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Abstract

The aim of this research is to explore how the critiques of different neoliberal and liberal approaches in the internationalization of higher education (HE) can help to identify obstacles for more ethically driven and sustainable practices. HE is going through a transformation wherein its purpose is increasingly interpreted through a neoliberal framing that emphasizes the entrepreneurial potential and role of universities in the knowledge economy. This has changed the role of internationalization as well, and the rising economic emphasis has caused ethical concerns. However, the argument in this dissertation is that sustainable practices require more than liberal critiques of neoliberalism. Internationalization has a global outlook and should also include the consideration of the global asymmetries around knowledge production and participation. Decolonial critiques of the internationalization of HE reveal how both neoliberal and liberal approaches have the potential to reproduce unethical practices.

This qualitative study utilizes the interview and document data from 16 different universities in seven countries collected as part of the Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education in Times of Global Crises project (2012–2016). The research draws from critical discourse analysis and utilizes discourse analysis and social cartography to analyze and present the data.

The findings first suggest that the dominance of neoliberal agendas in internationalization has the tendency to naturalize economic rationales and that although these can be criticized, they are perceived as inevitable and mandatory parts of the internationalization processes. Next, neoliberal agendas fuse other, non-economic, rationales, thus causing instrumentalization and re-framing of their former civic purposes. Finally, as long as the critiques of internationalization are not extended to global power asymmetries and coloniality, ethical dilemmas in internationalization cannot be properly tackled. As long as Western HE is seen as ubiquitous and a progressive force, its role in producing global injustices can be ignored or rejected, which can lead into the naturalization of unethical practices. The research adds to the critical scholarship in the internationalization of HE and provides practitioners with tools to discuss the obstacles for more ethically driven internationalization.
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**Tiivistelmä**

Tutkimuksessa kartoitetaan, miten korkeakoulujen kansainvälistymiseen liittyviä eettisiä haasteita voidaan tunnistaa erilaisen uusliberaalien ja liberalien lähestymistapojen kritiikin kautta. Korkeakoulutuksen yhteiskunnallista tehtävää on tulkittu enemmän uusliberaalista näkökulmasta, jossa yliopistojen yritysmäisyys ja rooli tietoyhteiskunnan rakentajana on korostunut. Samoin korkeakoulujen kansainvälistymisen rooli on muuttunut ja taloudellisen fokuksen kasvava osuus toiminnoissa on herättänyt kysymyksiä toiminnan eettisyydestä. Pelkästä kaupallisuuden vastainen kritiikki ei kuitenkaan anna vastauksia kestävien käytänteiden kehittämiseen. Kansainvälistyminen on globaalia toimintaa ja sitä tarkasteltaessa on otettava huomioon myös tiedon tuottamisen ja osallistumismahdollisuuksiin liittyvä epätasapaino. Dekolonialinen kritiikki osoittaa, kuinka sekä uusliberaalit että liberalilistit eettistä kehitystä tarkastavat mahdollistavat epäeettisten käytänteiden toisintamisen kansainvälistymisessä.
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1 Introduction

The aim of this Ph.D. dissertation is to explore the multiple ways in which the internationalization of higher education (HE) is connected to and framed within the wider societal context. More specifically, internationalization is examined on a discursive level to make visible which discourses are dominant, naturalized, and/or depoliticized and which discourses are foreclosed. The starting point of this dissertation is that HE, and internationalization within it, is going through a transformation wherein its purpose is increasingly interpreted through a neoliberal framing that emphasizes the entrepreneurial potential of universities. Research is valued according to its exchange value through new intellectual property, and education is subjected to the supply and demand logic of the market, where students, as autonomous customers, decide which disciplines/programs thrive and which do not. Universitites become less egalitarian because not everyone can afford tuition fees and the cost of university education can differ based on the students’ nationality. These developments can be contrasted with the previous, often romanticized, version of HE that is more grounded in liberal arts education, free access, and disinterested research. The resulting conversation can easily lead to an unfruitful binary where the neoliberal and liberal approaches in HE are seen as opposites and the only alternatives. Instead, it is more important to explore, pluralize, and critique the different “imaginaries” of HE, discuss which aspects of neoliberal and liberal approaches are constructive and/or necessary, and determine if there are alternatives/options outside the binary that can take the conversations forward.

Internationalization can be defined as “… process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). The internationalization of HE has gained strategic importance globally in recent decades. The growing commercialization is one of the most visible instances of the change in HE worldwide, and internationalization is often used as a tool to further the economic aims of universities (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Marginson, 2006). The economic focus changes the more traditional civic nature of HE as well as internationalization; this dissertation will explore these shifts from different perspectives. According to Knight (2014, p. 76), internationalization “has become a catch-all phrase used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the global, intercultural, or international dimensions of higher education and is thus losing its way.” The internationalization of HE is differently interpreted in different national and global contexts, and it is by no means a universal trend with a steady
and similar development history in different parts of the world. For example, in Finland, the integration of immigrants is attached to the internationalization of HE, and in Canada, it is strongly connected with trade (see Article II). Thus, internationalization can become an empty signifier for furthering a host of national interests. An illustrating fact is that the most recent Finnish and Canadian national/federal level internationalization strategies do not define internationalization, which points to two things: it has become such a commonplace term that it does not need definition and/or a strict definition would limit the options attached to it. If the internationalization of HE is understood as enhancing the international dimension of HE, it does not imply the integration of immigrants, or if internationalization is understood as contributing to the economy, it might not include the dimensions related to the personal growth of students, epistemological pluralism, social justice, or capacity development.

Internationalization is emphasized in HE worldwide not only because it has economic potential. As an internationalization practitioner myself, I recognize a plethora of benefits for participating in internationalization activities. Although this Ph.D. dissertation will adopt a largely critical, albeit a cautiously optimistic, view on internationalization, it does not mean that I belittle its positive aspects. Rather, as the title of this dissertation suggests, I am hoping to contribute to the larger self-reflective discussion in the field for more ethically minded internationalization that aims at decreasing the negative potential and enhancing the positive. Through the growing nationalism worldwide, internationalization has come under closer examination of the “general public” and some degree of defense is definitely needed (Altbach & de Wit, 2017). The danger is that in the times of government divestment in HE and the resulting scarcity of resources, the only arguments that can support the importance of internationalization are economic.

There are many positive aspects of the internationalization of HE. It contributes to the personal growth of students, and I have witnessed this transformation potential in students as well as experienced it myself as an exchange student. Exchanges diversify the demographics of universities, and the affiliated internationalization of the curriculum and home internationalization processes can also benefit non-mobile students (Crowther et al., 2001). The global emphasis in internationalization on global citizenship education is beneficial for countering nationalism and bringing into the discussion the importance of intercultural dialogue and understanding. Because not all countries can meet the demand for education nationally, some students can with relative ease go and study for a degree abroad. Internationalization also has a range of societal benefits. For instance, it
adds to the multiculturalization of societies both in terms of demographics and attitudes, and it provides economic benefits for the hosting countries through domestic consumption, tuition fees, and educated labor. Internationalization, owing to the flows of students and staff, can also contribute to the democratization of institutions and societies through exposure to diverse ideas and capacity-building projects (both domestic and foreign) (Jowi et al., 2013; Koehn & Obamba, 2012); moreover, different grant programs can facilitate inclusion by enabling the participation of individuals from marginalized groups. The international exposure of institutions also assists quality assurance in universities in terms of degree programs as well as institutional structure and governance (Nolan & Hunter, 2012). The internationalization of staff and students increases global interconnectedness and the use of only few “lingua francas,” such as English, meaning that the global distribution and availability of knowledge is wide and easy. This lowers the barriers for international research cooperation and knowledge sharing (Rodríguez-Pose, 2004).

The above non-exhaustive list of the positive aspects of internationalization can be contrasted with a list of its negative aspects, including a critical view of some positive aspects that have (unintended) negative implications. I will briefly summarize some of the arguments; however, because internationalization is a diverse phenomenon with endless contextual factors, my list is not comprehensive. The aim of this thesis is not to “fix” all of the presented problems, although I will discuss a few of them in more detail in the subsequent chapters. I mainly aim to illustrate that the internationalization of HE is a complex phenomenon and never a neutral process.

I will start the list of problematic sides of internationalization with the same theme that I started the list of its positive effects: the focus on personal growth. The overt focus on personal growth in the exchanges of students and staff can sideline structural considerations. There might not be enough emphasis on the dissemination of learning upon return, the learning itself can be superficial or tokenistic, and there are always personal and structural barriers for participation (Doyle et al., 2010). Not everyone participates in internationalization activities because they do not want to or cannot do so owing to different personal/economic or structural reasons, including aspects related to socio-economic status or ethnic background (Salisbury et al., 2011). The students and staff participating in mobility periods target a rather limited pool of countries and institutions; for example, in Finland in 2017, 58% of students went to European countries (Opetushallitus, 2018). There is also a trend of favoring shorter exchanges (one- to two-week
excursion-type visits) and the question is whether these are a form of academic tourism or possibly useful for first-time travelers or students with limited resources (Tarrant et al., 2013). As a part of growth in the amount of shorter duration exchanges, internships/service learning periods abroad are gaining popularity and it is difficult to guarantee the quality, sustainability, and ethicality of placements that in the worst case scenario cause more harm than good for the hosting institutions or communities (Butin, 2005). Internationalization is also increasingly recognized in instrumental terms as a way to acquire skills and build curriculum vitae that downplays the roles of transformative learning and changes to students’ worldview (Zeleza, 2012).

Although internationalization is seen as “global,” in reality, this perspective is limited. Western universities (which have better financial resources for internationalization activities) mostly cooperate with the institutions in the Global North (GN) and/or the countries in the Global South (GS)\(^1\) that have economic potential in the form of investments on the national level or student recruitment on the institutional level\(^2\). Moreover, the flows of students and staff are highly asymmetrical; bilateral exchanges\(^3\) take place mainly between the institutions in the GN and in limited capacity between the GN and GS, but the flow of fee-paying degree students is directed from the GS to GN and very little vice versa (Marginson, 2004; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2013a).

In terms of exchanges, the asymmetries are partly caused and reproduced by the differing funding of internationalization around the world; however, there are many structural considerations as well. European universities benefit from the almost guaranteed Erasmus funding, and more affluent countries and institutions have their own grant schemes as well as a more affluent student body who can afford to take part in the study abroad experience (Rumbley et al., 2012). The funding for

---

\(^1\) Global South (GS) and Global North (GN) are terms used to differentiate countries and regions in the world mainly based on the level of economic development (Rigg, 2007). These terms are used as opposed to more politically loaded/pejorative terms such as First and Third World and developed and developing/emerging nations. I do recognize that GN and GS are somewhat misleading and inaccurate, but they are used in the absence of better terms. In this work, I also use the term “Western” (institutions, knowledge, etc.), which is used interchangeably with GN, although a more precise term would be desirable.

\(^2\) Examples of this can be found in the nation-level international strategies of Finland (Ministry of Education and Culture [MOEC], 2010, 2018) and Canada (Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, 2014). A good example of an institutional-level international strategy can be seen in the plan of University of British Columbia (2011).

\(^3\) An exchange program here means a system of reciprocal exchange of students for one or two semesters, where the participants do not pay any tuition fees at the host university.
exchange programs in the GS remains limited and is predominantly obtained from the GN (Jowi, 2009). The dependency on the funding from the GN might mean less say for GS institutions in what type of activities are organized. Also, the possibilities for the development of mobility programs and other internationalization activities between the countries in the GS are fewer because the mobilities are mainly between the GN and GS (Oanda, 2013). Finally, with regard to mobilities, an often overlooked fact is that internationalization heavily relies on traveling and, more specifically, flying, which is not ecologically sustainable (Shields, 2019).

Although the flow of students through exchange programs between the GN and GS might be low, there is still an important flow of students from the GS to GN in the form of fee-paying degree students (OECD, 2013a). It is estimated that there are five million students studying for a degree outside their home countries, out of which approximately 77% are studying in OECD countries (OECD, 2013a, 2013b). The education market is thus a major industry for a handful of countries, mainly in the GN, and the foreign degree-seeking students usually pay more tuition than domestic students, which helps to subsidize the national systems of education in the already affluent Western countries (Brown & Tannock, 2009). Similarly, there has been a rising trend of branch campuses established by leading Western universities in different countries for additional income and prestige (Altbach, 2013). Degree-seeking mobility and branch campuses can have multiple harmful effects. Degree mobility causes loss of income and, in some cases, human capital through permanent migration for the countries from which the students originate. Branch campuses compete with the national HE institutions for students and thus decrease their enrolments and tuition fee income. Some countries invite foreign universities to set up branch campuses in their countries and the activity can be

---

4 I say mainly as there are high prestige institutions in the GS or in the otherwise “peripheral” areas in countries such as China, South Korea, and Singapore that attract international students. Similarly, it can be stated that not all institutions or countries in the GN attract international students in equal measures (Altbach, 2004).

5 An international branch campus can generally be defined as a part of a university operating in a different country but providing the same degrees as the “domestic” university (Altbach, 2011). As an example, New York University has branch campuses in Abu Dhabi as well as in Shanghai. This concept should not, however, be confused with joint-degree arrangements between universities; degree franchising, where another university utilizes the “brand” of some other university to provide education (prestige, quality assurance processes, right to award degrees not possible for the home institution, such as Ph.D.); or overseas campuses catering to the students from the home university abroad (Altbach, 2011).
mutually beneficial; however, there are also many examples where this is not the case (Altbach, 2013; Oanda, 2013).

The asymmetrical student flows between the GS and GN⁶ are also in part a sign of how the colonial relations are reproduced through the internationalization of HE (Altbach, 2004). The universities in the GN are better positioned through higher prestige and funding, among others, in recruiting “the best and the brightest” in terms of students and future labor (Marginson, 2006; Stein & Andreotti, 2016). The higher fees of internationally mobile degree-seeking students do not necessarily translate to better services or treatment, and students can face racism/othering and problems of integration, among other issues (Lee & Rice, 2007; Marginson, 2012). Also, many governments in the GN, such as Finland and Canada, have policies in place to ensure that the international students stay in the country after their graduation to contribute to the perceived gaps (high skills, aging population, etc.) in the domestic labor markets (Brown & Tannock, 2009; see Article II). The resulting brain drain is a complex issue for the students’ home countries and a serious ethical challenge with regard to internationalization (Jowi et al., 2013; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). In a similar vein, internationalization can be used to advance a country’s political, cultural, and economic interests through “soft power” (Trilokekar, 2010). The assumption here is that the students educated in a foreign country will return home and become “ambassadors” by favorably promoting the hosting country, thus globally increasing the hosting country’s influence (Lomer, 2017). All in all, democratization and inclusion through internationalization can be partial at best because the global terrain is very uneven for institutions and individuals.

From the institutional perspective, internationalization also has problematic aspects. In many cases, internationalization is just one agenda among the many competing for resources. Internationalization agenda can be in competition with, for example, the universities’ domestic responsibilities in education and research. Moreover, within internationalization, some activities can be considered as more important than others. For example, the recruitment of fee-paying students might be important on the institutional level but less so on the faculty level (Johnstone & Proctor, 2017). After the 2008 financial crisis, state divestment in HE has increased

---

⁶ The asymmetry naturally exists not only between the GN and GS but also within the countries in the GS and GN. For example, South Africa has an advanced HE sector that attracts students from its neighboring countries (Majee & Ress, 2018), and some European countries, such as the UK, receive more students than others (Grabher et al., 2014). Nevertheless, it could be argued that the mobility patterns within the GN and GS follow, at least partly, the historical colonial and/or power relations.
globally, which has undoubtedly caused universities to re-evaluate their priorities (Carpentier, 2018). Perhaps because of this, internationalization is used to further the diversification of funding of the universities (Marginson, 2013). The for-profit initiatives that partly rely on institutional prestige, such as student recruitment, are strongly connected with a neoliberal framing, where competition is seen as crucial and as a way to increase the efficiency and quality of operation. The result is the current emphasis on HE rankings that forces the universities in the competitive environment to emulate the top-ranking universities for better standing in the league tables (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2017). This causes institutional isomorphism that undercuts the local/national characteristics of HE\(^7\) (Bernasconi, 2007) and potentially enforces Eurocentric/Western curricula worldwide (Brown & Tannock, 2009; Connell, 2017). Relatedly, internationalization supports the dominance of English at the expense of local languages, as exchange/degree students need to take English-medium classes and research publications, which are important for the rankings, are mostly published in English. An often recurring issue is that internationalization is equated with teaching in English; this ignores the important process of internationalizing the curriculum needed to provide relevant and quality education for international and domestic students. The internationalization of curriculum generally aims to make learning more “global” in nature; however, if the implementation is not thoroughly planned and systematic, it can lead to tokenistic approaches or arbitrary delocalization in education. Fabricius et al. (2017) discuss instances where local references in teaching are replaced with examples from another national context with the hope of appearing more “international.” In effect, this maintains a national focus, albeit one that is located elsewhere (i.e., using US examples at a Danish university), and the resulting teaching might not be any more “global” in character. The internationalization of the curriculum is in many cases related to the concept of internationalization at home that aims to provide the perks of internationalization to domestic, non-mobile students and staff, and to further internationalize the entire campus. One of the key aspects of internationalization at home is placing international exchange and degree students in the same classes with domestic students. This implies that the international students will, through their mere presence, give international character to the classes. However, this provides a rather instrumental view of the international students who can be seen as cultural fodder for the domestic students (Suša, 2016).

\(^7\)Isomorphism is naturally also caused by other things such as the Bologna process in the European higher education area in Europe.
Moreover, instead of improving the quality of education and furthering the understanding between cultures, the joint classes with domestic and international students may elicit agonistic reactions from the local students (Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Lee & Rice, 2007).

When discussing the international dimension of research, focus is largely directed at knowledge production. First, Western/Eurocentric knowledge dominates HE globally (Jowi et al., 2013) and most research is, at least published, in the GN, where the most prestigious journals are “located” (Paasi, 2005). As an example, African scholars produce less than 1% of the research articles worldwide, whereas the continent contains 12.5% of the world’s population (Duermeijer et al., 2018). Second, the main language of publication in journals is English, which disincentivizes publishing in national languages with a small number of native speakers (Paasi, 2015). Third, because journals are mostly behind paywalls, only the more affluent nations and institutions can afford subscriptions (Maldonado-Maldonado & Lee, 2018). Finally, the publication “business” is also detrimental to the openness and collegiality of research because there is a race to publish and a dire competition for research funds.

The purpose of the above general and incomplete listing is to contextualize internationalization. It would also be useful to trace back 10–20 years of internationalization in HE to see how things have changed. However, this goes beyond the scope of this dissertation. The aim of this research is to offer an analysis of the factors that drive the transformation of HE and internationalization. The rise of neoliberal globalization has also changed the role of universities. Universities, at least in the GN, are currently aspiring to be international/global actors and leveraging internationalization to compete for funding both domestically and internationally (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2017). This changes the basic civic functions of universities and requires them to adopt new kinds of operational skills. Neoliberalism can be seen at play here in terms of creating the market and encouraging competition and state divestment that drives HE toward the market. As state funding decreases, the HE sector seeks alternative sources for revenue, thus leveraging the internationalization processes to recruit fee-paying foreign degree students. The international education market is huge, with five million degree students studying outside their home countries (OECD, 2018). Therefore, there is a significant drive from national governments and the HE institutions themselves to benefit from this market. To reap the most benefits through the recruitment of the “best and brightest” students, universities are in national and international competition with each other, and the “battle” takes place most visibly
through the international rankings. The processes at universities are thus aligned to produce outputs that help them to rise up in the rankings, which are expensive and might divert resources from the institutions’ core functions, such as education (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2017).

The critical lens in this work is not only applied to neoliberalism. I will also examine the liberal tradition and the ways in which it can reproduce the harmful approaches in the internationalization of HE. To contrast both the neoliberal and liberal ideological stances, I will discuss how decolonial approaches can diversify and bring scope to the examination of internationalization and introduce useful levels of depth into the conversation about its challenges and benefits. The outlook in this dissertation is not pessimistic but hopeful; although the neoliberalization of HE and internationalization is dominant or at least on the rise, it is not totalizing. As long as the discourses around HE and internationalization contain a degree of ambivalence, there is hope for maintaining and/or creating new spaces for alternative approaches. However, a strong warning comes out through this research. Through the normalization of the neoliberal ideology in HE, formerly liberal rationales have become conflated with economic interests, and this new “normal” can foreclose the alternatives activities and approaches or make them seem unfeasible. Through my findings, I will point out how to better identify the different motivations and rationales in the internationalization of HE and how they might be conflated with each other. This examination can help practitioners to make more informed choices that can drive more ethical engagements in internationalization activities.

The context of this research is the analysis of the wider trends in the internationalization of HE globally. However, as the current trends in internationalization are heavily steered by institutions/countries in the GN, I cannot claim that my context is truly global; however, it is not restricted only to the GN. The development of internationalization globally is uneven but different national policies, such as those in student recruitment, have effects in countries and regions less concerned with the intentional facilitation of internationalization. An example of this could be the policies in the GN facilitating student recruitment that might cause brain drain in the GS. In this sense, my context is global but only partially. In some cases, I will also use my native Finland as an example of the implementation of policies related to internationalization.

Although this study includes comparative elements, I have quite deliberately attempted to avoid making direct comparisons between the different countries and institutions included in this thesis. The aim in this dissertation is not to compare the
state of internationalization of HE in the participating countries but to discuss on a
deeper level how liberal and critical critiques of neoliberalism can, in general, help
to pluralize discussion about internationalization. My approach is based on the
underlying notion that the internationalization of HE shares enough commonalities
across the participating countries and institutions allowing me to say something
meaningful about the phenomenon. The articles included in this dissertation contain
more explicit comparative elements, notably Article II, and it is practically
impossible to discuss the data comprising different countries and institutions
without making some, at least implicit, comparative statements. However, even in
the articles, the analysis concentrates more on the range of different discourses
found in the data; which discourses are dominant, conflated or missing. In this
scenario, the differences between countries and institutions become less relevant.

This dissertation is structured as follows. I will first introduce the aims of the
research and the Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education in Times of Global
Crises (EIHE) project as the context for this dissertation and briefly discuss the
positioning of the research and the researcher. In Chapter 2, I will explore the
context of the internationalization of HE; this includes subchapters on neoliberal
globalization, the concept of knowledge economy (KE), and their link to HE. In
Chapter 3, the conceptual frameworks of this study will be presented, and Chapter
4 will introduce the methodology. In Chapter 5, I will introduce the three articles
included in the dissertation, and in Chapter 6, the findings of the dissertation will
be presented. Chapter 7 presents the discussion and concluding remarks.

1.1 Aims of the research

This article-based Ph.D. dissertation aims to critically examine the
internationalization of HE, exploring the ways for more equitable processes and
essentially for more sustainable/ethically driven practices in the
internationalization in HE. Interest in the ethical dimensions of internationalization
has been increasing in the last decade in research as well as in different professional
organizations working in the field. As an example, the European Association for
International Education (EAIE, 2012), International Association of Universities
(2012), the Canadian Bureau of International Education (2014), and the Association
of Canadian Deans of Education (2014) have released statements calling for
sustainability in the internationalization of HE. At the same time,
internationalization activities have intensified worldwide, and the resulting
increased competition has ensured that many of the issues in internationalization
have remained unresolved (Stein et al., forthcoming). Thus, the issue of sustainability in the internationalization of HE is highly topical, and I find it vital to continue and extend the discussions around the theme. Through my professional career as an international coordinator, I have witnessed how more liberal-minded orientations in internationalization have been replaced by orientations emphasizing, for example, economic benefit and institutional prestige instead of reciprocal cooperation, values, and social responsibility. Whether this development has been for the better depends on the viewpoint, but it is clear that the environment for internationalization has changed and exploring the process of this change has been a key motivation behind this research.

Because one of the changes in internationalization is the increasing effect of neoliberalism, my aim is first to describe and analyze the shift in HE from a civic-minded education into a market-oriented approach and how this affects the internationalization of HE. Second, I will critically examine the resulting binary between the civic and the market-oriented discourses to argue that for more ethical approaches in the internationalization of HE, we need an additional perspective that takes into account the systemic barriers for participation, epistemological pluralism, and questions around social justice.

This dissertation will explore how the neoliberal-driven market logic causes “market exclusions” with ethical ramifications while liberal approaches enable “false inclusions” because they are too universalist and take the dominance of Western HE and the equal opportunities of students for granted. Both viewpoints are contrasted using a critical approach that, albeit being very marginal, enables extending the discussions beyond the largely unhelpful neoliberal–liberal binary through the emphasis on the values and contents in internationalization. The following is the overall research question for the summary part of this dissertation: to what extent and how can the critiques toward neoliberal and liberal agendas help to identify the ethical issues in the internationalization of HE? The individual articles have their own research questions that approach the main question from different perspectives and contribute to the main findings (see Chapter 5 for the overview of the articles and Chapter 6 for their contribution to the main findings of this study).

