



AARHUS UNIVERSITY



# Cover sheet

---

## **This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.**

The content in the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, although typography and layout may differ.

## **How to cite this publication**

Please cite the final published version:

Katja Brøgger, Hannah Moscovitz; An International Institution Embedded in the Nation-State: Moving beyond the “Either/Or” Paradigm of the Globalization and (Re)nationalization of the Modern University. *Global Perspectives* 3 February 2022; 3 (1): 56932. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2022.56932>

## Publication metadata

<b>Title:</b>	An International Institution Embedded in the Nation-State: Moving beyond the “Either/Or” Paradigm of the Globalization and (Re)nationalization of the Modern University
<b>Author(s):</b>	Katja Brøgger & Hannah Moscovitz
<b>Journal:</b>	Global Perspectives
<b>DOI/Link:</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2022.56932">10.1525/gp.2022.56932</a>
<b>Document version:</b>	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

Published as Brøgger, Katja, and Hannah Moscovitz. 2022. “An International Institution Embedded in the Nation-State: Moving beyond the ‘Either/Or’ Paradigm of the Globalization and (Re)Nationalization of the Modern University.” *Global Perspectives* 3 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2022.56932>. © 2022 by [the Regents of the University of California/Sponsoring Society or Association]. **Copying and permissions notice:** Authorization to copy this content beyond fair use (as specified in Sections 107 and 108 of the U. S. Copyright Law) for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by [the Regents of the University of California/on behalf of the Sponsoring Society] for libraries and other users, provided that they are registered with and pay the specified fee via Rightslink® or directly with the [Copyright Clearance Center](#).

### **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 recognize 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*

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

*If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.*

## **Abstract**

In this essay, we take up the call of this review symposium to explore how the emergence of (new) nationalisms affects the university's status as a "global institution." We challenge the binary view that there is an inherent tension between the "national(ist)" and the "global" role of the university, whereby either its global character is reducing its national distinctiveness, or its nationalist appeal is challenging its global tendencies. This binary positioning, we argue, obscures the compound and context-specific understandings of both (new) nationalism and higher education. To make our case, we draw on our current comparative study on the impact of neonationalism on European higher education. We start with a discussion of neonationalism and how our conceptualization informs the debate on the "national" and "global" interaction. We then provide a snapshot of some of our empirical findings on the impact of neonationalism on higher education policy in Denmark and the United Kingdom to shed light on the complex ways they interact. Through this reflection, we hope to advance discussion on how to research the (re)nationalization of higher education in the context of an increasingly globalized system.

Keywords: neo-nationalism, higher education, globalization, European integration, protectionism

The university's evolving societal role is the focus of growing inquiry and debate. In their recently published volumes, Frank and Meyer (2020) and Douglass (2021) offer contrasting visions of the university's future trajectory. For the former, the global development of higher education is leading to a certain isomorphism, through the dissemination and application of global standards and international reforms. Universities have positioned themselves "beyond space and time" (Frank and Meyer 2020, 31), bounded by a "homogenous culture" (Frank and Meyer 2020, 42). In the account painted by Douglass, the global dimension of higher education is threatened by a return to nationalist ideals and values, with the university caught in the crosswinds. The international engagement of universities is increasingly threatened by rising authoritarian, antiglobal, and exclusionary ideological currents. These different scenarios reflect the view that the university's global and national vocations are opposing forces, or as the editors of this collection put it, in a state of "inherent tension." In this juxtaposition, either the university's global tendencies are reducing its national distinctiveness, or its nationalist vocation poses a challenge to its global tendencies.

In this reflection, we challenge the binary view that there is an "inherent tension" between the "national" and the "global" and call for a more nuanced understanding of how the two are connected in relation to higher education. The binary positioning of the "national" and the "global," we argue, obscures the compound and context-specific understandings of both (new) nationalism and higher education. Our point of departure also reflects the idea that the university was born as an international, European institution in the Catholic Middle Ages and reborn as an institution based on the nation-state in the nineteenth century. Thus, the university should be considered an international institution deeply embedded in and serving the nation-state at the same time (de Ridder-Symoens and Rüegg 1992-2011; Kristensen et al. 2007). To make our case, we draw on our current international comparative study on the impact of neonationalism on European higher education.<sup>1</sup> We start with a discussion of neonationalism and how our conceptualization informs the debate on the "national" and "global" interaction. We then provide a snapshot of some of our preliminary empirical findings on the impact of neonationalism on higher education policy in Denmark and the United Kingdom, to shed light on the complex ways they interact.

