

**THE FUTURE OF (EUROPEAN)  
HIGHER EDUCATION**

**International Workshop**

**Ankaran, Slovenia, 5-8 May 2011**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**Organisational Committee:**

Bastian Baumann  
Janja Komljenovič  
Igor Repac  
Pavel Zgaga

The international workshop was organised within the research project DEP (*Differentiation, equity, productivity: consequences of the expanded and differentiated higher education systems from the internationalization aspect*) performed by CEPS – Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, and financed by the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS).

CEPS – Centre for Educational Policy Studies  
Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana  
Ljubljana, July 2011  
<http://ceps.pef.uni-lj.si/eng.htm>

## I. Table of Contents:

I. Table of Contents: .....	2
II. Introduction .....	3
III. Agenda .....	5
IV. Participant' List .....	7
V. Presentations.....	8
Per Nyborg: Internationalisation and Globalisation in Higher Education: The Nordic Experience.....	8
Klemen Miklavič: Ideas underlying the Bologna Process.....	16
Janja Komljenovič: University Autonomy in the European Higher Education Area .....	18
Leon Cremonini: Considerations about Differentiation of Higher Education in a Globalized Context.....	20
Manja Klemenčič: Southeast European higher education systems in the context of internationalisation: preliminary thoughts for further exploration .....	23
Pavel Zgaga: Internationalization, competition and/or cooperation – “small”/”periphery” countries’ perspectives .....	25
John Brennan: Universities in their place: social and cultural perspectives on the regional impacts of universities .....	28

## II. Introduction

The Future of (European) Higher Education is the second May international workshop organised by CEPS. As last year this was a small meeting that took place from 5-8 May in Ankaran, Slovenia. The main aim of the meeting is to discuss in a small group of about 20 people what is currently happening in higher education in Europe.

We already acknowledged last year that an event like this is excellent in offering enough time and relaxed environment for participants to speak openly and avoid the usual pressures at conferences and other organised events. As last year, this meeting is supposed to bring together some young but nevertheless quite experienced people who see their future in higher education policy or research and some people in senior positions. It is supposed to be an open meeting with ample room for discussion.

The idea is to ensure a dialogue along a line of topics that should guide the discussion. Based on our last year's experience when the topic of the meeting was too broad, this year we decided to focus the theme of the event to the issue of *internationalisation and differentiation of higher education*. Possible topics of discussion are listed below. Yet, these topics are not rigid and deviation from them is more than encouraged. Each of them should be introduced briefly by one or more of the participants raising some of the questions for the discussion.

### Topics to be covered:

- I. Differentiation of higher education
  - Differentiation/diversification of higher education
  - Homogenisation ('uniformisation') of higher education
  - Horizontal vs. vertical differentiation; institutional vs. programme differentiation
- II. Internationalisation and globalisation of higher education
  - Internationalisation vs. globalisation of higher education
  - Connection to wider organisation of modern societies
  - New actors, new agencies, new structures
  - Internationalisation vs. globalisation: focus on higher education systems in small and medium size countries (e.g. Central Europe; South-eastern Europe)
- III. New role of the university
  - What roles for higher education (in general) and university (in particular) in the highly internationalised/globalised context?
  - "Global Higher Education Areas": their centres, their margins
  - Institutional diversity: challenges to universities in small and medium size countries (e.g. Central Europe; South-eastern Europe)
- IV. Scenarios; possible / (un)desired actions
  - Current developments and challenges to higher education in the new decade; light/dark scenarios
  - What needs to be done / could be done / what needs to be avoided to promote the light scenarios for the future?

The nature of the workshop is very open and flexible, targeted at discussion, information sharing and opinions. The agenda is open to change and we are also likely to deviate from it during the meeting. The inputs on certain topics are rather intended to initiate and support the discussion and to set the context than as an all encompassing content input. Free time available for informal individual and group talks (post-breakfast, pre- and post-dinner time) is part of the concept of the workshop and deliberately planned in the agenda.

The workshop is organised by CEPS – Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana (within the research project *DEP – Differentiation, equity, productivity: consequences of the expanded and differentiated higher education systems from the internationalization aspect*, financed by the Slovenian Research Agency ARRS).

### III. Agenda

**FRIDAY, 6.5.2011**

10.00 – 10.30	<b>Introduction to the meeting</b>
	Janja Komljenovič & Bastian Baumann
	Pavel Zgaga, on behalf of CEPS
	<b>Introduction of participants</b>
10.30 – 13.00	<b>Higher education in the internationalised/globalised context</b>
	INPUTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uvalić Trumbić Stamenka</li> </ul> Moderator: Zgaga Pavel  Discussion topics may include issues such as: - Internationalisation vs. globalisation of higher education - What has been changed around the world during the last ten years? Overview of HE reforms and developments - commonalities and differences in approaches - New actors, new agencies, new structures - Internationalisation vs. globalisation: focus on higher education systems in small and medium size countries (e.g. Central Europe; South-eastern Europe)
	DISCUSSION
13.00 – 14.30	<i>LUNCH</i>
14.30 – 18.00	<b>Connection between higher education, internationalisation / globalisation and social arrangements (“political projects”)</b>
	INPUTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jazz, Marx and John le Carre: Researching Higher Education in the End Times, Brennan John</li> <li>- Racké Cornelia</li> </ul> Moderator: Ivosević Vanja  Discussion topics may include issues such as: - Knowledge Society - Economic and/or Democratic Necessity - Internationally Influential Actors: their policies and agendas - Connection to wider organisation of modern societies (e.g. political or social orders)
	DISCUSSION
18.30 – 20.00	<i>DINNER</i>

**SATURDAY, 7.5.2011**

10.00 – 13.00	<p><b>Differentiation</b></p> <p>INPUTS:          - Cremonini Leon          Moderator: Hopbach Achim</p> <p>Discussion topics may include issues such as:          - Higher Education – towards diversification or homogenisation          - What roles for higher education (in general) and university (in particular) in the highly internationalised/globalised context?          - “Global Higher Education Areas”: their centres, their margins          - Horizontal vs. vertical differentiation; institutional vs. programme differentiation          - Institutional diversity: challenges to universities in small and medium size countries (e.g. Central Europe; South-eastern Europe)</p>
	DISCUSSION
13.00 – 14.30	LUNCH
14.30 – 18.00	<p><b>International – national – institutional: differentiation, autonomy, roles of HE</b></p> <p>INPUTS: the DEP project team          Moderator: Kladis Dionyssi</p> <p>ISSUES to be discussed:          - Differentiation of higher education systems;          - Autonomy of higher education institutions;          - The ideational and ideological discourses within the Bologna Proces.</p>
	DISCUSSION
18.30 – 20.00	DINNER

