

Tensions between research performativity and higher education as a nationalist public good

The case of Denmark, welfare chauvinism, and status competition

Warren, Simon

Published in:
Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research

DOI:
[10.1080/00313831.2023.2230233](https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2230233)

Publication date:
2024

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Warren, S. (2024). Tensions between research performativity and higher education as a nationalist public good: The case of Denmark, welfare chauvinism, and status competition. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 68(1), 36-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2230233>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Tensions between research performativity and higher education as a nationalist public good: the case of Denmark, welfare chauvinism, and status competition.

Simon Warren
Roskilde Universitet
Institut for Mennesker og Teknologi
Universitetsvej 1
DK-4000 Roskilde
Danmark

warren@ruc.dk

"This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. Simon Warren (2024) Tensions between research performativity and higher education as a nationalist public good: the case of Denmark, welfare chauvinism, and status competition, Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 68:1, 36-52, DOI:

10.1080/00313831.2023.2230233 .

It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way."

Abstract

This paper focuses on the tension between two political rationalities coordinating Danish higher education (HE) - a nativist politics of belonging and that of status competition and its technologies of university rankings, citation indexes, and performance management, explored historically drawing on Gramscian conjunctural analysis. The paper argues that Danish academics were invited into a performative culture of world class research, university rankings and citation indexes, and the dominance of English as the valued scientific language. Simultaneously a political consensus has developed around restricting international student access to Danish HE and reducing English-medium education in a context of hostility towards migrants generally. Consequently, Danish HE has been constituted as a nationalist public good with neoliberal characteristics.

Keywords

Higher Education, Conjunctural Analysis, Denmark, Politics of Belonging, Migration, International Students, European Union, Research Performativity

Introduction

It is nearly 20 years since the first major university rankings, the Shanghai Jiao Tong University's 'Academic Rankings of World Universities'. While not its intent, this spawned a wave of governmental, institutional, and subjective strategies to integrate national higher education systems into an emergent system of global status competition, institutional strategies to maintain or improve relative advantage in both national and global rankings with associated technologies of performance management, and individual academic strategies to make themselves visible in systems of audit and comparison, in this paper termed status competition. As noted by Ellen Hazelkorn (2014) rankings arose at a moment where HE in Europe, Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand, and North America were increasingly transformed by dynamics of economisation and marketisation. From the beginning there were concerns about the effect of status competition in terms of methodology, disciplinary exclusions, linguistic marginalisation, and knowledge production (see for instance Duszak & Lewkowicz, 2008; Flowerdew & Li, 2009; Grummell et al., 2009; Mertkan et al., 2017; Pusser & Marginson, 2013; Warren et al., 2021). As ubiquitous as rankings and other technologies of comparison are, as Erkkilä (2014) notes, transnational policy regimes are always mediated by local institutional and political traditions and provided both a challenge to and an opportunity for reform of European HE. The central argument presented here is that in Denmark status competition, of which rankings are a crucial technology of comparison and policy logics, sits in tension with a more pressing dynamic, that of a national(ist)isation of HE characterised by an exclusionary and nativist politics of belonging that has seen the emergence of a political consensus to limit the flow of international students into Danish HE and decrease English medium education (EMI). While HE continues to be conceptualised as a public good, it is increasingly articulated as a nationalist public good.

Scholarship on status competition, its formation, and enactments, tend to be conducted separate from that on the rise of nationalism or populism in HE. While still limited, some scholarly attention has now begun to examine this phenomenon (Douglass, 2021; Rhoades, 2017; van der Wende, 2020). Katja Brøgger (2021), for instance, examines the shift in Danish HE policy from a commitment to internationalisation to a national protectionist perspective, highlighting the tensions between universities as institutions, the nation/state, and supra-national bodies such as the EU. This paper seeks to add to this body

of work by exploring the relationship between a continued commitment to the internationalisation of research activity and the assertion of a nativist politics of belonging, their interactions, articulations, and tensions. Specifically, it seeks to explain how the conceptualisation of Danish HE as a nationalist public good should emerge in the form it does; to explain the emergence of this phenomenon historically both in terms of the formation of a Danish social democratic welfare regime and its integration into a neoliberal world order as well as its integration into a European HE space.

The paper outlines the integration of Danish HE into an emergent system of global HE through the European harmonisation strategies of the Bologna Process as part of a wider geopolitical move in Europe, the transformation of HE governance under the impact of neoliberal policy logics, and the late emergence of research performativity as an increasingly powerful organising idea in Denmark. This is followed by a discussion of the historical emergence of a nativist politics of belonging in Denmark, how it is manifest in practices of welfare chauvinism but also how it is rooted in the very formation of Danish social democratic welfare thinking as a kind of solidarity of the Danish ethnos. This provides a platform for then examining more directly the politics of belonging in Danish HE policy and politics. In conclusion the paper argues that these processes, though possessing their own temporalities, converge around attempts to restrict access to Danish HE by international students. Furthermore, the paper argues that the emergence of this nativist politics of belonging in Danish HE has origins in a social imaginary that conceived a social democratic welfare regime as ethnic solidarity.

Theoretical framing

While higher education is at the core of the paper's concern, it draws on a range of intellectual traditions from higher education studies, cultural studies, history, sociology, as well as political science. A distinction can be made between concepts that work analytically and those more descriptive and contextual. The distinction between the two lies in the work they do in the text. A small number of concepts carry much of the analytical load – conjuncture, politics of belonging, nativism, neoliberalism. That is, they seek to explain how policy developments constitute a nativist politics of belonging in the context of the wider political economy. Other concepts are more contextual in that they work descriptively of processes and structures, but do not in themselves do distinct analytical

work – internationalisation, status competition, welfare chauvinism. Of course, analytical and contextual concepts are connected. Neoliberalism, for instance, has corollaries in internationalisation and status competition, while nativism has a corollary in welfare chauvinism. The distinction is that neoliberalism and nativism, as examples, have the power to determine how internationalisation and welfare chauvinism are enacted, and not the other way. Below, the core analytical concepts are given some definition before moving on to the main analysis.

Conjunctural analysis

Methodologically, the paper adopts a Gramscian informed conjunctural analysis seeking to identify the historically specific conditions for the emergence of a national(ist)isation of HE in Denmark (Clarke, 2014; Spielman, 2018). Conjunctural analysis encourages a methodological disposition sensitizing the researcher to economic, political, and ideological/cultural elements and how they articulate with each other to give rise to such an emergence. The form of conjunctural analysis employed here is associated with that developed in the British tradition of cultural studies and Stuart Hall and Lawrence Goldberg specifically. Understood in this way conjunctural analysis privileges historical specificity, in this case how a nativist politics of HE that is antagonistic to EMI and international students can sit alongside an internationalisation of research productivity that promotes the mobility of graduate students and academics, and privileges publication through English. It is therefore this phenomenon, rather than a more abstract focus on global populism or neoliberalism, that motivates the inquiry. Conjunctural analysis is therefore interested in specifying the particular economic, political, and ideological/cultural elements that overdetermine the emergence in Denmark of this specific phenomenon, and therefore seeks to explain why these apparently contradictory policy logics have become hegemonic at this time (see Colpani, 2022 for discussion of different approaches to conjunctural analysis and hegemony). Conjunctural analysis offers a particular kind of historical analysis in that it recognises that the different elements that are constitutive of a historical situation involve different temporalities, temporalities that converge at particular moments to produce specific historical effects (see Jefferson, 2021 and Maccaferri, 2022 for discussions of both the operationalisation of conjunctural analysis and multiple temporalities). Overdetermination, in this context, refers to historical contingency and the fact that the

way different economic, political, ideological/cultural elements articulate with each other and the different temporalities interact are non-necessary. Nothing is determined by some underlying political logic. Things could have been different. That is why historical specificity is so important.

