

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Ferenc, Viktória; Laihonen, Petteri; Saarinen, Taina

Title: Dynamics of the International and National in Finnish and Hungarian Higher Education 1990–2020

Year: 2022

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2022 Berghahn Books

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Ferenc, V., Laihonen, P., & Saarinen, T. (2022). Dynamics of the International and National in Finnish and Hungarian Higher Education 1990–2020. In P. Ihalainen, & A. Holmila (Eds.), *Nationalism and Internationalism Intertwined : A European History of Concepts Beyond the Nation State* (pp. 301-321). Berghahn Books. *European Conceptual History*, 7.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781800733152-018>

<CN>Chapter 14**<CT>Dynamics of the International and National in Finnish and Hungarian Higher Education, 1990–2020**

<CA>Viktória Ferenc, Petteri Laihonon and Taina Saarinen

<HDA>Universities as National and International

This chapter presents a discourse analysis of the terms ‘national’ and ‘international’ in Finnish and Hungarian higher education legislation from the 1990s to the present day. We conduct the analysis by applying linguistic and textual methods in the study of conceptual and political history as argued by Ihalainen and Saarinen (2019). We compare the conceptual contextualizations of the words ‘international’ and ‘national’ in the political motivations presented in the preambles to the Hungarian Acts, and in the government proposals for the Finnish Acts. We analyse the relevant discursive and societal practices (see Fairclough 2003) linking occurrences of the national and international in our data to the discursively cycled practices and the societal contextualization of the legislation and their motivations. We approach the national and international as parts of long- and short-term discourse cycles, which reconstruct and recycle sedimented language ideological debates (Hult and Pietikäinen 2014; see Saarinen and Ihalainen 2018 on language policies) and produce new cycles (Saarinen 2020) that are still visible in today’s discourses of the national and international roles of higher education.

With our chapter, we contribute to the methodological development of conceptual history. As higher education scholars, applied linguists and sociolinguists, we share the need of comparative historians to unpack linear, apparently self-evident national(ist) histories and stories (see Ihalainen 2017), and to look for historical layers (Välimaa 2019) and contingencies (Stråth 2016), not least in research on histories of higher education policy.

<HDB>*Analysing the National and International in Higher Education Legislation*

To understand how the ‘international’ and ‘national’ are conceptualized and what meanings are attributed to these terms, we touch upon the classic semantic triangle of Ogden and Richards (1989) that links ‘words, thoughts, and things’ or symbols, references and referents in relation with each other. The word ‘internationalization’ may refer to different ideas and be realized in various kinds of activities. Our empirical focus is the legislative reforms of 1997 and 2010 in Finland and of 1993, 2005 and 2011 in Hungary. We thus focus on the practical side of concepts beyond nation states as opposed to ideological discourses (on the entanglement of European integration and the nation state, see Chapter 10).

There are three Acts on higher education in Hungary: the first was adopted in 1993, the second in 2005 and the current one in 2011. Before the first Act, higher education was included in the Act on Education. The overall trend has been an increase in references to the national as opposed to the international. The Finnish data consists of two universities Acts: the 1997 Universities Act (645/1997) and the 2009 Universities Act (558/2009). Since the Hungarian legislation includes lengthy preambles explaining the background and motivation of the Acts, to get a comparative view on Finland, the Finnish government proposals on both Acts were added to the data and analysed (HE 263/1996 and HE 7/2009). The government proposals are standard preparatory documents that briefly describe the main content of the proposal, general and more detailed motivations, and the draft Act (Rantala 2016). Here, too, the primacy of the nation over the international community can be observed, although not on the same scale as in Hungary.

Our data is presented in Table 14.1.

Table 14.1 Frequencies for national (*nemzet** or *kansa**) and international (*nemzetközi** or *kansainväli**) in the data.

| Country | Document | Year | Word counts | nation* | internation* |
|---------|---------------------|------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Hungary | Act | 1993 | 25,492 | 6 | 15 |
| Hungary | Act | 2005 | 60,827 | 21 | 24 |
| Hungary | Act | 2011 | 61,640 | 55 | 31 |
| Finland | Government proposal | 1996 | 11,794 | 6 | 2 |
| Finland | Act | 1997 | 6,196 | 3 | 1 |
| Finland | Government proposal | 2009 | 42,875 | 68 | 60 |
| Finland | Act | 2009 | 15 942 | 18 | 7 |

<HDB>Methodology

We combined deductive and inductive approaches. Following Mayring (2000), we started by deductively analysing our data by looking for keywords pertinent to our research questions, which were themselves a result of an inductive-deductive process. The specific keywords (or categories, following Mayring 2000) that we deemed relevant for our data were international and nation(al); i.e. in Finnish *kansa**, *kansain** and in Hungarian *nemzetközi** and *nemzeti**. The asterisk (*) denotes a root word; for instance the Finnish *kansa** can refer to *kansa* (nation, people), *kansalainen* (citizen), *kansalaisuus* (citizenship), closed compounds such as *Kansalliskirjasto* (National Library) or collocations such as *kansallinen kulttuuriperimä* (national cultural heritage).

This allowed us to narrow down the relevant themes in connection to our topic. While doing this, it became necessary to conduct an inductive analysis of our data (Mayring 2000): after the first round of analysis, we found that domestic*/local* as well as foreign*, global* and citizen* were related concepts (in Finnish *kotimai*/paikall**, *globaali**, *ulkomaalainen**,

*kansalai**; in Hungarian **hazai**, **idegen**, **külföldi**, **állampolgár**) which needed to be taken into account, as well as *suomalai** (Finnish) and *magyar** (Hungarian), and their collocations. The last round of context analysis circled back to the discourses of *international** and *national**, their occurrences and their relationships. It needs to be noted that the Finnish *kansa* includes notions of both ‘people’ and ‘nation’, and in some contexts ‘common people’ and ‘citizenship’. In Hungarian the term *nemzet** more often refers to ethnicity (e.g. *nemzetiség*) or to the ethnic Hungarian nation, but it can also be a general reference to the state as ‘national’ for Hungary – for example, Nemzeti bank: National Bank (of Hungary). *Kansainvälinen* (Finnish) or *nemzetközi* (Hungarian), or ‘international’, mainly refers to activities between countries, without ethnonational implications.