**SUNDAY, 8.5.2011**

10.00 – 11.30	<p><b>Conclusions, strategies and alliances</b></p> <p>Moderator: Baumann Bastian</p> <p>ISSUES:          - Current developments and challenges to higher education in the new decade; light/dark scenarios          - What needs to be done / could be done / what needs to be avoided to promote the light scenarios for the future?</p>
11.30 – 12.00	<p><b>Closing</b></p> <p>- Evaluation of the meeting</p> <p>- Next steps and follow-up</p>
12.00 – 13.30	LUNCH

## IV. Participant' List

- I. Baumann Bastian
- II. Brennan John
- III. Cremonini Leon
- IV. Doolan Karin
- V. Durr Jakub
- VI. Farnell Thomas
- VII. Hackl Elsa
- VIII. Hopbach Achim
- IX. Ivošević Vanja
- X. Kamšek Katja
- XI. Kladis Dionyssis
- XII. Klemenčič Manja
- XIII. Komljenovič Janja
- XIV. Lažetič Predrag
- XV. Miklavič Klemen
- XVI. Nyborg Per
- XVII. Pavlin Samo
- XVIII. Racké Cornelia
- XIX. Repac Igor
- XX. Tück Colin
- XXI. Uvalić Trumbić Stamenka
- XXII. Zgaga Pavel

## V. Presentations

### Per Nyborg

Former Secretary General, The Norwegian Council of Universities  
and the Nordic Association of Universities

**Address for correspondence:**

[ponyb@online.no](mailto:ponyb@online.no)

### ***Internationalisation and Globalisation in Higher Education: The Nordic Experience***

Abstract

This article is an updated presentation based on an article published by a Nordic team in 2009\*. It describes recent trends in student and staff mobility in the Nordic countries and the tensions between internationalisation and globalisation. These five countries have a long tradition for cooperation, supporting mobility of students and staff between the Nordic countries and internationally. However, the rapid growth of a global market for educational services, have resulted in the introduction of tuition fees for international students in three of the five countries. As there also is a global labour market, focus is shifting from academic mobility to job migration due to the increased need for highly skilled personnel. More and more, market oriented EU policies is dominating over Nordic policies based on equality and social cohesion. There is no common Nordic policy for meeting the challenges of the global market in higher education.

International cooperation is central to higher education. Mobility of students and staff has been an action line in the Bologna Process – to the benefit of home and host countries alike. However, alongside this cooperation, a global market for educational services has been rapidly growing, dominated by institutions and enterprises in a few large English-speaking countries as sellers. Large young economies can be found at the buying end. Small countries with their own national language may not easily adjust to the challenges from the market, where they at best will be buyers – if they can afford. The poorer countries should be prepared for increased brain-drain, as job migration may outnumber academic mobility.

The term *international* is used for processes relating to or affecting two or more nations (international cooperation, international competition), whereas the term *global* is used for processes relating to or affecting the entire world (global pollution, the global market). In higher education, the term *internationalisation* is widely used for cooperation between individuals, institutions or educational systems.

*Globalisation* describes processes by which economies, societies, and cultures are being integrated through communication, transportation, and trade. For higher education this implies new kinds of relationships that may involve or affect states, higher education systems, institutions and individuals. These are increasingly seen as “market” relationships – to be distinguished from “non-market” relationships based on cooperation, for which the *international* label is more appropriate.

The Nordic countries have been good at internationalisation, working very closely together, but they have not been able to develop a common strategy for meeting the global challenges in higher education.

### **1. The Nordic Cooperation**

The Nordic cooperation between Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden is based on close cultural, linguistic, economic and political ties. These ties are reflected in a number of formal and informal cooperation schemes. In the university sector, informal networks have existed for a long time, with the exchange of students and scientists and joint publications as results. On the formal side, parliamentarians cooperate in the *Nordic Council*, and national governments cooperate in the *Nordic Council of Ministers*. In the university sector, the *Nordic Association of Universities* was established in 1995, to link the national university networks and to establish a joint contact to the Nordic cooperation schemes set up by the ministers. In many respects, the Nordic countries have acted as a single unit: "Norden".

However, the growing strength of the European Union and the European Economic Area (which includes Iceland and Norway in the EU programmes) makes Norden a fading beauty. For higher education, also the Bologna Process contributes to the shifting of focus from Norden to Europe both with governments and higher education institutions. On a global scale, the Nordic countries are small entities, with a total population of 25 Mill. To meet the accelerating global challenges facing higher education, a common base and a common strategy might be an advantage. With a million study places, Norden could take many international students.

The basic ideas of the Nordic cooperation were far from market-oriented; social cohesion has been a leading principle. Nordic countries have succeeded in combining economic growth with social cohesion. Observers around the world have been amazed that the Nordic economies can prosper and grow in spite of high tax wedges and an egalitarian distribution of income.

Present economic and social trends, including globalisation and demographic change, pose significant challenges to the model as we have known it. The continuing trend of globalisation puts the Nordic model under pressure. There is a need to focus on the core tasks of the welfare state and to clarify the scope of the services that citizens are entitled to, including education, which has been seen as a central element in the combined striving for economic growth and social cohesion. The social dimension of higher education was introduced in Norden 50 years before its appearance in the Bologna Process: All qualified applicants should have the possibility for higher education, irrespective of socio-economic conditions. In each country a college sector was established in parallel with the traditional university sector. Gradually the difference between the two sectors is disappearing, colleges being renamed polytechnics or university colleges, some of them have been accredited as universities.

There still are no tuition fees for Nordic students in the state-owned majority of higher education institutions, and each country has a well-functioning student support system. However, not all Nordic countries will continue to include an increasing number of incoming international students in the sharing of such privileges.

The Nordic cooperation in higher education culminated with the 1994 Agreement on Admission to Higher Education, between the five Nordic countries. The Nordic Council of Ministers then decided that there should be equal treatment in higher education for citizens of the various countries within the Nordic group. It was made clear that as far as opportunities in higher education were concerned, the Nordic countries should operate as a single unit.

As the Erasmus programme opened up for EFTA countries and Finland and Sweden followed Denmark into the European Union, the Nordic dimension was gradually overshadowed by the

European dimension. With the Bologna Process, the European cooperation has very much influenced the Nordic higher education systems. Together with other European countries we have been building a common framework to realise the idea that students and staff shall be able to move freely within the European Higher Education Area, having full recognition of their qualifications. Each country has developed a three-cycle degree system and introduced national quality assurance systems cooperating in a Europe-wide network. The long-time Nordic mutual recognition of degrees and study periods has been broadened to a Europe-wide obligation through the 1997 Lisbon Recognition Convention.

Thus, fifty years of Nordic cooperation has been build into a European cooperation in higher education that has transformed the education system in each country, now with a common structure, including for instance for the first time also a common degree system in the Nordic countries. This makes Nordic cooperation easier, but it also opens up for a wider market.

What will be the consequences of the Lisbon Agenda, the enlargement of the EU, and other developments with respect to European higher education for the Nordic structures that were set up to support the Nordic cooperation in higher education? For meeting the challenges of globalisation, these structures may be inadequate. More important, the basic Nordic ideas of equality and social cohesion may not be the best platform for entering a global market for higher education. A more fundamental question is whether the Nordic model for free and open education can survive in the long run.