Politics of belonging

The politics of belonging (Brubaker, 2010) is used to explain the form that welfare chauvinism as a concrete enactment of this politics of belonging and HE national(ist)isation takes in Denmark through a discursive distinction between two categories of people: those who are perceived to belong in and belong to the national polity, and to demonstrate how this predates the economic crisis but takes on new forms in the period of neoliberal intensification post-2008. For Brubaker, belonging, the politics of belonging, and the modern conception of the nation/state are interrelated. In Brubaker's rendering the political nature of belonging in/to the nation/state is highlighted by the phenomenon of migration. It is important to stress that for Brubaker (2013) categories such as the nation, nation/state, and corollaries such as identity and ethnicity are categories of practice. As a category of practice 'nation' can be mobilised in order to distinguish between those deemed to belong/not-belong naturally to a given polity, often working through an identification between territory, ethnicised people, and language. It is this mobilisation of social and political categories that constitutes a politics of belonging. The analytical task is to understand the discursive and material elements that make up the politics of belonging, how these are articulated, and how they relate to a specific conjuncture. In other words: how does a particular politics of belonging emerge in the form it does, and at a particular historical moment? The paper therefore conducts an analysis at the level of the social formation and does not seek to explain or describe institutional or subjective practices. Neither is it an ethnographic study of policy formation in the style of Wright et. al. (2019) or policy analysis as such. Its guiding question is to explain the emergence into hegemony of two apparently contradictory policy logics – a nativist politics of belonging in HE alongside an internationalisation of research productivity.

Nativism

The analysis makes a point of calling the particular politics of belonging 'nativist'. Nativism, as an analytical term, works similarly to Brubaker's notion of a politics of belonging, in that it distinguishes between those who belong to the nation (natives) and those who are in but not of the nation (Higham, 1999). As a concept nativism, in particular racist nativism, seeks to make distinctions between racism and nationalist based xenophobia (Lippard, 2011). In its operation, nativism does not of necessity rely on racial distinctions or scientific racism. Instead, it works with ideas of a national body, a national more than racial ethnos. Consequently, certain populations are seen to weaken or threaten the 'nation' in terms of claims on collective resources which are seen to be the property of the native population, and language often becomes a focal point for a politics of belonging. Nativism as an analytical concept emerges out of critical and Latina/o race theories in North America. It is important to be sensitive to this and be attentive to the different historical conditions of othering, racism, and belonging between North America and northwest Europe.

Debates in North America have focused on the particular configurations of racial politics and nativism and discussions of ideas such as 'racist nativism' as a means of capturing the specificities of the politics of belonging (Huber et al., 2008). Rogers Brubaker (2017) has noted how in the European context, and especially in relation to more recent movements of refugees from Muslim dominant countries, there has been an increase in what we can term nativism that is coded through the language of a civilisational conflict between 'European Christian' values, albeit secularised, and an illiberal Islam. In the European context some scholars have noted the tendency to conflate nativism with nationalism and xenophobia and to downplay the relevance of racialisation, particularly in discussions of the rise of right-wing movements (Newth, 2023). Nativism offers an analytical way to disentangle certain kinds of politics of belonging from populist right-wing movements and understand how nativist discourses can come to frame the political mainstream. The analytical task is to assess how and when racialisation is a relevant aspect of nativism, and how the national body is constructed. Nativism seems particularly suited to understanding how access to Danish HE can be constructed as an exclusive politics of belonging without a particularly forceful racial aspect, even if the wider context of anti-immigration politics is racialised.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism can be a difficult term to define, despite its ubiquity in academic discourse (Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Davies, 2014; Mirowski, 2013; Peck, 2010). Neoliberalism as a set of recognisable policy options is often the way it is referred to, for instance in relation to marketisation, competition, privatisation, and forms of managerialism. The way neoliberalism is understood in this paper stresses its organising logics that lead to these policy options, allowing for the contradictions between various neoliberalisms and diversity in the way it is embedded within different political formations (Brenner et al., 2010). These organising logics include the commitment to separation of the political and economic spheres, so reducing the role of democratic institutions in economic decisions; how this separation of spheres privileges forms of multi-level and supra-national governance; that this separation of spheres and institutional arrangements lock-in neoliberal policy options and insulates them from democratic influence; and whether the political formation is social democratic or conservative, the nation/state largely functions to create the legislative and legal conditions for maximising market behaviour (Bonefeld, 2015; Harmes, 2006; Slobodian, 2018; Weingast, 1995).

The slow emergence of status competition – Danish integration into global higher education

As argued by the author elsewhere (Warren et. al. 2021), higher education systems appear caught between two rationalities – that of economic and status value. This has seen increasing demands for higher education to produce discernible economic benefits for national economies (economic value) as well as high positions in global university rankings and publication metrics (status value). These rationalities are translated into modes of governance and funding priorities at the systemic level; performance management, recruitment, and progression systems at the institutional level; and individual coping mechanisms and strategies at the subjective level.

While institutional or individual academics' concerns about positions in the *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings or citation index scores might not appear critically important to government concerns about economic growth and competitiveness, the imputed relationship between economic and status value has been an organising idea driving HE reform in Europe. As noted by Hazelkorn (2014) rankings became an element of

geopolitical interest. Although rankings are based on institutional data and comparison, they have come to signal the innovative capacity of a national or regional economy. This was evident in the Lisbon Agenda and more recently the Europe 2020 Agenda where emphasis was placed on "...competition and relevance of higher education for economic well being with the expectation that higher education institutions should produce innovations for technological progress and graduates for a highly qualified workforce" (Kehm, 2014, p. 107). The policy logic that rankings interact with construes the purpose of HE to be the development of close to market knowledge and human capital in its graduates. It is in this policy environment that the idea of world-class universities emerges (Deem et al., 2008; Rider et al., 2020; Shattock, 2017). More on this later. This does not sit in isolation from the wider project of European integration. The development of the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area were aimed at producing, out of what were otherwise disparate national systems with varying purposes, traditions of research and teaching, a coherent idea of European HE. But this itself, as exemplified by the Lisbon Agenda's ambition to make Europe the leading knowledge economy in the world, makes better sense if we locate this ambition in the longer history of European integration which explicitly sought to build a common European economic and political zone as a counterweight initially to American hegemony, Soviet power, and decolonisation (Hansen, 2002; Hansen & Jonsson, 2012), and later the rise of Chinese economic strength (see for instance this special issue Christiansen & Maher, 2017). The various aspects of the project of European integration have always been geopolitical and economic in orientation. Even where the economic rationale is not explicit, for instance in the Bologna process, "Often in the background is the hope for economic gains through HE as an element of innovation" (Erkkilä, 2014, p. 94).

