993.)

In 1993 the higher education institutions were faced with severe budget cuts due to the economic depression in Finland, and the development plan was modified in response to the new situation. In the new version of the plan, internationalisation gained more ground. At that time, Finland had started the negotiations to join the EU and the prospect of membership brought about new concerns for international co-operation in all areas of society. As a member of the European Free Trade Area, Finland had been able to take part in some of the EU programmes, such as Commett II (from 1990) and Erasmus (from 1992). The objective of the internationalisation programme and participation in Erasmus and other similar mobility schemes was closely related to the acknowledged need for education to provide students with skills needed in international cooperation (Melén-Paaso 1997). The Centre for International Mobility (CIMO) was established 1991 under the auspices of the Ministry of Education to back up the international orientation of universities and later also polytechnics, to provide information about study opportunities abroad and also to advertise Finnish higher education for international students.

Slowly internationalisation penetrated all aspects of higher education policy. The quality of education and research as well as internationalisation were set as central aims in developing higher education and those two objectives were intertwined into one self-enforcing circle: internationalisation was seen to enhance quality and enhanced quality was seen as a way to bring more international students and researchers to Finland, and to enhance its reputation.⁴ Internationalisation was also seen as the means to realise all the other objectives of higher education policy, such as the enhancing of the national innovation system. The quality of research was facilitated by supporting the creation of centres of excellence and full participation in European Union research programmes. The objective was for Finnish higher education institutions to be able to compete with the best institutions in the world. Internationalisation of the environment of higher education was also a reason for increasing the international comparability of the higher education system and degree system. The development plan emphasised the creation of a clear strategy for internationalisation of the higher education institutions in order to meet all the new demands. Internationalisation was to be backed up with enhancing the knowledge of foreign cultures and languages, increasing teaching in foreign languages, facilitating student and teacher mobility with better information and creating possibilities for higher education institutions to receive international students, teachers and researchers. A numerical target for international mobility was set, deeming that by the end of the decade, 5 000 university students and 8 000 polytechnic, general secondary education and vocational education students a year were to spend at least one semester of their studies at a foreign institution. Also, every postgraduate student enrolled in a postgraduate programme was to spend some time studying abroad. Internationalisation at home was to be facilitated by contacts with incoming international students, teachers and researchers. (Opetusministeriö 1993.)

Higher education institutions were especially to develop international education in their strong areas. Europe was of course one of the most important areas for seeking international co-operation in education and research and participation in various EU programmes was stressed. Cooperation with important trade partners such as the United States and Asia was mentioned, as well as the development of co-operation in education and research with less affluent countries. Finland's neighbours: the Nordic and the Baltic countries, as well as Russia, were also specifically mentioned as important areas for co-operation. All polytechnics were expected to participate in at least one international co-operation project. (Opetusministeriö 1993.)

4. However, the process did not go fully uncontested by university staff, who often felt that internationalisation meant having to meet new demands without necessarily being provided with the corresponding means. Insufficient financial and human resources were seen as a key challenge in the internationalisation aspirations, and there were occasionally tensions between the central and departmental levels of universities in implementing internationalisation strategies. Some research findings on the issue, although not necessarily generalisable, can be found in Maassen, Nokkala & Uppström, 2004.

By 1995 when the next five year development plan was drafted, Finland's joining of EU had created pressures to increase international cooperation with European and non-European countries alike, and internationalisation had become part of everyday business in higher education policy, though not necessarily part of the everyday life of the higher education institutions. Internationalisation was seen as a prerequisite for the development of Finnish higher education in general rather than just a separate function of the higher education institutions. The overall opening up of the economy and society and increasing international co-operation in other areas of society made the internationalisation of higher education and increasing its quality a necessity. (Virtanen 2002.) Internationalisation was also one of the corner stones in the creation of the polytechnic sector, and one of the features controlled when granting permanent operating licences for the newly established polytechnics. The universities were encouraged to pursue international co-operation, and establishing internationalisation became one of the indicators in allocating performance-based funding. In 1995 separate strategies were also drafted for higher education with regards to the education and research policies of the European Union. Higher education institutions were encouraged to create their own European strategies. Finland's objective was that education policy was not to be transferred from the member states to the European Union structures. Openness and transparency in EU education policy as well as co-ordination between different education projects were to be increased. The importance of flexibility, careful planning and co-ordination of different opinions in the education administration was emphasised in order to influence the EU policies on education. Also, political co-operation with other members was to be sought to ensure the support for Finnish aims in the EU. International co-operation was to complement the study opportunities provided by Finnish higher education institutions and to offer their expertise to international students, teachers and researchers. Higher education institutions were also encouraged to provide their international functions with adequate resources by making use of external funding opportunities. The European Union structural funds and the framework programme for research were extensively used by the Finnish higher education institutions. The Finnish strategy with regards to the EU research policy emphasised comprehensive participation in the EU research programmes and directing research funds into areas of specific interest for Finnish research. (Opetusministeriö 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, Maassen, Nokkala & Uppström 2004.)

The new version of the EU education strategy was drafted in 2001. The changes in Finnish higher education policy as well as in the European Union made it necessary to re-adjust some of the objectives. Education had gained weight in EU policies in general and was especially explicit in the so called Lisbon process initiated in 2000, and aimed at making Europe the most competitive knowledge-based economy in the world. Lifelong learning, e-learning and different mobility schemes were particularly emphasised in EU policies. The aim of the revised EU strategy was to update the Finnish objectives and to sharpen Finland's profile in the educational policies of EU.

The premises of Finnish EU policy were based on developing the Finnish education system, emphasising the cultural mission of education, active participation in European co-operation in education and research, and taking into account the increasingly horizontal nature of educational issues. The main aims were related to the quality of education, life long learning, information society skills and utilisation of information and communication technology in education, facilitating mobility, and the role of education in enhancing employment. The strategy also stressed the importance of internal co-ordination of the EU matter in education administration, co-operation within EU structures in horizontal issues as well as strengthening co-operation between EU, OECD, UNESCO, Council of Europe and Nordic Council of Ministers in educational issues. (Opetusministeriö 2001.)

The international dimension of higher education has further changed because of two separate but related developments. The first of these is the increased marketisation of higher education and the emergence of international higher education markets. The global market for trading higher education has expanded markedly over the past few years, and higher education has become one of the fastest growing service sectors and an affluent business. The second development is the so called Bologna process, aimed at creating a joint European Higher Education Area by 2010, which has often been seen as a response to the increasing marketisation. Even though the signing of the Bologna Declaration raised some questions in Finland, especially with regards to the development of the common degree structures, the opposition thereafter subsided and most of the goals of the Bologna Process are now shared by the higher education community. Having implemented many of its objectives in record time, Finland has become a sort of a model pupil of the Bologna process. (See e.g. Reichert & Tauch 2003, 2005.)

Increasing and ensuring the competitiveness of the Finnish higher education system and higher education institutions as well as the whole Finnish society is a prominent legitimisation for internationalisation, and the possibility for Finnish scholars and higher education institutions to integrate into international research and education funding schemes and use them to facilitate the work done in Finnish higher education institutions has been a prominent feature of internationalisation strategy. However, the internationalisation of higher education is not such a crucial funding mechanism for the higher education institution to the same extent that it is in some other countries. British universities attempt to attract foreign students to study in Britain as a source of fee income and this is also a conscious business strategy of some of the Australian universities operating on a large scale in South-East Asia. There are, also, full-scale corporate universities based in United States. At the moment, the internationalisation of higher education in Finland does not seem to be an instrument for gathering profit but internationalising education and building up quality may be creating a basis for possible future development on that area. (Maassen, Nokkala & Uppström 2004.)

The internationalisation of higher education also has a central position in the Finnish information society programme (Dobson & Hölttä 2001).

These developments are also noted in the international strategy for higher education institutions passed in 2001 by the Ministry of Education, which sets as a target for 2010 for Finland to be “*a well-known and influential part of the European education and research area, and a successful player in the global contest for skills. The higher education community will be international and the demands of internationalization will be taken into account in the content of education. Finland will have a community of 10,000–15,000 foreign degree students (around 4 per cent of all higher education students) and the annual volume of student exchanges will be around 28,000. At least 15 per cent of graduate school students will be foreigners. The numbers of students with immigrant backgrounds will have increased considerably. The numbers of foreign teachers, experts and researchers working at Finnish institutions of higher education will be double what they were in 2001. Finnish businesses will already be benefiting from the labour input of foreigners who have studied in Finland.*” (Ministry of Education 2001) The strategy emphasises the importance of Finnish higher education institutions to be able to compete with foreign providers in the internationalising field of higher education. The brain drain is perceived as possible a threat if the higher education institutions cannot keep attracting Finnish and foreign students to study and if Finnish students and graduates are searching for education and work abroad.

The strategy lists some mechanisms for attaining the goals lined out in the strategy. The high quality of education is the most important prerequisite. The attracting of international students will be facilitated by creating a marketing strategy for higher education institutions, by relaxing regulations regarding foreign students’ entry into the country and staying in Finland, by providing foreign students with adequate housing and healthcare services and by ensuring that there are enough courses provided in foreign languages. Although the option for charging tuition fees for non-EU students was discussed in a 2005 Ministry of Education report, the law has not yet been changed to permit this. In 2005 the University Act was changed so as to allow higher education degrees to also be granted in other languages other than Finnish or Swedish which had been the case up to that. (Ministry of Education 2001, Opetusministeriö 2005a.)

2.3 Finland’s survival history and higher education

The approach to history adopted in this study is primarily a narrative one. The history of Finland can be, and perhaps commonly is, seen as a survival history of a “small nation⁵”. The history of a particular country and nation, and the writing of its his-

5. The notions of Finland as a small nation or as a small country are presented in quotation marks to emphasise the narrative nature of this notion. “Finland is a small country” is also a phrase explicitly presented by some of the interviews.

tory, defines the characteristics of the country, its origins and development over time. History defines a country's friends and enemies and its place in the world alongside, and in competition with, the other nations of the world, illustrating the conditions for its survival and prosperity. History accounts for the values that have contributed to a nation's success or endangered it, what kind its people are and what they must do to survive, also providing images which warn the nation of what could happen if its suggestions are not followed and warnings taken into account. Because history and the writing of it are used to create an image of a country and nation and its identity, history has a tendency to turn into a hero story, which supports the construction of the national identity and image. (Upton 1999.) In order to understand the Finnish higher education or knowledge society discourse, it is important to understand certain features of Finnish history, both "*wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*"⁶ and the image it has created of the sufferings and survival of the nation and the characteristics of its people. Like the meta-narrative of the knowledge society (Jessop 2004) which will be discussed later on, history, too, is a meta-narrative which sets the other narratives and discourses in their place and defines their relationship. History should not therefore be taken as a collection of facts but as a story which is constructed to give ourselves an understanding of who we are and what we stand for (see e.g. Oakeshott 1983, 1–44). The story of the history of Finland constructed in the empirical data of my study, and interpreted by me, is the history of survival of a "small nation". In the following paragraphs, this story is told in its common form, which by no means represents the whole truth (such as there is one) of Finland's history.

Having been part of the Swedish kingdom for several hundred years⁷, Finland was passed on to Russia in 1809 and remained an autonomous grand duchy of the Russian empire until 1917, when Finland claimed independence in the aftermath of the First World War and the Bolshevik revolution. The nation-building in the 19th century was greatly facilitated by the Imperial Alexander University, later to be called the University of Helsinki.⁸ The young country faced a civil war in the months following

6. The famous maxim of Leopold von Ranke, the German founder of modern professional history writing in the 19th century, who called for historical science, uncovering the past "as it really was".

7. As a result of the Swedish period, Finland has a Swedish speaking minority population, currently consisting of ca. 300 000 people, 6% of the population. The Swedish speakers were, for a long time, in general, wealthier than the rest of the population. However, the differences have been diminishing since the late nineteenth century, and there is no antagonism between the two groups. Finland still has two official languages and a relatively strong official bilingual identity, although there are groups especially amongst Finnish speakers, who do not necessarily endorse the official bilingualism. Allardt (1979) has pointed out that the Swedish-speaking Finns present an unusual case amongst linguistic minorities in Europe, as they all speak and write their own language fluently.

8. For an analysis of the role of higher education in earlier Finnish nation building, see Välimaa 2001.

the independence, and the war split the nation in two⁹ for decades. The unification of the nation only took place during the Winter War against the Soviet Union between November 1939 and March 1940, when curbing the attack of the much larger nation helped the Finnish to set differences aside and the “miracle of the Winter War” came to symbolise the unity of the nation. While Finland had to surrender a large part of its territory to the Soviet Union, the country nevertheless retained its independence. After a short peace in 1940–1941, Finland faced another war with Soviet Union between June 1941 and September 1944. This time the country was better prepared for the war after having made a pact with the national socialist Germany, and initiated the hostilities with the idea of reclaiming the lost territories and further annexing Eastern Carelia to Finland. However, in the peace following the war Finland had to permanently relinquish 12% of its area to Soviet Union and had to resettle 420 000 of its citizens. An allied commission placed in Helsinki remained in the country until 1947, and, although Finland remained a democracy, the Soviet Union had certain influence on Finnish foreign and domestic policy throughout the cold war period and until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. This gave name to a political buzzword of its time, *Finlandisierung*, *finlandisation*, which refers to a smaller country letting its larger neighbour influence its domestic policy. Internally however, Finland developed as a relatively successful consociational nation.¹⁰ Joining the European Union in 1995 finally closed the era and brought Finland to the mainstream of Western European political and economic sphere. (See e.g. Jussila, Hentilä & Nevakivi 1995.)

Until the Second World War, the country had remained relatively poor, with agriculture, forestry and limited industrial production as its economic cornerstones. The heavy war reparations which Finland had to pay to the Soviet Union laid the foundation for the speedy industrialisation of the country, which contributed to a rapid structural change, industrialisation and urbanisation in the 1960s. The most important industries included forestry, paper and machinery. The post-war baby boom resulted in rapid expansion of the education system, including higher education in the 1960s, accompanied by the establishment of several universities around the country. The welfare state was modelled on the Nordic counterparts and the faith in education was strong. (Jussila, Hentilä & Nevakivi 1995.) In the 1970s and 1980s the slogan which defined the national self-image demonstrated the strong belief in the welfare state and the excellence of Finland: “Being born in Finland is like winning a lottery”. The high investment in education reaped benefits when Finland faced the

9. In the civil war, the two parties consisted of the “whites” i.e. primarily the advocates of political right wing parties, bourgeois, land owners and industrialists; and the “reds”, i.e. the advocates of the political left wing parties, industrial and agricultural workers. Both these groups had their own organised military groups in the civil war. See e.g. Alapuro 1988.

10. Consociational = “certain pattern of political life in which the political elites of distinct social groups succeed in establishing a viable, pluralistic state by a process of mutual forbearance and accommodation.” (Daalder 1973, 14). For a comparison of national building processes in European countries, see Linz, 1973.

most serious economic depression of its history from the beginning of the 1990s¹¹. The depression was seen yet as another struggle on the national horizon of struggles, and it became part of the story of national survival. (Blomberg, Hannikainen & Kettunen 2002b.) The effects of the depression, which can be attributed to the ending of the trade with Soviet Union on its collapse, and the simultaneous liberalisation of the financial markets and the unsuccessful monetary and financial policy at the turn of the 1990s, were felt by a large portion of the population for an extended period of time. A huge portion of businesses faced bankruptcy and in 1993 the unemployment figures reached 20%. Although the national economy was swiftly balanced, the social duration of the depression was much longer than the economic crisis. The employment structure was permanently changed, and the mental toll of the depression reached far into the 1990s, even to the 21st century. (Blomberg, Hannikainen & Kettunen 2002b, Kiander 2002.)

Besides the economic depression at the beginning of the decade, Finnish education policy in the 1990s was influenced by two other factors that radically changed the society, namely the mass unemployment resulting from the depression and the collapse of bilateral soviet trade, and finally the country's joining to the European Union in 1995. Despite the economic depression, and the reduction in the financial resources available to the Ministry of Education, the overall investment in education was not reduced to the same extent as in many other countries. The main policy lines in educational policy of the 1990s represented a follow-through of the ideas concerning the development of the educational system drawn up at the end of the 1980s, albeit that many of the developments were conditional on the smallest possible extra cost. (Virtanen 2002.) The educational policy has been marked by what Virtanen (2002, 294-295) calls preference policy: under the condition of economic scarcity, the Ministry of Education prioritised certain programmes over others, so that the information society project and higher education and research in general were the beneficiaries of the prioritisation. Education, lifelong learning and the information society have been seen as the central strategy by which Finland was to be pulled out of the depression. Increased evaluation, accountability and autonomy of the educational institutions, as well as a policy of increasing the educational level and educational attainment of the population, have been central to the education policy. National education policy has been compared with, and argued by, the international education policy developments; the OECD and EU evaluations have been especially significant in influencing Finnish policy. The contents of education have been made more international especially in the higher education sector and international exchanges have been emphasised. Although there has been some criticism that the education policy in the 1990s turned towards neoliberal policies, Virtanen (2002) argues that no such change took place and instead he maintains that equality was maintained as a central value in education

11. A good analysis of the economic depression and its effects can be found e.g. in Blomberg, Hannikainen & Kettunen (2002a) and Blom (1999a).

policy throughout the 1990s. Salmi (2002) has pointed out that stress on the importance of technology and technological solutions to the societal problem increased in the Finnish policy rhetoric in the 1990s. Despite the depression, the percentage of GDP invested in science, primarily in the development of technology, rose from the beginning of the 1990s. This was in contrast to the situation in many other OECD countries. Finland was able to rise from the depression by focussing on knowledge intensive new technologies, implementing radical measures combining liberalisation of the labour market economy whilst retaining the welfare state and implementing a multifaceted information society programme. (Castells & Himanen 2002.) In 2004 the R&D investment was 3.5% of GDP and Finland's R&D investment amounted to a total 5.3 Billion Euros. The country has held the top position in the World Economic Forum's competitiveness ranking for several years in a row (Ministry of Education 2006).

Upton's (1999) observation on the importance of history for the self-understanding of the nation may help us to understand why many of the "truths" uncovered by the writing of history, such as the expansive endeavours of the continuation war, the Finlandisation of the cold war era, and the economic depression of the 1990s, have been translated into a survival story. A good example of such a utilisation of the history narrative, is Castells and Himanen's (2002) analysis of the Finnish knowledge society model, take the archetypal narrative of Finland's survival and weave it to the narrative of the knowledge society, presenting them with a positive connotation and questioning neither. Thus, they create an even stronger narrative, but one whose narrative character is, nevertheless, not recognised. They argue that in understanding the Finnish identity, the most important background is the survival story of a "small country": survival against the harsh climate, survival under foreign powers, economic survival in face of hardship and economic depression, cultural survival of a small language and population evident from the brief history above. The knowledge society has become the new survival project and the rhetoric of the national survival legitimises the building the knowledge society and the role of the state in it. The Finnish knowledge society model is based on a mix of innovative knowledge-intensive policy and preservation of the welfare state. The Finnish identity is both the primary motor of building the knowledge society, and the knowledge society a way of building the Finnish identity, it is a new image which is aimed at replacing the old images of a forestry-based economy or the Soviet satellite. The short history of the country explains the strong orientation towards the future, instead of the past, as well as the certain inferiority, which causes the Finnish to be very interested in how other countries see them, and take great pride in success in international comparisons. The positive attitude towards technology, a homogenous population and social structure, and a high working morality reminiscent of Weber's protestant ethic are typical for Finland. Alongside the last feature, a new pleasure based the work ethic, *hacker ethic* as they call it, is emerging and changing work from obligation to leisure. (Castells & Himanen

2002.) In the follow-up report in 2004, Himanen (2004) however noted that during the two years which had elapsed since the first report, the Finnish knowledge society development was threatened to be stalled by too much self-satisfaction and the disappearing dynamism. With the arguments presented in Castells and Himanen (2002) and in Himanen (2004), the authors further reproduce the narratives of survival of a small country and the knowledge society project in it, setting further obligations for Finland, its citizens and institutions to fulfil.

2.4 The Finnish knowledge society

The Finnish strategy for bringing the country forth after the economic depression and to redefine its image as a modern, progressive, knowledge oriented country, was the strategy of bringing about an information society or a knowledge society. The Finnish language presents an interesting ambiguity about the nature of such a new society. The central concept, *tieto*, can be translated both as knowledge and as information, and there seems to be no single policy on whether *tietoyhteiskunta* (*yhteiskunta* meaning society) should be translated as information society or knowledge society. In my analysis I have tried to interpret rather freely which type of *tieto* is being referred to and in which context, be it information or knowledge. In general it may be said that while the older policy documents addressing this issue had a clearly technological orientation and warranted the use of term information society with its emphasis on the use of information technology and information work, the wider societal changes are such as to be better covered by the concept knowledge society. (See e.g. Tapper 2003.) I have chosen to use the competitive knowledge society as one of the central concepts of my study. The concept “knowledge society” in my opinion better captures the essence of the change in the nature of the society, and its new identity, than the more technologically oriented concept “information society”. Similarly, I have preferred to use the concept of knowledge society to knowledge economy, in order to avoid economic determinism (cf. Bagnall 2000), glorifying the economy as something which would be separate and independent of society, and disconnected from the individuals in it. In a knowledge society, as in any society, the economy is part of it, but the society cannot be reduced to the economy alone. As will be discussed later, most theorists of the knowledge society as well as most policy documents discussing it emphasise its competitive characteristics, and it is for this reason I have decided to use the notion of the competitive knowledge society as the central concept. The theoretical discussions on the distinctions between knowledge society and knowledge economy, or information society, knowledge society and learning society are referred to later on, but they are largely irrelevant to the purposes of this study.

The starting point of the Finnish knowledge or information society project may be said to be Suomi tietoyhteiskunnaksi -programme (“Finland to knowledge society”) published by the Finnish Ministry of Finance in 1995 (Valtiovarainministeriö 1995), in the aftermath of the great economic depression at the beginning of the decade. It was modelled on the respective US (*National information Infrastructure. Agenda for Action* 1993) and EU (*Europe and the Global Information Society – Recommendations to the European Council*, or the so called Bangemann report 1994) information society programmes published at the beginning of the 1990s. Following the technological determinism of its international predecessors, the Finnish information society policy also emphasised information technology as the cornerstone of the new Finnish information society. The first document set the basis for a rather technology oriented, even technocratic, interpretation of information society, while explicitly or implicitly assigning the information society as a shared national project and the responsibility of all the citizens. (Tapper 2003, Salmi 2002) The aim of the information society policy was to make Finland one of the leading information societies in Europe and in the world. It was seen as a survival strategy both in terms of the economy and the national self-image, and was aimed at increasing employment, increasing economic growth through widespread use of information technology and raising Finland to the forefront of international competition in the field of information technology products and services. Additional aims included a set of economic and social goals: Finland’s success in an open world economy improved prerequisites for employment and entrepreneurship, making Finland a leading information society and improving the competitiveness and service ability of the public sector, as well as enabling the balanced development of society, advancing the individual aspirations and civil society and further developing the knowledge-based civilisation. (Tapper 2003, Valtiovarainministeriö 1995.) Higher education had a special role in the information society programme right from the start, and the Ministry of Education drafted its first information society strategy in 1995, with subsequent strategies in 1999 and 2004. (Hölttä & Malkki 2000, Opetusministeriö 1995d, 1999, Ministry of Education 2004b). The next national information society policy was drafted in 1998, and it continued along many of the same lines as the first document, emphasising information technology in the Finnish information society development and presenting Finland as one of the leading information societies in the world. Information technology was presented as solving all problems related to skills and knowledge, competitiveness, efficiency, employment, regional equality, as well as providing new paths to self-development, self-fulfilment, interaction and quality of life. (Sitra 1998.)

Finland’s success in building the information society was rapid, and can be attributed to a set of developments such as the deep economic change resulting from the economic depression, international economic integration and globalisation, the rapid development of information technology, the early liberalisation of the Finnish telecommunications services industry, the national strategy for the use of information

technology in public administration and services, educational strategy emphasising information technology knowledge and skills, investment in information technology development and finally the strategy permeating all sectors and levels of society (Tapper 2003). The technological orientation of the Finnish information society concept at the turn of the millennium is evident also in the research done on it at the time, which emphasised the technological orientation by deeming Finland a good case study in terms of its use of information technology, informational infrastructure or information work. (See e.g. Blom 1999b.)

Salmi (2002) has argued that in the 1990s the horizon of the information society rhetoric in Finland was very narrow, constructing a clear line between the past and the future, which was to be in the making now. Besides the technological emphasis, the information society programme also relied heavily on the concept of innovation, the meaning of which was widened from technological to cultural and social innovation. In this context the universities were increasingly perceived as centres of innovation. Salmi argues that while innovation as such is irreproachable as a concept, in cultural contexts it sounds harsh, contracting the diverse education and research functions into rather technical, utility-oriented activity. As the rhetoric changed, the basic funding of universities decreased and funding for applied research increased. The innovation-centred understanding of education and science born in the aftermath of the economic depression emphasised the building of research and knowledge contributing to objectives of economic growth. (Salmi 2002.)

The economic depression at the beginning of 1990s brought about a new societal trend, a definition of the ideal citizenship of the knowledge society (cf. Dudley 1999, 65–66). The discussion changed from emphasising the rights of the individual to the obligations of the individual towards the society: the obligation to participate in education, employment and the project of raising national innovativeness, and thereby the obligation to contribute to the improvement of national competitiveness and economic growth. The new ideal citizen is information intensive, adapted to constantly collecting and applying information. The ideal citizen is expected to be an active member of the civil society, who, through network connections reaching every home, office and service-centre, communicates and participates in the decision-making of the civil society. S/he seeks knowledge and information and works flexibly regardless of time and space. S/he is flexible, manages risks in his / her own life and activities and adapts rapidly to the changes in all walks of life. (Tapper 2003, Salmi 2002.) Any development which is likely to hinder the birth of this “utopian citizen of the knowledge society” (Salmi 2002, 335), including the unwillingness of the individuals to learn, is considered a threat factor. As Blomberg et al (2002b) have noted, this national discourse in Finland was widely accepted and very unified during the 1990s. There was very little resistance to the idea that economic growth would solve all problems, and that the increased flexibility of the labour markets and social security systems would be the prerequisite of economic growth. The Finnish economic depression prepared the fertile ground

for the new flexibilisation discourse and ideal citizenship typical for the competitive knowledge societies. The birth of “the civil knowledge society” was seen to be dependent on erasing such threats and the resistance to adopting the new knowledge society premises. The economic depression and the adoption of the competitive knowledge society as the primary national rhetoric paved the way for an education and research strategy which is consistent with the objectives of economic growth, and which will have a long term effect on the Finnish culture and society. (Salmi 2002)

There are also indications that the information technology-oriented knowledge society model would be redefined. The latest information society programme, published in 2006 sets as its vision “A good life in the information society”, emphasising the shift from a society merely using information and communication technology to a society oriented towards knowledge-based growth, and emphasising the need to change structures and procedures of the society, economy and working life alongside the use of technology. It calls for a “Finland Phenomenon” (instead of a “China Phenomenon”): renewing Finland to become an “internationally attractive, humane and competitive knowledge and service society”, and for its main policy programme to include introducing measures to promote lifelong learning, reforming the rules governing working life and developing leadership and management skills, reforming the innovation system and establishing a policy programme to renew service structures within public administration. (Tietoyhteiskuntaohjelma 2006). Also, based on the theoretical work on information society by Manuel Castells (Castells 2000a, 2000b, 2004, Castells & Himanen 2002), Himanen (2004) has emphasised the need to develop a “model 2.0 knowledge society”, meaning a caring, encouraging and creative Finland defending the affluent society in the global knowledge society. The values of the Model 2.0 Finland, based on a heritage of Finnish and European values and traditions, should include caring, trust, community, encouragement, liberty, creativity, courage, vision, balance and meaningfulness. Our response to the challenges of global competition should rise from these values: a new society based on a creative economy, creative welfare society, humanly meaningful development and global culture. The creative economy means an economy with more funding for producing innovations especially in culture and wellbeing, more incentives through personal taxation, and emphasis on creative working culture and leadership. The creative welfare society is based on a separation of purchaser and provider levels in the production of welfare services, with the public sector as a purchaser of the services provided primarily by the private and third sectors and a strong basis of free and high quality education system. The humanly meaningful development refers to a socially, psychologically, physically and culturally balanced development, and the global culture refers to a culture of opening up and receiving as opposed to culture of closing the doors, global reciprocity and attractiveness.

2.5 Higher education policy in Europe

The national and international level developments around higher education share significant similarities, namely the emphasis on increasing the competitiveness of national and regional economies and the increasing convergence of national higher education policies around the new public management measure in governance of higher education¹². The convergence of the policies may take place for instance in the form of policy borrowing or learning or imposition of legislation and practises (Dale 1999). The two most important contexts for the Finnish higher education policy are the intergovernmental Bologna Process aimed at creating the European higher education area by 2010, in which Finland has been a signatory party since its initiation in 1999, and the European Union which has an increasing interest in higher education supported and conducted by its members, as a way of contributing to the competitiveness of the European Union. These two contexts have shaped the Finnish higher education policy both directly through a set of policy objectives and implementing joint policy agendas, but also indirectly through their specific discourses. Similarly there are significant international, non-European processes and policy contexts which contribute to the European discourse and discussions, especially the processes of international associations such as UNESCO, OECD or the World Bank. Also, in Europe there is a considerable number of other higher education policy actors and stakeholders, who aim directly or indirectly to contribute to the European higher education policy agenda. These include for instance the Council of Europe, as well as several common-interest organisations such as the European University Association (EUA), the Education International (ESIB), the National Unions of Students in Europe, the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), or the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). However, to account for all these organisations would be a massive task, and would also shift the focus of this study away from its primary context, namely Finnish higher education policy. Therefore this study only concentrates on the European Union and the Bologna Process as the European higher education policy contexts. To bring some further perspective to the governmental discussion of the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Process of the European Union, attention is also paid in the document analysis to the discourse the European University Association, EUA. The organisation was established as the two previous unions representing European universities and national rectors' conferences, namely the Association of European Universities (CRE) and The Confederation of European Union Rectors' Conferences merged in 2001. EUA has a double structure and it represents both national rectors' conferences and individual universities. As of October 2006, the membership base of the organisation comprised 780 members in 46 European countries.

12. These trends are discussed further in chapter 3.

According to the EU legislation, the EU does not have a mandate on education policy and EU activities have previously concentrated on student mobility programmes such as the Tempus programme and the Erasmus programme, the latter of which could be called an EU flagship programme, and has contributed to the mobility of over one million European exchange students. However, the perceived increasing competition between knowledge societies has rendered education increasingly important on the EU agenda during the past decade or so. While the Maastricht treaty establishing the European Union allocated a very modest role to the European Commission (EC) in the field of higher education, there has been a gradual yet visible change in the extent to which the higher education has risen on the EC and the EU policy agenda. This development has been intensified by the eagerness of EU members to keep a close eye on the policy development in other EU countries. A good example of this can be seen in the way the Finnish polytechnic sector was modelled on the German “Fachhochschulen” and Dutch “hogescholen” sectors. The European Union’s actions in higher education have increased on different policy levels and across geographical borders, sparking off new initiatives such as the introduction of the Erasmus Mundus degrees geared towards attracting students from third countries, increasing public consultations on the field of higher education policies, and connecting education and research more closely to the economic policy agenda. (van der Wende & Huisman 2004, Huisman & van der Wende 2004b.) The introduction in 2000 of the so called Lisbon Agenda, which aims at making the EU the most competitive knowledge economy by 2010, has increased the EU’s interest in education, research and life-long learning as a means of reaching this objective. The education and research objectives within the Lisbon Agenda aims at making European education and training systems a world quality reference by 2010. This is to be achieved through improving quality, facilitating universal access, and opening up to the wider world, as well as achieving a level of research and development investment equivalent to 3% of GDP in by 2010. The prominent role currently enjoyed by the European Commission as a partner in the Bologna Process and the so called open method of coordination increasing the cooperation of the EU member states in education has contributed to the increasing importance of the EU as a higher education policy actor. (European Commission 2003.)

Due to the lack of official EU competence in the field of education, alternative cooperation schemes have emerged in Europe, the most important of them being the intergovernmental Bologna Process currently including 45 signatory countries and aiming at creating the European Higher Education Area by 2010, by facilitating transparency and transferability of higher education degrees throughout Europe. The rationales, objectives and methods of the two processes are remarkably similar, and they are converging even further. However, they also have their differences, the most prominent being that the Bologna process is a bottom-up intergovernmental process, whereas the Lisbon process is steered top-down by the European commission. The Bologna process may also be said to give more weight to the social aspects, counterbalancing the calls for competitiveness. (Kwiek 2003, van der Wende & Huisman 2004, Wächter 2004.)

The driving forces behind the Bologna Process are the need to enhance competitiveness, comparability and quality of European higher education, and to increase the employability and mobility of European graduates (Huisman & van der Wende 2004b, Wächter 2004). The origins of the Bologna Process lie in the 800th anniversary of the University of Sorbonne in 1998. The ministers of education of four major European Countries: Britain, France, Germany and Italy signed a Sorbonne Declaration on harmonisation of the degree structures in Europe at the Sorbonne celebration. (Sorbonne Declaration 1998; Witte 2006, 124–129) The idea of harmonisation was a very contentious one, and very few countries joined in on the declaration later on, although the opportunity for this was offered. However, the idea of a Europe-wide higher education space was reintroduced the following year, and the Bologna Declaration was signed by 29 countries, with more countries to follow over the next few years. Currently the Bologna process includes 45 European countries, excluding only Belarus, which has been refused membership due to its undemocratic regime.

The Bologna Process aims to increase the transferability and comparability of degrees and thus mobility within Europe by comparable two-tier degree structures, the Diploma Supplement, European Credit Transfer System, quality assurance mechanisms and removing the social and economic barriers to mobility. Although the degree structure was perhaps the most emphasised element at the beginning of the process, the quality assurance goal seems to be emerging as the new top priority. The process is monitored by biannual ministerial meetings, organised in Prague 2001, Berlin 2003, Bergen 2005 with the next to be organised in London 2007. Between the ministerial meetings, the follow-up of the process is carried on by large groups with representatives from each of the signatory countries. The European Commission and the Council of Europe, EUA, ESIB, EURASHE, UNESCO/CEPES, ENQA, UNICE and EI are consultative members. The follow-up group is assisted by a secretariat based in the country which is to host the next ministerial meeting. A smaller board, chaired by the EU president, with the next host-country as the vice-chair, will oversee the process between the follow-up group meetings. (Bologna Declaration 1999, Prague Communiqué 2001, Berlin Communiqué 2003, Bergen Communiqué 2005, Witte 2006, Wächter 2004.)

As the Bologna Process is not a legally binding agreement, but rather a set of policy guidelines, its implementation has varied from country to country depending on the resources and specific interests of each country. The relative vagueness of the Bologna Process measures give the signatory countries considerable latitude to experiment with certain policy changes and call for Bologna Process as their legitimisation. (Huisman & van der Wende 2004b, see also Witte 2006; Reichert & Tauch 2003, 2005; Huisman & van der Wende 2004a for examples on implementation.) The significance of the EU Lisbon Process and the Bologna Process for the Finnish higher education discourse will become evident in the analysis later on in this study, as will the redefinition of the University institution in the context of the competitive knowledge society.

– Chapter 3 – The changing social institution of University

3.1 Introduction

The University as a social institution and as a set of narratives and discourses about its character has shown considerable durability. “About eighty-five institutions in the Western world established by 1520 still exist in recognisable forms, with similar functions and with unbroken histories, including the Catholic Church, the Parliaments of the Isle of Man, of Iceland and of Great Britain, several Swiss cantons, and seventy universities. Kings that rule, feudal lords and vassals, and guilds with monopolies, are all gone. These seventy universities, however, are still in the same locations with some of the same buildings, and with governance carried on in much the same ways. There may have been intervening variations of the same themes, it is true, but the eternal themes of teaching, scholarship, and service, in one combination or another, continue. Looked at from within, the universities have changed enormously in the emphases of their several functions and in their guiding spirits, but looked at from without and comparatively, they are among the least changed of institutions.” (Kerr 1995, 115.) This famous quote is a tribute to the continuing idea and institution of University, despite the changes in the ways in which its forms and functions have been carried out. At the same time, it along with many other University descriptions such as Bowen (1977) or Delanty (2000) implicitly and explicitly represents an important building block in the narrative of one kind of ideal University institution: one which stretches far back in the history and, by comparison with the other mentioned institutions, claims a special place amongst the most important institutions in society. This is not to say, however, that the University as an institution has not encountered significant changes during its nearly thousand year history.

With the rise of the territorial nation states during the 17th century, the originally cosmopolitan universities gradually became nationalised, absorbed in the centralising and absolutist state, and lost much of their cosmopolitan character. Universities became important centres for promoting and codifying national cultures, languages and geographies, and the academics became an important part of the national elites. They also evolved along different paths in different countries (see e.g. Ben-David 1977). One of the most influential university models was the 19th century German university model, often called the Humboldtian university model, which was characterised by its bringing together research and education functions in the university. Gradually the Humboldtian idea of the unity of research and education was adopted world wide (Ben-David 1977). During the course of the 20th century, the University moved from the margins of the society to the centre of it. This shift marked a change in the ethos of the University. Instead of the pursuit of truth and knowledge, the University came

to take the social project of equality, democratic plurality, justice and dissemination of knowledge to an ever widening audience as its key mission. Clark Kerr (1995) in his famous book *The Uses of the University*, based on a series of lectures delivered at the Harvard University and originally written in 1963, declared that a new University was born, characterised by a multiplicity of tasks, values and internal communities, sometimes even conflicting ones. Kerr called this the Multiversity, a post-modern University where there is no single set of truths, values or practises, a plural institution of mutual co-existence rather than a tight-knit single-purpose institution. With the rise of counter-cultures, post-modern philosophy and the political struggles in the 1960s and 1970s and University engagement in them, the University also ceased to be a place of cultural transmission and became an institution of cultural transformation and one of the most important institutions cultivating democratic values. (Delanty 2000, 28–36, 44–45, 58–61.)

The recent change of society from a modern, industrial society to the post-modern, globalised knowledge society has contributed to a significant change in the University, both as an organisation (university) and as a social institution (University) in society. The University, be it institution or organisation, is naturally a complex, multifaceted object of research, so no list describing its characteristics or changes would be exhaustive¹³, therefore I am concentrating on the ones I see as the most important for the change of the University as a social institution having certain perceived tasks in society, namely the changes in teaching and learning, knowledge production, governance and the characteristics of a new type of university organisation, an entrepreneurial university.

The changes faced by higher education and higher education institutions in the post-war decades, and more recently during the last two decades, have been described in numerous studies in the past years. (Gibbons et al 1994, Nowotny et al 2001, Smith & Webster 1997, Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Delanty 2000.) The common trends traced by those accounts include the step-up in the pace of higher education massification in the past decade and a half, curriculum reform to cater for the increasingly specialised needs of the labour market, and emphasis on transferable skills. These trends include the proliferation of institutional forms and missions, the diversification of the university funding base (and increasing market orientation), changes in the mode of knowledge production towards transdisciplinarity, cooperation between various knowledge providers, and increasing global competition. Last but not least, connected to the other reforms and changes, is the internationalisation of higher education, both expanding in scope and diversifying in forms, which will be discussed further in the next chapter. These have contributed to an increasing volatility and instability of the

13. For example Teicher (2000) presents one classification of the different perspectives from which the university can be studied. He names quantitative structural aspects, knowledge and subject-related aspects, person and teaching and learning related aspects, and finally aspects of institution, organisation and governance and possible windows to studying universities.

context in which universities operate, causing them to rethink their mission and role in society. Universities need to decide whether to seek recourse in old legitimations, to accommodate the multiplicity of missions and accompanying uncertainty, or to embrace the full-blown commercialisation and competition model, which is so often presented as the only logical course of action for them. At the discursive level, several legitimations coexist, as will be discussed later.

As with the majority of higher education research, I have also decided to accept this change as a given fact, both of the University as an institution and of the universities as organisations, an uncontested starting point of my research. The University has changed, and is changing. The story of the change of the University is essentially a story of the increasing entanglement of the University and the society. My aim in this chapter is to map some of these changes in order to understand what the main functions of the University as a social institution are, that is, as a particular configuration of norms, values and practises, and as such relatively resistant to change, but facing internal and external pressures to change (Scott 2001). The institutional change may be externally imposed through the introduction of changing legislative frameworks, but might also come about by means of assuming new identities and self-understanding and resulting changes in norms and values, practises and repertoires used by the universities to refer to themselves (Scott 2001, Fairclough 2001a, 2003a). In this chapter my aim is to look at the changes in the norms, values and practices of education, knowledge production, governance and the relationship between the University and the state, society and global market. I will also examine some of the narratives of the ideal University institution as described in much of the research about universities and the discursivity of the institutions in general.

In order to understand the behaviour of the universities it is important to understand the nature of the University as a social institution, constrained and constituted by the social context as well as the internal institutional logics. The patterns of this logic are made visible by institutional theory. Institutional theory is a broad group of theories which share the belief that the human actions that constitute institutions is also constrained by them. Institutional theory emphasises both the importance of the formal rules of the game, and the informal institutions embedded in culture and convention. Rules which guide behaviour and are embedded in social and political institutions include routines, procedures, conventions, roles, strategies, organisational forms, and technologies around which political activity is organised, and the beliefs, paradigms, codes, cultures and knowledge which surround, support, elaborate and contradict those roles and routines. Rules are historically contextualised, and although they are often seen as bringing stability, order and predictability to behaviour, they are potentially rich in conflict, contradiction and ambiguity. They therefore provide a source of deviation as well as conformity (March & Olsen 1989, 22, 38). The multiplicity of the rules, norms, roles and cognitive scripts related to University institution are

reflected in the combination of discourses of internationalisation of higher education and the legitimations of the University.

3.2 Institutions and institutional theory

In general it can be said that institutional theory, perhaps more appropriately described as a varied and multifaceted group of theories rather than a single theory¹⁴, consists of two main approaches. On the one hand there is the rational choice-oriented economic and public choice institutionalism, and more culturally and on the other cognitively oriented sociological institutionalism. The concept of institutions has several different meanings in these different theoretical approaches. In economics and public choice variations, institutions are seen as products of conscious human design, whereas in more sociologically oriented organisation theory and regime theory¹⁵ approaches, institutions are seen as outcomes of human activity, but as unintended ones, not as outcomes resulting from conscious design. This is a rejection of the rational actor model and represents a turn towards more cognitive and cultural explanations of institutions, which cannot be explained as aggregations of human interests or actions. Instead, institutions are seen as shared, taken-for-granted cognitions defining which actions are possible. Other differences also follow from this difference in the nature of institutions. The more rational choice-oriented institutionalists argue that actors construct the institutions which best serve their interests, whereas sociological institutionalists reject this approach and argue that individuals do not choose the institutions, customs social norms or legal procedures, but they are internalised through education and socialisation. The third difference between the two main approaches is related to the way in which institutions respond to the exogenous changes. Sociological institutionalism argues that institutionalised behaviours and structures change more slowly than non-institutionalised ones, and that they are reproduced because of their taken-for-granted nature, no appropriate alternatives can be conceived for them. The more rational action-oriented institutionalism on the other hand tends to treat institutions as any other temporary structures and norms, which are changed and adapted to best suit the environment. (Powell & DiMaggio 1991, 8–10).

The term institution is strikingly complex and vague. In general sociology, institution refers to an established, organised procedure, constitutive rule of society. However, the usage of the term is broad and varied, referring respectively to organisations and

14. Donaldson (1995, 122) criticises the institutional theory for being so internally incoherent and contradictory that it is even difficult to understand its basic premises or to discern its evolution.

15. Refers to the theory of patterned interaction particularly in international relations study. See Peters 1999, 129.

their environments as well as general cultural or historical effects. Different strands of institutional theory tend to have differing opinions on the nature of institutions, equating them varyingly with written rules or taken-for-granted mental scripts. Rather than treating this as a theoretical or empirical flaw¹⁶, Scott (2001) recognises these differences and attempts a compromise. He argues that institutions are composed of regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive systems. The regulative pillar of institutions consists of rule-setting, monitoring and sanctioning activities which through coercive mechanisms regulate the behaviour of individual and collective actors. The normative pillar emphasises the values and norms, which affect behaviour through the logic of social appropriateness. The cultural-cognitive pillar on the other hand consists of the shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and the frame through which meaning is made: the narratives and the discourses which tell what the reality is like. These elements are arranged on a kind of a continuum moving from conscious, legally-enforced elements to the unconscious, taken-for-granted elements. They function according to different logic and their basis of legitimacy and compliance, as well as their mechanisms and indicators of their existence is different. (Scott 2001, 51–58.) The three pillars of institutions emphasise different bases of legitimacy: the regulative pillar emphasises conformity with appropriate laws and regulative frameworks, the normative pillar stresses the deeper moral base of legitimacy based in internalisation of certain norms, whereas the cultural-cognitive pillar focuses on legitimacy of cognitive consistency, born of internalising a shared frame of reference and definition of the situation. (Scott 2001, 60–61)

For Scott (2001, 48), who mainly concentrates on analysing the different conceptions of institutions in sociological institutionalism, institutions are “social structures that have attained a high degree of resilience. Institutions are composed of cultural-cognitive, normative and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life. Institutions are transmitted by various types of carriers, including symbolic systems, relational systems, routines and artefacts. Institutions operate at multiple levels of jurisdiction, from the world system to localized interpersonal relationships. Institutions by definition connote stability but are subject to change process, both incremental and discontinuous.” Institutions are multifaceted, durable social structures, which are made of symbolic systems, social activities and material resources, which he later specifies are the four types of carriers. Symbolic systems consist of rules and laws, values or cognitive categories; relational systems consists of roles and systems of roles, routines are patterned action reflecting the tacit knowledge of actors and artefacts reflect the importance of material aspects of institutions. (Scott 2001, 49, 77–83.) Complex institutions such as the University have their symbols, routines, roles and identities as well as artefacts of symbolic and practical value which all together constitute the notion of University.

16. C.f. Donaldson 1995, 127

Institutions provide the cognitive scripts, categories and models without which the world and the behaviour of others cannot be interpreted. (Hall and Taylor 1996) This is not to say that individuals are not rational or purposive, but that rational action itself is socially constituted. Cultural categories, such as conceptions of roles and hierarchy, cognitive scripts and discursive frames, influence perception and therefore behaviour. Changes in policies or organisational strategies are not just a result of responding to the changing economic environment, but result from the changes in the perceptual lenses through which that economic environment is examined. (Immergut 1998.) Institutions also act as filters which favour particular interpretations of the policy goals and the best means to achieve these goals. Institutions have a double relation to context: they both act as a context to social and political action, and are in themselves influenced by various contextual factors. This is evident in the higher education discourse I have studied: on the one hand the discourse of the universities increasingly emphasises the notions of competitiveness and market, on the other hand the discourse of national and international higher education actors also draws from the traditional notions of science, knowledge and search for truth instrumental for the University institution. These constitute the different images of the ideal institution of University. As such, these ideal institutions are narrative and, like discourses discussed in the next chapter, bring about certain courses of action in constructing the other pillars of the institutions.

According to institutional theory, action is either guided by the calculating logic of consequentiality, whereby action results from rational, consequential calculation of rates of return from different alternative choices or by the cultural logic of appropriateness, whereby action results from different routines, rules and norms of appropriate behaviour which are learned and internalised through education. (March & Olsen 1989, 22–23, Hall & Taylor 1996.)

The former, “calculus approach”, stresses the instrumental aspects of human behaviour, based on strategic calculus, considerations of one’s values, preferences and alternatives available and consequences of one’s alternatives for those preferences and then choosing the best alternative. In the “calculus approach”, institutions increase certainty about the behaviour of others. The latter, “cultural approach”, on the other hand, stresses the way that individual rationality and purposiveness is bound to the individuals’ worldview and that behaviour is defined by interpretation of appropriate behaviour in the situation rather than on instrumental calculation. The obligatory action is based on considerations by a person of actions appropriate to a particular role, status or obligations in a particular situation. In the cultural approach, institutions provide the filters according to which the interpretations of appropriate behaviour are being made. Peters (1999, 30) argues that this logic of appropriateness can be seen as a version of role theory, where the institutions define, encourage or sanction what is appropriate and inappropriate for each role position. Action stems from a consideration

of necessity¹⁷, rather than preference (March & Olsen 1989, 160–161), in this sense bearing resemblance to the ideal citizen described by the governmentality theory.

3.3 The University as an institution

In the preceding paragraphs I have referred to the University as an institution and now intend to elaborate that definition. I am using the concept of institution to refer to the University as a larger scale social institution consisting of smaller scale institutionalised practises, norms, values, rules and sets of knowledge. In my text I also draw a distinction between the University as an institution and universities as organisations.

There are different ways of perceiving universities as institutions: Kerr (1995) conflates institution with organisation, whereas Dill (2003) sees universities as enterprises which themselves are influenced by many societal institutions. According to the neo-institutionalist tradition within institutional theory, institutions are not concrete organisations but rather macro-level abstractions, shared cognitive scripts and typifications, and, as such, independent of any single organisation (Powell & DiMaggio 1991, 14–15). This also explains the historical durability of the University: despite the fact that the Universities of Bologna and Paris are very different organisations in 2006 than they were, say, 800 years ago, there is enough similarity that we still can keep on recognising them by the same terminology. Following this tradition of separating the institution and organisation, I see the University as a social institution, made up of various customs, beliefs, values and scripts, as well as a variety of different organisations called universities. Universities as organisations on the other hand are bounded and constructed by the institution of the University, and on the other hand contribute to its change and construction¹⁸. The concept of organisation can also be seen as a kind of social meta-institution, the institutionalised form of organising of all collective activity, which on a general level defines the roles and procedures related to activity. (Scott 1991, 117.) Organisations become institutions when they are infused with value “beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand” and thus can “symbolize the community’s aspirations, its sense of identity” (Selznick 1957, 7,19). The University truly is an organisation infused with value, therefore making a distinction between university organisation and University institution is necessarily a problematic and artificial one. Keeping this in mind, I am focussing on the University as an institution, its changing tasks and legitimations, rather than the university as an organisation and its organisational changes. Thus, even the university organisation can be seen through

17. On the other hand, it is for this certain kind of disregard for individual action that the institutional theory has been criticised for, see e.g. Hay 2002, 107.

18. On the duality of actors’ agency and institutions, see Scott 2001, 74–77.

institutional theory, as an organisational form of the University institution. Therefore what pertains to the University institution, also pertains to university organisations, and to some extent, vice versa.

Important institutional agents and processes encountered by any organisation, and also contributing to the institution of University, are the nation-state, professions, and international organisations and associations¹⁹ which exert important regulative and normative influence on them. In addition, the various cultural and conceptual frameworks through which the regulative and normative elements are made intelligible are important. “Nothing is as portable as ideas. They travel primarily by cultural carriers, although they also are conveyed by relations and artefacts. And although they may circulate via specific social network, they also ride on the more generalised media.” (Scott 2001, 120, 126–132).

Meyer and Rowan (1991, 44–45) argue that the formal structure, programmes and technologies of organisation, such as universities, are highly institutionalised and function as taken-for-granted myths: rationalised impersonal prescriptions which describe appropriate action and the appropriate means to pursue these ends in a rational way. Many of the new university structures, procedures and activities, such as quality assurance systems and managerial procedures, commercial activities and orientation towards efficiency, competitiveness and internationality, represent legitimate organisational aims, accompanied by technologies such as marketing, quality assurance and internationalisation activities, which are seen as legitimate means to achieve those ends. Such institutionalised myths also contribute to the legitimacy of the university organisations, and the University institution. Universities have adopted the new structures, procedures and aims to accommodate the new myths of the knowledge society. In this way the University as an institution, but also the university as an organisation, retains its legitimacy in society, and uses its legitimacy to strengthen its support and to secure its survival. The failure to do so appears irrational and negligent. (Meyer & Rowan 1991, 50–51.)

Friedland and Alford (1991, 248–249) argue that each institution has its own particular logic, a set of material practises and symbolic constructions, which constitute its organising principles. These institutional logics are symbolically grounded, organisationally structured, politically defended and technically and materially constrained, and therefore have specific historical boundaries. The traditional logic of the University institution may be said to be that of scholarly research and teaching, cultivation of critical thinking and structuring of the society. They are reflected in its organisational and disciplinary structures and form an important part of the University legitimisation discourses. A discussion based on my own research will be discussed later. This logic may now be argued to be undergoing a transformation, and elements of competitiveness, efficiency and particular kind of internationality may be said to supplement and transform, if not quite supplant, the previous sets of logic. On the other hand, the

19. See e.g. Peters 1999.

change in universities and other highly institutionally-oriented / institutionalised sectors is often resisted simply because they threaten academics' sense of security, increase the cost of information processing and disrupt routines. This study does not cover the discourse of academic staff²⁰, which might have illustrated this aspect. Similarly, established conceptions on how things are done can also be used as useful guidelines for one's own action and in predicting the actions of others. (Powell 1991, 194.) Even amongst institutions and institutionalised structures some arrangements are more susceptible to change by deliberate design than others. In the case of universities, the surface structure of organisational structures or degree structures is easier to change than the intermediate level of academic discipline, which in turn is easier to change than the deep level of cultural categories such as perceptions, understandings and moralities. (Nooteboom 2000, 101.)

The change or evolution of the University institution is partly a result of conscious change and partly a set of unexpected outcomes. The oft-cited negative aspects of marketisation for the University, which will be discussed later, are unexpected outcomes of efforts to increase the competitiveness, rationality and efficiency of the university organisations. It is important to distinguish the extent to which the actual tasks of higher education have changed and the extent to which our way of speaking about them has changed, and to point out that certainly the discourse has changed, which could signal the change in the practices as well, or at least make changing them easier in the future. The change in practices has come about through an emphasis on the practices of academic management and the introduction of managerial governance, increase of academic consumerism, especially in defining students as consumers of higher education, and the academic stratification of staff and disciplines, based on their use-value in the wider society and exchange value in the market. Public higher education institutions are increasingly using a market discourse in order to gain legitimacy, but Gumpert (2000) warns that this may eventually decrease their legitimacy as they move further from the historical character, functions and accumulated heritage as educational institutions. The change in public higher education should not be seen merely as an organisational change but as an institutional change, and it should be carefully analysed, reflected and evaluated in order to see whether the direction of change is desirable. (Gumpert 2000.)

3.3.1 The traditional tasks of the University

The institutionality of the University rests on the idea that despite the differences in university traditions, the term University connotes that there is a common set of

20. Kekäle (1997) provides one interesting study in which the different concepts of academic leadership are discussed.

ideas for which all universities stand (Barnett 2000, 5). The Oxford English Dictionary defines the university as follows: University = “The whole body of teachers and scholars engaged, at a particular place, in giving and receiving instruction in the higher branches of learning; such persons associated together as a society or corporate body, with definite organization and acknowledged powers and privileges (esp. that of conferring degrees), and forming an institution for the promotion of education in the higher or more important branches of learning; also, the colleges, buildings, etc., belonging to such a body” (OED 2004).

This definition acknowledges the University as a community of people, as a place inhabited by those people, and as a set of tasks performed by them. The tasks included in the definition include research and teaching, but disregards the cognitive and cultural functions of the University in structuring the society and producing its cognitive values (Delanty 2000,52). Universities are also sites of cultural reproduction, they safeguard continuity of cultural traditions, contribute to the reproduction of stratified social structures and “provide an environment in which epistemological culture can be challenged, revised and renewed through exploration and innovation” (Filmer 1997, 52).

Universities as organisations and, more widely, the University as an institution, have always been important sites of governing individuals and societies: “Through the three major functions of instruction, research and public service, the institution hopes to influence students, faculty and members of the public to help set these people on a course of continuing and desirable activity and, through them, to achieve broad social and cultural advancement of the entire society” (Bowen 1977, 14). This has been achieved through both curricular and extracurricular involvement with students, aimed at three primary goals of cognitive learning: by expanding their knowledge and intellectual powers; through affective development by enhancing their moral, religious and emotional interests and sensibilities and practical competences by improving their performance in citizenship, work, family life, consumer choice, health and other practical affairs; and through these, to achieve self-discovery, career choice and placement and direct satisfactions and enjoyment. (Bowen 197, 8, 39, 42.)

The University is based on an idea of building individual character and morality, and on formation of personal qualities. This idea is based on the link between truth and morality and assumes that the University thereby inspires the highest truth and therefore also the highest morality. And in order to be able to tell the truth, the individual has to be autonomous, individually committed to ones work and both ready and able to stand up for ones argument. Research in its broad definition includes various scholarly, scientific, philosophical and critical activities of universities as well as their contribution to the arts. The purpose of those activities is to preserve, acquire, disseminate, interpret and apply knowledge. Public service on the other hand includes a wide variety of other functions, such as health care, consulting, off-campus lectures and courses, work performed by academics outside the academia, artistic performances and

exhibits and spectator sports. Education, research and public service should produce social benefits through the advancement of knowledge. These social benefits include preservation and dissemination of the cultural heritage; discovery and dissemination of new knowledge and religious, philosophical, cultural and artistic thought and direct satisfaction of the population in living in a society of advancing knowledge, technology, ideas and arts; discovery and encouragement of talent; advancement of social welfare in the form of economic efficiency and growth, enhancement of national prestige and power, progress towards identification and solving of social problems, general improvement of the motives, values, aspirations and attitudes of the general public and in the long run, progress in human equality, freedom, justice, security, order, religion, health and so on. In addition, the tasks of the University include the constellation of critique, democracy and emancipation, and all of this is related to configuration of knowledge and production. (Bowen 1977, 8, 58–59; Barnett 2000 53–57.)

3.3.2. The legitimation of the University

Any social order or institution requires legitimation, which is defined as a “widespread acknowledgement of the legitimacy of explanations and justifications for how things are and how things are done” (Fairclough 2003, 219). As Gumpert (2000) has argued, universities may be adopting the new competitive discourses in order to increase their legitimacy in the competitive knowledge society. Legitimacy can be defined as “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman 1995, 574) and implies that something is accepted as right, reasonable and just (Brown 1998, 38). Legitimacy is sought after by organisations in order to increase their credibility and acceptance amongst various audiences. Legitimacy of the organisation increases the stability of the operations of the organisation and makes the organisation more meaningful and trustworthy and better understood by its audiences. Organisations strive to increase their legitimacy also in order to pursue active or passive support. (Suchmann 1995, 574–575.)

Legitimacy may be primarily pragmatic, moral or cognitive by nature, i.e., based on calculation of organisation’s usefulness in relation to one’s interests, positive normative evaluations, or taken-for-grantedness. In order to evoke these different types of legitimacy, organisations have to comply with the different regulative, normative or cognitive institutions, schemes and models. Legitimacy of organisations resulting from isomorphism is exhibited in regulation, norms as well as culture. Organisations exhibiting culturally approved forms and activities, receiving support of the normative authority and complying with the legal regulations are more legitimate and thus more likely to survive than those lacking these evaluations. (Suchmann 1995; Scott 2001, 159). Legitimacy has a dual characteristic of being both a manipulatable resource,

resulting from conscious actions by the actors, and a taken-for-granted belief-system, which cannot be evoked on demand (Suchmann 1995, 577).

The institutionality of the University presupposes its legitimacy, as well as the legitimacy of university organisations from the outset. Organisations and institutions may also be said to have a legitimating idea, referring to those “taken-for-granted understandings that constitute parameters for what is legitimate – that is, what is expected, appropriate, and sacred, as well as the converse.” (Gumport 2000, 70.) In my empirical data, the perceptions about the legitimating idea of the University may be seen to be expressed in what I have named the “University discourses”, which, in addition to describing the reason and benefit of the existence of University, also have the dual function of constituting and strengthening them. These will be further discussed in chapter 6. In previous research, Bowen (1977, 267–268) has argued that the legitimating idea of University has consisted of cultivation of the free mind, freedom of thought and communication, interplay of individuality and academic community, cosmopolitanism and humane outlook. The University as a cultural institution has been contributing to the social cohesion and economic development of societies at a general level, without a concrete purpose. Its *raison d'être* has been universal science and the search for truth. Academic work has been characterised as a vocation, academic freedom perceived as sacred, and the university organised around a community of academics and their self-governance and rectors who are elected by their peers. Education has more or less been a free public service and universities have been little concerned with direct economic or technological matters (Braun & Merrien 1999, 11-12). Although many views have been expressed, that this world is now long gone, the notions of science and knowledge, academic freedom and institutional autonomy and the contribution of the University to the wellbeing of the society lives on.

The traditional legitimations of the University are under pressure; some scholars even go as far as to say that the University has faced a crisis of legitimation (see. e.g. Santos 2006). Gumport (2000) has argued that the legitimating idea of higher education has changed from higher education being a social institution into being an industry, a line of business. “Simply stated, from the perspective of higher education as an industry, public colleges and universities are seen increasingly as a sector of the economy; as with firms or businesses, the root metaphor is a corporate model of production – to produce and sell goods and services, train some of the workforce, advance economic development, and perform research” (Gumport 2000, 70–71).

Since the 1980s, universities have been faced with an increasingly utilitarian and service-oriented ethos towards public institutions. This can especially be attributed to the change of the society to one characterised by increasing volatility, economic insecurity and competition. The knowledge economy recognises universities as key knowledge producing institutions which are central for the strategies of creating national wealth and competitiveness. The discourses relating to the knowledge society and the policies of the knowledge economy and human capital creation are central

in contributing to massification and curriculum change, new contextual knowledge production, the culture of accountability and responsiveness in the governance of higher education, and the increasing entrepreneurialism and marketisation of higher education. It can be argued that these discourses have become institutionalised and taken-for-granted, so that compliance with them becomes more important and the failure to comply results in a loss of legitimacy and possibly related resources (c.f. Gumpert 2000). When norms, rules or roles become institutionalised, they begin to be considered as good and true, and to be linked to a wider general aspiration of what is good and true. This implies that alternative interpretations and regulations are eliminated. (Scott 2001, 164; Meyer et al. 1987, 13, 36–37.)

However, although much of the epistemological and ontological heritage of the University is challenged by the pressure for the universities to increase their performance in all tasks, and because the University's traditions are waning, at the same time there is a plea for the University to retain some of its heritage. "University seems to be unable to shake off its value inheritance and become fully modern: much as it embraces the out-stretched arms of instrumental reason, production, utility, measurement and performance, so the university also hangs on determinedly to old-fashioned stories of collegiality, pure communication, independence and critique." (Barnett 2000, 5–6, 62.) The universities have been using the idealised notion of University – academic freedom, the need for independence from external influences, the importance of developing new ideas through unconstrained curiosity-driven research, the value of a liberal education and related reasons – to fend off the calls for increased social accountability and defend its special position (Melody 1997, 75–76).

This ideal picture is not in line with the reality of the modern day universities and has been viewed by the major financiers of university activities, namely governments and business, as self-serving or self-indulgent. Despite the popular discourse (among left-wing critics of the new entrepreneurial university), universities are therefore neither "innocent victims" of politicians and businesses or "neo-liberal government", nor involuntary followers of the market discourse imposed on them by the same bodies, but strategic actors using both the old idealist science and knowledge -discourse and the new utilitarian competition and competitiveness -discourse as best suits their needs (c.f. Beckmann & Cooper 2004). Neither have they previously always been havens of peace, equality and understanding, but, instead, in many ways elitist, sexist or even racist institutions, which have used their position to reproduce existing social hierarchies and to intentionally ignore and undermine indigenous knowledge. A strong case can thus be made for the universities to balance the necessary changes with possible unwanted side effects. A reflection of this balancing act maybe found in the multiplicity of the discourses presented in this thesis.

Much of the legitimating work is textual, although the extent to which the legitimation is implicit or explicit changes from one text to another. Legitimation work is based on different strategies of legitimation, meaning that legitimacy might be con-

structed on authority or utility, or through appointing an institution a place in a larger narrative. (Fairclough 2003, 219). Due to the textual, or perhaps more specifically, discursive, nature of these strategies, discourse analysis seems an especially suitable method for uncovering them. It is reasonable to expect, however, that legitimisation work is not necessarily a conscious activity, but the taken-for-granted nature of the legitimacy may derive from unconscious reproduction of those discourses constructing and reconstructing the legitimacy of any given institution, such as the University.

Higher education researchers also contribute to the work done to legitimate the University. The research done on universities, including many of the studies cited in this work, such as Bowen (1977), and Kerr (1995), but also Slaughter and Leslie (1997) or Marginson and Considine (2000), contain implicit or explicit images of an ideal institution of the University. The research on Universities is usually done by people who are immersed in the institutions of University and embrace, consciously or unconsciously, some University ideal, which is reflected in their work. In my work I have focussed my attention on the discursive elements of the University institution as presented in various policy documents and by different higher education actors. Many of them carry narrative images of some ideal University institution or another, while also reflecting the non-textual, material practises which make up the other part of the institution (see e.g. Fairclough 1992, 64; Scott 2001, 77–83). It is worth remembering however, that not only policy texts or policy actions, like legislation, funding systems or organisational structures, reflect and reproduce the ideal images of the University institution. “Neutral” higher education research also contributes to the process.

3.4. Changes in teaching and learning

Although the following chapters focus on discussing the discursive change, or at best, the evolution of the University institution, several very real material changes have been encountered by universities as well. These will be discussed in the following sections. Perhaps the biggest change encountered by higher education, and a cause for many of the other changes which have taken place during the past decades, is the huge increase in the number of higher education participants. This massification of higher education has changed the picture of higher education from an elite activity to mass higher education (to use the concepts made famous by Trow (1974)). In many European countries this already amounts to universal higher education.

As a result of massification, the social profile of the student population has widened to include women, people from different ethnic and class backgrounds and mature-age students, and the means of education have been widened to include a range of teaching and learning technologies. The traditional full-time undergraduate and postgraduate study has diminished in importance compared to part-time study

and continuing education. The core of education is no longer in the liberal arts and sciences, and instead education has become increasingly profession-oriented. (Gibbons et al 1994, 76–84.)

The link between elite higher education and elite occupational positions has been eroded and the positional advantage flowing from higher education has been reduced, although strengthening the advantage of those participating in the remaining elite institutions and increasing the competition based on personal characteristics (Scott 1997, 38). On the other hand, although a higher education degree no longer provides guaranteed access to the higher rungs of the occupational ladder, it has become a necessity without which young people have a danger of falling into unrewarding, low skill, low pay jobs. (Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Brown & Scace 1997.)

As Barnett (1997, 1999) argues, the transferable skills and adaptability and flexibility of personal disposition are sought after and individuals are expected to refashion themselves constantly throughout their life through lifelong learning. The traditional academic disciplines are increasingly seen as an insufficient way to organise the learning experience, as in their cognitive orientation they lack insights into experiential and action-oriented forms of knowledge, and the reflexive qualities demanded by the post-modern world. Therefore the discipline-based curriculum has been amended by including work-based and other elements directly linked with the world outside academia, by introducing new learning methods, by including transferable skills learning and by increasing student centred learning experiences. All of these bring the context of knowledge application closer and emphasise the “performativity²¹” instead of the “contemplativity” of knowledge. (Barnett 1997, 1–8, see also Gibbons et al 1994.) Barnett argues that this is coupled with a narrow understanding of competences and skills, which provides a closure instead of opening new understandings of knowledge, and harnesses higher education as a tool of the world of work and business. In the “information society” or “knowledge society”, ethics are being forgotten, knowledge is being minimised into commodifiable, tradable data; higher education is seen as delivery of pre-packaged information; and learning is being understood in terms of simple transfer, rather than a complex reciprocal process of understanding, independent and critical thinking, personal development and intellectual collaboration. The vocabularies – and the substance – of understanding, critique, interdisciplinarity and wisdom are swamped by competence, skills, entrepreneurialism, flexibility and transferability, and the content of the concepts has changed. Tirronen (2005, 120–122) is less pessimistic about the changes of university education, and raises a question whether traditional education denoting ethical and aesthetic development of the individual, and the modern education geared towards the needs of the working-life, including problem-solving skills and skills to apply knowledge, could be seen as two sides of the same coin rather than being opposed to each other, and could be strived for at the same time. He argues that the challenge of assessing the expediency

21. See also Lyotard 1985, 20.

of university education and its long term strategic planning is not just a challenge for the universities but also for the education policy makers and increasingly for a great variety of external stakeholders.

The new ways of producing knowledge and the loss of University monopoly in knowledge production has challenged the traditional scholarly culture, as knowledge claims of universities have become weakened and the definitions of knowledge spread outside the academic sphere. Therefore universities are “less able to guarantee students access to a privileged body of knowledge, because such a body of knowledge no longer exists, or to socialise them into ‘expert’ niches within a carefully differentiated division of professional labour, because that division of labour has been eroded from ‘within’ by epistemological insecurity and from ‘without’ by the reconfiguration of the labour market.” (Scott 1997, 41–42.) Higher education with its academic community has ceased to define knowledge and present it to the benefit of the society. Instead, society defines useful knowledge and expects this of higher education, thereby defining its character (Barnett 1996, 93). Although the traditional notion of the University as a keeper and seeker of truth and knowledge still holds a strong legitimating position in the parlance of university actors, it now faces serious challenges.

3.5 Changes in knowledge production

The other major function of universities, research, although now featuring so prominently on the university agenda, is a relatively new addition to the tasks of universities²². The research task of universities was established by the end of the 19th century, but it only became prevalent after the Second World War, and came under attack with the expansion of the higher education system in the 1960s. (Nowotny et al. 2001, 81.) In the past decades, it has encountered changes at least as large as those faced by the teaching function. Different prognoses have been made as to the future of research in universities. As a result of the knowledge production increasingly taking place outside universities, the new knowledge production may even sidetrack universities from research completely. On the other hand, despite the widening of the teaching mission of universities, the balance between teaching and research has been tilted in favour of research, causing tensions in terms of allocating times and money for those different functions. It has been argued that university research should move in a more problem-oriented rather than curiosity-driven direction, and shift from primary knowledge production to become more innovation oriented. (Gibbons et al 1994, 76–84; Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Smith and Webster 1997, 13.)

Traditional discipline-based “mode 1 knowledge production” institutionalised primarily in universities and conducted by the small research elite has been joined by

22. See Ben David 1977 for a comprehensive history.

“mode 2 knowledge production” (Gibbons et al 1994). The latter mode has arisen because of the massification of higher education and the proliferation of recognised sites and performers of knowledge production, intensification of international economic competition, technological developments and increased marketisation and commodification of science. Characteristic of this mode 2 knowledge production is that it is produced increasingly in the context of application, that is, an increasing emphasis is placed on the utility of knowledge for industry, government or the society more generally and production of knowledge in the “triple helix” (Etzkowitz 1999, Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff 2000) between the university, government and industry.

This is in marked contrast with the long tradition of the separation of “science” and “society”. According to the Mertonian (1973) ideals of the norms of science, science should be as autonomous, disinterested and as detached from society as possible in order to retain its objectivity and potential for ‘truth’. Three strategies have been pursued to protect ‘science’ from ‘society’. First, in some countries stratification of higher education systems has been created and only a small number of research universities have been granted the right to offer PhD programs. This is especially typical of the United States higher education system. Second, binary systems consisting of universities and vocational higher education institutions have been created in several countries, such as Finland, the Netherlands and Germany. Another possible demarcation has been that between universities and independent research organisations such as the Max Planck Society in Germany and CRS in France. Third, countries with unified higher education systems such as Sweden or post-1992 Britain, have created and encouraged institutional differentiation through selective funding policies and market competition. These stratifications have typically upheld social stratification, as research-oriented universities have enrolled students from higher social backgrounds than vocationally or professionally oriented universities or other higher education institutions. (Nowotny et al 2001, 85–87.) Where the universities and science have previously been separated, segregated from society, they now need to be integrated into it. This results in many institutional changes, erosion of disciplinary boundaries and opening up the tightly-knit disciplinary communities (Becher & Trowler 2001) and organisational changes, public-private partnerships etc. What is required is socially robust, applicable knowledge, rather than just reliable knowledge (Nowotny et al 2001, 110, 167). This approach has been criticised by Ziman (1994, 178), who argued that the mertonian norms of CUDOS, (Communalism, Universalism, Disinterestedness, Originality and Scepticism) has been replaced by new norms of PLACE (Proprietary, Local, Authoritarian, Commissioned and Expert), and that “reliable science” is threatened by the new ethos and practices of “post-academic science”.

As a part of the production of knowledge in the context of application, the issues related to representation of different stakeholders, demands for financial and social accountability as well as reflexivity and sensitivity to the implications of knowledge production, become more pronounced. The traditional disciplinary and organisational

boundaries are being permeated and mode 2 knowledge production is increasingly transdisciplinary. In addition to traditional disciplinary communities in universities and colleges, knowledge is produced by varying configurations of experts, on increasingly heterogeneous sites such as non-university institutes, government agencies, industrial laboratories, think-tanks, consultant agencies etc, which are linked to each other via a range of organisational, social, informal and electronic ties and means of communication. Quality criteria are re-evaluated and a wider range of criteria from traditional disciplinary, to political, economic and social criteria are increasingly being utilised and quality control will become increasingly dependent on the context and use of produced knowledge, efficiency and usefulness. Researchers often complain that individual creativity is being undermined by the growth of the collaborative, multidisciplinary approaches to problem-solving that are characteristic of many government- or industry-initiated programmes. The balance of funding processes has shifted from academic peer review and self-governance to the directed mode, based on national priorities, thematic research, joint funding and managerial imperatives. (Nowotny et al 2001, 77.)

