

UNIKE Conference

# UNIVERSITY FUTURES

DPU, Aarhus University, Copenhagen  
15 - 17 June 2016

## Conference Programme

The conference is jointly supported by the EU-funded project UNIKE (Universities in the Knowledge Economy) and Aarhus University.



AARHUS  
UNIVERSITY  
DANISH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION





# CONTENTS

Timetable of conference.....	3
Introduction .....	5
Registration.....	6
Outline of scientific themes.....	7
Scientific theme 1 / Constructing a liveable university using feminist and post-capitalist ideas.....	7
Scientific theme 2 / Reassembling knowledge production with(out) the university.....	11
Scientific theme 3 / How do nation-states mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy? .....	15
Scientific theme 4 / How can universities be transformed to center on public goods in teaching, research, and community engagement? .....	20
Scientific theme 5 / Reconsidering "Internationalization" from Peripheral Perspectives .....	25
Scientific theme 6 / Market-driven or open-ended higher education?.....	29

# TIMETABLE OF CONFERENCE

Scientific theme 1	Reclaiming Feminism
Scientific theme 2	Reassembling Knowledge Production
Scientific theme 3	Mobilising Universities
Scientific theme 4	Alternative Pathways
Scientific theme 5	De-/Reconstructing Internationalisation
Scientific theme 6	Openness - Closeness
Paper presentations	Paper presentations from the call for abstracts

Wednesday 15 June 2016

08:30-08:50	Registration					
08:50-09:00	Welcome/opening speech					
09:00-10:00	<b>Keynote speech</b> Ove Kaj Pedersen, Copenhagen Business School Room D169					
10:00-10:15	Coffee break					
10:15-12:00	Plenary session Theme 6 Room D169 105 mins					
12:00-13:00	Lunch break					
13:00-14:30	Parallel session Theme 6 90 mins		Parallel session Theme 4 90 mins		Parallel session Paper presentations 90 mins	
14:30-15:00	Coffee break					
15:00-17:00	Coffee available	Plenary session Theme 4 Room D169 120 mins				
17:00-18:00		Development session 60 mins Theme 1	Development session 60 mins Theme 2	Development session 60 mins Theme 3	Development session 60 mins Theme 4	Development session 60 mins Theme 5
18:00-19:30	Guided walk and talk to Restaurant RizRaz through the gardens of Copenhagen					
19:30	Dinner at RizRaz					

## Thursday 16 June 2016

09:00-10:00	Keynote speech To be announced Room D169					
10:00-10:15	Coffee break					
10:15-12:00	Parallel session Theme 1 90 mins		Parallel session Theme 3 90 mins		Parallel session Paper presentations 90 mins	
12:00-13:00	Lunch break					
13:00-15:00	Plenary session Theme 3 Room D169 120 mins					
15:00-15:15	Coffee break					
15:15-17:15	Coffee available	Plenary session Theme 1 Room D169 120 mins				
17:15-18:15		Development session 60 mins Theme 1	Development session 60 mins Theme 2	Development session 60 mins Theme 3	Development session 60 mins Theme 4	Development session 60 mins Theme 5
19:30	Gala dinner at The Black Diamond					

## Friday 17 June 2016

09:00-10:45	Parallel session Theme 2 105 mins	Parallel session Theme 5 105 mins
10:45-11:00	Coffee break	
11:00-12:30	Plenary session Theme 5 Room D169 90 mins	
12:30-13:15	Lunch break	
13:15-15:15	Plenary session Theme 2 Room D169 120 mins	
15:15-15:45	Final plenary: Recap and Futures	
15:45-18:00	Conference reception	

# INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the summative conference of the UNIKE project. This conference aims to promote collective thinking about the future directions of universities in the knowledge economies of Europe and the Asia-Pacific Rim.

The programme sessions are organised around six scientific themes:

1. Constructing a liveable university using feminist and post-capitalist ideas
2. Reassembling knowledge production with(out) the university
3. How do nation-states mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy?
4. How can universities be transformed to center on public goods in teaching, research, and community engagement?
5. Reconsidering "Internationalization" from peripheral perspectives
6. Market-driven or open-ended higher education?

The aims of the conference are to highlight contemporary changes in universities and explore how critical researchers can influence the direction of future developments.

UNIKE (Universities in the Knowledge Economy) is an EU-funded Marie Curie Initial Training Programme for 16 PhD and Post-doc fellows and five Associated PhD fellows. The fellows involved in UNIKE have conducted original research on the dynamic relationships between universities and knowledge economies in Europe and in the Asia-Pacific Rim. At the same time, they have engaged in a training programme aimed to generate a networked group of critical researchers to be future research leaders.

With this in mind, the fellows have played a big part in designing this conference. They have identified scientific themes emerging across their individual projects, which are also issues on which they may want to keep working beyond the end of the project – whether they pursue careers in academia, policy making, consultancy or the new knowledge industries.

We used a 'search conference' methodology at our previous workshop, held in Oslo in November 2015, to form the groups of fellows around six themes they identified. Subsequently, each group networked electronically to develop their ideas, and drew in academics from the six European partner universities, members of UNIKE's 30 Associated Partners in Europe and the Asia Pacific, and other students and academics who responded to our call for abstracts. Each group has developed their own format for discussing their theme and each has been allocated a plenary session and a parallel session in the conference programme.

As these themes are issues on which fellows want to bring their research to bear not only to increase academic knowledge but also to achieve change, the idea is that they may want to keep developing a network of colleagues and a plan of activities beyond the end of the conference. There are two 'development' sessions in the programme for conference participants to work together on these further activities.

Last but not least, the first two days of the conference will start with a keynote, which addresses issues cutting across the conference themes.

We welcome participants to the conference who are academics, students, policy makers and other stakeholders concerned with universities in the knowledge economy. To register, please use the link below.

Susan Wright  
Coordinator of UNIKE  
Professor of Educational Anthropology  
Aarhus University

# REGISTRATION

If you would like to attend the conference, please register on the conference website [www.conferences.au.dk/universityfutures](http://www.conferences.au.dk/universityfutures).

Conference fee is 1200 DKK. Conference fee for self-funded PhD students is 800 DKK.

If you wish to join at the dinner on Wednesday 15 June, gala dinner on Thursday 16 June or at the conference reception on Friday 17 June, you can select this when registering.

Registration closes on 9 June 2016.

# OUTLINE OF SCIENTIFIC THEMES

## Scientific theme 1

### Constructing a liveable university using feminist and post-capitalist ideas

**Timing: Thursday 16 June. Parallel session: 10:15-12:00. Plenary session: 15:15-17:15**

#### Theme organisers

Rebecca W. B. Lund, UNIKE Postdoc fellow, DPU, Aarhus University, Denmark

#### Aim of theme

The ambition of this thematic session is to draw upon post-capitalist (JK Gibson Graham 2006) and feminist ideas to analyse, critique and rethink universities as workplaces, including e.g. practices of management, recruitment, academic work and work culture, notions of quality, life-work balance. Orienting ourselves towards local social, cultural, political and economic orders, we draw upon ethnographic studies of gendered and intersecting work practices in the neoliberal university to illustrate existing challenges and problems. We then invite people to analyse their own institutions and practices and collectively reimagine their universities through debating concrete ideas for transforming everyday workplace practices. Finally, participants will have the opportunity to establish a network in order to support each other in future local efforts.

#### Format of sessions

##### Session one: Paper session, mapping what we know

Facilitated by Katja Jonsas and Rebecca Lund

Full-length or short papers (3000 words) will be pre-circulated well in advance and all session participants will be expected to have read them beforehand. Each participant will be presenting the work of a colleague, rather than his/her own work (facilitators will divide the papers among participants). Each presentation will take the format of a poster presentation. The presentation should present frame, questions, problem, main concepts, methodological approaches and empirical findings and take no more than 8-10 minutes. The presenter will also be responsible for preparing minimum of two questions for the author to consider while developing his/her work. The poster presentation will be followed by a 30 minute collective discussion where we draw on the presented papers to make a map of *what we know*, mapping also the *limitations and possibilities for a more livable university from post-capitalist and feminist perspectives*.

