



Forum

The Shadows of Internationalisation: conceptual lens and policy perspectives

Svetlana Shenderova

Tampere University / University of Helsinki, Finland

Email: svetlana.shenderova@tuni.fi

Suvi Jokila

University of Turku, Finland

Email: suvi.jokila@utu.fi

Saule Anafinova

Independent researcher, Hungary

Email: saule.anafinova@gmail.com

Yingxin Liu

Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

Email: liuyingxin@cuhk.edu.cn

Harshita Sharma

National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration, New Dehli, India

Email: harshita2792@gmail.com

Natalya Steane

Coventry University, United Kingdom / Aarhus University, Denmark

Email: steanen@uni.coventry.ac.uk



©2024 Svetlana Shenderova, Suvi Jokila, Saule Anafinova, Yingxin Liu, Harshita Sharma, Natalya Steane. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing third parties to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format and to remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially, provided the original work is properly cited and states its license.

Abstract

This forum proposes the use of the concept of “shadows” in the analysis of internationalisation policies to make visible the decision-making processes and practices appearing at all levels of internationalisation policies. We focus on the problematic effects appearing at the intersect of the internationalisation policies implemented by the countries that perceive academic values differently, using the example of Finland as an EU member state and pre-war Russia. We consider these effects as preventing equal access to quality higher education and life-long learning for all (SDG4, target 4.3). The forum conceptualises the lessons of EU/Finnish-Russian internationalisation for further usage of the suggested conceptual lens in policy implementation in other countries which have developed their own internationalisation policy on a different value basis. This study addresses what happens when the internationalisation policies promoting a European view of fundamental academic values are implemented in countries where these values are perceived in another way. We answer the question of how and why the shadows of internationalisation appear and have an impact at a macro-, meso-, and micro-level, and conceptualize them for future policy improvement. The forum discusses the implications of internationalisation policies from the practice perspective and what might be learnt by the stakeholders previously involved in these cooperation partnerships.

Keywords: internationalisation of higher education, shadows of internationalisation, dark-side effects, post-socialist countries, post-imperial countries

Introduction

Internationalisation of higher education aims to contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goal SDG4, target 4.3 - equal access to quality higher education and life-long learning for all (UN, 2024a; 2024b). In implementing internationalisation policies, the member states and universities of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) commit to upholding, promoting, and protecting such fundamental values as academic freedom, participation of students and staff in higher education governance on the principles of partnership and collegiality, and responsibility of higher education towards the broader society (EHEA, 1999). The Bologna process documents (EHEA, 2024; Opetus- ja Kulttuuriministeriö – OKM [Ministry of Education and Culture], 2017) and national policies envisage these principles being applicable to all forms of internationalisation implemented both within EHEA countries and universities, and to their collaborations with foreign partners. However, the perception of these values has varied considerably both within the EHEA and outside it, including in those countries that also implemented their own internationalisation policies in collaboration with EHEA members (Shenderova et al., 2023).

As is shown in the forum, the same applies to access to international higher education, which is perceived as a public good in Europe and as a privilege in some other countries. This study conceptualises what happens when the internationalisation policies promoting a European view of fundamental academic values are implemented in countries where these values are perceived in another way. We exemplify our

3 The Shadows of Internationalisation

concept using the cases of Finland and Russia, bordering countries with a common imperial legacy and different approaches to internationalisation, and which targeted one another for internationalisation policy implementation over a lengthy period.

Over the past decades, the internationalisation of higher education and related policies have been predominantly framed through economic and neoliberal rationalisations (see Elken et al., 2023; Jokila et al., 2019; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Recently, major political and ecological processes alongside the work of international organisations aimed at Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have prompted the need to extend the analysis of internationalisation policies and practices (also Rizvi et al., 2022). National governments and supranational associations have developed policies on the internationalisation of higher education.

Since 2015, Finland has focused on SDGs with particular emphasis on quality education (SDG4) (OKM, 2017). In addition, all EHEA members, both democratic supranational bodies and countries (exemplified here by Finland as an EU member state), and non-democracies (exemplified by Russia), have declared the development of internationalisation, based on their commitment to the core values of higher education, such as democracy, human rights, equity, integrity, institutional autonomy, and academic freedom. These values, as the pillars of a quality education, are supposed to be encouraged both within/between all EHEA member states, and in their internationalisation activities with other, not necessarily democratic, countries (EHEA, 2017; OKM, 2017).