The unique contribution of this dissertation is that it adds to the discussion of the internationalization of HE by providing a more multifaceted analysis, combining the neoliberal, liberal, and critical viewpoints (and their numerous synonyms describing similar ideas) that are rarely brought together. This is particularly the case in a national context such as Finland, where the
internationalization of HE operates within an ambiguous balance between liberal and neoliberal rationales while strongly gravitating toward the market-oriented approach. This research exemplifies how different rationales in internationalization co-exist and conflate, in sometimes unhelpful ways, while certain rationales remain absent. Examining the “discursive gaps” in internationalization is helpful for identifying the perspectives that are necessary for more ethically driven approaches but are perhaps foreclosed by more dominant rationales. Decolonial perspectives are not sufficiently utilized either in professional debates or in research regarding the internationalization of HE, and they provide a useful contrast into the current discussion as counter-critique toward both liberal and neoliberal approaches. For the practitioners in the field, this study can provide the models and tools to identify and discuss the different rationales and approaches in the internationalization of HE that will increase the awareness of internationalization and facilitate in the planning of more sustainable activities. The social cartography approach used to analyze and present the data contributes to making the conflations between the sometimes very distinct approaches to internationalization visible and, in so doing, presents a way forward in practice and critical reflection. This pushes the research beyond mere description of critique. For research, the application of the EIHE conceptual frameworks in this study will add to the growing amount of critical literature exploring the values and foundations of the internationalization of HE. A common theme in research is the effects of neoliberalism on internationalization. However, the findings of this research point out to a more nuanced understanding on how liberal rationales—critical to some extent—conflate and co-exist with the neoliberal and affect internationalization. Finally, the data collected for this research brings forward the voices of people directly working with the internationalization in HE; this helps to contextualize the wider theories and debates.

1.2 Ethical internationalism in higher education in times of global crises project

This study is a part of the EIHE project funded by the Finnish Academy between 2012 and 2016. The principal investigator was Professor Vanessa Andreotti from the University of British Columbia, and she applied for the project while holding a professorship at the University of Oulu. The project was initiated through shared concerns that economic imperatives were driving unethical practices in the internationalization of HE (Andreotti, 2012). The EIHE collective comprised
scholars from 22 universities in nine different countries. The participating institutions were the University of Oulu and University of Helsinki from Finland; the Södertörn University and Örebro University from Sweden; the University of Exeter and DeMontfort University from England; the University of Stirling and Heriot-Watt University from Scotland; the National University of Ireland at Galway; the Western University, Bishop’s University, Simon Fraser University, University of British Columbia, University of Regina, University of Alberta, and University of Calgary from Canada; the University of Saõ Paolo and University of Parana from Brazil; the University of Cape Town from South Africa; the University of Canterbury from New Zealand; and the Southwest University and South Normal University from China. The participating universities were typically represented by one or two individuals representing the teaching staff.

The EIHE collective had several meetings, most notably in 2015 in Budapest and 2016 in Vancouver. The biggest task of the EIHE project was the collection of the data set, including the collection of student surveys (N = 4522) and staff surveys (N = 36), policy document analysis based on the internationalization documents of the partner universities, internationalization staff interviews (N = 29), and case studies related to the alternative approaches to internationalization. I worked in the EIHE project as a research assistant between 2014 and 2016, and my main role in the project was to collect the interview data and to provide analyses based on the data. The participating institutions had differing contributions to the project activities. Not all took part in data collection, and some universities neither participated in the meetings nor in the research activities. Although the project partners shared similar interests, the data collection, particularly in terms of the student surveys, was a huge undertaking. This task was slightly alleviated by reducing the amount of surveys from 300 to 200 per university. The EIHE data sets are rich and to some extent are still being worked upon. For an example of the analysis of the student survey data, you can see Rene Suša’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Social Cartographies of Internationalization of Higher Education in Canada. A Study of Exceptionalist Tendencies and Articulations” (Suša, 2016). The project also resulted in approximately 30 publications and two Ph.D. dissertations (the aforementioned work by Suša, 2016, and the present work).
In this dissertation, I use the EIHE interview data (and document data to some extent, see Articles I & II) as well as some conceptual tools developed in project. I knew that I was going to use the interview data for my research when I was collecting it. However, the data was collected for general use within the EIHE project, and some project partners have utilized the data as well. After the data collection, it took some time before my own research project begun to take shape as the interview data contained multiple interesting topics for research. As we were drafting Article I with Dr. Pashby, it started to become clear that I wanted to focus on the current topic, the decolonial and liberal critiques of neoliberalism.

1.3 Positioning of the research and the researcher

This study is a part of the multidisciplinary field of HE research and, more specifically, critical internationalization research. The multidisciplinary nature of the field implicates that HE research is approached from diverse disciplinary perspectives as well as from different disciplines. HE research as a field is rather new and somewhat lacking in strong or disciplinary identity (Tight, 2014). In line with the current study, the increasing research interest toward HE can be explained through its importance for the formation of the knowledge society/economy that is changing the role of universities globally (Jones, 2012; Kehm & Teichler, 2007). Tight (2013) notes that although the single largest group in HE research is formed by scholars with educational backgrounds, the research is conducted in most other disciplines as well, including professional groups such as administration and academic development. The more specific interest toward HE in this study is on its international dimension which is an emerging field of research and multidisciplinary by nature. Internationalization became an important theme within HE research only in the mid-1990s (Kehm & Teichler, 2007).

This study starts with a real-world social issue, and the methodological and theoretical approaches have been chosen to best suit the exploration of the issue. The common premises in both methodology and theory are the social constructionist view on “reality” and issues resulting from hegemonic discourses and imaginaries. Moreover, the approaches included are in some way part of the critical social science/theory tradition. I locate my research in the postmodern strand of critical social science, and it is inspired by educational, sociological, economic, and decolonial theories. My research involves HE and its educational dimension, but the ensuing conversation involves the larger society and is strongly connected to the funding of HE, thus incorporating the sociologic and economic
aspects. In my attempt to disrupt the binaries around the discussion on the commercialization of HE, I use the arguments stemming from decolonial theory that also bring to focus the questions of Eurocentrism and social justice. In this work, I start from the premise that there are shifts taking place in the internationalization of HE and attempt to discuss this phenomenon from many perspectives. Therefore, I have created a theoretical framework most appropriate for accomplishing such work (Weidman & Jacob, 2011). I am well aware of the possible ontological and epistemological conflicts in my work owing to the wide range of “inspirations.” The most obvious example would be juxtaposing the liberal critiques of neoliberalism and decolonial critiques of liberalism and/or neoliberalism. Whereas the former are based on the critiques of (meta-)narratives within the Western intellectual tradition, the latter question the meaningfulness of the entire Western tradition. However, I take a stance that at some level of synthesis it is, and should be, possible to make my contribution intelligible and directly relevant to the discussions of the internationalization of HE in theory and practice so as to drive discussions further toward the debates that have been largely overlooked (Rust & Kenders, 2011).

Positionality is very important when conducting any research and particularly with the topics covered in this dissertation. As a middle-class/age white male from Finland with a liberal education background, who is directly working in the internationalization of HE, I have frequently thought about how to discuss certain aspects presented in this work. Engaging particularly with the decolonial critique of internationalization has been a learning journey that is far from finished. As someone who completely is a product of the Western HE system, it has been challenging for me to write critique that would reach beyond “Eurocentric anti-Eurocentrism” (de Sousa Santos, 2016, p. 100) and would not be a superficial and tokenistic attempt to reframe HE in yet another way that would maintain the reproduction of the same colonial patterns. It has to be kept in mind that as Tuck and Yang (2012) state, decolonization is not a metaphor but lived reality for many people, and this is not only “elsewhere” but also within my own country and university. My approach here is not to attempt to speak for the marginalized groups of people but to bring up the issues related to internationalization and advocate for openings for these groups to be able to take part in academic conversations. Therefore, although I have made my critiques of Western HE in earnest, I still have much to (re)learn about engagements with the issue through theory and in practice.

My work as an international coordinator, since 2006, has also affected this research greatly. I wanted to explore the ethical dimensions of internationalization
in my Ph.D., as I had, and still have, faced many dilemmas in international cooperation through my work. Before taking part in the EIHE project, the topic of my Ph.D. was education export, which included an ethical lens and a focus on critiques of neoliberalism. However, when the opportunity came to join the EIHE project, I realigned my topic to focus more on internationalization. My work did not only affect the topic but also the data collection and analysis. I am sure that interviewing people working in the same field as myself has had an effect on what kind of data I was able to collect. I was very conscious all the time that I should not be making presumptions in the interviews or in the data analysis based on what I think I know about the topic. Engaging with this dissertation and examining the internationalization of HE through research literature as well as the data, has challenged my preconceptions on many occasions and has been extremely beneficial for my professional development.

Finally, I would like to note that my research approach has been influenced and inspired by the EIHE project and its members who come from different disciplinary backgrounds. Furthermore, as I have co-written most of my articles, the theoretical and methodological approaches utilized have been a result of negotiations and intellectual engagement with the writing partners, all of which have brought different “ingredients” to the dissertation.

From this general introduction to the dissertation, I will move on to discuss the context of the internationalization of HE. This includes subchapters on neoliberal globalization, the concept of KE, and their link to HE.
2 The neoliberal turn in the internationalization of higher education

Internationalization has become a strategic focus at universities globally (Knight, 2014). Furthermore, most universities in the world are taking part in internationalization activities, even if it is not always advantageous for them (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009). The internationalization of HE can be divided into partially overlapping activities that take place domestically, at the campus, and abroad. The domestic activities include introducing an international dimension into the curricula, teaching, and campus life (extra-curricular activities, internships/service learning, charitable work, etc.) as well as setting up international degree programs, hosting conferences, and engaging in domestic project work with international partners (Knight, 2008). The abroad internationalization comprises all forms of mobility (degree-seeking, exchange, staff and faculty, excursions, internships/service learning periods, etc.), international projects (capacity development, research, and education-related), and transnational education (branch campuses abroad, franchising, and validation/accreditation activities) (de Wit, Hunter, Howard & Egron-Polak, 2015).

Internationalization has in vernacular become synonymous with certain processes included in globalization, and as Knight (2014) notes, it “has become a catch-all phrase used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the global, intercultural, or international dimensions of higher education …” (p. 76). Although internationalization is linked with globalization, the two concepts are not synonymous. Internationalization can be seen as a collection of approaches by which universities react to globalization (Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012). However, according to Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado, the “internationalization as a reaction to globalization” explanation is often too simplistic because it assumes that HE institutions automatically and rationally respond to globalization and have autonomy in the matter (2009). The agendas and methods of reaction in internationalization greatly vary worldwide, and universities as “loosely coupled organizations” can produce irrational outcomes (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009, p. 291); this is surely familiar to anyone working in HE. Finally, because globalization is commonly described as inevitable, the implication is that the response to globalization is also inevitable, which undermines the institutional autonomy by eliminating the possibility of not reacting (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009).
Defining internationalization as a phenomenon is not a simple task because the definition should be applicable everywhere within a highly asymmetrical terrain at a global scale (George Mwangi et al., 2018). The relevant contents and priorities of internationalization for a metropolitan university in the GN might greatly differ from those for a regional university in the GS. Therefore, in defining the internationalization of HE, we can only produce a partial and contingent description of the phenomenon. As a note on terminology, internationalization and internationalism are terms that appear to be similar. Internationalism does not have just one definition and overall could be stated to have a more overt ideological character, whereas internationalization denotes a process (Knight, 2014). Although the statement is a generalization, it highlights that internationalization, as a process, is subject to change and variation from one context and time period to another and is connected to practice, which serves the purposes of this research better than using the term internationalism. Internationalization of HE, as a term, was popularized only in the 1990s, and prior to this, the most used label was international education, which was closely associated with comparative education (de Wit, 2014).

The most commonly utilized “working definition” for internationalization is that by Knight (2003), who defines it as “… the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). de Wit et al. (2015) revise Knight’s definition by adding that the process of integrating internationalization must be intentional and must enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff to make a meaningful contribution to society (p. 29). As some scholars strongly argue for the inherent international nature of science and the university institution, it might be added that internationalization is about the intensification of the international character of HE (Maringe, Foskett & Woodfield, 2013). Combining the different definitions, we can draft a picture of a university that consciously attempts to increase the level and content of activities related to internationalization to benefit the university as a whole (and possibly the society as well). Still, the picture remains vague because the international dimension itself is

---

10 To exemplify, the EIHE project includes the term internationalism in the title, and in that context, the ideological dimension enables a broader scope for examination and the inclusion of related but different concepts such as internationalization, global citizenship education, and cosmopolitanism.

11 The term is still in use to some extent, especially in the North American context, and it is reflected in the names of many organizations promoting internationalization such as European Association for International Education and Canadian Bureau of for International Education.
generally not defined, allowing room for interpretation and arrival into a situation where internationalization is used as a catch-all phrase (Knight, 2014; Maringe et al., 2013). An attempt to define the “international dimension of HE” would be challenging because it would include contextual, temporal, national, and international characteristics on the institutional level. As an example, internationalization at home as a concept emerged in the late 1990s and emphasizes the domestic facilitation of activities with an international dimension that would encompass domestic and international student alike. Furthermore, the articulated definitions of internationalization do not help to understand the motivation or values behind the internationalization processes. Discussing the conscious attempt at building an international profile does not explicate whether it is a proactive endeavor that is purposefully done to facilitate/advance some aspect of HE or is done out of necessity to respond to the challenges of the universities’ international and national environments such as competition for students and research grants. Thus, a more comprehensive definition of internationalization should also account for the universities’ external environments, which is difficult because HE institutions operate in highly diverse contexts around the globe.

Another question is whether we need a comprehensive definition of internationalization. It would be more appropriate to have multiple definitions to better suit the environments where internationalization activities take place. Similarly, it would be better to use a plural form, “internationalizations,” instead of the singular to recognize the different development trajectories of internationalization around the world. This would also help to problematize the Western and universalistic conceptualizations of internationalization, which often portray it as a beneficial process despite this not always being the case. However, regardless of whether a “clean” definition is needed, in the current situation, wherein the definition of internationalization can be seen lacking in specificity, internationalization can be used as a vehicle for all kinds of rationales around the interests of HE institutions. The ambiguity around the rationales can lead to conflicting interests, which is apparent in the later sections of this thesis. However, these conflicts should not be seen only as negative because ambivalence can create productive spaces for voicing critique and ethical considerations.

12 Beelen and Jones (2015) define internationalization at home as “the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments” (p. 69).
In this dissertation, the “history” of the internationalization of HE begins after the Second World War. A common claim in internationalization research is that universities have an inherent/historical international character (Altbach, 2004; Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012; Teichler, 2012), which is partly true and will be explored here in conjunction with the historical imaginaries of university in Sub-chapter 3.2. However, although the first universities in the 12th century were more “naturally” international owing to the historical circumstances—their scarcity and the fact that they predated the modern nation-states—than an intentional design. In medieval Europe, individuals taking part in HE typically had to travel to other parts of the continent. According to Verger (1992), the cosmopolitan nature of medieval HE has been somewhat exaggerated, and some of the first universities were more “international” than others. However, the main reason for starting to explore the internationalization of HE only after the Second World War is relevance. The nature of HE has fundamentally changed since the establishment of the first universities in the 12th century, and apart from the drastic revolutions in science, HE institutions transitioned from the influence of the Catholic Church into the property of the nation-states and in recent decades into corporate actors globally. So, from the perspective of internationalization, it could be stated that universities transformed from “cosmopolitan” into nationalistic institutions and have only since the last century attempted again to become international. Furthermore, the Second World War is a useful point of departure because it wreaked havoc on the HE institutions in Europe and helped the US obtain their current dominant position in the international student markets (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). Before 1940, international student flows were mostly directed to Europe; however, after the war, students would increasingly go to the US to study owing to successful lobbying and the fact that many universities were literally in ruins in Europe. The war also prompted the establishment of many transnational agencies and programs that later had a positive effect on internationalization. The United Nations (UN) and the precursors of European Union (EU) were set out as peace-building projects and through their cross-national set-ups greatly facilitated, in the long run, the internationalization of nation-states as well as HE institutions. A notable example is the EU Erasmus program that was established to counter nationalism and to support peace among European nations (Nørgaard, 2014). Finally, the timeframe for exploration has been limited to after the Second World War because internationalization, although being a highly asymmetrical field, is much more global nowadays. Universities began as
a European phenomenon\textsuperscript{13}, and the university institution has spread to all the countries worldwide and exploded in numbers. Thus, the discussion on the approaches and values of internationalization must include the perspective that takes into account the dynamics in HE globally, particularly between the GS and GN. Internationalization of HE is oftentimes described in a rather neutral manner that bypasses historical developments and the vested interests. This situation is hopefully balanced partly by the emerging critical research that is not yet mainstream.

Similar to how internationalization has gained strategic importance in HE, particularly over the last three decades, the interest in research in internationalization has increased within the same time period (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Kehm & Teichler, 2007). Internationalization of HE is a subset of HE research that has become more established since the 1980s alongside the growing university enrollments from 13.8% to 29% of the population worldwide (Brennan & Teichler, 2008; Varghese, 2013). HE research is a multidisciplinary field that applies to the study about internationalization as well (Tight, 2013). Owing to its multidisciplinary nature, internationalization research is often linked with other topics such as curriculum work or quality assurance. The researchers in the field are often not specialists in internationalization per se but reflect on the theme from their own disciplinary perspective (economics, sociology, etc.) (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). Moreover, the internationalization of HE research was initially targeted more toward practitioners, which is still visible today (Dolby & Rahman, 2018). Despite the traditional focus on practical application, the number of more ambitious and theory-driven studies has increased (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). There is a lot of “fuzziness” around the definitions of affiliated phenomena in internationalization, which according to Kehm and Teichler (2007, p. 262) is a result of the multidisciplinary and comparative natures of the research and the growing complexity in the internationalization of HE. The comparative aspect introduces significant challenges in terms of different geo-political contexts, and the growing complexity in internationalization has increased the topics of research from student mobility to education export, overseas campuses, and questions related to national labor policies, among others. Therefore, research has been fragmented as at the same time the amount of research solely focusing on internationalization has

\textsuperscript{13} There is a rich history of higher learning in other parts of the world outside of Europe, but the type of university to which I am referring has been built on European thought and Christianity. See more on this in Sub-chapter 3.3.
decreased (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). This is not to say the volume of published research on the topic of the internationalization of HE is low. For example, Yemini and Sagie (2016) in their review article on the research on the internationalization of HE had a sample of a little over 7,000 articles from 1980 to 2013 that only included journal articles written in English, thus excluding books and non-peer review articles, reports, and other material on the topic.

Although internationalization research is multidisciplinary in nature and has multiple strands, as Stein states, much of the research seeks answers to practical “how to” questions rather than probes what are the motivations behind the activities, why to internationalize, who benefits, etc. (Stein, 2017a, p. 63). Although, scholarship adopting a more critical stance on internationalization is definitely increasing, it is still in the margins (George Mwangi et al., 2018). To illustrate, research on multicultural issues, covering topics such as the treatment of students and racism, was non-existent in internationalization research from 1980 to 1993 but has increased to 11.86% of all the covered topics between 2007 and 2013 (Yemini & Sagie, 2016). This type of research includes different levels of and viewpoints on criticality toward internationalization. Still, the rise in the emphasis on the multicultural dimensions of the internationalization of HE, among others topics, has led to more research adopting critical stances toward the social, cultural, and economic aspects of internationalization (see Altbach, 2004; Lee & Rice, 2007; Marginson, 2012) and opened new venues for research, such as de- or post-colonial critiques toward internationalization (Stein, 2017a; Tikly & Bond, 2013).

2.1 Internationalization of higher education in Finland

To exemplify how internationalization has developed in the GN after the Second World War, I will examine my native country, Finland. Although the example is unique to Finland, there are development trends, such as the conversion from “aid to trade” in internationalization policies and the increase in education export, that have commonalities between other countries as well (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001; Schatz, 2015; see Article II). The modern and systematic phase of the internationalization of HE in Finland started in the 1980s, when the first national level policies were released, aided by the opportunity to take part in the different EU mobility programs, such as Erasmus (Ministry of Education [MOE], 2001; Opetushallitus, 1987, 1989). Prior to this, early steps in the internationalization of the country and HE were taken when Finland joined the UN in 1955, which meant being a part of an international community and having new international laws to be
introduced alongside the national ones. One example of this was when EU introduced, in the 1970s, a law forbidding the discrimination of labor based on nationality. This forced changes in the industry sector in Finland and necessitated changes in the HE sector as well (MOE, 1995). For the new international working environments, students required different types of competencies that reflected on education.

As a proof of the more systematic stance on internationalization, in 1987, the first national level strategy in the internationalization of HE was produced by the Ministry of Education (Opetushallitus, 1987). The Ministry has ever since strongly advocated for the internationalization of HE as part of its own and the government’s larger programs and has released several nation-level strategies in internationalization, with the latest being in 2018 (see MOEC, 2018). It is notable that internationalization has been one of the indicators in the government funding models for HE since the 1990s (Nokkala, 2007). This no doubt had an effect on the universities’ motivation in increasing internationalization activities and therefore the level of internationalization has quite rapidly risen in Finnish HE the 1990s onward (MOE, 2001, 2009). The 1990s saw the mainstreaming of internationalization activities in the HE sector in the universities and the newly founded polytechnics (later called the Universities of Applied Sciences). In the 2000s, the breadth of activities and mobility volumes in internationalization grew steadily until 2010, after which they have remained largely the same (approximately 10,000 outgoing students annually, with universities contributing to a little over half of the mobilities) (de Wit, 2015; Opetushallitus, 2018). The 2000s, influenced by the EU’s Bologna process, saw the expansion and mainstreaming of international degree programs (IDPs) that was an important step for the commercialization of Finnish HE (Jokila, 2020). Although, at the time, it was not possible to charge students for tuition, the rapid establishment of IDPs created a new market for education export that did not exist before. The creation of IDPs was made attractive for the HE sector through funding from the Ministry of Education in Finland as well as the EU (Filippou, 2019). The strategy was successful as Finland is currently one of the biggest providers of IDPs in Europe (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). In the 2010s, internationalization has notably changed into a more commercial direction; for example, tuition fees for non-EU/EEA (European Economic Area) students were introduced in 2017. Education export has also been strongly emphasized by the Ministry of Education and Culture since 2010 (MOEC, 2010; Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2016).
A big shift in the nature of internationalization in Finland was enabled by the new Universities Act that came into effect in 2010 and made it possible for universities to charge fees for their education (Schatz, 2015). However, the developments that resulted in changing the law were initiated much earlier (Kauppinen & Kaidesoja, 2014). The introduction of tuition fees did not happen immediately but took years and was a political “hot potato” (Hauhia, 2015). The tuition fees were also strongly supported by the OECD, which according to Kauko and Medvedeva (2016) had an effect on their appearance in Finland. Political parties favoring tuition fees argued that Finland cannot continue to pay for the education of non-nationals, whereas the opposing voices were concerned about the egalitarian premises of Finnish HE and the prospect that tuition fees for international students would one day mean tuition fees for everyone (Hauhia, 2015).

Still, tuition fees are a reality in Finland and, despite the strong critiques and collegial resistances, have quietly become the new norm. This new normal has been partly gained through discursive shifts that, on the one hand, emphasize the economic benefits (tuition fees/education export, local consumption, potential highly-skilled workforce) and on the other hand, conveniently forget to discuss any ethical dilemmas resulting from the fees (loss of egalitarianism, brain-drain) (Jokila, Kallo & Minkkilä-Edrmann, 2019; see Article II).