So far, the argument has suggested that rankings, though in themselves not explicitly linked to rationales of economic competitiveness, interact with broad policy logics that have, especially since the decline of Keynesianism and the rise of neoliberalism, privileged human capital formation and knowledge as generators of economic growth so drawing HE in as an agent of economic development (Brown, 2011; Olssen & Peters, 2005). In the context of Europe, the increasing importance of rankings created conditions for a coordinated HE strategy, as indicated above. Tero Erkkilä and colleagues have described how the sense of visibility produced by international comparisons brought disparate

national and institutional traditions within the purview of the European Commission (EC) and its interest in raising the status of European HE in a context of intensifying global status competition brought about by global rankings. Processes of European HE integration were, of course, already in motion with the Lisbon and Bologna agendas. Building on these, the EC was able to frame European HE as a problem in terms of its lack of competitiveness globally (Erkkilä, 2014; Erkkilä & Piironen, 2014). Erkkilä and Piironen (2014) further trace how the relative competitiveness of European universities was integrated into broader economic modernisation strategies by the EC, introducing the imaginary of world class universities (imagined as the leading elite research universities in the USA) as a pretext for advancing the innovation of institutional autonomy as a counter to a projected over-regulation and cultural conservatism of Europe's universities. Autonomy entailed a combination of both de- and re-regulation leading to creating institutions that were required to operate increasingly as independent economic units in a fiscal environment of competition for funding and students giving institutional managers more control (deregulation) while tying competitive or conditional funding to aligning institutional objectives to national economic and competitive objectives (re-regulation). This should be seen in the context of this dual process of de- and re-regulation across economic and social domains) (Vogel; 1998), that is part of the 'common-sense' of neoliberal policy logics that were reordering Europe¹ at the time. There is no space in the current paper to more fully discuss the transformation of Danish HE under the impact of neoliberal policy options. However, important to note are the changes in governance structures and reformed relationship between universities and government represented by the 1993 and 2003 University Laws (Wright & Ørberg, 2019), institutional mergers to concentrate research excellence in a smaller number of universities) (Aagaard et al., 2016; Rasmussen, 2019), study progression and completion (Sarauw & Madsen, 2020), and introduction of more direct governmental influence over the content of university education through the Accreditation of Higher Education Act 2013 (Rasmussen, 2014). We see here enactments of 'modernisation' as envisioned by the EC similar to the pattern that emerged across Europe as mapped by Barbara Kehm (2014).

¹ The term 'Europe' here can be misleading, disguising the very different experiences of neoliberalism between West and Central and Eastern Europe. However, for the purpose of this paper the distinction is not elaborated though the reader should assume that it mostly refers to Western Europe.

Danish HE was transformed from one imagined in national terms to one integrated into a European regime of multilevel governance and into a competitive global HE system. Rankings and research performativity were a key element of this neoliberalisation of Danish HE. While attention to rankings was an explicit part of Danish HE strategy, often integration into a globally competitive HE market was implicit or integral to other reform strategies. The modernisation of Danish HE then paralleled the modernisation of the Danish economy, integrating both into more global systems of competition and comparison. Reform of Danish HE therefore sits in the context of a composite of policy initiatives including the Globalisation Strategy (The Danish Government, 2006) and the 2006 Welfare Agreement (Finansministeriet, 2006). For instance, the Welfare Agreement provided for investment in research and development for increasing the stock and quality of human capital based on improving completion rates, a reformulation of the Danish knowledge system to emphasise market-ready knowledge in the form of patents and intellectual property rights and public-private partnerships while the Globalisation Fund was conceived of as a policy lever to further integrate Danish HE into EU programs and international comparative standards, that is integration into global citation and ranking systems therefore promoting status competition and introducing competitive funding for research aligned with government economic objectives, already anticipated in the reform of university governance in the 2003 University Law. The process of institutional mergers in 2007 sought to concentrate research capacity in Denmark's two most prestigious universities (Copenhagen and Aarhus) framed by a logic of world-class universities (see Aagaard et al., 2016; Rasmussen, 2019).

As Lim and Ørberg (2017) note, Danish governments were initially sceptical of rankings. While status competition emerged in Danish policy thinking in the context of the government's globalisation strategy indicating the close association of human capital and status competition, it remained muted and somewhat ambivalent. Change came with the election of a new Liberal-Conservative government in 2009. Lim and Ørberg (2017) trace the growing centrality of rankings and the language of world class universities in policy discussions and political discourse. In 2009 a political agreement was secured which saw the introduction of the Danish Bibliographic Research Indicator (BFI), a system of research assessment (Mouritzen & Opstrup, 2020; Pedersen, 2010) with 25% of university funding determined by performance measured by the BFI. Consequently, HE institutions introduced

internal mechanisms to encourage academics to coordinate their research activity in line with the research assessment. This was to see a systemic shift towards publication in English which also altered academics' conceptions of the epistemic communities they engaged with (Rowlands & Wright, 2020; Wright, 2014). Although the BFI was closed in December 2021 while the situation was reviewed, recent research indicates that status competition has changed academic behaviours in the direction indicated here (Deutz et al., 2021; Kulczycki et al., 2018). It should be noted that the Welfare Agreement was published simultaneously, and in the same document, with a parliamentary agreement on limiting migration (Aftale om fremtidig indvandring/Agreement on the future of Immigration)², indicating that a) HE was considered as a constituent element of the welfare society (a public good), b) internationalisation of research activity was conceptualised as integral to economic competitiveness, and c) that reform of public goods was considered in relation to immigration (politics of belonging). Rather than view the integration of the Danish economy into the global economy and Danish HE into regional and global systems of HE as distinct processes, the conjunctural approach allows for an analysis that can identify the entanglements between the economic (European integration, neoliberalism) and political (European integration) dimensions. Changes in the political economy introduce ways of conceptualizing HE in terms of modernisation, innovation, and human capital development. The argument presented here is that this configuration of contingent factors is claimed to produce conditions that make possible, but do not determine, the emergence of a nativist politics of belonging. To explore this further requires a focus on the cultural politics of migration and belonging in Denmark.

From solidarity to racialised exclusion in the Danish homeland

This second analytical section traces the political and ideational shifts in Danish politics and policy around migration and national belonging – the politics of belonging. This is presented as articulating with the political fragmentation of the 1970s in the context of a wider conjunctural shift to neoliberalism. Central to the analysis is the way HE is contained within an idea of public goods alongside other institutions of the welfare society, and particularly of them being nativist public goods. The shift from a liberal asylum policy to

² <https://bm.dk/media/6546/aftale-om-fremtidig-indvandring-2006.pdf>

strongly anti-immigration policies and aggressive restrictions on asylum on one hand, and an intensive welfare chauvinism on the other have been well documented. Therefore, here, the broad parameters of this shift will suffice. The aim will be to situate this shift historically in the formation of the Danish welfare regime, within the crises in the wider political economy that both intensified neoliberal policy logics alongside welfare chauvinism, and therefore provide some rationale for the manifestation of this politics of belonging in HE policy and politics.

Denmark shifted from a liberal policy position in its 1983 immigration law that gave rights to asylum seekers and refugees and supported family reunification to having some of the most restrictive asylum and immigration policies in Europe and conditional access to welfare and civil rights, and a growing environment of hostility particularly towards Islam and Denmark's Muslim communities. As with other Western European states, Denmark had admitted guest workers in the 1970s to meet the labour needs of a growing economy, a policy that was quickly changed following the economic crises of the mid-1970s (Jørgensen & Thomsen, 2014). In 1983 immigration was still not the highly charged political issue it would become later making it possible for the 1983 Aliens Act that "was one of the most liberal in the world at the time, giving legal right to asylum and family reunification" (Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013, p. 691), promoting a liberal discourse of individual human rights that presumed the migrant's right to belong in Denmark. Jumping forward to the present we witness a very different politics, one that is explicitly designed to make Denmark a hostile environment for asylum seekers and migrants alike, challenging their right to belong in or to Denmark at all. The Social Democratic government elected in 2019 made the ending of asylum an explicit policy aim, has discussed offshoring asylum applications to Africa in order to deny applications on Danish territory, and in the midst of welcoming Ukrainian refugees due to Russia's invasion of Ukraine Denmark was repatriating Syrian refugees (Hardman, 2022; *The Economist*, 2021; UNHCR, 2021). The formation of a new government in 2022, led by the Social Democrats but in alliance with a new centre party and the Liberals, saw a renewed commitment to this offshoring policy.