---

<sup>1</sup> The "Asserting the Nation" project (2021–2025) is supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark [grant 0163-00024B and grant 0163-00025B]. <https://projekter.au.dk/en/asserting-the-nation>.

### **Conceptualizing Neonationalism**

While “not entirely new” (Delanty 2021, 104), nationalism has reemerged in the post–Cold War era as a reaction to transformative transnational and global developments, most notably those attributed to globalization (Gingrich and Banks 2006). It is generally agreed that the extensive globalization process during the 1990s and early 2000s—which, in Europe, coincided with the strengthening of the European Union and the harmonization of European education systems, coupled with downturns, recessions, or depressions in the world’s economy—might have exacerbated nationalist movements. Meanwhile, as already indicated, the rise of neonationalisms does not seem to be a simple antithesis to globalization; the two tendencies are instead closely intertwined (Bergmann 2020; Bieber 2020; Brøgger 2021, 2022). We argue that nationalism cannot be addressed as a singular phenomenon. It is multifaceted, its manifestation varying from one context to the next. As pointed out by Douglass (2021, xi), “neo-nationalism has different meanings and consequences for universities in different parts of the world...” Thus, nationalism and associated protectionist agendas must be considered deeply embedded in the specificity of a particular region or nation, with different implications for universities depending on their historical and political contexts.

In this essay, we approach the university as a microcosm of conflicting political ideas and practices concerning the global/European and the national in a European higher education context. Analyzing the development of nationalist protectionist initiatives by bringing together knowledge on university history, European higher education reform processes, and national university politics reveals that new nationalisms are affiliated with post–Cold War readjustments occupied with asserting the nation’s right to intervene in and limit the agency of autonomous and self-governing institutions (Brøgger 2022). The tightening of the European integration process gave rise not only to extensive international reforms of European higher education (notably the Bologna Process) but also to new nationalisms as European geopolitics readjusted to post–Cold War realities (Brøgger 2022; Gingrich and Banks 2006). These new nationalisms have cultivated their idea of “the national” in opposition to the European integration process consolidated by the Maastricht Treaty on the European Union in 1992 (Brøgger 2021, 2022). As such, in a European context, we may consider neonationalist movements as concomitant to the strengthening of the EU from the beginning of the 1990s, presenting themselves as protectors of national interest in the face of reduced sovereignty, internationalism, and socioeconomic pressures brought on by European integration. New nationalist movements in Europe are thus tied together by their opposition to a perceived common threat seen in Europeanization processes accelerated even further by globalizing forces leading to a widespread outsourcing of manufacturing, loss of jobs,

and economic and social insecurity. In addition, critical junctures (Bieber 2020) such as the 2008 financial crisis and the 2015 “migration crisis” have propelled the rise of neonationalism. More recently, the global crisis engendered by the COVID-19 pandemic has been cited as evidence of the “contemporary power of nationalism” (Cox 2021, 5) and as a potential trigger for an additional “wave of neo-nationalism” (Bergmann 2021). The pandemic has reinforced attitudes and policies around the importance of national sovereignty and amplified the authoritative power of national governments (Douglass 2021). We might also expect the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine to increase certain nationalist sentiments in Europe. This, of course, remains to be seen.

While context specific, these emerging new nationalist movements (in Europe and beyond) are transnationally connected, evidenced by the emulation of language, tactics, and policies between them, as well as their declared and practical support for one another (Ashutosh 2022; Zúquete 2015). Paradoxically perhaps, neonationalism is thus understood as a transnational phenomenon, carrying with it a certain level of shared features and ideals across national boundaries. In this way, neonationalism is about both the “national” and the “global.” Following this, new nationalist movements and their influence on higher education and university politics should not be considered as evidence of the enduring nature of the national; rather, as Kaldor argued, they should be understood as responses to globalization (Kaldor 2004). They may be conflicting forces, but they are closely intertwined and mutually nourishing. Or, as Cox puts it, “nationalism and globalization are not two poles of a zero-sum game where one advances and the other retreats” (Cox 2021, 125).