The concept of mode 1 and mode 2 knowledge production has been very influential²³. Not just research has changed into mode 2, but Nowotny et al (2001, 68) argue that society has also changed into a “mode 2 society”, thereby changing the configuration between society and research, with the task of innovation production holding a special position. In the mode 2 society, ‘research’ has become more valued than ‘science’. ‘Science’, namely the institutional infrastructure, systematisation and transmission of knowledge and training of new knowledge producers, is naturally still vital to research, but the capacity for ‘research’ to bring about new stunning results and findings, as well as the possibility to quantify and commodify it, is more popular in the eyes of policymakers, media and the general public and even the researchers themselves. This preference is evident in setting the priorities of research policies, input and output control and the shifting of resources to support those. Knowledge in a knowledge society is essentially knowledge-in-action, knowledge in a “performative role”, as Barnett (2000, 40–42) calls it. Barnett distinguishes between overt performativity which can be measured in income, economic regeneration and improvement of status, and covert performativity, in which such activities become conceptualised as knowledge production, thereby having an effect on the epistemological foundations of University by shifting epistemology from contemplative to pragmatic in character. So the essence of knowing is transformed from knowing as contemplation to knowing as performance. These ideas of performativity, economic regeneration, economic

23. However, the mode 1 - mode 2 dichotomy has also faced some criticism: e.g. Weingart (1997) argues that while the characteristics of the Mode 2 knowledge production may pertain to certain sections of the research system, they can not be generalised to science as a whole and that the change in knowledge production is at most an institutional rather than an epistemological one. Godin and Gingras (2000) have argued that despite the diversification of the sites of knowledge production, universities still remain at the centre of the system and are not rendered obsolete by the changes. See also Delanty 2000, 5; Barnett 2000, 17-18, 35, 67–70.

competitiveness and skills upgrading are very much assimilated by the universities and thereby able to transform the old foundation of University thus forming an important part of the new governing of University. (Barnett 2000, 40–42, 49.) Similar results can also be found in the analysis of the empirical data of this study, as will be discussed later.

3.6 Changes in governance of higher education and universities

The traditional claims for institutional autonomy and self-governance in universities have been derived from the nature of academic work, which requires dedication and creativity, and cannot be controlled from the outside. Authority is based on disciplinary expertise, rather than membership of any particular higher education institution and loyalty is owed to the discipline, therefore warranting self-regulation by peers rather than managers. Also, universities' organisational and administrative structures have been based on disciplines for hundreds of years. (Clark, 1983; Bargh, Scott & Smith 1996, 28–29.)

Now those forms are being challenged by the general change of ethos from traditional public sector organisations to a business ethos, enterprise culture and managerial practises encountered by most public sector organisations including universities. This shift is demonstrated at two levels, that of a rhetorical change, a shift from citizens to customers and redefinition of key relationships and activities in terms of market exchange, and on a substantive level of new management and governance mechanisms to increase the efficiency and accountability of public sector organisations and introduce market-mechanisms in their governance. (Bargh, Scott & Smith 1996, 3.) The universities in Europe²⁴ are increasingly faced with new public management measures, which include “an emphasis on customer choice, creation of markets and quasi-markets, a greater scope for individual and private sector provision, the separation of purchaser role from the provider role, the growth of contractual or semi-contractual arrangements, the flexibility of pay and conditions” (de Boer and Huisman 1999, 100). The universities are required to take control of their own future by drawing up medium and long term plans and using resources effectively. The 1990s has seen a considerable change in the state-university relationship in most countries, with increased development of power and increased institutional autonomy, combined with changes in the funding structures (Bargh, Scott & Smith 1996, 160–166.)

Quality control and accountability measures are introduced to ensure efficient use of public money and that set objectives are being reached, and the definitions are more likely to draw from the culture of consumption than from the traditional public sector

24. The American universities have a longer tradition of market orientation and emphasis on customer choice. See e.g. Ben-David 1977.

and political cultures (Marginson & Considine 2000, 4). The pursuit of excellence has taken a central stage. Although Delanty (2000, 139) argues that the pursuit of excellence has taken over the place of national culture, separating the University from the ideological apparatus of the nation state, it can also be argued that the notion of excellence is used repeatedly in the national and European higher education policy, as will be discussed further on.

New management ethos is also geared towards establishing a new balance between the universities and their various stakeholders: students, commerce and industry, local governments and so on. The objectives are often set by the state which is also a primary financier, whereas the universities are required to reach pre-determined objectives both in terms of quality and quantity. In order to do this, they have considerable institutional autonomy to handle the everyday management of their institution. The increased size of universities and the need for the university to speak with one voice in the competitive situation leads to sidelining traditional shared governance and empowering administration. The new management culture involves strengthening of the powers of the central and intermediate level managers (rectors and vice-chancellors, and deans, respectively), setting clear organisational priorities and supporting those with earmarked funding, and a general orientation towards the market and serving the clients. At the same time, authority in certain issues is being devolved to the departmental level. This has been accompanied by the changing institutional structures, such as favouring multidisciplinary schools to traditional disciplinary departments. The divide between internal academic and external management issues in universities is becoming increasingly blurred. (Scott 1997, 40; Slaughter & Leslie 1997, 230–231; Braun & Merrien 1999, 14–15, 26–29; Bargh, Scott & Smith 1996, 19.) Due to the new governance and steering mechanisms and accountability pressures, the universities are also emerging as more “complete”, tightly-coupled organisations instead of traditional loosely-coupled systems (de Boer et al 2007). Despite certain differences between countries as to the extent to which they have modified their systems, and how far the outcomes converge, most countries in Western Europe have moved towards a similar culture of university governance and introduced similar changes in their governance structures and procedures.

3.7 Globalisation and the entrepreneurial university

Globalisation is often presented as a homogenous, over-powering process which forces nation-states and universities to act in a certain way and over which they can have little if any influence. Although different countries have had different responses to globalisation and to the challenges it brings to national higher education systems and institutions, the system level effects of globalisation are so powerful that the higher

education systems converge in certain areas, such as the policies of access, curricula, research and autonomy of academic staff and institutions. (Slaughter 1998, 47.) The effects of globalisation are at the same time converging and diverging. There is a convergence in the ideology of competitiveness, entrepreneurialism, stronger managerialism and revenue-seeking and on the other hand divergence of institutional missions as universities seek to find their specific niches in the market. (Marginson & Considine 2000, Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Slaughter 1998.)

What was described earlier in terms of the changes in education, knowledge production, governance of higher education and the general change in the relationship between the state, society and university, can be characterised as the emergence of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie 1997) and entrepreneurial (Clark 1998) or enterprise university (Marginson & Considine 2000). Academic capitalism refers to the market activities of individual academics, research units and universities in striving to generate extra income by external funding tied to market related research – either in the form of research grants and contracts, service contracts, partnerships with industry and government or technology transfer – or alternatively competing in attracting high fee paying students to substitute decreasing public budgets (Slaughter & Leslie 1997). The emerging “entrepreneurial university” (Clark 1998) or “enterprise university” (Marginson & Considine 2000) is a mixture of public, bureaucratic organisations and culture, and private business features.

Clark (1998) has introduced the central characteristics of this new entrepreneurial university. These include a strengthened steering core enabling universities to be better controlled, to become “quicker, more flexible and especially more focussed in reaction to expanding and changing demands” (Clark 1998, 5); an expanded developmental periphery linking the university with external organisations and groups, thereby facilitating knowledge transfer and the responsiveness of the university; a diversified funding base allowing the university to raise money from several different sources and to diminish its dependence on public funding; a stimulated academic heart-land, referring to the change of the traditional disciplinary units into entrepreneurial actors themselves; and finally an integrated entrepreneurial culture embracing the necessity of change. The entrepreneurial university is thus characterised by a shift from discipline-based collegial forms to general managerial forms of governance and increasing managerial control, governance through policy plans, block grant funding and accountability structures rather than line-item budgeting and legislation, revenue seeking through private partnerships, contract research, selling of educational services, patents and commercialisation of intellectual property.

The strategies of different enterprise universities include a strong commitment to entrepreneurial activities and revenue raising through high tuition fee education, commercial research and consultancy; increasing focus and investment in globalisation and international education and specialisation in distance education and flexible learning arrangements, are part of the process of that Marginson and Considine (2000) call

continuous institutional “reinvention”, changing of the institutional identity of the university to a “High enterprise university”, “International university” or “Distance education university”. They are often accompanied by certain institutional features, such as widespread commitment to the interest of the institution, corporate culture, strong entrepreneurial management system, commitment to revenue-raising and often also a vocational ethos, causing the boundaries between universities and other higher education institutions to blur. The success of the enterprise university is dependent on finding a right kind of balance between an entrepreneurial capacity to exploit earning possibilities, organisational coherence and academic culture, and to mediate the inevitable tensions between the managerial and the academic elements. (Marginson & Considine 2000, 222–238, Newson 1998, 72, Fisher & Rubenson 1998, 94.)

Marketisation and competition are changing the way that academics allocate their time to different functions, and although the change may not be clearly visible in academics’ day to day life, it can be detected in statistics. An increasing amount of time is allocated to functions related to academic capitalism, namely applied research, innovation and technology transfer activities, and less time for basic research and teaching. As universities are prestige-driven organisations, academics prefer external funding from sources which increase the status and prestige of individuals, research centres and universities, rather than just any external funding. In this way, the potential clash of University norms, values and systems of conferring prestige may be reconciled with market activities. This could lead to an increasing tension between academic and administrative staff on the one hand, and on the other to diversification of academics into two categories consisting of entrepreneurially-oriented academic capitalists especially in fields close to the market, such as applied science, technology, engineering, bio-science and agriculture’ and less entrepreneurially-oriented staff who are left with more and more teaching responsibility, but who often have to make do with short term employment contracts. Fields which cannot be immediately commercialised, such as humanities, social sciences and education, might even face further downscaling. (Slaughter and Leslie 1997) However, the extent to which universities themselves are free to decide on the disciplines they teach and degrees they award varies greatly from one country to another, and even in countries where the universities’ autonomy to decide on the degrees is great, there may be national planning for certain fields like medicine or teaching.

The discourse of the enterprise university and the emerging forms of academic capitalism has also received significant criticism and warnings of negative effects on University. According to Slaughter and Leslie (1997, 202–203, 226.), increasing engagement in the market carries certain risks, for the organisation, staff and students, and more generally, for the mission of the University in society. Risks include business failure, product liability, failure to meet societal expectations of economic improvement and job creation, and neglect of students. In the long run the demand for personal success in attracting external funding is increasing the stress of academics considerably.

The increasing managerialism could lead to the detachment of the leaders from the realities of the institutions which they lead, which may lead to unrealistic expectations, tensions and undermining of the academic cultures, and disciplines being seen as obstacles rather than tools of reform. As a result, the institutional community is weakened and the social ethic of the University jeopardised. (Marginson & Considine 2000, 241–243.)

It has been argued that the increased participation of universities in the market could undermine the implicit social contract which grants universities and academics a certain degree of autonomy in return for disinterested knowledge, and erodes the *raison d'être* of the special treatment of universities and their academics, increasing the likelihood of universities being treated as any other organisation and researchers as any other workers (Slaughter and Leslie 1997, 222). As a result of the isomorphic and mimetic processes (Powell & DiMaggio 1991) of convergence, universities also tend to choose increasingly similar rather than different paths in reaching competitiveness. There is increasing convergence of strategies towards a value-for-money ideology, making the enterprise university the dominant university form and diminishing the diversity of missions and purposes. (Marginson & Considine 2000, 4; Kumar 1997, 28-29.) Smith and Webster (1997) argue that the commercialised universities, having embraced the discourse of markets, industry-relationships and entrepreneurialism, are reluctant to “articulate a motivating purpose, to address questions of *raison d'être* of higher education” (Smith & Webster 1997, 4). This they take as an example of a new kind of passivity of higher education, which either seems to retreat to the old defences of legitimation springing from the importance of critical thinking and distance from the everyday battles of society, or wholeheartedly embrace the market discourse. They see in this a danger that the universities could be reduced to the position of servants to industry, employers and professions, and that in doing so, they could become obsolete, as other agencies could be better equipped for this job. The lack of critical engagement of the universities in the development of the knowledge society, leave it open for re-definition solely in terms of market forces. (Smith & Webster 1997, 7–10; Melody 1997.)

3.8 The new role of higher education

What is evident from the discussion above is that amongst those discussing the future of universities, there is by no means any agreement on which course the universities should take in relation to the state and knowledge society, and what are their resources and possibilities to direct it, or even their own destiny. Whether they should embrace the change or resist it, whether the changes of knowledge production and the state - higher education relationship are welcome or whether they create more problems

than they solve; whether universities are doomed or whether they are indeed finding a new lease of life as the central social institutions, yet retaining capacity for criticising the societies in which they are embedded. Although there are significant differences in the societal contexts, and, thus, in the operational environments of the universities, the general shared trends described above, warrant a question being asked as to what the University institution in the 21st century is like, and what its role in the society is.

The flexibility, uncertainty and fragmentation of experiences typical of the post-modern, post-fordist time, is apparent in the universities in many ways. A question could be asked whether there still is a single concept of the University, or just an increasing constellation of differences: “different academics pursue different knowledges, different teams of researchers combining and recombining to investigate shifting topics, different sorts of students following different courses, with different modes of study and different concerns among themselves, different employment arrangements for different types of staff – difference everywhere in this post-modern, flexible, accommodating university” (Smith & Webster 1997b, 104). This has to do with a wide array of topics, from the characteristics of knowledge and knowledge production, flexibility of the labour force and learning arrangements, to the contribution of the University to the education of the future labour force. (Scott 1997; Marginson & Considine 2000; Currie & Newson 1998; Champion & Freeman 1998; Filmer 1997.) For the contemporary university, as Barnett (2000, 65–66) argues, it is essential to recognise and embrace the “supercomplexity” where everything is challengeable, unpredictable, contestable and uncertain, conditions partly constructed by the universities, and partly defining the world in which they now have to live.

The University is an institution where knowledge, culture and society interconnect. It is embedded both in the sphere of society and culture, and holds a key position in the conceptual and epistemic structures of power and interest. Barnett (2000) criticises those views that lament the end of the University due to market forces, the retreat of the state from its role as a funder and provider of higher education and the primary patron of the University, and the loss of position as the sole producer and codifier of knowledge. Instead, rather than being a passive actor guided solely by the market forces, the University can by its virtue of reflexively engaging in the discourses of society, seize an important role in enhancing communication and citizenship in the global knowledge society. Universities must renew their commitment to the cosmopolitan project, which was nearly inundated by the national projects of the modern nation-states. Bauman (1997, 20–25) argues that, instead of clinging to the past of an idealised picture of the unity of University mission, universities may find new legitimation in embracing the multi-vocality and plurality of different values and different incentives for engaging in “the pursuit of higher learning”. It is only in this way, by putting the past behind and embracing the future and multiplicity of different university missions that the University as a social institution can rise to the challenge of the post-modern condition, retaining space for creative kinds of skills and knowledge.

The University has a double function of being aloof and engaging at the same time, it is “an embodiment of both a church and a supermarket, of otherness and commodities easily to be accessed and consumed. In it are combined, if uneasily, both the sacred and the profane. In these circumstances, talk of the death of the University must appear a little premature, to say the least. It is wanted more than ever before; it is enjoyed - if that is the word - more than ever before; and it is more active, visibly so, and in many more ways than ever before.” (Barnett 2000, 13.) In the age of “supercomplexity” the legitimacy of the University lies precisely in the recognition and embracing of that supercomplexity and in providing students and the wider society with tools to embrace it. The University is required both to fulfil its traditional tasks of being a critic of its society and the new task of being in service for it. (Barnett 2000, 13.)

– Chapter 4 – Globalisation, knowledge society and the government of individuals and universities

4.1 Introduction

At the turn of the 21st century, European higher education is probably more in tune with “the age” and “the society” than ever before during its nearly a thousand year history. Being previously described as “the ivory tower” or “the groves of academia”, the contemporary universities have taken a turn towards the society, the market and the state, engaging in the contemporary discourses of the Information Age (Castells 2000a), Age of Uncertainty (Nowotny et al. 2001), and Age of Supercomplexity (Barnett 2000). The society characteristic of this age has been called the Information society (Webster 2002), Informational society (Castells 2000a), the Knowledge society (Stehr 1994), the High skills society (Brown, Green and Lauder 2001) and the Risk Society (Beck 1992), all of which have designated higher education and its institutions with a very specific role for to fulfil. Characteristic of this age and its societies is the redefinition of the role and competencies of the state in the context of globalisation and emergence of “the knowledge society” as the preferred way for the “post-fordist state” (Brown & Lauder 1996), “neoliberal state” (Jessop 1990) or “competition state” (Cerny 1990) to understand and refer to itself.

In the context of globalisation, the state is undergoing a profound political transformation. The nation-states are being undermined from below with the resurfacing of many previously suppressed regional and local loyalties and identities, and from above as a result of the development of inter- and supranational institutions. The demarcation

between the public and private sphere has been eroded as a result of neoliberal policies and the culture of commodification. The public institutions are merely providers of public services and are judged on their efficiency rather than on their normative significance (Nowotny et al. 2001, 21–25). This requires the redefinition of the role of higher education, higher education institutions and highly educated people, and new mechanisms of governing them. In order to understand the contemporary discourses of higher education, it is necessary to look at the context within which they are formulated and fought over.

4.2 Globalisation and the competitive knowledge society

4.2.1 Globalisation

The concept of globalisation is amongst the most contentious ones in current political and scholarly discourse and it has been used to designate various parallel and even conflicting processes in the area of economics, politics, culture and identity. Globalisation is “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power.” (Held & McGrew 2003, 68.) The concept is most widely used to refer to the globalisation of markets and economies. The global economy emerges via its globalised core, namely globalised financial markets, international trade, transnational production and science, technology and speciality labour, upon which all economies around the world are dependent. (Castells 2000a, 101). It is often presented as an inevitable unstoppable and uncontrollable process. The proponents of economic globalisation argue it brings economic prosperity to developed and developing countries alike, whereas opponents either warn against the problems for the developed countries caused by flexibilisation, downsizing and the transfer of jobs to low-wage countries, or argue that globalisation further aggravates the inequality between developed and developing countries. Amongst those who argue for the inevitability of globalisation is Kenichi Ohmae (1995) and his thesis of the “End of the nation-state”, which argues the case that the state has lost the capacity to steer its own economy and society, due to the increasingly global flows of investment as well as industry and multinational corporations setting their strategies on a global basis and readily relocating in their pursuit of larger markets and cheaper production costs. The flows of both investment and industry are facilitated by information technology. Finally, individual consumers have become more global in their outlook and orientation; they want the best and cheapest products, no matter where they come from. Ohmae argues that these developments taken together have rendered the na-

tion-state as a traditional middleman largely obsolete. He criticises the nation-states for their reluctance to recognise the fundamental shifts in the functioning of global markets, and their unwillingness to change their own role accordingly and instead clinging to their traditional regulatory roles which do little more than obstruct the free flows of investment, industry, information technology and individuals. Instead of the nation-state, the sub-national region states are much better suited to be the basic agents, and as ports of entry into the global markets.

The inevitability of economic globalisation, and the way in which it is supposed to incapacitate the state, has faced considerable challenges and critique from different perspectives. The first critique argues that the whole economic globalisation is largely a myth, or at least its effects are highly exaggerated. For instance, there are few genuinely transnational companies, and the mobility of capital is concentrated in the developed countries and a small proportion of newly industrialised countries. The majority of the third world remains marginal, and rather than being truly global, the world economy is concentrated in the triad of Europe, North America and Japan, and perhaps also China, India and Brazil. Finally, global markets are not immune to the regulation and control exerted by the states but are, instead, highly controlled by the few economic superpowers that make up the triad. (Hirst & Thompson 1999).

The second critique argues that instead of an automatic, mechanical and unavoidable process brought about by multinational companies and something external to the states, globalisation is in fact a highly political project, dependent on the nation-states themselves and involving transnational players, institutions and discourse coalitions. In the creation of the global economy, equally important to the strategies of international business networks and multinational corporations are the actions of national and regional political institutions in fostering, restraining and shaping free trade. The global economy is politically constituted by the governments of the wealthiest countries in the world, and international institutions such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organisation and the World Bank through the policies of deregulation, privatisation and liberalisation of trade and investments. (Castells 2000a, 116, 137, 147; Beck 2000, 123.)

The third critique tackles the new political forms under globalisation. Slaughter (2000, 189–202) argues that the state is not so much disappearing, but is disintegrating into its component institutions. Increasingly, the interaction of the states and international decision-making takes place in various quasi-informal networks and cooperation organs. The Bologna process and the new European higher education governance are prime examples of this. The states no longer necessarily speak with a unitary voice in the global or international arena, but instead, various quasi-autonomous policy agendas are emerging.

The fourth critique is related to the concept of globalisation itself, and its reduction to neoliberal *globalism* which celebrates the supremacy of economic globalisation

and disregards cultural and environmental globalisation, the possibility of political action and the development of new transnational and translocal identities. Instead, a new type of *globality* should be taken in account, and it should recognise that we are living in a world society. Globalisation of all aspects of life is not reducible to by-products of economic globalisation, and the state of globality is irreversible in itself. The world society is not a meganational society containing and dissolving all national societies within itself, but rather is characterised by a multiplicity and non-integration of various global-local networks, constructed as a result of self-definition through mass-media, new social spaces and global flows of images on cultural, political, economic and military spheres (Beck 2000, 12–15). Central to Beck's account of globalisation is the emergence of transnational social spaces as a result of relocation of people, fragmentation of national cultural identities and spreading of global imagery through mass-media.

Similarly Santos (1999) argues that instead of one single globalisation, there are several globalisations, which are bundles of social relations involving conflicts between winners and losers and the current discourse of globalisation is often “the story of the winners told by the winners”. He defines globalisation as “the process by which a given local condition or entity succeeds in extending its reach over the globe and, by doing so, develops the capacity to designate a special social condition or entity as local” (Santos 1999, 216). Therefore globalisation consists of four kinds of social processes. The first two designate globalisation-from-above. The first is a successful globalisation of a given localism, namely a specific local feature establishing itself on a global scale and reducing other potential globalisms into localisms. Examples of globalised localism include the globalisation of American fast food and popular music, the worldwide operation of transnational corporations or the development of the English language into the *lingua franca*. The second process is that of localised globalism, the specific impacts of global practices and imperatives on local conditions, such as free-trade enclaves, ecological dumping and the touristic use of historical treasures and indigenous ways of life etc. The two forms of globalisation follow a pattern where the advanced industrial countries specialise in globalised localisms, and the global south in the localised globalisms. Opposed to the globalisation-from-above are the processes of globalisation-from-below, namely cosmopolitanisms and the common heritage of humankind. Cosmopolitanism consists of transnational organising by various groups in defence of perceived common interests. Examples include global networks of international non-governmental organisations (INGO's) and labour unions and north-south philanthropy, and the common heritage of humankind describes processes and phenomena which only make sense on a global scale involving all peoples of the world, such as the impacts of pollution and climate change and protection of the ozone layer, rainforests or Antarctica. (Santos 1999, 216–219)

These aforementioned critiques of globalisation have lead to a wider understanding of the different but interlinked processes related to globalisation. There are several

dimensions to globalisation and any account of globalisation should take into account at least considerations of the globalisation of communications technology, ecology, economics, work organization culture and civil society (Beck 2000,19). Despite the conflicting accounts of increasing global cultural flows and transnationalisation of identities, erosion of state powers and emergence of global civil society (see e.g. Castells 2000a, Ohmae 1995, Appadurai 1996, Santos 1999), and the seemingly constrained choices of national politics, the national political are still a focus of much debate and political deliberation, much more so than the global ones. “Modern nation-states are political communities which create the conditions for establishing national communities of fate; and few seem willing to give this up” (Held & McGrew 2003, 11). In the national policy discourse, globalisation is both a material reality and a powerful narrative, and the states are determined not to remain bystanders in the sidelines of globalisation but be conscious actors of it instead. Globalisation provides a kind of background against which the competitive knowledge society makes sense, and against which higher education policy can be evaluated.

4.2.2 The knowledge society

The concept of the knowledge economy or the knowledge society is used to illustrate the shift from an economy based on low skills industrial production to knowledge intensive production and services as the backbone of the economy, or the shift from a fordist to a post-fordist society, marked by denationalisation and transnationalisation of state regulation, transnational flow of capital and ensuing global competition (Frazer 2003, Webster 2002, Castells 2000a, Brown & Lauder 1996). Characteristic of contemporary society is the importance of the various aspects of accumulating, generating, processing, applying and transmitting skills, knowledge and information, with developing information and communication technologies, which claim a more and more important role in contemporary societies, economies and everyday life. The increase and intensification of knowledge production and the use of knowledge in different areas of work, economics and social life are widely agreed upon features of a knowledge society. Other features include the development of ICT and the way it revolutionises production, communication and lifestyle; the growth of economic worth of informational activities; the changes in occupational structures and the shift towards knowledge intensive occupations; the information networks and the changes they have on spatial and temporal organisation of social life; and finally the production and circulation of cultural images across the globe. (Webster 2002, 8–21.) The knowledge society emphasises the shift to knowledge-intensive high skills labour force, the international circulation of brains, emphasis on life long learning, transferable skills and competences, and knowledge management as a key individual and organisational capacity. On the flip side of this is the explosion of visual and aural informational

stimuli, a collage of fragmented, ever changing bits of information resulting in what in Finnish is called “*informaatioähky*”, and might translate as “information enteralgia”: a state where the amount of information available on all things imaginable – and unimaginable – obstructs the attainment and evaluation of relevant information.

The backbone of the transition to the knowledge society is the emergence of a knowledge economy. Amongst the most prominent theorists of the knowledge economy is Manuel Castells (2000a, b), who has attributed its development to the development of information technology in the last quarter of the 20th century. The new economy is informational, global and networked. Informational refers to the idea that the capacity to generate, process and apply knowledge-based information is at the heart of the competitiveness of all of its agents, be they firms, regions or nation. The core activities of production, consumption and circulation, as well as components such as capital, labour, raw materials, management and information, technology and markets, are organised in a global scale and the activities take place in a global network of interaction between business networks. It is based on flexibility of organisations, institutions and individuals and the networks are the flux of constant change. This unique economic form, informational capitalism, is characterised by an informational mode of development where the sources of productivity lie in the technology of knowledge generation, information processing and symbol communication. (Castells 2000a, 69–77.)

As most of the accounts of the information economy or knowledge economy testify, knowledge and skills are at the core of the competitiveness of contemporary societies, or more narrowly defined, knowledge economies, so education has become one of society’s most important sectors. The idea has already been presented in the 1960s human capital theory, which sees a direct link between individual and government investment in education and training and the increase in productivity, wages and economic growth (Becker 1964, Schultz 1971). In many knowledge economies, the introduction of market mechanisms, removal of barriers to global competition, creation of an enterprise culture and polarisation of core and flexible labour force are accompanied by emphasis on innovation, quality, value-added goods and services attracting highly-skilled labour, investment in key sectors such as transportation, telecommunications and R&D, and emphasis on education and training as national investments. (Brown & Lauder 1996.)

In the knowledge society, higher education is increasingly important for the international competitiveness of nation states. The discourse of the knowledge society and policies of the knowledge economy and human capital creation have been central in contributing to massification and curriculum change, new contextual knowledge production, establishment of a culture of accountability and responsiveness in higher education governance and increasing entrepreneurialism and marketisation of higher education (Peters 2001). Processes previously thought to be outside the boundaries of a market, such as the notions of knowledge and learning, are increasingly falling

within the category of commodities to be sold and purchased in the global market place. (See e.g. Barnett 1996, 1997.)

Higher education, although deemed crucial for the development of the knowledge society, does not necessarily provide a fast route to the elite of the society, nor does it necessarily guarantee a profitable and stable job as a symbolic-analyst. Similarly, although universities are seen as central institutions of the knowledge society, they also face strong pressures to change and find new legitimisation in fulfilling their role as accountable, efficient, entrepreneurial, knowledge-intensive, excellence-striving competitive institutions. As Barnett (1996) remarks, higher education no longer holds epistemic supremacy, the monopoly of defining what knowledge is. Instead, “the wider society is defining for higher education the forms of knowledge and being it deems valuable; and these in turn are serving to frame the character of higher education” (Barnett 1996, 93). In the context of the knowledge society, knowledge is essentially performative rather than contemplative, knowledge in the service of the knowledge society and knowledge economy (Barnett 1997).

Transferable skills and adaptability and flexibility of personal disposition are sought after in the contemporary labour market. Individuals are expected to refashion themselves constantly and throughout their lifespan through lifelong learning. The traditional academic disciplines are increasingly seen as an insufficient way of organising learning experience, as in their cognitive orientation they lack insights into experiential and action-oriented forms of knowledge, and the reflexive qualities demanded by the post-modern world. This is coupled with a narrow understanding of competences and skills, which provides closure instead of opening new understandings of knowledge, and harnesses higher education as a tool of the world of work and business. (Barnett 1997; see also Gibbons et al. 1994.)

Despite the nearly hegemonic discourse of education and high skills as a key to national competitiveness in the age of globalisation, what is understood by a knowledge society, as well as strategies utilised in bringing it about, are deeply embedded in a framework of national historical, cultural, social, political and economic conditions in each country. Different countries pursue different routes to the knowledge society and the ways in which skills and human capital contribute to the competitiveness of national economies is dependent on the particular types of competitiveness pursued. Globalisation, albeit often acclaimed to lead to policy convergence, has not led to a single strategy of increasing economic competitiveness, nor is likely to do so. Instead, national contexts and the influence they exert on companies, the education and training system and the labour market have a great influence on national systems of skills diffusion, and although importing influences from other countries is possible, they need to be tailored to local circumstances. (Brown, Green & Lauder 2001, 57–67, 205–237.)

The robustness and coherence of the concept of the knowledge economy or the knowledge society, as well as the extent to which European societies have actually

moved to a true knowledge economy, may be debated. May (2002) analyses and partly dismantles the dominant myths of the knowledge society, and argues that the division of labour, the ownership, political participation and forms of activity, as well as the role of the state, show no remarkable change from what they used to be. Instead of alleviating the existing social inequalities and the as differences in economic prosperity between developed and developing countries, the informational paradigm of production and the related discourse of high skills and education serve to aggravate them. Beck (2000) criticises what he calls the *cost myth* that reducing the costs of production, related to economic globalisation and shifting jobs to lower-cost countries, would decrease unemployment. Instead, he argues that the global capitalism of the information age reaps the profits of decreasing costs but does not create new jobs. Economic growth is therefore jobless growth, indicating an increase rather than reduction of unemployment. (Beck 2000, 61–62.) Since the 1980s, the focus of political rhetoric has shifted from promises of full employment to full employability, emphasising individuals' skills and education. National governments increasingly emphasise a 'high skills policy' with both the economic aims of competitiveness and the social policy goals of integration and social welfare. The discourse of employability is used to shift a responsibility for employment from the state and employer to the individual (Brown, Green & Lauder 2001, ix-xi, 258). By utilising the discourses of 'globalisation', 'flexibilisation' and 'uncertainty' and 'entrepreneurialism', individuals are increasingly charged with the entrepreneurial responsibility of "creating" their own life and employment and taught to embrace uncertainty and risk as positive rather than negative experiences, thereby creating ideal subjects for the knowledge economy (Brown & Lauder 1996; Amoore 2004). Barnett (1996, 42, 45) laments that in a society steered by the notions of the "information society" and the "knowledge society" with focus on economic competitiveness, ethics and morality, generosity, forgiveness, friendship and carefulness are being forgotten.

Similarly the concept of the knowledge society has been criticised. Webster (2002) reminds us that there are also downsides to the alleged benefits of an information society. He argues that accounts of the increase in the share of information workers are often exaggerated and even where the increase in the service jobs has taken place, it fails to bring prosperity to the majority of labour force. The overwhelming majority of service jobs can be categorised either as routine production services, where the information processing is basic and routine by character or low-paid in-person services. This is the situation for retail workers, waiters, hairdressers and taxi-drivers. Only a minority of service jobs fall within the category of symbolic-analytical service. These jobs include complex problem solving, identifying and brokering, and require extensive education and enable those employed as symbolic-analysts to be globally mobile. The formal education of a future symbolic analyst focuses on providing him/her with skills for abstraction, system-thinking, experimentation and collaboration. This kind of education, however, is not available for all, and instead most children from less advantaged

backgrounds are faced with repetitive, fixed-content education which does not enhance the capacities required of a symbolic-analyst. (Webster 2002, Reich 1992.) Peters (2001) on the other hand criticises the lack of clear analytical distinction between the concepts of knowledge and information, the concepts of knowledge and learning, and especially those of the knowledge economy and knowledge society, enabling the interpretation of society to be expressed solely in terms of the economy.

4.2.3 The knowledge society as a meta-narrative

Despite the lack of analytical clarity pointed out by Peters (2001), the notion of the knowledge society has become a way to characterise the new relationships between the state, society and economy and many of the national and supranational policies and practices are introduced in its name. In my research, I am using the concept of the knowledge society not as something the existence of which should be empirically proved, but rather as a meta-narrative which is “real” enough because its existence is thought, expressed and constructed by national and international policy makers, stakeholders and higher education actors.

Lyotard (1985) describes meta-narratives as legitimating framework stories which legitimate specific discourses or institutions, and argues that in the postmodern society such meta-narratives as the progress of history, omnipotence of science or uniqueness of an individual are increasingly obsolete. This view is challenged by Jessop (2004), who argues that, *au contraire*, the economic imaginary called the knowledge society, or the knowledge-based economy, has achieved a status of a meta-narrative or a ‘master-narrative’ across institutional and scalar boundaries. Its status results from semiotic (re)definition work done by economic, political and intellectual actors such as parties, think tanks, international organisations, organised interests, social movements and media, who engage in large scale the restructuring and redefining of economic policies, processes, actors, practises and vocabularies and try to secure such institutional and organisational forms which bring discursive imaginaries into reality. These powerful actors have a role in deciding which content is allowed in the discourse, which practices and vocabularies are linked to the discourse, and who gets to participate in the discourse. They selectively eliminate inappropriate articulations of the discourse, thereby consolidating its boundaries. He compares the hegemonic economic imaginary called the knowledge-based economy to a discursive order²⁵ which is a specific configurations of genres, discourses and styles constituting “the semiotic moment of a network of social practices in a given social field, institutional order, or wider social formation.” (Jessop 2004, 166.) The meta-narrative knowledge-based economy is constitutive and performative, and manages to transform its presupposed economic realisations and instrumentalities into material practises.

25. C.f. Fairclough’s order of discourse (Fairclough 2001, 23–26).

Jessop sees this imaginary as a by-product of initially American interests, that sought to legitimise and strengthen American economic interests in the aftermath of the crises of Fordism and the increasing competition from Europe and Asia. The persistence and strength of any new vision, projects and policies is dependent on the extent they can mobilise existing narratives of the relevant social classes, strata, and groups. The knowledge-based economy has achieved wide success amongst economic and political actors ranging from international agencies (notably the OECD and WTO but also the IMF, World Bank, and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development UNCTAD) through regional economic blocs and intergovernmental arrangements (such as the EU, APEC, ASEAN, Mercosur, NAFTA) and individual national states with different roles in the global division of labour (such as, New Zealand, South Korea, Germany, Colombia) down to a wide range of provinces, metropolitan regions, and small cities. (Jessop 2004.) Universities as well as national higher education policy actors also seem to embrace this discourse, as will be discussed later.

The knowledge-based economy has become a hegemonic economic imaginary because it has a capacity to satisfy two criteria: “First, it can inform and shape economic strategies on all scales from the firm to the wider economy, on all territorial scales from the local through regional to the national or supra-national scale, and with regard to the operation and articulation of market forces and their non-market supports. And second, it can inform and shape state projects and hegemonic visions on different scales, providing guidance in the face of political and social uncertainty and providing a means to integrate private, institutional, and wider public narratives about past experiences, present difficulties, and future prospects.” (Jessop 2004, 168.) Besides providing a rationale and a framework for technical and economic reforms, it can function as a broader framework for struggles over political, intellectual and moral leadership on various scales from international to national, local and organisational scales; and on several policy fields from education, science, health, welfare and law. It can also be inflicted from neocommunitarian, neo-corporatist or neostatist, as neoliberal perspectives, which is why Jessop compares it with Rorschach’s inkblot, which seems different from different angles. It can be deployed to use multiple and varying national, local and institutional traditions, and economic interests. However, he also finds counter-hegemonic versions of the knowledge-based economy and takes the continued existence of “neocorporatist Finland” in the top place of the World Economic Forum’s competitiveness rankings as an example of this. This discursive flexibility and space for interpretation contributes to the hegemonic position and durability of the knowledge based economy -narrative.

In this study the knowledge society is looked upon as such an “economic-political meta-narrative” (Jessop 2004) or a “dominant rationality” (Foucault 1991, Rose 1999, Dean 1999) or “regime of truth” (Rose 1999), which legitimises certain activities and delegitimises others, constituting and constraining the activities of actors as subjects of government. This implies that at a specific time and place, in a specific context,

a specific rationality of government emerges, bringing together various discourses, practices, laws and institutions underpinned by a coherent system of thought, making them seem a coherent whole. (Rose 1999). This implies that at a specific time and place, in a specific context, a specific rationality of government emerges, bringing together various discourses, practices, laws and institutions underpinned by a coherent system of thought, making them seem a coherent whole. (Rose 1999.) This mechanism is highlighted by the Foucauldian governmentality theory, which will be discussed next.

4.3 Governmentality theory

4.3.1 Government and governmentality

In order to understand the change of the University as an institution, and its ideal images in the context of a competitive knowledge society, a more general theory is needed which conceptualises the society and power in it. Much of the theorisation of society, politics and power has previously been centred round the territorialised nation state and the international community consisting of them. However, with the globalisation process, and the resulting deterritorialisation of many state functions discussed above, new models for analysis of power and politics are needed. Within political sciences and administrative sciences, these have been provided e.g. by the wide body of literature on governance, which is often used as a substitute concept for management, administration regulation and the like, and to signify a change in these processes. (See e.g. Hooghe & Marks 2001, Peters 2000, Rhoades 1997, van Kersbergen & van Waarden 2001). Although there are different definitions of governance, it is often understood as a set of mechanisms for governing organisations and institutions, including such contemporary trends as governing and service production through networks, devolution of authority from the central to the local level, replacement of command and control with governing at a distance, market-type mechanisms, and involvement of various stakeholders in governing organisations and institutions. Governance is narrow in its definition of the scope, processes and agents of governing. It generally does not refer to the governing of individuals or to the formation of subjectivities, but rather to the more limited understanding of governing organisation through various sets of mechanisms. It focuses on describing and analysing institutions, structures or functional patterns of governing individuals and organisations. (Rose 1999, 16; Newman 2001, 24.)

Michel Foucault's (1991) governmentality theory provides an alternative way of conceptualising power and governing individuals or organisations in a knowledge society. Foucault's neologism 'governmentality' refers to a rationality of government,

which describes the rationality or the 'guiding principle' behind the government, as well as the programmes and mechanisms through which government is exercised. In traditional political analysis, government is mainly thought about in terms of the idea of a monolithic state and its political apparatus, 'the government'. In governmentality theory, however, the concept of government is wider in scope and refers to 'the conduct of conducts', governing people through varied, rationalised strategies, techniques, programmes and actions across varied spaces, which are not necessarily defined in terms of the nation state. In the multiple webs of shaping, guiding and moulding the conducts of individuals, groups or societies in the varying circuits of power, the state is just one of the many elements²⁶. (Newman 2001, Rose 1999.)

Foucault's definition of government as conduct of conducts is a very broad concept. It refers to an art of acting on the actions of others either as individuals or collectives in order to shape and modify the ways in which they conduct themselves. Government can be exercised in various ways, methods and scales on oneself, on souls, on households, children or the whole state. Studies of government and governmentality are concerned with those conditions in which it is possible to act upon the conduct of others, or oneself, to achieve certain ends. Governmentality theory engages our gaze with the broad sets of practices used to guide the conduct of individuals or organisations. (Burchell 1996, 19; Rose 1999, 3, 19; Gordon 1991, 2–3.)

Foucault uses the concept of government as a synonym for power, to describe "a way in which power is exercised over individuals", yet on the other hand it refers to the ways in which individuals are guided to conduct themselves, that is, to steer and monitor their own behaviour. In many power theories, power refers to the mechanisms of coercion, but in the governmentality theory, the concepts of government and power refer to the various mechanisms of coaxing and training individuals to behave in a desired way. Government combines techniques which facilitate external governing of e.g. citizens of a particular state, as well as techniques through which individuals govern themselves. Government is exercised in various micro-locals, such as families, schools and workplaces, using a myriad strategies and tools, and can be brought, through various mechanisms, to bear upon organisations and institutions as well as individuals. The essence of government is in acting upon the actions of others or oneself in a way that constitutes the most efficient and beneficial way of managing the population as a whole, and increasing its wealth, health and wellbeing. (Burchell 1996, 19–20.) Power is seen as being embedded in the complex set of relations between state and non-state actors and authorities, networks, infrastructural authorities and so on and located in several agencies of government, which can be public or private, non-profit or for-profit, local, regional, national, international or global. (Dean 1999, 9, 209;

26. On the other hand, it is precisely for this dismissal of the state as an object of study that the governmentality theory has been criticised by some Marxist theorists, see e.g. Kerr 1999.

Rose 1999, 1–5, 15.) The studies in governmentality are diagnostic and critical²⁷, rather than descriptive or normative.

Government consists of political rationalities and related programmes of government in which the rationalities are spelled out and translated into activities of governing populations. Political rationalities constitute the moral and epistemological basis of the government, they are discursive fields which conceptualise and construct the legitimacy, rationality, practices, objects and subjects of governing and power. They deploy certain style of reasoning, thereby making use of particular language as an important intellectual technique in constituting the practical, rational and appropriate way of conduct (Rose 1996, 41–42). The contemporary political rationality of advanced liberalism, and knowledge society as its political programme will be discussed further on.

In order to achieve the conduct desired of the subjects of the government, the rationalities and associated programmes are translated into actual techniques, strategies and practices, which are called technologies of government. (Harris 1999, 34–35.) The technologies of government can take the form of diverse legal, architectural, professional, administrative, financial, judgemental forces, different techniques and devices, such as notation, computation, calculation, examination, evaluation, surveys and charts, systems of training, building forms and so on. The power of the state is an outcome rather than the cause of all those technologies directed at achieving certain common objectives. The power is achieved through a process of translation of generally articulated national programmes, such as democracy or a competitive knowledge society, “into ways of seeking to exercise authority over persons, places and activities in specific locales and practices.” (Rose 1996, 43.) In this way, different entities are embraced in a flexible web of relations, which ensures the option to govern from a distance, with the different locales, people and organisations retaining a certain degree of autonomy. Together these aspects of government reveal the multiple networks that connect the everyday lives and experiences of individuals and organisations alike to the aspirations and objectives of authorities (Rose 1996, 42–43; Rose 1999, 48–52; Rose & Miller 1992, 175–177, 183). In the context of my research, governmentality provides a mechanism for studying the dissemination of the dominant ideas and policies of the knowledge society beyond such top-down mechanisms as steering or policy implementation.

27. On the other hand, Kerr (1999) has criticised the governmentality theory for its top-down conceptualisation of power which he sees as subordinating struggle, contradiction and subjectivity so that power and governmentality can never be escaped, and therefore there can never be redemption from it. Thus power becomes a tool for social reproduction rather than transformation, and instead of a critical study, governmentality theory becomes a theory which reproduces capitalist rule.

4.3.2 Government in the knowledge society

Many studies of governmentality address the political rationality of governing a particular, liberal or neoliberal state or society. Labels such as liberal and neoliberal society, or in my case the knowledge society, are attempts to rationalise the nature, ends, means and limits of the exercise of power and styles of governing, as well as instruments, techniques and practices to which they become linked. (Rose 1999, 28) In my study I want to address the knowledge society as a dominant political programme of advanced liberal rationality, in which universities are central actors in the development and sustenance of the knowledge society. However, first it is worth looking more closely at what is meant by political rationality.

Specific political rationalisations and related political programmes, such as the competitive knowledge society, emerge in precise sites at specific times in history with their specific aims of government. In the Classical age the aim of government was to achieve a good life, in the Renaissance the aim was to sustain the power of the ruler, the Machiavellian Prince. The new rationality of the modern age, continuing in part to the present day, is aimed at increasing the scope of power of the state for its own sake and producing docile and useful individuals as well as a controlled and efficient population. This is done by bringing the subjects of the state under tighter discipline and surveillance, thereby increasing the interference of the state in the life of the individuals. The forms of exercising power over the population have changed, however. During the classical liberalism of the 19th century, power was individualising and normalising disciplinary power; during the building of the post-WWII welfare state, typical power was the collectivising and socialising bio-power aimed at maximising the health and welfare of the population, the emphasis on the social and governing the citizens of the society. This is done through disciplinary power and technologies of the self (the way people control themselves), rather than through coercion. In this way, the power itself is hidden into the seeming liberty of the individuals to control their own lives by making choices, and the individuals on whom power is exercised, are highlighted. (Foucault 1988; Rose 1999; Hacking 1991; Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983.)

During the past few decades, a new dominant political rationality may be said to have emerged. It is often called advanced liberalism and it is translated into the political programme of the competitive knowledge society. It is backed up by the various technologies, strategies and discourses aimed at making individuals, groups and organisations more competitive, knowledgeable and entrepreneurial. In this context, power has yet again changed its form. Rose (1999, 188) calls this new power in advanced liberal societies, or competitive knowledge societies, as “ethico-politics”. The national objective for good subject of rule is combined with the voluntarily assumed obligations of free individuals to make the most of their existence by conducting their life responsibly and ethically. This is also a part of the political technology of individuals, through which people have been led to recognise themselves as being part of a society, as part of a social entity, a nation or a state. What is deemed ethical and responsible behaviour is

framed in terms of consumerism and entrepreneurialism, customer choice is presented as the responsibility of the individual towards him/herself and towards other people. (Foucault 1988, 146; Rose 1996 45–46; Rose 1999, 98–136.) The image of an ideal citizen of the competitive knowledge society will be discussed below.

The political rationalities are underpinned by coherent systems of thought, linking together different types of calculations, strategies and tactics, which intervene in the local conditions and practises of everyday life in the name of the market, the social, the liberty of the individual, or the competitiveness of the nation state, internationality of the university or entrepreneuriality of the individual. Political rationalities are elements of government rather than external to it. Although the exercise of power and government may also take non-discursive forms, political rationalities can be seen first and foremost as discursive fields within which exercise of power and government, and its practices are being constituted and conceptualised and made to appear rational. (Rose 1999, 24, 28; Rose & Miller 1992, 175; Lemke 2002, 55.) The label ‘knowledge society’ gives a common name and expression to many of the contemporary policies and mechanisms of governing, making them seem like a coherent whole, and legitimises the actions of the state to govern universities and individuals.

Each political rationality includes conceptions of the nature and scope of legitimate authority and the distribution of authority across different sphere of life, as well as ideals or principles, such as autonomy, freedom, justice, responsibility, democracy or national competitiveness, which guide the exercise of authority. It also has a distinctive language which goes beyond mere rhetoric. It is performative in the sense that it creates a reality which is amenable to the aspirations of the authorities. It defines what counts as truth, who has the power to define truth, and what the epistemological, institutional and technical conditions of production and dissemination of truths are. The truths are contested, and often formed in the pragmatic, everyday practices of government, rather than as part of theories, experiments or comparative studies. They eventually come to shape the understandings of the subjects and objects of government and thereby reshape the foundations on which the government rests. (Rose 1999, 26–31; Rose & Miller 1992, 178–179.) To analyse government is therefore to analyse the variety of practices that try to influence our conduct, thoughts and desires, including the discourses, which are powerful ways of constituting and constructing social realities and possibilities of action. With its focus on deconstructing the practices and discourses which create the field of possible action as argued before, governmentality theory shares some of the basic assumptions of discourse analysis, namely the critique of taken-for-granted knowledge and the idea of knowledge and truth being constructed and maintained or challenged in social practices. As noted by Foucault, it is not possible to reach any truth outside the web of discourses, therefore no universal truth exists. Instead, discourses produce ‘truth effects’ and the important question is to ask how these truth effects are created in discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false. (Dean 1999, 12; Foucault 1980, 118; Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 14.) Language is not reduced

to a contemplative or informative role of a channel through which extra-discursive facts are communicated or even justificatory role but is performative constituting the social world, identities and relations. Therefore changes in the discourse are a means of changing the social world. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 5, 9, 14.)

In the competitive knowledge society, reality is described as consisting of increasing competition between nation states for knowledge and knowledge workers, education being the key to capacity building and to national and individual competitiveness. In the Finnish knowledge society, knowledge and innovation, and an economy built on their application, and the duty of the society to ensure knowledge society skills for all individuals, are constructed as the solution to the potential problems or dangers in society. Weak economic performance, unemployment, social disintegration or even environmental change are categorised as problems that can be solved by the utilisation of knowledge. The University as a central knowledge-producing institution is at the core of the knowledge society.

4.3.3 The ideal citizen and ideal university in the knowledge society

As noted before, government is an attempt to shape who and what we are and should be. Since the liberal government of the 19th century and emphasised further in the contemporary advanced liberal, competitive knowledge societies, the main aim of government has been to create independent, self-sufficient individuals who are able to govern and take care of themselves rather than needing to be governed or taken care of. The process of creating such individuals, ideal citizens, comes through two mechanisms. They are objectified as “subjects of government” through certain institutions such as the family or the education system. Subjects of government are also formed in scholarship, by classifying them as objects of study in sociology, economics and linguistics. For instance the values, attitudes and operations of communities, the economic behaviour of individuals, or the habits and patterns of the use of language studies in the aforementioned disciplines, constitute individuals as subjects of government.

Subjects and subjectivities are also formed in a process of subjectification, a kind of self-formation of active humans turning themselves into subjects of the government. (Rose 1996, 54; Rose 1999, 98-136; Rabinow 1984, 7–11.) The subjectification process is simultaneously individualizing and collectivizing, it is a process of identifying oneself with a collective identity and differentiating oneself from the kind of being one is not. (Rose 1999, 46). In this way individuals emerge as ideal citizens, and universities as ideal universities of the competitive knowledge society.

Governing takes place through a process of translation, whereby the objectives of authorities are aligned with the personal projects of the autonomous, free individuals, groups and organisations who are the subjects of government. As a result of translation in which they translate the objectives and values of governing authorities into their own terms which provide the norms and standards for their own ambitions and projects, they can be governed at a distance. Universities with their traditional value of academic freedom and institutional autonomy provide a fruitful ground for self-government. Common understandings of the nature of reality, appropriate courses of action and shared interests are construed and constructed in and through discourses, as a result of processes of persuasion, negotiation and bargaining (Rose 1999, 48–50; Rose & Miller 1992, 184). An example of this is that way in which the concept of ‘national efficiency’ is translated into physical efficiency of school children or industrial efficiency of a factory (Rose 1999, 50–51). In my study, I will argue that the universities are governed by aligning their interests with the interests of the knowledge society and the notion of international competitiveness of each knowledge society is translated into the international competitiveness of universities and the individuals residing in it. Power is exercised over universities through the discourses of competitiveness, knowledge economy or certain kinds of internationalisation. They appear to be making free choices, but the powerful rationality of the knowledge society as it is played out in the discourses, guides their activities to a particular, logical course.

Under the rationality of advanced liberalism and the competitive knowledge society, the technologies of government are aimed at strengthening the will and the capacities of individuals and organisations to act as enterprising subjects. All aspects of society: education, health, welfare and national insurance, need to be restructured along the lines of economic rationality. The calculation and exercise of consumer choice needs to be based on assessments of costs, benefits and return on investment. This is linked to privatisation, marketisation and supplanting traditional norms of service and dedication, with those of competition, quality and customer demand, and to the increasing introduction of new public management mechanisms. (Rose 1996, 54–61; Rose 1999, 139–142.)

Education in particular is an institution used to construct identities and subjectivities, and has therefore been significantly influenced by the rationalities of advanced liberalism. Education creates individuals who are able to govern themselves as active citizens. The citizens of advanced liberal societies are required to engage in constant training and re-skilling in order to qualify for the labour market. Human value is built around labour market capacity. (Rose 1999, 161.) Dudley (1999) for instance has studied the construction of lifelong learning in the context of advanced rationality, in which citizenship becomes primarily constituted in economic terms as participation in the labour market and economic production. Continuous learning, conceptualised in instrumental terms, becomes the obligation of every good citizen. This is evident especially in the discourse of the European Union, as will be discussed later. Individu-

als are supported in self-governance through training, counselling and programmes of empowerment, in order to equip them with skills of self-promotion, boost their self-esteem and enable them to assume their role as self-actualising and demanding subjects of advanced liberal democracies (Rose 1996, 60, see also Cruikshank 1996). On the other hand, the advanced liberal project has succeeded in restructuring the discourses of education which are increasingly conflated with discourses of marketing, advertising and management. As a result of this, learners have become increasingly viewed as consumers or clients, and courses as products or services. Education has increasingly become colonised by discourses from outside (Peters 1996, 81). The colonisation of the discourses of higher education, and the entrepreneuriality and life of learning of individuals are also evident in my empirical data, as will be discussed anon.

The concepts of uncertainty on the one hand, and risk and risk management on the other hand have become increasingly important ways of managing and responsabilising individuals (Amoore 2004, Robertson 1999). The ideal citizen of a contemporary society is a prudential individual, that is, a simultaneously responsible (moral) and rational (calculating) individual. As the competitive knowledge society is also a risk society (Beck 1992), where the risks are increasingly shifted so they must be shouldered by individuals, and where there is increasingly less sense of security about the course of the future, the ideal citizens of the knowledge society are also risk-aware: they are oriented towards the future, constantly considering the risks involved in the future and aiming at controlling and managing the risks of the future (Robertson 1999). The rational individual will wish to become responsible for him or herself as this will most effectively safeguard against risk, and the responsible individual will act rationally in order to avoid risks. Failure to take care of oneself is a form of irrationality or lack of skilfulness (O'Malley 1996, 199–200; see also Amoore 2004). Similarly, as will be discussed later on, becoming international is held in great esteem, and failure to do so is a form of irrationality in the contemporary discourses of the internationalisation of higher education.

Ideal citizens are rational, responsible, knowledgeable and calculative, in control of the key aspects of their lives. This change in the ideal citizenship implies that instead of being clients of the welfare service providers, they enter 'partnerships' with public authorities, such as the police, or becomes 'customers' of the service – literally or figuratively depending on the degree of marketisation of the service. (O'Malley 1996 203.) It is argued that in today's individualised world, the question of government is less the problem of governability of society and more the problems of governability of individuals defined by consumer patterns and lifestyle politics, and as part of various identity communities defined by locality, ethnicity, sexuality, lifestyle or political or moral standing. With this shift towards individual and community and away from the social, the governing is taking place increasingly through the identity related community rather than through the nation-wide society. (Rose 1999.) This may be partly true, and a good example of this may be for instance the erosion of population-wide

social welfare programmes or the decreasing trust and interest in large-scale political parties, and the emergence, instead, of individual social insurance and the increasing interest in single-issue political movements. I would however, argue, that there are elements in the knowledge society project which pertain to the entire population of a small country like Finland, whose unifying historical experiences have already been addressed in a previous chapter.

The new “responsibilisation” is not limited to individual subjects, however. There are several ways of creating ideal institutions and organisations in the knowledge society. One typical way of responsabilising public agencies such as universities, is through new public management practices. They can be called technologies of performance (Dean 1999, 168–169, 193), and they have been used to create “reflexive government” out of public institutions, making them accountable, transparent and democratic. They have been used to constructing universities as calculating, responsible and active, self-managing entrepreneurial agents.²⁸ Another technology which has contributed to the entrepreneurialisation of public institutions, such as the universities is the general commodification of discourse, which Fairclough (1992, 207) defines as a process “whereby social domains and institutions, whose concern is not producing commodities in the narrower economic sense of goods for sale, come nevertheless to be organized and conceptualized in terms of commodity production, distribution and consumption.” Commodification can be understood in terms of colonisation of a particular institution, or in a wider sense the whole social order of discourse by discourse types associated with commodity production. (Fairclough 1992, 207–215).

Education is a prime example of this process: vocabularies of enterprise converge with those of education and are accompanied by commodification and marketisation from other discursive practices. This appears, for example, in the ways universities advertise themselves to prospective students, the way they announce vacant positions and in their strategies. This has led to shifts in the self-identity within the university organisations, so that the organisational identities previously taken for granted have been side-lined, and much greater effort has been put into constructing more entrepreneurial organisational identities. (Fairclough 1995, 119, 140–142; 2003, 33.) These include, for instance, an increasing emphasis on competitiveness and a changing notion of quality, a changing perception about the role of higher education in society and so on. Kwiek (2003) has argued that the discourses of higher education policy and the associated academic discourses have been increasingly influenced by discourses of competitiveness and universities being seen as engines of economic growth, and that the discourses of the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Agenda are converging. He also argues that the University as an institution has already embraced it as legitimate, necessary and useful to accommodate the pressures to become the engines of economic growth and competitiveness in order to retain their significant role in society.

28. For an analysis of advanced liberal government in higher education, see e.g. Marginson 1997; Slaughter and Leslie 1997.

The ideal image of the university pertains to the University institution as well as to university organisations as pictures of the institution. The ideal image described above is different from the previous ideal University institution, reflected for instance by some of the work cited in this study, such as Bowen (1977), Kerr (1995) or Delanty (2000). The different ideal institutions, constructed by way of textual and material practices, materialise in different historical and cultural contexts, such as the pre-industrial, late industrial or knowledge societies, or European and American, colonial and post-colonial cultures. Although I have focussed on the University ideal of the competitive knowledge society, I have also recognised elements of older University ideal in the texts.

In my research I am arguing that a certain kind of ideal image of a university organisation and eventually, as a sum of these parts, University institution, emerges from the discourses of Internationalisation and University, consisting of the ideas of entrepreneurialism and internationality, contribution to the competition and competitiveness of the individual, the university and the country, quality, excellence and life long learning. However, the image of an ideal university contains elements from what maybe thought to be more traditional discourses. These include the contribution to science and knowledge, the search for trust and research integrity, or non-economic contributions to the national heritage and humanistic values, so the change of the University institution appears more an evolution than an abrupt change. These elements are discussed in connection with the University discourses, which will be discussed later. Government functions by way of individuals and universities translating the discourses of ideal citizenship and internalising the subjectivities constructed by them.

Governmentality literature has ventured beyond Foucault in the analysis of advanced liberalism and the dispersion of government outside the scope of the nation state and into the dispersed and privatised practices of governing in the global field. (Fraser 2003, Petersen et al. 1999, Rose 1999, Dean 1999.) The governmentality of the global economic system seems to be much gloomier picture of a zero-sum game with winners and losers and the governing of the population is subjugated to the aim of the international competitiveness of the state (Fraser 2003, Dean 2002). In the context of globalisation, “the task of the national government is no longer simply to engage in the management of national economies in the interest of national population, but also to affect economic performance in a way that will ensure global economic advantage” (Tikly 2003, 164). Therefore the concept of the security of the state as its ultimate goal has come to encompass the relative economic security vis-à-vis other nations. This also presents new demands for the competitiveness of the individuals and institutions belonging to the nation. (Tikly 2003, 164.) This is typical for the discourse of the knowledge society. It provides a truth about the state of the society, its strengths and weaknesses and its means of survival, and thereby provides a clear goal towards which its energies should be directed. It also has a tendency to reshape other concepts until they become compliant. Examples of this include knowledge

being reduced to commodity (see e.g. Barnett, 1996) and the internationalisation of higher education being reduced to a tool of national competitiveness and internationality into international reputation. However, as will be discussed later, this limited interpretation is not entirely supported by my analysis, which also recognises the continued existence of the discourses of University contribution to science and knowledge, civilisation and wellbeing.

The notions of entrepreneurialism, enterprise culture and knowledge society are creating a totalising and unifying meta-narrative of advanced liberalism. It legitimises economic growth and development as being based on science, education and technology and is sustained by the language of efficiency, effectiveness, excellence, information revolution, performance and enterprise which penetrate all fields, including education.²⁹ (Peters 1996, 88–89.) This is also evident in the discourses I have analysed in the course of my study. As will be seen from the analysis below, internationality has become an obligation for both universities and individuals: teachers, researcher and individuals alike. They are given the responsibility to open up, to rethink their work and organisation, and to learn skills needed in the international environment. They are given the task of securing the survival of Finland, its competitiveness, wellbeing and future. However, this obligation stems not only from the meta-narrative of competitive knowledge society but also from the meta-narrative of the history of Finland.

The governmentality theory focuses attention on the constructed and discursive nature of the knowledge society, rather than presenting it as a given consistent entity, thereby helping to denaturalise the knowledge society. It shows the relationality between power in the competitive knowledge society and the identities of the universities governed in it. It asks questions like why we should govern universities, how we should govern them, and what we should govern in them, and presents the competitive knowledge society and its demands, discourses and mechanisms as an answer to these questions. Governmentality theory and its notion of discursive political rationality illustrate the mechanisms through which the government of a knowledge society functions. Instead of the setting of formal rules and structures, funding and steering mechanisms, and legal frameworks emphasised the theories of governance, the government operates through aligning of the interests of its citizens and organisations with the interests of the state, through internalisation of certain knowledge-oriented, entrepreneurial identities by the citizens and universities and thus a subjectification of them as subjects of the knowledge society. This subjectification describes well the mechanisms used by the universities in integrating into the Finnish knowledge society and its aspirations. Governing takes place both through textual, discursive and material practices, although I have concentrated only on the discursive practices in my study. Combining the governmentality approach with the discourse approach can provide interesting insights into the ways in which individual subjectivities as well as institutional self-understandings are constituted and formed in the

29. For analyses of the constitutive role of market discourse in higher education, see e.g. Trowler 2001.

discourses about the knowledge society, entrepreneurialism and internationalisation.³⁰ Foucaultian governmentality theory emphasises the process of governing the material university organisations through constructed ideal images of the University institution and also by constructing the social reality in which they have to operate, whereas the discourse analysis (e.g. Fairclough, 2001) focuses on the process of how those ideal images and social realities are constructed. They allow us to question the certainties created in the discourse, and treat ideals such as internationality, entrepreneurialism, competitiveness or even older notions of science and knowledge, academic community and collegiality, or civilisation and wellbeing as discursive constructions. Analysis of government seeks to make visible and explicit “the thought” behind government, its rationality, which is largely tacit in the languages, practices and techniques on how people govern and are governed. It is critical in this sense, in making what is invisible, implicit and taken-for-granted, visible and explicit, and giving us tools to see, discuss and question any practices and truths. (Dean 1999, 36.) As pointed out by Walters and Haar (2005, 6), governmentality theory is continuous with discourse analysis, but inconceivable without it: “To reconstruct governmentalities, to excavate forms of political reason embedded in them requires that we take language as an irreducible medium. As theorists of discourse have emphasised, we need to understand language not as a mere reflection of an underlying ‘real’ world, but as a constitutive dimension of reality. Political struggles as also conflicts over meaning.” The theory also provides a larger scale theory about the society, which is required to supplement the discourse analysis. It provides a theory on the nature and operation of power and discusses its relationship to truth (as embedded in the discourses). The rationality of society as described by the governmentality theory, also accounts for non-discursive social practices such as university accountability and funding systems, making universities appear to be logical and coherent entities. This gives rise to the discourses constructing a new subjectivity of the idealised institution of the knowledge society.

Summing up, in this first part of my study, I have discussed the conditions essential to the production and understanding of the discourses I am about to present in the next part. I have presented the overall methodological principle that the discourses of this discursive order of higher education are social practices in themselves. They are constituted by the social practices of higher education, the institutions of the University, the rationalities of the competitive knowledge society, and the specific national, historical and cultural context in which they are played out. They are also constitutive of them, having material and practical effects. In the next part, I turn to an examination of the discourses themselves, discussing their content and intent, and asking how they define internationalisation, and the kind of University they constitute.

30. For examples of studies on discourses as mechanisms of government and formation of subjectivity, see e.g. Petersen et al 1999.

Part II

Discourses of internationalisation and the legitimating ideas of the University

– Chapter 5 –

The methodology and method: conducting the analysis

5.1. Introduction

In this part of the study I will describe the discourses that I have identified, based on the analysis of the empirical data. These include three discourses describing and arguing for internationalisation and three discourses describing and constituting the institution of the University. In the interest of readability, I have described the first three discourses as “Internationalisation discourses” and the next three discourses as “University discourses”. The Internationalisation discourses describe the content and consequences of the internationalisation of higher education, presenting internationalisation as the opening up of the country, as rethinking of the university or as empowerment of the individual. The University discourses constitute the legitimating idea of both the role of the University in society in general and internationalisation as part of it through university contribution to science and knowledge, to civilisation and wellbeing or to competition and competitiveness¹. As with any discourse, they do not exist independently in reality nor are they necessarily recognised by the speakers or document writers themselves, but, rather, are categories identified by the researcher from the material. Therefore, discourse analysis often includes simplification of the many varieties of natural speech. I also found a certain level of simplification to be necessary in order to be able to discuss critically the ways conceptualisations of internationalisation, university or higher education in the context of competitive knowledge societies are changing. The discourses are fragmented within the texts, and are intertwined and combined, strategically as well as unconsciously. That is, the discourses are not clearly

1. In keeping with the idea of universities as organisational forms of the University institution, I am drawing parallels between the explicit references in the texts analysed to university organisations and what is expected of them, and the University institution, made up of the organisations but also of the explicit and implicit values, norms and activities related to universities as organisations and the University as an institution. Thus the empirical examination of the material produced by university organisations and those organisations able to exercise power over them, leads to conclusions being drawn on institutional parameters.

delineated. The discourse of competition and competitiveness in particular co-opts and makes use of other discourses to increase its own strength, such as for instance the science and knowledge -discourse. On the other hand, discourses are used strategically by actors to argue for their own role and status. For instance, both the universities and the European University Association use the science and knowledge -discourse or alternatively the competitiveness discourse to argue both for their continued or increased role in policy making and further resources, and to describe internationalisation and university as such. The focus of the analysis has rather been on the constitution of the discourses themselves than on the actors, although some references to the discourses used by the actors are also made. My aim has not been to construct rigid discourses but to show the richness, the variability and also the internal incoherence and conflict with the discourses. Therefore for many of the six identified discourses, various perspectives have been identified. These sub-discourses emphasise one aspect or feeling over others, creating a somewhat different atmosphere within the same discourse. Before moving on to describe the six discourses, I will first account for the discourse analysis as a methodology and method, and the steps I have taken in conducting the analysis of the data and constructing the two sets of discourses.

The wider aim of my research is to provide further insight into the way in which the understandings about the roles and tasks of the University as a social institution, and the universities as a large set of individual organisations making up that wider social institution, are played out in the context of the competitive knowledge society in Finland and in the European Union, specifically the European Commission, which in this study provides a wider reflection point for the Finnish case. As I began my analysis of the empirical data, I asked myself a set of questions. Are the traditional notions of the Humboldtian University, so strongly presented in the traditional notions of the University, still valid? Have the newer notions of a new, perhaps entrepreneurial, University surpassed them? Are knowledge and truth still relevant values or have they been taken over by or been redefined through competitiveness and instrumentalism? Much of the contemporary critical research and critical discussion on universities argues that universities have been subjected solely to the goal of national competitiveness, that they have lost their autonomy vis-à-vis the market, and that the scholarly norms have faltered at the face of the increasing treadmill of competition and customer demand. While it might be true that the universities have had more demands placed on them by society to contribute to the nation's competitiveness and wellbeing, and that the discourse of competition and competitiveness has achieved a strong position amongst the various higher education actors, it is evident that alternative articulations of University tasks and roles survive or even thrive alongside the more instrumental notions.

However, it is also valid to ask whether, in the context of university and university policy, it is perceived as necessary to “pay homage” to the institution of the University and its traditional values by using the discourse of science and knowledge. Further, in the Finnish context, is it necessary to “pay homage” to the Finnish welfare state by

using the discourse of civilisation and wellbeing? These discourses would therefore only be mentioned as a “token”, and they would lend legitimacy to the argument for competitiveness, and to the competition and competitiveness –discourse by their sheer existence alone, even if their content was redefined so that the original discourse would no longer be present. My research in this sense has an emancipatory aim, to display and discuss the different ways in which University tasks and institution can be constructed, and how the discourses can be used to create different realities. Recognising the constructed nature of social reality offers options for changing it.

5.2. Discourse analysis as methodology and method

Discourse analysis is one approach amongst the language-based analysis traditions, which include for example narrative studies, rhetoric, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, ethnography, semiotics, speech-act theory, pragmatics, cognitive psychology, corpus analysis, linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis, critical linguistics and social semiotics, social-cognitive model and cultural-generic analysis.² It is not a particular method for data analysis, but rather a theoretical and methodological package containing ontological and epistemological premises regarding the role of language in construction of the world, theoretical models and methodological guidelines on how to approach the research, and finally a set of specific techniques for analysis. The philosophy, theory and method are intertwined in a sense that a discourse analyst must subscribe to the basic philosophical premises in order to do discourse analysis. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 4.)

Discourse analysis generally adheres to the socially constructed nature of meaning and knowledge (Berger & Luckmann 1987), but different discourse analytical traditions have different understandings as to what extent there is a reality outside the socially constructed meanings (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 18–20). For instance Parker (1998, 1–8) and Burr (1998, 13–25) present a distinction between a realist and relativist discourse analysis. According to realist discourse analysis, there is an ontological reality (nature, weather, the biological basis of thinking and acting) outside the discourse, even though we have no knowledge about it except through use of language. When this ontological reality becomes knowledge, it moves to the epistemological sphere through acquiring meanings in speech or text. Other epistemological categories which do not have ontological basis also exist, such as intelligence or attitudes. However, they are also treated as ontological. Parker (1992, 23–41) claims that it is impossible to distinguish between those epistemological things that really have an ontological status and those for whom ontological status is just epistemologically constructed.

2. For different categorisations, see e.g. Nikander 1997; Jokinen & Juhila 1999; Fairclough 1997, 39–49; Fairclough 2001b, 5–11; Stubbs 1996.

Together they form the material and social world in which we live, and about which people construct understandings and meanings in the discourse. Discourses are realised in different kinds of texts, and it is the task of the discourse analyst to ask what the material basis of those discourses is, which institutions are strengthened or silenced by those discourses, and who benefits from them. Texts reflect institutions and power even when they stand against them. People cannot create the world from nothing, they can only reproduce or transform the existing material-social structure of the world. Theorists adhering to a critical realist position such as Parker (1992) and Willig (1998), or Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer (2001), are worried that ontological and epistemological relativism may hinder critical work or point out problems in society such as inequality or oppression, which threaten to turn into just another set of stories. In unmasking taken-for-granted truths, and making their ideological outcomes visible, discourse analysis can contribute to showing that “things could be different” and making space for alternative interpretations of reality. Thereby discourse analysis can contribute to the empowerment of the vulnerable in society. Even in recognising the multiplicity of voices in society, there should be space left for collective action (Burr 1998, 17). It can therefore be said that discourse analysis, especially critical discourse analysis like Fairclough’s (2001b, 2003), has a certain emancipatory interest of knowledge, to take the side of the suppressed and the weak ones. However, it is important to remember that no particular discourse or practice is repressive or negative as such but the negativity or repressivity is dependent on the context in which it is constructed. (Jokinen & Juhila 1993, 101; Parker 1992, 18–19.)

Relativist discourse analysis on the other hand focuses on the contextual, linguistic practices instead of the ontological qualities of institutions and power. Texts and language are social practices which are available for research, whereas seeing behind them is impossible and therefore futile. The non-discursive world is therefore that which is discursively described and explained as non-discursive, therefore institutions or power are not non-discursive but just discursive strategies of producing reality. (Juhila 1999, 165–166, see also e.g. Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 19). Burr (1998, 22) defends the relativist position against charges of moral relativism which it has encountered from critical realists. She notes that “the debate between realism and relativism has often been set up as if it were primarily about moral relativism and nihilism. But it is becoming clear that those who adopt a relativist view of the world are no more likely than realists to recommend or defend an ‘anything goes’ morality”. On the other hand, categories such as race or gender can no longer be used as a basis for empowering action once the attention is drawn to the way in which the use of the categories obscures the differences between different disparate groups within them. She also points out that the debate flourishes primarily for the same reasons as any other dichotomous debates such as structure versus agency or mind versus matter; because it is dichotomous and in its limited capacity provides us with useful ways of viewing the world and our place in it. Also, Potter (1998, 28) who defends the relativist position, views realism/relativism

debate as a construction: “it is produced in narratives which invoke a range of tropes and produces a set of characters: realists, materialists, constructionists, relativists.” He recognises four kinds of realism prominent in the social scientific debates, having in mind especially the view of his own discipline social psychology: realism as a philosophical theory about the ontology of social science, how it should be conceived and studied; realism as another way of describing empirical work in social psychology; realism as an alternative formulation of the Marxist historical materialism (ideological superstructure determined by economic base) and realism as a rhetorical commonplace in a range of more or less everyday non-technical discourse.

My own methodological approach is similar to that used by Willig (1998, 91–92), Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer (2001) and Fairclough and Chouliaraki (1999), namely a position of essentially critical realist ontology with a socially constructed epistemology, that is, an understanding that social reality is essentially reachable through socially constructed meaning. In practice, this means that I do not believe that everything in social reality, such as institutions or power, can be reduced to a linguistically constructed meaning, but that the way that we can acquire knowledge about them is essentially through language. Study of discourses is capable of informing political interventions or critical, empowering action, and it is important to remember that, although discourses and practices are occasioned, however, some discourses and practices become dominant in particular historical periods and they serve to legitimate power.

Discourses and other social practices are in a dialectical relationship with each other: discourses are constituted within a particular historical, cultural and institutional context, but also constitutive of them. This means that the way that power relations or institutions are presented in the discourses also have material effects in constructing them. Different discourses point towards different courses of action as legitimate and rational ones. Discursive struggles contribute to the reproduction of as well as the changing of the social world, and power relations in it. It can therefore be said that changes in the discourse are a means of changing the world. There is a duality of discourse and social structure: meanings are socially constructed but at the same time those meanings constrain further constructions. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 9; Fairclough 2003, 8–9.)

This consequentiality of language refers to two points. Use of language has both situational functions, which are related to the short term current situation and can be both intentional and non-intentional, and longer-term ideological consequences which can be related to the reproduction or transformation of existing power relations and wider social practices. The idea of consequentiality of discourse assumes that in the end the intra-discursive struggles also have an effect on the extra-discursive social structures: they define what kinds of knowledge and truths, social relations and subject positions become legitimised. The ideological consequences are not present in the data as such, but are a result of speculative reasoning. (Jokinen & Juhila 1993, 89, 97; Fairclough 1989, 68–74–75; Fairclough 2003, 8–9.)