The journey from 1983 to the present has witnessed the rise of an aggressive nativist politics of belonging (Green-Pedersen & Krogstrup, 2008; Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008; Salo & Rydgren, 2021). By 2008 all the provisions of the 1983 Act had been reversed (Andersen, 2007; Green-Pedersen & Odmalm, 2008; Mouritsen & Olsen, 2013) including the

virtual ending of family reunion. In direct response to the 2015 refugee crisis Denmark introduced the Asylum Package (2015) which essentially closed the borders to asylum seekers aiming to prevent them from submitting asylum claims on Danish territory and intensifying the temporary nature of the protections offered (Garvik & Valenta, 2021). Then, in 2019, the Paradigm Shift Act meant that all asylum protection would be temporary and open to repatriation, including a drastic reduction in the possibility of family reunion, and committed the Danish state to withdrawing residency permits granted for humanitarian reasons (Garvik & Valenta, 2021; Pannia, 2021). This was to prefigure the stance taken by the Social Democratic government in 2021 to repatriate Syrian refugees.

This rise of a nativist politics of belonging was coterminous with a conjunctural shift in the wider political economy, as suggested above. As well as an economic crisis in 1973 Denmark also witnessed a fragmentation of the electoral landscape with the emergence of a more assertive conservative and nativist political formation in the Progress Party that challenged the previous dominance of the Social Democratic party and a left-wing challenge to the Social Democrats with the establishment of the Socialist People's Party (Emmenegger, 2010; Lykketoft, 2006). If Keynesian economics had provided the organising idea for the post-war period, the 1973 election opened up the opportunity for neoliberal ideas to provide a coherent set of policy options in wake of the crisis (Blyth, 2002a; Larsen & Andersen, 2009; Stahl, 2019). Stahl (2022), however, questions the extent to which neoliberalism as ideology was ascendant proposing that neoliberal policy options were pragmatic decisions, critiquing ideational institutionalism (see the arguments presented by Blyth, 2002b; Blyth & Matthijs, 2017). This critique, however, does not undermine the overall argument presented here that the socially embedded nature of neoliberalism locked-in neoliberal policy options making it difficult for alternative options to be implemented. The socially embedded nature of neoliberal logics would not require ideological commitment by policy makers or advisers.

Significantly, the objective of economic and social policy shifted from the achievement of full employment within largely national economies and demand side policy to price stability within globalised economies and supply side policies, a cornerstone of neoliberal thinking. 2007/8 was to present another earthquake with the global economic and fiscal crises, an historical conjuncture where neoliberalism struggled to reproduce itself and where ruling elites faced legitimation challenges. Economically this period of

uncertainty has seen a continuation of neoliberal policy logics characterised by austerity and intensification of labour activation strategies. Labour activation through the 1970s to 1993 emphasised a human capital approach promoting training and upskilling, reflecting a shift from demand to supply-side policies emblematic of the neoliberal growth regime (Kvist & Pedersen, 2007; Torfing, 1999). A comprehensive labour market reform introduced in 1993 by the Social Democrats reformulated labour activation into a 'work first' approach that emphasised activation strategies to push people into work or training (Bengtsson, 2014; Klitgaard, 2007), a shift that was consolidated in the 2005 Danish Reform Programme. Following the economic and financial crises, austerity measures and labour activation were intensified.

This brief discussion of key characteristics of the post-1973 political economy, and specifically the emphasis on labour activation is important for the analysis of the politics of belonging. In a relatively high employment society such as Denmark's, austerity and labour activation measures particularly affect those in marginal locations in the economy. Access to welfare support (belonging in the polity) became conditional on participation in labour activation schemes. Denmark's migrant communities became the focus for such conditional access. Labour market outcomes for non-Western and non-white migrants and their children are significantly lower than that of ethnic-Danes, and disproportionately live in subsidised social housing (Kvist & Greve, 2011; Liebig, 2007).

The aim of the analysis has been to locate the emergence of a nativist politics of belonging in HE in a wider political and policy environment. But why should this particularly aggressive politics emerge? While the politics of belonging was intensified in the austerity context post-economic crisis, an anti-migrant discourse and mobilisation had been growing since the 1990s. This politics of belonging has not been particularly accompanied by an attack on the social democratic foundations of the Danish welfare regime. Consequently, welfare (housing, education, health, etc.) and HE have continued to be largely conceptualised as public goods framed by universal access. Although there has been an interesting discussion on HE as a public good, this has been largely theoretical (see for instance Marginson, 2011; Nixon, 2011; Walker, 2012, 2018). For the purposes of this paper, HE as a public good is situated in the post-war Keynesian settlement that saw HE systems in much of Western Europe consciously developed as national public goods accompanied by the massification of HE across this whole period (Carpentier, 2019; Carpentier &

Courtois, 2022). They were public goods in the sense that they were mostly publicly funded and saw an increase in the proportion of school-leavers attending university and post-secondary education bringing in a broader social spectrum. It can be argued that they were public goods also in terms of the purposes of HE, where massification was seen as contributing to mostly national economic development through the generation of innovation and skilled workers, the shift to locating scientific and technical development in the universities, and the role of HE in rebuilding societies physically, socially, and politically following the destruction of war, fascism, and the Holocaust (Maassen, 2014). This idea of HE as a public good is compatible with the emergence of status competition and university rankings, where rankings worked to convey the innovative capacity of national economies.

Is it possible that the Danish conceptualisation of the welfare regime is, in fact, compatible with a nativist politics of belonging? Kevins and van Kersbergen (2019) note that the historical development of the Danish welfare regime was partially designed to bring about social inclusion but specifically of a Danish ethnos, an inclusion organised around a Copenhagen/rural and more-affluent/less-affluent set of distinctions. Social support was originally conceived as being the public good of those who belonged to the Danish polity and ethnos. They argue that this original conceptualisation has made it difficult for the inclusion of non-ethnic Danes, where “The result has been an increasingly prominent turn toward welfare chauvinism” (124). Consequently, the cuts to welfare not only disproportionately affected migrants or those from migrant families but many of the measures specifically targeted migrant communities (Jørgensen & Thomsen, 2016). The post-2007/8 setting saw policy options become organised around cultural concerns such as language and ‘Danish values’ as much as deservingness for social support. This represents a break with the universalist principles of the original Danish welfare regime that rested upon a separation of access to welfare support (the universal principle) and the ability to contribute (Rytter, 2019). This break is perhaps most dramatically represented in Denmark’s ‘ghetto strategy’. This was a range of initiatives aimed primarily at Denmark’s migrant communities including increased state surveillance of those living in particular social housing areas, enforced integration activities, conditional eligibility to welfare support, and the social engineering of subsidised housing areas to specifically reduce the concentration of migrant families and disrupt their social networks (Bakkaer Simonsen, 2016; Seemann, 2021).

