

Internationalization at Norwegian Universities and Colleges after the Quality Reform

MARIT TJOMSLAND

STEIN ROKKAN CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

UNIFOB AS

APRIL 2004

Working Paper 6 - 2004

Contents

FOREWORD	3
ABSTRACT	4
SAMMENDRAG	5
INTRODUCTION	7
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION	8
«Old» and «new» internationalization	10
THE NORWEGIAN SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEFORE THE QUALITY REFORM....	10
Internationalization before the Quality Reform	12
SOME POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONALIZATION FOLLOWING THE QUALITY REFORM	13
CONCLUSION	16
Literature	18

Foreword

This publication comes out of the *Strategic Program for Research on Globalization and Internationalization: welfare, work, legitimacy and globalization*, at the Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies at Bergen University Research Foundation. This program is designed as a University of Bergen research network, and its primary area of activity is the study of changes in *welfare and labor market institutions* as they are played out in the debate on globalization and internationalization

(see <http://129.177.180.14/globalisering/programnotat.pdf>).

Issues of distribution, regulation and fairness are central to the program, which incorporates research in sociology, political science, economics, history and philosophy. One basic premise for program research is that focusing on welfare and labor market institutions can provide important insights into other areas of society and that it can also shed light on other globalization issues, such as the status of the nation state and conditions for democratic governance.

Marit Tjomsland has a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Bergen. She was affiliated to the Globalization program during the autumn 2001, then spent two years at Bergen University College working with issues related to internationalisation of higher education. She is since January 2004 working at the Centre for Development Studies, University of Bergen.

Abstract

The Quality Reform of Norwegian higher education has been fully implemented since January 2004. One of the major features of the reform is the radical aims it sets for internationalization at institutions of higher education. These politically defined aims imply a significant national standardization of internationalization, a field formerly characterized by a relative absence of central regulation and large variation in extent and kind of activities. This article focuses on possible developments in the area of internationalization at Norwegian universities and colleges during the first years after the implementation of the Quality Reform. Main issues are the nature and extent of the convergence that may be expected to take place.

Sammendrag

Kvalitetsreformen av norsk høyere utdanning har vært fullt implementert siden januar 2004. En av reformens mest karakteristiske trekk er de radikale målene den setter for internasjonalisering ved høyere utdanningsinstitusjoner. Disse politisk definerte målene innebærer en vesentlig nasjonal standardisering av internasjonalisering, et felt som tidligere har vært preget av et relativt fravær av sentralregulering, og av stor variasjon i aktivitet. Denne artikkelen fokuserer på mulige utviklingsbaner for internasjonalisering ved norske universitet og høyskoler i løpet av de første årene etter implementeringen av Kvalitetsreformen. Hovedtema er naturen og omfanget til den konvergens som antas å finne sted.

Introduction

Introduced in 2001 and gradually implemented from early 2002 until the end of 2003, the *Quality Reform* of Norwegian higher education takes place at a point of time when processes of globalization and internationalization of higher education are objects of considerable political as well as social scientific attention worldwide.

The Quality Reform to a large extent reflects the current emphasis on international dimensions of higher education. The introduction of BA and MA degrees at universities and colleges can only be understood in terms of a major adaptation to international standards of education. The reform's increased emphasis on the economic sustainability of institutions of higher education in general and their ability to attract funds from other sources than the state in particular indicates adaptation to current international management trends (Välilmaa 1999). Moreover, the definition of in a European context rather radical aims for internationalization¹ (50% of students should conduct part of their studies abroad, all students have the right to be offered suitable programs for partial studies abroad by their university or college, etc.) expresses a strong desire to integrate Norwegian higher education – and new generations of Norwegians – in the international community of knowledge. (St.meld.nr. 27/2000–2001).

Norwegian policy in the area of internationalization has during the last decades focused primarily on interaction within the European context (Trondal et.al. 2001), and it is reasonable to say that the development within the European Community for some time has constituted the most significant external factor of influence on Norwegian policy of higher education. Norway's 1999 endorsement of the *Bologna Declaration* of a common European space of higher education is only one of several recent confirmations of this situation.² The Quality Reform maintains and further develops this European focus, and may usefully be perceived in terms of a political tool for further integration in the European Community in general, and a means to expose Norwegian students, teachers and researchers to Europe in particular.

Hence, the reform is characterized by a strong international focus. At the same time, however, the Quality Reform is a national reform of a system of higher education, which means that it in a profound sense is inwards-directed, and has the national arena of higher education both as primary frame of reference and object of reform. The various partial reforms it contains are inspired by international tendencies within higher education, but they are designed with an intention to suit the Norwegian reality of higher education, and will interact and melt with this reality as they are implemented.

¹ The outstanding nature of the Norwegian Quality Reform project of internationalisation as compared to other European countries was a topic in several presentations at the European Association for International Education (EAIE) annual conference in Porto, Portugal in September 2002.

² This political focus on Europe is, however, not necessarily reflected in the internationalization-activities at the institutions of higher education. Student mobility within a Socrates (EU exchange-programme) has, for instance, decreased the later years (Source: SIU).

The Quality Reform is, then, a national political reform created as a means to realize a vision that implies the replacement of major national characteristics of the Norwegian system of higher education with international standards and regulations. A narrow national focus may not provide any evident explanation of this voluntary erasing of national character and acceptance of foreign ways – the key to what is going on is to be found in the dynamic between the national setting and the international scene on which it is set. Hence, the development in the area of internationalization at Norwegian universities and colleges following the Quality Reform may usefully be approached as national concretizations of current international trends and dynamics within higher education. Such an approach requires knowledge of theoretical perspectives on international developments within higher education, however. Some such perspectives will therefore be briefly presented below.