**Session two: Workshop, where do we go from here**

Workshop leaders: Annette Risberg, Assistant Professor, Department of Intercultural Communication, CBS and Klara Regnö, Researcher, Centre for Gender Studies, Gothenburg University.

Guided by two experienced scholars in interactive gender research and feminist change projects targeting academia, and taking a point of departure in our collective map: concrete research findings, experiences and institutional practices, we discuss and learn how to identify, challenge and change institutions and practices that discriminate, marginalise and uphold inequality. This will hopefully provide a fruitful collective basis for rethinking our everyday lives at the university and for bringing about more energizing academic lives and inclusive working environments.

Following the workshop there will be a chance to discuss how we can support each other in bringing about concrete changes at our home institutions

**Presenters' abstracts**

**Jill Blackmore, Professor, Deakin University, Australia**

**Title: Entrapping the academic soul through flexibility: gender, consuming work and greedy entrepreneurial universities**

This paper focuses on the effect of the university's corporatization – as articulated through managerialist policies, strategies and practices – that has transformed the materiality of academic work as well as shifted the socio psychic economy of teaching and research, and as a result produced disenchantment, disengagement and distrust among academics with regard to the university and its leadership. Gender issues emerge when discussing the rapidly changing conditions and nature of academic work and the escalating expectations from 'quality' to 'excellence' in research and teaching. Despite a dominant discourse of gender neutrality, the legacies of and new institutional forms of gender discrimination – the material conditions created to meet edu-capitalist demands – continue to reposition academic women unfavourably. The paper concludes by discussing how we might create conditions for academic work and leadership practices more conducive to collegiality, professional autonomy, recognition, respect and trust, and indeed how such practices are more likely to result in the 'innovation' that universities and governments desire but fail to achieve.

**Kirsten Locke, Lecturer, University of Auckland, New Zealand**

**Title: Can 'Top Girls' say no? An exploration of young women academics as subjects of capacity**

Despite challenges to continue interpreting academia as a bastion of male privilege and dominance we are far from the happy ending anticipated by post-feminist aspirations of gender equality, as the 'scissor graph' continues to apply in the majority of university contexts. This paper draws on the notion of the 'perfectible self' and the New Age discourse of untapped potential, perpetual cycle of self-development and 'improvement' of the subject/worker to explore the gendering processes in universities. I claim that the ability for academic workers to say 'no' to the ever-increasing demands of academia and self-improvement is a specifically gendered performance. The paper explores how 'top girls', in their endless quest for perfectibility, willingly offer themselves as inexhaustible resources in academia, and as a result strengthen the very gendered power hierarchies they believe have been overcome.



**Birgitte Bonisch-Brednich, Professor, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand**

**Title: Gender, Equity and the Foreign Knowledge Worker**

The topics of gender and equity are separate and intertwined areas at New Zealand universities, as equity has moved to mean equity (equal opportunity) for Maori and Pacific students and (sometimes) staff. This shift has led to an increased emphasis on equity and a de-emphasis on gender equality. Hence gender issues are often invisible and have become a marginal topic. When academics move country and campus they subsequently spend a prolonged period of time figuring out the visible and invisible aspects of a new workplace culture. How the new organisation, the new university handles or does gender and equity are part of this culture. This paper will offer ethnographic data and an analysis of how gender and equity are done and perceived, focussing on Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. My data consists of long term participant observation of and interviews with female academic migrants; it also draws on my own experiences and insights as noted in my diary since starting in a management position as Head of School and as a member of group of professional and academic women trying to address gender issues and support for women on campus.

**Christian Rogler, PhD Candidate, University of Vienna, Austria**

**Title: Can there be only one? Academic work practice caught between collaboration and competition**

My paper addresses how early career academics working on temporary contracts negotiate the tension of being simultaneously colleagues and competitors. Their work and career logic is colonised by a project logic following a neoliberal governmentality and they depend on a source of income that is as competitive as it is precarious. Early career academics are vulnerable to cutbacks (e.g. due to austerity measures) and mostly do not have a stable or predictable career environment to look forward to. The new project logic of funding furthermore reintroduces the dependency of early career academics on senior academics who act as directors of successfully acquired research projects. The pressures to compete with other early career researchers as well as to collaborate within hierarchical structures produce a paradoxical situation: closest colleagues can turn into their fiercest competitors. This leads to a rise in insecurity and anxiety amongst young researchers in academia. The paper concludes by evaluating possibilities for counteracting this situation and scrutinizes room for manoeuvre.

**Gritt B. Nielsen, Lecturer, DPU, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark**

**Title: Queering Academia**

As an anthropology student at a Danish University in the 1990s, I recall a study environment and form of academic cultivation characterized by curiosity, humour, mutual support, sharing and warmth. We were driven by curiosity and worked in study groups to explore different topics. As I became a PhD fellow I gradually saw the contours of a different world, driven by different practices and values. Participation in conferences and seminars revealed a competitive economy. It was about winning: winning an audience and out-performing other scholars. While this is nothing new to academia, it is not the kind of academia I like or thrive in. This paper explores if and how Gibson-Graham's (2006) efforts to 'queer the economy' and promote a politics of possibility could be relevant in academia. I draw on my own experiences as a teacher on an international anthropology program characterized by great student variety (in terms of gender, nationality, educational background etc.) and discuss the possibilities and challenges of cultivating academic subjects for a community economy understood in terms of its *commons*.

**Katja Jonsas, UNIKE PhD Fellow, University of Roehampton School of Business, London, UK**

**Title: Gender and other equalities - creating a livable university**

In mainstream literature gender equality is often defined in terms of fairness and integration and associated with legal structures that secure equal pay and freedom from harassment. However, recent changes in higher education governance, emphasising performativity and measurable outputs, has both strengthened existing and created new forms of inequality. These emerging forms of inequality are not adequately captured or described by using quantitative approaches. In this paper I therefore explore practices of academic work and career capital in order to untangle how power and status differences emerge in contemporary academia. Furthermore, I explore *what* needs to be equalized in order to create a more equal and liveable university.

**Rebecca Lund, UNIKE Postdoc Fellow, DPU, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark – abstract pending**

## Scientific theme 2

### Reassembling knowledge production with(out) the university

**Timing: Friday 17 June. Parallel session: 09:00-10:45. Plenary session: 13:15-15:15**

#### Theme organisers

Janja Komljenovic, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Bristol University, United Kingdom  
Tatyana Bajenova, UNIKE PhD Candidate, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, France  
Chris Muellerleile, Swansea University, United Kingdom

#### Aim of the theme

What many have theorized as the university is disintegrating right before our eyes. Encouraged by processes of digitization, marketization, financialization, and globalization, the contemporary university is now constituted by, beholden to, and competing with a wide array of new actors and institutions. Among other things, where once the university held a virtual monopoly on formal academic, scientific, and technical knowledge production, now the production of authoritative knowledge seems to be ubiquitous across society and economy. Digital technologies in particular have facilitated many of these processes by lowering technical barriers on the distribution and “publication” of knowledge and information. Furthermore, new service providers, whether focused on education, research, or policy are marketing solutions to students, teachers, academic researchers, university administrators, and policy makers. In interrogating the ways universities are cooperating and competing with new actors and institutions, these sessions will engage with the ways *the university itself* is being transformed as a social and economic institution. In other words, these sessions will question how the university, *qua* a site of knowledge production, is being “re-assembled” from the ground up, and whether as a result we ought to reconsider the socio-economic purpose of the modern university.

#### Format of sessions

##### Session one: Paper session

Participants: Tatyana Bajenova, Janja Komljenovic, Nick Lewis/Cris Shore, Eva Hartmann, Daniel Couch.

Chair: Jana Bacevic

##### Session two: Plenary

Participants of the plenary: Chris Newfield, Kris Olds, Nick Lewis/Cris Shore, Susan Robertson and Chris Muellerleile.

