Helsinki Studies in Education, 30

Anna Medvedeva

University Internationalization and International Master's Programs

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Educational Sciences of the University of Helsinki, for public discussion in the lecture hall 10 (3010), Fabianinkatu 33, Päärakennus, on Friday, June 15th 2018, at 12 noon

Helsinki 2018

Reviewed by
Professor Barbara Kehm, Glasgow University
Adjunct Professor, Terhi Nokkala, University of Jyväskylä

Custos
Professor Markku Jahnukainen, University of Helsinki

Supervised by
Associate Professor Jaakko Kauko, University of Tampere
Assistant professor Sonja Kosunen, University of Helsinki

Official Opponent
Professor Fazal Rizvi, University of Melbourne

Unigrafia, Helsinki

ISBN 978-951-51-4321-1 (nid.)
ISBN 978- 951-51-4322-8 (pdf)
University of Helsinki, Faculty of Educational Sciences

Helsinki Studies in Education, number 30

Anna Medvedeva

University Internationalization and International Master's Programs

Abstract

This doctoral thesis focuses on international master's programs and develops an analytic typology of normative ideas, planning, and practices for understanding gaps in internationalization. The study sees internationalization as an empty term that acquires meaning in context. As a socially constructed phenomenon, it emerges through a variety of competing perspectives.

The macro-planning of internationalization relies on economic and political conditions; it envisions a broad societal impact. This context gives little room for university agency in developing internationalization for academic purposes. Internationalization implementation at the institutional level adds complexity to everyday functioning, rather than offering solutions to new challenges.

Critiques of internationalization often use references to the university system of the Middle Ages, where institutional functioning was not tied to the market. Despite the inconsistency of this metaphor, it raises a useful discussion about expectations regarding institutions of higher education. Currently, the university is aligned with the state economically and politically, while the individual dimension of internationalization is overlooked. Ideas of reacting to globalization and remaining competitive dominate those of transforming knowledge sources and rethinking curricula.

This study conducts an analysis of four English-medium master's programs at three universities in Finland. These programs exemplify long-term internationalization. Along with the macro context of development revealed through document analysis, research elicits individual perspectives on internationalization through interviews with students and teachers, revealing individuals' inclusion in higher education processes. Use of discourse analysis also brings attention to omissions and inconsistencies in the representations of internationalization.

Inquiry suggests that despite academic and planning discussion turning towards "holistic" and long-term internationalization, in the way it is operationalized in documents and individual responses it is still featured as an external characteristic. It is a separate university activity in terms of administrative efforts, managing content and viewing results. The framework of 'internationalization at home' is not overcoming the isolation of international students and master's programs within the university.

Arguments in the discussion about internationalization gaps point towards a lack of cohesion between normative ideas, planning and practices. Economic and

political rationales prevail in the macro discourse, and further dimensions of internationalization appear in the analysis of everyday implementation and individual perspectives. Current planning and indicators do not track the emergent processes in education, where internationalization acquires a situational value. Meanwhile, due to a lack of agency, the university often fails to develop and sustain internationalization for academic purposes.

Keywords: internationalization, higher education, master's programs

Helsinki Studies in Education, number 30

Anna Medvedeva

Yliopiston kansainvälistyminen ja kansainväliset maisteriohjelmat

Tiivistelmä

Tutkimus keskittyy kansainvälisiin maisteriohjelmiin ja käsittelee normatiivisten ideoiden, suunnittelun ja käytäntöjen analyyttista typologiaa kansainvälistymiskuilujen ymmärtämiseksi. Tutkielma näkee kansainvälistymisen tyhjänä käsitteenä, joka saa merkityksensä kontekstissa. Sosiaalisesti rakentuneena ilmiönä se näyttäytyy useiden kilpailevien näkökulmien kautta.

Kansainvälistymisen makrotason suunnittelu tähtää laajaan yhteiskunnalliseen vaikutukseen ja on riippuvaista taloudellisista ja poliittisista olosuhteista. Tämä konteksti antaa vain vähän tilaa yliopiston toiminnalle kansainvälistymisen kehittämisessä akateemisiin tarkoituksiin. Kansainvälistymisen toteuttaminen institutionaalisella tasolla pikemminkin mutkistaa päivittäistä toimintaa kuin tarjoaa ratkaisuja uusiin haasteisiin.

Kritiikissä kansainvälistymistä vastaan viitataan usein keskiajan yliopistoon, jossa instituution toiminta ei ollut sidoksissa markkinoihin. Vaikka tämä metafora on epäjohdonmukainen, se herättää hyödyllistä keskustelua korkeakouluihin kohdistuvista odotuksista. Yliopisto liitetään nykyään taloudellisesti ja poliittisesti valtioon, ja kansainvälistymisen yksilöllinen ulottuvuus jätetään huomiotta. Ajatukset reagoinnista globalisaatioon ja kilpailukyvyn ylläpitämisestä jättävät varjoonsa ajatukset tiedonlähteiden transformaatiosta ja opetussuunnitelmien kehittämisestä.

Tutkielma analysoi kolmen suomalaisen yliopiston neljää englanninkielistä maisteriohjelmaa. Ohjelmat ovat esimerkkejä pitkän aikavälin kansainvälistymisestä. Dokumenttianalyysilla tarkasteltavan makrokontekstin rinnalle tutkimus nostaa esiin yksilöllisiä näkökulmia kansainvälistymiseen opiskelijoiden ja opettajien haastattelujen kautta analysoimalla yksilöiden kytköksiä korkeakoulutuksen prosesseihin. Diskurssianalyysin avulla tutkimus kiinnittää huomiota myös puutteisiin ja epäjohdonmukaisuuksiin kansainvälistymisessä.

Vaikka akateeminen ja kehittämiseen liittyvä keskustelu on siirtymässä ‘holistisen‘ ja pitkäaikaisen kansainvälistymisen näkökulmiin, kansainvälistymisen toiminnallistaminen analysoiduissa asiakirjoissa ja haastatteluissa näyttäytyy yhä ulkoisena ominaisuutena. Kansainvälistyminen on hallinnollisten pyrkimysten, sisällön hallinnan ja tulosten tarkastelun kannalta erillinen yliopiston toiminto. ‘Kotikansainvälistymisen’ viitekehys ei pysty

ratkaisemaan kansainvälisten opiskelu- ja maisteriohjelmien eristyneisyyttä yliopiston sisällä.

Keskustelussa käytetyt argumentit kansainvälistymiskuiluista viittaavat koheesion puuttumiseen ohjeellisten ideoiden, suunnittelun ja käytäntöjen välillä. Taloudelliset ja poliittiset perustelut hallitsevat makrodiskurssissa ja kansainvälistymisen lisäulottuvuudet tulevat näkyviin päivittäisen toteutuksen ja yksilöllisten näkökulmien analyysissa. Nykyinen kansainvälistymisen suunnittelu ja indikaattorit eivät pysty havaitsemaan kansainvälistymisen on tilannekohtaista arvoa koulutuksen prosesseissa. Lisäksi, toimijuuden puutteen vuoksi, yliopisto usein epäonnistuu kansainvälistymisen kehittämisessä ja ylläpitämisessä akateemisiin tarkoituksiin.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor professor Jaakko Kauko for discussing ideas, supporting this research and encouraging my writing. I am also grateful to my other supervisor, professor Sonja Kosunen for her engagement with this project, advice and supportive and insightful commenting. I would also like to thank professors Pirkkoliisa Ahponen, Hannu Simola and Ulpukka Isopahkala-Bouret for endorsing my research project.

It was my honor to have professors Barbara Kehm (Glasgow University) and Terhi Nokkala (University of Jyväskylä) as my pre-examiners, their thorough reading, insightful comments and suggestions helped to improve the final version of this thesis. I am honored to have professor Fazal Rizvi (University of Melbourne) as my opponent in the public doctoral defense.

My warmest thanks to the EDUKNOW research group at the University of Tampere, Jarmo Kallunki, Íris Santos and Sari Eriksson and others for detailed comments and fruitful discussions, which helped me to shape my argument. Kupoli PhD seminar at the University of Helsinki and its participants have also contributed to my research project.

My time of working in the BCR project (Research project in Transnational Dynamics in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Politics of Basic Education in Brazil, China and Russia) has been invaluable in educating me as a researcher. I wish to thank Nelli Piattoeva, Galina Gurova, Tuomas Takala, and our whole team for invaluable time and experience.

I am grateful to our informal group of PhD students: Lisa Muszynski, Laura Sibinescu and Sonja Trifuljesko for incredible support, debates about research approaches and collaborative development of the writing practices. You were the first people who understood my study, which felt truly magical. I would also like to thank Grace I-An Gao for fruitful academic discussions. Sincere thanks to my dear academic friends Dušica Božović and Helena Candido for sharing the current moment and planning of the future research. I also benefited from the discussions at the Summer School on Higher education in Jyväskylä, Summer School on Higher Education Research at the Higher School of Economics (Moscow) and Theory Building Research Program at Halmstad University. I would also like to thank professor Jussi Välimaa for his supportive attitude and commenting of my research.

I am thanking Sovako graduate school and Kone Foundation for giving me the opportunity to pursue this project. Albion Butters and Eric Bergman gave me invaluable help with the language of this thesis. I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to Lena Gorbacheva, Keshia D'silva, Ran Goren, Emma Pulkkinen, Salla Anttila, Yasmeen Al-Eryani, Ran Goren, Ana

Toledo, Marguerite Beattie, Linda Sivander, and many others for being a wonderful and supportive academic community.

This research would have been impossible without support of my family, Pavel and Maria. I would also like to express gratitude to my parents and extended family for believing in me and supporting me in my academic path.

Contents

1 CHAPTER: INTRODUCTION: ENABLING INTERNATIONALIZATION CLAIMS 13
1.1 Establishing the topic 13
1.2 Academic research 14
1.2.1 Normative ideas 16
1.2.2 Planning of internationalization 20
1.2.3 Internationalization practices 22
1.3 The core of the problem 26
1.4 Building a theoretical framework 28
1.4.1 Approach 28
1.4.2 Concepts 29
1.5 Scope of the project 32
1.6 Structure of the thesis 33
2 CHAPTER: THE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION PLANNING 37
2.1 Political and economic discourse on internationalization 38
2.1.1 Far-reaching rationales of internationalization 38
2.1.2 Framings of international activities: globalization, internationalization and Europeanization 40
2.1.3 Operationalization of internationalization in the current university agency 42
2.2 Planning challenges 45
2.2.1 Assessment problems, and merging of the image-making and planning. 46
2.2.2 Internationalization at home: master's programs and innovations of internationalization 49
2.2.3 Category of the international students in research and education planning 53
2.2.4 Curriculum transformation through internationalization 60
2.2.5 Internationalization as a source of organizational problems 62

3 CHAPTER: ACADEMIC DISCUSSION ABOUT NORMATIVE ASSUMPTIONS IN INTERNATIONALIZATION 67
3.1 Major normative dimensions 69
3.1.1 Academia of the Middle Ages and current internationalization development 69
3.1.2 Internationalization and expectations for institutional development . 72
3.1.3 Definitions of Internationalization 74
3.1.4 Individual dimension 75
3.2 Normativities and the problems behind them 78
3.2.1 Idea of a small country for governance and marketing 78
3.2.2 Content and internationalization of different disciplines 80
3.3 Emergent critical dimension of internationalization: where the gaps come from 83
3.3.1 Academic discussion about normative stances of Internationalization 83
3.3.2 Ethical considerations in internationalization 84
4 CHAPTER: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 89
4.1 Building the methodological approach 89
4.2 The researchers' position 91
4.3 Data Collection 95
4.4 Discourse analysis approach 100
4.5 Application of analysis 104
4.5.1 Document Analysis 105
4.5.2 Interview analysis 106
4.5.3 Emergence of Categories throughout analysis: 107
4.6 Research ethics 113
4.7 Validity of the study 114
5 CHAPTER: PLANNING OF INTERNATIONALIZATION 116
5.1 Internationalization as an external characteristic 117
5.2 Scope of activities and responsibility on the European and national levels 122
5.3 University agency in developing master's programs 130

5.4 Lack of governance data 134
5.5 Implementation challenges: ethical issues in internationalization 139
6 CHAPTER: INTERNATIONALIZATION AS A NORMATIVE REPRESENTATION 144
6.1 Internationalization and quality 144
6.2 Individual expectations regarding the university 152
6.3 International degree programs: definition, demand and limitations 157
6.4 Internationalization value 162
7 CHAPTER: PERSPECTIVES ON PRACTICES 175
7.1 Policy perspectives on practices 176
7.2 Elements of studies contributing to internationalization 179
7.2.1 Influence of diversity on education outcomes 179
7.2.2 Language balance 185
7.3 Practical aspects in the transformation of teaching 189
7.4 Outcomes of the international program: student perception 198
7.4.1 Influence of internationalization on employment possibilities 198
7.4.2 Intercultural communication as a value-generating process in internationalization 208
7.4.3 Personal development as a result of international experiences 210
8 CHAPTER: CONCLUSIONS. INTERNATIONALIZATION GAPS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS 215
8.1 Claims about internationalization and their reasonings 215
8.2 Gaps in internationalization 215
8.3 Implications for internationalization development 218
8.3.1 How normative ideas, planning and practices determine internationalization development 218
8.3.2 Internationalization as an external characteristic 221
8.3.3 International master's program 223
8.4 Reconceptualization of internationalization understanding 225
8.4.1 Rethinking the place of the individual in internationalization 225
8.4.2 Refocusing the data 226
8.4.3 University agency in internationalization 227

8.5 Final words: how to internationalize responsibly 230

1 Chapter: Introduction: enabling internationalization claims

1.1 Establishing the topic

Discussion about internationalization takes place in a variety of situations: on campus, within the university administration, in the media and at policy forums. These occasions highlight different issues and offer a variety of perspectives, which form a public discourse about the topic. This makes any conceivable definition loose; such a great variety of phenomena could hardly be united under one characterization. However, there is a need to say something about internationalization. As Murphy asks, "What should the process include? Is reading a few books from different cultures enough to internationalize education?" (2007, 181). Forming an argument on internationalization development requires a starting point and criteria. Within this delineated space of investigation, it should be possible to identify what internationalization is, as well as when and what it brings to education. I explore internationalization from the perspective of gaps. These are different statements about insufficient internationalization, inadequate implementation and other kind of problems related to internationalization, which delineate the boundaries of the concept. Then, I suggest distinguishing three elements that enhance understanding of the claims about internationalization: a normative dimension, planning and practices at the university. The goal of this research is to account for the discrepancies between these elements and to derive the implications for internationalization development.

The topic of internationalization is flourishing in the current research (Huisman, 2008; Kreber, 2009; Kehm, 2011). However, there is no 'conceptual home', with developed theories supporting a range of methods (Kehm, 2011, 234). Some papers explore the overall tendencies of higher education development. Applied studies investigate the realization of internationalization within a defined area. They are widely used in higher education, but this does not ensure systemic generalization across multiple cases. Scholars in the field aspire for future internationalization research to understand the range of academic values in internationalization (Egron-Polak, 2014) and investigate implementation dynamics (Kehm, 2011); these inquiries should bring interpretations about the impact of internationalization on education (Bradenburg & de Wit, 2012).

In this chapter, I introduce my study and contextualize it in the academic field (1.1 and 1.2). The intention of my research is to account for the gaps in internationalization through a conceptual framework that categorizes internationalization discourse into normative ideas, planning and practices. A preliminary overview of the academic research expands on these dimensions (1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3).

Later in the thesis, I develop these categories with theoretical and empirical information and place them against one another. Specifically, I address the discrepancies between 'what was planned' and 'what turned out to be the case', which are often discussed as gaps. My research addresses these issues within one project type – international master's programs – as well as their implications for internationalization development. As a typical venture for the university, it is a suitable case for the broader discussion on internationalization. The analysis demonstrates the university's agency in implementing international projects, especially ones requiring sustainable organizational efforts due to a long-term time span. At the same time, it allows a close analysis of the individuals' role in enacting internationalization.

In subchapter 1.3, I describe the core of my research, and since internationalization covers a wide variety of processes, in subchapter 1.4, I describe the major theoretical considerations behind my study. Then, in 1.5 I delineate the margins of my analysis. The structure of the thesis is outlined at the end of the chapter (1.6). My inquiry contributes to development of theoretical perspectives on internationalization, the analysis of international master's programs and the understanding of internationalization impact on education.

1.2 Academic research

In this subchapter, I elaborate on internationalization as a field of academic inquiry and explore the key aspects for my study: normative ideas, planning and internationalization practices.

Internationalization research demonstrates interdisciplinarity; it is possible to look at the subject from the standpoints of educational, political, economic, social, cultural, anthropological, historical and legal inquiry (de Wit, 2002, 208). As international activities are rapidly diversifying, however, there is a challenge to track key tendencies, draw inferences and establish connections to theory (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 17). This gives grounds for the kind of study that I suggest – an exploration of internationalization through one project type. Theoretical framework distinguishing normative ideas, planning, and practices explicates the composition of reasoning about internationalization. Following this logic, it becomes possible to explain the 'gaps', when normative expectations, planning and practices do not match. It is also important to reflect the individual or institutional perspective.

Inquiries of internationalization often drift towards a comparative approach, focusing on the available numeric indicators to assess practices. Yet, a scarcity of data and inconsistencies in its collection in different countries preclude informative comparisons. Large-scale studies require significant resources and are in the

minority (Kehm, 2011, 236). Additionally, it is quite problematic to compare qualitative indicators, which could contribute to contextual knowledge about internationalization. Gornitzka et al. claim that "mechanisms, practices and the experience of internationalization" could be studied in comparison (Gornitzka, Gulbrandsen & Trondal, 2003, 133). Germane conclusions, however, would require extensive information about the nature of the projects. Therefore, my focus on in-depth analysis of one project type is an attempt to discover what kind of indicators would be relevant and feasible to argue further about internationalization practices. This kind of substantial background material supports further comparisons.

Kehm claims that among the "theoretically and methodologically ambitious studies", neo-institutionalism, network theories and discourse analysis are quite widespread approaches (Kehm, 2011, 234–235). Gornitzka et al. also add national innovation systems as one of the frequently used models in studies of international knowledge production (Gornitzka, Gulbrandsen & Trondal, 2003, 33). Especially policy studies and macro-level analyses are utilizing these methods, since they have an explanatory power about internationalization planning at the level of the education system.

There are also approaches that try to grasp the university processes influencing internationalization. Bartell focuses on the institutional culture as a predictive factor of the kind of internationalization emerging at the university (2003). Thus, the alignment of the university can be revealed by assessing the environment, internal culture, functioning structure and related strategies (Bartell, 2003). Stier conceptualizes differences in the realization of internationalization strategies at the institutional level as divergent internationalization ideologies of idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism, accentuating their explicit characteristics and underlying assumptions, which are expressed in the way of practising internationalization (Stier, 2004). These studies infer certain typologies of internationalization, which describe the variety of internationalization tactics at the institutional level. This is an addition to the theoretical ideas about internationalization planning.

Dealing with the problem of theory deficiency in internationalization, one might address the question of how current research captures crucial changes. The essentials of internationalization, according to Kehm (2011), are knowledge, institutions and people. While institutions receive more attention, transformations in people and knowledge are more obscure. Knowledge acquisition through international activities and people's perspectives on the educational process require further research. The links between institutional conditions, practical changes and transformations in education are also central for inquiries of internationalization and theory-building. Distinguishing dimensions of internationalization addresses the 'tangibility' question of the statements regarding internationalization, whether it is a desired change, a declaration of status and ambition, or a current situation.

Below I explore how these normative ideas, the planning of internationalization and practices appear in the prior research.

1.2.1 Normative ideas

I define normative ideas of internationalization as verbalized conceptions of how internationalization 'should be' understood and practiced. This reasoning can be found in academic articles, in policies and in respondents' claims, demonstrating various value orientations and suggesting different courses of action. Education, as Biesta (2007, 10) calls it, is a 'moral practice', and decision-making is based on the representations of what is good for education. Therefore, my focus on the normative ideas of internationalization is an exploration of what internationalization is and what its underlying ideas concerning how it should be practiced are. The overall development of this sphere is important for the understanding of internationalization and the actions that it includes. However, reliance on the ideas picturing a broad impact, building on the assumptions that are accepted uncritically, could have a negative impact. The examples in my research are the idea of the positive impact of international students on campus (without any further effort on the part of the institution) and the idea of internationalization's impact on the overall progress of the country (on a range of spheres that are not directly related to internationalization).

The role of public discussion in prioritizing aspects within internationalization is central. Kehm notes the strong political connotations in the rivalry of values underlying internationalization (2011). Despite the prevalence of economic and strategic priorities in the current development of higher education, there is a growing discussion about the academic values of internationalization. Until the initiative by the IAU (the International Association of Universities), this dimension of normative ideas was latent (IAU, 2012a).

Haapakoski and Pashby (2017) explore the discourses on raising the number of international students and how they draw on the competitive dimension of internationalization, hence missing out on the ideas of equality and diversity. The authors' claim is that it is important to reconstruct the missing ethical perspective on internationalization. They also note that recent literature on internationalization has been raising critical concerns. Discourses representing the critical orientation are least represented in the document data and interview data, so there is an attempt to reconstruct the claims of potential critical discourses within their research (Haapakoski & Pashby 2017). In another article, Pashby and Andreotti (2016) also focus on mapping the diverse orientations of internationalism. They highlight the intersections of internationalization, such as neoliberal, liberal and critical discourses. This is, as they call it, 'the imaginary', which is a part of the normative ideas as I understand them in this research.

Dervin (2015b) also explores the work of ideologies within the internationalization of higher education. He criticizes 'hyper-branding' and its impact on the intercultural dimension of education (2015b). These widely accepted assumptions, when not addressed critically, could have adverse effects on education. The author, however, comes with another normative agenda – the (r)evolution of interculturality – implying that internationalization should give greater relevance to intercultural aspects, which are concerned with the moral and ethical dimensions. Emerging ethical perspectives on internationalization are important, as education is never a neutral and unproblematic activity.

The argument on what internationalization and international education 'should be' is often built from the opposite angle, pointing out what is *not* international enough. The discussion on the myths or misconceptions of internationalization, described by Knight (2011) and de Wit (2011), explicates normative reasoning: statements about the number of international students, international subjects and studies in a foreign language are insufficient to demonstrate the internationalization value. The authors advocate for a holistic and reflexive approach to internationalization. They bring up negative examples to reveal an alternative vision of how universities should practice internationalization.

But the problem with the current development of the academic field is that internationalization research often departs from a latent normative agenda (Kehm, 2011, 237). The problem with these assumptions is that they might not be shared by the entire academic community; there are different, often contradictory, perspectives on internationalization. When research does not address assumptions and shifts towards performance indicators instead, there is a lack of explanatory power about internationalization at large. Uncovering different kinds of normativity and potential contradictions among these assumptions could be a key for understanding internationalization gaps as well.

Leask and Caroll (2011), acknowledging this problem, call the normative agenda 'wishing and hoping', and point out a potential discrepancy of this imaginary within practices. They refer to the emerging critical dimension and state that this led to a number of polarized views: ones praising internationalization's impact on education, and others that doubt its usefulness (Yemini, 2014 also notes a similar problem). Exploring the literature, Leask and Caroll find that positive assumptions about internationalization, its "hypothetical possibilities" (2011, 648), are not supported by evidence. The ideal, they claim, is not supported by information about practices. And, in fact, the research on practices often suggests the contrary – that international students face isolation. When the benefits from cultural diversity on campus are assumed to be natural, this shifts the attention away from inclusion and engagement, which would require effort from institutions (Leask & Caroll, 2011).

An excessively positive attitude to internationalization is another element of normativity (Stensaker et al, 2008, 9-10). Universities try to adhere to it at least

on the level of public rhetoric, and higher education research also contains this stance. The core idea is that the improvement of education is predicated on opening up and reaching out to institutions in other countries.

Through the same idea of better quality, internationalization is paradoxically entrenched in the national system of education: participation on a competitive level requires the positioning of national universities as 'the best' (Kehm, 2011, 223). This is also a starting point for marketing, which is one of the key discourses exemplifying latent normativity.

Internationalization is assumed to be a linear development, similar from one country to another. For instance, assessments of the quality of internationalization in terms of 'benchmarking' or 'best practices' suggest a normative foundation behind the investigation. Studies on benchmarking are on the border between research and policy-making, and they can fail to depict internationalization within the larger picture of higher education. On the one hand, these studies require an investigation of the university, rather than adopting several available indicators (Burquel, 2014; De Wit, 2002, 2005), even though these are among the few comparative studies in the field of internationalization that contribute to theory building. On the other hand, such a comparison suggests unidirectional development and judgements of superior or inferior practices (Deem, Mok & Lucas, 2008). The resulting inferences are less sensitive to the circumstances of the university. Paradoxically, subsequent suggestions do not ensure alignment of the university administration with these discoveries; actual governance may drift into other, circumstance-based decisions (Mok & Chan, 2008).

As for inquiries regarding 'best practices', methodologically these are case studies describing the success of a particular project (McCabe, Gross & Reynolds, 2009); they are also regarded as a primary means of knowledge production about internationalization (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999). Since they are considered to be 'best', there is an assumption concerning their transferability to another university's context, as the setting in which projects are implemented at another institution are beyond the research framework. Consequently, it is challenging to verify the regularities of successful internationalization, and the normative import of the research takes over. Another critical aspect of the 'best practices' perspective is that whenever a search for such practices takes place, Western universities' activities tend to be in focus (Haigh, 2002). However, once the adoption of Anglo-Saxon governance practices within a different context is assessed, the impact of this decision-making is deemed controversial (Currie et al., 2003, 191).

There are also studies that discuss internationalization as a 'norm' in higher education, without addressing how this standard emerged, and what its settings are (Tamtik & Kirss, 2016). In this case, acknowledgment of normative representations over higher education governance is built into the research perspective, it is a latent normative agenda in the research. Yet, an inquiry into the normative

ideas would demonstrate that they are discrete and can have various value orientations. Although building research that is entirely devoid of normative assumptions is unlikely, explicating the concealed starting points would improve theoretical reasoning.

The analyses delving into internationalization patterns also switch to norm-claiming statements. For instance, taking an analytical approach to assess institutional models of internationalization, Bartell includes a section called "the need for internationalization", in which he argues in prescriptive terms about the need for the university to change (Bartell, 2003, 48). It is close to a policy position. Childress (2009), while employing a systematic analysis of policies, argues for usefulness of this research approach in the design and evaluation of internationalization plans. The applied purpose of the study is in providing guidelines for successful internationalization. The distinction between research and recommendation is often fuzzy in internationalization studies (Kehm, 2011, 223). Meanwhile, the background ideas about education, which are behind these instructions, are not revealed. By saying that internationalization is needed, these studies do not develop what kind of internationalization is needed.

The normative discussion about the internationalization of higher education is represented by a variety of studies. Some of them dispute normative assumptions and advocate for a certain vision of internationalization. Then, there is a scholarly discussion on academic values within internationalization, which implies the questioning of the dominant normative ideas. Yet another type of study acknowledges a certain vision of internationalization as a norm and acts from that starting point.

Often, normativity lies within unaddressed assumptions about internationalization. There are studies that practice internationalization as a norm; taking its positive impact for granted is another norm, while claiming the excellence of internationalized education is yet another norm. This gives grounds for the upholding of assumptions that are taken for granted. Statements about internationalization gaps relate to these types of representations, along with accounts of practices.

When studies of internationalization hold a lot of normative claims, their representation in scientific reasoning ranges from latent ideas to methodological principles, as well as in researching the ways in which internationalization is implemented. This kind of situation weakens knowledge about internationalization, when 'what internationalization should be' is confused with 'what internationalization is', and therefore less attention is paid towards planning and practices. By distinguishing these three dimensions, I am going to address this problem in my research.

Dervin (2015b) points out the need to analyze the 'ideas, discourses and situated practices', and, although there is no explication of the premises of such research, it is clear that the discrepancy between ideas and practices could be medi-

ated by greater attention to each of these domains. Since internationalization nowadays is a strategic activity, this brings attention to the university's role and responsibilities. Leask and Caroll (2011) advocate for an increased focus on planning as a solution to the problem of normativity. Therefore, the combined framework of normative ideas, planning, and practices appears to be a reasonable research approach and deserves to be tested.

1.2.2 Planning of internationalization

For the purposes of my study, I distinguish internationalization as planning in contrast to other elements. This analysis addresses questions 'how it is being done' and 'for whom' are equally important in education (Biesta, 2007, 10). It encompasses the provisions for internationalization found in official documents, as well as organizational arrangements at the university, and shows the discrepancies between the institutional and individual perspectives. Additionally, it includes implementation measures corresponding to policy design. Research on internationalization planning includes inquiries into prerequisites of policy development and explorations of the gap between planning and practices. Current studies on internationalization are more inclusive in terms of issues (at home and abroad) and linkages (higher education policy and funding); the inquiries do not treat it as a separate university activity (Kehm, 2011). Despite the clear drive towards a 'holistic approach', classifications and theorizations are still lagging behind. The assumption that internationalization can be planned and implemented seems to be unquestioned.

Several frameworks have been developed for systematizing institutional internationalization. Childress is building her study on Knight's 1994 model, which describes the internationalization cycle as: "(a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement" (Knight, 1994). The suggested model is prescriptive and presumes that its implementation is a key to internationalization. However, Childress (2009, 292) describes this as a non-linear process, noting that certain stages could in fact be omitted.

Taylor also studies internationalization at the level of the institutional transformations, but addresses strategies critically, asking to what extent their development enables university change (2004). Yet, this research expresses a normative standpoint of strategic improvement. Policy planning is a way of changing the university from what was traditional to a new structure. The development of strategies requires extensive knowledge about the external environment of the university. Taylor also focuses on the implementation, monitoring and development of targets (2004). According to him, effective communication within the university predicates the enactment of international activities.

The planning model advanced by Knight works on the institutional level, and so it mainly holds internationalization as a plan for realization. Therefore, Childress's research also presumes that once a plan is made and realized, internationalization is successful. Yet, there often is a big gap between policies and practices, as Childress refers to issues missed in implementation (2009, 292). In the framework articulated by Taylor (2004), internationalization outcome is predicated on the course of actions suggested by the institution and the ability of the university to respond to societal pressures. This points towards the role of the university's agency in internationalization.

Internationalization planning takes place on international, national and institutional levels, which can have different foci. Stensaker et al. analyse the gap between national policies and institutional needs. Utilizing evidence from twelve Scandinavian universities and colleges, they claim that the internationalization process tests the capacity of the university to act strategically. They also argue that the future of policy-making is in diversifying approaches to an array of institutional needs (Stensaker et al., 2008). This demonstrates loose agreement between different levels of planning.

The adjustment of internationalization takes place through communication within the university. Planning and implementations of plans are not, according to Taylor, a complete process. He also refers to Knight's idea about the internationalization cycle, claiming that the assessment and monitoring of indicators become an unalienable part of the process. The benchmarking of comparative performance indicators, suggests Taylor, is a way to develop internationalization. This does not necessitate or specify qualitative assessments which would show the actual circumstances of the university. It recognizes the cycle of planning and changes based on previous results; therefore, it is sensitive to the context of implementation (Taylor, 2004). Yet, the process is seen as uniform, similar and linear for a variety of institutions. The problematizations of strategies, from reasoning to the means of implementation, are constantly widening; improving strategies is the main aim of this kind of pragmatic research. There are also studies concerning the gap between planning and campus practices, suggesting that these processes might take place independently (Green & Olson, 2003).

Bartell (2003) and Sporn (1996) analyse the input of the university culture in the implementation of changes; this framework pays closer attention to the institutional processes. It turns out that straightforward, top-down realization of internationalization is not viable in the academic community; constant dialog and negotiations of conditions are important for change. Due to the applied element, this kind of research lacks the perspective of students and teachers, knowledge creation as a part of internationalization, and the impact of these processes on teaching and research. There is a gap between administrative institutional plans and the vision of students and scholars, and this emerges due to the difference in perspectives and power.

Understanding internationalization is not limited to planning, but internationalization definitions do not tackle this issue. One of the most widely used definitions, articulated by Knight, relies on the institutional perspective: "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2003, 2). Apart from a 'process', it relates to the university's agency as a vehicle of change. Development of the institutional policies of internationalization has already been a reality for some time (Knight 2001, 228). Taylor (2004) questions the process of policy development within the institution and steps taken towards its realization. He also notes that integration of internationalization in all spheres of the university life, according to the definition, is an ideal. In reality, the response of different areas and the degree of their internationalization are different (Taylor, 2004). The national level of policy-making is absorbed by institutions in diverse ways (Graf, 2009).

Internationalization planning consists of policy and institutional activities, and research frameworks correspond to this understanding. The top-down structure of implementation is a given condition within these studies. But along with that, I would also like to include in my study the emergent, autonomous processes of internationalization in university life. Therefore, the following subsection reviews research on practices of internationalization.

1.2.3 Internationalization practices

The actual circumstances at the university are yet another aspect of internationalization development (Schoorman 1999; van der Wende, 1999). Research on the nature and effects of internationalization could supplement the picture (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 133). The inquiries into internationalization practices include a focus on the project and individuals' perspectives, as well as a growing number of ethical concerns.

As the essays on internationalization 'myths' and 'misconceptions' demonstrate, changes in education cannot be taken for granted. In order to gain something, the university should exert organizational efforts. Focus on one type of project could elicit knowledge about internationalization that is closer to the actual practices (Knight, 2011; de Wit, 2011). Although there is research concentrating on the experience of the particular international initiatives, generalizations about the project type and connections to theory are limited.

Scholarship on master's programs exhibits scanty references to practices. The initial discussion about master's programs linked them to Europeanization. For instance, the establishment of the joint degree programs was about fostering networks within Europe, which fed into larger internationalization planning. Early on, the analysis showed a number of organizational challenges, like transferring credit and adjustment to the local educational structure (Lawson, 1988). Although

presenting relevant issues about the project type, this is not a review of practices. Rather, it is a normative assessment of project development as an instrument of Europeanization. Continuing this line of research, Kehm and Teichler employ a three-tiered system of education as a framework for the assessment of master's programs; the objectives of the Bologna process are the major indicators of their development. However, the authors also acknowledge a multitude of expectations and variety of perspectives on outcomes (Kehm & Teichler 2006).

Studies about master's programs' branding and strategies of attracting students have a greater focus on institutional activity (Suomi, 2014). This explicates considerations of education quality but lacks a critical review of practices. Qiang (2003) differentiates between the organizational and academic elements of internationalization, both of which concern practices. I would like to delve into this context of the functioning of master's programs.

Bamber argues in favour of applied inquiry into student education (2015). According to him, the deficiency of knowledge about master's level learning and research hinders improvements in the organization of postgraduate studies (Bamber, 2015). Taking similar line of argument, Ryan notes that while internationalization of teaching and learning is seldom the focus of the university administration, these are the reorganizations in curriculum and pedagogy which convey the internationalization benefits (2011, 632). Kneale explores the benefits of group interactions in master's programs as a way to ascertain new topics. The university and study program should find ways to organize this process (Kneale, 2005). Leask and Caroll (2011, 647) suggest at least three things that need to be done in order to ensure benefits from internationalization: alignment of the formal and informal curriculum, focus on the task design and management, and new approaches to the professional development of the academic staff. In contrast to the ideas picturing a broad impact, this would have to be a 'reflective practice' on the part of the university, ensuring student participation in the construction of education.

Studies of master's programs often derive quality criteria and assessment indicators from the professional field. Rather than discussing internationalization in higher education, along with the form of study, they focus on knowledge and occupational preparation (i.e. Briihl & Wasieleski, 2004; Lukinbeal & Monk, 2015; Reeves, 2011). This prevents broader judgements about the degree program and educational development through internationalization. Although these inquiries draw from current practices and professional backgrounds, the normative aspect of the conclusions clearly dominates.

Research on "mastersness" focuses on the characteristics of the degree and the features of knowledge it offers. The distinguished facets at this level of studies are abstraction, depth of learning, research and enquiry, complexity, autonomy, unpredictability and professionalism (Warring, 2011). This supports the scholarship about the master's program as a type of project, but it is closer to a normative

representation of the form of studies rather than an exploration of practices. My study undertakes a new trajectory and comments on the input of the particular project to internationalization.

In the studies about internationalization's impact on students, individuals are often part of strictly defined groups (i.e. international and domestic students). Research focuses on either one group or the other. On the one hand, there is interaction with 'host students', which is the measure of adaptation. On the other hand, there is communication with international students, where the assumed impact is perceived as internationalization at home.

Harrison considers that the assumed impact of internationalization at home is overestimated (2015). Domestic students often remain isolated from their international peers in their studies; there is a resistance towards intercultural group work, as well as a lack of intermingling in the social life of the university (Harrison, 2015). While these kinds of issues are hard to assess and monitor, they constitute the core of international education. Yet, universities take them as a given and rarely facilitate intercultural contact. The research overlooks the participation of domestic students in internationalization (Jon, 2013). Construction of a transnational learning space for both international and domestic students depends on institutional efforts (Guo & Chase, 2011; Volet & Ang, 2008).

Academic discussion concerning international students is an example of a limited perspective on practices (I explore this in greater detail in Chapter 2). The model of culture shock by Furnham and Bochner (1982) is still in use, despite significant changes in educational mobility since that time (cited in Chapdelaine & Alexitch, 2004). It presumes exploration of social skills and the impact of cultural differences on adaptation. Although this model does not find relevance in the results, it is still used as a point of departure in some studies, and the nature of difficulties experienced by international students is seen as 'cultural' (i.e. Brown, Holloway, 2008). This approach towards international students was criticized for the limited view on international experiences (Zhou et al., 2008).

The major drawback of the culture shock model is that it builds on the most apparent difference of the student coming from abroad – cultural – and ascribes to it all the difficulties of adaptation. National origin is a general characteristic ignoring individual circumstances. Meanwhile, since the 'cures' of culture shock range from information supply to cultural awareness of the host culture, they point to the challenges of adjusting to the new place regardless of the individual's culture (i.e. Furnham, 1993). Moreover, it tackles students' initial challenges in an unknown place as a problem and as a deficiency based on the cultural difference between the international and domestic student. 'Fixing' culture shock lacks the student's perspective.

Studies focusing on people in internationalization often formulate internationalization ideas in prescriptive terms. For instance, Dobbert describes a 'globalized person' as a fluent speaker of two or three languages and one who has lived in at

least two non-English-speaking countries for a year or more (1998, 65). The rivalry of the normative ideas is apparent in the approach to practices, and the failure to meet one or the other type of ideals feeds into the argument about internationalization gaps. Apart from normative bias, this perspective presupposes that the individual is an object of internationalization and that a functioning form of internationalization would transform him/her in the right way. While the impact on the individual is certainly at the centre, people's influence internationalization, and co-creation of its outcomes is missing.

The inquiry on how internationalization affects people creates constructs of individuals which can often be controversial. For instance, there is a dichotomy of "global worker" and "global citizen" as an outcome of internationalization (Harrison, 2015). In this way, the depiction of internationalization also overlooks the understandings of students and scholars. For example, in the entry to the special issue on 'internationalising the home student', the formulation clearly sees the student as an object of change, and internationalization as action rather than as a process (Clifford, 2011). Psychological perspective on the conditions of the international students is not enriching the discourse as well (Ward & Kennedy, 1993; Yeh & Inose, 2003). The focus on stress mediation presumes crucial changes of individuals within internationalization, rather than the emergence of an inclusive place.

Studies of students' intercultural experiences delve into the lives of students only to a certain extent, yet they presume a certain impact of institutional practices on students. While justified causal inferences between the institutional actions and the student personal and professional growth are beyond the scope of this research, attention to the individual pathways within internationalization could be a source of profound implications.

According to some critical inquiries, students are not sufficiently engaged in international education, or consideration of the participants' perspectives is lacking (Schoorman, 1999). Only some of the studies conceptualize the student as an actor in internationalization. For instance, there is an investigation of international students' possibilities in co-creating the curriculum (Sawir, 2013). In my research, the primary interest is on students realizing themselves in international education, their standpoint in internationalization, and their assessment of university activities.

Another emerging issue in the study of internationalization involves ethical concerns about inequality, which affects a wide range of areas, from knowledge production to mobility (Gu & Schweisfurth, 2011, 614). Most of the mobility in the world is driven towards the wealthier countries; therefore, the disparities between the nations persist in education (Kehm, 2011, 223). It terms of the issues receiving attention, there is a dominance of matters stemming from the English-speaking countries. Jones and de Wit (2014) claim that the idea of internationalization itself has become globalized, and that the Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking

paradigm requires rethinking. While the statement itself is normative, it reveals an ethical dimension of internationalization development. Magyar and Robinson-Pant talk about the 'dialogical space' as a way to reconsider power hierarchies contributing to academic practices which prioritize 'big cultures' and prevent transformative changes as a result of internationalization (Magyar & Robinson-Pant, 2011, 674). Gorski argues that intercultural education should capture the socio-political realities and power imbalances, which would facilitate understanding of a wide variety of issues (Gorski, 2008). Harrison claims that there is also an internal inequality within the state in terms of domestic students' access to international activities and the increasingly hegemonic role of English (2015).

Therefore, research shows that the picture of practices is missing in many regards, ranging from the impact of internationalization on education, the treatment of different categories of students, and ethical concerns. There is a lack of individual perspectives on university experiences, but the picture of the institutional dimension is also missing a closer look at everyday practices.

For the purposes of my research, practices are approached through ideas about the current situation with internationalization. I delve into estimations articulated in policies and reports, but also analyse individuals' accounts to gain the 'inside perspective'. These are proxies of how internationalization happens in reality. Knowledge gain due to internationalization is the most difficult issue to measure. Along with approximations from several sources, I pay special attention to the problematic issues. Gornitzka et al. consider these to be especially fruitful for the analysis of internationalization (2003, 133). My position is that contradictions point to questions of power, disclosing general tendencies and the impact of internationalization on education, rather than revealing cultural discrepancies.

1.3 The core of the problem

The multitude of contributing issues makes statements on the overall development of internationalization highly problematic. In the discussion about higher education development, statements are often made about insufficient internationalization, or its diversion from its original purposes. This critical view often draws on the discrepancies between normative ideas, planning and practices. Therefore, explicating these three dimensions is instrumental for understanding the gaps. Normative ideas often remain latent, both in research and in public discourse about education. Planning draws on these multiple contradictory expectations and produces a mixed picture of impetuses; their impact on practices is often unclear. Yet, positive development should not be taken for granted, and this necessitates that attention be paid to practices. However, my goal is to explore these dimensions in relation to one project and draw inferences about its impact on education.

The idea of theorizing the gaps does not presuppose an evaluative study and it is not possible to determine deficiencies in internationalization objectively. Whenever there is a discussion about gaps, it is crucial to keep in mind the diversity of perspectives on education and clarify from which perspective (e.g. individual, institutional or at the national level) the development of internationalization has been insufficient. Also, there is a diversity in the explanations that could be brought up to account for the gaps. A legitimate question is whether this is a practical problem, a contingency of internationalization development, or the feature of a 'big idea' when normative ideology brings up such a broad reasoning that it inevitably does not match the practice. This shows that gaps are socially constructed in a variety of contexts, which I will elaborate on in my analysis.

My research addresses two logically connected questions. After answering the first one, I would be able to explore the second one.

(1) How can we account for the gaps between normative ideas, planning, and practices of internationalization at the university and master's program?

(2) What implications do these gaps have for internationalization development?

Literature review and data analysis address the first question. I explicate the formation of internationalization within an established setting, and this provides a framework for discussion about the discrepancies between planning and practices, and the underlying normativity. These three dimensions, reviewed above, require a separate exploration:

Normative ideas
Planning
Practices

Certainly, they intersect in research, in policy statements and in respondents' accounts. Nevertheless, their exposition allows me to distinguish multiple aspects when describing the gaps. This typology seeks to ascertain the degree of tangibility of the issues raised in any given statement, such as whether it is a declaration of status and ambition, a suggested action, or a perceived current situation. For instance, one way to discuss the gap is when normative assumptions clash with representations of practices.

Master's programs are a key example of internationalization development in the university. They can be considered as internationalization at home, producing long-term impact on education. Since these projects are important for the international image of the university, they can give us an understanding of how the university is representing itself internationally. For my study, I do an in-depth analysis of four English-medium master's programs in three universities in Finland.

Since no substantial revenue is generated yet from student fees, internationalization is comparatively much less market-oriented. Another relevant feature of the case is that the prevailing language of education and university administration is Finnish rather than English; this presents unique organizational challenges for internationalization. Taking these features into account, I explore the planning and implementation of a single project, as well as the effects of policy initiatives and all the macro trends in international education.

In addressing the second question about the possible implications of gaps in internationalization development in education, in this investigation I examine the intersections of the normative ideas on internationalization, its planning and practice. After analysing a socially constructed discourse of internationalization within the first question of the inquiry, I can finally make claims about internationalization development. I reconstruct what kind of knowledge about internationalization is available. My analysis explicates the conditions of internationalization development and the value of internationalization as it appears from multiple perspectives. Taking the gaps into account, I am able to look at the emergent processes of internationalization and the situational value created within everyday interactions. An enriched idea of practices, leading to a fuller understanding of internationalization development, is the goal of the second question.

1.4 Building a theoretical framework

1.4.1 Approach

This study does not start with the preestablished theory for two reasons. First, as the term internationalization refers to a wide variety of phenomena in education, the research in this sphere does not have an established set of approaches and a theoretical tradition (Kehm, 2011). Second, my intention is to conduct exploratory research, which concentrates on the particular feature of internationalization discourse in education. Therefore, an abductive theory reiterating between scholarly perspectives and empirical materials is a way to proceed with this study (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012).

The general perspective on education, underlying this study, derives from the absence of an objectively identifiable best practice for carrying out certain educational practices. However, abstaining from this kind of positivistic assumption does not mean that any given view on education is relative. As Biesta (2007) argues, education is not a linear and unproblematic activity; determining the desired shape of the educational activity requires informed judgements made by the stakeholders. Since education is a value-laden activity, it is unsurprising that research has a latent normative agenda, but, importantly, normative ideas and evidence cannot be viewed as value-free. Therefore, this exploration is not a ready-made agenda for policy change. It started with the idea that there is a need to systematize

and improve practices. However, I found out that, despite the abundance of normative assumptions, there is no normative standpoint to derive from. As Biesta (2007, 5) argues, we should move from 'what works' towards "what it should work for and who should have a say in determining the latter", which is the direction of reasoning that I am taking in my research.

While constructing a theoretical framework based on the research question, I considered prior development in the field. Looking at the discussion on the loose definitions that exist, which I expand on in chapters 2.1 and 3.1, my inference was that internationalization is an empty term that acquires meaning through context. Therefore, my intention is to stay within the existing terminology while outlining the given context rather than redefine the term itself.

The discussion about internationalization often consists of the binaries of us/them, national/international, and so on. They have to be treated as a part of the discourse, but they should not become a part of the reasoning, which is another reason to abstain from new terminology. As Coleman (2013, 6) points out, binary concepts have limited explanatory power. Instead of capturing a fixed idea with a term or definition, I aim to show that internationalization is a constantly changing and socially constructed process, and that the notions of gaps, normative ideas, planning, and practices are not fixed.

As I demonstrate in the following subsections of the introduction and in the literature review chapters 2 and 3, gaps, normative ideas, planning, and practices have surfaced as important aspects in prior research. Therefore, I decided to synthetize the existing research into a theoretical framework that would allow me to answer the research question while maintaining a meaning of my central term based on context.

1.4.2 Concepts

Power

The concept of power is multifaceted, especially in the exploration of powerful discourses and those that challenge this power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 9). For instance, in current research, one cannot delineate governance discourse as powerful and individual discourse as less powerful. Instead, there are multiple elements of power within both. Sometimes the national discourse within internationalization is presented as the one that values equality and is less powerful compared to the international discourse, which is premised on fierce competition. Alternatively, national decision-making and state interests can be seen as the most powerful aspects of education.

Internationalization is often seen as a symbol of educational success, as something that universities have to do in order to stay afloat in a competitive, global field. This portrays the power of external political conditions over the universities. Dervin (2015, 26) states that within modern higher education politics, universities

"need to play this game". However, Dervin (2015, 26) also sees a revolution of interculturality as necessary for countering the "power differentials". This suggests a power rivalry between the administrative and academic rationales. There are also counter discourses of national and cosmopolitan orientations within internationalization. Throughout his article, Dervin points out a lot of examples of ethnocentrism (2015).

In the discourse of individual internationalization, multiple positions of power were considered. For instance, having a foreign background and lacking familiarity with the education system was considered to be inferior. International students often complained that they were the "last hired, first fired" in the job market. Yet, there are also discourses pointing out the privileged position of international students as the ones having the means to study abroad. Hence, there are no conventional positions of power within internationalization, but rather multiple aspects that depend on the perspective. I found it very interesting that students mentioned their relative weight and power in the educational context as depending on their country of origin. However, within this study I do not have enough material to explore these power relations.

Dunne (2011) looks at how power inequalities appear within the curriculum, e.g. by looking at the dominance of certain cultural perspectives at the expense of others. Power appears both within planning and delivery and the author suggests that the possibilities of negotiating the inclusion of other perspectives would give more insights into power relations. The author states that the field of intercultural studies does not pay sufficient attention to power inequalities and the redefining of power within intercultural contacts (Dunne, 2011, 616-617).

Power positions are also constantly shifting and redefined within their context (e.g. in Coleman, 2013 there is a discussion about foreigner/local and professor/graduate student status). Therefore, an argumentative analysis I explicate its starting point, and look at social functions and their effects to argue about the distribution of power. I problematize its systemic nature in relation to the internationalization of higher education. This could be illustrated by the change of international credentials over time: exchange studies became valued at some point, and currently degree mobility is becoming a priority. Therefore, it would be misleading to claim full and stable knowledge of this field.

Agency

Emirbayer and Mische (1998, 962) understand individual agency as a "temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its "iterational" or habitual aspect) but also oriented towards the future (as a "projective" capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and towards the present (as a "practical-evaluative" capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment)". Within this analysis, I am interested in the agency of students, their own educational planning, how they negotiate membership within

the university and their future opportunities provided by the degree. I also look at the agency within the university, paying attention to the participatory practices prompted or not by internationalization.

Although there is a deficiency discourse constructed around international students (see the discussion in chapter 2.2.3), they are also seen as agents of change and the evolution of their agency is conceptualized (Kettle, 2010). Harrisson (2015, 413) problematizes the notion of culture and membership in the university community and opportunities for participation, which are fluid and context-dependent. He also notes the importance of the global context, especially via the Internet and media, which contribute to identity formation and the envisioning of future possibilities. This contributes to the agency of students within international education.

However, Harrisson also refers to the evidence that those students who choose to participate in internationalization at home are those with preexisting cultural interests. Along with that, there also exists the self-exclusion from internationalization of those students who hold stereotypical views, and therefore are in need of the cultural input (Harrisson, 2015, 424). Therefore, student agency is crucial in internationalization.

The analysis of institutional agency could be conceptualized in two different ways. One is based on the agency theory and explores the university-government relationship. It captures the change from hierarchical governance structures based on authority towards a contractual relationship based on exchange. Growing autonomy goes along with greater accountability pressures. Kivistö (2007) problematizes the lack of trust on behalf of the government towards the university. And since the university, as an agent, has greater knowledge of its own processes, the government comes up with a variety of ways to mitigate this information asymmetry.

Another research practice goes beyond the dichotomy of principal-agent. The exploration of university agency within this analysis includes interactions with a wide variety of actors and multiple factors that contribute to the university's performance (e.g. Canaan & Shumar, 2008). An important advantage for the internationalization analysis is that this perspective on higher education institutions goes beyond the framework of the nation state. For instance, Marginson and Rhoades (2002) claim that current institutional behavior is shaped by global, national and local dimensions.

However, the agency theory, despite all of its limitations, elicits the important organizational conditions of the university's work. For instance, in the current political climate, pressures of economic efficiency and accountability impact university decision-making in multiple spheres, including internationalization, where rationales of marketization and competitiveness dominate. Informational asymmetries and goal conflicts, which are two of the major tenets of agency theory (Kivistö, 2007, 17), could be extended to internationalization as well. As I

demonstrate throughout my analysis, unspecified goals and uncertainty of outcomes are typical of the planning for internationalization. As specified in the agency theory, this situation prompts performance-based indicators for funding and governance based on results. As it is hard to determine the costs of internationalization, as well as its potential revenues, this sphere depends on communication between the government and the university. Hence, the demonstratable achievements, e.g. the number of international students, gain greater relevance. Since the ability to present internationalization in a good light becomes important, the perspective on practices becomes one-sided.

I consider these aspects of the university's agency in my analysis and try to capture the transformations that are due to internationalization. When I look into institutional agency within my analysis, however, I consider the ability to act in a broad sense, for example towards governmental structures, students and society.

1.5 Scope of the project

Internationalization is a part of a complex network of concepts, and a single study can elaborate only on some of them. Therefore, I include the aspects that could be relevant and benefit the research on internationalization, but this is where I draw the boundaries of my current inquiry.

I tackle policy development only as much as it concerns the actual process of internationalization happening at the university. The political struggles behind internationalization (i.e. education reforms and funding cuts) are outside the scope of this thesis. Policy papers, along with reports and interviews, serve as a proxy here, in order to capture some aspects of the internationalization process. Similarly, there is no specific focus on the Bologna process, although most university internationalization revolves around this agenda. Hence, in my study it appears in the general framework and interpretations. This investigation does not possess detailed data on education economics, even though it would be quite informative. Since my focus is on content issues and educational dynamics, only publicly available general figures appear in this text.

There is no specific focus on the internationalization of research, though master's studies are research-driven and often result in PhD continuation, thereby contributing to the internationalization of research. Although I discuss the place of research in terms of degree studies, there is a lot more to study in this area.

The problem of rankings is very significant for higher education politics; universities often align their decisions with means of obtaining a better place in rankings. As a factor in university administrative performance, they are essential. There is also a belief that they attract master's and doctoral students, but there is no reliable evidence for that. Image and reputation matter, while the actual number in the rankings may not be connected. Hence, while this is not a central issue, I note on the influence of rankings within education politics.

Being an essential part of internationalization, university marketing appears in the literature review and empirical analysis. However, it deserves a separate research project, especially for countries like Finland, where international students have not been charged tuition fees for a long time. There is a lack of research about promotional activities at the formation stage of the educational market. The issue of tuition fees and the language dimension in internationalization are worthy of research projects of their own.

1.6 Structure of the thesis

Chapter 1 begins with the standpoint that there is a need for a structure of internationalization reasoning, and distinguishing normative ideas, planning, and practices allows a coherent argument about internationalization gaps, permitting exploration of when internationalization does not work and why. The following chapters elaborate on planning and normative ideas as they appear in the scholarship about internationalization, and later in the thesis I explore how planning, normative ideas and practices appear in the empirical material from one project type of international master's programs. Although each of the chapters focuses on one of these dimensions (planning, normative ideas and practices), I comment on the links with the other two throughout the text.

Chapter 2 explores the academic literature on internationalization planning. I state that since macro-level policy provisions are based on economic and political conditioning and presuppose wide societal impact, education-centred arguments are loose and do not serve as tangible progress indicators. Determination from the higher levels allows little space for further development of internationalization for academic purposes (for instance, problematizing content rethinking and the internal functioning of the university). My position is that, at the institutional level, internationalization is still a special case of university politics. For example, integration of international students is presented as a problem rather than as a potential for educational enrichment. Meanwhile, curriculum considerations within internationalization could benefit from taking individual perspectives into account, as due to internationalization there are many emergent tasks for the university.

In Chapter 3, I elaborate on the normative assumptions. When internationalization is criticized, there is often a reference to the Middle Ages and how the university functioned back then. Higher education was not tied to the market or politics. Although this comparison is inaccurate, and these were two different types of institutions that generated two different types of internationalization, it allows us to see that there are expectations concerning university performance apart from economic efficiency. The dichotomy between knowledge as a universal value and knowledge with an applied purpose persists in many controversies of internationalization. The difference between internationalization in the Middle Ages and in the current situation lies in the entrenched relationship with the state

that is characteristic of universities nowadays. This governance factor creates alienation with the academic community, as well as a lack of individuals' perspectives in the internationalization discourse. Finally, I provide an overview of the normative statements in the internationalization discourse and determine the extent of the changes, including emerging ethical considerations, attributed to internationalization.

Chapter 4 concerns the methodology of the thesis. I explore long-term internationalization and focus on four master's programs in three universities in Finland. I view internationalization as a socially constructed phenomenon, which implies that its meaning-making builds on a variety of perspectives and the way they are presented. Along with the macro-context, studied through documents, I also explore individual perspectives; interview analysis is at the centre of the thesis.

In Chapter 5, I return to the discussion on planning that was started in Chapter 2 and explore further how internationalization is considered apart from education. I start with how internationalization appears in policies among other concepts. Then, I analyse the justifications for internationalization and its claimed use for the university and education development. Finally, I work on how master's programs are introduced as an internationalization tool. This reveals internationalization to be an applied concept. Despite statements about holistic internationalization, long-term work and its impact on the university, internationalization is still an external characteristic. It is considered separately in terms of administrative efforts and reviews of results. This suggests that the idea of internationalization at home is not realized, since international students are isolated and international master's programs are isolated as well.

Chapter 6 relates to the normative ideas about internationalization; however, in contrast to Chapter 3, where I explore all of these value orientations in theory, it explicates normative ideas in policies and individuals' positions. I start with an analysis of the link between internationalization and the quality of education, as well as the arguments used to sustain this claim. This is based exclusively on policy statements about internationalization; I do not deal with quality assurance mechanisms. Then, I analyse expectations concerning the university, along with the ideas that internationalization brings to this picture. After that, I return to master's programs and the normative ideas advanced by requirements and assessment indicators. I ask about the delineations of the 'international master's program' concept, according to the respondents. Finally, I examine the expressions of internationalization value given by the respondents. Although it is deemed to be important, internationalization appears quite separate from other concepts, such as quality. This could be a source of distortions, contributing to the gap between planning and practices.

Chapter 7 analyses the accounts of practices. As a mode of describing internationalization, it delves into statements about 'reality', expressing 'what is actually going on in education' and how this contributes to internationalization. First, the

expressions of practices are manifest in policies, when the current situation is described. I draw on document study and address actual internationalization development as policy documents describe it. I do not take them as evidence of what internationalization practices are. Rather, I add this to a complex picture of internationalization planning and normative ideas. Second, individual perspectives on practices are not taken at face value; they represent an account of practices. Another subchapter features interview analysis and focuses on actual internationalization as a part of the daily education process. What individual participants describe as internationalization practices is yet another piece of the complex picture.

Finally, in Chapter 8 I conclude my study with a recap of the internationalization problems revealed through analysis of the three internationalization modes, which contribute to the internationalization gaps. My subsequent claim is that top-down processes are disengaged from the internationalization of everyday practices. They occupy the discourse of internationalization and drive the attention away from education-centred arguments, individual perspectives on internationalization, and emergent processes. I infer that university agency is crucial in defining internationalization.

2 Chapter: The political environment of internationalization planning

Introduction: different levels of planning and implementation

In this chapter, drawing on prior research, I review problematic areas of internationalization planning. There is a gap between rationales and outcomes featured at the European level and the national level, as well as internal university challenges in implementing internationalization. The first three subchapters are about the macro conditions of internationalization, and higher education governance. They explicate the political environment of higher education institutions, which makes the university consider internationalization as an external element and a credential of education quality, rather than a stimulus for the transformation of education. In 2.1.1, I assess how major rationales presuppose a macro-level impact on society, rather than focusing on the transformations within the university. This demonstrates that national-level planning draws on macro indicators, lacking internal changes at the university, and leaving little room for university agency.

In 2.1.2, I focus on internationalization's connections to globalization and Europeanization. They suggest similar university activities, though the former one is a perceived condition of higher education development and the latter one presupposes both organizational and ideological impact. Yet, the perceived conditions of globalization and the need to keep up competitively are determining educational governance. In 2.1.3, I elaborate on university agency and the conditions of economically driven policy in internationalization development. Strategic planning at the state level allows little room for university agency. Then, from broad circumstances of planning, I switch to implementation arrangements within the universities.

This is a contextualization of the discussion through decision-making and tangible actions. In 2.2.1, I review assessment problems. My claim is that the available data lacks a consistent picture of internationalization, especially in the areas of organizing studies and assessing educational impact. Measurements for planning and image-making are often merged together. In 2.2.2, I analyse internationalization at home as a planning provision and argue that the idea of having a greater impact on the institution and involving domestic students requires a sustainable approach from the university. Although master's programs are one of the mainstream projects within this framework, the requirements for their performance are not established based on this idea. In 2.2.3, I examine the institutional operationalization of diversity, as well as treatment of international students. It

turns out that they are a special case for the university; in governance their accommodation is perceived as a challenge rather than as a benefit of internationalization. Subchapter 2.2.4 is about curriculum internationalization and student involvement in the rethinking of education content. The idea of using diversity strategically for the transformation of studies meets with many obstacles in the organization of teaching. Finally, coming back to institutional development in 2.2.5, I claim that because of internationalization, the university has to resolve newly emerging problems. These range from administrative issues, supporting strategies through decision-making, and communication with staff and students. In the sphere of internal institutional functioning, internationalization adds complexity rather than providing solutions.

In relation to the first question of my study, this analysis elaborates on the idea that planning at the macro level is detached from education, and within the internationalization discourse it is taking attention away from practices. Within the macro context, statements on overall internationalization development are highly problematic. Internationalization's purposes are argued nationally and internationally, but not institutionally; therefore, this context does not provide the criteria to define internationalization. An interpretation of internationalization at the university level requires analysis of the institutional context. Therefore, the last five subchapters are closer to everyday processes at the university.