The growing trend of commercialization and academic capitalism is not unique to Finland; such developments have been witnessed in several countries. However, in Finland, the commercial interests have gained foothold slower than, for example, in Canada (see Article II). One reason for this is the traditionally strong social democratic foundation in Finland that resulted in a political commitment to the egalitarian principles of the Finnish welfare state (Simola et al., 2013). However, the global financial crisis of 2008 and the perception of the tough competition in the global education markets have largely naturalized the “crisis speech” and justified the aims toward diversification of funding through, for example, tuition-fees, and the focus on competition (Hauhia, 2015; Jokila, Kallo & Minkkilä-Edrmann, 2019). Although the economic interests are nowadays definitely a part of the HE functions, the older and more liberal approaches are still very much alive. Thus, Finland is a good example of a national context of HE where the liberal and neoliberal “values” appear to vie for dominance. This is not necessarily negative because as long as the dominance is contested, there is room for the non-commercial interests in the internationalization of HE as well.
2.2 Neoliberalism and neoliberal globalization

Neoliberalism has become a hegemonic economic ideology worldwide\(^4\), and it is based on the ideas of the self-interested individual, free market economics, reduced government intervention, and a commitment to free trade (Harvey, 2005; Olssen & Peters, 2005). The hegemonic position of the neoliberal economic imaginary means that it has gained a non-ideological appearance and has become the “new common sense” (Harvey, 2005). Although neoliberalism is connected to and enabled by globalization, the latter is a much wider phenomenon (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Neoliberalism is an element, or a particular framing of national and global economic relations, of globalization; thus, the term neoliberal globalization is preferred (Moore et al., 2011, Olssen & Peters, 2005). Although neoliberalism is hegemonic, it is not the only possible framing of globalization. Keynesianism, socialism, and developmentalism were all potential imaginaries of globalization before neoliberalism (Moore et al., 2011) and newer “ideas” such as circular economy exist as well.

Neoliberalism as a term is usually employed by its critics and might be considered as pejorative (Davies, 2014). In writings promoting neoliberal ideology, the preferred labels would be free market (economics), free/open trade, minimal state, etc. Neoliberalism in this research is primarily viewed as a politically imposed ideology rather than a purely economic development model, which has an effect on policies, including education (Olssen & Peters, 2005). The essence of the neoliberal ideology is the belief that free trade, unrestricted by governments, labor unions, social movements, etc., and competition always aim for maximum profit and maximum efficiency in the utilization of resources, including labor (i.e., employment) (Braedley & Luxton, 2010). In this sense, unemployment, poverty, and recessions are attributable to the interference of the government and/or labor union, and the primary role of the government is to build a market-friendly environment and to guarantee its free operation (Shaikh, 2005). In practice, this means that the state has to guarantee the integrity of the exchange currency, create new markets through the privatization of public assets (education, health care, etc.), and promote free market principles.

\(^4\) It has to be noted that this generalization does not do justice to the development histories of national economies in different parts of the world. However, today, all the nations in the world are affected by neoliberal policies through neoliberal globalization, whether they choose to do so or not. The theoretical conceptualization of neoliberal policies started in the US and UK (Palley, 2005), but Chile was the first country in the world to thoroughly “neoliberalize” (Connell, 2010). Ong (2006) has examined the different interpretations and implementations of neoliberalism in different national contexts in her book *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. 
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water, etc.), and have a legal system and enforcement capability (police, army, etc.) to protect the property rights of individuals/companies and the functioning of the market (Harvey, 2005). For the proponents of neoliberalism, government intervention in trade, instead of protecting nation-states from the unpredictable oscillation of the global markets, is the source of problems such as unemployment and economic recession (Palley, 2005). As we have witnessed most recently with the market crash of 2008, neoliberalism is evidently not an ideal solution for global or national problems; in fact, it is quite the contrary.

Neoliberalism is based on classic liberal economic thinking, and although it was initially just one possible economic imaginary, owing to a host of political and cultural factors, it became dominant in only a few decades (Harvey, 2005). The predecessor of neoliberalism in the Western countries was Keynesianism, named after the main developer of economic thinking, John Maynard Keynes, and it was the dominant economic paradigm for 25 years after the Second World War (Palley, 2005). Keynesianism was characterized by the government policies that controlled interest rates and provided subsidies to boost employment. The Keynesian ideology was the foundation of the welfare-state model and still has proponents globally. According to Palley (2005), Keynesianism might have been a victim of its own success. As prosperity rose (mainly) in the GN, people became “blind” to the need for government intervention in economics, and the intellectual division between the proponents of Keynesianism could not “rhetorically” compete with the rationale of neoliberalism that seemed to emphasize individual freedoms over the “tyranny” of the state (Palley, 2005). The success of neoliberalism can be partly attributed to the fact that its fundamental principles are based on the central values of Western civilization—human dignity and individual freedom—that have a huge discursive power (Harvey, 2005). Another reason for the rise of neoliberalism could be the stagflation of the world economy in the 1970s that forced the financial capital to seek alternative ways to enhance profitability (Duménil & Lévy, 2005). According to Harvey (2005), neoliberalism was/is a class project by the very rich to counter the rising egalitarianism in the democratic nation-states by creating a new powerful global elite. Last, it is important to understand the role and rise of neoliberalism (coinciding with the Cold War) as a conservative counterattack toward socialism and “socialist” resembling ideas with which, for example, the Keynesian welfare-state model was associated (Braudel & Luxton, 2010).

Neoliberalization cannot be defined purely theoretically because it “straddles a wide range of social, political, and economic phenomena at different levels of complexity” (Saad-Filho & Johnston, 2005, p. 1). Thus, I will use KE as a
manifestation of neoliberal ideology with a profound effect on HE and internationalization. KE is a policy tool/directive strongly influenced by neoliberalism and is a practical application of the neoliberal ideology. Furthermore, KE is a good example to be used in the current context as the aims of KE are often more visible in HE because they can be traced through policy work. In the next sub-chapter, I will discuss KE as a phenomenon and then move on to examine the internationalization of HE in the neoliberal context.

2.3 The knowledge economy

KE in its current form became popularized in the 1990s owing to the lobbying efforts of supranational organizations such as the OECD and the World Bank (Peters, 2004; Robertson, 2014). The concept has been developed by theorists from different disciplines since the 1930s, when Friedrich von Hayek started to examine the relation between knowledge and economy (Peters, 2010). One point of culmination for this development was the report by OECD (1996) called “The Knowledge-based Economy” that provided a policy model for KE and became a popular “narrative” by nation-states around the world (Robertson, 2014, p. 270). KE is connected with the idea of “new economy” that means that the rise of digital technologies has changed the markets and daily interactions of people and that this technological change also functions as a new source of business opportunities and markets (Peters, 2004). In other words, KE signifies a transformation into post-industrial economies/societies, away from traditional factory-based production, which is a profound change requiring new sets of tools and skills to be developed and thus has huge ramifications for education (Peters, 2010). KE as a concept is challenging to define because it is an assemblage of ideas that have many forms. There are at least 57 definitions for KE and similar concepts (Jessop, 2012). However, as a starting point, I will use the often quoted definition by Powell and Snellman (2004):

We define the knowledge economy as production and services based on knowledge-intensive activities that contribute to an accelerated pace of technological and scientific advance as well as equally rapid obsolescence. The key components of a knowledge economy include a greater reliance on intellectual capabilities than on physical inputs or natural resources. (p. 199)

The definition highlights that KE is mainly based on immaterial, knowledge-intensive activities that are reliant on scientific advances, including research, and
emphasizes the intellectual capabilities of the labor force. Furthermore, the term knowledge economy, in a less subtle manner, hints that the benefits of KE are perceived to be economic. According to this definition, the role of HE becomes emphasized because it is directly involved with the preconditions of KE, the scientific advancement through research, and growing the intellectual capabilities of the so-called knowledge workers through education\textsuperscript{15}. By linking work and education, KE prescribes to the human capital theory that functions as a model explaining the link between education and increased productivity. In KE, a central idea is that public or private investment in education is a means to increase economic performance (Gibb & Walker, 2011).

KE as an idea suggests that it is a new approach to the relations between economy and knowledge. Furthermore, by connecting knowledge with economic production, the implication is that some form of knowledge is more important based on its exchange value. Still, the idea of relations between economy and knowledge is hardly new as the economies of all societies have been reliant on knowledge (Carlaw, Oxley, Walker, Thorns & Nuth, 2012; Jessop, 2012). In contrast, as Bastalich (2010) describes, the current iteration of KE is “a discursive recasting of the relations between ideas and production” (p. 845). Although the novelty of KE can be questioned, the literature review conducted by Carlaw et al. (2012) suggests that central to KE are intellectual property creation and the protection of knowledge for commercial or other purposes. Therefore, instead of a more democratic approach where knowledge is produced for a “common good,” in KE, knowledge becomes a commodity that is owned by someone who controls the subsequent dissemination.

Although KE implies an increased role of HE institutions for the national economies, as a producer of knowledge and skilled workforce, it simultaneously undermines the value and autonomy of HE by favoring the disciplines and skills most beneficial for the economy (Bastalich, 2010). This is evident in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) vs. humanities discussion, where the latter is constantly on the fence, having to prove its worth to the society framed in neoliberal terms. Under KE, HE is defined based on its quantifiable outputs that contribute to the national economic growth. These include the amount of graduates “produced” for the labor market with suitable skills (to boost

\textsuperscript{15}Note that HE no longer has exclusive rights to research or education, as many companies have their own research and development, and education sections; however, it is definitely still a major contributor to both in any society.
employment), competitive research funding (to prove the quality of research and increase innovation), and amount of external funding, which is often procured through activities that could be labelled international, such as consultation projects and tuition fees for international students (that enables further state divestment) (McArthur, 2011; Nokkala, 2007). The importance of the HE sector is emphasized in KE, besides research output, in producing “knowledge workers” for the labor market, who are part of the foundation of a KE. In HE, this affects education because resources might be directed toward educational degrees with more employment potential and the contents of HE can be planned based on “labor-market relevance” that can decrease the autonomy of HE institutions. As degrees become commodities, skills and competencies become instrumentalized to better suit the needs of the labor market, which undermines the traditional idea of learning as a process and not a product.

The role of universities as the producers of knowledge workers is somewhat problematic. There is no definite proof that the amount of knowledge workers has increased globally or whether the technological change has simply just changed the way we work. The transformation to the post-industrial society has reduced the amount of people working in manual labor (at least in more affluent countries) and changed working life to a great extent. However, this might be more of a case of upgraded tools than a transformation to a new type of economic production because many jobs, although using advanced technology, still require routine transmission of data and other rather basic skills (Schugurensky, 2007). KE could then be further examined through the changed relation in the organization of work and the subsequent attempt to justify the changes through public discourse. The labor market is continuously restructuring with the prospect that some occupations will become obsolete while new unknown fields of employment will be discovered. For the students in HE, this means getting accustomed to uncertainty and the fact that they might have to re-educate themselves at some point in the future. Connecting with neoliberalism, the KE policies thus promote actions that “help” younger generations to adjust to the uncertain future through emphasis on disciplines with most economic potential (i.e., STEM), entrepreneurship (as a way to self-employ), and life-long learning (to re-educate when necessary).

2.4 Neoliberalism in higher education and internationalization

KE as a manifestation of the neoliberal ideology has many effects on HE, and although in KE universities have an important role, it might come with the price of
lowered autonomy through the condition of increasing market relevance. Neoliberalism reframes the role of HE, where the markets essentially define the value and use of teaching and research, which undercuts the traditional, professional, and collegial autonomy in HE. More specifically, as the value of knowledge shifts from use-value more to the direction of exchange-value, it changes the dynamics in education and research. It could be argued that the most visible effects of neoliberalization in HE are the increased commercialization and competition, followed by managerialism. Commercialization and competition drive HE institutions toward academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), whereas managerialism is a new form of governing that aims for increased productivity and accountability (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Commercialization and competition in HE are influenced by neoliberalism in various ways, but one of the starting points could be the state divestment that creates a need for commercialization to make up the funding deficits. The reasons for state divestment might vary in different countries; for example, in Finland, the stock market crash in 2008, itself a manifestation of the failure of neoliberal economic policies, was followed by cuts in HE funding (OECD, 2013b). What happened afterward was a textbook example of the neoliberal ideology executed through national policies. In 2009/2010, a new Universities Act was introduced that entrusted universities with more economic independence and, for example, the development of education export activities was encouraged (MOEC, 2010). The discourses in HE also took a more economic turn. Although tuition fees had been a taboo subject in Finland for decades, the financial crisis and the resulting “crisis speech” on the inevitable decline of the welfare state and the HE sector<sup>16</sup> enabled a trial period for tuition fees in 2010–2014 for non-EU/EEA students. The trial was not seen as successful (MOEC, 2013) and caused a lot of national resistance, which made it seem like the idea of tuition fees was buried. However, in 2016, rather suddenly, the decision was made to introduce tuition fees for non-EU/EEA students 2017 onward, and they are the new norm nowadays. In short, the “economic shock therapy” (Klein & Smith, 2008) caused by the 2008 crisis enabled a more neoliberal-minded policy reform justifying budget cuts while introducing/demanding more commercialization to make up the deficit. Commercialization leads to heightened competition (for tuition

<sup>16</sup> A 2013 Ministry of Education and Culture report on increasing education export activities is a good example of the “crisis speech.” On the one hand, the structural change in Finland (ageing population, decreasing national economy, and disappearing jobs) demands alternative funding sources/new business sectors so that the welfare state can be maintained. On the other hand, there is a great demand for educational services worldwide (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2013, p. 9).
fee income, education export projects, and external research funding) that is important from the neoliberal perspective because free trade and competition always aim for maximum efficiency, which is perceived to be beneficial for the society, social considerations aside (Hemsley-Brown, 2011). However, the effect of neoliberal policies in HE will be severely limited in most countries through the large involvement of the state. Most governments are not just interested in the economic potential of HE; they also support expanding participation and other social reforms (Marginson, 2013).

Although universities have acted in a corporate manner since the establishment of the University of Bologna in the 11th century, the situation is currently very different because the neoliberal-minded policies force universities under the “rule of the market” and into dire competition against one another, domestically and globally. Still, HE institutions are far from innocent victims of neoliberal ideology; instead, they have embraced the entrepreneurial possibilities in many cases while publicly lamenting the decreasing state funding when it suits the narrative. As universities produce different outputs with economic value, the quantity of the outputs becomes more emphasized, whether they are degrees or research, and managerialist approaches are used to monitor the performance (Olsson & Peters, 2005). In Finland, for example, the indicator-based funding models drive universities to “produce” degrees and research publications that by default value quantity over quality. Ranking systems are an affiliated neoliberal phenomenon and currently a measure for the success of any HE institution. In the system enforced by rankings, universities are often appraised by matters that have more to do with commercial factors than quality education and research (Kehm, 2014). Rankings strongly affect the functions of the universities as many universities conduct reforms that align them to do better in different rankings (Rauhvargers, 2011). This is also seen necessary in the context of the tightening competition for students, staff, and funding and creates few winners and many losers (Hazelkorn & Gibson, 2017). The ranking system also awards immense power to the businesses that conduct the rankings, decreasing the national and institutional autonomy in HE. Because nations want to have “one Harvard university” (Kehm, 2014, p. 111), policy imitation results in global isomorphism and the loss of local distinctiveness. Through the imitation of high prestige institutions from the GN, rankings also help to reproduce and maintain the superiority and epistemic privilege of the Western academia (Shahjahan, Blanco-Ramirez & Andreotti, 2017).

As more universities are preoccupied with the diversification of funding, the internationalization of HE has become an important vehicle to advance economic
interests. As educational markets have grown worldwide, most of the activities related to degree mobility are currently under the internationalization of HE umbrella. As highlighted later in this dissertation, the aspects of internationalization that are not necessarily directly linked with commercialization can still be seen to conflate with economic interests; these links will be explored further in the next chapters. Next, I will present my theoretical framework comprising two conceptual frameworks from the EIHE project as well as go through their historical and ideological backgrounds through literature.
3 Conceptual frameworks of the study

In this Ph.D. dissertation, I will be utilizing two conceptual frameworks or heuristics developed in the EIHE project, the four historical imaginaries of HE, and the discursive orientations of HE. Both conceptual tools are cartographies compiled using social cartography, and although they are based on extensive literature reviews, they contain overlaps, are contested even within the EIHE project, and are not exhaustive representations of the complex history and current situation in HE (Andreotti et al., 2016). Instead, the conceptual frameworks are used as heuristic devices to enable discussion about the different rationales and practices within HE. The conceptual frameworks combine the key concepts of this study and are used to analyze and discuss the data. Other researchers approaching the topic from another angle would surely compile different heuristics, but it can be claimed that the two presented conceptual frameworks are reasonably accurate and comprehensive representations/interpretations of the discussed phenomena in HE and internationalization (Paulston, 1999). Social cartography as a method for organizing and discussing data will be presented in Sub-chapter 4.4.

The historical imaginaries of HE are based on the concept of social imaginary that is “… not a set of ideas; rather it is what enables, through making sense of, the practices of a society” (Taylor, 2002, p. 91). The social imaginary is the normative framework, the common sense that largely implicitly directs individuals’ behavior in the society but only because it is “sanctioned” by the people themselves. Democracy and capitalism are surely good examples of social imaginaries, as for the majority of the people, they are the “natural order” of things and it is difficult to imagine a world operating under different systems or the alternatives are unappealing (despotism, communism, etc.). The situation is vice versa for individuals living under other types of systems of governance. Social imaginaries are dynamic and also contain the elements of opposition and change (Rizvi, 2011). Thus, they do slowly change, and the “old” common sense is at some stage replaced

---

17 The Oxford dictionary of sociology defines heuristic device as “Any procedure which involves the use of an artificial construct to assist in the exploration of social phenomena. It usually involves assumptions derived from extant empirical research. For example, ideal types have been used as a way of setting out the defining characteristics of a social phenomenon so that its salient features might be stated as clearly and explicitly as possible. A heuristic device is, then, a form of preliminary analysis. Such devices have proved especially useful in studies of social change by defining benchmarks, around which variation and differences can then be situated. In this context, a heuristic device is usually employed for analytical clarity, although it can also have explanatory value as a model” (Scott & Marshall, 2009, p. 305).
by the “new” common sense. Some changes are rather rapid, such as the change into the neoliberal model of economy that started in the 1970s and in 20 years became dominant (Harvey, 2005). This could be juxtaposed with the change from the feudal systems of governing to nation-states in Europe that took hundreds of years.

3.1 The juxtaposed imaginaries of higher education

The first conceptual framework/heuristic is an attempt to organize together the long history of HE. It comprises four broad and overlapping historical imaginaries of HE: scholastic (12th–16th century), classical (16th–19th century), civic (mid-19th to late 20th century), and corporate (1970 onward) (see Figure 1).

Fig. 1. EIHE juxtaposed imaginaries of the university (Andreotti et al., 2016, p. 6; published by permission of Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0).

The scholastic imaginary of the university (12th–16th century) starts with the establishment of the first universities18 (Bologna [est. 1088], Paris [est. 1150], and

18 Note that the scholastic imaginary, when applied to universities in the modern times, can be extended to include other religious traditions than Christianity. However, when discussing the history of universities in the context of the scholastic imaginary, it is distinctly European and Christian (Rüegg, 1992). Furthermore, although I acknowledge the existence of institutions that could be considered as universities predating the 11th–12th centuries (see for an extensive account Lowe & Yasuhara, 2013), they are not discussed here as their effect on the current HE environment is less visible.
Oxford [est. 1167]\(^{19}\). Altogether, 72 universities were established between 1100 and 1500 (Perkin, 2011), with about 39 surviving to date. The universities of this time were in the control of the church and their primary functions were the legitimization of the position of the church against the state and the conservation and reproduction of existing knowledge (Perkin, 2011). The aim of teaching in early universities was to put “the worldly wisdom at the service of the Christian wisdom to be found in the bible,” and theology was seen as a higher discipline (Leff, 1992, p. 309). The medieval universities had cosmopolitan characteristics and students travelled to the few existing universities from all over Europe\(^{20}\). The Catholic Church had an interest\(^{21}\) in the early universities for three reasons: to strengthen the catholic doctrine against “expanding heresies,” to strengthen the position of the church against secular powers, and to give the highest possible education to staff working for the church (Rüegg, 1992, p. 16). The situation was not to last as universities later paved the way for reformation and the rise of secular powers, kings/monarchs, and finally nation-states. Although the allegiance would later change, the idea that universities played a part in the legitimization of their funders is still a characteristic of HE. The institutions in the medieval time had very little resemblance to the modern research universities; for example, academic freedom as such was extremely limited and the church was quick to call on any ideas it considered heretical (Perkin, 2011). Already early on, the medieval universities started to converge in terms of organization; as an example, the 13th century universities only taught four disciplines—law, medicine, theology, and liberal arts—that comprised seven traditionally defined subjects\(^{22}\). As the number of universities was low, they were interconnected, and as universities were conservatories of knowledge, they followed the traditions inherited from the more established centers of learning (such as Bologna or Paris). These more established universities then based their teachings on the writings of respected church

---

\(^{19}\) The establishment dates are estimates at best because it is difficult to point out exactly when these institutions could be labeled as universities. All these developed from a group of scholars operating in the specified cities in different ways (Rüegg, 1992).

\(^{20}\) As Verger claims, the cosmopolitanism might not really have been as extensive as generally thought and some medieval universities were more “international” than others (Verger, 1992).

\(^{21}\) The mechanics of control included granting privileges for the teachers and students (immunity to be tried in secular courts, for example), providing funding (the extent varied between institutions), and “accrediting” universities by awarding the title of studium generale, essentially a university status (Nardi, 1992).

\(^{22}\) All disciplines were not taught at all universities, and variation could be found within the disciplines themselves as well (Rüegg, 1992).
intellectuals and different theorists, who drew their inspiration, in addition to the bible, from Hellenistic writings (Verger, 1992).

The move to the next imaginary, classical (16th–19th century), came along with the reformation that weakened the hold of the church and thus paved the way for the Enlightenment. However, the Enlightenment ideas were slow to creep into the curricula of universities that were still more interested in the conservation of knowledge than introducing new ideas. According to Perkin (2011), by the 18th century, universities were in decline as the student numbers dropped. The medieval curriculum taught at universities was not seen as relevant by the student population, which during this time represented only the elite of the society. As a result, many individuals would turn to private tutoring, where the new and critical ideas of Enlightenment were more readily presented (Perkin, 2011). The Enlightenment period dramatically changed the nature of HE, as there was a switch from scholastic teaching to the scientific method that changed the idea of knowledge. First, the pursuit of knowledge became an end by itself, grounding academic freedom and disinterested research. Next, empiricism (later positivism) started to replace natural theology (Delany, 2001). The development that started with the Enlightenment and the industrial age had a profound effect on the university institution and led to the “birth” of the modern research university in the 19th century. This same development helped the Western world to gain dominance and the “epistemological privilege” that led to the suppression of “less scientific” knowledge systems (de Sousa Santos, 2007b, xix). During the period of classical imaginary, the university institution started its “migration” to the European colonies and the rest of the world. Universities everywhere were used to transmit European cultural and intellectual values; however, after the inclusion of non-settler students, HE education caused largely inadvertent empowerment and gave rise, or at least more prominence, to decolonial movements (Perkin, 2011).

The transition to the next imaginary of the university, civic (mid-19th to late 20th century), was facilitated by the reinvention of HE and particularly the modern research university. The first example of this new kind of university was the University of Berlin (1810), founded by Wilhelm von Humboldt based on the ideas of Freiderich Schlieiermacher (Perkin, 2011). The new approach to HE emphasized the freedom of teaching and learning; instead of passing on existing knowledge, the focus was on discovering new knowledge (Rüegg, 2004). The simultaneous rise of the nation-states meant that universities had a part in their legitimization through educating the work force and contributing research with social utility. In the past, universities were only for the elite; however, the civic university meant including
more and more sections of the society into its realm (Delanty, 2001). The actual “massification” phase of HE in the Western countries was at its highest after the Second World War, and HE enrolment has been globally increasing to date (OECD, 2018).

The outmarch of neoliberalism in the 1970s together with the growing state divestment in HE brought up the fourth imaginary of the university, the corporate (Andreotti et al., 2016). Compared to the civic, the corporate imaginary is less focused on the nation-states, but the outlook is more global and market-oriented. The corporate imaginary is characterized by the commodification of education and the self-interested individual who is able and willing to buy the services needed for her or his education and future (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Here, HE becomes a provider, students become customers, and education is an investment. In the corporate imaginary, privatization, marketization, and corporatization are seen beneficial because they increase the cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of education (Rizvi, 2017). The role of universities changes in the corporate imaginary from the legitimization of the nation-states to the legitimization of the neoliberal ideology of competition and economic growth. The proposal is enticing for the nation-states as the corporate university requires less public investment because students themselves essentially pay for their education (Naidoo & Williams, 2015). Also, as the research funding is made more competitive, the focus shifts more toward applied research and innovation that have the potential to increase the gross national product (Kaidesoja & Kauppinen, 2014). This all comes at a price, where HE becomes a luxury for those who can afford it and the focus in more profitable applied research decreases the funding possibilities for basic research (Delanty, 2001). Moreover, because education is tuition-based and thus subject to supply and demand, certain disciplines and fields are in advantageous positions and some might become outright extinct²³.