Theoretical perspectives on globalization and internationalization of higher education

A basic thesis within theory of globalization is that globalization further economic forces at the expense of political ones (Meyer 2002; Readings 1996). Against this backdrop, some argue that institutions of higher education expand their activities beyond national borders primarily as a result of economic interest. This, it is argued, may happen because the national political authority is weakened as result of globalization (Wagner 2002). Others emphasize that globalization – of higher education and in general – has been possible because national political authorities consciously have facilitated the processes, and in that sense have complicity in the reduction of their own influence (Readings 1996). A main current tendency is in any case that higher education increasingly is on offer – and in demand – across national borders.

A major international market of higher education is in other words under development, preparing the ground for student mobility of unprecedented proportions. Processes of standardization concerning degree-systems, duration of studies etc. constitute a central part of this development. Some argue that these processes indicate a more profound movement in the direction of increasing *convergence* in models of higher education worldwide (Meyer 2002). Others modify or even reject the idea of convergence, and emphasize the fact that all systems of higher education exist in a specific historical, cultural etc. context, and that the features of the various national systems must be understood in relation to their respective contexts in order to grasp their real nature. Christine Musselin is a representative of this perspective. She argues³ that systems of higher education best can be understood if approached as *national configurations*. These configurations are constituted by specific combinations and inter-

³ With reference to her comparative studies of the French, German and American university systems, conducted within the theoretical framework of *sociology of organized action* (Musselin 2000).

actions of different *logics*: *institutional logics* (those of the universities), *academic logics* (those of the disciplines), and *public logics* (those of the state agencies) (Musselin 2000: 296).

Musselin considers that a system of higher education is a product of the interests of the institutions that belongs to it, the interests of the academics employed by the institutions, and the interests of the national political and administrative authorities the system is subjected to. She thus argues that national politics continue to play a major role in the constitution of systems of higher education in the era of globalization. The Quality Reform, a main political motivation behind which is greater integration and participation in the international community, clearly supports this argument.

Following a somewhat different approach to the topic, Peter Wagner (2002) also emphasizes that global free market models work badly to explain the product of higher education. Because of geographical, cultural, economic, status-related etc. preconditions of production, the market of higher education is in fact fundamentally segmented, and free global competition will not take place. Even within the same geographical area, central forces of segmentation will be at work – the force of status and reputation is one of these. Newcomers among the institutions of higher education will tend to figure at the bottom of the status-hierarchy, defending their right to exist by offering low-status professional educations and practical refresher courses at minimum rates. The newcomers may, however, improve their position in the hierarchy with time, as result of *academic drift* – aspiring institutions' upwards mobility (Wagner 2002).

The Norwegian system of higher education appears to constitute valid support for Wagner's description. Created in their current form as a result of the groundbreaking *College Reform* in 1994, Norwegian colleges may be regarded as institutional newcomers on the national arena of higher education. Constituted by a variety of formerly independent professional training schools and colleges, and major actors in the market of refresher-courses – many of which are based on distant learning – the colleges in most ways range lower than the universities in the status-hierarchy. After less than ten years of experience with the new college system in Norway some of the colleges have already expressed significantly stronger academic aspirations than others.⁴ There is little doubt that the Quality Reform introduction of the same academic degree-system (BA/MA) at colleges and universities will give aspiring colleges a major – and no doubt intended – push in upward direction, which illustrates the continued significance of what Musselin terms «public logics» for current developments within higher education in Norway. It also indicates that the Quality Reform continues and strengthens the process of *hierarchization* of the Norwegian system of higher education for which the College Reform was a major catalyst (Bleiklie 2002: 160).

Whether this means that the argument that globalization of higher education preconditions the marginalization of national political authorities is wrong, or whether it means that Norway has not yet entered the *globalized* world of higher education but lingers in the realm of *internationalization* and hence yet has to change its point of

⁴ The institutions on which the new state colleges are constructed had very different academic histories. In particular the former *district colleges* had strong academic identities and aspirations, which have tended to be transferred to the colleges they currently are parts of. Hence, the most aspiring colleges have to a large extent inherited their aspirations.

reference from that of the national state to that of the globe (Halvorsen 2002b: 212), is a question that will not be further dealt with here. In this context, it is more pertinent to relate to the concept of internationalization on a more practical level.

«Old» and «new» internationalization

Contact and interaction across borders is a rather fundamental aspect of academic activity. In that sense, internationalization at institutions of higher education is no new phenomenon. However, there is a profound difference between the way in which internationalization has used to be understood, and the new understanding of the concept that appears to be an implicit consequence of the current processes within higher education.

«Old» internationalization may be understood as *«international contact* between individual researchers, students, universities and states. Processes of internationalization in this sense represent mobility initiated by the individual researcher, the individual institution, and the individual student» (Trondal et.al. 2001: 8).⁵ It follows from the definition that internationalization in this sense is a *voluntary* activity, and that it as such has status as an «extra» rather than a regular part of studies, teaching, or research. Such internationalization is consequently characterized by a general focus on *difference* – it is an activity one chooses to engage in predominantly because it offers new experiences and different insights than what is otherwise available.