Answering the second question of my study, I presume that current internationalization planning is formed in such a way that changes in knowledge and education processes due to internationalization are precluded. Weakness of university agency makes internationalization benefits unsustainable.

2.1 Political and economic discourse on internationalization

2.1.1 Far-reaching rationales of internationalization

Internationalization is implemented as a strategic and top-down process; therefore, it is often justified through macro-level changes. For instance, Aigner et al. distinguished three rationales: 'safeguarding international security', 'maintaining economic competitiveness' and 'fostering intercultural understanding' (Aigner et al., 1992). These explanations for internationalization deal with the needs of society instead of focusing on education. Moreover, the first two do not take into account the individuals within universities. These justifications are claims reflecting ambition, rather than a planning element; they do not prompt measures of implementation for the institution of higher education. The impact of internationalization on these spheres of life is not explicated, and it is based on latent assumptions. Warner (1992) summarizes internationalization rationales into three models: competitive development, student progress and social transformation. Here the educa-

tional motivation is 'dispersed' across other justifications. Competitiveness applies to students, the institution, and even to the country in general. Such a perspective claims all-encompassing change, and its implementation would require definitions of the current situation and signs of progress in each of these areas. Development of the student, both academically and as a citizen, implies improvement due to education. Yet, the signs of this advancement also require specification. Finally, under the social transformation model, students are expected to develop skills helping societal progress towards equity and justice. It is notable that in this justification not only the needs of society are reflected, but there is also an individual perspective that goes beyond the education framework. These rationales are ambitious claims, justifying the value of internationalization for education, and turning them into planning principles would require indicators of competitiveness, desired student development and social transformation.

Knight points out rationales thematically by distinguishing four groups: political, economic, academic and cultural or social (1997). Universities define their own balance of rationales based on these general types; this would generate more specific justifications. At the crossroads between academic and intellectual rationales, there is a drive for status and reputation, university branding and marketing (Knight, 2008). Another possible overlap is when internationalization is seen as an investment in human capital, as here academic and economic rationales match. The idea of knowledge production also includes these rationales. All of them are broad enough, and their application to the education process, as well as the inclusion of individuals, can only be understood at the institutional level.

This difference in tangibility of rationales is elaborated by Knight (2008) when she distinguishes between emergent national and institutional justifications. Internationalization for the country implies a stimulus for development in many spheres, which are presumably connected to education. Human resources, sociocultural development and the fostering of mutual understanding are the rationales at the national level; they presume the impact of education on the other spheres of society. Motivations for internationalization evolve. In the political sphere, foreign policy and national security issues decreased in their significance, and the transformations of the country's position and influence are still important. Then, country-level rationales also vary across the world. Developed countries consider recruitment of global talent, generating revenues from tuition fees, and joining the global responsibility agenda. For the developing countries, support and advancement of the educational system are the grounds to pursue internationalization. There can also be many adjustments of internationalization on the institutional level. However, these anticipate a societal impact rather than reflect the processes within education. This shows that internationalization, as it is advanced now, is closely aligned with the state and rationalized from a governance perspective.

Finland is an example of internationalization development initially led by the top-down rationales. Early on, internationalization in Finland was focused on fulfilling the country's developmental needs; thus, it placed emphasis on research rather than studies. Governmental efforts in the 1990s tied internationalization to several other areas, like information society and lifelong learning; it also advanced the use of technologies in internationalization (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001, 248). Subsequently, considerations of competitiveness have dominated internationalization discourse in Finland; the leading rationales are to educate internationally successful citizens and to create internationally visible universities (Nokkala, 2007).

The idea of internationalization evolves over time, and there is an adjustment to the current needs of higher education and society; the development of the rationales indicates the 'burning topics' (De Wit, 2010). In the beginning of the 2000s in Finland, the idea of long-term internationalization inspired greater attention towards degree programs. To keep up the country's competitiveness, international students are now expected to stay and contribute to the labour market. That requires adjustments within higher education institutions, ensuring the subsequent professional integration of individuals. However, internationalization is an element of higher education politics, rather than a process within education. In this new policy orientation students are taken as a "ready source of highly qualified individuals who will fit perceived gaps in the national labour market" (Haapakoski, Pashby, 2017, 368-369). The expectations of societal impact supersede the discussion about what kinds of steps could be taken in education to achieve these goals.

Since the narrowing of these rationales is ascribed to the university, internationalization implementation depends on its agency. The institutional level includes branding, profile-building and the transformation of basic functions (Knight, 2008). However, these activities also prioritize interactions with the outside world, rather than institutional transformations. Interestingly, considering the internal functioning of the university, internationalization presents an organizational challenge: broad societal impact is dependent on implementation that is not reflected in European and national-level planning. I demonstrate this by the end of the chapter and in chapter 5.

2.1.2 Framings of international activities: globalization, internationalization and Europeanization

In this subchapter, I provide an overview of the framings of cross-border university activities. These interpretations shape the meaning of internationalization, supply ideas and organizational arrangements. The overall discussion about changes in modern higher education relies on the notion of globalization. Involving several national entities in internationalization does not mean the erosion of state power (Kehm, 2003; Horta, 2009), while globalization signifies 'borderless'

developments. Moreover, "internationalisation does not have the implicit references to economy-driven processes as globalisation tends to have" (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 21–22). Also, internationalization is the term mostly used with positive meanings (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 21–22).

Often internationalization is conceptualized as a reaction to globalization, a response to the new economic, cultural, technological and social circumstances of the global scale (Stromquist, 2007; Altbach, 2004; UNESCO, 2009). However, this understanding narrows the process to the requisite protective measures. Internationalization is presented as a must, and the alternative of "losing in the competition" is not specified (Nokkala, 2006, 190). In this way, implementation of an international agenda turns into mere market-driven reactions to global conditions; it demotes university agency in relation to educational transformations. This lack of conceptualizing internationalization as an independent process is criticized by some authors (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 21–22).

Europeanization has another geographic focus compared to globalization and internationalization. It denotes interaction within European borders, and it is not opposed to internationalization. However, the rationales and suggested actions are similar. This is, according to Barbara Kehm, "nothing but a regional variant of internationalisation even if it has visible global effects" (2011, 231, c.f. Adelman, 2008, Marginson, 2009). These activities are a part of internationalization, since they open the university up for new knowledge and create ties (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 22). Then, this defined geographic focus creates the idea of a common core. Europeanization has an organizational influence; it involves comparable practices and the organizational support of top-down governance from the state. It also aims at developing common European identity, although thematic impact is not confined to Europe.

Europeanization is a special kind of internationalization, operating on equal terms within the EU but being competitive towards other regions (De Wit, 2011). Higher education systems pursue common interests globally, and the process aims at enhancing opportunities for European universities through cooperation. Therefore, we can speak of the 'global effects' of Europeanization (Adelman, 2008; Marginson, 2009). This unity also brings common strategies for development (i.e. 'to fill the gap in young talented workers' by fostering internationalization of higher education and attracting qualified students from developing countries) (Ritzen & Marconi, 2011). Mobility encouragement from non-EU countries into Europe also has the aim of income generation. At the same time, mobility programs like ERASMUS require that within European borders, exchanges should be organized in such a way that host institutions would not charge tuition fees. The European focus is instrumental in raising organizational issues of internationalization, but with commercialization, income-generating activities receive more attention in terms of governance. For instance, as Teichler points out, more effort

is made to bring foreign students for degree programs than internationalizing domestic students (Teichler, 2009, 15–16). These developments vary, and the priority given by the respective institution to European or other countries can shift the focus of its international activities.

For my study, Europeanization processes are planned activities, while internationalization includes strategic action as well as independently emerging processes. European political developments, and in particular the Bologna process, were the most important drivers of internationalization in Finland (Hoffman, Välimaa & Huusko, 2008). Despite the non-binding character of this European-level decision-making, the Finnish government follows the strategies closely and turns these guidelines into national-level justifications for higher education reforms (Saarinen, 2007).

The Bologna process is the primary driver of the dialogue on higher education quality, as the assessment and comparison of indicators was strongly enhanced through European alignment (Saarinen, 2007). Then, the influence is sustained through policy recommendations, which are recognized and discussed internationally. Alignment with European policies also has an economic context, since after great resentment for over a decade, tuition fees were introduced in Finland in the end of 2015, followed by an overall downturn of education funding. The initial increase of European influence also coincided with Finland's economic recession of 1992–1993 (Rinne, 2004). Finally, it could be that national governments use these recommendations as legitimations for the advancement of policies which are not sufficiently justifiable on the basis of internal conditions in education (Kauko & Diogo, 2011, 128).

To sum up, both globalization and Europeanization provide arguments for the changes in the national system of higher education, aligning its universities with institutions around the world. Additionally, as I have established in subchapter 2.1.1, the arguments from macro-level planning are broad, and they purport that nearly all kinds of societal problems can be tackled through internationalization. This shows great expectations, but planning is less aligned with the needs of the institution.

2.1.3 Operationalization of internationalization in the current university agency

In terms of internationalization governance, there is a combination of the state and global frameworks. Most countries are trying to build 'world class' universities, and modern higher education institutions pursue visibility and high reputation. In Europe, participation in this competition is often endorsed through supranational efforts. While this provides access to the global academic system of science and enhances partnership and revenue-generating opportunities, there is also growing

inequality in between the education systems (Altbach, 2006). Institutional stratification impedes collaboration on equal terms. Teichler gives the example of student exchange; 'reputational risks' require that exchange only happen within a small circle of trusted institutions. The goals of the Bologna process, on the contrary, imply that exchange experience should be available to most students. Teichler states that high trust is likely to exist within flat institutional hierarchies. Competition and collaboration tendencies send contradictory impulses to the institution (Teichler, 2009, 16).

The use of indicators in governance, also called 'calculative practices', is a new environment for the university (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 851). As a result of these developments, the university should become economically independent but retain alignment with overall societal progress, sustain innovations, and prepare graduates for the global careers. Välimaa (2004, 41) distinguishes three steps followed in higher education governance: questioning efficiency and institutional management, the rise of evaluation practices, and the university's financial steering. In Finland, drivers of efficiency have clashed with the values of the welfare state and ideas of social justice within education (Rinne, 2004, 128; Haapakorpi & Saarinen, 2014). Since the idea of internationalization thrived within higher education in this context, it becomes an element of the overall managerial changes. Quantitative targets were set up for the university, while content, values and qualitative indicators were significantly underdeveloped. As a result, there has been a loss of power for the universities and a less favourable environment for academic work (Rinne, 2004, 127). This explains the lack of education-centred reasoning, academic development of internationalization, and inclusions of individuals in the macro-level argumentation of internationalization.

In Finland, features of the higher education system impede its continuous progress within competitive conditions. Equality, which is at the core of academic values, contradicts the strong competitive drive coming from the top down. Being relatively small, centralized in terms of resources and a uniform system of education, it shows less hierarchy. This implies that, until recently, institutions had much less pressure to exhibit competitive behaviour. Consequently, the universities' own initiative was not strong and caused not only low entrepreneurial spirit, but an overall lack of action and strategy (Rinne, 2004).

Välimaa examined the case of one university and distinguished the key areas under transformation. The circumstances of globalization and marketization have the potential to influence university functioning. First, new demand for knowledge production from private enterprises and global agents, such as the European Union, influences the development of research topics. As I will review later in the thesis, internationalization prompts rethinking in many scientific areas, which impacts both teaching and research. Second, student intake is affected by the popularity of study specializations, as well as local and national needs for profession-

als. I would also argue that universities have to assess student qualifications internationally, as they recruit students from abroad. Third, the funding of university activities has changed significantly over the last decades. Research projects often acquire European or corporate funding, which increases ties with the global market economy. Then, as funding from the state for basic university functions decreases, this creates challenges for long-term planning (Välimaa, 2004). The areas mentioned above demonstrate the most significant changes in university functioning. Overall institutional effectiveness is the major aim of the managerialism, evaluation and strengthening of the governing body (Rinne, 2004, 121). While all of this seems to be a transformation of university agency, it is still limited by the actions of the state. Since normative legislation has disappeared and Finnish institutions of higher education now have a high degree of self-regulation, there is remote steering and management by results (Rinne, 2004, 113–114).

Changes in university agency is a part of internationalization in Finland. Universities have autonomy in the internal processes, but they strive for certain outcomes set up by the government (Välimaa, 2004, 41). This happens along with financial dependency, since the largest share of funding comes from state sources. Universities need to progress to ensure funding from the state, but at the same time rules can be revised by the state (Rinne, 2004, 112). This leads to limited university agency, as governance-related choices are upheld by the government. These changes are prerequisites for wider discrepancy between the universities, as their resources and international opportunities vary. Internally, higher education institutions increasingly embrace new type of practices (i.e. international admission and international recruitment). The image and visibility of the universities, as well as the recruited international scholars and student body, drive further institutional development of the universities. Agency is exercised in the new conditions.

The crucial question at the crossroads of internationalization and university agency is whether the university belongs to the state or the world and how planning should take into account global and national stimuli. Higher education institutions are a subject of high expectations in terms of a country's economic competitiveness and progress. Development in this case would be limited to the perceived efficiency according to the macro perspective of national-level indicators. Alternatively, universities can become international agencies challenged by national conditions (Kerr, 1993). This presupposes openness for cooperation with other countries, universities and individuals. Therefore, it implies certain expectations about the system's functioning, which justifies comparable everyday practices. This line of development is less associated with the state, and it displays institutional autonomy in terms of research and teaching development.

When the university is tied to the state, internationalization ideas also remain at the macro level and are measured by quantitative indicators. Aarrevaara et al.

notice the continuity between national and university documents on internationalization, but they are sceptical whether this coherence transfers into visible changes at the university; the major factor here is that higher education institutions receive public funding (Aarrevaara et al., 2009). But there is no normative leadership over the internationalization planning pursued on the part of the state. This is also visible in national policy, which I analyse in Chapter 5; it is all-inclusive, and universities are expected to invent based on loose governmental goals.

Thus, while there is a need for university agency to develop practices, the ability of the university staff to innovate is constrained by volatile managerial conditions. Top-down changes have been met with "astonishing silence across the academic staff" (Rinne, 2004, 115–116). The lack of open conflict during the set-up of these changes could be explained by the overall political changes of Finland becoming closer to the West (Rinne, 2004, 96). According to Välimaa, the lack of discussion about the globalization impact was due to the shift of focus: the opponents of the reforms were discussing the traditional academic roles, and the other group saw the upcoming changes as an opportunity for reforms (Välimaa, 2004, 49–50).

While the drift away from the traditional institutional profile is causing multiple conflicts, the process of attracting and accommodating international students and scholars draws attention to practices, which are hard to compare due to a lack of data (which I point out later in the thesis). But the enactment of internationalization determines the educational value of these actions.

2.2 Planning challenges

Top-down planning has a limited reach towards university activities. Setting up the macro conditions, it does not consider implementation challenges. There is a lack of data and indicators to rely on when planning internationalization. Although various assessments proliferate in the current higher education climate, they are often used for image-making purposes, and they depend on the available quantitative indicators, missing information about everyday practices. Meanwhile, ideas like 'internationalization at home' take internationalization's positive impact on education for granted. Yet, interactions between international and domestic students are not featured in the planning. Moreover, the place of international students within the university is not established. The way they are represented in the academic discourse shows cultural differences to be insurmountable, and the overall deficiency discourse around students does not presuppose any benefits from internationalization proclaimed at the national level. Curriculum transformation, as it appears now, depends on the university's resources and pedagogical approach, which are not always ensured due to the deficiency of focus on everyday processes. Finally, development of the internationalization discourse raises issues which demonstrate growing institutional complexity due to internationalization.

There is an extension and diversification of services, increase of stakeholders with diverse perspectives, and growth in expectations of the university impact on individuals and society. Internationalization at home and internationalization of curricula are also considered problematic areas (European Parliament, 2015, 99). Further in this chapter I focus on this planning of everyday issues; this is an analysis of how the academic environment is accepting internationalization.

2.2.1 Assessment problems, and merging of the image-making and planning.

In macro-level governance, there are attempts to discover indicators pointing towards practices. Yet, there is a failure to focus on everyday processes. Due to the drive towards competitiveness, the university is a subject of multiple assessments, and the reliable picture of internationalization has not emerged yet; there are multiple data deficiencies. Available measurements are interesting for research in two ways. First, they are an indirect inquiry into what information about the education process is considered relevant. That said, they rely on already existing numbers, typically capturing general institutional performance, rather than specific practices; this includes statistics of international faculty, students and partnerships with other universities. The prevalence of these numeric indicators might pertain to accessibility and convenience, or a perceived link to quality. Second, unrelatedly to their purpose, they are the factor within modern higher education politics, the environment determining institutional behaviour.

Universities seek validation for their achievements internationally rather than exploring their internal processes; this makes data on internationalization an image-making element. Hence, it is quite limited and focused on the macro perspective of the institution. For instance, university rankings influence institutional status, and this dependence on an externally constructed body of tables causes changes in university governance. These comparisons represent a normative power; they contribute to homogenization, which wears away content discussion in higher education (Marginson, 2016, 78).

While managerial decisions include strategies to raise the institution's position, improvement of a university's place in the league table can mostly be ascribed to methodological changes. Indicators of internationalization in the university rankings are based on the number of international faculty and students. Yet, even the rise of these figures does not significantly affect its overall position in the table (Delgado-Márquez, Hurtado-Torres & Bondar, 2011). Since these results are widely popular in the media, they act as publicity for the university rather than indicating actual academic improvements (Altbach & Hazelkorn, 2017). Internationalization is a means of visibility as well; in this regard, it coincides with the function of rankings (Yonezawa, 2010). Consequently, it leads to posing, as every

university is trying to present itself as an "international university", a "multicultural campus" and a "vibrant intercultural place". Considering this determination of the data, an impartial perspective on institutional performance that would reflect the university's transformation is hard to obtain.

Production of measurable indicators to represent their work of higher education institutions is an important part of the university's activities. This is the case since diversification of funding encourages 'performativity' and demonstrations of efficiency. Comparisons across universities and different units, emphasis on student evaluations, and staff assessment, as well as numerous other procedures, comprise "diverse elements of university into calculable and comparative terms" (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 850). Citing Codd, the authors call these tendencies a 'culture of distrust' (Codd, 1999, in Larner & Le Heron, 2005). A proactive approach on the part of the university implies that the ad hoc indicators are introduced early on to mitigate governing pressures (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 849). This does not generate a coherent picture of university development, since numbers stem from different contexts and appear for different purposes. Yet, measurement outcomes regulate subsequent management and decision-making (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 852). Haapakorpi and Saarinen (2014, 14) suggest that internationally disseminated assessments stimulate universities to steer their development in the way to that would ensure passing the audits. This alignment of policies would promote homogenization and missing out on the needs prompted by the institutional context.

Then, as a part of the general performativity trend, the university generates data for image-making and marketing purposes; internationalization indicators are included in this argumentation. Knight distinguishes between internationalization as an action plan at the university and as an instrument of international visibility and marketing. The latter concerns establishing a positive image and creating a successful brand, while the former one is a process more integral to university functioning (Knight, 2013, 89). There is synergy between these two dimensions; as Knight states, a working internationalization plan improves international visibility. At the same time, the elements of discussion about internationalization's value appear in the marketing. This creates a confusing overlap in discourses. For instance, when internationalization is used for image purposes at the institutional level, this representation precludes a critical perspective. Internationalization is assumed to be an inherently good thing (Ninnes & Hellstén, 2005; Brandenburg & De Wit 2012). Development of the critical angle requires separate planning from the institution, which is not stimulated by the current environment; universities rarely have an opportunity to address failures in internationalization.

Accordingly, when data about university internationalization is collected for marketing purposes, its positive framing generates unreliable inferences. By this, I mean various assessment measures used in advertisements to demonstrate that

the university is indeed international. Reputation matters: claiming to be internationally established and having a multicultural campus are crucial for the university's overall image. Institutional positioning often includes claims to be a 'global player'. This kind of internationalization includes competition for the 'best talent' among students worldwide, which also necessitates marketing (Kehm, 2011). Maringe and Gibbs offer a critique of marketing in education, which is in the clash of values between learning institutions and the business world (2009, 29). Chen (2008) also posits that blurring of the boundaries between the notions of internationalization and marketing, is a problem in communication with international students. While this discourse is inevitably distanced from actual practices, its relevance to the various stakeholders (i.e. faculty and students) is an unaddressed problem.

For instance, the unification of forms through the Bologna process is not necessarily the most attractive factor for students from other parts of the world. Teichler identifies a moderate increase in mobility and suggests that it would be fruitful to track European efforts in these activities. He also pays attention to more salient factors, such as language and academic and administrative support (2009, 13). Top-down coordination may not reflect the true needs of internationalization; this ultimately suggests that the agenda advanced by international agencies impacts the national level of decision-making and the overall course of actions, rather than reflecting internal institutional challenges of organizing international studies. Hence, one could initially identify similar practices, but "ostensible uniformity often masks diversity" (Woolf, 2002, 11). As a counter trend, Newman (2002) writes about the difficulties in the university finding its own niche and target audience.

Finally, there are many assumptions which, being "taken for granted", are not assessed in evaluations of internationalization, like increased education quality and the improved intercultural skills of students, which are expected due to internationalization. Teichler is sceptical about international students being an indicator of internationalization; the growth in their numbers can be ascribed to the massification of education (2009, 5). Similarly, it is not evident that students become more open-minded due to international experience. Rather, those individuals who are initially open to cultural diversity are likely to enrol in international education; studies are a continuation and development of originally present qualities (Teichler, 2004). University internationalization is a source of myths and confusion; some actors in the field express high expectations, such as hopes for the emergence of a multicultural campus due to international students' presence. The most accurate general inference implies that organizing a study process in an open and inclusive way and integrating international students in the university would bring about some fruitful transformations in education; this kind of assessment requires a qualitative description, and it cannot be based on the available numeric indicators.

Then, an overall impact on society is hardly assessable through the currently available data. In Finland, higher education institutions are working together with the Ministry of Education and Culture (2009, 47) on a model for supporting labour market immersion. Yet, the factors of employment are only known in general. Some of the enquiries even suggest that situational factors may contribute to the students' subsequent staying or leaving (Kinnunen, 2003).

The data deficiencies mentioned above problematize the origins of knowledge about internationalization. Most of the inferences are based on available proxy measures like the number of international students and scholars; the additional purpose of creating a positive image also gets in the way of an unbiased account. These indicators only partially address activities, as the university's achievements in terms of its core functions are not strongly weighted in these measurements. Nevertheless, developing other kinds of indicators is challenging, as micro processes are not well documented by means of the numeric measurements.

2.2.2 Internationalization at home: master's programs and innovations of internationalization

This subchapter links the general tendencies of internationalization to a single project of the master's programs. Compared to the macro-level discourse, which is filled with general statements, this aspect of internationalization deals with implementation and considers the prerequisites of everyday performance. English-medium degree studies prevail among international projects. Due to the language difference of the mainstream education, at least in Finland, the international student body is largely comprised of master's students. Therefore, these degree studies exemplify internationalization development. In terms of general tendencies, it is connected to long-term internationalization, internationalization of learning, and internationalization at home.

Development of master's programs is closely aligned with the agenda of European internationalization. It started to spread already in the 1990, and the key advantage it offered was recognizability, since it already existed in the UK, USA and Canada. It was oriented towards enhanced internationalization through mobility, and the Bologna process made this form of education more widespread and popular. Already in the 1980s, Lawson was talking about the master's program as a specific 'academic identity' to be shared in Europe (Lawson, 1988). This is a normative idea about graduate knowledge, which is closer aligned with the needs of the job market and society at large.

Stemming from this inclination, three types of master's programs are commonly found in Europe nowadays: a taught master's degree with applied focus, a research master's degree, and programs oriented towards lifelong learning (University World News, 2009). Although in Finland there is no clear distinction between research and taught master's programs, this general trend still determines

the expectations of the master's program. For instance, 'lifelong learning' implies the capacity to supply knowledge for a professional career, and therefore a possibility of transforming practices to include diverse students (Reeves, 2011, 953–954). The anticipation of job market orientation, life-long learning and research training concern both domestic and international students.

Master's programs are more flexible in terms of providing "added value" to bachelor studies; they offer a possibility for students to get an international degree and acquire specialization. Although the opportunity to pursue higher education levels at different universities has become more customary in modern higher education than before, accommodating these possibilities has turned into an organizational challenge for the university.

Compared to exchange studies, a long-term project for the university forms an expectation of study organization which is inclusive of international students; there are many problematic areas requiring an institutional approach. For instance, recognition of foreign students' degrees is often a cause of concern. Diplomas from those countries which are closer in terms of education provision are trusted more. Yet, there is a greater demand among students outside of Europe for international master's programs; they have a more difficult process when it comes to confirming their qualifications (Teichler, 2009, 13). This delimits the inclusiveness and diversity that could emerge at higher education institutions.

Another example concerns the difference of academic systems and the development of everyday practices. Accepted international students are "primarily expected to adapt to the educational, cultural and social environment of their host institutions, while students mobile within Europe might challenge established practices and contribute to educational innovation" (Teichler, 2009, 13). This puts international students in a very unequal position within the national academic system. Therefore, apart from positive expectations, internationalization implies potentially problematic situations that higher education institutions should be able to resolve. Finally, although this long-term internationalization is focused on internal educational processes, it draws criticism in terms of global issues. For instance, it is expected to become an attractive destination for students from outside Europe, and attracting elites from developing countries exacerbates brain drain (Teichler, 2009).

However, the shift towards long-term internationalization included the idea of involving domestic students. The term 'internationalization at home' became captivating, since it promised to supply educational value for a wide audience of domestic students and ensure sustainable administrative efforts at the university level (Wächter, 2003; Jiang, 2008). Since 'internationalization at home' has also entered into policy terminology (e.g., it is mentioned by the European Commission, 2013), there is a need for indicators of the process beyond expectations of an overall impact on the university. Current discussions about this topic include international curricula and programs, changes in teaching, evolving extracurricular

activities, development of staff, and building relationships with different ethnic communities. There are no defined boundaries for the kinds of activities under this umbrella term, but the mingling of domestic and international students is expressed as a necessary requirement (IAU, 2015).

However, some authors mention outcomes being elusive at the institutional level; they point out that results take place on a faculty and program level, and thus are less assessable by measurements (Beelen & Jones, 2015). For instance, problems of social alienation between international and domestic students often arise. According to Chang, international students manage in a new cultural environment and thereby gain international experience, whereas domestic students often live in their traditional way, remaining untouched by the international aspects of university life (Chang, 2002). Hence, a transformation of practices is a prerequisite for their inclusion in internationalization. The problem of internationalization benefiting students is to a large extent a managerial issue of organizing the practices.

Apart from supplying study courses, useful skills and a diverse environment, which is an overarching task in internationalization, the university aims to deliver formative academic practices, even influencing identity formation (Gu et al., 2010, 7). But international experience is nowadays available in everyday life, and for international students the whole stay abroad often becomes educational (Campbell, 2010). Therefore, universities have to offer something extra compared to the opportunities of the outside world. Creating educational value out of internationalization is a task that requires framing of the available opportunities. Therefore, my focus is on university agency in internationalization, starting from macro planning and then encompassing the organizational issues related to students.

However, apart from these ambitious goals of bringing internationalization value, there are also circumstances that allow the advancement of internationalization tendencies. Since mobility-based internationalization is costly, activities at home become an attractive alternative and ensure financial contributions (IAU, 2010). While it might indeed be less costly for each individual student, the actual organization of these activities requires funding. As some of the authors state, partial engagement with internationalization is not sufficient, and purposeful consideration of the international aspect concerns all education carried out at the university (Beelen & Jones, 2015). Therefore, the idealistic model of enhancing education meets the institutional context when funding and organizational opportunities are limited, and the final impact on education is determined by university agency.

A disconnect between the idea and the reality is almost inevitable. Sometimes the intended impact of internationalization at home could be significantly diminished, if not undermined, due to the circumstances of implementation. Saarinen (2012, 165) claims that while the universities aim to bring together Finnish and foreign students, the latter group often prevails, and there is no consistent strategy

on the part of the university in terms of forming the audience of these programs. There is also the problem of ties between the international degree programs and the functioning of the overall university. For instance, at the master's level there have been noted "island programs", when study courses are specifically tailored for incoming students and there are few connections with the mainstream university functioning (Rumbley, 2010, 210).

Furthermore, when thematic cooperation between universities from different countries takes place, there is a question of which one has a greater voice over practices and the content of education (Rumbley, 2010, 214). A university's changes are different, depending on whether the institution advances its own program or if it follows the prospectus of a more influential partner. Sometimes joint degree programs can be conceptualized as collaboration between different institutions; indeed, they are able to unite academic efforts (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 852). At the same time, however, this indicates responsiveness towards the global demand for this form of education, and transformations of the core functions depend on the university's own actions.

In the previous subchapters, I have analysed the macro-level planning and concluded that these reasonings can hardly be traced in the everyday processes at the university. There are also numerous assessment challenges in terms of internationalization, and most of the currently available data does inform about practices. As I am now looking at planning provisions at the institutional level, a legitimate question concerns measures of internationalization implementation. Although the organizational and ideological boost by the Bologna process is important for master's programs, the impact of this process is difficult to assess due to the multitude of expectations and different national reform contexts (Kehm & Teichler, 2006).

Therefore, I assume several checkpoints for my inquiry about master's programs. This type of degree offers long-term academic mobility, which requires being comparable and recognizable. As an education model, it offers greater specialization compared to bachelor's level studies. Consequently, it should be sufficiently flexible in its curriculum formation. Alignment with the job market is another conferred feature, which means that issues of employability are relevant. Finally, the relationship of the university with international students determines outcomes, as they cannot be expected by default of proclaiming 'internationalization at home'. At the higher levels of internationalization discourse, the individual dimension is not represented. Meanwhile, students, their university integration and individual outcomes are a legitimate part of internationalization implementation.

2.2.3 Category of the international students in research and education planning

This subchapter focuses on how international students are included in the planning process, and how their perspectives are taken into account within the university and research. Chapter 3 will explore the underpinning normative idea about the need to integrate students, since diversity experiences are a source of positive education outcomes, and the application of this realization to the internationalization of learning.

Building on the theory of Allport about contact zones, Schweisfurth and Gu (2009, 465) distinguish four conditions that are needed for intercultural communication: equality, common goals, intergroup cooperation and authority support. In fact, all of these necessitate administrative efforts. The authors go beyond the normative assumption of classroom diversity as valuable for education. They question the existing communication between different groups at the university as a precondition for further education growth (Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009, 465–466). However, potential problems are attributed to international students: "either by conscious and positive choice or because of discomfort with other forms of interaction, some international students end up socializing and living with people from their own country or with similar cultural backgrounds, limiting the extent of their contact with other groups" (Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009, 466). Inequality between students (for instance, due to different fees) is a problem for establishing "common ground" among them (Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009). Therefore, while internationalization planning is clear about attracting international students, inclusive practices and foreign student participation in university life are uncertain.

The attitude of home students to international students is of critical importance in planning internationalization value. Domestic students may avoid interactions with students coming from abroad for linguistic and cultural reasons (Leask, 2009, 218). Creating education value depends on introductory discussions with students, forming their expectations about interaction experiences (Leask, 2009, 215). Leask provides some initial hints concerning faculty contributions to this process, as well as the danger of stereotyping: a "major inhibiting factor to interaction between domestic and international students can be a perception amongst academic staff that international students do not want to mix or do not have adequate language skills to do so easily" (Leask, 2009, 212). Therefore, educators should focus on broad cultural forces and the similarities of students that feed into the principles of good teaching. Leask argues that the key is to create an environment inclusive for all students, rather than forcing international students to integrate into an inflexible monocultural education system (Leask, 2009, 212). She notes that meeting the initial concerns of international students is just a foundation for this approach (Leask, 2009, 214).

Yet, international students are turned into a special category both in governance and in research. Often, these focus on their differences and difficulties of

adjustment to the new educational system, while participation in and contributions to university life are not sufficiently considered. Provisions for international students constitute a large part of planning for internationalization at home. This group indeed has special characteristics: they are new to the education system, and there is a process of adjustment that requires institutional support. Distinguishing them in a separate category, however, creates a discourse in which cultural characteristics and their academic abilities are at the centre. Constructing a suitable education for this special category thus becomes a problem for an institution (Strang, 2009, 519). Meanwhile, while potential benefits are expressed in normative statements, they do not transfer into practical actions.

A research approach which analyses the experiences of international students reveals a similar picture of misinterpreting their academic performance. For instance, Strang (2009) refers to "multicultural students" and only briefly clarifies that most students being researched are international, being from Asia or other countries (Strang, 2009, 520). This does not provide examples of actual correlations between the 'culture' and 'learning style', which are used to conceptualize challenges of international students. At the same time, the author refers to "western-oriented materials, learning objectives and pedagogy" in education, which are understood as unambiguous within the local environment and yet presumably distant from what these international students are used to. If culture and learning style are indeed correlated, this would necessitate several approaches oriented towards different cultures. Instead, there is a uniform way of bringing together culture and learning style which makes culture a mark of difference from the majority, requiring special pedagogical approaches.

An alternative approach (e.g. focusing on a single ethnic group of students and trying to distinguish difficulties specific to this group) can also be problematic. Campbell and Li (2008) analyse the needs of Asian students. The assumption in this case is that they have uniform characteristics, even though their cultures, countries of origin and experience of educational systems can be quite diverse. Byrne (2001) presents two isolated groups of Asians and Caucasians. But again, the similarity of their culture and experiences could be superficial. Referring to students as indiscrete groups suggests that there are fixed characteristics attributable to their ethnic background. From a number of studies cited by Strang, one can see that culture is a fluid phenomenon and that individuals relate differently to it; experience, age and other characteristics influence identity formation as well (Strang, 2009, 522). Thus, the macro approach carried out in the study, which distinguishes the major traits of an ethnic group, turns out to be problematic.

Strang relies on the model of Hofstede (1981; 1991; 2006), where culture is described within the range of four characteristics: acceptance of power distribution among societal institutions (more or less equality), attitude vis-à-vis uncertainty (handling of ambiguous situations, risk-taking), individualism and collec-

tivism (relationship within family, work or study group), and masculinity and femininity (values of success and money versus caring for others and the quality of life) (see Strang, 2009, 523). It is perplexing why these characteristics among many are distinguished as the ones depicting culture the most, and how they appear to be of the greatest relevance for education. Finally, if we delve into the meaning of these features, they could also be interpreted differently. Due to this, a quantitative study correlating these indicators with a learning style brings ambiguous results. They are aggregated for multicultural students, with "Asian and others" being a group with an unknown but shared culture, which is used for the prediction of their academic outcome.

Learning style conception brings ambiguity for internationalization planning as well. It is connected to individual characteristics, such as experiential learning and participatory and visual representation techniques, along with many others; they are not clearly correlated with ethnic origins. Moreover, these styles, as well as the cultural dimensions brought up by Strang (2009) from the model of Hofstede, are characteristics of an individual that can be revealed through close analysis rather than aggregate quantitative assessment. Thus, it is hard to verify the link between a particular culture and learning style, since they are not mentioned. Following the inferences of such research in planning may be problematic. Alternatively, convincing research of this kind is focused on one ethnic group of students, who study in an educational system which is other than their own (Chang, 2006 and Um, 2000, cited in Strang, 2009, 521). However, generalizations about the relationship of culture and academic performance are again limited, as a significant number of difficulties may arise from the lack of knowledge of and experience with the current system. Consequently, for university planning, it makes more sense to focus on the actual experiences of students, rather than predicting their educational performance on the basis of their national origin.

Campbell and Li (2008) correlate satisfaction with the level of adaptation to the current education system. This is a step away from generalizing on the basis of culture, but it still alienates international students and devalues their own perspective on internationalization. There is a tendency to align frustration about the quality of teaching with academic difficulties, limiting students' normative expectations to an individual perspective (Ward & Masgoret, 2004, cited in Campbell & Li, 2008, 378). The authors also emphasize maintaining education quality to meet the expectations of international students (378). In this generalization, it is unclear what role quality plays for providers, and whether the university has an approach towards education quality that goes beyond satisfying "customers". At the same time, it is unclear whether some value is ascribed to the opinions of international students and whether this perspective is important for the university's development. For instance, other scholars ascribe significance to students' perspectives on quality due to their first-hand experience with the study program

(Rautopuro & Vaisanen, 2000). This approach could support use of its conclusions for further expectations of internationalization.

But focusing on study experiences instead of culture can be interpreted in a dismissive way as well. Inquiries about the stressful situation that international students encounter encompass psychological adjustment and sociocultural adaptation (Ward & Kennedy 1993, cited in Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009, 464). This discussion about the 'culture shock' of international students adds to their alienation. Explanations drift towards generalizations of the typical difficulties and do not illuminate the perspectives on the university provisions. There is also an essentializing of the cultural provisions of the new environment, rather than the explorative novelty of the situation, expectations of students, and the actual circumstances at the university. Since the focus is placed elsewhere than on institutional provisions, this analysis is not sufficient for the consideration of the internationalization practices.

Another dimension of discussion about experience is that studies in a foreign country turn out to be transformational for international students (Schweisfurth & Gu 2009, 464). While there is pedagogical relevance regarding this, and international students acquire the maximum degree of the diverse experiences, this applies equally to all students. Distinguishing foreign students in this case essentializes the impact of the host institution's culture on the newcomers; this creates a patronizing discourse rather than a context of cultural exchange and enrichment.

A notable feature in the study of Campbell and Li (2008) is that it is based on the students' voices. This implies that their experiences are considered as valid in contrast to the 'culture-difficulties-outcomes' line of argument. As it turns out, many of the specific difficulties are related to the organization of studies in a foreign context instead of cultural specifics: unknown academic practices, scarce language support and lack of contact with local students. But due to the limited data on the perceptions of the international students in this research, even though their opinions were solicited, potential insights into planning are scarce. For instance, competitiveness in studies and the need for more structure were explained as typical for Asian students. Instead of analysing the nature of their claims, the authors discuss the need to be independent and the established practices are portrayed as "Western" (Campbell & Li, 2008, 383–386). The interpretation of the students' voices is bound by stereotyping.

The challenges of organizing an international classroom, like the tendency to work in groups of similar ethnic origin, are also interpreted as specific characteristics of multicultural students (Campbell & Li, 2008). Meanwhile, these kinds of choices are typical of local students as well (Strang, 2009, 529). Language issues are also treated as a constraint on academic communication (Campbell & Li, 2008, 381). This perspective overlooks the value that international students can bring to the university, apart from economic surpluses. Student voices are considered as

feedback on services, within the framework of customer satisfaction. The approach to teaching admits cultural underpinning, but does not bring up the possibility of developing an enriching international approach: "Teachers enacting pedagogies use the cultural conventions, norms, and canons to transmit and reinforce the cultural values embedded in every teaching approach. Asian students, equipped with little knowledge of these norms and conventions, found it difficult to make sense of it in this unmarked terrain" (Campbell & Li, 2008, 381). The fact that the academic environment is unknown, concomitant with lack of awareness concerning 'cultural values' and varied language skills, overshadows the problems of quality and managing of practices on the part of the university administration. Accommodating international students is depicted as a major challenge of the university.

This depiction of international students in research is problematic. The focus itself is revealing, since this group undergoes transition and adaptation to education in a foreign context. As a primary focus of internationalization studies, international students can certainly tell about the inclusiveness of the higher education institution. However, internationalization also concerns institutional transformation, which is overlooked in this case. The difficulties of international students and the institutional response to them comprise just one element in this process.

Smart, Volet and Ang (2000) state that academic literature often focuses on a 'one-sided process': international students adjusting to the host culture. Leask notes that institutions are often overly focused on adjustment assistance; this creates a 'deficit model', and a two-way process is often overlooked (Leask, 2009, 218). There is also acknowledgement in the academic literature that international students are perceived through the lens of multiple stereotypes (Spencer-Rodgers, 2001; Hanassab, 2006). For instance, plagiarism is seen as a cultural norm, and referencing sources is something that should be learned through absorbing the 'culture' at the host institution (Campbell & Li, 2008, 383–386; Strang, 2009). Certain instances may stem from social experiences within a given academic environment, rather than being a cultural feature. The overall trend of ascribing negative things to other cultures is a manipulative generalization that contributes to the ideological discourse about the educational systems of 'opponent' countries (Aydarova et al., 2016). Schweisfurth and Gu (2009) stress the importance of interaction between local and international students. Yet, they also state that "some cultural beliefs and values may be beyond modification" (464, referring to Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Paulston, 1992; Byram, 2003). Despite this cautious statement, no examples of such unsurmountable differences have been provided. Even the positive ideas about international students tend to be stereotypical (Hanassab, 2006, 158). The roles ascribed to them include being learning sources for domestic students, potential skilled workers and cultural diplomats (Spencer-Rodgers, 2001).

My supposition is that to overcome the limited perspective on the international students, one should focus on institutional provisions and established practices instead of cultural differences. If the research takes the adjustment to an unknown system of education as a major process under analysis, international students could be treated as a group which needs greater familiarity with the educational system. However, the approach becomes biased when the suggested support of Asian students in the conclusion of the study is defined as aiming to "help them transcend culturally framed borders and subjectivities" (Campbell & Li, 2008, 375). Students are expected to adjust, rather than the environment changing to accommodate diverse individuals. Therefore, the approach which holds students as co-creators of education is not consistent throughout; they are still considered a special group, an object of the institutional efforts.

The tactic of education for international students is based on fulfilling a range of needs (Bartram, 2007, 207). Hence, there is a challenge to interpret their perspectives on education. Sherry, Bhat, Beaver and Ling (2003) note that international students express a more negative attitude to the services provided by the university. In this case, the comparison of international and local students lacks context and does not consider the differences of their experiences in education. Moreover, the negatively perceived features are not analysed from an institutional perspective. Yet, Schweisfurth and Gu (2009) claim that international students tend to take responsibility for adjusting and acquiring competencies; this explains a critical approach towards the university's work. It also demonstrates that a need-based approach does not consider the agency of international students.

Closer to the end of the article, Campbell and Li also talk about the possibilities of reconsidering practices, opening a dialog about intercultural communication, including lecturers' voices, and so on (391). However, the analysis revolves around cultural notions, and it does not assess the instances when the university could fail to organize studies. Meanwhile, the concerns raised by international students were the following: "course offerings, learning support, lecturers' teaching competence and attitudes towards teaching, teaching approaches, friendship building and socialization, and sense of belonging" (Campbell & Li, 2008, 391). These issues are not necessarily culture-bound, and it might be the case that not only Asian but other international and local students would have an interest in reviewing these things. However, in the conclusion, the authors stress the overall satisfaction that the international students articulated in relation to their studies. This interpretation overrides student input on the specific problems, and institutional provisions remain unquestioned. The approach of analysing the students' voices on international education was not sustained throughout.

Therefore, on the basis of these drawbacks of the research, internationalization planning could incorporate several alterations. First, it should not be limited to the studies of foreign students. Numerous inquiries state that the isolation of interna-

tional students is a problem for internationalization (Volet & Ang, 1998; Robertson et al., 2000; De Vita, 2007). Yet, provisions for overcoming this problem are rarely discussed. Then, internationalization planning should shift views on international students from perceiving them as a burden and organizational challenge towards benefit and enrichment, from requiring help and adjustment towards co-creating education. Seeing international students through a deficiency framework eliminates considerations of their potential value for education. Alternatively, some of the authors talk about creating a supportive environment and opportunities to learn from international students (Ryan & Carroll, 2005, 95).

The discussion of practices could move away from cultural issues towards the relationship of the student and the institution, the environment created by the institution, and educational benefits acknowledged by the student. While exposure to diverse cultures creates occasions to develop necessary intercultural competencies, the university is taking the lead on progressions that individuals are already seeking on their own (Hammer et al., 2003, 423). The role of the university in adjusting pedagogy towards cultural features and enriching students through other cultures is limited. Since the cultures of international students are rarely explored, they are more likely to be used as a marker of difference; this does not take into consideration the potential enrichment from classroom diversity. Moreover, the role of culture in learning may be already mediated to a certain degree, as individuals come with refined expectations of international education. These realities elude a structured characterization. Research of international students' adaptation lacks descriptions of multiple encounters on campus; these are potentially indicators of improved education for the individual and the institution.

Finally, consideration of the student voice is limited to the assessment of student experiences, and their inclusion in the overall discussion of the processes in higher education does not take place. When scholars reflect on the perspectives of international students, those are often followed by clarifications: "Following their suggestions does not mean requiring less of them than you do of American students. However, you can ease their transition to an alien academic system by recognizing the problems they have in your classroom" (Lee, 1997, 93). This is based on the assumption that students' input is about "better treatment" or "easier grading", and the international students' experience is about overcoming problems. This vision of the students is disempowering, not only due to the use of culture as othering and emphasis on the help perspective, but also due to the assumption that their interests are limited to the narrow area of the individual study experience.

These disconnections limit possible perspectives on internationalization at home, as well as consideration of the relevant indicators. One of the most general notions worth reconsidering is student agency within internationalization. The normative stance of enriching studies through diversity imply that students participate in creating the education value. This should translate into inclusion of their diverse perspectives in the curriculum.

2.2.4 Curriculum transformation through internationalization

Macro-level discourse reflects campus diversity and the need for intercultural learning. Indeed, they are connected in the discussion about the internationalization of curricula (Van der Wende, 2000). Leask considers international students as an imperative for the university to reconsider its practices. She refers to the arguments of Mestenhauser (1998a) about reviewing the underpinnings of study content. However, the internationalization of curricula is often focused on separate projects rather than overall educational development or the necessary skills for all graduates. In this way, rethinking of the curriculum is not necessitated. Other authors cited by Leask ascribe importance to skills development as well (Marginson, 1999; Van der Wende, 2000; Leask, 2009, 208). Yet, the focus on skills alone does not shed light on the perspective of student agency within the university. If reconsidering established practices through internationalization applies to the content of studies, the constitutive principle would be to take campus diversity as a stimulus. Given the role ascribed to international students within the university (examined in the previous subchapter), they are not likely to induce transformations in learning content.

Leask (2009) does not differentiate between the needs of international and domestic students in this regard; yet meaningful interactions between them support learning development. The client role of international students at the university does not leave much room for such a shift towards greater inclusion. Schapper and Mayson (2004) state that internationalization of learning can either turn to the creation of unique curricula, drawing on the resources of the particular university, or it can use 'standardized' content to satisfy international students as customers. Bond (2003) argues that the approach to curriculum internationalization that ensures the greatest engagement of international students is institution-specific; this means bottom-up rather than top-down development. If it engages with campus diversity and university internationalization, it would mean that students are not only the recipients of 'internationalization lessons' but that they create this learning reality themselves.

Leask maintains that campus diversity could be used strategically (2009, 211). Communication in culturally diverse groups could instigate peer learning aligned with a formal curriculum. She also argues in favour of the tasks that would involve an exchange of cultural information and bring together home and international students (2009).

In contrast to the approach of focusing on the difficulties of international students, this tactic is based on improving communication between the students of different cultural backgrounds (Bloxham et al., 2008). While some of the learning aspects could be 'culturally situated' (like in Shin & Cho, 2003), learning need not be limited to cultural explanations; multiple dimensions of the context could be considered (Campbell, 2010, 494). This kind of knowledge creation becomes a form of critical pedagogy or pedagogies of inclusion (Maringe & Woodfield,

2013). Driven by student discussion and considering issues of global awareness, it creates a space for new knowledge production. Such practices depend on the university environment. At the same time, interactions within and outside the classroom also have a crucial effect, so planned and situational elements are combined in internationalization.

While potential benefits of internationalization emerge in the curriculum, they are shaped by planning and analysis of university practices. Most universities are involved in recruiting international students and curriculum internationalization, but the organization of these activities varies in terms of knowledge rethinking and reconsidering university practices. One of the planning elements is the inclusion of international students. While supplying students with skills is an important aspect of internationalization, the engagement of individuals brings a diversity of perspectives and can possibly advance knowledge development. Classroom discussion is yet another component of curriculum internationalization. While diverse interactions bring a situational value and can be institution-specific, these are the university provisions that could be assessed in internationalization planning.

However, the development of learning methods and interdisciplinary dimensions is often precluded by education governance. Clarke (2005) emphasizes the development of teaching:

> Though many departments have instituted problem-based learning and other student-oriented teaching methods, the lack of preparation time for teachers, particularly those teaching in a foreign language, often results in the utilisation of safe, traditional pedagogical methods. The promotion of internationalisation in education requires adequate investment in the planning and preparation of courses, especially those targeted at multicultural and multi-lingual student groups. (Clarke, 2005, 484)

Therefore, internationalization as a developmental opportunity for the university also reveals many structural necessities. Higher education discussion reveals less attention given to the provisions enabling good internationalization outcomes.

Clarke conceptualizes this as the development of a common learning space for Finnish and international students (2005, 484–485). Fortuijn (2002, 264) defines it as the perpetual struggle to balance diversity and commonality, exploring the 'diversity paradox'. Apart from time and resources, which are acknowledged by Clarke, this also reveals the need for an approach developed with the involvement of students, reflecting their diverse needs. Meanwhile, students mention the lack of interaction with Finnish students and the lack of information in English. This demonstrates the deficiencies of internationalization at home in its current stage of development. Due to scarce managerial attention, internationalization remains

an external process from the university, not empowering transformation of teaching.

Another internationalization problem in Finland revealed by Clarke is that many of the courses are organized only once. According to him, this precludes the development of joint studies. Apart from that, due to insufficient resources, continuity of internationalization is a problem (Clarke, 2005). This means that inferences about overall internationalization development are scarce; whatever one could say about one year of studies might not prove true about the next year. Internationalization value is situational but dependent on the current managerial situation.

Another influence on disciplinary development is that popular subjects receive greater attention. Performance of the job market determines the fate of the corresponding discipline. According to the logic of academic capitalism, the subjects that are 'in demand' receive more resources compared to the ones that represent a pure pursuit of knowledge. For instance, the goal of the European Commission is a balanced development of the national systems of education in this aspect. Reflecting upon its impact, the European Commission addresses the unequal nature of project development among European countries. Although these projects have a sufficient coverage of academic disciplines, engineering and the natural sciences dominate (European Commission, 2007, 6).

While there is no preference of disciplines at the EU level, at the university level priority is given to those disciplines which are close to the market. Reduction of academic quality due to a narrow labour market orientation remains an issue of debate (Kehm & Teichler, 2006, 277). Internationalization opens up the university to applications globally, but at the same time it allows comparisons of the offered subjects; they become more aligned with the international tendencies. There is a strong tendency for certain countries to have a privileged position in determining the agenda.

To sum up, internationalization offers multiple outlooks for the rethinking of educational content. However, it does not provide convenient solutions; the outcome depends on the approach of the institution and faculty. In the next chapter, I discuss the ideas behind internationalizing education content.

2.2.5 Internationalization as a source of organizational problems

Ideas about planning on the macro level feature justifications for internationalization, as well as the areas which it is expected to affect. But when internationalization is narrowed from a broad societal phenomenon to the education process, organizational challenges arise. Departing from the macro-level discourse, every institution and education system tailors internationalization according to its own vision, needs and resources; this produces a variety of expected outcomes (Graf,

2009; King, 2010; Matei & Iwinska, 2014). Modifications also entail numerous potential complications.

For instance, changes from short-term to long-term forms of internationalization stem from the realization that the latter type might have a more profound impact on university life, but this also presupposes transformation of the implementation procedures (Teichler, 2009, 1). The university is solving problems which were not on the agenda before (e.g. training in multiple languages, arranging accommodations for students and scholars coming from abroad, providing information services for the newcomers) (Teichler, 2009, 11). Top-down governance prioritizes quantifiable indicators which do not necessarily reflect governance at the university level.

Jiang and Carpenter (2013) identify several impediments to international strategy: resource allocation, communication, operational process, cooperation and coordination, organizational culture, resistance to change, student support and external environment. These could be attributed to higher education governance and planning of internationalization. The major inference of this study counters the leading idea that internationalization implies integration and cohesion. On the contrary, it can create divisions in many aspects of internal functioning (Jiang & Carpenter, 2013). This supports the earlier idea of Kerr that institutional changes involving the flow of ideas, scholars, students and curricula are the hardest to attain (1993, 18).

Another task that the university acquires along with strategic top-down internationalization is communication with the staff and students. One of the critiques of the new style of governance in education is that it contradicts the nature of academia: "traditional values of autonomy and academic freedom do not lend themselves to integrated planning; institutions are staffed by diverse professionals, both academic and managerial, with varied and different aims and objectives; and universities face a rapidly changing external operating environment with many conflicting pressures and no clearly agreed-upon priorities" (Taylor, 2004, 151). There is marginalization of the academic voice (O'Byrne & Bond, 2014) and yet internationalization presupposes the transformation of teaching and research functions (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 851).

These changes require a lot from university staff in terms of both planning and commitment. Enthusiasm varies among faculty members; Kerr distinguishes between 'cosmopolitans', 'locals' and the 'home guard' (Kerr, 1993, 11–12). Consent to ideas and planning does not eliminate resistance towards implementation: "the idea of the common market for learning may be welcomed in principle, but resisted in detail" (Kerr et al., 1994, 24). That said, it is an economy-driven style of governance, rather than internationalization itself, which generates resentment among the university community (Guri-Rosenblit, 2015, 15–17).

There are contradicting impulses to resolve this situation. On the one hand, there are arguments suggesting that there should be greater agency on the institutional level, which would advance a specific approach to internationalization. On the other hand, there is an idea of increasing organizational help and policy guidance for universities to develop their own way of practising internationalization (European Parliament, 2015). Higher education institutions are expected to be more cooperative with government and industry agendas (Larner & Le Heron, 2005), and at the same time their independence is emphasized, even in the achievement of economic and political goals. Meanwhile, the established top-down governance often discourages participation (Taylor, 2004). Best practices, benchmarking and comparison create pressures of implementation, while resources for internationalization development are often insufficient (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 855). The prioritization of internationalization projects in terms of cost and the growth of numeric indicators is divisive when it comes to communicating with university staff (Taylor, 2004). Due to governance problems, the agency in higher education is dispersed, and it does not induce the academic side of internationalization.

A decrease in student participation was acknowledged at the European level and it became one of the focus points of future planning (Planas et al., 2013, 572). Together with the fragile position of the personnel, this tendency creates a vacuum of managerial governance, resulting in a deficiency of the academic voice in internationalization (Rochford, 2014, 487). Yet, students' and teachers' perspectives on internationalization are one of the most critical ones, since their position at the university is often disempowered (Marttinen, 2009).

The rationalization of student inclusion through enhancement of university performance requires a retreat of the public role of higher education institutions, including their obligations of contributing to individual growth and the formation of productive citizens (Luescher-Mamashela, 2010). While managerialism justifies student participation through the customer's role – they are taken as informants of successful practices – in effect they are treated worse than customers, due to surveillance of their studies and their lack of voice in organizational issues (Macfarlane, 2016). Moreover, this position outmodes the discussion about a citizen's role and obligations towards society.

This lack of representation in internationalization planning matters for all students, but international students have less organizational capacities. The problem of information about the internal functioning of the higher education system was noted in the literature before (Kinnunen, 2003, 46–48). Since international students are often viewed by the university through a 'deficit model' perspective (McLoughlin, 2001), this reflects their membership at the university. Their inclusion requires changes in nationally established practices. Some of their interests are taken care of in a top-down manner, but the responsibility of the university towards them is not articulated in the ideologies of internationalization. As I have

stated earlier, handling of the categories of culture and intercultural competencies in the planning discourse points towards othering, rather than reflecting a student role in knowledge creation.

Early on, research reflected the isolation of Finnish and international students (Kinnunen, 2003). And since international students often find themselves in a bubble, they are unable to access major university practices. In this situation, they offer little to 'internationalization at home'. Another aspect of this problem is that universities receive insufficient information on who international students are and what kinds of contributions they might be able to bring to university life. They are still perceived as a special case within the university, a 'side activity'; internationalization does not engage with students. Therefore, internationalization of learning requires transformation of the university's approach, since teaching is often understood as an 'inherently national' endeavour (Nokkala, 2007, 176).

Therefore, changes accompanying internationalization add complexity to institutional functioning. The normative assumption here is that internationalization would affect the organization and content of education so that there will be less distinctively international projects in the future (Teichler, 2009, 16). Internationalization instigates some institutional transformations that might not be traced in the macro planning. But there is no acknowledged standard concerning internal decision-making, no established organizational approach to internationalization, as I noted in Chapter 1. Considering the lack of data on the practices, it is hard to understand the impact of international activities.

Conclusions

Since internationalization is advanced as a top-down strategy, there is a lack of arguments about education, teachers and students. Reasoning features claims about the broad societal impact, which are hard to transfer into indicators and verify through data. They are intangible and close to the normative ideas of 'why it is good to have internationalization'. Hence, there is little understanding of major constituencies in internationalization development: international and domestic students, and their interactions in the degree programs. This determines internationalization planning: it is an external characteristic, aligning university development with global higher education tendencies, rather than being a transformative process within the institution.

The European framework supplies both ideological and organizational indicators of internationalization. But state management is key in determining internationalization implementation. Yet, even on the national level there are multiple expectations of economic progress and innovations, due to successful university performance internationally, which do not come down to the provisions of mas-

ter's studies. National and institutional agency is dispersed when it comes to influence on degree studies. There are expectations and direction-taking at the state level, while the universities' role in bringing about change is much less articulate.

The lack of dialog among governance structures also exists within the institution. Although many of the changes are contradicting traditional academic values, the reaction of the academic community towards strategic internationalization is often silent. In these conditions, there is a lack of attention towards the everyday challenges that internationalization brings to the university. For instance, international students represent a relatively new constituency which has not yet acquired a place within the institutions of higher education. Administrative attention towards them is focused on helping students to adjust within the existing academic system, they are not seen as co-creators of education. Mediation of student learning in these new conditions is not fully conceptualized. In addition, the envisioned outcomes of employability and international opportunities do not come by default (Robson, 2011; Jones & Killick, 2013), but they depend on university engagement with students.

A similar problem emerges with internationalizing educational content. There is a demand for new types of knowledge generated through internationalization. Due to the flexibility of master's programs as a form of studies, universities could experiment with new knowledge and transform curricula through classroom discussion. However, these changes often fall short of a practical organization of studies.

Master's programs gained prominence due to their potential in internationalization and innovative educational approaches, but it has become a challenge for the university to derive these benefits given the governance conditions. In terms of organizational changes, a long-term internationalization project presupposes alignment of international studies with mainstream university activities, so that internationalization could become an integral part of the education. In practice, however, internationalization faces many challenges due to scarce funding and a lack of administrative support. It requires extra efforts for the university to implement internationalization, which reinforces the external character of activities. Since the high prospects of internationalization often encounter practical obstacles, there is a gap between ambitious claims and the circumstances of planning, which impact practices on the ground.

3 Chapter: Academic discussion about normative assumptions in internationalization

Introduction: Ideas driving internationalization forward and emerging critical dimensions

In the previous chapter, I examined internationalization planning as it appears within the academic discussion and the problematic ways of obtaining information about practices. The current chapter explores normative ideas within theoretical debates about internationalization. I complement this literature review with empirical analysis of the dimensions of internationalization (Chapter 5 on planning and Chapter 6 on normative ideas). Finally, in Chapter 7 I observe how practices are represented in policies and interview accounts.

Statements concerning internationalization and how it should be planned and practised typically entail a reference to a certain kind of thinking about education, culture and society. They could also be called 'ideologies', conceptions about the order of things in education or any other sphere of human life. This topic in general is widely researched across several disciplines (Samier, 2016). For instance, ideologies of education include ideas on skills and their value in modern education, technology, managerialism and language. They also imply a causal relationship between a certain input and an outcome (i.e. technology and the result of education, managerial features and the result of such governance). These are sought either to maintain or constrain certain arrangements (Samier, 2016). There could be opposite ideologies on the same topic (i.e. the value of knowledge per se, or their utilitarian value). Below I provide a review of key ideas, which is not exhaustive but aims at consistency of internationalization understanding. These ideas constitute a normative dimension of internationalization as it appears in the public discourse.

In the first part (3.1) of this chapter, I focus on the major normative dimensions of higher education that feed into the discussion about internationalization. These include expectations from higher education, attitudes towards knowledge and the relationship of university with wider society. This leads to an examination of how internationalization is defined and what kind of discourses are less represented in public discussion. In 3.2, I move on towards ideas that determine a certain direction in internationalization development. This could be either the idea of governance motivated by the need for a small country to survive globalization or the idea of content rethinking, which is applied in varied ways to different disciplines. In the last part of the chapter (3.3), I consider an emergent critical discussion about internationalization development. These arguments show that despite a wide variety of applications, the concept of internationalization has boundaries.

Subchapter 3.1.1 explores a comparison of internationalization in the Middle Ages and current strategic internationalization. The medieval university indeed pursued knowledge per se, but it was quite detached from the society and bound by religion. While it was not strategic, internationalization was a given condition rather than pursued for transformational purposes. Despite this inconsistency, a comparison nevertheless reflects the critical attitude towards internationalization development nowadays.

Subchapter 3.1.2 provides an overview of institutional development and the expectations of the university which determine the normative ideas about internationalization. Normative conditions for the university development, the perception of globalization, knowledge society and competition determine a certain type of internationalization. Governance in the university is also changing, and it allows less participation by students and staff. While gaining some autonomy, the university's link with the state is also strengthening. This affects institutional possibilities to contribute to critical discussion in society.