Based on this preliminary analysis, it seems that conceptions of internationalization in higher education discourse vary; it was viewed as a commodity, cooperation or a threat (see, for instance, Saarinen 2012; Saarinen 2020; Nokkala 2007; Välimaa 2019; Scott 2011). This insight led us to our research questions. What appears to be the motivation for internationalization in the higher education documents from the 1990s to the 2020s in Hungary and Finland? How is internationalization conceptualized? Which discourses of internationalization are recycled and reproduced in the higher education legislation and which are not? Internationalization also seems highly localized, with national goals intertwined in the internationalization goals (see Vares 2020; Saarinen 2020; Scott 2011; Välimaa 2019). This raised further questions: how do national and international aspects meet in the documents? What are the localized conceptualizations of internationalization in Finland and Hungary?

<HDA>On the Conceptualization of National and International in Higher Education

In line with this volume as a whole, we approach the national and international as interdependent and constituting each other historically. As we speak of national higher education and its different instantiations, it is also necessary to discuss dynamics between the national (often operationalized from the nation state) and cross-national activities of higher education as an institution. Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) point out that, paradoxically, focusing on the nation state has made us blind to its dynamics. They draw our attention to two kinds of methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002): ignoring the national framing of modernity; and taking national discourses and agendas for granted.

We take the dynamic nature of this relationship into account (Häkli 2013: 347), suggesting that while the national and international are often conceptualized as territorially bounded (the national as occurring inside the nation state's borders and the international outside them), this is not helpful for analysing the societal dynamics of higher education. The relationship is more complex than mere juxtaposition; both the national and the international operate within various fields of higher education policy.

Häkli (2013) theorizes the 'state space' by proposing the concept of the 'transnational field' as a more nuanced way of understanding the interrelationship of the national and international, and continues to criticize the understanding of the territorial space as 'a natural container of social relations and the concomitant dichotomy between national "inside" and international "outside"' (2013: 343). Emerging new nationalist politics in Europe and elsewhere appear to recycle and reproduce understandings of 'international' that centre on the nation state (e.g. Weimer and Barlete 2020). In Finnish higher education, the discourses of 'inside and outside' are mainly internal to the nation state, recently visible particularly in relation to framing English as a threat to Finnish and Finnishness or the Swedish-speaking

minority as not Finnish (Saarinen 2020). In the Hungarian case, since 1920 Hungarian-medium higher education in the neighbouring countries has blurred the picture of the Hungarian higher education space, at least in comparison with the Finnish one. The relevance of Hungarian higher education beyond the country's borders is established in the Hungarian Acts, analysed below: 'The scope of this Act covers all persons and organizations involved in the activities and governance of higher education, as well as the higher education activities performed by Hungarian higher education institutions *outside the territory of Hungary*' (2011 Act on National Higher Education, emphasis added).

The notion of universities as 'national' institutions stems in part from the fact that, with their students and teachers, they have often been strong national actors in many countries. *Universitas*, originally referring to the guilds or societies of students (Välilä 2019), started to refer to university-like organizations in the Middle Ages, predating nation states. In fact, Scott (2011: 59) points out that rather than being international (a term only coined in the late eighteenth century, see Chapters 1–3), the early universities can be characterized as pre-national, having roles as universal societies of mobile students and scholars, but also as agents of state formation.

The national nature of universities became even more prominent in the early modern period (Scott 2011), and by the early nineteenth century, universities played an ideologically, culturally, politically and economically strong role in nation-building all over Europe, not least in the Nordic countries (see e.g. Adriansen and Adriansen 2018). The university institution expanded in Europe in the early nineteenth century and was more closely tied to the educational and information needs of emerging nation states (Jalava 2012) as well as to the vernacularization of societies, particularly in Finland.

Before the First World War, when Hungary was a part of the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy, such tendencies were combined with cutting-edge scientific development in

various fields (Tarrósy 2002: 13). In the Hungarian historical narrative, the loss of vast territories and about three million ethnic Hungarians to foreign rule in 1920 constitutes a truly nationalistic turn in the history of Hungarian higher education (see e.g. Tarrósy 2002: 13). At that point, the universities of Kolozsvár (now Cluj Napoca) and Pozsony (now Bratislava) were evacuated to Hungary (Tarrósy 2002: 13). As Papp Z. (2011: 481) noticed, the higher education systems of Hungary's new or reinstated neighbours around 1990 (Slovakia, Ukraine, Serbia, etc.) had the uneasy threefold task of fostering the new ethnolinguistic national identity and loyalty of their citizens, reforming the Soviet legacy of higher education, and adapting to European Union (EU) expectations. For Hungarians, the higher education policies and funding of institutions of the large Hungarian-speaking minorities in these countries have been a recurrent topic in the post-Soviet era.

Both political push and pull factors can be seen in higher education internationalization, as exemplified by *numerus clausus*, wars and language policies in Russia (Finland was an autonomous Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire until 1917) that pushed students to become mobile in Europe before the Second World War (Dhondt 2008: 50). Germany lost its position as a receiving country after the First World War and, in the 1930s, became a source of forced mobility and/or migration because of antisemitism, economic crisis and wars. In the historical narrative of Hungarian higher education, the numerous Nobel Prize laureates are often mentioned (e.g. Tarrósy 2002: 20–21, lists 11) as proof of a golden era in interwar Hungarian education. Yet all of them migrated, most to North America, and received the Nobel Prize for their work there.