«New» internationalization differs from the «old» one in one crucial respect: As already discussed, higher education is increasingly and in a new and more profound way perceived in market terms, as an industry exposed to free international competition. In order to be able to compete on the best terms possible, it is necessary to offer products that have as wide validity and applicability as possible. As a consequence, the focus of the new internationalization is on *standardization*: The aim is no longer different knowledge and new experiences, it is similar knowledge of higher quality and/or at a lower cost (Trondal et.al. 2001: 9). «New» internationalization consequently also has a more formal, institutional and collective character.

The introduction of the Quality Reform implies a political intention to induce a major shift from «old» to «new» internationalization at Norwegian universities and colleges. For several reasons that will be discussed below, this makes internationalization a particularly interesting case when it comes to studying consequences of the reform.

The Norwegian system of higher education before the Quality Reform

The Norwegian university- and college sectors differ from each other in several central respects: The university-institutions are generally older, and they focus their activity pre-

⁵ My translation.

dominantly around the teaching of theoretical disciplines and research, while the main task of the college sector is to supply a broad specter of practical professions with qualified personnel. Furthermore, there are almost ten times as many colleges as there are universities,⁶ and a significant part of them are situated outside the larger town-centers, where the universities are located. Hence, both history, location, and areas of responsibility indicate that the universities have higher status than the colleges in the hierarchy of higher education.

The current situation – thus characterized by significant differences – is nevertheless the result of a long process of convergence between the university sector and the college sector (Kyvik 2002: 7; Bleiklie 1996: 9). The convergence is the result of several factors. First, both sectors have been exposed to significant growth and disciplinary – or professional – differentiation since the Second World War. The expansion has changed their nature: the university sector has lost some of its former elite status, and many of the older professional trainings have lost some of their original particularities. Hence, the post-war process of «massification» has in itself contributed significantly to narrowing the gap between the two sectors (Bleiklie 2002).

These processes of expansion and disciplinary or professional diversification have, of course, been politically sanctioned, and correspond with the general national political aim of the last decades, which has been a system level *standardization* of higher education in Norway. The universities have experienced their share of changes and reforms, but the main efforts have been directed towards the college-sector, more particularly towards a relative standardization of the form and content of the growing number of professional trainings. This process has at the same time moved the college sector standard as a whole closer to the university standard. The standardization has thus implied a transfer from an *organic* model of higher education, characterized by a functional division of labor between the different institutional sectors, towards a *hierarchical* model of higher education, characterized by the rating of all institutions of higher education according to the same criteria. As the criteria applied are those formerly reserved for the university sector – academic performance, quality of research, etc. – this hierarchization of the system of higher education at the same time implies an *academization* of the college sector (Bleiklie 2002). The 1994 College Reform was a milestone in these parallel processes of convergence/standardization/hierarchization/academization, as it merged earlier independent professional trainings into large colleges and subjected them to a common structure and common regulations similar to those of

⁶ There are three different kinds of colleges in Norway: Private institutions, scientific colleges, and state colleges. The private institutions are not subjected to the Quality Reform in the same way as the others, and will therefore not be considered in this study. The scientific colleges (8) figure at a similar level as the universities in the hierarchy of higher education, but have their own distinct characteristics, and thus represent a third category of institutions. Their student population is much smaller than that of the universities and state colleges respectively (6.400 against 71.000 and about 100.000 in 1993). They are not included in this study. Hence, «college» will here refer to the *state colleges* (26) that predominantly focus on vocational/professional trainings, some of which were not considered as higher educations prior to the 1994 *College Reform* (Source: Bleiklie et.al. 2000: 309–314). Despite significant historical differences between institutions that were merged into state colleges by this reform, «the college sector» will for the sake of simplicity be used to connote the institutions now part of this sector, also when references to the period prior to 1994 are made.

the universities, thus in principle closing the gap between the two sectors (Halvorsen 2002a :179).

The Quality Reform must be understood in this perspective: as the last in a sequence of political initiatives – among which the 1988 *Hernes Commission* and the 1994 College Reform were central – aiming to enhance integration and standardization of Norwegian higher education (Bleiklie et.al. 2000). Hence, any tendencies towards convergence following the reform would be continuations of a long process, and are as such highly probable. The question is therefore not so much *if* convergence will take place as it is *what forms* it will take. For several reasons, the area of internationalization constitutes a particularly suitable case for answering that question:

Internationalization before the Quality Reform

The international activities of institutions of higher education have so far lead an existence relatively detached from the last decades' national trends of standardization. Until the Quality Reform, there have been few national directives regulating this activity,⁷ and in many cases also few internationalization-strategies locally at the institutions. Activity has typically come about as result of initiatives from particularly motivated members of staff, and also focus and content of the activities have often been left to individual actors to define. In other words, Norwegian internationalization has so far been rather heavily characterized by the qualities of «old» internationalization.⁸

As a consequence of this relative lack of central regulation of internationalization, the different institutions of higher education have to a large degree been free to define their activities according to own perceptions of what correspond with their general objectives and purposes. This has resulted in a situation strongly characterized by *variation* between institutions. Some very general tendencies may nevertheless be identified: The universities have tended to be in the forefront concerning the extent of activity. However, the variation within the sectors has been large, and the difference between the most active colleges and the least active universities has been relatively small. Moreover, the colleges with the largest activity have – very generally – tended to be those with the greatest academic aspirations (Halvorsen 2002b).

Concerning *kinds* of activity, the universities have tended to engage in projects of theoretical nature and longer duration, while the colleges have based more of their

⁷ Internationalization – as international standardization of degree-systems and as area of activity – have been brought up and recommended by the political system several times the last twenty years – among other places in the Hernes Commission report (NOU 1988:28) and in the white paper *Fra visjon til virke* (St.meld. nr. 40 (1990–91) (Olsen 1999:10). However, no standards were introduced in connection with these reports or by the College Reform that followed in 1994 (Kyvik 1999: 199–201).