In 3.1.3, I give an overview of the evolution of internationalization definitions, namely, those which are determining normativity and what is currently understood under the broad term of internationalization. It turns out that value orientations become more apparent in the descriptions of the internationalization.

In subchapter 3.1.4, I discover theories pertaining to the individual dimension of internationalization. Understandings of these concepts shape further arguments concerning internationalization and how the educational value of internationalization is justified in this discussion. Then, I explore the notions of civic education, culture and diversity, along with their use in justifying the value of internationalization. It is the conception of culture which creates the most controversies.

The next two subchapters (3.2.1 and 3.2.2) introduce two opposing normative ideas that operate in the internationalization discourse. Subchapter 3.2.1 explores the idea of the 'small country' as the way to justify internationalization in Finland; my interpretation is that this channels university efforts into survival mode and draws focus away from internationalization as a vehicle for development. In subchapter 3.2.2, I analyse the approaches to internationalization content, as well as what kind of ideas feed anticipated results from studies.

Finally, in the last two subchapters (3.3.1 and 3.3.2) I illuminate the academic discussion about internationalization development and the emergent normative claims. In 3.3.1, I provide an overview of the return to academic values in internationalization, the dispelling of internationalization myths and looking for the "best practices". Subchapter 3.3.1 examines growing ethical concerns over implementation.

3.1 Major normative dimensions

3.1.1 Academia of the Middle Ages and current internationalization development

The discussion about deficiencies, gaps in higher education internationalization often involves a larger argument about the relationship between the university and society. Critical reviews often refer to the academia of the Middle Ages with its non-existent market dimension. The medieval university had no state-driven agenda, an intellectual pursuit was at the core of its functions, and it sustained internationalization of learning (Kerr, 1993, 7). Major features of internationalization were borderless knowledge, a traditional environment, a common language and religion (Gury-Rosenblit, 2015). The future 'ideal' of internationalization emerged out of these features, which were perceived as cosmopolitan.

Enders (2004) and Scott (2006) denounce the comparability between the medieval and modern universities. Although national borders did not stand in the way of free accumulation of knowledge, the diversity of cultures was not pursued for educational purposes. The university of that time was not experiencing internationalization as a transformative process, and its status and the nature of its operations corresponded to the borderless nature of knowledge and scholarly work. Internationalization was Europe-focused and secluded within the community of scholars. Language was shared within academia but not with the common people, and knowledge was confined by religion. The medieval university was more international than other institutions in the society of that time. But the scope of internationality constantly grows now, and it is considered as a key to future development (Enders, 2004, 3).

The link between the Middle Ages and the modern situation does not sustain the claim about internationalization already being the way that academia typically functions. These types of 'internationalization' are simply two different processes in two different types of institutions. Ollikainen (1996) noted that positive references towards the 'historically international nature' of universities and promoting the 'peaceful co-existence' of different national or ethnic groups were often repeated as justifications, while the implementation of ideas did not receive any further development. This euphoria over the supposed impact of internationalization implies normative ideas taking over the practices and planning.

Another statement conveyed through the reference to the Middle Ages pertains to the fading of academic values and the prioritization of economic pursuits in internationalization today. This difference can be explained by the intensified relationship with the state nowadays. As universities are involved in economic and political competition, coordination and control by nation states increases: "It is ironic that internationalization of the economies has led to the nationalization of

the universities" (Kerr, 1993, 11). Intensified global competition has transformed the university governance, as well as the demands in research and teaching.

Internationalization became one of the ways to endorse development. In this context, the notion of a 'knowledge society' is utilized to characterize development of the state and the place of higher education in it. It is an imaginary space, a device for understanding modern societies (Välimaa & Hoffman, 2008, 266). These perceived conditions become normative assumptions prompting university development in a certain way. They determine strategies that prioritize certain economic and competitive aspects over others. Knowledge in this case is a part of economic growth, which contrasts with the development of knowledge per se (UNESCO, 2004, 17). That said, a critical perspective of the changes argues for a possible reduction in applied knowledge and service to society in a narrow meaning of the word (O'Byrne & Bond, 2014). Therefore, the reference towards Middle Ages development is used to mark the dichotomy of knowledge use, along with the conflict that the co-existence of these opposites generates in practice.

In the national approach to education, where political and economic objectives dominate, internationalization has acquired market ideology which both endorses and challenges the competition between nation states. The expectations of higher education now extend towards its overall impact on societal progress. As noted by Kerr: "never before so many nations had so many purposes for higher education" (Kerr, 1993, 12). Though this assumed broad impact of internationalization is a normative representation of higher education development that cannot be traced in the planning and transformation of practices; there are additional settings that determine the eventual development of higher education. For instance, while the overall circulation of knowledge is beneficial to all states, they may be more reluctant to share their own innovations (Kerr, 1993, 15). Within the same conditions, this can create tendencies that are opposite to internationalization. Moreover, the political and economic situations of different countries vary significantly, and this affects choices and progress within internationalization (Kerr, 1993, 17).

Although national interests include internationalization of learning as well, in terms of ideology this transformation indicates less attention to student issues and academic development, and more pressure for the university to be a political and economic player, which limits the perspective of internationalization. Competing agendas of learning organization and independent economic development, which the university is expected to follow, contribute to the discrepancies in internationalization understanding which are behind the statements on the gaps in internationalization. This analysis demonstrates that internationalization is an empty term, which can be filled with meaning corresponding to the current developments at the university.

The criticism uncovered by references towards the Middle Ages points towards the deficit of discussion about learning through internationalization, and to a certain extent this could be explained by the economic and political expectations that

transform university governance. According to Clarke, internationalization in Finland is advanced in form but missing in content (2005). The role of the teaching staff in terms of internationalization is precarious – their intercultural skills are perceived as insufficient – but they are seen as the "main driver of [the] internationalization of the curriculum", while the level of support from the university in this area is unclear (Haapakoski, Pashby, 2017, 373). Therefore, the instability of funding, which precludes the development of long-term initiatives, goes along with the deficit of learning methods and development of interdisciplinary themes (Clarke, 2005).

The transformation of the university-state connection has an explanatory power over problematic issues in internationalization, since it challenges university autonomy (O'Byrne, Bond, 2014, 574). In the previous chapter, I stated that it is governance rather than internationalization itself that generates resistance among university staff towards the implementation of internationalization. Yet, a more general explanation of these conditions would be that the economic and political climate of higher education, as well as internal governance changes within the university, determine the kind of internationalization that is pursued strategically. I develop this idea further in the next subchapter (3.2).

Some of the critical theorists refer to this type of governance as new public management (Chandler et al., 2002). Apart from the imbalance of learning quests and economic pursuits in the university, this trend exacerbates inter-university relationships in terms of power alterations and management style. It leads to governance practices drifting away from the democratic principles of the 1960s, when European universities developed into a form of representative democracy which gave students and academics an opportunity to participate in governance (Olsen, 2007, 260). While the marketization of education sustains the position of students as clients, there is a lack of agency accorded to this role. Under this framework, they can be taken into account as recipients of services but not as members of the university community. Participation in university politics for decision-making related to improvement is not conditioned by the current governance. The idea is that the university's true purposes are better fulfilled through this process; that this could have an impact on society at large in terms of democracy (Luescher-Mamashela, 2010, 260) is also overlooked, compared to previous conceptualizations of student input. The lack of student input in university governance prompts a realization that a student perspective on internationalization development is missing as well. I develop this idea in subchapter 3.3.

3.1.2 Internationalization and expectations for institutional development

Transformations in the second part of the 20th century involved considerable rethinking of the university and its relationship with the state, society and the market. One normative idea behind internationalizing is that there is a transformation process from a national to an international kind of institution (Soderqvist, 2002). Paradoxically, internationalization does not presuppose any decline in the role of the state, or 'de-nationalization' (Kehm, 2003; Horta, 2009). On the contrary, "increased transaction beyond national borders is made possible through the consent and active encouragement of nation-states" (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 19). This underlines the literal meaning of the word 'inter-national', as in between different states. Therefore, there is no clear boundary between national and international; these dimensions co-exist within the institution, but the meaning of internationalization depends on the theory about the university.

Eric Ashby talks about two basic pressures for universities. One is the idea of belonging to a 'universal *studium generale*', while the other involves adaptation to the society where a particular university is based (Ashby, 1966 cited in Kerr, 1990, 5). The first is often argued within the context of internationalization of learning, and it is close to the normative idea about 'academia always being international'. The second conception applies to the current governance of higher education, as well as strategic internationalization that pursues national goals. This distinction of the university's affiliation, nationally or internationally, also determines the attitude to knowledge, whether it is valued per se, or advanced for the national purposes.

Another dichotomy concerning the university's purpose in society concerns liberal and theological models (Woolf, 2002). The liberal model presupposes that the university is a place of debate on national culture, identity and history. Encouraged by the state, scholars challenge dominant values and advance a spectrum of ideas, including diverse understandings of culture and history. This constitutes a specific function of advancing society through producing critical knowledge. The internationalization stance stems from the university's prospects as well. Välimaa and Hoffman (2008) claim that "higher education institutions are expected to initiate and maintain critical discussion within societies". Internationalization in this context is operationalized as an internal drive for institutional development, which can instigate an array of sustainable changes (Bartell, 2003; Turner & Robson, 2008). The normative idea about knowledge advancement is at the centre of this model.

The opposite of this perspective is a theological model. It is based on the ideal that university is a centre of the traditional values of society. Rather than challenging society with new perspectives, it is a disseminator of "truth" (Woolf, 2002). Apart from this conceptualization of knowledge, the overall stance is that the university is at the service of society. Therefore, there is an "intensification of the

interest of independent nation states in the conscious use of these institutions for their own selected purposes" (Kerr, 1990, 5). Internationalization appears here as an institutional response to global pressures. Van der Wende (1997) emphasized the challenges of globalization and the adjustment of higher education to this overall societal environment. The university is affiliated with the state through the 'particular understanding' of international competitiveness, which is useful when navigating the global environment. A comparison of indicators and identifications of strengths are a focal point in this process (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 845). Rizvi (2006) argues that the impact of globalization on internationalization is not exclusively economic; it also involves social and cultural issues. While the university is expected to compete internationally, it is also seen as a contributor to the well-being of the multicultural society (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 852).

Of course, these models are only 'ideal types', and the practices in each case depend on the institution's position and the national context (Enders, 2004, 362). Kerr calls the current university model a 'cosmopolitan nation-state', implying that both national and cosmopolitan impulses remain valid. There is no normative leadership over the pursued internationalization on the part of the state; therefore, this distinction between strategic and learning-driven internationalization is instrumental in understanding the justifications of knowledge development and the progress of higher education overall. It also elicits perspectives on 'culture' in education, either traditional or inclusive of diversities (Woolf, 2002, 11). Understanding of internationalization practices can illuminate institutional agency, the university's resources and opportunities to balance state and academic community loyalties. As the institutional nature of the university is changing, it becomes more flexible and dispersed, or "thin", which resembles networks (Zijderveld, 2000, cited in Scott, 2006). Therefore, Enders proposes to perceive the current university model as both the subject and object of internationalization at the same time (2004, 5).

Rizvi concludes that an alternative to the neoliberal market view on education should focus on the transformative agenda; thus, transnational educational endeavours can be both socially and culturally fruitful, as well as economically efficient (Rizvi, 2011, 700). The transformative idea appears as an alternative type of normativity: voicing what is a desired outcome of internationalization. While hopes for the modern university are high, the 'survivalist mentality' often requires higher education institutions to choose short-term priorities over long-term development (Gacel-Ávila, 2005, 129). Enders (2004) is sceptical about achieving a new balance of university functions that would satisfy a growing number of stakeholders.

Competing normative ideas and diverse representations of the university position, as well as contradictory impulses, in practice do not produce systemic indicators. It is not clear from this how to argue about internationalization gaps. In the

next subchapter, I focus on the definitions of internationalization to see how thinking about this phenomenon has evolved and what kinds of elements are included in its descriptions.

3.1.3 Definitions of Internationalization

Definitions capture normative ideas, and an evolution of the scholarly thought on internationalization can be traced through them. Since they are widely cited in academic and public discourse, they also possess an ideology-setting function.

An early definition by Knight, which derives from an institutional perspective, proposes a course of action for the university administration: internationalization is a "process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution" (1994, 7). This describes a planning process covering all areas of university life and requiring institutional responsibility in implementation. The actual projects and value orientations are outside of the focus of this definition. The normative dimension here prescribes institution-wide action but is not based on any ideological trend. A later definition by Knight advocates different understandings at the national and university levels (2006). At the national level, priorities of internationalization include the development of human capital, forming alliances, revenue generation, fostering institutional development, and mutual understanding. At the university level, there is a drive towards image and visibility, quality improvement and matching international standards, diversifying sources of income, student and staff development, partnerships and knowledge production (Knight, 2006, 216). Here the normative aspects manifest in the acknowledgement of two levels forming internationalization.

Other definitions discuss the ideological content of internationalization. Svensson and Wihlborg (2010) argue that one should not reduce internationalization to economic and political goals. This statement contains an implicit reference to practices where an imbalance of these aims can be distinguished. Other authors claim directly that the definition of internationalization should relate to teaching and learning, as they are the essence of education (Wang & Ho, 2012). Internationalization is also mentioned as an inclusive and counter-hegemonic process, defying a limited range of cultural perspectives (Schoorman, 1999). While a critical standpoint on internationalization denunciates its economic focus, practices may be less favourable for the development of the other perspectives. But the definition reveals the normative parameters of internationalization. They point to the negative aspects of the practices, which form the boundaries of the concept.

The EAIE (European Association for International Education) definition by Fiona Hunter (2015) takes a stance on the ethical issues of internationalization. First, she emphasizes that a process should be planned with quality enhancement in mind. Second, there is an acknowledgement that the process should be more

inclusive and less elitist, and it should prioritize activities at home over those carried out abroad. Third, she notes that although economic rationales are here to stay, they should not prevail over educational outcomes. Therefore, the definition apprehends internationalization's intended function for education through the reference to the current situation; it is both normative and practice-related.

Apart from these definitions, some authors remark on delimitations of the concept. Brandenburg and De Wit (2011) recognize the tendency to mark globalization as 'evil' and internationalization as 'good'. Although artificial, this distinction is aimed at separating the humanistic ideas of education from economic drivers. Some authors denounce the prevalence of internationalization's economic and political aspects by paying greater attention to education content and curricula. Nukaga (2003) states that international education builds on the idea of social justice, intercultural communication and awareness of global problems.

Kerr states that internationalization development involves both a national innovation system and advancement of learning. While the first of these is more related to society at large, the second entails the individual and national purposes (Kerr, 1990, 5). This touches upon the conceptual relationship of the national and international elements of the education system; there is no strict juxtaposition, and there are noteworthy contradictions in some of the aspects. Dronkers (1993), for instance, argues that a possible place of contention with the state could be language and its use in passing on local culture. Instruction in a foreign language creates competition with the dissemination of the national language and culture. Expanding from that, one could say that there is a thematic and linguistic competition between national and international education. Nukaga (2003) finds a dichotomy between learning about other cultures and fostering national identity. Hence, national and international priorities feed different ideas in education; the rivalry between these can create controversies in planning and implementation.

Therefore, the general problems of university governance (i.e. the lack of academic voice) can also be traced to the definition of internationalization when it does not distinguish between the individual and institutional dimensions. However, there is a noteworthy tendency towards pronounced values in the definition, as well as identifying the boundaries of the concept; these are the systemic elements for exploring internationalization.

3.1.4 Individual dimension

Comparatively speaking, internationalization is a term with a short history of development. Therefore, some of the ideas are derived from other theories. The development of the individual dimension of internationalization is the focus of this chapter. In the previous chapter, I argued that higher levels of planning do not feature individuals within the education system, but appeal to the broad justifica-

tions of internationalization and overall societal impact. Then, closer to institutional planning, there is the idea of internationalization at home, which accentuates activities within the university and supports the mingling of international and domestic students. Nevertheless, there is still a deficiency of the student dimension. International students, as I have elaborated in Chapter 2, are not included in internationalization as agents and co-creators of education. By contrast, the theories that I am going to explore in this subchapter speak about the education value for students, university and society in the creation of a diverse classroom. Yet, conceptually international students are explored more within internationalization normative ideas, and domestic students are often included by proxy.

Hammer et al. point out that experience and environment are developmental in the circumstances of international education. This is attributed to the theory of Vygotsky (1978), according to which the context of learning and language contribute to the nature of studies. Extending this theory from school children to adults, Hammer et al. claim high cultural competence to be the zone of proximal development for the international student. Awareness of that instigates common ground, improving teaching and the learning experience (2003, 420). The idea of evolving intercultural competence is extended to teachers and domestic students as well.

An internationalized classroom can also be argued for from another starting point – students' identity formation. The key argument is that 'direct contact between persons with different cultural backgrounds' is a way to learn 'cultural differences' (Fortuijn, 2002). Here the frameworks of knowledge per se and its applied value are considered: acquaintance with a variety of social and cultural aspects contributes to personal and job-related results. However, according to Gurin et al., this identity theory does not touch upon the diversity aspect, and major principles could be extended to include it (Gurin et al., 2002, 334). In the empirical examples of my research (Chapter 6), I explore how the value of internationalization is established and what aspects bring about the quality of education from the perspective of the individual.

Often terminology which tackles the educational benefits of internationalization relates them to 'culture'. Early on, there was an idea of 'cultural empathy', suggesting that internationalization helps individuals to manage in this new world (Wood, 1991). Subsequently came the term 'cultural competence'. In terms of teaching, some authors relate this to the ability to teach foreign students (Diller & Moule, 2005, 2). For the students, it implies skills allowing successful communication in a multicultural environment, which applies to domestic students as well.

Another concept describing the connection between culture and education is 'intercultural sensitivity', or the "ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences". This is a precondition for developing cultural awareness (Hammer et al., 2003, 422). Altshuler et al. place great emphasis on the attitude that makes intercultural encounters fruitful (2003, 388). Finally, study experiences

and societal impact are linked together. Presumably, learning to deal with diversity in education entails forming tolerance to the diversity in society (Otten, 2003). But, as it is claimed by Otten, while the actual diversity of students is present on campus, it is reflected far less in curricula, classroom discussions and the efforts to create the campus climate (2003). Thus, the university is enabling students' experiences and managing their educational progress, while individual agency in these practices is sought less and less. Although here 'cultures' are used as a learning source, the term is employed in the accounts of international students' difficulties (see Chapter 2.2.3). Finally, although several sources mention that interactions between students are key to fruitful experiences, normative ideas concerning the multicultural classroom are much less developed. One of such examples is a model of "culturally inclusive affordance networks", which emphasizes the need for the learning environment to reflect the diversity of student cultures (Rasi, Hautakangas & Väyrynen 2015).

Another aspect of the value of internationalization for students deals with applied knowledge. Master's programs have a normative idea of aligning graduates with the labour market demands. The conception of 'human capital' was initially developed by Schultz (1961) as a means of arguing for public investment in the educational development of individuals, who would bring synergistic value to society later. The idea of the public good was quite strong in the concept; a critical perspective in the 1970s contended that education should follow a more practical path. With the expansion of education, however, the argument about human capital was revived (UNESCO, 2004, 18).

Since the conception of "human capital" includes the idea of "investment" in individuals on the part of society, it goes along with the growing economic rhetoric of current higher education policy. Internationalization is also a form of cultivating human capital. For instance, government-funded study abroad, exchange programs and postgraduate degrees abroad are expected to bring economic returns (Crossman & Clarke, 2010; Flander, 2011). Study abroad contributes to graduates' employability (Messer & Wolter, 2007). Then, there are issues of skilled labour, including migration and brain drain. The factors of attraction of talent through the internationalization of education (Levatino, 2015) and job opportunities (Mahroum, 2000) are discussed. Geuna advances the idea of university research development through the recruitment of capable students and staff. Individuals are attracted to centres of excellence which, being outstanding in their 'human and physical capital', allow greater research performance (1998, 266–268). This is explained as a Matthew effect, by means of which great research centres increase their attractiveness even more (Geuna, 1998). This makes university positioning crucial for internationalization in its competitive dimension, but also highlights the problems of brain drain through internationalization (Rumbley et al., 2012).

Finally, there is also a civic approach, which includes expectations to keep up the development of the wider society (Harris, 2011, 18–20). International education is a resource for providing students with knowledge of global problems. The idea of civic education is extended to global citizenship (Green, 2012). In contrast to the national citizenship, it is a 'voluntary association', a way of thinking and a lifestyle. Individuals think of themselves as global citizens due to their life experiences, and they have their own interpretations of the notion. Unlike national origin, global citizenship is a choice (Schattle, 2007). Education supporting world-mindedness is another related conception, which draws attention to curricula that engage with global problems and issues of social justice (Van Gyn et al., 2009). There is also the idea of the 'global mindset', which denotes openness to diversity and awareness of global problems; this term is used more in relation to leadership skills (Cohen, 2010). Lehtomäki et al (2016) also call in "global connectedness", exploring the potential of cross-cultural dialog in the classroom.

To sum up, the individual dimension of internationalization is aligned with the cultural terminology, and it is less developed with regards to the role of domestic students, agency of the individuals, and classroom interaction. Yet, the impact of internationalization on education features perspectives on knowledge per se and applied understanding, as well as the broader societal impact of education.

3.2 Normativities and the problems behind them

3.2.1 Idea of a small country for governance and marketing

There is a conception that for a small country, internationalization is a strategy to endure globalization. This idea is consistent with internationalization being concentrated on the macro level and being expected to solve problems outside of the scope of education. Moreover, internationalization in Finland is sustained through country-wide actions. These are not only planning provisions that are supplied through the state framework, but a national-oriented idea is at the heart of internationalization ideology as well. Already in the early strategy of 2001, internationalization was justified as a factor that would boost the country's attractiveness and support its competitive future.

This strategy of justifying internationalization has been well described in the internationalization literature. For instance, Enders mentioned this approach as 'life or death' internationalization, which is customary for small European countries like Sweden or the Netherlands, which need to be integrated within the larger academic community (Enders, 2004, 19). Finland fits into this pattern as well. Nokkala (2008) identifies the narrative of Finland as a small country, where internationalization ensures competitiveness in unfair conditions. According to Davies and Bansel, it is coupled with the lack of democratic processes within institutions

(2007, 250). This prompts the use of the pragmatic approach to internationalization, and there is caution concerning overregulation and numeric targets in internationalization assessment. Globalization is an assumed condition of higher education policy, and the measures suggested in this context are sufficiently questioned, since the expected result is presented in terms of "survival".

With internationalization as a coping strategy, there are no projected benefits. By contrast, for countries like USA and UK, which pursue internationalization 'by import', it is used to develop a service industry for international students (Enders, 2004). The strategy of internationalization is different in a small country with a language that is not widely spoken around the world (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001, 244). Despite the developing market rationale and the introduction of tuition fees, even now this picture is far from the fully developed sector of the national economy. Yet, the competitive line continues, even with representations of internationalization difficulties.

Education marketing creates a divergent picture, focusing on the positive perspective of international possibilities. This is a normative construction as well, but its major purpose is to articulate the value of study degrees, making it visible to potential applicants and other universities, as well as demonstrating high-quality education which is able to accommodate students from abroad. Notably, there is also promotion of the country's image in general, which is done by the education portal *Into Finland*; it promotes the study destination. The website *Study in Finland* targets information to those who have little knowledge of and no experience in Finland. For instance, it does not reflect the needs of Nordic students (Norden, 2015, 14). These promotional strategies are a country-wide effort disengaged from institutional agency.

Marketing is based on generic positive statements that create an ideal picture. Finland is an exemplary case in terms of educational mythologies. Dervin explores the discourse concerning education:

> Thanks to the OECD PISA studies, Finnish education has been admired by many researchers, policy-makers and practitioners worldwide – often uncritically. We live in difficult times and it seems to me that many of these individuals are trying to find a 'dreamplace', a little paradise, often urged to do so by supra-national institutions like the European Union, probably one of the most active creator of myths in the world today. Finnish neoliberal universities have profited from the country being in the spotlight for 'selling' its education around the world. (Dervin, 2015a, xii)

This way normative ideas become influential in practice and affect the development of internationalization. Dervin claims that this kind of comparison con-

tains nationalistic ideas: "These assertions often lead to comparing different systems of education, countries and cultures and even groups of people… 'under apparent neutrality of description' (Holliday, 2010, 4) but 'stinking' of ethnocentrism and neo-racism" (Dervin, 2015a, xii). Clearly, this kind of ideology, even in the name of higher visibility, excludes the cosmopolitan turn in internationalization, and it does not reflect the internationalization of learning. Yet, the target group of the marketing activities are students, those who are most interested in this dimension. This feature of internationalization enactment creates a gap between the normative ideas and practices faced by students.

So, the narrative of a small country includes a justification for acquiring greater competitiveness, which is argued as a necessity. Even marketing is based on a small country image rather than education arguments. Predictably, rethinking education content is considered less within this framework. Continuing from globalization as a condition, one can even see unfortunate circumstances for the development of education content. Giving the example of Norway, Smeby and Trondal claim that globalization could be detrimental to higher education in small countries and minority language areas (2003). This 'small country survival' narrative reinforces a competitive type of internationalization, which promises to boost the development of higher education with a national at the core.

3.2.2 Content and internationalization of different disciplines

In the previous chapter, I discussed planning preconditions for the study content transformations induced by internationalization. The focus of the current piece is on the expectations around the internationalized curriculum and its envisioned adjustments informed by perspectives on knowledge.

Becerra (2006) claims that nowadays the university is perceived exclusively as a place of academic learning, where training for employability is at the centre (cited in Planas et al., 2013). This pertains to the applied conception of knowledge and the university being at the service of society. Alternative perspective regards transformative learning as having social underpinnings. Apart from pursuing knowledge per se, it ascribes a challenger role to the higher education institution. Yet, this change cannot be fully implemented from the top down, as self-reflexive and critical knowledge cannot be managed by the administration (Rizvi, 2000, 193; Planas et al., 2013, 573; Jones & Killick, 2013).

Nevertheless, an overall approach to knowledge is institutionally sustained, as I established in the previous chapter. Curriculum formation is often problematized in terms of taking on different perspectives and following certain political stances (Woolf, 2002, 12). Historically, education content was not impartial, being bound by the borders of the state and following the dominant national position. Transformations induced by internationalization fall into the category of meeting new societal needs; emphasis on employability and fostering intercultural skills for

work exemplify this trend. The macro focus on knowledge is justified, since it requires resources from the university. Current circumstances prompt the university to develop an approach to international education. Although curriculum internationalization does not happen exclusively due to incoming foreign students, long-term projects in internationalization have to consider diversity of backgrounds (Woolf, 2002, 12). In terms of normative ideas, this is a challenge for the university to develop a common ground, since there is no coherence between the knowledge systems of the different countries.

Another difficulty for curriculum development is that transformations are discipline-specific. International links between the disciplines have evolved from the model where national disciplines were represented internationally by national associations (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 856). But Kerr has noted a significant difference in the degree of internationalization and explained it by the preconditions of language, typically followed methodologies, nationally oriented content, or ideological divides (Kerr, 1993, 11–12). Disciplines like law, history and even sociology were framed as problematic in terms of knowledge exchange. In addition, there can be indifference towards the detailed knowledge of phenomena in another country, as in-depth comparisons are not utilized.

Kerr claims that forming an understanding of how internationalization applies to different fields of knowledge takes effort (1993, 13). Concerns over curriculum internationalization is greater in the social sciences than in the natural sciences or engineering (Chen, 2006). Morey (2000) acknowledges that although some of the disciplines "lend themselves more readily to transformation", other subjects become inclusive of international influences as well (29). Along with migration and cultural studies, which were always cross-cultural, traditional disciplinary structures are being challenged.

Internationalization also fosters interdisciplinarity, and new subjects are being developed at the crossroads, such as international political economy, international security and area studies (Taylor, 2004). Within this trend, there also are initiatives which formalize enrichment from internationalization, plan to influence a certain 'mindset', develop intercultural skills, and so on. This learning dimension generated a special branch of programs, which translate international experiences into competencies (Robson, 2011).

Some authors claim that in order to internationalize a discipline, it is not sufficient to introduce cross-national topics (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999). Problematizing education content is an essential part of internationalization ideology. It is tied up with democratic principles and inclusive practices (Robson, 2011), as well as values of equality and diversity (Odora Hoppers, 2009), and it includes addressing issues at local and global levels (Cross, Mhlanga & Ojo, 2009).

The rethinking of knowledge acquisition and the problematization of its context are also anticipated as a result of internationalization (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999). There are additions in terms of courses, but the Western paradigm of

knowledge, the structure of the curriculum, is seldom challenged. In terms of normative expectations, internationalization of the curriculum presupposes the plurality of knowledge and requires questioning of historical roots, political aspects and epistemological foundations (Van Gyn et al., 2009, 26).

The "de-Westernization" of the curriculum also requires in-depth revision within a discipline and its approaches. Breit et al. called it "treating internationalization as critical de-westernization", describing the work within the group of academics (2013, 131). Fitch (2013) exposed transformations of one discipline and stated that when the content is thoroughly reviewed, (e.g. for the purposes of internationalization), the drawbacks of its development arise, like the lack of theoretical basis. Moreover, the ethnocentric perspectives within the field could be identified. Finally, in-depth exploration within one discipline also explicates the relationship between different stakeholders: the university, industry and students. This uncovers larger revelations of academic and market-driven factors. Leask also distinguishes an 'informal', or hidden curriculum, that can be found in the source and form of prioritized knowledge and language use, the choice of textbooks, and references. These 'lessons' can be both positive and negative (Leask, 2009, 207).

Although internationalization opens new perspectives of knowledge, the prevalence of research standpoints from more affluent countries is not tackled through the top-down approach. There is also a tendency towards 'universalization of knowledge', a convergence of curricula through the variety of 'global studies' (Kerr, 1993, 9). This approach does not necessarily bring attention to many silenced topics. This ties back to the idea that the nature of knowledge created through internationalization is dialogical, which makes the engagement of students and staff even more crucial.

Greater individual agency in higher education development involves reconsidering the source, nature and transmission of knowledge. Rizvi underlines a cognitive aspect, understanding and forming 'epistemic virtues', in contrast to values and forming one's own identity. In this way, learning in internationalization differs from intercultural experiences which are not mediated by the university. This knowledge is socially constructed; it depends on the beholder of this knowledge and her/his particular interpretation (Rizvi, 2009, 243). This underlines the discussion as a process of learning and gives importance to classroom interaction. Robson conceptualizes this as "experiential learning" (2011). Approaching the curriculum as a context-driven development highlights the place of students as co-creators of knowledge. As opposed to the 'top-down' strategy, a combination of formal and informal curricula would generate a 'holistic approach' (Leask, 2009, 209).

3.3 Emergent critical dimension of internationalization: where the gaps come from

3.3.1 Academic discussion about normative stances of Internationalization

Discussion about reaffirming academic values brings to light normative reasoning in internationalization discourse (IAU, 2012a). The key argument is that while the current context of higher education politics prompts economic reasoning, internationalization should be pursued to ensure academic growth. This critical stance existed before. Jones outlines internationalism as "common sense notions of international community, international cooperation, international community of interests, and international dimensions of the common good", including the promotion of global peace and well-being (2000, 31). Stromquist (2007) stresses that international initiatives have been co-opted by the market forces, and distinguishes between internationalism and internationalization, with the latter being an economically driven agenda. However, this emerging public discussion gave a new spin to the topic of the applied and universal value of internationalization and education in general; it spoke about the need to articulate value orientation in internationalization.

Other critical accounts of internationalization development also presume the pursuit of principles. For instance, myths or misconceptions of internationalization described by Knight (2011) and de Wit (2011) put forward normative reasoning. Statements claiming that number of international students, international subjects and studies in a foreign language are not sufficient for internationalization, advocate for a holistic and reflexive approach. Since this notion is an empty concept, descriptions through delineations emphasize a critical angle. By pointing out what is not internationalization and what does not measure its progress, one can come closer to what is essential for internationalization. Arguing the value in it generates a normative statement. I apply this approach through the demarcations of the concept in Chapter 6, exploring the normative ideas of students and teachers.

While internationalization becomes more associated with the market and neoliberal governance, these normative ideas present an alternative discourse. Their notable difference is in reflecting the interests of the academic community; internationalization clearly has both institutional and individual agendas. The university has a range of goals to achieve, including strategic partnerships, statistical indicators, curriculum transformations and many other aspects. But students and scholars with their experiences of diversity, study and career-related goals are also a part of the internationalization discourse. As Kreber (2009) notes, by depending on those levels, a different picture of internationalization becomes available. For

instance, while economic goals prevail on the macro levels, socio-political, academic and cultural goals are more apparent at the level of curriculum. The fact that the university administration is leading internationalization development nowadays does not outmode the agency of staff, students and the university community (Gaffikin & Perry, 2009, 138). Madge et al. suggest conceptualizing the internationalization of learning in terms of 'international study' instead of 'international student'; the shift of the focus would imply that students are 'the agents of knowledge formation' (2014). Adding an individual dimension gives a proxy to the processes that are often overlooked in the traditional internationalization discourse: organization and the content of international studies.

This brings the discussion nearer to practices, as well as the relationship between normative ideas and practices, which accounts for some of the gaps. Questions about the effects of internationalization on education quality are on the rise in the public discourse; Gornitzka et al. (2003) consider the possibility of standard indicators to evaluate internationalization. This points towards normative considerations about implementation. This is close to the ideas of 'benchmarking' and 'best practices', which approach practices from the top down and ignore the university context, as well as the agency of those who implement internationalization (see subchapter 1.2.1 for this discussion). They do not discover regularities of internationalization, as often transferability to another context is not examined. Therefore, as much as there is a need for criteria to understand internationalization, when normative ideas advance a standard from the top down, this leads to the internationalization of learning being overlooked.

Hence, there are two concurrent trends in the development of the internationalization ideology. One of the tendencies is to develop ideas about internationalization's contribution to the content of education, as opposed to strategic drive. Another tendency, paradoxically, tries to formalize practices, making them implementable from the top down and transferable from one institution to another.

3.3.2 Ethical considerations in internationalization

Normative concerns about implementation also raise some ethical considerations. Enders (2004) states that internationalization is always linked to power relations, and this affects the content and organization of studies. Pashby and Andreotti (2016) also address ideas of governance from the ethical perspective. An ethically driven discourse of internationalization would lead to the rethinking of the higher education purposes.

Although internationalization of learning is at the heart of academia, it does not prove to be unproblematic in practice. Truong (2006) argues that universalizing, cosmopolitan ideas for education should involve a rich variety of sources and not just rely on knowledge of Western origin. There is a rivalry of thematic issues in internationalization, and certain stories receive less attention. For instance, a

European focus symbolizes integration within the regional borders. It also conveys the priority of common ground over the value of diverse heritages (Kerr et al., 1994, 24–25).

Another example is that when countries try to employ exclusion arguments in the competition, discussions can easily generate neo-colonial elements (Enders, 2004). When universities' reasons, roots and opportunities for internationalization are explored, not only historical references to internationalized academia are cited. Even the colonial past is brought into the discussion. Remarkably, these are not distinguished from each other. There is no vector of internationalization; it is indeed an empty term. For instance, Rumbley (2010, 208) explores the internationalization of Spanish universities and claims that under internationalization, we could consider the influence on regions that were former colonies. Internationalization is explained by historical rootedness, but its new goals and values are not articulated (Rumbley, 2010). This context is used to signify the "academic" leaning of internationalization but does not address the values behind it.

Nixon (2008) claims that the university's new role is in becoming a space for individuals to develop civic leadership. This is a return to the idea of the public good and higher education as a contributor to societal development. The governmental perspective on universities often lacks the idea of the common good and expects "both too much and too little" from universities (Marginson, 2017). Notably, the frame of reference for the university within this perspective is not the national society but the larger world; internationalization gives a new perspective on institutional development. Finally, Teichler (2009, 16) suggests that internationalization will become institutionalized within the university so that there will be less distinctively international projects in future.

Challenges of institutional development look different due to internationalization. For instance, funding pressures increase, and internationalization is a way for institutions to seek new sources of revenue. At the same time, however, Stromquist (2007, 82) notes that globalization has only exacerbated the institutional search for external funding. As for its role in society, the university has become responsible for innovation and the knowledge production; performing in these spheres is enhanced through internationalization. Yet, the university's contribution to the public good is also questioned in the climate of the competitive markets of higher education (Altbach, McGill & Peterson, 1999). Internationalization causes diversification of the student body which is even greater than the one caused earlier by the massification of education; the institutions of higher education should thus adjust both the content of teaching and the organization of studies. Transformations also concern the internal functioning of the university, as there is a reduction of democratic practices (Luescher-Mamashela, 2010). With the increase of diverse students and staff, it is a challenge to ensure that different perspectives are acknowledged. Hence, the impact of internationalization is not in providing solutions, but in contributing new perspectives on education content and

governance. In Chapter 6, I explore individuals' views on the characteristics of internationalization, the university and programs.

The dilemmas of institutional governance revive the issue of institutional ethics. With regards to internationalization, the stances are not always explicit. According to Enders (2004), globalization is an ideology, a perception of changes as inevitable and impersonal, and at the same time justifying certain kinds of policies. Here he follows Teichler (1999, cited in Enders, 2004), saying that the internationalization of higher education is praised 'almost unconditionally' by the most powerful actors, while the concerns of the vulnerable parties, such as brain drain and swift policy reforms, are ignored.

Yet, the opportunities to react to globalization pressures range from country to country. The European approach to internationalization aims to recruit elites from the developing countries outside the EU. This exacerbates brain drain and the competitive drive of internationalization, rather than the model oriented towards mutual benefit (Teichler, 2009, 16). While currently ethical guidelines range from academic integrity and non-discrimination to the respect and fair treatment of international partners (IAU/MCO, 2012a, 2), the discussion is likely to expand with regards to the content of education and the impact of the internationalization agenda on international students (Hoey, 2016). Therefore, institutional ethics should consider the content of studies, the treatment of different groups within the university, and finally internationalization's societal impact both within and beyond institutional borders.

Conclusions

Although the ideas of borderless knowledge and wandering scholars are often mystified, such that internationality is claimed to be the nature of academia, dependence on the nation-state is an equally strong and even more recent legacy of the modern university. The international mission is also subjected to the demands of the state. High expectations regarding the university and its role in societal and economic progress feed into normative assumptions of internationalization development. Current institutional governance favours a certain type of internationalization that has increased pressure for financial independence and diminished autonomy in academic matters. Hence, academic development and the student dimension within internationalization are overlooked. The arguments about gaps often note this problem.

Despite a prevalence of state interests, there is little place for national issues in internationalization. This is especially evident in the content-related aspects of internationalization, and it will be substantiated later in Chapter 6. It problematizes how language, culture and history might appear in the international studies, and how the uniqueness of the studies in Finland might be presented to students.

Ideology of a small country withstanding globalization impacts internationalization choices; this feeds into a 'need-based', reactive process, rather than a vehicle of development. Since competitiveness demands finding a niche within international higher education, universities need to search for their strengths and areas of specialization. This generates top-down governance, causing tensions with the academic community, and reinforces the lack of the university's agency. Yet, this approach on the state level is presented as a necessity, and the need to endure globalization and explore new resources ranges from optimistic to pessimistic, coping strategy.

The idea of globalization requiring an ultimate response from higher education institutions limits internationalization to the idea of market-driven governance. While current internationalization policy prioritizes the economic dimension, it cannot leave social and cultural factors of university development (UNESCO, 2004, 20) unnoticed. There is a tendency to develop alternative arguments in research. Kehm (2011) argues that instead of using a competitive determination of university management as an explanatory framework, one should delve into the strength and weaknesses of this approach, as well as university stratification and students' challenges in this regard. This should not be a debate between ideal and applied knowledge, academic standing and economic priorities. Instead of polarizing these, the analysis should explore the combination of these forces in practice. Considerations of individual perspectives, inclusion and academic development through internationalization add another layer to the analysis of planning and implementation.

Mestenhauser (1998b) called internationalization a 'cognitive response' to the problems of higher education in the 21st century, the idea being that while internationalization could be considered a reaction to the new societal demands, its agenda ought to be transformational and inclusive of a wide range of changes. Then, Gacel-Ávila (2005) built a concept of internationalization as an 'educational vision', which tackles demands of globalization, interdependence and multiculturalism.

Developmental ideas stem from the ideological understanding that internationalization should present a stimulus for the university and transform the education process. For instance, internationalization at home informs planning of master's programs. Yet, this discourse is underdeveloped in terms of subsequent ideas. It turns out that culture is one of the most problematic notions of internationalization, in terms of both ideologies and planning. In the empirical part of this thesis, I will demonstrate that the gains from cultural analyses are not evident in education; the problems in internationalization are situated around institutional provisions and financial pressures rather than clashes of cultures. International students can be distinguished as a special group in international policy planning; the important aspects of internationalization are associated with them, but their voice within the university is marginal.

The challenge in pursuing internationalization for a transformation of practices is that different disciplinary structures have a varied degree and various ways of internationalizing; the task is to find the relevance of the international context for the particular type of studies. Programs that promote internationalization on the basis of their particular study focus and the topics of their curriculum represent one sector among others. Here the diversity is often addressed specifically in the curriculum (for instance, in the case of some social sciences and culture-related programs). But these kinds of studies are contingent on classroom diversity and its inclusion in the study process.

Overall, what internationalization is filled in with depends on the country and the institutional context. Contrary to the overall positive bias, there are emerging ethical dilemmas, both in terms of curriculum development and institutional transformation.

When justifications of internationalization are contextualized in the wider discussion about university development and the purposes of education, this brings up controversies over ideal and applied knowledge, dependence on the state versus autonomy, and distance versus service to society. These considerations explicate the situation concerning the university's role in society. In this analysis, several dichotomies can be revealed: national-international, cultural-economic and individual-state. Whenever there is a discussion about the 'gaps' in internationalization or statements that internationalization does not work, there often is reference to the controversies surrounding these dimensions, and institutional reconciliation of these impulses.

4 Chapter: Research Methodology

4.1 Building the methodological approach

In this chapter, I summarize my methodological path in pursuing this research. In 4.1, I explicate the development of my approach to the problem under study. I elaborate on my position as a researcher in 4.2. It includes a self-reflexive attitude vis-à-vis my own normative assumptions as well as attention to individual perspectives on internationalization. Then, 4.3 describes the process of data collection. Subchapter 4.4 is an explication of discourse analysis approach, and 4.5 elaborates on data analysis. Finally, in 4.6 and 4.7 I discuss the research ethics and validity of the study.

There is a broad definition of internationalization as permeating all aspects of university life (Knight, 2011). However, in the discussions of educational phenomena it acquires different meanings. To characterize the application of this discrete notion within an empirical case, a more precise understanding is needed. Therefore, I adopt the conceptualization of internationalization, which would consider this tendency towards frequent changes of meaning. I view internationalization as a socially constructed phenomenon, which means that participants in the field understand the meaning of this notion, and their understandings construct the process of implementation, thus developing the understanding of internationalization further (like the 'double hermeneutic' of Giddens, 1993). This gives me grounds to rely on the interviews and their discourse analysis for the empirical data.

I wanted my study to include the following aspects from these different levels. It would be based on actual practices; the focus would be on individuals' internationalization perspectives and educational experiences, as this was considered missing in earlier research (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). The identities in education, personal learning pathways and pedagogical tools were, however, beyond the scope of my interest in this study. Then, it would highlight the circumstances at the university level that define the implementation of the educational project. I also planned to provide a broader context of higher education politics that determine decision-making, including ministerial and institutional strategies. However, my aim was not to reveal whether strategic plans receive accurate implementation, as this gives only limited access to the actual developments inside the university.

From an ontological perspective, I did not doubt the actual existence of practices or the participants' account of them. Rather, I imply that multiple perspectives compose a certain account of reality. Hacking (1999) demonstrates that social construction refers to things or facts, along with our beliefs about them. The target of the inquiry here is the exposure of these beliefs shaped by social forces. Often there is a view that social constructionism does not claim any reference to

the outside world, and it is not engaged with ontology of knowledge, instead relying on epistemological premises. Nightingale and Cromby argue for a perspective infused with critical realism, namely, that to some extent language represents a reference to the external reality, and while it is impossible to acquire a truthful account of reality, some of the picture can be shown by analysing text (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002).

Moreover, my research model explicates different ontological dimensions. Essentially, categorizing internationalization in terms of normative ideas, planning, and practices locates its claims in relation to ontology. Although ideas and planning are not concerned with reality, the description of practices does make a claim about it. A mere statement about something being true does not mean that that is the only truth, it is 'beyond improvement' (Sayer, 2002, 41, cited in Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, 704). There is no impartial account of practices that can be found, as details and perspectives might be added in further inquiries.

Normative elements, planning and practices also emerge in country-specific discourse. I tackle only recent changes in governance that pertain to internationalization; studies dealing with the university history of Finland are outside the scope of this study. I would like to avoid the perspective on the country as a very distanced and alienated case, where everything is special, including internationalization, the magnitude and outcomes of which we take on faith.

I was searching for possible theoretical solutions throughout my research. Since the inquiry was question-driven, relying on a preexisting theoretical framework was problematic. At the same time, data-driven inquiry was also insufficient, as my goal was to enable claims that go beyond the case under investigation. Meanwhile, according to some authors, grounded theory has generated scarce theoretical contributions (see the discussion in Timmermans & Tavory, 2012).

Additionally, according to Timmermans and Tavory (2012), the treatment of theory in this method has logical problems, as it is advised that pre-existing theory should not be relied upon, but rather that a wide range of theoretical knowledge and 'sensitivity' should be possessed (170). The authors advocate for an 'agnostic' approach, which means that the elements of the existing theories and empirical evidence are put together to answer the research question. Instead of denouncing the theory, there should be a familiarity with prior contributions, but also the ability to recognize surprising findings (Timmermans & Tavory 2012, 169). Therefore, I decided to follow the abductive strategy, constantly reiterating between theory and data (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 30).

Since the focus of my study is exploratory and question-driven, critical discourse analysis was an appropriate solution. However, since I did not rely on a broad theoretical framework, the approach developed by Norman Fairclough could not be used without modifications. Wodak and Meyer (2009, 3) argue that discourse analysis is not a well-defined empirical method, but rather an array of methods that have similar theoretical perspectives and research questions. While

I acknowledge the relevance of framing internationalization development as a part of the knowledge-based economy, which is impacted by neoliberalism, marketization and competitiveness, these kinds of inquiries have been done before (e.g. Nokkala, 2007). The absence of a macro level theory is also justifiable, since I wanted to stay away from country-based interests and focus on individual and institutional perspectives, including a student, migrant, an outsider perspective. In the case of my research that is the examination of normative ideas, planning, and practices, which is done by addressing the epistemological foundations of policy claims and interviewees' ideas. These are linked not only to internationalization as an ideology (and the subverted ideas that it is infused with), but also to how planning and practices (and the ways in which they are socially constructed) change education.

4.2 The researchers' position

The argument in a qualitative study stems from the positionality of the researcher, which is a starting point from which knowledge is claimed (Hall, 1990; Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). As for this study, it is important to keep in mind that my own international experience in Finland started at the same time as my immersion into the research topic. I had no preliminary insights. Initially, I was drawn to the popular idea that multicultural practices on campus could have an impact on wider society. I wanted to see how ethnic minorities participate in education, what kinds of rights and re-negotiation of spaces happen in practice in the context of the widely-promoted rhetoric about cultural enrichment and tolerance. However, I quickly realized that this kind of research is not achievable in the limited timeframe, as I did not have any contextual knowledge to start with. Therefore, I decided to focus on internationalization. This is the area, I thought, where everybody in the academia belongs and has access to.

This research started from the desire to find out what is a good internationalization, and how ideas like internationalization are operationalized (or not) in practice, and whether 'what is promised' in policy and via rhetoric is ever applied and operationalized in practice. Finally, I was intrigued by the success of internationalization as an idea and its usage as a marker of success in multiple contexts: in the CV of an individual, in university rankings, in the number of conference participants from different countries, and the idea that any knowledge base could be enhanced by the international perspective. It has almost become synonymous with high quality.

As an entry point to the study, I kept the idea of conceptualizing the discrepancy between the ideas picturing a broad impact, such as multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism and internationalization, and practices. Drawing from personal experiences with internationalization, I could state that it works differently in each context. However, in conversation with various people about internationalization,

I discovered that there is a perceived common ground. We referred to an intangible 'how it should be', yet did not explicate our expectations fully. I was convinced that the concept requires clarification, especially if there is a claim that internationalization practice does not work for the benefit of education.

The idea of further researching and theorizing something that is witnessed through personal experience is not new, and, similar to the idea of the 'living theory', it gives an impetus to improve the practice (Whitehead, 1982). Analyzing this, I hoped, would allow me to better understand how valuable educational experiences are created within internationalization. I was also keen on understanding the role of expectations, whether the university is able to meet diverse prospects on education and create a common ground for participants from all over the world. I inquired into the grounds of these perspectives on education, and how international experience transformed the educational path. Further along, while conducting research, my perspective on practice changed, as I realized the extent of contingency in international education. I understood that, irrespective of whether current educational experience meets prior expectations or not, the participants have to make sense of it and create educational value.

My social experiences at the university informed my position as a researcher. Since I came to Finland with no knowledge of Finnish, I could only participate in international activities. Most often, exchange- and international students are planned for as a single unit in the university. Therefore, both of these groups are seen by the institution as being here on a temporary basis. Due to this, membership in the university community is not discussed, but international students are rather the recipients of the university's services. Dervin and Layne (2013) utilize the metaphor of host and guest addressing the relationship between the institution and the international student. While Coleman claims that relying on dichotomies is problematic, and that position-taking is redefined multiple times in everyday communications, I find this comparison relevant because of the assumptions that come with it. For instance, it points towards the perceived information disparity about the situation in education and its context. Often people explained to me Finland and international education in it, trying to build up an ideal picture, as if I were not a participant of the same processes. Although the focus of my study was internationalization, and I felt that it was appropriate to work on this domain's representation in English, I felt the limitations of this sphere. The public rhetoric used to represent internationalization was uncritical marketing material with no downsides. It drew my attention closer to the discrepancy between normative ideas and practices.

However, I would like to acknowledge that this dichotomy of host and guest is not fixed, which is quite in line with the claim made by Coleman (2013). My position, information, and experience shifted, for instance, when I travelled to seminars abroad and I was the only participant from Finland. Another element of

positioning was within the international community. It was interesting to communicate within this 'bubble'; meeting and doing things with people from diverse backgrounds was enlightening. Apart from the educational benefit, however, I started to question inclusion and institutional support. I participated in the university's organization for international students, trying to see how they could be better integrated into the academic life. Based on these experiences, I would claim that this position within the university could be renegotiated.

When my Finnish language skills and socialization improved, the perceived position also changed. For instance, in the last year I participated in discussions in Finnish and acquired a greater grasp of the national position on higher education, language, and power anxieties. It was not my original priority in the research, but it allowed me to place the perspective of international students into a bigger picture of the everyday struggles within the university.

Although personal experiences resonated with the questions that I addressed in the inquiry, the major impact of my own position was in the perspective that I took. I was sensitive to the position of the recipients of institutional practices and looking at the arguments from this point of view was important for me.

Dervin (2015) takes on a position of the 'amateur intellectual' in arguing about interculturality and internationalization in Finland. Initially argued by Edward Said (1993, 61-62, c.f. Dervin, 2015), it implies being critical and concerned, having a moral stance on what is going on in society. It is contrasted with an image of the professional, who approaches things in a more impartial and technical way. This also includes the possibility of transforming the professional stance through critical insights.

My own positionality takes the stance of the recipient of policies and decision-making, whether it would be as a scholar or a student. I was determined to see the individual's perspective and role in negotiating a space within institutional practices. Despite the evolution of my position over time, I can't claim an established membership in a certain group of students or scholars. I think that this negotiation of being 'one of us' or 'the other', a 'host' or a 'guest', is a process that does not become complete. It depends on who looks at it and in what context.

This perspective, acknowledging the socially constructed nature of claims and definitions in education, also extends towards the ideas, which I explore as normativity in this inquiry. Therefore, it is important not only to criticize some of them, and argue for an alternative, as Dervin and Layne (2013) and Haapakoski and Pashby (2017) do, but to acknowledge that these ideas emerge, are redefined and criticized, while there are also processes in practice, such as student socialization and educational experiences, that happen in parallel with the macro view. This is another socially constructed process, which involves micro-level meaning-making in education. Therefore, my intent has been to avoid normative attitudes to internationalization in the author's voice. Instead of criticizing the practice from a particular position, I address the relationship between normative ideas, planning

and practices. The critical standpoint of my study is in approaching internationalization as a transformative idea in education and looking for its contributions to institutional and individual development.

Keeping in mind a student's perspective, we have to acknowledge that they come from one place to another, and this makes internationalization comparable in practice. Therefore, internationalization is a space that a foreigner is able to navigate, it is made available and has to meet at least some expectations of the newcomer. Relying on this realization, I explored the intertwinement of national and international reasoning as a part of the normative ideas about internationalization.

One of the implications of my positionality was that I did not write a separate chapter on education in Finland. I wanted to avoid creating another normative representation of Finland as a distinct case, where everything, including internationalization, is specific. Since context is important to internationalization, I add the details to the case along with the development of the study. However, I do not base the interpretation of the current development predominantly on the specificities of history and the education system. It was important for me to consider the other influences, e.g. global flows and local circumstances.

Every internationalization process has a context, which is perhaps not nationally-specific, but it is place-specific. Therefore, throughout the thesis I point out the circumstances of internationalization in Finland, and the features of the education system that have an impact on the student experience. This is highlighted, for instance, in the debate between Dervin and Layne (2013) and Coleman (2013) about the preparation of students for international experiences. Dervin and Layne (2013) argue that the clarifications that the university brings up in guides for international students reinforce stereotyping of cultural knowledge. In contrast, Coleman (2013, p.6) argues that students going abroad often hold firm stereotypes about themselves and others, while it is a "fairly standard part of the predeparture preparation" by the university to dispel the preconceived cultural categorizations. While both of these positions have relevance, I would also argue that the choice of the topic and its verbalization in the orientation session for the international students is revealing of the institutional position. In the universities that I visited over several years, the topics covered in the first meetings ranged from the ways to economize and survive in the country, to the communicative patterns common among locals and to the rules of dating that are 'appropriate in this culture'. I would say that these ways of accommodating international students reveal something fruitful about internationalization, which is not tracked in normative ideas and planning. Keeping these experiences in mind, I pay attention to the context of internationalization practices.

4.3 Data Collection

My research project involves several master's programs with a similar academic focus; their common ground is also the circumstances of the country and global tendencies of education politics. I do not compare these programs but only note regional differences, whenever those emerge in the data. Overall, I assume that these programs are a part of one project type within internationalization, since they have sufficient similar circumstances. For the sake of comparability, I chose master's programs within one subject field: social sciences. One reason for this is that the programs are alike in terms of administrative attitude and student demand, which gives me an opportunity to assess their international dimension. Another aspect that makes these programs similar is the "diversity" component as a part of their studies. It is essential for the research that they are related to internationalization also in terms of study content. My research on the master's programs' functioning is based on document data and interviews. I analyse the documents in order to derive the overall framework of how internationalization is understood, planned and assessed. Then, I rely on the interviews for two types of data: understandings of internationalization and accounts of the master's programs' functioning.

With the document collection, my guiding principle was to include multiple positions of power and elicit societal discussion. Therefore, I relied on publicly available documents. Many of the documents consider internationalization as part of larger university development, and in some of the documents internationalization appears to be a central focus. I selected documents at the European, national and institutional levels as a primary target of my analysis.

First, I analyse how European-level documents present internationalization. The European Commission is the major organization shaping the dialog in this area. Although its regulations are not legally binding, they have considerable power at the state level. The key ideas drift through the state structures to the universities. Second, there is also an elaboration of internationalization at the national level. Finland is endorsing university internationalization through its policy. Among the national-level documents, I analyse the publications of the Ministry of Education and Culture, the papers of the Center for International Mobility (CIMO), and the Research and Innovation Council of Finland. I consider the newest development plan "Education and Research 2011–2016" published by the Ministry of Education and Culture, which reflects the current situation in education, projects relevant measures and outlines the anticipated progress. Then, I study the up-to-date strategy of internationalization, which characterizes the development in this area and sets up benchmarks for achievements. I compare certain aspects with the earlier strategy of internationalization. This document explains the initial internationalization development in Finland, which started along with European integration.

The CIMO is an agency affiliated with the Ministry of Education. The tasks of this organization include support of educational activities and marketing of Finnish education abroad. The launch of this organization took place already in 1991, and its role included the promotion of Finland as an 'education country'. Already at that point, internationalization was perceived as a challenge requiring greater competitiveness (Ministry of Education, 2001, 3). The CIMO publishes both reports and position papers. It plays a great role in data mining about internationalization, producing internationalization assessments which entail an analytical approach to internationalization development. However, given the position of power in developing internationalization, role of the CIMO in shaping internationalization discourse is top-down, rather than representing an independent voice in the discussion. The strategy document analysed in Chapter 7 is an extension of the recent *Internationalization Strategy* published by the Ministry. This CIMO document has a marketing purpose. One can see that the layout is designed to catch attention, and the statements are short and impressive. It lacks a critical and analytical angle on the state of the art in Finnish education (which is present in the strategy for internationalization, for instance). Consequently, this is a substantiation of the need to internationalize, rather than a development of solutions or review of practices. Then, there is a collection of articles by the CIMO called *Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education*. For the purposes of my analysis, I consider these as an extended narrative of internationalization. The release of the publication was timed to match the new internationalization policy, as it is substantiated in several articles; they provide an overview of internationalization development rather than an analytical outlook. The Research and Innovation Council of Finland is aligned with governmental structures as well, and it primarily tackles research. However, the document discusses internationalization features, alongside research and education. The need for international cooperation is justified by the search for innovative measures, given the conditions of the economic downturn.

Context is quite important in understanding the meaning of the internationalization plan; which consists of national and university frameworks. There are both external and internal stimuli to engage in internationalization. Externally, the universities are influenced by the overall discourse of higher education, where internationalization is considered important. Internally, they have to consider their resources from multiple perspectives (Frolich & Vega, 2005; Frolich, 2008). In this study, I analyse university-level internationalization through university policies and internationalization policies. The general framework for internationalization is determined at the European and national levels, and the university adjusts according to its profile.

Finally, I scrutinize the systematic evaluation of international degree programs produced by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (FINHEEC, a unit

under FINEEC, The Finnish Education Evaluation Center), which included questionnaires covering the major features of degree programs' functioning and on-site interviews including aspects of practical organization. As the organization steering the work of universities and the polytechnic schools, the FINHEEC functions under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. Members of the Council are appointed for 4-year terms. This document was appealing, as it was an investigation of the international degree programs as a social phenomenon, and it did not claim to be a scientific inquiry of the issue. It is especially interesting for providing a discussion of the prerequisites of successful performance, and it presents multiple perspectives on the key features of master's program functioning.

Internationalization planning documents	
European Commission 2002	Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries
European Commission 2006	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation
European Commission 2007	Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Report on the interim evaluation of the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme 2004–2008
European Commission 2010	Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on 'Universities for Europe'
European Commission 2011	Commission Working Document on Recent Developments in European Higher Educations Systems
European Commission 2013	Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. European Higher Education in the World
European Parliament 2015	Internationalisation of Higher Education: Study
CIMO 2015	Strategy 2020: Towards a global-minded Finland

Research and Innovation Council of Finland 2009	Internationalisation of Finnish Education, Research and Innovation
FINHEEC 2013 (now FEEC)	An Evaluation of International Degree Programmes in Finland, the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council
Ministry of Education 2001	An international strategy for higher education
Ministry of education 2009	An international strategy for higher education.
Ministry of Education and Culture 2012	Education and Research 2011–2016
University of Eastern Finland 2012	Internationalisation Policy of the University of Eastern Finland 2012–2015.
University of Helsinki 2012	The best for the world. Strategic plan for the University of Helsinki 2013–2016
University of Oulu 2012	Strategy 2012–2015
University of Tampere 2010	Let's shape the future! Change in the University of Tampere 2010–2015
University of Turku 2012	University of Turku Strategy 2013–2016
University of Vaasa	Strategy of the University of Vaasa 2013–2016

Initially, I conducted a pilot study, interviewing four professors and communicating with several students. I asked a wide range of unfocused questions about internationalization. I wanted to understand what internationalization is. I was reading the academic literature on the topic, but I wanted to find out the practical, individual perspectives. This pilot study gave me a lot of polished, standard, and socially desirable answers, and also a mess of perspectives about us/them and who is international (the hierarchy of different foreigners), and whether something is international enough or not. Another layer of answers was disillusionment with the actual practices, both from the teachers' and the students' perspectives, when something was undermined by the way it was organized (difficulties to understand the teacher and poorly organized courses on the one hand, and poorly selected students and problems with the administration on the other). This discrepancy was

an interesting point to develop, so I took it as an approach for further data collection.

During the further inquiry, I worked with four programs to ensure a diversity of respondents and organizational approaches. I had to rethink the interview so that it would be closely linked to the respondents' own experiences. The questions were based on distinguishing between normative conceptions of education, planning and implementation. The first part of the interview focused on education values; the questions addressed internationalization among the valuable qualities of the university, exploring the links between internationalization and quality, and the definition and delimitations of international studies. The second part of the interview was about internationalization practices; questions reflected the major parts of the education process, internationalization practices and outcomes. The respondents for the interview were students who had studied at least one semester in the master's program as a full-time student, as well as teachers involved in planning or giving a course in the program.