### **Internationalization and (Re)nationalization: Higher Education in Denmark and the UK**

From the initiation of the Bologna Process in 1999 up until the EU’s so-called migration crisis in 2015, higher education policy in Denmark was strongly influenced by reform ambitions and initiatives aimed at strengthening internationalization and aligning Danish higher education with the European Higher Education Area. Yet this period was followed by a turn to national protectionism and opposition to “the European.” A nationalist reordering of the political arrangements around higher education in Denmark is observed in recent national policy initiatives, including the government decision to shut down its international education office and divide tasks between bureaus, as well as initiatives targeting student mobility and the structure of degree programs (Brøgger 2022). Specific measures, elaborated on below, include the drastic government-mandated reduction in the number of English-language university programs, designed to reduce the number of foreign students in Denmark.

The deceleration of internationalization policies within higher education in favor of national primacy began with the accession of a center-right Danish government in 2015 (Ministry of Higher Education and Science 2016, 2018). Rooted in the 2013 “SU settlement for migrant workers”<sup>2</sup> and despite Danish universities being formally autonomous self-governing institutions, the government decided to cut the number of international students enrolled in Danish higher education programs in 2018. The SU settlement was designed to counteract a 2013 EU ruling stipulating that all EU (or European Economic Area) citizens are entitled to study at any university within the EU under the same conditions as nationals (Court of Justice of the European Union 2013). For Denmark, this meant access to tuition and grant opportunities available to nationals, provided they work ten to twelve hours per week while studying and otherwise fulfill the conditions as a migrant worker (Ministry of Science Innovation and Higher Education 2013).

As EU antidiscrimination rules prevented Denmark from denying the admission of EU students, the “SU settlement” placed a cap on SU spending for non-Danish students. The decision to reduce international student intake at Danish universities mandated that approximately 1,200 student places in English-language bachelor’s and master’s degree programs be cut. In 2016, 2,232 international students were enrolled in bachelor’s degree programs, corresponding to a little less than 3 percent of the total bachelor’s degree population in Denmark; 9,919 international students were enrolled in master’s degree programs, corresponding to 15 percent of the total master’s degree population in Denmark (Brøgger 2021; Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education 2018). The decision to cut the number of international students by reducing the availability of English-language courses was justified through economic or welfare nationalism arguments, according to which the financing of international students posed a burden on the Danish economy. Meanwhile, these lines of argumentation in support of economic nationalism intersected with issues of ethnicity and race among national-conservative politicians and those backing the SU settlement, reclaiming education as an ethnic-territorial domain that should be tailored to benefit only nationals. This development has since been supported by a second round of reductions announced in autumn 2021, though this agreement targeted mainly university colleges and business academies (Brøgger 2022; Ministry of Higher Education and Science 2021).

---

<sup>2</sup> Danish students receive a publicly funded study grant called State Education Support, more commonly known as SU.

Like Denmark, the UK's higher education sector has been at the center of political shifts in recent years as the country comes to terms with its post-Brexit arrangements. The UK in the context of Brexit is often cited as a quintessential example of the current neonationalism "trend." Nationalism and especially the "newly-politicized" national identity in England, combined with contestations over sovereignty, were important contributing factors to the UK's decision to leave the EU (Wellings 2021, 322). The anti-EU sentiment driving Brexit was underpinned by a desire to see the UK "take back control" of competencies perceived as having been lost to the supra-state scale (Cox 2021). The impacts of Brexit on the UK's higher education sector are manifold, with repercussions on mobility (Zotti 2021) and access to research funding (Highman 2019), among others. In terms of funding, future access for UK institutions to the EU's Horizon program remains unclear as prospects could be challenged by disagreements on trade arrangements between the EU and the UK. Perhaps the most cited challenge to higher education, though, involves the UK's decision to retreat from the EU's flagship Erasmus mobility program.

