



**INTERVIEW WITH PROF. JUSSI VÄLIMAA:
FINNISH HIGHER EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY AND
COLLEGIALITY IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION**

ENTREVISTA COM O PROF. JUSSI VÄLIMAA:
EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR NA FINLÂNDIA, UNIVERSIDADE E
COLEGIALIDADE EM TEMPOS DE GLOBALIZAÇÃO

ENTREVISTA AL PROF. JUSSI VÄLIMAA:
EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR EN FINLANDIA, UNIVERSIDAD Y
COLEGIALIDAD EN TIEMPOS DE GLOBALIZACIÓN



*Bernardo Sfredo Miorando*¹

*Jussi Välimaa*²

Perhaps the main author studying universities in Finland, Professor Jussi Välimaa describes himself as “a historian with sociological imagination studying higher education”.

The education in history was pursued in bachelor’s, master’s and licentiateⁱⁱ degrees, while the sociological imagination is tied to the doctorate in social policy. All the degrees were obtained from his *alma mater*, the University of Jyväskylä, in central Finland. The institution’s roots are in the country’s first teacher training seminar to educate in Finnish language, and to date, the University occupies a leading position in the training and research in education. This is the context of the Finnish Institute for Educational Research (FIER).

Submitted on: 10/01/2018 - **Accepted in:** 24/01/2018 - **Published:** 06/03/2018.

Photo source: J. Välimaa’s personal collection.

© Rev. Inter. Educ. Sup.

Campinas, SP

v.4

n.2

p.468-480

May/Ago. 2018

After around three decades dedicating himself to the theme of higher education, and since 2001 as a professor in the area, Jussi Välimaa has of 2017 taken on the position of Director of FIER. In this Institute, he had formerly founded the research group *Higher Education Studies* (HIEST) and led the research focus area *Educational Systems and Society*.

Among other positions, he was a founding member of the *Consortium of Higher Education Researchers in Finland* (CHERIF), serving as its chair from 1999 to 2007. He is also a member of the *Consortium of Higher Education Researchers* (CHER), which he presided from 2014 to 2017, and of the *Association for the Study of Higher Education* (ASHE). He was a member of the *Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council* (FINHEEC) from 2008 to 2009 and chaired its evaluation of international degree programs in Finland in 2012-2013. He was also the editor of *Higher Education* journal for nine years, until 2017.

The interview took place in the end of December, 2017, in the RuusuPuisto building, where FIER is headquartered, together with the Open University and the Faculty of Education and Psychology of the University of Jyväskylä. In this dialogue, Professor Jussi Välimaa speaks about various aspects of Finnish higher education, such as the historical traits that modeled it, the current scene of higher education research in Finland, internationalization of higher education and the underpinnings of collegial academic culture.

Who is Jussi Välimaa?

Jussi Välimaa: Well, if I try to think it in a Brazilian wayⁱⁱⁱ, I am a white male in his 60s. I have been working in universities from 1984. Mainly in the University of Jyväskylä, but I have also spent short times doing research in the United States, in Japan, in the Netherlands. And I have been in the field of higher education research from the late 1980s. So, I have been in this field for close to 30 years. I am now a professor in educational research and director of the Finnish Institute for Educational Research.

You have been studying for a few decades the phenomena of higher education. What is higher education's role in national projects?

Jussi Välimaa: I would say that in every organized society there is a need for higher education. There is the need for educating young generations. Educating them, socializing them into their societies. In the contemporary world, in the modern world, there is also a need for the highest-level research. So, the role of higher education is crucially important for the well-being of contemporary societies. But how is this social function of education, research organized? That varies quite much. We reveal this variation with the help of different ideas of university.

Like, the Anglo-American idea of university, which is very much based on free society, as they understand it in the United States and Great Britain, and the rule of the market. The

traditional continental European model has the crucial relationship between the universities – and other higher education institutions – and the state. The French republican model is basically very open and democratic, but in practice, it is very stratified with *écoles normales*^{iv} being at the top of the system. And *écoles normales* are very selective, whereas universities are not that selective at all. So the answers to the question “how is higher education organized?” are very different. And this also has consequences when we think about institutional autonomy or academic freedom. In the Anglo-American model – or the Westminster model, as Simon Marginson^v calls it – academic freedom describes the relationship with the market forces, more or less. In the continental model, it describes the relationship with the state. And this is even more the case in the French model. So, even these basic understandings of institutional autonomy are understood very differently in different parts of the world. And then, when we go to East – Simon Marginson has called it the Confucian model –, the way of thinking and the idea of education in society is again a different story. Traditionally, there has been a very strong appreciation of education and a good life made through education. In the contemporary globalized world, this way of thinking has led to oppressive schooling practices, where families try to force their children to go to the best schools, so that they would go to the best universities and make the best of their lives.