Interview structure		
	Students	teachers
Normative ideas	university characteristics	
	Internationalization and quality of education	
	International program	
	Inefficient international education	
Planning and practices	Goals of the administration, teachers and students	Creation of master's programs, switching to English
	Program choice(s), parameters, sources, missing sources	Goals that are not yet realized
	Admission process, positive and negative	Target group of students, current students
	Teaching	Planning of teaching in the program
	Practice-related training	Involving international scholars
	Intercultural communication	Practice-related training
	International elements of the program	Skills after the program
	Employment opportunities and plans	Employment opportunities
	Personal development	

The 40 interviews that I use in this analysis lasted from 40 minutes to 1.5 hours each, which in the text version turned into 8–14 pages of the data. I transcribed

interviews as close to the audio version as possible, including all repetitions, colloquial phrases and emphasis. All interviews were conducted in English.

In collecting the data, I aimed at reaching different types of information. In order to establish my knowledge about the overall university functioning, I attended the organizational meetings that were open to public and had communication with university officials the international events. To ensure a greater proxy for the everyday processes at the university, I decided to do the interviews with teachers and students.

I established connections with my research sites, via email and explained the scope of my study and ensure the anonymity of the programs. To recruit respondents initially, I asked the program coordinators to distribute my message about the study. After that, the participants were recruited via snowball sampling. I had to travel several times for 1-2-day visits, and later on I maintained an email communication with 1-2 people at the program. I realized that my sample is saturated, once participants discussed the same examples, courses and events, and when in the broader context of four programs I could spot the equivalent interpretations and explanations of the problems. In the following analysis of Chapters 6 and 7 I refer to the student interviews as S, and to the teacher interviews as T.

To make an atmosphere at the interviews friendly, I usually had a little informal conversation with the respondents, sharing my path towards a PhD and migration experiences.

To some extent, that served as a shared ground with different students, since some of them visited same universities as I did over the years, others had recently moved to Finland, and yet others were thinking about doing a PhD in future. Yet, I could not say that I had an insider or outsider perspective on the internationalization of the master's programs. Rather, there were elements of communication that shifted from one interview to another. For instance, although some of my participants were Russian, I did not assume that cultural proximity would give me a different perspective (Ganga & Scott 2006). Neither it was the shared foreignness that was an entry point in other interviews. If there was one common factor that played a role in communication, this was a mutual understanding about each other's educational pathways and the international experiences. I kept communication with some of the students after the interview and picked up on the topics of the interview or other international experiences.

4.4 Discourse analysis approach

As discourse analysis includes varied traditions, the version of the method applied in this thesis is outlined below. I start with a general description of the method (4.4) used within this analysis. Then, I concretize the application of the analysis (4.5), exploring the perspective on documents (4.5.1) and the approach towards the interviews (4.5.2). In the last subchapter (4.5.3), I explicate the emergence of

categories within the analysis. I start with the dimensions of text typically utilized within critical discourse analysis. Then, I move on towards the categories specific to my inquiry and exemplify three kinds of them: a pre-existing category that stems from the question, a category emerging from within the analysis, and a category generated as a result of the analysis.

The essence of the analysis is in examining how internationalization is discussed; therefore, tracing the construction of a wide variety of arguments is crucial. Texts, conversations and interactions serve specific purposes in social contexts. They represent specific patterns of communication, which have circumstances of production, dissemination and reception (Reisigl, 2017, 10). These texts and their broader context constitute discourse, which sustains a particular topic within society and the ways of speaking about it. Language is socially practiced, constituting and reinforcing social reality (Wodak, 2001).

In contrast to a text or a conversation, discourse also involves a larger context; it actively engages with, rather than just represents, social phenomena (Wodak, 2001). This is often described through the Foucauldian notion of 'dispositive', which includes the analysis of the discursive and non-discursive aspects as a macro context contributing to the social order (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 25). Some of CDA (critical discourse analysis) approaches aim at tracing historical change (Reisigl, 2017, 11). Although my attention to this aspect of internationalization discourse is limited, I capture the continuity of internationalization development by involving two internationalization strategies and citing early sources on internationalization research in Finland. Another important dimension of discourse, studied by several branches of CDA, is represented by social actors and their internal perspectives (Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Reisigl, 2017, 3). This point of departure is central for my analysis.

Another important standpoint of the study is a consideration of power relations, which is characteristic of critical discourse analysis (Wodak, 2001). The latent nature of everyday beliefs and hidden ideologies contribute to the neutrality of the discourse, reinforcing social and political inequalities (Wodak & Meyer, 2002). Therefore, this kind of analysis often argues a political stance and aims at drawing practical implications from the analysis (Reisigl, 2017, 7).

I advance my analysis with the key concepts of internationalization, the university and master's programs, and their operationalization. The initial strategy was to uncover the framing issues: the use of national belonging, diversity and culture, as well as knowledge orientations and references to the data. Moreover, one of the critical aspects of the discourse is the context in which discussions about international students take place, which demonstrates othering, a perceived deficiency of skills and the lack of overall information about them. Within my research focus, this means examining what characteristics and functions are attributed to the individual and higher education institution within the larger context

of higher education politics. I spotted these tendencies in the data and the academic literature.

Two types of texts are at the centre of my analysis. First, policy texts are a part of naturally occurring discourse. Second, interviews with teachers and students are the texts induced by the researcher's participation. Although the latter type of text is not typically favoured in discourse analysis, I would argue that in the context of my research it is even more important to delve into the conversations about internationalization, linking ideas and examples of the everyday issues. Since openness to the genres of talk and explanation is essential for CDA, while constructing the interviews I tried to locate the study in real-life experiences. Also, I utilized everyday language and waited for the respondents to identify their understandings, trying to avoid interpretations within the questions.

Texts, in a variety of genres, are the central items under examination. Critical discourse analysis conceptualizes them as a social action, exemplifying structural features of power that enable or disable action (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 10). Upon closer look, an analyst could spot representations of different discourses, contemplations of ideologies that fight for dominance in concrete formulations (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 10). For instance, the internationalization policy texts utilize a variety of different frameworks drawing on the marketized academic discourse, internationally competitive discourse or traditional and nationally oriented discourse, often within the same formulations. They are often written by a group of persons and reconcile different visions. Moreover, CDA draws on the broader context of reading and writing, taking into consideration the conditions in which the documents were created, publication, distribution and reception by the intended audience (Coleman, 2013).

Apart from theorizing context, Wodak and Meyer also comment on knowledge creation within the discourse, which is in-between the language and the social context (2009, 13-14). This focus involves recreation of the cognitive models and conceptualizations that are behind the text. It is studied by critical discourse analysts as mediation, and the emphasis on these aspects varies from one analysis to the other. I find it fruitful to uncover the "subjective definitions of the relevant properties of communicative situations that influence text and talk" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 14). This supports my idea of deriving subjective understandings of internationalization and its dimensions, since alleviating the range of individual perspectives gives a perspective on gaps.

To examine the claims made in the statements about internationalization, I considered the language devices. In CDA, discourses are constituted by "relatively stable uses of language serving the organization and structuring of social life" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 6). The critical aspect of this analysis is in explicating the interconnections of different aspects and exploring the expression of power and ideology. For example, internationalization is often used as a catchphrase, which is manifested in the wide variety of meanings that it has acquired and in its

usage as a sign of prestige, presumed education quality or success. But when the discursive use of the term is so elusive, it also influences practices, since academic provisions are not sufficiently specified in policies. We could assume that their realization in practice could vary, since in contrast to the economic gains stated in the documents, the realization is not elaborated upon in the texts. This kind of internationalization is sustained and reproduced across several governance levels, which can be especially seen in the continuity of the European, national and university documents.

Internationalization is reproduced in spoken discourses from another perspective. In interviews, many students also referred to discussions among themselves about the gains and continuity of their studies from one place to another in terms of internationalization. Linguistic forms are characteristic of the social practices in use, making sense of the experiences that people have in education. Therefore, eliciting how normative orientations, planning provisions, and claims about practices are formulated both from the policy and individual perspectives ensures a diversity of internationalization discourses.

Yet, linguistic aspects in the narrow sense are less developed in my analysis. I was conscious of the fact that internalization typically relies on the medium of English as a second language (though there were several native speakers among my respondents). Therefore, I wanted to avoid overinterpreting the choice of words or grammar. However, I concentrated on the commonly used phrases and contexts of internationalization. I analysed the data so that the major message is taken first, and then linguistic structures are taken into account. Following Schiffrin (1994), this is a functionalist approach to language, which pays attention to the language in use, rather than being constrained by linguistic forms and their operationalization.

However, struggles for power and control, in this case in the field of educational ideas, are channeled through language. For instance, in internationalization this is evidenced by the choice of aspects that are described as internationalization. Language does not generate power, but it could express or challenge the dominant position. This drives attention to the descriptions of inequalities, discrimination and power hierarchies, and what the use of language means for these purposes (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 10). Therefore, with the respondents I was trying to focus on questions of normativity, views on education, and the other questions concerning everyday experiences.

Critical discourse theorists consider several layers of context, which expand the understanding of the particular texts under analysis (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 10; Reisigl, 2017, 12-13). First, there are intertextual factors, which involve a relationship with other texts, genres and discourses, establishing the context and recontextualization. Second, another layer of context encompasses social factors and institutional frames, which means interactive and political roles and their operationalization must be considered. Finally, there is the broader context of social,

political and historical factors that impact the rivalry of discourses in public spaces.

The discourse of internationalization certainly has ideological effects, especially when many issues are taken for granted and internationalization is argued in economic and political terms. This contributes to the emergent gaps in relation to student experiences. The realization of this ideology constitutes the relations of power and the status quo – of how internationalization is enacted; this functioning of ideology is constitutive of practice (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 8-9).

Critical discourse analysis approaches ideology as a stable set of beliefs about something. The power of these considerations surpasses the inquiries of the relevant information. This means that the need and presence of internationalization is more important than inquiring about performance in this sphere and value generated by it. Ideologies then feed into personal evaluations and individuals also internalize internationalization as an element of success. Ideological dispositions also induce actions, as when acquiring international credentials becomes a path to a successful career. Finally, all of these actions to some extent are based on a stable belief that traveling and a diversity of experiences provides educational value. Although hegemonic, this kind of idea can hardly be refuted. Outside of political theory, it is easy to understand ideology as a neutral belief. However, it has latent assumptions, and in common discourse (e.g. concerning higher education) they are often left unchallenged.

4.5 Application of analysis

The research problem in this study addresses the nature of knowledge about internationalization. I started out by questioning what kinds of claims are being made, and how they are operationalized in the educational environment. The gaps claimed by different actors drew attention to expressions of how it is, how it should be, and what could be done about it. This opened up distinctions between ideology and practice. Then, I realized that these dimensions are different for different actors according to their experience and position in education. This helped me to develop a critical dimension, claiming that taken-for-granted normative aspects go along with loose planning for internationalization. By also acknowledging the political pressure for quick calculable results, it is predictable that practices receive fragmented attention.

At the initial stage of data analysis, I was mapping the major strands of the arguments. My intention was to discover what was implied by internationalization, what characteristics, links and comparisons this concept acquired, and what positive and negative valuations respondents gave to it. Since I aimed at analyzing the gaps, keeping the distinction between the ‘idea’ and ‘practice’ in mind was essential. However, upon closer reading, I realized that students and teachers engaged quite a lot with planning, implementation and evaluating the work of the

university. The focus on institutional responsibility in sustaining internationalization emerged. I started to pay more attention to the students as recipients of institutional practices and their agency in co-constructing education.

Therefore, when I turned my attention towards document analysis, the broad statements that would be impossible to implement emerged in a new light. I started wondering about the role of these broad normative ideas in the processes on the ground. Apparently, it was not only the problem of neoliberal, competitive discourse, but also the absence of tangible steps that made the practice of internationalization so alienating from its normative dimension. My next step was to think about how the three domains of normative ideas, planning, and practices interact and reinforce or inhibit each other. I kept these notes and drawings in the paper version, and later on Atlas.ti.

4.5.1 Document Analysis

For the document study specifically, I used discourse analysis to determine how policies speak about internationalization, what kind of significance they ascribe to different actors, and how they shape the discourse. Articulating internationalization is a 'discursive event'. It is in 'dialectical relationship' with situations, institutions and actors; they have a mutual influence (Wodak, 2002, 8). Policy documents generate legitimations of what internationalization is, how it is justified, and what kind of actions advance internationalization; thus, they produce 'truth claims' and "constitute rather than reflect social reality" (Ball, 2015, 307). Along with that, policies are a value-laden map. They label practices as successful, exploring 'what works', and in this way they create ideologies of education (Ball, 2015, 308). However, the framework adopted in my research maintains that this is not an exhaustive stock of ideologies; involving other perspectives brings about a range of normativities. And finally, discussion upheld by policies does not equal internationalization as a transformative process in education; although the discourses reinforced by individuals do not yield powerful standpoints, they partake in an exchange of ideas. I argue that as result policy is embedded in the macro discourse, it lacks considerations about individuals in education.

Then, I adopted for my analysis the idea of Schrag, who stated that since policy debates are about what to do, they have to rely on normative and factual premises (Schrag, 2002). Thus, in Chapter 5, I try to illuminate the assumptions that constitute the discourse and analyse the internationalization measures they imply.

Childress (2009) distinguishes several types of internationalization plans: 1) when internationalization statements are found in the general institutional strategy, 2) documents that focus exclusively on internationalization, and 3) plans of particular units within the university. Under the first category, internationalization issues are either infused throughout the document, listed as bullet-point objec-

tives, distinguished as a separate section or marked as needing further development. Under the second category, there are three subcategories: general, specific and under development. Details, resource allocation and timeframe development are included in this categorization. In the third category, there are documents created by specialized units. The first two categories require more attention from the institutional leadership, as the work cannot be outsourced to a specific unit.

Internationalization policy at the institution is not a manual on how to do internationalization, but rather a set of broad guidelines establishing an institutional position. This follows the approach of Saarinen, who identified policy text in education not as a reflection of social processes and structures, but as the one creating and reinforcing them (Saarinen, 2008, 719). Correspondingly, Teichler is sceptical about internationalization policy being an actual depiction of internationalization activities. They are dispersed within the institution, and they range from short-term collaborations to specific activities in teaching and research, which are often stimulated by the personal networks of the faculty.

Certainly, top-down planning takes place as well (for instance, when cooperation agreements are signed between different institutions), but these are often "symbolic reinforcements" endorsed by several interested individuals. This does not characterize internationalization in general at the institution. The evaluations as well are not informative about actual education advancement; the number of foreign students and researchers is called by Teichler "an artificial aggregation of dispersed and diverse international links" (Teichler, 2009, 100). Although Teichler identifies the shift towards a systematic approach, this development still varies. Therefore, measurements and policies are a good indication of the position and conception of internationalization at the institutional and national levels.

Rather than being a proxy for internationalization practices, these exemplify governance practices, which prioritize national development and macro-level processes rather than developments within education. Policy documents support the education ideology, but with internationalization it makes a special case, since the strategy is competitive, and the process is image-driven to a large extent.

4.5.2 Interview analysis

Policy does not focus on individuals, but they are located within it as objects, so its analysis contextualizes the established ideological frameworks (Althusser, 1969). Among the competing discourses of internationalization, the individual dimension is clearly less prevalent. Therefore, in the interview part of the study I also asked participants to discuss overall education discourse, beyond their current experience in education. I solicited their views on education, university development and internationalization, along with the current practices at the university. I separated these accounts from their personal situation; I do not explain them in terms of gender, age, national origin and so on. My goal is to uncover a wide range

of perspectives on internationalization and ascribe equal legitimacy to them vis-à-vis the university and education system.

On the one hand, this reveals the socially constructed nature of representations of education, as participants either reproduce, transform or nuance the widely spread discourses. On the other hand, this offers a perspective with a different starting point, namely, experiences within education, which policy does not include.

Based on the block of similar interview questions to participants (administrators, teachers and students), I summarize multiple aspects of understandings of internationalization. The analysis is structured in three sections: internationalization definition, delimitations and value, which explicate the normative positions on education and internationalization. Nonetheless, this distinction is rather artificial, and all three of these are interconnected in the perspectives on internationalization.

The internationalization definition in this case mainly concerns study-related characteristics, not university politics. My goal was to capture the most essential characteristics of international studies according to students and teachers. Then, I was interested in the delimitations of internationalization, when some elements in education are no longer considered international. There are myths and misunderstandings of the internationalization explored in the literature; these showed the narrow level of understanding of the concept (Knight, 2011; De Wit, 2011). My interest was to explore the issue further, to see when education that was planned to be international is not perceived as such by teachers and students. Finally, through analysis of the interviews I tried to reveal the value of international studies for education, according to the participants. In the academic literature on internationalization, there is an assumption that an international element means higher quality of education. I was interested in the ways in which value is established, along with explanations on what educational processes are enhanced due to internationalization.

Analysing the second part of the interviews, I made a summary of perspectives on internationalization practices, following the educational process from admission to the opportunities upon graduation. I organized the responses on the questionnaires into patterns, focusing on specific issues which are important in internationalization, and compare the responses to particular questions among students and teachers.

4.5.3 Emergence of Categories throughout analysis:

I started my analysis from the answers to the questions, and from there I derived broad categories for further exploration. In the text below, I present major dimensions of analysis, they include modalities, rhetorical structure, naturalization, temporal characteristics and actors. These are features of the text, which sustain an

argument. Then, I represent the analysis with the examples of three categories, that emerged at the different stages of inquiry and were incorporated into the major reasoning. The first one is an exploration of the gap, the most general category that stemmed from my research design, which through the analysis acquired a nuanced explanation. A second type of category – culture – emerged from the literature review, which revealed that demarcations of the use of this term lead to divergent lines of reasoning in planning and practices. Analysing these categories shed light on the structure of the arguments. Finally, a third type of category – an external characteristic – emerged during the process of data analysis; through revisiting the material, it became saturated and systematized. I illustrate the exploration of this type of category with the notion of internationalization as an external feature of education. I present data in the table that summarizes all the lines of argument contributing to this emergent notion.

Dimensions of text analysis

A closer look at the text presupposes a reliance on linguistic categories, such as actors, mode, tense and time. It also includes an analysis of the structure and logic of the text, implicit implications, evidentialities and quotes (Meyer, 2002; Richardson, 2007; Jeffries, 2010). There is no complete list of devices, as they are to be defined via the research focus, and in the following paragraphs I summarize the categories that were crucial for my research.

Modalities affect the construction of the argument (Potter, 1996), and spotting these devices was especially instrumental in exploring the justifications for internationalization or a particular course of action. These are statements using the formulations of 'should be', or 'could be' to express the conditioning of the normative ideas. They are used especially when criticizing something and arguing for an alternative, e.g. when claiming that all students are students first and foremost, and no one should be considered foreign.

The rhetorical structure of the arguments starts with the outline of the document and its coherence, as well as visual elements that support the text (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 29). The examination of the argumentation includes its level of abstraction, perspectivization, the manner in which the discourse is framed, intensification or mitigation, as well as taking into consideration the order in which the elements are mentioned and their characteristics. Looking closer at the major claims, we can spot political inclusion and exclusion, distinctions between national and international, and positive and negative attributions (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 30). These elements are crucial for both the documents and interviews.

Another diagnostic tool was uncovering 'naturalization', or when something is considered as given and acceptable in its own right (Fairclough, 1995). This can be illustrated by statements of stipulation, or inescapability, that are frequently found in the internationalization argument when internationalization is condi-

tioned by globalization and competition. This inquiry brought up a set of dichotomies that often appear simultaneously within the internationalization argument: universal versus applied values of knowledge; national versus international belonging and characteristics; economic and cultural rationales in education; and competitive versus collaborative university tactics. Omissions from the discourse also acquire significance (Fairclough, 1992). Upon analysing the patterns contributing to the production of text, I also pay attention to the missing elements. Finally, evidentialities are the figures of speech that claim certain things to be either self-evident, known, or as referred-to by some sources; the choice of validation was also important.

Some scholars claim that it is important to watch out for temporal characteristics as they appear in internationalization discourse. A dimension of time is critical for understanding internationalization, e.g. when university policies argue for the 'future' vision of the university, or when changes are legitimized as demanded by time or as part of the zeitgeist (e.g., Teichler, 1999, 170; Rivza & Teichler, 2007, 471). Being a rhetorical tool for actors, this turns into an empirical, analytical category for the researcher (Stier & Börjesson, 2010). Although I retain the temporal element by comparing old and new forms of internationalization policy, in my case it was also important to reveal what kinds of 'anchors' or justifications are used for internationalization. In the planning dimension, internationalization is often involved in the future tense and linked to statements of ambition.

Finally, I studied the representation of different actors within the discourse, which are "textual instantiations of models of the self and others, both individual and collective" (Koller, 2009). These instances range from the pronominal structure, the mentioning of specific persons or groups of people, as well as membership categorizations, e.g. the use of the pronoun 'we' (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, 12, 29-30). Considering the processes of power and its impersonations was also relevant and they are analysable through the decision-making claims (Nikander, 2006, 5). The relative weight that is given to individuals and institutions within statements also illuminates inequalities. For this matter, I looked at quotes, references to authorities or the use of direct and indirect speech.

Pre-existing category: exploring gaps

The idea of the gap was explored before; it captured the differing representations of international education among the students and teachers (Hall et al., 2009) were captured. My addition was to employ it methodologically to unpack the statements about internationalization.

An example from the planning perspective can be found in Kuortti (2009), which projects the impact of the ERASMUS project on the future of education in terms of reduced "negative dependency on national identity". This is an ideal of the planning within the context of ERASMUS. The ideas about the usefulness of ERASMUS are normative, and the imaginary dimension is evident even in the

title: "Once upon a time there was ERASMUS: A reality-based time travel to the history of our future" (Kuortti, 2009). The author also asks if the state in this case is just an extended stakeholder group, projecting that internationalization will eventually remove it from the central role in education. This is a normative understanding of the anticipated future of internationalization, which may or may not be realized in practice. The gap typically emerges between the 'ideals' of internationalization, plans and practices; each statement on international education touches upon one or more of these dimensions.

Robson (2011) speaks about the impact of internationalization on 'individuals and communities', and what 'internationalized' institution is. Assumed ideals of internationalization are an explanation for the perceived 'gap'. Rizvi (2011, 700) utilizes the concept of the 'imaginary', which is included in the normative ideas within my research. He claims that reflexivity in education could bring up an alternative imaginary aimed at reviving cosmopolitan ideas in education. Scholarship on internationalization ideology was stimulated by the academic discussion problematizing the "academic values" of internationalization (IAU, 2012). Subsequent publications explored multiple representations of internationalization. In order to account for this gap, one should distinguish between the major ideological frameworks. Mostly they are assumed, and we can only discretely infer them by looking at policies, strategic plans and even studies of practice. The research about the preconceptions underlying certain internationalization patterns is in its early stages.

Marmolejo (2012) also talks about the discrepancies of the popular rhetoric of internationalization, and how many relevant issues are considered when planning takes place. He reveals unexpected problems, such as which countries are more or less viewed as potential partners. Here we could speak about the gaps between ideology and planning. To explore this gap, it would be instrumental to reveal the major internationalization data that policy-makers and administrators rely on when considering the future steps of education development.

The depiction of the gaps depends on the perspective and the macro or micro focus that is adopted; they are socially constructed. To some extent, they are inevitable, as a natural discrepancy exists between ideals and the reality. Despite the limitations, the university, country and region arrive at certain internationalization set-up. This is another way to discuss the process and impact of internationalization. This does not imply, however, that we should not pursue any assessments or ways to account for these gaps; in different situations, internationalization may or may not work for different people.

Category generated within the analysis: culture

Within the arguments about internationalization, the definition of culture is context-driven, case-dependent, and often entails a purpose. These kinds of notions

are social constructions; their problematization emerges from analysis of the literature, and a subsequent exploration of practices often provides supplementing or alternative perspectives.

Internationalization inevitably involves discussion about cultures and geographic regions, as de Wit postulates: "The notion of 'internationalization' is not only a question of the relations between nations but even more to the relations between cultures and between the global and the local" (de Wit, 2012). However, some of these discussions, especially about culture, point towards ethical boundaries. Cultural explanations are often used to make quick generalizations and to account for regularities untouched by deeper reflection. Using an alternative academic tradition, I assume that individuals are differently affected by culture, and fruitful cultural insights require extensive elaboration. When the number of cultural combinations is infinite, as in the international classroom, it is simply impossible to account for the cultural impacts in internationalization.

An example of culture used as a quick generalization can be taken from the article by Hénard et al. (2013), which claims that internationalization opens space for a multiplicity of attitudes towards teaching and learning; at the same time, it includes a cautious remark that "while recognizing that some behaviour is ethically acceptable in some cultures and countries and not in others, institutions have faced growing challenges to clearly define ethical standards" (2013, 34). This implies that one of the major things brought up by increasing diversity is a challenge of ethics. The article takes a broad view that people coming from different countries practices that are unacceptable from the perspective of our norms. Meanwhile, neither specific cultures nor practices are mentioned, which does not allow assessment of this inference. When this kind of perspective is adopted in planning and implementation, it erodes the idea of enrichment through internationalization.

Another problem with using cultural arguments is that most often culture is interrelated with power, and without deep analysis our arguments are going to miss that aspect. As Anne Philips writes: "cultural difference is more often read as cultural hierarchy than cultural variation" (2010, 20). In our context, this means that culture is often used to explain undesirable practices. Then, given the overall imbalance of power between different cultures, it is impossible to discuss them, allocating equal value. Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) refer to "overemphasis on the western context"; even two decades almost after that publication, decolonization of knowledge is not yet a universally accepted practice.

The point of departure taken in this research is to approach culture as a signatory of discourse development, requiring further exploration, and never as an explanatory framework. Dervin cites Martine Abdallah-Pretceille (2006, 480), who claims: "No fact is intercultural at the outset, nor is the quality of intercultural an attribute of an object, it is only intercultural analysis that can give it this character" (Dervin, 2013, 7). This means that involving culture in explanations often encounters decision-making on what is culture and what is not culture. As Dervin claims:

"as a practitioner or a researcher, we might decide that such or such a situation is intercultural or multicultural without even consulting the people who are taking part in the situation – and who may not consider it as such but just an act of interaction between friends, lovers, etc. The labels that we use always tend to be viewpoints and beliefs that we need to question" (Dervin, 2013, 7). Therefore, cultural arguments have a tendency to be imposed on individuals in a negative way.

I avoid intercultural reasoning. Even if our worldview is shaped by culture and its linguistic forms, this is very hard to take into account in an international classroom where the combinations of different cultures could be infinite. In my arguments, I move away from defining the undefinable. Although this inevitably appears in the respondents' perspectives, here I leave it to self-reports. Internationalization is challenging the education system and bringing a diversity of perspectives into the classroom and to governance. I ascribe a central role to students in interpreting their studies.

Category generated as a result of analysis: external characteristic

Finally, here is an example of an emergent category that was deciphered through recurrent analysis. First, I inquired into this by addressing the content that is referred to as internationalization; this complements the definition argued in the academic literature. Second, I delved into the composition of the argument and the dichotomies of national-international, cultural-economic, and individual-state. Third, since I spotted this in the planning discourse, my idea was to see how it is reflected in the normative ideas and transferred into practices.

Internationalization as an external characteristic: Composition of category	
Classification	Example
Acknowledgement	Rankings, positive characteristic of qualities in research and teaching, overall university performance
External determinants	Not transformational, not inducing changes in teaching but merely helping the university to cope with globalization pressures
External purposes	Country-level rationales
External outcomes	Extending to society as a whole, rather than changes in education
Macro planning	External environment as requiring greater reaction than the university's internal environment, always changing, no clear priorities

Macro assessment	Adjusting performance via indicators, comparing to other countries
Funding	Search for resources from other places rather than investment in internal development
External conditions for development	For example, marketing rather than improvement
External as a boundary	Internationalization depends on what we call 'us', geographic unit. Also, the idea of competition externally and public services internally
External activities within the university	Idea of long-term internationalization is changing this, but there are many obstacles
Separate planning	Additional challenges in terms of language, organization of teaching and student mingling
New roles	The term 'foreign student' is rejected in planning, yet there is no established place for students from abroad; identifying deficiencies in comparison with domestic students
External as a standard and as a stimulus	When students hope that internationalization would improve teaching

Initially, I noticed this feature in the arguments about globalization. Then, there were arguments about internationalization as a positive characteristic of teaching, research and university performance. Attempting to find a common ground between these arguments, I accumulated a web of conceptions that also posit internationalization as an external characteristic.

4.6 Research ethics

In conducting the interviews, I followed the ethical guidelines laid out by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics (2009). Throughout my study, I enhanced awareness of my research purposes and ensured the anonymity of the respondents. The initial email inquiry contained a brief research description. Then, before the interview, I thoroughly explained the questions and the way this data would be handled. I also offered the opportunity to request a transcript or recording later on, if the participant had doubts. I did not receive any requests, though I

continued communication with some of the respondents and thus had an opportunity to verify certain suppositions.

The anonymity of the responses was ensured by removing direct references to people and their study program from the transcripts. I also removed the country of origin of the participants, since some of the programs are small settings with only one person from a particular country. Overall, the students and teachers were comfortable answering the questions and there were no concerns about the interview content. In a small number of cases, teachers and students shared information which they wanted to be 'off the record'. Therefore, I used it in this way, noting general information but never quoting it. However, in order not to distort the picture, I tried to find alternative evidence for a tendency (i.e. attending public discussions on internationalization).

An important issue during the data collection was program confidentiality. The program administrators were especially concerned about sensitive information about their unit. For this reason, I concealed information about the programs.

4.7 Validity of the study

This was an exploratory study, and I did not rely on a pre-existing theory. I had an idea about the split between the 'ideals' of education, which are possessed by individuals and institutions, and the realities claimed to be one way or another. Upon examining the individuals' accounts, documents and blogs on internationalization, I decided on a framework of normative ideas, planning and practices. Afterwards, I was able to identify the literature supporting each of these domains.

Early on, I realized that the way internationalization is discussed is bounded by the state. Therefore, my idea was to bring in an alternative vision that would give details on the overlooked aspects of internationalization. Apart from focusing on individual perspectives, I tried to overcome the national and institutional points of view in the reasoning. Internationalization as a state agenda was denounced as a normative construction, and student views were not taken as an illustration of the large-scale developments in higher education. My intention was to refocus the debate towards everyday processes and changes in the education process, and then to contextualize them in terms of the larger picture. Along with my overall interpretation, I tried to keep the individuals' perspectives within the text by retaining the maximum possible number of quotes. I established long-term communication with some of the interviewees after the initial interview, and I shared my insights on internationalization with them.

Over several years of doing this research, I became familiar with the broad context of internationalization. I went to many events concerning internationalization, both within universities and at other kinds of organizations involved in higher education. I attended the events for the international students and participated in the meetings of organizations that dealt with international student issues.

Finally, I collected the printed materials on internationalization. This supplied me with an important information context for verifying my interpretations.

I enjoyed critical discussions with a researcher on a related topic. We shared a focus on the same environment, though with a different purpose of inquiry and methodological approach. This dialog allowed me to articulate some of my ongoing thinking about the topic. Apart from that, I had many interactions and shared my ongoing inquiry with the scholars of the same field, whose interest and research experience contributed to my progress.

Although I have tried to present a multifaceted picture in regard to my research question, further inquiries in the topic would certainly complement the understanding of the phenomena. One expanded investigation would be to consider the programs within other subject areas. Only programs of the social sciences are in my research focus; this is based on the idea that because of their study focus they would derive the most meaning of internationalization, especially concerning the link of "internationalization-education quality". While analysing the interviews, I tried to note specifically the comments regarding the role of the internationalized study focus. Other programs could develop essentially different relationships with internationalization. First of all, because of their clear link with the job market (i.e. business administration), they could differ in student demand and their support of the university administration. Second, because of their specific study focus (i.e. biochemistry), they could see internationalization simply as a way to communicate with a larger pool of colleagues; thus, the link between education quality and internationalization would not be even questioned.

Finally, there is an acknowledged problem of the positive bias in internationalization studies: reputation is important for universities, and they are not eager to report internationalization problems. Since the respondents are also personally involved in the programs, under certain conditions they also might hesitate to express criticism. Although I had an impression of acquiring both positive and negative statements, it could be that some critical nuances did not make it into the final picture.

5 Chapter: Planning of internationalization

Introduction: expectations and impact of internationalization

Chapter 5 is about internationalization planning in Finland. Drawing on the document analysis, I discuss what goals are set to advance it and how it is linked to university development. In 5.1, I provide an overview of the range of issues brought up by internationalization and explore the tacit meaning attached to this concept. Policies of internationalization are statements stimulating the understanding of internationalization within the institution, country or larger geographic unit. There is a focus on the reasons and conditions serving as a justification for internationalization, as well as the relevant measures suggested in response. Despite the prevalence of top-down governance processes, actual internationalization projects are loosely correlated with policy text. Yet, documents sustain the discourse and reinforce certain issues within education, which are a target of my analysis. In 5.2, I analyse European and national-level planning, where internationalization is a part of the overall development. The state attaches a transformative meaning to internationalization; it serves national purposes. Nationally focused, strategic, top-down and economically motivated internationalization is a European or national-level activity, a response to globalization. Transformations within the university and improvements in education receive considerably less attention. In 5.3, I show that at the university level, internationalization is finally bound to education, where there is an expectation of narrowing down and adjustment of internationalization to the institutional needs. While having certain autonomy in the academic activities, universities are dependent on the state in financial, planning and assessment issues. Narrowing down to the project, I trace the way in which international master's programs appear in the documents and what kind of significance they have in the whole picture of internationalization. In 5.4, I talk about the lack of data that surfaces within the analysis of the policy documents. Planning entails simultaneously striving for efficiency and reliance on the few inaccurate indicators (e.g. mobility rates). Closer focus on implementation demonstrates multiple data deficiencies. Finally, in 5.5 I discuss the ethical concerns that arise within the university due to internationalization. This shows the discrepancy between planning and normative ideas.

Contradictory ideas within internationalization discourse represent one way to account for the gaps in planning and practices. The analysis of the scholarship on internationalization planning (Chapter 2) exposed several tendencies, and the analysis below shows how these feed into internationalization conceptualization and planning. Key topics within internationalization are endorsed at the national

level, such as internationalization as a search for unexplored resources (i.e. revenues from international students or fruitful collaborations) and internationalization as a pathway to changes within Finland (i.e. attracting skilled migrants from abroad). While the boundary between national and international level arguments is blurred within planning, the key tendency is to argue responsibilities within the national or EU unity, and outward competitiveness. This makes internationalization an external activity, which is accented on the aspects outside of the university and outside of the national or European unity.

As I have already pointed out in Chapter 2, academic justifications of internationalization are presented far less within the planning discourse. Document analysis shows that they are considered with economic rationales and always underpinned by the interest of the state. In this way, the institutional perspective is contextualized by governance choices, rather than the education process or the perspectives of students and staff.

Although the idea of internationalization undergoes significant changes over time, it is always oriented towards the burning problems of broader society. Due to this, the aspect of interacting with external stakeholders acquires more relevance in the internationalization reasoning. For instance, there is a change of framework towards long-term internationalization and integration of foreign students in Finland after graduation, which remains at the national level in terms of internationalization reasoning. In the planning, there is a lack of focus on the everyday issues of the university's functioning.

The modern university is transformed into a highly complicated structure. In pursuing competitiveness, universities seek to balance the public and private good in their functions. Although theoretically juxtaposed, these are often contemplated within the operations of a single university. The borderline between international and national issues and public and private functions gives rise to ethical dilemmas. Economic considerations, i.e. globalization and the need to be competitive in it, are brought to the forefront. International students, in the discourse of internationalization planning, are a part of these great expectations. The university's responsibility for this group of students is different from the education of local students, who are part of the public mission of higher education. Another layer in these unresolved controversies is that international projects are carried out with a great deal of extra effort in planning as well as with scarce resources.

5.1 Internationalization as an external characteristic

In this subchapter, I review how the notion of internationalization is nuanced once it is brought up in policy text. My goal here is to come up with a range of operative meanings in the context of policy. The most general conception of internationalization stemming from policy is of transformation leading to an improvement in university competitiveness, argued primarily in economic terms. Globalization is

a perceived condition of higher education development, and internationalization is planned in reaction to the external environment.

This idea of communicating with the outside world is a source of representational aspects of internationalization, such as image-making, reputation and marketing. It is focused on indicators measuring the quality of teaching and research, rather than considering education processes within the university. Internationalization is a way to make education competitive, which means that it is attractive and known as being good quality.

The promotion of European or national higher education in the world is important for internationalization (European Commission, 2002). This envisions successful interactions between the educational system and others, rather than internal changes within the university, transforming the content of education. There are nuances, however, in the perception of the current conditions for development. Economically justified internationalization is optimistically pursued on the European level, while on the national level it either assumes a defensive tactic (CIMO, 2009a) or is conditioned by globalization and the need for development (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009). In both cases, however, internationalization is a reaction towards external stimuli rather than a transformation of education from within.

Determining the scope of the international activities also shows the outward meaning within internationalization. By internationalization, the European Commission implies cooperation with third countries, not cooperation inside the EU (European Commission, 2011). Since EU competence is within its borders, external activities are referred to as internationalization. Accordingly, at the national level, the term internationalization applies to activities outside of the national borders. Regardless of whether the frame of reference shifts from the European to the national level, internationalization is external to the unit of responsibility.

The nature of agency is different on the European, national and institutional levels. Broad direction setting takes place at the EU level, while at the national level there is an adjustment towards national goals. This development is independent and non-linear, but the difference here is in the tangibility of the planning considerations towards the everyday processes in education. And a characteristic feature of planning on the institutional level is that it finally has to deal with the organization of education.

Universities interpret and adjust high-level policies in their documents. The idea of common European or national goals sustain some of the university's rationales for internationalization. The Internationalization Policy of the University of Eastern Finland quotes from the National Strategy, and it concludes that university will address the "above challenges" pointed out at the national level (UEF, 2012, 4). Then, reliance on the objectives of the European Commission is emphasized, and internationalization is attributed to the influence of the Lisbon Strategy. The reason to engage in internationalization is a "transition towards the global

knowledge-based economy" (UEF, 2012, 3). The university ascribes internationalization to developments set up at the global level, outside of the university. It is connected to institutional development, yet macro-level considerations surpass the micro-level arguments about the educational impact and changes within the university.

Yet, narrowing down towards the everyday education processes does not take place. For the university, internationalization is an aspect of its relationship with the state. On the institutional level, competitive and economic-driven internationalization appears to be stratified along lines of service to the state and society, as well as international recognition. It is deemed important for the progress of the country as a whole, rather than regarded as an advance of knowledge, generally confined within education.

Formal acknowledgement is a key feature in international activities. For instance, the University of Eastern Finland aims to be among the three most significant universities in the country and in the top 200 in the world (UEF, 2012, 5). Image-building within and beyond the educational system is a rationale for internationalization, since it is crucial for competitiveness. Formal indicators and rankings may not be the rationales to internationalize, but they become a measurement of progress and status. As the strategy of the University of Helsinki formulates it:

> The coming years will be marked by financial uncertainty. Competition for students, personnel, resources and visibility will increase both in Finland and abroad. The University wishes to select the best students, recruit top quality personnel and invest in experts. To do this, the University will hone both its communications and its public image. We acknowledge the significance of international rankings to the University's visibility, as well as the role of international acknowledgement in ranking high on such lists. (UH, 2011)

From this statement emerges the following chain of dependency: rankings provide the university with international standing; prominence in the international arena improves the university's stakes in competition for 'students, personnel, resources and visibility'; and, lastly, good performance in this competition will help the university tackle fiscal uncertainty. Consequently, even considering all the problems of measurements, universities cannot afford to ignore rankings. Internationalization in its competitive dimension concentrates around image-building, and it also emerges in relations with the outside environment.

The University of Oulu illustrates this tendency, as its mission states:

> The University promotes internationally high-level free research, education and culture, strengthens the knowhow that creates well-being,

> and assures the availability of highly qualified work force and researcher base in our sphere of influence. (UO, 2012)

To be 'internationally high-level' is the aspired characteristic for all university functions. However, sometimes internationality is just broadly defined as 'international operations', naming activities beyond national borders without the changes that are indicative of it (UO, 2012). It is also called 'international presence' in other instances, meaning the number of researchers, teachers and degree students coming from abroad (UO, 2012).

The idea of international as an external characteristic appears in other examples as well. The University of Turku identifies itself as an 'internationally competitive research university' preparing 'internationally competitive experts' and having an 'internationally regarded loci of research' (UTU, 2012, 3). Apparently, 'international' in this context signifies recognition of quality and change in its scope of procedures. It is not the opposite of 'national' (such that 'nationally recognized quality' would be worse and 'national-level functioning' would be outdated). Rather, it signifies that the international-level functioning of the university is essential at the national level.

Internationalization could also appear as a circumstance in society necessitating changes:

> The internationalization and technologization of our societies have led to increasing demands for services and knowledge. In this development, our university has an excellent opportunity to benefit from its strengths in the interface of the private and the public sectors. (UTA, 2010, 4)

As a condition directing university development, internationalization is an external feature as well. This links to the national-level framework, where internationalization surpasses the scope of education and institutional development, serving the overall country progress.

Although internationalization is argued to help national purposes, the prioritizing of outward activities creates hidden tension. The tendency is for the university to compete internationally and provide services to the national community. Competition for resources is an argument in favour of greater internationalization, and entrance into the global education market is one of the tactics. Internationalization is tied to private rather than public functions of the university, which also contributes to its external understanding. Sometimes the university can declare membership in both realms: "The University is part of the international academic community and works in collaboration with society" (UTA, 2012, 3). But the general idea is that there is collaboration within the national system of education or the EU, and competition is pursued outside of these borders.

For instance, the possibilities of partnerships within Finland and internationally are characterized differently:

> Success will also require enhancing collaboration with universities, research institutes and companies. The Aalto University has become one of our most significant partners. By developing collaboration with the Aalto University and the future Helsinki Art University, the University of Helsinki will be able to increase the attractiveness and competitive advantage of the Greater Helsinki area in general and the City of Helsinki in particular. (UH, 2012)

However, the situation outside of the national borders is presented differently:

> The University's international operating environment is changing in rapid and partly unpredictable ways. East Asian countries have asserted their position in international politics. Major global challenges such as climate change, health promotion, sustainable use of natural resources and conflict prevention will create opportunities to strengthen the role of a multidisciplinary university in these developments. (UH, 2012)

This shows collaborative relationships within the national domain and competitive attitudes internationally. Collaboration with Finnish universities will strengthen international competitiveness. At the same time, the conditions for international relationships are unstable and volatile. Internationalization means reaching for new opportunities, but the rationale is based on economic and competitive considerations, being need-based and reactionary. Although the university is positive about succeeding in these new tasks, the difference between these two domains is notable. The division between the national and international does not decrease in internationalization, despite what the discourses of being enriched by diversity, transforming the curriculum and improving quality might suggest.

The contexts analysed above reveal the understanding of internationalization as an external characteristic. First, it is clearly directed externally in terms of activities. While on the European level the operational unity is the EU, at the national level a line is drawn along national boundaries, and everything beyond that is considered a place for international activities. Then, internationalization is driven by the idea of image, in which validation of quality is an important part. There is a division between competitiveness internationally and collaboration on the national level. Finally, there is an externalization of the rationale of internationalization. On the European, national and university levels, it is done to bring about changes in the economy and society rather than internal changes within the uni-

versity. This points towards the lack of university agency in arranging internationalization (analysed further in 5.3). Policy texts are prioritizing the macro-level discourse. Large-scale societal, economic and political impacts contrast with expectations of transforming content. In this context, statements about gaps point towards the deficiency of the academic agenda.

5.2 Scope of activities and responsibility on the European and national levels

European-level discussions endorse organizational changes and advance EU as a unity. Yet, academic ideas at the European level are implied rather than planned within the internationalization. Economic ideas are built on the assumption that attracting international students and launching international programs would further the competitiveness of education as a whole, yet the education-related steps in this development are not explicated. Macro-level planning receives greater attention than the consideration of practices. Leadership and marketing efforts, which are a priority at the European level, do not presume that the changes that take place would be tracked. This is the key difference with the national-level politics of internationalization, where consideration of practices is a part of the policy cycle. Yet, the justification of internationalization in the Finnish documents involves a broad range of conditions that the country has to deal with, without specification of their development within academia. Economic ideas, presuming an all-encompassing societal impact, dominate within this discourse as well.

Indirect steering takes place at the European level, as the initiatives of the European Commission include policy instruments, funding structures, mobility programs and assessments. Europe is seen as a unit with a common education agenda; this provides significant but not all-encompassing conditions for internationalization development. Member states and individual universities also consider issues beyond the suggested outline. Rationales to internationalize evolve, as the nature of agency concerning internationalization differs at the European, national and university levels.

There are two closely related sides of internationalization at the European level: one is about outward cooperation and the other concerns changes within the EU. The first one, cooperation with "third countries", presupposes marketing towards international students and skilled migrants. Once attracted, the assumption is that they will influence innovation and job creation, and contribute to the "development of quality education in Europe" (European Commission, 2002, 2). The role of internationalization is in "influencing and engaging new audiences" so that it works for the advancement of the member states within the EU (European Commission, 2013, 12). Marketing here has a broad meaning; it does not imply solely the attraction of fee-paying students. There is an idea of 'opening up' education, which would lead to improvements. This creates a combination of academic and

economic rationales. On the one hand, there is a pursuit of knowledge that is claimed to be a leading driver of internationalization. But on the other hand, this opening up process is suffused by economic motives; international students and scholars are expected to bring expertise to the EU, to strengthen the European position in the global competition. European input lies in assembling the organizational and promotional energies, but national and institutional actions also feed into this amalgamation of academic and economic rationales.

Another side of internationalization is about domestic changes presumed at the European level. The Commission argues for internationalization as a response to globalization, as a strategy which will "prepare its citizens and its workforce for a global environment by including the international dimension in an appropriate and effective way" (European Commission, 2002, 2). One of the suggested measures concerns citizens; there is a responsibility that the EU, or the nation-state, is taking for them. This is a justification for why they are provided with services. Economic and academic ideas about internationalization are combined again, for as education becomes open, it is held that students will become global citizens, which would increase their employability. Although this presupposes growth in external activities, there is an idea of changes within Europe, and the progressive role of internationalization is acknowledged.

To sum up, planning of internationalization exemplifies a strategic, top-down approach, where attention to the individual dimension is contentious and academic aspects of internationalization is diminished. There is a noteworthy difference in how policy understands the individual's role in internationalization: international students and scholars are attracted through marketing and they contribute to competitive advantages, while citizens are receiving services. Within this largely economic perspective on education, there is a different degree of responsibility assumed for these categories in education, which goes along national or EU boundaries.

However, the influence from the European level on the national and institutional levels is indirect. European-level documents seek to establish guiding principles for internationalization and emphasize central issues. They do not deal directly with universities, and in terms of legislation and implementation they always acknowledge the primacy of the state. Yet, they boost marketing outreach. The promotion of the higher education image abroad and improving performance on the global market are among the most significant undertakings related to internationalization. Competition here is a regular constructive development, and intra-European collaboration is a way to gain an advantage in the competition. There is no refutation of the settings demanding competitiveness of higher education institutions. Academic rationales of internationalization and knowledge development is subjected to the volatile market performance. Hence, individuals are present in this argument in the number of international students and scholars, but not in most of the other internationalization rhetoric. These numbers stand for diversity on

campus and the ability to attract talent; nuanced measurements of these processes are not available.

On the EU level, there is also an advancement of Europe as a unity. This thematic issue contrasts with the idea of diversity which is promoted as a benefit of internationalization; there is a dichotomy between diversity within Europe versus European unity, and diversity outside of Europe versus European unity. European documents posit that Europe also has similar thematic issues and coherent tactics of higher education development. Attracting 'international students' and collaboration initiatives both involve transcending national borders. It is notable for the definition of internationalization that 'international' activities are considered those that cross EU borders. A common identity is juxtaposed against the larger world, where Europe has to be competitive.

However, the notion of Europe is problematic. Enders claims that most academics do not utilize this European framework in their thinking. They see themselves as international, or cosmopolitan, rather than European. Often, actual Europe-led projects do not have clear regional delineations. Universities similarly position themselves as international and global, rather than European. For students also, exploring common elements across Europe is not a priority. In practice, this "European dimension" might be problematic, according to Enders (2004). It rests on organizational efforts and creating stimuli and opportunities to internationalize, rather than reinforcing European unity. Internationalization is thought of as cooperative within this unit and competitive outside of European borders.

The matters to tackle at this intergovernmental level are the convergence of degree structures and the refining of quality assurance mechanisms. It also presupposes the development of new instruments to resolve arising issues, such as the conditions of admission for students from non-EU countries (European Commission, 2002, 4). The Commission views its own role in internationalization as launching 'flagship products', fostering 'European identity for higher education', and sustenance of the European higher education profile development (European Commission, 2002). At least from the European perspective, internationalization implementation involves leadership. This idea finds support at the national level, as the Research and Innovation Council of Finland argues for internationalization through the collaboration of international organizations (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9). The search for solutions to modern problems is a motivation to internationalize.

However, the understanding of internationalization is not conveyed across all these levels. Despite the overall policy consistency, the content of internationalization is different. While the key features of the discourse take shape at the European level, national rationales of internationalization consider the local context and add new features. Internationalization measures are manifold, and many of

them need to be resolved at the national level, such as proactive internationalization on the part of the universities, development of student services, marketing and curriculum changes (European Commission, 2002, 4).

In national-level documents, the idea of internationalization as an external activity is even more evident, as these activities are expected to serve country-level purposes. Here Finland is established as a single unit participating in internationalization. For instance, the recent CIMO document lists a 'globally minded Finland' as a goal of development (CIMO, 2015, 2). The role of the CIMO, according to this strategy, is to "enhance internationalization of Finnish society" (CIMO, 2015, 2). Internationalization efforts extend beyond university internationalization. This could be a statement of ambition or a claim that the impact of internationalization is not limited to education. Internationalization is strongly enhanced on the country level, and governmental actors are powerful in its implementation in society. Yet, economic justifications are dominant as well.

The need to internationalize is sustained by the threats of the new global conditions. Four problematic areas mentioned in relation to internationalization are 'inequality', 'environment', 'public economy', and 'tougher competition' (CIMO, 2015). Three of them – inequality, public economy and the environment – point to the perceived problems within Finland. They demonstrate conditions that the state is in, postulating that the search for solutions lies in internationalization. The fourth – tougher competition – concerns the relationship of Finland with the outside world, and it is aligned to globalization even more closely. The threats presented by globalization are both within the state and at the level of interstate competition. The first three problems do not have a direct link to the internationalization of higher education; we can only suppose some kind of impact which it might have on these problems. However, the reasoning of them being conditions that make internationalization necessary adds to the meaning of internationalization as a defensive activity, which is expected to bring economic results.

The Research and Innovation Council of Finland, while justifying internationalization, makes no argument about globalization as a peril. It justifies the need for international cooperation by the search for innovative measures under the conditions of the economic downturn. According to the document, internationalization entails a joint search for solutions to global problems (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9). Consequently, it implies cooperation instead of competition. This foreshadows the market dimension of internationalization, but it remains economically driven, representing the utilitarian value of knowledge. The actors that lead this development are the UN, OECD, G20 and WTO (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9). Clearly, these organizations have education only as a part of their activities, as they specialize in global economic and social developments. The mentioning of these organizations underlines leadership in internationalization development. The ostensible impact of internationalization goes far beyond education and includes 'sustainable growth, public

economy, climate change and poverty reduction' (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9).

The idea of internationalization is quite similar to the idea of multilateral cooperation solving all kinds of problems. Since internationalization in this context is a quest for solutions, the role of an international organization directing this change from the top down appears to be quite natural. In addition to the earlier cooperative idea of internationalization, for Finland this presupposes taking advantage of 'knowledge' and 'know-how' of different countries, improving the quality and impact of activities, so that they would be jointly financed and not overlap (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9). In this way, internationalization appears as a practical and resource-saving approach. Although this is clearly not a market-aligned argument, the utilitarian logic here is quite apparent, and the education-related dimension is covert.

After reflecting wide-ranging issues of development, the document finally arrives at the market dimension of internationalization. Upon successful development, internationalized education is expected to become a competitive service, even though the sources of revenue in these undertakings are not specified (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9, 17). These could be either tuition fees or larger contributions to the economy which would sustain new development; there are no estimations concerning these. It is unclear what the vision of competitive internationalization would be with the absence of any reliable source of revenue. While this falls within the competitive, market-driven framework, it is not fully developed in this direction. Unlike the document of the CIMO (2015), collaboration for competitiveness acquires a positive undertone. Remarkably, integration and well-being appear along with the idea of competitiveness.

The need for internationalization emerges along with a broader plan of reforms; it is understood as one of the changes needed in the modern circumstances. CIMO strategy identifies the following conditions: "Global competition, environmental issues, migration of people and multiculturalism are placing new demands on us to do this [to be genuinely international and possess high levels of knowledge and skills]" (CIMO, 2015, 3). The statement is full of factual assumptions which substantiate the need to internationalize. It is also based on national unity, referencing society as a whole. In some ways, it parallels the idea of unity on the European level. Therefore, internationalization presupposes some unity and dealing with an external environment.

Then, the document lists several "pressures" in relation to which internationalization would bring relief. The first is "tougher competition", which concerns the state's competition for skilled labour, as well as individuals finding themselves in competitive situations. Enhanced cooperation, as the document attests, would improve competitiveness. The goal, stated in relation to the hazard, is the following: "Finland will be a socially just and competitive welfare state. CIMO boosts

Finnish competitiveness by improving international skills of individuals and communities and by fostering positive attitudes and by promoting Finnish culture, skills and knowledge abroad. CIMO encourages networking and consequently helps increase social capital in the Finnish society" (CIMO, 2015, 7). Therefore, good performance in the competition of the state for talented individuals and individuals in different situations would enable Finland to be a "socially just and competitive welfare state". The relationship between competition and social justice is not explicated further in the document.

We can reconstruct the argument by following the logic of the paragraph. Toughening competition is a challenge for social justice. Collaboration and an increase of social capital are the ways to tackle the situation. The CIMO would enhance "Finnish competitiveness" on the state level and individual level. Therefore, social justice and the competitive welfare state will prevail. This paragraph tries to restrain the binary of competition and collaboration. Yet, the emphasis on "Finnish culture, skills and knowledge abroad", as well as competition, reifies the framework of Finland versus the world. This implies competition rather than collaboration. The state's need to compete for talented individuals is mentioned in the beginning of the argument, while nothing related to this (i.e. fostering skilled migration and ensuring integration) is elaborated under the "Goal" heading. Finland as a "socially just and competitive welfare state" is a very broad objective for internationalization (CIMO, 2015, 7).

The second pressure justifying the need for internationalization is "increasing inequality" (CIMO, 2015, 4). The text argues that the "Finnish success story" was due to social welfare, which is a basic common value. The document addresses a number of questions for the future, such as "Will the welfare state prevail?" and "Will citizens continue to have equal opportunities to lead a dignified life?" (CIMO, 2015, 4). The goal stated under the identified problem is: "Citizens will have equal opportunities to participate in international mobility and cooperation. CIMO follows the development of internationalisation in Finland and tries to ensure that all Finns have equal opportunities to participate in international cooperation. CIMO actively fights inequality and promotes equality in its area of operation and supports socially sustainable development" (CIMO, 2015, 4). There is no expectation that internationalization development will resolve the problems of inequality. Rather, there is an anticipated inequality among the conditions of internationalization. The CIMO seeks to ensure that "all Finns" have equal opportunities. This leaves open the question about the equality of those who are considered to be "non-Finns" (for instance, skilled labour attracted through internationalization, as it is mentioned in the other documents). Moreover, "increasing social inequality", stated in the beginning, is a broad topic, which is consequently narrowed down to an inequality of international opportunities. There are certain groups of the population who face imbalanced opportunities in educational mobility, being non-traditional students. The document does not explore specific

problems pertaining to these unjust situations. The ways to ensure equality are not featured either. This problem unfolds within the national framework as both equality as a value for Finnish society and ensuring equal opportunities for Finns. Internationalization in this case appears to be a domain of possibilities for Finnish citizens.

The third argument necessitating greater internationalization is "shrinking the public economy". Problems of public spending in times of economic crisis and the decrease of the workforce exacerbate competition for resources, and "the public sector will have to focus more and more on producing basic services. This means concentration on those services that are the most significant for citizens, constant tightening of the belt and an increase in private service providers" (CIMO, 2015, 6). The goal here is the following: "High-quality public services to support international cooperation will be available to all. CIMO provides citizens with expertise and services that meet their needs and are in line with Finland's development strategies. CIMO is reliable and efficient" (2015, 6). A broadly stated problem is narrowed down to the solution through internationalization, within the powers of the particular organization.

This issue presents an inherent contradiction. On the one hand, due to the public deficit, the state would have to concentrate on the most basic and significant services, which are pensions, healthcare and education. On the other hand, opportunities in international cooperation are expected to be available for all. Despite the importance of education in general, it is hard to say that its international aspect is one of the most basic state provisions. Finally, there is a phrase that the services of the CIMO cover the needs of individuals aligned with the Finnish development strategies. This could be interpreted in two ways. It could be that only those needs of individuals which are in line with the Finnish development strategies would be supported. Alternatively, it could be that citizens' needs are in line with Finnish development strategies. While it could be the case that Finnish development strategies reflect citizens' needs, this linkage between the individual and state levels makes this claim dubious. Moreover, as it appears from the other documents, the services of the CIMO are not restricted to citizens. This phrase places additional emphasis on the national framework for internationalization: from development strategies to citizens' needs and Finland versus the world. The country appears as one entity rather than a discrete alliance of actors (i.e. universities or individuals) with diverse needs and approaches.

The fourth problem mentioned in relation to internationalization is the "changing environment". It starts with a national focus: "Finns are particularly reliant on their living environment. We are used to enjoying unspoiled nature and have become accustomed to having an abundance of natural resources" (CIMO, 2015, 6). Further on, it states the interdependencies created by globalization, and it highlights the role of ecological awareness and the sensitivity of youth in adopting these ways of life. The goal of internationalization advanced by CIMO is: "The

Finnish way of life will be sustainable. CIMO follows the principles of sustainable development in its work and tries to minimise negative environmental impact of its operations by, for example, encouraging virtual mobility. CIMO makes sure that those who participate in its programmes are well informed about different opportunities and options when pursuing their own international goals" (CIMO, 2015, 6). The option of "virtual mobility" is introduced as a substitute for internationalization requiring travel.

If we place this argument together with the problem of equality of opportunities in internationalization mentioned earlier, one can point out an interesting contradiction. The question is whether geographic mobility and virtual mobility are of equal value. If not, virtual mobility instead of geographic mobility is likely to be the option for individuals whose position in society is unequal. This paragraph is also full of factual claims about Finns and their ecological lifestyle, together with the stated need to keep it. At the same time, other countries, the EU and the greater world are not mentioned, only implied by the increased ecological interdependence. Moreover, the interchangeable terms "Finns-Citizens-We" reflect a national unity, and they are not fully compatible with the multicultural society mentioned earlier. The divisions of national and international within the context of internationalization are in line with the strategic approach. At the state level, internationalization is a response to internal and external challenges; it focuses on society and presupposes public impact. Internationalization is a way to deal with modern challenges, rather than a change in how society works and sees itself. Diversity, either already existing in society or increasing through migration, is also subjected to the demand for competitiveness.

There is a lack of an established relationship between national and international aspects, which would be based on the ideas of education and the individuals within it. This feeds into internationalization as an external activity, both by definition and by planning context. Competition is a feature and stimulus for internationalization development, and there is no questioning of the conditions ensuring its impact on education.

A recent strategy of internationalization published by the Ministry of Education and Culture (2009) employs the term 'genuine internationalization'. As seen in the document, the key of the new formula is to include a wide range of issues, from competitiveness to global responsibility, under the umbrella of internationalization; the order of priority is not specified. The understanding of internationalization at the national level implies any activity which transcends national borders and endorses a national progress. This amplified focus allows the universities freedom to form their internationalization approach.

5.3 University agency in developing master's programs

In this subchapter, my aim is also to examine how master's programs are conceived of as a project within internationalization. I am looking at the conception behind it and its anticipated outcomes, which suggest performance indicators and necessitate information about their functioning. Organizational efforts focusing on internationalization do not feature the impact of international activities. Therefore, in the next subchapter I explore the scarcity of data on the internationalization performance, which would allow assessing the long-term internationalization and its holistic value, which is advanced in the scholarly literature and policy discussions.

The recent change of framework shows different expectations concerning internationalization. According to the priorities of the new policy, foreign students are expected to stay in Finland. One way to ensure their integration is instruction of the national languages (Education and Research 2011–2016, 49). At the same time, education of students from non-EU and non-ETA countries is seen as an educational export, and the possibility of charging tuition fees is on the agenda (Education and Research 2011–2016, 49–50). According to the experience in other countries, the introduction of tuition fees brings about a significant decline in inward mobility, which could mean fewer students staying in Finland. The equilibrium between these two vectors of development is unclear. However, internationalization is now becoming a long-term effort. This is hard to combine with a pervasive macro focus. Nevertheless, in contrast to exchange-driven internationalization, which is confined within the education system, the emphasis on degree students presupposes greater overlap with migration, integration and high-skilled mobility. It requires coherent efforts on the part of the university, education system and governance structures.