Since Russia joined the Bologna Process in 2003, internationalisation policy actors, such as the government bodies of Finland as an EU member state and Russia, declared their commitment to these values (EHEA, 1999; 2003), also providing policy and finance support to develop internationalisation initiatives (Burquel et al., 2014; OKM, 2017; Shenderova, 2018a). However, these measures did not contribute to these values taking root in Russian universities but prevented equal access to quality education for all Russian students and academics involved in internationalisation with Finland. For example, the EDUneighbours project (2017-2022)¹ found that Finnish-Russian double degrees were characterised by unequal access to academic mobility to Finland. As the section below demonstrates, Finnish universities did not note the uneven access to mobility and the non-democratic decision-making processes of selected students and academics until their Russian partners ensured that there was a good intake of their students to Finnish-Russian double degrees (Shenderova, 2018b; 2023).

Such inequality raises the question of the extent to which European and Finnish internationalisation policies and partners have recognised what happened in post-socialist Russia during their support for

¹ More information about the project is available here: <https://research.tuni.fi/eduneighbours/>

internationalisation at a supranational and national (**macro-**) level (Shenderova, 2020b; 2018a), at a university, partnership (**meso-**) level, (Shenderova, 2020a; 2018b), and at a degree programme and individual (**micro-**) level (Balbachevsky et al., 2020; Shenderova, 2023). Considering Finland-Russia internationalisation, we focus on the internationalisation policies of democratic countries and their partners whose democracy and equity have not been understood to a similar extent. In doing so, we ask what prevents access to international quality education from being sustained when the internationalisation policies of these countries intersect.

We believe that a conceptual answer to this question provides a theoretical perspective and is of practical use for research and the improvement of the internationalisation policies of democratic countries and supranational bodies with partners in those targeted states that have developed their own internationalisation policies, relying on their own traditions of policy implementation, university governance and decision making.

What happens at the intersection of internationalisation policies: a conceptual lens

This forum proposes a conceptual lens to explore what might be happening behind the publicly declared goals of internationalisation policies, summarises the lessons learnt (or not) by their stakeholders, and suggests improvements to the internationalisation policies of countries with different traditions where they intersect. We consider the intersect and implementation of internationalisation policies at the macro-, meso-, and micro-levels, including the emergence of the dark-side effects previously studied as a result of trust in international business (Oliveira & Johanson, 2021). We consider the decline of quality and equity as the dark-side effects of internationalisation policies. We maintain that these dark-side effects undermine equal access to quality higher education (SDG4) and the core values of higher education not only in those countries where they have been weak (if any) historically but also within their democratic partners. Furthermore, applying simulacra of peacebuilding construction (Heathershaw, 2008) to intersected internationalisation policies provides a tool for understanding how the shadows appear and generate dark-side effects under the mottos of international collaboration for the achievement of sustainable development goals.

In terms of internationalisation policies and practices, countries vary in the extent to which national universities are included and enabled to participate in international cooperation and competition. In these countries, it is the elite universities and their staff that are able to benefit from these opportunities (e.g., Jokila, 2015; Marginson, 2006; Shenderova 2020a; Yudkevich et al., 2023). Hence, the appearance of shadows at the intersection of internationalisation policies does not seem to depend on the volume,

diversity and duration of internationalisation support, or on the complexity of the actors and networks governed by internationalisation policies (Brooks & Rensimer, 2024; Jokila, 2015; Shenderova et al., 2023). National traditions of policy implementation and university governance (Shenderova, 2023) together with the rationales of the stakeholders (Balbachevsky et al., 2022) operating globally and locally (Marginson, 2022) at macro-, meso-, and individual level, are of crucial importance.