In keeping with Fairclough's (2001b, 2003) critical discourse analysis and its premise of the dialectical relationship between discursive and non-discursive elements of social practices and structures, I believe that there is a dialectical relationship between the discourses and other practices in higher education, universities and internationalisation. The social structures and practices consist of both discursive and non-discursive elements. Discursive practices are shaped by non-discursive practices and in their turn shaping them. In social practices both discursive and non-discursive elements are present. Discourses may come to shape non-discursive practices on various levels: for instance discourses of internationalisation of higher education may be *materialised in organisational and material structures* within universities such as international offices (both in terms of organisation and office space) and *enacted semiotically in particular genres of language*, such as the genre of the counselling of international students. They may also be *inculcated in new styles of "being"*, meaning a process whereby people come to own the new discourses and to act, talk, think and see themselves in terms of the new discourses, such as academic staff seeing themselves as international actors. (Fairclough 2001a, 3; 2003a, 6; 2003b, 205–209.)

Change in discursive practices is also linked to the change in other social practices. The mechanism through which discursive change is brought about is that of intertextuality and its specific subcategory, interdiscursivity, i.e. that texts and discourses always draw on already existing texts and discourses. "Change is created by drawing on existing discourses in new ways, but the possibilities for change are limited by power relations which, among other things, determine the access of different actors to different discourses" (Phillips & Jørgensen 2002, 74). Discourses function ideologically by way of reproducing or transforming existing power relations. This happens through a hegemonic struggle between different discourses in a specific order of discourse. The order of discourse, such as the order of discourse of the University, is a common platform of different discourses, and the discourses are patterns of meaning within the order of discourse. For instance, as the different University discourses point towards different actions for the funding, administration, internationalisation, research and teaching in universities, this is capable of reproducing or transforming the wider social practice of the University. The aim of the analysis is to reveal the role of discursive practices in the maintenance or changing of the social world, including the way that they uphold or aim to change ideology and power relations (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 62–64, 75–7). Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 145) suggest that a researcher can concentrate on a) the aspects of the world to which the discourses ascribe meaning, b) the particular ways in which each of the discourses ascribe meaning, c) the points on which there is an open struggle between different representations and d) any understandings naturalised in all of the discourses as common-sense. The elements of competing alternative discourses may be found from the same data but can also be constructed by the researcher as possible alternatives in the discussions (Jokinen & Juhila 1993, 105). Similarly, attention can be focussed either on the multiplicity and complexity of the different ways

in which social reality can be structured and categorised in language and the great variety of different discourses and social realities dependent on the context, or on the relations of power in construction of social reality and the emergence of hegemonic discourses. The first approach highlights the way in which the same people use different discourses in different situations, or even use several different discourses during a single situation to justify or argue their point. The alternative approach clarifies how a single discourse can become so strong and taken for granted that it is repeated over and over again in different situations and contexts. Hegemony does not necessarily mean, however, that hegemonic discourses would be easy to find in analysis. They may easily be passed as everyday talk, instead of being taken as bearing any significance. The strength of a discourse may be demonstrated by the regularity with which it appears in speech and text, or by the way it appears as having no reasonable alternatives. These two approaches are not mutually exclusive but rather represent different sides of the same coin. (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 1993a, 11.)

In my study, I have especially focussed on the multitude of discourses of internationalisation, and the various ways of constructing the role and legitimation of the University in the context of the competitive knowledge society, instead of concentrating on finding a single hegemonic discourse. That said, the discourse of competition and competitiveness may also be argued to hold a very strong position, with characteristics of almost a hegemonic discourse. Hegemonic discourses are sometimes difficult to recognise as discourses. They come to signify facts, and lose their discursive character. Critical discourse analysis takes for granted the existence of certain kinds of power relationships and repression and focuses on the study of the type of discursive features that reproduce those relations. Therefore, while accounting for the wide range of discourses of internationalisation, my research will also provide a space for discussing the hegemonic nature of some of them. I have focussed on a broader cultural context of the representations of internationalisation and university, rather than analysing those representations as changing from one situation to the next, for instance, from one document or one interview, to the next. I have also concentrated on discussing the kinds of meanings that are produced in the empirical data, rather than analysing how³ those meanings are produced in the use of language. Although the question how the meanings are produced is very interesting, I have chosen to focus on the range of meanings attached to internationalisation and the university, in order to be able to discuss the changing institution of University in a knowledge society. Questions

3. This focus on how-questions has raised criticism of discourse analysis by saying that it forgets the more important why-questions. However, discourse analysis addresses the why-questions, referring to reasons behind discourses, mainly when they are represented in the discourse. Reasons for why a discourse is what it is, is addressed by norms, values, roles etc. which are the focus of analysis through their representations in the texts. Therefore some strands of discourse analysis also avoid large generalising, explaining theories. (Juhila & Suoninen 1999, 247–248). On the other hand, Fairclough's (2001b,22) critical discourse analysis does encourage inclusion of explanation also.

related to discourse in interaction and factualisation fall outside the analysis. (Jokinen & Juhila 1999, 54–86.)

5.2.1 The definitions of discourse

Discourses can in general be defined as systems of statements which construct an object; they are social practices, which mould the social reality. Discourses have an interdiscursive and extradiscursive dimension: they are formed in relation to other discourses as well as in relation to extradiscursive relations and forces, such as institutions, social processes and societal structures. (Fairclough 2001b; Fairclough 2003, 3–4, 25–26; Parker 1992, 5.)

Following Fairclough (2001b, 23–24, see, also Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 66–67), I am using the word discourse in three different ways. Firstly, the entire study is based on the first notion of discourse, the idea that the use of language is a social practice. Secondly, I am also using the word discourse as specific kind of language used within a specific field, such as political or scientific discourse, or by a particular organisation amongst my body of empirical data, such as EUA discourse, EU discourse, national discourse or university discourse. Thirdly, I use the word discourse to refer to a way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective and can be distinguished from other discourses. I have constructed six discourses which describe the different, although simultaneous ways in which the content and nature of internationalisation of higher education and the legitimations of university in the knowledge society are described, and discourses also being constitutive, contribute to their further construction. I will try to ensure that it is clear to the reader which of the three definitions of the discourse are utilised in which context.

Discourses are not neutral statements; they always provide an interpretation of an issue from a particular perspective. As Newman (2001, 29) has noted, discourses “are ways of organising knowledge, knowledge through which problems come to be defined in particular ways and through which particular solutions are privileged.” Discourses serve to incorporate different notions together in larger discursive regimes, and e.g. citizenship becomes defined through notions of community, public involvement, consumerism and value for taxpayers’ money. Similarly, the University gets defined in relation to knowledge, science, research, education and its contribution to society. Shifts in the discourse and the way different sub-discourses are co-opted together produces legitimating logics of appropriate action. Discourse constitutes the conditions of possibility of experience, observation and interpretation in a particular social context as well as constituting the social actors, motivation as and rules according to which actions can be validated and consequences identified. Discourses are historically located, emerging in particular times and contexts. They support and reproduce institutions and power relations and have ideological effects (Kjær & Pedersen, 2001,

226; Parker 1992, 6–20). As Wetherell and Potter (1992, 62–63) have noted, “Our accounts of objects always construct those objects in certain ways and this construction is inescapable. Some versions of reality may be infinitely preferable to others, and should be argued for and pushed forward whenever possible, but, in our view, there is no ‘versionless’ reality.” Thus the accounts of reality are historically specific and socially contingent, and it is important to question whose account of reality becomes generally accepted. Other social practices are not necessarily the direct cause of certain discourses, nor caused by them, but neither are their separate entities.

Individuals and organisational actors can use certain discourses strategically, but at the same time discourses play themselves out through the actions of individuals and organisational actors (Wetherell & Potter 1992, 93). Therefore it can be argued, for instance, that university strategies and the EUA documents make use of the notion of the University as an institution, as opposed to an organisation. These strategies refer to the various contributions the university makes to the advancement of scholarship and knowledge, civilisation and wellbeing, as well as the contribution of universities to the competitiveness of the nation, country or Europe. This is so universities can further their negotiation position in the national or European higher education policy making in a strategic way. The governments or the EU commission are also consciously drawing from the different discourses in order to pave the way for a change in the policy, legislation or funding of higher education, and to evoke voluntary changes on the part of the universities in their practices. On the other hand, not all the use of any particular discourse is strategic. Much of it is a result of internalised identities, norms and values of a particular social institutions and cultural settings. The inherent internationality of scholarship, the University mission of searching for the truth, independent and disinterested research, and critical thinking, are traditional values of the University which are internalised by the actors and played out in their discourse. The overall benefit of the University to society and the contribution to critical discussion in the society are similarly widely shared, institutionalised values. One might also argue that the somewhat more modern notion of the contribution of the university to the competitiveness of the nation and the region are new institutionalised values, almost equally taken for granted as traditional norms of scholarship. Similarly the interviewees for instance might link their representations with the specific material practices or moments in their own organisations. In these cases, the use of these discursive elements in the parlance of the actors is not strategic and consciously thought of, but rather a they are a reflection of internalisation of the certain mental schemes about the University. These internalised discourses are therefore playing themselves out through the discursive actions of the actors, rather than being tactically used by them to argue for any specific benefits or strengthened legitimacy for themselves.

5.3 Reflexivity in discourse analysis

Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) point out that even if meanings are contingent and therefore changeable, most meanings are anyway relatively stable and do not change rapidly from one situation to the next. One important reason for the fixed meanings is that they are naturalised and taken for granted, we do not view them as *understandings of the world* but *as the world*⁴. Therefore an important discourse analytical contribution is the unmasking of these naturalised taken for granted meanings and thereby providing space for alternative understandings about the roles of the University in society for instance. The problem in this is, however, that also the researcher is embedded in the same society and share the same understandings, how can s/he therefore provide alternative ones? The researcher can not claim to have access to ultimate truth either. Jørgensen and Phillips suggest that knowledge production should be understood as a collective process, and reflexivity and critique by the academic community help to build a more comprehensive picture. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 178, 184–185.) “The version of reality which one puts forward in research is not better than any other at the level of principle, and it can always be cast aside through discursive struggles both within the scientific field and in public sphere as a whole. But by representing qualified (that is, scientific) and different account of reality from those which are otherwise available, research knowledge can hopefully contribute to the addition of new perspectives to public debate.” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002, 210.)

The social reality is therefore both the object of the analysis and its product. The work of a discourse analyst is a similar activity than the activities s/he studies: the researcher engaging in discourse analysis is also speaking and writing. Discourse analysis is dialogical: the researcher has discussions with other researchers using his/her data, and speaks or writes for some audience or other. The analysis is dependent on the cultural resources available to the researcher and has a certain position with regards to the research and its object (Fairclough 2001b, 118). In conducting my research, I see myself first and foremost as an interpreter. I am using the academic and cultural resources accumulated throughout my life and my research to interpret the texts. This is to give the discourses a form which helps me, and hopefully my readers, to distance themselves from the vast array of descriptions of internationalisation and university, and to add to the level of abstraction on the discussion on internationalisation of higher education giving it a more analytical form.

On the other hand, this emphasises the importance of reflexivity in conducting the research. Reflexivity should include stating the ontological and epistemological premises of the study: considering the extent to which it is possible to describe things, phenomena, actions and practices without constructing them in the accustomed way, and what the outcomes of doing so are. The researcher should also analyse the extent to which the interpretations made on the data reflect the situation of data generation,

4. Italics in original. TN.

stating how the specific aspects of the text produce or bring forth specific aspects of the discourse. (Dant 1991, 228; Taylor 2001a, 17–19.)

Due to the reflexive nature of discourse analysis as a research process, and the assumption that knowledge is always contingent and situated, the traditional evaluation criteria such as reliability, validity and replicability are clearly not well suited for evaluating discourse analytical work. Other criteria have therefore been discussed (Taylor 2001b, 318–319; see also Lincoln & Guba 1985, 290–331; Lincoln & Guba 2000). Taylor (2001b) mentions e.g. the coherence of the argument, the systematicity of the investigation (including the spelling out of the deviant cases) and the diversity of the discourses, the richness of detail and the explication of the process of analysis to the reader as evaluation criteria. The researcher might argue for the quality of the analysis either through checking it with the participants of the research or through triangulation. The status of the researcher as an insider of the case might also with be an advantage in arguing for the quality of the analysis, rather than a disadvantage and a factor blurring the analysis. The whole research project can be evaluated in terms of its relevance to topical discussion, its usefulness in academic theory construction or its applicability in solving concrete social problems e.g. through critique and empowerment. (Taylor 2001b, 320–325.) Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 172–174) argue that coherence and fruitfulness are important measures of the validity of discourse analytical research. However, the coherence criterion has been criticised for flattening the message, and instead the opposing truths should have a place in the research as well. This can be counterbalanced by the criterion of fruitfulness and its capacity to bring about new knowledge. They also suggest that certain rules of thumb should be followed: the analysis should be solid and based on analysing several different textual features rather than just one. It should be comprehensive, meaning that the questions posed by the text should be answered fully. Conflict with the analysis should be accounted for, and the analysis should be undertaken in a transparent way, documenting the interpretations and reproducing lengthy extracts in the presentation of the analysis. Most importantly, the validity criteria chosen should be explicated and followed throughout.

Antaki et al. (2002) have identified six pitfalls in the practical process of conducting discourse analytical research. The whole approach has sometimes been accused of being unscientific and un-analytical, and one must be aware of this. Although part of their critique is particularly appropriate for more linguistically-oriented discourse analysis, rather than analysis that likens the discourses with wider truth regimes, their points might be useful for any discourse analyst to consider. They argue that under-analysis could occur by excessive or isolated use of quotations, thereby not getting beyond the text itself. The researcher might be taking sides for or against the text or interviewee by highlighting only selected issues and using biased expressions in reporting. S/he might also fall into the trap of making generalisations based on small samples, for instance about demographic groups. Circular discovery of discourses and mental constructs are possible problems which must be avoided. This means that the existence of certain

words taken from the empirical material could be taken to signify that the speakers share the same ideology. The existence of certain discourses as entities independent of the researcher and only “discovered” by the researcher based on the interviews must also be avoided. Mistaking recognition of well-known rhetorical or conversational features as analysis is a potential pitfall. Instead of analysing, the researcher might just be summarising what has been said, thereby losing much of the complexity of the text or interview. Antaki et al. (2002) point out that “in general, summarising does not offer an analysis of the discourse that the speaker was using. The analyst in the summary might be drawing attention to certain themes, pointing to some things that the participant(s) said, and not to other things. However, this pointing out is not discourse analysis. It might prepare the way for analysis, but it does not provide it. It can impede analysis, if it distorts the original by presenting the speaker as being more consistent, smoother and briefer than they might have been. And it will distort if it is freighted with heavy implication: if the summary attributes beliefs, policies and so on to the speaker as a short-hand, then it risks changing the object of analysis even before the analysis starts in earnest.”

On the other hand, Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) point out that *analytical re-description* of empirical material could be one way of discovering taken-for-granted truths embedded in the discourse. Using the concepts from the theories of the research can create distance between the researcher and the material and will allow for the empirical material to be described differently from the way the material describes itself. Thus it may be one way of discovering taken-for granted truths embedded in the discourse. In my research, the notions of the ideal citizen and ideal university, and to some extent also the institutionality of the University, pinpoint such analytical re-description. Jørgensen and Phillips also remind us that there are limits as to how far the analysis can be taken. In the case of lengthy texts or large corpus of texts, there is always more that can be analysed or new perspectives which can be highlighted, and it is part of the professionalism of the researcher also to be able to limit his/her study at a feasible point. (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002, 173, 189.) A certain measure of variability and richness of data is always lost when aiming for abstraction and clarity.

5.3.1. The reflexivity tools used

I have aimed to increase the robustness of my analysis by using a large pool of data: nine interviews with university rectors and other national higher education policy actors, and a total of 60 documents from universities, the Ministry of Education as well as several European documents. These latter documents came from the European University Association, the signatory ministers to the Bologna Process and the European Commission and the European Council. In order to increase the chance to evaluate my work and to increase the robustness of my analysis, I have described my own prior

experience relating to higher education policy. I have also described the theoretical, ontological and epistemological principles that have influenced my thinking and my analysis, recognising that a choice of different theories or methodologies would have led to different outcomes in analysis. I have used numerous direct quotations⁵ from the interviews and the documents to illustrate the discourses, and described the conduct of the analysis step-by-step. The analysis is based on a thorough reading of the text occurring on several occasions. This approach was used instead of simply paying attention to certain linguistic forms or certain key words. Conclusions were based only on the frequency with which key words appeared in the text, and attention was paid to the contextual connotations of the words or wider themes presented in the texts. Although the chosen method was challenging as no ready made formula could be applied to it, I believe that basing the analysis on finding a few key words would have given a much more limited picture of the discourse, and might have overshadowed the counter-discursive articulations. As Wetherell and Potter (1988, 177) have pointed out “Analysis is not a matter of following rules or recipes; it often involves following hunches and the development of tentative schemes which may need to be abandoned or revised”.

As a researcher and as a citizen I am more than a neutral observer. I too am part of the competitive knowledge society and of the university organisation and institution and am therefore inevitably immersed in the discourses and narratives within and about them. I am also a relatively junior member of the academic community, and thus necessarily relate to the discourses from my particular perspective. In order to distance myself from these contexts and to increase the credibility of my research, I have used governmentality theory and institutional theory both of which portray these contexts in a theoretical light and thus give me certain analytical distance from them. Supplementing the picture given by discourse analysis with these theories also provides options for the multiperspectival research recommended by Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 153-162) and Fairclough (2003, 210-211). They base the argument for multiperspectival research on the inherent perspectivism of social constructionist research. If knowledge can only be obtained from particular perspectives, then different perspectives produce different knowledge, and combined together provide a broader view of the object and give a preliminary understanding of the order of discourse and cues as to what discourses to look for in the material. Governmentality theory and the notion that institutions are socially constructed rather than pre-given solid entities, support the ontological and epistemological premises of discourse analysis. Also, as Fairclough (2001b, 22, 118; see also Taylor 2001b, 319) notes, discourse analysis

5. The discourses are illustrated by 86 quotes from interviews, and 193 quotes from documents. Of the latter, 27 are from university documents, regional strategies or CIMO's strategy, 14 are from national development plans for education and research, 32 are from internationalisation strategies, 35 are from EUA documents, 20 from Bologna Process documents and 65 from EU documents. Some extracts have been quoted more than once, and therefore count towards this figure more than once.

never starts from a *tabula rasa*, and can therefore never be fully deductive. Therefore the overall research setting is abductive (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2002, 97), rather than purely inductive or deductive. As Taylor (2001, 39) points out: "The discourse analyst searches for patterns in language in use, building on and referring back to assumptions she or he is making about the nature of language, interaction and society and the interrelationships between them. It is this theoretical underpinning rather than any sorting process which distinguishes discourse analysis".

The results of this research are dependent both on the observations based on the empirical data, as well as on attention paid to the theoretical viewpoints of the competitive knowledge society as a dominant governmental rationality and the understanding of universities as institutions with certain values, norms and mental schemes when conducting the analysis. The construction of the two categories, each consisting of three discourses, was a result of the analysis of the data, as was the inclusion of the viewpoint about Finland's survival. On the other hand, the analysis of the empirical data has also been influenced by the theoretical framework of the study: the notions of ideal citizenship and the ideal university, and the institutionality of the University. My disciplinary background in higher education research contributed to the understanding of the uniqueness of the university, and my previous background as a history student undoubtedly sensitised me to the survival story represented in the empirical data. This choice was not, therefore, a conscious one made before the analysis, but part of those cultural resources used in the analysis. The other side of the coin is, however, the assumption that if those cultural resources at my disposal led me to discover the elements, thematics and narratives I did, then someone else, with a different disciplinary background and cultural resources, might have discovered some other narrative which I could have overlooked.

Although I firmly believe that complete bracketing of the previous experience is not possible, and any claim to do so would be intellectual dishonesty, I have tried to ensure that my research can also be assessed, critiqued and discussed by the academic community. This I have done by laying out my experiences, theoretical and methodological choices, by describing the steps taken in the analysis, by reproducing extensive quotations from the empirical material and by adhering to a coherent and rigorous method of analysis. In interpretative research there is always a certain amount of intuition present which cannot be pinned down. However, as pointed out by Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 175) "even if we were to follow such reflexive procedures conscientiously, we would never be able to produce fully transparent knowledge, whereby our results would accurately depict reality one-to-one, and whereby we could somehow achieve full control over the effects of these results. It is precisely the possibility of absolute knowledge which is rejected in social constructionist premises."

5.3.2 Personal background

My disciplinary commitments, personal history and cultural experiences and contexts are reflected in the way I conduct analysis. As a higher education researcher working within a higher education research group in the Department of Management Studies, my immediate disciplinary commitments are related to recognising the unique characteristics of universities as organisations and as institutions. I am first and foremost a higher education researcher, secondly and perhaps less importantly, a researcher of organisations, albeit not using the most common theories within the field of organisation and administrative studies. My background as a history student is also reflected in my choices and in my interpretations. My exposure to various different kinds of theoretical and physical environments may have played a role in my choosing theories which in turn have influenced the outcomes of the analysis, and the choice of different theories might have highlighted different aspects of internationalisation and universities.

Also my personal experiences have shaped my thinking. I am a Finnish native, born in the 1970s, when the country was struggling to define its position between the east and the west, an independent, market economy country whose position and politics were nevertheless influenced by the large neighbour, the Soviet Union. The national self-understanding was also influenced by how the story of Finnish history has been told to me: the 700 years as part of the kingdom of Sweden, the 100 years as part of Imperial Russia, the national awakening of the 19th century, independence in 1917 and the gruelling civil war in 1918, the threats posed to the national existence by the winter war and continuation war. In the 1970s and 1980s the country was nevertheless booming, the building of the welfare state was crystallised in the slogan - first presented by Finland's then President of the Republic Urho Kekkonen in his new year's speech in 1977 - "...being born in Finland is like winning the lottery". The 1990s brought the fall of the Soviet Union and liberalisation of domestic policy attitudes, economic structural change and depression, followed by economic boom, the information society "miracle" and joining the European Union.

My family has always appreciated education. I was read to frequently when I was a child, and developed a passion for reading at an early age. My paternal grandparents and my father were educated to university level, my grandfather and father later went on to complete doctoral degrees in their later years. All sorts of traditions were always appreciated: going to church at Christmas, listening to the student union choir on the 1st of May, listening to the stories about the student balls in the university or the national defence college. I went on to become a great believer in the power of education. Despite a teenager's rebellious thoughts about becoming a gardener instead of going to university, by the time I graduated from high school, university studies were clearly the only imaginable option. Although my grandparents encouraged me to aspire to studies in fields which they considered to be of "higher prestige" such as law

or medicine, I originally applied to study communication. However, by coming up two points short in the faculty-wide entrance exam, I ended up studying political history at the University of Helsinki, the largest, oldest and perhaps the most traditional of the Finnish universities. Active participation in my own student association and a brief active period in the moderate centre-right Coalition party student organisation led me to work for several years in student politics, with a focus on higher education policy, first in my local student union, then in the national student union and finally in the European student union. My “cultural bourgeois” background (as an old friend termed it) with its fascination in university, history and academic traditions merged with fairly typical student political views about the importance of student participation and free education, and “real-political” recognition of the strength of the call for a change of priorities and increased accountability, and the need for the university funding base of the university to be diversified. My 2,5 years of working in the Committee on Commodification of Education of the European-wide umbrella organisation of the national student unions, ESIB – the National Unions of Students in Europe, which⁶ represents about ten million higher education student in Europe, were highly formative for my research interests. It opened my eyes for Europe, for travelling, for international cooperation and for the traditions of higher education in other countries. If it wasn’t for that experience, I probably would not have started my PhD when I did, but it might have been something to consider a few years later. The yearning for international experience kindled by the ESIB was also instrumental in my seeking to spend five months in the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies at the University of Twente in the Netherlands, and one academic year at the Graduate School of Education in the University of Bristol in UK.

The strength as well as the weakness of subjectivist research approach such as discourse analysis, is its acknowledgement of the inseparableness of the researcher and his/her research topic, the recognised and unrecognised influence of the personal and cultural history of the researcher, and theories, methodologies and interpretations. Rather than being a neutral observer, I am what could be called a *connoisseur* of my topic, of both the University institution and its traditions, and of internationalisation of higher education. I am also someone who in their former capacity of a student politician, had a special relationship with the hierarchies of academic and administrative institutions of the university. Similarly, I probably have my own, idealised vision of the University institution, a mixture of the traditions and history of the University of Helsinki, the mythical images of the ancient universities and the Mertonian norms of science. The discourses I have constructed based on my empirical data might have been somewhat different had my background been different. My perceptions could have been different if I had a past that didn’t include studying political history, being a student politician and experience in the higher education sectors in Finland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

6. In 2007, the name of the organisation was changed to ESU, the European Students’ Union.

Besides the more subtle influence caused by the mental schemes, values and cultural experiences, my research topic has undoubtedly been influenced most directly by my work experience in higher education policy. This experience means that I already personally knew some of the interviewees, and that I had some inside information regarding the formulation process of some of the documents I used as empirical data. I was aware of the background discussions relating to Finnish and European higher education policy. Knowingly or unknowingly, the interviewees might have related to me differently had we not known each other. Some might have addressed me as if an esteemed colleague with a good understanding of the issue and others might have presumed me to be a somewhat suspicious student politician whose aim was to advance the views of the national student union. On the other hand, perhaps I related to the interviewees differently based on my previous relationship with them.

5.4 Empirical data and the analysis

5.4.1 Empirical data

The empirical data I used was drawn from interviews and policy documents. The interview data consisted of nine interviews with key higher education policy actors in Finland, including six current or former university rectors, and three national-level higher education policy actors: a representative of the Ministry of Education, a representative of the University rector's conference and a representative of the Centre for International Mobility⁷. This selection of interviewees did not allow for an assessment of the different discourses within the university: researchers, teachers, administrative staff and students. However it enabled discussions with university leaders and national-level higher education policy makers on their perceptions about the University institution, universities' tasks and internationalisation of higher education. These are the actors who most prominently influence the national higher education policy discourse. The interviewees spoke primarily in an institutional role, as representatives of their organisations, rather than as individual academics. Some of the interviewees conveyed more of their personality in the interviews than others, who seemed to confine themselves to the official policy of the organisation. In both cases, this could have been affected by the relationship between of the interviewees and the interviewer⁸. However, the subject position which the interviewee might be speaking from at each given moment was not specifically analysed (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 1993b, 39).

7. In order to retain the anonymity of the interviewees, the university rectors are identified with codes U1-U6, and the national level actors with codes N1-N3.

8. For a discussion on the role of the interviewer's persona, see chapter 5.3.2.

The documentary material consists of a total of 60 policy documents relating to the university, national and European levels⁹. The university documents include the analysis of the general strategies and internationalisation strategies of four universities in Finland, including two multidisciplinary universities and two specialised single discipline universities. The universities have been chosen to represent universities of different sizes and types, covering both of Finland's national languages. They were chosen to concentrate on two specific and characteristically distinct regions of the country: the capital city Helsinki with 600 000 inhabitants, and Tampere, 170 kilometres north-west of Helsinki, a rapidly growing city of 200 000 inhabitants. Both regions are economically stable and growing, and they have long-established knowledge society policies. However, the main focus of the study has been on the variety of discourses represented in the field of Finnish universities, rather than on the differences between the universities themselves. Therefore the differences in the discursive construction between the different organisations are not compared.

The University of Helsinki is the oldest and largest university in Finland, with 11 faculties, 38 000 students and 7500 staff members. It was established in 1640 and was originally located in Turku, the capital city of the time. It was moved from there in 1828 when Helsinki was designated as capital. The University comprises Faculties of Agriculture and Forestry, Arts, Behavioural Sciences, Biosciences, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, Sciences, Social Sciences, Theology and Veterinary Medicine.

The University of Tampere is the second largest multidisciplinary university with six faculties, 15 400 students and 2100 staff. It was established in 1925 as a Civic College in Helsinki, and was relocated to Tampere in 1960. It comprises Faculties of Economic and Administration, Education, Humanities, Information Sciences, Medicine and Social Sciences.

The Tampere University of Technology is the second largest university of technology in Finland covering a broad repertoire of technical fields and architecture, with 12 000 students and 1800 staff. It was established in 1965 as a branch of the Helsinki-based University of Technology, and gained 'independence' in 1972. The university consists of ten departments, including Departments of Architecture, Automation, Civil Engineering, Electrical Technology, Environmental Technology, Industrial Engineering and Management, Information Technology, Materials Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and finally Science and Engineering.

The smallest of the universities analysed here is the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration. This Swedish speaking business school is located in Helsinki, and has 2400 students and 140 staff. It was established in 1909 and it comprises Departments of Accounting, Commercial Law, Economics, Finance and Statistics, Language and Communication, Management and Organisation, and Marketing,

9. The document key and the identification of documents is explained in the list of references in chapter 9.2.

The analysis focused on an analysis of the strategies of the aforementioned universities available on the internet. For some universities only the latest strategy was available, for some others the previous version was also available. Some strategies were available in English, some only in Finnish. If an English version was available, that was the one chosen. In addition, for two of the universities a separate internationalisation strategy was available, and for two universities a European Policy Statement prepared as one of the documents required for participation in the EU Socrates programme was available. The regional strategies for all higher education institutions in the Pirkanmaa region around Tampere and the capital region around Helsinki were analysed. Finally, the strategy of the Centre for International Mobility, CIMO, was analysed in this section, although strictly speaking it is a national organisation. However, it therefore deserves to be analysed separately as it has its own specific task as one of the actors in higher education policy, and its mission is separate from that of the Ministry of Education.

The national policy documents analysed include the national higher education development plans and internationalisation policy memos and strategies since 1987. This covers documents from the first internationalisation policy and first development plan onwards. The older documents might be less relevant for a discussion on the knowledge society, yet they provide a point of reflection on the temporal durability of some of the elements of the discourses. The European documents include the strategies, statements and declarations of the European University Association on topics relevant to the topic of this thesis since its establishment in 2001. Another international university document included was the Magna Charta Universitatum from 1988, which at the time of its preparation had been signed by 430 university rectors, many of them from European Universities. The Magna Charta was selected to provide some perspective to the documents written during the past half a decade. The European documents also included the Bologna process communiqués of the meetings of the higher education ministers since 1998, and finally a set of EU policy documents related to the Lisbon strategy, universities, research and education and training since 2000. That year marks the start of the so called Lisbon process, which can be seen as the crystallisation of the European Union's programme of becoming a competitive knowledge society. The Lisbon process, and its main document, the conclusions from the meeting of the European Council in Lisbon in 2000, also has a prehistory. This is the so called Bangemann report from 1994, which has been included to show that some of the key themes of the Lisbon process did not just appear from thin air in 2000. There is also a continuation document from 2005 to show that the Lisbon conclusions document is not a solitary one (*Working together for jobs and growth – The new start for the Lisbon strategy*). It was released when the process seemed to be slowing down a bit). The Lisbon process itself covers all activities of the EU and all the directorates of the Commission. As this study is about education, education documents such as *Education and Training 2010* were selected, and the documents

from there which are relevant to the research question were chosen for analysis. As the study is about research, the research programme was also included (Creating the European Research Area), but only documents of interest from the perspective of universities were included. As the focus of the study is universities, the documents related specifically to universities were also included.

In deciding the interview questions¹⁰, I took into account the inherent knowledge I had of the topical discussions around the internationalisation of higher education, international cooperation and competition, and the knowledge society. I was also familiar with many of the university strategies, national policy documents and European documents, which also tend to bring into the agenda the questions related to cooperation and competition, knowledge society, the role and status of the Finnish or European higher education institutions and systems and the ways of encouraging institutions into international activities. Therefore the interview questions were formulated around these topics, which naturally guided the direction of the interviews.

I conducted nine interviews between May 2003 and March 2006. The first two pilot interviews¹¹ were conducted in May and August 2003, after which I reformulated the interview questions somewhat to be broader and more coherent, and to provide better information about the topics of the research. I then conducted four interviews in February and March 2004, and finally, three additional three interviews between December 2005 and February 2006. The idea at the beginning was to conduct open thematic interviews, but this turned out to be difficult for the interviewees, so the interviews were conducted as semi-structured interviews instead, with the original themes supporting the formulation of the interview questions. The interviews lasted approximately one hour each I transcribed the nine hours of taped interviews accumulated. In the transcription process each word or sound was transcribed, but no emphases or pauses were marked. This process allowed me to become well acquainted with my interview data, as transcribing of each tape typically took one or two days, and often required more than one session of listening to the tape. The transcribed interview material amounted to 96 pages¹² of text. There are problems related to the language of the study, as the interviews were conducted and the analysis was done in Finnish, but the research is reported in English. As my study is a socially rather than a linguistically oriented discourse analysis - the possibility of which is effectively ruled out by the specific problem of operating in two different languages – individual wordings are not so vital to the understanding of the wider discourses. I was able to use the official translations of some of the documents, such as the newer university and national policy documents, as well as all the European level documents. In translating the interviews and the documents which only existed in Finnish, the aim was to retain as much of the original wording and style of the texts as possible, while omitting the

10. Interview questions are listed in Annex one.

11. In the analysis process, the pilot interviews were eventually treated in the same way as the other interviews.

12. Times new roman, 12 points, single spacing.

obvious unintended repetitions of individual words and sounds. The transcription and translation conventions are presented in Annex two. The quotations in the Finnish language¹³ on which the translations were based, are in Annex three. The interviews are reported and quoted anonymously, indicating only whether the quote is a university rector or a national level higher education policy actor.

In quantitative objectivist research, which aims for generalisation of the research results, the question whether the body of the empirical material is extensive enough is an essential one. In qualitative research, the empirical data are usually considered in terms of the saturation of the data rather than its statistical significance. In discourse analysis, there is a trade-off between the extensiveness of the data and the depth of its analysis. Some detailed analysis methods, such as linguistically-oriented discourse analysis or conversation analysis, can deal with a limited amount of data. More socially-oriented analysis, which pays attention to discourses as wide conceptual, world-view types of entities, can operate with a larger set of data. I recognised that the limited number of interviews, and the fact that the interviews were focussed on the top tier of higher education policy actors, would have an effect on the extent to which generalisations based on the results could be made. It might curb the amount of discursive formations, and would certainly prevent me from discussing the views and discourses at the grassroots level of the universities: academic staff, administrative staff and students. The focus on Finnish actors would limit the extent to which the results might reflect the higher education policy discourse in other countries. In collecting and analysing the data I was acutely aware that a huge amount of data could create limitations in the depth of the analysis. This led me to the decision to limit my data to nine interviews and to use only a limited amount of documentary material. Despite these limits, the body of data eventually accumulated was fairly large and sufficient for detailed discourse analytical research. I was prepared to collect more data if needed, but as the analysis progressed, it became evident that the data was saturated, and the discourses I constructed in the analysis were adequately supported by the existing data.

5.4.2 The data analysis

The process of analysing qualitative data is not necessarily a straightforward one. In this section, I will present my analysis process, which was also influenced by the ever growing circles of hermeneutic understanding, consisting of co-evolving processes of interpretation and understanding. (Varto 1992, 60–69). In qualitative analysis, the first categorisation is not the final one. The interview themes and questions often provide the starting point for categorising the data, whereas the eventual analysis inevitably

13. The last number in brackets after the quotes indicates the number of the quote, which corresponds with the number of the original quote in annex three.

takes place over several stages. (Eskola & Suoranta 1996, 116) Similarly, in an abductive research approach, (Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2002, 97) the theories used might not dictate, but they certainly influence, the analysis process. Taylor's (2001a, 38-39) description of the process of qualitative discourse analysis closely resembles the early stages of the analysis process used here: "The nature of analysis is therefore relatively open-ended and also circular, or iterative. The researcher is looking for patterns in the data but is not entirely sure what these will look like or what their significance will be. She or he must therefore approach the data with a certain blind faith, with a confidence that there is something there but no certainty about what. Conducting analysis involves going over data again and again, whether listening to recordings or reading transcripts or documents, noting features of interest but not settling on these. It involves working through data over quite a long period, returning to them a number of times".

As I was already generally acquainted with the document material, I started my analysis by reading through the transcribed interviews. On the first reading of the transcribed interviews, I noticed that my interviewees tended to present internationalisation in three different ways: as a general process of internationalising of society and higher education institutions, as a limited set of activities by the Ministry of Education and by the universities, and as an attribute of the universities or individuals or the higher education system, which were termed as "international". I proceeded to code each of the interviews according to the three categories, but on further reading I realised that this categorisation was not by itself a viable basis for a meaningful analysis. Nonetheless, I kept this categorisation at the back of my mind for the rest of the process. It proved to be a useful distinction on some occasions, directing me to pay attention to characterisations of universities or countries as international, as opposed to national or even regional. I was also aware of the oft-made contrast between inherently international science and scholarship, and the specific, temporal process of internationalising education.

Having read some of the interviews and some of the documents several times while writing various articles and conference papers, I was getting very well acquainted with the data, and decided it was time to proceed to a more systematic analysis. On the second round of analysis, I proceeded to write long summaries of each interview, akin to Phillips and Jørgensen's (2002, 189) analytical redescription, or Taylor's (2001a, 38-39) blind research for patterns in data. In writing the summaries, I found it very useful to focus on certain features of the text, such as factualisation strategies and the sources, other arguments, taken-for-granted facts and specific linguistic features that were drawn from in order to give weight to the argument or opinion of the speaker. If an interviewee presented something as a fact, either by referring to another authoritative source, such as a research document, or through use of a grammatical form, I could conclude that the issue might be of some significance. In the summaries I wrote descriptions of what was said and how, which connections between issues were made and which contrasts were constructed. A good example of this was the link

constructed by the first speaker between internationalisation and high quality or the contrast constructed between the regional and international role of universities by the second speaker:

But then it's a rather different matter as to why there should be internationalisation in education. It is partly motivated through quality. Through this international activity we can get better teachers and good students into Finland -- (U5, 12) (1)

(--) at this moment we have quite an interesting situation in Finland, and higher education institutions and universities have been placed in a schizophrenic situation. We are even expected to internationalise in performance agreements [with the Ministry of Education], but at the same time we are required to influence regional development significantly. (--)¹⁴ Well, you see, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but they pull in opposite directions. Maybe we in Finland have thought about how this local impact could be promoted, and have not realised that if we are good internationally and competitive, then, indirectly, regional impact will be there without us having to emphasise it so much. (U1, 1) (2)

I also looked at what was explicitly and implicitly argued in the interviews. The following quote illustrates both the explicit and implicit argument, and a related factualisation strategy:

(--) if education is seen as a line of business, we have education markets, then in Finland we don't have the mechanisms with which to export this product abroad. And what is partly related to this is that if you think of markets, price and quantity, then normally you have, this is the basics of economics, you have supply, the supply curve and you have demand curve. And at some point, if you can't put a price on it, then the problem is that when something is exported, we have a good national product which we can't export. For instance, how can it be exported? If we think of USA for instance, (I don't want to necessarily use it as an example), then exporting takes place so that the product, one establishes a unit, a filial, in another country, and it is funded so, that those who participate in the education pay for it. If one dares to use the word tuition fees. So that, so you understand that in a way when we have this legally tuition free education, then it's difficult to export degree education, and this I think is the problem. (U3,5) (3)

In this quote, the speaker does not explicitly argue that tuition fees should be introduced. However, by presenting higher education in terms of market, and arguing that the universities do not have the means to export "the good national product", the speaker seems to be implying that introducing tuition fees would be a logical conclusion. The argument is factualised by using theoretical concepts such as supply curve and demand curve.

14. The interviewer asks whether they are mutually exclusive.

I also paid attention to the tone of the interview, to the wording and to the general structure. As all the interviews were related to the internationalisation of higher education, I paid specific attention to how internationalisation was presented in relation to the country, the university and individuals. For instance what kinds of demands and challenges was it argued should be set for individuals, for universities and for the country? In the following quote, for example, the speaker argues that the university must change in the face of internationalisation:

(--)

The challenge for the universities is that the university must organise all its activities in a new way. And one task is of course to create these options and structures for this facilitation of the internationalisation of students. So that one has cooperation agreements, known partners, reciprocity, it is the task of the universities that all these things are not left for the students themselves to take care of. And in that way of course the management and administration of these things is also a challenge for the universities. These must be taken into account, because internationalisation must be planned. Strategic planning must be done and executed, and these things must be done in a high quality way, the universities must provide resources for it. (N1, 2) (4)

As one of the contexts of the study was the development of the competitive knowledge society and its dominant political rationality, I concentrated on the presentations of ideal citizens and the ideal university in the interviews. These observations were guided by the governmentality theory and the discussions on ideal citizens, for instance, by Amoore (2004), O'Malley (1996), or Tikly (2003). In the first quote, the speaker explicitly argues that the labour force (at least part of it) needs to be able to operate in the global markets. In the latter quote, the speaker uses a somewhat more roundabout way of arguing that universities need to be competitive, to meet international standards, and to be extrovert, rather than inward looking, in their activities.

Then we must have a labour force which is able to operate in global markets and we must already have in education such modules which promote the capacity for international communication. (N3, 3) (5)

Well again I revert to that chain of thought that if it didn't, if the university has a role, then it has to have it, it must be competitive, it must have quality activities meeting international quality standards. You just can't do this in a kind of vacuum where, if you only have this national outlook, you only look at national markets. So that in a way if you have, if you have, you have to be competitive, you have to be, you just have to be good. (U3, 7) (6)

The institutional theory also directed my attention to the presentations of the institutional nature of the universities, and the extent in which the institutional features of universities were referred to, and drawn from, in the interviews. The following quote,

for instance, presents the the Mertonian (1973) norm on the communism of science, and implies the inherent competition of science:

And what came to my mind is this, what is talked about in the research of science this communism of science that knowledge is shared by everyone, and, so in a way what automatically follows from this is that it is also shared across borders and in a way it has always been a part of the universities, the research topic is shared and competition and such across borders. (N3, 1) (7)

Much of this analysis process was the basis of constructing the first discourses, although the discourses were later modified to take into account the entire body of data. Having written, read and re-read the long analytical summaries for the first four interviews, I used a mind-map to chart the relationships between the different elements and to group them into larger groups while writing a conference paper¹⁵ in which the discourses first started to come together. This formed the basis for constructing three discourses, describing the range of ways in which internationalisation was presented. First, internationalisation was seen as opening up of the country (as a process which had already taken place or needed to take place, both in a metaphorical and practical sense). Second it was seen as rethinking the university (again either something which had already happened or needed to happen). Third, it was seen as growth, empowerment and increasing skills of the individual, both in a sense of increasing tolerance and understanding of oneself, one's own culture and other cultures, as well as in a sense of practical skills such as language skills, intercultural skills and communication skills increasing as a result of international communication, and/or needed in the internationalising labour force. I proceeded to go through the rest of the interviews in a similar manner to check the discourses and modify them to cover the entire body of interview data.

I then turned to the analysis of the documentary material, which, for its sheer volume, could not be analysed quite as thoroughly as the interviews. The results of the interview analysis, the theoretical concepts and the research literature on the changing context and conduct of higher education provided me with some initial perspectives on the document analysis. Therefore I concentrated more on the images construed of ideal citizens and ideal universities, the presentations of the institutional features of universities, and in general the argumentations presented for internationalisation, rather than on the linguistic representations and factualisation schemes. In the first quote, for example, the increased accountability and willingness to change are used to construct an ideal university. In the latter quote, notions of courage, wisdom, tradition and stability are used to connote the university as a trustworthy institution.

15. Nokkala 2005.

To attract more funding, universities first need to convince stakeholders – governments, companies, households – that existing resources are efficiently used and fresh ones would produce added value for them. Higher funding cannot be justified without profound change: providing for such change is the main justification and prime purpose for fresh investment. (Euu3, 8)

The university courageously trusts in the knowledge and wisdom it has acquired. The university tradition is to produce, cherish and develop the knowledge and skills accumulated through the history and to use them for the benefit of the society. (--) Courage also means reacting speedily and efficiently to the changing world when it is necessarily based on factual reasons. The university acknowledges the importance of deep and pondered knowledge and takes a stable and critical stand in incomplete knowledge and momentary fashion fads occurring more and more regularly in society. (TT2, 3) (8)

I also turned to the discourse theory in trying to understand the relationships between the documents and the interviews. The text and the discourses in the documents are a result of a longer period of negotiation and discursive struggle between the different higher education policy actors and stakeholders, and can therefore be seen as more institutionalised discourses, which are utilised, drawn from, creatively reproduced and reinterpreted in the interviews. There are naturally many similar elements in the interviews and discourses, as the interviewees have either read, or even participated in producing the aforementioned documents. On the other hand, interviewees might also express contrasting opinions and ideas, or explicitly criticise the images and policies presented in the documents. Documents, on the other hand, are specifically written to argue for a certain point, and thus they are not neutral documents, but they always have a clear motivation and specific, often manifold, audiences. Internationalisation strategies are written to argue that internationalisation is a positive thing; university strategies are written to convince internal and external audiences of the excellence of the university; national and international policy documents are equally meant to push various actors to change in order for a policy goal to be reached. The only interesting aspect in their analysis is not, therefore, whether they push a certain point, but also how they choose to represent and frame this point. In documents, each wording is carefully selected, debated over and perhaps voted on, and represent a compromise of the interests of all those groups involved in their drafting. As texts, documents are thus much more deliberate than interviews.

Having analysed and written similar analytical summaries of the documents, while trying to describe my results to a colleague I realised that the documents were geared towards arguing for a particular image or a policy line related to higher education and internationalisation, or in the case of some of the other documents, more widely to education and research. They were aimed at legitimating the need, and the mere existence of higher education and research, and more specifically, internation-

alisation of higher education in society, which they characterised for the most part as a (competitive) knowledge society. This discovery helped me to realise that the texts seemed to contain two qualitatively types of representation. Whereas some representations, based on which I had already constructed three discourses, were focussing on the internationalisation and its forms, arguments and benefits, the other set of representations seemed to have a wider task of arguing for the reason of existence and importance of the entire University, or even higher education, and internationalisation as part of that existence. These representations seemed to be representations of the legitimating idea of the University. Based on this realisation, I constructed three more discourses. The first discourse draws from the notions of science and knowledge, the task of universities in creating knowledge, the inherent internationality of science etc. The second discourse draws from the notions of civilisation and wellbeing, the task of universities in upholding national cultural heritage, the civilising effect of education for individuals and the society, global solidarity, and also more instrumental notions of education and research contributing to the wellbeing of individuals and the society. The third discourse is more utilitarian, emphasising the contribution of higher education and the necessity of internationalisation for the competitiveness of the individual, country or the whole of Europe.

As can be seen from the above description of the analysis process, at this point I had ended up with two different categories of discourse. Emphasising their different nature, I tentatively named the first category as “Discourses arguing for internationalisation”, or, “Internationalisation discourses”, for short. They described what internationalisation is and what its effects it has on different levels of the higher education system. The second category was “Discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University”, or “University discourses” for short, which describe why the University, or to some extent, higher education in general¹⁶, is important in society and how internationalisation is related to the different tasks of the University. I also named each individual discourse within these categories. The three Internationalisation discourses I named internationalisation as individual growth -discourse, internationalisation as rethinking of the university -discourse, and internationalisation as opening up of the country -discourse. The University discourses I named as science and knowledge -discourse, civilisation and wellbeing -discourse and competition and competitiveness -discourse.

The viability of this schematisation was confirmed by further reading of the 120 pages of summaries of the interviews and documents I had written, trying to trace discourses of both categories in either type of empirical data. In the actual text the two types of discourse would be very difficult to separate, and it has to be remembered

16. Some of the quotes used to illustrate the University discourses do not explicitly mention universities, but talk about higher education in general. However, as they implicitly refer to universities or their tasks in society, I deemed it appropriate to term the second set of discourses ‘University discourses’.

that the interviewees or the natural text of the documents would not be drawing such a distinction. Instead they are analytical categories created by the researcher. There is inevitably a level of intuition involved in analysing discourses, but I wanted to proceed in as systematic a way as possible. In order to do this and to check my analysis and the discourses I had constructed, I went back to the transcriptions of the interviews and the original policy documents.

In this reading, I coded the interviews and documents again, marking down the elements of internationalisation and higher education, and whether each element I thought belonged to any of the “Internationalisation” or “University” discourses I had constructed, as well as any remarks I might have had on each element. I produced a long table, which had columns for the elements or text extracts, the discourses each element or text extract represented, interview or document from which the element or text extract was taken, and other remarks I had of them.

I then read through the tables again, and noticed that some discourses seemed to have sub-discourses. These sub-discourses presented in each discourse, a perspective of society or the individual, or were more philosophical or instrumental, were more metaphorical or concrete perspective. I recognised two such sub-discourses for the individual growth discourse, three sub-discourses for the opening up of the country discourse, and three sub-discourses for the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse. The rethinking of the university, science and knowledge and competition and competitiveness -discourses on the other hand, did not seem to include any separate sub-discourses, but instead consisted of various complementary themes. I also made notes on elements and issues which did not fit neatly into any of the discourses but in which several discourses seemed to overlap or which (for other reasons) caught my attention and seemed to be somehow important for a deeper understanding of the Finnish internationalisation of higher education discourse. I understood many of these categories only when I realised that many of them seemed to be pointing towards a particular framework of understanding Finland as a “small country”, with a history of survival under many hardships. After this analysis process, I finally ended up with the following discursive order, described in Table 1.

Discourse category	Discourse	Sub-discourse
Discourses arguing for internationalisation = "Internationalisation discourses"	Individual growth -discourse	Philosophical sub-discourse
		Instrumental sub-discourse
	Rethinking of the university -discourse	
	Opening up of the country -discourse	Opening up as a metaphor -sub-discourse
		Opening up as a concrete process -sub-discourse
Image sub-discourse		
Discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University = "University discourses"	Science and knowledge -discourse	
	Civilisation and wellbeing -discourse	Traditional sub-discourse
		Global sub-discourse
		Instrumental sub-discourse
Competition and competitiveness -discourse		

Table 1. Discursive order of internationalisation and University

In order to be able to write the first descriptions of the contents of each discourse with its various sub-discourses, I proceeded to compile the discourse tables in a different order, preparing a separate table for each of the discourse and viewpoint, grouping the elements together for each of the discourses. That gave me a clear overview of the content of each discourse, and of the relationship between each of the discourses and sub-discourses, and of the interviews and documents in which they were presented. After this I was able to proceed to writing bullet point descriptions of each of the discourse and its contents. I checked whether there was any ambiguity in the coding of the tables, e.g. of coding general remarks on the contribution of higher education to individual growth, or urging universities to rethink their activities, but which were not necessarily related to internationalisation as such, but to universities and higher education in general. I removed such quotes from the Internationalisation discourses such as individual growth -discourse or rethinking of the university -discourse, moving them to civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, or to other University discourses, thus making an analytical distinction between those two groups. I confirmed the names of the discourses based on their ability to be distinguished from each other, recognising that while this offered analytical clarity and distinctiveness, it inevitably also clouded some of the internal complexity and overlapping of the discourses. I aimed to remedy this by highlighting the overlaps and contradictions in the descriptions of the discourses in the report. In writing the following chapters, I selected the quotes

that are used to illustrate the discourses carefully. The quotes often present a notion or a theme repeated over a wide selection of data, but specifically vivid or counter-discursive examples have also been included. Each document and each interview has its own code number, which can be found in the references. The same text extracts might have contributed to the construction of more than one discourse at the same time. In the Annex four I aimed to provide an example of how a single text could contribute to more than one discourse. Annex five includes a summary table of the textual analysis, compiled in order to allow the reader to see how the analysis of the text has evolved, resulting in the construction of the discourses. Through a detailed analysis of two extracts, I have exemplified the way a particular text extract contains certain expressions or words that triggered my attention, the remarks and analytical redescription I made on each of the attention triggers, and how these extracts contributed to the various discourses and sub-discourses. In the table, I have combined several rounds of analysis, both the written analytical summaries, notes on the margins of the transcripts and the tables of discourses, rather than the table being a direct extract of any of the single round of analysis.

In the final stage of checking the interpretations made based on the analysis, I also checked how many times each of the discourses had been referred to in each of the interviews and groups of documents. Although quantitative methods were not used in the analysis, this final quantitative element gave some tools to discuss the prevalence of certain discourses. The table showing the use of the discourses in the data can be found in Appendix six.

5.5 Discourses and practices of internationalisation

The internationalisation of higher education as a set of practices has been extensively analysed by numerous previous studies (see e.g. Knight 2004, Teichler 2004, Huisman & van der Wende 2004a), and therefore very limited amount of attention has been paid to internationalisation activities as described by the empirical data of this study. One of the prerequisites for analysing the internationalisation of higher education is the ability to see beyond internationalisation as a set of activities used by universities and the government in their attempts to increase internationalisation. Those activities are the sets of intertwined meaning systems and discourses, as described in the various strategies and policy documents, which construct reality rather than reflect it. Due to this focus on the different constructions of the nature and legitimisation of internationalisation as represented by the discourses, the concrete activities and practices of internationalisation as presented in the interviews and documents are listed here in brief.

Internationalisation, to follow the widest possible definition, includes any activity across borders, be it mobility, cooperation or policy. The forms of internationalisation include the mobility of students, researchers and teachers, whether for short term exchanges or more permanent mobility and immigration. Mobility has contexts for both the university and the wider society, and it includes the related activities of the universities and governments, such as mobility programmes, recognition of qualifications, marketing measures to attracting more foreigners to the universities and to society, and the related legislative issues such as residence permits, taxation laws, and tuition fees etc. It includes the more traditional practices of science and research, such as participating in international conferences and publishing internationally, with international languages, wider international research cooperation projects and shared use of research facilities and infrastructure, and the related practices that support this, such as international research funding. Similarly, internationalisation includes wider organisational cooperation with national and international partners as a direct form of internationalisation or as a way to facilitate the provision of resources and services required by other forms of internationalisation. Finally, internationalisation activities include international political cooperation aimed at facilitating and advancing the internationalisation of individuals, universities or higher education systems.

– Chapter 6 – The discourses arguing for internationalisation

6.1 Introduction

In this and the following chapter I will introduce the six discourses constructed as a result of the analysis of the empirical data. In the previous chapter I described the process by which I arrived to these two sets of discourses. Before proceeding to describe the discourses themselves, I want to discuss what these two sets of discourses do, and why it is useful heuristically to view these two sets as being qualitatively different.

Discourses always describe and also constitute their objects. They spring from the material reality and contribute to it. They convey both information and legitimation of their objects. They have “content” and “intent”. In the case of my two categories of discourse, they differ in terms of the information they convey, and in terms of their purpose. The first set, the “Internationalisation discourses”, focuses on describing the content, requirements and outcomes of internationalisation from the perspective of the individual, the university and society¹⁷. They can be used to make sense of the manifold processes and activities of internationalisation. As discourses

17. Depending on the document, “society” may refer to the Finnish or European/EU society.

are constitutive of social reality, the internationalisation discourses do not describe the perceptions about the contents of internationalisation, but are constitutive of it as well. They strengthen the positive connotation attached to internationalisation, the benefit and utility it conveys, and offer support for further internationalisation activities. They seem to be describing the problem and presenting internationalisation as a solution to it. The second set of discourses, that I have decided to call “University discourses”, convey an idea of the “University”, its tasks and role in the society, its reason for existence and its contribution to the society and to its citizens rather than focussing or limiting themselves to internationalisation. Due to their descriptive as well as constitutive nature, they describe and constitute the legitimating idea, the legitimation of the University.

The two sets of discourses are intertwined, so that it is impossible to cut out all references to the constituting ideas of the University. In describing the content of internationalisation, the speakers and the documents often also present its connection to the legitimation of the University. Some issues, typically the contribution to the growth of the individual, call for changes to the structures and processes of the university. They might be repeated in both the internationalisation and University discourses. Therefore for example individual growth, rethinking of the university or even opening up of the country might not be limited to only internationalisation at the textual level, but implicitly or explicitly present the image of an ideal citizen, ideal university or ideal country as well. However, in the construction of the discourses an analytical distinction between the Internationalisation and University discourses was made. In the analysis of the discourses, I have paid more attention to the similarities rather than differences in the discourse of the different actors. Therefore, both the internationalisation discourses and the University discourses are grouped and presented according to their content, rather than by the sets of data used in the analysis, and, correspondingly, have therefore not accounted for the differences between various universities or other actors.

6.2 The internationalisation as individual growth -discourse

The internationalisation of higher education is commonly described as contributing to the personal growth of the individuals, be they students, academics or the population in general. It is linked to the notion of internationalisation of higher education leading to, or being a result of, more foreign students, academics and staff being part of the same higher education institution, or in a wider sense, more foreign people coming to Finland. Although the discourse is present throughout the material, it is noteworthy that it is especially pronounced in the older internationalisation strategies, where this individual growth discourse is one of the predominant discourses.

On the other hand, the internationalisation as individual growth -discourse consists of two different viewpoints or sub-discourses, philosophical individual growth and instrumental individual growth. These are sometimes presented together, sometimes a distinction is made between them, and the instrumental viewpoint may be more prominent in the later documents. The older documents especially are interested in making the Finnish people more international rather than internationalisation as attracting foreign people to Finland.

Internationalisation as individual growth -discourse represents individual growth as an inherent benefit to the individual but also as a change expected and even required by the (knowledge) society. Although the latter view is more pronounced in the instrumental sub-discourse, it is by no means limited to it, but society can be said to be expecting individual growth in a more philosophical sense as well.

6.2.1 The philosophical sub-discourse: creating a civilised person

In the philosophical sub-discourse, which is more prominent in the interviews and in the internationalisation plans than in the other material, themes such as growing as a person, finding one's place in the world and tolerance and understanding in a multicultural community are constructed as the outcomes and benefits of the internationalisation of higher education. A good example of this is for instance the vision of the Centre for International Mobility:

CIMO is actively developing Finland into a broad-minded and multicultural *Bildung- [sivistys-, TN]*¹⁸ and information society by promoting balanced and high-quality international interaction. (CM1, 2004, ii) (9)

In this discourse, the internationalisation of higher education is constructed mainly as contributing to the individual's growth as a person, either through having experienced studying, working and living abroad, or through internationalisation at home, that is, studying and living in an international environment with foreign people in ones home country. A multilingual and multicultural community brings cultural and communication skills, but also demands international skills namely language,. The following quote exemplifies this common sentiment well.

18. Italics by TN. The Finnish word "sivistys", which can be a noun (sivistys) a verb (sivistää, sivistä) or an adjective (sivistynyt), referring to the education of the character and spirit rather than just of the brain, or mere a qualification, does not translate well into English. The closest international equivalent may be the German "Bildung", but occasionally words such as education, to educate, culture or possibly also civilisation may be used.

Student and personnel exchanges have a beneficial impact on European society as a whole. More and more such experiences are needed as the changing work environment requires an expert workforce with better language skills, knowledge of cultures, flexibility and ability to adapt to change. (UT3, 2001, 1) (10)

International experiences bring wider understanding, tacit knowledge, getting people to understand how and why things are done differently in other countries, and what its consequences are. People need the capacity to function in a multicultural, global society; it is no longer possible to function without international knowledge, understanding and skills in the modern world. Internationalisation was also described in one instance as an empowerment of the individual, a general positive change, which, though a singular formulation, characterises well the sentiment of the philosophical sub-discourse.

We must use all those existing funding mechanisms [to increase internationalisation, TN], because as I said earlier, it is becoming increasingly important that we understand those contexts of thought and action in which the people coming from or living in different societies function. In order for us to use all the options in the world, and do as little harm to other people as possible, we have to understand them. (U2,2) (11)

(--) but this internationalisation I feel has a value in itself and as I see it its only (--) only proven outcome is this positive change occurring in people, this empowerment. (N3, 10) (12)

An international person is civilised, broad-minded and tolerant. Internationalisation aims at and enhances not only knowledge of foreign cultures, but also a person's self-knowledge, understanding of their own culture and the awareness of interdependence of nations. Internationalisation provides people with a wider view of the world, enabling them to think globally and find their place in the world.

The internationalization of higher education involves objectives relating to attitudes, that is, giving students an understanding of their own and other cultures, and an awareness of the global interdependence of nations and of the necessity for international cooperation; (IS3, 1987, 4)

Besides these mental characteristics, international experiences bring students new friends, young and also older researchers and teachers useful contacts, and it is important to integrate research students into the international researcher community. This also has cognitive benefits as international experience brings multidisciplinary information about the world and makes it easier to handle and critique knowledge.

And as far as internationalisation goes, it is of course very good that, for example, someone spends a few months or terms [abroad, TN] as it gives them time to get acquainted, to create a networks and acquire friends, frequently for life, and learn what that country is like and what sort of people work there. (N2, 2) (13)

Yeah, because the knowledge is common, and produced here and there, and shared, [--] and then if you can study in another environment then I think this ability to just process knowledge changes, when one is in a different environment. The faculty to be critical, that is something we have also been thinking about [--] , this increase in the level of criticality, when you come from somewhere, whether you have been in a better or worse place, then anyway you have the ability to better criticise it, bring new ideas to it (N3, 8) (14)

According to the student evaluations the studies abroad do not only yield academic benefits (courses completed, new knowledge acquired, application of knowledge), what is important is also getting to know a foreign culture, intellectual growth and increasing self-knowledge. (UT1, 2001, 15) (15)

National people also benefit from the international atmosphere in the university; internationalisation of the university is constructed as a counterbalance for a too homogenous university community. Multilinguality is a cultural enrichment and exchange provides practical use of foreign languages, motivation for learners, teachers and trainers, and the possibility to interact with the world, learning from one another. The integration of foreign students and birth of a genuinely multicultural society needs to be facilitated by teaching foreign students national languages and culture, introducing them to Finnish society and facilitating integration through learning and living arrangements.

The EU documents in particular typically construct the picture where the internationalising, globalising knowledge society is constructed as setting its own demands for people, which need to be addressed for example through the internationalisation of higher education. The ideal citizens of a knowledge society need new basic skills, which include vocational and technological skills, social and personal competencies, and awareness of arts and cultures, enabling people to work together and to be active citizens. In addition, adaptability, tolerance, teamwork, problem solving, risk taking, independence, ability to learn, curiosity, and interest in everything new are skills required of the ideal citizens. These are exemplified by the first quote, which, however, does not limit itself to the discussion on internationalisation. On the other hand, Europe is constructed as having a tradition of democratic values and diversity from which individuals are seen to benefit due to mobility, as exemplified by the latter quote.

The changing nature of society and of work means that increasingly, professional or vocational skills are not enough. At work, the complexity of work organisation, the increase in

the types of task that employees are called upon to carry out, the introduction of flexible work patterns and of team working methods, mean that the range of skills used in the work place is constantly widening. Similarly, society as a whole is less uniform than in the past, so personal competencies (such as adaptability, tolerance of others and of authority, team work, problem solving and risk taking, independence, etc) are more widely required if people are to live together in tolerance and respect for each other. The most important of these competencies is the ability to learn – maintaining curiosity and interest in new developments and skills – without which lifelong learning cannot exist. For many teachers, however, this ability is difficult to stimulate; and its development should therefore be a focus both of teacher training and of educational research in the coming years. (EUE1, 2001, 9)

Ministers reaffirmed that efforts to promote mobility must be continued to enable students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff to benefit from the richness of the European Higher Education Area including its democratic values, diversity of cultures and languages and the diversity of the higher education systems. (BD3, 2001, 1)

6.2.2 The instrumental sub-discourse: creating a skilful person

In the instrumental sub-discourse, the utilitarian notion of a set of useful skills resulting from international experience or exposure is the most pronounced theme. The skills, which are seen as necessary in the increasingly internationalising university, society and labour market, consist of language skills and international communication skills in particular. Although the more practical skills already were mentioned in the philosophical sub-discourse, they are more pronounced in this instrumental sub-discourse. Other themes within the sub-discourse include presenting internationalisation as a personal must, tactical thinking related to internationalisation, and the utilitarian potential of internationalisation as well as the European dimension. Yet again, these themes are intertwined both within and beyond the instrumental sub-discourse of internationalisation as individual growth. The instrumental sub-discourse of internationalisation as individual growth builds a strong link to one of the university discourses, the competition and competitiveness -discourse, which will be discussed below.

Typical for this sub-discourse is the emphasis on the skills and capacities, the notion of an active and entrepreneurial individual who possesses qualities needed by the society. It is repeatedly argued within the discourse, that globalisation and the internationalisation of business and working life are a challenge for education, and that new skills and capacities are needed in order for graduates and academics to operate in the international labour market. The skills mentioned in the interviews and documents include language skills, interaction skills, knowledge of other cultures, flexibility, capacities for multilingual and multicultural activities, capacities for international

cooperation, working abroad, working with foreigners, international experience and an open mind. Acquisition of these skills is construed as improving the professional capacity of an individual and also benefiting society at large. Below are some examples of the discourse in the interviews.

So, on the other hand, in education, through internationalisation people should acquire skills and capacities to act in the global world. So that in my opinion it starts from this general globalisation: the need to change education, the content of education and people's capacities so they can find a place in this internationalising world. This could be through direct employment by these international companies or in companies having international cooperation. (N1, 1) (16)

The value [of internationalisation, TN] in my opinion is in the improvement of knowledge, skills and capacities so that graduates have a better chance of organising their own lives and finding their place in society so that they can provide for themselves and then through their knowledge support those companies or organisations in which they work. I think this is a crucially important issue for the success of Finland as a whole, the Finnish people and Finnish companies. (N1, 5) (17)

And then we must have a labour force which is able to operate in global markets and so in education we must offer modules which contain material to bring out these capacities for international communication. (N3, 10) (18)

The internationalisation of higher education is seen as a benefit, but it also requires skills and capacities from the universities' academic and administrative staff. Foreign language teaching is seen as benefiting the internationalisation of Finnish students and staff, better language skills are needed in teaching, research and publishing, and administrative staff need to have skills to operate in an international environment. On the other hand, international students and other foreigners should also receive education in Finland's national languages and culture, as this is seen to advance their integration into Finnish society. These notions are recurring, although not very prominent in the empirical data.

The instrumental sub-discourse of internationalisation as individual growth also exemplifies the tactical thinking related to internationalisation, especially present in some of the interviews. International experience is constructed as being useful for the students in terms of their future employability or for academic staff in terms of their career prospects. Tactical thinking is factualised in the notions of students consciously thinking about international labour markets, and acquiring international experience, and mentions student interest towards particular languages or exchange destinations. Those students who go abroad to acquire skills and competencies for their working

life are construed as “active people”. Similarly it is often mentioned that it is good for the career prospects of academics to publish internationally.

When evaluating the results of internationalisation, account should be taken of how much the international study experience increases the employability of the student in question. (UT3, 2001, 11) (19)

And I think it also has a genuine value from the perspective of the student, because labour markets are internationalising and people are much more mobile then it is of course an advantage to have studied abroad. (U1, 6) (20)

Internationalisation is at the same time construed as potential and as a must for the individual. The potential of internationalisation for the individual is construed for example by arguing that internationalisation is beneficial for the future labour market potential and employability. Employability is also a recurring theme in the Bologna process and one of its main goals. Internationalisation increases human potential, changes their view of the world and benefits the learning process. Internationalisation increases the ability to handle knowledge, to bring new ideas, to organise one’s life and to benefit society. Quality and academic benefits are repeatedly implied in student and staff mobility and the international university environment. Internationalisation as a compulsory activity is construed by arguing that internationalisation is a must in the modern world and that nobody will be able to live without international skills, and that graduates must have education with which to survive internationally and function in the global society. One of the interviewees also used the multinational character of information to argue for internationalisation, provided that students also study abroad rather than just stay there.

The first years of the new millennium will mark a period of transition. The process of European integration will bring Finland ever closer to the international economic and political community. Globalisation has a significant impact on education and research. This means growing challenges for people’s general education, cooperation and interaction skills, language proficiency and cultural knowledge. (DS5, 1999, 10) (21)

In the European discourse of the EUA, the Bologna Process and the European Union, the European higher education area, which equals internationalisation or forms a greater part of it, is construed as facilitating or enabling many of the benefits of internationalisation. It is regularly argued that teachers need European experience and that European mobility can enhance individuals’ self-identification as European citizens. A good example of presenting an obligation as an empowerment is the emphasis on life long learning and the notion that students must be given opportunities to seek and find their own area of excellence, which is so prominent in the EU discourse. The

following quotes exemplify the obligation of mobility as presented in the Bologna Process.

Ministers reaffirmed that efforts to promote mobility must be continued to enable students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff to benefit from the richness of the European Higher Education Area including its democratic values, diversity of cultures and languages and the diversity of the higher education systems. (BD3, 2001, 1)

Moreover, they stress the necessity of ensuring a substantial period of study abroad in joint degree programmes as well as proper provision for linguistic diversity and language learning, so that students may achieve their full potential for European identity, citizenship and employability. (BD4, 2003, 6)

6.3 The internationalisation as rethinking of the university -discourse

Internationalisation as rethinking of the university presents internationalisation as something requiring (or already having resulted in) complete rethinking of the university organisation and its functions. The elements of this discourse include the idea that internationalisation is/should be internalised, and that internationalisation is/should be part of the strategies of the university, and therefore implies that internationalisation requires strategic thinking. Rethinking can be related to the organisation and its structures, the structures of the degree system or restructuring of teaching. The elements of the rethinking-discourse also include the categorisation of the internationalisation of research as something traditional and internationalisation of education as something new, or alternatively deducing that if research is international by nature then education must be that as well. Internationalisation carries a positive connotation, and it can also be legitimised by referring to the natural international competition of science or to the rising costs of research environments. On the other hand, the internationalisation of higher education is presented not just as a must for the individual, as discussed in the previous section, but also for the university: internationalisation and attracting foreigners is necessary, otherwise Finland could lose out in competition. International activities and contacts are important for the cultural and economic interests of the country, so this implies that universities must be more international, and education must be made more international to give students the required skills. The success in networking is, in some occasions, presented as something that could determine the survival of Finnish higher education, although what the Finnish higher education would be surviving from is not described. However, another extract states that foreign teachers and students are needed in order to maintain a large enough academic community in a small country. Scientific progress requires international contacts, which

in the older documents is typically construed by referring to conferences and meetings and in the newer documents by exchange and deeper cooperation.

The big task for us is of course to get international researchers, teachers and degree students here, we'll get, maybe as it was the atmosphere at the departments to become international, with many languages and cultures co-existing (--)(U6, 2) (22)

Although this discourse does not include specific differing sub-discourses, unlike many of the other discourses, it contains a multitude of different themes. These include quality and excellence, need for and attracting of foreign people, internationalisation as a change, distinguishing between old and new internationalisation, participating in the international markets, language, internationalisation as internalised and part of strategic planning, rethinking of the activities of the university such as curriculum, degree structures, admissions, teaching methods, funding, language, and rethinking of the philosophy. It includes also the notions of the old traditional University institution and the new ideal University institution of the knowledge society. Although internationalisation seems to take a different form in the "old" and "new" University institution, these will, however, be discussed in connection with the University discourses as the scope of these ideals is not limited to the content and forms of internationalisation.

6.3.1. Quality and attractiveness

Rethinking the university discourse is to a large degree constructed around the notions of competitiveness, attractiveness and quality, which may refer to an individual university or the national or regional higher education system. These themes are naturally linked to the notions of attractiveness and competitiveness of the country or the whole of Europe and its higher education system. It is evident that the discourse has a close connection with competition and competitiveness legitimation and the idea of competition requiring change of the university, whereas the science and knowledge, and the civilisation and wellbeing legitimations seem to be connoting stability rather than change. The element running through the entire discursive order described in this study, repeated over and over again, is the taken for granted idea of increasing competition between universities for good students, good researchers and teachers and for research funding, and the need for the universities to prepare for this competition by improving their quality (for example). This competition, which will be discussed further in the competition and competitiveness -discourse, is not just a matter of attracting foreign people, but also of retaining Finnish students in Finland and in Finnish higher education institutions. One speaker argued that in the increased competition between universities, the key to success lies not so much in student exchange but that teacher exchange, international degrees and international research projects are key to

the success. The last quote (below) shows how international aspects, such as the urge for universities to become active globally, and emphasising their European aspects, are weaved into calls for other changes, including analysis of the change of the labour market, which is typical for the competition and competitiveness -discourse.

It is often forgotten that when talking about internationalisation, one is speaking only about research and education, but one must remember that we are talking about recruiting students. However, what is even more important is the recruiting of teachers and researchers. Because if you can't create attractive work conditions here, research environments are talked about, then you can't attract top international experts either. (U3, 6) (23)

Then another need for [international, TN] cooperation is to create the critical mass and the joint use of large research environments. Research environments and research equipment are becoming more expensive so smaller countries and smaller universities in particular have no chance to survive in the researcher environment competition. But through cooperation it is possible to gain access to research environments which are modern and of high enough quality. (N1, 4) (24)

(--) opening up universities to a greater extent to the outside and increasing their international attractiveness (--) (Euu1, 2003, 12)

If universities are to become more attractive locally and globally, profound curricular revision is required - not just to ensure the highest level of academic content, but also to respond to the changing needs of labour markets. The integration of graduates into professional life, and hence into society, is a major social responsibility of higher education. Learning needs to encompass transversal skills (such as teamwork and entrepreneurship) in addition to specialist knowledge. European and interdisciplinary aspects need to be strengthened. The potential of ICT should be fully exploited in teaching/learning, including for lifelong learning. The bachelor-master divide allows more diverse programme profiles and learning methods (e.g. research-based learning and ICT delivery). (Euu3, 2005, 5)

Another example of the link between the rethinking university -discourse and the competition and competitiveness -discourse is the way in which attracting international students, teachers and researchers is described as important. This could be either for reciprocity, which is especially emphasised by the older internationalisation documents, or for increased competitiveness of the university (in terms of quality) and the country (in terms of labour force). This link is exemplified below by a variety of sources, ranging from the earliest internationalisation document to the most recent.