As the UK government announced its departure from Erasmus at the end of 2020, it swiftly introduced its alternative, the Turing Scheme, aimed at opening the UK up to a broader list of countries, "well beyond Europe's frontiers," while "boosting our ties with international partners in the process" (Department for Education 2021). While couched as a necessary step toward the UK reclaiming its global status, the scheme offered no funding for incoming students, prioritizing the outward mobility of its own students. With depleted funding, the incentives for international students to study in the UK are significantly reduced. Yet, unlike the Danish case, the rationales behind the new scheme were not explicitly linked to a desire to cut the number of international students in the country. The government argued that the UK has "considerable appeal as a destination and partner in international mobilities and exchanges" (UK Parliament. House of Commons, 2021a), and that this would be harnessed in the new scheme. Indeed, the UK's long-standing position as a leader in global education renders it a prime destination for international students.

In contrast to the Danish case, then, student mobility remains on the agenda, though the UK government is in control of the narratives and features of its program. It has "taken back control," as it promised. Yet here the isolationist rhetoric often associated with neonationalism and the idea that these movements are pinned against global cooperation are not so clear-cut. The UK government is distancing itself from the EU, an actor perceived as having taken sovereignty away, while opening up to the wider world and leveraging this reach to strengthen its global image and appeal.

The UK is a devolved political system and understanding nationalism in this context also necessitates recognition of the UK's overlapping nationalist projects. Indeed, a context-sensitive approach to nationalism should account for competing nationalist projects within certain communities (Bieber 2020; Moscovitz 2022). While often described as a triumph of English (neo)nationalism, Brexit has also reinforced minority nationalisms in the UK. In Scotland, Brexit ignited contestations over sovereignty, especially as it relates to the EU (McEwen 2022). In terms of higher education, the Scottish government rebuked the UK's decision to leave the Erasmus program. While its efforts to remain within the program failed, the Scottish government is pursuing international education policy avenues that promote the maintenance of a strong relationship with the EU and underscore its distinct image as an "open, welcoming and internationalist country" (UK Parliament. House of Commons 2021b), seemingly in contrast to the UK's approach. In this context, different forms and shades of nationalism interact, and the higher education sector finds itself caught up in these contradictory forces.

These brief examples demonstrate that the impact of nationalism on higher education is not uniform, with crucial distinctions to consider even within the confines of a territorial state. As Denmark seems to embark on a more protectionist and isolationist nationalism and a closing of borders, the UK seems to venture into a more globally engaged nationalism rooted in the idea of British exceptionalism. The UK is accordingly promoting global collaboration despite distancing itself from the EU in the name of national sovereignty. These examples are also telling for the differentiated way the "national" and the "global" interact. The Danish case exemplifies a more straightforward tension between the desire to safeguard national interests and the ability of universities to act on the international scene. For the UK, however, the protectionist agendas and neonationalist ideals underpinning Brexit did not challenge universities' international engagement in the same way. It might have reoriented their international engagement but cannot be said to be eliminating them. Moreover, the UK and Scotland have diverging accounts of how global engagement should be oriented, the latter prioritizing the EU and the former attempting to demarcate itself from it. The juxtaposition of the Danish and UK cases supports the need for context-sensitive approaches to the study of higher education. Both neonationalism and higher education are in need of explanation and contextualization.<sup>3</sup>

### **Toward the Study of the (Re)nationalization of Higher Education Policy**

In the last two decades, higher education studies have been heavily focused on globalization and internationalization as frames of reference for understanding developments in higher education

---

<sup>3</sup> For further discussion on the importance of context-specific approaches to questions of nationalism, internationalization, and higher education, see Hsieh 2020.

policies and processes. This has, to a certain degree, come at the expense of research on the relationship between nationalism and higher education, which remains limited in comparison (Koch 2014). Taking inspiration from the idea of a “critique beyond criticism” (Foucault 1997)—a critique that does not begin with a plea for a revolution but “stays with the trouble” (Haraway 2016; see also Brøgger 2021; Butler 2004; Staunæs and Brøgger 2020)—this essay argues that current trends toward renationalization necessitate a better understanding of how nationalism and higher education interact. Yet this research should be accompanied by a continued inquiry into globalization/Europeanization processes in the higher education domain. Empirically, this could be facilitated by efforts to avoid both traps of “methodological nationalism” and “methodological globalism” (Takayama and Lingard 2021).