Chair: Chris Muellerleile

Abstract: While the paper session will focus on individual research questions, this panel session will focus on the core problem of reassembling knowledge production in a “post-university” world. The panellists will be

asked to reflect on the questions below (subject to editing by the organizers) in 7-8 minutes. The chair will then facilitate a ~30 minute discussion among the panel members, and the remaining time (~30 minutes) will be open for questions/discussion with the audience.

Questions:

7. If we begin from the assumption that the university is to some extent being transformed by various 'isms' and 'izations' (neoliberal/private, financial, global, digital) what are some starting points for understanding how academic knowledge itself is being transformed in and out of (but always in relation to) the university?
8. If the boundaries of the university are becoming increasingly porous to capital, and the operating logics of things like the law, risk management, corporate and consultant management, is it time to fundamentally question whether the university itself is still an actually existing institution, let alone an explanatory analytical category?

## Presenters' abstracts

**Tatyana Bajenova, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon, France**

**Title: EU think tanks and forms of their capital: how to create a powerful combination**

This paper aims to investigate and further develop an approach to conceptualising American think tanks (Medvetz, 2010, 2012) as applied to their European counterparts. It is based on empirical data on 25 think tanks from Brussels, London, Paris and Ljubljana. Think tanks are structures working within the counteractive logics of academic, political, economic and media spheres. Consequently they must accumulate and use different forms of capital: scientific authority and academic degrees, ability in particular political forms of rhetoric, funding and fundraising skills, entrepreneurial practices and access to the mass media. A victory in this game of "quadruple bind" is gained not only as result of accumulating large capital capacity, but by creating the most suitable combination of capital forms in a specific time-place. I argue that there are two other forms of capital, which think tanks accumulate and use, i.e. symbolic and network. Symbolic capital deals with public legitimation of a "think tank", such as an independent institution, serving public interest and bridging research and policy. Network capital refers to the power derived from formal and informal relations with other think tanks, universities and policy makers. These forms of capital are particularly important in the EU context, taking into account that the influence of the think tanks on the EU policy-making process is gained from three interconnected sources: expertise-based authority, independence and legitimacy. If expertise-based authority is related to academic and political forms of capital, independence and legitimacy are symbolic attributes of the think tank's public image. Networks have a capacity to drive public debates in Brussels as well as in member-states. Their significance is difficult to overestimate due to particular multinational, multi-lingual and multilevel characteristics of the EU policy conditions. This paper shows the complex and multiscalar processes of think tanks' operation and provides an insight into the strategies which EU think tanks employ to exert influence on European and national policy-making relying on the different forms of capital.

**Janja Komljenovic, University of Bristol, United Kingdom**

**Title: Education markets under construction**

This paper focuses on the question of how higher education is being transformed as a consequence of social processes broadly understood as 'marketization'. It is engaged in mapping the broad terrain of changes, on the one hand, and takes a series of case studies to explore the different actors, projects and outcomes for higher education as a sector, on the other. I propose a categorisation of the actors that are part

of market-making in the higher education sector, which serves as a useful heuristic in bringing specific processes to the fore. The category of the changing university reveals that it acts as a seller as well as a buyer of services and goods. A variety of actors strategically work to change the status of a service, from one that is not commodified to one that is. These actors are constantly seeking the means through which they are moving over, and making the boundary (understood as a particular mode of structural selectivity of institutedness that frames the university as a public good space) between the university and the wider commercial world, more porous so as quicken the pace and thicken the space of market exchanges. The next category – PPP (public private partnerships) – refers to a situation when a public university and a private company form new structural arrangements in order to together create and expand their markets. The brokers' are actors who are forging (market) relations between buyers (who are normally universities) and sellers (who are normally companies). The brokers' role in re-sectoralising higher education is to bring in and broker other markets and actors in the higher education sector. Enhancers are actors who provide structures and forms which enable actors to speed up the processes of instituting markets. Extractors are extracting value out of the higher education sector by building competition and structured exchange, but without monetary transaction. These cases together illuminate the spatial, temporal, social and political dynamics at play in the processes of global education 'market-making' at macro, meso and micro levels. They are also fruitful for reflecting upon existing theoretical learnings.

**Nick Lewis and Cris Shore, University of Auckland, New Zealand**

**Title: From Unbundling to Market Making: Reassembling and Reinventing the Public University**

Most critiques of contemporary public university reform centre on the introduction of commercialising logics, entrepreneurial subjectivities, new managerial technologies of control, and the spectre of privatisation. Critics see market-making technologies such as benchmarks, rankings, performance indicators, and productivity measures as illustrations of how public universities have become neoliberalised. In this paper, we extend this critique of university neoliberalisation to highlight how these various technologies work together to make a higher education market; that is to stabilise, qualify and make commensurable the activities of the public university so as to financialise it. Drawing on examples from New Zealand and the list of public university functions that Barber and colleagues (2013) see as open to unbundling, we offer a new reading of the entrepreneurial university. The paper explores how the multi-faceted assault on the institutions of the public university might be understood as market making in a world where even the most strident proponents of free markets understand them as having to be fashioned. The financialisation phase of the neoliberalising university centres on identifying its economic rents – such as reputation, degree-awarding status, research-based teaching and certification – and opening these up to external providers. The survival of the public university, it is claimed, rests on its ability to reinvent itself by unbundling these traditionally bundled attributes so as to render them calculable and financialisable. We argue that offering up universities to private capital must be understood as an economy making project as well as an ideological and political project.

**Eva Hartmann, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark**

**Title: The parallel universe of corporate universities**

It seems that an ever-shorter temporal rhythm is gaining ground with the end of the "short twentieth century" (Hobsbawm 1995) challenging the modern temporal horizon. The emerging economy relies on a continuous stream of scientific and technical knowledge closely related to information technology and networks. The paper explores the consequences of the ever-shorter life cycle of knowledge on the organisation of tertiary education where the distinction between higher education (HE), technical and vocational training (TVET) and career and technical education (CTE) has become blurred in the name of further edu-



cation. Little attention has been paid to the consequences of this change for the production of knowledge and its dissemination through education. The paper will present the findings of a study examining corporate universities and academies (Rademakers 2014). These universities are usually educational units set up by companies with a view to organising the further education of their staff. Cases in point are the pharmaceutical company's Bayer Academy or Apple University. Some of these educational providers have become company-independent entities selling their services to a range of companies. Other companies are research and consultancy firms that have moved into the educational sector to provide their services to companies. These different educational providers are about to establish a "parallel universe" (Adelman 2000) besides the formal tertiary education. The study seeks to provide insights into how knowledge production is reassembled in this parallel universe.

**Daniel Couch, University of Auckland, New Zealand**

**Title: Crowding in or crowding out? The crowded space of Higher Education following violent conflict**

For Afghanistan, 2014 was the beginning of what was termed by development agents as the 'decade of transformation' following a 'decade of transition'. During 2014, the second 5-year steering policy document for Afghan Higher Education was also drafted. The policy document sets out the direction for an integral national element within the first half of Afghanistan's transformation decade. What was once an elite and small-scale system has experienced massive and exponentially increasing growth of over 1890% since 2001, leading to significant challenges across Afghanistan's higher education sector. This is a sector still struggling to redress the physical and psychological damages of three and a half decades of war. As has been the case in previous conflict-affected contexts, the Afghan Ministry of Higher Education has sought international partnerships with Universities in the global North, as well as drawn on a range of international consultants at key stages for Higher Education development nationally, for instance in the drafting of its National Higher Education Strategic Plans. This presentation will draw on the concepts of 'crowding in' and 'crowding out' to explore Afghanistan's most recent Higher Education Strategic Plan. These terms describe a process in which aid (in the forms of expertise, governance, finance, and the like) is provided in a manner that either promotes independence or dependence within the receiving country. Using document analysis and interview data, I interrogate Afghanistan's Higher Education Strategic Plan to look for instances of both 'crowding in' and 'crowding out', to locate where opportunities for each exist, and begin to explore how such opportunities have emerged. The paper contends that businesses and stakeholders, particularly from the global North, are engaging with and reassembling Higher Education in Afghanistan in a very tangible sense.