How the shadows appear and generate dark-side effects: the case of Finland-Russia internationalisation

The conceptual lens above is confirmed by a series of funding programmes targeting Russia, via which the Finnish government financed such internationalisation activities as the Finnish-Russian Cross-Border University (CBU) aimed at developing collaborative/double degree programmes, academic and student mobility. The policy measures comprised special funding programmes for the CBU in 2005-2014; the Finnish-Russian Student and Teacher Exchange Programme (FIRSt/FIRSt+, 2006-2020); the Barents Cross-Border University since 2006 (BCBU/BCBU+, co-funded by the governments of Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the EU within the Kolarctic ENPI CBC programme); and the Team Finland Knowledge programme (TFK) since 2020. Russia used the EU and Finnish policy initiatives to reform national higher education through its own internationalisation policy, initiated by the President of Russia from 2006 and especially from 2012 onwards (Shenderova, 2018a). A series of Russian government programmes provided targeted funding for a limited number of specially selected universities to increase the number of collaborative (including joint/double) degrees and outcoming mobility in cooperation with European universities (Shenderova, 2020b). Those Russian universities that had already implemented these activities with the support of the government of Finland reported on their success to the Russian government as well as to national funding bodies. In addition, Finnish universities' involvement in Russian internationalisation policy legitimised the stakeholders of the latter within the networks governing internationalisation at the supranational level of the EHEA, EU, and BRICS (Shenderova et al., 2023) and served the foreign-policy goals of the Russian state (Mäkinen, 2023).

However, despite Russia's full participation in the Bologna Process in 2003-2022, its corresponding commitments to share the core values, and multiple long-term partnerships supported by European and Finnish internationalisation policies, Russian policy in this field followed the Soviet approach and considered internationalisation of higher education as a privilege distributed in a top-down manner for a limited number of predetermined stakeholders (Kangas et al.; 2023; Oleksiyenko, 2021; Shenderova, 2020a; 2020b). This led to the emergence of such dark-side effects as unequal access to internationalisation activities for Russian students and academics while selected university administrators prevailed (Shenderova, 2020a; 2023).

At the **macrolevel** of national policy, stratification has perpetuated within the higher education sector where quality education and research have been concentrated in 46 universities out of the 1,000 accredited in total, and there have been significant variations even within them (Burquel et al., 2014; Shenderova, 2018b; 2020a; 2023). At the **meso-level** of university and partnership, Finnish and Russian universities implemented their own quality assurance procedures separately, their collaborative degrees had poorly harmonised curricula and unsustainable enrolment. Those members of staff who travelled regularly were not necessarily involved directly in programmes, related research and interaction with the students (Shenderova, 2023). Furthermore, the decision-making processes at the intersection of internationalisation policies enabled their stakeholders not only to legitimise and enshrine these dark-side effects but to build their simulacra to control the resources (formally aimed at supporting internationalisation based on allegedly shared values). EU-Russia internationalisation did not provide sustainable democratic institutions in partnerships at the university and degree programme level (Shenderova, 2023) but constructing their simulacra. Russian universities charged additional fees from their students for providing them with transcripts of records and Diploma Supplements, and Finnish universities were indifferent to this. Russian academics were underrepresented in comparison with administrators in access to academic mobility, regardless of their contribution to the programme delivery. Meanwhile, a significant number of Russian administrators and academics received access to Finnish-Russian internationalisation initiatives due to their personal ties with the families of university top-managers and prominent academics of Russian universities. The non-democratic and non-transparent selection of academics and students for Finnish-Russian double degrees also went unnoticed by the Finnish partners (Shenderova, 2020a; 2023).

At a programme and individual (**micro-level**), Finnish partners perceived access to international education and career to be a self-evident right, while their Russian counterparts perceived it as a privilege available to those selected by their superiors only. Furthermore, access to internationalisation activities has been interpreted in Russia as evidence of a privileged position. This was particularly the case for those internal university stakeholders whose administrative and informal resources enabled them to monopolise their access to contacts with international partners (Shenderova, 2020a; 2023). Therefore, it has been not only the internal culture of Russian universities that has legitimised and strengthened privileges for specific persons irrespective of their real contribution to internationalisation activities, but also the fact that these privileged persons were welcomed by Finnish partners, simply by being more conspicuous. All this granted Russian internationalisation policy stakeholders the informal right to further privileges and impunity for violating basic academic values.