If, as we argue here, the “national” and the “global” dimensions of higher education are intertwined, the study of higher education should also bring the globalization and (re)nationalization literatures closer. This would support the call for scholarship to make stronger connections between studies of globalization and studies of nationalism (Cox 2021; Halikiopolou and Vasilopoulbu 2011), the latter having been somewhat neglected in favor of the former in higher education studies during the past two decades. The university offers a prime vantage point to advance these theoretical developments, as it has historically been tied to both nation-building and international/transnational/global goals. This dual function is apparent in the juxtaposition of the two volumes under review throughout this symposium, one highlighting a return to national and nationalist tendencies (Douglass 2021), and the other making the case for the university as a global institution pivotal to the development of the global knowledge society (Frank and Meyer 2020). Exploring how the higher education domain is entangled in the national-global nexus can advance a much-needed understanding of the until now “empirically opaque” (Cox 2021, 99) relationship between nationalism and globalization. This could go some way toward rupturing the “either/or” perspective on the university’s “national” and “global” vocations, and toward offering more nuanced views on its societal role, appeal, and future trajectory.

### **Competing Interests**

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

### **Author Biographies**

**Katja Brøgger** is Associate Professor at Aarhus University, Denmark. She is the research program director of [Policy Futures](#) and host of the Policy Futures International Webinar Series. Brøgger is the PI of two comparative projects on how new nationalisms and geopolitical shifts

affect European higher education and research. The projects are funded by the Independent Research Fund Denmark. She is a member of the editorial board of *Journal of Education Policy* and *Globalisation, Societies and Education* and remote evaluator for the European Research Council. Her primary field of expertise is higher education and research policy and governance, and she has published several articles and book chapters on topics such as the new geopolitics of higher education and research, the EU, governance of European higher education and research, accountability, privatization, and new nationalisms. She is a member of the European Consortium of Political Research, the Comparative and International Education Society, Society for Research into Higher Education, and the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers.

**Hannah Moscovitz** is a postdoctoral research fellow at the Danish School of Education, Aarhus University, pursuing research funded by the Independent Research Fund Denmark. Her research interests lie at the intersection between territorial politics and higher education policy and governance, touching on questions around regionalism, multinational federalism, and national/regional identity politics. Her recent work has focused on the relationship between higher education policy and minority nationalism, highlighting the cases of Quebec, Wallonia, and Scotland.

## References

- Ashutosh, Ishan. 2022. "The Transnational Routes of White and Hindu Nationalisms." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45 (2): 319-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.1924392>.
- Bergmann, Eirikur. 2020. *Neo-nationalism: The Rise of Nativist Populism*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41773-4>.
- Bergmann, Eirikur. 2021. "Will the COVID-19 Crisis Lead to a Fourth Wave of Neo-nationalism?". *English Studies in Africa*, 64(1-2): 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00138398.2021.1969101>.
- Bieber, Florian. 2020. *Debating Nationalism: The Global Spread of Nations*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350098558>.
- Brøgger, Katja. 2021. "A Specter is Haunting European Higher Education—the Specter of Neo-nationalism". In *Higher Education Hauntologies*, edited by Bozalek, et. al., 63-75. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003058366-4>.
- Brøgger, Katja 2022. "Post-Cold War Governance Arrangements in Europe: The University between European Integration and Rising Nationalisms". *Globalization, Societies, and Education*, May, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2022.2075832>.
- Butler, J. 2004. "What is Critique?. An Essay on Foucault's Virtue." In *The Judith Butler Reader*, edited by S. Salih and J. Butler. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Court of Justice of the European Union. 2013. Case C46/12: Judgment of Court (Third Chamber), 21 February 2013. REQUEST for a preliminary ruling under Article 267 TFEU from the Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtte (Denmark), made by decision of 24 January 2012, received at the Court on 26 January 2012, in the proceedings L.N., v. Styrelsen for Videregående Uddannelser og Uddannelsesstøtte.
- Cox, Lloyd. 2021. *Nationalism: Themes, Theories, and Controversies*. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9320-8>.
- Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education. 2018. *De engelsksprogede studerende. Registeranalyse (English-speaking Students. A Register Analysis)*.
- de Ridder-Symoens, Hilde, and Walter Rüegg. 1992-2011. *A History of the University in Europe* (Vol. I-IV). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2021. "Return of the Nation-State? De-Europeanisation and the Limits of Neo-Nationalism". *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 17(2):103-115. <https://doi.org/10.30950/jcer.v17i2.1180>.
- Douglass, John Aubrey. 2021. *Neo-nationalism and Universities: Populists, Autocrats, and the Future of Higher Education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1997. "What is Critique?". In *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Questions and Twentieth Century Answers*, edited by James Schmidt, 23-61. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Frank, David John, and John W. Meyer. 2020. *The University and the Global Knowledge Society*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.23943/princeton/9780691202051.001.0001>.
- Gingrich, André, and Marcus Banks, eds. 2006. *Neo-nationalism in Europe and Beyond: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Halikiopoulou, Daphne, and Sofia Vasilopoulbu, eds. 2011. *Nationalism and Globalisation: Conflicting or Complementary?* London: Routledge.
- Haraway, Donna J. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kinship in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cw25q>.
- Highman, Ludovic. 2019. "Future EU-UK Research and Higher Education Cooperation at Risk: What Is at Stake?." *Tertiary Education and Management* 25 (1): 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-018-09013-w>.
- Hsieh, Chuo-Chun. 2020. "Internationalization of Higher Education in the Crucible: Linking National Identity and Policy in the Age of Globalization." *International Journal of*