Early on, short-term mobility was prioritized over degree programs. Then, advancement of internationalization prospects implied greater mobility opportunities for completing the whole course of studies abroad, not just short-term exchange. Harmonization of degree structures, among other Bologna process objectives, was one of the means envisioned to advance this development. Further expansion and rethinking of the internationalization activities can be illustrated by the following formulation: "The definition of an appropriate level and pattern of international mobility, for staff as well as learners, should be part of all internationalisation strategies. But internationalisation should not benefit only the minority of students and staff in any HEI who will spend time abroad" (European Commission, 2013, 6).

This view implies the diversification of international initiatives within the institution of higher education. It also indicates the variety of anticipated outcomes: not only mobility, but internationalization at home and encompassing institutional change.

Among the forms which allow both long-term mobility and internationalization at home are international master's programs. Owing to the ideological shift towards internationalization at home, seeking a greater and more holistic impact of internationalization, they became one of the European priorities. The Bologna process determines the broad framework for organization and functioning of the masters' programs.

At the national level of internationalization, there is a similar turn towards degree students and internationalization at home; policy development follows this path. Master's programs are one of the most prevalent forms of long-term internationalization. They require greater efforts on the part of the university (such as long-term curriculum planning and courses); compared to exchange, they are more incorporated into university life. Finally, they are important for the promotion of international education in the university and in the country. They represent the higher education institution, as they exemplify areas of university expertise.

The expected effect of these initiatives includes changes in the country and system of education. The "definition of an appropriate level and pattern of international mobility" announced by the European Commission also implies that the approach to internationalization assumes its final shape in the context of the higher education institution, and that the impact of internationalization would affect the wide academic community. This is one of the few cases when internationalization appears as a transformative idea for education, not a characteristic of external competitiveness (2013, 6). One could suggest that it could become more tailored towards the university's needs.

Yet, the indicators of performance suggested on the European level determine the vision of internationalization. Two types of organizational issues are considered in connection with international degrees. The first one concerns the openings of new master's programs, which demonstrates stable growth. Yet, the greatest advance took place in 2006–2007, which coincided with the EU agenda in financing degree programs cooperating with higher education institutions abroad. It is unclear how many of the new programs continue now (European Commission, 2011). This means that the long-lasting impact on internationalization is in question. Also, questions of program functioning are unknown.

The second one estimates the correspondence between the macro features of organizational development and the guidelines of the Bologna process. The EUA (European University Association) study on master's programs (Howard & Davies, 2009) finds that while all signatory countries have implemented a three-cycle degree structure and credit system, transparency, degree recognition and mobility development are still underway. Again, it is unclear how much internationalization has advanced after this process was implemented.

The type of indicators that are available denotes the specificity of European outreach in terms of planning. Program establishment, which was counted, stands

for internationalization progress, although these openings might be either unsuccessful or short-term. Unlike further developments within the university, this kind of information is easier to accumulate on the macro level. Then, formal requirements featuring alignment of the provisions with other education systems do not capture the programs' functioning within the institution. The Bologna process aims to establish the initial framework, yet it does not reflect the university's circumstances. Finally, learning outcomes and credit ranges define the degrees, forming several recognizable types, but do not feature the progression of internationalization.

The national and institutional levels allow more insights into how internationalization happens. In contrast to the EU and national levels, where the internationalization of education has been part of the broader innovation strategies, at the university level it is finally bound to education. Yet, the narrowing down and adjustment of internationalization to the needs of the institution is not well established in the documents. The prevalence of macro discourse on internationalization leads to the situation where national progress is valued more than development within education. This exemplifies the relationship between the state and universities in Finland, as higher education institutions quite recently used to be state agencies, and they are subjected to government power, at least through financial provisions and 'governance by results'. The Ministry of Education and Culture (2009, 5) presents the internationalization of higher education institutions as a "national project". Therefore, it is the state refining internationalization within the universities, rather than universities promoting it in dialogue with government agencies.

Organizing international master's programs is also a national project, as shown by the following quote:

> The supply of education with international elements will be increased in Finland and high-standard and attractive programmes geared to foreign students will be linked to the priority areas of the higher education institutions. Progress in studies requires that mobility and foreign-language teaching is planned and applies a variety of teaching tools and that higher education institutions enter into close cooperation. (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2011)

This quote illustrates that establishing international programs is also a national-level endeavour, although they appear as islands, which do not bring together foreign and Finnish students. It is formulated that this would be done to attract students, not envisioning their actual engagement at the university.

This demonstrates that internationalization stays at the level of macro discourse about university development, while implementation is handed off to the university. The growth of studies in English was considered as a serious part of

the Finnish internationalization strategy (Clarke, 2005). Indeed, the number of English-language programs was boosted in the 2000s on the basis of the overall European trend and funding. Meanwhile, the factors of their development at the institutional level are not clear.

The overall change towards long-term internationalization implies focus on educational transformations. Higher education institutions, according to an evaluation conducted by the FINHEEC, place international degree programs at the centre of their internationalization undertakings, as they maintain the flow of international students and create 'multicultural environments' (FINHEEC, 2013). But apart from internationalization at home, they represent the university internationally and create opportunities for collaboration with other universities. However, development indicators in this area are also tardy and remain to be identified. The FINHEEC study claims that higher education institutions still justify internationalization and the choices related to it. Focusing on this could take "attention away from what really is at stake" (FINHEEC, 2013, 33). The normative idea of having internationalization is explored, but the study does not add details to the process.

The evaluation (FINHEEC) discloses the performance of anticipated master's programs and their contribution to overall internationalization development. For instance, it addresses the link to institutional strategies, which exposes an expectation of linear, top-down development and implementation. Then, it investigates how international students are integrated into the university, society and labour market. Internationalization, as the evaluation points out, is expected to contribute to the working life of the region. This matches the earlier analysis, when the rationales of internationalization were seen to place high expectations on the university, exceeding its agendas of research and education. However, here the tangible external impact is articulated; for example, successful employment is a measure of internationalization's contribution to regional development. Nevertheless, according to my data, the programs are still just in the phase of accumulating information about alumni.

The organizational development of the master's programs experienced a notable change, which could be illustrated by the issue of language. In the 1990s, the discussion was about English language in education, building necessary skills, organizing courses and the use of skills in the future working life. Current arguments concern Finnish-language skills for international students, which would give them the opportunity to find a job upon graduation and stay in Finland. As for the language of the master's programs, in the 1990s they were often offered in Finnish, Swedish and English; the latter two were often separate from mainstream studies (FINHEEC, 2013). Venues created for the international students changed the language politics within internationalization; earlier opportunities of studies in Eng-

lish presupposed an extension of competencies for Finnish students, and now language-related decisions are based on the need to include international students and enable their subsequent stay in Finland.

While one cannot say that long-term internationalization is fully realized this way, some normative change could be noted. This is an attempt towards holistic internationalization considering the local context and the linguistic difficulties related to staying and finding a job in the Finnish labour market.

The coherence of the master's programs with general institutional functioning and other study options was among the utilized criteria of the FINHEEC's evaluation as well. It revealed that degree programs are usually integrated into the faculties, but have their own administrative staff and teachers who are assigned to a particular program. While they have management and assessment similar to other programs, some of the objectives and qualifications of the teachers vary (FINHEEC, 2013, 54).

The following differences were noted: existence or establishment of an international office, the need for internationally qualified personnel, and the development of curricula with international content (FINHEEC, 2013, 54). They clearly signify the 'extra' organizational load stemming from internationalization, even though assessment indicators are based on mainstream university functioning. Universities note that international master's program management requires more staff than regular Finnish programs (FINHEEC, 2013). International degree programs still pose a supplementary task in university planning. From this example, we could also see that even in this case, internationalization sticks out as an external thing, and the efforts to make it less external are a challenge for the university. This raises the problem of the indicators, how to measure progress in this area, and what kinds of nuanced criteria work.

5.4 Lack of governance data

This subchapter explores the data deficiencies in understanding of internationalization. A problem of internationalization planning pertains to the simultaneous striving for efficiency and reliance on a few inaccurate indicators (e.g. mobility rates). Putting a closer focus on planning and implementation, I look at the data from the governance and planning perspective, showing how knowledge about internationalization informs the discussion. The discussion is continued in Chapter 7, showing how poorly policies represent practices, which is also problematic for planning.

It is paradoxical that within the search for competitiveness and the drive towards macro comparisons, which create interest in indicators, there is a scarcity of relevant data. This could be explained by the engagement with the macro focus in planning, rather than consideration of everyday processes. Due to this, the available indicators, rather than needed data, are utilized for assessing the progress of

internationalization. This impedes tracking of the problems within internationalization.

National-level documents establish the rationale for internationalization by placing the national system in European comparisons (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2009, 14–15). The strategy explores the deficiencies of the higher education system concerning internationalization:

> In recent years, several domestic and international evaluations have pointed out shortcomings and development needs in the Finnish research system. The standard of Finnish research has not been developing as expected in the 21st century, the research system is fragmented into many small units, the national research institutes do not constitute a functional entity and to some extent are operationally detached from the rest of the research system. The progress in international education and research cooperation has been slow. (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2012, 46)

The failure in performance within certain aspects of internationalization, like international competitiveness and attractiveness to foreign students, is identified as a threat to the system. Internationalization is justified through deficits of the current situation in education. This argument makes internationalization a dire necessity, as a process prompted by the external circumstances. On the one hand, it shows interest in the actual situation of internationalization, yet on the other hand it is dependent on the external indicators that are already available. The need to internationalize is external, as a coordination of development with other education systems.

Despite the change in internationalization ideology for long-term projects, growing expectations prompt the focus on the micro processes. Prioritizing international degree programs involve many practical issues and signify the need for indicators which can capture progress. Regarding the development of measurements, indicators should be aligned with the expectations concerning this form and normative considerations.

Mobility growth is still underway in terms of acknowledgement of degrees and diploma supplements. The report claims that opportunities for doing a bachelor's in one place and a master's in another are yet to be enhanced (European Commission, 2011). This also necessitates the data to track these processes. Among the indicators to measure outcomes are inward mobility rates. As one of the documents notes, the estimates of this are not completely accurate (European Commission, 2011). Residents of European countries who have foreign citizenships are included in the overall figures of the foreign students. Therefore, the numbers illustrate the diversity in education, which could originate from multiple sources, not necessarily resulting from institutional efforts. The estimates of demand for

European higher education would require the number of people who moved into the EU for the purpose of study. The indicator currently in use could be justified by the availability of the immigration data. Yet, an international student is defined as 'other' in this case, due to the variance of citizenship. This also underestimates the assimilation that the individual might have had prior to entrance in the university. It inflates the demand for the university programs, while the route of integration chosen by foreign residents may explain higher education enrolment.

Furthermore, estimates of international students at universities fail to measure competitiveness (apart from migration rates). Regarding the state level, I can argue that Finnish competitive performance in internationalization – at least the way it is measured – is currently not dependent on a flow of international students, since they do not bring revenue and their contribution to the economy through living expenditures is not estimated. When the fees would be introduced for non-EU/EEA students, the international education market with significant contributions to the economy is unlikely to emerge soon; this means that revenue-based indicators of competitiveness are not applicable either.

Therefore, the macro focus provides the wrong rationales to assess internationalization. By focusing on the external dimensions of education, these measurements fail to grasp individual choices while essentializing foreign origin. It is unclear which accomplished economic goals could be assessed by these indicators. There is a lack of suitable data to measure the outward competitiveness of European institutions.

As for student-related measurements, categorizations of students often raise concerns. In the FINHEEC evaluation, university managers acknowledged that the use of the term 'foreign students' might be problematic. It amalgamates different indicators, such as language proficiency, citizenship and experience of living in the country (FINHEEC, 2013, 15–16). Therefore, the choice of who should be called a foreigner is value-laden, and it can result in 'othering' of students. This is a noteworthy proxy of everyday processes; the normative idea behind it would be then in treating all students as members of the university community.

The evaluation clarifies that this term is used to distinguish between Finns and non-Finns; the need for this is justified by 'Finnish national identity', 'Finnish nation state' and 'Finnish language' (FINHEEC, 2013, 15–16). This explanation clearly goes beyond the university and educational considerations. National agenda dominates within internationalization, which is transferred into planning.

International students are tackled as a separate category in planning, e.g. when they are used as an indicator of internationalization. Moreover, admission requirements often differ, and it is presumed that the approach to teaching and guidance should be different. This is illustrated by the academic discussion about international students in Chapter 2. There is no immediate reference in the evaluation to national identity, or lack of it, in the actual internationalization process. The danger of othering is pointed out, but not addressed.

The category of international students is often used uncritically in discussions about internationalization (FINHEEC, 2013). Planning arrangements affirm their treatment as a different category. But even if planning terminology were to integrate international students, it would still be insufficient, as they are not always treated this way in terms of opportunities, internships, etc. Specific implementation measures should be addressed as well. This demonstrates that in some regards internationalization is still external and international students are not yet part of routine institutional functioning. The long-term nature of the project also invites consideration of the place that international students could occupy within internationalization. This would generate pointed data to track pertinent outcomes.

Flexibility of this form would prompt more adjustments to the labour market (Davies, 2009). This is not limited to employment figures, and it might include data on development of the labour market. Then, there is a lack of data on alumni of international degree programs. This precludes analysis of one of the key anticipated study outcomes, namely, integration within the labour market. Lack of information on the employment patterns of graduates leads to a situation where actual experience is not used for program development (i.e. networks for finding internships and communicating professional differentiation). The problem with alumni information is also such that programs are new and there is no stable graduation rate, people graduate at different times, and knowledge of this process in unavailable. Consistent data on students is also scarce, according to the evaluation (FINHEEC, 2013). A breakdown of nationalities reveals that the majority are Finns, Chinese and Russians, while the number of students from Europe is notably low. So far, there is no governance discussion on the overall diversity of students.

Indicators which provide extensive knowledge about students are non-existent; this is unfavourable for planning. It is unclear, for instance, what kind of capacities are lacking among international students and whether companies are simply looking for the "Finnish way of doing things" (FINHEEC, 2013, 88). Devising a comprehensive employment tactic would depend on this kind of analysis. Finally, in order to stimulate quality development, it would be fruitful to compare the programs' services with the similar programs across Europe (FINHEEC, 2013).

These are indicators of the links between the programs and macro processes conditioning internationalization, and they do not yet point towards education. Internationalization presumes comparisons, particularly regarding study openings, yet even within the national and institutional frameworks, these possibilities are often scarce. For instance, consistent comparisons between master's studies in Finnish and international master's degrees are not viable, since these different kinds of data are difficult to correlate. Sometimes there are corresponding programs in Finnish and in English, while at other times specific programs are developed in English for internationalization purposes. The data about course choices and degree progression is not comparable (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001).

Evidence on international master's programs alone is scarce as well. For instance, the number of the programs is quite unreliable. Some of the programs do not have a regular intake of students, and others are no longer functioning. At least in Finland, there is no summary information about all of the international degree programs (FINHEEC, 2013). A solid synopsis of the international degree programs' features is problematic, and the evaluation by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (2009) provides the most consistent overview.

International degree programs formed a sustainable trend in the beginning of 2000s. The evaluation conducted in 2013 already considered international bachelor's and master's degree programs vis-a-vis the strategy of internationalization (FINHEEC, 2013, 51). Organization, the relationship with the institutional strategies, and student integration in the academic community and Finnish society are at the centre of the evaluation. The programs' place within the university is addressed, which signifies the anticipation of institutional changes in terms of making internationalization a holistic process. Along with that, we can indicate that international degree students are a focus of the current institutional development.

The institutional change is tracked in the evaluation by examining how management and quality assessment are aligned with the university's overall approach towards these matters. It was discovered that the overall organizational framework is similar, but with regards to the arrangement of teaching and networks with the faculty, these programs often remain an isolated phenomenon. Internationalization is external even within the institutional processes.

The promotion Finland, Finnish language and culture abroad of are elevated as key priorities. Overall, there is pressure for internationalization to serve a wide range of societal goals. The link between some rationales and the internationalization of education can be very distant. Measuring the impact of internationalization in this context would be problematic, especially as only a few indicators (like mobility and rankings) are available.

Apart from these performance criteria and the processes they measure, there is also an acknowledged deficiency of data on many crucial aspects of the functioning of international master's programs. For instance, the FINHEEC evaluation points out that from an economic point of view degree programs are not assessed; there is no reliable data concerning cost per student, and so on. Only 52% of the programs were able to say whether they had any budget or not. Total expenditures, gains and otherwise detailed data were impossible to obtain (FINHEEC, 2013).

One of the circumstances contributing to the data deficiencies is the lack of sustainability, which is noted both in the European and in national evaluations. Välimaa et al. call international degree programs a "moving target", since they open, close or merge all the time (FINHEEC, 2013, 20). This form of studies is flexible both for institutional needs, as universities can demonstrate their areas of excellence to relatively qualified students, and the labour market, since the programs are more specific compared to the provisions at the bachelor's levels. Along

with this plasticity, I would add that international programs are too temporary as they currently appear in planning.

The link between some rationales and the internationalization of education is very distant; there are no available criteria to measure progress. Impact assessment is problematic. Attracting skilled labour prompts an anti-discrimination discussion, but these arguments are not taken further. Finally, individual-related issues, like student integration within the university, and further employment of the international graduates, are underprioritized.

5.5 Implementation challenges: ethical issues in internationalization

The prevalence of the macro discourse fails the university's own agenda in developing internationalization. Yet, a competitive framework and economic rationales do not eliminate everyday processes. New aspects in university planning create governance controversies, and some of them require discussion on ethics, which is the focus of this subchapter.

Ethical aspects are a counter-discourse within internationalization. Ideas of anti-discrimination, multiculturalism and integration seldom intersect or are reconciled with issues of competitiveness and economic outcomes. At the same time, the counter-discourse emerges within the dominant discourse. The link between individuals and macro goals does not pervade through and through, as exemplified by the (non-)discussion of discrimination. While an inclusive and multicultural environment 'free from discrimination' is a prerequisite for conditions where innovation flourishes, there is no exploration of the measures used to defy discrimination. Integration is merely mentioned as a task for multicultural policy (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9).

According to the document of Research and Innovation Council of Finland, anti-discrimination is a tool to retain skilled labour in Finland, which has primarily been attracted through education. In internationalization, ethical discussion acquires a competitive dimension. Another aspect of the counter-discourse concerns equal mobility opportunities for students, teachers and personnel (Education and Research 2011–2016, 49–50). There is an acknowledged need to promote them. At the same time, neither this nor the CIMO document of 2015 discussing similar measures point out whether these equal opportunities would be made available to foreign as well as Finnish teachers, students and staff. As my interview data shows, the level of access to information by these two groups is quite different, with international students and scholars being much less aware of the changes and opportunities at the universities. Hence, the management and scope of the equality issues are not fully clear. Bearing in mind the 'antidiscrimination' mentioned earlier, the approach towards equality and inclusion within the education system remains to be seen.

I also established earlier that individuals are treated differently within internationalization planning, depending on whether they are Finnish citizens or foreign students and researchers. On a broader level, the relation between policy goals and individuals is unclear. For instance, one finds a phrase that the services of the CIMO cover the needs of individuals which are in alignment with development strategies of Finland. This could be interpreted in two ways. It could be that only those needs of individuals which are in line with Finnish development strategies would be supported. Another version could be that citizens' needs are in alignment with Finnish development strategies. While it could be the case that Finnish development strategies reflect citizens' needs, this linkage between the individual and the state level makes this claim dubious. Moreover, as it is apparent in other documents, the services of the CIMO are not restricted to citizens. This phrase places additional emphasis on the national framework for internationalization: from development strategies to citizens' needs and Finland versus the world. The country appears as one entity rather than a discrete alliance of actors (i.e. universities or individuals) with diverse needs and approaches.

Internationalization carries a transformative meaning in terms of equality and ecology: the initiatives of the 'digitalized world' and 'creative interaction' mentioned in this CIMO document either stem from or are closely associated with internationalization. The document specifies that the 'digitalized world' would allow more virtual mobility as a solution for internationalization. New technologies promise to serve educational purposes (CIMO, 2015, 5). As the document states, it is less resource-consuming and more environmentally friendly to pursue these initiatives. In this case, internationalization is also linked to resources, and there are two sides of this issue. While international cooperation would increase assets in future, it also requires some investments in terms of travel opportunities and organizational funds.

The other idea – 'creative communication' – reflects networking as a vehicle of internationalization development. Existing networks and partners are mentioned in the following sentence: "We will strengthen our cooperation with our Nordic partners and participate actively in national debates and distribution of information" (CIMO, 2015, 9). Besides the use of the word "we", which presumably refers to the country's unity and reveals the national focus once again, internationalization is reduced to cooperation with Nordic partners. Therefore, positive ideas attached to internationalization are intertwined with the idea of national unity.

An idea of national superiority emerges within internationalization; this appears in the context of partnerships. Among the strategic priorities of internationalization, one finds "international know-how" and "global responsibility" (CIMO, 2015, 8). The first one concerns acquiring and creating knowledge that brings economic value. As it arises from the CIMO document, this flow can function both ways: from other countries to Finland and from Finland to other countries.

Despite economic drive and competitive underpinning, this entails a two-way process. The second term, "global responsibility", presupposes help from Finland to other, less developed countries. Given the one-way process meant by these initiatives, this kind of approach could be taken as a paternalistic attitude of the developed country towards the developing country.

The grounds for this cooperation is assistance rather than exchange for the sake of enriching education for both parties. The reason for this is that the economy and industry of developing countries are less advanced. In this case, internationalization also has underpinnings of utilitarian knowledge, with an altered vector from competitive to humanitarian values. This is not about education per se, but rather about education as a vehicle for economic and societal development. Although such internationalization activities appear as a public good extended internationally, they seem to be an isolated case which is not a central tendency within internationalization. Overall, economic and competitive rationales receive higher priority. However, institutional missions of teaching and research could not have a clear division between national and international, or competition and collaboration. Therefore, there are many unresolved controversies at the institutional level, which concern integration of internationalization into the everyday functioning at the university.

Conclusions:

My analysis demonstrates that problematic areas for internationalization planning emerge from its responsiveness towards macro conditions, a variety of external circumstances implied by globalization. The dominance of the market dimension highlights internationalization as a characteristic in interaction with the external stakeholders; it defines the level of the university's excellence. The logic of competitiveness creates demarcations between unity on the national or European level, where collaboration and responsibility are applied, and the outside world, where competition is the major driver. At the same time, there is a shift in the understanding of internationalization from a short-term to a long-term activity, and this change of framework poses significant demands for the planning of internationalization. Yet, at the university level, internationalization faces a few organizational challenges. At the macro level, there is a scarcity of arguments exploring academic developments linked to internationalization. Correspondingly, at the institutional level, there is a lack of internationalization being integrated into the university's mainstream activities. Therefore, internationalization development maintains an external position in relation to other university functions.

Since there is a lack of rethinking towards internationalization and tailoring it to institutional needs, some of the problems in internationalization planning could be attributed to university agency and its orientation towards the macro discourse rather than everyday processes. Therefore, internationalization gaps in relation to

planning concern institutional standings. While macro-level ideas postulate the impact of internationalization beyond education, a closer exploration of planning suggests that new questions emerge at the institutional level. Hence, the justifications for internationalization in the planning divert attention away from the solutions of problematic situations.

The macro focus in planning also explicates unresolved normative dimensions. First, the understanding of internationalization reveals blurred divisions between the national and international, as well as between the public and private good. For example, there is a distinction between the national and international aspects of university work. In the national sphere, the university is tied up with obligations, which include the ability of the university to be international. Outside of the national borders, the university strives for competitiveness. This distinction is not fully consistent. For instance, the idea of global responsibility entails certain obligations. International students and scholars, once attracted to the country, fall into the sphere of the domestic activities of the university; they participate in teaching and research on similar terms as local faculty and students.

Second, some of these unresolved normative dimensions point towards tensions in implementation. For instance, the idea of non-discrimination does not evolve into practical measures on the level of planning. The integration of international scholars and students is reduced to the language-learning aspect. Meanwhile, employers' attitudes and graduates' skills that are suitable for the local job market are overlooked. There is a difference between the position of foreigners and locals in the job market and society, which is not addressed in the planning. The university is anticipated to address this, since there is an expectation for graduates to stay in Finland. This highlights the deficiency of the individual dimension within internationalization. The modern functions of the university are full of ambiguities, and one of the tensions runs along the lines of education being for both public and private good. While in terms of international activities the university mostly envisions education as a private good, there is also an idea of internationalization being important for the public good. The compatibility of internationalization with other university functions is unclear.

The analysis of planning also points towards potential inconsistencies with practices, which are an impediment to understanding internationalization as an everyday university activity. Along with competitive behaviour, globalization also implies openness and comparisons, which creates an interest towards data. Apart from economic and political forces, this could give a greater view on governance development (Larner & Le Heron, 2005, 859). Currently, as the focus on the macro level results in data deficiencies, there are problems in assessing internationalization. The overall number and current functioning of programs are hard to obtain, as well as other data on the everyday functioning of the master's degree programs. In the discussion on internationalization outcomes, the establishment

of new programs is not sufficient as a progress indicator; the numbers of international students are a loose proxy for the development of internationalization. Therefore, due to the lack of data, it is hard to say whether internationalization is transformative for the educational process and whether it is fulfilling the expectations towards competitiveness. Consequently, major problems with internationalization planning stem from the key tendencies of the higher education politics, which prioritize a response to globalization. In turn, the problematic planning creates a limited perspective on practices that impedes further planning.

6 Chapter: Internationalization as a normative representation

Introduction: individual perspectives on normativity

In this chapter, I analyse interviews and derive an array of the normative meanings behind internationalization as they are represented in the respondents' views. I discuss students and scholars' views on internationalization as contesting and recreating internationalization. As I have established earlier, since the concept itself often functions as an empty term that acquires meaning in the context, I identify its normative dimensions through the links with other notions: internationalization and education quality, internationalization and characteristics of the university, internationalization and degree programs, and internationalization and its educational value.

Subchapter 6.1 deals with the idea that internationalization enhances quality, suggesting that there is a transformative value to the process. I intend to demonstrate what international students and teachers bring up in terms of quality improvement. In subchapter 6.2, I compare this against the expectations of the university and conceptualizations of its agency. In subchapter 6.3, I analyse the ideas of master's programs' functioning and limitations, or what is considered indispensable for the functioning of a degree program. Subchapter 6.4 investigates the missing discourse of internationalization, such as what kinds of failures according to students and teachers eliminate the value of internationalization. Since I talked about institution and education improvement in the chapters above, these are the most general normative dimensions.

Here normative dimensions mainly appear as expectations of what internationalization 'should be', as well as what the university, education and individual should get from it. The 'ideal picture' concerns how respondents view the place of internationalization among other dimensions of university education. This analysis is not a characterization of practices in internationalization or a diagnosis of the current situation. Whenever respondents bring up critical examples, the purpose is to make a clearer argument of a certain normative point. I provide an analysis of respondents' experiences and depict their practices in Chapter 7.

6.1 Internationalization and quality

This subchapter delves into the link between internationalization and quality based on one of the interview questions. I did not direct this question towards the curriculum in particular. My intention was to stimulate the respondents' own formulations of the linkages between internationalization and quality. The answers

ranged from macro conditions (like globalization) to ideas about international experience as a credential for the student. These are aspects of internationalization as an external characteristic. Another array of answers dealt with quality created through internationalization, such as through having classroom diversity, engaging in discussions, and involving students in rethinking education.

Many of the teachers and students affirmed the link between internationalization and quality without any further clarifications: "Yes, definitely." They pointed out internationalization gains through further responses; but the overall positive link between internationalization and quality was evident for them. Other respondents brought up globalization as the most general reason for internationalization: "…because we live in a world that is globalized somehow. I think definitely it helps" (S15). No direct link with education was elaborated; the globalization argument was used to emphasize the importance of the institutional response: "I think it does, especially since there is so much talk of globalization. I think it is really worthwhile to have this" (S10). There was no clarification whether it is good for employment or important for getting a good education. A similar type of argument featuring the reactive approach was seen in the academic literature (Chapter 2). Based on the macro discourse, it treats internationalization as a necessity prompted by circumstances, rather than as a process within education. This stems from a normative perspective of the circumstances that surround higher education institutions. An acceptance of this norm is seen here on the level of the individual.

Then, one of the most elaborate arguments about internationalization and the quality of education is based on the idea of classroom diversity. Students pointed out the value of enriched discussions. One respondent claimed that maybe this value is even more accessible for students than for teachers, due to the closer interaction between diverse peers and joint projects among them (S5). That said, some of the teachers also mentioned gaining ideas for future research through classroom discussion with students and through thesis supervision (T35; T39). The idea of enrichment was built around common experience and the process of working together. One of the students also pointed out that an international classroom is needed for the individual to realize "how narrow minded you are" and that "there are other ways of doing things" (S16). In these responses, identity exploration and cultural arguments did not have a central place.

Students also stated that being international (for instance, if they had travelled, worked or studied in other countries before) makes students more valuable participants in the discussion (S25). This implies that intercultural experiences, rather than origin from a particular culture, make classroom interactions fruitful. Another respondent mentioned that individuals with this experience bring 'first-hand' knowledge to the classroom; this comment comes in contrast to books being seen as 'second-hand' knowledge' (S29). The idea of experiential learning appears in another quote as well: "as an experience, yeah, I would definitely want

international people at the university, just so that you get a variety of perspectives" (S29). Consequently, diversity becomes educational when communication between people with different backgrounds takes place.

Two things could be inferred from this for the university. First, it is hard to quantify diversity. For example, the number of countries that students originate from does not necessarily correlate with a variety of perspectives. Second, educational opportunities are realized in discussion. Thus, unless the university is prioritizing and promoting discussion in its approach to studies, one cannot speak about benefits from diversity. One of the responses expanded on this by noting that exposure to people from other countries "creates a new and interesting dialogue, even about topics that I am already quite familiar with from my previous studies. So, I think it kind of gives you a new lens through which you can view the current world and things that are happening, that is really important to me" (S29). Consequently, internationalization's contribution to education quality is found in the new kind of experiential knowledge generated through diverse encounters.

Other respondents also spoke about the variety of insights: "I think it definitely deepens the scope of education, this internationalization. It helps you to understand different perspectives in different cultural settings, in different people's understandings" (S30). This impact was noted as personal and situational, depending on the classroom diversity and teaching style at the university. But even here, when cultural issues are brought up, they are not ascribed to a person, nor are any inferences about studies based on culture.

Another dimension where internationalization improves the quality of education is curriculum formation. Along with the formal structure of courses, this also gives an opportunity to include other scientific perspectives in the discussion. As one student noted: "it reduces ethnocentrism" (S8). The student acknowledged that some countries have long traditions in developing certain disciplines (e.g. German sociology). For these kinds of situations, it might be difficult to overcome the traditional ways of constructing studies in order to include other perspectives (e.g. those of someone who studied in Egypt). But this could take place within class discussion. Otherwise, the expansion of curriculum perspectives might be an advantage, which depends on the efforts of the faculty. The presence of international students is not sufficient, yet it is a necessary condition. This normative idea has a cosmopolitan underpinning and conveys the value of knowledge for its own sake. Another student formulated it specifically in regard to her study focus:

> Maybe it is not so much different in the other disciplines, but I think in the social sciences and humanities it is crucial to include this international perspective, because we are studying the human world, and humans behave differently in different cultures, different religious settings… in different settings in general. So, I think you would lose a

> big… a large picture would be ignored if you don't include this international perspective. (S25)

Some of the teachers also acknowledged that science development is not viable without internationalization:

> Of course, it improves the level, especially if we are talking about the research that we are doing, because all the research nowadays is international, because it is implemented in the international research networks… So, without internationality there is hardly any research in Finland, for example. Of course, it is a little bit up to the discipline that we are talking about. There might be different degrees of internationality in different disciplines… But if we are talking about the social sciences, medical or hard sciences, they will not survive without the international aspect of the research. (T36)

In this formulation, internationalization concerns networking more than the thematic dimension. Nevertheless, the same respondent also acknowledged that this link between science and internationalization is not so easily transferred to teaching. Organizing teaching requires serious rethinking of the university's practices. The normative perspective, which holds that "research is always international" (and therefore teaching is international as well), emerged in several interviews (S1; T38; T39). Indeed, it is hard to imagine research being secluded in one country, "in purely national terms", "so that you would not cross borders, would not have any transnational activities, cooperation" (T35). While these personal positions of the teachers justify the need for research to be 'internationally aware' or 'internationally enhanced', the claim that teaching is based on research (and therefore is international) is loose. It is a normative statement justifying the need for the internationalization of teaching, rather than confirming the transference of this to actual practices.

Another theme represented in the interviews was that of standardization developing along with internationalization. The idea of "internationally verified quality" implies that education should have an international standing. Therefore, several respondents indicated that making programs international serves as a stimulus for raising overall quality (S5; S32). Some students even hoped that with the newcomers from abroad, the university would pay more attention to organizing teaching in general (S5). This brings up the educational expectations of international students becoming a stimulus for the institution, while internally there is not enough incentive for that.

It was also mentioned that the idea of quality could be different in different countries, or that studies in the same discipline could be carried out differently. This standpoint is contrary to the argument of 'science is international and makes

teaching international as well'; while science is international, even good studies (assumingly based on that science) are dissimilar in different places (S1; S2; S4). There is a gap between the macro planning of internationalization, where the mobility and recognition of degrees are discussed, and practices based on nationally established norms and procedures, where the transition from one education system to another takes place. Accepting international students is a challenge for universities: since ensuring full degree comparability during admission is problematic, institutions should adjust to diverse qualifications and different study expectations. Coordinating university study offerings with international standards is seen as an impetus for many institutions.

As I explored earlier, internationalization is often viewed in policy as a characteristic evidencing the quality of education. It appears as an external feature, because rather than revealing something about internationalization development, it is used as a standard. For students, the formal value of education plays a great role as well: obtaining an international degree in English stands for a good education. In comparison with studies on the home country, this presents a greater challenge and conveys more prestige (S23; S3). The question twists from internationalization and quality to education in English and the advantages of having one (i.e. managing 'academic English" was also considered an educational improvement). This normative idea conveys a utilitarian value of knowledge; it also raises the issue of employment advantages. An alternative perspective on the English-language medium is that it merely makes education feasible and assessable to students, rather than being directly correlated with quality (S27). For instance, this works for foreigners who are already living in Finland but are still unable to speak Finnish that is advanced enough for studies. One student also acknowledged that while other students could take a program "not marketed as international", for an immigrant, the English-language medium improves quality merely by providing access (S21; S22).

I was also interested if there is any variance in the perception of internationalization at different levels of university studies: bachelor's, master's and the PhD. Since international studies at the bachelor's level are scarce, at least in Finland, it makes more sense to talk about master's and PhD studies and their international dimension. Then, my special interest was in the connection between international studies at the master's level and the quality of these studies. Several participants acknowledged that international characteristics as valuable in master's programs (S6; S9; S11). One of the participants also mentioned that this value is simply different at different levels (S22). For instance, at the graduate levels one needs more 'interaction with the outside world' in terms of professional opportunities. But at the bachelor's level it is important to 'introduce students to the internationality' and set up the expectations of the studies and knowledge creation:

> Because if you do a bachelor in the bounded community, the students would have difficulties later in the master's. As I see myself now, having studied my bachelor's abroad, not in my home country, I compare this with my friends who studied at home… I see how different I am in my viewpoints and in my formation of education. So, I think it is important in all levels of studies. (S22)

Here we can also clearly see that the value of internationality is not explained through culture. Another student also claimed that there is a special interest in having diverse BAs admitted into one master's program:

> I think if you have a master's program and admit students that have done bachelor's all over the place, it just makes thinking a bit more open. Everyone comes from different teaching, everyone comes from different methods and background. It just makes it a bit more interesting and maybe a bit more faceted. (S26)

This contradicts the admission requirement in Finland for studies at the graduate level to correlate with the student's previous education. Clearly, a leading normative idea at the level of the administration is not fully compatible with the everyday functioning of internationalization. Students see the choice of master's level studies as a change or an important addition to their previous studies, which brings them closer to the job market.

In relation to this, a practical dimension of education quality brought up by internationalization is that students see an opportunity to acquire contacts from different countries, which could be professionally important in the future (S28; S31). Another aspect related to networking was that it is hard for students to establish ties with faculty during their master's studies; this becomes a challenge for those who wish to continue their academic career (S21). Some of the teachers realized that the benefits of internationalization depend on the inclusion of the international students:

> If we are talking about education, I think it is hard to say that it is improving, because it depends so much on the context that we are talking about. For example, in Europe there are many universities utilizing much international students and involving them… We are struggling still with the idea of how and to what extent the international students should be involved at the university. (T37)

There is a realization that only a determined organization of practices leads to educational benefits, while often the value from internationalization remains situational.

Some of the respondents focused especially on the difficulty of getting benefits from internationalization. The potential value was not questioned; rather, scepticism about practices was expressed: "Over here the international element is a bit complicated" (S21). The respondent then continued that international students do not get similar support as the domestic students, such as benefits from Kela, familiarity with the system, or greater acquaintance with faculty due to sharing the native language. Moreover, the timeline of studies is different for international students: "There is a lot of pressure in the international programs to complete the degrees on time. And that pressure is hard on the students who are international and can't survive in Finland any longer" (S17). Also, the 'train and retain' approach is affected by this problem: "For international students that choose to continue to live in Finland, putting so much pressure to complete their thesis on time does not actually give them the skills to integrate economically and to stay" (S13). There is not enough time to learn Finnish, for example, or to volunteer. Therefore, the actual quality of education for international students in Finland can be seen as vulnerable, compared to the general international perspective.

Another question regarding the university sustaining internationalization was raised by one of the teachers, specifically in terms of those university structures that do not support internationalization. He claimed that although the university is of very good quality, "it takes too much time to get the bachelor's, master's or PhD degree, because the students are without good tutoring or good programs in which to participate. But in general professors demand a good standard, and that is one of the best things at the university" (T40). Therefore, quality is in place, but administrative practices do not allow it to be fully realized. It is not internationalization that improves quality, but rather quality has to be visible in internationalization. According to another teacher, since adding the international dimension and education in English makes organization of work more complicated, managing these new tasks compromises quality:

> They are not very linked together. I am very surprised about it. We have administrative problems, which make it difficult to be more international. So, if the university teacher, for example, wants to change place [to a university abroad], and someone would come back to [our] university to give classes, the university does not allow that my teaching there could be calculated as my teaching responsibility here. There is no sense, but that's the practice. (T39)

Internationalization, along with many possible gains, creates a number of practical problems that are hard to anticipate.

Some people acknowledge the individual value of international studies for themselves, but are sceptical about the normative idea of quality improvement through internationalization:

> Not necessarily… For my future perspectives it is very important, for my personal goals, because first of all I did my bachelor's in international studies, so I already had an interest in it. Then, because I have lived in three countries myself, I've always been interested in internationality. But it does not necessarily mean that just because the university or a corporation is very international, that it goes hand in hand with quality. You can have bad quality and yet have an international aspect, and also the other way around. (S31)

Some of the teachers are sceptical as well, since a great deal of internationalization takes place in the higher administrative levels of the university and remains as a rhetoric:

> It depends… because it is written in the university strategies that there should be more internationalization, more international students, more international degrees, but it should not lead to the situation that universities accept international students just because they have international background. So, I think the academic level should always be maintained. And if you get good applicants, then the international issues do bring more perspectives just in class, they bring more quality maybe to teaching. But there is just so much hype on universities having to integrate into an international field and everything… international is not enough… (T35)

Other teachers also supported the idea that internationalization can only bring fruits if it is sustained by stable funding, administrative support and a good program of studies. A couple of teachers also dismissed the connection between internationalization and quality, claiming that in Finland the faculty's mindset and practices are not ready for this kind of change: "It will take another generation of teachers and researchers, a change in attitudes, for internationalization to bring some benefits" (T37). The overall normative idea that could be derived from this is that there is a need for human and institutional resources to enhance quality through internationalization.

To sum up, there are several clusters of answers to this question. First, there are positive responses without clarification, and general justifications on the basis of globalization; they do not explore the impact of internationalization on education. Second, there are answers linked to classroom diversity and experiential knowledge, which enrich education through a variety of perspectives. The answers exploring internationalization as a set of formal credentials also fall into this group, as they are constructed around internationalization's individual benefits for students. Third, the intertwinement of teaching and research, and their contrast in

the degree of internationalization, are another cluster, which probes deeper into the link between internationalization and education quality. Fourth, the difference across the various levels of study show that early on internationalization forms student expectations concerning the kind of knowledge that students can gain. At the graduate levels, however, it can also open up professional opportunities, including an academic career. Fifth, analysing the involvement of international students and the ability of the university to benefit from their presence, it is possible to speak of institutional resources that are crucial to ensure the advantages of internationalization. This is also true for the discrepancy between teaching and research, and the idea that an improvement of teaching could result from stimuli brought by international students. Sixth, the opposite idea of 'internationalization brings quality' refers to practices, which either shows that these two notions can exist separately, or they require greater commitment and institutional changes in order to succeed. Thus, it is not internationalization that improves quality; instead, 'quality has to be visible in internationalization' is a stand-alone recognition within this cluster. It parallels the formal approach to individual benefits from the international degree, and it ascribes internationalization to the image and recognition.

Thus, normative representations of an enhancement trace some of the ideas from the policy discourse. Internationalization can be perceived as an external characteristic, acquiring individual dimensions. It could be argued through globalization, though in this case the conditions are also conceptualized in terms of personal success in the labour market. Finally, some of the ideas about quality enhancement point towards university agency as a key in internationalization development; the exploration of these normative ideas holds relevance for planning.

6.2 Individual expectations regarding the university

Internationalization is changing expectations around university performance. I asked a question about the institutional characteristics which are relevant for a university issuing a master's degree. It was an inquiry which aimed to elicit general views on education. If the respondents hesitated, I would ask that if they were discussing a choice with a friend, what would they recommend looking at. The discussion did not involve assessing the particular universities, one against another. My intention was to see if internationalization would appear as a relevant characteristic of education, and what place it would occupy among other features. The respondents either voiced general ideas about the issue or they cited their personal experiences. The emphasis in their answers also varied. Some focused on what is important for a master's degree in contrast to a bachelor's, while others were more interested in the general ideals of a good university. I asked about relevant university characteristics from an individual perspective.

The size of the university and its overall capacity to organize a learning environment was mentioned as important. This presupposes a "critical mass of researchers and fellow students", so that it is "large enough and vibrant enough, and well-equipped enough to be able to accommodate people from different strands of life, from different disciplines, different backgrounds" (T35). Therefore, the ability to engage with and benefit from diversity within the university was seen as crucial. This is connected to the university's organizational and financial resources. Another respondent, who stressed the available options at the university, was critical about the current state of affairs in Finland: "Internationalization is so much in the beginning. So, if you take an average university, you probably will not find very much in English" (T38). The teacher added that bigger universities provide a larger selection of courses in English.

Feedback on options was relevant from a student's point of view as well: "But I think ideally I would choose a university that would have different options, that is going to provide me with an experience, that is going to provide me with a career trajectory in my field, but also other careers as well" (S30). This builds towards the international relevance of the choices available at the university. Overall, the 'general' orientation was mentioned, meaning that students can benefit from interdisciplinarity and the selection of courses. Within this individual perspective, conditions at the university, student life and institutional structures were also exposed. Academic choices were emphasized by a teacher: "Looking at ones' own specialization, the student might consider what kind of disciplines are represented in the social sciences. It is desired that the student could choose not just within one's own specialization, but from a little bit wider range of topics" (T36). This supports the idea that the overall academic standing of the university is important, and that the synergy which benefits from different disciplines should be available to students.

Then, academic communication was seen as key to the university offering international master's programs: "For the master's degree, there needs to be a good interaction with the teaching staff, a lot more than at the bachelor's level" and "atmosphere… almost equality between teachers and students" (S12). The teaching approach was also mentioned as a relevant feature: "lectures that stimulate, and help you to express your ideas, not just press you to remember something…" (S1). This points to the overall pedagogical approach within the university. The accessibility of lecturers was also held to be a matter of the overall atmosphere and established practices at the university: "I think that a good university should also have good teacher-student relations in terms of you being able to approach your tutors and teachers. When there is a problem, and you get feedback, constructive feedback" (S24).

However, some of the respondents mentioned that the quality of the particular degree program could be a stand-alone issue. Accordingly, the choice of university should be guided by information about a program, rather than vice versa: "For

example, if the program is in natural science, there are some things that are important. If the program is in social science, practical training in the society is better for students, in order to find employment" (S7). Another student added to this perspective the viability of doing the degree: "I think that it is obviously program-specific. For me, pursuing a master's degree is also a question of economics. Cost is an important aspect" (S14). Financial viability was commented on by many other respondents. Then, she continued about education quality, which should be highly acclaimed internationally. Overall, the major point was on finding a good opportunity, both financially and organizationally, which could be case-specific.

Largely, I would say that internationalization was not seen as being the primary characteristic of a good university. Often, it was mentioned as a sub-aspect of something (e.g. a feeling of membership in the university community for international and domestic students alike, introducing international aspects to the curriculum, and so on). Another important aspect found here is that the university has to create conditions for a good education and ensure that established practices function and achieve the desired objectives. This refers to internationalization as well.

Then, several respondents mentioned the university's reputation: it is important to have internationally recognized quality, since many of the students strive to be employed internationally. The situation with the university's reputation in Finland was mentioned as being different from other countries:

> …the whole master's and bachelor's [programs] are not that separate. Usually when you apply for a master's you look at the university differently… whereas if you look at programs outside, there might be some universities that are better for doing a master's than a bachelor's. This especially concerns the research background. A bachelor's is more about getting to know your subject, about these people that are experts in their field theoretically. Once you do your master's, it is better to be in the university where professors have more of a research background, less theoretical, I would say. When you do your master's, you get more into the practical matters. (S33)

While reputation is a formal characteristic of the university, it stands for greater quality. Here we can see how it could be related to actual university practices.

Other respondents also expanded on the international dimension, stating that the university should have ties with businesses and the community. This would introduce students to the practical applications of their studies and employment opportunities. One of the faculty members established a connection between the research focus of their program and the job opportunities associated with it, stating that they are reciprocally significant (T40). Other teachers distinguished commitments for the two institutional types. While universities of applied sciences are

more oriented towards industry and developing the practical skills of their graduates, research universities are focused on science development and orient their alumni in this direction as well. Many of the student respondents, however, did not juxtapose practical instruction and research skills; the latter were also considered important career qualifications. Research success was also a part of the overall reputation, and "respected in their field" was a proxy for quality of instruction as well (S28). It was also tied to internationalization: "If it is international, it is valued in research, because that is how it is known abroad as a university. That is how it attracts more international students" (S23).

Respondents also commended research accomplishments in their particular field of studies and mentioned the need to be aware of the university's methodological orientation. For instance, some of the students came from universities with a strong quantitative training, and they were not aware of the mostly qualitative research at their current university in Finland. One of the students appreciated the experience in the new approach (S24). Yet, others revealed that employment opportunities are higher with a quantitative background, as well as the fact that they eventually had difficulties in finding good supervision (S28). Other students noted that these problems have affected their prospects of doing a PhD at the same university: "I find that there is not enough done at this university. So, I am always looking outwards, meeting researchers from other places" (S29). Therefore, opportunities of methodological training at the university are an essential normative expectation of the university.

Several respondents also mentioned the importance of students' integration into the academic community, including opportunities to be involved in research projects already at the master's level. Apart from enhancing interest in research, this is also a way to understand "how education and research training are intertwined and interdependent" (S32). Teachers also added that multidisciplinary research is particularly valuable for students' involvement, as well as their understanding of the university's strengths and its niche in the academic world: "This probably makes students' selection more conscious in the sense that they know that if they want to pursue this, that is the best way to achieve it" (T37). The same teacher also acknowledged that in order for this to work, it should be that "the university has openly expressed its orientation and strengths… presented [these] already to the applicants, in order to have the best ones" (T37). This reinforces the importance of enhanced communication between the university and potential applicants.

Yet, students already during their time of study may sometimes feel that the university is prioritizing research over teaching. The focus of the master's program should be closely interrelated with the studies done by the faculty so that there is an added value for the student learning. Otherwise there is a danger that "researchers are too focused on getting more citations and getting publications,

[rather] than directing the master's programs at the university" (S14). Other respondents noted the value of studies in a small group, being in the research lab and learning from weekly research discussions (S18). Teachers, on the other hand, expounded on the university's support of teaching. The way the university values teaching is revealed in the funding of this area and the importance given to that part of the workload (according to several teachers). However, one pointed out: "At the moment the problem is that research is more valued than teaching. Those who are in teaching positions, there are so few of them, that they are overloaded with teaching" (T35). Balanced funding would allow the university "to hire qualified teaching staff and be able to do high-quality research, and then transmit this knowledge to the students" (T38). This link between teaching and research is crucial for master's programs, since their quality is "always about offering up-to-date knowledge" (T40).

Apart from the quality of teaching and research, the university should have "good enough administrative structures, supportive ones, that take care of the program's logistics, I would say". This especially concerns international students: "…sometimes if you move halfway across the world, you need a little bit of support for things. … You might need a bit of extra guidance, because studying in Finland is different" (S24). Other students also added that the university should reflect on the relevant focus and training for international students, so that their choice of going abroad for degree studies would be justified. Teachers also commented on room for internationalization in the local students' studies: "I think that it should not be like a divide, that you could study without ever taking a course in English. If you want to study social sciences, anyway you have to read in English" (T36). Another lecturer also added that "so-called 'international master's programs', they should be integrated into the general master's programs" (T37) in order to ensure study in different languages and the intermingling of students.

Another related topic is the issue of students' rights and the opportunity to navigate the academic environment. Teachers claimed that students should be treated equally "no matter where they come from" (T36). Yet, several international students claimed that their opportunities at the university are very limited compared to those of locals: since they are new to the university, during the short period of studies at the master's level, they do not have a chance to influence university life (T19, T20). Others noted positively that program managers were responsive to their feedback and did their best to resolve the problems. However, the normative idea behind these is the same: it does not just involve equality, but that the university is expected to involve students in decision-making. Yet, another student also mentioned that it is impossible to know beforehand what kind of internal life one would find at the university upon arrival (S25).

This is tied to the issue of unpredictability and expectations that applicants have when choosing the university; they have to shift from the normative idea of

the university to reality, and then make this choice work for their career and personal development. In contrast to the academic literature, which depicts academic studies as transformative for students' personal development and career opportunities, this exposes another side: the choice of the degree program abroad is risky and entails many contingency factors. For the university, in fact, international studies are a similar kind of challenge: they should suggest internationally relevant course offerings and select students with unfamiliar qualifications, who would be capable to complete a degree. Success in the internationalization of learning is case-specific, although meeting these challenges is stimulating for the university. Individual expectations of the university develop in line with the academic literature.

The normative idea regarding the university was formulated by one of the teachers like this: "open to the world, and not an introverted, self-sufficient body… one which is able to exchange and communicate ideas" (T40). This correlates with the topic of the university atmosphere mentioned by many respondents. Apart from the general meaning of a vibrant and multicultural environment, this is associated with spatial characteristics: links between different campuses, libraries and an availability of places for studies and communication. Students also emphasized the feeling of belonging to the university community.

Overall, a range of expectations is tied up with the university in the current situation. The idea of the university being international is not a central one. Rather, due to internationalization, the university has to possess certain resources and develop novel approaches. Sometimes internationalization is just a stimulating factor for issues that should be present in any case (i.e. high-quality teaching). A separate dimension is the relationship between the university and international students. For the latter, the institution is their primary frame of reference in the foreign country. It was noted by several respondents that there is no way to know accessibility, organization, infrastructure and quality of teaching before joining international studies. This underlines the importance of the students' expectations and their subsequent evolution, along with the university's review of practices vis-à-vis international tenets.

6.3 International degree programs: definition, demand and limitations

I inquired about the respondents' ideas of the international master's program and what its building blocks might be. My initial interest was in relation to how demanding participants were and what the boundaries of internationalization's understanding were in practice. The key characteristic was diversity of students; many respondents saw this as a major facet. Some teachers and students just noted that it is fruitful to have participants from all over the world, while others elaborated that diversity should not be limited to Europe, Northern Europe or some

other clearly delineated area. In some of the answers, openness to applications from all over the world was emphasized. Respondents claimed that since studies are in English, that adds to openness, and usually applications are from different countries.

Some of the students were determined to conceptualize diversity in an open way, namely, in terms of "country-wise background" and "academic background" (S4, S7, S23). This formulation depicts diversity as an experience of another country or another academic system, rather than an ethnic origin. In this case again, diversity would not be assessable through the macro figures of international students at the university and the countries they originate from. There is no aggregate measure for the institution to rely on. These are micro-level processes that expose the benefits of diversity for studies.

One of the students also noted that it is a big part of the international program when students themselves "realize the variety of their backgrounds" (S23). This speaks of the international experience as a conscious pursuit of students, as well as a long-term effort that extends beyond the timeline of the degree studies: "…even the Finnish students would be with an international background in the sense that they are interested in very international issues, or they lived abroad a lot, or in general just don't feel themselves as a typical Finn" (S5). In turn, this experience brings students closer, irrespective of their backgrounds. If individuals seek international studies due to their prior experience and inclinations, this means that universities cannot fully claim the transformation of students through the current studies; thus, the institution's role in internationalization could be questioned. Understanding of the institutional role in these micro-level internationalization processes has not yet emerged.

The realization that ethnic and country origin should not be essentialized as diversity agrees with the implication about faculty always being international due to the nature of their academic career; it is their experience that makes them international. One of the teachers expressed this perspective:

> And then having international teachers, well, not necessarily, since as I said, as researchers, and as teachers, we are in any case, even those who are Finnish by nationality, we are in any way connected to international research cooperation. With some few exceptions, there could be some people who do not have much contact with foreign colleagues, and who are not so used to teaching in English. (T37)

This did not imply anything negative against international faculty. The respondent was interested in having colleagues from other countries, but the point was that in contrast to students, the faculty is international, irrespective of their ethnic origin. Yet, as established by the earlier insights into the question of diversity, there may not be such a great contrast between students and scholars.

Furthermore, some of the respondents appealed for diversity among the teachers and guest lecturers as well. The situation when "university teachers are Finnish, and students are international" was brought up as being particularly awkward (S26). This recalls the argument that when diversity is delineated by some geographic area, it limits the perspectives that are brought into education. Students mentioned the importance for teachers to have diverse educational backgrounds.

The teachers also acknowledged that there is a need to expand the faculty recruitment process internationally, to make it "truly open for non-Finnish nationals", and "not just native English speakers" (T39). As some of the respondents mentioned, this would internationalize the university practices and make them open for discussion. The access to power in discussing internal issues at the university is tricky for international faculty and students; thus, international programs should have a "committee that includes international people" (S20). Therefore, this goes beyond formal diversity and problematizes the question of who is deciding about the actual practices, creating a common place of interaction.

Diverse backgrounds and experiences are a challenge for the institution to engage with: for fruitful education, more diversity is needed, and yet practices, the admission of students, and the recruitment of faculty have to transform. Another concern at the institutional level is that since diversity importance for education can have many aspects which are not measurable quantitatively, there should be some other ways for the university to sustain internationalization.

If we relate these claims to the normative principles, the question is whether the university builds on available diversity or fosters diversity through the internationalization approach. Some of the students mentioned that it is essential how the program is marketed, such as whether it positions itself as international and open to the whole world: "I think the program makes the point of bringing students from different areas, different universities, different backgrounds, educational backgrounds, so to speak" (S14). That said, the idea of selection on the basis of diverse backgrounds received a great deal of criticism from both teachers and students. One of the students even mentioned that it would make the program "technically" international, and the rest of it depends on the institutional approach (S18). Another student called the pre-selection process based on diversity "artificially international" (S33). Other students also expressed anxiety over the 'tokenistic' approach to internationalization, where the agency of the university is channelled towards selecting a "Chinese, Japanese, Indian and European" and deliberating that this is internationalization (S21). One lecturer also mentioned that even Finnish students from different parts of the country, along with Chinese and Americans, can bring a diversity of perspectives into the classroom discussion (T39). Lastly, a teacher mentioned that the success of the program rests in its ability to attract students from all over the world though interesting focus and good quality (T36).

The university's agency within this aspect of internationalization is in creating a space that interests diverse students and scholars, as well as fostering practices that can include them. Maybe there is a way to manage diversity through admission and recruitment, but the overall capacity of the university to influence these micro processes is rather limited.

Language issues are tied to the idea of creating a common place as well. First of all, as I already mentioned, it is equalized with the idea of openness to applications from all over the world, rather than being "bound to just several nationalities", as in the case of French, German or Spanish language. Yet, there was a contrasting opinion by one student, who claimed that there is "a lot of demand for teaching French culture in French" and that these programs could also be considered international (S27). Still, another respondent explained that it would be impossible to have an international program in Finnish, because "in Finland we speak the language that nobody talks" (S31). Furthermore, as one of the teachers noted, language use should be sustained by the large group of the international students: "There is no idea to teach some Finnish subject to some Finnish students, there needs to be some added value for the international dimension there, too" (S37). But this is considered a necessity rather than a "synonym to being international". Several respondents also acknowledged the organizational challenges in managing studies in several languages, "not just the language that is originally spoken at this university" (S8). This condition, like the idea of diversity, is just a foundation for the international studies, on which the university could build some educational value.

Language requirements, according to several respondents, also imply that there should be enough courses taught in English, which deal with a curriculum "that has an international scope in it – cultures, countries, integration and migration"; the issues should have a "global touch" (S14). In this case, the issue of language belongs to the larger topic of the curriculum. But, as one of the respondents mentioned, the choice of language also changes the audience of the course and affects the content of the course (S19). Instead of opening up the curriculum, this could also have a counter-effect, if the course were to prioritize European and American sources:

> I think at this university they very much focus on the European curriculum, but not the curriculum of other places, not Africa or Asia… So, at the beginning it was very difficult for me to get into what is going on in these European people's minds... Because it wasn't what I was used to, I was used to the perspective from our part of the world. (S24)

Other students mentioned the dominance of the European perspective as well. They suggested that having diverse students who manage different languages and

have an experience of different realities should inspire teachers to verify their approach, as "you can't sort of take things so much for granted and you have to think as a teacher a bit beyond your comfort zone" (S12, S16). This reinforces the university's responsiveness to create a common space for diverse students.

Then, there is an idea similar to what is explored in the academic literature as a two-way street of learning and communication (Leask, 2009): "…and then you sort of have to be open to new ideas and new challenges, that the students bring, and sort of listening to their experiences from different realities, for example" (S23). So, it is not only about the content of studies, but about the teaching approach as well: "I would say that the quality is international, if it also incorporates discussion. We cannot only see the professor as the authority, more or less conveying information to the students" (S15). This requires a change of the teachers' position within the classroom: "…the teacher should not look down at the students, but rather be quite equal with the students in order to have a discussion. Because this is at the core of being internationalized" (S15). In this way, the responsibility for creating internationalization value is seen to also fall on the teachers.

There is also an understanding that different disciplines involve different kinds of internationalization. Some subjects, like the natural sciences, are and have always been international. Other, like social sciences, have been recently enhanced through international perspectives. Thus, there has emerged an understanding that due to globalization, many aspects of social science should be reconsidered with these different perspectives in mind. Yet, some of the teachers also mentioned that these disciplines were always international, since the classical sources of sociology, philosophy and political science have always had a core of "international classics" (T35). Yet, other disciplines require a careful consideration of how internationality applies to them. Among the most controversial are subjects with a national focus. Here the opinions of the respondents were divided. Some of the teachers mentioned that it makes no sense to make a Finnish history course, or a course on *Kalevala*, in English, since that focus should probably require some language skills (T37).

In contrast, a couple students mentioned that they chose to come to Finland because of their academic interest in the country. For them, it is valuable that even international courses are mostly based on examples from Finland or other Nordic countries. Others characterized this situation as limiting for international studies. Moreover, some of the students realized that teaching is based on the particular kind of academic tradition established in Finland: "I think it would be interesting to have more from the American academic tradition, Asian academic tradition… I think that is something I have not seen yet. I don't know if there are programs like those. It would be interesting to see. But I think in this case it's mainly that you have a lot of different people there" (S21). The respondent recognizes this as a normative idea, which is not easily transferred into practices, but its educational

value is clearly elaborated. Other students connected a similar issue to the presence of a range of scholars, who could introduce a diversity of ideas into the curriculum. Many of the respondents elaborated on how indispensable the internationalization is for their study focus.

They also referred to the international standards for their particular discipline and mentioned that the university should work on the "big issues" and supply knowledge that would be relevant in other parts of the world (S12). The overarching idea was that the focus of the course or the study program should be openly argued in internationalization planning. Examples of this include the geographic area, the choice of the language of instruction, or any other issue limiting the "global scope" of the studies (S1). Finally, according to many respondents, the international program should have a practical application. Also mentioned as important were the organization of internships, ties with society and industries, and partner universities and partner programs.

In conclusion, the international dimensions of the degree program were conceptualized as essential, but not sufficient elements. It is not the diversity itself that is important, but the ability of the university to mobilize its educational value. Similarly, language does not ensure internationalization, but only opens the opportunities for it. The internationality of teaching is not limited to a diversity of perspectives, but points towards the openness for new additions and a rethinking of familiar topics. This can be resolved through a two-way pedagogical approach and a non-hierarchical organization of studies. The question of what international master's programs should be like revealed that internationalization challenges institutional practices and that there are critical areas which determine the value of this process for education.