## Scientific theme 3

### How do nation-states mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy?

**Timing: Thursday 16 June. Parallel session: 10:15-12:00. Plenary session: 13:00-15:00**

#### Theme organisers

Jie Gao, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Que Anh Dang, UNIKE PhD Candidate, University of Bristol, United Kingdom  
Miguel Lim, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Jakob Williams Ørberg, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Philipp Friedrich, PhD Candidate, University of Oslo, Norway

#### Aim of theme

This panel explores how nation states mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy and how governments use them to further national interests. Through cases from Europe and the Asia-Pacific we aim to study, among others, (1) the processes of region building that aim at enhancing competitiveness of world regions, (2) the construction of international campuses or outposts that position national universities' in 'global' settings, (3) higher education as an instrument of 'soft' diplomacy, and (4) the construction of frames of reference such as university rankings to define the space of global excellence and access national universities' position within it. We reflect on the 'globalization' of national higher education agendas and the widening role of universities within a 'global knowledge economy' and ask how both this 'global knowledge economy' and the university are constituted in the process. Finally, we raise questions about university autonomy and accountability with regard to national priorities, about the continued role of the 'world class' university in national development and regionalization, and about how imaginaries of global spatial hierarchies come into being.

#### Format of sessions

##### Session one

Chair: Peter Maassen

Brief Introduction by Peter Maassen on the aims and format of the sessions

Presenters: Takao Kamibeppu, Philipp Friedrich, Fadia Dakka, Gaoming Zheng and Yuzhuo Cai, Maresi Nerad

Questions and comments from the floor

##### Session two

Chair: Susan Robertson

Presenters: Que Anh Dang, Jie Gao, Miguel Lim, Jakob Williams Ørberg

Questions and comments from the floor

Roundtable participants: Takao Kamibeppu, Susan Robertson, Peter Maassen, Ove Kaj Pedersen (pending) and Chris Tremewan (pending)

**Presenters' abstracts****Takao Kamibepu, Professor, Fukuyama City University, Japan****Title: Internationalization policy of Japanese higher education: Analysis from multiple perspectives**

This presentation inquires into the development of Japan's internationalization policy of higher education from the early 1980s to today by employing a multiple-perspective approach for policy analysis. By viewing the policy developments from rational, organizational, political, and symbolic perspectives, this paper attempts to reveal the complex nature of the policy evolution of internationalization of higher education in Japan. From rational perspectives, the shortage of foreign students compared to other industrialized countries was a problem for Japan or for the Japanese government at least. The natural course of action was to increase scholarships and loosen immigration policies to encourage them to come. Looking from organizational perspectives, it was necessary for the Ministry of Education, the agency mainly in charge of foreign student policy, to maintain its status among ministries by having many foreign students in the context of the declining child population and ageing society in Japan. From political perspectives, Japan had to meet the demands from developing countries and the wider international community to accept more foreign students as one of its contributions to international society, and also to compete in securing highly skilled workers, based on the demands from politicians and industry. In symbolic perspectives, targets of 100,000 or 300,000 had no convincing rationales, serving as symbols. The initial target of 100,000 was set merely to be equal to France at that time, and the next 300,000 was to maintain Japan's share in the increasingly mobile student network worldwide.

**Philipp Friedrich, PhD, University of Oslo, Norway****Title: Balancing autonomy in Austrian higher education: the university between national agendas and institutional traditions**

The key argument of this first idea is that university autonomy is a central issue in mobilizing universities in the (global) knowledge economy. This is created by changing governance mechanisms between the university and the state.

One example is the case of Austria. The university sector in Austria has undergone several reform attempts in the recent decades, the latest one in 2002. These reforms can, in general, be understood as a shifting relationship between universities as institution/organizational actors and the state. Special emphasis has been given to the notion of autonomy, and how it can be used in an effective way between these two poles. Autonomy here is elaborated on a set of different assumptions and purposes: on the one hand, e.g. the university became increasingly important for national purposes, in a sense of contributing to national economic development. More autonomy granted by the state has the intention that universities then do what is best for them which eventually will serve national economic agendas. However the university is still too important, so it cannot be completely without state supervision. This then is the tricky part, because on the other hand, autonomy is only granted under the condition that universities will fulfil national purposes no matter how well or poorly they are defined. However, this may clash with the immanent notion of how knowledge is explored and how research is handled, so autonomy for the university may in fact be very differently interpreted by the university itself.

**Dr Fadia Dakka, Senior Teaching Associate, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, United Kingdom****Title: Competition, differentiation and convergence in the English higher education: hegemonic discourses and national strategies.**

Looking simultaneously at structural economic constraints and at the semiotic turn that animates the cultural shift toward the entrepreneurial-competitive university, this paper illustrates the powerful yet contradictory role of market mechanisms, strategies and discourses at play in the current restructuring of the English HE sector.

While attempting a preliminary evaluation of its recent radical policy changes in terms of institutional diversity and homogenization, this paper will rely on the conceptualization of "competition fetish" (Naidoo 2011, 2015) to decipher the ideological dispositifs through which nation-states mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy. It will be argued that contemporary higher education represents the "point of grace" wherein three master narratives – globalization, competitiveness, and

knowledge based economy- have merged and intensely interacted over the past 30 years (Jessop and Sum 2013). Competition will be construed both as a quintessential and effective market mechanism and as a symbolic point of reference that is increasingly orienting economic action without fully understanding the totality of factors animating competitive processes nor –significantly- its outcomes.

The recent emergence of competitive-collaborative alliances/strategic partnerships (GW4, M5, SES-5) operating simultaneously at a regional and global level provides a powerful example of how the English higher education elite segment is being reconfigured in response to the new fee environment: regional collaboration strengthens and exacerbates national and global (research) competition while serving as a catalyst for economic growth and innovation. However the logic of competition and its corollary narratives of excellence (and ensuing “excellence policies”, Olssen, 2015) decontextualize and simplify performances, reducing the potential for diversity and ultimately weakening higher education systems by ranking institutions and people, reinforcing pre-existing hierarchies and creating paradoxical, unintended consequences, such as “polarized convergence”. (Dakka, 2015).

**Gaoming Zheng, PhD, Higher Education Group (HEG), School of Management, University of Tampere , Finland and Yuzhuo Cai, Higher Education Group (HEG), School of Management, University of Tampere, Finland**

**Title: Europe-China doctoral education collaboration in the Global Knowledge Society: historical development and future challenges**

Collaboration on higher education between Europe and China has developed rapidly in the global knowledge society over the past decade due to the common interests and objectives of both sides. Our study aims to fill a research gap of lacking comprehensive research on Europe-China higher education collaboration, particularly at the level of doctoral education. In so doing, we review and analyse the Europe-China higher education collaboration, with a specific research emphasis on the doctoral education collaborative initiatives from an evolutionary perspective and with analytical foci on national/supranational, institutional and disciplinary levels. Our analysis reveals that with the implement of multiple collaborative initiatives from both Europe and China, such as cooperative projects, joint institutions, joint programmes and joint supervision, as well as the development of policy dialogues between EU and China, the collaboration on doctoral education between the two sides has developed fast in 21st century, and both Europe and China have enhanced their competitiveness in the global knowledge society gradually. In the analysis, we also find that the development of Europe-China doctoral education cooperation is aligned with interest fits between the two sides. In this light, we also identify some challenges in EU-China doctoral education collaboration and accordingly solicit policy recommendations for both European and Chinese stakeholders for deepening the collaboration as well as further enhancing their global competitiveness in the future.

**Maresi Nerad, Professor, University of Washington, United States of America**

**Title: Becoming Part of the Global Knowledge Economy- National Innovation Policies and Recent National Policies in India and China to attract their Scholars Back Home: A Critical Analysis**

The concerns about the PhD labour market and the process of PhD education, long of interest primarily to academic faculty, departmental administrators, university presidents, and the individual PhD recipients, are increasingly an arena where competing interests are converging to affect national policies, to set academic standards worldwide, and to influence PhD recipients' career choices. India and China, two countries in which many of their students have been getting doctorates abroad, recently have established national policies to attract their PhDs, postdocs, and senior scholars back home.