## 2. Nordic student mobility in a global perspective

Nordic students have for long been mobile. Table 2.1 shows some overall trends in the period 2000-2006. (Development in individual countries since 2006 will be commented separately.) From Table 2.1 it can be seen that there has been a decreasing trend in the number of students going abroad for a full degree. There may be several reasons for this: the introduction of Bachelor and Master Degrees have opened up new possibilities at home, an increase in fee levels at foreign universities compared to no fee in the home country, in Norway also a slimming down of the generous support scheme for studies abroad. Iceland is an exception. Denmark have had and still have relatively few students abroad, one reason being that until 2008, no support was provided for tuition at foreign institutions.

	<b>International students</b>	<b>Out 2000</b>	<b>Out 2006</b>	<b>In 2000</b>	<b>In 2006</b>
<b>Denmark</b>	Exchange students	4312	4950	3725	6713
	full degree students	4245	3154	3432	7757
<b>Finland</b>	Exchange students	6880	8610	4805	8191
	full degree students	5340	4360	6372	10066
<b>Iceland</b>	Exchange students	213	376	248	498
	full degree students	1944	2705	239	370
<b>Norway</b>	Exchange students	3520	4498	4516	4455
	full degree students	14745	12375	6323	12680
<b>Sweden</b>	Exchange students	4100	5100	6533	11232
	full degree students	21300	19000	5531	16865

**Table 2.1** shows incoming and outgoing students to and from the Nordic countries. Numbers are from national sources and not directly comparable.

There is an upward trend in the number of Nordic students taking part in exchange programmes, but apart from Finland this increase in outgoing exchange students does not fully reflect the increased focus on internationalisation in the respective national strategies since the Bologna Process started in 1999.

Incoming mobility shows different trends. In Denmark, Finland and Sweden there has been a 70-80% increase in the number of incoming exchange students from 2000 to 2006, in Iceland the numbers have doubled. For Norway, there has been no increase in the same period. One possible explanation could be that one cannot easily survive in Norway on an Erasmus grant.

Numbers of international full degree students have increased significantly in the Nordic countries. All Nordic countries are welcoming international students, although for students from countries outside the European Economic Area (EEA) the immigration procedures have been complicated and time-consuming, this being one reason that the number of foreign students that enrol has been much lower than the number of applications from qualified applicants. One obvious reason for an increasing number of applications has of course been the Nordic non-fee regime in higher education.

Following the 2006 introduction of tuition fees for students from non-EU/EEA countries, there has been a decrease in the number of international full-degree students in Denmark. In the 2008/2009 intake Norway was the largest source country with 1394 students, followed by Sweden (931) and China (868). In spite of active marketing, the expected substantial income from tuition-paying students in Denmark has not materialised: Not only has the number of non-EU/EEA students decreased after 2006 (see Table 2.2), but data from Universities Denmark, see <http://dkuni.dk/>, show that most of them are excused from paying tuition.

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09
EU/EEA	1.733	2.030	2.477	1.975
None-EU/EEA	1.274	741	813	962
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.048</b>	<b>2.778</b>	<b>3.293</b>	<b>2.939</b>

**Table 2.2** Intake of international full-degree students in Denmark 2005-09.  
Source: Danish Agency for International Education <http://en.iu.dk/>

The Swedish parliament has recently passed a law outlining tuition fees for non-EU/EEA students. These fees will apply from the 2011/2012 academic year but will be supplemented by scholarship programs. This is not a “for profit” approach like the Danish strategy, but an adaption to the existence of a global market. The need for an adaption is indicated by the observation that after the Swedish degree structure was changed according to the Bologna Bachelor – Master structure in 2007, the number of foreign citizen student has been high and increasing - enrolment in two-year Master programmes increased from 4985 in 2007 to 7430 in 2009 (data from Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, see <http://www.hsv.se/>).

Finland is adapting in a similar way: Finnish higher education institutions may now charge tuition fees from non-EU/EEA students for English-language Masters’ degree programmes.

In Iceland and Norway international students are not expected to pay for tuition. In Norway the number of non-EU/EEA students increased from 1922 in 2005 to 3036 in 2009. In 2010, Russia topped the list with 1035 students registered at Norwegian higher institutions. China came fourth with 601 students in Norway, after Sweden and Germany (data from Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education, see <http://www.siu.no/>). These numbers may continue to rise as neighbouring countries introduce tuition fees, however, there is no indication that the Norwegian non-tuition policy will change.

### 3 International PhD students in the Nordic countries

In all Nordic countries, the three tier degree system is in place, with the PhD as the third degree. Candidates for the PhD-degree are in most countries seen as students, in the Nordic countries

they will usually be supported by the university, they may even be considered as university employees, not as students.

**Example: The Norwegian model**

In Norway, PhD-candidates are not considered to be students and they are not included in the student statistics. To be accepted for PhD-work in Norway, the candidate must apply for a temporary position as “stipendiat”. International candidates may compete on equal terms. As a result of an increasing number of “stipendiat” positions for PhD work at Norwegian HE institutions, the number of doctorates has more than doubled since 2000. The number of degrees awarded to foreign candidates was 81 in the year 2000, this number had grown to 308 or 24 % of the total in 2006, see Table 3.1. A most interesting question (yet unanswered) is how many of the internationally recruited candidates will stay in Norway after graduation as highly competent specialists working in Norwegian research, industry or business.

Table 3.1 also shows where the foreign PhDs come from. A special programme supports candidates from developing countries. There is a marked increase in degrees awarded to men and women from Asiatic countries. A similar tendency has been seen in Sweden.

Citizenship / award year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Norway	566	548	628	577	636	675	688	789	936
Norden	13	21	17	27	27	34	37	43	42
West/SouthEurope	20	30	22	33	37	42	50	55	83
East Europe	11	14	16	14	14	20	23	38	40
North America	4	3	5	6	5	7	8	7	11
Africa	15	27	17	31	30	37	38	42	54
Asia	15	33	28	31	29	36	54	49	64
Total	647	677	739	723	782	855	905	1030	1244
Foreign citizens	13%	19%	15%	20%	19%	21%	24%	23%	25%

**Table 3.1.** PhD-degrees in Norway.

Source: Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, see <http://www.nifustep>

**4 Staff mobility – academic exchange or job migration?**

Increased staff mobility has been one of the goals of the Bologna Process, eagerly taken up also by the Nordic countries. Yet, the “Bologna vision” of staff mobility is not well articulated. There has been little consideration of objectives and means to reach them. What kind of mobility do we want to encourage, and how can it be realised?

In the Bologna Process, staff mobility has mainly been related to teacher exchange and development of joint study programmes – traditional academic mobility. However, issues such as social security and pension rights have also been brought up, bringing in the aspect of job migration – another form for mobility. Visas and working permits have been obstacles for mobility between the EEA region and countries outside. This is now rapidly changing.