6.4 Internationalization value

The aggregate analysis of the respondents' perspectives above gives an assessment of the demands within internationalization. This section reveals what elements are the most indispensable for the respondents' vision of internationalization. In the interview, I asked the following questions: What are the instances when international education becomes inefficient? When was it meant to be international, but due to some problems when is it no longer valuable? My intention here was to explore the boundaries of the concept and to narrow it down to specific examples. Students and teachers draw either on practices or their own thinking, but the idea of how it 'should be' emerges from their contributions. Lastly, to wrap up the question of internationalization value, I asked respondents directly whether these studies were an international experience for them. The variety of replies reveals how people perceive and absorb an international experience.

The university's standing and work towards creating internationalization conditions matter for internationalization. To some extent, this is revealed in the partnerships and cooperation with other universities, or the lack of such contacts, that master's programs may demonstrate. In contrast to the approach of the administration, it is not a formal agreement that is valued by respondents, but the reality of whether the university has a network with similar scientific interests. This precludes the university from being focused on the "local setting". Academic commitments are at the core of institutional functioning, and, as several students and teachers state, poorly developed courses and the absence of knowledgeable faculty members undermine internationalization value. What is more significant is that the value of internationalization can and should be communicated by the university to the students and faculty members.

Somehow the university should demonstrate the advantages of internationalization for the students: "If they can't form our expectations, our expectations would be lower than what we could have [from internationalization]" (S11). This is not only about the university framing international experiences. It also signifies that internationalization does not have value per se, but that learning, possibly enhanced through internationalization, is at the core of university studies. Another part of the 'expectations' is that the university has to create a 'common ground' for different students to study together: "The problem is that it is not made clear for students when they come here what is expected from them… Because they all come from different… they all have to adapt to culture or education here" (S21). This perspective on the academic and cultural differences is notably different from the one presented in the literature. Differences are not presented as intractable; the creation of the common learning space is emphasized. Finally, the theme of expectations touches upon the difference of what is advertised and what students receive within the university:

> [The international master's program] markets itself as international, but its pool of applicants doesn't really represent as diverse student body as… They probably could be international, even if there is just one demographic representative. Maybe it is all Finnish students, but it is international depending on what they study and how they study it. But let's say the program is marketed as an international degree program open to whoever fits… whatever country… you just have to meet certain qualifications based on educational goals… but then if this program only has Finland and Sweden, just two countries represented within a student body, when there are 20–30 [students]… Maybe it is time to look at why there are only these applicants… Why isn't there a diverse pool of applicants – let alone students? (S31)

This quote demonstrates that the educational value of internationalization is situational and "program-specific". There could be multiple set-ups which bring fruitful educational outcomes, but every approach of internationality requires its own justifications. This depends on the university's positioning and analysis of the ongoing internationalization. Therefore, normative ideas in the institutional perspective could be verified through actual practices, and the internationalization value could be argued once again. Although respondents ascribed high value to the university's agency in this area, the existing diversity in the classroom was the major concern, and "limited demographics" were argued as a constraint for internationalization (S20). Accordingly, a teacher expressed apprehension that if a program is unable to attract international students, that points towards an inadequate profile, poor education or a lack of institutional resources (T39).

As an institutional solution for ensuring diversity, one student pondered the idea of making quotas for admission from different places, although, she notes, that would make studies "artificially international" (S33), with token students from different countries. Several students acknowledged the existing diversity of their study programs and its educational value. But along with that, there was a reflection on the limitations of a diverse environment:

> The problem with the international aspect is that we are so separate from the Finnish students that we have to bond with each other, which is good in some ways, but then we are not sharing with Finnish people, we are not understanding what Finnish sociologists are like, so we are kind of trapped in our own little world. (S29)

The isolation of studies from the Finnish context and lack of networks with Finnish students were thought of as drawbacks of internationalization. While the normative idea would be unlimited, open diversity, there was an acknowledgement that this might be an ideal and far from practice. At the same time, when the diversity pattern is pointing towards a certain problem in implementation, that underlying reason is a problem for internationalization. The lack of Finnish students in international programs shows a deficiency of the locally oriented marketing and internal organization of the university life. It was stated that when students come from only two or three different places (i.e. only from Northern Europe, or even just Europe), that significantly limits the perspectives in the classroom discussion (S32). This diversity issue also concerns lecturers who in the normative representation should represent a variety of backgrounds as well.

Among the possible limitations of internationalization, the university's support structures were mentioned by several respondents. These were teachers who noted that in an ideal world, the university would sustain the transition of students coming from all over the world. In this case, as one of the teachers noted, extra efforts are needed from the professors in terms of tutoring and integrating students in the

university life (T36). Another teacher noted that this issue should be tackled before admission, such that students, despite their different backgrounds, would be on the same level (T40). This retains the deficiency discourse on international students in the academic literature. While institutional support is vital, and acknowledged by students themselves, picturing them as dependent and lacking the necessary capacities to adapt is a limited normative perspective, which contradicts the idea of importance of diverse backgrounds. Moreover, the focus shifts from the works of the university and faculty to the students' backgrounds.

Insufficient language command was brought up as another problem. Yet, students mentioned that since language skills are an entrance requirement, there should not be a problem in classroom communication. Clearly, either the admission process or everyday practices have to be addressed. This problem was noted in relation to teachers as well: "I think that the English of teachers is also very important, because here we have a lecturer, and she is really very good, but her English is not understandable… Every time we are at her lecture, we have to concentrate on her English. Otherwise, it's very distracting, because of English…" (S26). Here we can see that the language medium challenges university pedagogy. But there is also an overall communication issue connected to the switch of languages. For example, another teacher mentions that it is awkward to use English when there are only two or three international students, and the majority share a language. The issue of language prompts questions around practices. If a language switch takes place, what are the sufficient grounds for it, and if it does not, how would the interaction with the few international students take place.

Apart from English, internationalization problems also arise with the use of the Finnish language. Since not all information is available in English, this makes adjustment complicated, but it does not preclude internationalization. Additionally, Finnish-language learning can be problematic due to the limited timeframe of master's studies. A deficiency in Finnish skills is a problem for participation in the political and social life at the university. The lack of their voice contributes to the inequality of international students. As one of the teachers noted, language as such does not make education international, but it serves as an important starting point, an opening up of education for different constituencies.

Internationalization in English leads to thematic and curricular limitations due to the language choice: "…it builds a little bit of a wall, that with foreign people we speak English. When all international programs are taught in English and not in Russian or French, Spanish… it affects the content that you use" (S27). Other forms of internationalization, according to this respondent, could include widely spoken languages and still gather students from different parts of the world, although within a limited framework. This normative idea is clearly less dominant in practice. There are few widely spoken languages, and there would be a challenge to find faculty and applicants for such a program in Finland. This might

apply more to those countries which have a possibility to develop internationalization in their own language. Considering this dimension is important when we try to understand the role of English. There is a trade-off between openness for applications, where the choice of English wins, and the idea to ensure a variety of options in internationalization while still retaining national features.

Communication itself, however, is another challenge for the university when organizing internationalization. The isolation of the international students has already been mentioned. Sometimes the issue is not about cultural differences or a lack of networking, but about the type of communication that international students experience: "… it can be like a revolving door, that you meet people as they go. The way that international students are often put in the same frame as exchange students. A lot of courses that we take are also suitable for exchange students" (S10). The respondent adds that this affects cooperation with international students. It goes along with the lack of supervisors; since the program becomes a "little bubble" within the faculty, it is hard to find adequate advice apart from the staff directly involved with the program. This pertains to the overall ability of the university to sustain the academic and social needs of the students. Another student notes that the university should ensure the possibility to continue studies at the higher level. The most necessary condition for that is being integrated into the academic community from the beginning of one's master's studies. The respondent also emphasizes that in the case of degree studies, this is their home university, and therefore integration is essential (S6). The normative idea behind this claim is that the university, when one comes for degree studies, should academically become an alma mater. There are variations on what this could mean, but the overall gist is that the university should note the differences of international and domestic students in terms of integration, but it should not create differences within their level of involvement at the university. It should build a common ground for all.

The gap between local students and international students was noted by many respondents (though much less by the teachers). It is also manifested in the area of curricula. On the one hand, if education is international, one should be able to feel 'in the word'; on the other hand, since internationalization takes place in Finland, there should be an appropriate place for the Finnish context in international studies. It is quite different for international and domestic students, as the former participate in courses suitable for exchange students, where the "polished picture of Finland is presented" (S7). Several respondents acknowledged that creating a common ground for diverse students is challenging:

> When you have many students from different cultures, you don't have a protocol to follow. You need to set this up at the beginning, find your mutual way of co-working or co-studying. This is always a challenge, and this is something the university could do a little but more, when they give group work, for instance, they could give a certain standard

> or divide a labour a little bit. So that people don't need to spend many hours in just agreeing what should be done. This is something that the university could help, but in Finland this is not very customary. They tend to leave students to find their own way, which is also good, but experience is that it sometimes takes time and could be problematic. (S31)

The complications explored above were imaginary; respondents described their ideals in education, and they arrived at certain principles for managing practices. The issues below arise from problems, and then they arrive at the normative principles.

Students noted the difference between what is said about internationalization and what is done or actually happens in practice; this brings us to the problem of gaps. For instance, students pointed out the lack of content in English as a problem: "When you read about how international this university is, and then you come here and face these problems, it kind of demotivates you. This puts you down sometimes. I thought it is international, but then it is not that international" (S23). In turn, teachers have their own expectations about students in terms of qualifications, motivations and participation in the academic environment. One of the teachers spoke about the difficulties of selecting qualified students. He noted that once you meet students for the first time, they might seem to be totally different people than those originally selected; it is especially hard to assess discussion skills and motivation through the submitted paperwork (T36). Another teacher noted that they review more carefully those applicants who already have a master's degree; the idea behind that is that their motivation to complete their studies would be lower (T38). Then, upon arrival, teachers often encounter students with insufficient academic skills (i.e. essay writing and taking notes). One teacher noted that sometimes student skills are at an unacceptably low level:

> We had one case where a student got his master's degree with the lowest possible mark. I surely know that he does not have the skills as a researcher that a master's of social sciences should have. … There were a lot of difficulties, some kind of mutual misunderstanding in his guiding process during his studies. It was very hard somehow. I did not understand him, he did not understand me… We did not have some kind of shared language in this process. (T39)

It is probably hard to select students from abroad and assess foreign qualifications; without prior interaction, there is always a risk of misjudgement and selection of poorly qualified applicants. Of course, it is almost always true that the idea and the reality differ in international studies, for both the institution and the individual.

Yet, the university has a choice to resolve these difficulties: addressing admission procedures and building support structures, or exploring the problems of some students and extrapolating to the whole group. The latter approach feeds into the same deficiency discourse; inadequate academic skills are not discussed in relation to domestic students. This could be ascribed to the difficulty of receiving students from unfamiliar academic environment. Sometimes the challenges of international students may point towards the unknown educational system, not insufficient academic skills. Another dimension could even be that students come to upgrade their academic skills through the international degree, and they should be able to achieve that during their studies.

This again points to the support structures of the university. The value of internationalization, or the lack of it, is connected here to the question of responsibility for situations where something does not work in the intended way. Students expect the university to resolve problematic issues and anticipate certain difficulties of newcomers. Teachers, in turn, have expectations of what students should know upon arrival: "Because when people come to the master's, everybody has at least a bachelor's degree. It somehow felt that everybody knows already what to do. But if you are used to [something] different, it might be difficult to follow how it should be done" (T37). While teachers often mention the study skills that students should possess, there is a larger problem of being new to the system and receiving guidelines. That is missing from this discussion, but quite strikingly mentioned by students exploring their integration challenges.

Moreover, teachers talk about the need to "get used to one academic environment", expecting a student to adapt to the existing order of things, rather than creating a shared academic environment with students (T40). It is a dilemma whether internationalization value is created when expectations are met or whether it emerges when one adjusts expectations and manages to maintain academic standing. For the students, the value is when they find things to be different, but still can learn something new and meet their educational goals. For the teachers and the institution, the value is much more problematic. If students are not independent enough and lack academic skills, there is no way to talk about internationalization having a benefit for the university. The whole interaction is framed in terms of giving help to the newcomers.

Sometimes the difference between the former and the present academic system is noted in a complimentary way by the students. The Finnish academic system was characterized in various accounts as very flexible, where one could create his or her own degree from a variety of options. Though many students noted that this was very unusual for them and "not all people like it", along the way they were able to develop an independent approach to their studies. However, managing this kind of approach depends on the student's awareness about this feature and the available options to choose from.

For international students, many options can be quite restricted due to language boundaries and a lack of networking with the faculty. Some students expressed concerns that their program, being isolated, does not attract the majority of the faculty: "There are just a couple of teachers who ever meet these people. That is why I don't think that there should be a separate curriculum for them. It should be that you have access to all teaching" (S13). Another student also stated along these lines: "The majority of the faculty in my major do not know about my program. They do not know who the students are, they never meet them, so it is something really marginal" (S20). One teacher also acknowledged that for international studies, they "don't offer that many courses" (T35). Apart from the diminished value for international students, this also demonstrates that international degree programs and the need to integrate international students do not stimulate a wider rethinking of the university's operations. The university takes on the challenge of receiving international students, but the institutional benefit is unclear.

This kind of gap between normative ideas and organizational issues in practice affects teaching in the program as well. Organizing the courses in English often takes place with limited resources and receives harsh criticism from students: "I don't feel that the classes have been very good. They are not very organized, and I don't think we are getting the best teachers for them. Like the people that really know what they are doing. They are getting whoever they can get. So, in that way it has been inefficient" (S27). Another student also points out the lack of commitment to international studies:

> When the department is not dedicated to it, when a lot of teaching responsibilities are given to the junior teachers. To me, my gut feeling about the way that this is done is that it is still not seen generally speaking as important, to have the basic curriculum in Finnish or Swedish so that it would guarantee that you would have regular students with quality basic teaching. It puts them in a more vulnerable position from the beginning. (S15)

This shows that there are a lot of organizational issues within the university which are important in order to ensure benefit from international studies. Integrating foreign students and arranging studies in English exceed the university's operations. Some of the students emphatically stated that there are no specifically international or internationality-related problems: "It has nothing to do with whether it is international or not, it is just about how it is run, how it is developed, and who is responsible for it." (S8)

Even diversity and its contribution to classroom discussion depend on developing an approach to internationalization. A couple of students mentioned the cultural differences of students as a source of potential problems. It was not brought up as a central issue with concrete examples, but rather as an idea that students

should adjust their expectations to different approaches to studies and different backgrounds:

> I've never experienced that enough. I think if you are in the international program, you should kind of go with the expectancy that you are going to meet many different people that think completely differently from you. So, it would be surprising if you get into cultural conflict. You don't have to agree with them. I've never actually experienced any conflict being unsolvable in that sense. This type of problem is definitely not the dominant one! (S17)

This contrasts with the academic literature, which essentializes the role of culture in dealing with international students. It turns out that expectations and responsibilities are the key aspects behind the value of internationalization.

Finally, in order to wrap up the question of internationalization value, I asked students the question whether this was an international experience for them. I wanted to see how they conceptualized internationalization value for their personal learning path. Several students mentioned the value of diversity: "The most international that I can find in Finland" (S6), "I think it is quite international, at least compared to my home country" (S23), and "the diversity in my classroom is the highest it has ever been" (S11). Other students also mentioned the educational value of perspectives distant from their own thinking (i.e. studies from the European perspective, the viewpoint of the Chinese student in the discussion, and so on). One student also commented on less stereotypical representations, due to studies in a diverse student group: "I think that is when you realize that you can't really generalize, that they are all different" (S18). Some students elaborated on the process of exploring stereotypes and comparing knowledge from experience and scientific knowledge: "I think it is funny when people talk about the country that you have grown up in, and then people maybe have read about it and have an alternative standpoint, really funny experience in the study context" (S30). This value of internationalization, which depends on fruitful classroom discussion, is situational. It depends on the diversity and interest of students, as well as the topic and flow of the discussion.

Nevertheless, the institutional approach in seeking this value was praised by the students: "I think there was less emphasis put on internationality back home. I think that you feel that any international experience is really pushed here" (S3) or "My previous university also had a course on internationalization, but they are approaching it in a different way, and I think that this university does a much better job" (S22). Several Finnish students also mentioned the value of international studies: "But in general, I think it could not have been possible to do that degree and not be international at all. Of course, that comes from the teachers, who are not Finnish. That is one thing. But this program is from the outset a lot

more international. You can't avoid it even if you want to" (S5, S7). For them, the fostering of internationality on the part of the university is crucial to gain international experiences. One of the students commented: "When I was abroad, I was the international student, so yeah, now it is very international" (S7). This suggests that the value from the international degree program might be different for the domestic students.

Being local, domestic students do not have to concentrate on getting to know the system. They can see how other students perceive the environment which is familiar to them, and they can focus on establishing networks. Two students mentioned their realization of how isolated newcomers are, and they took the initiative of organizing their own social life at the faculty, where mingling of international and domestic students would take place. This was an especially valuable international experience for them. It demonstrates that initiative-taking in creating internationalization value also applies to students.

Many of the students mentioned prior experiences (i.e. living abroad and doing exchanges) that prompted their choice of international education. Several students noted the difference between exchanges and degree studies. For instance, one student said that this time (in the degree studies), internationalization comes with knowledge, and therefore it is more productive (S6). In contrast, another student claimed that the university is more invested in the experiences of the exchange students, and there is much less emphasis on the well-being of the degree students.

Other students, offering criticism about their current experiences, emphasized that they had more international experiences before or they were "already international" (S29). They insisted on this element of studies being a norm, an imperative for modern education, rather than an added value: "I don't say this is international or not, this is just the study. Being in this, for me it is hard to compare what is not international. Because I am already far away from the non-international" (S29). Or, "I only notice things when they are not international" (S29). Another student wrapped it up like this: "International just feels normal. I believe that internationalism is invisible, then it is international" (S21). This element of internationalization ideology is called 'normalization' by Kehm (2011). She explains that when everyday life became international, the university lost its power position in supplying students with unique experiences. Students' expectations of what they could obtain from the university were raised.

Therefore, the contribution of the university to internationalization was converted to framing diverse experiences into learning. This is called the university's specialization (2011, 237–238). Kehm also predicted that the value of study abroad or short-term studies would decrease and that universities would search for internationalization value. Based on my data, I would suggest instead that these will transform into two kinds of formative experiences. First, there will be studies with an established approach engaging with internationality. Second, there will be international experiences in parallel to that. Students mentioned that even though

a course may sometimes be good or bad in their opinion, "Living abroad gives more. Meeting people is good" (S4). Even more revealing, another student stated that the benefit from international studies is "not that much from the university, but from this society in general" (S13). She mentioned witnessing different events in the country (e.g. elections), reading news, learning from public discussions on important issues, and so on: "it was very interesting to witness and have time to appreciate what is going on around" (S13). This shows that internationalization value depends on the students' responsibility and level of interest, and although it is crucial for the university to supply quality education, an understanding of the student as an emancipated learner is even more essential in developing internationalization.

In summary for this part, we can infer that the characterization of internationalization through the delineations reveals two key issues: expectations and responsibilities. The issue of expectations reveals the gap between 'normative', 'planned' and internationalization in practice. The topic of responsibilities highlights the role of institutional and individual agency in internationalization; this determines the interpretation of internationalization value in the particular set-up.

Conclusions:

This analysis revealed a range of key internationalization elements: diversity, language and curriculum. It also showed that these are necessary but not sufficient instruments for creating educational value. An exploration of the normative dimensions from an individual perspective shows that many things are conditional, which means they are considered valuable within certain circumstances.

For instance, the benefits of diversity arise within the discussion, and this means that classroom practices that allow participation and teacher-student communication are needed to ensure educational value. At the same time, this highlights that although purposeful student involvement in co-constructing education is important, its value is often situational and depends on the situation at the university in terms of diversity and resources. However, the situational value of internationalization does not make it entirely contingent. Rather, it highlights the importance of the university's framing of the degree program by which it argues for the value of the particular kind of internationalization that is available. For instance, some of the initiatives could be either regional or truly global; their value depends on the institutional justifications for such an approach.

Another interesting dimension arising from individual normativities is that competitive, formal indicators of internationalization and the applied value of knowledge are not entirely juxtaposed with internationalization as a form of education content. While they cannot be considered alone, these elements are indispensable within the overall value of education. Internationalization could serve as a formal evidence of quality, both for institutions and individuals. It does not have

to be reduced to this narrow understanding, however. The economic and logistical feasibility of studies is also important for students, yet it does not make them any less demanding of the quality of the education. The university's reputation is an external characteristic, but it conveys the value that the education has for the students that come from abroad. It consists of multiple indicators and cannot be narrowed down to rankings or any other rigid, formal criterion, but rather is a complex body of information that allows students to hypothesize about education quality. Lastly, many of the student respondents did not juxtapose practical and research skills, as both of these were considered relevant for employment. Yet, as I explore in Chapter 7, both of them are addressed insufficiently by the university. Hence, from the individual perspective, the division between the universal and the applied value of knowledge, or competitive and academic internationalization, is not that sharp. However, this is the institutional approach that attracts the most attention.

Looking at the individual perspective, I return to the issue of expectations and their distance from actual practices. A gap between anticipated and real experience is almost inevitable, although the university could make it smaller by creating a common ground for the studies of students from diverse backgrounds. Another facet is individual agency in interpreting personal internationalization value and making use of the available experience. It turns out that quite often, even if the education provisions do not meet the students' prior expectations, there is a process of adjustment to the situation that he or she is in, which is informed by the chosen way of interpreting and fine-tuning the environment to one's personal goals and learning from the foreign country's broader environment.

An inference from this analysis of the individual normative perspectives in terms of internationalization planning is that the internationalization process depends on the institution's agency to outline, sustain and interpret internationalization's value. For instance, while attracting diverse students from all over the world, it is insufficient to focus only on degree recognition, as the macro-level discourse would suggest. Even within the pool of recognized degrees and accepted students, there is a lot of effort needed on the part of the university to adjust the teaching towards diverse qualifications and to mediate different study expectations. When students argue about the value of diverse educational backgrounds at the bachelors' level, it challenges the widely used admission requirement of matching with the prior studies. This means that there is a lot of room to reconsider the formal criteria so that they work for the benefit of education within the classroom. This also applies to the specification of the 'train and retain' approach of long-term internationalization. The narrow framework of the master's level studies and the emphasis on fast graduation does not necessarily ensure students' professional integration into society. Finally, the higher educational institutions are to communicate the international relevance of the choices available at the university. With internationalization, students gain the possibility of comparing the higher education

offerings critically, and the universities' challenge is to communicate their approach and selection of courses towards international audience.

In delineating the boundaries of internationalization, students expressed scepticism about internationalization's value as an independent characteristic, or its limited use in relation to insufficient practices. This also highlights the university's role in mitigating the gap between planning and practices. There is room to consider the problems of internationalization in everyday university processes and assess whether the overall interpretation fulfils the current needs of education at the individual and institutional levels.

Several normative aspects of this analysis are important for further exploration of practices. Internationalization presupposes a certain standardization, as available studies have to meet the expectations of diverse students. This implies internationally verified quality. Although there is no established "standard" in practice, the university, or the particular program, has to create a common ground for the diverse students, correlating it with academic and professional canons, which might also appear as quite blurry categories. This, once again, highlights the importance of communication on practices with students, a potential area to be improved by taking into account feedback. Currently, universities have to balance between the functions of teaching and research, and if the latter is prioritized in terms of competitiveness, universities see internationalization and international students to be a stimulus for greater attention towards teaching. This raises the question of how the individual dimension could be considered in practice and what are the mechanisms at the university for the inclusion of individual voices about practices.

7 Chapter: Perspectives on practices

Introduction: approaches to practices

The practices of international degree studies are at the centre of this chapter. Analysing policies and interviews, I summarize them along institutional and individual lines. In subchapter 7.1, I gather policy accounts about the current situation in university internationalization, and I argue that probes into practices are used as statements that current developments are insufficient and thus justify intensive measures. In 7.2, I analyse essential elements of master's programs' functioning. My inference is that while diversity and language balance determine education outcomes, realization of potential benefits depends on university agency. Then, in 7.3, I review representations about teaching; multiple issues are raised with regards to curricular and pedagogical approaches, which challenge the university approach to internationalization. In 7.4, I review the envisioned outcomes of internationalization. First, I explore perspectives on employment and the impact of a master's degree on that. International studies are often seen as a means of improving career choices, so I explore the participants' views on the utilitarian value of education. Second, I investigate the impact of the degree program on intercultural communication. Finally, in contrast to that, I also pay attention to the knowledge per se and ask respondents about the contribution of these experiences to personal development.

Policy papers rely on cogent conceptions; they exemplify normative ideas and planning rather than epitomize practices. Therefore, on the policy level, the characterizations of the current situation concerning internationalization are used rhetorically to justify the need for greater changes, rather than validate progress in the actual projects. Master's programs' routines are scarcely commented upon in the documents. Yet, the signals at the policy level impact practices, along with relevant circumstances at the institutional level.

Since everyday occurrences in education are only occasionally drawn into the discussion, practices are not generalized to an equivalent degree. Therefore, analysis also probes into everyday internationalization from the individual perspective, namely, the way it is experienced by participants in the education process. Interview data reveals the discourse of internationalization that has less power and representation in the internationalization development while at the same time it is closer to the practices. Interview participants look at the implementation of international degree studies from different angles depending on their background and position.

7.1 Policy perspectives on practices

Practices are represented in European policy through a competitive lens. Setting the direction of higher education development and the place of internationalization in it involves a comparison of performance in relevant areas. This is driven from the macro context and relies on the available indicators rather than inquiry into practices. This does not reveal a tangible effect by internationalization on university development. Along with that, marketing constitutes a fair share of practices from the top down; this is a market-driven representation of international activities. Although the EU is promoting higher education, marketing is considered in the broad sense of the term – promoting and opening up education to the world – and this cannot be used as a proxy for the actual processes taking place in higher education.

At the core of promoting the image of higher education, there are national and European websites with relevant information about work and study opportunities, as well as the practicalities of moving to the EU. The majority of countries have launched "one-stop shopping" websites (European Commission, 2013, 12). European-level documents focus on marketing national education systems worldwide, and these are based on assumptions about good education, rather than drawing from actual practices.

On the national level, the creation of 'brand' is fragmented. The early strategy posits Finland as a "a well-known and influential part of the European education and research area", which confirms the key role of reputation in internationalization (Ministry of Education, 2001). Finland is characterized as a "successful player in the global contest for skills"; this reflects the competitive part of the discourse. Then, it is stated that the university community will be international, and the content of education will reflect internationalization as well. Becoming internationalized is described in future terms, and substantiated by the numbers to be achieved: 10,000–15,000 foreign degree students and 28,000 exchange students per year. There would be an increase of students with an immigrant background, and a twofold rise of foreign teachers and researchers is planned (Ministry of Education, 2001). It starts with a characterization of the current state of the art, and it moves on towards future successes. There is a vague depiction of the 'global player'. As a future development, an increase in the tangible numeric indicators emerges, which does not point towards the actual practices stemming from these changes.

The main rationale of the promoted changes is a shift towards the global education market, as well as positioning of the national system within it. A consideration of the problems within the national system of education is not within the scope of the internationalization agenda; there are different approaches for internal and external performance. This is addressed in the policy: "The ministers took the position that higher education should still be regarded as a public service" (Ministry of Education, 2001, 9). We can assume that the intention here was to

keep it as a public service for within the national and EU framework, while becoming a market service for students outside the EU. Albeit significantly delayed, an introduction of tuition fees was the next step the reforms took. The relevant account of practices would then be high demand and significant revenues.

Top-down agency on several levels is relatively new within higher education governance, and the degree of acceptance and criticism varies from one actor to another. Internationalization measures pursued from above also cause strain within the university. Although it is openly stated that education will remain a public service, there is a clear market orientation that brings a conflict of values to the university. This hidden tension with the academic community is an important factor for practices.

The feedback of the academic community regarding the changes from above was often unfavourable. The European Commission commented on the criticism, which concerns 'fragmentation' of European higher education and the speed of the reforms (European Commission, 1999, 1). On the national level, policy also reflects that reforms developed on the European level (i.e. harmonization of the degree structure) was met with criticism in academia. It "caused confusion and stiff opposition in Finland and most other EU/EEA countries, even those whose ministers of higher education had signed the Declaration" (Ministry of Education, 2001, 7). Before the Bologna conference and Lisbon Strategy, higher education was not in the spotlight at the European level (European Commission, 1999, 1).

A comparison of the old and new internationalization policies is quite revealing in terms of academic voice. The preceding document paid attention to the criticism of the Bologna process and changes in the degree structures. It also pointed out the subsequent acceptance of these changes (Ministry of Education, 2001, 9). The newest internationalization policy gives room to criticism of the existing system of education (rather than criticism of the proposed reforms); it serves as a justification for the proposed changes. As for the position of the members of the academic community, they are presented in quotes on every page, substantiating the need for change as well. This produces a mixed message to the academic community concerning future development. On the one hand, there is a clear economic drive, which requires efforts from the staff. On the other hand, there is an attempt to balance it with cooperation and the idea of public service. Yet, there is no agreement with the academic community on the way internationalization should proceed. New policy development was denounced for a lack of dialog, being expert-driven (Kuortti, 2009, 125).

Agency in determining strategy is unclear. According to Kuortti, the major criticisms related to internationalization strategy from the higher education sector were the following. First, a lack of strategic vision was cited, along with sectoral and geographic priorities. Second, academics were "wondering why immigrants should receive a special treatment". Third, they defended the right of the institu-

tion to make its own choices (Kuortti, 2009, 126). The first and the third are distinct in terms of the agency that internationalization is driven by. Strategic vision and sectoral and geographic priorities presume top-down dominance of decisions. In contrast, the third line of criticism defends the university's independence in determining the course of internationalization. Projects pursued on this level would draw from the university's characteristics and staff's networks; individuals' perspectives would be more reflected in that case. The second critical point, about the special treatment of immigrants, also stems from the macro perspective on internationalization, since they appear as a social group. The position of the academia in this case is driven by the dialog with the governance structures, which envisions a competition for resources in education between 'locals' and 'immigrants'. This highlights divisions within the university community. In the context of university-based internationalization, the faculty would have to establish personal contacts with immigrants and clarify the terms of membership. This would necessitate a rethinking of practices, which might be challenging to established academic traditions but nevertheless could not be achieved on the macro level.

Paradoxically, a clear agenda and the resources to achieve it are projected by the Ministry of Education and Culture through these policies. Its development at the institutional level requires funding, which is primarily anticipated from the government. While the national approach aims at the inclusiveness of a wide range of issues, the lack of agreement with the academic community is a detrimental factor for the formation of practices.

The assessment of the current situation serves as a justification for internationalization; a variety of factors are showcased to rationalize the newer plans. For instance, the mobility of researchers from Finland abroad and the decline in these numbers were noted as an example of curtailed internationalization. Finland is compared to countries which are advanced in science, and there is an idea that it should attain a comparable number of foreign specialists (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 16).

These are the figures that are available about the country's performance, and this prompts comparison across different states. The relevance of linking them to overall internationalization development is based on the ostensible factors. Similarly, the impact of university internationalization on education and the country's development is not specified, but grounded on global education policy discourse. At the institutional level, outward mobility is sustained through specific provisions. Internationalization in this case is a service creating opportunities for students and researchers to go abroad (Education and Research 2011–2016, 49–50).

The change of framework from a short-term and exchange-based form of internationalization towards a long-term approach focused on degree programs suggests an adjustment of practices. According to the new policy's priorities, foreign students are expected to stay in Finland, and their integration necessitates the instruction of the national languages. Simultaneously, the education of students

from non-EU and non-ETA countries is seen as an educational export (Education and Research 2011–2016, 49–50). There is an anticipation of a double benefit for Finland from the increase of incoming students. Aside from language skills, well-being and integration measures have not yet become a policy priority.

Then, there is a need for mobility into Finland, and current records are considered inadequate. This is argued through the impact on society as a whole: "Finland must ensure the renewal processes and sufficient availability of experts and researchers. An increase in the number of foreign researchers is as yet an unresolved challenge and it has not been possible to remove the barriers to the exploitation of knowledge and know-how" (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 16). Obstacles for recruiting highly skilled immigrants are not discussed. However, an 'inclusive and multicultural environment free from discrimination' is pointed out as a prerequisite for conditions where innovation flourishes; there is no assessment of the current discrimination. Integration is just mentioned as a task for multicultural policy (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 9).

The measurement of diversity through statistics reveals a number of people with a foreign background in education. This could be interpreted only as migrants' involvement in education, and it explains the relatively low number of international students in Finland (Garam & Ketolainen, 2009, 28). That said, a substantial number of international opportunities are at the master's level, which typically involves a small number of students. Courses are offered in English and do not ensure a smooth entry to the labour market in Finland. Therefore, the inferences about the overall integration of migrants cannot be sustained either (Garam & Ketolainen, 2009, 31).

Policy provisions focus on outward mobility, as well as attracting and integrating foreign researchers and students; this is a proxy for a productive exchange of science and knowledge in practice. Discussion at this level does not yet encompass the topics of diversity and its impact on education.

7.2 Elements of studies contributing to internationalization

7.2.1 Influence of diversity on education outcomes

Diversity in practices includes two major issues: actual diversity and its growth, and the provisions for it on campus. From the perspective of policy, there is a challenge for the university to win the "competition for intellectual resources" and become an "attractive living environment for professionals" (Research and Innovation Council of Finland, 2009, 14). Diversity is also closely related to the university's image. Apart from dealing with practical issues, it strives to demonstrate the situation as an accomplishment in terms of recruitment and integration: "multiculturalism will be rendered visible in the University community and interna-

tional networking will be supported, among others through social media" (University of Tampere, 2010, 6). Notably, these developments are described in the future tense, but as a statement of the state of the art, rather than a pathway to achieve this situation. This is a striking example of internationalization being an external element, when diversity, which should enable fruitful classroom practices, is used as a formal sign of the university's success.

On the institutional and program levels, considerations of how to deal with these issues are limited as well. For instance, the evaluation by the FINHEEC examined anxieties of university instructors about classroom diversity. It was noted that the prevalence of a certain national group within the classroom caused concern among some of the teachers. Yet others promoted the targeted enrolment of Finnish, Russian, Eastern European and EU students, arguing about their employability as an advantage. Thus, future labour market success is a solid argument at the institutional level. It is used to claim the success of the provided education. That said, the university so far possesses insufficient knowledge about the career paths of graduates; alumni networks are in still the process of being established (FINHEEC, 2013).

The idea that certain national groups could be targeted since their chances of employability are greater is shifting the accountability for education quality and resulting employment from the higher education institution to the individual and his/her national origin. In this way, the impact of education on career success is not reckoned. Diversity becomes a problem for the university in terms of provisions for different students, rather than a developmental opportunity. In my data, by contrast, several teachers and students spoke negatively about the 'targeted recruitment', and they argued for the sole use of academic considerations. The argument was based on the idea that diversity could have multiple aspects which cannot be determined at the time of admission, but rather should be revealed in classroom discussion (see Chapter 6).

Market-led and education-oriented approaches look at different aspects of university functioning. The former one is based on the macro view on education, as it prioritizes institutional advancement. The latter one is better revealed through focusing on micro-level functioning, and individual perspectives. Analysis of the interview responses on diversity provides more insights on the effects of education.

I asked students about the international elements of their program, and they emphasized the diversity of students. This is achieved well in practice; most of the settings described by respondents were diverse enough to bring about educational benefits. Policies typically frame this as 'raising numbers of international students', but then again the education-related goal is formulated as 'internationalizing the university community'. At the individual level, the emphasis and indicators are different. From the respondents' perspectives, numbers are not relevant, due to the small setting of the master's program, but socializing with diverse peers

and having a fruitful classroom discussion are the key benefits. Another student elaborated on how diversity of individuals transforms into a diversity of knowledge:

> I don't know if that would fall into the word 'international', but a different focus, regarding what they are studying, different goals, different interests… You could maybe have that same diversity in the non-international program, but that is just kind of something that complements this program. And that diversity creates an interesting dialog for reading a certain text. You can have many different perspectives brought forth, so that text-studying would be supplemented with a lot of different perspectives that I would not have been exposed to otherwise. That also creates a kind of stimulating positive environment. If I am in a class with people that I think have the same background more or less, I can make assumptions on what I think they know. That might be completely wrong, but I'll still make them… (S17)

The variety of origins is just one way to measure diversity, but it could be accompanied by a range of prior studies, political orientations, social backgrounds, or something else (see discussion in Chapter 6). An important thing to note is that diversity does not equal being international, as it can be found in other settings as well. The value of these experiences depends on the organization of the university practices. For instance, communicating with Finnish students can be as important as diversity from abroad:

> From all the group, I think we are just two people from Europe. From one point of view we learn more from other continents and the practices there in education. But then we are here, so it would be nice to be more connected to this place. These ideas we can get best from the Finnish students. I don't know how to advertise this program among Finnish students, because the moment itself is called international. It feels that it is more for the foreign students. So, in all international programs, I know really few Finnish students who studied. Yeah, international does not mean just foreigners. That is something that could be advertised more for the Finnish students to actually get the idea that to study in English would be good for them. (S6)

Therefore, the simulated apposition of Finnish and international surfaces as a challenge in practice. Since the benefits from diversity concern the focus of study, it is not foreign origin that brings value, but the fact that students had different prior trainings. In addition, 'connections' to the place of education happen through

students taking part in the discussions. Another respondent expanded on the value she derived from the diverse classroom:

> …learning from one another in the way that you can't learn from a textbook. You are joking about cultural things, and you realize how similar some cultures are but how different others are. I realize that sometimes I am bonding with people from my country because we have shared backgrounds and histories. You are starting to question what constitutes your personality and why you are the way you are, so this international aspect is really amazing for sharing these ideas, but also for looking into yourself. (S13)

This speaks about turning diverse experiences into knowledge, and it implies sharing a lot of cultural information. Therefore, it is enlightening both about others and one's own uniqueness. Another respondent, referring to the similar cognition process, spoke about the positioning of oneself within the classroom:

> But I feel very international here in the sense that I am a Finn, but I don't hang out with Finns that much. Whereas when I was studying abroad, to some extent I was very Finnish. More Finnish than I am here. Because I was "the Finn" when I was abroad. Finland was not that well known. I was not surrounded by other Finns. So, then I became a representative of Finland in a way. Whereas here everyone is Finnish, so now I play more to my international background. The fact that I lived abroad and did my education in English… I definitely feel more international here. (S7)

National and international characteristics are contrasted here. This quote explicates tokenism as essentializing one's national identity and its fluid nature, whereas living abroad and multicultural experiences could be common among the group as well. Internationality necessitates diversity and shared characteristics within it, in contrast to nationally bounded representation. Although identity exploration and reflecting on cultural issues are evident from these quotes, unlike in the academic discourse on the international students there is no linking of them to learning difficulties.

Many of the teachers acknowledged the diversity of students as well. Some of them also distinguished between ethnic diversity and diversity of backgrounds, claiming that the latter is more important for education. According to one respondent, students bring areas of expertise from their home universities (T36). This again contradicts the agenda recognized in the academic literature, where curriculum construction should address the international students' backgrounds in terms of the specific difficulties that they might encounter within the learning process.

Under this framework, students' education and experiences are taken as a source of learning.

Although the master's program environment is often diverse, and this factor reinforces the study focus, there is no consensus yet whether admission should reflect these needs. Since learning does not emerge from a particular culture but from the diversity of the group, educational outcomes may be different in terms of content, not only quality of studies.

Another respondent underlined that besides diversity in the study process, high numbers of international students stimulate the university to improve services. Before they arrive, the higher education institution can hardly anticipate problematic areas. While the university's responsiveness still varies, due to different challenging situations, awareness of the students' needs grows and the university's procedures are advanced. One of the respondents also elaborated on the reverse situation. She studied in a group of very few international students, with the others being Finns with some international experience. In this situation, everyone but the couple foreigners knew their way around and could benefit from the opportunities provided by the university. For instance, not knowing the faculty or being able to communicate with professors were often mentioned as problems.

Another problematic issue discussed in the scholarly literature is when students 'self-select' themselves to a culturally similar group within the studies, reducing their own exposure to diversity (Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009, 471). My research indicates that group homogeneity may be a problem in theory, but not in practice at the respective institutions: student groups are too diverse, often only having one from each country, and they regularly receive group tasks to collaborate with new partners.

Only one of the responses mentioned culture shock, which is so widely referred to in the academic literature: "In my home country we don't really have many international students. Maybe a few students from neighbouring countries. Of course, it was hugely different, a European context. And of course, Finland is a unique country. It is too far, too strange, too cold. I didn't know anything about Finland. I just jumped into cold water" (S30). The respondent himself ascribed this to a lack of preparations before his studies and non-existent knowledge about Finland, rather than substantial culture-related misunderstandings.

Yet, study-related variations were labelled as cultural by one of the respondents:

> Well, I think that there are always cultural differences of students, and what students think is expected from them… That is not always clear… It sounds a bit mean to say, but some students have slightly different attitudes towards studying… Some don't take it so seriously. Others take it really seriously and get worried about everything, be-

> cause from their educational culture you have to make all the deadlines… Some other people come from the culture where there is just "relax and don't worry, and do the work when you want to". (S14)

Clearly, there is a spectrum of different attitudes to studies, which may have been gained through previous academic experiences. Regarding the organization of common practices for diverse students, the variance connected with different cultures may be counterproductive. While some authors say that it is important to recognize differences, trying to manage international communication (Wang & Folger, 2004), others claim that sometimes this can turn into essentializing differences, building on the "deficiency" of international students (Leask, 2009, 212). Student adjustment should not be a one-sided process (Leask, 2009, 218), and university work could be concentrated on creating a common learning environment.

The position of the teacher is central in managing educational value in a diverse classroom. As one of the students elaborated, "there was a professor who was from Finland, but had cases from all over the world. He really drew from our diverse experiences" (S30). This was another way in which lecturers can internationalize studies, apart from their own background, which concerns living, education and research in another country. Leask elaborates on the essential characteristics: "they must be able to adapt their teaching to an international, culturally diverse teaching and learning environment rather than expecting learners to adapt to a monocultural, inflexible environment. They must be self-reflective and critically aware of how their own culture influences what they do, including the way they select and structure what they teach, how and what they learn, and how they respond to students and other staff" (Leask, 2009, 212). Here cultural arguments are placed alongside the power of negotiating practices.

A student also regarded highly the actual presence of international teachers, noting the fruitfulness of this for her studies. Yet, she noted that most of the international scholars had only temporary involvement with the program: "quite a few international professors who came for a week or two weeks to give lectures, or months" (S8). The administration tries to bring international academics and maintain the standards of the studies. This is specifically pursued for research seminars with inclusion of scholars from different countries or Finnish scientists who have done research in other places. She concludes that "the focus gives it a bit of importance, it shines on internationality" (S8). Yet, she noted that similar input cannot be ensured in the long term due to the temporary involvement of the international scholars (S8). This makes the emergent educational value from internationalization situational. According to another student, there were not that many international lecturers; they gave an 'international feel' to the studies, and the re-

spondent wished to have them more involved in the study program (S10). Different programs clearly had different capacities to ensure this element from one year to another.

One of the students acknowledged as well that, being in the international program, "in theory we are supposed to talk about international issues". But performance in this area is uneven, as visiting professors give an intensive course here and there, and teaching staff is only "somewhat diverse" (S26). Then, another student agrees that teachers "could be a bit more international, so that they would have different perspectives"; this would internationalize knowledge and ensure global perspectives, which are currently lacking. She mentions that there are few teachers from different places, which means that knowledge is not international enough, especially since "they teach about one thing, from one perspective, and they want us to be experts in one thing, not several things" (S25). Other respondents also ascribed importance to the experience with diverse teachers, which means a highly varied curriculum and teaching style.

One of the administrators also mentioned that this dimension depends on initiative and could develop over time: "It comes down to my international colleagues and how active they are. If you are active, they are also active back to you. I think these are the most encouraging aspects in terms of internationality" (T38). This implies that the existing diversity within the institution may not yet be used to a full degree. Having international scholars is not only an issue of recruitment from abroad, but organizing the process. It was a shortcoming of my data, however, that I did not get the opinions of international lecturers on how effective it is to take the initiative in getting involved with international degree programs.

Although a majority of the respondents praised their exposure to the diverse university community, there were several central concerns which depend on institutional action. For instance, the integration of Finnish and international students, which is a foundation of internationalization at home, requires university endorsement. Then, recruitment of teachers and fostering an international curriculum depend on the university's efforts.

7.2.2 Language balance

Language is one of the aspects that arises in practice differently than in governance. Policy provisions concern organizing courses in English and providing services for international students. Yet, in practice there are new aspects that concern inclusion, privilege and communication.

The division of what is carried out in English and what is in Finnish explicates the boundaries of internationalization at the university. Then, there is an issue of being a 'native speaker', which is held to be a good quality for a teacher or an unfair advantage for a student. Another problem involves the limited language

skills of the teachers and the quality of their teaching. Finally, there is also a question of what level of English is sufficient for studies, and whether this could be ensured through admission.

Universities often aim to regulate language issues. For instance, the University of Tampere specifies the need for language policy to define the languages of teaching, research and administration. The main objective is to use these in "such a way that they promote the internationalization of the University and support quality teaching and research". There is an acknowledgement that "the University's internal and external communications in Finnish and in English are highly significant as regard its influence and international visibility". But at the same time, the document claims that the university has a "responsibility for preserving Finnish as a full-fledged language for science and societal interaction" (UTA, 2010, 4). There is a hidden juxtaposition of languages, a conflict between the national and international domain and related language use. Due to internationalization, the university becomes bi- or even trilingual, and it operates in several separate domains. The use of Finnish and English is not equivalent, and it is hard to compare provisions in both languages (Dobson & Hölttä, 2001, 251).

The choice to organize something in English is based on the perceptions of international students' needs. Accordingly, what is attributed to mainstream education, which does not involve foreigners, is provided in Finnish only. One of the students critically mentioned that studies in English are "a symbol for the international" in Finland (S27). The negative example of that for her was that she wanted to learn statistics, but it was in Finnish, not tailored for international studies. According to this account, the divisions into international and non-international are not easy to overcome due to the language issue.

One of the teachers argued that internationalization requires much deeper institutional changes than currently understood by the academic community. He argues that for a long time, the education system was mono- or bilingual, using just Finnish and Swedish. The supply of education in English emerged due to the pressure from the Ministry of Education and Culture. He named it "an externally imposed effort to increase internationalization of the universities on the level of teaching" (T39). Although he claimed that there are probably interest groups within the university, internationalization as a national project is ministry-driven.

Other respondents noted that international programs are not necessarily about instruction in English, as some programs have been functioning in Finnish earlier, supplying international competencies for the Finnish labour market. Hence, topics and their labour market applicability were key to internationalization (T40, S21). Change has taken place due to the perception of new opportunities opening up through instruction in English.

In the everyday life of the university, this means that teachers are asked to teach in a different language than they have been used to. And since most of the university staff is Finnish, this change is not happening smoothly. According to

this teacher, getting benefits from internationalization would require better integration of studies in English into the general curriculum, as well as a "new generation of teachers who would grow up teaching-wise in a more bilingual environment than they are used to" (T39). Due to this situation, when teaching in English is an "extra burden", most successful professors, since they are busy, are likely to pass this responsibility to someone else. Therefore, the quality of teaching available in English may be lower than in the national language (T39).

Another professor confirmed this perspective:

> I think it makes it more difficult, because as a teacher… I am such an old person. I think it is easier sometimes to work with your own language. I think it is very difficult to teach, to be a teacher in this kind of program. Because you always think that your expression is a little bit limited, it is difficult. Pedagogically I think that somehow students would earn much more [if the instruction were in Finnish] than they get [now in English]. (T40)

For this respondent, therefore, teaching presumed flexibility of language use. One of the student respondents expressed a similar idea:

> I think the teaching can be hit or miss. I think everybody knows their subjects really well, but the presentation is much different. I would say that it is often the teachers from outside of Finland that I connect with the most. I wonder why that is. I've had a British professor. It might be a language issue sometimes, but he knows the shades of meanings of words, which that I understand. But most Finnish people don't have the exact concrete language. (S12)

Yet, the respondents had different opinions about the connection between being a native speaker and the quality of teaching.

For instance, there also was an opposite estimation, that teaching quality improves due to a switch of language. Some of the students believed that the style of teaching changes completely due to the change of language:

> This was a totally different world. I believe that when people change the language, they also change. The professors have a different audience and they have to change their techniques… Of course, many lecturers also were non-Finnish, so that also makes a difference. I had one class in Finnish, and I did not pass it. I took the same course with international students, and I passed it with flying colours (I got a 5). The same person, the same subject. Of course, it was the second time, but still that proved something to me. (S11)

The same professor was more interactive. The respondent suggested that maybe it was due to the lack of their English skills, so that being unable to speak for a long time they had to organize conversation; the respondent also observed that "when there are international students, there are always questions" (S11). Interestingly, a lack of confidence in language use is conceptualized here as an advantage, since it necessitates dialogue with students. Teachers also note that, on the one hand, organizing discussion in English is challenging, since most students are not native speakers of English. On the other hand, even if teaching is done in the national language, there should not be "nationally-minded" teaching, and at least the international terminology should be embraced. Therefore, irrespective of the language of instruction, there are some teaching-related linguistic considerations; these range from the context of expression difficulties to the added value of a complicated situation.

As for international teachers, some respondents claimed that their shortage at the university is due to language boundaries. One of the teachers emphasized the importance of foreign faculty inclusion in administrative work and casual communication in the work environment (T36). Another professor noted that involving more international faculty would require the use of English (T39).

In contrast, other respondents emphasized that "if you want to be really international, you have to admit students from different countries. And then it becomes impossible to communicate just in Finnish. So maybe, yeah, the language plays a role" (S13). In this case, openness and inclusiveness are pointers to internationalization; removing the boundaries to access maximizes diversity.

Another language-related issue concerns the learning of Finnish by international students. Despite the policy shift towards long-term internationalization, there is no coherent institutional approach. Students take these courses even though they are not mandatory for the degree. Several respondents, both teachers and students, claimed that it is not feasible to learn the language within 2–3 years of study time. Some denounced the expectation to learn Finnish, and they suggested relying on possibilities in English for the internationalization of the university (T35, S2). Yet others argued in favour of waiving institutional expectations concerning a fast graduation and accommodating students' possibilities to be integrated in the labour market (T37, S15).

There is a hidden clash of languages that everyday internationalization has to face. The underlying ideas include preserving the national language, the integration of foreigners into the labour market, and maximizing inclusiveness and internationalization; these are not always in accord.

7.3 Practical aspects in the transformation of teaching

Little is known about the organization of teaching and its practical aspects, though some of the sources testified to value being situational, both in terms of annual organizing and classroom discussion. For the university and program administration, this is an extra effort in terms of sustainability and teaching approach.

The evaluation by the FINHEEC (2013) confirmed that most of the international degree programs do not have a separate teaching staff. Supposedly this reflects better integration within the faculty:

> This may increase the workload of the teachers and other members of the staff. But there is also a positive side. Having common teachers helps facilitate communication and cooperation between the IDPs [international degree programs] and other programmes. It prevents IDPs from becoming marginalized within the department. It also makes it easier to create common courses for IDPs and Finnish programmes and to integrate international and Finnish students. (FINHEEC, 2013, 49)

According to other accounts, the current situation is an annual challenge for program managers in terms of ensuring contact teaching. Since they function in English, programs remain isolated from the life of the faculty for the most part. In addition, many programs are too small to sustain their own teaching staff, so this is also a question of resources.

Master's program integration with faculty life is not specified. There is also no agreement on what plan of courses is better for education, such as whether they should be the same as at the faculty or formed specifically on the basis of the needs of international students. Until now, teaching in English has been an isolated activity within the university functioning, and its requirements and delimitations have not been articulated. Also, it is unclear how this instruction partakes in overall institutional development or what kinds of advantages it provides. For example, the University of Tampere includes 'opportunities for teachers' as part of their internationalization agenda. The institution is responsible for implementing a change and "providing the staff with improved opportunities for research and internationalization" (UTA, 2010, 3). Consequently, international opportunities are a service which is provided on the part of the university, rather than something which is advanced by university staff and supported by the university. In one of my interviews, a teacher acknowledged that international master's programs are created for teachers to have the opportunity to practice teaching in English (T37).

This is a stark contrast with the position of teachers sometimes that instruction in English is a burden and extra workload which is not properly compensated (T35). Accordingly, this top-down provision is not well received by academia. The evaluation also considered the development of the intercultural skills of the

existing faculty (FINHEEC, 2013). Passing a language test for the incentive of a higher salary was discussed as one of the options. Enhanced communication among the teachers of master's programs was another suggestion within the evaluation; this would generate discussion on how to deal with challenging situations. Debates about degree program development were suggested as well (FINHEEC, 2013, 50). In this situation, top-down internationalization which provides opportunities for teachers also involves top-down interaction with them; tests, creating incentives and developing their skills are hierarchical instruments. But along with that, discussions were suggested as a way of horizontal interaction, since teachers are also enablers of internationalization and they engage with students.

The foremost problem articulated by the teachers was sustainability of the course provision. One of the program coordinators mentioned that apart from her, there is no permanent staff. Therefore, organization of teaching becomes unstable:

> After the university reform, which is not the direct cause, but the organization of the whole system, there are no such resources as there were before. When, for example, this program was on a separate funding, it used to be easier to hire teachers from wherever, from other universities, for example. Probably that was by experience. Someone had contact with someone, and so on. (T36)

Although these challenges are not attributed to the change itself, frequent fluctuations in the situation around master's programs are problematic, and funding is not secure.

Personal connections and networks are important to maintain the provision of good courses, but as one respondent mentioned, they are hard to keep when changes affecting master's program functioning are so frequent (T37). Another teacher also lamented that long-term planning is impossible due to insecure funding: "I think in order to develop a successful program, it is a work that takes anywhere between 5–10 years. To create a specific culture, to find what are the best ways for it to work." (T38)

At the same time, education endures annual cuts: "There is this question that if we have to cut from somewhere, if we have to reduce, then we will reduce from those that we do not consider as significant. It would again be different than if the national and international teaching were more integrated. It would make the totality better. It depends on what you see as the most central thing in teaching and for whom" (T36). Therefore, international education is more susceptible to funding cuts. Institutional support is needed for master's program functioning, and when they are seen as additional, external activity, there is not commitment and responsibility to sustain them.

Meanwhile, programs are often a part of change, but they are not included in the 'assets' that the university should keep. One of the teachers, for instance, mentioned that foreign contacts established by his program are going to be lost due to a new set of reforms which involve a change of study focus (T40). The university strives to provide internationalization possibilities for faculty, but it does not preserve emergent internationalization.

The FINHEEC (2013) evaluation acknowledges that there are problems with teacher diversity in international degree programs; it refers to the Strategy for Internationalization of Finnish Higher education, which aims to increase non-Finnish teachers (2013, 48). Site visits confirmed that this direction of development is positively viewed within institutions and the rethinking of the recruitment process; making it more inclusive was seen as one of the ways to enhance diversity. Exchange teachers, recent graduates of international programs, and visiting lecturers are seen as a resource. The evaluation formulates the value in an unspecified way, 'building up an international higher education community' and 'strengthening the international point of view in education' (FINHEEC, 2013, 48). These conceptions do not presume measurement, although the evaluation mentions that current funding would reflect the number of international teachers and researchers at the institution. Hence, quantity rather than the integration of international personnel is taken as a proxy for institutional practices.

Budgetary decision-making is an obstacle in organizing courses with international scholars. One of the administrators explained that since the program has no especially allocated funding, there is no possibility to hire teachers, either short term or long term. The program should take someone who is available (i.e. through the Finnish Academy or in the faculty), but often they already have a full workload. Additionally, the thematic context and networks of the existing faculty play a significant role; teachers try to recruit colleagues with the relevant focus. An administrator admitted overall difficulties in organizing courses: "So we try to share a lot and look for courses within our department, what is suitable for our issues, but also we do cooperate a lot. It requires a lot of negotiation, and dealing, and trading" (T40). This kind of approach to teaching is precarious, since it is not known beforehand which kinds of courses would be available. Moreover, it is difficult to plan coherence of courses, with the whole flow of studies forming a certain specialization and professional field.

Students acknowledged that funding is an obstacle for "enlarging the pool of diverse guest lecturers" (S16) and that sometimes there are no 'core studies' (S9). Thus, it is not only the diversity of teaching approaches and thematic issues that is affected. The scarcity of international scholars has a more foundational problem, due to only short-term planning in internationalization.

The openness of the recruitment process also necessitates discussion about university practices. The difficulties to attract international teachers was mentioned by one of the professors:

> First of all, it is really hard to attract international teachers for a long-term contract, and then… Then, it is really hard to hire international teachers, even if they are, for example, succeeding in the competition. Nevertheless, it is really hard because of this language thing. Many times, they lack the experience or knowledge on how the Finnish educational system works. Because of all this, the situation is still far from good. (T35)

Therefore, it is unclear whether the university is ready to rethink the practices for including international teachers or whether there is an expectation to adapt to the national educational environment. The normative idea that international teachers and students provide a stimulus for the university to increase the quality of teaching meets obstacles in practice: unstable funding leads to precarious planning.

I asked in the interviews about teaching quality, and comparisons with previously experienced educational systems were often raised. For instance, one respondent assessed it against the British system; citing greater freedom in education in Finland as a positive thing, he praised the opportunity to "build your own studies" (S31). At the same time, he remarked on the social aspect of the studies as more problematic. The university does not provide overall structure, only several uncoordinated activities. Another student acknowledged the freedom to manage one's own studies: "You can pack everything in one semester, or you can just spread courses evenly all over the period of studies"; the same student also added, however, that there is often a difference between the description of the course and classroom practice, such that "the whole program is not tightly organized" (S15). Some respondents acknowledged that their prior experiences formed their expectations and assessment of teaching:

> That depends on different lectures and professors. Some are good, some not. Overall, I am quite satisfied, but others are not. Maybe they are… or maybe I am more naïve. I have not studied in a high-class university before. For me the quality is good, because my comparison does not come from a very prestigious university. So, I know that some of the students are a little bit challenged. (S28)

Even though the student is aware of possible criticism, she notes that her expectations have been met, while other respondents criticized teaching on the basis of their prior experience. Another participant noted:

> Teaching has been two extremes: it has either been really good or really bad. But I think that is the same everywhere. I had the same in my

> previous university. Some professors are really inspiring, and they really know what they are doing. And then some people are doing the teaching just because they have to. They don't really want to be there. (S3)

The problems with the current arrangement of studies were pointed out by the respondents through comparisons. The prism of previous educational experiences also reveals the expectations of students:

> Teaching in general relies very much on my own… devotion… Because the teachers don't really demand [students] to read anything. If we don't want to read… it's ok not to read, and it's quite different from the culture of the studies that I am used to back home, which is very demanding. And the teacher will poke you all the time, if you read it or not… Otherwise they are going to punish you, and stuff like this… So, it's more like an authoritarian approach. I am used to that system, and I am used to people demanding everything… And here it's quite the opposite. So, in the beginning, this putting too much emphasis on my own effort, it's quite difficult to appreciate this system. (S16)

These complications cannot be entirely explained by 'cultural differences', as in a later interview the same student described eventually coming to grips with the new system. Yet, she was still critical of the current teaching style, where "they just bounce off ideas, and you are supposed to go and find your readings and everything by yourself" (S16). However, the availability of help from teachers was also acknowledged. She noted that when students are made aware of these possibilities in advance, they can use this help to become integrated into the academic environment.

Part of the challenge is that the university receives a wide variety of students from different backgrounds. Agreeing on the common rules of the game is a new university pursuit, due to internationalization. One respondent explained the need for general planning of the curriculum, taking into consideration the difference of academic traditions, especially in terms of the methodologies and theories used in different countries. Common ground established by introductory courses would bring diverse students to the same academic standpoint (S9).

Another respondent expanded that in practice, the "teaching style can be very different, and the way they present things. We are just being offered research examples and no background, or the opposite" (S20). It becomes hard to anticipate whether the course would be theoretical or case-based. He claimed that there is no standard or criteria for what the course would contain; it is also hard to know what

professors expect. The freedom to make choices in education sometimes results in a lack of knowledge of what to do.

Paradoxically, students with a Finnish background also noted that the system is loosely arranged:

> The thing that I find negative in the teaching is that it is quite mixed. There is no clear process; the courses don't follow any kind of guidelines. We have a list of thematic courses that we can choose for our degree. There is pretty much everything there, and you have to build it yourself. They are related to the program, but they are quite different. I kind of did part of a master's in Finnish, because I am allowed to; there was some teaching available. But I think for students in the Finnish programs, quite many do book exams. If you are a master's student, you might have a job already. (S5)

Thus, the university might derive organization of teaching from the fact that some students take courses in addition to their job and are not fully immersed in their studies. In addition, some students expected more involvement with the faculty, due to the small classroom size. These expectations also came from their previous education experience.

From the institutional side, the lack of a common core exposes the formal approach to internationalization and the lack of financial security. According to students, courses taught by PhD students are more likely to have this problem, since teachers rely on their own research in this case. Although master's programs presuppose a narrower specialization than the bachelor level, it should not just be restricted to case studies. Students also pointed out the need for PhD candidates' teaching delivery to be improved (S29). Another respondent brought up an example of a course taught by a PhD student: "that is her first time teaching the course, so I am trying to be understanding there, but at the same time I am frustrated as well" (S15). She noted that while some teachers are quite engaging, others just presuppose sitting and taking notes: "I don't really find that very helpful, because I already do the readings. There are also power point slides. I just feel that this is kind of the waste of my time" (S15). The teaching method makes a difference, and "there is a discrepancy between the different levels of teachers" (S15).