- Educational Development*, 78 (October): 102254.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102245>.
- Kaldor, Mary. 2004. "Nationalism and Globalization." *Nations and Nationalism*, 10 (1-2):161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1354-5078.2004.00161.x>.
- Koch, Natalie. 2014. "The Shifting Geopolitics of Higher Education: Inter/nationalizing Elite Universities in Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, and Beyond". *Geoforum*, 56 (September): 46-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.014>.
- Kristensen, Jens Erik et al. 2007. ed. *Ideer om et universitet: det moderne universitets idehistorie fra 1800 til i dag*. Aarhus universitetsforlag.
- McEwen Nicola. (2022): "Irreconcilable Sovereignties? Brexit and Scottish Self-Government", *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 10 (15): 733-749.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2022.2044898>.
- Ministry of Higher Education and Science of Denmark. 2016. "Fire ud af ti udenlandske SU-modtagere forlader Danmark efter studierne." Press release.  
\_ \_ \_ . 2018. "Justering af engelsksprogede uddannelser."  
\_ \_ \_ . 2021. *Ny politisk aftale begrænser SU-udgifter til udenlandske studerende fra EU*.
- Ministry of Science Innovation and Higher Education of Denmark. 2013. *EU-Domstolens dom i sag C-46/12, L.N.:2. april, 2013*.
- Moscovitz, Hannah. 2022. "Projecting the Nation (s) in Multinational Federal Systems: International Education and Nation Branding in Canada/Quebec". *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 52(1):82-106. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjab005>.
- Staunæs, Dorthe, and Katja Brøgger. 2020. "In the Mood of Data and Measurements: Experiments as Affirmative Critique, or How to Curate Academic Value with Care." *Feminist Theory*, 21(4): 429-445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700120967301>.
- Takayama, Keita, and Bob Lingard. 2021. "How to Achieve a 'Revolution': Assembling the Subnational, National and Global in the Formation of a New, 'Scientific' Assessment in Japan." *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 19 (2): 228-244.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1878016>.
- UK Government. Department for Education Press Release. 2021. "40,000 students to study across the globe as part of new Turing Scheme." August 4, 2021. [40,000 students to study across the globe as part of new Turing Scheme - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/40000-students-to-study-across-the-globe-as-part-of-new-turing-scheme)
- UK Parliament. House of Commons. 2021a. "Turing Scheme, Question for Department of Education." January 28, 2021 [Written questions and answers - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament](https://www.parliament.uk/written-questions-and-answers/written-questions-answers-and-statements)

- \_ \_ \_ 2021b. "Universities and Scotland, HC 673". Scottish Affairs Committee Oral Evidence. January 28, 2021. <https://committees.parliament.uk/oralevidence/1618/pdf/>
- Wellings, Ben. 2021. "Brexit, Nationalism and Disintegration in the European Union and the United Kingdom". *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 29 (3): 322-334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2020.1753664>.
- Zotti, Stephan. 2021. "Academic Mobility after Brexit: Erasmus and the UK post-2020". *European Journal of English Studies*, 25(1): 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825577.2021.1918834>.
- Zúquete, José Pedro. 2015 "The New Frontlines of Right-Wing Nationalism." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 20 (1): 69-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2015.991492>.