⁸ Parallel to the post-war voluntary and relatively modest internationalization activities at the institutions of higher education, there have been a significant number of Norwegians studying for their degrees abroad. This activity has, however, predominantly been managed on an individual student basis, and is therefore not part of the picture of internationalization at Norwegian institutions of higher education (Rikstad 2001).

exchange on practice-related placements of shorter duration.⁹ Concerning college staff-exchange, more has been centered round teaching, less around research.¹⁰

These tendencies, however vague, suggest that internationalization has been an indicator of academic aspirations and status also prior to the Quality Reform. However, it has not been a particularly strong or clear indicator, since such activities have not been objects of much political attention, and therefore have not been particularly efficient channels of expression. The Quality Reform changes this situation in a profound way, as it transforms the political wishes and recommendations earlier expressed by The Hernes Commission, The Mjøos Commission, The Aamot Commission and others into clear national aims and standards. The reform's definition of internationalization as a central quality-promoting agent within higher education and its statement that Norway is to be in the global forefront of internationalization (St.meld. nr. 27/2000–2001: 16 and 41) constitute strong evidence of the seriousness with which internationalization currently is treated by Norwegian political authorities.

This new strong political interest in internationalization, *in combination with* the pre-Quality Reform relative lack of interest, makes internationalization a particularly interesting case when it comes to studying convergence following the Quality Reform, as it gives reason to expect significant change in the institutions' internationalization-related activities. The exact nature of the changes is hard to predict, due to the high number of variables that may influence the course of change. However, it is possible to suggest some possible developments.

Some possible developments in the area of internationalization following the Quality Reform

The political aims for internationalization of higher education presented by the Quality Reform are so radical that there are no examples of similar national projects to lean on when it comes to predicting the reform's chances of success. One must, however, assume that the factors that will tend to influence the success of political reforms generally will be at work also in this case. Central such factors are the amount of resources that are made available for the realization of the project, the effectiveness of the incentives that are introduced to make involved actors cooperative, the degree to which the reform conflicts with the self-defined interests of involved actors, etc. As Musselin's conception of systems of higher education as national configurations illustrates, the constellations and interests of actors in this field are likely to be complex and conflicting. This makes it difficult to predict how the consequences of the reform will evolve during the first few years after its implementation. Some possible develop-

⁹ This practice is more widespread within certain vocational trainings, particularly teaching and nursing.

¹⁰ Source on main tendencies within internationalization: SIU.

ments may nevertheless be suggested. Before that can be done, it is, however, necessary to give internationalization an operational definition.

Internationalization as *activity* may be operationalized as student and staff mobility to and from institutions abroad, number and kinds of formal agreements of cooperation and exchange with institutions abroad, formalized international cooperation on research- and development projects, and use of English – as teaching language, in syllabus, and in scientific production. It follows from this definition – and is in any case fairly obvious – that internationalization *in practice* is planned and executed locally at the different institutions of higher education. Until the Quality Reform, decisions concerning internationalization have often been made on department or faculty levels, and the activities have in many cases been developed as tailor-made accessories to specific pedagogical or research-related projects. The new standards introduced by the reform may change this local, exclusive nature of internationalization to some extent. However, the fact will remain that it is the individual students, researchers and teachers who do or do not choose to *do* internationalization, and who choose how they want to do it. The decline in recent years in student mobility within the Erasmus-program – a decline that has taken place in parallel with national political efforts to *expand* exactly this kind of mobility – is a good illustration of the fact that the distance between national political intentions and local practical preferences often may be significant in this field. Nevertheless, the relatively massive focus of the Quality Reform on internationalization is likely to produce some kind of changes in the practices locally at the institutions of higher education. Which?

The intention of the reform clearly is to set a national standard for internationalization. Hence, it is as mentioned earlier reasonable to expect some degree of national level development in the direction of *convergence* in internationalization practices. Convergence may be operationalized as movement towards a more similar status on the above mentioned operational indicators of internationalization, and as movement towards more similar intentions with and argumentation for internationalization at the institutions. The standards for internationalization defined by the Quality Reform reflect, in central respects, the internationalization-activities that so far have been favored primarily by the universities: theoretical projects of longer duration. Hence, when it comes to the extent and nature of the convergence likely to result from the Quality Reform, the universities may be expected to increase their level of activity, while the colleges – particularly the academically aspiring ones – may be expected to both increase the activity, and to change its nature.

It is reasonable to expect that colleges with a more professional profile will be likely to make fewer changes in their practices, as they may have other foci for their aspirations, such as further development of cooperation with local industry- and service-sectors. The incentives built into the Quality Reform may nevertheless persuade such institutions to internationalize their activity and to «akademize» their internationalization *despite* what they perceive as the internally defined best interests of the institution, because they may consider that they cannot afford to lose the economic rewards and/or the goodwill implied in indulging the political authorities.

Hence, the processes of change are likely to be more extensive and complex in the college sector than in the university sector. This situation will probably be reflected also

in the internal processes of negotiation and decision-making producing the change at the different institutions. There is reason to expect significant conflict of interest between the academic and institutional logics within the individual institutions. While the institution may be expected to have a more instrumental relationship to internationalization and be more inclined to adapt to the standards of the Quality Reform primarily due to the incentives involved, the academics are likely to give more importance to pedagogical, academic or professional arguments when negotiating strategies of internationalization. Moreover, both these logics are likely to attempt to use the increased status of internationalization – externally imposed by the public logic – to further other, self-defined projects and interests locally at the institutions.