What about the Finnish idea of university?

Jussi Välimaa: I would like to call it more like the Nordic idea of university. Well, it is the Nordic model with five exceptions^{vi}, as they say. The Finnish exception has some similarities with the Norwegian and the Swedish models. In Finland, higher education played a crucial role in the making of the nation-state. Because 200 years ago, Finland was part of the Russian Empire. It was part of the Russian Empire for 100 years. It had been 700 years under Swedish rule before that. So, during this 100 years, Finland created all the institutions needed for civil society. And university trained the civil servants basically for all these different institutions needed for civil society.

Ideologically, it is a very strong part of the birth and emergence of the Finnish nationalism. And Finnish nationalism is an interesting story, because it is a story of a nationalism creating a nation, creating its identity, its culture, its history. And university played a really important role in all these processes: making the Finnish nation, developing the Finnish language into a language that can be used in every field of society – whereas it used to be a language spoken by peasants and lower estates in society. Something like indigenous languages in South America. And if you think from that perspective, you really need to develop a vocabulary. You need to develop concepts. You need to systematize the grammar. And then all these things need to be done in a way that not only the common people, but also the educated will start using that language. These processes happened in Finland during the 19th century. And university was in their core.

The other important part was the teacher training because teachers more or less were the modernizing agents in Finnish society; because they went to rural villages and educated the nation in a nationalistic and Christian^{vii} way. So, in the Finnish version, university has been understood as a strong cultural institution. In Finland, higher education has been a very important social and cultural institution in the development of the nation-state.

It strikes me now that the Finnish university has the particularity of not being only an institution for civilizing the people, but also for popularizing what is the notion of civilization. It produced different relationship between what is modernity and what is tradition, in the sense that modernization was linked to re-enacting and reliving this traditional language and uses of the Finnish people.

Jussi Välimaa: Yes, and the mechanisms in how it happened was that academics and civil servants started to establish scientific associations in all fields, from biology to language and culture. And in all these scientific associations, they started to publish in Finnish, scientific texts in Finnish. Which meant that they needed to develop the concepts in Finnish to be able to write in Finnish about biology or astronomy or geography or history or popular culture. And this kind of development was done in a very nationalistic way. Because the cultural-political movement of the Fennomans^{viii} really aimed to not only to educate the people, to educate the nation, but also to nationalize the educated. So, they had both of these actions. And of course, this kind of process which challenges the existing ruling class, which was Swedish-speaking, it was full of conflicts, problems, and so it was not a very easy process.

How does the national role of Finnish universities present itself nowadays?

Jussi Välimaa: I would like to say that the national role of Finnish universities is still here. It is one of the historical layers. And when we follow the debates on the importance of Finnish-speaking publications, of the importance of putting the Finnish-speaking journals into this Publication Forum categorization^{ix}, this debate echoes the debates in the 1840s, 1850s. So, this national role has not vanished, but it has gotten weaker. And it has been challenged by globalization, by neoliberal policies, by the economic rationale, the economic perspective of seeing society from the perspective of productivity, efficiency, impacts. Not necessarily from the perspective of making profit, but acting in a rational, effective way so that the tax-payers' money is not wasted. This kind of historical layer in university is closely related with managerialism – because new public management is the managerial fad in universities and in societies. So, this seems to be taking over. But I am not sure if it truly manages to take over. I think it rather creates a new layer on top of existing nationalistic understandings of universities and higher education. And depending on disciplines, depending on universities and polytechnics^x, it plays a different role. And it seem to be the dominating one, but we will see.

Amidst this social struggle, can the university be an agent in the national political scene?

Jussi Välimaa: I think that you have to look at who are the actors in the national political scene, or rather scenes. I think that in the field of higher education policy-making, universities are real actors. Other actors in that field are labor organizations, students, representatives of employees, and the higher education institutions. And then, when I try to answer this question, I should pay attention to the fact that universities are not monolithic entities. Universities have conflicting interests inside them. So, the question ‘who is university?’ is crucial here. Is the university the rectors of the universities? Well, they have their own association, UNIFI^{xi}, which tries to act as the representative of the Finnish universities, tries to speak in the voice of the Finnish universities.