Taking again Norway as an example, *international exchange* of staff between higher education institutions is reported on a regular basis. Exchange of academic staff has increased from around 1500 in 2003 to more than 2500 in 2007 for outgoing staff and from 800 to nearly 1600 incoming visiting staff staying for *more than one week*.

Little is known about *job migration* of HE staff between countries. In 2001 13% of the tenured staff in Norwegian universities and university colleges had foreign citizenship. Recent reports

from individual institutions indicate that there has since then been a marked increase in job migration by university staff. The Norwegian University of Science and Technology has reported that in 2008, 26% of the research staff had foreign citizenship, so had 35% of those working for a PhD-degree. The University of Oslo has reported that 1 400 researchers, 25% of the research staff in 2008 had foreign citizenship. For higher education this will mean that the teaching staff will become truly international. This opens up new possibilities: Russian-born professors may give courses in Russian, Chinese-born professors may lecture in Chinese. English professors will master the language of the most popular courses for international students. The challenge may be not to lose the Norwegian cultural basis.

The EU Commission has recently made some very visible efforts to stimulate the mobility of researchers, see <http://ec.europa.eu/>, introducing the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (2005), the Scientific Visa for researchers from third countries (2005), and the proposal of Social Security and Supplementary Pension Rights for Researchers. A Human Resources Strategy for Researchers was been announced (2008) for better job opportunities. A Researchers Mobility Portal was recently established (2011), see <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/>. Clearly, the Commission is now focusing on job migration, not so much on academic exchange.

### **5 Recruitment of highly qualified specialists**

All Nordic countries and most European ones have to face a shortage in the national recruitment of skilled workers and specialists over the coming years. Immigration policies are being adjusted for a dual purpose: To limit the flow of refugees and to increase the flow of highly qualified specialists.

Our countries are aging societies, although the average number of children pr. woman varies (between 1.4 in Denmark and 1.96 in Norway). In order to handle this situation in relationship to the proper development of our societies, we need a well educated population. However, experience tells us that there is a lack of highly educated specialists in a number of areas, in particular within medicine, natural sciences and technological sciences. We have to look abroad for recruitment of the right type of specialists. This is presently much more actively done in Denmark than in Norway. Methods used in Denmark are e.g. green card arrangements for certain professions, special salary arrangements, proper and inexpensive schooling for accompanying children, job opportunities for accompanying partners and special (low) tax arrangements. Foreign specialist working in research is for a limited period ensured tax on income at a maximum of 25%, which is approximately half of the normal taxation level in Denmark. This has helped attracting foreign specialists, but if they don't bring their family, they usually leave again.

The introduction of the *EU Blue Card System* <http://www.bluecard.eu.co.uk/> in 2009 indicates a further common development<sup>†</sup>:

The directive establishes more attractive conditions for third-country workers to take up highly qualified employment in the member states of the Union, by creating a fast-track procedure for issuing a special residence and work permit called the "EU Blue Card". The Blue Card will facilitate access to the labour market to their holders and will entitle them to a series of socio-economic rights and favourable conditions for family reunification and movement across the EU. Under the rules set by the directive, EU Blue Card holders will enjoy equal treatment with nationals of the member state issuing the Blue Card, as regards working conditions, including pay and dismissal; freedom of association; education, training and recognition of qualifications; etc.

---

<sup>†</sup> EU Council press release. Brussels, 25 May 2009

On this basis, authorities in all European countries may see international students in their higher education institutions as candidates for highly qualified employment in the host country after graduation. Danish authorities may shift their focus from seeing international students as a possible source of income for Danish universities to seeing them as potential candidates for highly qualified work in the Danish industry. Norwegian authorities may perhaps more clearly also see their international students as a reservoir of coming specialists for Norwegian employment – not only as a contribution to internationalisation.

Clearly, measures to limit the brain drain from developing countries will be necessary. In Norway, students from these countries are supported on equal terms with Norwegian students. To stimulate the return to the home country, loans from the Norwegian State Loan Fund for Education will be converted to grants after a year at home. However, international standards will be needed to prevent that graduates from developing countries are actively recruited to work in rich countries.

### **6. Nordic challenges and dilemmas**

Fifty years before Bologna, the social dimension of higher education was seen as a central element in the expansion and broadening of higher education systems in the Nordic countries: There were no tuition fees and in each country a financial support system was set up to give all young people equal opportunities for a higher education. Activating the intellectual potential of the population may be one of the reasons for the success of the Nordic model.

It has been argued both by politicians and economists that the money might have been used more effectively in a support system combining tuition fees and grants, placing more responsibility with the students for studying full-time and finishing on time. Over the years some adjustments have been made, for instance partially converting grants to loans or introducing a bonus for those finishing on time. Such changes have generally had little effect on students in their home country. One possible explanation might be that although student organisations claim that loans and grants should be sufficient for full-time studies, individual students today prefer a combination of studies and part-time work for a more comfortable life. Private institutions may charge tuition fees. The fact that private institutions in Iceland receive funding from the state according to the same rules as public universities, has led to the discussion whether the public universities should also be allowed to charge tuition fees. However, the right for a free higher education is so deep-rooted in the Nordic countries that it might be political suicide to propose a change to the system. Most probably the Nordic countries will continue a no-fee policy in state institutions for their home students.

Students that consider going abroad for their degree have much more been under the influence of the support system than home students. Support for studies abroad may not cover all costs and possibilities for part-time jobs may not be good for foreign citizens. Costs become an element when deciding where to go, even more so when tuition fees in some countries may be high above what can be obtained from the support system in the home country. For example, even with the still generous support scheme of the Norwegian State Loan Fund, the high tuition fees at UK and US universities have drastically reduced the number of students going to those countries. Further restrictions in the support scheme turned out to be an effective brake on the exodus to Australian universities. On the other hand, the possibility of English-taught medical education in low-cost countries in Eastern Europe has considerably increased the student flow to Hungary and Poland. If Norwegian authorities should decide that the country will not need a higher density of medical doctors (already among the highest in Europe), they may simply stop supporting medical studies abroad. It has happened before, it may happen again.

Higher education was in 1995 been defined as a service to be traded under the regime of GATS and the World Trade Association. Governments supporting students abroad may then be inclined to see international higher education more as an import of services to the country than

as a benefit for the students. Schemes for the support of international students may be changed accordingly. Even in the Nordic countries the right to higher education may not in times to come imply the right to buy an education on the global market, sending a substantial part of the bill to the government in their home country. Why should the home country pay for an international education if the candidate does not come back after graduation? Why should it pay for the offspring of an increasing number of guest workers, perhaps supported as international students in their country of origin? Questions like these may corrode the system.

Looking towards the global market for educational services, Nordic countries are individually small units in a big world, and they have (with the exception of Denmark) not fully taken a stand regarding their relation to this market. Nice words have been said in the Nordic Council about joining forces, but nothing substantial relating to education has emerged<sup>‡</sup>. In a global perspective, the Nordic Region is barely visible.