Most respondents noted that teaching quality was very different from one instance to another: it "varies very much from person to person", "there are teachers I like more than others", "in general good, but varies much, depends on the teacher", "it varies quite a lot", and so on. Performance was also uneven within one program, while courses were very different in their quality, workload and requirements. According to the accounts in the academic literature, impressions about teaching and interactions with staff are often "patchy" and dependent on the individual: "They can be lucky or unlucky in the people they encounter"

(Schweisfurth & Gu, 2009, 471). Internationalization value appears to be situational. From the individual perspective, it looks like a student's accomplishment depended on his or her ability to navigate the education system to one's own benefit. Later in this chapter, I explore individual value-making from international experiences.

From the institutional perspective, it is fruitful to discover mechanisms of ensuring teaching that, involving both international and domestic students, would reflect their diverse interests. For instance, students mentioned that the quality of teaching depended on the ability of the teacher to engage with the students: "Some were good, some were bad, some were excellent. There is a professor who really knows the subject. Cares about the students. Changes the course depending on who is taking part in it. Being strict, but flexible. Then there were some who did not care who the audience is" (S1). Since students are different, the university cannot adjust its approach in advance, and successful teaching in this case is developed 'in process'. Another respondent mentioned that internationalization could be a solution:

> In some cases, I think that there is a need and urge to be international, and some things are… not the best possible solutions have been chosen. I think that if you can find a foreign specialist that is good enough to have these classes, I mean, actually to have good teaching skills, because they are all good specialists, but it does not mean that they can actually teach us… They can't keep us in the lectures. I think that it is very important to pay attention to this, that not all the teachers can do lectures in an interesting way. (S34)

In this case, as well as several others, there was introduced a division between the Finnish and the 'international' way of doing things. This sounds very critical of the Finnish system, but at the same time there is a juxtaposition between the national way of doing things, as the one that is not familiar (and not enough explained) to the international students, and the 'international' way, which is more inclusive of people with different backgrounds. Several other respondents also noted that they found it easier to connect with the international lecturers (S13, S15, S26).

Higher education institutions face diverse expectations from students, and internationalization becomes a task of creating a common ground in terms of both organizational issues and forming the content of teaching. However, financial and organizational challenges limit the freedom of the university to fulfil this mission. Logically there emerges a question whether internationalization is utilized to a full extent as a stimulus for the university. According to teachers, attention of the university towards international students already studying at the university is lacking.

One of the professors criticized that the introduction upon arrival of the international students depends upon program personnel rather than an overall university approach (T40). Other respondent emphasized the importance of peer support, as well as the saturation of the program. She noted that the university is not offering enough courses. Alternatively, students have to take book exams. This is the difference between Finland and the Anglo-Saxon type of education, which does not rely on this form (T35). So far, the universities are not transforming their practices enough for international students to fit in.

Then, besides characteristics of teaching, I asked about the content of studies and its international aspects. In many cases, respondents brought up the diversity of curricula as a condition for internationalization, but it was clear that there were multiple framings of internationality utilized either by the university or by individuals. So here I address directly whether and how internationality was built in the learning process, and whether it was fostered by the program or not.

Some of the respondents elaborated on 'learning from each other', 'experiential knowledge' and 'first-hand information'. Although there were no classes 'specifically about different cultures', team work enabled this kind of learning. Another student mentioned that the curriculum itself relied on limited geographic perspectives:

> Curriculum is based on the assumption that everybody knows what is going on in Europe. Of course, everybody knows what is going on from the newspapers, but academic base is very much European centric… there are many other things we don't talk about back in my home country, but here people assume that you know it beforehand. (S32)

She continues that studies are based on a premise that one continues from the bachelor level in the same academic system. She adds:

> I think it's a pity, because people would benefit so much from… because we are all from different basis, and if the teacher notices differences, they could stimulate a dialogue between the students. But it wasn't the case for me… because I kind of find it stupid to ask 'What do you mean by…' and everybody would like… It is not the discussion of a friendly environment. It's more like… a little bit offensive to me… the teacher said "You should have known this. Why didn't you know that?" It's kind of like… I must be so stupid not knowing this. It was kind of negative in the beginning, so in the future I did not ask any questions. But I don't think that this is a very nice solution to this kind of situation. (S32)

This demonstrates that the university is not ready to receive different kinds of students, as well as the fact that the difference in their backgrounds could be perceived as a deficiency. Similarly, the academic literature that claims that international students often lack academic skills (i.e. in writing essays and participating in group work) misses the integration aspect and educational benefit from different backgrounds.

Another student posited that the international curriculum is very problematic at the moment, since the university and the faculty are not aware of students' background knowledge. She was aware of the perspectives on her subject in different parts of the world, and she emphasized that it would have been easier if the university had anticipated these differences and did not just continue teaching from the local bachelor's studies (S24). Other students also mentioned that when students look at ideas from all over the world and challenge different perspectives, this makes education better: "I have a class right now where we look at how this Northern perspective is so much looked at from the European view. But we are trying to incorporate other aspects into it. So, I think that makes it such a broad view" (S15).

Commenting on the thematic focus, one of the students also mentioned that explored cases had some clear geographic delimitations:

> Sometimes I just had the feeling that it's all about the Nordic countries. I thought, like, how about you just take something different? Either Europe or the Americas? So, it's very much focused on that, and I think that for the international program it just needs to be wider. I think that is a complaint that a lot of people had… like when we talk to each other, that's the thing that always keep coming up. Because we are from different places… and it's kind of different what you start applying it to the case in Africa. Yeah, well, great… frameworks that only apply to these societies. How am I gonna do this here? (S22)

So, it is not only students who might lack necessary skills, but academically the university can also miss students' expectations. Consequently, internationalization prompts rethinking of the university's practices, not just in terms of helping diverse students; it also presupposes the institutional benefit of developing studies.

Talking about the institutional approach, students also questioned the inequality of educational opportunities within internationalization:

> For example, we can't all understand the meaning of the word [used in class]. When we asked the teacher, he used a Finnish word to explain. But we don't know Finnish either, so that is… I joined one book exam where the teacher was from Russia. One student said, "Can I

> write in Russian?" The teacher said yes, so I thought, can I write in Chinese? So, it's local, not international. (S28)

Internationalization in this case presupposes constructing the approach that would include everyone; this question concerns the organizational capacities of the institution. There were several other similar situations described by respondents that touched on inequality in relation to Finnish students, who can submit their essays and book exams in the native language. This shows the discrepancy of the institutional provisions vis-à-vis the different categories of students.

The balance between national and international generated the most polarized perspectives in my data. One representation considered that courses, in order to be truly international, should be open enough to avoid limitations of geographic focus and academic traditions; they should reflect the diversity of students as well as their diversity in the classroom discussion. Another representation presupposed that international studies should include a national focus as well:

> I really enjoy getting the Finnish perspective now. I have not been really getting it in my past education. So, it kind of changes the way I think as well. I have been looking at Finland from the outside, and now I am looking at how Finns see Finland. (S21)

But the critical angle on internationalizing the curriculum is to make courses relevant for Finnish students as well (S15). To benefit mainstream studies, they should not just 'cater' to international students. To sum up, integration of the internationalization into the mainstream studies puts university agency at test, as the institution has to balance national and international domains, devise inclusion and rethinking of practices.

7.4 Outcomes of the international program: student perception

7.4.1 Influence of internationalization on employment possibilities

The master's program presupposes an emphasis on the needs of the labour market, so I asked students about practice-related training during their studies. Employability is viewed differently from the institutional perspective, in terms of individual qualities and exploration of the professional field. Here we can see what the university provides and how it is developed.

One of the students mentioned the lack of applied aspects of the degree, suggesting that although in the social sciences there are no labs like in the natural sciences, there is still a need to 'go outside and observe', to do field work (S13). Another respondent added that not everyone is surely going to be a researcher, so

practical training, even in the applied research, is a necessity (S11). It is good to have more professional options. Yet another student added that it is very hard to search for hands-on options independently, and that in the social sciences it is often unclear "what kind of jobs and occupations we can do" (S23). Case studies were mentioned as a desirable possibility. One respondent criticized that even some of the practical issues were evaluated in a theoretical way (i.e. a practice-oriented class had a traditional exam) (S15). In Chapter 2, I established that master's programs are bringing education closer to the labour market, but in practice this often means exploring a new professional field for which applications have not yet been discovered.

Most of the students indicated the difficulty of finding internships independently, and they wanted to learn about the places where one could apply knowledge from the program (S32). Other students noted that most of the information about internships is in Finnish, and since internship is compulsory for Finnish students, they get priority (S34). For international students it is optional, but this was claimed to be "just the excuse" (S21). Another student mentioned that since final funding decisions for internships are made through the lottery, it might miss the fact that some candidates had a hard time finding places suitable for international students. She argued that "they could employ more people and just go through the applications" (S25). Paradoxically, as the internship is not required, on the part of the faculty there is even a negative perception about doing one:

> …in any case I did my own. But the reaction of the professor was "So you are not going to finish your thesis this year?" He was so disappointed. It was a bit surprising, because it was actually quite a prestigious internship. I was incredibly fortunate to have gotten it. When I came back I got more realistic and picked a more feasible master's topic. As far as the program providing internships, for the first years they were quite open that they are not willing to do it, because it would distract students from completing their thesis. (S1)

Hence, for faculty there may be a conflict of interest between the graduation time and practical training. One respondent, who also criticized the inequality of opportunities for international students, believed that faculty employment would improve the situation:

> I got my internship. The advertisement was written in Finnish, even though there is no need to speak Finnish there. So, it is kind of just these invisible barriers… I was trying to explain to other students that they would advertise in Finnish, but you don't need it and few people seemed to believe that and just…There is no emphasis on really assisting students to get trainings. (S7)

Another student also mentioned that apart from the language, familiarity with the system played a role:

> …that is the thing about the Finnish system, you really have to look for it. You have to be in touch with career services, you have to read a lot online, and become knowledgeable in order to find. Perhaps they could make a little bit more user-friendly approach. (S31)

According to the FINHEEC evaluation, many program managers rely on other university staff to find internships and are not necessarily aware of how students deal with this non-compulsory part of their studies (FINHEEC, 2013, 41). This problem reveals the 'shifting responsibility' for international students between different university structures. Internship turns into a symbolic addition which is not integral in the overall education approach. While the idea of the master's degree at the European level was to create a greater connection with the job market, complications of implementation affect the outcomes. There is a boundary between the national language and the limitation of resources, which leads to a situation where it is easier to waive the internship requirement that exists for other degrees than overcome the difficulties.

Research-oriented prospects seem to be more available: "A lot of them are not paid, but I think since I am going to do a PhD, I feel more prepared here than I would if I would be searching for a job in Finland afterwards" (S9). But, as several respondents mention, often even research assistantships within the university require knowledge of Finnish. Applied aspects of the degree are significantly less developed than the research orientation. Another participant stated that the attitude of professors was often negative, and that one should "do good research for the sake of good research. You should not have dollar signs in your eyes" (S15). Thus, developing practicality of the discipline is devalued; as one of the respondents claimed, this degree might be good for getting into a doctoral program, but problematic in terms of applying for a regular job.

Students noted that although the university is not held responsible for training and career matters, there are several initiatives in this sphere. At least some of the programs suggested career fairs, as well as seminars for creating one's CV and for preparation for job interviews, but some of the students were sceptical about the impact of these ventures on employability. For instance, one career development course offered the chance to visit different companies relevant to the field of studies and explore opportunities to be hired in the international workplaces. On the one hand, this project attempted to acquaint students with the professional field. On the other hand, one of the respondents doubted the impact of this initiative on student employability: "But then this is just short visit, not a practical training. So

that we see, 'Ah, we can work here one day.' But then we don't do anything, we just visit" (S34).

Another student was also critical of this approach:

> Due to student pressure, there has been some effort to arrange a work-life program and develop discussion on where to get jobs. A lot of these I found to be very basic and relatively irrelevant for me. There is also a lot of emphasis that you have to speak very good Finnish, and it is very difficult to get a job in Finland. They were factoring in all these barriers, but not giving any means on how students can get away from them. The opportunities were not very apparent. (S14)

As seen from this quote, the university itself is not quite aware of how to employ international students after the provided studies. One student mentioned that in some other universities, there is more engagement with companies already during the course work and insisted that when the university does not establish connections, most of the time companies do not answer the inquiries of the international students (S32).

Bartram (2007, 208) notes a disparity between the expectations of students and staff about how much the university should be involved in organizing activities for international students. The faculty may not necessarily distinguish between international and domestic students in their responsibilities. Within the higher education community, there is an expectation that students be independent, and there is a perception that international students lack these qualities (FINHEEC, 2013, 81). So far, the difference of the labour market for international and domestic students is hardly noted by higher education institutions. Attending university may not be enough for the international students to become socially integrated. This reveals the lack of an organizational approach on the part of the university. Universities have reoriented themselves towards a long-term internationalization, but the relevant elements of this have not yet been developed.

In one way, the idea of a market-oriented university with staff working on satisfying students' needs and the idea of a self-reliant student are contrary. The entrepreneurial university (especially the one charging fees) is expected to serve customers, while the traditional institution of higher education aims to produce independent learners (Bartram, 2007, 21). As for the university in the process of transformation, the significance of services and the importance of students' independence are unclear. The position of staff reveals tensions between these two situations, they recognize the need for the students to be autonomous (Bartram, 2007, 21). However, this also depends on the previous educational system's experience of the students (Bartram, 2007, 21). Every so often, respondents claim that there is a deficit of means to be independent, especially for international students. The

review of practices in terms of student immersion is an emerging challenge of internationalization.

To reflect organizational perspectives on what students are entitled to from the university, I asked teachers about the skills they envision students to acquire through their studies. The crucial learning goals of the program, according to one of the respondents, are the core content and research skills, which would ensure the possibility to do a doctorate (T35). Since the degree programs offer multidisciplinary opportunities, it is essential to become a specialist in one discipline, being able to utilize other fields covered by the program (T38). Every so often, teachers also attribute personal qualities, awareness and intercultural skills to their teaching. One teacher alleged "sensibility and understanding of the other" as the most desirable skill. She explained: "I think that you must have tools for different situations, because we cannot teach every situation. You must have creativity to apply your understanding" (T35). This covers research, as well as everyday working situations, where you encounter diverse perspectives and approaches. Thematic knowledge and disciplinary focus are connected both to scientific specialization and the professional field. Yet another teacher remarked on the importance of transferable skills, which would be applicable to many sectors of employment (T36).

Yet, the applied value of international studies also emerged in the discussion about educational outcomes. One of the teachers collected information about possible employment opportunities on the program's website. Yet, she acknowledged that the pattern of employment is completely different for the international and domestic students: "It depends if the international student wants to stay here in Finland. To get a job matching the education is, of course, extremely difficult if one does not speak Finnish. If you are a Finn, I think you can fairly easily find work" (T38). Nevertheless, she acknowledges that the intake of students is small, it always takes more than two years to graduate, and due to that there is not enough information about the careers of international students. Though, maintaining a network of alumni has proven to be very fruitful. The instructor brought up an example of a graduate advertising a job position and another student getting it.

Another teacher also exposed the lack of information about students' employment, but underlined that students have to be in charge: "I think that international students, if they just think about their assets somehow… If they learn how the Finnish working life is, get some contacts and be active…" (T40). He elaborated that the lack of social network often becomes a challenge for students. For instance, when an international student is married to a Finn, this already creates some support for integration; however, the situation of students who come here just for studies may be different. Although the teacher was trying to describe the skills essential for employment, the overall interpretation did not look positive. It depends on the personal situation and versatile resources of the student, rather than what is advanced by the institution of higher education.

Another professor claimed that at the university, there is no big difference between Finnish and international researchers, adding that "of course, they cannot go to the Finnish primary school to teach Finnish, and so on, but otherwise… But in the field of social sciences they can work wherever in the world" (T36). Later she was claimed that academia requires no integration and is cosmopolitan, on which is based the idea that it is more assessable to international students. This perspective, once more, does not presuppose impact of the acquired international degree on employability. The academic world provides a relatively small number of places, and not all students are research-oriented. However, a professor acknowledged the lack of awareness on the part of the program about this issue: "I don't know if there has been a kind of analysis where students end up… whether they return, whether they stay… what their employment chances are… I think there should be a follow-up… That would be really interesting to know…" (T38).

The teacher did not see this within the immediate tasks of the program or her own professional responsibilities. Yet, she also hoped that that there would be employment for the international students afterwards:

> I hope people don't end up just doing a master's. I do realize that some people might use this program as a gap… not like a gap… but like a possibility to do an exchange program… If they haven't an exchange program, then doing an international master's would be… And that of course gives you an added value in the sense that you've got an international experience. I hope that they can transfer this when they go back… (T38)

This kind of position, as well as the lack of awareness about the international students' paths, constructs an alienating discourse. The difficulties of finding a job are ignored, and maybe the teacher is not aware of them. She continued:

> I hope that this is an added value to the labour market, wherever they go back… And of course, the students that we get here are already the privileged students… It takes a certain amount of money to get here… Of course, the courses that I have been teaching, they don't target you to specific employment. This is not a professional school, so… (T38)

Accordingly, the integration of students from abroad is not found within this depiction. The idea that students use this master's as an international opportunity instead of exchange, along with the circumstance that coming to Finland requires sufficient funds, stands as a supposition. Factual claims about students are accompanied by a lack of awareness about the actual career trajectories of international

students. All of this creates a very vague understanding of what students are provided with, and who is responsible for that. At least on the part of the teacher, there is no accountability towards international students.

Another representation is that that education in Finland is prestigious for international students:

> …some them have clear plans of returning to their home countries. And also, there they might have that researcher part as well. If you ask the students, this could be a big motivation to get a foreign degree, because it is very prestigious in some of these countries where they come from. They could be welcomed to their home countries in different capacities. (T38)

This establishes a paternalistic context where students arrive to a more affluent environment, and it creates a one-way process of education rather than internationalization as mutual enrichment.

Since most of the teachers were uninformed of the international students' career opportunities, the perceived sphere of interest and obligation of the academia remains within the national boundaries. Despite the policy framework of 'train and retain' directed towards international students, at the practical level there is no clear picture of how to prepare students for a career in Finland. It becomes easier to waive this objective than to attain it. Hence, teachers stick to the idea that students return home, but in this case, they are also ignorant about the applications of the received education.

Another teacher seized the goal of integrating into Finnish society, although she still had no idea about the actual employment rate:

> If we take the goal of staying in Finland, then we would need to invest much more in their Finnish language skills. Because evidently in Finland you need Finnish in order to be employed. It is hard to say how many of the students who already graduated actually decided to stay. No idea. But I understood that those students who either have partner here or… knew Finnish beforehand, those are the students who are staying here. But for other students it is probably much more difficult. (T35)

Noting that students are staying due to their personal situation removes responsibility from the university to supply an education suitable for successful integration. However, the teacher also acknowledged a lack of awareness about the objectives of the international students:

> Actually, I don't know about their willingness to stay here either, so… This is something that comes from the newspapers or general public discussion. These are the difficulties that we have here in terms of attracting… and keeping a qualified labour force here… I think in the master's programs we contribute to this problem. They would probably need to think to what extent these language courses, or Finnish culture, you know, are oriented towards better knowledge of the Finnish labour market. To what extent should these be included in the program? Difficult to say… (T35)

So, general knowledge about the international students, which is derived from established public discourse rather than from continuous interaction with students on campus, informs the administrative approach.

Apart from the pathways of the international students, I also asked teachers specifically about the professional arena which graduates could inhabit. One teacher claimed that there is a "huge field": international affairs departments, polytechnics, private enterprises, ministries, embassies, NGOs, international organizations, and working in different kinds of consulting and establishing own company (T40). Another professor just emphatically exclaimed "all kinds of great jobs, all the time" (T38). Yet one more teacher mentioned that he is trying to explain to students that there is no direct career path and that acquired skills could be applicable in any field of employment. She mentioned that there are no job announcements citing the study focus, and that along with specialization, one has to learn how to apply these skills (T36). This kind of challenge is equally applicable to both international and domestic students.

Finally, one of the respondents insisted that international students have similar work prospects, since many Finnish companies use English (for example, Nokia and Kone) (T36). However, another instructor was quite sceptical about that:

> I think it is a bit difficult, and the international students, I think they have also gotten work quite well, but I think it has been a bit more difficult than if you think about those who speak Finnish. I think it comes again about knowing the field, and so on. I think there also international students who got their grants, and they are doing their PhD. (T39)

The PhD in this case was an option in case one did not get a job. This matches the university's orientation towards preparing students for undertaking research. Among academic and non-academic career options, the former one was clearly a preference.

I asked students whether they perceive their employment opportunities to be enhanced and what they would do with these opportunities. Some of them expressed scepticism that this social science major would be popular among employers (S28). Still, an international background and the focus of the program might be a good starting point and significant for employers (S8). Another respondent also regarded the focus as very "actual and fancy" (S24). Yet another student pointed out that his program has a unique focus, the only one in Europe, which should be an advantage for employment opportunities. He envisioned working in an NGO or government organization with the international aspect.

Both internationality and the content of the studies presume a scientific and practical career, albeit this cannot be taken for granted. One student mentioned that the ability to work in globally oriented work settings seems to be a resource, but she does not really know where she would apply it (S33). Another student said that she had no idea what kind of career she might pursue, even with the career course from the university. She envisioned working in an NGO abroad (S21). Although students are aware of the possibilities, this is still an undersized professional field, and there is a need for more information about actual employment.

A career that a student had before was also a relevant factor in the projected employment. One of the respondents drew on his prior work experience and intended to apply his intercultural knowledge in the business setting. He also planned to influence public policies (S31). Another student mentioned that since he knew what he wants to do already before the master's studies, this experience at the university gave him even sharper focus (S1). Students also anticipated the problem of fully applying their skills due to underemployment.

The target was "to get something relevant to education, and a job that pays. This is the phenomena for immigrants regardless of where they are. Credentials are not evaluated equally" (S25). Hence, apart from the language challenges, there is an additional problem with migrant employment. To some extent, this is fixed by obtaining an international degree. Another student acknowledged the improvement of employment opportunities, but said that in Finland it would be unlikely for her to get the position she wants, so she "will have to take it home or to another place where there are some opportunities", and that "back home they really value looking at problems from different perspectives and bringing new fresh ideas" (S13). One of the students mentioned that the labour market in Finland, both for internships and for permanent employment, is built on 'who you know' (S21). The absence of a social network becomes a problem for migrants.

Another participant mentioned that getting a job in Finland for a foreigner is a matter of "personal luck", since the "program itself does not have a human resource or even financial resource to facilitate this to happen" (S22). The rationale of staying and integrating, or leaving Finland, is based on professional opportunities. Students attempt to assess their job market skills, and try to find the best application for them. Consequently, the question from the university, 'whether

students want to stay, or go back to their home countries' appears to be irrelevant – they stay if they find professional realization. Also, the dichotomy of staying or going back is loose, as there might be other relevant options. For instance, one student claimed that although this education would have a good reputation back home, his plan was to look for jobs internationally (S26). Many respondents discussed the weight of education in Finland back home, but hardly any of them expressed a clear desire to go back. They considered possibilities according to the opportunity of applying their skills professionally.

Some students expressed a desire to do a PhD and stay in Finland, mentioning that their language skills were not yet good enough for the labour market. Hence, the strength of this aspect of the educational preparation was acknowledged, and the ease of integration through the academic track was noted as well. However, just doing a PhD was considered to be problematic. Before engaging in an academic career, one student noted that it would be great to acquire volunteering experience, doing social work in another country (S14). Another student mentioned that doing PhD research was not within her immediate plans: "right now I would like to work and get distance from the university" (S4). Other participant, initially considering the PhD, received discouraging stories from other students about supervisors and the research process at the university being depressing and lonely. Another student also added about the challenges in doing a PhD:

> I am still not sure about the PhD process. Right now it seems like… we had a class where the PhD students came to us, and they said that if you are not completely 100% passionate about this work, don't do it. It is going to drain you, and there is not so much… there is support, but you have to really search it out. (S17)

Looking closely, one can determine multiple limitations in pursuing an academic career as well.

The FINHEEC evaluation (2013) concluded that a majority of the international students wish to stay in Finland. It dispelled the idea of stakeholders that students come to Finland to take advantage of the free education and then leave the country. Institutions provided opposing data to the effect that many students face significant challenges while trying to integrate in Finland, due to the political climate and labour market expectations (FINHEEC, 2013). One of the students mentioned that even when universities try to prepare students for their prospective careers, there is rarely an opportunity to consider students who already have work experience; these are merely starting-level courses (S27).

Observing the depictions of the prospective professional field, it appears that students discover along with the teachers that there are no established strategies of employment. The differences in the employment opportunities of the interna-

tional and domestic students are not reflected by the university. Since the accumulation of information on alumni is only just beginning, there is little evidence of the connections between the master's studies and the professional field.

7.4.2 Intercultural communication as a value-generating process in internationalization

Universities often claim to teach students intercultural communication. I asked students what kind of opportunities they had, and whether and how it was encouraged by the program. One of the students claimed that activities facilitating intercultural skills were arranged by the student union. Neither the university nor the master's program organized or took part in these experiences (S32). Several respondents mentioned enjoying such activities as a language exchange café, skiing and parties (S2, S6, S15).

One participant mentioned that they had tea and cookies together with other students, which was organized by the program; sometimes there were also lectures and the possibility of getting together afterwards. But she claimed that the program's input was small, and most of it depended on the person: "So if you completely rely on the faculty and don't facilitate it yourself, you see those people in a class, and then once a year at the welcoming gathering, which is very little in my opinion" (S16). The sense of community within the program could easily be compromised when students chose different courses and did not meet, as well as when the faculty was not involved. Programs do not necessarily see themselves as fostering internationalization at home. Many professors see international students as coming to their courses, but otherwise being a responsibility of the larger university. Meanwhile, for the students this is the central place where they start their integration. When administrators change frequently, it is challenging to maintain a point of reference for inquiries, help and discussion regarding issues that arise.

The issue of intercultural communication was tackled within the formal studies as well. It concerned the organization of classroom discussion and sometimes was reinforced by the topic of the course. For instance, one of the students described a relevant module within their studies where they did group work and had enlightening communication (S13). Another student stated that discussion was "a big part of understanding the material" that it often continued during lunch (S11). Some respondents mentioned that adjustment to group work and discussions took some time (S28). Other student characterized the people in his program as being especially rich in terms of intercultural experiences, since they had all travelled before and often received their bachelor's in a country which was not their own before coming to Finland (S3, S4, S17, S22). Therefore, both discussions and group work skills were among the educational gains.

However, other students had criticisms about classroom communication. One student stated that a special course on intercultural communication did not make

the benefits from the program any stronger, and "it did not really live up to the expectations" (S9). Another student revealed that even the lecturers were "kind of shy" in her opinion:

> So, they won't look into your eyes, and say. 'Yeah, that's a very interesting question.' Debates rarely happened. It tended to be mostly lecturers wandering around the class, saying something, and then looking out the window and clicking the next slide. Of course, if I asked a question, the lecturer would respond, but it's not like [what is] commonly seen as a course discussion. I've seen lecturers [that are] very shy, but also willing to discuss, and I have seen lecturers that were unwilling to discuss and just thinking that everybody was kind of stupid. There are all kinds of different lecturers, but they don't really engage people to talk to each other. (S32)

She also drew a national-international delineation in regard to this kind of phenomenon:

> There are one or two of the courses that I have taken where the lecturers really engaged the class. But these are the lecturers that either have been to the US to study or have experienced this by talking with those people. But it's very hard to see a Finnish-based teacher trying these kinds of things. (S32)

The respondent ascribed the interactional classroom practices to the international experience of the lecturers. It appears that the study experience and its educational value have often been situational, depending on the lecturer and his or her background and pedagogic approach. The opinions within one program were also polarized; teaching in one year could differ from another, since other instructors could be hired.

Another student wished there would be more projects. He added that "courses were good, but somehow we lacked the enthusiasm to do something extra. For example, just to meet and have some talks about the problems that happen nowadays, or just to discuss something, or even organize seminars. It was just the classes, and that's it" (S13). The benefits of having such an international audience were not fully utilized.

Several respondents admitted that it would be great to have this organized by the students, but since they are new to the place and do not really know the rules of the game, they need some encouragement from the program. Another weakness is that since students come and leave due to the varying study load, internship, graduation and employment, continuity is a problem (S5). Doing something with

the whole university was even envisioned as a desired possibility, such as engaging with students who are not in the international programs. It would be good, since "they don't really merge with the foreigners, and there is a possibility that they see foreigners as a distant group" (S4). Another student revealed that international students have good connections among themselves, maintain communication through Facebook, and have regular hangout meetings (S1). The prospect of bringing up and exploring problematic topics together was discussed: "like immigration, for example. Some cases… some journalists that actually do research about how different people deal with racism, the way they see foreigners. Not just this, also the media, and how the immigration process takes place" (S15).

Finally, reaching outside of the institution was discussed. For instance, one student attempted to communicate with a program at another Finnish university which had a close study focus, but sustaining this over the long term required institutional support (S33). Another respondent told about a student organization that endorses integration in society. Arriving students initially have a tutor, but afterwards students often still feel lonely and lost. He pointed out that there was isolation: "there was no way for us to get to know any of the Finnish students. We were completely separate from the Finnish students who study the same things that we study. So, I think that could be made much better than it is" (S33).

Briefly, classroom discussions, when they were available, served as important initiating points, but at the same time they were not sufficient for academic and societal integration. Students had to rely on their personal initiative to launch events, but this varied from year to year and did not have the necessary continuity. Finally, it was acknowledged that reflecting multiple perspectives is essential for communication; involvement of Finnish students was often recognized as rare. Clearly, there are gaps between individual and institutional understanding. For students, internationalization is conditional on the university's efforts and does not always convey educational value. It relies on emergent processes that cannot be planned, yet could be sustained by higher education structures.

7.4.3 Personal development as a result of international experiences

According to the normative ideas, in addition to facilitating employment and expanding knowledge, universities educate citizens and contribute to their identity and personal development. When I conversed with students whether studies contributed to their personal development, the responses touched upon various spheres, from living in a foreign society to understanding their own professional focus and developing their own study path. The interviews demonstrated the breadth of experience that students get through international studies and the multiplicity of factors that contribute to outcomes.

Respondents praised the experience of living in a foreign country: "Being in Finland, the whole environment taught me a lot, not only at the university" (S13).

Others claimed international studies to be a transformative experience on its own: "just starting a school in a new place and going through all the stages yourself, starting a new level of studies… I think that it always develops you as a person" (S12). Overall, this discloses learning through challenges, both in terms of life in society and at the university. Another student mentioned the independent nature of studies being a contributing factor:

> For me, it's now that you are no longer directed. Now you have to direct your education, which is very new… I always thought it is good to choose a lot, but the schedule is always given, so… The way I have to learn is very new and different here… There is no teacher who is going to scold you if you don't learn… Ha-ha-ha, so that has been a big change as well. (S15)

The response demonstrates that interaction with the new faculty and its guiding principles could be conceptualized by students as an improvement. This contrasts with the academic literature, where the prevalent focus is on the adjustment challenges due to the discrepancy between the academic environments that students come from, as well as expectations surrounding the current educational system.

Other respondents also acknowledged cognitive development and a structured understanding of their discipline (S30, S3, S14). For instance, one of the participants formulated it in the following way: "If I would have to come back to my job that I had before, I would take less for granted. Not only a degree matters, [but also] intellectual thirst. The environment to keep an open mind keeps you exposed to different [things]" (S7). Another participant considered all of this due to personal influence from a professor, whose research and career development she considered as a role model (S28). Others also acknowledged influence from their professors. Still, this confirms a situational value of the gains from internationalization, that it depends on the academic environment and personal input from the teachers. Another student pointed out networking: "Yeah, definitely. I am not happy with the classes and not knowing the professors. But I know people in my studies, and I am really happier" (S16). Due to the absence of good communication with the faculty, students seek other values in their studies: they rely on peers or pursue transformations that are valuable in their own situation. For instance, returning to studies after work was also a landmark for several students.

Yet another student revealed enduring communicative challenges as a developmental experience:

> I felt I was singled out as far as the whole pressure to finish the master's thesis, and it was a bit hard for me to actually change the master's topic. I was really worried that I would be completely shut out by the faculty. It was necessary, not only for the lack of feasibility but for

> ethical reasons. It was finally good to do this new topic, which I find rather empowering. The first time I did the interview, I was just relieved and inspired. I knew I was right, so it taught me to be more selective and to do what I want to do. That is just a reaction rather than something that was taught to me. (S9)

The respondent noted this as very relevant for pursuing an academic career. This demonstrates that enduring negative experiences in certain circumstances also brings development.

Another personal account included problematizing the issues of justice and diversity:

> I realized that some people are not as equally treated as I thought. Like Finnish people don't really know what is going on in the north of Finland. It is not this wonderful dreamy image of being Saami people in the northern country. They have their own grievances. There are certain things that you have to overcome. So, that is also a very important finding. But academic training per se is not really solid enough according to my own standards. (S32)

Hence, even though the studies were not that good, there still was a search for learning possibilities. Personal development within internationalization is also situational. Moreover, since most of the social events and the orientations are organized by a student union, the program and the university have no established approach, and thus they also have a limited influence on development. Personal development means that once a student chooses these studies, there is a challenge to make them work, even if they do not meet the initial expectations.

As a source of gaps arising from this dimension of internationalization, I would argue that the university does not determine the input into student development. Among the emergent processes, there is personal internationalization. We can consider this as a way to mend the gaps between student expectations and institutional provisions. Instead of following the framework of culture shock developed in the academic literature, this would provide a perspective on student experience as a way of naturalizing in the unknown education system and turning this process into a learning experience. These micro-outcomes could be placed alongside the considerations of the macro-impact considered in policies.

Conclusions:

My supposition in this chapter is that neither the academic literature nor the policy texts create a summarized picture of the university's internationalization practices.

In the policy texts, practices are often used as a justification for change, and arguments in favour of greater internationalization are laid out. There is an ambition to solve country-level problems through internationalization, and the measurements used in assessing internationalization are mainly prompted by their accessibility and comparability with other countries rather than insights into the educational context. To complement this limited picture, I used the perspectives of multiple respondents as a proxy for everyday activities at the university; this explicates the connections between normative ideas and planning.

Due to its market orientation and a lack of education-related arguments at the higher planning levels, the planning discourse is not practice-driven but grounded in a global, educational policy discourse. Following these global tendencies, a change of framework occurred from short-term to long-term internationalization. Institutional efforts are diverted from exchange studies to degree programs, and graduates are expected to stay and integrate into Finland. Yet, there is a lack of a targeted approach at the institutional level.

The inclusion of international students and the retention of graduates presume the advance of new measures. Apart from "instruction of the national languages" as an assimilative action, international students' challenges, such as integration within the university and employment, are not reflected. The absence of a coherent strategy is tied to shifting responsibility for international students between several levels of governance. Paradoxically, there is also the advancement of an export agenda in terms of the students from outside of the EU, which requires service development, and the introduction of tuition fees that do not entirely coincide with the students' stay after graduation.

At the practical levels of internationalization, the dichotomy of normative ideas about the value of knowledge per se and education for applied purposes acquires new specificities. Despite an acknowledged market orientation, the facilitation of employment upon graduation is problematic, and internationalization is making this even more difficult. Master's programs often deal with the emerging professional field, and information about potential occupations and workplaces is scarce. Some of the activities in this area turn out to be counterproductive for international students, since the ways in which they will be employed are unpredictable. Therefore, in terms of practical measures, a competitive market-oriented approach is not fully consistent. It is expressed in the pursuit of numeric indicators and overall strategy on the macro level, yet this does not transfer to the attention paid to practices and inclusion at the individual level (in terms of employment).

A vivid example of this is a "graduate fast" approach, which is thought to shorten the study time. Often for individuals coming from abroad, a tight study schedule is insufficient for acquiring language skills and the necessary social network. Getting internships is equally problematic, as they are not compulsory for international students, and the university is not responsible for ensuring them.

Therefore, accountability on the part of the university towards international students has not been developed.

Another aspect of educational goals in internationalization, stemming from normative ideas, concerns improving the curriculum and developing new knowledge. A diversity of students, scholars and scientific topics comprise the university's key assets; they could be tackled at the planning stage. In terms of the institutional approach, this aligns with the shift towards long-term internationalization and 'internationalization at home'. Although assumingly students are benefiting from actual diversity on campus, fruitful interaction does not seem to be always attained in practice. Several issues depend on the flexibility and adaptability of institutional practices. Attracting international teachers, development of the curriculum enriched with perspectives from all over the world, and ensuring the interaction of Finnish and international students necessitate a tactic on the part of the university. An academic community can treat diverse students either as a problem or as a developmental opportunity for rethinking practices; the outcome depends on the vision and available resources.

So far, there has been an absence of an overall institutional approach towards deriving the educational benefits from internationalization and the shifting of responsibility among different levels of governance. Master's programs suffer from diminished institutional attention: they do not have secure long-term funding and administrators with long-term employment contracts. Hence, the possibilities to develop and sustain own teaching at these programs are diminished.

The provisional position of university lecturers does not allow them to feel ownership of the outcomes. The educational value produced by the programs can often be situational and depend on the teachers and guest lecturers that were available in a given year, the funding that was obtained, and the diversity and qualifications of the students who were selected. On the level of practices, internationalization appears to require greater resources; this is in contradiction with the expectations at the policy level, where it is anticipated to bring in revenue. Until this paradox is resolved, internationalization is unlikely to become a stimulus for the development of education. The weakness of the university's agency in relation to internationalization is at the core of the gaps in practice.

8 Chapter: Conclusions. Internationalization gaps and their implications

8.1 Claims about internationalization and their reasonings

The approach used in this study – distinguishing normative ideas, planning and practices – provides a larger framework for understanding internationalization. Specifically, it enables an analysis of the gaps in internationalization, expressed in the arguments about the discrepancy between what internationalization 'should be' and 'what it is'. In the beginning of the analysis, I established that internationalization is an empty term, which could denote multiple phenomena in the field of higher education. Institutions and higher education systems fill this empty concept to describe their own purposes, and it is a term that acquires meaning through context. Therefore, when internationalization is claimed to be insufficient, the statement involves a wide variety of assumptions. Pointing out the normative ideas, planning, and practices in relation to internationalization gives tangibility to the claims about it. By explicating these aspects within international master's programs as a project type, I accumulate criteria characterizing internationalization.

In the next subchapter 8.2, I return to the first question and account for the gaps between the normative ideas, policies and practices of internationalization applied in the university and master's programs. Internationalization gaps appear in the discussion when cohesion between the normative ideas, planning, and practices is lacking. This reveals multiple realizations of internationalization development. Answering the second question of my research in subchapter 8.3, I look at the implications for internationalization development based on the results of my analysis. My argument is that key features of current planning prevent long-term changes at the university in relation to internationalization. In 8.4, I write about the reconceptualization of internationalization based on my research. Distinguishing normative ideas, planning, and practices explicates critical aspects of internationalization, such as creation of the common space, institutional responsibility and student participation. Subchapter 8.5 closes the book and presents my perspective on internationalization development based on exploring the social construction of internationalization in the first question.

8.2 Gaps in internationalization

The lack of connections between the normative ideas, planning and practices is a major source of the gaps. The analysis of normative ideas shows that internationalization is integral to the purposes of higher education. The discussion about academic values pointed out the deficiency of an economic orientation for higher

educational institutions, and highlighted an expectation of knowledge and curriculum transformation through internationalization. The dichotomy between economic and academic ideas within internationalization highlights the issue of perspectives, which are taken into account within the internationalization discourse. Various actors within the university generate expectations of internationalization; this is also a starting point for understanding the gaps. Since education is a "moral practice" (Biesta, 2007), the question "for whom" internationalization is carried out could also be extended towards internationalization.

Normative representations are divergent at the individual and institutional levels. While the university is aligned with the state and broad societal anticipations, considerations of individual expectations are much less developed. The underlying factor for this is that internationalization is reactional rather than a proactive process for the university. Global conditions are considered as a threat at the national level, and higher educational institutions are subjected to the process of coping with this environment. The question is whether this stimulus, derived from the macro conditions, enables internationalization development.

Criticism of the current internationalization process and the intensive involvement of the state in it is often argued through a comparison with medieval times, which, it is assumed, allowed for the greater involvement of the individual in the search for knowledge development. The individual dimension of internationalization is less represented in the current internationalization discourse, and taking it into account allows for the conceptualization of the transformative idea of internationalization and necessitates student participation and classroom discussion.

Yet, the analysis of planning demonstrated that institutional strategies are more oriented towards the external environment, namely national and European-level policies. The university's relationship with the broader world, image-making and competitiveness are more represented within internationalization than the consideration of internal processes of internationalization. Ideas of internationalization change over time and are adjusted to the current situation in the politics of higher education. For instance, the change towards long-term internationalization has become a leading trend due to the demand for skilled labour. This is partly due to the influence of global education policy, but there is also an understanding that practices do not produce enough impact on education.

Within the university, there is also the problem of individual agency in planning, meaning the staff's and students' perspectives and possibilities for participation. The university's affiliation with the state and alignment with its macro goals compromise communication with the staff and students. I argue that there are 'planned' processes and 'independent' processes in education, and it is unclear to what extent it is fruitful to direct academic work. This highlights communication issues and the need to build relationships within the university, as well as the way in which internationalization is framed. Administrators and teachers imple-

ment internationalization within precarious administrative and financial conditions. The implementation of internationalization is plagued by funding problems and frequent changes in planning. It points towards the weakness of the university's agency, which, in this case, brings up the lack of a justification for the specific institutional approach to internationalization.

This comes down to agency in internationalization at different levels: the European level deals with a limited range of issues, while national-level governance envisions the solving of various state problems, and, at the university level, it is expected that these ambitious plans are to be implemented. The reactions of the institutions of higher education to the external environment varies. Along with the rhetoric by which internationalization is legitimized and a broad impact is promised, internal university practices concerning internationalization are not normalized; there is no established way of doing things. This creates a perpetual source of claims about gaps, since the underlying normative ideas can be very divergent.

How internationalization is framed depends on institutional agency. This suggests that policies at different levels should not only be coherent, they could be narrowed down to be made more specific in order to enable changes through internationalization. Though planning envisions a broad economic and societal impact, and narrowing this focus towards progress indicators is problematic.

The current climate of competitiveness and the focus on institutional position and reputation diverts attention from the practices. Marketing is one of the areas in which information on practices is accumulated, and it is often taken as a proxy for institutional processes. Although it has the purpose of promoting a positive image, ideas about the master's programs' practices cannot be inferred from these accounts. Producing this discourse takes a lot of attention at the level of planning.

The lack of information about the everyday functioning of the university goes along with the problem of data deficiency. This makes internationalization planning prone to gaps. Bridging the talk on policy and actual implementation is not seamless, as there are institutional circumstances that must be considered. My analysis shows that internationalization's impact should not be taken for granted and that it is conditional on the specific university.

An investigation of practices brings up problematizations of internationalization at home and in the institutional treatment of international students. Specifically, the university is dealing with the organizational and ethical challenges of internationalization. The treatment of different student categories is unclear. A blurred boundary between international and domestic students raises concerns about the university's obligations towards citizens and non-citizens, the ways in which equality is ensured and how diverse backgrounds and labour market prospects are mediated. So far, there is no established point of responsibility for international students within the university. At the policy level, there is even a reference towards a collective actor in which 'we' implies national unity. This, once again, explicates an understanding of internationalization as an external aspect of

the university's functioning. Lastly, limited resources and problems of sustainability impede the transformative agenda of internationalization.

Internationalization development is problematic for another reason: apart from the unforeseen problems, the value of internationalization is also situational due to individual input and independent, emergent processes within international education, e.g. classroom discussion. Since not all value from internationalization can be generated through planning, the university's role in creating conditions for sustaining internationalization is crucial. The gaps in internationalization are also conceivable in this case.

Although I established at the beginning of this dissertation that internationalization is often used as an empty term, the public discussion about internationalization development and arguments on the lack of the academic values are a process by which boundaries for the concept are being sought. The impact of internationalization should not be taken for granted, as argued in the papers about the myths and misconceptions of internationalization (Knight, 2011; de Wit, 2011). My addition to this scholarly dialog is that the process is conditional on institutional agency, which determines implementation. Finally, the university's agency also mediates the contingency created by the emergent processes of internationalization. Some of the internationalization gaps could be attributed to the situational value of everyday internationalization.

8.3 Implications for internationalization development

8.3.1 How normative ideas, planning and practices determine internationalization development

Internationalization, as several authors have argued, is a response to globalization (Stromquist, 2007; Altbach, 2004; UNESCO, 2009). There are also suggestions that this conception reduces internationalization to economic dimension and fails to grasp an independent process within education (Gornitzka et al., 2003, 21–22). I acknowledge the fruitfulness of this critique of a normative understanding of internationalization as an economic process and the reconceptualization of internationalization as a multidimensional process. The way internationalization has been discursively constructed in the planning for the empirical analysis of this research is closer to the first explanation, referring to the process conditioned by globalization. As I have established in chapters 2 and 5, this implies multiple expectations of economic progress and innovations, rather than arguments about transformations within education. The key feature of internationalization then becomes communication with external stakeholders and justification of the university's excellence. This is coupled with the lack of attention to, and communication with, teachers and students. The macro orientation in planning also explains the lack of attention towards practices. The claims of the broad impact that higher

education would produce in society are close to the normative ideas. In this case, they have a negative impact on internationalization development, since they rest on justifications of 'why it is good to have internationalization', assuming a positive impact, rather than establishing some formal indicators for it.

Features of internationalization planning create challenges for the governance of internationalization. While the change from short-term to long-term internationalization could be attributed to a top-down influence, the same forces also limit its development and integration into the mainstream functioning of the university. Namely, scarce funding, the lack of administrative attention and uneven rethinking of everyday practices are induced by the university's focus on external stakeholders. One of the core problems rests with agency at different levels, which exerts influence on internationalization. The European framework sustains ideological and organizational influences, while the state's approval is crucial for internationalization to take a particular form. Governmental influence also has a macro focus. The conditions for degree studies take shape at the institutional level. Yet, there is a lack of communication within internal university structures and limited attention is paid to students. This contributes to the problems with the university's agency.

Studies have claimed similar ideas and pondered about the lack of academic response to higher education reforms (Rinne, 2004), the conflict of values within the university (Haapakorpi & Saarinen, 2014) or the problems of governance as obstacles to long-term planning (Välimaa, 2004). Healey (2008) states that even the overall economic drive does not pertain to institutional standing, but rather that it is a response to governmental conditioning, which creates a quasi-market situation. The contribution of my research is in contextualizing these ideas into the university's planning and distinguishing critical points of the university's agency. For instance, the dominance of justifications for internationalization in planning over implementation measures (as described by FINHEEC, 2013) exemplifies the deficiency of institutional adaptation and contextualizing within the university's processes. Since the analysis of planning and practices showed a number of organizational challenges, presenting internationalization as a solution to a wide variety of problems also creates a normative claim if it is not underpinned with measures of problem resolution. At the macro level, internationalization is an everyday process with juxtapositions of national vs. international or public vs. private. Resolving inevitable tensions and inventing implementation processes that would address them are another important dimension of the university's agency. The understanding of these challenges is, however, limited by the scarcity of data that would allow accessing practices.

The exploration of normative ideas showed that the major difference between the internationalization of the Middle Ages and the current situation is the role of the state, which attracts criticism the most. Paradoxically, despite the prevalence of governmental power in planning, normative ideas concerning national interests

are underdeveloped. As I demonstrate in chapter 6, it specifically concerns aspects related to content, such as national language, culture and history within international studies. This shortage, again, can be traced back to the understanding of internationalization as a response to globalization. In connection to internationalization, Finland is presented as a small country facing the pressures of globalization. Hence, internationalization is a reactive, rather than a proactive process, and normative ideas are borrowed from the global discourse rather than generated from within the state.

There are studies that try to recreate the normative dimensions of internationalization by expanding its meaning beyond economic terms (e.g. Mestenhauser,1998b; Gacel-Ávila, 2005). They advance the reasoning behind the academic aspects of internationalization, which is, as I have demonstrated above, crucial for planning. With my study, I would like to add the idea that these potential applications of internationalization are conditional on the institutional measures. Claiming the relevance of internationalization does not allow one to assume any tangible impact. In order to reveal this conditioning, I would argue, there is a need to consider normative ideas, planning and practices together.

The potential conditions to saturate the normative dimension of internationalization could be drawn from focusing on individual perspectives, which were analysed in chapter 6 of this study. Since the overall internationalization discourse prioritizes macro level arguments, this addition gives a fruitful refocussing of the analysis. Along with the discrepancy between the national and institutional needs in internationalization (Stensaker et al, 2008), there is a notable discrepancy between institutional and individual demands. The analysis showed, for instance, that diversity, language and curriculum are the core elements of internationalization. Yet, the possibilities of deriving educational value from these elements depends on the institutional framing. One of the problematic areas concerns provisions related to culture. Analysis of the normative representations demonstrates that in relation to planning, provisions focusing on the creation of the common space, building curriculum to meet the diverse qualifications of students, and ensuring students' rights creates a more encompassing institutional approach.

Another insight from the normative ideas at the individual level is that, to some extent, the gap between the individual's normative ideas (e.g. expectations) and practices (what students encounter upon arrival to the university) are inevitable. First, the diversity of educational backgrounds is impossible to foresee in advance. Second, internationalization's value is often situational, since it is created in the classroom by drawing on the individual resources of the participants. This temporary value might be intensified by frequent institutional changes and a lack of resources (prompting, e.g., cuts in teaching provisions). This understanding creates implications both for individual and institutional agency. In the academic literature, students often appear as the objects rather than the subjects of internationalization. This analysis showed, however, that individual input and participatory

practices are crucial for educational value. Moreover, the process of adjustment to the new educational environment is a vital part of education and personal growth. Considering the implications for planning, this conclusion highlights once again the function of institutional agency in communicating with students about educational provisions and the interpretation of internationalization that is taking place. This allows, to some extent, for the gap between planning and practices to be mitigated, and opens up university-level planning to consider the problems that emerge within internationalization.

The analysis of practices highlighted multiple data deficiencies and an absence of reliable indicators of internationalisation, which preclude sustainable conclusions about the everyday aspects of internationalization. Yet, some regularities could be derived from the analysis of individual perspectives. There is a demand for a certain kind of standardization and established approaches towards problematic situations. Yet, new issues constantly emerge, and they require an institutional approach. For instance, 'internationalization at home' and the integration of students into society upon graduation appear, in practice, to be much more complex than as they are presented in the planning. A number of authors mentioned that these kinds of outcomes do not come by default (e.g. Robson, 2011; Jones & Killick, 2013). Yet, the conditions of their realization are context dependent and this justifies a deeper analysis of practices. My analysis showed that in Finland, the language aspect is what keeps the national and international domains apart within the university; this makes international students' integration into the academic community problematic. Then, the pressure to graduate quickly does not allow students to acquire sufficient language skills and an understanding of the labour market. Moreover, international master's programs often explore new professional possibilities, which do not suggest a predictable professional path. This justifies the university's involvement in fostering employability even more. Therefore, an exploration of practices could supply indicators for an analysis of the institutional approach.

8.3.2 Internationalization as an external characteristic

Analysis within this inquiry shows that internationalization is conceptualized as a process external to mainstream education. This is tied to the prevalence of the political and economic rationales of internationalization, the lack of attention to curriculum rethinking and development of classroom practices, and the overall lack of transformative meaning connected to internationalization. Answering the second question of my study on the implications of the gaps for university development, I argue that under the current construction of the internationalization policy, there is a lack of preconditions for the international degree studies to become more integrated into the university. Being external for internationalization means being adaptive to the environment, yet not fully applied to changing education.

On the contrary, internalizing internationalization could be a metaphor of transformation.

Although cooperation and competition are two drivers of internationalization development, in dealing with the countries outside the European Union, competition plays a greater role. Internationalization comprises external efforts; the changes inside the European education are justified as a tool for that (not as a separate or a primary goal). As for students, the estimations of international mobility show individuals with a foreign background in education rather than migration for education purposes. The key to success is in competitiveness; this puts an emphasis on marketing efforts and image-making as activities that constitute internationalization.

Market-led development is at the crux of modern internationalization strategy. Many measures are introduced with potential revenues in mind. Even the 'idea of internationalization as a promotion of intercultural values' is brought up mainly due to the employment opportunities of the graduates, and it is linked to the market. This creates an implicit contradiction with traditional university functions, where the education provided by the university is a public good. The discussion about pursuing academic values (as a necessary change) underlines the perception in academia that internationalization is external vis-à-vis the core university functions. It is developed due to stimuli from the Ministry of Education, rather than being something generated and promoted from within the university.

Another aspect of 'internationalization as externality' is that it generates divisions, often along national lines. For the country and the university, international activities include any projects that happen across the national borders. Together with that, there is a division into Nordic, European and other partners. A similar approach shows up in relation to students: there are domestic and international students, divided into groups of Nordic, European and others. The line between international and domestic students also lies across citizenship and nationality. These geographic references in relation to internationalization signify that despite the idea of openness implied in the process, there are also divisions and inequality. The idea of inclusiveness does not extend to planning and practice.

There is a shifting agency in the enactment of internationalization associated with it as external phenomena in terms of the focus of the higher education system. It turns out that internationalization can be passed down through all the planning levels without attention to the educational aspects. For instance, it is unclear who is responsible for the integration of international students and ensuring the organization and progression of studies. Multiple entities do their share of the work, but there is no stable system supporting the implementation of internationalization.

8.3.3 International master's program

International master's programs are at the core of internationalization within the university. This is a challenge, given the limited nature of the university's agency. When internationalization is taken as an external factor, the development of international master's programs is not fully realized. International master's programs are a venue to host international students and a stimulus to organize teaching in English. Yet, this type of international project requires reasonable efforts from the university (i.e. student services, housing and safety). Along with that, attractive master's programs are a way to make the university visible internationally. So, there are both internal and external aspects to be considered.

On the one hand, there is a problem of sustainability. Since many programs offer different content over the course of several years, they rely on guest lecturers whose value can be situational and not built over time. Hence, continuity and development are also elements of internationalization. They are possessed to a various degree, depending on the actions at the institutional context. On the other hand, the value of internationalization is inevitably situational (based on individual interactions that are impossible to measure, but at the same time dependent on the conditions provided by internationalization). As I established before, internationalization is viewed as an instrument to generate new resources rather than an area requiring investments. Not only it is governed from the top down, but it has EU and national involvement. To justify it on these levels, it should be presented as profitable rather than as requiring investment. Policy-level discourse prioritizes the applied, practical value of internationalization, which brings quick results. This normative standing impacts practices.

The master's degree as a form of studies has clear relevance in the current conditions of higher education. It has advantages for international mobility development. It is feasible for universities to organize a 1–2-year study program in English at the master's level, and to advertise professionally focused degrees (in contrast to bachelor' studies). For students, short-term degrees in a foreign country are more possible, and the desired professional focus increases motivation to go abroad. Yet, the possibilities to realize these advantages are limited both from the institutional and individual perspectives, as it is a challenge for students to complete the degree within a two-year timeframe (not least because of the unavailability of course and lack of supervision), learn Finnish, and integrate sufficiently to find a job. For the university, the perceived flexibility of the degree turns into problems of ensuring academic input and sustaining it.

Marketing – or, even in more general terms, image-making – is a central element of internationalization (the way it is currently realized). In order to advertise their master's programs, universities are trying to communicate the usefulness and uniqueness of the study experience they offer. The major elements are: the country and place where the university is situated, the academic status of the university,

the areas of university's expertise, the feasibility of study, and employment prospects. The most beneficial combination of these factors is chosen to communicate the key advertising message: 'Why does it make sense to study this subject here?' This dimension relies on normative ideas, yet it draws from practices. It selects from the available data what will serve the argument. The prevalence of this approach to internationalization as an external idea diverts attention from practices and considerations of what kind of data would serve education governance.

The future promises even less stability for master's program development. Since tuition fees have been introduced now for students outside the EU and the EEA, programs will have to focus on marketing and restructuring, rather than on getting to know about the practices for existing students. How programs function is already nebulous, and currently some of them are being shut down or restructured to meet the new goals. This is the situation in one of the universities which closed down several programs and opened new ones in the period of one year, in order to already admit fee-paying students to the new structures. Meanwhile, students currently studying at the university are voicing concerns about whether their specialization was valid enough, and valuable enough for the university (based on the research expertise), or if it will have to be ended due to the introduction of the tuition fees.

As positions of different groups of students are unequal, the university has to reflect this in its practices. International students have to complete studies much faster than local students due to visa limitations. Meanwhile, there are additional challenges that they face in terms of language learning and integration. Therefore, the introduction of fees will put even more pressure on international students, while the graduation time for the Finnish students will not be affected. A lack of common standards and the uneven quality of teaching also contribute to the precarious situation. To sum up, the university's responsibility towards students is a marginal element of internationalization, and the external character of internationalization and the top-down governance do not provide enough stimuli for the university to understand students' needs.

At the same time, there is no possibility to do away with the internationalization of the education as classroom practices and everyday processes. This is difficult to measure, and the little attention paid towards the organization of practices presents a challenge in accumulating relevant knowledge. Apart from qualitative measurements, it could be proxied through the organizational conditions. Approaching these issues necessitates addressing internal practices on the normative level as well. Integration, dealing with diversity, and fighting discrimination are less processed in university discourse, at least in the internationalized university context. In practice, for instance, integration of Finnish and international students, which is a foundation of internationalization at home, could take place through

the university's endorsement. But given the isolation of international master's programs from the mainstream university activities, the effect on the student body is marginal.

There is a normative expectation that internationalization will bring about improved quality of education (either making it more competitive or just better) and that this stimulus will be sufficient for the university as an institution to fit current societal needs better (either through competitiveness or through becoming an important voice in society). This is a common core between internationalization pursuing knowledge for its own sake and internationalization for applied purposes. The applied value of internationalization for society is argued, for instance, as a way to acquire a qualified workforce; international students are expected to stay in the country and find employment. Yet, tuition fees and this "train and retain" approach contradict each other. This shows that the plans of the different agencies may not correlate well when planning internationalization.

The university is supposed to advance society and foster scientific, social and cultural development. Through this, internationalization is also connected to ideas of justice and power. Yet, there is a prioritizing of certain topics within the discussion, and the university has to deal with these challenges along with the institutional transformations.

8.4 Reconceptualization of internationalization understanding

8.4.1 Rethinking the place of the individual in internationalization

According to this analysis, individual representations of internationalization are little reflected in internationalization planning, and normative ideas from the perspective of students and staff are unexplored. The analysis of policies and planning does not provide a perspective on this. This creates a deficiency in understanding the students' role. It could be tackled through research, for instance in changing the perspective on the role of culture in the education process and a better understanding of student agency.

Internationalization at home points to the need for individual participation in internationalization. Yet, this is not always feasible due to the nature of the top-down governance. There are policies that stay on paper (Aarrevaara et al., 2009) and policies that get implemented. Micro-level internationalization depends on the university's approach to diversity. This line of study awaits further inquiry. By promoting international education and admitting students from around the world, the university and the academic community assume a certain responsibility for the educational outcomes. These aspects could be considered in the further research.

The reasoning about diversity and its pursuit in admissions varies. Irrespective of how this planning dilemma is going to be resolved, it is safe to say that internationalization of the student dimension as a part of everyday classroom activities depends on diversity. Yet, the shift in planning accentuates the gap between higher-level planning and university practices, which will inevitably be reduced due to the tuition fees.

University governance demonstrates shifting responsibilities towards students. It is unclear which structures are responsible for integration into the academic community and fruitful educational experiences. While dealing with a diverse student body is indeed a new task for the university, the challenges related to culture are overstated (as pointed out by Magyar & Robinson-Pant, 2011, Harrisson, 2015 and in chapter 2.2.3 discussion). The lack of experience in the new system and the lack of communication with the staff are the key problems that are suggested by the analysis of student perspectives. In addition, there frequently emerges the topic of student alienation from the mainstream university life. This also contributes to the understanding of internationalization as an external entity in everyday life as well.

8.4.2 Refocusing the data

I looked at the problem of reliable data in internationalization and the inferences that could be made on the basis of this, and I argued that there is no normative underpinning behind what one measures in internationalization. Determining that everyday processes are not sufficiently represented in the internationalization discourse, I suggest that this is a suitable focus for data accumulation.

There are plenty of assessments, and these have an influence on governance. But at the same time, there is not enough data to make decisions concerning the quality of education. Neither one could prove that a country's competitiveness is enhanced through internationalization. Some of the measurements are chosen due to their availability, and they do not produce a coherent picture of internationalization (e.g. the measurement of international students based on the number of people with foreign citizenship) (European Commission, 2002, 2). Other measurements are skewed by the normative power and used for image-making purposes, and therefore they do not produce a reliable picture of the education processes. Finally, there is a lack of data measuring the impact of internationalization. In this sphere, the normative understandings of 'what is a good internationalization' are lacking (Hahn & Teichler, 2005, 45–51) and there is no sufficient foundation on which to base targeted measurements.

An alternative focus of the data collection might be emergent processes within internationalization. My study elicits individual perspectives on internationalization; this brings a balance to the representation of internationalization processes. Since education through intercultural experiences is elusive, one might question

the addition of governance to this kind of internationalization. A critical discussion shows that governance is misinterpreting the value of internationalization and that alternative representations would be enriching.

8.4.3 University agency in internationalization

The examination above leads me to the realization that an analytic focus on internationalization framing by the university would elicit an understanding of the planning at the university level. Making planning processes more conscious about university agency would allow a better view of the educational dimensions. This addresses the question of what universities can do and what room is left within the national governance.