Increasing globalization and transnational cooperation after the Second World War, and particularly following the Cold War, took new forms that were seen as blurring the boundaries of nation states. This was perceived as a global market opportunity (neoliberals) or a threat to either nation state interests (statists or neoconservatives) or local communities

(radicals) (Held and McGrew 2007). While the legitimation project of nation states more or less ended in Western Europe with the Second World War, and in the Cold War period Hungary was surrounded by three major European multinational states (the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia), the conceptualization of nation states as the ‘constant unit of observation through all historical transformations’ (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002: 305) continued.

Yet universities have always been international, at least in their knowledge base, teaching staff and activities (Scott 2011). Additionally, scientific disciplines and research have a universal basis (see Clark 1983 on the fundamentals of disciplines; Becher and Trowler 2001 on the nature of disciplines); a single path explanation has never sufficed in the analysis of universities in society (Scott 2011). Thus, before entering the analysis, we provide a brief historical contextualization of higher education in the two countries.

<HDA>Finland and Hungary from the 1990s to the 2000s

Hungary and Finland lie on the periphery of the Anglo-American hegemony so prevalent in higher education research. The populations of both countries mostly speak non-Indo-European languages with a relatively small readership outside their (historical) borders. Both turned westwards following the fall of the Soviet Union, but from different historical and societal backgrounds and with different outcomes. Present-day Finland can be framed as a Nordic welfare state, which joined the Council of Europe in 1989, the EU in 1995, and became a signatory to the Bologna Process in 1999. Unlike other Nordic countries, Finland is a member of the Eurozone. However, joining NATO has not gained popularity in Finland, which cherishes a narrative of military neutrality and self-sufficiency.

In the last twenty-five years, Hungary has rushed through the development trajectory of higher education accompanied by tensions between national and international interests,

often to impose immature ideas in haste (Polónyi 2015). Hungary swiftly joined all available Western and European alliances, including NATO in 1997 and the EU in 2004, only to turn into a maverick member of these alliances in the 2010s. Like Finland, Hungary has been a full member of the Bologna Process and European Higher Education Area since 1999.

After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, both Finland and Hungary experienced political, economic and social changes that shaped their higher education. The westward turn was strongly reflected in the ‘internationalization’ agenda of higher education. That being said, the Hungarian case is more complex due to the (higher) educational needs and market of about three million Hungarian speakers living in neighbouring states (see Papp Z. 2011). According to Papp Z. (2011: 482), all major Hungarian minority regions in Romania, Slovakia, Serbia and Ukraine had established separate Hungarian-medium private and/or state universities by the new millennium, often with Hungarian funding and cooperation with institutions in Hungary.

As early as the 1980s, systematic policy measures had changed the landscape of higher education internationalization, as organizations and individuals were expected to ‘internationalize’ in ways that have been operationalized as student mobility (see also Chapter 12), networking, research cooperation and publishing activities. These activities have both national and international implications and have always played a role in higher education (Scott 2011), but the increase in transnational cooperation programmes initiated by supranational organizations since the 1980s has made mobility-based internationalization a systematic part of higher education. A neoliberal turn (see e.g. Rhoades and Slaughter 2006) in higher education policy has brought an emphasis on global markets of intellectual capital; competitive international funding schemes; a comparative and global ethos of excellence; and a formal depoliticizing and outsourcing of higher education to consultants and experts, as well as to intergovernmental and transnational policy networks.

<HDB>*Finland: Internationalization Needed to Protect National Commercial Interests*

Finnish society and consequently its educational system have faced relatively major changes since the late 1980s (Saarinen 2020). Educational steering and regulation have been formally decentralized at all educational levels, including higher education, and softer forms of regulation such as funding based on internationalization measures have replaced centralized normative steering (Simola et al. 2017). After the economic boom of the 1980s, several factors led to a severe recession in the early 1990s. The liberal fiscal politics of the late 1980s and early 1990s, the consequent overheating of the economy, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the consequent decline in Soviet trade combined with problems in international trade were a massive blow for Finnish society (Kiander 2001; Välimaa 2019) that was so dependent on exports (on internationalization and the national economy in the interwar era, see Chapter 6).

The above developments have been described as the first ‘globalization shock’ as Finland’s relatively closed economy and exports sector that had been strongly dependent on Soviet bloc trade met the harsher realities of Western markets (Välimaa 2019: 213). The prevalence of economic factors in societal and political developments has also been visible in higher education policies (Välimaa 2019; Saarinen 2020). The first Finnish internationalization strategy of higher education was drafted during the economic boom, in 1987 (Nokkala 2007). It linked the internationalization of higher education to economic and cultural prosperity, mirroring the traditional national function of the university institution to provide *Bildung* (Jalava 2012; Saarinen 2020). In practice, internationalization was operationalized as staff and student mobility; particularly in the EU, this became the tool for combining the European goals of freedom of mobility of goods, capital, services and labour, by creating a workforce that was ready, willing and able to be mobile.

The 2001 internationalization strategy introduced the concept of competitiveness in internationalization, as a powerful national (economic) basis seen as indispensable for international competition. The strategy underlined the importance of national legislation protecting the universities, apparently in response to the ongoing Bologna Process. The 2001 strategy thus contrasted the national and international, implying that Finnish higher education needed protection and that legislation would secure this (Saarinen 2020).

The 2009 internationalization strategy continued the economic discourse by naming higher education as a nationally significant export product. Since Finnish universities generally did not charge tuition fees at the time, it seems that this export argument was linked to Finnish higher education as a brand rather than as a commodity.