Nordic countries and their students going abroad are buyers on the global market for education. At least one of the countries also hopes to establish itself as a seller. The questions remain: Will a common Nordic approach to the challenges of the market be possible? Can the Nordic model for free and open education survive in the long run? Has it perhaps already started to corrode??

---

<sup>‡</sup> See for instance: Globalisation report to the prime ministers, 20 May 2010, <http://www.norden.org/en/nordic-council-of-ministers/globalisation-co-operation>

## **Klemen Miklavič**

*Researcher at Centre for Educational Policy Studies,  
Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana.*

### **Address for correspondence:**

Kardeljeva ploscad 16  
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
[klemen.miklavic@guest.arnes.si](mailto:klemen.miklavic@guest.arnes.si)

## ***Ideas underlying the Bologna Process***

**(Notes for presentation)**

### **Interpretations of Bologna:**

Cultural power struggle between (neo)colonial powers  
Response of democratic authorities to globalization and TNE  
Response of European nation states to Commission advance in the field of HE  
Instrument for labor market integration  
Neoliberal agenda to cut the costs and speed up the preparation for productive phase  
Commodification and trade in education

### **EU involvement:**

New boost to integration (Mitterrand/Delors) – economic union, market integration  
Sinking continent – need for a boost in competitiveness – Knowledge economy  
Policy recommendations invading many subfields of HE policy  
No time for social dimension and other romantic ideas

### **Sorbonne 1998**

Broad idea to kick off – idea of Europe  
Central role of governments

### **Bologna 1999**

Harmonisation  
Diversity of cultures/languages + university autonomy + intergovernmental co-operation  
Competitiveness mentioned but marginal and in correlation with civilization appeal

### **Prague 2001**

Public good and public responsibility  
Social dimension  
Stakeholders' inclusion + EC  
Sensing TNE- a challenge  
Europe's international Attractiveness and competitiveness

### **Berlin 2003**

Social dimension becomes a slogan carried along the process  
Attractiveness becomes a substitute to competitiveness  
Direct reference to the EU Lisbon Strategy  
EC strategy on short and concise text with feasible goals

### **Bergen 2005**

Secretariat vs. EC + presidency state- powerful player

Things are slipping out of EC hands - EC back up strategy - the promoters

NL, UK, Levy Clemet insist on GATS - the debate vetoed by F

EI and UNICE join - social partners and employability

NO makes Social dimension one of the pillar characteristics of BP

**London 2007**

From growing to clarifying

Purposes of HEIs - only in London because of commission hysteria on the length

Gats faded away

**Leuven 2009**

Financial crisis and role of HE

Ranking - a new toy

TNE mentioned again in relation to UNESCO/OECD

## **Janja Komljenovič**

*Researcher at Centre for Educational Policy Studies,  
Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana*

### **Address for correspondence:**

Kardeljeva ploscad 16  
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
[janja.komljenovic@guest.arnes.si](mailto:janja.komljenovic@guest.arnes.si)

## **University Autonomy in the European Higher Education Area (Notes for presentation)**

### **Institutional autonomy appearance**

In theoretical literature

In policy documents

Centre of attention in the past decade as it was from the beginning of the university

### **About institutional autonomy**

No coherent definition

Depending on time, region and stakeholders involved ('who is talking about autonomy')

Shared point: value in itself that needs to be safeguarded

Connection to university's role in society

Many recent changes in the environment that influences universities like other social systems

General shift in the past decade from focus on academic freedom to other dimensions including financing and governance

### **New circumstances that influence university and its autonomy**

Globalisation, internationalisation and supranational decision-making

Massification of higher education

New political and cultural circumstances (neo-liberalism, marketisation, new public management)

### **General definitions - theory**

General and vague definitions: 'The right of university to govern itself'

Many interpretations allowed and many elements can be included

Need for new understandings in relation to new circumstances and contemporary roles of the university

### **Understandings – policy**

Centre of attention

Many stakeholders and organisations:

EUA

CoE

EU

UNESCO

Bologna Process

Other relevant organisations: OECD, WB

Common denominator – positive connotation and value

New trend: instrumentalisation of the concept

**Findings from policy analysis**

Consistency in how to achieve or increase institutional autonomy

Inconsistency in understanding what institutional autonomy actually is or why it is needed

Imaginary of autonomy possible to fail

## Leon Cremonini

Research Associate at Center for Higher Education Policy Studies  
University of Twente.

### **Address for correspondence:**

P.O. BOX 217

NL-7500 AE ENSCHED

[l.cremonini@utwente.nl](mailto:l.cremonini@utwente.nl)

## ***Considerations about Differentiation of Higher Education in a Globalized Context***

Key words: Vertical differentiation, horizontal differentiation, civilizational attraction, world-class, élite

Building »prestigious higher education« has become somewhat of a leitmotif. Universities want to be »world-class« to attract the best talent on the market and boost their funds. Governments go to great lengths to reward excellence in education and research (the Excellence Initiative in Germany and China's projects 985 and 211 are examples). Even citizens are increasingly aware about the position of their national universities in popular international rankings (for example, Liu (2007) mentions that building world-class universities »has been the dream of generations of Chinese, including politicians, university administrators, staff, students and the ordinary public«. Building élite universities is promoting inter-institutional differentiation both within and beyond the higher education system. It is a prestige-building endeavour that rests upon globally shared assumptions about what constitutes excellence.

Which »outputs« a university ought to produce to become world-class, and how a system could be classified as »world-class« can be interpreted in the light of institutional theories of isomorphism and policy diffusion. As an institution, the university claims the existence of a unified knowledge and authority rooted in universal principles and supports the production of a system of knowledge and assumptions about the world (Meyer, 2006). Therefore, a world-class university produces authoritative science through the employment of scientists with acknowledged qualifications awarded by recognized universities (see, *inter alia*, Drori et al., 2003, Meyer, 2006). Still, the pursuit of prestige may have several consequences (of varying degrees of desirability) that warrant further investigation.

1) First, it may encourage inter-institutional inequality in the system derived from dismissing all universities that do not fit in the model as »less worthy«. In other words, world-class university policies focus solely on *vertical* differentiation but, arguably, a higher education system benefits just as much from horizontal differentiation, which includes dimensions such as institutional ownership (public vs. private), curricular thrusts, and structure differentiation (e.g. binarity, which refers to the basic orientations in the system, namely research and professions). Through horizontal differentiation the system can reach out to heterogeneous student clienteles and align with their different learning needs (UNESCO, 2004; MOC&W, 2010). In times of mass higher education this is often considered a strong point.

2) Second, the pursuit of prestige may build new societal criteria upon (or even in contrast with) the traditional expectations about higher education's social role, with potentially negative consequences for nations – if in fact new expectations build on top of old ones, there is the risk

that higher education systems will be assessed and steered according to criteria that increase inequality whilst failing to serve society.