This presentation will critically analyse, how two universities, one in China and one in India, reacted and implemented these new national policies and what roles the governmental incentives played in the individual scholars' decision to return home.

**Jie Gao, PhD, Aarhus University, Denmark**

**Title: The Shadow of World-ordering in Sino-Foreign Joint Campuses**

A narrative of world-order is embedded in the discourses of the global knowledge economy, in which different countries and regions are imagined to occupy different positions within a hierarchical ranking in relation to a developmental timeline. Universities are critical institutions mobilized by the nation-states in positioning themselves competitively within such order. They interact with this narrative throughout their praxis of internationalization and take effect in reinforcing and shaping it.

In this project I explore the interaction between the nation states, the universities and the imaginary world order in the particular cases of Sino-Danish joint campus. I will investigate: 1) the construction of the imaginary of world-order in the (inter)national discourses of China and Denmark; 2) how the universities and the joint campuses have been mobilized in varied ways by the Chinese and Danish governments in their agenda to secure good positions in the world-order; 3) how the imaginary/logic of world-order have been activated and negotiated in the practices of internationalization of Chinese and Danish universities

The initiation and operation of the joint campuses are both prescribed and actively mediating the construction of the imagined world-order. I use the ethnography of the Sino-Danish joint-campus to map out the key actors and the dynamics they situate in, tracing through the key policies governing their operation. Through the meaningful interpretation of the specific cases, the roles of the universities in negotiating the world order in the global knowledge economy are re-examined.

**Que Anh Dang, UNIKE PhD Candidate, University of Bristol, United Kingdom**

**Title: Regionalising Higher Education and Repositioning Southeast Asia**

The ten members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have recently declared the establishment of the ASEAN Community, in which higher education is acknowledged as "one of the catalysts in accelerating ASEAN's economic, political and sociocultural development agenda" and contributing to "the promotion of peace, prosperity, resilience, and vibrancy of ASEAN". This paper applies the concept of 'variegated regionalism' (Robertson 2014) to explain how higher education has been mobilised to contribute to the ASEAN region-building project and with what outcomes. The variegated regionalism approach views regionalization of higher education as a process of transforming governance. The construction of region is materialized through vertical and horizontal rescaling of the state's space and power, and re-territorialising projects (regional rules and institutions) which in turn constitute particular forms of regionalization. Furthermore, variegated regionalism and the rescaling of higher education governance are the outcome of neoliberal globalization and of the ongoing expansion of global capitalist markets including the creation of an education services sector.

Based on the case study of ASEAN's intra-regional new institutions and extra-regional higher education cooperation, particularly with the European Union in the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process, this paper also argues that higher education is brought into the regional policies to (re)position the ASEAN region economically, politically and culturally in relation to other regions and in the global knowledge economy at large.

**Miguel Lim, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark**

**Title: Global rankings, reputational risk, and the competition state**

Rankings, understood as calculative devices, contribute to the development of a new kind of risk that universities and nations need to manage. Global rankings, presented as stylized visual tables, make the relative positions of both universities and states very clear. Rankings create a 'distance' between universities and show the differences between the number of 'world class universities' that different nations and states have. The emergence of the 'competitive state' in the context of the knowledge economy is one way to understand and frame how rankings bring institutions and states into competitive relationships with one another.



The ranking device's 'logic' of comparative competition brings the rankings' objects into a management game. Policy makers, as managers of the knowledge economy, attempt to manage these visible, measurable and volatile distances by working out what they need to do to climb up into the category of 'world-class university'. These strategies are especially relevant for nation states that (1) are 'emerging' and need to establish their position in the knowledge economy hierarchy, (2) are established but are at threat by the emergence of new economic players and (3) states which earn or stand to earn significant revenue from the export of education services. The management of this new reputational and positional risk – the risk of not having a competitive advantage in the new economy – is linked to the rise of performance management and risk management within the university and between the university sector and the state itself.

**Jakob Williams Ørberg, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark**

**Title: Mobilizing World Class in Indian National Development**

Seeking a leading role in a global knowledge economy, India's tryst with world ranking has been a frustrated one. While it has been government policy to establish a set of World Class Universities for near to a decade the best Indian universities still fall short of the global elite according to ranking institutes. The response has been frenzied public debate followed by tightened demand on performance data and policy focus on ranking parameters.

This paper investigates the role of 'global excellence' in Indian higher education policy making through the example of the Indian Institutes of Technology, which were set up with lavish budgets and strong international links at the time of independence in order to charge India's way to membership of the developed world. I argue that the existence of these 'islands of excellence' in India's higher education landscape throughout their history have made government claims about the delivery of 'development and modernity' credible. They have furthermore served as 'policy ambassadors' in implementing 'international standards' in the wider system through faculty training programs and mentorship of institutions.

The inability of contemporary Indian institutions to meet global definitions for excellence endangers this policy dynamic. It not only questions the arrival of India in the knowledge economy, but also the ability of government and its institutions to deliver this 'arrival' in the future.

## Scientific theme 4

How can universities be transformed to center on public goods in teaching, research, and community engagement?

**Timing: Wednesday 15 June. Parallel session: 13:15-14:30. Plenary session: 15:00-17:00**

### Theme Organisers

Catherine Butcher, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Roehampton University, United Kingdom  
Daniel Kontowski, PhD Candidate, University of Winchester, United Kingdom  
Susan Wright, Professor, DPU, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Rebecca Boden, Professor, Roehampton University, United Kingdom  
Roger Dale, Professor, University of Bristol, United Kingdom  
Davydd Greenwood, Professor, Cornell University, United States of America  
Cris Shore, Professor, University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Jon Altuna, Academic Vice Rector, Mondragon Unibertsitatea, Spain  
Joss Winn, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom  
Mike Neary, Professor, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom

### Aim of theme

To identify some potential pathways to address the current deficiencies in higher education institutional structures and practices; and to use current alternative university trends and best practices to begin developing an audit tool by which universities could be evaluated and helped to focus on their public good initiatives and community benefit.

### Format of Session

#### **Session 1 Alternative ways of organising the university: (parallel)**

Facilitator: Pending

Discussants: Rebecca Boden and Cris Shore

Introduction:

Catherine Butcher on the aims and objectives of the sessions and the format.

Presentations:

- Jon Altuna on a successful cooperative university in the Basque of Spain.
- Mike Neary and Joss Winn on establishing the Social Science Centre at Lincoln which is a constituted co-operative for higher education. They are currently working on developing a model framework for co-operative higher education.
- Catherine Butcher on heterodox university models that may offer students a different educational outcome in terms of cost, access, pedagogy and curriculum.
- Daniel Kontowski on liberal education institutions in Europe with a focus on curriculum design, multi-level governance and advocacy, with international comparability.

- Oğuz Babüroğlu and Tunç Evcimen on designing and developing three Universities from ground zero, two foundation-owned non-profit private universities and one state university supported by a foundation.
- Olav Eikeland on a pilot program called "Program for Lifelong Learning" which is concerned with the informal and non-formal learning outside the formal educational institution.
- Tim May on how universities can enhance their contributions to socio-economic engagement with a focus on examining the relations between knowledge, organization and practice.
- Klaus D. Beiter, Kwadwo Appiagyei-Atua and Terence Karran on academic freedom in Europe and Africa.
- Yuzhuo Cai and Cui Liu on the entrepreneurial university in regional innovation systems

### **Session 2 Workshop (Plenary)**

Facilitator: Davydd Greenwood

The group will organise a workshop in which participants will brainstorm principles, issues, and approaches (democracy, social justice, pedagogy, ownership, financing, governance) in groups to address the identified problems, moving forward. As part of the process moving forward, we will initiate discussions of the development of an alternative audit tool that embodies an alternative approach to higher education accountability based on the concepts and principles of solidarity, collaboration, *bildung*, mutual engagement, and service locally, nationally, and globally. We aim to recruit interested collaborators and begin planning a developmental process extending beyond the conference. We will set an initial agenda to be presented and followed up in the closing meeting of the group at this conference

### **Session 3 Open organisation meetings**

Wednesday 15 June and Thursday 16 June, from 5.00 -6.00 pm (and may continue during dinner).