All of the four imaginaries are partially overlapping and still exist in different constellations in different parts of the world. As an example, universities in Finland can be considered to be operating under the civic imaginary with an ever-growing influence of the corporate (Kauppinen & Kaidesoja, 2014), whereas majority of the UK and US universities are mainly operating under the latter (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). There also exist institutions with, for example, a religious affiliation, which

²³ As an example, the decline of humanities and social sciences in Japan: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/social-sciences-and-humanities-faculties-close-japan-after-ministerial-intervention
can contain characteristics belonging to the scholastic imaginary in addition to the civic and the corporate. Although all of the four imaginaries probably have an effect on HE globally, in this research, I will focus on the civic and the corporate imaginaries because they are most salient today, having the most visible effect on the operation of universities globally.

The EIHE heuristic is neither an unproblematic nor an exhaustive representation of the complex history of HE, and other categorizations can exist. One such example is Perkin’s (2011) five stages of the history of HE: the medieval cosmopolitan university (12th century–1530s), the “nationalization” of universities and decline during the Enlightenment (1530–1789), the revival of the university and slowly increasing role in the industrial society (1789–1939), and the transition from élite to mass HE (1945 onward). Perkins also includes the migration of the Western university to the GS (1538–1960) as part of his model (Perkin, 2011, p. 161). Apart from being more specific than the EIHE heuristic, Perkin’s model follows similar lines with a slightly different emphasis. Perkin reflects more on the role of the university in the society, whereas the EIHE imaginaries are more “university-centric.” Perkins also discusses less about the colonial effect of the HE system worldwide but does start from the premise that the modern university is a European invention (2011).

Modern/colonial global imaginary as a meta-frame

All the imaginaries of HE described above operate under a modern and colonial meta-frame (see Figure 1) (Andreotti et al., 2016). This means that all universities in the world have the same foundations built on the Enlightenment ideals and scientific method and are profoundly a part of the European intellectual tradition24 (Rüegg, 1992). The overall imaginary of HE is based on European (and Christian) intellectual foundations; this means that in many contexts globally, although not exclusively, the local intellectual traditions have been sidelined, particularly in the GS (Mignolo, 2002). As an example, indigenous cosmologies and knowledge production are not seen as equal to the “scientific knowledge” acquired through research using the scientific method (de Sousa Santos, 2007b). The role of indigenous knowledge is thus being the object of anthropological/philosophical/sociological research, where ideas are being

---

24 This can be claimed, although the organizational tradition of the university is based on Islamic education institutions (Rüegg, 1992).
interpreted through the lens of the Western tradition, creating epistemological and ontological challenges. In particular, indigenous thinking interpreted from the Western perspective might fall victim to “abyssal thinking” (de Sousa Santos, 2007a), where knowledge outside of our social imaginaries becomes unintelligible and the conversion of knowledge into a more intelligible form might require the distortion or denial of its relevance.

Apart from the vague generalization of indigenous thinking, the colonization effect of Western HE can be seen in different fields. For example, in medicine, there exists a field of traditional Chinese medicine that denotes a different approach. Without commenting on the benefits or dangers of any particular field, the point here is that the Western science is so dominant that in many cases, alternatives are labeled as pseudo-science or outright humbug, which means that even viable new openings are easily foreclosed (Andreotti, 2009). In humanities, the different post-traditions have managed to decenter the Western “majority” thinking (and in the case of post-humanism, even people) to enable minority/alternative perspectives that could be seen as a move toward epistemological pluralism. However, even here, the frame of reference comes from the “rules” of HE that define how research can be done and, more importantly, what kind of research is published (Mignolo, 2011). The norms of Western science can be seen as a safeguard against the ideas and practices considered as harmful, such as eugenics; however, at the same time, it creates a self-legitimizing system that decides what is good and bad in terms of knowledge production. This self-governing system safeguards sciences through normative frameworks, which are also used to foreclose alternative approaches; this has ramifications for epistemological pluralism (Stein, 2019). My approach here is not to critique the practices in scientific research or try to emphasize a romanticized view on generalized concepts such as indigenous knowledge. This would be beyond the scope of this dissertation and my knowledge of the issue, not to mention hypocritical. It should also be emphasized that the call for epistemological pluralism is neither an attempt to help a “non-Western” source of knowledge to become hegemonic nor an attempt to claim that these knowledge claims would automatically be legitimate (Ruitenberg, 2012). What I am pointing out here is the need to recognize “alternatives” so that they can be included in the
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25 Owing to my positionality described in Sub-chapter 1.3 and the resulting fact that the interpretations I make may reinforce the Western frames of interpretation that I criticize here.

26 According to Mignolo (2011), calling something an alternative means accepting its inferior position. Instead of alternatives, we should speak about options, which means that at least on the surface, all options are equal and viable.
discussion to continue to de-center Western onto-epistemic dominance. Like Mignolo (2010) writes, the “de-colonial option starts from narrating a silenced history” (p. 125), and although the main agency in this narration should be with those whose history has been silenced, those writing from within a modern-colonial imaginary can still recognize the present and future existence of such narratives. The purpose of decolonial critique should be understood as emancipatory, anti-oppressive, and counter-hegemonic. The examination of epistemological pluralism and structural barriers in the internationalization of HE brings important variation to the discussion that can get stuck around the dangers and benefits of marketization.

3.2 Discursive orientations of higher education

The second conceptual framework from the EIHE project contains different discursive orientations within the civic and corporate imaginaries of HE and as framed within a modern colonial imaginary. This heuristic comprises three main discursive orientations—neoliberal, liberal, and critical—and their interfaces—neoliberal–liberal, neoliberal–critical, liberal–critical, and all three combined (Andreotti et al., 2016) (see Figure 2). The discursive orientations are a way to articulate how the historical imaginaries of HE, partly produced and reproduced through discourse, are iterated (Andreotti et al., 2016). The historical imaginaries of HE are reproduced through multiple competing and overlapping discourses, and the current heuristic is an attempt to provide an organized presentation of them (Andreotti et al., 2016). Like with the historical imaginaries, the discursive orientations are not an exhaustive attempt to portray the reality in HE but a cartographic exercise to assist in mapping diverse and conflated discourses so that they can be discussed in terms of their difference, borders, overlaps, and absences. It would also be possible to change or add an orientation to the mix, which might be the case with other researchers approaching the topic from another angle; this would not only be acceptable but also encouraged.
Fig. 2. Corporate/civic discursive orientations of higher education (Andreotti et al., 2016; published by permission of Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0).

The first discursive orientation is neoliberal, which is placed at the top of the triangle (see Figure 2); as already discussed extensively, it is globally the most dominant and the only main orientation belonging to the corporate imaginary of HE. The neoliberal discursive orientation stems from the neoliberal ideology based on free markets, the self-interested individual, and the diversification of HE funding affected by the state divestment globally (Olssen & Peters, 2005). In this orientation, the discourses are centered on the entrepreneurial role of the university, academic capitalism, recruitment of fee-paying degree students, as well as the rankings and quality assurance that feed back to the income aspects of HE. In the neoliberal orientation, education and research are instrumentalized; the former producing transferrable skills and qualified workforce and the latter becoming a new mode of production through patents and intellectual property rights (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Stier, 2004). In the larger society, the neoliberal orientation is closely linked with the idea of the KE where universities become an important vehicle for economic growth through highly skilled workers, education export, and “useful” research (Bastalich, 2010). In the neoliberal orientation, the relationship between the HE sector and the state changes, and the autonomy of universities is, at least in theory, increased. However, the autonomy is framed through competition
for students and funding that creates “winners and losers,” and the supply and
demand principle guides what is feasible for universities. This guides research
toward a more applied direction and changes what education the universities can
“afford” to offer (Bullen, Robb & Kenway, 2004).

The next discursive orientation is the liberal. The liberal orientation is rooted
in the civic imaginary of the university and the discourses in the orientation focus
on personal growth, democracy, equality, and the role of education and research as
a public good (Delanty, 2001). In the civic imaginary, universities and the state are
closely linked because the universities are part of the nation-building project
through educating the citizens and providing research that benefits the country. In
this scenario, the state also has a large control in the values and direction of the HE
sector because funding is tax-based (Marginson, 2013). Furthermore, as per the
civic underpinnings, the state is mainly responsible for the education of its citizens,
as opposed to the self-interested individual in the neoliberal discursive orientation.

In the third main discursive orientation, the critical, the focus is on the
examination of power asymmetries in HE, systemic barriers for participation,
racialization, coloniality, and epistemological pluralism. The critical orientation is
also located in the civic imaginary of HE; however, instead of supporting a unified
vision of the nation-state, like in the liberal orientation, “it aims to transform,
pluralize, or replace these narratives through historical and systemic analyses of
patterns of oppression and unequal distributions of power, labor, and resources”
(Andreotti et al., 2016, p. 8). The critical orientation, informed by post and
decolonial readings of HE, gives voice to the marginalized groups in the societies
and examines the histories and practices causing exclusion as well as how to
dismantle the barriers for participation. In this manner, the critical orientation can
be seen as a response to both the neoliberal orientation, through the critiques of
capitalist exploitation, and the liberal orientation, through the focus on the singular
vision of progress and the nation-state.

As nothing arises from “clean breaks,” the heuristic also includes a second part,
four interfaces, where the main discursive orientations conflate and mix in different
ways. The neoliberal–liberal interface combines economic and public good
discourses, such as in accreditation, where the focus is on enhancing the quality of
the universities but the motivations are more managerial and income-related
(attracting more students and research funding through branding, etc.) (see Article
I). The liberal–critical interface includes discourses that emphasize inclusion and
equal opportunities but aim for change on a more individual and institutional than
systemic level, such as fundraisers and theme weeks that help certain individuals
but do not necessarily tackle any root problems. The neoliberal–critical interface recognizes the systemic barriers for participation but has more open financial motivations as well, such as targeted grant schemes for certain marginalized groups that can be used as a “gateway” for further fee-based recruitment (for those who do not receive a grant); the existence of such grants is used for polishing the brand and image of the institution. The fourth interface combines discourses from all three main orientations like, for example wider institutional strategies that attempt to reconcile the interests of various parties (such as the government-level HE internationalization strategies in Finland).

3.3 Theoretical approaches to the discursive orientations

In this chapter, I will discuss the theoretical underpinnings of the discursive orientations to provide background on the ideas and historical developments on which the orientations are based. I will only discuss the three main orientations, starting from the liberal orientation that can be seen as a precursor for the neoliberal orientation. I will also present the critiques toward the liberal tradition and then discuss the critical orientation that in many ways functions as a critique toward both the liberal and neoliberal orientations.

3.3.1 Liberal orientation

The liberal discursive orientation is rooted in European liberalism, which is a rich, complex, ambivalent, and highly contested concept (Bell, 2014). Several attempts have been made to define liberalism, which at times contrast each other (see for example, Bell, 2014). The use of the term in scientific texts greatly differs from its vernacular usage, where it is currently being used as a binary concept for conservatism and right-wing thinking.

To characterize liberalism, we can examine some of its tenets. According to Gray (1995), although having historical and national variants, liberalism is based on four elements: individualism, egalitarianism, universalism, and meliorism. Liberalism is thus based on individualism, the equal rights between humans, moral unity of humans, and the belief that the human condition can be improved through indefinite human interference (as opposed to “nature taking its course”) (Gray, 1995). However, the application of these ideals varies across different contexts and time periods.
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27 European liberalism has roots in Ancient Greece as well as in Christianity, but here the discussion will be limited to the modern conception that took place no earlier than the 17th century.
1995). For the 17th–18th century European societies, these ideas were revolutionary because they rejected the idea of hereditary power through the equal rights of all humans and denial of fatalistic thinking by claiming that humans can influence their own fates. From a slightly different angle, Dunn has proposed that liberal ideology has included “political rationalism, hostility to autocracy, cultural distaste for conservatism, and tradition, tolerance, and individualism” (as cited in Bell, 2014, p. 684). Liberalism as an ideology has developed over three centuries and has been influenced by Enlightenment philosophers John Locke and Immanuel Kant, developers of classical liberalism John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer, economists J. M. Keynes and F. A. Hayek, and modern philosophers John Rawls and Robert Nozick, who all have provided different contributions to the same topic (Gray, 1995)28.

When examining liberalism, it is important to distinguish the classical variant from the later ideology. Classical liberalism was akin to what could be nowadays called libertarianism, where “a society of free men” existed and the role of the government was to guarantee the rights of individuals with little interference. Here, economic/individual property and political rights were seen as essentially the same and as enabling each other. The move from the classic view on liberalism happened in the 19th century, when aspects of social engineering and utilitarian thinking were introduced. The key thinker in the transition from classical to modern liberalism was John Stuart Mill, whose “attitudes to trade unions, to nationalism, and to socialist experimentation represent a divisive breach in the intellectual fabric of the liberal tradition” (Gray, 1995, p. 30). The difference between classical and modern liberalism can be found in how they view freedom/liberty and rights between individuals. In classical liberalism, freedom and rights of the individual are seen as the ultimate aims but there is no responsibility toward others. This can be contrasted with Kant’s categorical imperative that balances freedom with the idea of responsibility. When responsibility is taken to a societal level, the result is a form of utilitarianism wherein an agent in the society, usually the state, exercises power to guarantee the “common good” that results in a more just society but which can violate the freedom of individuals and/or groups. This for the critics of the approach signaled a socialist turn in liberalism, whereas the proponents emphasized the social justice perspective as the government intervention reduced the harmful effects of the laissez-faire policies (Duncan, 2014). Berlin (1969) discussed the
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28 John Gray (1995) discusses the importance of Thomas Hobbes and Benedict de Spinoza for the liberalist ideology, but they are excluded in the list as neither was a liberal per se.
distinction between individuals’ rights and responsibilities in terms of positive and negative freedom. Despite the connotations carried by its label, negative freedom simply denotes an approach where individual freedom can only be realized in the absence of external, societal or authoritarian, control (Berlin, 1969). According to Berlin, negative freedom is preferred because it protects people and nations against totalitarian regimes and better ensures plurality of the people within societies as everyone is able to follow their own practices and beliefs (Berlin, 1969). Positive individual freedom, in the Hegelian sense, requires a possibility for self-realization. However, to be free, an individual must possess the required resources for self-realization that can only be achieved in a “harmonious or integrated society” (Gray, 1995, p. 57). The welfare state is an example of an attempt to realize the Hegelian idea of freedom, where the state provides healthcare, different benefits, and education for its citizens as well as imposes some form of control toward the markets (Olssen & Peters, 2005). For the critics, positive freedom is a gateway to totalitarianism because societal control is not necessarily benevolent and can be oppressive. Negative freedom, then again, can be seen as a gateway toward “social Darwinism,” where individuals with power and means can exercise their freedom at the expense of others (Taylor, 2017). In this thesis, positive freedom and equal self-realization secured by state “intervention” are the underlying ideas behind the liberal orientation, whereas negative freedom is the basis of the neoliberal orientation.

Liberalism, when understood in relation to HE and the liberal discursive orientation in this thesis, is a mix of modern liberalism and the Humboldtian ideas of education. The purpose of the state is to provide equal access to education, which should be broad-based and supporting the individual growth of the students (Bildung) (Zelić, 2018). Research should be disinterested and seeking knowledge for knowledge’s sake, without a demand for market relevance. Thus, in terms of liberalism, a central tenant of education is academic freedom coupled with ideas about egalitarian access. This type of approach had its golden period after the Second World War in the ensuing massification period of HE (Trow, 2007).

**Critiques of liberalism**

Although liberalism can largely be seen as a beneficial ideology, at least when aiming at ensuring more equal and just societies, it has several problematic characteristics. Defining liberalism is as difficult as realizing it on a national level. A country labeling itself liberal is bound to have characteristics that contradict the
label. As concluded in the Article II, seemingly liberal countries such as Finland and Canada have benefitted, and continue to do so, from colonialism and have actively participated in colonial activities in the past. Furthermore, the liberal identification can easily lead to exceptionalist discourses, where some form of comparative tactics is used to elevate the national identity of the country in question. For example, Finland prides itself better in terms of education, anticorruption/democracy, and living standards than some other countries. There is nothing wrong with healthy national self-esteem and promotion, but these discourses can just as easily lead to othering and the negative exceptionalist comparisons that exist. This is happening in Finland in relation to Russia, which is portrayed lacking many of the Finnish accomplishments such as transparent governing, “true” democracy, and free press. In addition to othering, exceptionalist discourses are harmful because they create complacency and “blindness”/resistance toward critique.

Another problematic part of the liberal ideology is the bind between ownership and freedom. As Losurdo (2005) states in his book *The counter-history of liberalism*, many influential liberal thinkers such as Locke and Mill did not directly oppose the slavery and colonization of the land’s of indigenous people in North America and their outright eradication. Although Locke and Mill advocated for the freedom of the individuals, the indigenous people in North America could be excluded because they did not cultivate the land they inhabited. This was seen by the settlers as proof of the absence of ownership, and it was understood that individuals can only have freedom through ownership. The early and later liberal thinkers also discussed immature civilizations that were better off under the European colonial rule and did not “need” the same freedoms as the Europeans. This type of othering was partially based on Christian faith and biblical justifications (Losurdo, 2005). The stance toward slavery and the rights of indigenous people in colonized countries casts a strong shadow over the liberal ideological tradition.

The last issue with liberalism, as explored here, is the claim for universalism. The European way of life was very much seen as exceptionalist, far exceeding any other culture’s ways of life. Therefore, in the name of liberal progress, it was seen as a duty to spread the European way of life and knowledge system all over the
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29 By othering I mean a process of social differentiation based on race, religion, nationality, student status, etc. that is used to differentiate and group individuals into “us” and “them.”

30 Locke is a notable liberal who had investments in slave trade, which perhaps affected his stance on slavery (Losurdo, 2005).
world; this helped to suppress or eradicate local traditions. Furthermore, in modern times, the Western concept of development has created scenarios wherein calls for democratization (right to vote, free press, etc.) have been accompanied by calls for modernization based on capitalism and the exploitation of human and natural resources. This type of Western framing of development displays how the liberal and neoliberal ideologies easily go hand in hand through the idea the freedom, connected to the requirement of ownership. As an example, the right to vote and right to own are central to the capitalist critique of socialist countries, and the level of development of a nation is often portrayed through figures such as the gross national product that above all highlights the level of income and capital accumulation of nations. From the proximity of liberal and neoliberal traditions, we can next examine their relationship and the foundations of the neoliberal discursive orientation.

### 3.3.2 Neoliberal orientation

The neoliberal discursive orientation is based on the neoliberal ideology already discussed in Chapter 2. Thus, I will restrict my discussion here to the connection between liberalism and neoliberalism. Through the essential role of the concept of freedom or individual liberty in classical European thought, we can begin to understand why neoliberal ideology is so pervasive globally. According to Harvey (2005), neoliberalism takes freedom as its basic tenet that is similarly the foundation of the Western democracy. After all, neoliberalism is a reinterpretation of classic liberalism where freedom was seen as the highest aim for humans (Braedley & Luxton, 2010, p. 7). This greatly adds to the persuasive potential of neoliberalism and effectively naturalizes it, as who would oppose freedom? According to the self-interested individual, people have the right to make their own life-choices and a responsibility to take care of themselves that can be seen as differing from the modern utilitarian liberal approach, where the foundations of freedom are guaranteed through some external actors, such as the state. In the neoliberal context, government intervention can be seen as restricting individual freedoms of some and therefore not acceptable. Here, it is again useful to make the distinction between negative and positive freedom (Berlin, 1969). The neoliberal concept of freedom is essentially negative freedom, which implies the lack of any constraints to individual’s actions, as opposed to positive freedom that typically involves some form government intervention. As the starting point for freedom in the neoliberal ideology is negative, it implies that freedom is universal in nature.
and all people have the same starting point in life to exercise their freedom. This is a fallacy as the neoliberal order favors the more affluent countries and segments of societies (Duménil & Lévy, 2005).

One of the biggest flaws of the neoliberal ideology, at least from the social justice perspective, is the evident inequality stemming from the implementation of neoliberal policies. On the surface level, the neoliberal ideology includes the idea of an equal starting point, where the “impersonal” market forces have little interest in class, race, gender, religious affiliation, or sexual orientation of individuals (Braedley & Luxton, 2010). The unrestrained markets, at least in economic theory, always aim for the most efficient utilization of resources, including human capital, which would mean full employment for everyone interested in working (Shaikh, 2005). However, it is self-evident that the possibilities for work, wage levels, and the ability to make “consumer choices” depend on the personal and social circumstances of individuals, and inequality has increased globally under the neoliberal policies (Hursh & Henderson, 2011). The neoliberal ideology contributes to growing inequality by reproducing the colonial exploitation of less economically advanced countries and racialized minorities domestically (Connell, 2010; Thomas, 2010) through gender-bias favoring men (Braedley & Luxton, 2010; Williams, 2013), by increasing and solidifying class differences (Harvey, 2005), and by disadvantaging people with disabilities (Pinto, 2010). When strong support of neoliberalism is connected with conservative/right-wing politics, this also has potentially negative effects on LGTBQ minorities (Binnie, 2014; Hoggart, 2005) and immigrants (Ong, 2006).

Neoliberalism and liberalism are distinctly Western ideologies and the latter is often used to critique the former. However, as they both are part of the same intellectual and cultural tradition, they are lacking in analytical power when discussing the challenges of HE and internationalization, as the critique of Western ideas using Western concepts can only be self-referential in the end. In contrast to the neoliberal and liberal discursive orientations, the critical orientation approaches for the internationalization of HE from a decolonial perspective extend the discussion beyond the Western intellectual tradition. The critical orientation highlights some of the challenges in internationalization with regard to HE institutions in the GS and indigenous/minority groups in the GN and GS.
3.3.3 Critical orientation

The critical orientation is based on the decolonial/postcolonial critiques of Western modernity as well as the dominance of Western knowledge and the affiliated institutions such as universities. In this work, I will be mostly referring to decolonial critiques, instead of the related field of postcolonialism, and I mainly lean on scholars such as Walter Mignolo and Boaventura de Sousa Santos, who identify themselves as decolonial thinkers. According to Mignolo (2011), although postcoloniality emerged as a response to postmodernity and poststructuralism, decoloniality responded to the discourses of development and modernity and the critiques of these resonate well with the examination of both the liberal and neoliberal discursive orientations and their interfaces with the critical orientation.

For Mignolo (2011), decoloniality is a project and “means both the analytic task of unveiling the logic of coloniality and the prospective task of contributing to build a world in which many worlds will coexist” (54). The decolonial critique of modernity greatly differs from the Western critique of modernity. The latter employs ideas such as Marxism or postmodernism to critique the dominant narratives or meta-narratives of Western thinking, whereas decolonial critique starts from the meaningfulness of the rise of modernity itself. The Western critiques of modernity are largely self-referential and take place within the sphere of modernity, but decolonial critique is an attempt toward an outside view on modernity that is seen as a European invention. In this sense, decoloniality should not be affiliated with postmodern thinking, although the rise of the latter, as an enabler of non-mainstream views/ideologies, has helped decolonial thinking to gain at least some legitimacy in the Western academia (Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

The decolonial perspective is integral to the examination of the internationalization of HE because the depoliticized idea of internationalization paints it as a reciprocal process, ignoring its historicity and power asymmetries. In
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31 Mignolo (2011) states that he sees decoloniality and postcoloniality “as complementary trajectories with similar goals of social transformation. Both projects strive to unveil colonial strategies promoting the reproduction of subjects whose aims and goals are to control and possess” (p. xxvi).
32 The discursive orientation was labeled in the EIHE project as critical, although in the context of my research, it could be called decolonial as well.
33 The inherent paradox with decolonial research is that owing to the dominance of Western-style science, the only tools to describe and discuss phenomena are dictated by the “rules” of Western research. Furthermore, any attempt to use alternative ways to research and critique modernity would seem non-academic and/or straight-up unintelligible.
reality, internationalization is never a neutral process, and the global “playing field” is extremely asymmetrical. This will continue to be the case unless something is done to the colonial structure underneath the global neoliberal structure. When viewing internationalization from the liberal and neoliberal perspectives, it is portrayed as a global phenomenon that is inclusive and largely beneficial for all parties. On the other hand, it is also visible how internationalization is limited in scope and asymmetrical, with countries in the GN largely leading and dictating the activities by setting the rules, which can result in the reproduction of colonial relations through mono-epistemic approaches in education and the unilateral flow of students motivated by for-profit education (Stein & Andreotti, 2016).