(--) but now the big challenge for Finland is how to attract international teachers, researchers and students, and, in this regard we are clearly lagging behind reasonable European

requirements. If we only have a couple of per cent of foreign students, we are apparently in the weakest situation after Portugal in that respect. (U5, 4) (25)

Expanding student exchange and participation in the international student exchange programmes requires that the education of foreign students in Finland is increased. (--) Participation in all reciprocal or multicentre exchange programmes entails that Finland reciprocally receives more foreign students and that study programmes and services for foreigners are developed in Finland for purposes of exchange. (IS1, 1988, 34) (26)

The system of higher education degrees will be developed to respond to the needs of working life and also with international development of degree structure in mind. An important premise is to ensure the competitiveness of Finnish higher education institutions. (DS5, 1999, 36) (27)

The committee was to assess how the competitiveness of Finnish higher education could be best secured especially in the European, but also international, education market and make proposals to this end. The committee was also to propose means of increasing the number of foreign students in Finland; to explore the possibility of providing Finnish higher education abroad; and to address the question of financing and possible fees to be charged for these services. Further, the committee was to investigate the need for new quality assurance systems in the Finnish higher education institutions (HEIs) operating in the internationalising and diversifying education market. (IS4, 2001, English abstract in the Finnish language version of the report)

The higher education community will be international and the demands of internationalization will be taken into account in the content of education. Finland will have a community of 10,000–15,000 foreign degree students (around 4 per cent of all higher education students) and the annual volume of student exchanges will be around 28,000. At least 15 per cent of graduate school students will be foreigners. The numbers of students with immigrant backgrounds will have increased considerably. The numbers of foreign teachers, experts and researchers working at Finnish institutions of higher education will be double what they were in 2001. Finnish businesses will already be benefiting from the labour input of foreigners who have studied in Finland. (IS4, 2001, 51)

One of the strongest, most repeated constructions in the discursive order is the link between internationalisation and quality: internationalisation and international cooperation increases the quality of the university, and quality must be increased to facilitate internationalisation and international attractiveness and competitiveness. International networking and cooperation is important for quality, for a meaningful research process and for attractiveness. Having more international people equals more quality, high reputation, a more international environment and new ideas. On the other hand, in some interviews, the link between internationalisation and quality is produced in a

way as to present international as inherently of high quality, and national as inherently of low quality. Internationalisation is important for the reputation and prestige of the university. Remaining cocooned into the national sphere means, that the potential for higher quality is lost. The quality, excellence and attractiveness argument is also used to argue for greater structural change or “transformation of the university”, for instance by the European Union, as is indicated by the third and fourth quotes (below) and will be discussed later on.

But then it's a rather different matter as to why there should be internationalisation in education. It is partly motivated through quality. Through this international activity we can get better teachers and good students into Finland -- (U5, 12) (28)

(--) on the one hand we're competing and on the other hand we're cooperating, but in some ways this competitive aspect is in a way a little hidden. What is visible is this cooperation, but if we're successful at that and succeed in terms of quality, then in a way this competitiveness is also increased and this competition means competition for good students, good teachers and research funding. (U1, 7) (29)

European universities in fact offer researchers and students a less attractive environment. This is partly due to the fact that they often do not have the necessary critical mass, which prompts them to opt for collaborative approaches, e.g. creation of networks, joint courses or diplomas. But other factors, outside the university, play also an important role, e.g. the rigidities of the labour market or lower entrepreneurship entailing fewer employment opportunities in innovative sectors. This is reflected in lower performances in e.g. research funding, links to industry, patenting rates and spin-off creating rates than in the USA and Japan. (Euu1, 2003, 7)

Raising quality and attractiveness requires major transformations at universities. Those who drive these transformations within universities require specific support (including funding) from their environment. Universities failing to undertake these changes - for want of drive, power to act or available resources - will create a growing handicap for themselves, their graduates and their countries. (Euu3, 2005, 5)

Different sources brought up a variety of themes in this construction. Internationalisation requires that universities provide an attractive and high quality research and study environment, good career structure, more courses in English, national language teaching for foreigners and integration to the Finnish society through participating in the joint courses with national students and accommodation provided in the same quarters with national students. They must also be able to prove their own quality to the partners, and be convinced of the quality of the partners as well. Quality can be increased for instance by using international experts in the evaluation of the quality of

dissertations. All of this requires more and stable funding. The rethinking university –discourse can also be used strategically, not only as an account of the universities on what they have done or as a requirement for the universities to rethink their action, but also as an argument for changing the universities' regulatory environment. An example of this is the argument of one of the development plans, that in the international competition for good students, the unclear situation of tuition fees is a hindrance to the universities' competitiveness. Instead, universities must have the possibility to operate on the same footing with universities in other countries and capacities so that they can consolidate their position in the market. Tuition fees and exporting of education can be used for generating resources and for enhancing the reputation of Finnish universities. This kind of argument constructs tuition fees as a necessity and logical conclusion, disguising any possible ideological nature. The theme of tuition fees, brought up in many of the interviews and some of the new national level documents, will be discussed later.

Then thinking about internationalisation of education, if we think how Finnish university education has been exported then we are not necessarily very good at that. If one thinks, and there I am back where I actually started, that if one sees education as a line of business, we have education markets, then in Finland we don't have the mechanisms to export this product, this education product. (U3, 5) (30)

6.3.2 Rethinking university functions and strategies

Another prominent theme within this discourse is the way in which university functions, structures and processes should be changed in order to accommodate and increase internationalisation, international cooperation and an increasing number of foreign students and staff. Internationalisation should be linked to the strategic planning of the entire university; it should be internalised in the everyday activities and thinking of the university, its departments and individuals. On the other hand, internationalisation is variably constructed as a change that has already taken place, an already internalised strategy. As the following quotes indicate, this theme has been brought up by several different types of sources.

European higher education institutions want to be in a position to attract talent from all over the world. This requires action at institutional, national and European levels. Specific measures include the adaptation of curricula, degrees readable inside and outside Europe, credible quality assurance measures, programmes taught in major world languages, adequate information and marketing, welcoming services for foreign students and scholars, and strategic networking. Success also depends on the speedy removal of prohibitive immigration and labour market regulations. (EUA3, 2001, 8)

Internationalisation requires that you are credible, you have competence, you have quality, you have international skills in the fields in which you want to operate. So today I think internationalisation is such a natural part of the university strategy that I don't think it is necessarily possible to say which is a challenge [of internationalisation specifically, TN] , which is a demand, because it is clear that today it is so internalised that there should not be any specific, in a way, different challenges, different demands. (U3, 3) (31)

Internationality is part of the normal activities of the university, and the funding required by it must primarily be handled through the normal funding channels of the departments. (UT3, 2001, 5) (32)

Internationalisation is the concern of the entire academic community and should therefore involve all levels of the university. For instance, the Bologna process has been mentioned as a way that the different actors within a university have been brought together to discuss and work. The requirement for rethinking includes taking internationalisation into account at all levels of university strategy and in all university activities such as the curriculum, teaching methods, admissions criteria and administration.

(--) The challenge for the universities is that the university must organise all its activities in a new way. And one task is of course to create these options and structures for this facilitation of the internationalisation of students. So that one has cooperation agreements, known partners, reciprocity, it is the task of the universities that all these things are not left for the students themselves to take care of. And in that way of course the management and administration of these things is also a challenge for the universities. These must be taken into account, because internationalisation must be planned. Strategic planning must be done and executed, and these things must be done in a high quality way, the universities must provide resources for it. (N1, 2) (33)

Transparency instruments must be introduced, and the degree structures must be easily explainable to foreigners as well, and must correspond to the needs of working life and international development of degree structures. Internationalisation requires introducing more foreign language courses and better skills for researchers, teachers and students, as well as the administration to operate in a foreign language and also with foreign cultures. This sentiment is shared by many, and was implied in the earlier internationalisation documents.

Scholarship and research are international in them selves. (--) The internationalisation of education requires, in addition to developing the curricula, diversifying study methods, developing teacher and student exchange and increasing the resources, as well as developing the teaching of foreign languages – including extra-European languages- and related teaching of other foreign languages and cultures. (IS2, 1989, 4) (34)

Some interviews and documents called for more systematic cooperation between local universities for providing adequate services for foreign students. It was also widely indicated that in order to improve success in the competition, profiling the university and cooperation between universities across and within borders would be required.

Growing competition between universities is leading to certain degrees of specialisation as universities increasingly play to their strengths rather than maintain strong research profiles in every research field, thus also enhancing their capacity to compete globally. The proposed European Research Council, by funding the best basic research wherever it is found, should support this process. One result of growing competition is an increasing trend towards differentiation of mission between universities. Europe needs a diverse spectrum of research institutions, all of which are based upon the link between teaching and research and fulfil key research training and knowledge transfer functions. (EUA10, 2004, 2)

It includes attracting people to the strong fields in Finland and at each university, and the recruiting of foreign experts must be well planned and active. On the other hand, not all internationalisation is good; it has to match the strategy of the university, the whole organisation must be committed to it, and adequate resources must be available. “Conference internationalisation”, as one interviewee put it, is not worth while. Implementation of reforms requires leadership and management, and internationalisation activities require adequate funding, a common message conveyed by the rectors interviewed.

The rethinking of university functions includes notions of new types of strategic thinking. In order to attract foreign partners, universities must be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses, and be fully committed to cooperation. In addition, because of EHEA, the European Higher Education Area and ERA, the European Research Area, there is a need for new types of cooperation, not just between individual researchers but increasingly strategic alliances on an organisational scale, to enhance study opportunities, create critical mass and gain access to research facilities. The next quote sums this up.

Yes, so we prepared this paper in the spring for the faculties, where the faculties themselves must think which fields they could operate in as European research universities. We will soon get responses to it, and its basic idea is that in those strong fields we should create permanent international operating structures. We can't afford to create them for all the fields in the university, so we have to then evaluate what can be done on the basis of the views of the faculties. It is like the start of quite a long process. (U2, 5) (35)

However, the discourse of the beneficence of cooperation was not wholly without counter-discursive formulations. Cooperation could cause problems as well, and therefore cooperation must be strategically thorough and the entire organisation must be

involved. New forms of cooperation, such as international consortia, emerge. On the other hand, the new technology and virtual learning is argued to facilitate internationalisation and therefore virtual teaching and producing material for distribution abroad and participation in virtual consortia should be increased. In addition to competition, and often presented as a counterbalance to it, the discourse of rethinking university also constructs development cooperation as an important and generally accepted task. It may also be part of the university strategy to give something of its own knowledge to other universities in developing countries.

An interesting feature to be found regularly in the discourse of the Finnish higher education actors is the pervasiveness of the notion of the importance of English language as the language of teaching as a characteristic of internationalisation. Remarks regarding the increasing use of English as the language of teaching, or the importance of English for the internationalisation of the universities, were made in all of the interviews and many of the documents. In some cases, this seems to be even undermining the position of Finnish and Swedish, the national languages. In general, it is argued that there are too few options to complete a whole degree in English, and that those countries with English as a native language had an advantage in attracting foreign students.

The language proficiency of younger teachers is improving, although it is maybe not considered quite such an important recruitment prerequisite as I would consider it. I think the university should no longer hire teachers who can't function in an international environment. (U2, 4) (36)

And, there are of course well known obstacles from the Finnish perspective in particular: a small, closed language area and no-one else speaks Finnish, and all that. The only way is to increase the use of major languages, especially English. And in everything that is now offered, especially when talking about higher education, then in teaching and learning methods a foreign language (should be, TN) used, usually English. But one has to keep in mind all the time that part of that group is coming here hopefully to stay, we can attract people to stay, so that it would be possible for them, then there of course has to be an opportunity, flexible ways and good, effective means to learn the languages of the country, at least one of them. (N2, 1) (37)

Then of course it places demands on teachers, on the language skills of teachers in international courses, training in how to teach in a foreign language. That was also at some point the kind of issue, it was just assumed that everyone knows English but that's not true. Besides, teaching in a foreign language is always harder than teaching in your own language, so recognising this. Also, it also emerged in the evaluation of our research that a lot of research would also deserve an international publishing forum but there is a threshold and it is especially a problem of older researchers. (U6, 4) (38)

However, this dominant notion of the use of English language in teaching, research and even administration being a prerequisite and attribute of an international university does not go completely uncontested. In the context which generally glorifies competition and competitiveness, or equates the use of the English language with internationalisation, alternative discursive formulations survive. An example of this is the remark made by one university rector, on the importance retaining of one's own language in the operations of the university. The rector argued that the language question goes to the values and identity of the university. Another speaker remarked that a wholly English language university is not needed in Finland, although such plans did exist at the turn of the decade. English language schools are presented as a valuable service to immigrating families. In terms of the research function of the universities, less explicit references to the language of research were made. However, the notion of the internationality of scholarship and research was repeated by all interviewees. They made reference to the importance of international publishing of results, implying that the language question would be at least as significant and less of a novelty now being taken-for-granted, as is the case for education, although there are exceptions to that view.

Because we have this idea that if we just move more into the English language, we are international. And that is not true. That is not true. It is just like in the business world there is talk about it when two companies merge, (--) yeah then what is the language of the new merged company. The official language may be English, but is it really the internal language of the company, is it really. And this I think, this is important because an international university is not the kind which just teaches in English or does research in English. And to this I would really pay a lot of attention myself, this is maybe the biggest challenge for us. Because we see that for instance now when a lot of universities here in Finland move to, or start up these foreign language master's programmes and there is a huge demand for them, and we for instance have five English language master's programmes and of course in some way it does internationalise, it is one dimension of internationalisation. Research has to be international, and there of course language is also decisive, but internationalisation is much deeper than the language that is spoken. (U3, 4) (39)

6.3.3 Internationalisation as change

The internationalisation of higher education as a change which has taken place in universities was mentioned earlier as being one of the key themes of the rethinking-university discourse. The construction of this internationalisation as a change -theme includes a variety of issues. Universities have changed in the past ten years because of internationalisation, both in terms of increasing numbers of exchange and degree students and foreign teachers and researchers, and in terms of varying forms of co-operation.

(--) and this radical change, first there is the strong emphasis of the university's position and in this knowledge society it concerns all fields, not just technology. This process has started pretty well in the universities. In the universities, people specifically work via the internet, and all those functions, starting with exchange students, the number of which has probably increased five-fold in ten years, and [international, TN] degrees have started up during that time. (U4, 10) (40)

(--) yeah we have changed a lot in other ways too, goal-orientation, even in doctoral education has produced a significant share of international students (--). And then publications: our number of publications may not have tripled but it will have at least doubled in ten years. (U4, 10) (41)

On the other hand, although internationalisation is generally constructed as having changed the universities, some interviewees also remarked that one must recognise that there are differences between departments in terms of the extent to which they have internalised internationalisation and how much they are publishing in the English language. The attitudes of people have changed, internationalisation is taken for granted and students for instance view international careers as a natural possibility. They have also come to expect new things such as higher quality, having international opportunities and to be treated as customers getting value for their money.

The attitudes have probably changed, and then consumer issues are a new thing which is increasing through internationalisation, so that when students come here they expect high quality teaching. And this has come up in Finland as well in that we have received complaints from a few foreign students that in some universities their affairs have not been organised as well as they would have liked and their time has been wasted, and that information has been incorrect. So that is a new thing the Finnish universities are not used to. (N1, 7) (42)

Universities have changed or need to change their attitude, increase target-orientation and open up to society and to the world. This theme was prominent in a variety of sources, exemplified by the quotes below. Some interviews indicated that there could also be ideas of a new university which is more focussed on research and innovation, is more dynamic and flexible, and is less focussed on giving basic education to large numbers of students and more internationally than nationally oriented. Internationalisation might also be related to a wider attitude change, seeing education as a marketable commodity, exporting education and charging national or non-EU students tuition fees, and seeing the value of internationalisation instead of treating it as a nuisance. The marketisation of higher education and participation in higher education markets is also presented as going against the traditional Nordic idea of education as a basic right.

(--) I would say that internationalisation has changed the universities in a way that, it is seen clearly in a different way than before, how important this profile is, finding strong fields, strong competence is important. You can no longer act as in the times when it was possible to say 'let all flowers bloom'. That situation no longer exists; it might be the biggest thing. No, I wouldn't say biggest, but that it at least one change. (U3, 8) (43)

Finnish higher education institutions will have built a profile in their own areas of strength. In international cooperation, they will have focused on areas in which they command internationally significant and interesting expertise which is both exportable and can be offered to foreign students in Finland. (IS4, 2001, 51)

6.3.4 Old and new internationalisation

A somewhat different theme under the rethinking of the university is the duality of the way in which internationalisation is constructed simultaneously as something old and new. This is related to the notion that research is inherently international whereas the internationalisation of education requires specific measures. Exemplified by the quotes below, this notion was brought up widely, particularly in interviews. The same notion is also constructed in a range of documents, although less explicitly.

(--) well first, scholarship itself is international. An academic community which would be nationally curled up in itself is inconceivable (--)(U5, 11) (44)

(--) if one does basic research, which is the most important function of the universities, then that is inevitably international. It must be published in international languages utilising international peer review systems and so there is inevitably interaction with the international academic community. Otherwise it simply will not work. No matter how bright a research group is, if it cocoons itself in the national sphere, it can't achieve a high level in terms of quality. (U1, 4) (45)

But the thing which requires action and in which progress should be made is specifically the internationalisation of teaching. Because it does not come about spontaneously, it requires support and special measures. (U1, 1) (46)

Old internationalisation is related to the internationality of research, cooperation between individual partners and perhaps student exchange. For instance, one older internationalisation plan raises the issue of the "traditional free mobility" of students and researchers, which it argues must be maintained. New internationalisation on the other hand is related to the strategic activities and coalition-building amongst universities, cooperation on an organisational scale, and competition in the global

education markets. On the other hand, all international activities have increased: student and teacher mobility, international publishing, international conferences, as well as networking.

And in the future, these strategic networks will of course be central to this internationalisation process. And then in a way I mean that it is these strategic networks or these partners that are critical. It is not a question of individual research cooperation but that we go in there as an organisation. (U3, 5) (47)

6.4 The internationalisation as opening up of the country -discourse

The opening up of the country -discourse constructs internationalisation as a metaphorical, concrete or image-related opening up of the country and its higher education system as a result of, or in response to internationalisation. This opening up has a positive connotation, whereas the implied alternative to opening up is closing the door, which carries a more negative connotation. The discourse, which can be obligating as well as descriptive, constructs not just the opening up of a single small and previously closed country like Finland, but is also utilised to construct the European process as inevitable and necessary. The discourse consists of three sub-discourses, namely opening up as a metaphor, opening up as a concrete process and opening up in terms of image.

6.4.1 The sub-discourse of opening up as a metaphor

The sub-discourse of the opening up of the country as a metaphor is most prominently represented in the interviews and both older and newer national policy documents, although a few examples of the construction of the metaphorical opening up can also be found in the European policy documents, especially in documents relating to the Bologna process. The EU documents make very little use of the view-point and, somewhat surprisingly, it does not feature at all in the university or EUA documents. The specific themes within this sub-discourse, expressively exemplified by the following quotation from an older document, address issues such as understanding ourselves and others, Finland's specific role, tolerance and multiculturalism, and finally European values and citizenship.

The internationalisation development in higher education is not merely a matter of economic competition. It is equally important to strengthen the cultural cooperation between different countries. The aim of international student exchange is to educate cultivated,

internationally-minded young people, who promote understanding between nations and people. (IS2, 1989, 4) (48)

The Finnish discourse emphasises the unique history and opening up of the country, while acknowledging the dominant international trends. The Finnish history is presented as a history of a closed country, where nobody dreamed of issues such as the EU membership. This changed after the death of the president Kekkonen and the fall of the Soviet Union. During the economic depression, the European money available for internationalisation of higher education was attractive for the universities. The majority of the discourse, especially as presented in the interviews, presents contemporary Finland as opening up, or even as being a rather international country already. On the other hand, there is also a counter-articulation which argues that Finland does not yet understand the limitations of being a “small country” as clearly as for instance the Netherlands does. This implies the need for internationalisation, and attributes this to the history is now just happy to be independent. This is expressed particularly vividly by the following speaker.

(--) we were quite a closed country until the death of {President, TN} Kekkonen. The great opening up then in Europe, in Finland we saw that these education cooperation programmes were born, and we wanted in our way to stay with that. Nobody even dared to dream at the end of the 1980's (--) that we would join the (European, TN) Union but that we would in some way keep with the development. (N3, 2) (49)

The international trends are weaved into the discourse by arguing that Finnish society is internationalising and becoming increasingly multicultural, and this creates a demand for education and skills. The early internationalisation strategy also argues that internationalisation increases cultural learning, understanding and tolerance as well as our self-understanding. This recurring theme was discussed above in connection with the individual growth discourse.

Then of course there may be very different views about this but I have the impression that the universities in general take the view that immigrants who bring their own cultural traditions with them and their views is a richness in itself. If the matter is handled properly in Finland for these people, then such clashes and controversies within society could be avoided. (N2, 2) (50)

In a more national perspective, the internationalisation is constructed as improving Finland's self-respect and self-image. This is especially the case in the interviews but also comes out in some of the documents. Internationalisation contributes to a realisation that Finland might actually be popular, Finland can make a practical contribution, and that Finland has special skills and a role to play in the international higher education

arena. This opening up is also represented as a responsibility for Finland as well, in terms of both competition and development cooperation. The international markets are constructed as an existing reality throughout the internationalisation discourse and Finland is seen to be a part of that, whether Finns want it or not. It is further argued that the knowledge society is inherently international by nature, as are also the university and scholarship, and these are used to construct the ability for the country to be opened up. Internationalisation is important for not falling behind, no country or university can be self-sufficient.

We want to succeed in this, be it in competition or the level of knowledge, and I have said many times that one of our finest innovation systems is this entire education system. All the way from kindergarten to university, it is a self-renewing system, and it educates people on the different levels of the education system in university, starting from kindergarten teachers. Then it's one such reflection of that, and this system must be generally internationally connected in different ways, so that it knows it will not fall behind. (U1, 10) (51)

(--) such a genuine knowledge society cannot come into existence without our universities and higher education institutions being international. Knowledge moves as fast as a lightning and if you don't try to take possession of all world knowledge and not in all details but so as to know what it contains. But no, no knowledge society will come into being, not that way. (N2, 10) (52)

In the European documents, namely the Bologna process documents and EU documents, the metaphorical opening up is constructed from the perspective of or in relation to Europe. The earlier Bologna documents especially construct a mythical past of Europe and its universities, referring to the days of the universities of Bologna and Paris when scholars were freely circulating between universities and building a link from the past to the present Europe, where a more far reaching Europe with cultural learning is needed. The Europe of knowledge, exemplified by the European higher education area, is presented as a factor of human and social growth, enriching European citizenship, awareness of shared values and belonging to same cultural space. Mobility is needed for people to benefit from the richness of the EHEA, which is also a partner for other regions of the world. Some EU documents continue on that note, arguing that it is a special task for the EU to promote education for democratic citizenship outside Europe.

Universities were born in Europe, some three-quarters of a millennium ago. Our four countries boast some of the oldest, who are celebrating important anniversaries around now, as the University of Paris is doing today. In those times, students and academics would freely circulate and rapidly disseminate knowledge throughout the continent. Nowadays, too many of our students still graduate without having had the benefit of a study period outside of national boundaries. (BD1, 1998, 1)

Ministers reaffirmed that efforts to promote mobility must be continued to enable students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff to benefit from the richness of the European Higher Education Area including its democratic values, diversity of cultures and languages and the diversity of the higher education systems. (BD3, 2001, 1)

6.4.2 The sub-discourse of opening up as a concrete process

The sub-discourse of opening up as a concrete process emphasises the practical, regulatory or legislative aspects of internationalisation as opening up of the country. This includes issues such as legislation and other regulation related to immigration and the operation of the higher education institutions; various research and education cooperation programmes and internationalisation funding schemes; mobility and its obstacles, attracting and integrating foreign people here; international education and labour markets, labour shortages; the advantages and disadvantages of Finland; and Finland's participation in the international higher education arena. The following quote sums up the survival theme.

Well I firmly believe that we can then produce the labour force that will keep us alive here. (N3, 7) (53)

The big task of getting more international students and scholars into Finnish universities is acknowledged throughout the national interviews and documents, as well as in the EU documents. Internationalisation requiring change of certain regulations, like immigration and labour policy and taxation, is also commonly presented as a fact, clear in the following quotes from Finnish and European sources.

Yes, I think it [internationalisation, TN] definitely has a value because in a way if we think of the other option then it is as if we closed the door, went inside and told each other how good we are. (U6,3) (54)

(--) actually we want to attract foreign people to Finland to work and in the future we will need more of the labour force coming from abroad. And what better way to integrate them than if they have studied here and learnt a little bit of the Finnish language and culture at the same time. After that they will be ready for placement in the Finnish labour market. (U5, 12) (55)

If the EHEA is to become a reality, governments must tackle the current obstacles to mobility, amend legislation on student support, (e.g. to make study grants and loans portable), and improve regulations on health care, social services and work permits. (EUA4, 2003, 8)

All in all, the environment offered by the European universities is less attractive. Financial, material and working conditions are not as good. The financial benefits of the use of research results are smaller and career prospects are poorer. There is also the inappropriate and poorly harmonised nature of arrangements with regard to visas and residence permits for students, teachers and researchers from other countries – be they from the European Union or from other countries in the world. (Euu1, 2003, 21)

The benefits and the impediments of the Finnish image are construed in some of the interviews and documents as follows. The salaries and general attitudes could be more attractive, language and location are certain hindrances and Finland's image is not necessarily good. Foreigners have to face the huge Finnish bureaucracy, and Finland may even be a xenophobic society. On the other hand, the strengths of Finland are its security and organised society, the good university infrastructure, the IT infrastructure, and the good reputation of the educational system as exemplified by PISA. It is also argued that Finland is inexperienced in international marketing, but it is also argued that this could be something which might turn out to be to Finland's advantage.

There are many things that prevent the settling and integration of those coming here. Such nasty things as salary and taxation and such. These are high thresholds to climb over. (N2, 2) (56)

We have a very good reputation abroad, and partly maybe these comprehensive school studies [PISA, TN] are imparting to the entire system a kind of international glory and the universities are benefiting from it as well (--) (U2, 7) (57)

The concrete opening up sub-discourse is also occasionally used by the universities to address critique towards the ministry of education. It is used in the argument that internationalisation of the university requires changes in regulations, such as the introduction of tuition fees, and that Finland and its universities have neither the same incentives nor the same mechanisms as other countries for exporting education and that the Finnish universities must be able to work from the same footing. This antagonism is not reciprocal, however, as the idea is backed up also by the latest national internationalisation plan, which argues that existing regulations hinder participation in education markets and that HEIs should have same opportunities as other countries. This implies that regulations should be changed, which would be an incentive for further recruitment of international students. One interviewee strongly criticised the internationalisation plan for not providing concrete tools for universities, and that Finland does not want to see how many Finnish students leave the country.

So that, so you understand that in a way when we have this legally tuition free education, then it's difficult to export degree education, and this I think is the problem. (U3,5) (58)

Calling for more regional impact, which is high on the national policy agenda, and is a prominent part of the competitive knowledge society discourse, was implicitly or explicitly contrasted with the policy calling for internationalisation in some of the interviews. This is exemplified by the quote below. In the discourse of the various policy documents, this conflict is not constructed, but rather the two are presented as a harmonious whole, especially as part of the quest for more competitiveness.

(-- at this moment we have quite an interesting situation in Finland, and higher education institutions and universities have been placed in a schizophrenic situation. We are even expected to internationalise in performance agreements [with the Ministry of Education], but at the same time we are required to influence regional development significantly. (--¹⁹) Well, you see, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but they pull in opposite directions. Maybe we in Finland have thought about how this local impact could be promoted, and have not realised that if we are good internationally and competitive, then, indirectly, regional impact will be there without us having to emphasise it so much. (U1, 1) (50)

In much of the domestic opening up of the country discourse, opening up is presented as something benefiting Finland, but also counter-articulations exist. Finland may also have something to give in development cooperation, for instance. In addition, certain emerging countries, like China and Russia, which are repeatedly mentioned as interesting markets in national and EU policy discussions, are mentioned in the Finnish internationalisation discourse. Finland could also contribute to international standards in certain fields in which Finland is good. However, Finland cannot be good everywhere. However, an image of “selfish Finland” is also presented. As one interviewee described it, Finland is not active enough on development cooperation, it is only interested in gaining rather than contributing, it thinks of students only as a labour reserve, and it’s not providing education for those who wish to go back to their own countries. Instead of thinking of students only as a future labour force, this speaker argues that it should also be considered that the foreign students can be educated in Finland and then go back. A similar problem is also implied in the latest internationalisation plan, albeit with a different wording and without the connotation of selfishness. Although this remark is counter-discursive to the future labour force –theme, they both show the link with the competitiveness discourse, which will be discussed later. Similarly, the question of selling or exporting education is clearly a matter of opening up of the country, in terms of changing the regulations to allow for it, either in a form of tuition fees, or in a form of providing education abroad with external funding. However, as this theme might also be said to be more linked to the competition and competitiveness -discourse, it will be discussed in the next chapter.

19. The interviewer asks whether they are mutually exclusive.

(--) but the Finns' interest in many of the dimensions of internationalisation is pretty limited. The Finnish teachers are very poor at participating in exchanges. Finland does not use the development cooperation funding to take care of its responsibility for international students. Finnish research is not interested in anything else but gaining in international exchanges; it does not really see any responsibility on why it should in its turn participate in development cooperation. (U2, 3) (60)

The need for internationalisation is backgrounded in the university and national policy documents. This need is identified in several ways, including through the notion of increasing economic globalisation and competition as barriers in services are eliminated. Also highlighted are the emergence of the knowledge society and the increasing demands for knowledge and competencies, the changing and internationalising of business life and society, scientific and technical development as sources of competitive edge, and a focus on human capital. The call for more skilled labour is presented both as an obligation to educate better skilled Finnish people, and to attract more foreign skilled labour and students. The competitiveness discourse, and the intertwining of the opening up and competitiveness discourses, is gaining more and more ground. This is especially the case in the newer internationalisation and development plans, as well as in the newer university policy documents. This shows a clear interdiscursivity and intertextuality, and the way in which the hegemonic competitiveness discourse makes up of and penetrates other discourses, contributing to a building up of interdiscursively produced hegemonic discourses, which are able to carry themselves, without help from other carriers. Another good example of this is the emphasis on skills and competencies discussed earlier, and the related focus on issues such as life long learning and basic skills, which are so prominent especially in the discourse of the European Union. Although this wide theme is only exemplified by one quote, it is nevertheless represented by nearly all contemporary Finnish documents in the empirical data.

The internationalisation of Finnish society and business and the trend towards multiculturalism make demands on language and communication skills, tolerance, knowledge of cultures and general education. With a view to achieving these skills, measures must be taken to promote the internationalisation of curricula, joint projects in education and research, as well as international exchanges. (DS5, 1999, 16) (61)

The commitment of Finnish higher education policy to the European higher education policy is illustrated in the way in which European cooperation is presented in the national documents. With European integration, international activities become more important in terms of Finland's cultural and economic interests and competition for labour force. On the other hand, European integration will bring Finland closer to the international community. Participation in EU research cooperation is vital as it

brings much needed resources; joint programmes increase coordination and efficiency. Finland has to participate in the preparation of framework programmes and the participation of researchers in EU programmes has to be facilitated. Participation in the EU increases demands for knowledge of languages, cultures and integration process, but also increases our understanding of our own origin. The following examples are from a relatively early Finnish EU policy document. On a wider notion, internationalisation of education is argued to making “European integration a reality”, as one interviewee presented.

EU research means a natural expansion of science and technology cooperation as part of the internationalisation development of research. It also means the strengthening of the prerequisites of research and an additional resource especially for those fields of research that are crucial to the reindustrialisation and strengthening of the innovation system. (IS7, 1995, 29) (62)

Finland’s membership and operating in the European Union requires a thorough knowledge of European languages, cultures, history and the entire integration process and legal system. (--) Knowledge of our own society and culture is emphasised with internationalisation. Equal functioning in the European Union also requires knowledge of our own origins and characteristics. (IS7, 1995, 37) (63)

Finland is sometimes also constructed as a strong actor in EU higher education policy making and an advocator and leader in international research and education policy and cooperation, especially in the national level discourse,. This is an example of a discourse that is very typical for Finnish political discussion in general, as well of Finland wanting to be a model student of the EU.

The EU is another story altogether, and now throughout the EU, in the Lisbon strategy this know-how and skills is in a pivotal position and Finland has been there to lobby for a policy for the EU so that targets would be set for education and that education has a strong position on the EU agenda and is receiving investments. – we want to be in this international education and research policy and cooperation a kind of, or at least a proponent, and then we do have a policy that we would like to be there at the top. (N1, 3) (64)

In the European level documents, the sub-discourse of opening up as a concrete process is focussed around the European higher education and research area and mobility measures such as increasing mobility through programmes and by removing obstacles to mobility. Mobility both within Europe and into Europe seems to be the key node around which the opening up is constructed. Mobility is also seen to promote the feeling of Europeaness and European citizenship, this being the metaphorical dimension of the common Europe. This notion is especially typical of the Bologna Process and EUA

discourse. The discourse is very similar to the national one: increasing the attractiveness of European higher education requires action at all of the European, national and institutional levels: structures have to be changed, information and marketing should be available, services and strategic networks should be built, and immigration and labour regulations should be rethought. A common frame of reference is needed for European higher education, which would address questions of recognition, employability, mobility, comparability, compatibility, transparency and also quality.

An open European area for higher learning carries a wealth of positive perspectives, of course respecting our diversities, but requires on the other hand continuous efforts to remove barriers and to develop a framework for teaching and learning, which would enhance mobility and an ever closer cooperation. (BD1, 1998, 1)

European higher education institutions want to be in a position to attract talent from all over the world. This requires action at institutional, national and European levels. Specific measures include the adaptation of curricula, degrees readable inside and outside Europe, credible quality assurance measures, programmes taught in major world languages, adequate information and marketing, welcoming services for foreign students and scholars, and strategic networking. Success also depends on the speedy removal of prohibitive immigration and labour market regulations. (EUA3, 2001, 8)

The EU discourse is concentrated around the notion of removing rigidities, making the system more flexible. This discourse of flexibility is part of the new governmentality of the knowledge society; it is required of citizens, organisations and larger systems. A somewhat similar notion is the demand for the modernisation of universities, which is a strong feature in the EU discourse, and will be discussed later on. The EHEA requires continuous effort to remove barriers and to develop structures. Mobility of staff, students and graduates is an essential dimension of EHEA. Universities are active participants in the process and the commitment of all partners in building the EHEA is required. Amidst the emphasis on the competitiveness and attractiveness of Europe, the discourse nevertheless recalls the fact that EHEA is also a partner of other regions of the world, stimulating balanced mobility, including instruments such as Tempus and Erasmus Mundus and discouraging the brain drain.

We see the European Higher Education Area as a partner of higher education systems in other regions of the world, stimulating balanced student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of intercultural understanding and respect. (BD5, 2005, 5)

6.4.3 The image sub-discourse

This sub-discourse represents opening up of the country primarily in terms of the international reputation and prestige of the country and its higher education system. This viewpoint was emphasised particularly in the interviews and national documents and in the documents of the European Union. It received less space in the EUA and Bologna process documents. The themes constituting this sub-discourse include the good and bad reputation of Finland on the one hand, and questions related to how to increase the reputation of a university, a country, the EU and the European higher education on the other. The image sub-discourse is connected to the competition and competitiveness -discourse, and it could be said that the increased competitiveness of the country and the higher education system through increased reputation legitimises internationalisation.

As can be seen in the quotes below, there is an interesting duality in most of the interviews and in some national documents as they relate to the representation of Finland and its higher education system. The reputation of Finland and Finnish higher education in the international arena is presented alternatively as a good one, or as not so good. On the one hand there is modesty or even low self-esteem and playing down of the quality, resources and internationality of Finnish universities. Finland is presented as being a not particularly attractive country, and a lot of work is still being done to make Finland better known. Finland's image is said to be one of a closed country, with a difficult language, unattractive salaries and taxation and a poor climate. It is argued that Finland is doing poorly on ranking lists and does not have a coherent immigration policy. It is also said that Finland does not see the limitations of being a "small country" as clearly as the Netherlands (another small country). In addition, the lack of a brain gain is presented as a problem. International or foreign matters are attributed high quality, contrasted with the "merely" Finnish or national, which is implied to be of lower quality. Another aspect of this modesty is the nearly unreserved celebration of international discourses and policies in higher education and the knowledge economy.

But then we know the other side, and that we have been doing poorly in these ranking lists, the *Times* list and *Jiao Tong Shanghai* list²⁰. (U4, 7) (65)

And, there are of course well known obstacles from the Finnish perspective in particular: a small, closed language area and no-one else speaks Finnish, and all that. The only way is to increase the use of major languages, especially English. And in everything that is now offered, especially when talking about higher education, then in teaching and learning methods a foreign language (should be, TN) used, usually English. (N2, 1) (66)

20. Italics by TN.

(--) it is related to the international competitiveness of the Finnish universities, so some managerial aspects should be transformed so that good teachers and researchers could be hired from abroad for Finland. (--) if there were more flexibility in the system than there is now, then a package with more flexible arrangements could be constructed which would make it attractive for someone to come here and stay here to work. (N2, 5) (67)

But it is of course also a national question about Finland's image and what Finland's immigration policy is. In some ways, this is a grim country so that it is not very easy to settle here, even if one had a legitimate business. That is in a way a national question and a responsibility that should be taken care of. (U1, 3) (68)

On the other hand, many interviewees seem to take great pride in Finland's achievements in the international field. The construction of "goodness" is based on the success of Finland in the recent World Economic Forum competitiveness rankings and indicators of university-business life cooperation, and the success of Finnish primary school graduates in the OECD PISA statistics. Finland and its universities are presented as a desirable partner, with a successful education system, research and innovation policy, and a country of whose experiences many other countries are interested. Finnish researcher education is taken as an example abroad and Finland has achieved the targets set in the Bologna process. Finland has certain strong fields and strong universities, which generate great interest abroad. Somewhat alternative attractiveness factors are also presented, including information about Finland's abundance of space and unspoiled nature, which might appeal to people from more densely populated countries. Even the change of seasons must seem exotic and appealing to some. One interviewee presented Finland's target as wanting to be a wise village smith appreciated by everyone, or to be at the top of OECD countries in educational indicators.

Yeah, I would say that when we're talking about regional activity, in the future one can suppose that Finland's strength is that we have space, we have splendid natural conditions and then it might be that even the change of seasons might be a source of fascination, despite the darkness. Even the darkness may be fascinating for many people. We have quite a few great things now in terms of the quality of life, which might be significant in the future. And as we know, among those who are keen on Finland, it is these kinds of quality factors they are interested in, and maybe this will strengthen our position in the future (--) (U4, 11) (69)

And then an interesting issue has now come up that we are also this kind of - I am really nauseated by this Finland is best at this and that - but it is pretty well-known in Europe as well, that this nationally chosen strategy has in a way succeeded. Many countries look upon Finland as an example (--) and of course there is PISA, and the education ministers from every single German state came to the Finnish Board of Education to ask how on

earth you can read better than we can. It was really exciting (--) And then this amount of education using English that we have, you have the ACA survey on education in English, so that this world record, this status of ours as a kind of substitute England also, as we say. And it is true, it is why people come to Finland. Then the English language teaching is in an important position there, and as there are these profiling factors as well, I think like networking abilities and also this kind of willingness to be involved in these kinds of activities. (N3, 7) (70)

(--) as a small nation, we aspire to be a kind of wise village smith whom everyone respects in a certain way for his skills (--) (U4, 11) (71)

Many of the interviews concentrated on convincing the interviewer of the success of Finnish higher education and its universities, by arguing that the Finnish universities have gained a high reputation abroad, that other countries are interested in the Finnish experiences, that they look up to Finland and see it as a credible partner. The Finnish education system is widely appreciated, which improves the attractiveness of the country as a study destination. Finland is presented as a “small country” but with an internationally successful research and innovation policy.

Well, Finland is a small country but now the education and research policy and then innovation policy and generally through these comparisons of know-how and skills and through different evaluations it has become clear that the education, research and innovation policy is internationally successful in Finland. And this has then aroused great interest and respect for Finnish universities and also Finnish university policy. So in that sense the familiarity with Finland has increased and the attractiveness of Finnish universities as cooperation partners has increased. (N1, 4) (72)

This unlimitedly optimistic picture is counterbalanced by one speaker's remark that in some fields, we have internationally attractive environments which belong in the top class, but this is not the case in all fields. It is even argued that Finland has a dreary image, lacks a coherent immigration policy, and is impeded by its difficult language. There is still a lot to do to make Finland better known. The regional strategy for higher education institutions for the metropolitan area even reminds one that the Metropolitan region of Finland is the only area that is known internationally. It is recognised, however, that the value of internationalisation lies in belonging to the international research community and its economic impact, and that university profiling is needed to ensure international excellence.

The greater Helsinki metropolitan area is the engine of Finland's national development and international competitiveness. It is also the only internationally widely known region in our country. (RM1, 2005, 1) (73)

Each of the discourses and sub-discourses presents its own argumentation for internationalisation. The image-centred opening up sub-discourse constructs international cooperation as a means for making Finnish know-how and culture known abroad. The international appeal of universities is an indicator of the quality of higher education, and the likely future shortage of labour requires an increase in Finland's international visibility and competitiveness. Finland is presented as having the image of a closed country because of the low number of foreign students. This leads to the argument that the number of foreign students should be increased.

The need to increase the international visibility and competitiveness of Finnish institutions of higher education is emerging in part from the existing shortage of labour in certain industries, which will worsen in some sectors. Attracting foreign students is one way to increase the availability of labour, because study in Finland teaches students about the country and binds them more to Finnish society and working life than other immigrants. (IS4, 2001, 19)

Our reputation is not enhanced when publications with an international circulation classify Finland as a country with a relatively closed system of higher education merely because of our small number of foreign students. (IS4, 2001, 22)

The current internationalisation plan harbours a vision that in 2010 Finland will be a well-known and influential part of the European Higher education Area and the European Research Area and its HEIs attractive and appreciated partners, participating in international education markets and having considerably more foreign degree and exchange students than at present.

The vision is that in 2010 Finland will constitute a well-known and influential part of the European education and research area and produce competitive knowledge. Its higher education community will be international, and the demands of internationalisation will have been taken into account in educational content. There will be 10,000–15,000 foreign degree students in Finland, and the volume of student exchanges in higher education will be around 28,000 persons annually. In the graduate schools at least 15% of students will be from abroad. The number of students from immigrant families will have risen substantially. The number of foreign teachers, researchers and experts in Finnish HEI will be at least double the 2001 figure. (IS4, 2001, English abstract in Finnish version)

The vision for Finland for the future as construed in the national policy documents paints rosy images of Finland being at the top amongst the knowledge and interaction societies, and a leading nation in lifelong learning. These projects of image-boosting include ideas such as attracting people to Finland's particularly strong areas and introducing tuition fees as an incentive for universities to undertake further international

recruiting, which would in its turn increase their international visibility. For Finland's reputation, it is also important to participate in EU planning of education and research policy and to participate actively in building the European Higher Education and Research Areas. One of the basic objectives of Finland's EU policy is said to be to make Finnish knowledge and culture known abroad through Finland's participation in the European Union.

The primary aim of international cooperation is to promote high-quality education and research and to ensure their quality. International cooperation in education and research supports the internationalisation of Finnish business and industry and makes Finnish know-how and culture known abroad (DS5, 1999, 16) (74)

The European reputation-building discourse is similar in the EUA documents, the Bologna process documents and the European Union documents, which serve clearly as a reflection point for the other two. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal its culture has in other countries. Europe's higher education institutions want to be in a position to attract talent from all over the world; this requires measures, of which the Bologna process is one. Europe must know its own strengths and weaknesses in order to improve its reputation and attractiveness. Investing in modernising and creating universities that are more efficient is an investment into the future of Europe.

We must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions. (BD2, 1999, 3)

The European Higher Education Area must be open and should be attractive to other parts of the world. (BD5, 2005, 4)

Europe will be open to cooperation for mutual benefits with all other regions and should be the most-favoured destination of students, scholars and researchers from other world regions (EUE2, 2002, 4)

The discourse of the EU documents is more pessimistic in tone than that of the EUA or the Bologna process documents. This wide sentiment is exemplified by the following quotes. The EU wants to gain leadership in key scientific and technological areas and the aim of making Europe the world reference point in quality and relevance and to attract high quality teachers and students requires specific activities and further investments. Europe's universities however, are, ill prepared for global competition over

talent. They don't offer attractive environments, working conditions or employment options. The European HE system needs to be more readable if it wants to regain its position as the most attractive destination, its degrees are not likely to be recognised elsewhere as long as Europeans don't cross-recognise them. This pessimistic presentation constructs an urgent need to reverse the course of European higher education and this can also be said to be the aim of the documents.

One aspect which plays a significant role is the lack of familiarity of European researchers with the research "cultures" that exist in other countries, and the lack of attraction that they feel for them. There are also obstacles of an administrative nature. Application at national level of Community directives on free movement and right of establishment, social or pension cover, is not always straightforward and requires an effort from interested parties which can be dissuasive. (EUR1, 2000, 16)

European higher education remains fragmented – between and even within countries – into medium or small clusters with different regulations and, naturally, different languages. It needs to become "readable" in the world if it wants to regain its position as the leading destination of mobile students – a privilege lost to the US in the 1990s. It also remains largely insulated from industry, with limited knowledge-sharing and mobility. As a result, too many graduates – even at the highest level – lack the kind of entrepreneurship and skills sought on the labour market. Most universities are strongly dependent on the state and ill prepared for worldwide competition over talent, prestige and resources. (EUV3, 2005, 4)

– Chapter 7 – The discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University

7.1 Introduction

Unlike the three internationalisation discourses, whose main function is to describe the content and consequences of the internationalisation of higher education, the function of the University discourses is wider. The University discourses are the representations of the legitimating ideas of the entire University in the knowledge society and of internationalisation as a specific part of that role. As discourses are also constitutive of social reality, the University discourses do not just describe the legitimations of the University, but further strengthen them. The more the discourses are repeated, the stronger they

become and the stronger they also legitimate the University. In the analysed texts, the University and internationalisation discourses are inevitably intertwined so that it is impossible to separate the two, and any distinction is necessarily an analytical one. Therefore, many of the University discourses have already been referred to and also built into the analysis of the internationalisation discourses above. The discourses constituting the legitimating ideas of the University include three discourses, namely, the discourse of science and knowledge, the discourse of civilisation and wellbeing, and finally the discourse of competition and competitiveness.

7.2 The science and knowledge -discourse

According to the science and knowledge -discourse, the legitimation of University and its primary contribution to the society is the accumulation of science and knowledge. The discourse emphasises the inherent internationality of science, research and the University institution. It is presented mostly in the discourse of the interviews, university documents and the European University Association documents, where it is widely used to legitimate the position and role of the organisation in the European field of higher education policy making. In many ways, the discourse reflects the traditional institution of the University, and indeed the institutionality of the University itself: the ideal of the search for truth, the integrity of research and the inherent internationality of the scientific and academic community. This is combined with the themes of quality and excellence springing from international interaction. Although the discourse in the interviews and in the documents is fairly similar, the documents are using the discourse as what seems to be a strategic tool.

7.2.1 The inherent internationality of science

One of the strongest themes in the entire discursive order of this study is the notion that science and research are inherently international; knowledge knows no borders and moves fast across them. This was mentioned for instance in many of the interviews. The value of internationalisation lies in belonging to the international academic community. Internationalisation means participating in international scholarly discussions and with the scholarly community, which sets the agenda of science and knowledge. This is the basis for credible research. The universities are presented as always having been international specifically because of their embodiment in the international community of scholars. For instance, it is claimed that Finnish science was already internationalised in the 19th century, and the universities are pictured as the most international institutions of our society.

Then on the other hand this internationalisation means that people go abroad. We have always had that; it was that very way that Finnish science internationalised in the 19th century. Researchers started to leave both on expeditions and on study trips abroad and then brought international influences from there. (U5, 3) (75)

(--) well first, scholarship itself is international. An academic community which would be nationally curled up in itself is inconceivable (--)(U5, 11) (76)

Yeah, in a way we talk about self evident things when it's a question of universities, but anyway it is the case that any university which aspires to this traditional university role, namely research and research-based education then, of course, research is international and it is international in a way that from a university management perspective it finds its own channels without having to be guided or supported in any particular way. (U1,1) (77)

This connection is also used by some of the speakers to set a distinction between “real” and “fake” universities and to argue for more internationalisation: the universities aiming to be traditional universities must be international because science is international. Indeed, it was even argued by one of the interviewees that without an international academic community, the university has nothing to say; it does not manage internationally, and that there can be no science without it being international. This sets an obligation for the university to act as a part of the international academic community, an appreciated member of the international science and education community, based on strong and international basic research.

The inherent internationality of science is based on the traditional internationalisation of research. This is also where the distinction between education and research is made: the internationalisation of research does not require any specific measures, whereas education does. Traditional cooperation in publishing and meeting at conferences is also described as a path to further cooperation over the decades. Researcher exchange has always been important for its function in the transfer of knowledge. The quotes in recent interviews and a much older document exemplify how this distinction is constructed, thus indicating that the notion also has considerable durability.

Well, firstly if one thinks about this traditional internationalisation of the academic community, that the Finns travel and attend conferences and publish in international journals, it is quite an established activity. Of course, it requires its own support system. Anyway, we have to have the money to do it (--) but it is quite established and it does not have any new dimension to it (--) (U5, 4) (78)

And then, I think that research has always been international but that it also comes into education, that has been a terribly important step. (N3, 2) (79)

(-- it is often though that one can be regionally... that the university can have a regionally important impact but it is obvious that if the university is not internationally known it has much poorer chances of having an impact regionally or nationally. Therefore, in a way the credibility of the university comes from its being an internationally appreciated cooperation partner. (U3, 2) (87)

A link is constructed between the inherent internationality and the notion of the quality of research. International cooperation can be increased by increasing quality and at the same time international cooperation is crucial for quality, as it strengthens the research and increases its national and international impact. This seems to be internalised and taken for granted in most policy documents, as is indicated by the following quotes 13 years apart. International cooperation should be established with high quality partners. Finland is too small by itself to ensure quality, and international experts are needed to ensure the quality of dissertations and the evaluation of education and research. However, in one interview, a flipside was presented on the connection between internationality and quality. Although strong research environments are naturally based on international cooperation and good research is inevitably international, not everything international is inevitably good.

High quality research communities are naturally based on international cooperation. The university has several strong research communities which operate across department and faculty borders and are nationally and internationally networked. (UT2, 2006, 8) (81)

The development principles of a *Bildungs*university [sivistysyliopisto, translation TN] the competition based on the quality of teaching and research, internationalisation in many directions, and the freeing up of resources for new projects through structural development are emphasised. It is also important to essentially improve the ability of the higher education institutions to react to the changes in the fields of education and research.²¹ (DS3, 1993, 24) (82)

In many sources, exemplified by the following quotes from Finnish and European documents, the inherent internationality of science and the international cooperation ensuing is presented as also benefiting the education. In line with the emphasis of the inherent value of knowledge and the search for truth, mobility is also claimed to be a value in itself. Additionally, it has a utilitarian value of contributing to better learning and to fostering different views in ones own discipline, and bringing academic benefits, provided that students actually study and not just spend time abroad. Internationalisation is seen as a part of the quality of education in which students' options to specialise are enhanced.

21. Italics by TN.

Teacher and researcher exchange significantly benefits the internationalisation of the university. On exchange the teachers of the University of Helsinki can take the knowledge of the university abroad and gain knowledge, contacts and skills from the international academic community. (UH3, 2003, 5) (83)

According to the student evaluations the studies abroad do not only yield academic benefits (courses completed, new knowledge acquired, application of knowledge), what is important is also getting to know a foreign culture, intellectual growth and increasing self-knowledge. (UT1, 2001, 15) (84)

Exchanges provide participants with a new view on the world – a practical use for foreign language skills, motivation for learners, teachers and trainers, and a possibility to interact with the world. International exchanges also provide a different perspective on the learning process, and the possibility for teachers and trainers to share good practice with their foreign colleagues, and to learn from each other. (EUE1, 2001, 15)

7.2.2 The development of science

The inherent internationality of science and its link to the quality of research can also be expanded into a larger theme that conceptualises the development of science in the international interaction and environment. As the quotes throughout this paragraph indicate, the notions of internationality and development of science have a considerable temporal durability. Internationalisation helps providing multidisciplinary information about the world. The rapid growth of scientific information increases the need of international contacts among researchers and associations, meetings and conferences. It increases the demands for researcher education as well as opportunities for it. The international contacts are an integral part of researcher education and of the young researcher becoming part of the academic community.

Internationality is a central part of researcher education and at the beginning of a research career people must acquaint themselves with the practices of the international academic community (UH3, 2003, 5) (85)

It is indispensable for the creation of international contacts that a young student is able to go abroad in the earliest possible phase. During his/her postgraduate training, at the latest, a student should conclude contacts with the international researcher community. (IS3, 1987, 15)

Internationalisation gives depth to research and provides standards for comparison. The following quotes are a good example of this sentiment. It helps erase the problems

of a too homogenous community in research, and therefore international cooperation is also needed to enhance science in the so called national fields. As one interviewee summarised it, science cannot be tied up in itself. Similarly, the procedures of research should make use of the international community; international experts should be used in research evaluations and in reviewing dissertations. Research should be published in English for the academic community; research groups and individual researchers cannot just stay cocooned in domestic circles. In a small country, there are few top experts; universities therefore need to cooperate internationally as the inventions of top researchers are born out of networks.

Scientific publications are indispensable both for keeping up-to-date about international developments and for making Finnish research findings known abroad. (IS3, 1987, 19)

Universities – particularly in Europe – regard the mutual exchange of information and documentation, and frequent joint projects for the advancement of learning, as essential to the steady progress of knowledge. (EUA2, 1988)

7.2.3 Reputation and the inherent competition of science

The connection between quality and internationalisation also gives rise to another topic: the inherent competitiveness of science and the reputation of the university being based on the quality of research, presented in its different forms from a variety of sources. This is exemplified by the following quote.

And what came to my mind is this, what is talked about in the research of science this communism of science that knowledge is shared by everyone, and, so in a way what automatically follows from this is that it is also shared across borders and in a way it has always been a part of the universities, the research topic is shared and competition and such across borders. (N3, 1) (86)

As universities are prestige-seeking organisations, it is important that teaching and research fares well in international comparisons. The international standing and reputation of universities is argued to be dependent on international cooperation in research and education. The reputation of an institution, the international recognition and credibility of the university comes from its being an esteemed partner in the international field. This also leads to a claim that science is and has always been competitive by its nature and that therefore it is also good that universities compete for students by using their quality and reputation. The best way to compete is to ensure high quality and only by being internationally competitive in research and education can the university also benefit the region. The high quality of research is a

pre-condition for the survival of the university and the only way for it to increase its international visibility.

(--) it is often thought that one can be regionally, that the university can have a regionally important impact but it is obvious that if the university is not internationally known it has much poorer chances of having an impact regionally or nationally. So in a way the credibility of the university comes from its being an internationally appreciated cooperation partner. (U3, 2) (87)

The national policy documents, namely the development plans and internationalisation plans, do make use of the science and knowledge -discourse as an abstract legitimating discourse and all of the aforementioned themes can also be found in them. The discourse is also used, however, as a way of setting requirements for the universities. For instance, they should create conditions to receive knowledge created elsewhere, create research units to achieve a high international ranking and internationally significant research centres of excellence. They must also develop all basic research so that it can stand up to international comparison. The science and knowledge -discourse is therefore not just a defence and argument of the universities and their interest organisation, but also a tool of the state to influence universities, or that of the European Union to call for increased modernisation, as will be discussed below. In the policy documents, the discourse is also used as a way of describing the Finnish situation or arguing for the national higher education policy. This includes such matters as attracting foreign students and researchers to create a critical mass in a small country, or changing funding mechanisms and creating research school networks to improve research and researcher education to strengthen the role of basic research. EU cooperation is also legitimated by arguing that it is a natural way of strengthening research resources and widening technology cooperation, that it is important to ensure that national research base is strong, and that currently the diminished research capacity of higher education institutions is a problem. Although the following quote is an older one, there are also newer examples which imply this.

The impaired research capacity and outdated research equipment are turning out to be the greatest obstacles to the development of technological and scientific research. (IS7, 1995, 36) (88)

7.2.4 The University as an institution

Science and knowledge are an essential part of the conceptualisation of the University as an institution, rather than just as an organisation or any random part of the state structure, which is suggested e.g. by the legal status of the Finnish universities. The

University as an institution is constructed by a set of values, norms and idealised schemes about science, knowledge and the role of the University in society. Although the institutionality of the University is discussed here in the context of the science and knowledge -discourse as a wide backgrounding theme, it is also embedded in some of the viewpoints of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse. The following quote from the Magna Charta Universitatum, which constitutes a definitive document of the University as an institution, is an example on how institutionality is constituted.

Freedom in research and training is the fundamental principle of university life, and governments and universities, each as far as in them lies, must ensure respect for this fundamental requirement. (EUA2, 1988, 1)

The University institution is directly referred to in the strategy of one of the Finnish universities, which defines itself as an institution of mental rejuvenation, and calls itself innovative with scientific ways of thinking and new knowledge transmitted through cooperation. It aims to be among the best multidisciplinary universities in Europe, its research and degrees trusted by stakeholders. The values of the university as expressed in the strategy include truth, knowledge, university autonomy, research ethics, creativity and criticism. Another university states that its vision is to rank at the top of the Finnish universities, with high quality, socially important and ethically sustainable research and the strongest fields comparable with the best international universities. Its education and research advance free science and civilisation, and contribute to the mental development of society. The university needs courage to trust its own wisdom, cherish the past, to develop international standards of science and teaching. The basic function of the university is to produce, structure and provide knowledge. This theme is presented in many university documents, some contemporary examples of which below.

The University of Helsinki is the most versatile of Finland's institutions of higher education and of mental rejuvenation. It generates innovative, scientific ways of thinking and new knowledge with the aid of high quality research, teaching, and co-operation. It also acts as a medium for transmitting new ideas to the Finnish society for the well-being of society as a whole. (UH1, 2003, 23)

Aiming at knowledge and truth is the basic starting point of University activities. *A critical mind* is a basic characteristic of a member of the University community, who aims at the truth. The University must be capable of making a bold assessment of the basis of its own activities and that of the society around it. *Knowledge* is both a value in itself and a means to other ends. Applied research must not, however, threaten the needs of free basic research required for scientific development. The University is multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary in its basic nature. Freedom of research and teaching is necessary for a

critical and creative attitude, and this again means *university autonomy*. The University acknowledges its responsibility towards society, but meeting societal needs is not the only task of the University. It must also influence the direction in which the society develops and the needs arising within it. The University must have confidence in the value of its own expertise.²² (UH1, 2003, 24)

The university trusts firmly in the knowledge and wisdom it has acquired. The university tradition is to produce, safeguard and develop the knowledge and skills accumulated in the course of history and to use them for the benefit of society. (--) Courage also entails reacting rapidly and effectively to the changing world when there is good reason for so doing. The university acknowledges the importance of profound and considered knowledge and takes a firm and critical stance to the incomplete knowledge and fleeting fashion fads occurring more and more regularly in society. (TT2, 2004, 3) (89)

This vocabulary is drawn from the notions of the inherently valuable production and mediation of knowledge, the freedom, integrity and ethics of research, the connection of research and teaching and the balance of basic and applied research. The interviewee in the following quote evokes the image of the Humboldtian University by arguing that market competition does not fit the university's image. Competition diverts too many resources away from the major functions and dictates content. It is best to stop and ask what the basic mission of a university is instead of engaging in market competition, which is this way implicitly set apart from the inherent competition of science.

(--) the competition in these education markets is really very education based and market based, and for instance, where the toughest markets are, it's this like business education, MBA and such. And we have started from this idea that we don't want to compete in education, instead we compete in research. Actually all these virtual universities, these American corporate universities, they do hardly any research, they just teach, you can't do research through the Internet, you can distribute study material, even teaching and learning is a bit questionable. But anyway they are focussing solely on this education function and when we emphasise this that our basic task is research and education based on it, then we don't see this competition as a threat but have started out from the idea that there still is a social need for this kind of traditional Humboldtian university. (U1, 9) (90)

7.2.5 The strategic use of science and knowledge -discourse on the European level

The European University Association is keen to make use of the notion of the University as an institution in arguing for its own role in the European higher education

22. Italics in original. TN.

policy making, either explicitly or implicitly. Implicitly, they legitimate the role of the University as an institution by arguing that the university remains a natural location for high quality doctoral programmes thanks to its pluri-disciplinary teaching and learning environment. They refer to university missions that include the creation, preservation, evaluation, dissemination and exploitation of knowledge, and strong academic and social values underlying its contributions to society. They explicitly state that universities need to be viewed as institutions. For centuries the strength and originality of the University institution throughout Europe has been based on the shared values of university autonomy, education as a social good, and research as the foundation for learning. The link between education and research is still the basis of the strong European research and education identity. The universities have been at the centre of development in Europe, promoting learning, stimulating critical thinking and innovation and also ensuring continuity. The Europe of knowledge is based on strong research capacity and research-based education. Higher education must therefore remain a public responsibility so as to maintain core academic and civic values, stimulating excellence. The universities work in a long term perspective, promoting critical thinking and respect for democracy. Research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all political authority and economic power. These arguments all contribute to the aim of maintaining the traditional institutionality of the University and its traditional privileges.

The centrality of the link between knowledge production and dissemination. EUA will consult its members in order to develop a position supporting the essential link between teaching and research, as a basis for the European higher education and research area. (EUA1, 2001, 6)

The university is an autonomous institution at the heart of societies differently organized because of geography and historical heritage; it produces, examines, appraises and hands down culture by research and teaching. To meet the needs of the world around it, its research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all political authority and economic power. (EUA2, 1988, 1)

Progress requires that European universities be empowered to act in line with the guiding principle of autonomy with accountability. As autonomous and responsible legal, educational and social entities, they confirm their adhesion to the principles of the Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988 and, in particular, to that of academic freedom. (EUA3, 2001, 7)

In addition to this, the organisation also makes use of the science and knowledge - discourse in its convincing and commitment talk, which constructs the organisation and the European universities as credible, trustworthy, accountable and complacent partners in the European knowledge society project, as embodied in the European

higher education and research areas. Europe needs strong and creative universities shaping the knowledge society and promoting excellence in all activities. There should be a balance between innovation and tradition, academic excellence and social and economic relevance. The university has a responsibility to provide broad research-based education and to enhance research and innovation through the use of resources and research strategies and diverse research profiles. The universities and the EUA seek to identify a “European way” of fostering and utilising high quality research. There is a strong commitment to the European higher education area, and a set of requirements is attributed to it: it must be built of academic core values but take into account stakeholders’ expectations, the free mobility of staff and students essential for it and it must go hand in hand with the European research area, because research is the driving force of higher education. In this way, the EUA in a way claims an ownership over the process, tames it into a process which inherently belongs to its territory.

Quality is the basic underlying condition for trust, relevance, mobility, compatibility and attractiveness in the European Higher Education Area. (EUA3, 2001, 8)

An internal quality culture and effective procedures foster vibrant intellectual and educational attainment. Effective leadership, management and governance also do this. (EUA4, 2003, 9)

Universities must exercise their own responsibilities for enhancing research and innovation through the optimal use of resources and the development of institutional research strategies. Their diverse profiles ensure that they are increasingly engaged in the research and innovation process, working with different partners. (EUA5, 2005, 4)

This move is replicated by the Bologna process documents, which in their turn acknowledge, utilising the science and knowledge -discourse, that the universities are committed to the European higher education area. This is important, given that universities’ independence and autonomy ensure that higher education and research systems adapt to society’s changing needs and demands and to the advances in scientific knowledge. The Bologna process also makes use of the traditional institution of the university in talking about the European extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions and in stating that academic values should prevail in international academic cooperation and exchanges.

They [the ministers of higher education, TN] emphasise that in international academic cooperation and exchanges, academic values should prevail. (BD4, 2003, 1)

The legitimisation process of the Europe of knowledge can be built on the traditional notions of science and knowledge. The EU discourse in some of the documents for

instance, make use of the discourse in stating that the search for knowledge is at the heart of European adventure, that it has helped to define our identity and our values, and that it is the driving force behind our competitiveness. To be a competitive knowledge-based economy, Europe must be better at producing knowledge through research, diffusing it through education and applying it through innovation. Many of the EU documents also draw from the science and knowledge -discourse vocabulary, such as the creation of knowledge and advancement of science, even though not necessarily of the content.

The Lisbon agenda calls for efforts from a wide range of players. These include the universities, which have a particularly important role to play. This is because of their twofold traditional vocation of research and teaching, their increasing role in the complex process of innovation, along with their other contributions to economic competitiveness and social cohesion, e.g. their role in the life of the community and in regional development. (Euu1, 2003, 3)

The EU university documents argue that the European universities have long been modelled after the Humboldtian university, with the connection between research and teaching defining the ethos of the university. In addition to their traditional vocation of research and education, they have an increasing role in innovation, economic competitiveness and social cohesion. The pursuit of knowledge is important for its own sake but also for the sake of developing knowledge for products, processes and technologies. On the other hand, too much applied research with the business sector might endanger the university's capacity to contribute to the progress of knowledge.

European universities have for long modelled themselves along the lines of some major models, particularly the ideal model of university envisaged nearly two centuries ago by Wilhelm von Humboldt in his reform of the German university, which sets research at the heart of university activity and indeed makes it the basis of teaching. Today the trend is away from these models, and towards greater differentiation. This results in the emergence of more specialised institutions concentrating on a core of specific competences when it comes to research and teaching and/or on certain dimensions of their activities, e.g. their integration within a strategy of regional development through adult education/training. (Euu1, 2003, 6)

Fundamental research therefore remains a major area for university research activity. It is this capacity in the big American research universities that makes them attractive partners for industry, which in turn provides them with substantial funding for it. Fundamental research in this context is therefore conducted with its application very much in mind, but at the same time without losing its fundamental character. In Europe, universities tend to undertake directly applied research for the business sector, extending even to the provision

of scientific services, which if taken to excess could endanger their capacity to contribute to the progress of knowledge. (Euu1, 2003, 8)

In the interest of science and knowledge, the EU documents also urge universities to change. Their central weakness is argued to be the absence of critical mass, and often too compartmentalised disciplines. They require more resources and better conditions for excellence, autonomy and professionalism in academic and managerial affairs. They must consolidate their excellence in research and teaching through networking. A culture of excellence is needed to achieve outstanding quality, and excellence also requires constant challenging. Cooperation between universities, industry, research centres and authorities must be supported to gain leadership in scientific and technological areas, and creativity and excellence supported through the funding of frontier research. In this way, the European Union makes use of the traditional discourse of the universities to govern them through their own empowerment.

(--) consolidating their excellence in research and in teaching, particularly through networking (--) (Euu1, 2003, 12)

To gain leadership in key scientific and technology areas by supporting cooperation between universities, industry, research centres and public authorities across the European Union as well as with the rest of the world. (Eur4, 2005, 5)

7.3 The civilisation and wellbeing -discourse

If the discourse of science and knowledge addresses the main functions of the University in producing and distributing knowledge, the discourse of civilisation and wellbeing is based on the other task of the University: increasing the civilisation and wellbeing of the society and its citizens. The discourse consists of the three sub-discourses, namely that of the traditional civilising and wellbeing mission, the global mission and finally the instrumental mission, which is similar in some ways to the last discourse of competition and competitiveness.

As most of this discourse is geared towards the benefit of society, whether 'society' refers to local, national or European society, or humanity overall, it makes sense to pick up the specific elements in which the individual is presented in the discourse. It is also argued that higher education or the universities, or more specifically internationalisation, should benefit the individual, or that the society should benefit through the capacities of the individuals. This comes close to the discourse of internationalisation as growth of the individual, and shows the way in which the internationalisation and University discourses are connected. These two discourses for instance are often pre-

sented together to construe both the outcomes and the argument for internationalisation. The following issues were raised about the discourse, either in the interviews or in national and international documents: access to education and life long learning and the possibility of mobility should be guaranteed. Individuals should have or acquire certain skills and capacities, those needed both for the national or European labour market, and to improve communication: international capacities such as language skills, multicultural communication skills, understanding other cultures, and tolerance. Individuals should be able to fulfil their potential and expectations and lead a good life, be employable and be active citizens. Tuition fees could be used to increase their responsibility for their education. They should become independent learners, with academic competence and good career opportunities. International experience will give students friends, contacts and valuable skills and increase their awareness of shared values, of sharing a common social space and European identity. Education in general will make them civilised and broad minded. Student rights and freedom of choice should be guaranteed, and no discrimination should be tolerated.

7.3.1 The traditional sub-discourse

The traditional sub-discourse is centred on the University contribution to the themes such as multiculturalism and cultural richness, preserving our own language and culture, learning other languages and cultures, enhancing democracy, equality and social cohesion, individual understanding and empowerment, benefiting humanity, and contributing to European values. Just like the science and knowledge -discourse, the traditional sub-discourse of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse can be said to be at the core of the traditional institution of the University.

One of the themes of the traditional viewpoint of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, presented by many interviews and documents, is the preservation and advancement of the national language and culture. This may be specifically pronounced in a country with few people and a little-spoken language like Finland. In the past, this was also very important for the birth of the Finnish nation and the creation of the Finnish state. Besides the important task of preserving the Finnish language, some of the universities have been assigned the task of preserving the bilingualism of the country through fostering the Swedish language. This point was mentioned in some of the university documents.

And when the university system internationalises then of course the language used by the university becomes pretty crucial. And today this is, I would say, almost one of the most topical issues when talking about internationalisation. Because in this you go directly to the values of the universities, what kind of values do you have and in which language do you give education (--)(U3, 3) (91)

Because we have this idea that if we just move more into the English language, we are international. And that is not true. That is not true. It is just like in the business world there is talk about it when two companies merge, (--) yeah then what is the language of the new merged company. (U3, 4) (92)

As the language question is so intertwined with the notion of internationality, as discussed above, this discourse constructs a counterbalance to it, by aiming to convince the reader that internationalisation does not mean giving up Finnish and that a university can be international while retaining its own language. Fostering and preserving the national cultural heritage and making it known abroad is also deemed important and internationalisation is presented as helping us to understand not just other cultures but also our own culture and origin. It is also argued to be important to teach the national languages and culture to foreigners to facilitate formal and informal interaction and integration. The following quotes from documents ten years apart, show how these are being constructed.

In order for a genuinely multicultural community to come into being in Finland, the starting point should be that Finnish and foreign students primarily study the same programmes. (IS5, 2005, 34) (93)

Because Finland is a small language area, the higher education institutions should further expand teaching given in foreign languages, which can be utilised by both foreign and national students. The development of foreign language teaching requires an investment in the language skills of the teachers. However, care must be taken at the same time that enough tuition in Finnish and Swedish language and culture is available for the foreign students, teachers and researchers coming to Finland (IS6, 1995, 27) (94)

Similarly the advancement of cultural understanding and preservation of cultural richness are, as discussed in connection with the earlier discourses, presented as important civilisation missions of the University. Understanding foreign cultures, awareness of the interdependence of nations and the necessity of international cooperation are presented as the central aim of higher education and internationalisation, and as a precondition for us to understand the world and do as little harm to others as possible. Fostering a genuinely multicultural society and advancing the integration of linguistic and cultural minorities through education are part of internationalisation, presented in many sources.

We must use all those existing funding mechanisms [to increase internationalisation, TN], because as I said earlier, it is becoming increasingly important that we understand those contexts of thought and action in which the people coming from or living in different societies function. In order for us to use all the options in the world, and do as little harm to other people as possible, we have to understand them. (U2,2) (95)

The institutionality of the University is also made up of certain principles, which are presented as being under a threat in the discourse, but are partly bypassed in the much stronger competition and competitiveness -discourse. These discourse, as presented by a few speakers in the traditional civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, include the idea of education supporting democracy and also the notion of free education as a basic right. The latter point, however, is not always presented as the opinion of the speaker but as a wider general idea in a society, which in some interviews seemed to be viewed as some sort of a hindrance to the university to operate and to collect tuition fees. In this case, it seems to fall under the competitiveness discourse. On the other hand, in the science and knowledge -discourse, competition is presented as not fitting the university style, portraying the peculiar duality in the attitude towards competition. As was seen from the previous discourse, competition is sometimes simultaneously construed as “good competition” (competition in scholarship, competition in quality) and “bad competition” (market competition involving money). Competition is also construed as neutral and inevitable, something of which Finland is part of and will necessarily have to participate in, competition for students, staff, funding, reputation and future labour force. The following quotes show how several different formulations and connotations of competition exist in the empirical data.