Facilitator: Roger Dale

An informal meeting **open to all participants of the Conference**, has been scheduled in order to discuss:

1. the possible outputs of the two sessions, and
2. ways for interested participants to continue working together post Copenhagen.

### **Presenters' abstracts**

**Dr Joss Winn and Professor Mike Neary, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom**

**Title: Beyond public and private: A framework for co-operative higher education**

Universities in the UK are increasingly adopting corporate governance structures, a consumerist model of teaching and learning, and have the most expensive tuition fees in the world (McGettigan, 2013; OECD, 2015). This paper will report on a 12-month project funded by the Independent Social Research Foundation (ISRF) to develop an alternative model of knowledge production grounded in co-operative values and principles. The project has been run with the Social Science Centre (SSC), a small, experimental co-operative for higher education established in Lincoln in 2011 (Social Science Centre, 2013). We will discuss the design of the research project, the widespread interest in the idea of co-operative higher education and our approach based on the collaborative production of knowledge by academics and students (Neary and Winn, 2009; Winn 2015). The main findings of the research so far will be outlined relating to the key themes of our research: pedagogy, governance, legal frameworks, business models, and transnational solidarity. We will consider how these five themes relate to three identified routes to co-operative higher education (conversion, dissolution, or creation) and argue that such work must be grounded in an adequate critique of labour and property i.e. the capital relation. We will identify both the possible opportunities that the latest higher education reform in the UK affords the co-operative movement as well as the issues that arise from a more marketised and financialised approach to the production of knowledge (HEFCE, 2015). Finally, we will suggest how the co-operative movement might respond with democratic alternatives that go beyond the distinction of public and private education.

**Daniel Kontowski, PhD Candidate, University of Winchester, United Kingdom**

**Title: Community good in European liberal education"**

Liberal education institutions historically claimed to be delivering both a private good to educated graduates and a public good for the local community and the wider society (Marginson 2011; Delbanco 2012). The relatively recent rise of such initiatives across Europe, which now well exceeds 50 programs in several countries (Godwin 2015b), can certainly be considered a growing alternative pathway in European higher education, focusing less on direct professional preparation of the graduates, and more on transferable skills useful in a longer perspective (The Task Force on Higher Education in Developing Countries 2000; van der Wende 2011; Quinlan 2014). The extent to which such initiatives place their ends and means in the extra-academic space varies across countries and institutions, reflecting the diversity within European liberal education (Becker et al. 2012; Detweiler & Axer 2012; Norgaard & Hajnal 2014; van der Wende 2013; Godwin 2015a). In my short presentation, I would create an overview of the general trends in European liberal education, showing to what extent they contradict the neoliberal agenda of seeing higher education as primarily the factory of a skilled workforce. I will conclude with few examples of good practices in these dimensions (eg. community projects, support for the refugees, public issues).

**Oğuz N. Babüroğlu, Arama Participatory Management Consulting and Sabanci University and**

**Tunç T. Evcimen, Arama Participatory Management Consulting and Turkish Air Force Academy, Turkey**

**Title: The Emergence of Next Generation Universities: Integrating Missions**

Next generation models create a more integrated approach between undergraduate education, academic research and community projects. Next generation universities are derived more from real life and community needs. This feature in turn calls for integrating disciplines and missions of higher education institutions. Next generation higher education institutions generate solutions via institutions that tackle real life problems together with NGOs, research agencies and R&D departments. Our approach stands in contrast to the "third generation university" definition of Wissema (2009) who has adopted a neoliberal approach by emphasizing the role of the University as an agent of entrepreneurship and innovation. Over the last 21 years we have been engaged in designing and developing three Universities from ground zero. These University action research initiatives have differed in a number of ways. We have actively served and implemented the co-generated design ideas in Sabanci University as a member of the University, prepared a turn-key design for Ozyegin University and continued in a monitoring role and we are working with the Abdullah Gul University supported with a research grant to generate a model that puts societal impact in front of research and education missions which can then be diffused to the other Universities in Turkey. Our presentation therefore will bring new generation and alternative to mainstream universities' design experiences and try to generate meaningful reflections about the process and content of action research within this context.

**Tim May, Professor, University of Durham and Co-director of the Sustainable Urban and Regional Futures Research Centre, University of Salford Manchester, United Kingdom**

**Title: Seeking Alternatives and the Ambivalence of Context and Content**

There are profound changes affecting universities. Under pressure from the forward march of neoliberalism there is a process of forgetting about the origins of the university and its distinctive place in society. Whilst responses by university management often amplify these consequences, there are similar tendencies to be found within academic professional cultures. One tends to emphasise the importance of the control of context, whilst the other seeks to transcend that through a focus on the content of work via a celebration of expertise. What becomes apparent are varying degrees of 'epistemic permeability' between disciplines and institutions. Overall, these forces combine to enable forms of power to individualize issues around the pursuit of recognition for global excellence that can work to displace the pursuit of local-

ly, engaged relevance. Universities have always played important civic functions over time. In the context of the 'knowledge-based economy', however, these have become increasingly codified and institutionalised under the varying rubrics of community engagement, participation, outreach or 'third mission'. A series of heightened environmental expectations adds to ambivalence on the part of academics in terms of the constitution of their own expertise within particular disciplines and organizational structures. It also leads to claims about universities being to the post-industrial society 'as coal mines were to the industrial society'. Whilst we see calls to inter-disciplinarity to meet new demands, the actual means of achieving this and adding community engagement with those outside of institutional boundaries remains problematic. The talk argues that this is symptomatic of a 'missing middle' that needs to be the subject of reflexive consideration and action in order that the unique role of the university in society to benefit varying groups is not lost. For this reason there is not only an examination of the above forces, but a consideration of organizational alternatives to improve the realisation of this value.

**Klaus D. Beiter, Marie Curie Intra-European Fellow, University of Lincoln; Kwadwo Appiagyeyi-Atua, Marie Curie Incoming International Fellow, University of Lincoln and Terence Karran, Professor of Higher Education Policy, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom**

**Title: Developing a Survey Instrument to "Measure" the Factual Protection of the Right to Academic Freedom (With a Focus on Europe)**

UNESCO's Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel, a document of 1997 that is not legally, but "politically" binding, protects the right to academic freedom. Academic freedom in terms of the Recommendation covers various aspects: freedom of teaching, freedom in carrying out research, institutional autonomy, self-governance and job security (including tenure). These diverse entitlements must be seen to constitute manifestations of requirements posited by international human rights law. The UNESCO Recommendation therefore remains a blueprint for organising universities and their relations with society. Its values remain relevant to restraining the power of states to control universities, whether so as to ensure they will endorse certain ideological tenets or to mobilise them to play a pivotal role in implementing a state's economic agenda and sufficiently contributing to the growth of national GDP. The reality is that academic freedom continues to be – and renewedly has come – under threat in many parts of the world. Apart from "attacks" on scholars for ideological reasons, the commercialisation of higher education poses a major threat to academic freedom. A recent study by the authors of the legal protection of the right to academic freedom (i.e. its protection under relevant legislation) in 29 European states shows that this leaves much to be desired. This presentation focuses on efforts undertaken at developing a survey instrument to "measure" the factual protection of the right to academic freedom, applying, on the one hand, a typology of threats to academic freedom and, on the other, the criteria of academic freedom referred to. The instrument is intended to help finding out whether, in a certain country/region/academic context, the situation in practice reflects compliance with the criteria of that right. The instrument has been widely endorsed by national and international human rights/higher education NGOs and is currently being applied in the format of an online survey on academic freedom in Europe, Africa and Australasia. The presentation will also address initial results of the survey obtained in the stated 29 European countries, discussing whether these results confirm the findings for the legal protection of the right to academic freedom in the states concerned.