But then, we have academics, and we still have academics who act as public intellectuals, who address important political questions in society. We have researchers. It is quite often the case that experts from universities have been interviewed by the press. There has been an attempt to renew our health care and social care system – it is called SOTE^{xii}, SOTE reform – and this attempt has been going on for some ten years. And the university professors and researchers are continuously being interviewed as experts in this process. So, I would like to say that yes, universities have some role, but academics in Finnish society still have a strong role in our public debates. It has been challenged, but still they have a role, they are listened to as experts in their fields.

Which are the main trends of higher education research in Finland, today?

Jussi Välimaa: I think higher education research in Europe and in Finland is very much influenced by national higher education policies. Because that is where the money comes from, partially. And that is where the public interest is. When we say that we have a very equal system of higher education, it can be formulated as research questions: ‘do we really have an equal system of higher education?’; ‘do we have an equal access to higher education?’; ‘who gets access to higher education?’; what are the background factors that support access to higher education?’. The crucial social values of equality really influence our research interests, it is the interest of society. So, this is one of the long-term interests in Finnish higher education. Other permanent theme is the pedagogical perspective: ‘how to teach better in universities?’; ‘what is learning in higher education?’; ‘what is their relationship?’. The third theme, which is represented by public administration academics, is management, leadership, decision-making processes.

As I said that: what are the values of society? What are the public interests to higher education? I would assume that this influences the research done on higher education in every nation. But the public interests and the values of the society may be different. Well, if you think about the United States, they have thousands of books on leadership and management. In Finland, we are just beginning to see something like that. But why is it so important in the United States? Because, for them, university or college is the main unit of analysis for research. It is the unit that they recognize as an entity. And in the American capitalist context,

management and efficient functioning of this socio-economic entity is really important. In continental Europe, that was not really so important, because universities were part of the state machinery – meaning that they were regulated by the laws and the staff had the status of civil servants. And there was not really room for institutional management. In most European countries and in Finland, this has changed. So, now our legislators try make the universities as independent organizations from the state machinery. But still, in Finland, the state has not given up its controlling power. It uses it through economic incentives, through the funding model, through performance agreements. And somebody has said – I think it is pretty right – that now our Ministry of Education has more control of universities than it had when they were part of the state machinery. Because the values were very different in the 1970s-80s, when universities were understood as autonomous institutions and politicians and civil servants were not allowed to deal with academic topics. Now, through the funding system, through different funding instruments, that is what our government, Ministry of Education, tries to influence. And it is pretty successful.

This being the new focal point of the relationship between university and the state, which themes, on the other hand, are left out of the arena? What is not researched?

Jussi Välimaa: I think that there are two questions: ‘what is researched?’ and then ‘what is funded to be researched?’. Still, professors in Finnish universities have academic freedom. So, in their own time, they may research anything. And if they want to be independent from the state influence, they don’t apply for extra money. They do small projects by themselves. So, this state of matters has not changed. It is not fashionable, it is not desirable, but that is what we can do. And some do. But if you have many doctoral students, if you have many colleagues who are on fixed-term funding, then you need to start the funding race. You need to start applying for external funding, to help your doctoral students, to help your colleagues. And this is what normally professors do, and of course external funding is very much expected and favored by our management, by our leadership, including me, of course, in this role. But it is not the only option.

Which other themes would you say should be given more attention in the Finnish academic scene?

Jussi Välimaa: Well, critical analyses of management, of leadership. I think it is really needed, because our legislators have created structures which really emphasize the role and the power of leadership. I think it should really critically analyzed. Then, I think what is also interesting is the relationship between higher education institutions and society. How they are connected, how they are networked. Well, this is what we are researching in a FIER’s academic project^{xiii}. I think these are the basic things that are important for the functioning of universities. What is taught, what is learned? How are the decisions made? These are broader themes, just like management and leadership. And then, of course, I think that collegial structures would still exist as the basic layer in academic life. That could be researched also. I

don't have a feeling in my current position that we are restricted from researching anything. But we are supported and expected to research themes that are relevant for society. And this is the kind of field we are working.

How can internationalization be seen in Finland, nowadays?