This competition is part of the world of science and should be there in higher education institutions as well, so that one can genuinely say we have such good education and learn so efficiently that it can stand competition. (N2, 7) (96)

Then another dimension in competition is of course that Finnish higher education institutions can compete amongst themselves as to who is the most successful at attracting foreigners. (--) So where there could be a little weird competition is this relationship between the universities and the polytechnics, as the polytechnic system has been of a certain kind in Finland but abroad it may be seen is a very different way and some countries don't have a similar system. The polytechnics have actively implemented their internationalisation programmes and they also have these international agreements and they attract students who don't always know that in Finland they are actually coming to a non-university sector institution, they think that they are universities. (U5, 8) (97)

I can't believe that some university could start competing with some other university for students. I think this is still on the level of countries and maybe national internationalisation organisations, or the ACA [Association for Academic Cooperation, TN] (--) (N3, 6) (98)

Tampere University of Technology aims to produce useful services for the rest of society. The aim of scientific activity, in addition to research objectives, is to develop Finnish society, advance civilisation [sivistys, TN] and national intellectual capital. The university does not

see practising science as a value in itself or a competition reminiscent of top sports. (TT2, 2004, 9) (99)

Well again I revert to that chain of thought that if it didn't, if the university has a role, then it has to have it, it must be competitive, it must have quality activities meeting international quality standards. You just can't do this in a kind of vacuum where, if you only have this national outlook, you only look at national markets. So that in a way if you have, if you have, you have to be competitive, you have to be, you just have to be good. (U3, 7) (100)

As was noted before, the growth and empowerment of the individual is one of the ways to construe the content and the benefits of the internationalisation of higher education. The inherent value of education for human growth and enriching of person's life is also one of the ways to conceive the civilisation and wellbeing mission of higher education and the University in society. The task of the University is presented as guiding students towards scientific and cultural thinking and artistic knowledge, to search, create and critically evaluate knowledge to understand and solve new problems, taking the responsibility for knowledge and results. Students are to become respectful of life and the purposes and applications of knowledge, and intellectual, cultural and social wellbeing. A large university system which lays emphasis on educating large numbers of the population and supports people's growth is presented by one speaker as a national idea and contrasted with a smaller and more exclusive, international research university. The following quotes from contemporary Finnish documents as well as from the international Magna Charta document from the 1980s quote present a larger sentiment and indicate its temporal durability.

The highest education means guiding the students to scientific and cultural thinking and artistic skills. Education is teaching and learning combined. The university provides teaching which creates preconditions for learning. The students are guided to search, create and critically evaluate knowledge and cultivate it into an understanding based on their own strengths and personal aptitudes, and into skills to accomplish new kinds of tasks. Scientific education also guides students to take responsibility for the knowledge produced and results obtained. (TT2, 2004, 4) (101)

(--) universities must give future generations education and training that will teach them, and through them others, to respect the great harmonies of their natural environment and of life itself. (EUA2, 1988)

The main legitimating factor for the University, however, is the contribution it brings to the civilisation and wellbeing of the entire society through its education and research. It emphasises on the one hand the dependence of the national survival on education and internationalisation, and on the other the role of universities in serving society

with education and research by mediating new ideas for the wellbeing of the society as a whole. The University existence is legitimated by its task of producing long term benefits for the entire society rather than short term economic gain. Examples of this notion can be found in many different categories of data.

Finland can't afford to waste its human capital, because maintaining an optimally high level of education [sivistys, TN] is a prerequisite for national survival. Finland needs a research and education policy which takes the national premises into account and aiming at internationally high quality results. (DS3, 1993, 19) (102)

Economic efficiency is a challenge for the university, because it usually means the ability to produce short term economic gain for its community. The historical importance of the university is, nevertheless, based on the opposite objective of producing *long-term benefit for the society as a whole*, which cannot usually be evaluated in economic terms.²³ (TT2, 2004, 5) (103)

Some sources present the universities as making the Finnish society one worth living in, by cherishing the past, advancing science, civilisation and the spiritual growth of the nation, contributing to social and human innovations and to the to the intellectual, social and economic development of the country. One university presents values such as wisdom, responsibility, civilisation and courage, which are intrinsically part of the Finnish society. One interviewee argued that the universities have a good reputation in Finnish society.

The values of the university are anchored in Finnish society and in practices deemed nationally successful: *wisdom, responsibility, education* [sivistys, TN] *and courage*.²⁴ (TT2, 2004,3) (104)

On the other hand, the task of the University is presented as also contributing to critical thinking and knowledge and to a culturally diverse environment, wide and equal learning opportunities and just welfare and ethical leadership. It is benefiting humanity, building an active civil society and assessing critically the developments that provide a global or regional threat to people's basic security and their opportunity to fulfil their intellectual and cultural aspirations. The students and academics are to become responsible citizens and active discussants. Also important are equal educational opportunities, equality between people and equity between regions Finland's international success is based on these. Social, ethical and aesthetic capacities are also an important part of civilisation and knowledge. An important goal in EU policy is to pay attention to how wellbeing and development can be advanced while retaining

23. Italics in original. TN.

24. Italics in original. TN.

national and local cultural diversity and features. The many tasks are exemplified by the following quotes.

The university wants to increase its societal impact by giving its students and staff the capabilities to participate as responsible citizens in the societal discussion and by encouraging them to be active discussants. (TT2, 2004, 13) (105)

Equality between people and equity between regions will be enhanced. Education and research will be developed with focus on supporting the strengths and specific characteristics of the regions with the aim of increasing the employment rate. Educational development will cater for the cultural significance of Swedish-language education and training for the Swedish-speaking population. (DS6, 2003, 15)

Tolerance and a positive attitude to different cultures will be stressed in all education and training. (DS6, 2003, 27)

The European discourse on the traditional civilisation and wellbeing task of the University is fairly similar to the national one, but rather than emphasising preservation of the national culture, its emphasis is on European traditions and values, and the cultural and linguistic diversity of the region. The following quote is an example of the Bologna Process discourse.

The emerging European Higher Education Area will benefit from synergies with the European Research Area, thus strengthening the basis of the Europe of Knowledge. The aim is to preserve Europe's cultural richness and linguistic diversity, based on its heritage of diversified traditions, and to foster its potential of innovation and social and economic development through enhanced co-operation among European Higher Education Institutions. (BD4, 2003, 2)

The discourse also emphasises the role of higher education in building a European society and active citizens with a European identity, fostering awareness of shared values and belonging to same culture in Europe. It also mentions higher education's contribution in uniting peoples throughout the continent, and fostering peace, stability and sustainable development especially in the aftermath of the fall of the "Eastern block".

(-- building upon and transmitting a heritage of shared European values and culture, as well as a tradition of openness to the international environment; strengthening public responsibility for higher education systems across Europe; promoting equity and access on the basis of merit; (EUA9, 2003, 2)

We must strengthen and build upon the intellectual, cultural, social and technical dimensions of our continent. These have to a large extent been shaped by its universities, which continue to play a pivotal role for their development. (BD1, 1998, 1)

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space. (BD2, 1999, 1)

In some cases, as below, EU cooperation in education may also be presented as realising the aims of European integration, and the researchers and students are seen as making the integration a reality.

In education, the cooperation in the European Union is very important. So through this cooperation this entire integration of Europe becomes visible or is realised, so universities and students and researchers have a very important role in making European cooperation and integration a reality. (N1, 4) (106)

The emphasis on social cohesion is very strong in the European discourse, as shown by the EU and EUA quotes below. It forms the other part of the European competitive knowledge society discourse, which emphasises competitiveness on the one hand and social cohesion on the other. The EU quotes show how the universities are given the task of contributing to defining the European social model and to the development of individuals so that they can realise their potential and live a full life.

Universities are central to the development of European society. They create, safeguard and transmit knowledge vital for social and economic welfare, locally, regionally and globally. They cultivate European values and culture. (EUA4, 2003, 7)

The EUA wishes to underline the fundamental role of the university as institution in building Europe, and in further defining the European social model. In recent decades, in response to increased student numbers and growing societal demand, the university has shown itself capable of responding to these challenges through opening to its environment, both economic and cultural. The university is thus a fundamental element of social cohesion, constructing a shared community based upon common values among various sectors of the population in different countries, through its mission (--) (EUA6, 2002, 1)

The new knowledge-based society offers tremendous potential for reducing social exclusion, both by creating the economic conditions for greater prosperity through higher levels of growth and employment, and by opening up new ways of participating in society. At the same time, it brings a risk of an ever-widening gap between those who have access to the

new knowledge, and those who are excluded. To avoid this risk and maximise this new potential, efforts must be made to improve skills, promote wider access to knowledge and opportunity and fight unemployment: the best safeguard against social exclusion is a job. (EUL2, 2000, 11)

The University is also to contribute to the development of a democratic, tolerant, non-discriminating and equitable society and cultural diversity, and is expected to develop citizenship, to promote democratic citizenship outside the EU and to promote human rights. It is argued that the University should be a trustee of European humanist tradition and its task is to care for the universal knowledge and interaction of different cultures.

While education and training systems need to change in view of the challenges of the knowledge society and globalisation, they pursue broader goals and have broader responsibilities to society. They play an important role in building up social cohesion, in preventing discrimination, exclusion, racism and xenophobia and hence in promoting tolerance and the respect for human rights. (EUE2, 2002, 7)

Education and training systems have an important role in helping to sustain democratic societies in Europe. All citizens should have equal access to education and training. Member States need to take care of the needs of vulnerable groups, particularly people with disabilities and people with learning difficulties as well as those living in rural/remote areas or having problems in reconciling their work and family commitments. It cannot be accepted that substantial proportions of people drop out of learning prematurely, and miss essential basic skills and qualifications to participate actively in society, without accepting also the loss to society and the economy as a whole which their unfulfilled potential represents. Other aspects related to citizenship, equal opportunities and social cohesion are essential dimensions of education and training in their own right. (EUE2, 2002, 30)

Ensuring that the learning of democratic values and democratic participation by all school partners is effectively promoted in order to prepare people for active citizenship. Integrating fully equal opportunity considerations in the objectives and functioning of education and training. Ensuring fair access to acquisition of skills for the less privileged or those currently less well served and motivating them to participate in learning. (EUE2, 2002, 30)

7.3.2 The global sub-discourse

The last things mentioned under the traditional sub-discourse come close to a global understanding of the tasks and roles of the University and higher education. This somewhat rare viewpoint emphasises themes such as global responsibility, tolerance and

multiculturalism and development cooperation as tasks undertaken by the University that can lend it legitimation. The sub-discourse can be found in the interviews and national policy documents, as well as in the EUA and Bologna process documents. However, it does not feature much in the EU documents, possibly because the issues such as development cooperation are presented through the perspective of competition rather than global solidarity.

The global sub-discourse is based on an idea that universities have responsibilities beyond the scientific sphere and beyond their immediate local, national or regional context. In this sense the global viewpoint might also be part of the traditional institutionality of the University, and recognised by older as well as newer documents. Some of the national interviews and documents from different decades mention development cooperation as a beneficiary of internationalisation and an important point, which will be strengthened, both in terms of education and training and research contributing to technologies applicable in developing countries. Although a system of tuition fees may at the onset seem like an adversary to global solidarity and development cooperation, one interviewee advocating tuition fees argued for a system of scholarships for students from poor countries. Tuition fees are even presented as being a necessity for Finnish universities' contribution to development cooperation. The argument is that universities cannot participate in offering HE to developing countries because of the current regulations – a euphemism for the law not allowing tuition fees to be charged at the moment – or by arguing that Finland has something to give in higher education by educating people who then return to their own developing countries.

It is more and more clearly understood that the development of production requires special attention to be paid to education and training. The key to the success of all development efforts is raising the population's level of education. (IS3, 1987, 23)

Finland cannot keep out of international competition and, as part of the international community, it must bear its responsibility for immigrants and refugees. Opening up our education and research system will promote these goals. (IS4, 2001, 2)

I am a strong supporter of these international university markets. We have to use all honest means of livelihood in this country so that when industry flees from here we have to develop other occupations instead so that we can live here and that we have work here so that we can maintain our type of society. Maybe international students don't exist only so that they would come to work in Finland but that Finland can simply participate as an actor in this education and start from the idea that the Chinese can study in the west in order to return to work in China also. (U2, 3) (107)

Anyway, we need foreign students; we need some of them to stay in Finland to work. The money with which we would then give this education, then here one possibility is that it

would be partially fee-paying and it would be linked to a scholarship system for students coming from poor countries but those who have the ability to pay would then pay reasonable tuition fees, with which these services, too, could, and English language programmes and master's programmes could also be developed. (U5, 5) (108)

The fostering of tolerance in society through integration of immigrants and the aims of making a broad-minded multicultural civilisation through international interaction, fostering intercultural understanding and respect, combating racism, xenophobia, exclusion, and promoting respect for human rights are seen as contributions of the University to the society in a globalising world. It is an equally important goal for the University and for internationalisation to advance cultural cooperation and understanding amongst nations and people than economic competitiveness. It is the task of the universities to assess developments which threaten people's basic security and their aspirations. The values of the University are presented to be based on human values, multicultural community, equality, democracy and sustainable development, all fitting in to the paradigm of humanist values and global solidarity. These themes are presented here primarily through the EU discourse, but as the last quote shows, examples can also be found in the national discourse.

Europe's universities have become active partners in building Europe, both within the European Union and beyond, supporting cooperation, mobility and networking, in particular within the framework of the Bologna process. This has been aptly demonstrated in the key role played by Europe's universities since 1989 in uniting peoples throughout the continent, and fostering peace, stability and sustainable development. (EUA8, 2003, 1)

We see the European Higher Education Area as a partner of higher education systems in other regions of the world, stimulating balanced student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of intercultural understanding and respect. (BD5, 2005, 5)

While education and training systems need to change in view of the challenges of the knowledge society and globalisation, they pursue broader goals and have broader responsibilities to society. They play an important role in building up social cohesion, in preventing discrimination, exclusion, racism and xenophobia and hence in promoting tolerance and the respect for human rights. (EUE2, 2002, 7)

Universities must critically assess those developments that globally or regionally threaten people's basic security and their opportunities to fulfil their intellectual and cultural aspirations. (UH2, 2006, 61)

7.3.3 The instrumental sub-discourse

The instrumental sub-discourse of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse comes closest to the discourse of competition and competitiveness, and it is valid to question whether it should be distinguished from it at all, or whether it would be more viable to represent it as part of that larger, stronger discourse. In my opinion, what speaks for the distinction is the notion that even though the instrumental sub-discourse does emphasise more direct rather than indirect benefits to society, the benefits are not directly linked to competition or competitiveness and present a long rather than short time perspective. The two discourses are strongly intertwined and are often present in the same text extract. The themes addressed by this sub-discourse include issues such as diverse, excellent and inclusive universities, increased cooperation with businesses and society, regional and local cooperation, life-long learning and new skills for the labour market, the service mission of the universities, University contribution to European higher education and research area and the Europe of Knowledge, social cohesion and active citizenship, and the utilitarian element of international cooperation.

In the Finnish university and national discourse, the instrumental contribution of the University to the civilisation and wellbeing of society and to the lives of its citizens is repeatedly constructed around the notion that knowledge and human capacity are the key to the survival of a small nation and that universities contribute to the knowledge society through education and training, research and innovation. The universities must therefore interact and cooperate closely with society and change as the society changes in order to increase the wellbeing of Finland and its business. University education must anticipate and adapt to changes in society and society's demands, yet focus on each university's strong fields of each university. The European discourse also utilises the notion of survival, as implied by the last quote.

Finland's future depends on know-how and a capacity for utilising the know-how and creating new innovations. Raising the level of know-how among the population as a whole supports Finland's development as an educated nation [sivistyskansana, TN] and Finland's competitiveness. Equal opportunity for education and training is the right of every person permanently resident in Finland in accordance with the principles of lifelong learning, regardless of their gender, place of residence, age, language, economic standing, state of health, disability or origin. (DS5, 1999, 6) (109)

Knowledge and skills are the basis of the economic competitiveness and the wellbeing of the society as a whole. Finland's success is based on high quality education and research, innovative knowledge and the use of modern information and communication technology. (IS8, 2001, 25) (110)

Finnish development policy emphasises the central role of education and research in Finland's survival strategy and in the balanced development of the innovation system. Quality and impact of education, internationalisation, maintaining the high educational level [sivistystaso, TN] of the nation, increasing the efficiency of the HE system and creating a flexible and highly responsive education system are the main aims of the chosen development policy. (IS6, 1995, 24) (111)

Investing in knowledge is certainly the best, and maybe the only, way for the EU to foster economic growth and create more and better jobs, while at the same time ensuring social progress and environmental sustainability. In other words, it is Europe's chance to strengthen its model of society. (EUR4, 2005, 2)

The traditional philosophy of higher education in Finland is presented as follows: to invest in a big even quality university system serving the nation and the national and regional innovation system, producing various innovation processes, helping to commercialise them and supporting social innovations. Universities also operate in close cooperation with industry. One university describes its role as being of high quality, advancing the mental and economic development of industry and society, regional technological-economic development. It is nationally known and is a knowledgeable and innovative partner for business community. The universities are called on to internalise this service mission in relation to the society, and the aforementioned quote seems to show this indeed has taken place. The following interview quote also shows how this sentiment has been internalised.

(--) with us the great ideology is that we have a large consistently high-quality university system serving national needs, especially the national and regional innovation system, (--) and the strong notion that the university trains and educates [kasvattaa, kouluttaa, sivistää, TN] people, citizens, who get tools for their life and a deep understanding of professional and other things, so that maintains a better life and a better society and of course this perspective speaks in favour of a large university system, which does not need to be very competitive but broadminded in principle. (U2, 3) (112)

Internationalisation is presented as one way of contributing to the wellbeing of society, either through providing its citizens with the skills and competencies they need in the internationalising society, or through providing society with skilled foreign labour force, or by the universities sharing with the rest of the society their expertise in international matters. The contributions to society could also include universities developing human-centred technology or new models of culture and wellbeing services, creating social and human innovations alongside the technological innovation and maintaining a safe environment and preserving the cultural capital of the country. The long term effect of the universities' contribution cannot always be measured in economic terms. If the aim of the universities is to produce enough highly educated people to

advance the wellbeing of society, it is society's task to ensure that adequate funding is available for the universities to fulfil their task. The different ways of constructing this are evident in the following examples, which span 15 years.

(--) and as I see it, this internationalisation in the higher education institution, besides being related to this employment question, the fact that the knowledge which is being taught and those skills which are being learned, in content they are already such that they were not invented in Finland, and not meant only to be used here. It is an essential need in the modern world so that one can live, none of us can any longer live without some kind of internationalisation (--) (N3, 2) (113)

The University of Tampere educates high level academic experts for the public, private and third sectors. The knowledge and skills needed in working life and in society are assumed and values and attitudes are created in the university. (UT2, 2006, 5) (114)

University graduates must have such an academic competence and professional ability that they can work successfully in an international and multicultural environment. (UT3, 2001, 2) (115)

International educational cooperation is aimed at diversifying educational opportunities, improving the quality of education and giving students the competence needed in international cooperation. (DS2, 1991, 33) (116)

The need to increase the international visibility and competitiveness of Finnish institutions of higher education is emerging in part from the existing shortage of labour in certain industries, which will worsen in some sectors. Attracting foreign students is one way to increase the availability of labour, because study in Finland teaches students about the country and binds them more to Finnish society and working life than other immigrants. (IS4, 2001, 19)

Somewhat newer conceptualisations of the service mission of the University include their contribution to regional development and to lifelong learning, although as the following quote shows, this notion also has been around for the past 20 years. These newer conceptualisations are especially emphasised by the national policy documents, which make use of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse to argue for the universities to direct more of their attention to a balanced regional development, and cooperation with regional business and industry, and also to profile their own research and education in such a way as to take the regional characteristics into account better. Regional development must also be taken into account in a more even distribution of study places across country. The documents do not present the regional role as being out of kilter with the international role, unlike some of the interviews.

The goal is also to increase the openness of the higher education system towards the rest of society. In fee-based service functions of the higher education institutions, the research and continuing education services are increased. The aim is for the higher education institutions also in this aspect to be able to function as centres of development in their own regions. In general the goal is for the changes in the society and working life to be able to be flexibly taken into account in developing the activities of the higher education institutions. (DS1, 1987,4) (117)

Life long learning, increased employability and efficiency and a more thorough way of reconciling the demand for education by prospective students and the demands of working life for educated workers, form another new focal theme envisioned in many national and international sources. These contribute to the civilisation and wellbeing of the society and its citizens. There is an increasing need for human capital and new skills are needed in the dynamic knowledge-based economy. Higher education policies must focus on reducing the number of early school leavers and low achievers, and increasing participation in mathematics, technology, science and engineering. Those policies must ensure that new skills are available for labour market; these skills must be provided through lifelong learning, using for instance distance learning and tailored training services. The standard and efficiency of education should be increased, study times made shorter, the number of drop-outs decreased, more individual choice facilitated by the curriculum, and graduates provided with more international capacities, and an entrepreneurial and independent attitude. Education also contributes to alleviating the impact of unemployment. These demands contribute to the images both of an ideal citizen of the knowledge society, and to the image of an ideal university, which will be discussed in connection with the final discourse. Lifelong learning is needed for competitiveness, social cohesion, for increased quality of life and because of the challenges presented by the use of new technologies. Also, in general, the curricula need to take into account the relevance to labour market needs, employability, diversity, flexibility and development of transversal skills and competencies. Europe must secure widespread acceptance and use of new technology, and universities must respond to the need for scientific and technological information and understanding. University graduates must also be exposed to the research environment and research-based learning in order to meet the needs of Europe as a knowledge society. The theme is particularly present in the documents of the European Union. The theme of lifelong learning is particularly difficult to place under a single discourse, as it could just as well be argued that it belongs to the competition and competitiveness -discourse.

Hanken invests in life-long learning by developing post-graduate education for business life and persons with university degrees. Open university studies offer academic study opportunities for a wider target group. Our alumni operations are of major strategic importance

as part of our investments in life-long learning and internationalisation. We wish to engage our alumni in our development efforts. (HA1, 2003, 6)

Lifelong learning is an essential element of the European Higher Education Area. In the future Europe, built upon a knowledge-based society and economy, lifelong learning strategies are necessary to face the challenges of competitiveness and the use of new technologies and to improve social cohesion, equal opportunities and the quality of life. (BD3, 2001, 2)

Everyone accepts that education and training systems must adapt to a world of lifelong learning. This requires inclusive and coherent education and training systems, which are attractive both to young people and adults, as well as a strategy which overcomes the traditional barriers between the various parts of formal education and training and non-formal and informal learning. High quality basic education for all, from early childhood onwards, is the essential foundation. However, the change in the demographic structure – the proportion of young people in society has never been smaller – reinforces the importance of encouraging continuing learning in the older age groups too. Part of the learning process is the promotion of active citizenship. The focus of active citizenship is on whether and how people participate in all spheres of social and economic life, the chances and risks they face in trying to do so, and the extent to which they therefore feel that they belong to and have a fair say in the society in which they live. The promotion of active citizenship and employability are to be seen as complementary. (EUE1, 2001, 11)

(--) a European framework should define the new basic skills to be provided through lifelong learning: IT skills, foreign languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills; a European diploma for basic IT skills, with decentralised certification procedures, should be established in order to promote digital literacy throughout the Union; (EUL2, 2000, 9)

Lifelong learning is an essential element of the European Higher Education Area. In the future Europe, built upon a knowledge-based society and economy, lifelong learning strategies are necessary to face the challenges of competitiveness and the use of new technologies and to improve social cohesion, equal opportunities and the quality of life. (BD3, 2001, 2)

The discourse of the European University Association makes use of the same images of the future of mankind depending on the cultural, scientific and technical development and the contribution that universities must and are willing to make here to serve society. The basic conceptualisations in the EUA discourse comprise the role of universities in educating students for active citizenship and employment, building links with the various stakeholders of higher education, creating and transmitting knowledge, fostering economic growth and regional development and wellbeing, and ensuring the future of higher education and training of researchers across Europe. These

notions are shared by other discourses on the role of universities in the civilisation and wellbeing, which shows the widely shared common ground of the discourse. The EUA also constructs its own position by arguing that the organisation promotes the active contribution of universities to society.

The European Higher Education Area must be built on the European traditions of education as a public responsibility; of broad and open access to undergraduate as well as graduate studies; of education for personal development and lifelong learning; and of citizenship as well as of short and long-term social relevance. (EUA3, 2001, 7)

Universities' multiple missions involve the creation, preservation, evaluation, dissemination and exploitation of knowledge. Strong universities require strong academic and social values that underlie their contributions to society. Universities share a commitment to the social underpinning of economic growth and the ethical dimensions of higher education and research. (EUA5, 2005, 2)

The EUA wishes to underline the fundamental role of the university as institution in building Europe, and in further defining the European social model. In recent decades, in response to increased student numbers and growing societal demand, the university has shown itself capable of responding to these challenges through opening to its environment, both economic and cultural. The university is thus a fundamental element of social cohesion, constructing a shared community based upon common values among various sectors of the population in different countries, through its mission (--) (EUA6, 2002, 1)

Everyone accepts that education and training systems must adapt to a world of lifelong learning. This requires inclusive and coherent education and training systems, which are attractive both to young people and adults, as well as a strategy which overcomes the traditional barriers between the various parts of formal education and training and non-formal and informal learning. High quality basic education for all, from early childhood onwards, is the essential foundation. However, the change in the demographic structure – the proportion of young people in society has never been smaller – reinforces the importance of encouraging continuing learning in the older age groups too. Part of the learning process is the promotion of active citizenship. The focus of active citizenship is on whether and how people participate in all spheres of social and economic life, the chances and risks they face in trying to do so, and the extent to which they therefore feel that they belong to and have a fair say in the society in which they live. The promotion of active citizenship and employability are to be seen as complementary. (EUE1, 2001, 11)

Mobility helps to promote the feeling of belonging to Europe, the development of European awareness, and the emergence of European citizenship. It allows young people to improve their personal skills and employability, and offers trainers the chance to broaden

their experience and enhance their skills. In an increasingly complex Europe all the available means for facilitating and promoting mobility must be used in the most effective way possible, so that people – in particular young people – can identify with Europe. Mobility in education or training, including pre-doctoral research training, also plays a part in creating a European education and training area and can contribute to achieving a European Research Area. (EUE2, 2002, 38)

The core of the EUA discourse (and other European discourse on civilisation and wellbeing) lies yet again in the envisioning the European Higher Education Area and the university's contribution to it. In turn, the EHEA contributes to the rest of the society. The EHEA is construed as a mediator through which European universities can contribute to society, as it promises to make universities more active, excellent and more transparent, stronger, more creative and self-confident. It promises joint programmes and increased mobility, social cohesion and equal access, and short and long term relevance. The Bologna process discourse emphasises the contribution of universities to European citizenship, social cohesion and quality of life, in addition to the more utilitarian contributions to knowledge production, innovation and training of skilled labour. This theme is widely spread, although here represented only by the following quotes 15 years apart.

(-- the universities' task of spreading knowledge among the younger generations implies that, in today's world, they must also serve society as a whole; and that the cultural, social and economic future of society requires, in particular, a considerable investment in continuing education (-- (EUA2, 1988, 1)

Moreover, they stress the necessity of ensuring a substantial period of study abroad in joint degree programmes as well as proper provision for linguistic diversity and language learning, so that students may achieve their full potential for European identity, citizenship and employability. (BD4, 2003, 6)

The EU discourse is firmly centred on two main themes, increasing competitiveness and increasing social cohesion. The first of these themes requires universities to contribute to knowledge production and innovation and education of skilled labour, and the latter requires equality. These two are derived directly from the goal of the Lisbon strategy. The following quote is the original wording from that strategy and it has been repeated intertextually across a wide array of other documents. By 2010, Europe must become the most competitive knowledge based economy, and it must have more and better jobs and social cohesion. Quite naturally, the legitimacy of the University is envisioned through its contribution to these two themes.

The Union has today set itself a new strategic goal for the next decade: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion (EUL2, 2000, 2)

The contribution to the Lisbon programme is therefore inimically related to the contribution to the wellbeing of society. Universities are presented as having an important role to play in the Lisbon programme for several reasons. They have a two-fold role in education and research, a role in innovation, a contribution to make to competitiveness and cohesion, and something to contribute to the life of the community and to regional development. This role is constructed as vital, by arguing, for instance, that the Lisbon goal is only possible if education and training systems function as factors in economic growth, research and innovation, competitiveness, sustainable employment, social inclusion and active citizenship. In this way the basic missions of the University as represented by both the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse and the science and knowledge -discourse, are co-opted to the fulfilment of the Lisbon strategy. Therefore, the universities can best contribute to the Lisbon strategy by doing the things they already do, only doing them a bit better.

Alongside its fundamental mission of initial training, universities must cater for new needs in education and training stemming from the knowledge-based economy and society. These include an increasing need for scientific and technical education, horizontal skills, and opportunities for lifelong learning, which require greater permeability between the components and the levels of the education and training systems. (EUV1, 2003, 8)

European universities are directly concerned by scientific education, in particular because they train science teachers for secondary education. (--) encourage institutions to develop stronger partnerships with the society around them, including local communities and the business world. (EUV1, 2005, 9)

At the same time, knowledge is a major component of the European way of life. It supports sustainable development: the improvement of living standards, quality of life, health and the environment all depend greatly on the advancement of knowledge and its applications to address the challenges faced by society. (EUR4, 2005, 2)

The themes of employability and lifelong learning may be said to be the non-competitive focus of the Lisbon process within the discourse of civilisation and wellbeing, repeated throughout the EU documents. In order for the Lisbon goals to be reached, more education is needed. Advancing skills and educational attainment in the young, in groups previously excluded, and doing so throughout life, combats social exclusion and increases equality. Therefore lifelong learning, widened access for those without secondary education qualifications, recognition of non-formal and informal learning

and better links with employers are needed. In this way, universities and employers will have a better understanding of the needs of each other and that the universities will be able to respond to the changing needs of knowledge-based society. The number of non-completions must be decreased as they constitute unfilled potential. Lifelong learning and equipping people with more and better skills is also seen as a vital university contribution to combating exclusion and poverty and to increasing social cohesion. Measures are needed in order for the knowledge economy to reduce, not to increase poverty and cohesion, and this is where education and universities have a special role to play.

In addition, the contribution expected of universities to lifelong learning strategies leads them gradually to widen the conditions of access to this area of tuition (in particular to allow access to those not coming through the route of upper secondary education, through better recognition of skills acquired outside university and outside formal education); to open up more to industry; to improve student services; and to diversify their range of training provision in terms of target groups, content and methods. (EUV1, 2003, 9)

Education and training are a structural means by which society can help its citizens to have equitable access to prosperity, democratic decision-making and individual socio-cultural development. Access to the updating of skills throughout their lives therefore becomes a key element in the fight against social exclusion, and in the promotion of equal opportunities in the widest sense. Education and training systems should aim to contribute to the creation of an inclusive society by ensuring that structures and mechanisms are in place to remove discrimination at all levels. Within this context, specific regard has to be paid to vulnerable groups such as people with special educational needs. (EUE1, 2001, 6)

The need for schools and training institutions to relate to the world of work is widely acknowledged. In the area of training, work placements are valuable in enhancing employability and in offering an insight into the world of work. Links with employers are also important, for example, in providing trainers with a perspective on future skill needs. (EUE1, 2001, 14)

The EU discourse therefore expects two parallel, yet possibly conflicting contributions from the universities. They need to be competitive and excellent, yet retain processes to ensure wide, fair and democratic access. They need to be international and yet contribute to the local and regional contexts. They need to ensure the competitiveness of the European Union vis-à-vis the other regions of the world, yet contribute to the internal equality, wellbeing and social cohesion of Europe.

It is crucially important to maintain and strengthen the excellence of teaching and research, without compromising the level of quality offered, while still ensuring broad, fair and democratic access. (EUV1, 2003, 6)

Research shows that there is no trade-off between efficiency and equity, because they are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing. Increasing access to education and training for all, including disadvantaged groups and older workers, will contribute to increasing the active population, which simultaneously promotes growth and reduces inequalities. (EUE6, 2005, 11)

7.4 The competition and competitiveness -discourse

Compared to the other two discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University, the competition and competitiveness -discourse is more utilitarian and emphasises how universities function in the innovation system, how internationalisation increases competitiveness of the country and the national higher education system, how universities educate future knowledge workers and how internationalisation is necessary in the context of competition for international knowledge workers. It has no specific sub-discourses but instead it addresses several related issues. The national discourse on competition and competitiveness addresses issues such as markets, tuition fees, competition and competitiveness, internationalisation, prerequisites of a competitive university, the competitiveness and reputation of Finland, research and innovation. The European discourse addresses fairly similar issues, namely competitiveness and attractiveness, university commitment and requirements, quality, structures, partnerships and cooperation, and research and innovation. Through these issues the discourse addresses the theme of the competitiveness of higher education, of an individual university, of an individual, of a country, the reputation of a university and a higher education system, of a country, of Europe and of the European higher education.

7.4.1 The competition, competitiveness and attractiveness

Competition is a complicated and manifold topic containing numerous issues, such as competition for funds, research funding, students, good teachers and the future labour force within and across borders. In the Finnish discourse international competition and cooperation are sometimes contrasted. An example of this comes from one speaker who presents the current decade as a decade of competition, but the previous one as a decade of cooperation. Cooperation and competition are also presented as going hand in hand, cooperation increases quality which increases competitiveness. On one

hand, competition is presented as unavoidable and Finland as being inherently part of that competition. On the other hand, competition is described as a difficult sport in which Finland is not experienced at it. Competition might even be presented as something that has already been lost. For instance, one interviewee argues that Europe is a big loser in the competition for higher education, both in science and in the university system. This great variety shows how manifold the meanings of competition and competitiveness are, many of which have already been illustrated in this and the previous chapter.

Yes, I mean Europe is a big loser in this international higher education competition. Europe has lost both the top place in science and in the university system to the USA. I don't know whether there is anyone in Europe who questions this defeat but at least in the international literature it is taken for granted that this has happened, and then of course that it is a part of this EU's big struggle for economic position compared to the USA and Japan, this creation of a university system (--)(U2, 7) (118)

The increase of this mystical competition in its many forms is a standard backgrounding element in the university documents and national documents, contributing to the taken for granted nature of the existence of competition and strengthening the legitimation of the University through its contribution to competitiveness. Globalisation, division of countries and individuals into winners and losers, internationalisation of business and labour markets, competition between universities, looming labour shortages, competition in the integrating labour markets and the diminishing public budgets are all part of the construction of competition as a reality. In this context, competitiveness of the national economy and national higher education system, as well as competitiveness of each university in the international higher education arena, and even the competitiveness of individuals in the labour market, are constructed as a framework condition for any university or higher education strategy. Universities, with their tasks of research, education and innovation are presented as a key factor in that quest for competitiveness. This is part of the construction of the narrative of the knowledge society and the survival of a "small country", in which knowledge gets constructed as a key to the national survival. This was also discussed under the previous discourse. Finland's survival and success depends on know-how and innovation; knowledge is a central production factor. The different ways of constructing this include the following.

International expertise is the basis of innovation, which produces good researchers and teachers for the university, and for society those who improve our national economy in the face of increasing international competition (UT3, 2001, 11) (119)

The goal is that universities should work efficiently as part for the Finnish research system. The research environments in universities will be internationally competitive and researcher training and researcher career prospects of a high standard. (DS5, 1999, 42) (120)

Finland must strengthen its international competitiveness in higher education and research, which is also part of its overall economic competitiveness. To succeed, it must take an active part in building up European higher education and research. (IS4, 2001, 2)

Europe must strengthen the three poles of its knowledge triangle: education, research and innovation. Universities are essential in all three. Investing more and better in the modernisation and quality of universities is a direct investment in the future of Europe and Europeans. (EUV3, 2005, 2)

The citizens of Europe are already among the best educated in the world and the European education and training systems rank among the best in the world. However, Europe should plan ahead to remain competitive on a global scale, including the use of the new ICTs. (EUE1, 2001, 5)

As was discussed above in the internationalisation as opening up of the country -discourse, the practical opening up of the country in terms of attracting foreign students, academics and other people, and facilitating their mobility and general immigration, is motivated in the interviews and university and national level documents with the competition and competitiveness -discourse. Internationalisation is needed because of labour shortage and increasing competition between universities; attracting international students and scholars increases quality and competitiveness of the university; internationalisation produces critical mass and access to larger research environment, and knowledge and professions are transferable, not only meant for use in Finland. Not internationalising, which is the case at the moment, is constructed in some cases as “falling behind”, which must be avoided. Attracting foreign talented people is also alternatively constructed as a selfish aim, but pardoned by arguing that global competition is always a bit selfish. By presenting internationalisation as a survival method, as one person so well summarised it: “internationalisation brings labour force which will keep us alive here”.

(--) and anyway, the thing is that Finland thinks that through internationalisation we'll get talented people who would then stay in Finland and there is this selfish aim (--) (U4, 4) (121)

The need to increase the international visibility and competitiveness of Finnish institutions of higher education is emerging in part from the existing shortage of labour in certain industries, which will worsen in some sectors. Attracting foreign students is one

way to increase the availability of labour, because study in Finland teaches students about the country and binds them more to the Finnish society and working life than other immigrants. (IS4, 2001, 19)

Universities must cater comprehensively for the education and training needs of society and labour market; they are the basis of society's competitiveness and welfare, and equal opportunity and competitiveness in Finnish education and training. Under the current internationalisation plan, the aim of Finland is that by 2010 it will have become a well-known and influential part of the European education and research area, will produce competitive knowledge, and will be a successful player in the global contest for skills. The main threats to the internationalisation of Finland's higher education system are presented in this document to be: not recognising this competitive position, not being able to attract foreign students and researchers, or losing its native students and academics abroad.

By 2010, Finland will be a well-known and influential part of the European education and research area, and a successful player in the global contest for skills. (IS4, 2001, 51)

The worst threat is probably that the competitive position of higher education is not recognized and the authorities are content with the present state of affairs. The threat has two aspects: first, Finland is not able to attract enough foreign students and researchers and second, it risks losing its own students and researchers, who will leave to study abroad. (IS4, 2001, 49)

In the European competition and competitiveness -discourse, the defining theme is the Lisbon agenda's co-opting of the notions of competitiveness and social cohesion and the emphasis that competitiveness and excellence must be balanced with social cohesion, strong civil society and access to education. Typical for this co-opting is that all other university activities are conceptualised through their contribution to the competitiveness/social cohesion -hybrid. This includes doctoral programmes, funding, governance structures and procedures and even the traditional values like the link between research and teaching, and other university-related aspirations such as increased access and the participation of women. The following quotes show that from the EU discourse, this has spread also to other European discourses.

Increasing the participation of women in research and teaching is essential in a competitive Europe. Gender equality promotes academic quality and universities must promote it through their human resource management policies. (EUA4, 2003, 9)

In facing the challenges of global competition the existence of high quality doctoral programmes becomes more and more crucial. The university, thanks to its pluridisciplinary teaching and learning environment, remains the natural location. (EUA6, 2002, 2)

While universities need to be encouraged to develop in different forms and to generate funds from a variety of sources, governments must empower institutions and strengthen their essential autonomy by providing stable legal and funding environments thus ensuring that universities have the capability to manage themselves in a dynamic way and the freedom to act to seize the opportunities that are offered to them. (EUA10, 2004, 3)

We note that the efforts to introduce structural change and improve the quality of teaching should not detract from the effort to strengthen research and innovation. We therefore emphasise the importance of research and research training in maintaining and improving the quality of and enhancing the competitiveness and attractiveness of the EHEA. (BD5, 2005, 3)

Another interesting feature is the co-opting of the competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education, in which competitiveness seems to refer to the ability to attract foreign students and researchers into European universities. The general aim is the increasing of international competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education. The extent of attractiveness of education and culture is presented as a sign of vitality and efficiency of any civilisation and in the European context also linked with the idea of the proud history and traditions of Europe, which the contemporary attractiveness of higher education should match. This seems to be drawing in a subtle way from the idea of the medieval European universities and their world-wide (i.e. Europe) attractiveness at the time. The European higher education area, with its emphasis of converging higher education systems, readable and comparable degree structures and the introduction of transparency measures is also often represented as a condition for competitiveness and attractiveness. These notions are used especially by the EUA and Bologna Process, as shown below.

We must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions. (BD2, 1999, 2)

Europe's universities are not sufficiently funded and cannot be expected to compete with other systems without comparable levels of funding. (EUA5, 2005, 5)

In order to realise these ambitious goals it is important to ensure that universities, as a unique space for basic research, are able to work in a long-term perspective. Governments and universities alike must be committed to the long-term vision of a Europe of Knowledge based upon university based research and innovation. (EUA10, 2004, 3)

Ministers emphasized that for greater flexibility in learning and qualification processes the adoption of common cornerstones of qualifications, supported by a credit system such as the ECTS or one that is ECTS-compatible, providing both transferability and accumulation functions, is necessary. Together with mutually recognized quality assurance systems such arrangements will facilitate students' access to the European labour market and enhance the compatibility, attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education. The generalized use of such a credit system and of the Diploma Supplement will foster progress in this direction. (BD3, 2001, 2)

Ministers agreed on the importance of enhancing attractiveness of European higher education to students from Europe and other parts of the world. The readability and comparability of European higher education degrees world-wide should be enhanced by the development of a common framework of qualifications, as well as by coherent quality assurance and accreditation/certification mechanisms and by increased information efforts. (BD3, 2001,3)

Ministers will make the necessary effort to make European Higher Education Institutions an even more attractive and efficient partner. Therefore Ministers ask Higher Education Institutions to increase the role and relevance of research to technological, social and cultural evolution and to the needs of society. (BD4, 2003, 7)

7.4.2 Competitiveness and commitment of a university

What then increases the competitiveness of an individual university? Internationalisation and being an attractive work and study place for foreigners naturally is one of them, and will be dealt with in more detail later on. Quality is another important factor, and operating at the forefront of science and education. Profiling, partnerships with businesses, statutory autonomy and size are represented as offering competitive advantage, as well an open attitude, entrepreneurship, flexibility, efficiency, ethics, and a modern and open information environment. This theme is closely linked to the rethinking of the university -discourse, as it functions as an obligation for the rethinking of the university. The following quote is one example on how this sentiment can be constructed:

The starting point of Hanken's strategy is that its statutory autonomy and present size offer clear competitive advantages for its ability to meet new challenges. It is easier to

conduct open debate on reform needs and plans in a relatively small organisation, and the implementation of the selected strategy is also easier. Research and education of high quality is the major factor with which we can improve our competitive edge. The quality of the operations must be assessed regularly and critically. (--) An open attitude towards the surrounding world has traditionally been one of our advantages, when compared with our domestic competitors. One of the main reasons for this has been our language, Swedish, which naturally facilitates contacts with other Scandinavian countries. (HA1, 2003, 4)

In the face of competition, the discourse assigns universities a set of requirements and tasks, more explicit than the general notions that universities are a key to the competitiveness of the nation and that their task is to educate a skilled labour force for the knowledge based society. In order to attract students, they must create short attractive international degrees, ensure that the teachers have adequate proficiency in English, and also reconsider their admission systems. The competitiveness discourse maintains that the university should aim to get degree students who can study in English rather than in the national languages. This was emphasised by the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse. It is also important to provide Finnish students what they need; if the active and internationally oriented Finnish students feel that they are not getting the required skills in Finland, they will choose to go abroad to study instead. This is explicit in the following quotes, and is also implied in many documents:

Now as this student mobility is hopefully on the increase, and studying for a degree is also internationalising so that people come here more and also go elsewhere to study significant parts of the degree, or even the entire degree, then I think that we need, for instance, to scrutinise the admissions systems. (--) If you and go to study in France freely and mobility increases, then sooner or later there may be voices asking why can't I get into a Finnish university to study. (N2, 12) (122)

Yeah, then another reason why a huge number of good students are leaving Finland is that we don't have good enough universities. Maybe the question is partly one of image or that we don't have universities with a good enough of image, but also that one can't get such international training with us, which some people seek for their working life, by going into some more international and more prestigious university to study. Not all leavers are those who haven't made it into the university of their choice in Finland, whose parents are so rich they can send them abroad. Not all leavers are those but there are really these goal-oriented leavers and we should be able to give them more. (U2, 2) (123)

But in the struggle for an internationally acknowledged position, universities are sometimes presented as requiring tools other than student exchange or even foreign students in degree education. In order to attract researchers and other international experts, the universities need to be attractive environments, with an appealing career

structure and salary system. The university also must have a specific profile or identity. As one interviewee presented this idea, if the main task of university is research and innovation, that does not require a big system but small centres of excellence and strong internationality. The university needs to be aware of its strengths and to have a realistic picture of its abilities. Another interviewee argued that faculties also need to profile themselves and act as the faculties of a European research university. Universities also need to participate in international consortia between universities, yet have to be selective in forming networks.

In the European discourse, exemplified by the EU and EUA quotes below, competitiveness and attractiveness are also presented as requiring measures related to funding, quality assurance and increased partnerships and cooperation. More sustainable funding, including increased private funding, is called for; the universities must also convince stakeholders that existing resources are spent efficiently in order to qualify for new investment.

European higher education institutions accept the challenges of operating in a competitive environment at home, in Europe and in the world, but to do so they need the necessary managerial freedom, light and supportive regulatory frameworks and fair financing, or they will be placed at a disadvantage in cooperation and competition. (EUA3, 2001, 7)

Europe's universities are not sufficiently funded and cannot be expected to compete with other systems without comparable levels of funding. (EUA5, 2005, 5)

To attract more funding, universities first need to convince stakeholders - governments, companies, households – that existing resources are efficiently used and fresh ones would produce added value for them. Higher funding cannot be justified without profound change: providing for such change is the main justification and prime purpose for fresh investment. (EUA3, 2005, 8)

Additional funding should primarily provide incentives and means to those universities (they exist in every system) and to those groups/individuals (they exist in each university) that are willing and able to innovate, reform and deliver high quality in teaching, research and services. This requires more competition-based funding in research and more output-related funding in education. (EUA3, 2005, 8)

In terms of quality, it is presented as a key to trust, relevance, mobility and attractiveness, and the promotion of excellence through targeted networking activities. The need to increase the numbers of excellent universities, and not to concentrate all resources on few top universities is also mentioned. Whereas the vocabulary of excellence is also part of the traditional science and knowledge -discourse, it has taken on a special flavour in the competition and competitiveness -discourse. Instead of being just excellence

within the framework and institutions of science, excellence seems to be presented as a wider responsibility. The universities are repeatedly presented as aiming for a top international standard, which seems to be assuming that there is such a thing as an international standard, and that it is higher than the national one. It is also seen as a variable standard and that the Finnish universities must be at the top end. The notion of creating and supporting centres of excellence is presented frequently, although otherwise the excellence discourse is more present in the European discourse, especially in the European documents.

It is crucially important to maintain and strengthen the excellence of teaching and research, without compromising the level of quality offered, while still ensuring broad, fair and democratic access. (EUV1, 2003, 6)

To promote excellence, however, it is also necessary to ensure a sufficient level of competition between private and public research operators. Schemes to finance centres of excellence on the basis of competition have been put in place in several Member States. This formula could be applied to the European level, with collaboration between the Commission and the Member States. (EUR1, 2000, 10)

In terms of partnerships, certain requirements are presented both for universities and for the rest of society. Universities must increase cooperation and strategic partnerships in general as they bring in economies of scale, strengthen partnerships with local industry, and contribute to local competitiveness and cohesion. The EU discourse presents this theme widely:

Universities' contribution to the creation and dissemination of knowledge throughout the Union must be reinforced. The Commission will come forward with ideas on how to increase their potential and quality in research, science in order to be more attractive and build better links with industry. The Commission will also propose guidelines to improve their research collaboration and technology transfer with industry. It will address the question of how to enable European universities to compete internationally. In many ways, the existing approaches to financing, governance and quality are proving inadequate to meet the challenge of what has become a global market for academics, students and knowledge itself. (EUL4, 2005, 23)

Co-operation between universities and industry needs to be intensified at national and regional level, as well as geared more effectively towards innovation, the start-up of new companies and, more generally, the transfer and dissemination of knowledge. From a competitiveness perspective it is vital that knowledge flows from universities into business and society. (EUV1, 2003, 7)

The Communication tries to look at the issue of investment in education and training from a broad perspective, paying attention in particular to the research and lifelong learning dimensions and to the European Employment Strategy. It starts by exploring the relevance and contribution of education to core elements of the Lisbon strategy, such as sustainable growth, competitiveness, R&D and innovation, the creation of more and better jobs, social inclusion and active citizenship and regional policies. The new investment paradigm in education and training will be shaped by factors such as the new requirements of the knowledge society, globalisation, EU enlargement and unfavourable demographic trends. In view of these factors, the challenge to be met will be even more considerable than envisaged in Lisbon. Many regions and several countries of the current and the future EU need to overcome massive challenges for Europe to reach the Lisbon goals. (EUE3, 2003, 3)

Partnership working has been identified as a critical factor for motivation, openness, relevance and quality of education in a lifelong learning perspective. Partnerships involving private financial contributors may also have the potential to encourage more responsible behaviour of students, families and educational staff, and may thus enhance the efficiency of overall spending. This should however under no circumstances be allowed to restrict access for learners from less favoured backgrounds. (EUE3, 2003, 21)

In order to make the European Union the leading knowledge-based economy in the world, there is an urgent need to invest more, and more efficiently and effectively in human resources. This involves a higher level of public sector investment in key areas for the knowledge society and, where appropriate, a higher level of private investment, particularly in higher education, adult education and continuing vocational training. Community funding, including the structural funds and the education and training programmes, should have an increasing role to play in supporting the development of human capital. (EUE5, 2003, 4)

The EUA discourse constructs another variation of the theme: all stakeholders need to agree on shared long terms goals and the role of university, and the universities need to pursue European objectives while at the same time strengthening international cooperation world wide.

The EUA wishes to underline the key role of the institution “university” in these endeavours, and encourages the Heads of Government to make more systematic use of this resource in the important process of consolidating and strengthening Europe’s position in the perspective of a global competitive world, and in the creation of a European Area of Knowledge. (EUA6, 2002, 1)

In order to realise these ambitious goals it is important to ensure that universities, as a unique space for basic research, are able to work in a long-term perspective. Governments

and universities alike must be committed to the long-term vision of a Europe of Knowledge based upon university based research and innovation. (EUA10, 2004, 3)

While universities need to be encouraged to develop in different forms and to generate funds from a variety of sources, governments must empower institutions and strengthen their essential autonomy by providing stable legal and funding environments thus ensuring that universities have the capability to manage themselves in a dynamic way and the freedom to act to seize the opportunities that are offered to them. (EUA10, 2004, 3)

As higher education is presented as an investment in the future and the genuinely competitive knowledge-based economy is pictured as a condition that can only be achieved with the full participation and engagement of universities, the universities need to be adequately and fairly funded in order to compete in the international arena. They need to be empowered and have more autonomy. They need managerial freedom and light frameworks. Finally, they need to be involved in all discussions concerning the future of European education.

Europe must strengthen the three poles of its knowledge triangle: education, research and innovation. Universities are essential in all three. Investing more and better in the modernisation and quality of universities is a direct investment in the future of Europe and Europeans. (EUA3, 2005, 2)

European higher education institutions accept the challenges of operating in a competitive environment at home, in Europe and in the world, but to do so they need the necessary managerial freedom, light and supportive regulatory frameworks and fair financing, or they will be placed at a disadvantage in cooperation and competition. (EUA3, 2001, 7)

Spreading knowledge through high quality education system is the best way of guaranteeing the long-term competitiveness of the Union. In particular, the Union must ensure that our universities can compete with the best in the World through the completion of the European Higher Education Area. (EUA4, 2005, 9)

The universities have also expressed their commitment to the goals of the European research and higher education areas and the the related objectives of increased competitiveness. A good example of this is the EUA discourse, below. The universities are presented as being active on a global scale, willing to concentrate and focus their efforts through enhanced cooperation with various partners, willing to accept accountability and efficiency claims, and committed to improving governing structures and management in order to be more efficient and innovative and to achieve multiple missions. Finally, their diversification and competitiveness is balanced with inter-institutional cooperation and commitment to quality.

Universities are committed to improving their governing structures and leadership competence so as to increase their efficiency and innovative capacity and to achieve their multiple missions. (EUA5, 2005, 2)

Universities are developing differentiated missions and profiles to address the challenges of global competition while maintaining a commitment to access and social cohesion. Diversification and greater competition are balanced by inter-institutional cooperation based on a shared commitment to quality. (EUA5, 2005, 2)

(--) universities are engaged in knowledge transfer as full partners in the innovative process; – universities' willingness to focus and concentrate their efforts through enhanced cooperation and networking among themselves and with business, industry and other partners. (EUA10, 2004, 2)

The EU discourse presents a gloomier picture: European universities are currently not faring well in competition, the environment offered by them is less attractive, and the financial, material and working conditions or career prospects poorer than those of their US counterparts.

It then identifies a number of common signs of inefficiencies in expenditure (high failure, dropout and graduate unemployment rates, excessive duration of studies, low attainment levels) and their possible sources, with a view to inciting Member States to address these factors and to measure their incremental costs. The need for the efficient management of resources (through educational decentralisation, partnership approaches and better coordinated action) and the indispensable role of national and European benchmarks are also underlined. (EUE3, 2003, 3)

Since 2000, as far as total investment in key knowledge-economy sectors are concerned, the gap has not narrowed between Europe and competitor countries such as the United States. Some Asian countries such as China and India are catching up fast. (EUE6, 2005, 4)

The EU discourse is a kind of *citius, altius, fortius*²⁵ -discourse, of doing this better, cheaper, more efficiently. The following quote is a good representation of this. What is required is better organisation of research, more coordination and greater efficiency of investment in education and research. The discourse relies on the extremes. It is, for instance, stated by the European Union that Europe needs excellence in universities to underpin the knowledge society and to reach the Lisbon goals, and that Europe's aim is to become a world reference point in higher education by 2010 and the most favoured destination of students from all over the world.

25. The Olympic motto: Swifter, higher, stronger.

Making Europe a worldwide reference for the quality and relevance of its education programmes and institutions implies specific action and investment. It is a highly ambitious target for the current EU, and even more so for the enlarged Union. Initiatives such as Erasmus-World and the introduction of common visa policies for non-EU students and trainees, combined with similar action in the area of research, have the potential to enhance the image of Europe worldwide as a destination for students, scholars and researchers. However, lasting success in this area will depend on curricular renovation, the establishment of an understandable, coherent qualifications framework, and the promotion of European institutions and degrees throughout the world. Of course, European degrees are unlikely to be better recognised in the wider world, and the world is unlikely to see Europe as a reference, as long as Europeans themselves do not cross-recognise their own degrees. (EUE3, 2003, 24)

7.4.3 Higher education markets and tuition fees

One of the predominant features of the competition and competitiveness -discourse in the interviews and to some extent in the national documents is the “taken for granted” nature of the existence of international markets in higher education. Countries try to attract international students or to sell their education outright, although there is some dispute as to whether and how Finland should be participating in these markets.

On the one hand, international markets are constructed as a part of the competitiveness and presented as inevitability, and as something bringing more resources to the national higher education and for the universities. On the other hand, the principles of the Nordic welfare state are evoked and higher education treated as a basic right. It is argued that one must consider whether it fits the other tasks of the university or the national and international roles and images.

(--) especially now that the education markets internationally, or the volume increases then it is perfectly obvious that either the university wants to be there in the international markets or then not. (U3, 2) (124)

It is also argued that the discussion on internationalisation and markets in Finland is important because other countries are participating in them and because the volume of international markets is said to be on the increase. In some interviews, higher education is presented as a line of business which is overlooked in Finland. Because of the participation of other countries in the markets, and as the cross-border supply of education increases, it will also increase in Finland. It is therefore important for Finland to consolidate its position in international education markets. Active participation in the HE market is seen as a challenge which requires that Finnish universities have the same possibility to operate in international markets as universities in other countries.

This implies the introduction of tuition fees. This notion is presented in the interviews and in some national documents, but not yet in the university documents, indicating its previously very sensitive nature in the Finnish discussion.

International competition for talented students, teachers and researchers is gaining momentum while Europe is pooling resources with a view to strengthening its impact on the global level. Finland must provide its own education and research system with conditions which enable it to operate on an equal footing with others. (DS6, 2003, 13)

Markets also refer to marketing and it is, for instance, stated that activities to “market education” jointly in cooperation between higher education institutions are already established in the Capital region. In addition to these, a counter-discourse adverse to markets also exists. This was demonstrated by one interviewee arguing that in selling education, the content is decided by the market, not by the interests of the research or the university, that it is better to stop and think whether markets fit the real university functions, and by categorising some small market-based universities not as “real” universities. The notion of markets is also evoked when calling for more room for operation for the universities: increasing competition entails universities responding flexibly to changes in the markets. This is related to the theme that regulations must be somehow changed in order for universities to be able to become market operators.

As the international competition is increasing all the time, it is necessary that the higher education institutions retain the ability to react speedily and flexibly, also to the changes in the international education markets. (IS5, 2005, 31) (125)

Tuition fees are integrally related to the last point. They are alternatively presented as going against the University idea, or presented in a disinterested, distance and technical manner, as a mere technicality, or as being crucial for facilitating the participation of the Finnish universities in the international arena, and indeed for the internationalisation in general. One speaker pointedly asks “Do we really want to sell our education?”, whereas another one argues that tuition fees are a taboo issue in Finland, but that Finland cannot keep on providing free education everyone. In this remark, the tuition fees are construed as a necessity.

(--) this issue [tuition fees] is taboo with us, tuition fees can't be discussed but I think that this discussion will be started sooner or later, society is just developing in the direction that we can't give all free goods limitlessly to everyone. (U1, 8) (126)

Surely we don't see selling education as a kind of competitive factor or a prerequisite for the survival of the universities. We do have areas of strength and if we think that ok, we could for instance arrange a programme then I can see that the first thing which comes to

mind is who do we do that with, on the national, the Nordic scene, the European scene, or whatever. But then there is of course the one big question, because here in the Nordic countries education is seen as a constitutional right (--) (U6, 5) (127)

The following quotes show how tuition fees are an emerging issue in the Finnish discourse. Tuition fees are presented as one way of financing internationalisation. It is implied that there is no point in small Finland marketing a “free good” or educating foreign students for free. The universities are euphemistically presented as being in an unfavourable situation, because they lack the necessary mechanisms to export a good “product”. Tuition fees are presented as a new opportunity for universities in the world of diminishing public budgets and a means to national survival, and that “we have to use all honest means and find new lines of business so that we can keep on living here.” Tuition fees are also implicitly presented as beneficial for the development cooperation and capacity building, as it is argued that instead of thinking of foreign students only as a future labour force, Finland can also educate foreign students to return to their own country, and, in this context, tuition fees are implied to be a prerequisite for this. Even though the majority of this construction of the necessity of having tuition fees occurs in the interviews, fees do not go without a response in the national policy documents. It is stated that Finland must respond to increasing international demand for education and that as the Finnish Higher education institutions cannot take full advantage of education markets because of the current regulations, it diminishes the attractiveness and visibility of Finnish education on a global scale. Allowing fees would increase the ability to participate in international markets and fees could improve funding. Universities need more resources for developing international activities and they need the same opportunities to operate as the higher education institutions in other countries.

This, of course, this a question of chargeability, it is, as is of course understood, nationally, the national welfare thinking is that this degree, and education right up to a profession, is tuition free. It is a good principle to be cherished but that little Finland would start educating foreigners is another problem and how this will be solved. (U4, 3) (128)

(--) if one sees education as a line of business, we have education markets, then in Finland we don't have the mechanisms to export this product, this education product (--) (U3, 5) (129)

And that [participating in education markets, TN] in this world of diminishing public budgets, it is one of the few promising opportunities for the university to save itself, that it can arrange both more funding and international teachers by participating in those international markets. (U2, 4) (130)

The situation is very complicated from the perspective of Finland's internationalisation objectives, as the master's programmes accepted for the Erasmus Mundus Programme are used in marketing as a kind of quality projects in European higher education. If the Finnish higher education institutions can't participate fully in the programme due to lack of funding, it detracts from the visibility and attractiveness of Finnish education on the global level. (IS5, 2005, 11) (131)

Allowing institutions to charge fees would enhance Finland's opportunities to participate in the international higher education markets and in capitalising on Finnish know-how. (IS5, 2005, 28) (132)

In light of the analysis, the committee considers that the developing of the international activities of the higher education institutions and increasing foreign student intake as decided by the Council of State entail that considerable further resources can be allocated for these activities. Strengthening the competitiveness of Finnish higher education institutions on the international higher education markets entails that the higher education institution should have equal opportunities to operate internationally like the higher education institutions in other EU Member States. The universities and polytechnics have plenty of international level competencies, which should be better utilised. Finland must, for its own part, be able to respond to the increasing international demand for education. (IS5, 2005, 20) (133)

However, tuition fees are clearly a sensitive issue in Finnish higher education policy. They are often only implied in interviews and documents, and when explicitly argued for, they are presented as a technicality, as a logical conclusion or even apologised for. The idea of higher education as a public good which thus should be free, has perhaps been so strong in Finland that those daring to present any sort of argument in favour of tuition fees, are at the same time hedging themselves for a fear of attack.²⁶

7.4.4 Research and innovation

Other elements in the discourse of competition and competitiveness include research and innovation, quality and excellence and lifelong learning, skills and employability. Research and innovation are conceptualised in two main ways in the context of the competition and competitiveness -discourse. The first of them is related to the need to strengthen research and to raise its quality and competitiveness through further

²⁶ The interviewees seemed to have this complicated relationship with tuition fees, whereas policy document rarely even mention them. However, the political discourse has rapidly changed in the past two years, the government has changed and in the Autumn 2007, it was suggested that universities should be given right to provide fee-based degree education for the citizens of non-EU countries. One suspects that had interviews and policy documents been collected in October 2007, they might have provided somewhat different views.

investment, EU cooperation and scientific international cooperation, which is presented as being inherent to high quality research. The second one is related to research in general strengthening the national competitiveness and presents universities as having an important task for developing and widening the knowledge and production base and innovation system. Both are typical across a large scale of empirical data:

International expertise is the basis of innovation which produces good researchers and teachers for the university, and for society those who increase our national economy in the face of intensifying international competition (UT3, 2001, 11) (134)

Higher education and research are crucial to an effective national innovation system. (DS5, 1999, 36) (135)

Scientific research and technological development more particularly are at the heart of what makes society tick. More and more, activities undertaken in this domain are for the express purpose of meeting a social demand and satisfying social needs, especially in connection with the evolution of work and the emergence of new ways of life and activities. By creating new products, processes and markets research and technology provide one of the principal driving forces of economic growth, competitiveness and employment. They are the best way of modernising European companies, which Europe must do to improve its competitive position. In overall terms, both directly and indirectly, they help to maintain and develop employment. (EUR1, 2000, 5)

A special sub-theme of this is the contribution of universities to the regional innovation system and the long term positive effects for the regional economy and welfare and the structural development of business and employment in the region. In the Finnish context, the capital region is especially conceptualised as a *primus motor* or a locomotive for the development of the international competitiveness of the entire country. The regional innovation system theme recurs in some university documents and in most of the national and EU documents, but it was contested in some of the interviews.

The universities have major challenges ahead as the dependence of the Finnish national economy on the world economy increases and the universities operate more and more as engines of the development of their own region. They must ensure their ability to respond rapidly and creatively to the challenges in their operating environment and in the development of science. (UT1, 2001, 1) (136)

The main objective of the higher education institutions in the Helsinki region is to create prerequisites for the international competitiveness and balanced social development of the region and the nation. (RM1, 2005, 3) (137)

(--) how to make universities contribute better to local and regional needs and strategies
(--)(Euu1, 2003, 2)

In the European Union discourse, the research and innovation are presented as vital, but also as requiring serious rethinking and further investment. As research and development have a key role in the competitiveness of Europe, they must be integrated and coordinated and made more efficient and innovative. Obstacles to the mobility of researchers must be removed and it must be ensured that Europe offers attractive prospects for the best brains. Measures are needed to integrate innovation within the European knowledge area better: intellectual property rights, investment and the use of risk capital in research, networking between industry and research actors, and networking of universities and research institutes must all be improved.

To be a genuinely competitive, knowledge-based economy, Europe must become better at producing knowledge through research, at diffusing it through education and at applying it through innovation. (EUR4, 2005, 3)

This “knowledge triangle” of research, education and innovation functions best when the accompanying framework conditions reward the knowledge that is put to work to the benefit of the economy and society. (EUR4, 2005, 3)

All this would remedy R&D deficiencies. R&D and innovation efforts need a significant boost to bridge the gap between the EU and its major competitors. R&D investment should amount to 3% of the GDP, with two thirds coming from the private sector. The new framework programme will boost industry competitiveness. Other measures are also mentioned: establishing a future European research council composed of world class experts, which selects research projects and programmes based on excellence. A European institute of technology is envisioned as a means for attracting the best minds, ideas and companies from around the world. Profiling is needed to find areas in which universities can achieve excellence at the European or international levels.

In order to close the gap between the EU and its major competitors, there must be a significant boost of the overall R&D and innovation effort in the Union, with a particular emphasis on frontier technologies. The European Council therefore: agrees that overall spending on R&D and innovation in the Union should be increased with the aim of approaching 3% of GDP by 2010. Two-thirds of this new investment should come from the private sector; (EUL3, 2002, 20)

7.4.5 Constituting the competitive knowledge society's ideal university and ideal citizen

Quite typical for the competition and competitiveness -discourse in general is the idea that the legitimation of the university lies in the extremes and idealisations of the contribution: the ideal university being one of excellence, and the ideal citizen being one attuned to continuous learning. The legitimacy therefore needs to be gained over and over again through more, better, faster, cheaper and more efficient and effective performance.

The themes of the ideal university and ideal citizen of a competitive knowledge society are present especially in the European level documents, most prominently in those of the European Union. However, as a conformist feature also in the Bologna Process and EUA documents, as well as presented in several of the discourses of internationalisation, is a construction of a kind of ideal university of the knowledge society. These themes also go across the other themes mentioned above, and are not limited to the content discourses of internationalisation, but are also related to the legitimation of the University institution in the knowledge society. Due to their important role vis-à-vis the governmentality theory, they deserve to be mentioned on their own. Although they are discussed in the context of the competition and competitiveness -discourse, this wide background theme is present also in two of the content discourses, the individual growth discourse and the rethinking of the university discourse respectively.

Within the context of the competition and competitiveness -discourse, the ideal university represents the outcome of the rethinking of the university, and the idea citizen a product of the instrumental individual growth, prompted by the rethought university.

Europe's education and training systems need to adapt both to the demands of the knowledge society and to the need for an improved level and quality of employment. They will have to offer learning and training opportunities tailored to target groups at different stages of their lives: young people, unemployed adults and those in employment who are at risk of seeing their skills overtaken by rapid change. This new approach should have three main components: the development of local learning centres, the promotion of new basic skills, in particular in the information technologies, and increased transparency of qualifications. (EUL2, 2000, 8)

Given that they live thanks to substantial public and private funding, and that the knowledge they produce and transmit has a major impact on the economy and society, universities are also accountable for the way they operate and manage their activities and budgets to their sponsors and to the public. This leads to increasing pressure to incorporate representatives of the non-academic world within universities' management and governance structures. (EUV1, 2003, 5)

If universities are to become more attractive locally and globally, profound curricular revision is required – not just to ensure the highest level of academic content, but also to respond to the changing needs of labour markets. The integration of graduates into professional life, and hence into society, is a major social responsibility of higher education. Learning needs to encompass transversal skills (such as teamwork and entrepreneurship) in addition to specialist knowledge. European and interdisciplinary aspects need to be strengthened. The potential of ICT should be fully exploited in teaching/learning, including for lifelong learning. The bachelor-master divide allows more diverse programme profiles and learning methods (e.g. research-based learning and ICT delivery). (EUV3, 2005, 5)

The universities must act responsibly, adapt to changes in society and in the labour market, and take the views of the stakeholders into account better. They must have more relevance, accountability and dialogue with the community, and form more partnerships with industry and the labour market, especially at the regional and local levels in order to increase competitiveness and contribution to society. They must become more competitive, attractive, excellent and high quality. They have to be willing to innovate and to be more enterprising. Their growing role in the innovation system requires quality and efficiency, networking and better research and research training facilities. They must also respond to the special needs of immigrants. They must secure adequate funding, including from private sources, and use them efficiently. They need more efficient leadership and management and better governance combined with more autonomy.

Universities' contribution to the creation and dissemination of knowledge throughout the Union must be reinforced. The Commission will come forward with ideas on how to increase their potential and quality in research, science in order to be more attractive and build better links with industry. The Commission will also propose guidelines to improve their research collaboration and technology transfer with industry. It will address the question of how to enable European universities to compete internationally. In many ways, the existing approaches to financing, governance and quality are proving inadequate to meet the challenge of what has become a global market for academics, students and knowledge itself. (EUV4, 2005, 23)

The changing role of universities as sellers of education must also be taken into account by university profiling, increasing the diversity of what is on offer, and by strengthening their business know-how. In terms of the European cooperation, the Bologna process and quality assurance systems, universities must be committed to them, play an active role in the process keeping quality and employability in mind, and be attractive, efficient and high quality in all their operations.

If they are to play their full role in the creation of a Europe of knowledge, European universities must, with the help of the Member States and in a European context, rise to a number of challenges. They can only release their potential by undergoing the radical changes needed to make the European system a genuine world reference. There are three objectives to be pursued simultaneously: ensuring that European universities have sufficient and sustainable resources and use them efficiently; consolidating their excellence in research and in teaching, particularly through networking; opening up universities to a greater extent to the outside and increasing their international attractiveness. (EUV1, 2003, 11)

The competitiveness discourse also seems to construct the image of an ideal citizen of the knowledge society: an active, internationally oriented, entrepreneurial individual, who is keen to learn and develop him/herself throughout their entire life. This image is implicit rather than explicit, but the discourse, especially of the European Union, provides copious lists of the characteristics EU citizens should possess. Similarly, describing a set of rights people are entitled to might equally represent a set of obligations. Empowerment could be seen as an obligation, a mechanism of governing the individual.

(--) it is a huge change, that soon it begins to be a discriminating factor if it [international experience, TN] are lacking, it is no longer a value added but the lack of it is a minus, that the young people have so much experience. (N3, 9) (138)

Making learning attractive throughout life means, first of all, making learning relevant for the individual. Everyone needs to understand, from an early age, the importance of education and training throughout life. Education and training systems have a major role to play here, but families, local communities and employers must play an important role too if learning is to become part of everyone's activity. Learning needs to be made attractive if the higher employment rates sought are to be combined with the higher skills levels needed. If people do not see the value to themselves of continuing to learn, they will never make the effort needed and the rise in skills levels that the knowledge society demands as foreseen by the Lisbon European Council will not be reached. (EUE2, 2002, 28)

Education and training should provide an understanding of the value of enterprise, as well as models of successful entrepreneurship, of the value of risk-taking and of the need for everyone to have a sense of initiative. The changes in society and the economy that the knowledge society will bring, and the existing trend towards a services-based economy, will give the opportunity to millions of individuals to start their own business, and this should be seen by students as a viable career option. Over recent years the importance of developing new forms of business has been recognised, often based on the needs of local communities. Developing the spirit of enterprise is important for individuals, for economy and for society at large. (EUE2, 2002, 34)

In a knowledge-based society, people must continue to update and improve their competences and qualifications, and make use of the widest possible range of learning settings. (EUE5, 2003, 20)

The EU documents typically talk about the “new basic skills”, which include vocational and technical skills, IT skills, languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills, being able to work together and being active citizens. These also need to be proved by diplomas and by producing certain qualifications and competencies. The new society requires these skills and they are needed in order to enhance Europe’s potential. They benefit civilisation, genuine European citizenship and employability.

The basic skills which society requires education and training to deliver are those which give an individual a secure foundation for life and work. They thus cover the vocational and technical skills, as well as social and personal competencies, including awareness of arts and culture, which enable people to work together and be active citizens. The increased pace of change in society and in the economy, in particular the introduction of the ICTs, requires us to keep the definition of relevant skills under review, to adapt it to those changes on a regular basis and to make sure that those who left formal education or training before the new skills were widely taught, have a chance to acquire them later. (EUE1, 2001, 8)

A European framework should define the new basic skills to be provided through lifelong learning: IT skills, foreign languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills; a European diploma for basic IT skills, with decentralised certification procedures, should be established in order to promote digital literacy throughout the Union (EUL2, 2000, 9)

Part III

University, discourses and the knowledge society

– Chapter 8 –

Conclusions and discussion

8.1 Research results

The aim of this thesis was to discover the kinds of discourse used in policy documents produced by European and Finnish universities and by central Finnish higher education actors to describe the internationalisation of higher education. Through these specific examples it was hoped that further insights could be gained into the way in which the understandings about the roles and tasks of the University as a social institution are played out in the wider context of the competitive knowledge society in Finland and in the European higher education arena. At the beginning of this thesis, the following three research questions were presented.

1. What kinds of discourse are used to describe the internationalisation of higher education and the role of the University in the Finnish and European Union higher education arena?
2. Is there one dominant discourse, or do several equally strong discourses exist?
3. How do the discourses of internationalisation constitute the changing University institution in the competitive knowledge society?

A set of discourse analytical strategies was used in analysing the empirical data, and institutional theory and governmentality theory were utilised in making sense of the University as a social institution and the competitive knowledge society as a dominant political rationality, and the way these two “framework conditions” relate to the analysed discourses of internationalisation and higher education. The third context, within which the analysis of the Finnish data is located, has the narrative of Finland’s history and its survival as a “small country”. In this final chapter, I will present my answers to the research questions, as well as discuss them in the wider perspective of governmentality in a competitive knowledge society. The chapter is divided into three

parts. In the first part (8.1), I will reiterate the six discourses identified in the course of the analysis, their evolution through time and their strategic use by the different higher education policy actors. In the second part (8.2), I will discuss the change of the University as a social institution in the context of a competitive knowledge society in general and Finland in particular as exemplified by the discourses. Finally, in the third part (8.3), I will set the discourses into a wider context of power and government in the knowledge society.

8.1.1 Discourses of Internationalisation and the University

Trying to define the internationalisation of higher education, to distinguish it from globalisation of higher education or the Europeanisation of higher education, to make a distinction between old and new internationalisation, between cooperative and competitive internationalisation, or internationalisation on institutional and national level, has been the objective of several higher education researchers in the past decade. (See e.g. Källemark and van der Wende 1997, van der Wende 2001, Huisman & van der Wende 2004a, Trondal et al. 2001, Knight 2004, Teichler 2004). The representation of internationalisation as a change of the University and as responsiveness of the University to its changing context represented in most of the previous definitions of internationalisation was the starting point of my research. Following the manifold reality of the processes and practices of internationalisation of higher education, its discursive representation is far from being a single uniform discourse, but instead it consists of several discourses, which are further divided into different viewpoints or sub-discourses. My aim was to highlight the multitude of different ways of constituting and constructing internationalisation and university, while also providing space for discussing possible hegemonic nature of some of them. The analysis of the empirical data of my research led me to identify and articulate six discourses, three of them describing internationalisation and three more generally the legitimating ideas of the University.