The increasing attention to national needs was apparent in the latest internationalization guidelines of 2017. The strategy balanced the need for ‘international’ languages (increasingly spoken also in Finland) with the importance of Finnish national languages for international students and staff. To summarize, it seems that – despite their aim of internationalization – these strategic documents of 1987, 2001, 2009 and 2017 tend to reinforce a protectionist discourse of national economic interests. The recent rise in neo-nationalism in higher education policy has added a layer to the tensions between the national and international roles of higher education (Saarinen 2020).

<HDB>*Hungary: from Soviet Bloc to a Sovereign Nation in Free Europe*

The centralized ideological and planned labour market approach under state socialism has been characterized as ‘a Soviet type of education system marked by strong centralization, a predominance of technical subjects in secondary and higher education, and compulsory secondary education coupled with a shortage of higher education and early, largely irreversible, specialization’ (Papp Z. 2011: 481). According to Polónyi (2015: 8) the task of

higher education was to ideologically nurture an intelligentsia (e.g. Marxism was a compulsory subject for all disciplines) and to educate experts for the needs of a socialist economy based on heavy industry.

Until the end of the 1990s, the primary goal of higher education in Hungary was to reach the level of Western European countries, to foster academic autonomy and expand student cohorts (see Kozma 1990). In the 1990s, both international, private universities (e.g. the English-medium Central European University, 1991) and state funded church institutions (Pázmány Péter Catholic University and Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, 1993) were established in Hungary (see Tarrósy 2002).

In the early 2000s, the right-wing politics of Viktor Orbán's first government (1998–2002) emphasized training a competitive workforce as a new goal in higher education. Later, the left-wing governments (2002–2010) also emphasized international competitiveness and meeting labour market needs. The second and third Orbán governments (2010–2014, 2014–2018) once again formulated a strongly ideological approach (shaped in the Act on National Higher Education 2011): national economic progress and the intellectual development of the nation, as well as serving the needs of the national and, to a lesser degree, international labour market. As a sign of this new orientation, the University of Public Service, Ludovika, was established in 2012. Due to a conflict with the fourth Orbán government (2018–), the Central European University is now (2020) being relocated to Vienna.

Catching up with 'developed democratic societies' (Preamble to the 1993 Hungarian Act on Higher Education) since the end of the Cold War had been a fundamental endeavour in the political aspirations of Hungarian governments. This reform appeared in higher education policy in the 1990s in terms of increasing the number of students and strengthening the autonomy of universities (e.g. the universities retained the right to award internationally compatible doctoral degrees). In the first decade of the 2000s it was increasingly

reformulated as serving an economic catch-up. Most remarkably, the 2005 Act described joining the EU in 2004 as joining the neoliberal economic competition in higher education. It seems that there is no long-term, coherent concept of internationalization in Hungarian higher education policy. The concepts of different governments compete with, rather than build on, each other (for a recent discussion, see Parson and Steele 2019).

<HDA>Results of the Discourse Analysis of National versus International

<HDB>Finland: International and National Intertwined

The 1996 government proposal on higher education made two explicit references to *kansainvälinen* (international): in the context of international benchmarking of degrees, and in the context of international cooperation of evaluation. Typically, these were measures to develop the transparency of higher education degrees and studies; since the EU's first education policy measures, they have ultimately been devised to make free movement of labour easier (Corbett 2005). While the original goal of this proposal only covered vocational education, by the time the government programme was drafted, the Maastricht Treaty had been signed in 1992 and Finland had joined the EU in 1995.

The goals of benchmarking and cooperation were designed very specifically to develop Finnish higher education – i.e. its degree structure and evaluation systems – to more explicitly respond to EU needs. For approximately fifteen years, the lowest higher education degree in most fields had been a master's. With the establishment of a polytechnic sector from earlier post-secondary vocational institutions, and the international benchmarks, bachelor's degrees were reinstated. The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council had been established in 1995 (Välmaa 2019). In other words, the arguments for international benchmarking and cooperation were expressed somewhat after the fact. Thus, it seems that arguments referring to internationalization were a combination of internalized European

competitiveness goals and national reforms, both of which had been normalized in Finnish higher education by the mid-1990s, when the new university legislation was drafted. In the 1996 government proposal and the original 1997 Act, ‘international’ denotes a dynamic of national and European higher education politics and policies. It also refers to international comparisons both as a vehicle for national benchmarking and as means to argue for or demonstrate the convergence (see Chapter 3) of Finnish higher education with (ideal or imaginary, see Chapter 10) European higher education policies. The 1997 Universities Act was amended several times before the next major reform in 2009. In the amendments, two additions had an effect on conceptualizations of nation* and internation*. These were related to the tasks and administration of the National Library and the new task of universities to provide commissioned education. The National Library was expected to advance the ‘domestic and international’ cooperation of libraries. The amendment made in 2007 referred to providing education to foreign organizations and students that is paid for a foreign state, international organization, domestic or foreign public organization, foundation or private society. This controversial addition to the free education for traditional target groups paved the way for the legislative reform in 2009 (Välímää 2019) and was seen as a fundamental change in the logic of university funding and operations.

Coming to the conceptualizations of people or nation* (*kansa**), the concept appears in the 1996 government proposal mainly in compounds like *Kansalliskirjasto* (National Library) or *kansalaisopistot* (Civic Adult Education). All in all, there were six mentions of *kansa* in this proposal, three of which (references to *Kansalliskirjasto* and to citizenship [*kansalaisuus*] in a section on language requirements for non-native Finnish citizens [*kansalaiset*]) ended up in the 1997 Universities Act. As the references to citizen(ship) often appear in collocations like Finnish, foreign or EU citizens, it seems that in this context the *kansa** is a part of the demarcation between national and international, or us and the others.