3) Third, policies to create élite universities often justified on the grounds that institutional repute will *ipso facto* attract (foreign) students and researchers to the entire system – suggesting that prestige epitomizes, nourishes and sustains a nation's »civilizational attraction« towards the rest of the world.

The latter consideration introduces us to the second key question I wish to address, namely: why has »world-class« in higher education become almost "T.I.N.A.-style" obsession? »Civilizational attraction« is defined as a pattern of social contacts or a flow of people, which explains why students and researchers tend to travel to certain centres or countries that are attractive and recognized. Indeed, a zone of civilizational attraction is also called »zone of prestige« (Collins, 2001). This transcends geopolitical and economic hegemony (in fact, 20<sup>th</sup> century France is an example of the contrary, because Parisian intellectual culture »set the fashions that have been emulated throughout the richer and more militarily powerful parts of the world«/ *Ibid.*).

The concept of »civilizational attraction« is related to other concepts that are used to study mobility in higher education and its consequences for different countries, including the centre-periphery effect (*Ibid.*) and the »knowledge gap« (Stiglitz, 2007). These notions posit that many of the educational possibilities are constructed in specific places around the world, which then become the most obvious study destinations for prospective students at the expense of peripheral countries.

It is true that the massification of higher education in a globalized environment empowers students and researchers to choose their study destinations among increasingly numerous countries, but it is likewise true that the U.S. remains today *the* global »academic powerhouse«. In 2010 there were almost 700,000 foreign students there, of which Chinese, Indian and South Koreans alone accounted for almost half (IIE, 2011). The U.S. remains the top destination for non-citizen students and researchers – a long-standing and well-documented trend (for example, in his 1968 comparative study about fundamental research, Ben David (pp. 17 ff.) already pointed at the gap in fundamental research between the U.S. and Europe, which deepened during and after World War II).

Although one may concede that the prospect of more students, more researchers, and stronger civilizational attraction ensuing from policies promoting (vertical) differentiation (believed, in turn, to yield global status for the higher education system) has its allure, the fundamental question (hinted to above) remains: is the promotion of excellence, as currently conceived, publicized and implemented, compatible with the equally proclaimed aspirations to establish world-class higher education systems? Or, on the contrary, is developing a world-class university, which emphasises vertical diversity, inconsistent with developing an excellent higher education system, which calls for inter-institutional equality, well-established intra-systemic educational pathways &c. (in other words focuses on horizontal differentiation at least as much as on vertical differentiation)?

Ultimately, as citizens how confident can we be that our policy makers are expressing good and earnest judgement rather than conveying mere rhetoric (called »diversity« or »world-class«) to inform the allocation of public funds to different actors in the system?

### **Selected References**

1) Ben-David, J. (1968), *Fundamental Research and the Universities: Some Comments on International Differences*, Paris, OECD

- 2) Collins, R. (2001), *Civilizations as Zones of Prestige and Social Contact*, International Sociology, Vol. 16(3): 421-437. at: [http://club.fom.ru/books/Collins01\\_3.pdf](http://club.fom.ru/books/Collins01_3.pdf), accessed April 15, 2011
- 3) Drori, G.S., J.W. Meyer, F.O. Ramirez, & E. Schofer (2003), *Science in the Modern World Polity: Institutionalization and globalization*, Stanford University Press
- 4) Institute of International Education (2011), *Open Doors fast Facts, 2010*, November 15, 2010 at: <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>, accessed April 15, 2011
- 5) Liu, N.C. (2007). "The Differentiation, Classification, and Future World-Class Status". In: P.G. Altbach and J. Balán (Eds.). *World-Class World-Wide. Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America*, pp. 54-69
- 6) Meyer, J.W. et al. (2006), *Higher Education as an Institution*, CDDRL Working Papers, at: <http://cddrl.stanford.edu>, accessed April 2, 2008
- 7) MOC&W (2010). *Dutch Committee on the Future Sustainability of the Dutch Higher Education System: Threefold Differentiation for the Sale of Quality and Diversity in Higher Education*. The Hague: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Netherlands
- 8) Stiglitz, J. E. (2007). *Making Globalization Work* (pbk. [with a new Afterword] ed.). New York; London: W. W. Norton
- 9) United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (2004). *Diversification of Higher Education and the Changing Role of Knowledge and Research*. Papers presented at the Second Scientific Committee Meeting for Europe and North America (Paper No. 6). Paris. At: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001467/146736e.pdf>. Accessed April 15, 2011

## **Dr. Manja Klemenčič**

*Postdoctoral Researcher at Centre for Educational Policy Studies,  
Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana.*

*2011/12 Visiting Researcher at Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin and INCHER Kassel*

*2010/11 Visiting Scholar at Boston College Center for International Higher Education*

### **Address for correspondence:**

Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin

Wallotstrasse 19

14193 Berlin, Germany

[manja.klemencic@gmail.com](mailto:manja.klemencic@gmail.com)

### ***Southeast European higher education systems in the context of internationalisation: preliminary thoughts for further exploration***

This contemplation begins with a working assumption that the higher education environment which influences behaviour of governments and higher education institutions extends from national to international context. Also the normative environment that shapes what is valued by these governments and higher education institutions is extended to international context. Thus, the decisions on what are viable and – indeed – desirable governmental higher education policies, institutional policies and university structures in one country are shaped by international context.

The international context consists of policies and policy processes formulated in various international policy regimes - such as for example the EHEA - and by global higher education trends analysed and interpreted by/in these regimes. The international higher education policy regimes consist of governments, higher education institutions, international organisations, policy experts and academic as well as other higher education stakeholders, such as associations representing students, universities and teacher trade unions. Global higher education trends are the various developments associated with terms of globalisation of higher education, such as cross boarder education, international rankings, etc.

In absence of international policy regimes, national governments and institutions use bilateral or multilateral cooperation to compare each other's' policies, and to formulate their own policies. In doing so they most often apply the method principle of 'cherry-picking': they imitate the perceived best practices and emulate them into national context. Policy formulation supported through national comparisons may improve the policies and national practices, but it does not necessarily create conditions for sufficient convergence of policies that would support international cooperation. Both international cooperation in higher education and consequently internationalisation of national higher education are near universally promoted as beneficial for advancement of national higher education systems. Thus, various international policy regimes have been developed to better realise the goal of internationalisation.

In the case of international policy regimes, a common policy discourse and normative framework is developed. The regime provides a forum for sharing and exchange of ideas, for mutual learning, and for negotiation of commonly acceptable policy recommendations and normative declarations. The participating actors – through intensity of interactions - socialise into this framework, develop common 'vocabulary' and possibly common identities related to their role and participation within the regime. The common initiatives are formulated based on the expectation that soft instruments – such as joint policy recommendations, declarations as

well as benchmarking, naming and shaming, etc. – will influence national and institutional policies and practices in the commonly desired direction and ultimately lead to convergence of national policies. This will - in turn - make possible for internationalisation of higher education.