The Internationalisation discourses answer the question of what internationalisation of higher education is and what its consequences are from the perspective of the individual, the university and the country, be that Finland or in a wider sense, Europe. The three Internationalisation discourses can be named as internationalisation as the individual growth -discourse, internationalisation as the rethinking of the university -discourse and internationalisation as the opening up of the country -discourse. They portray internationalisation as a positive process encountered and engaged in by the universities and individuals, as well as a set of activities by individuals, universities and national and international level actors. It is seen both as an inevitable result of the changing context of higher education and as a conscious response to it. The discourses present internationalisation as an obligation for students and academics, for

the universities and for policy makers alike, and motivate this obligation with calls for more responsiveness at the face of a changing society and labour market. Yet, at the same time, some of the discourses evoke more traditional images of internationality as a fundamental core of the traditional university activities, learning and science, or the notions of universities' global responsibility and solidarity.

The internationalisation as individual growth -discourse portrays internationalisation of higher education as resulting in a process of personal growth and professional empowerment of the individual, be they students or staff in higher education, as result of international experiences, or, alternatively, as being required by the internationalising working life. In line with this division, the discourse consists of two different, although complementary, sub-discourses, a philosophical one and an instrumental one. The philosophical sub-discourse emphasises the benefits of international experience gained through studying, working and living abroad or in an international environment at home. The benefits include tolerance, multiculturality, wider understanding, tacit knowledge and useful international academic contacts. The instrumental sub-discourse on the other hand emphasised the more direct benefits and demands of internationalisation, the skills and capacities acquired as a result of internationalisation, the usefulness of the international experiences for future employability, and the demands of the internationalising working life on the competencies of the individuals.

The internationalisation as rethinking of the university -discourse presents internationalisation as something either requiring or already having resulted in a complete rethinking of the organisation, the strategies, the processes and the functions of the university. It implicitly or explicitly distinguishes between old internationalisation of research and new internationalisation of education, or presents internationalisation as having resulted in a profound change in the universities. It emphasises the contribution of internationalisation as such and a set of specific internationalisation activities to the quality and attractiveness of the university and the importance of the strategic thinking of the university functions and mission in the face of internationalisation, including the internalisation of internationalisation as part of the everyday thinking of the university life.

The internationalisation as opening up the country -discourse presents the metaphorical and practical opening up the country and the society as a result of, or as required by, internationalisation, and the need to attract foreign higher education students and staff, as well as other potential employees to Finland. It consists of three separate, but complementary, sub-discourses: metaphorical, concrete and image sub-discourses. The sub-discourse of opening up as a metaphor emphasises issues such as increased understanding of others as well as ourselves, tolerance and multiculturality in the society, European values and European citizenship. Finland is presented as a formerly closed country that is now opening up to the world. The sub-discourse of concrete opening up addresses issues such as legislation and other regulation related to immigration and operation of the higher education institutions. It also covers vari-

ous research and education cooperation programmes and internationalisation funding schemes, mobility and its obstacles, attracting and integrating foreign people here, international education and labour markets, labour shortage, Finland's advantages and disadvantages, and Finland's participation in the international higher education arena. The opening up can also refer to the opening up of Europe and the mobility in the European labour markets and higher education systems. Finally, the image sub-discourse addresses the opening up in terms of the image, reputation and prestige of the country and its higher education system, or of the entire Europe and European higher education. It includes representation of the strengths and weaknesses of Finland's and Europe's reputation and attractiveness.

The scope of the University discourses is wider than the Internationalisation discourses. The University discourses represent the legitimating ideas, the legitimations, of the University in the knowledge society, and internationalisation as a specific part of that role. They constitute the "Idea of the University" and describe why the University is needed in the society and what a "true" university is like. The three University discourses can be named as the science and knowledge -discourse, the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse and the competition and competitiveness -discourse.

The science and knowledge -discourse emphasises the University legitimation as stemming from its contribution to science and knowledge and it has to engage in internationalisation as science and knowledge are inherently international by nature and cannot be bound by national borders. It addresses issues such as the inherent internationality of science, research and education, the development of science as a result of internationalisation and the inherent competition in it. This discourse is central to the portrayal of the University as an institution with its fixed set of norms and values. It represents a more traditional understanding of the University legitimation and relies to some extent on a more traditionalist vocabulary.

The civilisation and wellbeing -discourse addresses the contributions of the University to society in terms of the increased civilisation and wellbeing of the individuals as well as the entire society as accruing from the education, research and the other functions of the University. It argues that contribution to civilisation and wellbeing also requires internationalisation as the society is increasingly multicultural or even global. The discourse consists of three sub-discourses: the traditional sub-discourse, the global sub-discourse and the instrumental sub-discourse. The traditional sub-discourse addresses the University contribution to themes such as multiculturalism and cultural richness in Finland and in Europe, preserving ones own language and culture as well as learning other languages and cultures, enhancing democracy, equality and social cohesion, individual empowerment and understanding, and European values. Like the science and knowledge -discourse, the traditional sub-discourse can be said to be at the core of the institutionality of the University. The global sub-discourse addresses themes such as global responsibility, development cooperation and sustainable development and fostering multiculturalism and tolerance on the global level. The global sub-dis-

course is weaker than the other two sub-discourses of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse. Finally, the instrumental sub-discourse, which is similar to the competition and competitiveness -discourse, emphasises the indirect instrumental benefits of the University to society. The sub-discourse addresses themes such as diverse, excellent and inclusive universities, increased cooperation with businesses and society, regional and local cooperation, LLL and new skills for the labour market, service mission of the universities, university contribution to European higher education and research area and the Europe of Knowledge, social cohesion and active citizenship, and the utilitarian element of international cooperation.

The final University discourse, the competition and competitiveness -discourse, has gained an almost dominant position in the discourse of European and Finnish higher education policy actors, and can be found in almost all of the contemporary higher education policy documents and strategies. It presents the University contribution primarily as a contribution to competitiveness, while arguing that this contribution requires internationalisation as competitiveness is increasingly internationally defined and not limited to national settings. It addresses the questions related to the functioning of the universities in the innovation system, the contribution of internationalisation to the competitiveness of the country and the national higher education system, the University role in educating future knowledge workers and the importance of internationalisation in the context of competition for international knowledge workers. Through these issues, the discourse addresses the themes of the competitiveness of higher education, of an individual university, of an individual, of a country, and the reputation of a university and a higher education system, of a country, of Europe and of European higher education.

The discourses I have identified supplement the picture given by earlier studies on discourses and legitimations of internationalisation and higher education (see e.g. Söderqvist 2002, Knight 2004). My study provides further evidence in the discussion that the rationales of competition are becoming increasingly significant in the higher education policy. This applies both to the internationalisation of higher education and to the view that the universities are an increasingly integral part of the national competitiveness and knowledge society construction. However, the legitimations of the internationalisation are varied, not unified, and that different discourses live side by side. Previous studies did not discuss the consequences of these to the institution of the University, or to the perceptions about the University's role in society in a wider sense. Neither is the rationality of the competitive knowledge society, which is taken for granted as a background condition questioned, nor are any insights into the power resulting in and from those discourses or rationales presented. The emancipatory approach of my study offers space for questioning the rationality of the competitive knowledge society and its consequences for the University.

8.1.2 The commonness, overlap and temporal evolution of the discourses

The analysis of the empirical data indicates that the three Internationalisation and three University discourses are intertwined. It seems evident that all of the Internationalisation discourses can occur in connection with any of the University discourses. In much of the data, be that interviews, university documents, national documents or any set of the European documents, the same extracts can use several of the discourses arguing for Internationalisation as well as discourses constituting the idea of the University. There are certain differences between the different actors, such as the somewhat stronger usage of the science and knowledge -discourse amongst the university actors and the EUA than amongst national or European level governmental actors. On the other hand, it seems that the competitiveness discourse has gained a very strong position in the discourse of all actors, and very few counter-hegemonic articulations of it are presented. One of the reasons for this nearly-hegemonic position may be found in the intertwining of the discourses and texts: texts and discourses borrow from other texts and discourses, thereby building intertextually produced hegemonic discourses. These hegemonic discourses come to be taken as facts, and their discursive character is blurred. Therefore, it is difficult to tell the discourses apart, as they have been bundled up as entities which seem to be unbreakable. On the other hand, the “factual” nature also brings a certain sense of security to those embedded in the discourse, an absolution from the task of questioning their truthfulness. They can just be accepted as facts.

Certain themes are specifically prone to overlapping with discourses within the same category of discourses or across both the categories. Therefore, the researcher is faced with a difficult challenge in placing certain themes in one discourse or another. An example of the latter case is the theme of tuition fees, in which the discourses of opening up the country and competition and competitiveness overlap. The same goes for the theme of reputation or image of Finland, which I have placed as a sub-discourse to the opening up the country discourse, but which can also be argued to be a special theme within the competition and competitiveness -discourse. The question of new skills required by internationalisation and the knowledge society may be a matter of individual growth, but they are legitimated through civilisation and wellbeing, as well as competition and competitiveness. An example of the former case is the theme of lifelong learning, which may be said to fall under the instrumental idea of universities' contribution to civilisation and wellbeing, or be seen in a more limited way as a contribution to the competitiveness of the individual and the country. The increase of quality and excellence is similarly an aspect of the rethinking of university. It holds its place in the traditional science and knowledge -discourse yet it is deemed obligatory for the competitiveness of the university, which may be seen as the outcome of the rethinking.

The research framework included three larger contexts, in which the discourses were seen to be embedded, namely the survival of a “small country”, the institutionality of the University and the rationality of the knowledge society, especially ideal subjectivities of an ideal citizen and ideal university embedded in it. These three contexts were often present in several discourses at the same time, which exemplifies their contextual significance. The survival of small Finland is explicitly or implicitly embedded in all of the sub-discourses of the discourse of internationalisation as opening up of the country, as well as two of the University discourses, the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse (especially the traditional and instrumental sub-discourses), and in the competition and competitiveness -discourse (especially in the research and innovation theme). The Institutionality of the University is embedded in the two more traditional University discourses, the science and knowledge -discourse and the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, especially in its traditional and global viewpoints. The notions of the ideal citizen and ideal university of the competitive knowledge society are particularly exemplified in the competition and competitiveness -discourse, but also in the two Internationalisation discourses, internationalisation as individual growth -discourse (especially in the instrumental sub-discourse) and internationalisation as rethinking of the university -discourse (especially in the themes of quality and attractiveness and strategic thinking in universities).

The strength of any given discourse cannot be solely be determined by counting any specific words related to it, as the same word or expression can have different meanings in different contexts. Nor do the discourses appear in a pure, easily distinguishable form in the texts, but are a result of the semantic analysis work done by the researcher. Yet the more frequently and in more contexts the elements of a particular discourse are repeated, the more there is reason to ask whether the discourse as achieved a hegemonic position. Also, the level of taken-for-grantedness of an idea or world view presented by the discourse, the extent to which it is presented as having no alternatives, and to which also other discourses are dependent of it, may tell us something about the strength of a discourse. (Jokinen & Juhila 1993, 81.) The strategic use of the discourse might also be a sign of the strength of the discourse: it would not be used strategically if it was thought to be insignificant in not evoking sympathy on the predicted audiences. The extent to which a certain discourse is repeated by the interviewees or represented in the documents might indicate that the world view presented by it has been internalised and become taken-for-granted. Alternatively, it can be considered to be so powerful and legitimate that it is repeated in a strategic manner without internalising it, especially if this happens without being explicitly or implicitly unprompted by the interview context. Although the research approach of this study has been entirely qualitative, in this final section it is important to glance at the extent to which specific actors have used certain discourses in the interviews or in the documents.

Looking at the tables compiled during the checking of the analysis, the competition and competitiveness -discourse achieved unparalleled status if the number of times it was used in the texts is taken as an indication of its strength. It achieved the largest number of references¹ in all but one interview and in all but one university, as well as in the combined tables for interviews and universities respectively. It was also the most frequent discourse used in internationalisation plans and in all of the EU document categories. The civilisation and wellbeing -discourse achieved the most references in one university, in the development plans and in the combined tables for all the national policy documents, as well as in the Bologna Process documents. In the EUA documents, the science and knowledge -discourse was referred to the most, and the internationalisation as opening up of the country was the strongest discourse in the CIMO document. The internationalisation as individual growth -discourse seemed to get the least number of references in four of the nine interviews, two universities, in the national documents, in the EUA and Bologna process documents, and in three out of the four EU document categories. In three universities the opening up the country received the fewest references. The science and knowledge -discourse received very few references in various sets of documents. Table 2 summarises the use of the discourses in the broad document categories. The complete table is presented in Appendix 6.

	IGD	RUD	OCD	SKD	CWD	CD
Interviews	44	113	91	53	51	177
University documents	13	31	5	45	60	68
Ministry of Education	34	64	52	48	106	98
EUA	4	17	7	53	52	50
Bologna Process	3	9	13	10	25	18
European Union	13	47	30	26	82	148
TOTAL	111	281	198	235	376	559

Table 2. The Use of discourses in different categories of data.

Some of this usage of certain discourses can be easily understood. The very nature of the development plan would assume that civilisation and the wellbeing of the nation would be its main aim. The science and knowledge -discourse would seem to give most to the EUA to argue for its position and the EU Lisbon process was initiated to increase the European competitiveness. CIMO is in the very business of opening up the country, caring less about the different legitimations of the University. However, no such immediate interpretation can be given to the wide spread use of the competition and competitiveness -discourse. Strategic usage may account for some of it in the case of the universities and interviews, but one should at least stop to think to what extent

1. "Most references" may mean that a particular discourse received most references either alone, or sharing first place with another discourse.

it may also tell us something of its “taken-for-grantedness”, of the internalisation of the rationality of the competitive knowledge society, and the subsequent waning of the importance of science and knowledge for their own sake.

As the majority of the empirical material, all the interviews and most of the documents, go back only a couple of years, I decided to concentrate on the analysis of the contemporary discourses rather than focussing my efforts on a longitudinal analysis of the discursive change. I will, however, venture to make some remarks on the discursive shift, which can be reflected upon the changes of the universities, their operating environments and their internationalisation activities. My starting point was the previous research on the change of higher education. That research indicates that the operating context of the higher education institutions has changed into a more competitive one, that the financial and accountability pressures have increased, and that the universities have assumed a more responsive approach towards the needs of society and have evolved into entrepreneurial organisations. The participation in higher education has increased and the academic profession has been faced with many changes, including time and performance pressures and increased job insecurity. Similarly, much of the previous research (see e.g. Källemark & van der Wende 1997, van der Wende 2001, Trondal et al 2001, Knight 2004) has already shown that there has been a clear evolution in the internationalisation of higher education, both in terms of the practical forms and activities of internationalisation, as well as in the discourses describing it. Internationalisation has evolved from meaning primarily student mobility, individual international academic cooperation and presenting and publishing research in the international arena, to more comprehensive, planned and strategic cooperation and participation in the international higher education market.

As my research has shown, the increase of the elements of competitiveness, accountability and tighter university-society relationship has been increasingly reflected in the discursive level. During the last few years, the discursive representations of higher education have increasingly been colonised by market terminology, and by the ubiquitous, taken for granted nature of global competition. The policy argumentation has shifted from the perspective of national wellbeing and national perspective more generally to a European perspective and to the wellbeing of Europe, which in turn is defined in the EU Lisbon process slogan, and perhaps in the entire EU discourse, as a mixture of “competitiveness, social cohesion and more and better jobs”. The strong part of this discourse is its emphasis on skills and competencies, consisting on the one hand of the broad increase of the general level of education and skills of the entire population, and on the other hand aiming for excellence in terms of the few. This is combined with a set of individual personality attributes, such as responsible, active and enterprising behaviour, contributing to an image of an ideal citizen of a competitive knowledge society.

Some of the discourses or sub-discourses or themes within them identified in my research, may have become more visible, or alternatively lost ground in the documents

throughout the research period. The discourses arguing for internationalisation have also been present in the older documents, although in general the Internationalisation discourses have become stronger and more pronounced in the later documents. Where the previous higher education policies scarcely mentioned internationalisation, it has recently been established as one of the key policy areas, and the international aspects are mentioned in connection with all higher education policy issues. The definitions of international cooperation and competition have been significantly changed from individual cooperation to strategic institution-wide cooperation and from scientific competition to competition in the higher education markets. The attractiveness of the universities and national higher education system for potential students and staff has emerged as another new policy issue. In many cases, the definitions (or at the least connotations of certain policy issues) have evolved in the course of the nearly 20 years the analysis of the Finnish national documents covers. For instance, the idea of quality assurance has emerged more strongly on the policy agenda and its definition has changed from peer review of academic outputs to the installing accountability measures and audits to ensure the procedural quality of the university activities, and excellence from inherently known to explicitly measured.

The discourses constituting the legitimating idea of the University are also more pronounced in the more recent than the earlier documents, as the general style of the policy documents and university strategies have shifted from being more technical planning documents into more policy oriented documents. In the latter, more attention is paid to the argumentation and motivation, rather than just listing the policies to be implemented. This may reflect the change of the relationship between the state and the universities: as universities are given more autonomy, the steering of universities has to be better argued for in the policies. Similarly, the universities face pressures of accountability from an increasing number of stakeholders. Therefore they have to present a positive picture to a wider, more varied set of audiences. In the context of knowledge society policies, higher education itself has also taken a more central stage in the national and international policy making, which might have contributed to the changing style of the documents.

The discourse of competition and competitiveness has gained ground over the years compared to the science and knowledge -discourse and the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, which were more prominent in the earlier Finnish policy documents. At the European level, a similar shift could not necessarily be established, as a shorter time period has lapsed. It is clear, however, that as different documents are designed for different purposes, they make use of different discourses. For instance, several shifts can be detected in the Bologna process documents². First, there has been a shift in the way in which the Europe of Knowledge as the background and legitimisation of the Bologna Process has been conceptualised, from cultural and intellectual to economic and innovation-oriented framing, and back to one connecting the two. Second, the

2. See also Nokkala 2004.

actual intended outcome of the Bologna Process, the European Higher Education Area, seems to be framed somewhat differently with the shift from primarily cultural to primarily practical and competitive framing, with a social and equality-centred framing emerging gradually. Third, the conceptualisation of the role of the universities and other higher education institutions seems to have shifted from being more autonomous and automatically beneficial to something more instrumental and conditional. They are expected and encouraged to adopt and implement the proposed Bologna Process measures in order to contribute to the creation of the Europe of Knowledge. It should be remembered though, that the fluctuation in the discourse may be a result of the different documents being aimed at different purposes, rather than this being taken as a conclusive evidence of a wider discursive shift. In the case of the afore mentioned Bologna documents, the first documents might have been aimed more at convincing the ministers themselves of the viability of the process. Once that process had achieved political legitimacy, later documents were perhaps aimed at a wider audience of higher education institutions and administrators on whose life the process had substantial bearing. However, the selection of policy texts indicates that some of the contemporary themes have recurred through the past twenty years, which also points to the conclusion that the change in the University is not particularly rapid, however radical the change might seem. It should be remembered, however, that this analysis is a snapshot of the discourse at a particular, comparatively short period of time. It does not, therefore, present the end point in the development of the discourse.

8.1.3 The strategic and token usage of the discourses

When discussing discourses, a question that inevitably arises is to what extent a discourse is internalised by the actors, and to what extent it is used strategically by the actors to provide leverage for a better position or for more benefits for themselves. Discourse analysis as a research method does not reveal the internal intentions of the users of the discourse, and it is therefore not possible to verify empirically the extent to which the usage of a certain discourse is based on internalisation of the discourse, and the extent to which it is strategic. However, it is important to remember that the discourses do not take place in a vacuum, but they have to do with concrete organisations, European and Finnish universities, their faculties and departments and individual students and employees. This must also be taken into account when evaluating the texts and interviews; the reason why the texts and interviews are the way they are is because they were produced by real people who are connected with these real organisations, with their legislative and financial context, internal policies and politics. The actors do not wholly think about their statements as discourses, but think about this real institution in which they are embedded. The actors are embedded within the values and conventions of the organisations and the University as an

institution, but they must also think of their strategic position in the “real world”. This makes strategic use of the discourse highly likely. Actors want to convince their stakeholders of their compliance and cooperation, to protect their own status in general and their own position within a specific university, or to speak from a particular office, be that the office of a ministry employee or the position of the university rector. They might also try to advance the agenda of their organisation and therefore to use the discourse strategically. The University discourses are more typically used for strategic or token purposes than the Internationalisation discourses, and amongst the University discourses, the science and knowledge -discourse and the competition and competitiveness -discourse are most explicitly used for those purposes.

The strategic use of discourses (or at least the themes and vocabularies) is common, especially within documents which are meant for internal and external audiences and stakeholders. The policy and strategy documents are designed as strategic texts, both to give internal guidelines and to give internal and external actors certain kinds of representations of the organisation, association or country. The documents might also be the result of negotiations, which have to satisfy the views of several different types of actors. This process is especially easy to understand in the Bologna Process documents, which present a field in which the strategic interests of several countries and organisations are struggled over. Interviews, however, could also be strategic. The aim might be to produce certain kinds of representations either for the interviewer, or for the potential readers of the study. This strategic use of the discourses, wanting to appeal to several different audiences or to present one’s own organisation to its advantage, also partly explains why the same text extracts often carry several discourses.

The permeability and the wide spread use of the competition and competitiveness -discourse could indicate that the political idea of competition and the economic rationales as the legitimating factors for universities have been homogeneously accepted throughout European and national higher education policy. The wide spread of the vocabulary does not, however, necessarily explain the hegemony of the discourse, but can indicate that the competition and competitiveness -discourse is strategically used by higher education actors in their attempt to lever themselves or their organisation into a better position, to counter anticipated criticism, or to indicate compliance with certain policy processes. For instance, the concept of competitiveness can be redefined in order for it to be more suitable for strategic use, or used to argue for more benefits, such as funding, for the actors. The university rectors may in their external communication be reproducing the competition and competitiveness -discourse, while internally using the science and knowledge -discourse. The competitiveness vocabulary can also be used to show the compliant and responsible attitude of the higher education actor, such as the European University Association in the following quotes. This compliant attitude can be expressed explicitly by using certain wording such as “willingness and preparedness” or the notions of being “committed to full engagement”. It can also be expressed by interdiscursivity in using the lexicalisation of the competition and

competitiveness -discourse such innovation, competitiveness, knowledge society and excellence; or by compliance in terms of content by making the goals of the EUA consistent with the goals of the EU, as the organisation wants to be recognised as an important player in the European higher education policy.

The science and knowledge -discourse is another one typically used in a way that appears to be strategic use. The universities and the European University Association are particularly likely to use the concepts of science and knowledge, university values and search for truth to boost their own status. The EU documents also make use of the discourse by stating that the search for knowledge is at the heart of European adventure, that it has helped to define our identity and our values, and that it is the driving force behind our competitiveness. To be a competitive knowledge based economy, Europe must become better at producing knowledge through research, diffusing it through education and applying it through innovation. Many of the EU documents also draw from the science and knowledge -discourse vocabulary, such as creation of knowledge, advancement of science, even though not necessarily on the content. The science and knowledge -discourse is therefore not just a defence and argument for the universities and their interest organisations, but is also a tool of the state to influence universities, or of the European Union in its calls for increased modernisation.

The notion of the University and its institutionality, is drawn upon by several actors even more widely than the use of the explicit science and knowledge -discourse. The notion of University seems to carry great legitimacy amongst actors. As Melody (1997, 75–76) has noted, the universities have been using the idealised notion of the University-academic freedom, the need for independence from external influences, the importance of developing new ideas through unconstrained curiosity-driven research, the value of a liberal education and related reasons – to fend off the calls for increased social accountability and defend its special position. In the same way, the European University Association emphasises the institutional nature of the University, as it offers them more leverage in negotiating a position for themselves in the European higher education policy arena, and in a way gives them an expertise role rather than just a policy actor role. The EUA documents repeatedly emphasise the institution of the University and its long history and its European character. The institution of the University is emphasised by the EUA more than by any other actor. It seems to me that the University Institution is the first and foremost way of legitimating the organisation in relation to the European higher education policy, and of arguing for the continued strong role of the universities as organisations in the European knowledge society. The institution of the University is connected in the documents with a notion of a specific European social model, which is also strongly advocated in the documents. In the EUA documents the institution seems to be defined by evoking the essential connection between education and research, the traditional values of the universities such as fostering critical thinking, and the hundreds of years of history of the European universities.

One of the definitive international university documents, The Magna Charta Universitatum, also utilises the notion extensively. The document was first signed by those universities gathering in Bologna in 1988 to celebrate the 900th anniversary of the University of Bologna. By February 2006, it had been signed by over 500 universities around the world. The solemn and festive occasion of its adoption goes a long way towards explaining the elevated style of the document. The Magna Charta document is embedded in the discourses of civilisation and knowledge, whereas the discourses of competitiveness, market and utility are mostly absent. However, the idea of a knowledge society is present in the document, and it is acknowledged that society is changing and that the universities also have a role to play in the economic development of society. The role of the universities in society is legitimated through the “future of mankind” being dependent on the cultural, scientific and technical development which is seen as being “build up in centres of culture, knowledge and research as represented by true universities”. It is interesting to note how the document uses the concept of a “true university” (which raises a question whether there might be some “untrue” or “false” universities as well) and seems to represent a way in which the document and the discourse of civilisation especially, draws from the institutional notion of a University. It is assumed that a “true university” is an existing entity recognised by all. The future of society, its social, cultural and economic development, are represented as being dependent on the contribution of the universities. The document also draws upon another institutional idea, the universities having a “vocation”, which must be supported by the principles guiding their activities. The task of the University is represented through the notion of culture, with one of the fundamental principles listed in the document presenting the University as being “an autonomous institution at the heart of the societies differently organised because of geography and historical heritage; it produces, examines, appraises and hands down culture by research and teaching.” Similarly, societies are presented as varied and different, whereas the University is presented as a single and unified concept, thus giving an idea about what the “true” university is like. The rest of the principles also describe its features: autonomy, the inseparability of research and teaching, freedom of research and teaching, rejecting “intolerance” and being “open to dialogue”, and enriching of the minds of individuals. These, as well as the reference to the “European humanist tradition” constitute the notion of a true university, thereby drawing heavily on the traditional discourse of university’s task in serving the society through civilising the society and enriching the minds and the lives of individuals. This document could be described as crystallising the traditional ideal of University, and in that sense might be seen as setting a kind of a baseline for the change of any university discourse.

This legitimacy of the institution might also shed light on one of the topical debates in the Finnish higher education arena. The umbrella organisation of the Finnish non-university sector higher education institutions, ammattikorkeakoulut, commonly translated as polytechnics, has recently issued a recommendation that the

polytechnics translate their English name to universities of applied sciences, perhaps inspired by such international examples as German *Fachhochschulen* or Dutch *HBOs*. This appears to be a move to increase their legitimacy and prestige by utilising the term university, which has been highly contentious amongst traditional universities and has been reproached by the Ministry of Education. In a similar way, the legitimacy of the EU discourse is increased by its using only of the concept of universities without making distinctions between them and other tertiary education institutions. By using the term “universities” to denote all higher education institutions, the EU might also be trying to redefine the institution of the University to better suit its own policy. If a distinction between different types of higher education institutions would be made in the discourse, that would allow more the universities to pick and choose which of the policies and definition they would like to comply with and possibly allow them to discard the ones they find less appealing, thus making the policy effect of the discourse less effective.

In addition to the intentional strategic usage of these discourses, a question may be raised whether certain kinds of half-hearted token usage of the discourses exist. It is possible to think that in the context of universities, one must always pay token homage to the search for truth -ideal. Similarly one might envision that in the Finnish context, one must always pay homage to the idea of welfare state, keeping in mind Finland’s Nordic welfare state ideal. Perhaps one must also pay homage to it in the European context, given that the discourse sometimes introduces the concept of a European social model, implying that such a thing exists.

The question remains whether this strategic or token use of discourse has any effect on anything that is happening in practice in any given university, or the extent to which the discourses either call forth an idealised future or even an idealised past (Ylijoki 2005). One could also ask what the structures and processes mediating the discourses into the everyday practical life of the university would be. Those would include the funding structures and legislation, including the extent to which legislation permits university initiative on operating in the market place, and what kind of activities the funding structures reward and sanction. One must also remember that universities are very heterogenous, both internationally and amongst themselves, and therefore the discourse at the national level might differ drastically from the everyday realities of different universities, let alone their academics. Similarly, the reality of internationalisation of higher education at the departmental level, or at the level of individual academics, may be entirely different from the discourse employed by the international, national and university level strategies and policies. While internationalisation is lauded in the upper level discourse, at the departmental level it might be considered as costly and cumbersome and not as something worth aspiring for. Internationality may be perceived as artificial in a situation of lacking international colleagues and students, especially if it means changing the language of teaching or interdepartmental communication. On the other hand, the internationality of any

university activity without further efforts may be taken for granted, or may be reduced to little more than a question of the language used in teaching or publishing of research, or at its most modest, as participation in international conferences.

8.2 The change of the University institution

One of the frameworks of this study was institutional theory and the notion of the University as a social institution made up of values, norms and cognitive scripts as well as of material practises and tangible artefacts (Scott 2001, Powell & DiMaggio 1991, Friedland & Alford 1991). Previous research has pointed out that the role of the University and of higher education as social institutions has been complicated by the fragmentation of society, and as a result, the very institution of the University may be changing. This was one of the starting points of my research, and indeed the widespread of the competition and competitiveness -discourse seems to be proving this point. Gumpert (2000) has even gone as far as to argue that the University has changed entirely from an institution into a business. This research has shown that the case may not, however, be quite so obvious. Although this study has not focussed on the special status of the University from a legislative position, even the discourses of Internationalisation and University indicate that the universities still hold a special position in society, and still implicitly or explicitly include much of the old institutionality of the University, which Gumpert includes in her University institution.

The different discourses can be mixed together and be drawn from to constitute and legitimate the University as a social institution. The institutionality of the University presupposes its legitimacy, its status as a widely accepted, legally, normatively and cognitively accepted position and taken-for-granted understanding that its existence and tasks are important and “right”. The traditional institutionality, which was discussed above, can be evoked by using the science and knowledge -discourse and the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, which can be used to produce a picture of a traditional, Humboldtian University, representing a nostalgic, idealised past, the golden age of the European University. The same discourses can, on the other hand, reproduce a new innovation-oriented, entrepreneurial University, the ideal university of the competitive knowledge society. The competition and competitiveness -discourse is somewhat different from the other two, as it seems to be used for constructing the image of the “new” University institution only.

It is important to remember, however, that both of these images, the “old” University institution and the “new” University institution are ideal types, which do not necessarily exist, and might not have ever existed in the reality. Similarly, the ideal university as well as the ideal citizen have both been reproduced throughout the history; the ideal university and the ideal citizen of the knowledge society represent a snapshot

in which the ideal is fixed for a moment, before being remodelled again in some other context. As noted by Ylijoki (2005, 560) “academia, like other organisations, embraces a rich, historically constructed stock of narratives – nostalgia represents an important form of institutional remembering and forgetting through which members of academia interpret their work experiences and attach meaning and purpose to their lives within the organization”. Similarly, the discourses may represent an idealised institution, an aspiration achieved in the future or even a reality-shunning mirage or strategically motivated consciously falsified image. This research has shown that the University is not just a taken-for-granted, internalised institution, but its institutionality is also recognised, and used consciously. The same discourses both reproduce the institution of University but also mobilise it strategically to produce the universities as organisations. The discourses construct an ideal university organisation, and the elements and descriptions about the nature and tasks of the university are carriers of the University institution, and, as elaborated by Scott (2001, 77–83), they are continuously evoked in constructing the material organisations.

By utilisation of the discourses of ‘competitiveness’ ‘globalisation’, ‘flexibilisation’ and ‘uncertainty’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’, the competitive knowledge society produces a new ideal University institution as well as a new ideal citizenship, which seem to be primarily defined through entrepreneurial characteristics and economic contribution (c.f. Amoore 2004, Marginson & Considine 2000). The new ideal university organisation is presented as entrepreneurial, efficient and productive, engaged in international cooperation and competition, and developing itself as an attractive work and study place for foreigners. The imagery includes profiling the university, forming partnerships with businesses and engaging in regional development. The ideal university assures the quality of its operations and outputs, and aims for excellence. It embraces the “supercomplexity” (Barnett 2000) where everything is unpredictable and uncertain. The new ideal of a university organisation may result in the change of the University as an institution, its norms, values scripts, structures and practices. Clark’s (1998) concept of entrepreneurial universities seems to be the ideal university arising from the discourses, legislation and the funding principles of the contemporary university context. Similarly, de Boer et al. (2007) have argued that the shifting governance and the emerging markets favour the universities as corporate actors, complete organisations that can be addressed, and that can act and make choices, take responsibility and produce, consume, buy and sell. This results in a change of universities from loosely coupled systems to complete, manageable organisations, capable of taking responsibility of themselves and to be entrepreneurial in their activities. Scott (2003) argues that as a result of managerialism in higher education, the differences between academic and other organisations are disappearing, and that universities in the knowledge society are losing their unique nature and converging with other kinds of organisations.

Although we may be critical of the new University ideal, it is essential that we are able to discuss critically the strengths and weaknesses of both the old University ideal

as well as the new one. Rather than just saluting the old University ideal as a serene haven of search for truth, or denouncing the new University ideal because of its features of competition and competitiveness, we must be able to recognise the benefits of the new ideal model, as well as the bleak past of the old idealised University: the heritage of colonialism, class society and disregard of indigenous knowledge (see e.g. Santos 2006, 27). In order for such a critical discussion to be possible, we must acknowledge the discursivity and the narrative character of those ideals. My study, which has discussed the discursive mechanisms through which those ideals are constructed, may be useful in the discussion.

This research has shown that the discourses of the competitive knowledge society are essential to the constitution of the new University institution. The strength of the competition and competitiveness -discourse, and the relative weakness of the science and knowledge -discourse, poses questions about the University value being embedded in its instrumentality rather than in the University having a value in itself. While internalising new ideas, carried by the discourses, on what universities should be like and how they should function, produces a new type of rational acting in the universities, and a gradual shift in the operational contexts of the universities could shed light as to why the universities have embraced the competitiveness discourse to such a large extent. On the other hand, the research has also pointed out that the institutional position of the University and it is subsequently utilised in the discourses. There are also features in the traditional university values and practices that support the embracing of the new roles. It can be argued, as is evident also in the science and knowledge -discourse that competition is inherent to the University and to science, and that universities are prestige-seeking organisations by nature. For decades, the competition for professorial posts, scholarships and reputation have been standard features of academic life. Now this competition has been redefined and repackaged, competition for reputation or even for a status of world class university have in a way changed form. This as such is nothing new for the universities. It may be claimed that they no longer aspire excellence for the sake of science itself or even for the sake of the university, but also for reasons external to the University as an institution. Fame and status manifest themselves as standings in the global ranking lists, and those standings in turn manifest themselves in monetary rewards for the university, and long term reputation and competitiveness gains for the national or regional higher education systems. Competition therefore serves not only the interests internal to the university or to science but also external to the university. (Nokkala & Treuthardt 2006.)

On the other hand, there are several limitations to the scope of the study, which curb the possibility of making broad generalisations on the change of the University institution. This research has for practical purposes concentrated on the general global notion of the University as a social institution, without highlighting the differences between the different types of university organisations, or the different groups of actors within and around those organisations. This focus on University institution

has overshadowed the different university organisations, disguising their potential heterogeneity, or temporal evolution. The focus has primarily been on the Finnish material, for which the European documents have provided a reflection point, which limits the extent to which the results can be generalised for other European countries. The changing expectations of society towards the universities are represented by the state documentation, not by the non-governmental, yet increasingly powerful actors such as the interest organisations of the industry and employers, the labour unions or the national student unions. Similarly, the internal institutions of the universities are presented solely by the rectors or the organisation level strategies, and the multiplicity of the academics, teachers, administrative staff, not to mention students, fell outside the scope of the study. They would undoubtedly have given a richer, more varied picture of the discursive construction of the University institution and internationalisation, or alternatively, confirmed the predominance of the discourses mentioned here. Interviewing more people in the same categories might also have broadened the picture, although this is questionable due to the already saturating discourse. I have focussed on the ideal images and textual and intertextual practices, leaving out other, material practises, but also omitting the questions on whose interests are served by the exercise of power, what struggles over meaning are being had, how they are being had, and by whom. From this follows also my decision not to focus my analysis on the differences between different actors.

8.2.1 The national tasks of higher education and the survival of small Finland

Besides being a global institution, the University is also a national institution organised as a group of primarily³ nationally located organisations with nationally set guidelines, targets and expectations, and influenced by national culture, history and experiences. One of the persistent criticisms raised when talking about the higher education discourses of the competitive knowledge society is that the global higher education rhetoric has a tendency to overlook the national task of the universities, or that the current globalisation has even constituted the end of the national project of universities (Santos 2006, 20-21). Some convincing arguments have been presented that there are features in contemporary higher education policy that have a potential to undermine the national tasks of higher education, the international rankings and the quest for countries to have a set or at least one world class university being the point in case. Deem, Lucas and Mok (2006) have argued that the world class university quest may be harmful for the national tasks of the universities. As many discourses of the

3. A single university being primarily located within one country is still the predominant form, although notable exceptions to it exist as well, especially among for-profit universities. See e.g. Cunningham et al (2000), Taylor & Paton (2002), Newman & Couturier (2002).

competitive knowledge society, the world class university presents an idealised picture which sounds attractive enough for each country to aspire to have one, and for each university to aspire to be one, yet ambiguous enough for flexible use. They name the increased compilation and use of rankings and league tables as one of the causes for the prevalence of the world class university discourse and identify several problems arising from what they call the world class university quest. Prominent rankings such as the Times Higher Education Supplement or the Shanghai Jiao Tong University rankings have a bias towards science, technology and medicine to the expense of the humanities or social sciences, and they favour publishing in English language journals over journals published in other languages.

The eagerness of the nations and universities to aspire to be world class universities, as characterised by the rankings, threatens to undermine the regional and national roles of the universities and to over emphasises publishing in English on international topics over publishing in national languages on national topics. While emphasising research performance over education, the quest contributes to reallocating funding from education to research. While education reforms may also be planned, they are not necessarily aimed as helping students but at controlling academics and urging them to produce more research or to become more international. With an increased emphasis on private higher education and private investment, the quest may also lead to a concentration of funding and vulnerability of public higher education to the GATS agreement, producing few winners and many losers in the global market place. The national systems do not necessarily benefit from the world class university quest, but it may indeed cause them harm.

Similarly, Marginson (2006) has pointed out that reputation oriented rankings such as the Times Higher Education Supplement ranking tend to have adverse effect on “public goods”; they reduce “public goods”, and create “private goods”, as well as “public and private bads”. The international ranking processes intend to represent homogenous and unified definitions of quality by pretending to be able to define and rank the best of the world class universities, and lead to homogenisation of university strategies, while universities forgo their unique profiles and mimic the organisational features and profiles of the successful universities (Proulx 2006, Usher & Savino 2006). The rankings do not necessarily present an ultimate truth, but are narratives that explicate certain criteria of the “best universities”. They do not mean that the universities at the top of the rankings are universally best, but the criteria may also be “wrong” which would indicate that the top universities are the best according to “wrong” criteria. There should therefore also be space for criticising them.

In the Finnish case, the reputation discourse is perhaps less concerned with the reputation of any single university, but with the reputation of all Finnish universities and Finland as a higher education area, Finland as a country and culture. This may be a sign that both the threats and the benefits are perceived to be shared, rather than just limited to one university. The world class quest may therefore be a quest for world

class higher education system, rather than for single world class universities. This may be because Finnish higher education as a system is presented as a success story in the international arena, e.g. according to the PISA results, whereas individual universities are not faring so well in the rankings. It may also be that in this particular context (although one should be very wary of generalising this into other higher education policy questions such as funding or mandates to confer degrees), the Finnish universities do not perceive each other as competition, but rather that competition is something more abstract, being faced by the universities from outside the country. Reputation benefits to one university may turn out to benefits for all of them.

The history of Finland was one of the contexts within which this study was located. The success of the Finnish higher education system in its turn is linked with the specific connection between the notions of survival, welfare, competitiveness and knowledge society, which are evident in the Finnish higher education policy discourse. It contains many of the elements of the knowledge society narrative: the competitiveness of the country, the changing labour market requirements, the role of research, innovation, education and lifelong learning. The Finnish discourse of internationalisation of higher education reflects an underlying narrative of Finland as a small remote country, with a cold climate, difficult language, short history, high taxes, few people and scarce natural resources, yet combined with a strong belief in the importance of education and research in sustaining the country. According to this narrative, the internationalisation of higher education is seen essentially as opening up the country to the wider world, as a way of increasing the quality of higher education and research through international contacts, and also as increasing the limited human resources in the form of foreign researcher and employees. As a small country, with scarce resources and population, Finland cannot survive in global competition without strong, high quality internationally oriented education. In order to preserve the Finnish welfare state, we need an international labour force, which means both giving the Finnish labour force the skills to work in the internationalising labour market, as well as supplementing the Finnish population with foreign high-end knowledge workers. This on the other hand requires increasing the quality of our higher education, which can be done by internationalising our universities, as well as the content of our education. Internationalisation is pictured as essential to the competitiveness of the country, and thereby contributes to the construction of Finland as a competitive knowledge society.

Yet there is a peculiar duality towards the achievements of the country in the Finnish discourse. On the one hand, there is modesty or even low self-esteem and the playing down of quality, resources and internationality of Finnish universities. The country is presented as closed, remote and not particularly attractive internationally. High quality is attributed to the international or foreign, and contrasted with the “merely” Finnish or national, which is implied to be of lower quality. Another aspect of this modesty is the strong interdiscursivity between Finnish and international discourses and policies

in higher education and knowledge economy. On the other hand, there is great pride in the achievements of Finland in the international field, as exemplified by Finland's R&D investments, success in the PISA-study or foreign visitors coming to Finland to learn from the Finnish experience. The interesting duality of the Finnish discourse seems to call for constant reassurance from other countries, international statistics and foreign visitors in ensuring us of the quality, relevance and international compatibility of our higher education system. It is reminiscent of the attempts of Finland to reassure itself and the rest of the world constantly of its political independence, neutrality and Western European mentality during the cold war period. The current project of convincing and being convinced by others relates to Finland fulfilling the knowledge society criteria. In this way it reproduces the dominant meta-narrative of the knowledge society.

The struggle and survival of a “small country” and the contribution of knowledge (society), higher education and internationalisation to it are scarcely new themes. Instead, they have been evoked in various forms throughout the Finnish history at least since the age of autonomy in the 19th century, and thus presumably forms a national-romantic meta-narrative strand in the Finnish collective consciousness. This assumption would shed light into the persistence of the survival theme in the Finnish discourse, and the way that it came up in the interviews, unprompted, therefore encouraging me to dedicate more attention to the historical context of the discourses than I might have otherwise decided to do. The economic depression may have been a definitive experience and a driver for many changes discussed in previous research, but in the discourses of this study it featured less explicitly. As it was a pronounced context for many of the changes in higher education and knowledge society policies, it nevertheless warrants a place as one of the recent survival experiences. This study also shows that internationalisation of higher education is an essential part of the survival narrative of “Finland as a small country”, higher education in itself is not enough. Even the benefits of higher education for the survival of country are partly defined through higher education's international element.

8.2.2 The University role in knowledge society, civil society and sustainable development

Universities have a long history of contributing to the democratic development of societies and in cultivating active citizenship and critical mindset in individuals. In short, they have played a central role in establishing and consolidating democratic and vibrant civil societies, offering students skills and capacities to challenge and critique the society (Barnett 1996, 1997; Delanty 2000; Filmer 1997; Bowen 1977, Tirronen 2005). With the competitive knowledge society becoming the dominant political rationality, and the competitiveness discourse gaining ground as the legitimating

discourse of the University role in society, many scholars have asked what the effects of the emphasis on the competitive knowledge society for the University role in civil society and sustainable for world society on the other will be.

Barnett (1996, 2000) laments that in the knowledge society, with its focus on competitiveness, issues such as ethics and morality, generosity, forgiveness, friendship and carefulness are being forgotten, and knowledge in the knowledge society is increasingly defined as performative knowledge, overtly or covertly serving the economic needs of the society. Scott (2003) argues that the academic “Mertonian” (1973) values of critical inquiry, disinterested science, intellectual freedom and commitment to truthful knowledge are facing increasing challenges as a result of knowledge society-induced changes in higher education. These include the reconceptualisation of higher education and science as a knowledge industry, increasing vocationalism and emphasis on private rather than public benefits of education and science, and the emergence of new paradigms of research and education. To make a slogan-like simplification out of the question, is the “Humboldtian” University still valid, or has the “entrepreneurial” University surpassed it? Are knowledge, and truth, democracy or empowerment still relevant values or have instrumentalism, competitiveness and economic value for money taken over? Is the University still educating individuals who are “widely educated, harmonious, emphasising ethical and aesthetic aspects and defending humanity” (Tirronen, 2005, 3) or just training students in instrumental skills?

Teichler (2004, 23) asks whether the contemporary emphasis on “global forces” and their conceptualisation as “turbo-capitalism”, and the increased managerialism in higher education, are limiting the higher education policy discussion too much, diverting it from issues such as social cohesion or ecological survival and suffocating alternative conceptualisations of the context of higher education such as “the global village”, “global learning” or “global understanding”? Is the University still doing research with no foreseeable commercial potential (Santos 2006, 33), or has it succumbed to the utilitarian demand of commercialisable knowledge?

The United Nations have named the years 2005–2014 as the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (Kaivola & Rohweder 2007). Many scholars have expressed their concern about the space for sustainable development in contemporary globalisation, and argued that a new pact on the role of the universities in contributing to economically, ecologically, socially, culturally and politically sustainable development would be needed. (See e.g. Kaivola & Åhlberg 2007, Kaivola & Rohweder 2007, Santos 2006). Boaventura de Sousa Santos, one of the established scholars of empowerment of the developing world, seems to be asking the question: Is the university driven by policies of global capitalism or global solidarity? Santos (2006, 23–33) has called for a project of “counter-hegemonic globalisation” in order to confront the “neoliberal globalisation”. The counter-hegemonic globalisation project in universities should include reconceptualisation of the University as a public good, radical democratising of the universities and ending the long history of exclusion of social groups and their

knowledge for which Santos argues that the University institution has been responsible for a long time. He calls for a new type of public university, which also entails a new kind of transnationalisation of the university outside the trade regimes. Santos's new kind of University, which seems to bear signs of a wider institution rather than merely an organisation, should not look to the past as any kind of a golden age, but should confront the new challenges of globalisation with even new, but counter-hegemonic solutions. Santos's new University should include graduate and postgraduate training, research and social responsible extension (as he calls the third mission of the universities), which should provide services to all classes and groups of society rather than just being geared towards money-making activities. Santos also argues that, should any of these missions be lacking, "what you have is higher instruction, not a university" (Santos 2006, 29). In its research a university should strive for research involving all classes and communities of society and "ecology of knowledges" which give value to all kinds of knowledges, not just to those considered scientific according to the western model. (Santos 2006, 33–35). In order to achieve this, Santos (2006, 432) calls for a new relationship between the University and the society, and democratic bottom-up pressure which would help ensure that matters with little commercial interest but great social impact are included in the research agendas.

At the discursive level, it may seem at first glance that the competition and competitiveness -discourse as a legitimating discourse has taken over the other legitimations of the University, its contribution to the science and knowledge and its contribution to the civilisation and wellbeing, or even to the civil society and sustainable development. However, according to my analysis, many issues related to civil society, global citizenship and sustainability, multiculturalism and tolerance have come up in several of the discourses, in each case from a slightly different perspective. These issues, which I shall here call civil society issues, may be addressed by the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse, and its elements are present also in the more philosophically oriented varieties of the internationalisation as empowerment of the individual discourse or on the metaphorical opening up of the country. The task of the University is presented also as contributing to critical thinking and knowledge and to a culturally diverse environment, wide and equal learning opportunities and just welfare and ethical leadership. It is benefiting humanity, building active civil society and assessing critically the developments that globally or regionally threaten people's basic security and their opportunities to fulfil their intellectual and cultural aspirations. The students and academics are to become responsible citizens and active discussants. Also important are equal educational opportunities, equality between people and equity between regions, on which Finland's international success is based. Social, ethical and aesthetic capacities are also important part of civilisation and knowledge. An important goal in EU policy is to pay attention to how wellbeing and development can be advanced while retaining national and local cultural diversity and features. The global perspective of University responsibility to contribute to sustainable development, global solidarity,

multiculturalism and tolerance is also still presented in the discourse, albeit being quite weak.

Although the “civil society” and the “knowledge society” are sometimes set apart, just as often they are argued to be two sides of the same coin, and should not be contrasted. At least for the University, they live side by side. This research has shown that the “civil society” and “knowledge society” functions are not mutually exclusive in the discourse. Instead, the civil society issues and the “knowledge society” issues, such as skills and competencies, reputation and attractiveness, have spread across many of the same discourses. They have in fact been co-opted together, thereby increasing the credibility and strength of both of the discourses. One might therefore argue that the civil society discourse is stronger than what one would think on the outset, and they would contribute to counteracting some of the more adverse aspects of the emphasis on competitiveness and entrepreneurialism in universities as well as in society.

Similarly, it can be argued that although the discourses of competitiveness are strong, the effects of the discourses may prove to be somewhat less tangible than the discourse would suggest. For instance, although the Lisbon process carries a strong discourse and its indirect effects are great, it is not necessarily such a success in practice, and its goals are far from being fulfilled. The Lisbon agenda was set in the year 2000, after which the “information technology bubble” burst and many European national economies floundered for several years. The accession of ten new EU countries in 2004 and the expected accession of two more countries in 2007, all of which are far beyond the economic standards of the 15 “old” EU countries, has put an enormous strain on the competitiveness and economy of the entire EU region. The free mobility of labour, which is at the core of the Lisbon policy, is facing substantial resistance in many EU countries. The competitiveness, although featuring so prominently in the Lisbon discourse, may not carry such weight in the EU policy making after all, was the conclusion of the analysis of Helsingin Sanomat (12.7.2006), the largest newspaper in Finland, which published a report on the meeting of the EU competitiveness ministers in Finland in the summer of 2006. This conclusion was drawn from the list of meeting’s participants. Many ministers were significantly absent, and in most cases replaced by civil servants or deputy and junior ministers. According to the paper, the absence of the ministers suggests that competitiveness is not considered to be a pressing issue, and the paper speculates that competitiveness is considered to be a problem of the companies rather than of the member states. Also on a wider scale, the entire process of globalisation, with free movement of goods, capital and labour, which the competitive knowledge society is linked with, seems to be under renegotiation. The so called Doha round of WTO negotiations has been pronounced to have failed due to the deadlock between developed and developing countries. The “war on terror”, the policy which was initiated by the United States and its allies as a response to the terrorist attack on the US in September 2001, has also been argued to have shifted the attention from open multilateral trade to closed national security interests.

These do not erase the question, however, of whether the primary context of the University these days is that of hard, global neoliberal capitalism, or of responsible, tolerant sustainable world society, or possibly both, and how the universities should navigate this complex terrain. Universities as organisations and the University as an institution should be able to prepare for different contrasting scenarios. In Finland there are also signs that national consensus of retaining major state involvement in higher education may be breaking and calls have been made to change the universities and their operating contexts into more liberal, American type reconfiguration of dispersed responsibilities funding sources and legal statuses (c.f. OPM 2007a, 2007b). Alternatively, the global market liberalisation and opening of borders may be revoked by a backlash of national protectionism once more, and internationalisation be deemed less worthy a cause. Less likely, however, is the shift of the tide of globalisation from neoliberal capitalism to Santos's (2006) counter-hegemonic globalisation and sustainable world society.

8.3 Power, discourse and the competitive knowledge society

The competitive knowledge society is a meta-narrative of contemporary developed societies, through which they define themselves. It is a constitutive and performative discursive order, which succeeds to an extent in transforming its presupposed economic realities and instrumentalities into material practices (Jessop, 2004). It emphasises knowledge, knowledge production, application and innovation as a means of production, distinction, wealth accumulation and competitiveness. It favours individualistic, entrepreneurial and innovative acting both in people as well as in organisations. However, there is no single ubiquitous knowledge society, or even a single agreed concept of it. Instead there is a myriad of national and local translations of the knowledge society, and a myriad of conceptual definitions that are being used to argue for very different types of policies, even completely opposite ones. This flexibility of the knowledge society concept makes it strategically highly usable and contributes to its dominant position as a meta-narrative, which in turn makes it an interesting framework for analysis.

On this note, Castells and Himanen (2002) argue that for Finland the competitive knowledge society is a project of new image creation, self-esteem or even self-invention and survival. Through its knowledge society achievements, Finland is able to let go of the past as a "finlandised" country with a largely forestry based economy and recreate itself as a dynamic, modern and competitive society, which nevertheless appreciates the value of education, welfare, quality of life and a certain down to earth character. The universities in the knowledge society also face pressures to reinvent themselves, as discussed above.

For my research, the knowledge society meta-narrative and its governmental rationality – as illuminated by the governmentality theory (Rose 1999) – has provided the third framework within which the University change can be evaluated and discussed. It gives a name and a coherent rationality to all the specific changes in the context and conduct of higher education and to the societies at large, which otherwise would just appear to be sporadic policy decisions. This applies not only to this research, but also to policies of the knowledge society themselves, which are legitimated and argued for by reference to the way in which they contribute to the building of the knowledge society. Therefore the notion of the knowledge society has a dual role: it is used consciously to give a frame of reference to national policies and university activities while at the same time it has a taken-for-granted dimension which is taken as a base-line contextual factor for any University discourse.

According to the governmentality theory, the government in the knowledge society can be defined as conduct of conducts (Foucault 1991): as self-government based on a process of initiating and embracing particular rationalities and internalising particular forms of subjectivity of the universities leading them to govern themselves within and in relation to the overall rationality provided by a dominant discourse and related non-discursive mechanisms of government (Rose 1999). Rose has noted that power in an advanced liberal society is essentially manifested in a form of “ethico-politics” in which top-down rule is combined with the voluntarily assumed obligations of free individuals to conduct their life responsibly and ethically, which in its turn is framed in the rationality of the knowledge society in terms of consumerism and entrepreneurialism. (Rose 1999, 188)

The knowledge society and its discourses function as such a governmental rationality creating a logical coherent understanding within which the universities are evaluated, and in which they evaluate their own activities as actors in the knowledge society. However, there is not just a single knowledge society or even knowledge economy, and the discourses of even those actors most commonly related to the competitive knowledge society, such as the OECD or the World Bank are varied (Robertson 2005). The upper level political rationalities are translated in the local concept to fit the local circumstances and internalised in the process in their translated form. This means that the rationality of competitive knowledge society functions as a mechanism of government in which the power does not only come from one direction, top down from the state to the people, but rather from all different directions. It is a form of self government, towards multiple, albeit increasingly converging, ends. As shown by my study, in the knowledge society, the universities and their internationalisation is governed through their discursive conceptualisation as a field of markets, as a cultural domain or a longstanding institution, as in many ways beneficial part of the wider (knowledge) society and (knowledge) economy, but also as a part of national civilisation and of international space of knowledge and international academic community. Having focussed on discourses rather than other tools of government, this study by

no means exhausts the potential field of research into government of the university in the knowledge society.

As presented in the chapters above, in the knowledge society power is embedded in the complex set of relations between state and non-state authorities, public and private, non-profit and for-profit local, regional, national, international and global actors and networks. It cannot be pinned down to any specific set of locations, but it is constituted in varying constellations at different times, locations and occasions. According to the discourse theory, discourses are both constituted by and constitutive of social reality, material practicalities, institutions and power. Jokinen and Juhila (1993) argue for the consequentiality of discourse. The intra-discursive struggles also have an effect on the extra-discursive social structures: they define which knowledge and truths, social relations and subject positions become legitimised. As knowledge and power are intertwined (Foucault 1980), the powerful agents are those in the position to participate in the discursive struggles of the knowledge society and insert their own versions of knowledge as dominant truths. Similarly, the dominant truths, constituted in discourses, are able to assign power to different agents. However, the ideological or practical consequences of any discourse are not necessarily present in the empirical data as such, but are a result of speculative reasoning.

The discourses, especially those emphasising competitiveness, are carriers and indicators of rationality, and therefore function as mechanisms of government of the competitive knowledge society. Other mechanisms include many of the elements described in the discourses aimed at making individuals and organisations more competitive and entrepreneurial: the programmes aimed at increasing the quality of university activities or providing all citizens with information society skills or even programme encouraging students and academics to internationality. While they may be empowering to the individuals and to the universities, they at the same time represent governing towards ideal citizenship and “university-ness” of the political rationality of the competitive knowledge society.

We may then ask, what is the capacity of individual country, individual university or a single person to provide their input to the discourse? Good examples of such a power shift are the winners in the numerous different rankings, league tables and performance studies, who gain status as model examples. For Finland, the success in PISA studies, the economic competitiveness rankings and the country’s reputation as a wonderland of high technology, stemming largely from the success of Nokia, have provided an option for input. Regardless of the criticism faced by the ranking lists, especially the recent university ranking lists such as the Shanghai Jiao Tong University ranking and the Times Higher Education Supplement ranking, they have become points of reference for the higher education community. By doing well in the ranking lists, individual universities gain extra authority for their message. The providers of those ranking lists also gain authority as providers of creditable knowledge, imprinting their own reality as a widely accepted truth. Individual people may have power over the

discourse by holding a significant position within the institutions of the knowledge society. Some individuals have successfully developed concepts which have gained wide acceptance and changed from analytical concepts to aspired models, in which cases, the concepts have started to live lives of their own apart from the original cases which they try to describe, or even the authors who created them. Good examples of this are Burton Clark's (1998) entrepreneurial university or Gibbons et al's (1994) mode two knowledge production, both of which can be seen as taken for granted established truths rather than as theories created by an individual scholar or a group of scholars to describe a phenomenon they see in their case context. They have discursive strategies that have material effects on the account that they have become models aspired to through non-discursive practices in steering, funding or legislation.

The dialogical nature of discourses as both constituted and constitutive indicates that power is always embedded in discourse, and discourses embedded in power relations and structures. One should always be cautious when something is presented as having no alternative, and ask whose interests such a representation serves, whom does it constitute as powerful or powerless actors, what does it constitute as a course of action having no viable or rational alternative, and what are the means through which such a representation is created. Discourse analysis has an emancipatory interest of knowledge, meaning that it aims to deconstruct the discourse and to show how something is construed as having no alternative, and to provide space for those alternative construals of reality.

The dominant image of the ideal university organisation of the competitive knowledge society seems to be one with increased efficiency and productivity, engaged in international cooperation and competition, offering an attractive study and work place with a distinguishable profile, assured quality and targeted excellence. The ideal University institution is one that has embraced the entrepreneurial norms and values and become an Entrepreneurial University Institution. It may be asked whether this discourse actually has an alternative. Are there grounds for any university to aspire to be less efficient and less productive, not to engage in international activities, not to be attractive as a study and work place, not to aim to assure its quality and be substandard rather than excellent? Should the university retreat to the ivory tower of times gone by? Creating dichotomies which represent the alternative of efficiency as inefficiency, or the alternative of productiveness as unproductiveness is one of the ways in which the state-of-no-viable-rational-alternatives is created. Seizing discursive initiative, one might argue that instead of efficiency, effectiveness would be a better policy goal, and instead of internationalisation, a national and regional orientation might serve the national policy goals better. Instead of profiling, one might go for a broad spectrum of fields and missions. Also externally dictated attractiveness, rigid quality assurance systems and running after narrowly defined excellence criteria can be argued against as futile or downright harmful.

We could ask what harm would be caused to the university organisation or the University institution by its internalisation of the rationality of the competitive knowledge society and subjectivity of the ideal University? It might lose its ability to criticise society and its dominant values. Financial and legislative independence, which have been emphasised in order for the universities to be able to act as a critical consciousness of the society, may be jeopardised if the University has internalised the identity of the ideal institution of the competitive knowledge society. On the other hand, the governmentality of the knowledge society does not designate a top-down exercise of power and domination but rather a process of translation, in which the universities mould the rationality and their own identity to correspond with each other. It is precisely for this reason that the universities are not powerless actors, nor is the University a powerless institution. If we accept the governmentality theory's suggestions that the rationality of the competitive knowledge society is carried by discourses (particularly by the competition and competitiveness -discourse in this study), and assume that the extent to which this discourse has become hegemonic tells us something about the extent to which the rationality of the competitive knowledge society is internalised, we could see that the universities may not yet be its ideal subjects.

History has shown us that the narratives and discourses may also be potentially dangerous, the narrative of nationalism, and what it has inspired in the past, provides a good example of this. Narratives and discourses are often instated by the winners rather than the losers, and they become dominant when other narratives are no longer tolerated. The ideal university presented by the meta-narrative of the knowledge society and its discourses is not necessarily sustained by facts but rather by established narratives that both reproduce the western hegemony and delegitimize indigenous knowledge and alternative ways of organising a university. Similar observations could be made about the ideal university's predecessors, the medieval Universities of Bologna and Paris or the "Humboldtian University model" as idealised models of the past University institution. Discourse analysis allows us to step outside such a narrative and evaluate it, allowing ourselves to question our own positions and see how our own beliefs, such as the norms of science, and environments, such as the competitive knowledge society, are narrative themselves. This study has also been a narrative of what I want to say about the University.

The aim of my study has been to pick apart the discourse used to describe the contents and consequences of the internationalisation of higher education, and to assign roles, tasks and identities for universities in the context of competitive knowledge society. My analysis has shown that the internationalisation of higher education carries a predominantly positive connotation and is seen to reap benefits for the individual, for the university and for society. It also sets several obligations for them, further efforts to internationalise not being the least among those. Internationalisation contributes to the legitimacy of the University institution in the knowledge society in several ways. These can be described in terms of the ways in which it contributes to the different

elements through which the University is legitimated, namely its contribution to science and knowledge, civilisation and wellbeing or competition and competitiveness. The representations of internationalisation and the roles and tasks of the University and its identity as an institution in a competitive knowledge society are therefore far from being singular or homogenous. Instead of a single dominant discourse, several discourses co-exist. They do not seem to be in stark competition with each other, but instead complement each other and are mixed by all of the actors represented in the empirical data. Although the University contribution to competition and competitiveness makes a strong constitutive and legitimating discourse, other discourses and legitimations also live side by side with it. This indicates that there is no single unitary view of the role of the University in society and no single contribution expected of it.

The critical awareness and internal reflexivity of the University enables it to engage in the discourses of society, seizing an important role in enhancing communication, equality, wellbeing as well as citizenship and civil society in the global knowledge society. The University might find further legitimacy in embracing the plurality of different values and missions vis-a-vis society. Its task now as well as in the future is to produce constructive critique to the hegemonic discourse, to the “state-of-having-no-alternatives”. It is more important to keep alive the question about what an ideal university or an ideal citizen is like, and to create and maintain fora in which the question can be asked, than actually to answer the question.

9. References

9.1 Literature

- Alapuro, Risto (1988). *State and Revolution in Finland*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Allardt, Erik (1979). *Implications of the Ethnic Revival in Modern, Industrialized Society. A Comparative Study of Linguistic Minorities in Western Europe*. *Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium*. 1979, No. 12. Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki.
- Amoore, Louise (2004). Risk, reward and discipline at work. *Economy and Society*. Vol. 33, No 2.
- Antaki, Charles et al. (2002). Discourse Analysis means Doing Analysis: A Critique of Six Analytic Shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*. <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2002/002/antaki2002002-paper.html>. Accessed 3.7.2003.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at large. Cultural dimensions of globalisation*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Bagnall, Richard G. (2000). Lifelong learning and the limitations of economic determinism. *International journal of lifelong education*, Vol. 19, No. 1.
- Ball, Stephen J. (1998). Big Policies/Small World: An Introduction to International Perspectives in Education Policy. *Comparative education* Vol. 34, Issue 2.
- Bargh, Catherine; Scott, Peter & Smith, David (1996). *Governing Universities. Changing the Culture? The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press*, Buckingham.
- Barnett, Ronald (1996). *The Limits of Competence. Knowledge, Higher Education and Society*. The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Barnett, Ronald (1997). *Towards a higher education for a new century*. Institute of Education. University of London, London.
- Barnett, Ronald (2000). *Realizing the University in an age of supercomplexity*. The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Barry, Andrew; Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (eds.) (1996). *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. UCL Press, London.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1997). *Universities: Old, New and Different*. In Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Beck, Ulrich (1992). *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. Sage Publications, London.
- Beck, Ulrich (2000). *What is Globalization?* Polity Press, Cambridge.

- Becker, Gary S. (1964). *Human capital: a theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
- Beckmann, Andrea & Cooper, Charlie (2004). "Globalisation", the New Managerialism and Education: Rethinking the Purpose of Education in Britain. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. Vol. 2 No. 2.
- Ben-David, Joseph (1977). *Centres of learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- Beerens, H.J.J.G (2004). *Global Opportunities and Institutional Embeddedness. Higher Education Consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia*. CHEPS, University of Twente, Enschede.
- Bergen Communiqué (2005). Accessed 3.10.2006.
- Berger, Peter & Luckmann, Thomas (1987). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books, London.
- Berlin Communiqué 2003 http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/030919Berlin_Communique.PDF Accessed 3.10.2006.
- Blom, Raimo (Ed.) (1999a). *Mikä Suomessa muuttui? Sosiologinen kuva 1990-luvusta*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.
- Blom, Raimo (1999b). *Tietoyhteiskunnan lupaus*. In Blom, Raimo (Ed.) (1999). *Mikä Suomessa muuttui? Sosiologinen kuva 1990-luvusta*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.
- Blomberg, Helena; Hannikainen, Matti & Kettunen, Pauli (2002a). (Eds.). *Lamakirja. Näkökulmia 1990-luvun talouskriisiin ja sen historiallisiin konteksteihin*. Kirja-Aurora, Turku.
- Blomberg, Helena; Hannikainen, Matti & Kettunen, Pauli (2002b). *Lamafatalismin historiallinen ja vertaileva kritiikki*. In Blomberg, Helena; Hannikainen, Matti & Kettunen, Pauli (2002). (Eds.). *Lamakirja. Näkökulmia 1990-luvun talouskriisiin ja sen historiallisiin konteksteihin*. Kirja-Aurora, Turku.
- Bologna Declaration 1999 http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/990719BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.PDF Accessed 3.10.2006.
- Bowen, Howard R. (1977). *Investment in Learning. The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Braun, Dietmar & Merrien, François-Xavier (Eds.) (1999). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- British Council 2007. <http://www.britishcouncil.org/home.htm>
- Brown, Andrew, W. (1998). Narrative, politics and legitimacy in an IT implementation. *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 35. No 1.
- Brown, Phillip; Green Andy & Lauder Hugh (2001). *High Skills. Globalization, Competitiveness and Skill Formation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Brown, Phillip & Lauder, Hugh (1996). Education, Globalization and economic development. *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 11, No.1.

- Brown, Phillip & Scace, Richard (1997). *Universities and Employers: Rhetoric and Reality*. In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Burchell, Graham (1996). *Liberal government and techniques of the self*. In Barry, Andrew; Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (eds.) (1996). *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. UCL Press, London.
- Burchell, Graham; Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago press, Chicago
- Burr, Vivien (1998). *Overview: Realism, relativism, Social Constructionism*. In Parker, Ian (ed.) (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism*. Sage, London.
- Campion, Mick & Freeman, David (1998). *Globalization and Distance Education Mega-Institutions: Mega-Ambivalence*. In Currie, Jan & Newson, Janice (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalisation. Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oakes.
- Carter, D.S.G. & O'Neill, M.H. (1995) *International Perspectives on Educational Reform and Policy Implementation*. Falmer. Brighton. Cited in Ball, Stephen J. (1998). *Big Policies/Small World: An Introduction to International Perspectives in Education Policy*. *Comparative education* Vol. 34, Issue 2.
- Castells, Manuel (1991). *Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions*. In Muller, Cloete & Badat (ed.) (2001). *Challenges of Globalisation. South African debates with Manuel Castells*. Centre for Higher Education Transformation. Maskew Miller Longman Ltd., Cape Town.
- Castells, Manuel (2000a). *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Volume 1. The Rise of the Network Society*. Second edition. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Castells, Manuel (2000b). *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Volume 3 End of Millenium*. Second edition. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford
- Castells, Manuel (2004). *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Volume 2. Power of Identity*. Second edition. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford
- Castells, Manuel & Himanen, Pekka (2002). *The Information Society and the Welfare State. The Finnish Model*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cerny, Philip (1990). *The Changing Architecture of Politics. Structure, Agency, and the Future of the State*. Sage, London.
- Clark, Burton R. (1983) *The Higher education System. Academic Organization in Cross-national Perspective*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Clark, Burton R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Crotty, Michael (1998). *The foundations of social research. Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage, London.

- Cruikshank, Barbara (1996). *Revolutions within: self-government and self-esteem*. In Barry, Andrew; Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (eds.) (1996). *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. UCL Press, London.
- Cunningham, Stuart et al (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education. Evaluations and Investigations Programme*. Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra.
- Currie, Jan & Newson, Janice (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalisation. Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oakes.
- Daalder, Hans (1973). *Building Consociational Nations*. In: Eisenstadt, S.N. & Rokkan, Stein (Eds.) (1973). *Building States and Nations. Volume II*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Dale, Roger (1999). *Specifying globalisation effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms*. *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol 14, No 1.
- Dant, Tim (1991). *Knowledge, ideology and discourse. A sociological perspective*. Routledge, London
- de Boer, Harry; Enders, Jürgen & Leisyte, Liudvika (2007). *Public Sector Reform in Dutch Higher Education: The Organisational Transformation of the University*. *Public Administration*. Vol 85, No 1.
- de Boer, Harry & Huisman, Jeroen (1999). *The new public management in Dutch universities*. In Braun, Dietmar & Merrien, François-Xavier (Eds.) (1999). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Dean, Michell (1999). *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. Sage Publications, London.
- Dean, Michell (2002). *Liberal government and authoritarianism*. *Economy and Society*. Vol 31 No 1.
- Deem, Rosemary, Lucas, Lisa & Mok, Ka Ho (2006). *East Meets west meets 'world-class': What is a 'world-class' university in the context of Europe and Asia and does it matter?* Paper presented at the 19th annual Consortium of Higher education Researchers Conference, Kassel, Germany, September 7th-9th 2006.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000). *Challenging Knowledge. The University in the Knowledge Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Dill, David (2003). *An Institutional Perspective on Higher Education Policy: The Case of Academic Quality Assurance*. in Smart (ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Agathon Press, New York.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. & Powell, Walter W. (1983/1991). *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organization Fields*. In Powell, Walter W. & DiMaggio, Paul J. (1991) (Ed.). *The New Institutionalism in organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Dobson, Ian & Hölttä Seppo (2001): The internationalisation of university education: Australia and Finland compared. *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 7 No. 3.
- Donaldson, Lex (1995). *American anti-management theories of organization. A critique of paradigm proliferation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. & Rabinow, Paul (1983). *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Second Edition With and Afterword by and an Interview with Michel Foucault. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dudley, Janice (1999). Higher education policy and the learning citizen. In Petersen, Alan; Barnes, Ian; Dudley, Janice & Harris, Patricia (1999). *Poststructuralism, Citizenship and Social Policy*. Routledge, London.
- Enders, Jürgen (2004). Higher education, internationalisation and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*. Vol 47. No 4.
- Eskola, Jari & Suoranta, Juha (1996) *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. Lapin yliopisto, Rovaniemi.
- Etzkowitz, Henry (1999). *Academia agonists: The 'triple helix' of government-university-industry relationships in the United States*. In Braun, Dietmar & Merrien, François-Xavier (Eds.) (1999). *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London
- Etzkowitz, Henry & Leydesdorff, Loet (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy*, Vol 29, No2.
- European Commission (2003). *Education & training 2010. The success of the Lisbon strategy hinges on urgent reforms*, Brussels.
- Fairclough, Norman (1989): *Language and Power*. Longman, London.
- Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman, London.
- Fairclough, Norman (1997): *Miten Media Puhuu*. Vastapaino, Tampere (Original: *Media Discourse 1995*)
- Fairclough, Norman (2001a). *The Dialectics of Discourse*. Textus XIV 2. 2001. www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/2001a/doc Accessed 21.9.2006.
- Fairclough, Norman (2001b). *Language and Power*. Second Edition. Longman, Edinburgh.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003a). *Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning*. In Rogers, R. (ed) (2003). *New directions in Critical Discourse Analysis: Semiotic Aspects of Social Transformation and Learning*. Erlbaum. www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/2003e/doc. Accessed 21.9.2006
- Fairclough, Norman (2003b). *Analysing Discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge, London.

- Fairclough, Norman & Chouliaraki, Lillie (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Filmer, Paul (1997). *Disinterestedness and the Modern University*. In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Fisher, Donald & Rubenson, Kjell (1998). *The Changing Political Economy: the Private and Public Lives of Canadian Universities*. In Currie, Jan & Newson, Janice (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalisation. Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oakes.
- Foucault, Michel (1980). *Truth and Power*. In Gordon, Colin (ed.) (1980). *Michel Foucault. Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* by Michel Foucault. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Foucault, Michel (1988). *The Political Technology of Individuals*. In Martin, Luther H.; Gutman, Huch & Hutton, Patrick H. (eds.) (1988). *Technologies of the Self. A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.
- Foucault, Michel (1991). *Governmentality*. In Burchell, Graham; Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago press, Chicago.
- Frazer, Nancy (2003). *From Discipline to Flexibilization? Rereading Foucault in the Shadow of Globalization*. *Constellations*. Vol 10, No2.
- Friedland, Roger & Alford, Robert R. (1991). *Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions*. In Powell, Walter W. & DiMaggio, Paul J. (1991) (Ed.). *The New Institutionalism in organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fulbright Programme 2007. <http://www.fulbrightonline.org/>
- Gibbons, Michael; Limoges, Camille; Nowotny, Helga; Schwartzman, Simon; Scott, Peter & Trow, Martin (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. Sage, London
- Godin, Benoit & Gingras, Yves (2000). *The place of universities in the system of knowledge production*. *Research Policy*, Vol 29, No2.
- Gordon, Colin (1991). *Governmental rationality: an introduction*. In Burchell, Graham; Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of
- Gordon, Colin (ed.) (1980). *Michel Foucault. Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* by Michel Foucault. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Gumport, Patricia J. (2000). *Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives*. *Higher Education*, Vol. 39.