**Dr. Yuzhuo Cai, University of Tampere, Finland and Dr. Cui Liu, Zhejiang University, China**

**Title: The entrepreneurial university as an institutional entrepreneur in regional innovation system development: The case of Tongji Creative Cluster in Shanghai**

The current literature concerning the role of the university in a knowledge economy or innovation system, mainly accentuates the entrepreneurial nature of university from an economic perspective without paying much attention to the potential of the entrepreneurial university as a key actor shaping the future society in terms of enabling changes in the institutional settings. This paper tries to fill this gap by advancing our theoretical and empirical understandings of the role of the entrepreneurial university as an institutional entre-



preneur in innovation system development. Through a case study of the Tongji Creative Cluster, a unique and successful model of a regional innovation system in Shanghai, China, it reveals that Tongji University, as the knowledge production actor in the system, plays a key role in fostering a favourable institutional environment conducive to innovation. Such a finding challenges the prevailing view that it is the government that plays a leading, if not sole, role in formulating the institutional contexts for developing innovation systems in China, thereby raising an interesting issue for future research on the relations between university and the society.

Keywords: Institutional entrepreneurship; Institutional logics; Innovation system; Triple Helix; Entrepreneurial university; social engagement, China; Shanghai

**Catherine Butcher, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Roehampton University, United Kingdom – abstract pending**

**Jon Altuna, Academic Vice Rector, Mondragon Unibertsitatea – abstract pending**

**Olav Eikeland, Vice Dean, Oslo Akershus University College – abstract pending**

## Scientific theme 5

### Reconsidering "Internationalization" from Peripheral Perspectives

**Timing: Friday 17 June. Parallel session: 09:15-10:45. Plenary session: 11:00-12:30**

#### Theme organisers

Sintayehu Kassaye Alemu, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Ljubljana University, Slovenia  
Mei Qu, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Sonja Trifuljesko, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, University of Helsinki, Finland  
Zulfa Sakhiyya, PhD Candidate, University of Auckland, New Zealand

#### Aim of theme

In the past few decades, the concept of "internationalization" has been dominated by powerful actors such as university ranking agencies, intergovernmental organizations, university consortia, university managers in the corporate-like universities, and researchers/practitioners from the developed areas. The voices of the unprivileged actors — students, administrators, academic staffs, and researchers/practitioners speaking for developing areas — who are situated within the "periphery" of the higher education sector, have largely been overlooked. This session will bring together a group of critical thinkers, who will present papers representing marginalized voices to supplement the current discussion on the concept of "internationalization" in higher education research. The session will be followed by a round table discussion, in which participants will comment on and summarize the views contributed by previous presentations and discuss how the peripheral perspectives can exert an influence in the internationalization process of higher education.

#### Format of sessions

##### Session one: Paper presentation

Chairs: Mei Qu, Sintayehu Kassaye Alemu, Sonja Trifuljesko and Zulfa Sakhiyya

##### Session two: Roundtable discussion

Chairs: Mei Qu, Sintayehu Kassaye Alemu, Sonja Trifuljesko and Zulfa Sakhiyya  
Key Discussants: Rui Yang, Davydd Greenwood, Pavel Zgaga, Susan Wright

#### Presenters' abstracts

**Shamsul A.B., National University of Malaysia, Malaysia**

**Title: The price of success: Internationalization of private higher education in Malaysia and its unexpected challenges**

It has been claimed that Malaysia has initiated and developed a successful and healthy business model of the internationalization of private higher education. This model apparently has been replicated in a number of developing and developed countries. It is interesting to note that, contrary to general perception, the Malaysian model is not really defined and dominated by 'powerful actors from the centre.' The centre and

the hub has been Malaysia itself. The clients are indeed from different 'powerful centres,' semi-periphery countries and underdeveloped ones. The phenomenal growth and expansion of private international higher education in Malaysia since the mid-1980s, has made this sector a substantial contributor to the national income. To regulate and manage this sector the Malaysian government felt compelled to introduce, in Parliament, "Act 555, The Private Higher Educational Institutions Act 1996." The healthy growth enjoyed by this sector in the last decade has made the Malaysian National Higher Education Strategic Plan Beyond 2020 to focus, as one of its major targets, on making Malaysia a top academic hub in the world. The success thus far has resulted not only in increased national income and other benefits but also has brought about negative impacts and generated unexpected challenges for the Malaysian society as a whole. The overall success story and its unexpected negative impacts shall be discussed and analysed.

**Zulfa Sakhiyya, PhD Candidate, University of Auckland, New Zealand**

**Title: Internationalization of Higher Education in Indonesia**

This paper examines the internationalization of higher education in the periphery, by taking the case of Indonesia. This decade has witnessed two major reforms in the higher education sector in Indonesia: privatization and internationalization. Privatization is characterized by making the public private, whereas internationalization refers to increasing global partnerships and mobility. While privatization and internationalization are parts of a global ensemble of higher education; in the Indonesian context, privatization is heavily resisted, but internationalization is widely accepted. This paper traces the emergence of internationalization and highlights how this seemingly localized form of internationalization strategies is intricately connected to global processes. In addition, it shows how the dominant discourse of internationalization is established in the higher education sector and maintained through various mechanisms. As a consequence, this leaves little space for alternative explanations and imagination about the university future. The paper argues for greater critical engagement with internationalization in order to open up space for re-interpretation and re-orientation of internationalization for greater local control and local focus.

**Sintayehu Kassaye Alemu, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Ljubljana University, Slovenia**

**Title: Challenges of Internationalization of Higher Education from a Periphery Perspective: Sub-Saharan Africa**

Internationalization of higher education is understood as an increasingly transformative phenomenon pushing institutions to adjust competitive standards for global visibility in the creation of a knowledge society through research, innovation, teaching, and services. However, the fact that it is predominantly shaped and driven by the Western industrialized world, it has posed, along with some positive benefits, complicated impacts, and challenges such as brain drain, cultural values, quality problems, the commodification of higher education, sustenance of inequality between North and South higher education. The unequal playground of internationalization has created serious challenges particularly for developing regions like Africa. African higher education institutions are the most internationalised as colonial creations, nevertheless they are also the most brain drained and globally marginalised and excluded. As a host of poorly developed knowledge systems, Africa is to deal with globalization not from a position of strength, but from one enmeshed in weaknesses. The challenge of internationalization of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa is not well articulated in the literature. This discussion makes an appraisal of the challenges of internationalization of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa focusing on research and mobility. The paper will be developed based on a qualitative discourse analysis and review of related literature.

**On Hee Choi, PhD Candidate, University of Bristol, United Kingdom**

**Title: Global Identity Emergence across Digital Space and Physical Space: a Multiple Case Study**

In the digital era where globalization has triggered internationalization in higher education, overseas study is still considered the best way for students to broaden their international and intercultural awareness. Digital space has contributed to internationalization in higher education by blurring physical boundaries, enabling information access and communication, which also trigger offline physical activities and social integration. This research will show how international students as significant stakeholders negotiate their existing identities over digital and physical space during their study abroad. Drawing on social constructivism, this multiple case study of five international students will explore how individual values are negotiated

among individuals and investigate what perceptions are embedded in their lived experiences. Most of all, this research will explore the potential emergence of 'global identity' through everyday practices over both digital and physical space. The main discussion highlights an investigation of how digital space, along with physical space, functions as 'social space', which is an influential locale in identity formation of international students. The practical argumentation of students' identity negotiation helps to find how internationalization of higher education makes an impact on everyday practices of international students.

**Sonja Trifuljesko, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, University of Helsinki, Finland**

**Title: A sense of location in 'internationalization'**

'Internatinalization' is, in its essence, a spatial metaphor. It evokes a movement of people, curricula, knowledge and so on - between one locality and another. Yet, 'internationalization' is rarely analysed from the perspective of space, place and location. This paper investigates the significance of location in 'internationalization of higher education', through the experience of doctoral candidates in Finland. Although peripheral actors, PhD candidates - being students and/or staff - provide a vantage point to understand what is going on at Finnish universities. Drawing upon my long-term ethnographic fieldwork at the University of Helsinki, I explore the manner in which doctoral candidates locate their own university. Furthermore, I pay attention to the relationships between different locations of the University. Finally, I look at the ways in which a particular location comes into being, through PhD candidates' experience. I conclude that a university gets located in multiple ways, that these different locations are at times in tension with each other, and that they are not fixed, but are shifting, depending on the relationships that constitute them.