Finnish partners demonstrated little interest in the internal university environment of their Russian partners, being satisfied by the incoming mobility numbers at the macrolevel of national

internationalisation policy and closing partnerships with unsustainable intake at the microlevel (Jänis-Isokangas, 2017; Shenderova, 2018b). No data were found regarding the collaborative degrees of at least two Finnish universities which received CBU, BCBU and FIRST funding, despite there being evidence of numerous meetings being held both in Russia and in Finland. Some partnerships were developed with privileged Russian universities including those directly supervised by the Government of Russia and the Presidential Administration (INREES, 2023).

Therefore, one could assume that the low level of interest of democratic universities in what was happening within partner universities operating in a non-democratic context could shadow the decision-making processes and contribute to the appearance of the dark-side effects at the intersection of internationalisation policy implications.

Conclusion: Why are Russia's lessons important?

We suggest the term “*shadows in the internationalisation of higher education*” for all decision-making processes leading to the dark-side effects of policies, threatening the core values and hindering the achievement of equal quality education as a sustainable development goal. It should be taken into account that internationalisation of higher education is an *intentional* process (de Wit, 2024). Thus, the shadows of internationalisation cannot be considered *unintended* consequences (Kamyab & Raby, 2023) because, as is shown above, they appear as the results of *deliberate* efforts behind the façade of democratic internationalisation policies.

Despite the formal suspension of internationalisation with Russia, the EU and Finland have continued their internationalisation policies in other targeted countries which, like Russia, combine imperial and socialist legacies and implement their own internationalisation policies (EDUFI, 2024; TFK, 2023). Therefore, the intersection of policy implications in non-democratic contexts potentially brings the risks of similar shadows of internationalisation with new partners. By shadows of internationalisation, we mean all decision-making processes invisible to or unnoticed by international partners from democratic countries, which appear at the intersection of their internationalisation policies and the policies of the countries where university autonomy, democracy, and academic freedom have not taken root for historical reasons. These countries and policy stakeholders implement their own internationalisation policies using EU initiatives for their own benefit. This may lead to the construction of simulacra that undermine university autonomy, democracy and academic freedom within the partnerships, and hinder the ensuring of access to quality higher education as a sustainable development goal (SDG4).

All this generates questions regarding the possibilities and practices of different partners for actualising

internationalisation policies within the value base in which they are positioned. In addition, it should be noted that the internationalisation policies of post-socialist and post-imperial countries have much in common with the internationalisation policy of Russia, which increases the probability of similar shadows of internationalisation hindering SDG achievement. For example, China and India have introduced stratification within the higher education fabric and concentrated academic freedom and internationalisation as a privilege in a narrow segment of the sector (Varghese & Sarkar, 2022; Wu, 2019). The internationalisation policies of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, which were former USSR republics alongside Russia (with Kazakhstan being an EHEA member), have followed the top-down approach, albeit giving them more opportunities to establish joint initiatives. Like Russia, these countries are implementing their own internationalisation policies and also rely on European, including Finnish, support to develop similar internationalisation activities, such as academic and student mobility, collaborative (joint/double) degrees, and joint universities (Akkari et al., 2023; Chuanya & Yun, 2023). Similar dark-side effects have already manifested themselves as increased inequality within the sector in relation to internationalisation opportunities, with the few flagship universities having been funded or having received administrative preferences at the expense of all the others. Unequal access to international higher education for the students and academics of flagship and all other universities perpetuated inequality within the sector in general (EUA, 2019; Ubaydullaeva, 2020).

The concept of shadows of internationalisation reveals their impact on the perspectives of development of the core values of higher education (democracy, human rights, inclusiveness, integrity, institutional autonomy, and academic freedom) at the intersection of policy implications as the pillars of quality education. Further, the concept of shadows of internationalisation allows us to summarise the lessons from Finland's cooperation with Russia and explains how these lessons could be used in Finland's internationalisation policy in countries with socialist and imperial legacies. Finally, drawing on the shadows of internationalisation opens up the perspective to study how the dark-side effects of internationalisation may be prevented and how internationalisation policies may be improved at the supranational, national, partnership, university, degree programme and individual level.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their special thanks to Ms Tania Northorpe (MCIL, MA (Cantab)) for her unique ability to edit the text in a manner facilitating perception of Russian specifics for an international audience.