Furthermore, the differences of interest of the institutional and academic spheres may result in *segregation* in the area of internationalization at the institutions. As earlier stated, most of the activity at Norwegian institutions has so far been characterized by «old» internationalization, typically initiated and managed by individual members of academic staff. The Quality Reform standards favor activity characterized by the principles of «new» internationalization. Academic staff involved in «old» internationalization may be expected to continue with that rather than engaging in «new» activities, while activities initiated by the institution are likely to be of more «new» character. Academic staff previously not engaged in internationalization will, moreover, probably become involved in such activities as result of the general upgrading of internationalization by the institution. Such «newcomers» will most likely become engaged predominantly in «new» activities.

Different, more or less un-coordinated segments of internationalization activities are thus likely outcomes of conflicting interests within institutions, given the new coordinates set by the reform. The only way to avoid this will probably be through thorough planning by the joint forces of the spheres of interest present at the institutions, by careful supervision of the realization of the plans, and by proper administrative as well as moral support of the actors realizing it. Such follow-up requires considerable resources. This means that the cost of a co-ordinated institution-level internationalization-program is likely to be much higher than the cost of old-style, de-centralized «laissez-faire» internationalization. On the other hand, a properly run internationalization-program already implies significant benefits in terms of competitive advantage both concerning the recruitment of students and staff, and these benefits are likely to increase in the future. In addition, student mobility is already awarded with a certain sum per mobile student, and a similar award for staff-mobility is under discussion. Hence, there may also be an income-generating aspect to internationalization – when conducted according to the rules defined by the reform.

Nevertheless, the institutional costs of Quality Reform-style internationalization are likely to be so significant¹¹ that in the end, the question of which institutions will succeed in fulfilling the aims of the reform will boil down to which institutions are able and willing to pay the prize. It is likely that such motivation will exist primarily at

¹¹ As an illustration: Oslo University College has estimated that the administrative cost of student mobility was one full time position per 20 students in/20 students out. The pedagogical cost per foreign student at the institution was estimated to NOK 25 000 per semester (Foss 2000: 19).

institutions that have an interest in internationalization beyond pleasing the authorities. Several reasons for such interest may exist. Some institutions may be interested due to its geographically peripheral position within the Norwegian environment of higher education, which may make it rational for the institution to seek cooperation in neighboring countries or abroad generally. Finnmark University College is an example of such institutions. As one of the most active institutions in the area of internationalization prior to the Quality Reform, it is clear that this particular college is aware of the potential in co-operation across borders.

Other institutions may be expected to pay the prize of internationalization due to self-defined academic aspirations. Stavanger University College is a representative of this category. It is among the colleges with clearest academic aspirations, in the sense that it seeks university status. Until the Quality Reform, it has had a rather low level of internationalization activity, according to the earlier presented operational definition. SUC has thus so far deviated from the general tendency that academically aspiring colleges approach the extent of internationalization-activity of the universities, but has ample reason to change this situation following the authorities' new focus following the reform.

While some institutions may be willing to pay the prize due to aspirations, others may be willing to do the same in order to protect already achieved status. The University of Oslo is an example of institutions that have a clear self-interest in meeting the internationalization-aims of the Quality Reform for this reason. UiO is the largest and oldest university in Norway, situated in the capital. Despite these indicators of high status in the hierarchy of higher education, it has prior to the reform had a relatively low activity-level in the area of internationalization. Given the new standards introduced by the reform, UiO is likely to have to improve this situation rather significantly if it is to maintain its position as Norway's most prominent institution of higher education.

All the institutions here used as examples have one thing in common beyond their likely future investments in internationalization: If they take internationalization seriously it will be because it represents such a favorable *means* to achieve other, more important, self-defined aims. Very possibly, it is through such status as vehicle internationalization is going to achieve best conditions of existence – it is likely to be too expensive to be pursued for its own sake.

Conclusion

Norway's extent of activity in the area of internationalization was at the introduction of the Quality Reform fairly average compared to other European countries.¹² The rather massive investments in internationalization currently made by Norwegian political authorities will probably improve Norway's rating among other European countries.

¹² According to statistics on Erasmus student mobility 1999/2000 at <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/erasmus/statisti/stat1.pdf>

The considerable dis-incentives representing themselves to many Norwegian institutions of higher education – high costs, large workload related to planning and execution, lack of correspondence between such activities and experienced core-activities, to mention some – do, however, suggest that the improvement will be rather insufficient to reach the reform's declared aim to put Norway in the global forefront of internationalization. The project of internationalizing a system of education through a national political decision gives, perhaps, the Norwegian Quality Reform a hint of anachronism.