Conjunctural analysis asks us to consider if there are any historical factors that might contribute to the conditions for the emergence of particular social formations. The historian Uffe Østergård (1992, 2004), for instance, has argued that Denmark's political culture, including that of the Social Democrats, is organised around an integral nationalism that formulates an intimate connection between territory-people-language and a strong sense of cultural homogeneity as the basis for social harmony. This modern nationalism was born out of the diminution of a previously multinational, multilingual, composite imperial state and the necessity to constitute a new cultural and political identity in a much-reduced territory and a largely linguistically homogenous population. The discussion in the next section on the politics of language policy, and the role of HE in nation-building and state formation in the Nordic region is of relevance here. This history has conditioned, argues Østergård, the unresolved colonial relationship with the Faroe Islands and Greenland, a variously ambivalent or hostile attitude towards European integration, and its response to migration in the context of globalisation. Political attitudes towards 'immigrants' or Denmark's ethnic minorities came to be framed by what Ulf Hedetoft (2010) has termed a politics of ethnic consensus whereby integration is conditional upon assimilation into a civilisational conception of 'Danish values' (see also Wren, 2001). As will be discussed further below, this historical understanding can help us grasp how cultural ideas of the nation can overdetermine how a nativist politics of belonging can emerge in the form it does. The universalist conception of the Danish welfare regime presumed that Denmark was constituted by a homogenous ethnos, an integral national community of Danes. The presence of more numerous and visible migrants disrupted this presumption and has opened space for a discussion of differentiated or conditional access to welfare support (to both belonging in and belonging to the Danish polity). Denmark's is then a distinctly ethno-national conception of belonging. The argument presented here is that it is this that conditions the constitution of HE as a nationalist public good. 'National' interest, then, can simultaneously contain both a general societal hostility to migrants and an openness to research internationalisation that is conceived of as signalling national innovative capacity.

Emergence of a nativist politics of belonging in higher education

This final analytical section works with a slightly different configuration of the political,

economic, and cultural/ideological. Having outlined a politics of belonging mobilised around nativist and civilisational responses to migration, this section returns to the field of HE and internationalisation. This section focuses mostly on the cultural politics of belonging and entitlement as represented by the figure of the international student, so introducing a more strongly nativist politics.

In November 2020 the newly elected Social Democratic government in Denmark commended the previous conservative government in its aim to restrict access for international students to Danish HE. This previous conservative government had called for a reduction in the number of international students in Danish HE and a reduction in education programs conducted through the medium of English (Matthews, 2018). These direct and indirect restrictions of access to Danish HE contravened Denmark's international commitments in the context of the EU, a contravention that invited the intervention of the European Court of Justice who directed the Danish government to open the student support grant, *Statens Uddannelsesstøtte* (SU) to all EU students wishing to study in Denmark. This was not a sudden emergence. In 2006 the nationalist Dansk Folkeparti (DF)³, who had replaced the Progress Party as the voice of xenophobic nationalism, had proposed a law to make Danish the predominant language in university teaching. Although this was not passed by the government, DF proposed it again in 2008. This followed a period where Denmark had joined the rest of Europe in internationalising its HE system in accordance with both the Bologna process and the Lisbon agenda (The Danish Government, 2010). This saw an increase in the number of international students entering Danish universities and other higher education institutions (HEIs), and an increase in international programs where the language of instruction was English (Lueg, 2015), a phenomenon common across the Nordic region in particular (Airey et al., 2017; Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013; Brenn-White & Rest, 2012; Maiworm F., 2002; Wächter, B. & Maiworm, 2008). Data collated by *Danske Universiteter* (2020), the body that represents Danish universities, confirms this phenomenon. Between 2010-2020 there was an increase in English-speaking students

³ At the time of writing DF was rapidly declining as the main voice of an ethnic nationalism in Danish politics. DF was challenged by a new right-wing party, that combined anti-immigration along with neoliberal style economics thus challenging the general political consensus around the Danish welfare regime. DF was being further weakened by the emergence of a new political grouping around a former immigration minister who had been impeached for her policy of separating asylum-seeking families. This right-wing grouping is somewhat in flux as we write, and has not settled into a decisive reconfiguration.

(non-Nordic citizens enrolling in EMI programmes). This number increased up to 2016, after which the proportion has remained stable. As with the European wide analysis, the majority of non-Nordic English-speaking students in Denmark are entering Master's or PhD programmes, most international students continue to be from the EU/EEA, with the largest cohort coming from Germany.

The role of English, whether explicitly articulated or not, can be seen as working within an 'internationalisation as ideology' frame (Hultgren et al., 2014b; Tange & Jæger, 2021). This can variously refer to political rationales that promote student mobility as a contribution to economic competitiveness or to institutional strategies to increase market share of international students or improve marginal positions in global university rankings. What they share is the idea of internationalisation as a good thing in itself. Despite the default to EMI or publishing through English as a consequence of educational and research internationalisation there has been some resistance to this process of Englishisation, with academics in the region expressing concern about the threat of English to national languages as scientific languages (see Bowles & Murphy, 2020 for a discussion of these issues on an international scale). The Nordic region sees these debates articulated in very similar ways, often in terms of a zero-sum competition between national languages and English (see Hultgren, Gregersen, et al., 2014 for a summary of the Nordic context; and Saarinen, 2020 for a detailed historical account of the Finnish context). This zero-sum, either/or framing of Englishisation is challenged by a more nuanced argument, such as that proffered by Anna Hultgren and colleagues and Taina Saarinen. This alternative argument challenges the assumption that nation-state-language are synonymous and draws attention to the multilingual worlds of actual academic practice. If the zero-sum argument assumes a singular 'national' language, the alternative argument draws attention to the fact that the Nordic region has been and is multilingual. Saarinen's account of language politics in Finnish HE highlights the changing fortunes of Swedish in relation to Finnish, Sámi, and English. The reduction of this complex multilingual reality to a simplistic 'national' language versus English then appears limited in analytical power or policy options. A simplistic focus on the threat of English might deflect from a more complex reality that academic practices are often multilingual, where the languages of knowledge consumption, production, and communication may be varied and multiple.

Linguistic politics in the Nordic region are intimately connected with various processes of empire, nation-building, post-colonialism, and geopolitics. The different countries of the region do not share the same histories in relation to these phenomena. Consequently, language politics will be configured around various dimensions including the standardisation of 'national' languages, asserting indigenous or minoritised languages, etc. The particularity of the Danish politics of belonging and its mobilisation around language in HE, while sharing much of the wider Nordic politics, will have its own distinct historical influences. Therefore, the form of a politics of belonging will be framed by the historical circumstances. It cannot be assumed that the form it takes in Norway or Finland, for instance, will be the same as that in Denmark. Denmark's particular history of colonialism, territorial expansion and contraction, affected the development of HE, including "where knowledge creation and higher education should take place" within the Danish state (Adriansen & Adriansen, 2018, p. 194). As with other Nordic states the development of HE was integral to strategies of nation-building and geopolitical considerations, whether that be the centralisation of political power in Copenhagen, incorporation of peripheral regions (Jutland) into the national polity, or the consolidation of 'national' identification which inevitably involves the cultural politics of language. This will be discussed further below.

Ursula Tange and Kisten Jæger (2021) demonstrate how what had previously been muted criticism of Englishisation came to dominate political discourse following the European Court of Justice ruling in 2013 that Danish study grants be equally available to all EU citizens. Here we see a clash between a public good imagined in nationalist terms and Denmark's integration into a European HE space (Brøgger, 2021, 2022). The science minister in the 2011-2019 Liberal-Conservative government argued that Denmark needed to restrict the number of international students accessing HE on the basis that they represented a drain on public resources – of foreigners taking advantage of a Danish public good. He argued that since a large number did not remain working in Denmark after graduation, they did not contribute to national wellbeing (Bothwell, 2018; Matthews, 2018), an argument refuted by representatives both of Danish universities and Danish industry. He reduced the number of international students and called for a reduction in the number of international programmes teaching through English. HEIs were given responsibility to control admission of international students, reduce international programs, or prioritise Master programs that had a positive domestic economic impact. Because Denmark had

ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention, HEIs could not directly discriminate against EU students. Institutions therefore had to find other ways of closing access to EU and other international students. The proposals have affected the behaviour of Danish universities with many stating that they were either closing EMI programs to meet government requirements or changing the language of instruction to Danish. For instance, the University of Southern Denmark closed one programme and converted two others to Danish and Aarhus University closed two international master's programmes, while Aalborg University announced it would close seven degree programmes and change the language of instruction in another six. This process is still ongoing as HEIs manage reduced budgets and changing government priorities.