The premise of decolonial critique is that there cannot be modernity without coloniality (Mignolo, 2011). In other words, coloniality is a condition for our modern and postmodern existence, and both coloniality and modernity were born at the same time. Coloniality is naturalized in our thinking and often not visible. As an example, many nation-states, including Finland and Canada, have appropriated lands previously inhabited by indigenous people, and very little reparations have been made to rectify or compensate the land grab. If the same would happen between nation-states, it would be an act of war. In another vein, many people purchase products made under questionable conditions in the GS, even utilizing child labor, which would be unthinkable and highly unethical if the context would be GN. The liberal tradition has been key in legitimizing and normalizing the behavior and attitudes resulting in the aforementioned exploitation, and neoliberal globalization has further continued this development. The advancement of neoliberal globalization is seen as universal, inevitable, and beneficial for all nation-states. Although it is true that the living standards around the world have taken huge leaps in many countries, the development remains uneven and is based on the exploitation of human and natural resources. This skew in perspective can be accounted to what Mignolo (2002) calls the colonial difference, which is essentially a concept denoting the differentiation between the GS and GN. Modernity represents the Eurocentric idea of progress (i.e., the historical progress is the result of European/Western exceptionalism), whereas coloniality represents underdevelopment, a state that can only be fixed by striving toward the ideals of modernity. In other words, the insistence of Western modernity as the dominant and beneficial form of organizing and evaluating life requires the concept of coloniality to exist (Mignolo, 2011). Coloniality, as the undesirable opposite, helps to define

34 See Critiques of liberalism section under 3.4.1.
modernity. The perceived underdevelopment of coloniality is not only material but also ideological/epistemic and both sides are vital when discussing the internationalization of HE. The material aspect deals, for example, with the systemic barriers for participation, such as HE attainment in the first place and costs related to exchange periods. Similarly dire is the “epistemicide”—a destruction of a knowledge system—caused by the dominance of Western knowledge production. This is normalized and reproduced through, for example, the degree and short-term mobilities directed toward the GN to seek “superior” education and the idea of the international nature of research, which more often than not is framed through the lens of Western science.

Just like modernity requires coloniality to define itself, modernity sets the boundaries of coloniality, resulting in what de Sousa Santos (2007a) calls abyssal thinking. Abyssal thinking is based on the lines that separate the metropolitan societies and colonial territories and renders the “other side of the line” as non-existent and invisible (de Sousa Santos, 2007a, p. 1). In terms of knowledge, abyssal thinking means that “on this side of the line” is the modern Western science that is universal. Anything not utilizing its epistemological and ontological foundations belongs to the “other side of the line” and is categorized not as proper knowledge but as non-scientific, subjective, and primitive (de Sousa Santos, 2007a). The “this side” controls and monitors the abyssal lines, and the co-existence of the two sides would be impossible because it would mean de-centering the Western knowledge and recognizing that it is not exceptional and that the history of the progress of modernity is based on silencing other narratives. The Enlightenment and technological revolution helped the Western world to dominate over others and granted “epistemological privilege” that enabled the suppression of “less scientific” knowledge systems (de Sousa Santos, 2007b, xix). de Sousa Santos claims that “there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice,” which means that abyssal thinking and the resulting monocultural approach needs to transcend into an ecology of knowledges (2007b, xix). The ecology of knowledges, instead of denying the value of Western knowledge, decenters it to allow the contribution of other types of knowledges/cosmologies. This renders the knowledge “form the other side of the line” visible, enabling dialogue and participation.

The implications of the ecology of knowledges on HE and internationalization are profound. Universities with their European roots and a role in the rise of modernity and knowledge production in general would need radical realignment of their epistemological foundations to include non-Western thinking as an equal option (and not just an alternative) in a way that would be something else than
“Eurocentric anti-Eurocentrism” (de Sousa Santos, 2016, p. 100). Otherwise, it would risk being just another attempt to appropriate and translate non-Western knowledge within the Western knowledge frames, resulting in the reproduction of global hegemony and epistemicide. Owing to the scope of this thesis and vastness of the topic, the discussion about the ramifications of decolonial critique on HE is limited. The purpose of decolonial critique in this work is to be counter-hegemonic and render the modernity/coloniality pattern visible because it is so central to the challenges of HE and internationalization and is deeply connected to an ethical engagement with internationalization. In the liberal and neoliberal discursive orientations, the critiques of internationalization mainly revolve around the extent to which commercialization is beneficial/detrimental for it. In contrast, the critical discursive orientation, with its decolonial/counter-hegemonic critique, approaches the internationalization of HE as an epistemic issue as well as a political issue through the reproduction of asymmetrical (colonial) power relations. It is important to note that the challenges, as viewed from the critical orientation, are systemic and not individual, such as those in the liberal and neoliberal orientations. The asymmetries in power and “development” can result in different kinds of barriers for participation in internationalization that require the re-distribution of resources and epistemic considerations. After all, colonialization is not something that took place in the past but a structure reproduced and maintained by contemporary nation-states and international institutions (Stein et al., 2019).

Critiques of decoloniality

There are different types of critiques toward decoloniality in HE. Many decolonial scholars point out the danger of superficial and tokenistic approaches toward decolonialization (Andreotti et al., 2015). As Tuck and Yang (2012) remind us, decolonization is not a metaphor for a host of things used to improve society but a real-life movement that aims at the repatriation of indigenous land and life (p. 1). This implicates that research, very much like the present one, utilizing the ideas of decoloniality to critique the Eurocentric concept of internationalization may turn decolonialization into a catchphrase and thus undermine the aims and rights of marginalized/indigenous groups. Also, positionality is important when approaching the topic of decoloniality, particularly in any attempts to appropriate the knowledge by marginalized groups by those who benefit from the inequality—that is, by those who, in de Sousa Santos’ terms, speak from “this side of the line” (Noxolo, 2017; de Sousa Santos, 2007a).
Other types of critiques toward decolonial theory could be labeled as “soft-reform,” after Andreotti et al. (2015), where decolonialization is acknowledged more as a failure of institutions to integrate diverse individuals and perspectives than a structural and epistemic issue. The soft-reform can be seen as a liberal approach to decolonization, where it is important for everyone to “get along” and calls for more radical changes are dismissed “as violent, unproductive, and uncivil” (Andreotti et al., 2015, p. 26). Thinking more broadly, this type of approach is rather common; for example, a lot of internationalization research recognizes the power asymmetries between the GN and GS but frames the inequalities more as an issue of underdevelopment than that resulting from the underlying modernity/coloniality structure. Thus, the suggestions to remedy the situation contain grant programs, technical assistance, and integration measures at the host universities, and other means that are more a matter of policy do not demand change from the HE institutions themselves through addressing the systemic roots of inequalities.

This concludes the examination of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the research. Next, I will discuss my methodological approach.
4 Methodology

In this chapter, I will present my methodological choices. My research approach draws from the tradition of critical discourse analysis (CDA) that sets the research agenda. CDA also guides the epistemological and ontological assumptions related to knowledge and the social world. For data analysis, I use discourse analysis as well as social cartography. The latter also serves as a connecting link to the conceptual frameworks used in this dissertation. Figure 3 illustrates how the different parts of my methodology are connected to each other.

![Fig. 3. Overview of the methodology.](image)

Next, I will introduce CDA as a research approach before explaining my data collection procedure and research methods, discourse analysis, and social cartography.

4.1 Critical discourse analysis

This dissertation adopts a CDA approach that guides the use of methodological tools as well as the ontological and epistemological perspectives. CDA can be described as a research methodology and a larger project toward social sciences. I see CDA, first and foremost, as a project by researchers interested in social issues and the role of language (as defined broadly to include all signs related to the production of meaning in social interaction) in their emergence and reproduction. According to van Dijk (1993), CDA focuses on “the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance” (p. 283); this describes the approach taken in this dissertation rather well. Language in CDA is seen as performative and
socially constructed, which indicates that we construct our reality through language/discourses and this reality is thus subject to change over time and in different contexts. Language does not represent an objective reality, but it “is an unstable social practice whose meaning shifts depending upon the context in which it is used” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2008, p. 412). From the CDA perspective, our social practices are formed by discourses; however, as Fairclough (2003) states, not everything can be reduced to language. Our reality is also constituted by non-discursive elements such as weather, nature, and markets, but the way we ascribe meaning to them in our interaction is discursive. Thus, the epistemological stance for CDA researches asserts that although things (might) exist outside language, they can only be examined within the constraints of language. And when language is so deeply subjective, CDA research, also confined in the cage of language, rejects the idea of value neutral and objective research. CDA has a decidedly explicit ideological stance that focuses on exposing social issues and sees the researcher(s) aligned with the marginalized (Lester et al., 2016). Through the focus on social issues, CDA approaches are by default interdisciplinary and do not necessarily aim to contribute to a specific discipline (van Dijk, 1993). CDA research has an emancipatory knowledge interest, which means that research aims at not only examining and elaborating on social issues but also affecting them, and the methods, theories, and empirical work are chosen accordingly (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Although this type of approach has certainly faced criticism from more positivist-minded researchers, as Luke mentions, the approach is “not a designer option for researchers but an absolute necessity for the study of education in postmodern conditions” (Luke, 1995, as cited in Rogers et al., 2016, p. 41). CDA research calls for a high level of explicitness because it adopts, along with other strains of critical research, “a form of self-conscious criticism—self-conscious in the sense that researchers try to become aware of the ideological imperatives and epistemological presuppositions that inform their research as well as their own subjective, intersubjective, and normative reference claims” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2008, p. 406).

The unit of examination in CDA is a discourse that can be generally defined as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1). Discourse as a word can have (at least) three different uses depending on the context: 1) the use of language in social practice (semiotic elements of social practices—language, nonverbal communication, and visual images), 2) the language typical for a certain field/social practice (e.g., medical discourse), and 3) a way of speaking that expresses a certain
perspective, distinct from other perspectives (e.g., neoliberal discourse and liberal discourse) (Fairclough, 2013; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The usage of the word in this work primarily follows the third definition that emphasizes the ideological premises of discourses. When elaborating on the different discursive orientations, the difference between them is ideological as much as it is related to practices. Discourses are dialectically tied to social practices; discourses both constitute and are constituted by social practices (Fairclough, 1995). This produces a complex picture of the social practices that are culture/context dependent and are constantly shifting with discourses as their catalyst. The resulting picture has a drastically relativist character, which begs to ask how any type of systematic analysis is possible? Although the social fields (discourses, knowledge, identities, social practices, etc.) are constantly shifting, they have rules and norms that are quite inflexible and can be identified in different contexts. This provides a sufficiently stable setting for analysis, but the results are seen as contingent, partial, and contextual—that is, not something that can or should be generalized.

CDA examines how discourses are used to normalize and reproduce values and power relations. The “critical” component in my CDA approach specifically focuses on the naturalized and depoliticized discourses related to internationalization in the data, both liberal and neoliberal, that potentially reproduce harmful practices and foreclose other, alternative, discourses that might be necessary for more ethical approaches. In addition to looking for existing discourses, there is an emphasis on finding omitted, foreclosed, and/or implied discourses (Allard & Santoro, 2008). One way of examining the naturalization process is to look at how discourses change over time and between different contexts. With the internationalization of HE, it is easy to trace the emergence and consecutive naturalization of market discourses: for example, those in the Finnish national level strategies. In interviews, the change is less visible; however, examining the dominant discourses and the foci of critique typically reveals the discourses that are more naturalized than others.

Criticism has been directed toward the CDA approach both within and outside of the field of study. One of the more pertinent observations is that the “critical” approach of CDA is very much taken for granted and the objects of criticism are defined by each researcher based on their own, typically left-wing, viewpoints (Breeze, 2011). Similarly, starting research with predefined categorizations, such as critiques of neoliberalism, instead of looking for new ones to emerge from the data can be seen as problematic (Lester et al., 2016). Many researchers using the CDA approach, myself included, would try to negate the criticism by seeking
justification via pointing out a need to address systemic imbalance (such as dominance of neoliberalism) and emphasizing the explicitness on the motivations and starting points of the research as well as the researcher. However, as Breeze (2011, p. 501) notes, these type of “gambits” do not absolve the researcher from the responsibility to interpret the data in a misleading way to fit the narrative of the research. Still, in the vein of other “postmodern” research, CDA research should not be seen as something that can be generalized but is partial and situated.

CDA has also been criticized for being a loose framework for different types of research and methods. As Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) note, the CDA approach should be tailored to fit the research project and not vice versa. This does allow for certain vagueness in research design, and I hesitate to call CDA a method in general. Distinctive methods can be found in the field of CDA, such as Norman Fairclough’s textually oriented CDA or Ruth Wodak’s discourse historical approach, but both are rather specific and not applicable to all projects. As a final point of criticism, CDA research has been called out for not being constructive (Breeze, 2011). Although there is an emancipatory aim in research, the results are not necessarily taken any further than pointing out the negative aspects found in the analysis (Martin, 2004). How to translate the results for practical use is an issue with any research. In the EIHE project, the use of social cartography is a valid method for bridging different conversations in a constructive manner and for taking them beyond mere critique (more on social cartography in Sub-chapter 4.4).

4.2 Data

The data for this study comprises a set of 29 interviews collected between 2014 and 2015 from 16 different universities in seven countries. I worked in the EIHE project as a research assistant between 2014 and 2016, first part-time and later full-time. My main role in the project was to collect the interview data and to provide analyses based on the data. The participating universities, number of interviewees, and interviewee position (upper/lower administration, faculty level) are included in the Table 1 below.
Table 1. Participating universities in the EIHE interview data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Type of interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Regina</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper admin and faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western University</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södertorn University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stirling</td>
<td>UK/Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Örebro University</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper admin and faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUI Galway</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMontfort University</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper admin and faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops University</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sao Paolo</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Parana</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upper and lower admin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participating institutions were part of the EIHE project. I was recruited in the project as a research assistant to collect the interview data set for general research purposes among the project partners. Although, I have used the interview data most, other EIHE partners have utilized the data in their research projects as well. In terms of the data collection, I contacted all the partner universities, but I was not able to organize interviews in all universities included in the larger project within the given timeframe and had to move on to the analysis phase. Because of this the interview data set is represented by 16 universities, instead of the 22 taking part in EIHE. Notably, interviews could not be organized in China or South Africa, which would have balanced the GN emphasis in the interview data set.

At the time of the interviews, all interviewees were employed in positions related to internationalization as heads of internationalization, international coordinators, or academic staff assigned with administrative internationalization tasks. The interviewees were typically chosen based on recommendations by a contact from the same university, and in some cases, the individuals were contacted based on their position at the university. The premise was to choose one interviewee working at the upper management level and one working at the lower administration or the faculty level. In the most typical configuration, this entailed an interview with the head of internationalization from the central university administration and then with an international coordinator or an academic staff.
member. All interviewees were engaged in administration affairs related to internationalization, and only one interviewee was an academic staff member in charge of linguistic preparation of international students without administrative duties. The selection/distinction was to ensure a wider range of discourses rather than solely choosing interviewees among faculty members or upper management. There were typically two interviewees per university, apart from three cases—the University of Sao Paolo, University of Örebro, and Bishop’s University—where only one interview was conducted.

Most interviews were conducted via Skype but also face to face and over the phone. The language of the interviews was English, apart from Brazil, where Portuguese was used. The length of the interviews varied from 15 min to 1.5 h, averaging 35 min, and they were transcribed verbatim. The Brazilian interviews were translated and transcribed by a person with high fluency in both Portuguese (native) and English (native-level).

The data was collected through semi-structured interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2005), and the interview guide can be found in Appendix 1. The interview questions are based on the research questions of the larger EIHE project (see Appendix 2) as well as guided by the conceptual frameworks of the project (see Chapter 3). The interview questions were drafted based on the main EIHE project’s research questions 2 and 3 as well as question 1 to some extent (see Appendix 2). The conceptual frameworks were considered during the formulation of the interview questions. The questions were formulated to elicit discourses on the aims and functions of internationalization at the respondents’ universities from the perspectives of the students, staff, and institution. The interview guide was mostly compiled before my involvement in the project, but I was able to comment on the guide and introduce one question, 3b, on social responsibility in internationalization. Otherwise, as I was responsible for the interview data set collection in the EIHE project, I conducted most of the interviews (25 out of 29). The three Brazilian interviews were conducted by a local contact, and in one case, the EIHE contact at the interviewee’s university requested to do the interview herself. In this case as well as with the one in Brazil, a few extra questions were added to the interview structure to facilitate further research of the interviewers.

In addition to the interview data, in Articles I and II, different strategy documents on internationalization were used. In Article I, we utilized, along with the co-author, Dr. Karen Pashby, the aforementioned interview data that included the European participants in the EIHE project and the document analysis from the same universities. The document analysis mainly included publicly available
strategies as well as some internal documents focusing on internationalization at the partner universities (see Appendix 3 for the list of the documents). The documents were collected in 2014–2015 and included the latest documents available at the time. Not all universities had a separate international strategy, but they all had some document addressing the aims and practical measures of their internationalization activities. Article I was a direct result of our cooperation in the EIHE project, where Dr. Pashby was in charge of collecting and analyzing the document data set and my responsibility was to collect and analyze the interview data set. This means that prior to writing the article, we both had done a lot of work on the data analysis and also conducted our separate analyses for the article. However, we carefully went through both analyses and coordinated the final analyses. In Article II, the data comprised Finnish and Canadian national level strategies that were jointly analyzed by Dr. Sharon Stein and myself.

4.3 Discourse analysis

Although, CDA can be used a research method in and of itself, in this dissertation CDA is understood as a wider methodology that guides the choice of topic, use of methods as well as the epistemological and ontological premises of the research. For the analysis of the data, I use discourse analysis and social cartography (see Sub-chapters 4.3 and 4.4). CDA in general is interested in the role of language in the construction of our social reality, whereas discourse analysis as a method for CDA considers the language in use and, more specifically, the patterns that can be identified and interpreted using the theoretical framework of the study (Taylor, 2001). This Ph.D. dissertation combines three articles that all utilized a CDA approach and discourse analysis as the method. The articles included two types of data, interviews (see Articles I & III) and policy/strategy documents (see Articles I & II), but the process of discourse analysis was relatively similar in each case. The iterative nature of analysis means that the data was repeatedly read to find the recurring, interesting, and missing features. Although the analysis was guided by the EIHE conceptual frameworks, the process required “blind fate:” assumed certainty that the readings would produce interesting results without knowing what they are exactly and where they can be found (Taylor, 2001, p. 38). The textual analysis of the transcribed interview data and the document data was performed in several phases. In the analysis, I was mainly interested in the existence/omission of discourses themselves and not so much on the linguistic features in the texts
(interviews and documents) or the silences in speech, pitch, and emphases in voice, etc. during the interviews.

Before starting the analysis specifically for the articles included in this dissertation, I worked on the interview data for the EIHE project. Dr. Karen Pashby and I conducted general analyses on the interview and document data (see Appendix 4). This meant that I was rather familiar with the data by the time I started working on the analysis for Article I, and I had also completed the analyses utilizing the EIHE conceptual frameworks. The first rounds of analysis for the articles included identifying the emerging themes/patterns in the data based on the EIHE conceptual frameworks (the discursive orientations and imaginaries of HE) that were coded using NVivo qualitative analysis software; I also kept a journal about the analysis process. During the second rounds of analysis, the discourses were specifically “read” in relation to the research questions\(^{35}\) and the specific analytical categories, described below. During this phase, the discourses were coded again and suitable quotes and examples were located for the write-up. After the analyses were composed, they were once more checked with the data to ensure that the claims were rightly represented and that the examples were not used outside of their context. The discourse analysis included, in addition to the research question, looking at certain analytical categories in the data: a) how the social order is presented and justified, b) how internationalization and its actors are framed and described, and c) which discourses are hegemonic and which discourses are omitted. The questions were the same for both the interviews and the policy/strategy documents, but in the former, identifying and collecting the discourses was difficult because they were more scattered within the data.

In the question/category a), “social order” meant looking at how the context for internationalization was described and how these articulations could be placed on the heuristic. Interviewees could, for example, refer to global competition that meant a more neoliberal approach or the need for more global citizenship education that denoted a more liberal orientation. In cases where interviewees or the policy documents would mention critical points or discrepancies, I checked if the discourses could be mapped in the critical orientation or, as in most cases, to the

\(^{35}\) Research questions for Article I are as follows: 1. How is internationalization, particularly the policy to increase student numbers, rationalised, and who are the key actors and/or what are the processes associated with this aspect of internationalization? 2. What value is attributed to difference, and under what circumstances, in relation to the push to increase international student numbers? In Article III, the research question is how is social responsibility in the internationalization of HE conceptualized? Article II did not utilize the research data.
liberal–critical or neoliberal–critical interfaces. Regarding point b) in the above list, I looked at how the interviewees framed internationalization and their own, their colleagues’, the university community’s, or the society’s role as agents in the realization of internationalization and mapped the articulations to the heuristic. Finally, an important part of the analysis was, apart from the examination of the dominant discourses, to identify the discourses that were missing. As an example, when interviewees or documents described gaining more prestige as a goal in internationalization, I checked if critique or alternative approaches were presented or if such considerations were omitted. All in all, mapping and identifying the articulations was an iterative process, where the analysis was started with a certain understanding of the data that with each subsequent “round” was discussed, revised, and developed into the final forms. This process was highly intertwined with the use of social cartography as a method for presenting the data, which is presented in the next chapter.

4.4 Social cartography

In addition to discourse analysis, social cartography was utilized in the articles of this Ph.D. thesis for the analysis and presentation of the data. It should be emphasized that the role of social cartography in the EIHE project is significant, and in this work, I am using the conceptual frameworks developed in the project that themselves are cartographies as well as producing mappings of my own. In addition, social cartography has a pedagogical function because the iterative and visual nature of mapping facilitates discussions between different stakeholders and helps to bridge different conversations on the internationalization of HE in a more inclusive manner. Social cartography is accessible because it makes different discourses, their proximity, and their conflations visible, thereby helping to identify the themes that are dominant, conflated, or missing altogether. The mapping of the present situation with a range of different rationales and particularly the missing aspects facilitates a discussion that can reach beyond mere critique to find new ideas and alternatives for current activities (Khoo et al., 2019).

Social cartography functions as a tool for discourse analysis by making visible imagined/perceived borders and limits, forced/involuntary absences, and conflations of discourses. Social cartography is a form of mapping where the maps are seen as performative (Casebeer, 2016a). Instead of attempting to produce a representation of the reality, mappings are always in the process of becoming. They are created, revised, and consumed at the same time and are hence never finished;
they form a way to draw together multiple, even opposing, discourses while favoring none (Andreotti et al., 2016; Kitchin et al., 2011). Social cartography has been influenced by the postmodern turn in social science that discards totalizing meta-narratives in favor of including the “mini-narratives” of excluded individuals and groups to the discussion (Paulston & Liebman, 1993, p. 3). Furthermore, with social cartography, it is crucial to emphasize the temporality, partiality, and reflexivity of the mappings as well as to note that the aim is not “Hegelian synthesis” (Paulston, 1999, p. 447), where the plethora of perspectives is reduced in favor of a more coherent argument (Andreotti et al., 2016). This is extremely pertinent when discussing the internationalization of HE and its, at least perceived, global scale.