With the latest amendments to the 1997 Act, the number of references to *kansa** had increased to twelve. This was mainly due to more frequent mentions of the National Library and to universities' added task of commissioned education in the 2000s. As these additions affected discussion of the international, next we look at *nation** and *internation** together. Both these concepts or related ones largely appear in collocates such as 'domestic or international' (*kotimaista ja kansainvälistä*) or in defining which organizations and other actors can commission education from universities – a Finnish or foreign state (*Suomen valtio, ulkomaan valtio*) or a Finnish or foreign public authority (*suomalainen tai ulkomainen julkisyhteisö*). While references to *internation** are less frequent, they still appear to respond to a need to demarcate national activities from international ones; adifferentiation that was not apparent earlier.

By the 2009 Universities Act, references to *internation** and *nation** had increased significantly. This Act presented a major change in higher education in Finland. Amendments between 1996 and 2009 had mainly related to universities' funding and their societal tasks and had been benchmarked from international examples (Välimaa 2019: 252).

In our analysis of the international and national, this shift in the nature of university legislation is reflected in increased references to international cooperation, competition and comparison (*yhteistyö, vertailu, kilpailu*) and particularly to international high-level (*korkeatasoinen*) rankings and comparisons. All in all, all these indicate a need to benchmark the Finnish system against presumably high(er) level international universities. International, used in this way, positions the Finnish higher education system in a hierarchy of other (Western) systems, as lower internationally, but aspiring to reach the high ranks. An interesting detail in this perspective is the change from the wording in the 1996 proposal and 1997 Act to the 2009 proposal and Act – 'reaching' (*saavutetaan*) becomes 'assuring' (*varmistetaan*) the high level of universities, the implication being that while in 1996/7

Finland still had not reached the top, in 2009 the aim was to maintain the highest level which had been achieved.

All in all, the ethos of comparison, cooperation and competition is strong in the most recent government proposal. Internatio* appears as the benchmark against which the Finnish system is compared. International competitiveness, in turn, appears as a goal to be reached and is ultimately the reason for the renewal of higher education administration and funding. The preparation for the 2009 reform was led by Ministers of Education who were members of the market liberal National Coalition Party.

Coming to conceptualisations of the nation and its derivatives, reference to national organizations and actors continues to be a way of demarcating the international and the national. While the 1996 government proposal had mentioned nation seven times in the three contexts of the National Library (*Kansalliskirjasto*), citizenship (*kansalaisuus*) and adult education institutions (*kansalaisopisto*), the 2009 proposal refers to nation* sixty-eight times, mostly still in compound names such as the National Library (sixteen times), or other compounds such as national goals, innovation systems or research universities. ‘National properties’ and ‘national regulations’ emerge in a context in which international comparison of higher education systems is beginning to include competitive elements, again based on international examples. While the references to the international largely relate to competition, markets and rankings, the references to national concern matters within Finland’s borders, including national knowledge base, *Bildung* and cultural heritage. Internationalization is countered by a concept of the national as being in need of protection or strengthening.

What stands out again in 2009 are the compound name of the National Library and the references to citizens (of Finland and other countries). Individual mentions are given to national cultural heritage (*kansallinen kulttuuriperintö*), national collection (*kansalliskokoelma*) and national services (*kansalliset palvelut*). The latter reference is in the

context of the services provided by the National Library, as opposed to local municipal, university and other libraries. The former two imply something separable from ‘others’ that needs to be preserved; in other words, *kansallinen* (national) here refers to something that is deemed valuable and in need of protection.

<HDB>*Hungary: from International to National*

The analysis indicates that *nemzetközi* (international) was present in the 1993 Act and it can be found more often in later Acts, partly due to the growing length and detail of the Hungarian Acts on Higher Education.. The term *nemzet* (nation) has been on the rise, and outnumbers *nemzetközi* in the 2011 Act for the first time. The term *nemzeti* (national) is of a different character; it has replaced earlier expressions such as *magyar* (Hungarian), *hazai* (domestic) or *Magyarország* (Hungary), which have sometimes been translated as national in the English translations of the Acts. This is especially notable in the 1993 Act, which barely includes six occurrences of *nemzet(i)*, whereas the English translation has over fifty hits for nation*.

In general, the word frequencies display a tendency for *nemzeti* (national) to become a less rare and more general expression, gradually outnumbering *nemzetközi* (international); this tendency has grown with every extension of the Act. That is, by sheer numbers of occurrences, the 1993 Act is more ‘international’ and the 2011 Act more ‘national’.

The general justification of the Hungarian Parliament’s first Act on Higher Education (1993), in addition to maintaining quality and adapting the system to Western European standards, was to increase the proportion of people receiving higher education in each age cohort, which is below the Western and Northern European average (Polónyi 2015; Kozma 1990). Based on the preamble, the Act can be characterized as liberal, in the sense that it refers to academic freedom and autonomy of universities, research and study, teachers and

students. Furthermore, it expresses Hungary's need to join the 'developed democratic societies', which seem to have a higher number of students in higher education. That is, in 1993 there was a need to transform higher education from an elite privilege to an opportunity for the masses (cf. Kozma 1990). Nation is mentioned once in the preamble to the 1993 Act; the principles and values are similar to those of the Magna Charta Universitatum, signed by 388 European university rectors in Bologna in 1988.

There are only six references to *nemzet** (nation*) in the 1993 Act on Higher Education. Two of these are expressions that are paired with an international term, such as 'national and universal culture'. The term international appears more frequently – fifteen times – in the 1993 Act, with most occurrences in a section entitled International Academic Relations. The first Act on Higher Education in Hungary has an international focus, mostly concentrating on international situations and relations. What is more, there are references to structures, such as the system of international higher education. Such references anchor Hungarian higher education in international structures, networks, norms, practices and standards.

The theme of admitting foreign students to Hungarian universities, the process of recognizing diplomas acquired abroad, and the increasing requirement to prove foreign language skills (e.g. for appointment as a university lecturer or obtaining a PhD) also appear several times in connection to internationalization.