As stated above, the new Social Democratic government in 2019 initially promised to lift restrictions on international students in Danish HE. However, by November 2020 the Social Democratic minister for Education and Research reversed her earlier criticism of the restrictions and commended the previous government for "for at have vist rettidig omhu, da man reducerede de engelsksprogede uddannelser (for showing timely diligence in reducing English-language education- author's translation) (Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet, 2020), and committed the government to continue with the restrictions while further policy options were considered. The nativist politics of belonging in HE had been normalised and HE had been reconfigured as a nationalist public good with neoliberal characteristics.

Conclusion

Conjunctural analysis asks us to specify the particularities of a historical moment rather than default to overly abstract conceptualisations. Thus, what are the specific elements that make up the constitution of Danish HE as a nationalist public good with neoliberal characteristics, and why now in this form alongside a continued internationalisation of research activity?

The emergence of a nativist politics of belonging in Danish HE is explained in terms of different historical processes that each have distinct temporalities that nevertheless interweave with each other. Despite the changes wrought by neoliberal policy rationalities, Danish HE remains conceptualised as a public good. However, the more recent formulation of this as a nationalist public good has roots in the original social imaginary that formed the

Danish welfare regime, constituted in terms of an imagined Danish ethnos. This social imaginary runs through the various manifestations of welfare chauvinism. What became the Danish social democratic welfare regime was anticipated to benefit a national ethnos. Consequently, access to SU was always imagined as support for a Danish ethnos. European integration also brings with it a sharing of what were previously considered national benefits (making SU available to EU students). This is met with a Danish ambivalence or hostility to the European integration it has also been an active participant in. But this confrontation, so the argument here suggests, is amplified by a nascent national chauvinism, a chauvinism that asserts a nativist integral nationalism. Migrants, whether international students or asylum seekers and refugees are perceived negatively as threatening to social harmony. Consequently, the principle of universal access to public goods is removed and replaced with conditional and racialised access.

The point to be made is that this impulse is not alien to the mainstream of Danish political thinking; it is not something that enters from a radical exterior. Of course, the contradiction is that simultaneous to Danish HE turning its back to international students its academics are propelled into a range of practices of audit that require that they publish in English. The global systems of comparison made the diverse traditions of HE in Europe amenable to coordination and harmonisation, bringing about changes in structure and governance in Danish universities. They also make scientific communication visible in new powerful ways that have involved new methods of managing the intellectual labour of individual academics and embedding research performance management in the everyday concerns of university managers.

We have before us a sublime tension: less English should be used in university teaching, but more English should be used in research publications. Is there not then a contradiction between a retreat from student mobility focused internationalisation and the promotion of research internationalisation? Maybe not. To extend a point made above, 'national' interest can simultaneously contain both a general societal hostility to migrants in the form of a nativist politics of belonging, an enactment of that in terms of perceiving HE as a nationalist public good and the mobilisation of a politics of belonging focused on EMI and international students, and an openness to research internationalisation that is conceived of as signalling national innovative capacity. It is therefore possible that a new politics of belonging could emerge, one that welcomes forms of student mobility that

contribute to national economic innovative capacity while continuing to create a hostile environment for migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers more generally, all within a neoliberal policy logic.

References

- Aagaard, K., Foss Hansen, H., & Gulddahl Rasmussen, J. (2016). Mergers between governmental research institutes and universities in the Danish HE sector. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 6(1), 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2015.1099459>
- Adriansen, H. K., & Adriansen, I. (2018). A Political Geography of University Foundation: The Case of the Danish Monarchy. In P. Meusburger, M. Heffernan, & L. Suarsana (Eds.), *Geographies of the University* (pp. 193–217). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75593-9_5
- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., Salö, L., & Schwach, V. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, 73(4), 561–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9950-2>
- Andersen, J. G. (2007). Restricting access to social protection for immigrants in the Danish welfare state. *The Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*, 15(3), 257–269.
- Bakkaer Simonsen, K. (2016). Ghetto-Society-Problem: A Discourse Analysis of Nationalist Othering. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 16(1), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12173>
- Bengtsson, M. (2014). Towards standby-ability: Swedish and Danish activation policies in flux. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 23(S1), S54–S70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12075>
- Blyth, M. (2002a). A Theory of Institutional Change. In M. Blyth (Ed.), *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 17–46). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9781139087230.003>
- Blyth, M. (2002b). Disembedding Liberalism: Ideas to Break a Bargain. In M. Blyth (Ed.), *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 126–151). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9781139087230.006>
- Blyth, M., & Matthijs, M. (2017). Black Swans, Lame Ducks, and the mystery of IPE's missing macroeconomy. *Review of International Political Economy: RIPE*, 24(2), 203–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2017.1308417>
- Bonefeld, W. (2015). European economic constitution and the transformation of democracy: On class and the state of law. *European Journal of International Relations*, 21(4), 867–886. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066115570158>
- Bothwell, E. (2018, November 27). *Policy shift forces Danes to close degree programmes and cut English teaching*. Times Higher Education Supplement. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/policy-shift-forces-danes-close-degrees-and-cut-english-teaching>
- Bowles, H., & Murphy, A. C. (2020). *English-medium instruction and the internationalization of universities*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47860-5>

- Brenner, N., Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2010). Variegated neoliberalization: geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks*, 10(2), 182–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2009.00277.x>
- Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the Geographies of Actually Existing Neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 34(3), 349–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00246>
- Brenn-White, M., & Faethe, E. (2013). *English-taught master's in Europe: A 2013 update*. Institute for International Education.
- Brenn-White, M., & Rest, E. van. (2012). *English-Taught Master's Programs in Europe: New Findings on Supply and Demand*. Institute of International Education.
- Brøgger, K. (2021). A specter is haunting European higher education – the specter of neo-nationalism. In Vivienne Bozalek, Michalinos Zembylas, Siddique Motala, & Dorothee Holscher (Eds.), *Higher Education Hauntologies: Living with Ghosts for a Justice-to-come* (pp. 63–75). Routledge.
- Brøgger, K. (2022). Post-Cold war governance arrangements in Europe: The University between European integration and rising nationalisms. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2075832>
- Brown, W. (2011). Neoliberalized Knowledge. *History of the Present*, 1(1), 113. <https://doi.org/10.5406/historypresent.1.1.0113>
- Brubaker, R. (2010). Migration, Membership, and the Modern Nation-State: Internal and External Dimensions of the Politics of Belonging. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 41(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jinh.2010.41.1.61>
- Brubaker, R. (2013). Categories of analysis and categories of practice: a note on the study of Muslims in European countries of immigration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2012.729674>
- Brubaker, R. (2017). Between nationalism and civilizationism: the European populist moment in comparative perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(8), 1191–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1294700>
- Carpentier, V. (2019). The History of Higher Education in Modern Europe. In J. L. Rury & E. H. Tamura (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of The History of Education*. Oxford University Press.
- Carpentier, V., & Courtois, A. (2022). Public good in French universities: principles and practice of the 'republican' model. *Compare*, 52(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2020.1722943>
- Christiansen, T., & Maher, R. (2017). The rise of China—challenges and opportunities for the European Union. *Asia Europe Journal*, 15(2), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10308-017-0469-2>
- Clarke, J. (2014). Conjunctures, crises, and cultures: Valuing Stuart Hall. *Focaal*, 2014(70), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.3167/fcl.2014.700109>
- Colpani, G. (2022). Two Theories of Hegemony: Stuart Hall and Ernesto Laclau in Conversation. *Political Theory*, 50(2), 221–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00905917211019392>
- Danske Universiteter. (2021). *Tal om danske universiteter*. [dkuni.dk/tal-og-fakta/fakta-om-sektoren-2/](https://www.dkuni.dk/tal-og-fakta/fakta-om-sektoren-2/)
- Davies, W. (2014). Neoliberalism: A Bibliographic Review. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 31(7–8), 309–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414546383>