Despite the promise of international policy regimes, there are two major caveats. One caveat pertains the politics behind the regime policy processes and, in particular, the question whose interests are served, whose influence is the strongest, and – consequently - the legitimacy and general acceptance of the policies proposed. Or to see the issue from a point of view of smaller/peripheral states, the question here is whether and to what extent governments and institutions from these states are in position to influence common policies and raise awareness about their specific needs. The closely related concern is that of potential ‘democratic deficit’ within regime policy processes and disassociation of individual students, academics and staff with the regime policies.

The other – and related - caveat is concerned with the capacity of governments and institutions from smaller, peripheral and/or lesser developed higher education systems to formulate comprehensive national higher education policies and strategies. Such capacity contains three main aspects: (1) rigorous and effective systems of national data collection on various higher education indicators, (2) a sufficient critical mass of policy experts and academics to conduct comparative analyses and studies, policy reviews, evaluation and impact assessments and work on statistics and indicators; and (3) informed and involved stakeholders to feed into the policy process at various stages. These aspects are equally important to influence negotiations of international regimes’ policies and development of mainstream policy discourses. Finally, they are important for these actors’ ability to critically evaluate and examine policy recommendations stemming from international policy regimes or propagated by individual policy actors and/or funding agencies.

In line with discussion, the questions that interest me are: “How are international higher education policies reflected in the national and institutional context of South East European states?” and “What is the capacity of these states for comprehensive higher education policy formulation?” These questions are built on a presupposition of some common characteristics of smaller peripheral states such as those from the SEE region: (1) relative financial weakness, i.e. relatively lesser funds available for public spending on HE; (2) weak (or developing) government structures and governance coupled with weak democratic procedures, possibility for corruptive moments, interference into institutional autonomy and academic freedom; (3) that these states are typically not considered as “zones of civilizational attraction”; (4) that these states are at different level of economic and social advancement from the states that they compare themselves to, or even more importantly, that these states have a different starting point in terms of their development than those to whom they themselves or other most often compare them. Hence, there may be different forces that shape higher education at play in these states than those that are at the forefront of the policy-making in policy regimes, such as EHEA. It would be then worth exploring problems that are magnified in, but also problems and opportunities and advantages that are specific to these countries when it comes to higher education development

## **Dr. Pavel Zgaga**

*Centre for Educational Policy Studies,  
Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana.*

### ***Address for correspondence:***

Kardeljeva ploscad 16  
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
[pavel.zgaga@guest.arnes.si](mailto:pavel.zgaga@guest.arnes.si)

## ***Internationalization, competition and/or cooperation – “small”/“periphery” countries’ perspectives***

### **The relative notion of attractiveness**

Taking part in internationalization of higher education is very often understood as conditioned by an “enhanced attractiveness”: an *attractiveness* of both national systems and individual institutions within it.

Yet, national systems differ; they also differ regarding their size as well as their political (economic) “weight”.

What about attractiveness of “small” or “periphery” HE systems?

### **Why an enhanced attractiveness?**

The notion of *attractiveness* is closely associated to *competitiveness* and *cooperation*. What could enhanced attractiveness be good for?

On the one hand, it can strengthen international – but also national – *competitiveness*: higher education systems in general and institutions in particular should perform better in terms of mobile as well as international students, teacher and researchers, programmes obtained, etc.

This issue is, first of all, related to quality assurance and quality enhancement aspects.

### **Attractiveness vs. cooperation**

On the other hand, enhanced attractiveness can also strengthen international *cooperation* in higher education.

This issue is closely related to the promotion of partnerships in higher education – nationally and internationally, in particular close relationships that could be built through joint programmes of teaching and/or research among institutions with a strong mobility aspect, but also through dialogue and mutual learning from good practices.

In this sense, cooperation can also increase competitiveness but by diminishing the strict “egoistic” character.

### **Away from excessive competition**

“To facilitate change, universities should move away from excessive competition fuelled by pernicious rating systems, and develop structures and procedures that foster cooperation. This would enable them to share faculty members, students and resources, and to efficiently increase

educational opportunities. Institutions wouldn't need a department in every field, and could out-source some subjects. Teleconferencing and the Internet mean that cooperation is no longer limited by physical proximity. Consortia could contain a core faculty drawn from the home department, and a rotating group of faculty members from other institutions."

Mark C. Taylor, *Reform the PhD system or close it down*. Nature, Vol. 472, 21 April 2011

### **A case from SEE: Shanghai University to rank Macedonian Universities**

Shanghai Jiao Tong University, which analyzes the top universities in the world on quality of faculty, research output quality of education and performance, has been selected to evaluate the public and private institutions for higher education in Macedonia, Minister of Education and Science Nikola Todorov told reporters on Sunday.

The ranking team included the Shanghai University Director, Executive and six members of the University's Center, Todorov said, pointing out that Macedonia is to be the first country from the region to be part of the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), commonly known as the Shanghai ranking.

"The Shanghai ranking list is the most relevant in the world, and being part of it is a matter of prestige. We shall be honored our institutions for higher education to be evaluated by this university. This is going to be a revolution in the education sector, as for the first time we are offered an opportunity to see where we stand in regard to the quality," Todorov said.

*MINA – Macedonian International News Agency*, 16 January 2011

### **Internationalization, research and PhD studies**

Internationalization pressures HEIs to raise their "attractiveness" and "competitiveness". Yet, this call is received differently with the "top research", "national" or "local" universities; it is received differently in different countries and world regions. It is a general expectation of founders and public today that HEIs should increase their "attractiveness" which is predominantly measured by the number and strength of research projects and doctoral programmes (or "doctoral schools").

Their fight for "attractiveness" and prestige is linked with a today's fight for financial survival and, hopefully, expansion.

### **Explosion of doctoral students and studies?**

This is a serious challenge for HE systems in small countries due to low academic critical masses; it is a particular challenge for HE in countries "in transition" (and/or "post-conflict" societies) with their unstable politics and weak economies.

As a result, we are witnessing – also e.g. in the South-eastern Europe – an explosion of ("research") universities – as well as an explosion of doctoral students and studies.

On the other hand, doctoral candidates more and more often decide to do their studies at one of the "leading universities" (brain drain).