- Hacking, Ian (1991). How should we do the history of statistics? In Burchell, Graham; Gordon, Colin & Miller, Peter (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago press, Chicago.
- Hall, Peter A. & Taylor, Rosemary C.R. (1996). *Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms*. *Political Studies* XLIV.
- Harris, Patricia (1999). Public welfare and liberal governance. In Petersen, Alan; Barnes, Ian; Dudley, Janice & Harris, Patricia (1999). *Poststructuralism, Citizenship and Social Policy*. Routledge, London.
- Held, David & McGrew, Anthony (2003). *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Second Edition. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Himanen, Pekka (2004). Välittävä, kannustava ja luova Suomi – Katsaus tietoyhteiskuntamme syviin haasteisiin. In Himanen, Pekka; Castells, Manuel; Saxenian, AnnaLee; Kam, Wong Poh & Kalliokoski, Matti (2004). *Gloaalitietoyhteiskunta. Kehitysuuntia Piilaaksosta Singaporeen*. Teknologia katsaus 155/2004. Tekes, Helsinki.
- Hirst, Paul & Thompson, Grahame (1999). *Globalisation in Question*. Second edition. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hooghe, Liesbet & Marks, Gary (2001). *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., Oxford.
- Huisman, Jeroen & van der Wende, Marijk (eds.) (2004a). *On cooperation and competition. National and European Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Lemmens, Bonn.
- Huisman, Jeroen & van der Wende, Marijk (2004b). The EU and Bologna: are supra- and international initiatives threatening domestic agendas? *European Journal of Education* VOL 39, No.3.
- Hölttä, Seppo (1999). Regional cooperation in postsecondary education in Europe – the case of Nordic Countries. *Journal of Institutional Research* Vol. 8 No. 2.
- Hölttä, Seppo (2000). From Ivory Towers to Regional Networks in Finnish Higher Education. *European Journal of Education* Vol. 35, No. 4.
- Hölttä, Seppo & Malkki, Pertti (2000) Response of Finnish higher education institutions to the national information society programme. *Higher Education Policy*. Vol 13, No. 3.
- Hölttä, Seppo & Rekilä, Eila (2006). Ministerial Steering and Institutional Responses: Recent Developments of the Finnish Higher Education System. *Higher Education Management and Policy*. Vol. 15, No. 1.
- Immergut, Ellen (1998). The theoretical core of the new institutionalism. *Policy and Society*. Vol. 26, Issue1.
- Jessop, Robert (1990), *State Theory. Putting Capitalist States in Their Place*. Polity Press, Cambridge

- Jessop, Robert (2004). Critical semiotic analysis and cultural political economy. *Critical Discourse Studies*. Vol 1, No 2.
- Jokinen, Arja (1999). Vakuuttelevan ja suostuttelevan retoriikan analysoiminen. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1999). *Diskurssianalyysi Liikkeessä*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Jokinen, Arja & Juhila, Kirsi (1993). Valtasuhteiden analysoiminen. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993). *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Jokinen, Arja & Juhila, Kirsi (1999): Diskurssianalyttisen tutkimuksen kartta. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1999). *Diskurssianalyysi Liikkeessä*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993a). Johdanto. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993). *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993b). Diskursiivinen maailma: teoreettiset lähtökohdat ja analyttiset käsitteet. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1993). *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Juhila, Kirsi (1999). Kulttuurin jatkuvasti rakentuvat kehät. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1999). *Diskurssianalyysi Liikkeessä*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1999). Kymmenen kysymystä diskurssianalyysistä. In Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi & Suoninen, Eero (1999). *Diskurssianalyysi Liikkeessä*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Jussila, Osmo; Hentilä, Seppo & Nevakivi, Jukka (1995). Suomen poliittinen historia. WSOY, Porvoo.
- Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage Publications, London.
- Kaivola, Taina & Rohweder, Liisa (Eds.) (2007). *Towards Sustainable Development in Higher Education – Reflections*. Publications of the Ministry of Education 2007:6. Helsinki.
- Kaivola, Taina & Ålberg, Mauri (2007). Theoretical Underpinnings of Education for Sustainable Development. In Kaivola, Taina & Rohweder, Liisa (Eds.) (2007). *Towards Sustainable Development in Higher Education – Reflections*. Publications of the Ministry of Education 2007:6. Helsinki.
- Kekäle, Jouni (1997). *Leadership Cultures in Academic Departments*. University of Joensuu, Publications in Social Sciences 26. Joensuu.
- Kerr, Clark (1995). *The Uses of the University*. Fourth Edition. With 1994 Commentaries on Past Developments and Future Prospects. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kerr, Derek (1999). Beheading the king and enthroning the market: A critique of Foucauldian governmentality. *Science & Society* 1999, Vol. 63, No 2.

- Kiander, Jaakko (2002). 1930-luvun pulakausi ja 1990-luvun talouskriisi. Talouspolitiikan ja taloudellisen ajattelun vertailua. In Blomberg, Helena; Hannikainen, Matti & Kettunen, Pauli (2002). (Eds.). *Lamakirja. Näkökulmia 1990-luvun talouskriisiin ja sen historiallisiin konteksteihin*. Kirja-Aurora, Turku.
- Kjær, Peter & Pedersen, Ove K. (2003). *Translating Liberalization: Neoliberalism in the Danish Negotiated Economy*. In Campbell, John L. & Pedersen, Ove K. (Eds.) (2003). *The Rise of Neoliberalism and Institutional Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Knight, Jane. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints*. Research Monograph No. 7. Canadian Bureau for International Education, Ottawa.
- Knight, Jane (2004). *Internationalization Remodelled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales*. *Journal of Studies in international Education*. Vol. 8, No.1.
- Kumar, Krishan (1997). *The Need for Place*. In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Kuoppala, Kari (2004). *Neljän suomalaisen monialaisen yliopiston hallinnon itsearviointin yhteenvetoraportti*. Tampereen yliopisto, Tampere.
- Kwiek, Marek (2004). 'The Emergent European Educational Policies under Scrutiny: the Bologna Process from a Central European perspective'. *European Educational Research Journal*, 3, 4, pp. 759–776.
- Kälvemark, Torsten & van der Wende, Marijk (1997). *National Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe*. National Agency for Higher Education. *Högskoleverket Studies 1997:8*. Stockholm.
- Lemke, Thomas (2002). *Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. Rethinking Marxism*. Vol. 13, No.3.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. & Guba, Egon G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage, Newbury Park.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. & Guba, Egon G. (2000). *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences*. In Denzin, Norman K & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Second Edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Linz, Juan (1973). *Early State-Building and Late Peripheral Nationalism Against the State: The Case of Spain*. In: Eisenstadt, S.N. & Rokkan, Stein (Eds.) (1973). *Building States and Nations*. Volume II. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Luijten-Lub, Anneke et al (2004). *International Comparative Analysis*. In Huisman, Jeroen & van der Wende, Marijk (eds.) (2004). *On cooperation and competition. National and European Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Lemmens, Bonn.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois (1985). *Tieto postmodernissa yhteiskunnassa*. Vastapaino, Tampere.

- Maassen, Peter; Nokkala, Terhi & Uppström, Therese Marie (2004). Internationalization of higher education institutions in Northern Europe in the light of Bologna - National and Institutional Case Studies. NIFU STEP Working paper, 12 2004. NIFU STEP, Oslo.
- March, James G. & Olsen, Johan P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics*. The Free Press, New York.
- Marginson, Simon (1997). Steering from a distance: Power relations in Australian higher education. *Higher Education*. Vol 34. No 1.
- Marginson, Simon (2006). Global university rankings: private and public goods. Paper presented at the 19th annual Consortium of Higher education Researchers Conference, Kassel, Germany, September 7th -9th 2006.
- Marginson, Simon & Considine, Mark (2000). *The Enterprise University. Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Marginson, Simon & van der Wende, Marijk (2007). *Globalisation and Higher Education*. OECD Education Working Paper No. 8. Paris.
- May, Christopher (2002). *The Information Society. A Sceptical View*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Melén-Paaso, Monica (1997) Erasmus-ohjelman tausta ja alkuvaiheet Suomessa. In: Centre for International Mobility (1997). *Erasmus, Sokrates ja Suomi. Korkeakoulutuksen eurooppalainen ulottuvuus 1992–1997*. Helsinki.
- Melody, William (1997). Universities and Public Policy. In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Merton, R. 1973. *The Normative Structure of Science*. *The Sociology of Science*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Meyer, John W.; Boli, John & Thomas, George M. (1987). Ontology and Rationalisation in the Western Cultural Account. In Thomas, George M.; Meyer, John W.; Ramirez, Francisco O. & Boli, John (1987). *Institutional Structure. Constituting State, Society and the Individual*. Sage, Newbury Park, California.
- Meyer, John W. & Rowan, Brian (1991). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. In Powell, Walter W. & DiMaggio, Paul J. (1991) (Ed.). *The New Institutionalism in organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ministry of Education (1987). *Development of International Activities in Higher Education*. Helsinki.
- Ministry of Education (2001). *An International Strategy for Higher Education*. Ministry of Education committee reports 2001:23. Helsinki
- Ministry of Education (2004a). *Management and Steering of Higher Education in Finland*. Publications of the Ministry of Education, Finland 2004:20. Helsinki.

- Ministry of Education (2004b). Information Society Programme for Education, Training and Research 2004-2005. Publications of the Ministry of Education, Finland 2004:14. Helsinki.
- Ministry of Education (2005) OECD thematic review of tertiary education; Country Background report for Finland. Publications of the Ministry of Education, Finland 2005: 38. Helsinki.
- Ministry of Education (2006) Education and Science in Finland. Publications of the Ministry of Education, Finland 2006:15. Helsinki.
- Neave, Guy (2002a). Anything Goes: Or, How the Accommodation of Europe's Universities to European Integration Integrates an Inspiring Number of Contradictions. *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 8, No.3.
- Neave, Guy (2002b). On Stakeholders, Cheshire Cats and Seer: Changing visions of the University. Inaugural lecture 14.3.2002. Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies. University of Twente, Netherlands.
- Newman, Frank & Couturier, Lara K. (2002). Trading Public Good in the Higher Education Market. The Observatory on borderless higher education. London.
- Newman, Janet (2001). *Modernising Governance*. New Labour, Policy and Society. Sage Publications, London.
- Newson, Janice (1998). National responses to globalisation. In Currie, Jan & Newson, Janice (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalisation. Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oakes.
- Nikander, Pirjo (1997). Diskursiivinen käänne (sosiaali)psykologiassa. *Psykologia* 32.
- Nokkala, Terhi (2004). Discursive Construction of the European Higher Education Area – Window to the changing role of higher education in the knowledge-based society. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Consortium for Higher Education Researchers Conference, 17th-19th September, 2004 Enschede, The Netherlands.
- Nokkala, Terhi (2005). "Finland is a small country" – The discourse of internationalisation of higher education and the Finnish knowledge society. Presented at the Institute of Advanced Studies, University of Lancaster Workshop on Critical Semiotic Analysis of the Knowledge-Based Economy, Lancaster, UK, 30th November-1st December 2005.
- Nokkala, Terhi & Treuthardt, Leena (2006). Competitive knowledge society and the convergence of the higher education policy discourse analysed through the concept of fashion. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Consortium for Higher Education Researchers Conference, 7th-9th September 2006, Kassel, Germany.
- Nokkala, Terhi & Uppström, Therese Marie (2003). Internationalisation of Higher Education in the Nordic Countries – Cooperation and Competition. Paper presented at 25th EAIR Forum, Limerick, Ireland 26.8.2003
- Nooteboom, Bart (2000). *Learning and Innovation in Organizations and Economies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- Nowotny, Helga, Scott, Peter & Gibbons Michael (2001). *Re-Thinking Science. Knowledge and the Public in the Age of Uncertainty*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Oakeshott, Michael (1983). *On History and Other Essays*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Ohmae, Kenichi (1995). *The End of the Nation State. The Rise of Regional Economies*. The Free Press, New York.
- O'Malley, Pat (1996). Risk and responsibility. In Barry, Andrew; Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (eds.) (1996). *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. UCL Press, London.
- Opetusministeriö (1987). *Korkeakoululaitoksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1987–1992*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1991). *Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1991–1996*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1993). *Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1991–1996, tarkiste 1993*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1995a). *Euroopan Unionin korkeakoulupolitiikka. Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 1995:15*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1995b). *Euroopan Unionin tutkimuspolitiikka. Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 1995:14*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1995c). *Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1995–2000*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1995d) *Koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen tietostrategia 1995–1999*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (1999). *Koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen tietostrategia 2000–2004*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2001). *EU:n Koulutuspolitiikka - OPM:n Strategia Koulutuspoliittisessa EU-yhteistyössä. Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 2001, 26*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2004). *Koulutus ja tutkimus 2003–2008. Kehittämissuunnitelma. Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2004:6*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2005a). *Korkeakoulujen ulkomaisten tutkinto-opiskelijoiden maksutyöryhmän muistio. Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2005:22*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2005b) *Yliopistotilastot 2004. Taulukoita KOTA-tietokannasta. Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2005:26*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2005c). *Ammattikorkeakoulut 2004. Taulukoita AMKOTA-tietokannasta. Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2005:23*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2007a). *Yliopistojen taloudellisen ja hallinnollisen aseman uudistaminen. Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2007:2*. Helsinki.
- Opetusministeriö (2007b). *Teknillisen korkeakoulun, Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulun ja Taideteollisen korkeakoulun yhdistyminen uudeksi yliopistoksi. Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2007:16*. Helsinki.

- Parker, Ian (1992). *Discourse dynamics. Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. Routledge, London.
- Parker, Ian (1998). *Realism, Relativism and Critique in psychology*. In Parker, Ian (ed.) (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism*. Sage, London.
- Peters, B. Guy (1999). *Institutional Theory in Political Science. The 'New Institutionalism'*. Continuum, London.
- Peters, Guy (2000). *Globalization, Institutions and Governance*. In Peters, Guy & Savoie, Donald J (2000). *Governance in the Twenty-first Century. Revitalizing the Public Service. Series on Governance and public Management*. Canadian Centre for Management Development. McGill-Queen's University press, Montreal.
- Peters, Michael (1996). *Poststructuralism, Politics and Education*. Bergin & Garvey, Westport, Connecticut.
- Peters, Michael (2001). National education policy constructions of the "knowledge economy": towards a critique. *Journal of Educational Enquiry* Vol. 2, No 1.
- Petersen, Alan; Barnes, Ian; Dudley, Janice & Harris, Patricia (1999). *Poststructuralism, Citizenship and Social Policy*. Routledge, London
- Potter, Jonathan (1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. Sage, London.
- Potter, Jonathan (1998). *Fragments in the Realization of Relativism*. In Parker, Ian (ed.) (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism*. Sage, London.
- Powell, Walter W. & DiMaggio, Paul J. (1991) (Ed.). *The New Institutionalism in organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Prague Communiqué 2001 http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/010519PRAGUE_COMMUNIQUE.PDF Accessed 3.10.2006.
- Proulx, Roland (2006). *World university rankings. The need for a new paradigm*. Paper presented to the 28th Annual EAIR Forum, 30th August to 1st September 2006, Rome, Italy.
- Ramirez, Francisco O (1987). *Institutional Analysis*. In Thomas, George M.; Meyer, John W.; Ramirez, Francisco O. & Boli, John (1987). *Institutional Structure. Constituting State, Society and the Individual*. Sage, Newbury Park, California.
- Rabinow, Paul (ed.) (1984). *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. Penguin Books, London.
- Reich, Robert (1992). *The Work of Nations. Preparing ourselves for 21st century capitalism*. Vintage Books, New York.
- Reichert, Sybille & Tauch, Christian (2005). *Trends IV. European Universities Implementing Bologna*. European University Association, Brussels.
- Reichert, Sybille & Tauch, Christian (2003). *Trends 2003. Progress towards the European Higher Education Area*. European University Association, Brussels.
- Rhoades, R. A.W (1997). *Understanding Governance. Policy networks, Governance, Reflexivity and accountability*. Public Policy and Management series. Open University Press, Buckingham.

- Robertson, Susan (1999). 'Risky Business': market provision, community governance and the individualisation of 'risk' in New Zealand education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. Vol. 9, No.3.
- Robertson, Susan (2005). Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education: global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education*. Vol. 41, No.2.
- Rose, Nikolas (1996). Governing "Advanced" liberal democracies. In Barry, Andrew; Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (eds.) (1996). *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. UCL Press, London.
- Rose, Nikolas (1999). *Powers of Freedom. Reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rose, Nikolas & Miller, Peter (1992). Political power beyond the state: problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*. Vol 43, No 2.
- Salmi, Hannu (2002). Tietoyhteiskunta ja talouskriisi. Informaatioteknologinen näkökulma 1990-luvun lamaan. In Blomberg, Helena; Hannikainen, Matti & Kettunen, Pauli (2002). (Eds.). *Lamakirja. Näkökulmia 1990-luvun talouskriisiin ja sen historiallisiin konteksteihin*. Kirja-Aurora, Turku.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (1999). A Multicultural conception of human rights. In Featherstone Mike & Lash, Scott (ed.) (1999). *Spaces of Culture. City-Nation-World*. Sage, London.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2006). The University in the Twenty-First Century: Towards a Democratic and Emancipatory University Reform. In Rhoads, Robert A. & Torres, Carlos Alberto (2006). *The University, State and Market. The political Economy of Globalisation in the Americas*. Stanford University Press, Stanford. Chapter accessed on the internet 26.3.2007. <http://www.ces.uc.pt/bss/papers.htm>
- Schultz, Theodore W. (1971). *Investment in human capital: the role of education and of research*. Free Press, New York.
- Scott, Peter (1997). The Postmodern University? In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Scott, Peter (2003). Challenges to Academic Values and the Organization of Academic Work in a Time of Globalization. *Higher education in Europe*, Vol. 28, No.3.
- Scott, W. Richard (1991). Unpacking Institutional Arguments. In Powell, Walter W. & DiMaggio, Paul J. (1991) (Ed.). *The New Institutionalism in organizational Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Scott, W. Richard (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. Second Edition. Sage Publications, Thousand Oakes.

- Selznick, Philip (1957). *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Sitra (1998). *Elämänlaatu, osaaminen ja kilpailukyky. Tietoyhteiskunnan strategisen kehittämisen lähtökohdat ja päämäärät*, Helsinki 1998.
- Slaughter, Sheila & Leslie, Larry R. (1997). *Academic Capitalism. Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Slaughter, Sheila (1998). *National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy*. In Currie, Jan & Newson, Janice (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalisation. Critical perspectives*. Sage, Thousand Oakes.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2000). *Governing the Global Economy Through Government Networks*. In Byers, M. (ed.) (2000). *The Role of Law in International Politics*. Oxford University Press. Reproduced in Held, David & McGrew, Anthony (2003). *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Second Edition. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (1997). *Changing Ideas of the University*. In: Smith, Anthony & Webster, Frank (ed.) (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Sorbonne Declaration 1998 http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/980525SORBONNE_DECLARATION.PDF Accessed 3.10.2006.
- Stehr, Nico (1994). *Knowledge Societies*. Sage, London.
- Stubbs, Michael (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis. Computer-assisted Studies of Language and Culture*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Suchman, Mark C. (1995). *Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches*. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 20, No 3.
- Söderqvist, Minna (2002). *Internationalisation and its management at higher-education institutions. Applying conceptual, content and discourse analysis*. *Acta Universitatis Oeconomicae Helsinkiensis A-206*. Helsinki School of Economics, Helsinki.
- Tapper, Helena (2003). *Tietoyhteiskunta ja kansalainen*. In Seppänen, Rauno (Ed.) (2003). *Tietoyhteiskunnan harha*. UNIPress, Kuopio.
- Taylor, Scott & Paton, Rob (2002). *Corporate Universities – historical development, conceptual analysis & relations with public-sector higher education*. *The Observatory on borderless higher education*, London.
- Taylor, Stephanie (2001a). *Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research*. In Wetherell, Margaret; Taylor, Stephanie & Yates, Simeon J. (2001) (Eds.) *Discourse as Data. A guide for analysis*. Sage, London.
- Taylor, Stephanie (2001b). *Evaluating and Applying Discourse Analytic Research*. In Wetherell, Margaret; Taylor, Stephanie & Yates, Simeon J. (2001) (Eds.) *Discourse as Data. A guide for analysis*. Sage, London.

- Teichler, Ulrich (2000). Higher Education Research and its Institutional Basis. In Schwarz, Stefanie (ed.) (2000). *The Institutional Basis of Higher Education Research. Experience and Perspectives*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Hingham, MA.
- Teichler, Ulrich (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*. Vol. 28, No.1.
- Tietoyhteiskuntaohjelma (2006). *Uudistuva, ihmisläheinen ja kilpailukykyinen Suomi. Kansallinen tietoyhteiskuntastrategia 2007–2015*. Valtioneuvoston kanslia, Helsinki.
- Tikly, Leon (2003). Governmentality and the study of education policy in South Africa. *Journal of Education Policy*. Vol 18, No2.
- Tirronen, Jarkko (2005). Modernin yliopistokoulutuksen lähtökohdat ja sivistyskäsitys. *Kuopion yliopiston julkaisuja E. Yhteiskuntatieteet 122*. Kuopio.
- Treuthardt, Leena; Huusko, Mira & Saarinen, Taina (2006). Management by Results and Higher Education Evaluation as Fashions and Success Stories: The Case of Finland. *Higher Education in Europe*. Vol. 31, No.2.
- Trondal, J.; Gornizka, Å.; Maassen, P. & Stensaker, B (2001). *Internasjonalisering av høyre utdanning*. NIFU Skriftserie nr 28/2001. Oslo.
- Trow, Martin (1974). Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education. In *Policies for Higher Education, from the General Report on the Conference on Future Structures of Post-Secondary Education*, OECD, Paris.
- Trowler, Paul (2001). Captured by the Discourse? The Socially Constitutive Power of New Higher Education Discourse in the UK. *Organization*. Vol 8, no 2.
- Tuomi, Jouni & Sarajärvi, Anneli (2002). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi, Helsinki.
- Upton, Anthony F. (1999). History and National identity: some Finnish examples. In Branch, Michael (ed.) (1999). *National history and identity. Approaches to the writing of national history in the North-East Baltic region nineteenth and twentieth century*. Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki.
- Usher, Alex & Savino, Massimo (2006). *A World of Difference: A Global Survey of University League Tables*. Educational Policy Institute, Toronto.
- Valtiovarainministeriö (1995) *Suomi tietoyhteiskunnaksi: kansalliset linjaukset*. Helsinki.
- van Kersbergen, Kees & van Waarden, Frans (2001). *Shifts in Governance: Problems of Legitimacy and Accountability*. Social Sciences Research Council, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research. The Hague.
- van der Wende, Marijk (2001). Internationalisation policies: about new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher education Policy*, Vol. 14.
- van der Wende, Marijk & Huisman, Jeroen (2004). Europe. In Huisman, Jeroen & van der Wende, Marijk (eds.) (2004). *On cooperation and competition. National and European Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Lemmens. Bonn.

- Varto, Juha (1992). *Laadullisen tutkimuksen metodologia*. Hygieia. Kirjayhtymä, Tampere.
- Virtanen, Aki (2002). *Uudella koulutuksella uudelle vuosituhannelle*. Suomen 1990-luvun koulutuspolitiikka. Opetusministeriö, Helsinki.
- Vossensteyn, Hans; Deen, Jarno; van Adrichem, Nelleke; Dekker, Peter; Mesker, Peter, Verkroost, Marie-José & de Veert, Egbert (2007). *Offshore Education. Offshore education in the wider context of internationalisation and ICT: experiences and examples from Dutch higher education*. Stichting Digitale Universiteit, Utrecht.
- Välilä, Jussi (2001). *A Historical Introduction to Finnish Higher Education*. In Välimä, Jussi (ed.) (2001). *Finnish Higher Education in Transition. Perspectives on Massification and Globalisation*. Institute for Educational Research. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.
- Walters, William & Haas, Jens Henrik (2005). *Governing Europe. Discourse, governmentality and European integration*. Routledge, Oxon.
- Webster, Frank (2002). *Theories of the information society*. Second Edition. Routledge, London.
- Weingart, Peter. (1997). "From 'Finalization' to Mode 2: Old Wine in New Bottles?", *Social Science Information*, Vol 36, No 4.
- Wetherell, Margaret & Potter, Jonathan (1988). *Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires*. In Antaki, Charles (1988) (ed). *Analysing everyday explanation*. Sage, London.
- Wetherell, Margaret & Potter, Jonathan (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Willig, Carla (1998). *Social Constructionism and Revolutionary Socialism: A Contradiction in Terms*. In: Parker, Ian (ed.) (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism*. Sage, London.
- Witte, Johanna (2006). *Change of Degrees and Degrees of Change. Comparing Adaptations of European Higher Education Systems in the Context of the Bologna Process*. Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente, Enschede.
- Wächter, Bernd (2004). *The Bologna Process: developments and prospects*. *European Journal of Education* Vol. 39, No. 3.
- Ylijoki, Oili-Helena (2005). *Academic nostalgia: A narrative approach to academic work*. *Human Relations*. Vol. 58, No. 5.
- Ziman, John. (1994). *Prometheus Bound. Science in a dynamic steady state*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

9.2 Empirical document data

The documents are grouped into university documents, development strategies, internationalisation strategies, EUA documents, Bologna process documents, and four different types of EU documents. The university documents can be identified by the abbreviation of the name of the university (e.g. University of Helsinki **UH**, University of Tampere **UT** etc.), and regional strategies and CIMO strategy is grouped under this heading and can be identified similarly (Regional strategy for Metropolitan area **RM** etc). The national development strategies are marked with **DS** and the abbreviation for internationalisation strategies as **IS**. The EUA documents are marked with **EUA**, and Bologna process documents by **BD**. The EU documents are categorised into **EU** Lisbon (**EUL**), **EU** University (**EUU**), **EU** Research (**EUR**) and **EU** Education and Training (**EUE**) documents. The documents are also numbered within their groups, although the numbers are not solely based on chronological order, but also on type of document within each group.

9.2.1 University documents

- Helsingin yliopisto Strategia 2004–2006 (2003)
University of Helsinki Strategy 2004–2006 (2003) UH1 (in English)
- Helsingin yliopisto Strategia 2007–2008 (2006)
University of Helsinki Strategy 2007–2009 (2003) UH2 (in English)
- Helsingin yliopiston kansainvälinen toimintasuunnitelma 2004–2006 (2003)
University of Helsinki internationalisation strategy 2004–2006 (2003) UH3 (in Finnish)
- Tampereen yliopiston strategia (2001)
University of Tampere Strategy (2001) UT1 (in Finnish)
- Tampereen yliopiston strategia (2006)
University of Tampere strategy (2006) UT2 (in Finnish)
- Tampereen yliopiston kansainväliset asiat toimintasuunnitelma (2001)
University of Tampere internationalisation strategy (2001) UT3 (in Finnish)
- University of Tampere European Policy Statement (2001) UT4 (in English)

- Swedish school of economics and business administration 2015 (2003) HA1 (in English)
- Hanken European Policy Statement 2003-2006 HA2 (in English)
- Tampereen teknillisen korkeakoulun strategia 2000–2005 (1999)
Tampere University of Technology strategy 2000–2005 (1999) TT1 (in Finnish)
- Tampereen teknillisen yliopiston strategia 2004-> (2004)
Tampere University of Technology Strategy 2004-> (2004) TT2 (in Finnish)
- Metropolialueen yliopistojen ja ammattikorkeakoulujen yhteinen aluestrategia 2006–2009 (2005)
The regional strategy for the universities and HEI's in the metropolitan area 2006-2009 (2005) RM1 (in Finnish)
- Pirkanmaan korkeakoulujen Aluestrategia 2007–2011 (2006)
Regional Strategy for Pirkanmaa region 2007–2011 (2006) RT1 (in Finnish)
- CIMO (2004). CIMOn virta: visio – missio – strategia – arvot
CIMO Strategy 2005–2008 (2004) CM1 (in Finnish)

9.2.2 National policy documents

Development plans for education and research

- Opetusministeriö (1987). Korkeakoululaitoksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1987–1992
Ministry of Education (1987). Higher education development plan 1987–1992 DS1 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1991). Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1991–1996
Ministry of Education (1991). Development plan for education and research 1991–1996 DS2 (in Finnish)

- Opetusministeriö (1993). Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1991–1996, tarkiste 1993
Ministry of Education (1993). Development plan for education and research 1991-1993, update 1993 DS3 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1995). Koulutuksen ja korkeakouluissa harjoitettavan tutkimuksen kehittämissuunnitelma 1995–2000
Ministry of Education (1995). Development plan for education and research 1995-2000 DS4 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1999). Koulutus ja tutkimus vuosina 1999–2004 kehittämissuunnitelma Ministry of Education (1999). Development plan for education and research 1999–2004 DS5 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (2003). Koulutus ja tutkimus 2003–2008
Ministry of Education (2003). Development plan for research and development 2003–2008 DS6 (in English)

Internationalisation policy documents

- Opetusministeriö (1988). Opiskelijain vaihdon hallinnon työryhmän muistio
Ministry of Education (1988). Working group memo on student exchange administration IS1 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1989). Korkeakoulujen kansainvälisen opiskelijavaihdon työryhmän muistio
Ministry of Education (1989). Working group memo on international student exchange in higher education IS2 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1987). Korkeakoulujen kansainvälisten toimintojen kehittäminen
Ministry of Education (1987). Development of International Activities in Higher Education 1987 IS3 (in English)
- Opetusministeriö (2001). Korkeakoulutuksen kansainvälisen toiminnan strategia
Ministry of Education (2001). International strategy for higher education 2001 IS4 (in English)
- Opetusministeriö (2005). Korkeakoulujen ulkomaalaisten tutkinto-opiskelijoiden maksutyöryhmän muistio

Ministry of Education (2005). Working group memo on foreign student fees 2005 IS5 (in Finnish)

- Opetusministeriö (1995). Euroopan Unionin korkeakoulupolitiikka
Ministry of Education (1995). Memo on EU higher education policy 1995 IS6 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (1995). Euroopan Unionin tutkimusstrategia
Ministry of Education (1995). Memo on EU research policy 1995 IS7 (in Finnish)
- Opetusministeriö (2001). EU:n Koulutuspolitiikka – OPM:n Strategia Koulutuspoliittisessa EU-yhteistyössä
Ministry of Education (2001). Ministry of Education strategy on EU education policy cooperation 2001 IS8 (in Finnish)

9.2.3 European documents

EUA documents

- EUA strategy 2001 EUA1
- Magna Charta Universitatum 1988 EUA2
- Salamanca declaration 2001 EUA3
- Graz Declaration 2003 EUA4
- Glasgow Declaration 2005 EUA5
- EUA statement Universities as the motor for the construction of a Europe of Knowledge 2002 EUA6
- EUA statement More research for Europe – Towards 3% of GDP 2002 EUA7
- EUA statement the role of universities in shaping the future of Europe 2003 EUA8

- EUA statement The role of Universities in the Europe of Knowledge 2003
EUA9
- EUA Statement on the Research Role of Europe's Universities 2004 EUA10

Bologna documents

- Sorbonne Declaration 1998 BD1
- Bologna Declaration 1999 BD2
- Prague Communiqué 2001 BD3
- Berlin Communiqué 2003 BD4
- Bergen Communiqué 2005 BD5

EU documents

EU Lisbon documents

- EU Bangemann report 1994 EUL1
- EU Lisbon conclusions 2000 EUL2
- EU Barcelona conclusion 2002 EUL3
- Working together for jobs and growth 2005 EUL4

EU University documents

- EC The role of Universities in a Europe of knowledge 2003 EEU1
- EU Council resolution on mobilising the brainpower of Europe 2005
EEU2
- EC Communication Mobilising the Brainpower of Europe 2005 EEU3

EU research documents

- EC Towards a European Research Area 2000 EUR1
- EC More research for Europe 2002 EUR2
- EC Investing in research: an action plan for Europe 2003 EUR3
- EC Building the ERA of knowledge for growth 2005 EUR4

EU education and training documents

- EU Council Concrete future objectives of education and training systems 2001 EUE1
- EU Council detailed work programme on the objectives of Education and Training 2002 EUE2
- EC Investing efficiently in education and training 2003 EUE3
- EC Education and training 2010 2003 EUE4
- EU Council Education and training 2010 2003 EUE5
- EC Modernising education and training 2005 EUE6

Appendix one

Interview themes and questions

Interview themes

- a) What is internationalisation of higher education?
- b) The role of Finnish higher education in the international higher education arena?
- c) The relevance of internationalisation for the university and for the country?
- d) The roles of different actors in internationalisation

Interview questions

Pilot interviews

- Explain your views on the national policy for internationalisation of higher education.
- Your view on the relationship between the quality of higher education and internationalisation.
- Explain your views and opinions the most important aspects of internationalisation and internationalisation policy.
- Describe the position of Finnish higher education in the international field of higher education.
- Explain your views on the relevance of internationalisation from the perspective of the university.
- Explain your views on the value of internationalisation.
- Your views on what the national internationalisation policy for higher education should be like.
- Explain your views on the steering of internationalisation: the roles of the universities, the ministry and other actors.
- Explain how the internationalisation of the universities should be supported.

- Your views on what internationalisation demands of the universities and the ministry.

Rectors

- Internationalisation of higher education has been discussed a lot in Finland. To start with, could you tell me your views on the internationalisation of higher education, what in your opinion does it mean and is it of value for universities? Please explain why. (theme a)
- What demands and challenges does internationalisation set for universities? What about for the ministry and other organisations? Please motivate why. (theme d)
- The ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed with the debate on the internationalisation of higher education,. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them. (theme a/b)
- Explain your views on the steering of internationalisation of higher education in Finland. In your opinion, how should the internationalisation of the universities be supported? Please motivate. (theme d)
- How would you describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in the international field of higher education? (theme b)
- What, in your opinion, is the value of internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why? (theme c)
- Society today is often characterised as the knowledge-based society and higher education is often said to be important for its development. Do you see internationalisation as being somehow related to the role of higher education in the knowledge based society? Please motivate why. (theme c)

Ministry of Education

- Internationalisation of higher education has been discussed a lot in Finland. To start with, could you tell me your views on internationalisation of higher education? What in your opinion does it mean and what kinds of demand

and challenge does it set for universities? What about for the ministry? Please motivate why. (theme a/d)

- The ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed with the debate on the internationalisation of higher education,. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them. (theme a/b)
- Tell me about your views on the steering of internationalisation of higher education in Finland. What in your opinion is the role of the ministry? (theme d)
- How would you describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in the international field of higher education? Please motivate. (theme b)
- What, in your opinion, is the value of internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why? (theme c)
- Society today is often characterised as the knowledge-based society and higher education is often said to be important for its development. Do you see internationalisation as being somehow related to the role of higher education in the knowledge based society? Please motivate why. (theme c)

Rector's conference

- Internationalisation of higher education has been discussed a lot in Finland. To start with, could you tell me your views on internationalisation of higher education. In you opinion, what does it mean, and is it of value for the universities? Please motivate why. (theme a)
- What demands and challenges does internationalisation set for universities? What about for your organisation? Please motivate why. (theme d)
- The ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed with the debate on the internationalisation of higher education,. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them. (theme a/b)

- Tell me about your views on the steering of internationalisation of higher education in Finland. How do you see the role of your organisation in the internationalisation of higher education in Finland (theme d)
- How would you describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in the international field of higher education? Please motivate. (theme b)
- In your opinion, what is the value of the internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why? (theme c)
- Society today is often characterised as the knowledge-based society and higher education is often said to be important for its development. Do you see internationalisation as being somehow related to the role of higher education in the knowledge based society? Please motivate. (theme d)

CIMO

- Internationalisation of higher education has been discussed a lot in Finland. To start with, could you tell me your views on internationalisation of higher education. What, in your opinion, does it mean and what demands and challenges does it set for universities? What about your organisation? Please motivate why. (theme a/d)
- The ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed with the debate on the internationalisation of higher education,. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them. (theme a/b)
- Tell me about your views on the steering of internationalisation of higher education in Finland. How do you see the role of your organisation in the internationalisation of higher education in Finland/? (theme d)
- How would you describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in the international field of higher education? Please motivate. (theme b)
- In your opinion, what is the value of the internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why? (theme c)

- Society today is often characterised as the knowledge-based society and higher education is often said to be important for its development. Do you see internationalisation as being somehow related to the role of higher education in the knowledge based society? Please motivate why. (theme c)

Appendix two

Translation conventions

While transcribing the interviews, all the words were written out, including the unintentional repetition of words such as “is” or “like”. Laughter and pauses etc. were indicated, although no attention was paid to actual turn-taking, the interviewer and the interviewee speaking over each other, emphases or accents or length of the pauses. However, in the course of the analysis, it became evident that such a detailed linguistic or conversational analysis was not needed and therefore for the translation process, a cleaned up version of the selected quotes was written, in which repeated words etc. were omitted. The quotes were translated by the author, after which the translations were checked and corrected by a native English speaker, who is also fluent in Finnish and had at her disposal the cleaned up versions of the original Finnish quotes. Finally the quotes were further clarified by the language editor.

The translation of interview quotes endeavours to retain the colloquial style of the quotes, so grammatical correctness and coherence were not aspired to in the translation process, even when this means that some wordings may be rendered in unidiomatic English (see quote 1). In some cases the quotes were, however, shortened to some extent, for instance in those cases where the speaker changed to a completely different thing in the middle of his/her speech or clarified it with a personal anecdote, or referred to the personal experience of the interviewer, but then immediately reverted to the topic (see quote 3). In some other cases, it is clear from the context that the speaker is referring to a specific issue, but does not mention it explicitly in the selected quote. In these cases the issue is mentioned in square brackets (see quote 2). In transcribing the document quotes, which in the original versions are written in literary language, the literary style is retained, even when this means larger changes in the individual wording, due to the different grammatical structures or expressions in Finnish and English (see quote 4).

Quote 1

Original interview quote

Joo, siis meidän tehtiin semmonen paperi tossa keväällä tiedekunnille sellanen paperi jossa tiedekuntien pitää itse miettiä millä aloilla ne pystyy parhaiten toimimaan eurooppalaisina tutkimusyliopistoina niin että millä aloilla yliopisto pystyy parhaiten toimimaan eurooppalaisena tutkimusyliopistona ja me saadaan pian siihen vastaukset ja niinkun sen perusidea on se että, että niillä, niillä vahvoilla aloilla niin sitten pitäis luoda pysyvät kansainväliset toimintarakenteet. Koko yliopiston kentälle niin niitä ei oo varaa luoda. Niin meidän

pitää arvioida sitten niitten tiedekuntien näkemysten pohjalla että et mitä voidaan tehdä. Se on, se on semmonen niinku alku aika pitkälle prosessille. (U2, 5)

Cleaned up version

Joo, siis mehän tehtiin tossa keväällä tiedekunnille sellanen paperi jossa tiedekuntien pitää itse miettiä millä aloilla ne pystyy parhaiten toimimaan eurooppalaisina tutkimusyliopistoina, niin että millä aloilla yliopisto pystyy parhaiten toiminmaan eurooppalaisena tutkimusyliopistona ja me saadaan pian siihen vastaukset ja niinkun sen perusidea on se että niillä vahvoilla aloilla niin sitten pitäis luoda pysyvät kansainväliset toimintarakenteet. Koko yliopiston kentälle niin niitä ei oo varaa luoda. Niin meidän pitää arvioida sitten niitten tiedekuntien näkemysten pohjalla että mitä voidaan tehdä. Se on semmonen niinku alku aika pitkälle prosessille. (U2, 5)

Translated interview quote

Yes, so we prepared this paper in the spring for the faculties, where the faculties themselves must think which fields they could operate in as European research universities. We will soon get responses to it, and its basic idea is that in those strong fields we should create permanent international operating structures. We can't afford to create them for all the fields in the university, so we have to then evaluate what can be done on the basis of the views of the faculties. It is like the start of quite a long process. (U2, 5)

Quote 2

Original interview quote

Ja ja että että se on, se on niinku, täs supistuvan julkisen talouden maailmassa niin, niin se on niitä harvoja lupaavia mahdollisuuksia yliopistolle pelastaa itsensä, että se pystyy järjestään sekä lisärahoitusta että ulkomaisia opettajia sillä että se osallistuu niihin kansainvälisiin markkinoihin. (U2, 4)

Cleaned up quote

Ja että se on niinku, täs supistuvan julkisen talouden maailmassa, se on niitä harvoja lupaavia mahdollisuuksia yliopistolle pelastaa itsensä, että se pystyy järjestään sekä lisärahoitusta että ulkomaisia opettajia sillä että se osallistuu niihin kansainvälisiin markkinoihin. (U2, 4)

Translated interview quote

And that [participating in education markets, TN] in this world of diminishing public budgets, it is one of the few promising opportunities for the university to save itself, that it can arrange both more funding and international teachers by participating in those international markets. (U2, 4) (130)

Quote 3

The following words are omitted from the translated quote.

The first square brackets read: “that you have also probably left all the study books which have been written, none of them are written in Finland so that in that way”. This line is still included in the cleaned up Finnish version.

The second square brackets read: “when there are a lot of these individual experiences, we think a lot about these things here”. This line is omitted also from the cleaned up Finnish quote.

Original interview

Joo-o koska se se tieto on yhteistä ja eri, eri puolilla tuotettua ja jaettua, et kylhän säkin oot varmaan lukenu kaikki oppikirjat jotka on kirjoitettu, eihän niistä Suomessa on mikään kirjoitettu että että et sillä tavalla tavalla ja sitten vielä jos sä vielä voit niinku opiskella toisenlaisessa ympäristössä niin must se kyky ihan jo käsitelläkin tietoo muuttuu kun, kun on vähän erilaisessa ympäristöissä että. Kriittisyys, sitä me on kans mietitty kun on, on näitä yksilökokemuksia paljon, me paljon pohdiskellaan et me jutellaan tämmösistä asioista aika paljon täällä, niin tätä kriittisyyden tason nousua myös sit ku sä tuut jostain niin olit sä sit ollu paremmas tai huonommas paikas niin silti sul on kyky paremmin kritisoida sitä, tuoda uusia ajatuksia siihen (N3, 8)

Cleaned up quote

Joo-o koska se se tieto on yhteistä ja eri puolilla tuotettua ja jaettua, et kylhän säkin oot varmaan lukenu kaikki oppikirjat jotka on kirjoitettu, eihän niistä Suomessa on mikään kirjoitettu että että et sillä tavalla tavalla ja sitten vielä jos sä vielä voit niinku opiskella toisenlaisessa ympäristössä niin must se kyky ihan jo käsitelläkin tietoo muuttuu kun, kun on vähän erilaisessa ympäristöissä että. Kriittisyys, sitä me on kans mietitty (--) tätä kriittisyyden tason nousua myös sit ku sä tuut jostain niin olit sä sit ollu paremmas tai huonommas paikas niin silti sul on kyky paremmin kritisoida sitä, tuoda uusia ajatuksia siihen (N3, 8)

Translated interview

Yeah, because the knowledge is common, and produced here and there, and shared, [--] and then if you can study in another environment then I think this ability to just process knowledge changes, when one is in a different environment. The faculty to be critical, that is something we have also been thinking about [--], this increase in the level of criticality, when you come from somewhere, whether you have been in a better or worse place, then anyway you have the ability to better criticise it, bring new ideas to it (N3, 8)

Quote 4

Original document

Korkeakoulujen ja oppilaitosten edellytyksiä osallistua ETA-sopimuksen ansiosta laajenevaan eurooppalaiseen koulutusyhteistyöhön vahvistetaan. Korkeakoulut ja oppilaitokset parantavat kiinnostavuuttaan kansainvälisenä yhteistyöosapuolena kehittämällä kansainvälistä koulutusta osaamisensa vahvoilla alueilla. Erityisesti hakeudutaan sellaisiin yhteistyöhankkeisiin joissa voidaan hyödyntää ulkomaisten yhteistyökumppaneiden osaamista suomalaisen koulutuksen tason nostamiseksi ja koulutuksen monipuolistamiseksi. (DS3, 1993, 14)

Translated document

The opportunities for higher education institutions and other educational institutions to participate in the European educational cooperation, which is widening due to the EEA Agreement, will be strengthened. The higher education institutions and other educational institutions will increase their attractiveness as international cooperation partners by developing international education in their strong areas. Such cooperation projects are especially sought after in which the knowledge of the foreign partners can be used to raise the standard and diversity of Finnish education. (DS3, 1993, 14)

Appendix three

Original Finnish interview and document quotes

1. Mut sitte se on vähän toinen asia sitten kysyä et miks pitäis olla koulutuksen piirissä kansainvälisyyttä ja tietysti me, yleensäkin niinku, siis osaltaan siis sekin motivoituu tän laadun perusteella, että me voidaan saada tän kansainvälisen toiminnan kautta parempia opettajia, hyviä opiskelijoita tänne Suomeen (--)(U5, 12)

2. Joo no me puhutaan tavallaan itsestäänselvyyksistä silloin kun on yliopistoista kysymys mutta tavallaan kuitenkin, sehän on niin että mikä tahansa yliopisto joka pyrkii tähän perinteiseen yliopiston rooliin eli tutkimukseen ja tutkimukseen perustuvaan opetukseen niin sehän on tottakai, tutkimushan kansainvälistä ja se on kyllä sillälailla kansainvälistä että se niinku yliopiston johdon näkökulmasta hakee omat kanavansa ilman mitään et sitä tarttis millään tavalla ohjata tai tukea sen kummemmin. (U1, 1)

3. (--)(jos nähdään koulutus toimialana, meillon koulutusmarkkinat, niin Suomessa meillä ei ole, ne mekanismit joilla voidaan viedä tätä koulutustuotetta ulkomaille. Ja sehän liittyy osittain, siis jos ajattelet markkinoita, hinta ja määrä, niin normaalisti sillon, tää on kansantaloustieteen ihan perusteet, sillon tarjonta, supply curve, ja sillon demand curve. Ja jossain vaiheessa jos sä et pysty hinnoittelemaan, siis ongelmahan on se että kun viedään, meillon hyvä kansallinen tuote jota emme pysty viemään. Muummoassa se, ja millä tavalla sitä voidaan viedä? Jos ajatellaan esimerkiksi USA:ta, en halua välttämättä käyttää sitä esimerkkinä, niin vientihän tapahtuu joko sillä tavalla että se tuote, pannaan pystyyn yksikkö, filiaali jossain toisessa maassa ja se rahoitetaan sillä tavalla että ne jotka osallistuu siihen koulutukseen maksavat siitä. Jos uskaltaa käyttää sanaa lukukausimaksuja. Eli ymmärrätsä siis että tavallaan koska meillä on lakisäätöinen maksuttomuus niin tutkimukseen perustuva koulutus on vaikea viedä, ja tää minusta on ongelma. (U3,5)

4. (--)(varmaan se yliopiston haaste on sen että, yliopiston täytyy järjestää kaiken kaikkiaan toimintansa uudella tavalla. Ja yks tehtävä on tietysti luoda näitä mahdollisuuksia ja rakenteita tälle opiskelijoitten kansainvälistymisen mahdollistamiselle. Et on näitä yhteistyösopimuksia, on tunnettuja partnereita, on vastavuoroisuutta niin tää on yliopistojen tehtävä niin et ne kaikki asiat ei jää opiskelijoitten itsensä hoidettaviksi. Ja sitä kautta tietysti sitten näitten asioiden johtaminen ja hallinnointi on haaste yliopistoille joka täytyy ottaa tietysti johtamisessa huomioon, sillä täytyy kansainvälistymistä tietysti suunnitella, tehdä strategista suunnittelua, toimeenpanoasiaa ja hoitaa niitä asioita laadukkaasti, yliopiston täytyy osoittaa siihen resursseja. (N1, 2–3)

5. Ja silloin meillä pitää olla työvoimaa joka osaa toimia globaaleilla markkinoilla ja silloin meidän täytyy jo koulutuksen sisällä saada semmosia osioita, jotka tuo näitä kansainvälisen kommunikaation kykyjä. (N3, 3)

6. No se taas mä palaan siihen niinku tavallaan siihen ajatusketjuun että jos korkeakoululla on rooli niin sillä pitää olla, se pitää olla kilpailukykyinen, se pitää olla laatua kansainvälisiä laatukriteerejä täyttävä toiminta ja sitä sellasta osaamista ja toimintaa, kansainvälisiä niinku laatukriteerejä täyttävä toiminta, se ei niinku kerta kaikkiaan, sä et pysty toteuttamaan sitä jonkinlaisessa tyhjiössä jos niinku sul on vaan tämmönen kansallinen, katsot vaan näitä kansallisia markkinoita. Eli että tavallaan jos sulla on, sun pitää olla kilpailukykyinen, sun pitää olla,.. sun pitää vaan olla hyvä. (U3, 7)

7. Ja mulle tuli ensimmäiseksi mieleen semmonen tän niinku tieteen tutkimuksen puhutaan semmosesta tiedon kommunismista elikkä tieto on yhteistä ja kaikille (--) niin että tavallaan eli siitähän on niinku automaattisesti seuraa et se on myös yli rajojen yhteistä että tavallaan se on niinku aina ollu osa tota yliopistoja ja kuuluu ihan siihen sen yliopiston ideologiaan että se on niinku yhteistä se tutkimusaihe ja kilpailu ja semmonen niinku yli rajojen. (N3, 1)

8. Yliopisto luottaa rohkeasti hankkimaansa tietoon ja viisauteen. Yliopistojen perinne on tuottaa, vaalia ja kehittää ihmiskunnan historian aikana kertyneitä tietoja ja taitoja sekä käyttää niitä yhteiskunnan hyväksi. (--) Rohkeutta on myös reagointi muuttuvaan maailmaan nopeasti ja tehokkaasti silloin, kun se on asiasyiden perusteella tarpeellista. Yliopisto tiedostaa syvällisen ja punnitun tiedon merkityksen ja suhtautuu vakaan rauhallisesti sekä kriittisesti yhteiskunnassa yhä yleisemmin esiintyvään puolinaiseen tietoon ja hetkellisiin muotivirtauksiin. (TT2, 3)

9. CIMO on aktiivisesti kehittämässä Suomea avaramieliseksi ja monikulttuuriseksi sivistys- ja tietoyhteiskunnaksi edistämällä tasapainoista ja laadukasta kansainvälistä vuorovaikutusta. (CM1, 2004,ii)

10. Henkilövaihdoilla on koko eurooppalaista yhteiskuntaa hyödyttävä vaikutus. Tällaisia kokemuksia tarvitaan yhä enemmän kun muuttuneessa työympäristössä tarvitaan osaajia, jotka omaavat entistä enemmän kielitaitoa, kulttuurien tuntemustam joustavuutta ja kykyä sopeutua muutoksiin. (UT3,2001,1)

11. Meidän pitää käyttää kaikkii niitä rahoitusvälineitä mitä siinä vois olla koska niinkun mä aiemmin viittasin niin niin siit tulee koko aika tärkeempää että me ymmärretään ne ajatukselliset ja toiminnalliset kontekstit missä eri yhteiskunnista tulevat tai niissä elävät ihmiset toimii, et jotta me... voitais käyttää maailman mahdollisuudet ja aiheuttaa mahdollisimman vähän vahinkoo toisille ihmisille niin meidän pitää ymmärtää niitä. (U2, 2)

12. No mä uskon vakaasti siihen että me pystytään tuottaan sillä sitten sitä henkilökohtaa joka pitää meiat hengissä täällä, mut kyllähän must täl kansainvälistymisellä on myös tämmöstä itseisarvoa ja itse asiassa ainoo mun mielestä, (--) ainooahan tämmönen niinku todistettu tulos-han oo tää ihmisessä tapahtuva positiivinen muutos, tämmönen empowerment. (N3, 10)

13. Ja ja kansainvälistymisen mielessä on tietysti erittäin hyvä asia että on esimerkiksi muutamman kuukauden tai lukukauden [ulkomailla TN], koska kyllähän siinä jo ehtii tutustua, luoda verkostoa ja saada ystäviä, mones tapaus- tapauksessa elinikäisiä ystäviä ja ja oppia tietämään et mikä tää maa on olemassa ja minkälaiset ihmiset täällä toimii. (N2, 2)

14. Joo-o koska se se tieto on yhteistä ja eri puolilla tuotettua ja jaettua, et kylhän säkin oot varmaan lukuun kaikki oppikirjat jotka on kirjoitettu, eihän niistä Suomessa on mikään kirjoitettu että että et sillä tavalla tavalla ja sitten vielä jos sä vielä voit niinku opiskella toisenlaisessa ympäristössä niin must se kyky ihan jo käsitellään tietoo muuttuu kun, kun on vähän erilaisessa ympäristöissä että. Kriittisyys, sitä me on kans mietitty (--) tätä kriittisyyden tason nousua myös sit ku sä tuut jostain niin olit sä sit ollu paremmas tai huonommas paikas niin silti sul on kyky paremmin kritisoida sitä, tuoda uusia ajatuksia siihen (N3, 8)

15. Opiskelija-arvioiden mukaan ulkomailla suoritetuista opinnoista ei koidu vain akateemista etua (suoritetut kurssit, saatu uusi tieto, tiedon soveltaminen), vaan tärkeää on myös tutustuminen vieraaseen kulttuuripiiriin, henkinen kasvu ja itsetuntemuksen lisääntyminen. (UT1,2001,15)

16. Et kai- toisaalta siellä koulutuksen puolella tän kansainvälistymisen kautta pitäisi ihmiselle syntyä taitoja ja valmiuksia sitte toimia tämmösessä globaalissa maailmassa. Et kyl se mun mielestä siitä lähtee tästä yleisestä globalisoitumisesta, tarve muuttaa, muuttaa koulutusta, koulutussisältöjä ja ihmisten, ihmisten valmiuksia niin et he voivat sitten sijottua semmosiin työtehtäviin tässä kansainvälistyvässä maailmassa, suoraan näissä kansainvälisissä yrityksissä tai sitte yrityksissä jotka harjottaa kansainvälistä yhteistyötä. (N1,1)

17. No kyl se arvo mun mielestä on näitten näitten opiskelijoitten tietojen, taitojen ja valmiuksien parantaminen niin että tutkinnon suorittaneilla on paremmat edellytyksen järjestää omaa elämäänsä ja sitte sijottua yhteiskuntaan sillä lailla että pystyvät elantonsa hankkimaan ja sitte osaamisensa kautta tukemaan niitä yhtiöitä tai organisaatioita missä he he toimivat. Et kyl mun mielestä tää on aivan niinku ratkasevan tärkeä asia koko Suomen, suomalaisten ja suomalaisten yritysten menestymisen kannalta. (N1, 5)

18. Ja silloin meillä pitää olla työvoimaa joka osaa toimia globaaleilla markkinoilla ja silloin meidän täytyy jo koulutuksen sisällä saada semmosia asioita, jotka sisältää, että tuo näitä kansainvälisen kommunikaation kykyjä. (N3, 10)

19. Kun arvioidaan kansainvälistymisen tuloksia, pitäisi myös huomioida se, kuinka paljon ulkomainen opiskelukokemus lisää kysiesen opiskelijan työmarkkinakelpoisuutta. (UT3,2001,11)

20. Kyl mä luulen et silloin aitoa arvoa kyllä opiskelijankin näkökulmasta, koska työmarkkinat kansainvälistyy ja ihmiset liikkuu paljon enemmän paikasta, niin silloin on ilman muuta etua siitä että on myöskin opiskellut ulkomailla. (U1, 6)

21. Uuden vuosituhannen alkuvuosina eletään murrokautta. Euroopan yhdentyessä myös Suomi on entistä tiiviimmin osa kansainvälistä taloudellista ja poliittista yhteisöä. Globalisaation vaikutukset koulutukselle ja tutkimukselle ovat kittavat. Ne asettavat kasvavia vaatimuksia mm. yleissivistykselle, yhteistyö- ja vuorovaikutustaidoille, kielitaidolle sekä kulttuurien tuntemukselle. (DS5,1999,10)

22. Se iso homma meillä on on tietysti se että me saadaa niinku ihan tänne kansainvälisiä tutkijoita, opettajia, tutkinto-opiskelijoita, me saadaan niinku se semmonen, ehkä sanotaan ku ilmapiiri laitoksilla muuttumaan semmoseks kansainväliseks, jossa elää monta kieltä ja kulttuuria samanaikaisesti, (-) (U6, 2)

23. Et unohdetaan usein kun puhutaan kansainvälistymisestä, niin puhutaan pelkästään tutkimuksesta ja koulutuksesta mutta pitää muistaa että me puhutaan niinku opiskelijoiden rekrytoinnista ja mut vielä tärkeempi on niinku opettajien ja tutkijoiden rekrytointi. Koska ellet sä pysty luomaan houkuttelevat työolosuhteet täällä, tutkimusympäristöistähän puhutaan paljon, niin silloin sä et pysty niinkun houkuttelemaan tänne niinkun kansainvälisiä huippujakaan. (U3, 6)

24. Sit toinen yhteistyön tarve on niinku tän kriittisen massan kasvattaminen ja suurien tutkimusympäristöjen yhteiskäyttö. Et jotain, et tutkimusympäristöt tutkimuslaitteistot kallistuu niin niin erityisesti sitten pienemmällä mailla, ja pienemmällä yliopistoilla ei oo mahdollisuuksia siihen tutkimusympäristökilpailussa yksin pärjätä. Mut et yhteistyöllä sitten voidaan saada käyttöön ajanmukaisia ja riittävän laadukkaita tutkimusympäristöjä. (N1,4)

25. (-) mut et se mikä nyt on ainakin Suomelle tällä hetkellä se suuri haaste on se että miten tänne houkuteltaan kansainvälistä tutkija ja opettaja ja opiskelija joukkoa ja siinähan me ollaan selvästi jäljessä semmosista aika kohtuullisista eurooppalaisista vaatimuksista

että jos meillä on vaan muutama prosentti ulkomaalaisopiskelijoita niin, mehän ollaan kai Portugalin jälkeen Euroopan heikommassa asemassa siinä suhteessa. (U5, 4)

26. Opiskelijain vaihdon laajentaminen ja erityisesti kansainvälisiin opiskelijain vaihto-ohjelmiin osallistuminen edellyttää että ulkomaalisten opiskelua Suomessa lisätään. (--) Kaikkiin vastavuorosiin tai monenkeskisiin vaihto-ohjelmiin osallistuminen edellyttää, että Suomeen vastavuoroisesti otetaan lisää ulkomaalaisia opiskelijoita ja että vaihtoa varten kehitetään suomessa ulkomaalaisia varten tarkoitettuja opiseluohjelmia ja palveluita. (IS1,1988, 34)

27. Korkeakoulututkintojen järjestelmää kehitetään vastaamaan työelämän kehittämistarpeita ottaen huomioon myös tutkintorakenteiden kansainvälinen kehitys. Tärkeä lähtökohta on Suomen korkeakoulujen kansainvälisen kilpailukyyn turvaaminen. (DS5, 1999, 36)

28. Mut sitte se on vähän toinen asia sitten kysyä et miks pitäis olla koulutuksen piirissä kansainvälisyyttä ja tietysti me, yleensäkin niinku, siis osaltaan siis sekin motivoituu tän laadun perusteella, että me voidaan saada tän kansainvälisen toiminnan kautta parempia opettajia, hyviä opiskelijoita tänne Suomeen (--) (U5, 12)

29. (--) toisaalta kilpaillaan ja toisaalta ollaan yhteistyössä mut jollakin lailla se kilpailuaspekti on siinä sillä lailla vähän piilossa, se mikä konkreettisesti näkyy on tää yhteistyö, mutta jos siinä hyvin onnistuu ja pärjää laadullisesti niin sillon myöskin tää kilpailukyky tavallaan paranee ja se kilpailu nyt sitten tarkoittaa kilpailua hyvistä opiskelijoista, hyvistä opettajista ja tutkimusmäärärahoista. (U1, 7)

30. Sitten koulutuksen kansainvälistyminen, jos ajatellaan et miten suomalainen yliopistokoulutusta on viety ulkomaille niin siinähan me ei olla välttämättä hirveen hyviä, siis jos ajatellaan, ja siinä mä tulen tähän mistä mä oikeestaan alotin että jos nähdään koulutus toimialana, meillon koulutusmarkkinat, niin Suomessa meillä ei ole - ne mekanismit joilla voidaan viedä tätä tuotetta, koulutustuotetta ulkomaille. (U3, 5)

31. Kansainvälistyminen edellyttää että sä olet uskottava, sullon osaamista, sullon laatua, sullon on kansainvälistä osaamista, niillä aloilla joilla sä haluat toimia. Eli tänä päivänä minusta niinkun, tää kansainvälistyminen se, se on niin luonnollinen osa koko yliopiston strategiaa että minusta niinku ei, voidaan sanoa, mä haluisin melkein sanoa että ei välttämättä voi puhua enää että mikä on haaste, mikä on vaatimus koska koska se on aivan selvä että sehän on tänä päivänä niinku, se on niin sisäistetty, tai se pitäisi olla niin sisäistetty että siitä ei pitäisi olla joku erillinen niinku tavallaan, erilaiset haasteet, erilaiset vaatimukset. (U3, 3)

32. Kansainvälisyys on osa yliopiston normaalia toimintaa, ja sen vaatima rahoitus on pääsääntöisesti hoidettava laitosten normaalien rahoituskanavien kautta. (UT3, 2001, 5)

33. No, no yliopistoille siellä koulutuksen puolella varmaan se yliopiston haaste on se että yliopiston pitäis tai yliopiston täytyy järjestää kaiken kaikkiaan toimintansa uudella tavalla. Ja yks tehtävä on tietysti luoda näitä mahdollisuuksia ja rakenteita tälle opiskelijoitten kansainvälistymisen mahdollistamiseksi. Et on näitä yhteistyösopimuksia, on tunnettuja partnereita on vastavuoroisuutta, niin tää on niinku tää yliopistojen tehtävä niin et ne kaikki asiat ei jää opiskelijoitten itsensä hoidettaviksi. Ja sitä kautta tietysti sitten näitten asioitten johtaminen ja hallinnointi on haaste yliopistoille joka täytyy ottaa tietysti johtamisessa huomioon sillä täytyy kansainvälistymistä tietysti suunnitella, tehdä strategista suunnittelua, toimeenpanoasiaa ja sitte hoitaa niitä asioita laadukkaasti, yliopiston täytyy osoittaa siihen resursseja. (N1, 2)

34. Tiede ja tutkimus ovat sinänsä luonteeltaan kansainvälisiä. (–) Opetuksen kansainvälistäminen edellyttää koulutusohjelmien sisällön kehittämisen ohella opiskelun työmuotojen monipuolistamista, opettajain- ja opiskelijain vaihdon kehittämistä ja voimavarojen lisäämistä sekä vieraiden kielten – myös Euroopan ulkopuolisten kielten- ja niihin liittyvien kulttuurien että muun vieraskielisen opetuksen kehittämistä. (IS2, 1989, 4)

35. Joo, siis mehän tehtiin tossa keväällä tiedekunnille sellanen paperi jossa tiedekuntien pitää itse miettiä millä aloilla ne pystyy parhaiten toimimaan eurooppalaisina tutkimusyliopistoina, niin että millä aloilla yliopisto pystyy parhaiten toiminmaan eurooppalaisena tutkimusyliopistona ja me saadaan pian siihen vastaukset ja niinkun sen perusidea on se että niillä vahvoilla aloilla niin sitten pitäis luoda pysyvät kansainväliset toimintarakenteet. Koko yliopiston kentälle niin niitä ei oo varaa luoda. Niin meidän pitää arvioida sitten niitten tiedekuntien näkemysten pohjalla että mitä voidaan tehdä. Se on semmonen niinku alku aika pitkälle prosessille. (U2, 5)

36. Nuorempien opettajien kielitaito on hyvin paranemassa joskin ehkä sitä ei pidetä niin välttämättömänä edellytyksenä rekrytoinnille kuin mä pitäisin. Mun mielestä yliopiston ei enää pitäis palkata opettajia jotka ei pysty toimimaan kansainvälisessä ympäristössä. (U2, 4)

37. Ja, siinon tietysti tunnettuja esteitä noin Suomen näkökulmasta nimenomaan, pieni suljettu kielialue, kukaan muu ei puhu suomea ja kaikki tämmönen, ja ainoa konstihan siihen on suurten valtakielten, ennen kaikkea englannin enempi käyttäminen ja kaiken mitä nyt tarjotaan, nimenomaan kun korkeakoulutuksesta puhutaan niin opetus ja opiskelun työtavat ja metodit et niissä sitte käytetään vierasta kieltä, yleensä englantia. Mutta tietysti siinä kaiken aikaa täytyy pitää silmällä myös sitä että osa siitä joukosta joka tänne tulee niin toivottavasti tulee jäädäkseen, me pystytään houkuttelemaan ihmisiä jäämään

niin että, ja jotta se olis heille mahdollista niin täytyy tietysti olla mahdollisuus, sujuvat tavat ja hyvät ja tehokkaat konstit oppia maan kieliä, ainakin toinen niistä. (N2, 1)

38. Sitte se asettaa tietysti vaatimuksia opettajien, kansainvälisten kurssiopettajien kielitaidolle, semmosta sitä sitä treenausta miten opetan vieraalla kielellä. Sekin oli jossain vaiheessa semmonen asia et sitä vaan, se niinku ohitettiin et kaikkihan englantii osaa mut eihän se pidä paikkaansa. Sitä paitsi vieraalla kielellä opettaminen on aina raskaampaa kuin äidinkielellä, et sen tunnustaminen. Plus sitten se mikä meidän tutkimuksen arvioinnissakin tuli vastaan et paljon tutkimusta ansaitsis myös kansain- kansainvälisen julkasufoorumin mutta koska siinä on tietysti se kynnyks ja se on erityisesti vanhempien tutkijoitten ongelma. (U6, 4)

39. Koska meillä on sellanen käsitys että kunhan vaan siirrytään englanninkielelle niin ollaan kansainvälisiä. Ja se ei pidä paikkansa. Se ei pidä paikkansa. Se on aivan samalla tavalla kun elinkeinoelämässä tai yritysmaailmassa puhutaan siitä että kun kaks yritystä fuusioituu (--)joo niin mikä on se sen uuden sen fuusioidun yrityksen kieli. Ja virallinen kieli voi olla englantii mutta onks se välttämättä, onks se sitten se niinku yrityksen sisäinen kieli, onks se sitte. Ja tää minusta, tää on tärkeä sen takia että kansainvälinen yliopisto ei ole sellainen joka pelkästään antaa opetusta englanninkielellä tai tekee tutkimusta englanninkielellä. Ja tähän itse kyllä tosiaan kiinnittäisin hyvin paljon, että tässä on ehkä se suurin haaste meille. Koska mehän nähdään että että esimerkiksi nyt kun monet yliopistot täällä Suomessa nyt siirtyvät tai panevat pystyyn näitä vieraskielisiä Master-ohjelmia niin niihin on valtava kysyntä, meillä esimerkiks Hankenilla on viis englanninkielistä Master-ohjelmaa ja tietysti tietyllä tavalla se tietysti kansainvälistää, se on yks kansainvälistymisen dimensio., mut ei se, tutkimuksen pitää olla kansainvälinen ja siinä tietysti se kieli on ratkaiseva mutta kansainvälistyminen on paljon syvemmällä kun se että mitä kieltä puhutaan. (U3, 4)

40. (--) tää voimakas muuttuminen, se että ensinnäkin niinku tää yliopiston aseman korostuminen tietoyhteiskunnassa niin se koskee kaikkia aloja, ei pelkästään teknologiaa ja et niinku tää äskeinen prosessi se on jo alkanut aika hyvin yliopistoissa. Yliopistossahan nimenomaan työskennellään verkon välityksellä, ja...kaikki ne toiminnot, siis alkaen vaihto-opiskelijoista, se määrä on kymmenessä vuodessa viisinkertaistunut varmaankin ja samoin niinku tää tutkintotoiminta on niinku lähtenyt tänä aikana niinkun liikenteeseen. (U4, 10)

41. (--) joo me ollaan niin paljon muutenki muuttuneet että juuri tää tavoitteellisuus, tohtorikoulutuksessakin merkittävä osa on kansainvälisiä opiskelijoita (--). Ja sitten julkaisut, meidän julkaisumäärä on kymmenessä vuodessa ei nyt ehkä kolminkertaistunu mutta kaksinkertaistunut ainakin. (U4, 10)

42. Asenteet on varmaan muuttunu ja sit consumer issues uus asia, joka nousee tän kansainvälistymisen myötä että tota kun opiskelijat tänne tulee niin ne haluaa laadukasta opetusta. Ja tää on noussu nyt Suomessakin esille sillä lailla että, meille on tullu valituksia muutamilta ulkomaalaisilta opiskelijoilta siitä että jossain yliopistossa heidän asiansa ei oo järjestetty niin hyvin kuin he oisivat halunneet ja että heidän aikansa on mennyt hukkaan ja informaatio on ollut väärää. Eli se on uus juttu mihinkä Suomen yliopistot ei oo tottuneet. (N1, 7)

43. (--) mä sanoisin kyllä kansainvälistyminen on muuttanu yliopistoja sillä tavalla että nähdään kyllä aivan selvästi toisella tavalla mitten tärkeä on näitten niinku profiili, vahvojen alojen, vahvan osaamisen löytäminen on tärkeä. Et sä et voi toimia - tää aika jolloin jolloin jolloin pysty sanomaan että låt alla blommor blomma siis kaikki kukat saa kukkia niin niin niin niin se ei ole enää, se on ehkä ehkä suurin. Ei, en käytä sanaa suurin mutta se on se on yks ainakin muutos. (U3, 8)

44. (--) no ensinnäkin tiede sinänsä on kansainvälistä, et ei voi kuvitella semmosta tiedeyhteisöä joka olis kan- kansallisesti käpertynyt itseensä (--) (U5,11)

45. (--) jos tehdään perustutkimusta mikä on yliopistojen tärkein funktio, niin se on väistämättä kansainvälistä. Se pitää julkaista kansainvälisillä kielillä käyttäen hyväksi kansainvälisiä peer review –systeemeitä jota kautta väistämättä tulee tää kanssakäyminen kansainvälisen tiedeyhteisön kanssa. Muuten se ei yksinkertaisesti toimi. Vaikka olis kuinka välkky tutkimusryhmä täällä jo se koteloituu tähän kotoiseen ympyrään niin ei se voi nousta laadullisesti korkeelle. (U1, 4)

46. Mut se mikä vaatii toimenpiteitä ja jossa pitäs niinku päästä eteenpäin on nimenomaan opetuksen kansainvälistyminen. Koska se ei synny spontaanisti, se vaatii niinku tukea ja toimenpiteitä. (U1, 1)

47. Ja siinä tulevaisuudessa nää strategiset verkostot niin tulee tietysti olemaan keskeisiä tässä kansainvälistymisessä. Ja silloin mä niinku tavallaan tarkotan sillä, että se on niinku strategiset verkostot tai nää partnerit (--)niin se ei oo kyse niinku yksittäisestä tutkimusyhteistyöstä vaan mennään niinku organisaationa siihen mukaan. (U3, 5)

48. Korkeakoulujen kansainvälistymiskehityksessä ei ole kyse pelkästään taloudellisesta kilpailusta. Yhtä tärkeää on vahvistaa kulttuuriyhteistyötä eri maiden välillä. Kansainvälisen opiskelijavaihdon pyrkimyksenä onkin kouluttaa sivistyneitä kansainvälisesti ajattelevia nuoria, jotka edistävät kansojen ja ihmisten välistä ymmärtämystä. (IS2, 1989, 4)

49. (--) mehän oltiin aika sulkeutunu maa vielä sen [presidentti, TN] Kekkonen kuolemaan asti että semmonen voimakas avautuminen sitte Euroopassa alko syntyä näitä, näky

Suomeen jo et oli syntynyt näitä koulutusyhteistyöohjelmia ja haluttiin niinku omalla tavallamme pysyy mukana, että eihän kukaan uskaltanu uneksiikaan kahekskytluvun loppupuolella, (--) siitä et liityttäis Unioniin mut että jollakin tavalla pysyttäis tässä kehityksessä mukana. (N3, 2)

50. Sitte tietysti tähän voi olla hirveen monenlaisia suhtautumisia mutta minulla on kyllä se käsitys että yliopistoissa yleensä katsotaan että maahanmuuttajat jotka tuovat mukanaan niinku omat kulttuuritraditionsa ja näkemyksensä niin se on rikkaus eikä siis, ja jos asia Suomessa hoidetaan kunnolla näitten ihmisten kannalta niin tuota semmosia niinku törmäyksiä ja ristiriitoja yhteiskunnan sisällä voitaisiin välttää. (N2, 2)

51. Me halutaan pärjätä tässä, on se sitten kilpailussa tai on se sitten tiedon tasossa, ja et kyllä mä oon monta kertaa sanonu et kyllähän yks niin meidän suurimpia, hienoimpia innovaatiojärjestelmiämme on meidän koko koulutusjärjestelmä. Ihan lastentarhasta yliopistoon, et se on itseään uusiva järjestelmä semmonen, ja se kouluttaa eri koulutustasolla olevat ihmiset yliopistotasolla, lastentarhanopettajista alkaen. Ja silloin niinku, se on niinku yks semmonen heijastuma sitte siitä et, ja tän systeemin pitää olla siis semmosessa kokonaiskansainvälisessä yhteydessä eri tavoin, et se tietää ettei jää jälkeen. (U6,10)