In conclusion, the meanings, connotations and contexts of the occurrences of the terms *nemzeti* (national) and *nemzetközi* (international) display an international orientation in the 1993 Hungarian Act on Higher Education. On the basis of these meanings and connotations, values, relationships, agreements, structures, system and practices and norms are fundamentally international in this first Act.

The 2005 Higher Education Act was elaborated under a left-wing government. The introduction to this Act states that higher education must be able to create and transfer up-to-date knowledge in order to maintain the desired level of social cohesion, sustainable development, international competitiveness and technological innovation. In the justification of the amendment to the law (2007), the goal of higher education is to provide professional training that is in line with labour market needs, competitive at European level and high quality, in institutions that are successfully involved in national and international research development, innovative, efficiently economically and academically managed, and open in their relations (Polónyi 2015).

The preamble to the 2005 Act extends the 1993 preamble with many references to international phenomena. Hungary's accession to the Bologna Process (1999) and to the EU (2004) seem to be the starting points of the Act. References to the term European in the 2005 Act increased to seventeen (in the 1993 Act it was mentioned only twice) in connection with the EU, the European Economic Area, European Higher Education Area, European Research Area and Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The relevant passages discuss integration into EU structures and compliance with EU law. In sum, 'international' can often mean 'EU' in the 2005 Act, linking the Hungarian discussion to the post-1960s Europeanization debates (see Chapter 10).

Economic competition and efficiency are mentioned several times, making it a distinct marker for this Act. From the economic point of view, the 2005 Hungarian Act on Higher Education could be characterized as neoliberal; freedoms and autonomies are now accompanied by an emphasis on participating in international economic competition and fiscal efficiency.

The term *nemzet* (nation) appears approximately as frequently as *nemzetközi* (international) in the 2005 Act. Nation appears in the naming of certain country-wide

phenomena and institutions such as the Hungarian state budget (national budget, *nemzeti költségvetés*). As in the 1993 Act, the rights of national minorities are mentioned in the 2005 Act, in fact the most mentions of *nemzet* in this Act are in the collocation ‘national minorities’ (*nemzeti kisebbség*) inside Hungary’s borders. A new term is Hungarian nationality (i.e. ethnicity) beyond Hungary’s borders (*határon túl élő magyar nemzetiségű*).

According to the 2005 Act, higher education should prepare the students to acknowledge and commit themselves to national, European and universal values. It includes an abundance of meanings and connotations for the word ‘international’. A new expression since the 1993 Act is ‘international competitiveness’. The preamble to the 2005 Act specifically links internationalization to ‘academic capitalism’, which according to Piller and Cho (2013: 31) is often introduced in the disguise of ‘global academic excellence’ and similar terms erasing the commodification of higher education. Another new term, again with neoliberal (see Rhoades and Slaughter 2006) connotations, is ‘international labour market’. International student mobility is now mentioned in the law. The international structures are now more specific, perhaps as a token of deepening international integration.

According to Piller and Cho (2013), a main force in enhancing neoliberal structural reforms in higher education in Asia has been the International Monetary Fund (IMF) crisis relief. In 2008, Hungary received an IMF loan of €12.5 billion. This loan was soon turned into a political weapon in the hands of the Fidesz (Hungarian Civic Alliance) and its leader, Viktor Orbán, who won the elections by a landslide in 2010, 2014 and 2018. Orbán soon argued for an anti-liberal turn in politics. In the second year of their practically one-party reign – with two thirds of the seats in parliament needed to change the constitution at will – Fidesz delivered its Act on National Higher Education.

The preamble of the current 2011 Act is true to its new name: On National Higher Education. In the preamble, discourses about the nation have replaced references to

educational and academic freedoms, international and European values, and economic competitiveness and efficiency. In the current (neo)nationalistic preamble, an ethnonational historical narrative is constructed. Higher education should be a tool for the Hungarian nation's children and grandchildren to bring about a national renewal which could restore Hungary to its past glory of numerous Nobel laureates (see Tarrósy 2002: 20–21) and internationally renowned inventors.

Since the preamble has been formulated around the notion of the Hungarian nation, its naming practices have also changed to favour references to *nemzeti* (national) Acts and institutions. In the previous Acts, the system of higher education institutions was international, now it is termed as national. In the 2011 Act, a national scholarship is established (*nemzeti felsőoktatási ösztöndíj*). A national strategy is also mentioned. As in the previous Acts, national minorities are mentioned fairly often. Provisions with International Relevance contain the same sections as in 2005. In this part, international agreements are mentioned several times. International recognition is still deemed important in some cases in the newest Act. New meanings are contained in the expression 'international commitment' referring to foreign policy commitment, which might be a sign of tightening political control and the primacy of (neo)national(istic) political interests over the universal academic freedom and autonomy that was so strongly expressed in the 1993 Act.

As a result of these changes in the legislation, Hungarian higher education is being thoroughly transformed: from a classical Humboldt-type system with high autonomy, established to educate the broad masses and train intellectuals, to a highly centralized, narrowly autonomous vocational training system to serve national labour market purposes (cf. Polónyi 2015). In the 2010s, the labour market was no longer perceived as international; what is more, Orbán's first government introduced a system of tuition-free higher education

for students who agreed to work in Hungary after graduation for a predetermined number of years (Polónyi 2015: 6).

<HDA>Conclusion

Our chapter has demonstrated how systematic analysis of two closely related concepts, the national and international, illustrates the contextual differences in different national systems, thus pointing at the inherently national nature of international comparisons in Europe at the turn of the twenty-first century. The methodological flip side of this approach to comparative and conceptual history would be that, done unsystematically and without proper contextualization, focusing on a narrow selection of political concepts could lead to linear and even superficial interpretations. Thus, close discourse analysis of concepts always has to be complemented by research into the political and historical context. We do not claim to present an overarching analysis of the conceptual fields of these concepts and the neighbouring ones; rather, we discuss what happens and what is done particularly with the concepts of the national and international (in Finnish, *kansa* and *kansainvälinen*; in Hungarian, *nemzet* and *nemzetközi*).