- Deem, R., Mok, K. H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the 'world-class' university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300179>
- Deutz, D. B., Drachen, T. M., Drongstrup, D., Opstrup, N., & Wien, C. (2021). Quantitative quality: a study on how performance-based measures may change the publication patterns of Danish researchers. *Scientometrics*, 126(4), 3303–3320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03881-7>
- Douglass, J. A. (2021). *Neo-nationalism and Universities Populists, Autocrats, and the Future of Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Duszak, A., & Lewkowicz, J. (2008). Publishing academic texts in English: A Polish perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(2), 108–120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.001>
- Emmenegger, P. (2010). The Long Road to Flexicurity: The Development of Job Security Regulations in Denmark and Sweden. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 33(3), 271–294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2010.00251.x>
- Erkkilä, T. (2014). Global university rankings, transnational policy discourse and higher education in Europe. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12063>
- Erkkilä, T., & Piironen, O. (2014). Shifting fundamentals of European higher education governance: competition, ranking, autonomy and accountability. *Comparative Education*, 50(2), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2013.807643>
- Finansministeriet. (2006). *Aftale om fremtidens velstand og velfærd og investeringer i fremtiden/Aftale om fremtidig indvandring*. Finansministeriet.
- Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). English or Chinese? The trade-off between local and international publication among Chinese academics in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.005>
- Garvik, M., & Valenta, M. (2021). Seeking asylum in Scandinavia: a comparative analysis of recent restrictive policy responses towards unaccompanied afghan minors in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 9(15), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00221-1>
- Green-Pedersen, C., & Krogstrup, J. (2008). Immigration as a political issue in Denmark and Sweden. *European Journal of Political Research*, 47(5), 610–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00777.x>
- Green-Pedersen, C., & Odmalm, P. (2008). Going different ways? Right-wing parties and the immigrant issue in Denmark and Sweden. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(3), 367–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760701847564>
- Grummell, B., Devine, D., & Lynch, K. (2009). The care-less manager: gender, care and new managerialism in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 21(2), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250802392273>
- Hansen, P. (2002). European Integration, European Identity and the Colonial Connection. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(4), 483–498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136843102760513875>
- Hansen, P., & Jonsson, S. (2012). Imperial Origins of European Integration and the Case of Eurafrica: A Reply to Gary Marks' 'Europe and Its Empires'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), 1028–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2012.02282.x>

- Hardman, N. (2022). *Denmark's Mismatched Treatment of Syrian and Ukrainian Refugees Government Should Treat - All Refugees Equally*. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2022/03/16/denmarks-mismatched-treatment-syrian-and-ukrainian-refugees>
- Harmes, A. (2006). Neoliberalism and multilevel governance. *Review of International Political Economy*, 13(5), 725–749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290600950621>
- Hazelkorn, E. (2014). Reflections on a Decade of Global Rankings: what we've learned and outstanding issues. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12059>
- Hedetoft, U. (2010). Denmark versus multiculturalism. In S. Vertovec & S. Wessendorf (Eds.), *The Multiculturalist Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices* (pp. 121–139). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203867549-10>
- Newth, G. (2023). Rethinking 'nativism': beyond the ideational approach. *Identities*, 30(2), 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2021.1969161>
- Huber, L. P., Lopez, C. B., Malagon, M. C., Velez, V., & Solorzano, D. G. (2008). Getting beyond the 'symptom,' acknowledging the 'disease': theorizing racist nativism. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 11(1), 39–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580701850397>
- Hultgren, A. K., Gregersen, F., & Thøgersen, J. (2014a). English at Nordic universities. In A. K. Hultgren, F. Gregersen, & J. Thøgersen (Eds.), *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and practices* (pp. 1–26). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/wlp.5.01hul>
- Hultgren, A. K., Gregersen, F., & Thøgersen, J. (2014b). *English in Nordic Universities* (A. K. Hultgren, F. Gregersen, & J. Thøgersen, Eds.; Vol. 5). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/wlp.5>
- Jefferson, T. (2021). *Stuart Hall, Conjunctural Analysis and Cultural Criminology*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74731-2>
- Jørgensen, M. B., & Thomsen, T. L. (2014). Crises Now and Then—Comparing Integration Policy Frameworks and Immigrant Target Groups in Denmark in the 1970s and 2000s. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 14, 245–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-012-0238-4>
- Jørgensen, M. B., & Thomsen, T. L. (2016). Deservingness in the Danish context: Welfare chauvinism in times of crisis. *Critical Social Policy*, 36(3), 330–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018315622012>
- Kehm, B. M. (2014). Global University Rankings - Impacts and Unintended Side Effects. *European Journal of Education*, 49(1), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12064>
- Keivins, A., & van Kersbergen, K. (2019). The effects of welfare state universalism on migrant integration. *Policy & Politics*, 47(1), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557318X15407315707251>
- Klitgaard, M. B. (2007). Why are they doing it? Social democracy and market-oriented welfare state reforms. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 172–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380601019753>
- Kulczycki, E., Engels, T. C. E., Pölönen, J., Bruun, K., Dušková, M., Guns, R., Nowotniak, R., Petr, M., Sivertsen, G., Istenič Starčić, A., & Zuccala, A. (2018). Publication patterns in the social sciences and humanities: evidence from eight European countries. *Scientometrics*, 116(1), 463–486. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2711-0>
- Kvist, J., & Greve, B. (2011). Has the Nordic Welfare Model Been Transformed? *Social Policy & Administration*, 45(2), 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2010.00761.x>

- Kvist, J., & Pedersen, L. (2007). Danish Labour Market Activation Policies. *National Institute Economic Review*, 202, 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027950107086172>
- Larsen, C. A., & Andersen, J. G. (2009). How New Economic Ideas Changed the Danish Welfare State: The Case of Neoliberal Ideas and Highly Organized Social Democratic Interests. *Governance*, 22(2), 239–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01434.x>
- Liebig, T. (2007). *The Labour Market Integration of Immigrants in Denmark*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/233783261534>
- Lim, M. A., & Williams Øerberg, J. (2017). Active instruments: on the use of university rankings in developing national systems of higher education. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 1(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2016.1236351>
- Lippard, C. D. (2011). Racist Nativism in the 21st Century. *Sociology Compass*, 5(7), 591–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00387.x>
- Lueg, K. (2015). English as a medium of instruction and internationalization at Danish universities: Status, perspectives, and implications for higher education executives. *Communication & Language at Work*, 4(4), 53. <https://doi.org/10.7146/claw.v1i4.20772>
- Lykketoft, M. (2006). *The Danish Model*. Arbejderbevægelsens Erhvervsråd.
- Maassen, P. (2014). A New Social Contract for Higher Education? In G. Goastellec & F. Picard (Eds.), *Higher Education in Societies. Higher Education Research in the 21st Century Series* (pp. 33–50). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-746-9_4
- Maccaferri, M. (2022). Reclaiming Gramsci's "historicity": A critical analysis of the British appropriation in light of the "crisis of democracy". *Constellations*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12614>
- Maiworm F., W. B. (2002). *English-language-taught degree programmes in European higher education: Trends and success factors*. Lemmens.
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher Education and Public Good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2011.00496.x>
- Matthews, D. (2018, August 31). Danish universities dismayed by cut to foreign student numbers. *Times Higher Education Supplement. Times Higher Education Supplement*.
- Mertkan, S., Arsan, N., Inal Cavlan, G., & Onurkan Aliusta, G. (2017). Diversity and equality in academic publishing: the case of educational leadership. *Compare*, 47(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2015.1136924>
- Mirowski, P. (2013). *Never let a serious crisis go to waste: how neoliberalism survived the financial meltdown*. Verso.
- Mouritsen, P., & Olsen, T. V. (2013). Denmark between liberalism and nationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(4), 691–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.598233>
- Mouritzen, P. E., & Opstrup, N. (2020). *Performance Management at Universities: The Danish Bibliometric Research Indicator at Work*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21325-1>
- Newth, G. (2023). Rethinking 'nativism': beyond the ideational approach. *Identities*, 30(2), 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2021.1969161>
- Nixon, J. (2011). *Higher education and the public good imagining the university*. Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Olsen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500108718>