Jussi Välimaa: I think that it is quite interesting, because internationalization came to Finnish higher education in the 1990s as an issue that would save our society, our universities. By becoming more international, we would be more successful, more efficient. We would have better quality. We would be more tolerant to other people, etc. Not only in universities, but as a society. And this kind of thinking has not disappeared. But our current government made the very unhappy decision to connect internationalization and international students to migration topics. Like most governments in Western Europe. This created new tensions for internationalization. Still, internationalization is high in the agenda in our Ministry of Education. They have not abandoned it. I just listened to a speech by one of the highest state officials in the Ministry of Education and in her agenda, internationalization was a very important issue. But it has really been weakened by our national government. So, internationalization, like Frank Zappa said, it is not dead, it just smells odd^{xiv}. So, internationalization is not dead, but it is in a more challenging environment at the moment. But I think that in universities, internationalization continues to be a very strong topic. And the fact that Finland joined the European Union in 1995 has really helped to make Finnish universities more international in the European scale and in the global scale. The European Union funding instruments really support this kind of international cooperation inside Europe. So, how do I see the role of internationalization in Finnish higher education? I think it is very strong. And I am hoping that we get rid of the tuition fees for international students because I think it is a very stupid decision and it doesn't really bring big money to Finland, but it prevents us from having good students, international students in our universities.

What would be the role of Finland in global higher education?

Jussi Välimaa: Finland is a very small player in global higher education. The role Finland could play is to make higher education free of tuition fees. So, that would be one case. The other role Finland, together with other Nordic countries, can play in global higher education is to show an alternative model to Anglo-American model, to French model. And why is that? It is because in Nordic countries, we have managed to combine high-quality education to everybody with high-quality higher education institutions. And this is in the conditions of universal access to higher education. In the Anglo world, the normal story is that when you have universal access to higher education, you have a very steep institutional stratification. And this is the case in the East as well. And in Russia, and in France, etc. Nordic countries are the exception to the rule. So, I think that is an alternative possibility to organize higher education in a society. That is the role that Nordic countries can play. And why am I saying this? I am saying this because I think that we cannot imitate the models of other countries, but

we can study how they have done it. We can learn from the experiences and then think: 'if we want to reach the same kind of situation, what should we do?'. This is not imitation, it is more like a translation process. And that is why we need to have alternative models. Otherwise, it could be too easy to think that there is only one best way to organize higher education. We have thousands of consultants and American professors who would gladly take money out of being consultants and saying how you should do it. Sorry, my good American colleagues, I didn't speak about you (laughs).

We are talking about how Anglo-American models diffused and became predominant in a context of globalization. How does university fit in a context that has been characterized as one of 'post-globalization' and rise of nationalisms?

Jussi Välimaa: Well, in a positive picture, universities have always been international, global, knots in academic networks. Universities have always been alternatives to nationalistic policies, because academics have always had contacts across national borders, in most fields. Not everybody, but in most fields. I am not sure if we have entered the period of post-globalization. Because, from a historical point of view, this is the third globalization, maybe. First, the period of the sailing ships, when the Europeans found out the rest of the globe. Since then, every part of the globe gets connected. Now, the connections are faster than ever, but the phenomenon in itself is old. And I think that in the sense of what Manuel Castells^{xv} says about the age of information^{xvi} is very true. Maybe it is better than globalization. Because we are connected through electronic media.

So, what can be the role of universities in this situation? We have written a book with David Hoffman^{xvii} about re-becoming universities^{xviii}, the universities in networked knowledge societies. We are suggesting that universities could be the social spaces and social places for different ways of thinking, for different people to meet each other to communicate with each other. Because universities have global networks, international networks, and they have also the institutional basis, resources and infrastructure, to bring different people and ideas together. And I think that if universities take that role, they can play a role in their societies: connecting people, connecting ideas; bringing together people, bringing together ideas. And to encourage friendly debates. In the core of good politics is respectful debating. In the core of good academic practice, is the respectful debate, where we can argue, we can try to find the better arguments to support what we think. And I that kind of social space and social place universities could be.

So, structuring positive political values.

Jussi Välimaa: Yes. Democracy, collegiality, tolerance.

In 2017, Finnish higher education institutions started to collect tuition fees from non-European students studying in foreign-language programs. Later the same year, the World

Bank published a report suggesting that tuition-free public higher education institutions in Brazil should charge tuition fees according to students' family income. How should societies decide on the funding of higher education?

Jussi Välimaa: If we will get it from the economic perspective, there are studies which show that one euro, or dollar, or whatever, invested in higher education creates 6 to 8 euros or dollars in income. So, from an economic investment point of view, investing in higher education is rational policy, because it brings more money to society than what society spends for higher education. But that benefit goes, of course, through different kinds of taxes, which makes it harder to see. So, this is one perspective. The other one is social fairness. I think that what World Bank acknowledges is that those who benefit from higher education should pay for that. And then, in following statistics they will show is the majority of students come from middle class. And they benefit from higher education. So, they should pay for that. Which I think is a difficult argument to find counter-arguments to the fairness.