Analysis of national and international in the Finnish and Hungarian contexts from the 1990s to the 2010s empirically depicts a development from liberal to neoliberal, or postnational to new national in both countries. However, this occurred at different speeds and on different scales. The global neoliberal turn in higher education (Rhoades and Slaughter 2006) is visible in both cases. The Finnish developments appeared to occur more slowly, however, not just in global comparison but also in comparison to Hungary, which made a speedy move from liberal higher education (1993), briefly to neoliberal/postnational (2005) and then to clearly and strongly new nationalist policy (2011). Finland, in turn, was still in a largely liberal phase in 1996–1997 while in the 2000s the country quickly transitioned to a

postnational and neoliberal phase. The new national phase emerged only later and is not visible in our data (Saarinen 2020).

In the Finnish data, the national and international appear intertwined, particularly in the 2009 data (and the amendments to the 1999 Act), where they demarcate each other's space. This demarcation of the inter/national appeared to have the purpose of hierarchizing higher education systems, but also assuring the Finnish higher education community that the national (alongside the international) was still there and not about to disappear. This implies that the new nationalist tendencies that surfaced in Finnish higher education only after 2010 (Saarinen 2020) were already emerging around 2009.

The Finnish conceptualization of internationalization in our data is mainly pragmatic and economic. In the Hungarian data, the values and principles of higher education were universal in the first Act of 1993. The goals were to (re)integrate Hungarian higher education into Western European academic traditions and practices. In the 2005 Act, this was combined with an incentive to (neoliberal) international economic competitiveness. It no longer sufficed to join Western academia with its freedoms; Hungary was supposed to compete internationally in making a profit and commercializing its higher education. Finally, in 2011 all this changed; internationalization or universal academic freedom and neoliberal global virtues were no longer values or goals for Hungarian national higher education. Internationalization was now subordinated to national interests and in practical terms to the foreign political preferences of the government negotiating (bilateral) agreements. Internationalization is sometimes conflated with national interests, at other times, particularly in the Hungarian case, with European identities (see also Chapter 10).

Hungary is at the forefront of a global nationalistic trend, in which higher education management is centralized in political hands. The fourth Orbán government has just finished taking over research institutions from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. It has also

established its own ‘alternative’ research centres in so-called national studies (see Kamusella 2019). On the global scene, Hungary is moving from multilateral relationships to bilateral agreements both with other countries and with global corporations. Even though the EU remains a major multilateral alliance for Hungary, both economically and in higher education, Hungary is entering into bilateral cooperation with China, Russia, Turkey and other partners in the ‘illiberal’ world. There are no signs of change in the overwhelming popularity of the Orbán regime; the left-wing and liberal opposition was decimated by the economic crisis in 2008 and has not yet resurged.

Whether Finland will follow Hungary’s path, or whether the neoliberal trend will prove stronger than the emerging nationalist one, remains to be seen. Finland has already witnessed a new nationalist turn with higher education strategies turning inwards, and higher education policies being conducted with the national interest in mind. The dynamic in the relationship of international and national higher education is likely to tilt towards the national, and the spaces of internationalization may become more narrowly nation-centric.

Viktória Ferenc is a researcher at the Research Institute for Hungarian Communities Abroad (Budapest), who focuses on Hungarian language use and education beyond the border of Hungary. Her work has been published in several edited collections and international journals such as *Nationalities Papers*. Recently, she contributed to the project Linguistic Minorities in Europe Online as an author of the resource published by de Gruyter. ORCID 0000-0002-5849-204X.

Petteri Laihonen is an Academy of Finland Research Fellow (2016–2021) at the Centre for Applied Language Studies of the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. His research deals with educational language policy in multilingual contexts. It develops sociolinguistic theory,

extends into Eastern Europe and has societal impact on the life of the investigated communities. His publications include articles in the *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *Visual Communication* and *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. ORCID 0000-0002-3914-0954.

Taina Saarinen is Research Professor of Higher Education at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. She has published widely on internationalization and language policies in higher education, as well as on contemporary and historical language policies, recently in journals such as *Higher Education* and *Rethinking History and Language Policy*. Her monograph *Higher Education, Language and New Nationalism in Finland: Recycled Histories* was published by Palgrave in 2020. ORCID 0000-0002-5117-2756.

<HDA>References

<HDB>Primary Sources

Finland:

Universities Act 1997, 645/1997. Yliopistolaki 1997, available at

<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1997/19970645>.

Universities Act 2009, 558/2009. Yliopistolaki 2009, available at

<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2009/20090558>.

Government Proposal on Universities Act 1996, HE 263/1996. Hallituksen esitys

yliopistolaiksi, available at

<https://www.eduskunta.fi/FI/vaski/sivut/trip.aspx?triptype=Valtiopaivasiat&docid=he+263/1996>.

Government Proposal on Universities Act 2009, HE 7/2009. Hallituksen esitys

yliopistolaiksi, available at <https://www.finlex.fi/fi/esitykset/he/2009/20090007>.

Hungary:

1993. évi LXXX. törvény a felsőoktatásról / Act LXXX of 1993 on Higher Education,

available at <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99300080.TV>

2005. évi CXXXIX. törvény a felsőoktatásról / Act CXXXIX of 2005 on Higher Education,

available at <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0500139.TV>

2011. évi CCIV. törvény a nemzeti felsőoktatásról / Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher

Education, available at <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A1100204.TV>

<HDB>*Secondary Sources*

Adriansen, H.K. and I. Adriansen. 2018. ‘A Political Geography of University Foundation:

The Case of the Danish Monarchy’, in P. Meusbürger, L. Suarsana and M. Heffernan (eds), *Geographies of the University*. New York: Springer, pp. 193–217.