The origins of social cartography can be traced to the work of Rolland Paulston (1930–2006) and his colleagues at the University of Pittsburgh. Social cartography is a part of the postmodern turn in social sciences and the critical cartography movement that rose into prominence in the 1990s (Paulston, 2000). Paulston’s (2000) intent was to demonstrate how social cartography “might serve to identify and visualize difference within and between disputatious intellectual communities in a way that would open space for all knowledge perspectives discovered, privilege none, yet problematize all and promote a useful visual and verbal dialogue” (p. 3–4). Paulston’s (1996) work in comparative education was pedagogical in the sense that he attempted to provide (comparative) educators with tools to “open a way for intertextuality among competing discourses” (p. 23) via cognitive maps. He saw social cartography as “a critical practice as it questions all inclusions and exclusions, demystifies rhetoric (including its own), and interprets discourse as a site and object of struggle where different groups strive for hegemony in the production of meaning and ideology” (Paulston, 1996, p. 23). The usefulness of social cartography lies in the reflexive practice of map-making connected with the breaking down of “good–bad” binaries via the inclusion of multiple perspectives, their spatial arrangement, and how ideas and discourses (potentially) overlap and conflate. Pedagogically, these anti-essentialist notions are very important in showing how different discourses and ideas rarely arise from clean breaks; they can appear as separate, even opposing, but can still be interlinked and conflate in unexpected ways. As the reflexive practice insinuates, mapping is a subjective activity, and according to Paulston (1999), “every social map is the product of its maker and open to continuous revision and interrogation” (p. 316). Although, Paulston’s (1999) writings are philosophical and meta-analytical, he did suggest a practical way for implementing social cartography:
(1) Choose the issue or debate to be mapped. (2) Select the widest range possible of texts that construct this debate and, with close reading, translate their defining rhetorical characteristics, ideas, and worldviews. (3) Identify the range of positions in the intertextual mix … (4) Identify the textual communities that share a way of seeing and communicating reality … (5) Field test the map with the individuals or knowledge communities involved. Share the conflicting interpretations and remap as desired. (p. 453–454)

In this work (see Articles I & III), I have closely followed Paulston’s “cookbook,” although the second point has less applicability when focusing on interview data. The mapped issues can be seen as the larger research questions of the articles, and the data has been explored to identify the different positions and articulations based on the EIHE conceptual frameworks (see Figures 4–6). To exemplify the mapping process, I examined the data for articulation by referring to the income generation or rankings that could be clearly mapped in the neoliberal category. An example of this is a quote from a UK interviewee: “UK universities have invested in internationalization because international fee revenue is very important to the financial well-being of the British universities” (E136). An example quote of a liberal rationale in the interviews is “international students bring much more to the classroom, you know, [than] their fees; they bring international perspective, they bring diversity, they bring globalization” (D2). The quote posits internationalization as an activity that fosters multicultural learning and personal growth and thus belongs to the liberal category. More interesting examples are articulations belonging to one of the interfaces, such as “… teaching in English should be available but it requires long-term planning and developing of the degree programs, contents, and curriculum. And also [developing] the language competence of the teachers, their attitude, willingness, or ability to teach in a foreign language” (G1). This articulation was mapped in the neoliberal–liberal interface because the context and aim for developing teaching in English is partly related to student recruitment (neoliberal). As the mappings are visual representations of the data, they can illustrate, in addition to the distances and conflations of discourses, where discourses are missing. In Article I, I could not find articulations belonging to all discursive orientations (mainly the critical) regarding the theme of the paper: increasing the number of international students. Therefore, I added my own articulations to the empty spots, which were clearly

36 To anonymize the quotations, I have used a random letter to indicate the university and a number to differentiate between the interviewees from the same university.
marked to be differentiated from the actual data in italics, to show what they might look like if present in the data. Social cartography does not aim for generalizability, but it aims to represent a wide range of intellectual communities for the analysis (Paulston, 1999). In this vein, to increase the range of ideas presented in the mapping, the added articulations leaned on the decolonial scholarship absent from the data but present in literature. For example, increasing the epistemological pluralism in curricula (see Figure 5) emerged from the writings of de Sousa Santos (2007a) and Paraskeva (2013), among others. Because of the subjective nature of the mapping, I have “field-tested” the maps in different conferences and research group meetings, and the resulting discussions have been taken into consideration in the final versions of the mappings. The articles have also been peer-reviewed. I have included an appendix exemplifying how some of the articulations in Article I have been mapped to make the process more explicit (see Appendix 5). Furthermore, the analysis chapters in the three articles included in this dissertation contain descriptions on how the articulations found in the data were mapped.

Transparency of the researcher’s own position in the mapping is crucial for the process, but the resulting lack of objectivity and generalizability have been used to critique the approach (Casebeer, 2015). However, because the maps are in the constant stage of becoming and are seen as a process, the emphasis is shifted toward the pedagogical function; what can be achieved through the mappings and the kind of new information and perspectives they open through engagement? Also, from the perspective of more positivist research, the inclusion of possibly agonistic viewpoints can be seen as problematic; however, social cartography does not “propose” a synthesis but “a further opening of dialogue among diverse social actors” (Paulston & Liebman, 1996, p. 38). The social maps neither aim at nor are able to resolve the differences between contesting perspectives but are a way of illustrating the “representations of perceived social and cultural relations” (Paulston, 1999, p. 319) and providing visual tools to discuss these differences. Attempting to tie together discourses from different types of intellectual communities is also challenging in terms of their epistemological/ontological foundations; however, because the purpose is not generalization and synthesis but the opening of possibilities, these concerns become secondary.

Social cartography has been used in diverse research settings, but the majority of the literature is from people who have worked or studied at the University of Pittsburg, where Paulston worked most of his life. Paulston widely published studies on social cartography as a “method” for comparative education, and his colleagues have extended the discussions (for example, an entire edited book on
social cartography, Weidman & Jacobs, 2011). Outside theory building, social cartography has been used to examine teacher education (Casebeer, 2015, 2016b; Weidman et al., 2014), debates around entrepreneurial education in the US, the UK, and Finland (Erkkilä, 2000); possibilities of mapping in educational theory (Ruitenberg, 2007); policy studies (Nicholson-Goodman & Paulston, 1996; Yamamoto & Maclure, 2011); and in the EIHE project to examine the current state of the internationalization of HE and possibilities for ethical internationalization (Andreotti et al., 2016; Pashby & Andreotti, 2016; Stein 2017b; Suša, 2016; see Article I & II).

The aim of social cartography of communicating diversality to diverse audiences in an intelligible manner is lofty and, as Suša (2016) states, almost presupposes some kind of essentialist approach. Furthermore, mapping presupposes that the map-maker has the knowledge and authority to master all the epistemological positions utilized in the mappings; this highly contradicts the participatory and inclusive principles of social cartography (Gottlieb, 2011, xxiii). Epstein and Carroll (2005) accused Paulston of taking a moral high ground while attempting to replace the modernist meta-narrative with his own postmodern interpretation. Although the “single story” approach is certainly something to look for in any research, with social cartography, the criticism is unfair. The purpose of Paulston’s classic mapping of ideological communities was not to prove that he was right but to contextualize and visualize their positions in relation to each other, and he most definitely never claimed his mapping as the “truth” (Paulston, 1999). Epstein and Carroll (2005) also raised questions of the extent of relativity in postmodern research such as in social cartography that can potentially promote harmful mini-narratives. This is again a misunderstanding of the role of mapping, where specific objects of mapping are not promoted or privileged over the other. Social cartography can be seen as “a conversation opener,” and every time we deviate to view it as representative analysis, we move away from the essence of mapping as a visual representation of social/intellectual fields. The role of the map-maker is not to attempt to portray the truth but to map relations based on an informed opinion that is subject to further discussion and analysis. Because social cartography rejects meta-narratives and embraces the importance of disenfranchised/silenced discourses, the idea that the map-maker is a holder of all knowledge must be abandoned. The fact that maps are subjective and partial and can be interpreted differently based on the knowledge and experience of the interpreter is a strength because every new layer of perspectives brings something new to the discussion, potentially enabling new, undiscovered directions for
discussion and practice. According to Suša (2016), the more diverse the interpretations, the better the map.
5 Overview of the articles

This dissertation comprises three articles, two of which have been already published and one has been submitted for publication. The two published articles have been co-authored by colleagues from the EIHE project, which was an enjoyable and challenging process. I am the primary author of the two published articles and the sole author of the third. In Articles I and II, my main responsibility was writing the articles. In Article I, the co-author and I conducted separate analyses, and in Article II, I performed the data analysis. As research is a social process, having co-authors to reflect and comment on the texts was useful, and I learned a lot more this way than writing the articles on my own. The co-authoring process was also challenging as individuals have their own methodological approaches, styles and methods of writing, and their own schedules. All three articles were written based on conference presentations, and during the writing process, the contents slightly evolved from the original “master plan” for the dissertation. This caused challenges for coherence in this summary part of the dissertation, but I have viewed this as a part of the learning process and thus important. This thesis originally contained four original articles; however, owing to the realities of family and working life, one article Moving from Interdisciplinary Researchers to a Community of Transdisciplinary Global Learners (Khoo, Haapakoski, Hellstén & Malone, 2018) was not included in the thesis to reduce the scope. The contribution of each article to the overall research question is elaborated in Chapter 6.

5.1 Article I: Implications for equity and diversity of increasing international student numbers in European universities: Policies and practice in four national contexts

Article I was authored with Dr. Karen Pashby from Manchester Metropolitan University and published in June 2017 in Policy Futures in Education. As evident in the title, the article focused on the European data set of the EIHE project and included eight universities: De Montfort University (England), University of Exeter (England), and University of Stirling (Scotland) from the UK; National University of Ireland, Galway from Ireland; Örebro University and Södertörn University from Sweden; and University of Helsinki and University of Oulu from Finland. In the article, we drew from the university-level internationalization policy/strategy documents and interviews with the universities’ internationalization staff. We set
two questions for the article: 1. How is internationalization, particularly the policy to increase student numbers, rationalized, and who are the key actors and/or what are the processes associated with this aspect of internationalization? 2. What value is attributed to difference, and under what circumstances, in relation to the push to increase international student numbers? We used the CDA approach and social cartography to examine and discuss the data.

The results of data analysis showed the dominance of neoliberal and secondarily liberal orientations and their interface. Furthermore, the corporate imaginary of the university was questioned in neither the strategy documents nor the interviews, but it was more or less accepted as the norm; this was hardly surprising. It was more interesting to see how the liberal discourses conflated with the neoliberal ones. For example, the discourses belonging to the liberal orientation emphasized the importance of diversity of the campus and internationalization of the curriculum; these were seen to benefit the foreign and domestic students alike. However, the framing can also be seen as neoliberal because the diversity of the campus as well as a more accessible curriculum will definitely help in the recruitment of international student recruitment and in the marketing/branding activities of the university. Following this pattern, it could be argued that the dominance of the neoliberal discursive orientation can also be seen in the ways that the economic rationales were used to frame the other orientations. This was much more explicit in the strategy documents than in the interviews. The interviewees tended to emphasize the liberal rationales much more, but further probing often revealed that income-related factors were deemed important to enable them.

Some instances of the critical orientation were present but only in interface with the two others. For example, the facilitation of domestic disadvantaged students came up in the data, but it could not be interpreted as purely critical because the focus was more on the individual than systemic level. The critical orientation also interfaced with the neoliberal orientation in some instances; here, the discourses were about “targeted diversity,” such as setting up grant programs/tuition waivers for students from specific countries/communities abroad. This could also be seen very much as a temporary fix for a larger problem, and it is possible to see these programs as tools for further student recruitment from the same countries/communities. Furthermore, the neoliberal rationales were evident in how the existence of grants could be used in marketing and polishing the “brand armor” by framing the activities as forms of social responsibility.

We concluded in the article that although the neoliberal orientations were dominant, the existence of both the liberal and critical orientations demonstrated
that there are still possibilities to interrogate the corporate imaginary of HE that is needed for more ethical practices in the internationalization of HE. The dominance of one orientation has the potential to foreclose the others, and to promote more equitable HE and the internationalization of HE and to discuss the inherent power asymmetries, the other discursive orientations are needed as well. Another contribution of the article was the utilization of social cartography and the two mappings that complemented the data analysis (see Figures 4 and 5). The mappings provided a visual representation of the different rationales around the diversification of the campus theme and showed how in many cases, the different rationales conflate with each other.

Fig. 4. Social cartography of the key themes emerging from the document analysis (see Article I, p. 371).
5.2 Article II: The ethical implications of internationalisation for a knowledge economy: A critical discourse analysis approach to contemporary strategies in Finland and Canada

Article II was co-authored with Dr. Sharon Stein from the University of British Columbia, and it is included as a chapter in the book *Internationalisation and Transnationalisation in Higher Education*, edited by Vesa Korhonen and Pauliina Alenius and published by Peter Lang in October 2018.

In the article, we used national level HE internationalization strategies from Finland and Canada to examine the effects of KE on internationalization practices. The two documents analyzed were the *Strategy for the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015* (MOE, 2009) and Canada’s international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity (Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, 2014). For the examination of the documents, we used the CDA approach.

Our aim was not to directly compare the strategies, as the two countries are in quite different places in terms of internationalization, but to examine how the emphasis on KE framed internationalization in each document and then discuss the
convergences and differences—but more in terms of juxtaposition. The research question was how the visible focus on KE shapes the national level HE internationalization strategies in Canada and Finland and what are the ethical implications of this focus? We used Finland and Canada as the target countries because in addition to us being familiar with the contexts, both countries had interesting similarities. In both countries, the internationalization of HE had similar beginnings after the Second World War, both countries heavily emphasize KE in their national level internationalization strategies, and both countries have high hopes for education export as a business sector—Canada hoping to maintain their dominant position and Finland hoping to become a major player in the field. Our examination was grounded in the concerns about the ethical implications of KE focus for the internationalization of HE.

Our starting point was that KE is an existing phenomenon that is reframing the role of universities and thus also internationalization (Ölssen & Peters, 2005). At the same time, the imaginaries of HE are shifting, where the civic purposes of HE are merging with the corporate in various ways with various consequences (Andreotti et al., 2016; Khoo, 2011). In the internationalization of HE, a result of these trends is the superficial approach to cultural diversity that bypasses the questions around the reproduction of local and global inequities (Andreotti, 2009). An example of this is the tuition fees that become naturalized through the commodification discourses advanced by the neoliberal KE “ideology” that consequently frames HE students differently based on their nationality. Education becomes a “luxury item” that only some can afford. This example is perhaps more understandable by looking at the changes in Finnish HE when the tuition fees for non-EU/EEA student were introduced in 2017. In the current situation, some students pay and most do not. This is highly unequal when examined from the “social democratic” perspective, but it is being legitimized through the discourses supporting government austerity measures and the KE discourse, where education export is seen as a lucrative business (MOEC, 2018). As a side note, this type of legitimization is not purely state-dictated but is largely approved by the HE sector that in Finland is getting more and more invested into “academic capitalism” (Kaidesoja & Kauppinen, 2014).

In the article, we discussed the challenges of the concept of a KE that in part is “a discursive recasting of the relations between ideas and the economy” (Bastalich, 2010, p. 845). Furthermore, KE as a concept is vague, and there are dozens of different interpretations of the same phenomenon (Carlaw et al., 2012; Peters, 2001). Still, the concept has discursive power in the “public domain,” and it is used
to advance a host of different policies. In HE, KE approaches emphasize the exchange value of research and education as well as economic imperatives (education export). In a country such as Finland, this means that universities are urged to market and sell services and the exchange value of research and education changes their contents to better serve the interest of funders and students as customers. Because marketing is mainly about generating a positive image of an institution, it can become extremely problematic as it reduces space to provide critical commentary toward inequalities globally (e.g., tuition fees) as well as epistemic hegemony and national exceptionalism (“we have the best education system in the world!”). The absence of critiques toward the dominant economic and exceptionalist approaches then has the potential to reproduce, among other things, power asymmetries based on European superiority and non-European inferiority (Stein & Andreotti, 2016).

In our analysis of the strategy documents, it was visible how in Canada, internationalization was fully framed through the economic viewpoint and how in Finland, there were elements of the civic and corporate imaginaries in a sometimes conflicting manner. The economic emphasis with exceptionalist characteristics in the documents was seen in othering, where individuals were placed in different categories depended on their nationality and immigration status. In the Canadian strategy, the focus was on the recruitment of students from specific countries that were seen as lucrative markets both in terms of education export and export in general. These were big markets such as India, China, and Brazil, and the recruitment of students from other countries, not specified in the strategy, was seen secondary. Also, because internationalization was only seen through its economic impacts in Canada (how much income, how many jobs created, and how many highly skilled students introduced to the domestic labor markets), the social and cultural impacts were completely bypassed.

As already mentioned, the Finnish strategy was more ambiguous in tone, fusing the civic and corporate imaginaries of HE. This resulted in contradictory rationales. On the one hand, “global responsibility,” including diverse capacity building activities, was promoted; on the other hand, universities were urged to leverage the contacts gained through these “aid” activities for education export purposes. Also, the civic emphasis in the strategy was usually framed as something enabled by the economic activities. The othering was also visible in the strategy, where individuals from abroad were divided into two categories: immigrants and non-Finnish. The
immigrants comprised individuals already living in the country\textsuperscript{37} and the non-Finnish were degree-seeking students, teachers, and researchers. What is important here is that the two “foreign” groups of people were framed through the different imaginaries of the university. The immigrants were seen through the civic imaginary as a domestic social responsibility. The immigrants were seen as individuals who lack skills and competencies that universities need to provide them with\textsuperscript{38}. The non-Finnish individuals were seen through the corporate imaginary as highly coveted (future) professionals, the top-talent that Finland needs to attract to say ahead in the global competition. For us, this categorization was an example where “internationalisation is used as an arena for addressing forms of social difference, in ways that potentially reproduce existing social inequalities, or create new ones” (see Article II, p. 58).

In conclusion, we found that the national level internationalization strategies in Finland and Canada discursively naturalize the reproduction of a limited vision of HE functions in the service of a national KE. This limits the space for critical questioning regarding the effects of the diminishing support for other social purposes of HE or questions about local and global equity. Because internationalization is largely framed through its economic impacts, the resulting discourses leave very little room to discuss the reproduction of the colonial relations, othering, and more concrete effects of the activities, such as brain-drain. Still, as in the case of Finland, although the economic imperatives were ascendant through the emphasis on KE, the ambiguous mix of discourses means that there are still chances to counteract the corporate imaginary of HE.

As a related note, just when we submitted the article in March 2017, a new national level HE strategy was released (see MOEC, 2018). It was unfortunately too late to include it in our analysis. The document had significantly changed from the 2009 version, but the ambiguity was still evident as was the economic focus.

\textsuperscript{37} The immigrants were defined in the strategy as follows (MOE, 2009): “A person with an immigrant background here refers to first-generation immigrants who have entered the country primarily for reasons other than study or for short-term employment. In addition, a person with an immigrant background can refer to second- or even third-generation immigrants who form a group somewhat differing from the majority population.” (p. 44)

\textsuperscript{38} It is interesting why the Finnish HE internationalization strategy also included matters related to the “integration” of immigrants as this is generally a task of the Ministry of Labour.
5.3 Article III: Conceptualizing social responsibility in higher education internationalization

Article III was the first one that I started to write during my Ph.D. process, but its completion was severely postponed owing to the other articles, where co-authoring and the publishing deadlines required prioritization. The theme of the article has been for a long time of special interest to me, predating my Ph.D., and I was able to include a related question to the interview guide that was otherwise already completed before I was part of the EIHE project. Questions around social responsibility have been raised many times through my work as an international coordinator. In many of the international projects I was involved in, there were always justified questions about whose terms the work is conducted on, who benefits, and how and how much (domestic) resources can be used? In the current situation, where internationalization is not fully integrated into the operations of universities, activities drawing resources from the “core activities” can be subjected to scrutiny by the management as well as the staff (Jiang & Carpenter, 2013). Thus, there is a noticeable rift between national and international agendas that begs to ask which “responsibilities” are more important.

The research question in the article is how social responsibility in the internationalization of HE is conceptualized. My data comprised all 29 interviews collected in the EIHE project and they represented 16 universities in seven countries. All interviewees were working in internationalization in upper management or in implementation as coordinators or academics with internationalization duties. The research question is related to several items in the interview guide but most closely to 3b: “Do the strategies and/or policies promoting internationalism at your university mention ‘social responsibility’? If so, how is it understood and/or conceptualized?” Discussion related to the theme also came up in the sub-questions of the final question (see Appendix 1 for the interview guide). The following were the specific items (three out of seven in total): [Internationalization] helps people from other countries (4e); enables the inclusion and recognition of a diversity of voices, especially those who tend to be disadvantaged (4f); can help in integrating non-Western knowledge systems and interdisciplinary study to enable changes in current systems (social, political, educational, etc.) and possibilities for alternative futures (4g).

Social responsibility in internationalization is approached in literature from many different strands of research. To explore the coverage, I divided the literature into three categories that are partially overlapping and definitely not exhaustive.
The categories are global citizenship education (GCE), education for sustainable development (ESD), and critical internationalization scholarship. Although the literature approaches social responsibility in the internationalization of HE from different perspectives, the ideas around social, economic, and ecological sustainability connect the literature. I defined social responsibility as a contract between a university and its stakeholders, including the domestic and “international” students and staff, regional and national society, and international partners. When inspecting social responsibility in internationalization, I limited my examination to education to reduce the scope.

Based on the data analysis, the themes related to social responsibility in internationalization could be divided into three broad and overlapping categories with their separate subcategories: global responsibility, development cooperation, and domestic social responsibility in internationalization. Social responsibility in internationalization was understood in diverse ways and the breadth of articulations was surprising. As evident from Figure 6, the discourses ranged from the neoliberal idea of selling a transformative product (i.e., a degree) to individuals who can after graduation make a difference in their home countries to the need for capacity development projects and calls for epistemological pluralism.

Fig. 6. Social cartography of the key themes emerging from the interview transcript analysis on social responsibility in the internationalization of HE (see Article III, p. 17).
Overall, and particularly compared with Article I, the discourses on social responsibility were very much grounded in the civic imaginary of HE, with many articulations belonging to the critical discursive orientation and the liberal–critical interface. Social responsibility was not a part of the official strategies in the majority of interviewees’ universities, but the interviewees discussed the theme in more applied ways. This was a result in itself, but in the study, I was more interested in the interviewees’ conceptualizations of social responsibility than in if it exists in the strategies or not. Many discourses were critical toward the current activities of the interviewees’ universities, implying that, in part, the agenda of social responsibility in internationalization is at odds with the neoliberal orientation. Or, at least, the interviewees discussed how they would like to see more socially responsible activities take place, which was not possible at the time of the interviews. This also explains why social responsibility or the related themes were not always found in the strategies, as this would cause contradictions between the economic and more socially responsible rationales.

Although the discourses were mostly along the liberal–critical axis, there were very few instances of the purely critical discursive orientation. Considerable focus was on the individual and institutional “remedies” that fail to address the issues causing the problems in the first place. Different grant programs and capacity development projects are definitely a step in the right direction, but when the challenge is looked from the viewpoint of the modernity/coloniality structure, there is little impact. Addressing coloniality would mean changing the structures of HE itself, and this would be costly and painful because it would mean confronting our complicity in creating and reproducing global injustices (Stein, 2017b). In terms of the data, it is not difficult to understand the relative absence of the purely critical articulations, even as the entire “framing” was more liberal–critical oriented, owing to the invisibility of the modernity/coloniality structure. Conceptualizing the actual problems in terms of practical and epistemological considerations is difficult when you are “on this side of the line” and are unable to recognize them (de Sousa Santos, 2007a). I concluded in the study that more socially responsible engagement in internationalization requires taking the perspective beyond the neoliberal and liberal perspectives. However, this is a long process, and like one of the interviewees stated, perhaps social responsibility is the next evolutionary step in the internationalization of HE.
6 Main findings

The findings across the three articles as well as the interview data set as a whole showed the diversity and complexity of the internationalization of HE as a phenomenon and how much there is to unpack in terms of more ethical practices. The interviewees had different foci based on their position at the university as well as in relation to internationalization, which reflected on the discourses in the data. Also, the location of the universities affected what was articulated, although not as much as anticipated. The global isomorphism resulting from the bench-marking and best practices approaches was visible through the appearance of similar discourses between different institutions in the interview data set. As an example, I assumed that the Brazilian and Finnish interviews would have included more diversity of discourses than they actually did. The aim of this Ph.D. dissertation was not to produce quantitative or generalizable results but to discuss the complexity of the internationalization of HE from different perspectives. Still, a few topics and patterns in the interview data came up more frequently than others and are worth mentioning before the attention is directed to the research question of the thesis.

Topic-wise, almost every interviewee mentioned how internationalization is just one of the rationales in HE, which means a battle for resources and a necessary buy-in from the staff and students. Also, based on most interviews, it became evident how internationalization is in part a “numbers game,” wherein quantifiable results, which are not necessarily based on any “real” institutional need, are important in determining the success of internationalization activities. As an example, many universities have goals such as 20% of the student population should be international or 50% of the students should get internationalization experience during studies, and these numbers could not be justified with any research or “data.” These observations are not very novel and follow the conclusions presented in the literature on the role of rising managerialism in internationalization and HE in general (Khoo, 2011; Nokkala, 2007). The role of the English language in internationalization was also a commonly appearing discourse, but it was one that took different guises depending on the country and context. In the non-English-speaking institutions, the challenge was the limited proficiency of the staff and the low number of courses offered in English. In the English-speaking institutions, the challenges revolved around the domestic students’ lack of knowledge in other languages; this was provided as a partial explanation for why students had low interest in studying abroad. In the same
context, another challenge was, at times, the low proficiency of international students (and staff) that caused friction with the domestic students. Again, this notion about the challenging role of English is not new. Considerable research has been conducted on how internationalization is oftentimes understood as teaching in English; although this might be necessary in many contexts, it is not the same as internationalization (Fabricius et al., 2017). This approach underestimates the role of pedagogical and curricular considerations in education for international students and/or domestic students in the form of internationalization at home. Related to the role of curriculum work, there was surprisingly little discussion around how the delivery of an internationalized curriculum is facilitated. Staff training was mostly mentioned in terms of intercultural training to avoid conflicts with international students, which can be related to supporting curriculum work as well. However, this was not explicitly articulated to be the case (see Article I), and it could be argued that owing to the growing managerialist agenda in internationalization that mainly looks at indicators and not contents, the bureaucratic and educational processes are becoming separated. Most interviewees were working in internationalization administration and their work input was assessed differently to the teaching staff; therefore, the success and development needs in internationalization might look different, although the aims for internationalization themselves might be shared by the entire university.