Literature

- Bleiklie, I. (ed.) (1996) *Kunnskap og makt. Norske høyere utdanning i endring*. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.
- Bleiklie, I. (2002) «Hierarki og spesialisering i bevegelse. Om forholdet mellom universiteter og statlige høyskoler». In Michelsen, S. and Halvorsen, T. (eds): *Faglige forbindelser. Profesjonsutdanning og kunnskapspolitikke etter høyskolereformen*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Bleiklie, I., Høstaker, R. and Vabø, A. (2000) *Policy and Practice in Higher Education. Reforming Norwegian Universities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Foss, D. (2000) *Internasjonalisering: Planlegging av tilbud for utenlandske studenter. En teoretisk studie av internasjonal litteratur*. Oslo: HIO-notat 2000, nr. 21.
- Halvorsen, T. (2002a) «Kunnskapsmiljø og høyskolereform». In Michelsen, S. and Halvorsen, T. (eds): *Faglige forbindelser. Profesjonsutdanning og kunnskapspolitikke etter høyskolereforme*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Halvorsen, T. (2002b) «Høgre utdanning og globalisering. Nye nettverk og nye styringsvilkår». In Michelsen, S. and Halvorsen, T. (eds): *Faglige forbindelser. Profesjonsutdanning og kunnskapspolitikke etter høyskolereformen*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Kyvik, S. (ed.) (1999) *Evaluering av høyskolereformen. Sluttrapport*. Oslo: Norges forskningsråd.
- Kyvik, S. (ed.) (2002) *Fra yrkesskole til universitet? Endringsprosesser i høyskolesektoren*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Meyer, J.W. (2002) «Globalization and the Expansion and Standardization of Management». In Sahlin-andersson, K. and Engwall, L. (eds): *The Expansion of Management Knowledge. Carriers, Flows and Sources*. Stanford University Press.
- Musselin, C. (2000) «Do we compare societies when we compare national university systems?». In Maurice, M. and Sorge, A. (eds): *Embedding Organizations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- NOU 1998:28: *Med viten og vilje*.
- Olsen, H. (1999) *Internasjonalisering ved de norske høyere utdanningsinstitusjonene*. Oslo: NIFU Rapport 1/99.
- Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Rikstad, T. (2002) *Knowledge Production between Globalisation and Local Identity*. Bergen: SIU report for The Norwegian Government Commission on higher Education after 2000, 2001 web-edition. <http://www.siu.no/vev.nsf/o/SIUs+publications-Report+presented+to+the+Norwegian+Government+Commision+on+Higher+Education+After+2000>
- St.meld. nr. 40 (1990–1991) *Fra visjon til virke*.
- St.meld. nr. 27 (2000–2001) *Gjør din plikt – Krev din rett. Kvalitetsreform av høyere utdanning*.
- Trondal, J., Stensaker, B., Gornitzka, Å. and Maassen, P. (2001) *Internasjonalisering av høyere utdanning. Trender og utfordringer*. OSLO: NIFU skriftserie 28/2001.
- Välimaa, J. (1999) «Managing a Diverse System of Higher Education». In Henkel, M. and Little, B. (eds): *Changing Relationships between Higher Education and the State*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Wagner, P. (2002) «Higher Education in the Era of Globalization: What is at Stake?». In Manicas, P. and Odin, J. (eds): *Higher Education and Globalization*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, in preparation.

PUBLICATIONS FROM THE GLOBALIZATION PROGRAM, ROKKANSENTERET

The publications can be ordered from Rokkansenteret, tel +47 55 58 97 10,

e-mail: post@rokkauib.no, <http://www.rokkansenteret.uib.no>

WORKING PAPERS**2004**

- 6-2004 *Marit Tjomsland*: «Internationalization at Norwegian Universities and Colleges after the Quality Reform». April 2004.

2003

- 4-2003 *Kjell Erik Lommerud, Frode Meland and Lars Sørgard*: «Unionised Oligopoly, Trade Liberalisation and Location Choice». March 2003.
- 8-2003 *Rune Ervik*: «Global Normative Standards and National Solutions for Pension Provision: The World Bank, ILO, Norway and South Africa in Comparative Perspective». April 2003.
- 11-2003 *Nina Berven*: «Cross National Comparison and National Contexts: Is what we Compare Comparable». July 2003.
- 15-2003 *Ilcheong Yi*: «The National Patterns of Unemployment Policies in Two Asian Countries: Malaysia and South Korea». September 2003.
- 25-2003 *Kjell Erik Lommerud, Odd Rune Straume and Lars Sørgard*: «Downstream merger with upstream market power». December 2003.

2002

- 12-2002 *Nina Berven*: «National Politics and Global Ideas? Welfare, Work and Legitimacy in Norway and the United States». September 2002.
- 13-2002 *Johannes Hjellbrekke*: «Globalisering som utfordring til samfunnsvitskapane». September 2002.
- 14-2002 *Atle Møen*: «Den globale produksjonen av symbol og kunnskap. Verdsflukt og verdsherredømme». September 2002.
- 19-2002 *Marit Tjomsland*: «Arbeidsinnvandringssituasjonen i Norge etter 1975». November 2002.
- 20-2002 *Augustín José Menéndez m.fl.*: «Taxing Europe. The Case for European Taxes in Federal Perspective». December 2002.
- 21-2002 *Fredrik Andersson and Kai A. Konrad*: «Globalization and Risky Human Capital Investment». December 2002.
- 22-2002 *Fredrik Andersson and Kai A. Konrad*: «Human Capital Investment and Globalization in Extortionary States». December 2002.

REPORTS**2003**

- 12-2003 *Birte Bjørkelo*: «The Power of Learning in the Global Age – The World Bank and Environmental NGOs». December 2003.
- 13-2003 *Ingrid Hagen*: «Global konkurranse og lokal fleksibilitet. Omstillinger og fleksibilitetsstrategier i en norsk elektronikkbedrift». Oktober 2003.
- 14-2003 *Mariann Moberg*: *Engasjement og trygghet i et mer globalisert arbeidsliv. En studie av endringsprosesser i et multinasjonalt konsern i lys av trekk ved den nye kapitalismens ånd*. Oktober 2003.