The authors are grateful to Dr Anni Kangas, Tampere University, for her kind advice regarding literature in the field of international relations.

References

- Akkari, A., Seidikenova, A., Bakitov, A., & Minazheva, G. (2023). Internationalization of Higher Education in Kazakhstan: from political will to implementation. *Ensaio (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)*, 31(119). <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362023003103730>
- Balbachevsky, E., Cai, Y., Eggins, H., & Shenderova, S. (2020). Opportunities and Challenges in Higher Education Cooperation between the EU and Four Continents: Towards a Typology of the Internationalisation of Higher Education. In E. Balbachevsky, Y. Cai, H. Eggins, & S. Shenderova (Eds.), *Building Higher Education Cooperation with the EU: Challenges and Opportunities from Four Continents* (pp. 199-214). Brill | Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004445420_012
- Brooks, R., & Rensimer, L. (2024). Higher education actors' responses to the Ukraine-Russia conflict: an analysis of geopolitical spatial imaginaries. *Journal of Education Policy*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2024.2334945>
- Burquel, N., Shenderova, S., & Tvorogova, S. (2014). *Joint Education Programmes between Higher Education Institutions of the European Union and Russian Federation. Innovation and transformation in transnational education*. Final Report. European Union. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6bb2175a-75f9-11e8-ac6a-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-78326987>
- Chuanya, J., & Yun, S. M. (2023). The policy of the higher education internationalization in China and the development of educational cooperation between China and Uzbekistan. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*, 482, 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/482/12>
- de Wit, H. (2024). 'Everything That Quacks is Internationalization' - Critical Reflections on the Evolution of Higher Education Internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 28(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153231221655>
- EDUFI (2024). *Finnish Education Cooperation with the Global South*. <https://datawrapper.dwcdn.net/bRqg5/38/>
- EHEA (1999). *Bologna Declaration*. https://ehea.info/Upload/document/ministerial_declarations/1999_Bologna_Declaration_English_553028.pdf
- EHEA (2003). *Berlin Communiqué*. https://ehea.info/Upload/document/ministerial_declarations/2003_Berlin_Communique_English_577284.pdf
- EHEA (2017). *Fundamental values of the Bologna Process*. https://ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/20170524-25-Gozo/73/4/BFUG_MT_NO_54_6_FundamentalValues_762734.pdf
- Elken, M., Hovdhaugen, E., & Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2023). Policy framing of international student mobility in the Nordic countries. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 7(1), 29–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2022.2105255>
- EUA (2019). *Transition to University Autonomy in Kazakhstan: State of Play of University Governance and Recommendations for the Reform Process*. Report for the TRUNAK project. <https://eua.eu/resources/publications/810:transition-to-university-autonomy-in-kazakhstan.html>
- Heathershaw, J. (2008). Seeing like the International Community: How peacebuilding failed (and survived) in Tajikistan. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 2(3), 329–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17502970802436346>
- INREES (2023). *The International Network in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies. About the network*. Retrieved 21.07.2024 from: <https://blogs.helsinki.fi/inrees-research/about-the-network/>
- Jokila, S. (2015). The internationalization of higher education with Chinese characteristics: Appadurai's ideas explored. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(1), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2014.940029>