**Elizabeth Koier & Wout Scholten, Rathenau Institute, The Hague, The Netherlands**

**Title: In Search of the War on Talent: Motivations of Internationally Mobile Researchers**

The national character of science policies and the international focus of research create a tension between science policy and the international mobility of researchers. Due to the rising international mobility among researchers, science is increasingly detached from one specific location in one country and more and more an international endeavour. International mobility of students and academics has caught the attention of (national) policy makers who emphasize that international mobility can contribute to (national) economic competitiveness and scientific excellence, which is why they try to attract and retain the most talented researchers. The rise in internationalisation and concomitant concerns about a possible brain drain raise the question if we are witnessing a 'global war on talent' in which universities and countries compete for the best researchers or if the increase in international mobility is caused by the worldwide increase in numbers of researchers and a rising competition for scarce academic jobs. To answer these questions we need insight into why researchers decide to move and what factors steer their choice of university or country. To this end we conducted about 25 semi-structured, in-depth interviews with foreign researchers who moved to a Dutch research institution about their decision making processes and negotiations.

**Mei Qu, UNIKE Associated PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark**

**Title: Striving for the Position in Global Knowledge Economy: A Comparative Ethnographic Study of Academic Staffs' Participation in Internationalization of Higher Education in a Danish University and a Chinese University**

It is widely acknowledged that academic staff are the driving force of internationalization. However, only a few studies, which mainly focus on academic staff working in North America, showed interest in their understanding of the term, and few of the studies investigate how they can fully play their leading roles, making their imagination of "internationalization" into realities. The paper derives from an ethnographic study that was carried out in a Chinese university and a Danish University. The two universities reside in two widely divergent cultures and societies, which leaves space for the researcher to explore how the term "internationalization" was transformed and presented by academic staff working in distinct cultures and social contexts. The paper describes and compares the interpretations of "internationalization" made by academic staff from the two universities. It is argued that there were shifts of focus in the concept of internationalization held by the academic staff from both universities, although the shifts were presented in different ways. For academic staff, "internationalization" is a continual process of positioning themselves in the ever-changing global knowledge economy. By elaborating the experiences of academic staff who played

leading roles in internationalization, the paper further argues that realizing their imagination of internationalization, requires university leaders' trust in academic staff's entrepreneurship and effective dialogues which involve "rooting" (in one's own subjectivity) and "shifting" (to that of the partner[s]).

**Lisanne Wilken, Dr. Phil., and Mette Ginnerskov Hansen, PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark – abstract pending.**



## Scientific theme 6

### Market-driven or open-ended higher education?

**Timing: Wednesday 15 June. Plenary session: 10:15-12:00. Parallel session: 13:00-14:30**

#### Theme organisers

Corina Balaban, UNIKE PhD Candidate, DPU, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Benedikte Custers, UNIKE PhD Candidate, University of Porto, Portugal  
Sina Westa, UNIKE PhD Candidate, Ljubljana University, Slovenia  
António Magalhães, Associate Professor, University of Porto, Portugal  
Chris Newfield, Professor, University of California, Santa Barbara, United States of America

#### Aim of theme

The massification of higher education on a global scale has led to an increased standardisation of the ways in which education is being viewed and practiced. Policy bodies such as the European Commission and the OECD have been encouraging universities to focus on preparing students for the labour market, by equipping them with a set of competences and predefined learning outcomes. While this economy-driven approach can arguably be useful as a component of someone's (vocational) 'training,' the panel focuses on some empirical cases to explore how far education is being objectified and reframed from a public good into a tradable commodity. We set out to imagine alternative visions for education at universities, by looking at empirical cases in which actors were able to go beyond the instrumental conception of training and sustain what we call open-ended education, in line with Biesta's "beautiful risk of education" and Masschelein's warning for the immunisation for the call of the other. This scientific theme wants to take up the question of what open-ended higher education could look like in practice in contemporary and future universities and welcomes contributions of this kind.

#### Format of sessions

##### Session one: Plenary

Introduction to session through fieldwork vignettes of UNIKE fellows:

- Sina Westa
- Corina Balaban
- Benedikte Custers

Panel with invited speakers:

- Sarah Amsler
- Gert Biesta

Questions and answer session

Question and answer moderator: Chris Newfield

**Session two: Workshop with short presentations of empirical work**

Workshop: Presentation by Jan Masschelein

Short presentations of empirical work focusing on the theme of open-ended and market-driven higher education

- Fan Wu, Shaoxue Liu
- Chris Newfield
- António Magalhães
- Tanja Kanne Wadsholt

**Presenters' abstracts**

**Sarah Amsler, Lincoln University, United Kingdom**

**Title: Pedagogies of pluriversity: learning for a 'world in which many worlds fit'**

The creation of alternatives to market-driven higher institutions, including higher education, is necessary for social justice, ecological survival and human flourishing. In this paper, I explore how such alternatives are being created in a subaltern ecosystem of counter-systemic educational practices and institutions around the world. I begin with a critical reading of recent university policies in the UK to illustrate how the dominant forms of the 'globalization of higher education' are not only undesirable but entangled within a broader system of Eurocentric colonial-capitalist 'monocultures' (Santos 2014) which both destroy human and ecological possibility and render existing and emerging forms of transformative learning invisible or impossible. I then examine how these violent logics are being theorised, resisted and transformed in two locations. One is at the borders and 'relative exteriorities' of hegemonic educational systems, focusing on diverse struggles to reclaim and decolonize established westernized universities. The second is in the organizational forms, theories of knowledge and pedagogical practices which characterize autonomous educational projects, movements and institutions around the world, focusing on radically democratic models of learning in a growing network of counter-capitalist 'ecoversities'. I suggest that these living examples, which both refuse and educate refusal of the logics of neoliberalism and other forms of patriarchal colonial capitalism, offer important resources of hope and possibility for our common struggles to democratize the university.

**Fan Wu and Shaoxue Liu, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China**

**Title: Beyond skills training: rethinking doctoral education in science and engineering**

In China, many doctoral graduates forge non-academic careers after completing the doctorate. However, there is a significant lack of information of Chinese doctoral graduates outside of academia. Such information is vital to help us to understand how well current doctoral education in science and engineering prepare its students for their increasingly non-academic careers. The purpose of this study is therefore to explore the value of doctoral graduates in enterprise and the impact of doctoral education on individual career success. A mixed method approach is employed in this study. Questionnaires are sent to doctoral graduates who work in enterprises. The survey results were supplemented by qualitative data generated through in-depth interviews with both doctoral graduates and HR in enterprises. Our initial findings demonstrate that PhDs think the most important skills are coordination and integration of technical activities, interacting effectively with others, and resilience. From the perspective of HR, technical skills are not a distinguishing criterion between PhD employees. What sets good PhD employees apart is their ability to learn new things fast and communicate with other employees, partners and customers.

**Tanja Kanne Wadsholt, PhD Candidate, Aarhus University, Denmark**

**Title: Market-driven or open-ended higher education? Internationalization at Aarhus University as a case**

Seeing the internationalization of higher education as inscribed in a neoliberal doxa continuously challenged by calls for other open-ended or ethical approaches that recognize epistemological diversity, *the paper investigates the relationship between approaches to internationalization, knowledge forms and inclusion of the Other*. It is argued that while diversity is widely celebrated in international education, the market-oriented approaches promote epistemologies and epistemological hierarchies that are excluding or reduce difference through convergence of positions. However, the paper also gives examples where difference results in open-ended encounters. These seem to rest upon an ethics of response and responsibility in which the experiential intercultural relationship acts as a catalyst for realization of critical-relational knowledge.