From these few general remarks on the data, I will now explore the main research question for this summary part of the dissertation: to what extent and how can the critiques toward neoliberal and liberal agendas help to identify ethical issues in the internationalization of HE? There are three, interrelated, main findings/ideas that are important when responding to the research question: the dominance and naturalization of neoliberal discourses in the data, the extent to which the neoliberal discursive orientation conflates with the two other main orientations, and the extent to which the critical orientation was absent in the data.

6.1 The dominance and naturalization of neoliberal discourse

As described in Article I, the neoliberal orientation was dominant across the interview (and strategy) data, followed by the liberal orientation. Although Article I targeted European universities, the dominance of neoliberal discourses applies to the data as a whole. Income generation was a strong rationale for internationalization in the interviews, and where tuition fees were not a possibility or had little effect on the overall funding (Brazil, Sweden, Finland, and Scotland),
institutional prestige, another strong neoliberal motive, was deemed important. Both the income generation logic and emphasis on rankings/prestige show a shift toward the corporate imaginary in HE because universities are seen as competing with each other on a global scale for students and better positions on the ranking lists. Although competition also exists between the HE institutions domestically, the “playing field” is global. As an example, the interviewees from the University of Helsinki mentioned their aim to be among the 50 best universities in the world according to an undisclosed ranking listing and noted that this will help their position in Finland through, for example, increased networking possibilities with other prestigious HE institutions around the world. This in turn will improve the chances of obtaining competitive research funding, domestically and internationally, because international networking is emphasized in the funding calls. Like the other interviewee from Helsinki commented, the rankings are not the aim in themselves but internationalization is used to improve the quality of the institution that in turn will translate into better rankings. Although this argument is logical, the inherent problem with this kind of neoliberal approach is that it connects the internationalization of HE to competition, where rather randomly and externally selected values are used to define what makes a good university. For example, in the popular Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU, 2018) ranking, 30% weight is on the Nobel prizes and Fields Medals of the staff and alumni and 20% on the articles published in two journals: The Nature and The Science. Further, 40% of the score is based on citations and the remaining 10% on the “per capita performance,” where the number of full-time staff is divided by the weighted scores of the other indicators (ARWU, 2018). There is no indicator for the quality of education (only for the quality of faculty based on Nobel prizes and Fields medals) or for student experience, and the overall ranking is biased toward Anglo-Saxon research universities emphasizing STEM subjects (Rauhvargers, 2011). Rankings thus simultaneously reproduce and reinforce the superiority and epistemic privilege of the Western academia (Shahjahan, Blanco-Ramirez & Andreotti, 2017). Using internationalization to diversify funding or gain prestige and better rankings frames the activities through the neoliberal orientation that can potentially shadow and/or foreclose the liberal and critical orientations. Income generation and rising prestige both rely on positive brand image, which means “managing” critical voices and presenting itself with an absence of unfavorable discourses (Levin, 2007; Ramirez & Hyslop-Marginson, 2015). For example, the Finnish and Canadian national level internationalization strategies do not mention ethical dilemmas such as brain-drain or cultural imperialism. These issues were
also scarce in the interview data (see Article I & II). Mentioning the negative impacts of student recruitment or education export is simply not good for business and is an example of how the dominance of the neoliberal rationales can foreclose ethical considerations.

The dominance of the neoliberal rationales can also in part be explained through naturalization, where the neoliberal rationales in internationalization and in HE generally have become the new norm, reproduced by national policies, institutional strategies, as well as the university staff and students. Even when the neoliberal bias in the rationales around internationalization was acknowledged, it was accepted as a prevailing condition that cannot be changed. This echoes the “There is no alternative” discourse around neoliberal globalization, signaling that it is inevitable and unstoppable and has no feasible alternatives (Rizvi, 2017). The globalization mantra follows a “logic of appearance,” where the socio-economic order is presented as an existing fact without the need for evidence (Fairclough, 2003, p. 95; see Article II). In the internationalization of HE, this sense of inevitability of the neoliberal agenda can also be used as an excuse to promote the economic side of internationalization if the general view is that there is no alternative and therefore it is better to take part in the “game,” as otherwise someone else will reap the benefits. This inevitability aspect of internationalization was more prominent in the strategy documents used in Article II, but it was also present in the interviews.39

6.2 The conflation of neoliberal discourse

The second set of findings came through the use of social cartography to examine how the liberal and critical orientations conflated with the neoliberal orientation. For example, when looking at the diversification of campus discourses in Article I, the interface between the neoliberal and liberal orientations was the most populated. Although the research did not aim to provide representative or quantitative results, the interviews and strategy documents seem to indicate that the liberal and critical values and ideas are increasingly being framed through the neoliberal orientation. The realities of funding drive the decision-making in internationalization toward actions that combine the orientations. This is not necessarily bad because

39 Note that owing to the national policies and the participating universities’ funding requirements, it might not be feasible or realistic for the strategies or interviewees to promote the liberal and/or critical rationales over the economic ones. Instead, the question here is whether the other rationales are constrained or foreclosed by the dominance and naturalization of the neoliberal rationales.
internationalization in general was viewed very positively in the data and even if activities were funded for benefitting economic aims, such as degree student recruitment, this can still be seen as increasing the level of and “consciousness” about internationalization. However, there are two issues. First, if the emphasis is mainly on the economic aspects, this might be done at the cost of the liberal and/or critical aspects and might have unethical consequences owing to the incommensurability of values. For example, if student recruitment is the key priority, the differential fees cause inequality between the domestic and foreign students. Second, internationalization has non-economic sides such as transformative learning and different international projects that do not have quantifiable or commodifiable outcomes. If the economic rationale in internationalization is naturalized, the less “profitable” activities might be ceased or reduced in scale. For example, in Finland, where education export has become a strategic focus for universities, this naturalization can decrease the resources on the non-education export-related cooperation with institutions in the GS. In Article II, we juxtaposed the Finnish and Canadian national level policies and observed that although both countries started with similar premises in the internationalization of HE, the neoliberal advancement has been much stronger in Canada, which is evident in the aid-to-trade transformation (Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013). Whereas the Finnish strategy makes contradictory statements about the importance of global responsibility, in Canada, the cooperation in the strategy is solely valued according to its economic potential (see Article II)40. The hegemony, and naturalization, of the neoliberalism/commercialization of education leads to a situation where it is increasingly difficult to justify the use of resources on something that does not have an immediate material payback. As observed in the aforementioned strategy documents and in the interviews, the neoliberal rationales are presented in a manner where they are required in order to afford the liberal and critical rationales.

The fusing of rationales can take forms that have ethical ramifications. For example, internationalization at home is currently seen as an important form of internationalization that enables the participation of the non-mobile students. It can be viewed as a liberal rationale through, for example, the idea of cultural exchange opportunities; however, in the strategies and interviews, internationalization at home is strongly connected with student recruitment and thus becomes conflated

40 As explained in the Article II, whereas the Finnish strategy was compiled by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Canadian strategy was produced by the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development. This means that the two strategies are not directly comparable, although both have been made in consultation with stakeholders representing education and industry sectors.
with the neoliberal orientation. Internationalization at home requires curricular and organizational changes to education, where the contents of courses are “internationalized.” This means, among other things, that international students are included more and more in the same classes with the domestic students, which has a connection to student recruitment, through the development of a more inclusive campus that can be utilized in marketing, etc. This is problematic, first because it implies that the role of the international students is to function as cultural fodder for the non-mobile domestic students who can and have the right to consume the otherness of the international students (Suša, 2016). Second, through the conflation, the fundamentally liberal rationale of internationalization at home is used to justify student recruitment and income generation. In the interviews, many discourses on the conflation of rationales and generally the liberal rationales were often used to “soften” the more economic discourses (see Article I, p. 373).

6.3 The relative absence of the critical discursive orientation

The third finding is related to the extent to which the critical discursive orientation was present in the data. As discussed in Article III, at times, the critical rationales are at odds with the universities’ strategies, and although the interviewees were urged to voice their opinions instead of merely acting as official representatives of the institution, the discourses belonging to the critical orientation were rather few. This is not to say that the interviewees were not critical and thoughtful, but within their comments during the interviews, the scope of criticism was narrow, mostly focusing on the liberal and neoliberal perspectives and the conflict between the international and national agendas. The discourses around the issues of internationalization were related to visible issues such as student integration and treatment and not so much on internationalization itself and its highly political and asymmetrical nature. The absence of the critical orientation is understandable. As explored in the theoretical framework, the modernity/coloniality division is largely invisible, suggesting that the critiques in the rather Western/Eurocentric university settings are mostly directed toward the neoliberal and liberal perspectives. Recognizing certain topics in internationalization, such as epistemicide, as a problem is difficult because the naturalized idea of the superiority of Western knowledge is very ubiquitous. Furthermore, the Western practices and rules in both HE and the internationalization of HE can mean that decolonial approaches seem unfeasible or unintelligible. Regarding the data, the discussions around, for example, structural barriers in the internationalization of HE and issues with mono-
epistemic knowledge production were limited. Question 4 in the interviews included an item prompting discussion around the decolonial possibilities in internationalization, but only few interviewees commented on these at any length or depth. It was interesting to note that the internationalization rationales belonging to the critical discursive orientation were seen as important in the interviews from the personal perspective but not so much from the institutional one. There were articulations where interviewees lamented that their institutions did not do enough to support the rationales falling under the critical orientation. One example would be adopting more epistemological pluralism in the curricula. Thus, in many cases, there was a discrepancy between the perceptions of the institutional and personal rationales, and the latter were oftentimes more liberal/critical than the former. However, again, if the neoliberal rationales are dominant and naturalized, the critical discourses are easily foreclosed as incompatible; this limits the potential for more ethical engagement in internationalization.

Articles I and III showed an interesting contrast in the distribution of articulations. Article I, dealing with increasing the number of international students, showed the dominance of neoliberal and then liberal rationales, whereas Article III, which examined social responsibility in internationalization, included articulations belonging to the liberal–critical axis. Social responsibility was not a part of most universities’ strategies, but it was a topic that was deemed important. The question asked in Article III was “Do the strategies and/or policies promoting internationalism at your university mention ‘social responsibility’? If so, how is it understood and/or conceptualized?” This question prompted many interviewees to conceptualize what social responsibility would mean in their context. In many cases, the articulations of social responsibility were critical toward the neoliberal rationales, such as the higher tuition fees of international students, which is why it is easy to speculate the reason for social responsibility being absent from the strategies at most participating universities. Using international students’ higher fees to subsidize the education of domestic students or the colonial undertones of development work were examples of unsustainable practices in the data. Moreover,

41 Question 4 inquired about institutional rationale for internationalization, and it included the rationales that could be labeled as critical: e) helps people from other countries; f) enables the inclusion and recognition of a diversity of voices, especially those who tend to be disadvantaged; g) can help in integrating non-Western knowledge systems and interdisciplinary study to enable changes in current systems (social, political, educational, etc.) and possibilities for alternative futures. Also, part b) of question 3, “Do the strategies and/or policies promoting internationalism at your university mention ‘social responsibility’? If so, how is it understood and/or conceptualized?” was designed with the critical “potential” in mind (see Appendix 1; Article III).
there were some examples on how internationalization in some cases had detrimental effects domestically. For example, an emphasis on foreign languages can weaken the status of domestic minority languages. The idea of social responsibility was deemed as important; however, at the time of the interviews, it was weakened by competing rationales, most typically by the neoliberal.

One of the major structural challenges found in the data was related to the othering practices connected to the division between the domestic and international students. By othering I mean a process of social differentiation based on race, religion, nationality, student status, etc. that is used to differentiate and group international students as separate from the domestic. Multiple interviewees commented that a university can only be international when there is no more division between the international and domestic students. However, as indicated in the interviews, the domestic and international students tend to form two distinct cohorts, and this by itself was not necessarily seen as an issue. Although diversity was univocally seen as a positive effect of internationalization, there was a need for diversification within diversification. Some interviewees described how large mono-ethnic international groups were seen in a negative light by students and staff and groups labeled as “Chinese” and “Arab” were singled out in this context. Although not explicitly mentioned, this implies that some nationalities are more “wanted” than others. One UK interviewee did mention how domestic students had easier cooperation with European students than with Asian students through the perception of cultural similarity. Rather than a systemic issue, this type of racialization or negative attitude toward multiculturalism was seen as a problem of individuals, students, and staff that could be solved through intercultural training and/or mobilities and internationalization at home. This is also an instance where the neoliberal agenda of student recruitment might go against the wishes of the domestic staff and students and produce negative reactions such as racialization and othering (Lee & Rice, 2007). Student recruitment was generally perceived as an important rationale across the participating universities (Pashby, 2016), and China, for example, was seen as a priority market for recruitment (see Article II). However, because internationalization usually is a top-down process (de Wit, 2011), the staff and student perspectives might be outweighed by the economic pressures.

6.4 Summary of the main findings

To summarize the main findings and as an response to the research question of the dissertation, when examining the neoliberal and liberal orientations in the
internationalization of HE, first, as long as the neoliberal is dominant, the affiliated rationales become naturalized. Moreover, although they can be criticized, they are seen as inevitable and mandatory parts of the internationalization process. Examples of this are increasing the amount of (fee-paying) international degree students and raising the prestige of the universities through rankings. When the rationales are perceived as inevitable, the ethical considerations around them are pushed aside or silenced. Differential fees, othering of international students, and brain drain are phenomena that might be recognized but not in a way that typically leads to action. Despite being largely framed through the neoliberal, the liberal rationales in internationalization were more emphasized by the interviewees. However, even if the liberal orientation could become dominant, this would not necessarily be desirable because the liberal rationales are generally universalist and excessively focus on the individual and institutional perspectives that, like the focus on the neoliberal, continue to leave many of the global injustices in HE unchallenged. Furthermore, attempts to “fix” these challenges can lead to superficial and tokenistic approaches toward inclusion, where modernity is seen as the answer for “underdevelopment” and marginalization and not as the root cause. This enables universities to continue their operations without the need for systemic analysis and change and to feel good while doing it (Andreotti et al., 2015).

Second, as long as the neoliberal orientation is dominant, the liberal and critical orientations are easily framed through and instrumentalized by the neoliberal orientation. The liberal and critical rationales fuse with the neoliberal, transforming the previously civic processes into the corporate imaginary. For example, the liberal aim of internationalization in facilitating transformative learning becomes secondary when more instrumental perspectives, such as CV-building, are emphasized or grant programs are established for disadvantaged groups to enable favorable marketing materials and targeted recruitment. This also diverts resources from the non-profit activities to those with more economic potential. It makes less sense to engage in capacity development projects when the same work can be sold as consultation. The fusing can also lead to situations where for-profit activities, such as short-term/service-learning programs and selling degrees with “transformative potential,” are re-framed as beneficial and benevolent activities that increase the social responsibility and responsiveness of HE institutions (Jefferess, 2012). The for-profit focus further reinforces the colonial undertones of the internationalization of HE, where students from the GS are seen as requiring Western education to be able to “make a change” in their own national contexts. For-profit exchanges mean even more exclusivity in participation.
Finally, as long as the modernity/coloniality structure is not recognized, the power asymmetries and “epistemicide” in HE and internationalization cannot be properly tackled. Because Western HE is seen as ubiquitous and a progressive force, its role in producing global injustices can be ignored or rejected, which can lead into the naturalization of unethical practices. An example is othering that pits domestic and international students in different cohorts and largely views the former from a deficit-based framework. Also, international projects, non- or for-profit alike, can end up reproducing colonial relations despite benevolent aims. This is bound to happen when development is understood as an aim and a result of modernity instead of modernity being seen as promoting a Western idea of development. In education export, an often repeated discourse is that certain countries in the GS are lacking HE capacity and therefore the universities in the GN can help with the demand (for example, MOE, 2009). Although this might be true in certain cases, the relations position both the home countries and the international students as lacking education that only the GN can then provide, for a fee. This approach once again bypasses the history and interpretation of development and the role of Western HE in maintaining and reproducing the system that has resulted in the perceived “underdevelopment” of national education systems in the GS.
Discussion

In this Ph.D. dissertation, I have identified obstacles that hinder the attempts at promoting more nuanced and ethically driven approaches in the internationalization of HE. I have critically examined neoliberal and liberal rationales and juxtaposed them with the critical approaches, informed by decolonial readings. In the title of this thesis, I mention the “market exclusions” and “false inclusions” that refer to the findings. The former refers to how the dominance of the neoliberal orientation has the potential to foreclose ethical considerations, such as the asymmetries in internationalization globally and critiques toward market-based approaches. “False inclusions” refers to the liberal discursive orientation and ideas around universalist notions about, for example, the beneficial nature of internationalization. The recognition of the neoliberal/liberal binary is rather unproductive because both “ideological” positions are results of the same Eurocentric intellectual tradition and thus criticism directed toward the binary from a Eurocentric position can only be self-referential (Stein, 2016b). Moreover, as seen in this research, the neoliberal orientation has the potential to “colonize” the liberal (and critical) orientations by framing the formerly civic processes through the economic lens. This can be witnessed, for example, as universities increasingly adopt entrepreneurial activities, mainly transforming education and research from a public to a private good but in the name of the public good/interest (Hensley, Galilee-Belfer & Lee, 2013).

To disrupt the neoliberal–liberal binary, I have employed the critical orientation to highlight how both neoliberal and liberal orientations conflate and have limited perspectives on education. This is particularly relevant in the internationalization of HE owing to its global dimension. In the critical orientation, the starting point is that the naturalization of the Western “epistemological privilege” globally has created injustices that have repressed or silenced local knowledge traditions. From the perspective of the critical orientation, the internationalization of HE is seen as highly political and asymmetric and helping to maintain the violence of the modernity/coloniality structure. Thus, a short answer to my research question “to what extent and how can the critiques toward neoliberal and liberal agendas help to identify the ethical issues in the internationalization of HE?” would be that such critiques help to recognize the inherently problematic nature of internationalization and enable the search for new imaginaries and approaches. The recognition itself will not solve the problem; doing something about the matter would demand deep
introspection from HE institutions, and whether that will exist in universities is another question.

Regarding the first main finding—the dominance and naturalization of neoliberal discourse—the strong emphasis of economic rationales and the dominance of neoliberalism in internationalization has been discussed by many authors (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Deschamps & Lee, 2015; Robson, 2011). The insight in this study into the topic was not so much that the dominance could be found in the data but how neoliberal agendas, such as profit-seeking or gaining better position in international rankings, were seen as natural parts of internationalization. In the data, many interviewees explicitly discussed how neoliberal agendas were gaining importance in internationalization, but the critiques revolved around what should be done in addition rather than instead42. The hegemony of neoliberalism is thus causing a certain lack of vision for alternatives and certain “blindness” to ethical considerations. International rankings, for example, are clearly flawed instruments for measuring “the worth” of any institution (Rauhvargers, 2011). Still, many universities strive to be included in the league tables and gain higher placements, even if getting to the top might not be feasible or institutionally relevant (Kehm, 2014). However, as rankings are utilized in national policy-making and prospective students utilize them in their decision-making, many universities have no alternatives but to participate in the game. As the rankings only cover 1%–3% of all the universities in the world (Rauhvargers, 2011), they appear to be a minor issue in HE globally. However, rankings, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores, have captured attention in the national level policy-making, and according to Kehm (2014), every nation “wants at least ‘one Harvard University’” (p. 111).

The relative strength of neoliberal rationales causes many ethical dilemmas, and they can exist through the foreclosure of incompatible views (Ramirez & Hyslop-Marginson, 2015). For example, if nations wish to attract highly skilled workforce either through student recruitment or directly into the labor-market, discussing brain-drain would contrast with these aims and cause an ethical dilemma. Because of this, for example, in the two latest nation-level strategies on the internationalization of HE in Finland, brain-drain is not mentioned, although attracting skilled workforce is one of the key aims in both documents (MOEC, 2009,

---

42 This statement is not to say that rationales in internationalization should exclude economic considerations. Rather, I mean to say that as many interviewees perceived the economic imperatives in internationalization problematic, it would not seem out of place to try to figure alternatives for something that is causing contradictions.
This type of selective presentation could be seen as a form of “willful ignorance,” as discussed by Suša (2016), that helps individuals to maintain an image of doing good.

The second finding explored how the non-economic rationales fused with the neoliberal rationale. This has been explored in the literature through themes such as academic capitalism (Kauppinen & Kaidesoja, 2014; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), change of education from a public into a private good (Hensley et al., 2013; Olssen & Peters, 2005), and change in the internationalization policies from aid to trade (Trilokekar, 2010). In this study, it was seen how while the economic emphases are evident, the activities were, in the interviews, still largely discussed in liberal terms. The internationalization of curricula and offering programs in English (in non-English-speaking countries) are examples that could be justified through liberal discourses, but the larger context can be connected to pursuing economic benefit because the activities boost student recruitment (Deschamps & Lee, 2015). Although it cannot be claimed that, in general, the internationalization practitioners prefer the liberal orientation over the neoliberal, some indication of this could be found in the data. It is possible to speculate that as neoliberal rationales have well-known unethical side-effects, such as inequality and brain-drain, explicitly labeling these rationales as the main motivation for internationalization can seem distasteful. There is still a belief within the HE community that internationalization stands for “humanistic ideas,” although the value aspect is losing to more instrumental, quantifiable aims (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p. 15). Some indication toward the complexity of the situation can be found in the EAIE Barometer “Money Matters” (2019). In the Barometer, internationalization practitioners within the European higher education area (EHEA) were inquired about funding-related matters in their institutions/countries. The EHEA average for respondents claiming that financial benefits were one of the main goals for internationalization at their HE institutions was 12%, ranging from 6% in Denmark and the Netherlands to 42% in the UK (EAIE, 2019). This is a very low overall percentage compared with goals such as “prepare students for global world” that ranged from 55% to 94% in different countries (EAIE, 2019). This finding seemingly contradicts with some of the claims in this dissertation, where neoliberalism and economic benefits are seen as important drivers in the internationalization of HE. However, the prevalence of some other top rationales
in internationalization in the Barometer\textsuperscript{41}, such as “institutional reputation and competitiveness” (EHEA average 53%) or “international student recruitment” (EHEA average 53%) and “programs in non-local language” (EHEA average 33%) (EAIE, 2019), shows that neoliberal/economic rationales are important for institutions, although they are not necessarily directly/explicitly linked to direct financial benefit. For example, institutional reputation and the pursuit of higher rankings, as explored in this dissertation, are strong neoliberal rationales that have economic impacts, such as increased potential for domestic and international student recruitment and better chances in securing different types of funding (Kehm, 2016; Rauhvargers, 2011). To further complicate the matter, different research show different results. For example, only 6% of respondents in the Netherlands in the EAIE Barometer placed economic benefit as a main institutional goal in internationalization (2019). In an OECD survey, albeit a decade earlier, the Netherlands was seen as one of the countries most interested in seeking revenue through internationalization (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). It is possible that the attitudes have changed between the different research projects, and as mentioned in the EAIE Barometer conclusion, “many respondents might have opted for ‘socially desirable’ responses” to the survey (EAIE, 2019, p. 22). Direct financial benefit seems to be less of a key motivation in internationalization for institutions within EHEA than within English-speaking Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand (EAIE, 2019). Owing to the different national funding systems in internationalization and the existence of programs such as Erasmus, the approaches differ; this was also reflected in the data of this dissertation. However, the high interests in student recruitment, prestige, and competitiveness are clear signs of the adoption of neoliberal agendas within EHEA as well.