- Jokila, S., Kallo, J., & Mikkilä-Erdmann, M. (2019). From crisis to opportunities: justifying and persuading national policy for international student recruitment. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 9(4), 393–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2019.1623703>
- Jänis-Isokangas, I. (2017). *Higher education cooperation with Russia*. Finnish National Agency for Education. Assessment of CIMO's Russia Operations.
- Kamyab, S., & Raby, R. L. (2023). *Unintended consequences of internationalization in higher education: comparative international perspectives on the impacts of policy and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi-org.libproxy.tuni.fi/10.4324/9781003189916>
- Kangas, A., Mäkinen, S., Dubrovskiy, D., Pallot, J., Shenderova, S., Yarovoy, G., & Zabolotna, O. (2023). Debating academic boycotts and cooperation in the context of Russia's war against Ukraine. *New Perspectives*, 31(3), 250-264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2336825X231187331>
- Mäkinen, S. (2023). Nothing to do with politics? International collaboration in higher education and Finnish-Russian relations. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 13(2), 216–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2022.2141814>
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52, 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-7649-x>
- Marginson, S. (2022). Space and scale in higher education: the glonacal agency heuristic revisited. *Higher Education*, 84(6), 1365–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00955-0>
- Oleksiyenko, A. V. (2021). Is academic freedom feasible in the post-Soviet space of higher education? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(11), 1116–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1773799>
- Oliveira, L., & Johanson, M. (2021). Trust and firm internationalization: Dark-side effects on internationalization speed and how to alleviate them. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.042>
- Opetus- ja Kulttuuriministeriö (OKM) (2017). *Better together for a better world*. The strategy of internationalisation in Finnish higher education and research 2017–2025. <https://okm.fi/documents/1410845/4154572/YMP-en-net.pdf/ab74d6b2-a48f-49ee-9563-6313f87198ae>
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy*. Routledge.
- Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Rinne, R. (2022). *Reimagining Globalization and Education*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- RUR (2022). The Address of the Russian Union of Rectors. *Russian Union of Rectors*. 4 March. Retrieved 21.07.2024 from <https://rsr-online.ru/news/2022/3/4/obrashenie-rossijskogo-soyuz-rektorov/>
- Shenderova, S. (2018a). Internationalisation of higher education in Russia: National policy and results at institutional level. In V. Korhonen & P. Alenius (Eds.), *Internationalisation and Transnationalisation in Higher Education* (pp. 69–100). Peter Lang AG. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b11212>
- Shenderova, S. (2018b). Permanent Uncertainty as Normality? Finnish-Russian Double Degrees in the post-Crimea world. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(6), 611-628. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1529134>
- Shenderova, S. (2020a). Finnish-Russian Double Degree Programmes: When a Partner's Responsibilities Become a Challenge for Internationalisation. In B. Broucker, V. Borden, T. Kallenberg, & C. Milsom (Eds.), *Responsibility of Higher Education Systems: What? Why? How?* (pp. 185-203). Brill | Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004436558_011
- Shenderova, S. (2020b). Russia-EU Internationalisation of Higher Education: Cooperation vs Competition? In E. Balbachevsky, Y. Cai, H. Eggins, & S. Shenderova (Eds.), *Building Higher Education Cooperation with the EU:*

11 The Shadows of Internationalisation

Challenges and Opportunities from Four Continents (pp. 86-106). Brill | Sense.

https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004445420_006

Shenderova, S. (2023). Collaborative degree programmes in internationalisation policies: the salience of internal university stakeholders. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 13(2), 197-215.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2022.2120035>

Shenderova, S., Antonowicz, D., & Jaworska, M. (2023). New Actors, Administrative Measures and Conflicting Agendas: The Impact of the Pandemic on Internationalisation of Higher Education in Poland and Russia. In R. Pinheiro, E. Balbachevsky, P. Pillay, & A. Yonezawa (Eds.), *The Impact of Covid-19 on the Institutional Fabric of Higher Education* (pp. 65-87). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26393-4_3

Team Finland Knowledge programme (TFK) (2023). *TFK programme*. <https://www.oph.fi/en/programmes/tfk-programme>

Varghese, N., & Sarkar, N. (2022). Privatization versus Private Sector in Higher Education in India. In S. Chattopadhyay, S. Marginson, & N. V. Varghese (Eds.), *Changing Higher Education in India* (pp. 95–120). Bloomsbury Academic.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350192409.ch-004>

Ubaydullaeva, D. (2020). “Franchise” Branch Campuses in Uzbekistan: The Internationalisation of Higher Education as a Solution? *Central Asian Affairs*, 7(2), 152–174. <https://doi.org/10.30965/22142290-00702002>

UN (2024a). *Goal 4. Targets and Indicators*. https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4#targets_and_indicators

UN (2024b). *What is Goal 4*. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Goal-4-Fast-Facts.pdf>

Wu, H. (2019). Three dimensions of China’s “outward-oriented” higher education internationalization. *Higher Education*, 77(1), 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0262-1>

Yudkevich, M., Altbach, Ph. G., & Salmi, J. (2023). *Academic Star Wars: Excellence Initiatives in Global Perspective*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14601.001.0001>