WORKING PAPERS ROKKANSENTERET (ISSN 1503-0946)

The publications can be ordered from Rokkansenteret, tel +47 55 58 97 10,

e-mail: post@rokkkan.uib.no, <http://www.rokkkansenteret.uib.no>

2004

- 1-2004** *Dag Olaf Torjesen and Hallgeir Gammelsæter*: «Management Between Autonomy and Transparency in the Enterprise Hospital». January 2004. ATM.
- 2-2004** *Haldor Byrkjeflot and Simon Neby*: «The Decentralized Path Challenged? Nordic Health Care Reforms in Comparison». January 2004. ATM.
- 3-2004** *Tom Christensen and Per Læg Reid*: «The Fragmented State – the Challenges of Combining Efficiency, Institutional Norms and Democracy». March 2004.
- 4-2004** *Morten Dyrdal*: «Europeisering av tilsynsmyndigheter i Norge og Sverige». Mars 2004.
- 5-2004** *Karsten Vrangbæk and Katarina Østergren*: «The Introduction of Choice in Scandinavian Hospital Systems. Arguments and Policy Processes in the Danish and the Norwegian Case». March 2004. ATM.
- 6-2004** *Marit Tjomsland*: «Internationalization at Norwegian Universities and Colleges after the Quality Reform». April 2004. The Globalization Program.

2003

- 1-2003** *Tom Christensen og Per Læg Reid*: «Politisk styring og privatisering: holdninger i elitene og befolkningen». Mars 2003.
- 2-2003** *Ivar Bleiklie, Per Læg Reid and Marjoleine H. Wik*: «Changing Government Control in Norway: High Civil Service, Universities and Prisons». March 2003.
- 3-2003** *Badi H. Baltagi, Espen Bratberg and Tor Helge Holmås*: «A Panel Data Study of Physicians' Labor Supply: The Case of Norway». March 2003. HEB.
- 4-2003** *Kjell Erik Lommerud, Frode Meland and Lars Sørgard*: «Unionised Oligopoly, Trade Liberalisation and Location Choice». March 2003. The Globalization Program.
- 5-2003** *Lise Hellebø*: «Nordic Alcohol Policy and Globalization as a Changing Force». April 2003.
- 6-2003** *Kim Ove Hommen*: «Tilsynsroller i samferdselssektoren». April 2003.
- 7-2003** *Tom Christensen and Per Læg Reid*: «Trust in Government – the Significance of Attitudes Towards Democracy, the Public Sector and Public Sector Reforms». April 2003.
- 8-2003** *Rune Ervik*: «Global Normative Standards and National Solutions for Pension Provision: The World Bank, ILO, Norway and South Africa in Comparative Perspective». April 2003. The Globalization Program.
- 9-2003** *Nanna Kildal*: «The Welfare State: Three Normative Tensions». Mai 2003.
- 10-2003** *Simon Neby*: «Politisk styring og institusjonell autonomi – tre illustrasjoner». Mai 2003.
- 11-2003** *Nina Berven*: «Cross National Comparison and National Contexts: Is what we Compare Comparable?». July 2003. The Globalization Program.
- 12-2003** *Hilde Hatleskog Zeiner*: «Kontrollhensyn og kontrollpraksis. En studie av Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)». August 2003.
- 13-2003** *Nanna Kildal*: «Perspectives on Policy Transfer: The Case of the OECD». August 2003.
- 14-2003** *Erik Allardt*: «Two Lectures: Stein Rokkan and the Twentieth Century Social Science». «Den sociala rapporteringens tidstypiska förankring». September 2003.
- 15-2003** *Ilcheong Yi*: «The National Patterns of Unemployment Policies in Two Asian Countries: Malaysia and South Korea». September 2003. The Globalization Program.

- 16-2003 *Dag Arne Christensen*: «Active Ageing: Country Report Norway». November 2003.
- 17-2003 *Kim Ove Hommen*: «Tilsynspolitikk i Norge: Utflytting og autonomi». November 2003.
- 18-2003 *Dag Arne Christensen, Rune Ervik and Ingrid Helgøy*: «The Impact of Institutional Legacies on Active Ageing Policies: Norway and UK as Contrasting Cases». December 2003.
- 19-2003 *Ole Frithjof Norheim og Benedicte Carlsen*: «Legens doble rolle som advokat og portvakt i Fastlegeordningen. Evaluering av fastlegeordningen». Desember 2003. HEB.
- 20-2003 *Kurt R. Brekke og Odd Rune Straume*: «Pris- og avanseregulering i legemiddelmarkedet. En prinsipiell diskusjon og en vurdering av den norske modellen». Desember 2003. HEB.
- 21-2003 *Per Lægreid, Vidar W. Rolland, Paul G. Roness and John-Erik Ågotnes*: «The Structural Anatomy of the Norwegian State 1947–2003». December 2003.
- 22-2003 *Ivar Bleiklie, Haldor Byrkjeflot and Katarina Östergren*: «Taking Power from Knowledge. A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Two Public Sector Reforms». December 2003. ATM.
- 23-2003 *Per Lægreid, Ståle Opedal and Inger Marie Stigen*: «The Norwegian Hospital Reform – Balancing Political Control and Enterprise Autonomy». December 2003. ATM.
- 24-2003 *Håkon Høst*: «Kompetansemåling eller voksenutdanning i pleie- og omsorgsfagene? Underveisrapport fra en studie av pleie- og omsorgsutdanningene». Desember 2003.
- 25-2003 *Kjell Erik Lommerud, Odd Rune Straume and Lars Sørgard*: «Downstream merger with upstream market power». The Globalization Program. December 2003.
- 26-2003 *Ingrid Drexel*: «Two Lectures: The Concept of Competence – an Instrument of Social and Political Change». «Centrally Coordinated Decentralization – No Problem? Lessons from the Italian Case». December 2003.