Becher, T. and P. Trowler. 2001. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Clark, B. 1983. *The Higher Education System*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Corbett, A. 2005. *Universities and the Europe of Knowledge: Ideas, Institutions and Policy Entrepreneurship in European Union Higher Education Policy, 1955–2005*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dhondt, P. 2008. ‘Difficult Balance Between Rhetoric and Practice: Student Mobility in

Finland and Other European Countries from 1800 to 1930’, in M. Byram and F.

Dervin (eds), *Students, Staff and Academic Mobility in Higher Education*. Cambridge:

Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 48–64.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London:

Routledge.

- Gal, S. 2011. 'Polyglot Nationalism: Alternative Perspectives on Language in 19th Century Hungary', *Langage & société* 136: 31–53.
- Held, D. and A. McGrew. 2007. *Globalization/Anti-globalization: Beyond the Great Divide*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hult, F. and S. Pietikäinen 2014. 'Shaping Discourses of Multilingualism through a Language Ideological Debate', *Journal of Language and Politics* 13 (1): 1–20.
- Ihalainen, P. 2017. *The Springs of Democracy: National and Transnational Debates on Constitutional Reform in the British, German, Swedish and Finnish Parliaments*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Ihalainen, P. and T. Saarinen. 2019. 'Integrating a Nexus: The History of Political Discourse and Language Policy Research', *Rethinking History* 23(4): 500–19, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2019.1638587>.
- Häkli, J. 2013. 'State Space – Outlining a Field Theoretical Approach', *Geopolitics* 18(2): 343–355.
- Jalava, M. 2012. *The University in the Making of the Welfare State: The 1970s Degree Reform in Finland*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kamusella, T. 2019. 'The Fallacy of National Studies', in J. Fellerer, R. Pyrah and M. Turda (eds), *Identities In-Between in East-Central Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Kiander, J. 2001. *1990-luvun talouskriisi. Suomen akatemian tutkimusohjelma: Laman opetukset. Suomen 1990-luvun kriisin syyt ja seuraukset*. Helsinki: Valtion taloudellinen tutkimuskeskus.
- Kozma, T. 1990. 'Higher Education in Hungary: Facing the Political Transition', *European Journal of Education* 25(4): 379–90.

- Nokkala, T. 2007. *Constructing the Ideal University – the Internationalisation of Higher Education in the Competitive Knowledge Society*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Ogden, C. K., and I. A. Richards 1989. *The Meaning of Meaning*. (Published originally 1923). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mayring, P. 2000. 'Qualitative Content Analysis', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1(2): Art. 20.
- Papp Z., A. 2011. 'The Education Issue', in N. Bárdi, C. Fedinec and L. Szarka (eds), *Minority Hungarian Communities in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 480–92.
- Parson, L. and A. Steele. 2019. 'Institutional Autonomy and Academic Freedom in Hungary: A Historiography of Hungarian Higher Education', *College and University Journal* 94(4): 10–24.
- Piller, I. and J. Cho. 2013. 'Neoliberalism as Language Policy', *Language in Society* 42(1): 23–44. doi:10.1017/S0047404512000887.
- Polónyi, I. 2015. 'A hazai felsőoktatás-politika átalakulásai' ['Transformations of National Higher Education Policy'], *Iskolakultúra* 25(5–6): 3–14,
<https://doi.org/10.17543/ISKKULT.2015.5-6.3>.
- Rantala, K. 2016. 'Argumentaatio hallituksen esityksissä: keskeiset ehdotukset ja vaikutusten arviointi', *Oikeus* 45 (2): 159–183.
- Rhoades, G. and S. Slaughter. 2006. 'Mode 3, Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Making Higher Education Work for Whom?', in P. Tynjälä, J. Välimaa and G. Boulton-Levis (eds), *Higher Education and Working Life – Collaborations, Confrontations and Challenges*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 9–33.

- Saarinen, T. 2012. 'Internationalization and the Invisible Language? Historical Phases and Current Policies in Finnish Higher Education', in S. Ahola and D. Hoffman (eds), *Higher Education Research in Finland: Emerging Structures and Contemporary Issues*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, pp. 235–48.
- Saarinen, T. and P. Ihalainen. 2018. 'Multi-sited and Historically Layered Language Policy Construction: Parliamentary Debate on the Finnish Constitutional Bilingualism in 1919', *Language Policy* 17(4): 545–565.
- _____. 2020. *Recycled Histories: Higher Education, Language and New Nationalism in Finland*. London: Palgrave.
- Scott, P. 2011. 'The University as a Global Institution', in R. King, S. Marginson and R. Naidoo (eds), *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 59–75.
- Simola, H. et al. 2017. *Dynamics in Education Politics: Understanding and Explaining the Finnish Case*. London: Routledge.
- Stråth, B. 2016. *Europe's Utopias of Peace: 1815, 1919, 1951*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Tarrósy, I. (ed.). 2002. *Higher Education in Hungary: Heading for the Third Millennium*. Budapest: Ministry of Education.
- Vares, V. 2020. *Turun yliopiston historia. Kansallinen tehtävä 1920-1974*. Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- Välimaa, J. 2019. *A History of Finnish Higher Education from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Weimer, L. and A. Barlete. 2020. 'The Rise of Nationalism: The Influence of Populist Discourses on International Student Mobility and Migration in the UK and US', in L. Weimer and T. Nokkala (eds), *Universities as Political Institutions: Higher Education*

Institutions in the Middle of Academic, Economic and Social Pressures. Leiden: Brill, pp. 33–57.

Wimmer, A. and N. Glick Schiller. 2002. 'Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation–state Building, Migration and the Social Sciences', *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–334