**A case: Doctoral students in Slovenia 2000 – 2010**

<b>Doctoral students; Slovenia, Academic year 2006/07 vs. 2010/11</b>									
Ac. year	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2010 – 2011					
Type of doctoral studies	Total	Total	Total	1. Full time – all	2. Part time – all	Total 1 + 2	3. Full time – 1 <sup>st</sup> y.	4. Part time – 1 <sup>st</sup> y.	Total 3 + 4
A. “Traditional”	964 (U+I)	1012 (U + I)	U= 1027 I = 124	U= 199 I = 97	U= 761 I = 84	U= 960 I = 13	U = n/a I = n/a	U = n/a I = n/a	U = n/a I = n/a
B. “Bologna”	n/a	45 (U + I)	U = 99 I = n/a	U= 521 I = 233	U= 2174 I = 127	U= 2695 I = 106	U= 268 I = 71	U= 1062 I = 40	U= 1330 I = 111
<b>Total A + B (U + I)</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>1057</b>	<b>1250</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>2301</b>	<b>2801</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>1102</b>	<b>1441</b>
U = Universities; I = Independent Colleges Data: SURS									

<b>Graduates in tertiary education, Slovenia 2010</b>	Total	HE 1 <sup>st</sup> cycle (level? Degree?)	HE 2 <sup>nd</sup> cycle (level? Degree?)	HE 3 <sup>rd</sup> cycle (level? Degree?)	Comp.: Doctorate 2005
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.694</b>	<b>11.284</b>	<b>6.918</b>	<b>1.492</b>	<b>369</b>
Education	1.468	318	1.111	39	
Arts and humanities	1.213	237	776	200	
Social sciences, business, law	8.726	5.608	2.467	651	
Science, maths, computing	1.087	437	430	220	
Technologies, engineering	3.072	1.889	969	214	
Agriculture, veterinary science	560	341	193	26	
Health and social affairs	1.707	858	779	70	
Services	1.861	1.596	193	72	

“HE 3rd cycle”; definition in Slovenian → Visokošolski programi 3. stopnje: Specializacija po univerzitetni izobrazbi (prejšnja), Magistrski (prejšnji), Doktorat znanosti (prejšnji), Doktorat znanosti (3. bolonjska stopnja).

**Questions to discuss**

Questions that arise:

- What could be outcome(s) of these trends?
- What type of “doctoral studies” could we expect in these countries in e.g. five (ten) year period?
- Will all these new doctors be employable?
- What effects could these trends produce in small countries (in particular with regards their research capacity)?

## **Professor John Brennan**

*Centre for Higher Education Research and Information,  
the Open University, UK*

### **Address for correspondence:**

[j.l.brennan@open.ac.uk](mailto:j.l.brennan@open.ac.uk)

### ***Universities in their place: social and cultural perspectives on the regional impacts of universities***

The presentation will draw on a recent UK project<sup>§</sup> (and the presentation's title reflects the title of the planned book based on the project). Through four university/regional case studies in the UK, the project sought to examine the regional impacts of universities, with the emphasis upon the social and cultural rather than the economic. Although the empirical focus was on the UK, the origins of the project lay in a larger international project on 'The role of universities in social transformation' and the presentation will attempt to set the UK findings in this larger international context. (The international project comprised a series of national and other case study reports, including a comparative report on India, Pakistan, Poland and Slovenia!)

Below, the main findings of the recent UK project are summarised.

#### **Universities and economic development/regeneration**

- ② Universities are important as nodes in the transmission of globalised competitive agendas – e.g. relating to the knowledge economy, digitisation, creativity etc.;
- ② Universities play a part in up skilling and re-skilling local workforces, but it is dangerous to see them as only doing so for their immediate region – the regional impact in terms of the local labour force is more apparent in the public sector than in the private sector;
- ② Universities have a significant impact as businesses in their own right – e.g. through their property strategies – and are significant employers of technical and professional staff (including knowledge professionals);
- ② The business strategies of universities are driven by their own priorities – in practice, however, these often seem to align with local and regional development priorities, whether because they create opportunities for them or because place and location matter (it is hard – although not impossible - for a university to relocate);
- ② The unintended (or unplanned) consequences of university activity on places and their regeneration may be as important as the planned or intended ones – e.g. impact of studentification, bohemianisation, service activities, property development etc..

---

<sup>§</sup> Higher Education and Regional Transformation: social and cultural perspectives (the HEART project), a project funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council

### **Regional and university images, local and institutional cultures**

- ☒ Image is a transformative discourse that runs through all the HEART case studies for both the universities and regions (from image 'enhancing' to image 'constraining').
- ☒ Universities have a *strategic* impact on their regions through partnership/development opportunities with agencies concerned with regional regeneration.
- ☒ Universities have a *physical* impact on their immediate environments (e.g. buildings, car parking). ☒ Universities' involvement in cultural ventures (both high and popular culture) and through the presence of students is *impact rich*. ☒ However, universities' involvement in cultural innovation and attitudinal change is *impact poor*.

### **Aspirations and opportunities for personal change and social mobility**

- ☒ All four case study institutions are reinforcing the dominant discourse around widening participation and 'low aspirations' locally by justifying engagement activities through this narrative
- ☒ However, how each institution engages with this discourse varies and is heavily dependant upon their position within the highly competitive higher education market
- ☒ The aspirations of many living in these four regions do not align with those valued within the policy and practice of national/local governments and educational institutions including universities.
- ☒ Universities were regarded by stakeholders as 'creaming off' the most able students through widening participation activities.
- ☒ While important opportunities for social mobility are being provided, a function of class reproduction and status confirmation may still be the dominant story.

### **Forms and discourses of public and community engagement**

- ☒ Developing active citizenship skills and programmes often form an element of the "public engagement" strategy of universities along with leadership and coordination roles in community development and regeneration strategies.
- ☒ The level and nature of universities' engagement and promotion of active citizenship vary according to the shape of the local HE market.

- ② All universities develop a rhetoric of public engagement but those explicitly positioning themselves on a global market show a more instrumental (strategic partnerships and actions) and/or institutionalised (being visible on commissions and fora, adhering strictly to HEFCE guidelines) approach. On the other hand, the more entangled universities (in local systems of social economic relations) seem to struggle to develop a more holistic rhetoric of engagement.
- ② 'Opportunity' universities: in 'new' universities located in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation, the rhetoric of engagement is not dissociated from the discourse on employability. Their discourses and activities around community support, civic engagement and active citizenship also seem more explicit and very diverse (in terms of the range of actions).
- ② A transformative approach: these universities also tend to have a self- assigned mission of cultural regeneration (raising aspirations, entrepreneurial culture,) and build their engagement rhetoric around the issue of the depreciated image of the city or region they are associated with.

### **The role of universities in tackling social inequalities and relative disadvantage**

- ② Within the project's four sub-regions, widening participation activities tend to provide social mobility opportunities for the few without necessarily altering patterns of inequality that affect the many.
- ② In sub-regions with several higher education providers, a social stratification of institutions may map onto and reinforce wider patterns of inequality.
- ② However, by its contribution to regional economic development and by increasing local employment and consumption levels, a local university may bring advantages to all within its sub-region.
- ② By their impact on the local economy and labour market, universities may be changing who the 'winners' and 'losers' are without necessarily impacting on overall levels of inequality and relative disadvantage.
- ② At least one of the case study universities saw its role in tackling inequalities and disadvantage as very long term and inter-generational, seeking to be 'open' to all and broadening its notions of 'access' beyond course enrolments to include, knowledge, expertise and facilities.