2002

- 1-2002 *Håkon Høst*: «Lærlingeordning eller skolebasert utdanning i pleie- og omsorgsfagene?». April 2002.
- 2-2002 *Jan-Kåre Breivik, Hilde Haualand and Per Solvang*: «Rome – a Temporary Deaf City! Deaflympics 2001». June 2002.
- 3-2002 *Jan-Kåre Breivik, Hilde Haualand og Per Solvang*: «Roma – en midlertidig döv by! Deaflympics 2001». Juni 2002.
- 4-2002 *Christian Madsen*: «Spiller det noen rolle? – om hverdagen på nye og gamle sykehjem». Juni 2002.
- 5-2002 *Elin Aasmundrud Mathiesen*: «Fritt sykehusvalg. En teoretisk analyse av konkurranse i det norske sykehusmarkedet». Juni 2002. HEB.
- 6-2002 *Tor Helge Holmås*: «Keeping Nurses at Work: A Duration Analysis». June 2002. HEB.
- 7-2002 *Ingvild Halland Ørnsrud*: «Mål- og resultatstyring gjennom statlige budsjettreformer». Juli 2002.
- 8-2002 *Torstein Haaland*: «Tid, situasjonisme og institusjonell utakt i systemer». Juli 2002.
- 9-2002 *Kristin Strømsnes*: «Samspeillet mellom frivillig organisering og demokrati: Teoretiske argument og empirisk dokumentasjon». August 2002.
- 10-2002 *Marjoleine Hooijkaas Wik*: «Mangfold eller konformitet? Likheter og forskjeller innenfor og mellom fem statlige tilknytningsformer». August 2002.
- 11-2002 *Knut Helland*: «Den opprinnelige symbiosen mellom fotball og presse». September 2002.
- 12-2002 *Nina Beroven*: «National Politics and Global Ideas? Welfare, Work and Legitimacy in Norway and the United States». September 2002. The Globalization Program.
- 13-2002 *Johannes Hjellbrekke*: «Globalisering som utfordring til samfunnsvitskapane». September 2002. Globaliseringsprogrammet.

- 14-2002** *Atle Møen*: «Den globale produksjonen av symbol og kunnskap. Verdsflukt og verdsherredømme». September 2002. Globaliseringsprogrammet.
- 15-2002** *Tom Christensen and Per Læg Reid*: «Complex Patterns of Interaction and Influence Among Political and Administrative Leaders». October 2002.
- 16-2002** *Ivar Bleiklie*: «Hierarchy and Specialization. On Institutional Integration of Higher Education Systems». Oktober 2002.
- 17-002** *Per Læg Reid, Runolfur Smari Steinthorsson and Baldur Thorhallsson*: «Europeanization of Public Administration: Effects of the EU on the Central Administration in the Nordic States». November 2002.
- 18-2002** *Tom Christensen and Per Læg Reid*: «Trust in Government – the Relative Importance of Service Satisfaction, Political Factors and Demography». November 2002.
- 19-2002** *Marit Tjomsland*: «Arbeidsinnvandrings situasjonen i Norge etter 1975». November 2002. Globaliseringsprogrammet.
- 20-2002** *Augustín José Menéndez m.fl.*: «Taxing Europe. The Case for European Taxes in Federal Perspective». December 2002. The Globalization Program.
- 21-2002** *Fredrik Andersson and Kai A. Konrad*: «Globalization and Risky Human Capital Investment». December 2002. The Globalization Program.
- 22-2002** *Fredrik Andersson and Kai A. Konrad*: «Human Capital Investment and Globalization in Extortionary States». December 2002. The Globalization Program.
- 23-2002** *Anne Lise Fimreite, Yngve Flo og Jacob Aars*: «Generalistkommune og oppgavedifferensiering. Tre innlegg». Desember 2002.
- 24-2002** *Knut Grove*: «Frå privat initiativ til kommunalt monopol. Lysverk, sporvegar og renovasjon i Bergen og Oslo 1850–1935». Desember 2002.
- 25-2002** *Knut Grove*: «Mellom 'non-intervention' og 'samfundsvillie'. Statleg og kommunal regulering av økonomisk verksemd i Norge på 1800-talet». Desember 2002.
- 26-2002** *Dag Arne Christensen*: «Hovedtyper av valgordninger. Proporsjonalitet eller politisk styring?». Desember 2002.
- 27-2002** *Jan Erik Askildsen, Badi H. Baltagi and Tor Helge Holmås*: «Will Increased Wages Reduce Shortage of Nurses? A Panel Data Analysis of Nurses' Labour Supply». December 2002. HEB.
- 28-2002** *Sturla Gjesdal, Peder R. Ringdal, Kjell Haug and John Gunnar Mæland*: «Medical Predictors of Disability Pension in Long-Term Sickness Absence. December 2002. HEB.
- 29-2002** *Dag Arne Christensen og Jacob Aars*: «Teknologi og demokrati. Med norske kommuner på nett!». Desember 2002.
- 30-2002** *Jacob Aars*: «Byfolk og politikk. Gjennomgang av data fra en befolkningsundersøkelse i Bergen, Oslo og Tromsø». Desember 2002.
- 31-2002** *Hjørdis Grove*: «Kommunaliseringsprosessen i Århus 1850–1940». Desember 2002.