- Østergård, U. (1992). Peasants and Danes: The Danish National Identity and Political Culture. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34(1), 3–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500017412>
- Østergård, U. (2004). The Danish Path to Modernity. *Thesis Eleven*, 77(1), 25–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513604042658>
- Pannia, P. (2021). Tightening Asylum and Migration Law and Narrowing the Access to European Countries: A Comparative Discussion. In V. Federico & S. Baglioni (Eds.), *Migrants, Refugees and Asylum Seekers' Integration in European Labour Markets* (pp. 49–71). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67284-3_3
- Peck, J. (2010). *Constructions of neoliberal reason*. Oxford University Press.
- Pedersen, C. V. (2010). The Danish Bibliometric Research Indicator – BFI - Research publications, research assessment, university funding. *ScieCom Info*, 6(4).
- Pusser, B., & Marginson, S. (2013). University rankings in critical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(4), 544–568.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777301>
- Rasmussen, P. (2014). Accreditation and Expansion in Danish Higher Education. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 34(3), 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1891-5949-2014-03-05>
- Rasmussen, P. (2019). Higher Education System Reform in Denmark in the Bologna Era. In B. Broucker, K. de Wit, J. C. Verhoeven, & L. Leisyte (Eds.), *Higher Education System Reform: An International Comparison after Twenty Years of Bologna* (pp. 79–96). BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004400115_006
- Rhoades, G. (2017). Backlash Against “Others”. *International Higher Education*, 89, 2–3.
<https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.89.9830>
- Rider, S., Peters, M. A., Hyvönen, M., & Besley, T. (2020). *World Class Universities: A Contested Concept*. Springer Singapore Pte. Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-7598-3>
- Rowlands, J., & Wright, S. (2020). The role of bibliometric research assessment in a global order of epistemic injustice: a case study of humanities research in Denmark. *Critical Studies in Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2020.1792523>
- Rytter, M. (2019). Writing Against Integration: Danish Imaginaries of Culture, Race and Belonging. *Ethnos*, 84(4), 678–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2018.1458745>
- Saarinen, T. (2020). *Language and Long Nation Building in Finnish Higher Education* (pp. 35–58). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60902-3_2
- Salo, S., & Rydgren, J. (2021). *The battle over working class voters: how social democracy has responded to the populist radical right in the Nordic countries*. Routledge.
- Sarauw, L. L., & Madsen, S. R. (2020). Higher education in the paradigm of speed. *Learning and Teaching*, 13(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.3167/latiss.2020.130102>
- Seemann, A. (2021). The Danish ‘ghetto initiatives’ and the changing nature of social citizenship, 2004–2018. *Critical Social Policy*, 41(4), 586–605.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018320978504>
- Shattock, M. (2017). The ‘world class’ university and international ranking systems: what are the policy implications for governments and institutions? *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 1(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2016.1236669>
- Slobodian, Q. (2018). *Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism*. Harvard University Press.

- Spielman, D. (2018). Marxism, Cultural Studies, and the "Principle of Historical Specification". *Lateral*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.25158/L7.1.5>
- Stahl, R. M. (2019). Ruling the Interregnum: Politics and Ideology in Nonhegemonic Times. *Politics & Society*, 47(3), 333–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329219851896>
- Stahl, R. M. (2022). Neoliberalism with Scandinavian characteristics: The slow formation of neoliberal common sense in Denmark. *Capital & Class*, 46(1), 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03098168211029001>
- Tange, H., & Jæger, K. (2021). From Bologna to welfare nationalism: international higher education in Denmark, 2000–2020. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 21(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1865392>
- The Danish Government. (2006). *Progress, Innovation and Cohesion. Strategy for Denmark in the Global Economy*. The Danish Government.
- The Danish Government. (2010). *Denmark 2010: Knowledge, growth, prosperity, welfare*. Retrieved from http://www.stm.dk/publikationer/arbprog_10_uk/Denmark_2020_knowledge_growth_prosperity_welfare.pdf.
- The Economist. (2021, May). Denmark wants to send Syrian asylum-seekers home. *The Economist*.
- Torfin, J. (1999). Workfare With Welfare: Recent Reforms of the Danish Welfare State. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879900900101>
- Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet. (2020). *Regeringen efter ny SU-prognose: Indgreb nødvendigt for at begrænse SU-udgifter til EU-studerende*. Press Release. <https://ufm.dk/aktuelt/pressemeddelelser/2020/regeringen-efter-ny-su-prognose-indgreb-nodvendigt-for-at-begraense-su-udgifter-til-eu-studerende>
- UNHCR. (2021). *News comment by UN High Commissioner for Refugees Filippo Grandi on Denmark's new law on the transfer of asylum-seekers to third countries*. <https://www.unhcr.org/neu/58141-news-comment-by-un-high-commissioner-for-refugees-filippo-grandi-on-denmarks-new-law-on-the-transfer-of-asylum-seekers-to-third-countries.html>
- van der Wende, M. (2020). Neo-Nationalism and Universities in Europe. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.7.2020. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Center for Studies in Higher Education.
- Vogel, S. K. (1998). *Freer Markets, More Rules*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501717307>
- Wächter, B. & Maiworm, F. (2008). *English-Taught Programmes in European higher education. The Picture in 2007*, Lemmens.
- Walker, M. (2012). Universities, professional capabilities and contributions to the public good in South Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 42(6), 819–838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2012.685584>
- Walker, M. (2018). Dimensions of higher education and the public good in South Africa. *Higher Education*, 76(3), 555–569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0225-y>
- Warren, S., Starnawski, M., Tsatsaroni, A., Vogopoulou, A., & Zgaga, P. (2021). How does research performativity and selectivity impact on the non-core regions of Europe? The case for a new research agenda. *Higher Education*, 81(3), 607–622. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00559-6>

- Weingast, B. R. (1995). The Economic Role of Political Institutions: Market-Preserving Federalism and Economic Development. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 11(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jleo.a036861>
- Wren, K. (2001). Cultural racism: Something rotten in the state of Denmark? *Social & Cultural Geography*, 2(2), 141–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360120047788>
- Wright, S. (2014). Knowledge that counts: Points systems and the governance of Danish universities. In D. Smith & A. Griffith (Ed.), *Under new public management: Institutional ethnographies of changing front-line work* (pp. 294–337). University of Toronto Press.
- Wright, S., Carney, S., Krejsler, J. B., Nielsen, G. B., & Williams Ørberg, J. (2019). *Enacting the University: Danish University Reform in an Ethnographic Perspective*. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1921-4>
- Wright, S., & Ørberg, J. W. (2019). Contested Narratives of University Reform. In Wright, Susan, S. Carney, J. B. Krejsler, G. B. Nielsen, & J. Williams Ørberg (Eds.), *Enacting the university: Danish university reform in an ethnographic perspective* (pp. 87–126). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1921-4_4