With regard to the research question—"to what extent and how can the critiques toward neoliberal and liberal agendas help to identify the ethical issues in the internationalization of HE?"—neoliberalism can be critiqued through its colonizing effect over the liberal and critical rationales that can cause ethical concerns. Liberal rationales, such as the internationalization of the campus and curricula, can be repurposed under neoliberalism. These themes become central not because they simply have positive educational effects but because the image and results can be used in marketing and student recruitment (welcoming, international

\textsuperscript{41} The data comes from two different figures in the EAIE Barometer (2019), “Main goals for internationalization” (p. 7), where respondents could choose up to three answers and “Top 10 internationalisation activities prioritized in strategy” (p. 9), where up to five answers could be chosen.
Critical activities such as dismantling the barriers for participation can be reinterpreted as furthering neoliberal aims. An example is the grant programs that target a certain country, institution, or ethnic minority. Examples of these are the now inactive Finnish North–South–South program and the recent Erasmus+ international credit mobility that both enabled targeting institutions in the GS. These programs will surely help some students but will not have a sustainable impact for larger communities. In contrast, they might help with further student recruitment through the favorable reputation of the university/country giving out the grants and also help to give out an appearance of a globally responsible institution (Stein & Andreotti, 2016). To conclude, the neoliberal has the potential to colonize the liberal and critical in a subtle manner by exploiting their value-based underpinnings. Activities such as internationalization of the curriculum can thus simultaneously support different rationales and whether this is good or dangerous depends on the viewpoint. In time, the justifications tend to favor one or other, and as long as neoliberalism is globally hegemonic, the rationales tend to gravitate toward the neoliberal undermining or foreclosing of the liberal or critical rationales (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

The third finding—relative absence of critical orientation—relates to considerable research that acknowledges the lack of decolonial perspectives in mainstream internationalization and internationalization research (Majee & Ress, 2018; George Mwangi et al., 2018; Stein, 2017; Tikly & Bond, 2013). The findings in this research also indicate the lack of decolonial considerations in the data. One way to approach the finding is to use Mignolo’s (2011) point regarding how the modernity/coloniality division is largely invisible. Decolonial viewpoints in internationalization are omitted because people are not necessarily cognizant of the existence of coloniality-based asymmetries in internationalization and knowledge production or do not think that it applies in their case. This is unsurprising because one of the aims in the proliferation of Western modernity has been to hide its conditions such as racism and epistemic violence (Andreotti, 2016). Further, the Western HE seeks to legitimize its position, and the alternatives for it are framed through abyssal thinking as non-scientific and/or unrealistic (de Sousa Santos, 2007a). Still, the decolonial perspectives in HE and particularly internationalization are crucial because they make the global asymmetries visible. From this perspective, it is possible to criticize both the liberal and neoliberal rationales in

---

44 The awareness can be affected among other things by national exceptionalist discourses. In Finland, for example, participation in colonial affairs in the past or current time is denied (Suša, 2016).
internationalization and expose their ethical shortcomings by extending the critique beyond “Eurocentric anti-Eurocentrism” (de Sousa Santos, 2016, p. 100). From the critical perspective, both the liberal and neoliberal rationales in internationalization can be connected to a form of neocolonialism that causes the weakening of intellectual, cultural, and financial autonomy in the GS and peripheries in the GN (Altbach, 2004).

7.1 Implications of the research

Claiming that emphasizing the critical or liberal orientations, instead of the neoliberal orientation, would transition the internationalization of HE into something more ethical would be naïve. The fact that the corporate imaginary of HE is not only dominant but a real phenomenon with real consequences must be acknowledged. Attempting to altogether bypass the economic incentives in internationalization might result in a situation wherein no internationalization takes place. It would be more important to see the internationalization of HE as a field of conflicting and conflating rationales where different approaches exist, and our task in this work within the field is to distinguish which activities fall under the neoliberal orientation and simultaneously protect the liberal, non-economic activities. However, an overt focus on the liberal orientation might also not be productive in terms of more ethical approaches in internationalization. Thus, the critical orientation should be acknowledged as important in terms of social justice and more ethical engagement in internationalization. Switching the perspective from the individual to a systemic level will provide insights, making intelligible normalized power inequalities and adding to the considerations related to social responsibility in internationalization. Ethical internationalization entails the awareness, explicitness, and critique that should transcend positional barriers. Taking the decolonial considerations into account requires an examination of the effects of the modernity/coloniality division on HE globally as well as a recognition of the role of HE in their reproduction (Stein et al., 2019). Following this path will eventually require more drastic systemic changes; this is a long and unglamorous process and will result in unexpected outcomes (Andreotti et al., 2015).

To discuss more soft-reform approaches, part of the problems in internationalization are related to its ambiguous nature as a “catch-all phrase” (Knight, 2014). Because the definition of internationalization in different institutional and national contexts is often not provided or the same vague
definition is repeated\textsuperscript{45}, this leaves opportunities to attach internationalization with all kinds of projects, benign as well as problematic. Currently, the core functions of HE, including internationalization, are easily framed through neoliberalism, and although the realities of decreasing funding might call for creative ways of diversifying the institutions’ funding, this does not mean that everything can or should be reduced to economic necessities. Because internationalization can be used to advance economic aims, there should also be explicit focus on identifying its non-economical functions that need to be guaranteed as well. For example, the value of exchange programs should not be merely justified in terms of the income they generate or what skills they produce but should be based on how they benefit the individuals and the society in a wider manner. Individuals who have taken part in exchanges are, in general, more emphatic toward diversity, which cannot be quantified in mere economic terms (Kreber, 2009).

Thus, one of the ways toward more ethically driven internationalization is to produce a more plural and contextualized definition for internationalization that also helps institutions to bring out more localized characteristics and makes international activities explicit, which is already an ethical act by itself. Attached to this project is the preceding discussion about the underlying assumptions regarding “international education” and what it entails for the institution in questions. This explicit stance enables the further unpacking of internationalization and can help, for example, with reacting to “epistemological imperialism” by establishing the foundations of teaching and learning in the institution. This is not to say that a definition requires or forces change; however, clarity helps all the parties involved to understand the aims of activities such as education. Because groups such as international or domestic students comprise individuals who have a multitude of identities and aspirations, not everyone is interested, for example, in the decolonial approaches on education but are happy to participate in economically driven Western education. At the same time, some would find this problematic. By being clear about their values, HE institutions can help students to make informed choices instead of burying challenging issues to not damage their brand. Critique is understandably difficult to handle for institutions, particularly if their rankings are at stake; at the same time, the lack of it will stall development. The neoliberal ideology of competition is undeniably very strong and a threat to openness and self-
reflexivity, and it is difficult to imagine how to change the situation unless the
metrics are changed. If institutional transparency, sustainability, and ethics were the
deciding factors for rankings, instead of the amount of publications in Western
journals and the amount of Nobel prizes, they would cause significant change in
the practices. However, owing to the nature of the rankings, a risk here might be
the quantification of something that cannot be quantified, such as ethics.

Internationalization is a challenging field, where very narrow framings limit its
educational and social potential. Most universities wish to become “global leaders”
or “world-class universities,” which is rather futile because the status quo is ensured
and reinforced through rankings. For the majority of universities, no number of
international students or publications will boost them to become the next Harvard
or Cambridge (Demeter, 2019). Thus, it would make more sense to approach
internationalization from a pedagogical perspective and not as a vehicle for
acquiring prestige and better rankings. It would be desirable to pluralize the concept
of internationalization into internationalizations that would enable looking at the
contextual relevance of activities. Universities should also adopt a healthy dose of
self-reflexivity to be able to navigate the ethical challenges that are inevitable in
the organization of activities. Because many of these ethical challenges rise from
the contrast between the economic and more “value-based” aims, an open debate
about ethics would be one solution, or at least a way forward, for the situation.
Although diminished by the neoliberal aversion of critical voices (Levin, 2007;
Ramirez & Hyslop-Marginson, 2015), HE has at many points in history functioned
as a critic of society, and the first step toward revitalizing this role would be to
engage in a critique of HE’s own functions. The ensuing critique would surely
touch upon the sore and difficult sides of HE but would also enable change.

7.2 Evaluation of the study

There are certain limitations of this study that should be addressed. The data
utilized in this work was very rich in material, and I have only been able to include
a part of it in this study. The data provided a good spread of different national and
institutional contexts for the purpose of discourse analysis but was limited in global
scale. The interview data set included 16 universities in seven different countries,
with the majority of the universities located in the GN. The EIHE project included
more GS partners than are represented in the interview data set, namely China and
South Africa, but I was unable to schedule interviews from the universities in these
countries within a reasonable timeframe. I was working part-time in the EIHE
project at the time and had to move on to the analysis phase with the data already collected. Given my decolonial emphasis in the dissertation, I acknowledge that it would have been interesting to include more GS perspectives in this dissertation. However, I still find that I have been able to discuss the modernity/coloniality theme to a sufficient extent with the data I had available.

Related, the partners included in the data set, all interviews, apart from Brazil, were conducted in English. In Finland and Sweden, English was not the mother tongue of the interviewees. Or mine, considering that I conducted the interviews and did the analysis. It would have been possible to arrange the four interviews in Finland in Finnish, but they were conducted in English to facilitate the transcription process. I inquired beforehand from the interviewees if the use of English was acceptable to which they all agreed. I deemed the question of whether English or Finnish/Swedish was used less important with the Finnish (and Swedish) interviewees, because they all used English as a language of communication, to varying extent, in their everyday work and were thus able to sufficiently express themselves. Using a non-native language for the interviews would have been a bigger issue in cross-cultural interviews, where cultural conventions or hierarchies might have affected the communication (Cortazzi, Pilcher & Jin, 2011). The interviews were conducted in a non-native language only in Finland and Sweden. I consider the cultural conventions between Finland and Sweden similar enough to have been able to avoid communication issues stemming from culture. Furthermore, because I was interviewing professional colleagues, there was no risk of communication problems due to hierarchy. The linguistic issues in the Finnish and Swedish interviews were mostly related to not remembering words or idioms and these were easily resolved. Moreover, if the interviewees had difficulties with words or phrases, they could use their mother tongue to “assist” as I speak Finnish and can understand Swedish. With regards to my own language competencies, I regard my fluency in English very high and do not think that there were any English-related problems with the data analysis. The Brazilian interviews were translated by a native speaker of Portuguese with an extremely high fluency in English. Translation is always a process where meanings are subject to change which is a valid point especially in research focusing on discourses. However, owing to the high fluency of the translator in both languages, I am confident that the data was not corrupted by the process.

Otherwise, in terms of data analysis, the conceptual frameworks of this study guided the identification of the discourse patterns that were then interpreted again through the framework to form the results. In practice, this meant that I was looking
at discourses that could be interpreted as belonging to the main discursive orientations (neoliberal, liberal, and critical, including the interfaces) and to the imaginaries of HE. After the discourses were coded, they were examined again using the conceptual frameworks (see Sub-chapter 4.4 on social cartography). Starting the data collection and interpretation processes from a set topic or framework has been criticized as potentially producing incorrect interpretations because the discourses are “forced” into a model rather than analyzed without preconceived notions on what they should contain (ten Have, 2007). This might be a more serious issue if the interviewees would have been a more heterogeneous group and the topic more general. However, because all interviewees were experts in internationalization, the theme of the interviews, the EIHE project and context of the interviews were explained well, and the interview questions were sent beforehand; it can be stated that the data did not need “forcing” to fit the heuristic. Furthermore, the interview questions (see Appendix 1) were semi-structured and did not attempt to manipulate the interviewees to provide more “socially desirable” answers (EAIE, 2019, p. 22). The analysis itself is a subjective process, but I have tried to make my position and research process explicit enough to allow the reader to evaluate the “quality” of my results. In any case, the aim of this research has not been to “discover” generalizable results but to explore the different aspects of internationalization to contribute to the general discussion on the values and forms of internationalization. As the discourses identified in the data are situated, temporal, and partial, a similar consideration should be given to the results.

The EIHE data collected was analyzed for multiple purposes using multiple approaches. In addition to the present articles, I worked on the EIHE project data for another unpublished manuscript, and before initiating the work on the articles, I coded the data based on the heuristic using NVivo qualitative analysis software for the EIHE project meeting purposes. Although, I knew that I was going to use the interview data for my Ph.D. project, when I started to work for the EIHE project, it took some time before my own research project begun to take shape. Examining the data from multiple perspectives helped the subsequent analysis that later materialized as the three articles in this work, and the co-authoring process based on the data and the related discussions assisted with drawing conclusions based on the data. The work conducted in the different groups strengthened the rigor of the analyses by confirming the results through questioning and the possibility to test conclusions on a critical audience. Aside from the co-authors, the analysis was checked by the other researchers in the EIHE project as well as in the EDGE research group and in various conferences where each paper was presented before
the final submissions. The peer-review comments were essential in improving the analyses and the overall quality of the articles. As already stated, my analysis is subjective, partial, and contingent and is thus not generalizable. I invite the reader to engage with the analysis that is fully open for interpretations that not necessarily conform to my own, and I hope that my argumentation is sufficiently transparent to enable this.

The global and national contexts of the internationalization of HE are in a constant flux. This has provided challenges for my research that has taken a long time to complete. However, this merely highlights the contingent, temporal, and partial nature of any research project. Major events have occurred since 2014–15, when the interview data was collected. The 2015 flow of refugees to Europe, Brexit, and the visible rise of conservative and right-wing politics globally have considerably changed the HE environment and internationalization. If the interviews and data collection would have been conducted later, the answers would be different in relation to the matters regarding ethics, social responsibility, and rationales around internationalization. Or perhaps not, as having actively followed the scene and participated in different conferences and trainings for almost 15 years, it is clear that there are initiatives that go in and out of fashion, whereas the “core” activities remain mainstream despite of potential criticism. For example, the Scholars at Risk projects were very much emphasized for a few years after 2015 but have unfortunately received less attention since. On the other hand, the discussion around the climate effects of international mobility is emerging and it remains to be seen if it affects the internationalization of HE globally.

7.3 Concluding remarks and future research

The scholarship in the effects of neoliberalism on the internationalization of HE from the liberal and decolonial viewpoints is a growing but still an emerging field. The EIHE project has made a valuable contribution to the examination of ethical engagements in internationalization, and the developments in the project have guided my work as well. With my research, I have attempted to produce a multifaceted examination of the challenges and, to some extent, the potentials of internationalization that would extend beyond just the neoliberal and liberal perspectives/binary. My data set provided a plethora of information for the purpose of this research, and it was interesting, academically as well as professionally, to learn about internationalization, its rationales, and the agents in the different institutional and national contexts. With this research, I am also hoping to ignite a
discussion of the motivations behind the internationalization of HE, which in my native Finland is severely lacking.

Although the tone of this work has been critical, I would like to repeat my claim in the introduction that my outlook on internationalization is not merely pessimistic. Although I see many potential obstacles for more ethical approaches in internationalization, I am cautiously optimistic. My firm belief is that through the denaturalization of exceptionalist myths around globalization and internationalization (“we have the best education in world!”), we can initiate conversations that are much healthier for all involved parties. Also, the point of my criticism is not to say—adapting Foucault—that everything is bad or even that everything is dangerous but to elaborate on different motivations and make explicit and examine their taken-for-granted assumptions and what they mean in practice (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 2014). I do not want to point a finger at neoliberalism and its unspecified agents as the root of all evil but to offer a partial and contextual examination of the potential implications of the neoliberal approaches in HE. As Clarke states, “It might be better to treat neo-liberalism as a project seeking to make the world in its image rather than an achieved condition” (Clarke, as cited in Marginson, 2013, p. 354). The implication here is that although some trends point at increased the neoliberal policies in HE, there are also signs that the resistance is growing, even outside the academic circles (Pusser, 2014). Furthermore, as ethical perspectives are always contextual and subjective, I cannot claim that neoliberalism in internationalization is simply “unethical.” It can be seen as problematic from many different perspectives; however, for example, there were articulations in the interview data where neoliberal approaches were considered as “ethical.” One respondent claimed that selling a degree with transformative potential could change the life of the individual and possibly enact a positive change in the student’s home country through the gained expertise. I fully realize that there are many other nuances that would need to be examined for an exhaustive account of the effects of neoliberalism in HE, but the inclusion of all variations and complexities around the topic would be almost impossible, and certainly so within the scope of this Ph.D. research. My research has not been predominately aiming at practical solutions for the issues I have raised. Thus, attempting to develop practical ways for more ethically driven internationalization is definitely a project for the future. There are also topics that I had to exclude to make the work more manageable. I was very interested in the role of exceptionalism in internationalization as well as the role of soft-power as a rationale in internationalization. Moreover, I originally intended to
discuss the pedagogical potential of social cartography in more detail. I intend to explore these topics in the future.

What is certain is that the theme of ethics in internationalization is topical and relevant, and there are plenty of themes for future research. It would be interesting to develop institutional case studies looking at internationalization of the curriculum from the ethical and social responsibility perspectives. It would also be interesting to deepen the decolonial perspectives presented in this work and examine their possibilities in internationalization in Finnish HE institutions. Traditionally, the oppression of indigenous people and involvement in colonial affairs are explicitly denied in Finland. One of the topics that has been on my mind for years is what comprehensive internationalization would look like, for example, in a Finnish university. The new challenges in the field would also be interesting venues for further examination. For example, as the global environmental crises make the traditional parts of internationalization relying on long-distance traveling unsustainable and unfashionable, examining the alternatives and how these change the global dynamics in the internationalization of HE would be interesting.

---

46 As a note, Rene Suša (2016) in his Ph.D. dissertation and subsequent work has examined both exceptionalism as well as the use of social cartography.

47 Not to mention global pandemics like COVID-19, which have the possibility to stop mobilities altogether.
References


Duermeijer, C., Amir, M., & Schoombee, L. (2018). Africa generates less than 1% of the world’s research; data analytics can change that. Retrieved from https://www.elsevier.com/connect/africa-generates-less-than-1-of-the-worlds-research-data-analytics-can-change-that


Appendices

Appendix 1. Interview guide

Interview questions:
1. From your perspective, which internationalization strategies at your University are most beneficial for:
   a) students,
   b) faculty and staff
   c) the university in general?
2.a) What do you perceive as the most challenging aspects of internationalization in your university?
2.b) Are there any unanticipated issues arising from internationalisation strategies and policies?
3.a.) Which changes in attitudes and/or concrete actions by students, faculty and staff would facilitate internationalization at your university?
3.b) Do the strategies and/or policies promoting internationalism at your university mention 'social responsibility'? If so, how is it understood and/or conceptualized?
4. Based on the literature review for the research project, we have identified common rationales for the internationalization of higher education.
   Internationalization
   a. generates extra income;
   b. raises the profile, prestige and/or status of the university;
   c. enables international benchmarking/rankings;
   d. focuses on building global competencies for the job market;
   e. helps people from other countries;
   f. enables the inclusion and recognition of a diversity of voices, especially those who tend to be disadvantaged;
   g. can help integrating non-western knowledge systems and interdisciplinary study to enable changes in current systems (social, political, educational etc.) and possibilities for alternative futures.
4.a) Can you think of other rationales for internationalization?
4.b) Which rationales for internationalization are most strongly prioritized in your university. Are there rationales that are not currently prioritized that you think should be?
5. Please comment, if you have anything to add or would like to talk about something not yet discussed.
Appendix 2. Research questions of the EIHE project

Research questions of the Ethical Internationalisation in Higher Education in Times of Global Crises (EIHE) project.

1. How is epistemic difference perceived in internationalization policies and initiatives in participating universities?

2. How is difference constructed and what value is attributed to it in terms of capacity for relevant knowledge production in institutional relations: between international and local faculty, international and local students, faculty and students, curriculum design, indigenous/aboriginal students, as well as international partnerships (e.g., the value attributed to allegedly global and local/national/indigenous knowledge systems)?

3. How is the role of the university, faculty, and graduates perceived in terms of global citizenship ideals?

4. What kinds of educational policies and processes have the potential to resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge production that restrict possibilities for ethical relationalities and solidarities in local and global academic spaces? (Andreotti, 2011, p. 3).
Appendix 3. List of documents used in the document analysis

List of the internationalization strategies or related documents used in the document analysis in Article I.


Appendix 4. Research questions for document and interview analysis

Ethical internationalism in higher education: Research questions (document and interview analysis).

Internationalism and its actors:
A1. How is internationalism defined (to what extent is it defined)? What processes are associated with internationalizing the university?
A2. How is internationalism justified; what are the rationales for internationalizing higher education?
A3. Who are articulated as the actors of internationalization?
A4. How are the rationales and actors tied/related?

Supra-territorial role:
- How do the university and staff understand globalization?
- How are development and poverty perceived, explained, and/or justified?
- How do the university and its staff construct their role (and those of its graduates) in the world?
B1. What is the supra-territorial role of the university and what language is used to define the broad role of the university in the context of internationalization?
B2. What is the role of staff within this supra-territorial role?
B3. What is the role of students within this supra-territorial role?

Difference:
- What counts as relevant knowledge?
- What value is attributed to knowledge perceived as global and/or local?
- How do the university and its staff perceive their relationships and responsibility toward others?
C1. What value is attributed to difference?
C2. Under what circumstances is difference valued?

Resistance and alternatives
D1. What kinds of discourses/initiatives have the potential to contest unethical forms of engagement with the other?
D2. What kinds of discourses/initiatives have the potential to promote ethical globalism and epistemological pluralism?
D3. What kinds of discourses/initiatives have the potential to fracture Eurocentered and/or neoliberal ideas of the university?
## Appendix 5. Example of the mapping process

The below table includes examples from the interview data analysis for Article 1. Note that the interviews in Article 1 did not include articulations that could be mapped to the critical orientation. The examples follow the mapping presented in Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview excerpt</th>
<th>Discursive orientation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“… one [rationale] that has been most strongly prioritized recently has been the international benchmarking and ranking system because our university wants to become one of the most prestigious universities.” (G1)</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Focus on rankings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I would say the rationales in our case is quality and competition, you have to show your strengths, in both education and your best research and you have to compete with other and you have to be the best, in some areas.” (C1)</td>
<td>Neoliberal</td>
<td>Focus on competitiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… using internationalization to generate additional students and therefore additional income … is a very strong driver but also, of course, international students bring much more to the classroom, you know, [than] their fees, they bring international perspective they bring diversity, they bring globalization.” (D2)</td>
<td>Neoliberal-liberal</td>
<td>Contains elements of income generation but addresses also liberal rationales of diversification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… [We] need to support the interaction between the international students, and you know, the domestic students, for the lack of a better term, as so that there is, they are an integrated cohort, otherwise you are going to have two ghettos and that’s not an international experience in the true sense …” (C2)</td>
<td>Neoliberal-liberal</td>
<td>Discusses integration, (liberal, or even liberal-critical) but from the viewpoint of creating a more welcoming campus that can be tied to student recruitment (neoliberal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview excerpt</td>
<td>Discursive orientation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If you take students, clearly, you know, things like study abroad opportunities, um, are very beneficial for our students, we try to let as many students as possible experience study abroad because many students do not want to but if they want to try it we are looking at that long term to short term exchanges. Um, obviously those students who don’t, um, travel overseas they benefit from help of having students from different parts of the world in their classrooms.” (E1)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Addresses multiculturalization of the campus through mobilities and home internationalization. The latter could be also mapped under the neoliberal-liberal, but the context here does not contain links to student recruitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That internationalization is a complicated set of different priorities and it’s challenging to align the commercial with the non-commercial priorities. So I think this would be the greatest challenge, being able grow, develop, and protect the non-commercial aspects of internationalization. Which are about learning mobility, um, quest for new knowledge, creation of knowledge and cultural exchanges and global citizenship and those elements which are non-commercial and possibly not commercializable. That their fundamental aims and objectives that have been in internationalization for, since it’s very beginning.” (C1)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Defending the non-economic rationales of internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… some of our policies for looking at it’s actually picking things out of those internal barriers to exchange, um, because we feel it is very important that all students, you know, regardless of their kind of financial background … are provided with an opportunity so we have applied for, um, funding for the Scottish government to try promote more students from those categories.” (B1)</td>
<td>Liberal-critical</td>
<td>Addressing systemic barriers for participation in internationalization activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview excerpt</td>
<td>Discursive orientation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… the place where I am at the moment is kind of, we have got so far down this road of celebrating international students and the idea of international students, and I am starting to think about maybe I should turn around, it is this idea of communities of practice and small cultures again whereby I don’t, perhaps I need to turn around, go down a different road that says they are not international students, they are students and it’s, maybe that’s the best way to shift everything. It is kind of moving away from international marketing and international recruitment and, the irony is that only way that we can truly become an international university is if we remove the tabloid international.” (D1)</td>
<td>Liberal-critical</td>
<td>More equal treatment between domestic and international students but conceptualized on the level of one institution as opposed on a more general level that would denote a critical approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yeah, certainly I think one has to be a bit careful about … helping people from other countries, again that is because, yes we do, but obviously we want to be seen very much as being able to go back and help themselves, I mean we don’t see ourselves helping them as that would be rather colonial in a sort of, approach. So, um, but yes certainly, you know, we see it as being , you know, being able to teach some skills that perhaps they wouldn’t be able to get in their own country, you know, sort of specific programmes and opportunities and then take, to take that back to their own countries … [we] obviously have scholarship provision that would enable students some disadvantaged, you know, actually disadvantaged background, you know, to, um, to … you know, from that point of view.”</td>
<td>Neoliberal-critical</td>
<td>The articulation combines a rationale for student recruitment (neoliberal) with empowering aims and institutional help in the form of scholarships (both critical)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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