52. (--) ei semmosta aitoa tietoyhteiskuntaa synny ilman että yliopistot ja ja korkeakoulut ovat meillä kansainvälisiä. Ei se, tieto liikkuu ja salamannopeasti ja jos ei pyri ottamaan koko maailman tieto-corpusta haltuunsa, ei nyt kaikkia yksityiskohtia myöten mut et tietää niinku mitä siellä on. Niin eihän se, mikä tietoyhteiskunta siitä syntyy, ei se semmosella. (N2,10)

53. No mä mä uskon vakaasti siihen että me pystytään tuottaan sillä sitten sitä henkilökohtaa joka pitää meiat hengissä täällä. (N3, 7)

54. On, mun mielestäni sillä on ihan ehdoton arvo koska tavallaan jos ajatellaan sitä toista vaihtoehtoa niin sit on vaan semmonen niinku pistettäs ovet kiinni, mentäs kaikki sisälle ja kerrotais toisillemme kuin hyvii me ollaan. (U6, 3)

55. (--) et itse asiassa me halutaan houkutella tänne ulkomaalaisia ihmisiä niinku työskentelemään Suomeen ja me tullaan tulevaisuudessa tarvitsemaan enemmän ulkomailta tulevaa työvoimaa ja ja mikä nyt olis parempi tapa kotouttaa tänne kuin se että ne opiskelee täällä ja oppii siinä yhteydessä vähän suomalaista kieltä ja kulttuuriakin, ja sen jälkeen on valmiita sijottumaan suomalaisille työmarkkinoille. (U5, 12)

56. Tääl on niinku monta seikkaa jotka estää tänne tulevien asettumista ja sopeutumista. Ihan semmoset raadolliset seikat kun palkka ja verotus ja muut tämmöset, se on aika, siin on kovia kynnyksiä ylitettävänä meillä. (N2, 2)

57. Meillon erittäin hyvä maine maailmalla, ja osittain ehkä nää peruskoulututkimukset niinkun antaa koko koulutusjärjestelmälle niinku sellasen kansainvälisen gloorian ja yliopistot saavat siitäkin hyötyä (--) (U4, 7)

58. Eli ymmärrätsä siis että tavallaan koska meillä on lakisääteinen maksuttomuus niin tutkintoon perustuva koulutus on vaikea viedä, toimia, ja tää minusta, tää on ongelma. (U3, 5)

59. (--) tällä hetkellä meil on aika mielenkiintonen tilanne Suomessa ja korkeakoulut ja yliopistot on pantu tavallaan tämän hetken skitsofreeniseen tilanteeseen kun meiltä ihan tulossopimuksia myöten ni odotetaan kansainvälistymistä mutta samalla merkittävää vakuttamista alueelliseen kehittämiseen. (--) ei ne välttämättä toisensa poissulkevia oo mutta nehän vetää siis tasan päinvastaseen suuntaan ja ehkä me on liikaakin Suomessa ajateltu juuri sitä että miltä nyt, sitä ihan paikallista tavallaan vaikuttamista voitaisiin edesauttaa eikä oo oivallettu sitä että jos me olemme kansainvälisesti hyvä ja kilpailukykyisiä niin epäsuorasti myöskin se alueellinen vaikuttaminen tulee sitä kautta ilman että tarvii välttämättä sitä niin hirveesti korostaa. (U1, 1)

60. (--) suomalaisten kiinnostus sitten niin moniin kansainvälisyyden ulottuvuuksiin on aika heikko, suomalaiset opettajat on hirveen huonoja osallistuun vaihtoon, Suomi ei käytä kehitysapumäärärahoja hoitaakseen oman vastuunsa kansainvälisistä opiskelijoista, suomalainen tutkimus ei o kiinnostunut muuta kun saamaan kansainvälisessä vaihdossa, se ei nää juuri minkäänlaista vastuuta siitä että sen pitäis osallistua niin itte vuorostaan kehitysyhteistyöhön. (U2, 3)

61. Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan ja elinkeinoelämän kansainvälistyminen ja monikulttuuristuminen asettavat vaatimuksia kieli- ja viestintätaidoille, suvaitsevaisuudelle, kulttuurien tuntemukselle ja yleissivistykselle. Näiden taitojen saavuttamiseksi on tarpeen edistää opetussuunnitelmien kansainvälistämistä, opetuksen ja tutkimuksen yhteistyöhankkeita ja kansainvälistä henkilövaihtoa. (DS5, 1999,16)

62. EU-tutkimus merkitsee luontevaa tiede- ja teknologiyhteistyön laajenemista osana tutkimuksen yleistä kansainvälytymiskehitystä, johon EU-jäsenyyden antama uuden ulottuvuuden. Kansallisella tasolla ovat lisäksi sisältötavoitteet sekä erityisesti hyödyntämistavoitteet tärkeitä. (IS7, 1997, 29)

63. Suomen jäsenyyden ja toiminnan Euroopan unionissa edellyttävät eurooppalaisten kielten, kulttuurien, historian sekä koko integraatioprosessin ja eurooppalaisen oikeusjärjestelmän syvästi tuntemista. (--) Oman yhteiskuntamme ja kulttuurimme tuntemus korostuu kansainvälistymisen myötä. Tasavertainen yhteistoiminta Euroopan unionissa edellyttää tietoa myös omasta alkuperästä ja ominaislaadustamme. (IS7, 1995, 37)

64. EU on oma lukunsa ja nyt sitten koko koko EU:ssahan, sen Lissabonin strategiassa nyt sitte tää osaaminen on keskeisellä sijalla ja Suomi on ollut ajamassa EU:ssa sellasta politiikkaa että koulutukselle asetetaan tavoitteita ja että koulutus on tässä EU:n asialistalla vahvalla sijalla ja että koulutukseen panostetaan. (--) me halutaan olla tämmöissä kansainvälisessä koulutus- ja tutkimuspolitiikassa ja yhteistyössä niin jonkunnäkösenä, tai sen puolestapuhujana ainakin ja sit kyl meillä on semmosta politiikkaa että me haluttas olla sen etunenässä. (N1, 3)

65. Mut sitten, sitten me tiedämme toinen puoli, ja et me ollaan näillä rankkauslistoilla huonosti pärjänneet, Times-lehden ja Jiao Tong Sanghain lista. (U4, 7)

66. Ja, siinon tietysti tunnettuja esteitä noin Suomen näkökulmasta nimenomaan, pieni suljettu kielialue, kukaan muu ei puhu suomea ja kaikki tämmönen, ja ainoa konstihan siihen on suurten valtakielten, ennen kaikkea englannin enempi käyttäminen ja kaiken mitä nyt tarjotaan, nimenomaan kun korkeakoulutuksesta puhutaan niin opetus ja opiskelun työtavat ja metodit et niissä sitte käytetään vierasta kieltä, yleensä englantia. (N2,1)

67. (--) se liittyy Suomen yliopistojen kansainväliseen kilpailukykyyn mitä niinkun manageriaalisia asioita pitäis saada uuteen uskoon meillä että Suomeen voitaisiin palkata hyviä opettajia hyviä tutkijoita maailmalta. (--) jos tätä tämmöstä liikkumavaraa siihen systeemiin saataisiin nykystä enemmän niin siinä voitais sitten niinku joustavammin järjestelyin ihan rakentaa semmonen paketti joka tekis jollekin henkilölle houkuttelevaks tulla tänne ja jäädä tänne työskentelemään. Onhan niitä tuota onneks joitakin olemassa tuota mutta kyl enemmän sais, pitäis olla. (N2, 5)

68. Mutta että kyllä se on sitten tietysti tollanen kansallinenkin kysymys myöskin että mikä on Suomen imago ja millä lailla yleensä et mikä on Suomen ulkomaalaispolitiikka, täähän on aika ankeeta maan siinä mielessä et ei tänne on kovin helppo asettua vaikka olis ihan niinku laillisella asialla. Et se on tavallaan valtakunnallinen kysymys ja vastuu joka pitäis hoitaa. (U1, 3)

69. Joo-o sitä mä sanon, kun puhutaan tästä aluetoiminnasta ja että tulevaisuudessa voi niinku ajatella et Suomi on, Suomen niinku tällanen valtti on, meillon tilaa, meillon hieno luonto ja sitten voi olla että tää vuodenaikojen vaihtelukin omalla tavallaan, pimeydestä huolimatta, mut se pimeyskin saattaa olla kiehtova monelle ihmiselle että, meillon aika paljon hienoja puolia nyt niinkun elämisen laadun suhteen mikä voi olla niinkun kansainvälisesti merkittävää tulevaisuudessa. Ja niinkun me tiedämme niistä jotka ovat innostuneet Suomesta että ne on juuri tämmösiä laaturekijöitä, et ollaan todella innostuneita että tämäkin niinku ehkä tulevaisuudessa niinku vahvistaa meidän asemaamme (--) (U4,11)

70. Ja sitte semmonehan nyt on tullu jännittävä asia esille että mehän ollaan myös tämmönen, mua nyt kauheesti oksettaa tää Suomi on paras siinä ja tässä, mutta se on tullu niinku aika hyvin niinku Euroopassakin tietoon että miten niinku tää strategia tavallaan onnistunu mikä kansallisesti on valittu että kyllä hyvin monet maat katsoo niinku mallia Suomesta, (--) täällä et tietysti se nyt se PISA ja joka ikisen Saksan osavaltion opetusministeri kävi tuolla opetushallituksessa kysymässä et miten ihmeessä te voitte lukee paremmin kuin me. Niin se oli hirveen jännää (--) Ja sitten tää meiän englanninkielisen opetuksen määrä, et meillähän on, sullon se ACAn selvitys niistä englanninkielisestä opetuksesta, niin tää maailmanennätys, että onhan tää meiän asemahan vara-englantina myös niinku me itse sanotaan. Ja se on ihan totta, et kyllä kun miks tullaan Suomeen niin kyl se on se englanninkielinen opetus aika merkittävässä roolissa siellä, et sillä tavalla kun on näitä omia profiilitekijöitäki sitten mut et kyl musta se verkostoitumiskyky ja tämmönen halukkuus myös olla tämmöses toiminnassa mukana. (N3, 7)

71. (--) kyllähän me pienenä kansana kuitenkin niinkun havittelemme semmosta viisasta kyläseppää jota kaikki arvostavat tietyllä tavalla, taidoistaan (--) (U4,11)

72. Että Suomihan on pieni maa, Suomi on pieni maa mutta nyt tämän koulutus- ja tutkimuspolitiikan ja sitte innovaatiopolitiikan ja yleensä näitten osaamisen vertailujen kautta niin ja erilaisten arviointien kautta niin on tullu selväksi että Suomessa on koulutus- tutkimus- ja innovaatiopolitiikka niin kansainvälisesti hyvin menestynyttä. Ja tää on herättäny sitte suurta kiinnostusta ja arvostusta suomalaisia yliopistoja, ja yliopistoja kohtaan ja myöski Suomen yliopistopolitiikkaa kohtaan. Et tässä mielessä tämmönen Suomen tunnettuus on kasvanut ja Suomen yliopistojen houkuttelevuus yhteistyökumppanina on on kasvanut. (N1, 4)

73. Laaja Helsingin metropolialue on Suomen kansallisen kehityksen ja kansainvälisen kilpailukyvyyn veturi. Se on myös maamme ainoa kansainvälisesti laajasti tunnettu alue. (RM1,2005,1)

74. Kansainvälisen yhteistyön ensisijaisena tavoitteena on tukea korkealaatuisen koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen syntymistä ja toimia osaltaan näiden laadun varmistajana. Koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen kansainvälisellä yhteistyöllä tuetaan suomalaisen elinkeinoelämän kansainvälistymistä ja tehdään tunnetuksi suomalaista osaamista ja kulttuuria. (DS5,1999,16)

75. Et toisaaltahan tää kansainvälistyminen on sitä että meiltä lähdetään maailmalle, sitä meillon aina ollu, ja Suomen tiedehän kansainvälisty silloin aikanaan ensisijaisesti just sitä kautta että 1800-luvulla tutkijat alko lähteä sekä tutkimusmatkoille että oppimatkoille maailmalle, ja sieltä toi sitten kansainvälisiä vaikutteita. (U5, 3)

76. Joo, no, mun mielestä, no ensinnäkin tiede sinänsä on kansainvälistä, ei voi kuvitella semmosta tiedeyhteisöä joka olis kansallisesti käpertynyt itseensä (U5, 11)

77. Joo no me puhutaan tavallaan itsestäänselvyyksistä silloin kun on yliopistoista kysymys mutta tavallaan kuitenkin, sehän on niin että mikä tahansa yliopisto joka pyrkii tähän perinteiseen yliopiston rooliin elikkä tutkimukseen ja tutkimukseen perustuvaan opetukseen niin sehän on tottakai, tutkimushan kansainvälistä ja se on kyllä sillälaililla kansainvälistä että se niinku yliopiston johdon näkökulmasta hakee omat kanavansa ilman mitään et sitä tarttis millään tavalla ohjata tai tukea sen kummemmin. (U1, 1)

78. No, ensin jos ajattelee tätä perinteistä tiedeyhteisön kansainvälisyyttä, sitä et suomalaiset liikkuu maailmalla ja käy kongresseissa ja julkaisee kansainvälisissä lehdissä, se on aika vakiintunutta toimintaa, tietysti se vaatii oman tukijärjestelmänsä. Et meillä pitää olla kuitenkin rahaa jolla sitä tehdään ja Helsingin yliopistossahan kansleri myöntää matkaraajoja ja laitokset voi sitä maksaa, mut se on aika vakiintunut, must siinä ei oo semmosta niinku uutta ulottuvuutta (--)(U5,4)

79. Ja silloin musta niinku tää että tutkimushan on aina ollu kansainvälistä mut et se tulee tän opetuksen piiriin niin must on ollu kauheen tärkeä askel. (N3,2)

80. Tiede ja tutkimus ovat sinänsä luonteeltaan kansainvälisiä. (--) Opetuksen kansainvälistäminen edellyttää koulutusohjelmien sisällön kehittämisen ohella opiskelun työmuotojen monipuolistamista, opettajain- ja opiskelijain vaihdon kehittämistä ja voimavarojen lisäämistä sekä vieraiden kielten – myös Euroopan ulkopuolisten kielten- ja niihin liittyvien kulttuurien että muun vieraskielisen opetuksen kehittämistä. (IS2, 1989,4)

81. Laadukkaat tutkimusyhteisöt perustuvat luonnostaan kansainväliseen yhteistyöhön. Yliopistolla on paljon vahvoja tutkimusyhteisöjä, jotka toimivat yli laitos- ja tiedekuntarajojen ja ovat verkottuneet kansallisesti ja kansainvälisesti. (UT2, 2006, 8)

82. Sivistysyliopiston kehittämisperiaatteina korostuvat opetuksen ja tutkimuksen laatuun perustuva kilpailu, monipuolinen kansainvälistyminen sekä resurssien vapauttaminen uusiin kohteisiin rakenteellisen kehittämisen avulla. Tärkeää on myös olennaisesti parantaa korkeakoulujen kykyä reagoida koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen alueella tapahtuviin muuotuksiin. (DS3, 1993, 24)

83. Opettaja- ja tutkijavaihto edistää merkittäväällä tavalla yliopiston kansainvälistymistä. Vaihdoissa Helsingin yliopiston opettajat voivat viedä yliopiston osaamista ja saada tietoa, kontakteja ja osaamista kansainväliseltä tiedeyhteisöltä. (UH3, 2003, 5)

84. Opiskelija-arvioiden mukaan ulkomailla suoritetuista opinnoista ei koidu vain akateemista etua (suoritetut kurssit, saatu uusi tieto, tiedon soveltaminen), vaan tärkeää on myös tutustuminen vieraaseen kulttuuripiiriin, henkinen kasvu ja itsetuntemuksen lisääntyminen. (UT1, 2001, 15)

85. Kansainvälisyys on olennainen osa tutkijankoulutusta ja tutkijan uran alkuvaiheessa olevan henkilön tulee perehtyä kansainvälisen tiedeyhteisön käytäntöihin. (UH3, 2003, 5)

86. Ja mulle tuli ensimmäiseks mieleen semmonen tän niinku tieteen tutkimukses puhutaan semmosesta tiedon kommunismista elikkä tieto on yhteistä ja kaikille (--) niin että tavallaan eli siitähän on niinku automaattisesti seuraa et se on myös yli rajojen yhteistä että tavallaan se on niinku aina ollu osa tota yliopistoja ja kuuluu ihan siihen sen yliopiston ideologiaan että se on niinku yhteistä se tutkimusaihe ja kilpailu ja semmonen niinku yli rajojen. (N3, 1)

87. (--) nyt useinhan kuvitellaan että voidaan olla alueellisesti niinkun, yliopisto voi olla niinku tärkeä vaikuttaja alueellisesti mutta, on aivan selvää että mikäli yliopisto ei ole kansainvälisesti niinku tunnettu niin sillä on paljon heikommat mahdollisuudet myös olla vaikuttaja alueella, alueellisesti tai valtakunnallisesti. Et tää niinku, tavallaan se uskottavuus tulee, yliopiston uskottavuus vaikuttajana tulee siitä että se on kansainvälisesti arvostettu yhteistyökumppani. (U3, 2)

88. Teknologisen ja luonnontieteellisen tutkimuksen kehityksen pahimmaksi esteeksi ovat muodostumassa korkeakoulujen heikentyneet tutkimusedellytykset ja vanhentunut tutkimuslaitteisto. (IS7, 1995, 36)

89. Yliopisto luottaa rohkeasti hankkimaansa tietoon ja viisauteen. Yliopistojen perinne on tuottaa, vaalia ja kehittää ihmiskunnan historian aikana kertyneitä tietoja ja taitoja sekä käyttää niitä yhteiskunnan hyväksi. (--) Rohkeutta on myös reagointi muuttuvaan maailmaan nopeasti ja tehokkaasti silloin, kun se on asiasyiden perusteella tarpeellista. Yliopisto tiedostaa syvällisen ja punnitun tiedon merkityksen ja suhtautuu vakaan rauhallisesti sekä kriittisesti yhteiskunnassa yhä yleisemmin esiintyvään puolinaiseen tietoon ja hetkellisiin muotivirtauksiin. (TT2, 2004, 3)

90. (--)se kilpailu näillä koulutusmarkkinoilla niin se on hyvin paljon todellakin koulutuslähtöistä ja markkinalähtöistä, ja se esimerkiksi missä nyt ylivoimaisesti kovimmat markkinat on niin ne on tämmösessä niinkun business-alan koulutuksessa, MBA ja vastaavat jutut. Ja me on nyt lähetty siitä ettei me haluta kilpaillakkaan koulutuksella vaan me kilpaillaan tutkimuksella. Ja sitä ei oikeestaan kaikki nää virtuaaliopetus, virtuaaliyliopistot ja nää tämmöset amerikkalaiset corporate universities niin nehän eivät tutki ollenkaan, nehän vaan opettaa, ei verkon kautta voida tutkia, verkon kautta voi jakaa oppimateriaalia, se opetus

ja oppiminenkin on hiukan kyseenalaista. Mutta tota ne on kuitenkin puhtaasti tähän koulutusfunktioon keskittyviä ja kun me korostetaan juuri sitä että meidän perustehtävä on tutkimus ja siihen perustuva opetus niin eihän me koeta sitä kilpailua niinkun sillä lailla uhkana vaan on lähetty siitä että tämmösellä perinteisellä humboldtilaisella yliopistolla on edelleenkin niin kuin sosiaalinen tilaus.(U1, 9)

91. Ja se, kun mennään kansainvälistymiseen, puhutaan kun yliopistolaitos kansainvälistyy niin tulee tämä tietysti tää yliopiston kieli, käyttämä kieli, aikalailla keskeiseksi. Ja täähän on tänä päivänä mä sanoisin melkein ajankohtaisimpia niinku aiheita kun puhutaan kansainvälistymisestä koska silloin sä menet monessa suhteessa aivan niinku yliopistojen arvoihin, minkätyyppisiä arvoja sulla on, ja millä kielellä sä annat sitä koulutusta (--)(U3, 3)

92. Koska meillä on sellanen käsitys että kunhan vaan siirrytään englanninkielelle niin ollaan kansainvälisiä. Ja se ei pidä paikkansa. Se ei pidä paikkansa. Se on aivan samalla tavalla kun elinkeinoelämässä tai yritysmaailmassa puhutaan siitä että kun kaks yritystä fuusi- fuusioituu (--)(U3, 4)

93. Jotta Suomeen syntyisi aidosti monikulttuurinen korkeakouluyhteisö, tulisi pääsääntöisesti lähteä siitä, että ulkomaiset ja suomalaiset opiskelijat opiskelisivat samoissa ohjelmissa. (IS5, 2005, 34)

94. Koska Suomi on pieni kielialue, tulee korkeakoulujen edelleen laajentaa vierailta kielillä annettavaa opetusta, jota voivat hyödyntää niin ulkomaiset kuin kotimaisetkin opiskelijat. Vieraskielisen opetuksen kehittäminen edellyttää panostusta opettajien kielitaitoon. Samalla on kuitenkin huolehdittava siitä, että Suomeen tuleville ulkomaisille opiskelijoille, opettajille ja tutkijoille on tarjolla riittävästi suomen ja ruotsin kielen sekä kulttuurin opetusta. (IS6, 1995, 27)

95. Meidän pitää käyttää kaikkii niitä rahoitusvälineitä mitä siinä vois olla koska niinkun mä aiemmin viittasin niin siit tulee koko aika tärkeempää että me ymmärretään ne ajatukselliset ja toiminnalliset kontekstit missä eri yhteiskunnista tulevat tai niissä elävät ihmiset toimii, et jotta me... voitais käyttää maailman mahdollisuudet ja aiheuttaa mahdollisimman vähän vahinkoo toisille ihmisille niin meidän pitää ymmärtää niitä. (U2, 2)

96. Että et tieteeseen nimenomaan kuuluu tää kilpailu ja kyllä se korkeakoulutuksessakin se että pitäis olla sillä tavalla niinkun kilpailua että voi aidosti sanoa että meillon meillon niin hyvää opetusta ja opiskellaan niin tehokkaasti ja hyvin että se kestää kilpailun.(N2, 7)

97. Mut sitte toinen kilpailu-ulottuvuus on tietysti et suomalaiset korkeakoulut voi keskenään kilpailla siitä että ketkä menestyy parhaiten ulkomaalaisten houkuttelemisessa (--)(U3, 3)

Et se missä voi olla vähän outoakin kipailua on tää yliopistojen ja ammattikorkeakoulujen

suhde että kun ammattikorkeakoulujärjestelmä on Suomessa ollu tietyn mallinen mut maailmalla se voidaan nähdä hyvin eri tavalla tai joissakin maissa ei oo vastaavaa järjestelmää, niin ammattikorkeakoulut on hyvin aktiivisesti tehny tätä kansainvälistymisohjelmaansa ja niillon myös näitä kansainvälisiä sopimuksia ja ne houkuttelee opiskelijoita, jotka ei kyl aina tiedä että ne tulee sitte Suomessa itseasiassa tämmöseen non-university sektorin koulutuslaitokseen, et ne luulee et nää on yliopistoja. (U5, 8)

98. Et en mä voi usko et joku yliopisto vielä niinku vois ajatuksissa lähtee kilpailemaan joku toisen kanssa jonnekin opiskelijoista, et se on kyllä tämmönen niinku musta niinku vielä tämmösellä niinku maitten tasoilla ja ehkä niinku meiän kaltasten organisaatioiden, et et sieltä mä oon niinku ollu aisti- meilähän on sellanen yhteisjärjestö kun ACA [Academic Cooperation Association, TN] (--)(N3, 6)

99. Tampereen teknillinen yliopisto pyrkii tuottamaan muulle yhteiskunnalle hyödyllisiä palveluja. Tieteellisen toiminnan tarkoitus on tutkimustavoitteiden lisäksi kehittää suomalaista yhteiskuntaa, edistää sivistystä ja kansallista henkistä pääomaa. Yliopisto ei miellä tieteen harjoittamista itseisarvoksi tai huippu-urheilun kaltaiseksi kilpailuksi. (TT2, 2004, 9)

100. No se taas mä palaan siihen niinku tavallaan siihen ajatusketjuun että jos korkeakoululla on rooli niin sillä pitää olla, se pitää olla kilpailukykyinen, se pitää olla laatua kansainvälisiä laatukriteerejä täyttävä toiminta ja sitä sellasta osaamista ja toimintaa, kansainvälisiä niinku laatukriteerejä täyttävä toiminta, se ei niinku kerta kaikkiaan, sä et pysty toteuttamaan sitä jonkinlaisessa tyhjiössä jos niinku sul on vaan tämmönen kansallinen, katsot vaan näitä kansallisia markkinoita. Eli että tavallaan jos sulla on, sun pitää olla kilpailukykyinen, sun pitää olla,.. sun pitää vaan olla hyvä. (U3, 7)

101. Ylin opetus on ohjaamista tieteelliseen ja kulttuuriseen ajatteluun sekä taiteelliseen osaamiseen. Koulutus on opetuksen ja oppimisen kokonaisuus. Yliopisto antaa opetusta, joka luo edellytyksiä oppimiselle. Opiskelijoita opastetaan etsimään, luomaan ja kriittisesti arvioimaan tietoa sekä jalostamaan sitä omiin vahvuuksiinsa ja perustuvaksi ymmärrykseksi ja taidoksi ratkoa uudenlaisia tehtäviä. Tieteellinen koulutus ohjaa myös vastuun kantamiseen tuotetusta tiedosta ja löydetyistä tuloksista. (TT2, 2004, 4)

102. Suomella ei ole varaa hukata henkisiä voimavarojaan, koska mahdollisimman laajan sivistystason ylläpitäminen on kansallinen elinehto. Suomi tarvitsee kansalliset lähtökohdat huomioon ottavaa kansainvälisesti laadukkaisiin tuloksiin pyrkivää tutkimus- ja koulutuspolitiikkaa. (DS3, 1993, 19)

103. Taloudellinen tehokkuus on yliopistolle haaste, koska sillä tarkoitetaan yleensä kykyä tuottaa lyhyellä aikavälillä rahallista hyötyä taustayhteisölleen. Yliopistojen historiallinen menestys perustuu kuitenkin vastakkaiseen ta-voitteeseen tuottaa *pitkäaikaista hyötyä koko yhteiskunnalle*, mikä ei yleensä ole edes arvioitavissa taloudellisin välinein. (TT2, 2004, 5)

104. Yliopiston arvot ankkuroituvat suomalaiseen yh-teiskuntaan ja kansallisesti menestyskekkäiksi havaittuihin toimintatapoihin: *viisauteen, vastuullisuuteen, sivistykseen ja rohkeuteen*. (TT2, 2004, 3)

105. Yliopisto laajentaa yhteiskunnallista vaikutustaan antamalla opiskelijoilleen ja opettajilleen valmiuksia osallistua vastuullisina kansalaisina yhteiskunnalliseen keskusteluun ja rohkaisemalla heitä aktiivisiksi keskustelijoiksi. (TT2, 2004, 13)

106. Koulutuksen puolelta nin se yhteistyöhän nyt sitten Euroopan Unionissa se on hyvinki suurimerkityksellistä. Et sen yhteistyön kautta nyt sitte niinku ilmenee tai realisoituu koko tää Euroopan yhdentymisen et yliopistoilla ja ja opiskelijoilla ja tutkijoilla on siinä tavattoman suuri merkitys niinku tehdä todeks tää Euroopan yhteistyö ja yhdentymisen. (N1,4)

107. Mähän oon näitten kansainvälisten yliopistomarkkinoiden vahva kannattaja. Meidän pitää käyttää kaikki rehelliset elinkeinot täs maassa hyödyks et kun teollisuus karkaa täältä niin meidän pitää kehittä jotain muita elinkeinoja tilalle että me voidaan asua täällä ja et meil on töitä täällä että me voidaan pitää tätä omaa yhteiskuntamuotoa ja ehkä kansainväliset opiskelijat ei oo olemassa sitä varten että ne tulis Suomeen töihin vaan että Suomi voi yksinkertaisesti osallistua toimijana tässä opetuksessa ja lähtee siitä ajatuksesta että kiinalaiset voi opiskella lännessä myös palatakseen kiinaan töihin. (U2, 3)

108. Mut et silti me tarvitaan ulkomaalaisopiskelijoita, me tarvitaan osa niistä semmoiksi joka jäis Suomeen tekemään töitä. Ja et millä rahalla me sit sitä koulutusta annetaan niin, tässä nyt sitten siis yhtenä mahdollisuutena on se, että se olis osittain maksullista ja sitten siihen liittyis tää stipendijärjestelmä köyhien maiden opiskelijoille mut et ne joillon maksukykyä niin sitten maksais kohtuullisia lukukausimaksuja joilla sitten näitä palveluja vois, ja myöskin englanninkielisiä opintokokonaisuuksia, myöskin maisteriohjelmiä voitais kehittää. (U5, 5)

109. Suomen tulevaisuus on riippuvainen osaamisesta, kyvystä hyödyntää osaamista ja luoda uusia innovaatioita. Koko väestön osaamistason nostaminen tukee Suomen kehittymistä sivistyskansana ja Suomen kilpailukykyä. Yhtäläiset koulutusmahdollisuudet kuuluvat jokaiselle Suomessa vakinaisesti asuvalle henkilölle sukupuolesta, asuinpaikasta,

iästä, kielestä, taloudellisesta asemasta, terveydentilasta, vammasta tai alkuperästä riippumatta elinikäisen oppimisen periaatteen mukaisesti. (DS5, 1999, 6)

110. Tieto ja osaaminen on taloudellisen kilpailukyvyyn ja koko yhteiskunnan hyvinvoinnin perusta. Suomen menestyminen perustuu korkeatasoiseen koulutukseen ja tutkimukseen, innovatiiviseen osaamiseen sekä modernin tieto- ja viestintätekniikan hyödyntämiseen. (IS8, 2001, 25)

111. Suomen kehittämisspolitiikka korostaa koulutuksen ja tutkimuksen keskeistä roolia Suomen selviytymisstrategiassa ja innovaatiojärjestelmän tasapainoisessa kehittämisessä. Koulutuksen laatu ja vaikuttavuus, kansainvälisyys, kansakunnan korkean sivistystason säilyttäminen, korkeakoululaitoksen tehokkuuden parantaminen sekä joustavan ja muutoksiin nopeasti reagoivan koulutusjärjestelmän luominen ovat valitut kehittämissinjan päätavoitteita. (IS6, 1995, 24)

112. (--) meillä se suuri ideologia on se että meillä on suuri tasalaatuinen yliopistojärjestelmä palvelemissa kansallisia tarpeita ja tota erityisesti kansallista ja alueellista innovaatiojärjestelmää (--) tähän on sitten vahvasti taas toinen ajatus että yliopisto... kasvattaa, kouluttaa, sivistää ihmisiä kansalaisia jotka saa sieltä elämäänsä aineksia ja että niin syvälinen ymmärrys ammatillisista ja muista asioista niin se pitää yllä parempaa elämää ja parempaa yhteiskuntaa ja tietysti se näkökulma niinku taas puoltaa isoo yliopistolaitosta jonka ei tarvi olla hirvittävän kilpaileva vaan niinku avaramielinen periaatteessa. (U2, 3)

113. (--) ja et mä näkisin sen, mitä se on se kansainvälistäminen korkeakouluissa niin paitsi et se liittyy tähän niinkun työelämäkysymykseen niin just että se tieto mitä opetetaan ja ne kyvyt joita opitaan niin ne on niinku sisällöltään jo sellasia että ne ei oo Suomessa nyt keksitty ja tuotettu tai täällä vaan käytettäväks tarkotettu vaan että on niinku välttämätön tarve nykyisessä maailmassa, että pystyy elämään, eihän kukaan pysty meist enää elämään ilman jonkinlaista kansainvälisyyttä vaikka harrastuselämässä (--) (N3, 2)

114. Tampereen yliopisto kouluttaa korkeatasoisia akateemisia asiantuntijoita julkiselle, yksityiselle ja kolmannelle sektorille. Yliopistossa omaksutaan työelämässä ja kansalaisena tarvittavia tietoja ja taitoja ja luodaan arvoja ja asenteita. (UT2, 2006, 5)

115. Yliopistosta valmistuneella tulee olla sellainen akateeminen komptenssi ja ammatillinen valmius, että hän voi menestyksellisesti työskennellä kansainvälisessä ja monikulttuurisessa ympäristössä. (UT3, 2001, 2)

116. Kansainvälisen koulutusyhteistyön avulla pyritään monipuolistamaan koulutusmahdollisuuksia, nostamaan koulutuksen laatua ja antamaan opiskelijoille kansainvälisessä yhteistyössä tarvittavia valmiuksia. (DS2, 1991, 33)

117. Tavoitteena on myös lisätä korkeakoululaitoksen avoimuutta muuhun yhteiskuntaan päin. Korkeakoulujen maksullisessa palvelutoiminnassa lisätään tutkimus- ja kehittämispalveluja. Tarkoituksena on, että korkeakoulut voisivat tässä suhteessa toimia sijaintialueensa kehittämiskeskuksina. Yleensäkin pyrkimyksenä on, että yhteiskunnan ja työelämän muutokset voidaan joustavasti ottaa huomioon korkeakoulujen toimintaa kehitettäessä. (DS1, 1987, 4)

118. Joo, siis Eurooppahan on suuri häviö tässä kansainvälisessä korkeakoulukilpailussa, et Eurooppa on hävinnyt sekä tieteen kärkiaseman että yliopistolaitoksen kärkiaseman USAlle. En tiedä onko Euroopassa joku joka kyseenalaistaa tämän häviön mutta ainakin kansainvälisessä kirjallisuudessa niin tätä pidetään ihan itsestään selvänä asiana et näin on tapahtunut ja et se on sit tietysti osa tätä EU:n suurta kamppailua taloudellisesta asemasta USAan ja Japaniin verrattuna niin on tää yliopistojärjestelmän luominen (--) (U2, 7)

119. Kansainvälinen osaaminen on innovation perusta, josta kasvaa yliopistolle hyviä tutkijoita ja opettajia ja yhteiskunnalle kansantaloutemme kasvattajia kilpailun kovetessa ulkomailta päin. (UT3, 2001, 11)

120. Tavoitteena on, että yliopistot toimivat tehokkaasti osana suomalaista tutkimusjärjestelmää. Yliopistojen tutkimusympäristöt ovat kansainvälisesti kilpailukykyisiä ja tutkijakoulutus- ja tutkijanurajärjestelyt ovat korkeatasoisia. (DS5, 1999, 42)

121. (--) siinä on sitten sekin että kun tää Suomi niinkun kuitenkin ajattelee näin että kansainvälistymisen kautta niin saamme saamme tota noin lahjakkaita ihmisiä jotka sitten jäisivät Suomeen siinä on niinkun tämä itsekäs päämäärä (--) (U4, 4)

122. No nyt sitte tän opiskelijaliikkuvuuden toivottavasti kasvaessa ja myöskin tutkinto-opiskelun kansainvälistyessä siis niin että tullaan enemmän ja meiltä mennään opiskelemaan muuallekin, merkittäviä tutkinnon osia, tai ihan koko tutkinto, niin kyl mä luulen että ennen pitkään joudutaan katteleen esimerkiks näitä valintajärjestelmiä, (--) mut et se että jos sä tuota Ranskassa pääset vapaasti opiskelemaan ja tää liikkuvuus lisääntyy niin ennen pitkään varmasti voi ruveta kuulumaan semmosia ääniä että miksen mä pääse sit Suomessa opiskelemaan yliopistoon. (N2, 12)

123. Joo, siis toka syy siihen et miks Suomesta lähtee hirveen hyviä opiskelijoita ulkomaille on se ettei meillä oo tarpeeks hyviä yliopistoja ku me.. ehkä kyse on osin imagoista että meil ei o imagoita tarpeeks hyviä yliopistoja, mutta myös siitä niin että meil ei saa sellaista kansainvälistä valmennusta mitä jotkut hakee työelämään menemällä johonkin kansainvälisempään ja maineikkaampaan yliopistoon opiskelemaan. Kaikki lähtijät ei oo niitä jotka ei oo päässy Suomessa haluamaansa yliopistoon, joitten vanhemmat on niin rikkaita että

voi lähettää ne ulkomaille. Kaikki lähtijät ei oo niitä vaan et on ihan oikeesti tämmösiä päämäärätietosia lähtijöitä ja niille meidän pitäis voida antaa enemmän. (U2, 2)

124. (--) varsinkin nyt kun, kun koulutusmarkkinat kansainvälisesti tai koulutusmarkkinat se volyyymi kehittyi niin se on aivan selvä että joko yliopisto haluaa olla mukana näillä kansainvälisillä markkinoilla tai sitten ei. (U3, 2)

125. Kansainvälisen kilpailun kiristytessä koko ajan, on tarpeen, että korkeakouluilla säilyy mahdollisuus reagoida nopeasti ja joustavasti myös kansainvälisillä koulutusmarkkinoilla tapahtuviin muutoksiin. (IS5, 2005, 31)

126. (--) sehän on tabuaihe meillä, eihän lukukausimaksuista saa keskustella mutta luulenpa vaan että siihen keskusteluun tästä ajaututaan ennenpitkään, siihen suuntaan tää yhteiskunta nyt vaan on kehitymässä että ei kaikkea ilmaista hyvää voi rajattomasti kaikille jakaa. (U1 ,8)

127. Ei me varmaan nähdä koulutuksen myyntiä semmosena kilpailutekijänä, eikä yliopistojen hengissä pysymisen edellytyksenäkään että must tuntuu et jos meillä on, kun meillä on, niinku sellasi vahvuusalueita ja aatellaan että okei me voitas järjestää esimerkiks semmonen ohjelma, niin kyl mä nään siinä et ensimmäiseks tulee mieleen et kenen kanssa me tehdään tää yhdessä, kotimaisessa, pohjoismaisessa kuviossa, Eurooppalaisessa kuviossa, mikä se on se, mut sitten se tietysti on vielä se yks iso kysymys, meillä pohjoismaissa koulutus nähdään tämmösen perustuslaillisen oikeutena (--) (U6, 5)

128. Tää tietysti tää maksullisuus et se on niinkun tietysti ymmärretään, näin kansallisesti, kansallinen hyvinvointiajattelu että tää on maksuton tää tutkinto ja koulutus ihan ammat- tiin saakka, se on hyvä ja vaalittava periaate mut se että pieni Suomi rupee sitten kouluttamaan ulkomaalaisia se on sitten toinen ongelma ja miten tää ratkaistaan. (U4, 3)

129. (--) jos nähdään koulutus toimialana, meillon koulutusmarkkinat, niin Suomessa meillä ei ole - ne mekanismit joilla voidaan viedä viedä tätä tuotetta, koulutustuotetta ulkomaille (--) (U3, 5)

130. Ja että se [korkeakoulutusmarkkinoihin osallistuminen, TN] on niinku, täs supistuvan julkisen talouden maailmassa niin se on niitä harvoja lupaavia mahdollisuuksia yliopistolle pelastaa itsensä, että se pystyy järjestään sekä lisärahoitusta että ulkomaisia opettajia sillä että se osallistuu niihin kansainväliisiin markkinoihin.(U2, 4)

131. Suomen kansainvälistymistavoitteiden kannalta tilanne on erittäin hankala, sillä Erasmus Mundus -ohjelmaan hyväksytyjä maisteriohjelmiä käytetään eräänlaisina eurooppalaisen korkeakoulutuksen laatuhankkeina markkinoinnissa. Jos suomalaiset korkeakoulut

eivät voi rahoituksen puutteen takia osallistua ohjelmaan täysipainoisesti, vähentää se suomalaisen koulutuksen näkyvyyttä ja houkuttelevuutta globaalitasolla. (IS5, 2005, 11)

132. Maksullisen tarjonnan salliminen parantaisi Suomen mahdollisuuksia osallistua kansainvälisille korkeakoulutusmarkkinoille ja suomalaisen osaamisen kaupalliseen hyödyntämiseen. (IS5, 2005, 28)

133. Tarkastelun perusteella työryhmä katsoo, että korkeakoulujen kansainvälisen toiminnan kehittäminen ja ulkomaisten tutkinto-opiskelijoiden määrän lisääminen valtioneuvoston päättämällä tavalla edellyttävät, että toimintaan voidaan suunnata merkittävästi lisävoimavaroja lähivuosien aikana. Suomen korkeakoulujen kilpailukyvyyn vahvistaminen kansainvälisillä koulutusmarkkinoilla edellyttää, että korkeakouluilla on samanlaiset edellytykset toimia kansainvälisesti kuin muilla EU-maiden korkeakouluilla. Yliopistoissa ja ammattikorkeakouluissa on runsaasti kansainvälisen tason osaamista, jota tulee voida hyödyntää nykyistä paremmin. Suomen tulee voida vastata omalta osaltaan kasvavaan kansainväliseen koulutuskysyntään. (IS5, 2005, 20)

134. Kansainvälinen osaaminen on innovation perusta, josta kasvaa yliopistolle hyviä tutkijoita ja opettajia ja yhteiskunnalle kansantaloutemme kasvattajia kilpailun kovetessa ulkomailta päin. (UT3, 2001, 11)

135. Korkeakoulutus ja tutkimus ovat kansallisen innovaatiojärjestelmän toimivuuden kannalta keskeisessä asemassa. (DS5, 1999, 36)

136. Yliopistoilla on edessään suuria haasteita, kun Suomen kansantalouden riippuvuus maailmantaloudesta lisääntyy ja yliopistot toimivat yhä enemmän oman alueensa kehityksen vetureina. Niiden on huolehdittava kyvystään vastata nopeasti ja luovasti toimintaympäristönsä ja tieteen kehityksen haasteisiin. (UT1, 2001, 1)

137. Helsingin seudun korkeakoulujen keskeisenä tavoitteena on luoda edellytyksiä alueen ja valtakunnan kansainväliselle kilpailukyvyille ja tasapainoiselle yhteiskuntakehitykselle. (RM1, 2005, 3)

138. (--) kyl se on valtava muutos, et kohtahan se alkaa olla niinku syrjivä tekijä se et puuttuu et on niinku luonnollista, se e enää oo lisäarvo vaan sen puute on miinus et on niin paljon tätä kokemusta nuorissa ihmisissä. (N3, 9)

Appendix four

Discourses in quotes

Quote 1

This quote contributes to two Internationalisation discourses, internationalisation as opening up of the country, and internationalisation as individual growth, as well as to one University discourse, civilisation and wellbeing -discourse. It draws from the sub-discourse of opening up as a metaphor when talking about the importance of understanding other cultures, but also seems to imply that philosophical individual growth is required for understanding other people and doing them as little harm as possible. The same notions also contribute to the traditional and global sub-discourses of the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse.

We must use all those existing funding mechanisms [to increase internationalisation, TN], because as I said earlier, it is becoming increasingly important that we understand those contexts of thought and action in which the people coming from or living in different societies function. In order for us to use all the options in the world, and do as little harm to other people as possible, we have to understand them. (U2, 2) (11)

Quote 2

This quote seems to contribute to all three University discourses: the science and knowledge -discourse, the civilisation and wellbeing -discourse and the competition and competitiveness -discourse, as well as to one content discourse, internationalisation as rethinking of the university. The rethinking of the university is implied by what kind of quality assurance must be implemented. The sentence explaining what is required draws from the discourse of science and knowledge, with emphasis on tradition and academic excellence, and from utilitarian discourse of civilisation and wellbeing, with its emphasis on social and economic relevance. Maybe also the competition and competitiveness -discourse is used in mentioning innovation and the call for accountability of the quality assurance system.

Indeed, quality assessment must take into consideration the goals and mission of institutions and programmes. It requires a balance between innovation and tradition, academic excellence and social/economic relevance, the coherence of curricula and students' freedom of choice. It encompasses teaching and research as well as governance and administration, responsiveness to students' needs and the provision of non-educational services. Inherent quality does not suffice, it needs to be demonstrated and guaranteed in order to be acknowledged and trusted by students, partners and society at home, in Europe and in the world. (EUA3, 2001, 2)

Appendix five

Analysis scheme

The process of textual analysis is schematised in the following table, in which the different rounds of analysis are combined into one single table. The first column includes the original text extract, the next two columns include the elements which were been paid attention to and the remarks made on those elements at the beginning of n the analysis process. The fourth column describes the next step of the analysis, in which the discourses were compiled, and each of the text extracts was assigned to a certain discourse. The the final column describes the last step of the analysis, during which the sub-discourses were identified and each text extract was placed under certain sub-discourses, often each extract into more than one sub-discourse.

Two documents are analysed in the table. The first one is the summary of the European Commission communication, *The Role of Universities in the Europe of Knowledge*. The second one is an interview with a central Finnish higher education policy actor.¹ The texts can be found in full at the bottom of the page, whereas in the table they are analysed in smaller pieces. For practical reasons, for the interview only the responses of the interviewee are analysed here, as they are more interesting. From the perspective of discourse analysis, however, also the assumptions and connotations build into the interview question might be interesting, as well as the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee.

The discourses are abridged as follows:

Internationalisation discourses	University discourses
IGD Individual growth discourse	SKD Science and knowledge -discourse
IGDp Philosophical sub-discourse	CWD Civilisation and wellbeing -discourse
IGDi Instrumental sub-discourse	CWDt Traditional sub-discourse
RUD Rethinking university discourse	CWDg Global sub-discourse
OCD Opening up of the country discourse	CWDi Instrumental sub-discourse
OCDm Opening up metaphor sub-discourse	CCD Competition and competitiveness -discourse
OCDc Concrete opening up sub-discourse	
OCDi Image sub-discourse	

1. The interview is an almost word-by-word translation from Finnish, and thus its grammatical structures may not be accurate in English language. However, as the analysis was done in Finnish, this has no effect on the analysis process.

Text extract	Attention trigger	Remarks	Discourse	Sub-discourse
Communication from the European Commission: The Role of Universities in the Europe of Knowledge, February 2003 (EUU1)				
The Role of Universities in the Europe of Knowledge	Role of universities Europe of knowledge	Assumes there is a role Taken for granted, establishes this as a given entity, the content of which is defined in this and in many other EU documents, implies that EU first and foremost wants to define itself through knowledge/knowledge society	The discourse would depend on the content given to the Europe of Knowledge, possibly CWD, but reading the entire document, CCD is more likely	
This Communication seeks to start a debate on the role of Universities ¹ within the knowledge society and economy in Europe and on the conditions under which they will be able to effectively play that role. 1 In this Communication, the term "universities" is taken to mean all higher education establishments, including, for example, the "Fachhochschulen", the "polytechnics" and the "Grandes Ecoles".	Knowledge society, knowledge economy effectively play the role All HEI's named as universities	Taken for granted that they exist, carry a positive connotation assume that universities have a role and that there is an effective way to play it, raises a question whether there is ineffective way as well Recognises the institutionality of university, may be an attempt to "own it" or to redefine it		
The knowledge society depends for its growth on the production of new knowledge, its transmission through education and training, its dissemination through information and communication technologies, and on its use through new industrial processes or services.	knowledge society	very mainstream definition of knowledge society, partly technological orientation		
Universities are unique, in that they take part in all these processes, at their core, due to the key role they play in the three fields of research and exploitation of its results, thanks to industrial cooperation and spin-off; education and training, in particular training of researchers; and regional and local development, to which they can contribute significantly.	Universities key institutions of the knowledge society Three tasks of universities: research, education and regional development	Research defined in rather utilitarian, instrumental way Education science-centred, as raises specifically the training of researchers regional and local development undefined but one gets a sense of instrumental rather than philosophical contribution	partly SKD, but also CWD	CWDi

<p>The European Union therefore needs a healthy and flourishing university world.</p> <p>Europe needs excellence in its universities,</p> <p>to optimise the processes which underpin the knowledge society and</p> <p>meet the target, set out by the European Council in Lisbon, of becoming <i>the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion.</i></p>	<p>healthy and flourishing</p> <p>excellent universities</p> <p>optimising the processes</p> <p>Lisbon target</p>	<p>the document implies a description of what is healthy and flourishing, very much in line with competitiveness discourse</p> <p>excellence redefined in terms of competition and competitiveness, not the old definition which started from the internal definitions of the academic community</p> <p>strong governmentality, optimising processes</p> <p>Lisbon process starting point for any EU policy, direct intertextuality of policy documents</p>	<p>Reference to excellence could be SKD, but here seems more like CCD</p> <p>Reference to Lisbon implies CCD</p>	
<p>The European Council in Barcelona recognised this need for excellence, in its call for European systems of education to become a “world reference” by 20102.</p> <p>2 Barcelona European Council - Presidency Conclusions.</p>	<p>excellence</p> <p>world reference</p>	<p>need for excellence taken for granted here: “recognised this need”</p> <p>implies being the best, just like the Lisbon target, uses the language of extremes</p>	<p>CCD</p>	
<p>However, the European university world is not trouble-free, and the European universities are not at present globally competitive with those of our major partners, even though they produce high quality scientific publications.</p>	<p>not trouble free, not globally competitive</p>	<p>playing down the universities as they are now, implies that are not good enough</p> <p>takes global competition for granted</p>	<p>publications refer to SKD, otherwise CCD, maybe also RUD is implied</p>	
<p>The Communication notes a number of areas within which reflection, and often also action, is needed, and raises a series of questions such as:</p> <p>– how to achieve adequate and sustainable incomes for universities, and to ensure that funds are spent most efficiently;</p>	<p>reflection and action is needed</p> <p>adequate and sustainable income</p> <p>most efficient use</p>	<p>Implies that something must be done for the universities</p> <p>implies not enough money, but where should the money come from</p> <p>efficient one of the key words of the discourse of doing more, cheaper and better</p>	<p>CCD, possibly also RUD implied although is a sense wider than just internationalisation</p>	

<p>- how to ensure autonomy and professionalism in academic as well as managerial affairs; – how to concentrate enough resources on excellence, and create the conditions within which universities can attain and develop excellence</p>	<p>autonomy and professionalism</p> <p>excellence</p>	<p>seems like a redefinition of these words</p> <p>excellence is now presented as something which can be consciously managed</p> <p>In both these examples EU seems to want to govern universities by defining central concepts</p>	<p>SKD, also RUD as above</p> <p>Excellence more likely to be defined within CCD than SKD</p>	
<p>- how to make universities contribute better to local and regional needs and strategies; – How to establish closer co-operation between universities and enterprises to ensure better dissemination and exploitation of new knowledge in the economy and society at large</p>	<p>contribute better, establish closer cooperation</p> <p>exploitation of knowledge in economy and society</p>	<p>sets demands for universities to contribute better</p> <p>presents knowledge as something which should be exploited</p> <p>economy mentioned before society, does this imply a prevalence of economy over society?</p>	<p>CWD, implies also RUD as above</p>	<p>CWDi</p>
<p>- how to foster, through all of these areas, the coherent, compatible and competitive European higher education area called for by the Bologna Declaration, as well as the European research area set out as an objective for the Union by the Lisbon European Council, in March 2000.</p>	<p>coherent, compatible and competitive EHEA</p> <p>Bologna declaration, Lisbon declaration</p>	<p>defines EHEA with these attributes</p> <p>Intertextuality with these documents</p>	<p>CWD, CCD, possibly also OCD</p>	<p>CWDi, OCDC</p>
<p>This Communication, which has been prepared in the context of the 2003 Spring European Council, invites responses to these questions from all those concerned with higher education, research and innovation. The Commission will review the state of the debate in the summer of 2003 and identify suitable initiatives, possibly in a further Communication for examination by the Education Ministers in the Education Council and the Research Ministers in the Competitiveness Council, as well as by the European Summit of Higher Education Ministers scheduled for 18-19 September 2003 in Berlin.</p>	<p>all those concerned with higher education, research and innovation</p>	<p>implies a broad understanding of the stakeholders</p> <p>Innovation a taken for granted part of the university activity, as a parallel is drawn with education and research.</p>		

Interview with central Finnish higher education actor, March 2004 (U3)

<p>Interviewer: Together with the debate on internationalisation of higher education, the ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them?</p> <p>Interviewee: So this comp-</p> <p>Interviewer: cooperation and competition</p> <p>Interviewee: I would say that in a sense that the education markets are a line of business, and now I am coming to this line of business dimension or viewpoint or point of analysis, I don't necessarily find the right words, but that, just as we see that in business, or in other industries, other markets, these units, companies, what ever you may call them, are in some contexts competitors and in others they are cooperation partners.</p>	<p>education markets, line of business</p> <p>competitors and cooperation partners</p>	<p>The existence of education markets taken for granted, education characterised by using market vocabulary and parallel drawn with other markets</p> <p>These two are not mutually exclusive, so cooperation and competition is not contrasted, but presented as living side by side, later on it is also presented that one cooperates in order to compete. The existence of both, and that they are relevant to internationalisation is taken for granted, already by the interviewer.</p>		
<p>And in this sense, I think it is natural, exactly the same thing can be said about the universities. We have quite clearly a certain competitive situation regarding students and then teachers, researchers but exactly the same way, we cooperate, researchers cooperate, joint courses and such internationally as well.</p>	<p>we have quite clearly a competitive situation</p> <p>students, teachers and researchers</p> <p>researcher cooperation, joint courses</p>	<p>existence of competition taken for granted and not questioned</p> <p>defines what competition is about: competing to attract certain groups</p> <p>defines cooperation</p>	<p>CCD</p>	

<p>And this today is quite, it is natural, it is a challenge, it is a demand, I don't know which words you want to use in this context. It is a challenge because,</p> <p>these days people in my opinion think that the more we cooperate internationally, the more we internationalise, the more international we are. And myself I see as a clear danger there that there networks which are being created, this cooperation often takes place as networks, then today one quite a big risk is that maintaining the networks takes more energy, or they cost, if you make some sort of a cost-benefit analysis, then the cost is in a way, maintaining the network costs more than what is gained from it.</p>	<p>today</p> <p>it's natural, it's a challenge</p> <p>people think</p> <p>risk of cooperation networks</p> <p>cost-benefit analysis</p>	<p>Does this imply a temporal change?</p> <p>This competition and cooperation are taken for granted, later factualised also by explaining why it is a challenge seems to distance the speaker from this "general opinion"</p> <p>counter-discursive, presents that also problem exist, not all internationalisation is good</p> <p>the speaker is using another market metaphor, which strengthens the notion that education and international cooperation is somehow a function which is guided by a sort of market mechanism, and that it has to have a utility which is higher than the costs.</p>	<p>RUD</p>	
<p>And this is why I see, and this has quite clearly been the policy [in our university], that one has to be very selective when searching for these, when forming these networks. Because networks are maintained solely through people. And in the future these strategic networks will of course be central in this internationalisation. And then I in a way mean that it is these strategic networks or these partners, it is not a question of individual research cooperation but we go in there as an organisation.</p>	<p>One has be careful when forming the networks</p> <p>in the future of course will be central to internationalisation</p> <p>not individual research cooperation but organisational</p>	<p>Implies that as such networks nevertheless are taken for granted, but that some principles are set regarding them.</p> <p>as above</p> <p>two different definitions of what cooperation is, implies also a temporal evolution?</p>	<p>RUD</p>	

<p>Interviewer: How would you then describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in this international field of higher education?</p> <p>Interviewee: From the perspective of research one may of course say that it is quite clear that because, and now I come back to this that without internationalisation our education won't manage internationally,</p> <p>we don't really have anything to say, now I am going back to this that</p> <p>without international research we don't have international education.</p> <p>And how about Finnish education, the Finnish research is strongly internationalised, researcher training, I don't know whether you want to separate these, this education now?</p> <p>Interviewer: If you think that it is in this question - Interviewee: Yeah because I think -</p> <p>Interviewer: relevant.</p>	<p>from the perspective of research</p> <p>without internationalisation our education won't manage internationally</p> <p>we don't have anything to say</p> <p>without international research we don't have international education</p> <p>Finnish research strongly internationalised</p>	<p>conceptually distinguishes research and education</p> <p>Taken for granted idea that internationalisation and survival of education are linked</p> <p>having something to say is linked to being international</p> <p>link between education and research</p> <p>Taken for granted, and seems to have a positive connotation</p>	<p>focus on the internationality of science seems to point out to SKD, also RUD</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

<p>Interviewee: I think it is in many ways because if we look at this researcher training then it has been internationalised very, it has in many cases been used as a model example on what to do. Then thinking about internationalisation of education if we think how Finnish university education has been exported then in that one we are not necessarily very good, if one thinks, and there I come again to where I actually started from, that if one sees education as a line of business, we have education markets,</p> <p>then in Finland we don't have the mechanisms with which this product, this education product can be exported. And what is related to this is how, it is partly related, if you think about markets, price and amount, then normally you have, this is the very basics of economics, you have supply, supply curve and you have demand curve (draws curve up in the air with hands).</p>	<p>researcher training has been internationalised , used as a model example</p> <p>thinking about internationalisation of education -> how it has been exported, education as a line of business</p> <p>we don't have the mechanisms to export,</p> <p>supply and demand curves</p>	<p>This is taken for granted, and the speaker seems to take great pride in it, implies that we are doing something well, if we are used as an example</p> <p>Seems to draw a parallel between internationalisation and exporting of education, uses market vocabulary, and seems to imply that internationalisation of higher education equals international markets. This notion strengthened further by another market expression, education as a line of business</p> <p>see above</p> <p>see above</p>	<p>OCD, RUD</p> <p>OCD</p>	<p>OCDc</p> <p>OCDc</p>
<p>And at some point if you can't set a price then the problem is that when exporting, we have a good national product which we can't export. This among other things, and how could it be exported? Well for instance if one thinks about the USA, I don't necessarily want to use this as an example, then exporting takes place either so that a the product, a unit is established, a filial in another country and it is financed so that those who participate in the education pay for it. If one dares to use the word tuition fees.</p>	<p>we have a good national product which we can't export, how could it be exported</p> <p>for instance if one thinks about</p> <p>If one dares to use the word tuition fees</p>	<p>market vocabulary, portrays education as an export</p> <p>implies tuition fees though an example, without mentioning them explicitly</p> <p>Implies this is a sensitive issue</p>	<p>OCD</p>	<p>OCDc</p>

<p>So do you understand,</p> <p>in a way because we have this statutory free education then it is very difficult to export education leading to a degree, and this I see is a problem.</p> <p>By this I don't want to say that I would necessarily argue for tuition fees, or that I would think that these tuition fees should be made possible, but for example I do think that, especially from the perspective of internationalisation, it should be considered whether non-EU students should pay tuition fees in Finland. This is a sensitive question, I don't want at this point, and I want to say it very clearly, that I don't want at this point in anyway defend tuition fees for Finnish students, but let's say, let's take an example.</p>	<p>Do you understand,</p> <p>because of statutes education difficult to export</p> <p>Sensitive question, I want make it clear, don't want to argue for tuition fees</p> <p>but let's say, let's take an example</p>	<p>wants to make sure the interviewer understand what speaker is saying, which is implying that does not trust interviewee, probably because knows the background in student politics</p> <p>presents tuition fees as a mere technicality, which gives them a connotation of neutrality and "harmlessness"</p> <p>See above the relationship with the interviewer, tuition fees explicitly recognised as a sensitive issue. The speaker is hedging a lot, using very non-committal language</p> <p>seems to imply that although the speaker explicitly says that s/he is not arguing for tuition fees, s/he is implicitly presenting them as inevitable</p>	<p>implying implementing tuition fees seems to imply CCD</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

<p>I had, the [university] had, we were involved in a consortium where there was one American university and one from each European country, or almost, approximately ten universities. The Americans presumed that the students coming from here to California pay tuition fees, we don't because it was this joint degree system, we can't take tuition fees from Americans or from others, so those plans ended there, because in a way, we should be able, and this is a challenge of course how we can equitably participate in these joint and double degree educational networks, in consortia where one partners demands tuition fees.</p>	<p>Example of a thwarted consortium</p>	<p>factualises the need for tuition fees</p>	<p>as above</p>	
<p>So this is the problem, a little simplified, but I think that maybe you can get some sort of a picture on what I am trying to get at.</p> <p>Interviewer: Yes of course. What is then, if you want to return to this, maybe you already referred to it to some extent, but What is, then, in your opinion, the value of internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why, if we assume it has a value?</p>	<p>maybe you can get the picture</p>	<p>see above on the relationship with the interviewer</p>		

<p>Interviewee: Yes well in a way it is quite clear that it has a value,</p> <p>a small country, limited resources, I can only refer to this that</p> <p>wellbeing is based on knowledge. So that it is, both research and of course education is related to it. And we have, and in this context one may ask or say, that of course all this lifelong learning and education which now also is included in the task of the universities,</p> <p>then through this demographic development it has an even more important role.</p> <p>So I don't know what I could say but the value of education for the country crucial and then I am assuming, or this argument is based on that I am not talking about national education but that it is then education system fulfilling international criteria, standards.</p>	<p>quite clear internationalisation has a value</p> <p>small country</p> <p>wellbeing is based on knowledge</p> <p>demographic development</p> <p>value of education is crucial</p> <p>not national but international standards</p>	<p>value taken for granted</p> <p>reproduces the narrative "Finland is a small country"</p> <p>presents the link between wellbeing and knowledge, and the relationship of education and research those, implies that universities have a role, through education and research, in knowledge and therefore also in wellbeing</p> <p>typical knowledge society discourse implied, the demographic development is not explained but taken as a factor which is unquestionably understandable also to the interviewer</p> <p>positive connotation, seems to imply also the Finnish/ knowledge society faith in education</p> <p>seems to include a connotation that national is somehow inferior compared to international, also implies that such a thing as international standards exist</p>	<p>wellbeing is based on knowledge, refers to CWD, the small country on OCD</p> <p>LLL etc implies CWD</p> <p>OCD seems to be implied</p> <p>CWD</p> <p>international criteria refer to RUD, but could also be SKD or even CCD</p>	<p>CWDi, OCDmc</p> <p>CWDi</p> <p>CWDi?</p>
<p>And I don't know whether this is necessarily related to it, but very central to this is that in order for us to have in Finland an educational system fulfilling international criteria, we have to have the kind of universities which can attract foreign- international top people here, permanently, and this is a completely different,</p> <p>it has to do with tax issues, taxation, it has to do with aliens act, residence permits, etc, all this.</p>	<p>fulfilling international criteria demand that universities can attract foreign, international top people</p> <p>has to do with taxes etc</p>	<p>syllogism, link between "international criteria" and "international people" , draws a parallel between foreign and international, implies that what is wanted is primarily the "top" people, not the others, sets demands for universities, attractiveness being one of them</p> <p>sets demands for the government as well</p>	<p>universities: RUD</p> <p>taxation ect OCD, also previous CWD turn into CCD</p>	<p>OCDc</p>

<p>It is often forgotten when talking about internationalisation, one only talks about research and education, but one must remember that we are talking about recruiting students but even more important is the recruiting of teachers and researchers.</p> <p>Because if you can't create attractive work conditions here, research environments are talked about, then you can't attract here international top experts either.</p>	<p>education and research vs. recruiting</p> <p>attractive working conditions</p>	<p>seems to imply a qualitative and possibly also temporal evolution of the concept of internationalisation from student mobility and individual research cooperation to something different, namely "recruiting", which is market terminology, and refers to degree students and permanent mobility</p> <p>attractiveness presented as a goal and as a demand for universities, the use of this term typical throughout the documents</p>	<p>RUD, CCD</p>	
---	---	--	-----------------	--

Extract one: EU document (EUUI)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION

- The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge

I. SUMMARY

This Communication seeks to start a debate on the role of Universities¹ within the knowledge society and economy in Europe and on the conditions under which they will be able to effectively play that role. The knowledge society depends for its growth on the production of new knowledge, its transmission through education and training, its dissemination through information and communication technologies, and on its use through new industrial processes or services. Universities are unique, in that they take part in all these processes, at their core, due to the key role they play in the three fields of research and exploitation of its results, thanks to industrial cooperation and spin-off; education and training, in particular training of researchers; and regional and local development, to which they can contribute significantly. The European Union therefore needs a healthy and flourishing university world. Europe needs excellence in its universities, to optimise the processes which underpin the knowledge society and meet the target, set out by the European Council in Lisbon, of becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. The European Council in Barcelona recognised this need for excellence, in its call for European systems of education to become a “world reference” by 2010². However, the European university world is not trouble-free, and the European universities are not at present globally competitive with those of our major partners, even though they produce high quality scientific publications. The Communication notes a number of areas within which reflection, and often also action, is needed, and raises a series of questions such as:

- how to achieve adequate and sustainable incomes for universities, and to ensure that funds are spent most efficiently;
- how to ensure autonomy and professionalism in academic as well as managerial affairs;
- how to concentrate enough resources on excellence, and create the conditions within which universities can attain and develop excellence;
- how to make universities contribute better to local and regional needs and strategies;
- How to establish closer co-operation between universities and enterprises to ensure better dissemination and exploitation of new knowledge in the economy and society at large

1. In this Communication, the term “universities” is taken to mean all higher education establishments, including, for example, the “Fachhochschulen”, the “polytechnics” and the “Grandes Ecoles”.

2. Barcelona European Council - Presidency Conclusions.

- how to foster, through all of these areas, the coherent, compatible and competitive European higher education area called for by the Bologna Declaration, as well as the European research area set out as an objective for the Union by the Lisbon European Council, in March 2000.

This Communication, which has been prepared in the context of the 2003 Spring European Council, invites responses to these questions from all those concerned with higher education, research and innovation. The Commission will review the state of the debate in the summer of 2003 and identify suitable initiatives, possibly in a further Communication for examination by the Education Ministers in the Education Council and the Research Ministers in the Competitiveness Council, as well as by the European Summit of Higher Education Ministers scheduled for 18–19 September 2003 in Berlin.

Extract two: interview (U3)

Interviewer:

Together with the debate on internationalisation of higher education, the ideas of cooperation and competition in higher education are often discussed. What in your opinion do cooperation and competition mean and how do you feel about them?

Interviewee:

So this comp-

Interviewer:

cooperation and competition

Interviewee:

I would say that in a sense that the education markets are a line of business, and now I am coming to this line of business dimension or view- viewpoint or point of analysis, I don't necessarily find the right words, but that, just as we see that in business, or in other industries, other markets, these units, companies, what ever you may call them, are in some contexts competitors and in others they are cooperation partners. And in this sense, I think it is natural, exactly the same thing can be said about the universities. We have quite clearly a certain competitive situation regarding students and then teachers, researchers but exactly the same way, we cooperate, researchers cooperate, joint courses and such internationally as well. And this today is quite, it is natural, it is a challenge, it is a demand, I don't know which words you want to use in this context. It is a challenge because, these days people in my opinion think that the more we cooperate internationally, the more we internationalise, the more international we are. And myself I see as a clear danger there that there networks which are being created, this cooperation often takes place as networks, then today one quite a big risk is that maintaining the networks takes more energy, or they cost, if you

make some sort of a cost-benefit analysis, then the cost is in a way, maintaining the network costs more than what is gained from it. And this is why I see, and this has quite clearly been the policy [in our university], that one has to be very selective when searching for these, when forming these networks. Because networks are maintained solely through people. And in the future these strategic networks will of course be central in this internationalisation. And then I in a way mean that it is these strategic networks or these partners, it is not a question of individual research cooperation but we go in there as an organisation.

Interviewer:

How would you then describe the position of the Finnish higher education and higher education institutions in this international field of higher education?

Interviewee: From the perspective of research one may of course say that it is quite clear that because, and now I come back to this that without internationalisation our education won't manage internationally, we don't really have anything to say, now I am going back to this that without international research we don't have international education. And how about Finnish education, the Finnish research is strongly internationalised, researcher training, I don't know whether you want to separate these, this education now?

Interviewer:

If you think that it is in this question

Interviewee:

yeah because I think

Interviewer:

relevant

Interviewee:

I think it is in many ways because if we look at this researcher training then it has been internationalised very, it has in many cases been used as a model example on what to do. Then thinking about internationalisation of education if we think how Finnish university education has been exported then in that one we are not necessarily very good, if one thinks, and there I come again to where I actually started from, that if one sees education as a line of business, we have education markets, then in Finland we don't have the mechanisms with which this product, this education product can be exported. And what is related to this is how, it is partly related, if you think about markets, price and amount, then normally you have, this is the very basics of economics, you have supply, supply curve and you have demand curve (draws curve up in the air with hands). And at some point if you can't set a price then the problem is that when exporting, we have a good national product which we can't export. This among other things, and how could it be exported? Well for instance if one thinks about the USA, I don't necessarily want to use this as an example, then exporting takes place either so that a the product, a unit is established, a filial in another country and it is financed so that those who participate in the education pay for it. If one dares to use the word tuition fees. So do you understand, in a way because we have this statutory

free education then it is very difficult to export education leading to a degree, and this I see is a problem. By this I don't want to say that I would necessarily argue for tuition fees, or that I would think that these tuition fees should be made possible, but for example I do think that, especially from the perspective of internationalisation, it should be considered whether non-EU students should pay tuition fees in Finland. This is a sensitive question, I don't want at this point, and I want to say it very clearly, that I don't want at this point in anyway defend tuition fees for Finnish students, but let's say, let's take an example. I had, the [university] had, we were involved in an consortium where there was one American university and one from each European country, or almost, approximately ten universities. The Americans presumed that the students coming from here to California pay tuition fees, we don't because it was this joint degree system, we can't take tuition fees from Americans or from others, so those plans ended there, because in a way, we should be able, and this is a challenge of course how we can equitably participate in these joint and double degree educational networks, in consortia where one partners demands tuition fees. So this is the problem, a little simplified, but I think that maybe you can get some sort of a picture on what I am trying to get at.

Interviewer:

Yes of course. What is then, if you want to return to this, maybe you already referred to it to some extent, but What is, then, in your opinion, the value of internationalisation of higher education for Finland and why, if we assume it has a value?

Interviewee:

Yes well in a way it is quote clear that it has a value, a small country, limited resources, I can only refer to this that wellbeing is based on knowledge. So that it is, both research and of course education is related to it. And we have, and in this context one may ask or say, that of course all this lifelong learning and education which now also is included in the task of the universities, then through this demographic development it has an even more important role. So I don't know what I could say but the value of education for the country crucial and then I am assuming, or this argument is based on that I am not talking about national education but that it is then education system fulfilling international criteria, standards. And I don't know whether this is necessarily related to it, but very central to this is that in order for us to have in Finland an educational system fulfilling international criteria, we have to have the kind of universities which can attract foreign- international top people here, permanently, and this is a completely different, it has to do with tax issues, taxation, it has to do with aliens act, residence permits, etc, all this. It is often forgotten when talking about internationalisation, one only talks about research and education, but one must remember that we are talking about recruiting students but even more important is the recruiting of teachers and researchers. Because if you can't create attractive work conditions here, research environments are talked about, then you can't attract here international top experts either.

Appendix six

Use of discourses in empirical data

The use of discourses in the different sets of empirical data is presented in the following table. It has been compiled based on the coding of elements in the documents into the six discourses. If an element is coded into two or more discourses at the same time, the element will show in the table under all discourses it is coded in. However, if an element is coded under more than one sub-discourse within a particular discourse, it will only show in the table once.

			IGD	RUD	OCD	SKD	CWD	CD
Interviews	University actors	U1	3	13	15	15	3	23
		U2	6	23	5	1	11	28
		U3	4	10	7	4	5	25
		U4	5	9	12	6	3	21
		U5		10	11	6	5	16
		U6	10	21	15	7	8	7
	National actors	N1	3	8	10	4	2	17
		N2	4	10	7	4	5	25
		N3	9	9	9	6	9	15
University documents	University of Helsinki	UH1		3	1	6	7	8
		UH2	2	3		4	4	4
		UH3	1	6	1	16	4	4
	University of Tampere	UT1	1			4	6	4
		UT2	2	4		5	3	8
		UT3	6	9			6	4
		UT4					1	
	Hanken University	HA1		3	2	3	7	19
		HA2	1	2				2
	Tampere University of Technology	TT1		1		2	3	2
		TT2				5	15	6
		RM1			1		3	5
		RT1					1	2

			IGD	RUD	OCD	SKD	CWD	CD
National policy documents		CM1	1		2		1	1
	Development plans	DS1				3	8	
		DS2	1	1	1	3	5	1
		DS3	2	4	2	3	9	11
		DS4	1			1	9	3
		DS5	3	3	3	3	11	14
		DS6		6	3	2	10	12
	Internationalisation policy documents	IS1	2	3	2		1	
		IS2	6	11	5	5	9	4
		IS3	7	7	2	11	10	4
		IS4	3	13	12	2	5	22
		IS5	1	7	6	1	5	11
		IS6	4	8	3	5	12	8
		IS7		1	5	7	3	3
IS8		3		6	2	8	4	
EUA documents		EUA1				3	4	2
		EUA2				6	8	
		EUA3	3	2	2	7	3	6
		EUA4	1	5	1	8	7	4
		EUA5		4		6	6	9
		EUA6		1	1	4	4	4
		EUA7				2		4
		EUA8				2	7	
		EUA9		3	2	8	10	10
		EUA10		2	1	7	3	11
Bologna process documents		BD1	1		3		2	
		BD2		1	3	2	5	1
		BD3	1	2	3		3	5
		BD4	1	4	2	5	9	7
		BD5		2	2	3	6	5
	EU Lisbon Process documents	EUL1				1		4
		EUL2	1	1	2		3	6
		EUL3	1	1	2			2
		EUL4		2		1	1	13

			IGD	RUD	OCD	SKD	CWD	CD	
European Union documents	EU University documents	EUU1	1	18	3	13	8	24	
		EUU2		6	2	1	9	6	
		EUU3		14	3	2	7	12	
	EU Research documents	EUR1		1	2	2	1	5	
		EUR2						3	
		EUR3				1		5	
		EUR4			1	3	5	5	
	EU Education and training documents	EUE1	5	1	4	1	10	7	
		EUE2	5	2	5		21	11	
		EUE3		1	5	1	6	27	
		EUE4					4	7	
		EUE5			1		2	5	
		EUE6					5	6	
			TOTAL	111	281	198	235	376	559
			INTERV	44	113	91	53	51	177
		UNI'S	13	31	5	45	60	68	
		MINED	34	64	52	48	106	98	
		EUA	4	17	7	53	52	50	
		BP	3	9	13	10	25	18	
		EU	13	47	30	26	82	148	