So far, there is no clear evidence on how universities tailor internationalization to their own needs, apart from following internationalization as an image and as an overall trend. For a long time, there were no fees, so there was no clear economic incentive. Some of the programs drew on the faculty's expertise. There also were some programs that filled in the market niche and started out in Finnish, only later being expanded to the international level. The more recent programs do not possess that kind of background; they are closer to hands-on internationalization planning. Along with this, there is the lack of organizational and financial sustainability of the programs.

Within this type of international project, the administrative attention to outcomes is scarce. From the administrative point of view, the launch of the program is already a product of internationalization, it further functioning receives less attention. The language difference makes the administration consider 'international' and 'regular' programs separately, with the former ones requiring greater attention. International students, despite the efforts to attract them, are a special case for the institution as well. The framework of 'internationalization at home' is not yet developed enough to avoid the isolation of the international students, which turns into a hindrance of internationalization. This posits that institutional agency is crucial in establishing conditions for internationalization.

There is a larger problem of university agency and how planning reflects individual dimensions and treats different categories of students. Through the analysis of practices, I note that internationalization's impact should not be taken for granted. The exploration of practices implies a focus on one project type, but academic research of the master's programs features normative expectations of this form of studies rather than systematically reviewing the state of the art. The inquiries of pedagogy and the organization of studies are closer to the exploration of practices and internationalization's impact on education. A closer look at the practices would also problematize internationalization at home and the institutional treatment of the international students.

Given the current positioning of the higher education institutions, focus on everyday activities is not incentivized by the state. Changes are introduced as performance requirements, while the opportunities to pursue these standards are not always ensured. There are more prospects to follow internationalization as an external benchmark of competitiveness than as an internal academic need.

Consequently, there is little room or stimulus for alternative visions of internationalization (e.g. the ones developing from the bottom up, or establishing other priorities). Progress is measured through steering, resource management, and employing models used by countries which are competitive in the international education market. They are essential in the creation of the university's image and positioning; their role in internationalization discourse is a leading one. Yet, on the practical level, the university has to explore new things due to internationalization, e.g. in developing marketing, accommodating students, and supporting graduates' employment. This development is challenged by the introduction of fees, as the creation of the market sector within public education will produce another set of problems. At the same time, there is a gap of provisions concerning the fruitful development of internationalization.

Apart from pursuing internationalization as an external validation, the state does not delve into actual practices. There is a lack of arguments about education itself on this level. An exemplary feature is a subtle conflict with the academic community in terms of values and, later, at the university level, in terms of institutional support of the faculty's efforts. Internationalization is perceived as income generation (and this is the major reason to engage it), not something that requires investment.

Currently university agency is problematic, despite the autonomy in financial issues and decision-making matters. However, state affiliation should not be taken as an explanatory framework for internationalization or as a normative starting point. This suggests that instead of analysing the coherence between the strategies at different levels, consideration of the emergent processes and circumstances of everyday planning would explain internationalization planning and feature the advancements in education. The examination above leads me to the realization that an analytic focus on internationalization framing by the university would elicit an understanding of the planning at the university level. Making planning processes more conscious about university agency would allow a better view of the educational dimensions. This addresses the question of what universities can do and what room is left within the national governance.

So far, there is no clear evidence on how universities tailor internationalization to their own needs, apart from following internationalization as an image and as an overall trend. For a long time, there were no fees, so there was no clear economic incentive. Some of the programs drew on the faculty's expertise. There also were some programs that filled in the market niche and started out in Finnish, only later being expanded to the international level. The more recent programs do not

possess that kind of background; they are closer to hands-on internationalization planning. Along with this, there is the lack of organizational and financial sustainability of the programs.

Within this type of international project, the administrative attention to outcomes is scarce. From the administrative point of view, the launch of the program is already a product of internationalization, it further functioning receives less attention. The language difference makes the administration consider 'international' and 'regular' programs separately, with the former ones requiring greater attention. International students, despite the efforts to attract them, are a special case for the institution as well. The framework of 'internationalization at home' is not yet developed enough to avoid the isolation of the international students, which turns into a hindrance of internationalization. This posits that institutional agency is crucial in establishing conditions for internationalization.

There is a larger problem of university agency and how planning reflects individual dimensions and treats different categories of students. Through the analysis of practices, I note that internationalization's impact should not be taken for granted. The exploration of practices implies a focus on one project type, but academic research of the master's programs features normative expectations of this form of studies rather than systematically reviewing the state of the art. The inquiries of pedagogy and the organization of studies are closer to the exploration of practices and internationalization's impact on education. A closer look at the practices would also problematize internationalization at home and the institutional treatment of the international students.

Given the current positioning of the higher education institutions, focus on everyday activities is not incentivized by the state. Changes are introduced as performance requirements, while the opportunities to pursue these standards are not always ensured. There are more prospects to follow internationalization as an external benchmark of competitiveness than as an internal academic need.

Consequently, there is little room or stimulus for alternative visions of internationalization (e.g. the ones developing from the bottom up, or establishing other priorities). Progress is measured through steering, resource management, and employing models used by countries which are competitive in the international education market. They are essential in the creation of the university's image and positioning; their role in internationalization discourse is a leading one. Yet, on the practical level, the university has to explore new things due to internationalization, e.g. in developing marketing, accommodating students, and supporting graduates' employment. This development is challenged by the introduction of fees, as the creation of the market sector within public education will produce another set of problems. At the same time, there is a gap of provisions concerning the fruitful development of internationalization.

Apart from pursuing internationalization as an external validation, the state does not delve into actual practices. There is a lack of arguments about education

itself on this level. An exemplary feature is a subtle conflict with the academic community in terms of values and, later, at the university level, in terms of institutional support of the faculty's efforts. Internationalization is perceived as income generation (and this is the major reason to engage it), not something that requires investment.

Currently university agency is problematic, despite the autonomy in financial issues and decision-making matters. However, state affiliation should not be taken as an explanatory framework for internationalization or as a normative starting point. This suggests that instead of analysing the coherence between the strategies at different levels, consideration of the emergent processes and circumstances of everyday planning would explain internationalization planning and feature the advancements in education.

8.5 Final words: how to internationalize responsibly

As a final addition to the second question of my inquiry about the implications of the gaps for internationalization development, on the basis of my research, I formulate the following conclusions. Some of the internationalization gaps are foreseeable. First, since individual perspectives of teachers and students are not sufficiently reflected in the internationalization discourse, their position in internationalization does not reach full potential. Second, data about internationalization does not reach everyday processes, and therefore planning is detached from practices, which creates gaps. These problems stem from how internationalization is realized. They depend on higher education politics and they affect education outcomes.

Internationalization acquires its meaning in context, and each educational system and institution tailors internationalization to its needs. However, when internationalization remains an external entity, the use of the empty concept becomes a problem. Typically, this is a sign that internationalization is not becoming transformative in education, and the gap between the rhetoric and implementation is widening. The positive ideas associated with internationalization do not transfer into tangible actions and outcomes.

The other kind of gaps stem from the context changing all the time. For instance, the courses provided, the lecturers, and the classrooms are different each year. Hence, the value of education varies as well. This can create gaps from one year to the next. Sustaining the education value from the emergent processes could conceptualize internationalization planning in a new way; this depends on the university's agency.

Moreover, students and lecturers coming from different places simply have different expectations about the study process. There is no scientifically established way to address the practices, no pre-existing standard. These gaps are inevitable, but possible to overcome if internationalization is a taken as a process. In

some ways, they are also fruitful and enriching, as they contribute to the essence of internationalization. The university's role is in negotiating a common ground, making fluid practices sustainable and maintaining education value.

References

Aalto, P. (2003). Ulkomaalaiset tutkinto-opiskelijat Suomen korkeakouluissa. Korkeakoulujen politiikat ja käytännöt [Foreign degree students in Finnish higher education. Higher education policy and practice] *Occasional paper 2a* (Helsinki, Center for International Mobility (CIMO)).

Aarrevaara, T., Dobson, I., Elander, C. (2009). Brave New World: Higher Education Reform in Finland. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 21*(2), OECD. doi: 10.1787/hemp-21-5ksj0twnffvl

Adam, S. (2001). Transnational Education Project. Report and Recommendations. *Report to the Confederation of European Union Rectors' Conference.*

Adelman, C. (2008). *The Bologna Club: What U.S. Higher Education Can Learn from a Decade of European Reconstruction?* Washington, D.C: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Agnew, M., Van Balkom, W. (2009). Internationalization of the university: Factors impacting cultural readiness for organizational change. *Intercultural Education, 20*(5), 451–462. doi: pdf/10.1080/14675980903371324

Aigner, J., Nelson, P., Stimpfl, J. (1992). *Internationalizing the University: making it work*. Springfield: CBIS Federal.

Airey, J., Lauridsen, K., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., Schwach, V. (2015). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education, 73* (4), 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2

Allan, E. (2010). Feminist poststructuralism meets policy analysis: An overview. In Allan, E., Iverson, S., & Ropers-Huilman, R. (Eds.) *Reconstructing policy in higher education: Feminist poststructural perspectives.* New York: Routledge, 11–35.

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10* (1), 3–25. doi:10.1023/B:TEAM.0000012239.55136.4b

Altbach, P. (2006). Globalisation and the university: Realities in an unequal world. Forest J. & Altbach, P. (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer, 121–139.

Altbach, P., Hazelkorn, E. (2017). Why most universities should quit the rankings game. *University World News*, 442. Retrieved from: http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20170105122700949

Altbach, P., Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11* (3/4), 290–305. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303542

Altbach, P., McGill Peterson, P. (1999). Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response. *IIE Research Report No. 29*, Altbach, P., Ed. McGill Peterson, P., Eds.

Althusser, L. (1969). *Contradiction and Overdetermination. In L. Althusser*, For Marx (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York: Verso.

Altshuler, L., Sussman, N., & Kachur, E. (2003). Assessing changes in intercultural Sensitivity among physician trainees using the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural relations, 27* (4), 387–401. doi: 10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00029-4

Amaral, A., Meek, V., Larsen, I. (eds.). (2003). *The higher education managerial revolution?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Andrews, T. (2012). What is Social Constructionism? *Grounded Theory Review, 11*(1). Retrieved from: http://groundedtheoryreview.com/2012/06/01/what-is-social-constructionism/

Aydarova, E., Millei, Z., Piattoeva, N., Silova, I. (2016). Revisiting Pasts, Reimagining Futures: Memories of (Post)Socialist Childhood and Schooling, *European Education, 48* (3), 159–169. doi: 10.1080/10564934.2016.1223977

Ball, S. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36* (3), 306–313. doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.1015279

Banks, J. (1993). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. *Review of Research in Education, 19* (1), 3–49.

Banks, J. (2003). Introduction: Democratic Citizenship Education in Multicultural Societies. Banks, J. (Editor). *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J., McGee Banks, C., eds. (2009). *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*, John Wiley & Sons.

Bamber, V. (2015). Mixing Decks: Frameworks for Master's Scholarship. *Higher Education Quarterly, 69* (3), 221–236. doi: 10.1111/hequ.12070

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education, 45*(1), 43–70. doi: 10.1023/A:1021225514599

Bartram, B. (2007). The Sociocultural Needs of International Students in Higher Education: A Comparison of Staff and Student Views. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11* (2), 205–214. doi: 10.1177/1028315306297731

Becker, R.F.J. (2009). *International branch campuses: Markets and strategies*. London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

Beelen, J., Jones, E. (2015). Europe Calling: A New Definition for Internationalization at Home. *International Higher education*, 83, 12. doi: 10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9080

Berchem, T. (1991). The internationalisation of higher education: the German Perspective. *Higher Education, 21*(3), 297–304. doi:10.1007/BF00132722

Bergan, S. (2003). Student participation in higher education governance. EHEA, Bologna seminar. Retrieved from: https://www.ehea.info/cid104268/student-participation-in-higher-education-governance.html

Berstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique.* Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Biesta, G. (2007). Why "what works" won't work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic Deficit in educational research. *Educational theory, 57* (1). doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00241.x

Bloxham, J., Eade, K., Harrison, N., Peacock, N. (2008). A toolkit of learning activities to improve cross-cultural exchange between students of different cultural backgrounds: for academic and support staff/students. Thinking people. Retrieved from: www.ukcisa.org.uk/files/docs/pmi/learning_activity_toolkit.doc

Boland, J. (2005). Student participation in shared governance: A means of advancing democratic values? *Tertiary Education and Management, 11*(3), 199–217. doi:10.1007/s11233-005-5099-3

Bollin, G. (2007). Preparing teachers for Hispanic immigrant children: A service learning approach. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 6* (2), 177–189. doi:10.1080/15348430701305028

Bond, S. (2003). *Engaging educators: Bringing the world into the classroom: Guidelines for practice*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Brandenburg, U., de Wit, H. (2011). The End of Internationalization. *International Higher Education 62*, 15–16. Newsletter. Boston, MA: Boston College Center for International Higher Education. doi:10.6017/ihe.2011.62.8533

Brandenburg, U., de Wit, H. (2012). Getting internationalization back on track. *IAU Horizon, 17–18* (3-1), 17–18.

Breit, R., Obijiofor, L., Fitzgerald, R. (2013). Internationalization as De-Westernization of the Curriculum: The Case of Journalism at an Australian University. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2) 119–135. doi: 10.1177/1028315312474897

Brennan, J., Osborne, M. (2008). Higher education's many diversities: of students, institutions and experiences; and outcomes? *Research Papers in Education 23*(2), 179–190. doi**:** 10.1080/02671520802048711

Briihl, D., Wasieleski, D. (2004). A Survey of Master's-level Psychology Programs: Admissions Criteria and Program Policies. *Teaching of Psychology, 31* (4), 252–256. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3104_5

Brown, L. (2004). Diversity: The challenge for higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *7* (1), 21–34. doi: 10.1080/1361332042000187289

Brown, L., Holloway, I. (2008). The initial stage of the international sojourn: excitement or culture shock? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 36* (1), 33–49. doi: 10.1080/03069880701715689

Burquel, N. (2014). *Benchmarking your university: Why and how?* EAIE. Retrieved from: http://www.eaie.org/blog/benchmarking-your-university/

Burslem, A. (2004). *International students in UK universities and colleges: Broadening our horizons*. London: UKCOSA.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism* (2nd Ed). London: Routledge.

Byrne, C. (2001). Cross-cultural differences in psychological distress. *Dissertation Abstracts International. Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, *61* (11-B), 6126.

Böhm, A., Davis, D., Meares, D., Peace, D. (2002). *Global student mobility 2025: forecasts of the global demand for international higher education*. IDP Education Australia.

Callan, H. (2000). Higher education internationalization strategies: Of marginal significance or all-pervasive? The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe, 25* (1), 15–23. doi:10.1080/03797720050002161

Campbell, A. (2010). Developing generic skills and attributes of international students: The (ir)relevance of the Australian university experience. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 32*(5), 487–497. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2010.511121

Campbell, J., Li, M. (2008). Asian Students' Voices: An Empirical Study of Asian Students' Learning Experiences at a New Zealand University. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 12* (4), 375–396, doi: 10.1177/1028315307299422.00

Canaan, J., Shumar, W. (2008). *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University, Routledge*.

CIMO. (2009a). Competition for talent intensifies. *Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education,* CIMO, Sotamaa, Y., 76–83.

CIMO. (2009b). Erasmus exchanges, international degree students, and Teaching in foreign languages: the internationalization of Finnish higher education. *Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education*, Garam, I., Ketolainen, J., 18–33.

CIMO. (2015). *Strategy 2020: towards a global minded Finland*.

Chandler, J., Barry, J., Clark, H. (2002). Stressing academe: the wear and tear of the new public management. Human Relations, 55(9). doi: 10.1177/0018726702055009019

Chang, M. (2002). The Impact of the undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes, *The Journal of General Education, 51* (1), 21–42. doi:10.13.53/jge.2002.0002

Chapman, M. (1999). The campus at the millennium: A plea for community and place. *Planning for Higher Education*, *27* (4), 25–31.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory objectivist and constructivist method. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 509–535. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Chapdelaine, R., Alexitch, L. (2004). Social Skills Difficulty: Model of Culture Shock for International Graduate Students. *Journal of College Student Development 45* (2), 167–184. doi: 10.1353/csd.2004.0021

Chen, L. (2006). Internationalizing Canadian Graduate Education: East-Asian international students' perspectives. Paper presented at the Internationalizing Canada's Universities: Practices, Challenges and Opportunities. Retrieved from: http://international.yorku.ca/global/conference/canada/papers/Lian-Hsuan-Chen.pdf.

Chen, L. (2008). Internationalization or International Marketing? Two Frameworks for Understanding International Students' Choice of Canadian Universities. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 18(*1), 1-33. doi: 10.1080/08841240802100113

Childress, L. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(3), 289–309. doi:10.1177/1028315308329804

Clarke, K. (2005). Critical, multicultural education for remembering and reconciliation: A discussion of an interdisciplinary social science course for international students in Finland, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 35* (4), 479–494. doi:10.1080/03057920500331447

Clifford, V. (2011). Internationalising the home student. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30* (5), 555–557. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598446

Cohen, S. (2010). Effective global leadership requires a global mindset. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 42*(1), 3–10. doi:10.1108/00197851011013652

Coleman, J. (2013). Dymplexity: new theories, new contexts and new labels for mobile students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 8*(1), 20-28. doi:10.1080/17447143.2013.776057

Craciun, D. (2015). Systematizing internationalization policy in higher education: Towards a typology. *PRADEC Interdisciplinary Conference Proceedings, 3* (1), 78–85. doi: 10.15208/pieb.2015.04

Crawford, B., Bethell, L. (2012). Internationalized campuses just don't happen: intercultural learning requires facilitation and institutional support. In S. Ahola, & D. Hoffman (Eds.), *Higher education research in Finland: emerging structures and contemporary issues*,189–213. Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Crosling, G., Edwards, R., Schroder, B. (2008). Internationalizing the curriculum: the implementation experience in a Faculty of Business and Economics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 30* (2), 107–121. doi: 10.1080/13600800801938721

Crossman, J., Clarke, M. (2010). International experience and graduate employability: stakeholder perceptions on the connection. *Higher Education, 59* (5), 599–613. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9268-z

Cross, M., Mhlanga, E., Ojo, E. (2009). Emerging concept of internationalisation in South African higher education: Conversations on local and global exposure at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits). *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(1), 75–92. doi:10.1177/1028315309334635

Currie, J., Deangelis, R., de Boer, H., Huisman, J., Lacotte, C. (2003). *Globalizing Practices and University Responses: European and Anglo-American Differences*, Praeger.

Daigneault, P. (2014). Reassessing the concept of policy paradigm: aligning ontology and methodology in policy studies, *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*-3, 453–469. doi:10.1080/13501763.2013.834071

Daly, H. (1999). Globalization versus internationalization – some implications. *Ecological Economics, 31*, 31–37.

Davies, J. (1992). Developing a Strategy for Internationalization in Universities: towards a conceptual framework. *Bridges to the Future: strategies for internationalizing higher education*, Klasek, C. (Ed.). Carbondale: Association of International Education Administration, 177–190.

Davies, L. (2006). Global Citizenship: Abstraction or Framework for Action? *Educational Review, 58* (1), 5–25. doi:10.1080/00131910500352523

Davies, B., Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20* (3), 247–259. doi:10.1080/09518390701281751

Davies, I., Evans, M., Reid, A. (2005). Globalising Citizenship Education? A Critique of 'Global Education' and 'Citizenship Education', *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53* (1), 66–89. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8527.2005.00284

Deem, R, Mok, K., Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming Higher Education in Whose Image? Exploring the Concept of the 'World-Class' University in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 83–97. doi:10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300179

de Haan, H. (2014). Internationalization Interpretations Among Dutch Practitioners. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18(*3), 241–260. doi:10.1177/1028315313496571

Delgado-Márquez, B., Hurtado-Torres, N., Bondar, Y. (2011). Internationalization of Higher Education: Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of Its Influence on University Institution Rankings. *Globalisation and Internationalisation of Higher Education* [online monograph]. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC). 8* (2), 265–284. UOC. Retrieved from: http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-delgado-hurtado-bondar/v8n2-delgadohurtado-bondar-eng>ISSN 1698-580X

Dervin, F. (2013). Making Sense of Education for Diversities: Criticality, Reflexivity and Language. In *Multicultural Education: From Theory to Practice*, Arslan, H., Raţă, G., 85–101. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Dervin, F., Layne, H. (2013). A guide to interculturality for international and exchange students: an example of Hostipitality? Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 8(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/17447143.2012.753896

Dervin, F. (2015a). Taking Myths Seriously. Towards Mythologies of Education. *Myths in Education, Learning and Teaching: Policies, Practices and Principles*. Harmes, M., Huisjer, H., Danaher, P. (eds.), xii–xvii. doi: 10.1057/9781137476982.

Dervin, F. (2015b). Country 'Hyper-branding' and the Internationalization of Higher Education in Finland: Is the (R)evolution of Interculturality Coming? *Educational Practice and Theory, 37*(2), 25-49.

De Vita, G. (2007). Taking stock. An appraisal of the literature on internationalising HE learning. *Internationalising higher education*. Jones, E., Brown, S. (Eds.) London: Routledge, 154–167.

De Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education*. Retrieved from: http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News15/text1.html

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical Comparive and Conceptual Analysis*. Center for International Higher Education, Boston College Massachusetts.

De Wit, H. (2005). Report on Internationalisation (E21). *Report for the European Benchmarking Programme on University Management,* Brussels.

De Wit, H. (2010). *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe and its assessment*, trends and issues. NVAO publication. Retrieved from: www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Internationalisation_of_Higher_Education_in_Europe_DEF_december_2010.pdf

De Wit, H. (2011). Internationalization of Higher Education: Nine Misconceptions. *International Higher Education, 64*, 6–7.

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and Internationalisation of Higher Education [introduction to online monograph]. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC), 8* (2), 241–248. UOC. Retrieved from: http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-dewit/v8n2-dewit-eng

De Wit, H. (2011). *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Amsterdam. Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management, Hogeschool van Amsterdam.

De Wit, H. (2015). Who owns internationalisation? *University World News, 350*. Retrieved from: http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150113140806307

Diller, J., Moule, J. (2005). *Cultural Competence*. Portland, OR: Book News.

Dobbert, M. (1998). The impossibility of internationalizing students by adding materials to courses. *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus*, Mestenhauser, J., Ellingboe, B. (eds.), Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press, 53–68.

Dobson, I. Hölttä, S. (2001). The internationalisation of university education: Australia and Finland compared. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7 (3), 243–254. doi: 10.1080/13583883.2001.9967056

Dronkers, J. (1993). The causes of growth of English education in the Netherlands: Class or internationalization? *European Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 295–307. doi:10.2307/1503760

Dunne, C. (2011). Developing an intercultural curriculum within the context of the internationalisation of higher education: terminology, typologies and power. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30* (5), 609-622. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598451

Education and Research 2011–2016. (2012). Ministry of Education and Culture, 49–50.

Egron-Polak, E. (2014). Internationalisation – Many issues, not much consensus. *University World News, 323.* Retrieved from: http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140604152612279

Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory, *Higher Education* 47 (3), 361–382. doi:10.1023/B: HIGH.0000016461.98676.30

Emirbayer, M., Mische, A. (1998). What Is Agency? *American Journal of Sociology, 103* (4), 962-1023. doi:10.1086/231294

European Commission. (2002). *Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries* (Erasmus World) (2004–2008), (2002/C 331 E/05) *COM(2002) 401 final — 2002/0165(COD)*.

European Commission. (2006). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and innovation.* COM (2006) 208 final.

European Commission. (2007). *Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Report on the interim evaluation of the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme 2004–2008*. COM (2007) 375 final.

European Commission. (2010). *Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on 'Universities for Europe' (own-initiative opinion)*, (2010/C 128/09). Rapporteur-general: Mr VAN IERSEL

European Commission. (2011). *Commission Working Document on Recent Developments in European High Educations Systems*. SEC (2011) 1063 final.

European Commission. (2013). *European higher education in the world strategy,* Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. European higher education in the world. COM(2013) 499 final.

European Parliament (2015). Internationalisation of Higher Education: study. doi:10.2861/444393

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London, UK: Longman.

FINHEEC (2013). *An Evaluation of International Degree Programmes in Finland*. The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council. Retrieved from: https://karvi.fi/app/uploads/2014/09/KKA_0213.pdf

Fitch, K. (2013). A Disciplinary Perspective: The Internationalization of Australian Public Relations Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 136–147. doi: 10.1177/1028315312474898

Flander, A. (2011). Is a mobile student also a more employable student? Research on employers' perceptions on academic mobility. In *Paths to Internationalization: Higher Education Policies, Trends, and Strategies in Europe and Slovenia*, Centre of the Republic of Slovenia for Mobility and European Educational and Training Programs, Miklavic, K (Ed.), 86–120.

Fortuijn, J. (2002). Internationalising Learning and Teaching: A European experience. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 26* (3), 263–273. doi: 10.1080%2F0309826022000019855

Frolich, N., Veiga, A. (2005). Competition, Cooperation, Consequences and Choices in Selected European Countries. *Internationalisation in Higher Education: European Responses to the Global Perspective,* ed. B. Khem and H. de Wit. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education and the European Higher Education Society (EAIR).

Frolich, N. (2008). Justifications and Drivers. *Borderless Knowledge, Understanding the "New" Internationalisation of Research and Higher Education in Norway*. Higher Education Dynamics 22. Gornitzka, A., and Langfedlt, L. (Eds.), Springer.

Furnham, A. (1993). Communicating in foreign lands: The cause, consequences and cures of culture shock. *Language. Culture and Curriculum, 6* (1), 91–109. doi: 10.1080/07908319309525140

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Paradigm for Global Citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9 (2), 121–136. doi: 10.1177/1028315304263795

Gaffikin, F., Perry, D. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The U.S. research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(1), 115–144. doi:10.3102/0002831208322180

Ganga, D, Scott, S. (2006). *Cultural "Insiders" and the Issue of Positionality in Qualitative Migration Research: Moving "Across" and Moving "Along" Researcher-Participant Divides* [40 paragraphs]. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7(3), Art. 7. Retrieved from: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs060379.

Geuna, A. (*1998*). The *internationalisation of European universities: a return to medieval roots. Minerva, 36* (3), 253–270.

Gornitzka, Å., Gulbrandsen, M., Trondal, J. (2003). *Internationalisation of Research and higher education. Emerging patterns of transformation,* Oslo: NIFU Rapport 2.

Gorski, P. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: a decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19* (6). 515–525. doi: 10.1080/14675980802568319

Graf, L. (2009). Applying varieties of capitalism approach to higher education: Comparing the internationalization of German and British universities. *European Journal of Education, 44* (4), 569–585. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3435.2009.01401.x

Green, M. (2012). Global Citizenship: What Are We Talking About and Why Does It Matter? In Trends and Insights for International Education

Leaders. Retrieved from: https://globalhighered.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/ti_global_citizen.pdf.

Green, M., Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Rethinking university internationalisation: towards transformative change. *Teachers and Teaching, 17(*6), 611–617. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.625110

Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M., Day, C. (2010). Learning and growing in a 'foreign' context: Intercultural experiences of international students. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(1), 7–23. doi: 10.1080/03057920903115983

Guo, S., Chase, M. (2011). Internationalisation of higher education: integrating international students into Canadian academic environment. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16* (3), 305–318. doi:10.1080/13562517.2010.546524

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (3), 330–367. doi:72.3.01151786u134n051.

Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2015). Internationalization of Higher Education: Navigating Between Contrasting Trends. *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies.* Curaj, A., Liviu, M., Remus, P., Jamil, S., Peter, S. (eds.), Springer International Publishing, 13–26. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_2.

Haapakorpi, A., & Saarinen, T. (2014). Transnational turn and national models of higher education: The case of Finland. *Nordic Studies in Education, 34* (3), 187-200.

Haapakoski, J., Pashby, K. (2017). Implications for equity and diversity of increasing international student numbers in European universities: Policies and practice in four national contexts, *Policy Futures in Education, 15*(3), 360–379. doi: 10.1177/1478210317715794

Hacking, I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?* Harvard University Press.

Haigh, M. (2002). Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Designing inclusive education for a small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 26* (1), 49–66. doi:10.1080/03098260120110368

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. *Identity: community, culture, difference*. Rutherford, J. (Ed.), London, England: Lawrence & Wishart, 2-27.

Hammer, M., Bennett, M., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27* (4), 421–443. doi:10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4

Hanassab, S. (2006). Diversity, International Students, and Perceived Discrimination: Implications for Educators and Counselors. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10* (2), 157–172. doi: 10.1177/1028315305283051

Harris, S. (2011). *The university in translation: internationalizing higher education*. Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Harrison, N. (2015). Practice, problems and power in 'internationalisation at home': critical reflections on recent research evidence. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20* (4), 412–430. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2015.1022147

Hénard, F., Diamond, L., Roseveare, D. (2012). *Approaches to Internationalisation and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice: A Guide for Higher Education Institutions*. OECD Publishing.

Healey, N. (2008). Is higher education really internationalizing? *Higher Education 55* (3), 333-355.

Hoey, M. (2016). The internationalisation of higher education: some ethical implications. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 20* (2-3), 37–43. doi:10.1080/13603108.2015.1128491

Hoffman, D., Välimaa, J., Huusko, M. (2008). The Bologna process in academic basic units: Finnish universities and competitive horizons. In J. Välimaa & O.-H.Ylijoki (eds.) *Cultural perspectives on higher education*. New York: Springer, 227–244. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6604-7_15

Horta, H. (2009). Global and national prominent universities: internationalization, competitiveness and the role of the State. *Higher Education, 58* (3), 387–405. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9201-5

Huisman, J. (2008). Higher education policy: The evolution of a journal. *Higher Education Policy, 21* (2), 265–274. doi: 10.1057/hep.2008.6.

Hunter, F. (2015). What's in the name? Refocusing internationalization of higher education. EAIE blog. Retrieved from: http://www.eaie.org/blog/whats-in-a-name-refocusing-internationalisation-of-higher-education/

IAU Survey Report. (2003). *Internationalization of Higher Education. Practices and Priorities*, Knight, J. ed.

IAU (2005). Statement on internationalization: Towards a century of cooperation: *Internationalization of higher education. International Association of Universities Blog*. Retrieved from: http://www.iau-aiu.net/internationalization/i_statement.html.

IAU (2010). International Association of Universities. (2010). *Internationalisation of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives*. Paris: IAU.

IAU (2012a). Affirming academic values in internationalisation of higher education. A call for action. *International Association of Universities*. Retrieved from: http://www.iauaiu.net/sites/all/files/Affirming_Academic_Values_in_Internationalization_of_Higher_Education.pdf

IAU (2012b). In focus, Rethinking Internationalisation. *IAU Horizons*, 17(3) and 18(1), 15–33. Retrieved from: http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU_Horizons_Vol17_3_18_1_EN.pdf

IAU/MCO (2012). IAU/MCO Guidelines for an Institutional Code of Ethics in Higher Education. *International Association of Universities/Association Internationale des Universite´s &Magna Charta Observatory*. Retrieved from: http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/outcomes

IAU (2015). Internationalization at home, of the curriculum and learning outcomes. Blog. Retrieved from: http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/internationalization-home-curriculum-and-learning-outcomes

IAU (2015). Global Survey. Retrieved from: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies

IIE [Institute of International Education]. (2012). *English-Taught Master's Programs in Europe: New Findings on Supply and Demand*, Brenn-White, M., van Rest, E. (eds.)

Jäger, S., Maier, F. (2009). Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis. R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis,* London: Sage (2nd revised edition), 34-62.

Jeffries, L. (2010). Critical Stylistics*: The Power of English*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jiang, X. (2008). Towards the internationalisation of higher education from a critical perspective. *Journal of further and higher education, 32*(4), 347–358. doi:10.1080/03098770802395561

Jiang, N., Carpenter, V. (2013). A case study of issues of strategy implementation in internationalization of higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *27*(1), 4–18. doi:10.1108/09513541311289792

Jon, J. (2013). Realizing Internationalization at Home in Korean Higher Education Promoting Domestic Students' Interaction with International Students and Intercultural Competence. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17* (4), 455–470. doi: 10.1177/1028315312468329

Jones, P. (2000). Globalization and internationalism: democratic prospects for world education, in *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. Stromquist, N. and Monkman, K. (ed.), Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, 27–42.

Jones, E., Killick, D. (2013). Graduate Attributes and the Internationalized Curriculum: Embedding a Global Outlook in Disciplinary Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education,17*(2), 165–182. doi: 10.1177/1028315312473655

Jones, G., de Wit, H. (2014). Globalized internationalization: Implications for policy and practice. *IIE Networker*, 28–29. Retrieved from: http://www.naylornetwork.com/ iie-nwl/articles/index.asp?aid = 258971&issueID = 40248

Kauko, J., Diogo, S. (2011). Comparing higher education reforms in Finland and Portugal: different contexts, same solutions? *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *23*(3). doi:10.1787/HEMP-23-5KG0SJTCNNZT

Kinnunen, T. (2003) "If I can get a good job after graduation, I may stay…" Ulkomaalaisten tutkinto-opiskelijoiden integroituminen Suomeen [The integration of foreign degree students in Finland] *Occasional paper 2b* (Helsinki, Center for International Mobility (CIMO)).

Kehm, B. (2003). Internationalization in higher education: From regional to global. *The dialogue between higher education research and practice,* Begg, R. (Ed.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, 109–119.

Kehm B., Teichler, U. (2006). Which direction for bachelor and master programmes? A stocktaking of the Bologna process. *Tertiary Education and Management, 12* (4), 269–282. doi:10.1080/13583883.2006.9967173

Kehm, B., Teichler, U. (2007). Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11* (3-4), 260–273. doi:10.1177/1028315307303534

Kehm, B. (2011). Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Uluslararas Yükseköretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelifller ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011)* 27–29 May 2011, Istanbul, 231–239. Retrieved from: http://www.uyk2011.org/kitap/pages/uyk2011_s_0231_0239.pdf

Kehm, B., Teichler, U. (2006). Which direction for bachelor and master programmes? A stocktaking of the Bologna process. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12 (4), 269–282. doi:10.1080/13583883.2006.9967173

Kerr C. (1990). The Internationalization of learning and the nationalization of the purposes of higher education: two 'laws of motion' in conflict? *European journal of education, 25* (1), 5–22.

Kerr, C. (1993). *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-first Century*: State University of New York Press.

Kerr, C., Gade, M., Kawaoka, M. (1994). *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-first Century:* SUNY Press.

Kettle, M. (2010). Agency as Discursive Practice: From "nobody" to "somebody" as an international student in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *25(*1), 45-60. doi:10.1080/0218879050003252

King, R. (2010). Policy internationalization, national variety, and governance: global models and network power in higher education states. *Higher Education*, *60* (6), 583–594. doi:10.1007/s 10734-0 10-93 17-7

Kivistö, J. (2007). *Agency Theory as a Framework for the Government-University Relationship*. Doctoral dissertation, Tampere University Press, Tampere.

Kneale, P. (2005). Enthusing staff delivering taught Master's programmes. *Planet, 14*(1), 13–15. doi:10.11120/plan.2005.00140013

Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalisation: Elements and checkpoints*. (Research Monograph, No. 7) Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Knight, J. (1997). Internationalization of higher education: A Conceptual framework. *Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*, Knight, J., De Wit, H. (eds.), 5–19. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.

Knight, J. (2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*, 228–243. doi: 10.1177/102831530153004

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, *33*, 2–3. doi: 10.6017/ihe.2003.33.7391

Knight, J. (2006). Internationalisation: Concepts, complexities and challenges. In *International handbook of higher education*. Forest, J., Altbach, P. (Eds.), Dordrecht: Springer. 207–227.

Knight, J. (2008). *Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalization.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization, *International Higher Education, 62,* 14–15. doi: 10.6017/ihe.2011.62.8532

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation – for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 17* (3). 84–90. doi: 10.1080/13603108.2012.753957

Koller, V. (2009). Analysing collective identity in discourse: social actors and contexts. *Semen* [En ligne], 27 | 2009, mis en ligne le 13 décembre 2010, consulté le 19 avril 2018. Retrieved from: http://journals.openedition.org/semen/8877

Kreber, C. (2009). Different perspectives on internationalization in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 118, 1-14. doi:10.1002/tl.348

Kuortti, K. (2009). Once upon a time there was ERASMUS: A reality-based time travel to history of our future. *Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education* (2009), CIMO.

Larner, W., Le Heron, R. (2005). Neo-liberalizing Spaces and Subjectivities: Reinventing New Zealand Universities. *Organization*, 12(6), 843–862. doi:10.1177/1350508405057473

Lawson, H. (1988). A Model For Developing Common Master's Degree Programmes In Europe. *Higher Education in Europe, 13* (3), 67–76. doi: 10.1080/0379772880130309

Leask, B. (2009) Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(2), 205–221 (1552-7808). doi: 10.1177/1028315308329786

Leask, B. Carroll, J. (2011). Moving beyond 'wishing and hoping': internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30* (5), 647-659. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598454

Lee, D. (1997). What Teachers Can Do to Relieve Problems Identified by International Students, *New Directions For Teaching And Learning*, *70*, 93–100. doi: 10.1002/tl.7011

Lehtomäki, E., Moate, J., Posti-Ahokas, H. (2016). Global connectedness in higher education: student voices on the value of cross-cultural learning dialogue. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41 (11), 2011-2027.

Levatino, A. (2015). Transnational higher education and skilled migration: Evidence from Australia. *International Journal of Educational Development, 40*(C), 106–116. *doi*: 10.1177/0002764212443817

Luescher-Mamashela, T. (2010). From University Democratisation to Managerialism: The changing legitimation of university governance and the place of students. *Tertiary Education and Management, 16*(4), 259–283. doi:10.1080/13583883.2010.529161.

Lukinbeal, C, Monk, J. (2015). Master's in Geographic Information Systems Programs in the United States: Professional Education in GIS and Geography. *The Professional Geographer, 67* (3), 482–489. doi:10.1080/00330124.2014.983630

Madge, C., Raghuram, P., Noxolo, P. (2014). Conceptualizing international education: from international student to international study. *Progress in Human Geography, 39* (6), 681–701. doi: 10.1177/0309132514526442

Macfarlane, B. (2016). Why students are treated worse than customers. *University World News*, 414. Retrieved from: http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20160517150918945

Magyar, A., Robinson-Pant, A. (2011). Internationalising doctoral research: developing theoretical perspectives on practice. *Teachers and Teaching:*

theory and practice, 17(6), 663–676. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2011.625189

Mahroum, S. (2000). Highly skilled globetrotters: mapping the international migration of human capital. *R&D Management, 30*(1), 23–32. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-44654-7_12.

Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: Emerging politics of education. *Journal of Educational Policy, 14* (1), 19–31. doi:10.1080/026809399286477

Marginson, S., Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets and systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher education, 43* (4), 281-309. doi: 10.1023/A:1014699605875

Marginson, S. (2009). The External Dimension: Positioning the European Higher Education Area in the Global Higher Education World. *The European Higher Education Area. Perspectives on a Moving Target*, Kehm, B. M., Huisman, J. Stensaker, B. (Eds.), 297–321. Rotterdam, Tapei: Sense Publishers.

Marginson, S. (2016). *The Dream Is Over: The Crisis of Clark Kerr's California Idea of Higher Education*, University of California Press.

Marginson, S. (2017). *Higher Education and the Common Good.* Melbourne University Press.

Maringe, F., Gibbs, P. (2009). *Marketing higher education: theory and practice*, Open University Press.

Maringe, F., Woodfield, S. (2013). Contemporary issues on the internationalisation of higher education: critical and comparative perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative And International Education, 43* (1), 1–18. doi:10.1080/03057925.2013.746545

Marmolejo, F. (2012). "Internationalization of higher education: the good, the bad, and the unexpected", *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 22, 2012.

Marttinen, K. (2011). *Discourses of internationalization in Finnish higher education: A critical discourse analysis of legitimation strategies used in internationalization documents*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Jyvaskyla, Finland.

Matei, L., Iwinska, J. (2015). National strategies and practices in internationalisation of higher education: Lessons from a cross-country comparison, *Higher Education Reforms in Romania,* Curaj, A., Deca, L., Egron-Polak, E., Salmi, J. (Eds.). Springer, London.

McCabe, V., Gross, M., Reynolds, P. (2009). Toward the Development of Best Practice in a Postgraduate International Hospitality Management Program. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 8* (2-3), 283–304. doi: 10.1080/15313220902732647

McLoughlin, C. (2001). Inclusivity and alignment: Principles of pedagogy, task and assessment design for effective cross-cultural online learning. *Distance Education, 22*(1), 7–29. doi:10.1080/0158791010220102

Meyer, M. (2002). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. *Methods of critical Discourse analysis,* Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (Eds.), London: Sage Publications, 14-30.

Meyer, M. (2009). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*, Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.), London: Sage (2nd revised edition), 14-30. doi: 10.4135/9780857028020.n2

Messer, D., Wolter, S. (2007). Are student exchange programs worth it? *Higher Education, 54*(5), 647-663. doi:10.1007/s10734-006-9016-6

Mestenhauser, J. (1998a). Portraits of an internationalised curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. *Reforming the higher education curriculum*. Mestenhauser, J., Ellingboe B. (Eds.). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 3–35.

Mestenhauser, J. (1998b). Internationalisation of higher education: A cognitive response to the challenges of the twenty-first century. *International Education Forum, 18*(1/2), 3–7.

Ministry of education. (2001). *An international strategy for higher education.*

Ministry of education and Culture. (2009). *An international strategy for higher education.*

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2012). *Education and Research 2011–2016 (English version).*

Mok, K., Chan, Y. (2008). International Benchmarking with the Best Universities: Policy and Practice in Mainland China and Taiwan. *Higher Education Policy, 21*(4), 469 – 486. doi:10.1057/hep.2008.21

Morey, A. (2000). Changing higher education curricula for a global and multicultural world, *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(1), 26–39. doi:10.1080/03797720050002170

Murphy, M. (2007). Experiences in the Internationalization of Education. Strategies to Promote Equality of Opportunity at Monterray Tech. *Higher Education, 53*(2), 167–208. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-3664-9

National Advisory Board on Research Ethics. *Ethical Principles of Research in the Humanities and Social and Behavioural Sciences and Proposals for Ethical Review*. Retrieved from: http://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/ethicalprinciples.pdf

Newman, C. (2002). The Current State of Marketing Activity Among Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 12*(1), 15–29. doi: 10.1300/J050v12n01_02

Ninnes, P., Hellstén, M. (2005). Introduction: Critical Engagements with the Internationalization of Higher Education. *Internationalizing Higher Education: Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*, Ninnes, P., Hellstén, M. (eds.), 1–8. doi: 10.1007/1-4020-3784-8_1

Nightingale, D., Cromby, J. (2002). Social Constructionism as Ontology: Exposition and Example. *Theory & Psychology, 12* (5), 701–713. doi:10.1177/0959354302012005901

Nixon, J. (2008). *Towards the Virtuous University: The Moral Bases of Academic Practice*: Routledge.

Nokkala, T. *(2006)*. Knowledge Society Discourse in internationalisation of higher education. Case study in governmentality. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada,* 12 (2006), 171–201.

Nokkala, T. (2007). *Constructing Ideal Universities – The internationalisation of higher education in the competitive knowledge society*. Tampere University Press, Tampere.

Nokkala, T. (2008). 'Finland is a small country' narrative construction of the internationalisation of higher education. *Education and the Knowledge-Based Economy in Europe*. Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., Wodak, R. (eds.). Sense Publishers, Amsterdam.

Norden (2015). Higher Education in the Nordic Countries. Evaluation of the Nordic agreement on admission to higher education. Elken, M., Hovdhaugen, E., Wiers-Jenssen, J. (eds). doi:10.6027/TN2015-526

Norris, C. (1997). Against relativism: Philosophy of science, deconstruction and critical theory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nukaga, M. (2003). Japanese Education in an Era of Internationalization: A case study of an emerging multicultural coexistence model. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, *12*, 79–94. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6781.2003

Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

O'Byrne, D. & Bond, C. (2014). Back to the future: the idea of a university revisited. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36* (6), 571–584. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2014.957888.

Odora Hoppers, C. (2009). Education, culture and society in a globalizing world: Implications for comparative and international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 39*(5), 602–614. doi:10.1080/03057920903125628

OECD. (2015). Indicator C4 Who Studies Abroad and Where? *Education at a Glance 2015*. OECD Publishing, Paris. doi:10.1787/eag-2015-en

Olsen, J. (2007). The institutional dynamics of the European university. *University dynamics and European integration*, Maassen, P., Olsen J. (Eds.) Dordrecht: Springer, 25–53.

Ollikainen, A. (1996). Conflicts, status competition, and different rationales for mobility: a Finnish experience on some neglected issues in international education. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 2. Retrieved from: http://www.frontiersjournal.com/issues/vol2/vol2-05_Ollikainen.htm

Paige, M., Mestenhauser, J. (1999). Internationalizing Educational Administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly,35* (4), 500–517. doi: 10.1177/0013161X99354005

Pashby, K., Andreotti V. (2016). Ethical internationalisation in higher education: interfaces with international development and sustainability, *Environmental Education Research*, 22(6), 771–787. doi:10.1080/13504622.2016.1201789

Peters, M. (2007). *Knowledge economy, development and the future of higher education*. Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Planas, A., Soler P., Fullana J., Pallisera, M., Vila, M. (2013). Student participation in university governance: the opinions of professors and students. *Studies in Higher Education, 38* (4), 571– 583. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.586996

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of Higher Education: towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*(2), 248–270. doi:10.2304/pfie.2003.1.2.5

Rasi, P., Hautakangas, M., Väyrynen, S. (2015). Designing culturally inclusive affordance networks into the curriculum, *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*(2), 131-142, doi: 10.1080/13562517.2014.957268

Rautopuro, J., Vaisanen, P. (2000). *Keep the customer satisfied: A longitudinal study of students' emotions, experiences and achievements at the University of Joensuu*. Paper presented at the European Conference of Educational Research, Edinburgh. Retrieved from: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001613.htm

Reeves, J. (2011). Investigating knowledge exchange and creation on a practice-based Master's programme. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36 (8), 953–967. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.487558

Reisigl, M. (2017). *The Discourse-Historical Approach. The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies.* Flowerdew, J. & Richardson, J. (eds.), Routledge.

Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Report on the interim evaluation of the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme 2004–2008 (2007). COM(2007) 375 final.

Research and Innovation Council of Finland. (2009). *Internationalisation of Finnish Education, Research and Innovation.*

Richardson, J. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 26-45.

Rinne, R. (2004). Searching for the rainbow: changing the course of Finnish higher education, *Reforming higher education in the Nordic countries – studies of change in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden*. (2004). Fägerlind, I., Strömqvist, G. (Eds.), International Institute for Educational Planning. Retrieved from: http://www.unesco.org/iiep

Ritzen, J., Marconi, G. (2011). Internationalization in European Higher Education. International *Journal of Innovation Science, 3* (2). doi: 10.1260/1757-2223.3.2.83

Rivza, B., Teichler, U. (2007). The Changing Role of Student Mobility. *Higher Education Policy, 20* (4), 457–475. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300163

Rizvi, F. (2000). *Internationalisation of the curriculum: RMIT University*. Retrieved from: http://www.pvci.rmit.edu.au/ioc/back/icpfr.pdf

Rizvi, F. (2006). Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 35*(1), 17–35. doi: 10.1007/BF03216873

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(3), 253–268. doi: 0.1080/01596300903036863

Rizvi, F. (2011). Theorizing student mobility in an era of globalization. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 17* (6), 693–701. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.625145

Robertson, M., Lane, M., Jones, S., Thomas, S. (2000). International students, learning environments and perceptions: A case study using the Delphi technique. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19* (1), 89–102. doi:10.1080/07294360050020499

Robson, S. (2011). Internationalization: a transformative agenda for higher education? *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 17*(6), 619–630. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.625116

Robson, S., Turner, Y. (2007). 'Teaching is a co-learning experience': Academics reflecting on learning and teaching in an 'internationalized' faculty. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(1), 41–54. doi: 10.1080/13562510601102115

Rochford, F. (2014). Bringing them into the tent – student association and the neutered academy. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(3), 485–499. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.896184

Rumbley, L. (2010). Internationalization in the universities of Spain: Changes and Challenges at four institutions. In *Globalization and Internationalization of higher education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management perspectives*. Maringe, F., Foskett, N. (eds.), Bloomsbury.

Rumbley, L., Altbach, P., Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the Higher Education Context. *The SAGE Handbook of International*

Higher Education, Deardorf, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, J., Adams, T. (eds.), SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA, 3–26.

Ryan, J. (2011). Teaching and learning for international students: towards a transcultural approach, *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 17* (6), 631–648. doi: 10.1080/13540602.2011.625138

Ryan J., Carroll J. (2005). Canaries in the coalmine: International students in western universities. In Carroll J., Ryan J. (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving education for all*. London, England: Routledge, 3–10.

Saarinen, T. (2008). Position of text and discourse analysis in higher education policy research. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(6), 719–728. doi: 10.1080/03075070802457090

Saarinen, T. (2012). Internationalization of Finnish higher education is language an issue? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 157-173. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2012-0044

Salmi, J. (2009). *The challenge of establishing world-class universities*. Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank.

Samier, E. (2016). *Ideologies in Educational Administration and Leadership*, Samier, E. (eds.), Routledge.

Sawir, E. (2013). Internationalisation of higher education curriculum: the contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 11*(3), 359–378. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2012.750477

Schrag, F. (2002). Facts and Norms in Policy Scholarship. *Philosophy of Education Archive,* 188–196.

Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and social science*. London: Sage.

Scott, J. (2006). The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77* (1), 1–39. doi: 10.1080/00221546.2006.11778917

Schapper, J. Mayson, S. (2004). Internationalisation of curricula: An alternative to the Taylorisation of academic work. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(2), 189–205. doi:10.1080/1360080042000218258

Schattle, H. (2007). *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Shin, S., & Cho, E.K. (2003) The culturally situated process of knowledge production in a virtual community: A case of hypertext analysis from a university's ClassWeb discussion boards. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*. Teachers College, Columbia University, 50–60. Retrieve from: http://www.tc.edu/CICE/Issues/06.01/61shin_cho.pdf

Schoorman, D. (1999). The Pedagogical Implications of Diverse Conceptualizations of Internationalization: A U.S. Based Case Study. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 3* (2), 19–46. doi: 10.1177/102831539900300203

Schuster, J.H. (1994). Emigration, internationalisation, and Brain Drain: Propensities among British academics. *Higher Education, 28*(4), 437–452.

Schweisfurth, M., Gu, Q. (2009) Exploring the experiences of international students in UK higher education: possibilities and limits of interculturality in university life. *Intercultural Education, 20* (5), 463–473. doi:10.1080/14675980903371332

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK, Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell.

Sheets, R., Gay, G. (1996). Student perceptions of disciplinary conflict in ethnically diverse classrooms. *NASSP Bulletin, 80* (580), 84–94. (EJ 524 399)

Sherry, C., Bhat, R., Beaver, B., Ling, A. (2003). *Managing expectations of international and Kiwi students: A challenge for beyond 2003!* Paper presented at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia (HERDSA) Conference: Learning for an Unknown Future, July 6–9, 2003, Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology. Retrieved from: http://hdl.handle.net/10652/1936

Slattery, W. (2005) Linking teaching and learning: a master's level programme for primary and secondary classroom teachers, *Planet, 14*(1), 33–35. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.11120/plan.2005.00140033

Smart, D., Volet, S., & Ang, G. (2000) *Fostering social cohesion in universities: Bridging the cultural divide*. Canberra: Australian Education International Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Smeby, J. Trondal, J. (2003). *Globalisation or Europeanisation? International Contact among University Staff*. CES – Working paper no. 3. Retrieved from: https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/134877/wp_03-03.PDF?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Söderqvist, M. (2002). *Internationalization and its management at higher-education institutions: Applying conceptual, content and discourse analysis*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki School of Economics.

Spencer-Rodgers, J. (2001). Consensual and individual stereotypic beliefs about international students among American host nationals. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *25* (6), 639–657. doi:10.1016/S0147-1767(01)00029-3

Sporn, B. (1996). Managing universities culture: An analysis of the relationship between institution culture and management approaches. *Higher Education*, *32* (1), 41–61. doi:10.1007/BF00139217

Stensaker, B., Frølich, N., Gornitzka Å., Maassen, P. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education: the gap between national policy-making and institutional needs, *Globalization, societies and education, 6*(1), 1–11. doi: 10.1080/14767720701855550

Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism, *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(1), 1–28. doi:10.1080/1476772042000177069

Stier, J. Börjesson, M. (2010). The internationalised university as discourse: institutional self-presentations, rhetoric and benchmarking in a global market. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 20* (4), 335-353. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2010.530863

Strang, K. (2009). Improving supervision of cross-cultural postgraduate university students. *International Journal of Learning and Change (*3) 5, 521–542. doi:10.1504/IJLC.2010.032711

Stromquist, N. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53* (1), 81–105. doi: 10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5

Suomi, K. (2014). Exploring the dimensions of brand reputation in higher education – a case study of a Finnish master's degree programme. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 36* (6), 646–660. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2014.957893

Svensson, L., Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education*, *60* (6), 595–613. doi:10.1007/s10734.010.9318.6

Tamtik, M., Kirss, L. (2016). Building a Norm of Internationalization. The Case of Estonia's Higher Education System. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 20* (2), 164–183. doi:10.1177/1028315315587107

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a Strategy for Internationalisation: Lessons and Practice from Four Universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8* (2), 149–171. doi:10.1177/1028315303260827

Teichler, U. (1999). Research of the relationship between higher education and the world of work: past achievements, problems and new challenges. *Higher education, 38*(2), 169-190.

Teichler, U. (2004). The Changing Debate on Internationalisation of Higher Education. *Higher Education, 48* (1), 5–26. doi:10.1177/1028315303260827

Teichler, U. (2009). Internationalisation of higher education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*(1), 93–106. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9002-7

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research from grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory, 30*(3), 167-186. doi: 10.1177/0735275112457914

Truong, T. (2006). One Humanity, Many Consciousnesses: Unresolved Issues in Nussbaum's New Frontiers of Justice. *Development and Change, 37* (6), 1259–1272. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006...x/pdf

Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalising the university*. London: Continuum.

UNESCO (2004). *Reforming higher education in the Nordic countries – studies of change in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden*, Fägerlind, I., Strömqvist, G. (Eds.). International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., Rumbley, L. (eds.). Retrieved from: https://www.unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf

University of Eastern Finland. (2012). *Internationalisation Policy of the University of Eastern Finland 2012–2015.*

University of Helsinki (2012). *The best for the world.* Strategic plan for the University of Helsinki 2013–2016.

University of Oulu. (2012). *Strategy 2012–2015.*

University of Tampere (2010). *Let's shape the future!* Change in the University of Tampere 2010–2015.

University of Turku Strategy (2012). *University of Turku Strategy 2013–2016*. Retrieved from: http://www.utu.fi/en/university/strategy-and-values/Documents/UTU_strategy_2013-2016_final.pdf

University of Vaasa (2013). Strategy of the University of Vaasa 2013–2016 (in English translation, not an international strategy).

University World News. (2009). *Europe: Future of Masters Programmes*, 73, 29 April 2009.

Välimaa, J. (2004). Nationalisation, localisation and globalisation in Finnish higher Education. *Higher Education, 48* (1), 27–54. doi: 10.1023/b:high.0000033769.69765.4a

Välimaa, J., Hoffmann, D. (2008). Knowledge society discourse and higher education, *Higher Education, 56* (3), 265–285. doi:10.1007/s10734-008-9123-7.

Van der Wende, M. (1997). Missing links: The relationship between national policies for internationalisation and those for higher education in general. In *National policies for the internationalization of higher education in Europe,* Kalvermark T. van der Wende, M. (Eds.), Stockholm: Hogskoleverket Studies, National Agency for Higher Education. 10–31.

Van der Wende, M. (1999). An innovation perspective on internationalisation of higher education: The critical phase. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 3* (1), 3–14. doi:10.1177/102831539900300102

Van der Wende, M. (2000). Internationalising the curriculum: New perspectives and challenges. *Internationalising the curriculum in higher education: Reflecting on practice,* Hudson, B., Todd M. (Eds.), Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Hallam University Press.

Van Gyn, G., Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Preece A. (2009). Education for World-Mindedness: Beyond Superficial Notions of Internationalization. *New Directions for Teaching and Leading*, 118, 25-38. doi: 10.1002/tl.350

Volet, S., Ang, G. (1998). Culturally Mixed Groups on International Campuses: an Opportunity for Inter-cultural Learning. *Higher Education Research & Development, 17* (1), 5–23. doi: 10.1080/0729436980170101

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, M., Folger, T. (2004). Faculty and student diversity. In A. M. Johns & M. K. Sipp (Eds.), *Diversity in college classrooms: Practices for today's campuses*, 152–173. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Wang, L., Ho, H. (2012). Internationalization versus Localization. The Case of Primary Education in Taiwan, *International Education Studies, 5* (4). doi:10.5539/ies.v5n4p39.

Ward, C., Kennedy, A. (1993). Psychological and Socio-Cultural Adjustment During Cross-Cultural Transitions: A Comparison of Secondary Students Overseas and at Home. *International Journal of Psychology, 28* (2), 129–147. doi: 10.1080/00207599308247181

Warner, G. (1992) Internationalization Models and the Role of the University. *International Education Magazine, 9*(1).

Warring, S. (2011). An analysis of learning levels within and between a degree and a diploma: New Zealand case study, *Quality Assurance in Education, 19*(4), 441 – 450. doi: 10.1108/09684881111170113

Weinstein, C., Tomlinson-Clarke, S., Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(1), 25–38. doi:10.1177/0022487103259812

Welch, A. (1997). The peripatetic professor: The Internationalisation of the academic profession. *Higher Education 34*(3), 323–345.

Whitehead, L. (2014). *Transnationalism of Teacher Education: A new paradigm for Ontario? Teacher education in a Transnational World*, Bruno-Jofre, R., Johnston, J. (eds.), University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.

Whitehead, J. (1988). Creating a living educational theory from questions of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?'. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 19*(1), 41-52. Retrieved from: http://actionresearch.net/writings/livtheory.html

Wihlborg, M. (2009). The Pedagogical Dimension of Internationalisation? A Challenging Quality Issue in Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century. *European Educational Research Journal, 8* (1). doi:10.2304/eerj.2009.8.1.117

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Ruth Wodak, Michael Meyer (Eds.): *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, vol. 1. London: Sage (Introducing qualitative methods), 1–13.

Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (2002) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis,* London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory, and methodology. R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage (2nd revised edition), 1-33. doi: 10.4135/9781446286289

Wood, R. (1991). Toward Cultural Empathy: A Framework for Global Education. *Educational Record, 72* (4), 10–13.

Woolf, M. (2002). Harmony and Dissonance in International Education: The Limits of Globalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 6* (5). doi: 10.1177/1028315302006001002.

Wright, D. (2000). Culture as information and culture as affective process: A comparative study. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*, 330–341. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb00610.x

Wuttig, S. (2009). Current Challenges of internationalization and the impact of ERASMUS: The German Example. P.64–75. *Internationalization of Finnish Higher Education* (2009), CIMO.

Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: internationalisation at home in context, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 5–11. doi:10.1177/1028315302250176.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2002). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: Trends and success factors* (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education). Bonn: Lemmens.

Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The picture in 2007* (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education). Bonn: Lemmens.

Yeh, C., Inose, M. (2003). International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 16* (1), 15–28. doi:10.1080/0951507031000114058

Yemini, M. (2014). Internationalisation discourse hits the tipping point, Perspectives: Policy and *Practice in Higher Education, 19*(1), 19-22. doi: 10.1080/13603108.2014.966280

Yonezawa, A. (2010). Much ado about ranking: why can't Japanese universities internationalize? *Japan Forum, 22* (1-2), 121–137. doi: 10.1080/09555803.2010.488948

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(1), 63–75. doi: 10.1080/03075070701794833

Appendix: Interview questions

QUESTIONS TO STUDENTS

What kind of university is better to pursue a master's degree in?
Does the international aspect improve the quality of education?
What makes the program international?
What are the instances when international education is inefficient?
What do you think are the goals of the administration organizing international master's program?
What about the teachers, what do the teachers try to convey?
What about the students that study, what kind of typical goals do students have?
What about the program choice, what kind of education were you looking for?
Why did you find this program suitable? The focus, and what were other attractive factors?
What about the sources about the program, was it easy to find everything?
What kind of issues were you looking for, when you were looking at this program?
What kind of sources did you use? What could be improved?
What were the positives and negatives of the admission process?
How was teaching at the program?
What about practice-related training?
What about intercultural communication?
What were the international elements of the program?
Did this program improve your employment opportunities?
What about plans after graduation?
Did this program contribute to your personal development?

QUESTIONS TO TEACHERS

What kind of qualities the university should have in order to give a good master's degree?
Does the international aspect improve the quality of education?
What makes the master's program international? What would you say are the key characteristics?
What are the instances, when international education becomes inefficient?
Could you comment on the creation of this international master's program?
What about creating it in English? Was it planned from the very beginning?
What goals of the program were realized better, and which less?
What about interdisciplinarity, what was the reason to take specifically these disciplines?
What kind of students do you aim to get at the program?
What about diversity, is it important for this program?
If you were to distinguish some groups of students who typically study at the program, what would they be? What kind of people apply to the program?
What are the most important skills, that students get/should get at the program?
What about the typical jobs after that? Is this pattern of employment different for the international and domestic students?
Is the information about alumni collected?
Have you done evaluations of the program?