But if you start charging tuition fees from the students, empirical evidence from Canada and United Kingdom shows that it favors middle class students. Because students from labor class, students from families which have poor cultural and social resources don't see the benefit of a higher education degree, they see only the cost of a higher education degree. So, in their mind, easily, they think that 'should I put 10,000 dollars or euros to my one-year education or should I buy a new car?' or 'should I get vocational training^{xix} which lasts one or two years and then I would go on and work and make money?'. Finnish experience shows that those who go to vocational education make more money than university students before they are 30 years old. But when you look at life-time earnings, the university students earn much more.

So, collecting tuition fees benefits middle-class students. Then, normally, it is said that you should create scholarship programs – and that is the argument in Finland as well – that help poor students to go into universities. Again, you should have the knowledge of the scholarships. You should have somebody to help you to do that. And if your family doesn't have these resources, or if you live in a very poor environment, you don't apply for them.

The fourth argument would be the well-being of society. Do we want to have a society which tries to reduce inequality or strengthen inequality? If you create a system with tuition fees – and especially if they are high – you create a society which strengthens inequality. And in the long term, everybody loses in that kind of society: both the rich and the poor. Not immediately, but in the long term. But if you have a society which wants to reduce social inequality, you will have a safer society, healthier people and, in a way, a more stable society, a fairer society. So, I think that societies should really think carefully whether they charge tuition fees or not. Where they put the public investments: into the guns or into the education?

Among the trends that have resurfaced in recent, post-financial crisis years, we have seen the ideology of the minimal state, privatization and the responsabilization of the individual, with the weakening of the ties of social solidarity. What is the public character of university and what is its importance?

Jussi Välimaa: I think universities can be social spaces that support rational argumentation in society, that teaches their students for rational argumentation, introduces them to the ideas of tolerance, to understanding other people; help them to think better. So, I think universities really have a crucial role in societies. And I think that is maybe a strong argument for universal higher education. But of course, then, the higher education institutions should be quite good and not stratified that labor classes go to the very crappy universities and the elite goes to the best universities. And here, I am speaking as a Nordic person. I think that we should have high-quality education for everybody.

One of your topics of discussion is the role played by collegiality in making universities unique institutions. Amidst dynamics of corporatization, academic capitalism and globalization, how to situate collegiality and academic solidarity in the university of today?

Jussi Välimaa: Historically speaking, universities were established as collegially organized and run communities. And still are, in the meaning that, in the academic world, we make decisions together, we discuss with our colleagues, we find arguments and counter-arguments and then, when everybody agrees which is the best argument, then we follow that argument. So, this kind of collegial decision-making practices of academic work, in teaching and in research, that is still the very basis of universities. This is my argument. Collegiality is also based on consensus. So, when we argue, the best argument wins. It is quite different from the political decision-making, which is based on voting and basically the majority is right. In collegiality, when everybody agrees, that is what is followed. This means that it is also a more complicate and slower decision-making process. But the outcomes are normally better, because then people commit to the decisions made. So, this kind of understanding of collegiality as the basic layer of functioning of universities is pretty much focal to me. So that we should re-establish the collegial processes and respect that, because that is how universities work. I think that understanding this basic value can in itself change the universities, at least a bit. Because, independent of the management or leadership or management system, you can introduce collegial practices into them. Our managers, who now have much power, they can have collegial bodies with whom they discuss and then, after discussing, they execute the decision. Collegial principles could be followed in universities' senates even though they are very political bodies and normally they follow the voting principles. But what about considering the alternative?

You have developed a consistent work and established a sound career within the area of higher education, represented by your current position ahead of FIER. What should universities and scholars stand for nowadays?

Jussi Välimaa: I think we should defend tolerance, democratic society, which also means open society. Because in open society, you can debate on different things. Not open society in the political sense of the left, but democratic open society. And also, high quality which emerges from the collegial processes. But I think I have already preached about these things which I think that are important: tolerance; intellectual debates; high-quality research, which is based on academic criteria rather than political criteria; the independence of university from political decision-making processes. I still think that academic freedom and institutional autonomy are the best guarantees for high-quality universities and if universities have the highest quality, then they will be beneficial for societies. But I don't think that high academic quality is mechanic or a mechanism. It is rather the outcome of good processes in universities. And I think that in the heart of good processes in universities is collegiality.

What would you like to tell Brazilian people about your current work?

Jussi Välimaa: My current academic work? Well, I have written a book on the history of the Finnish higher education from the medieval times to the 21st century. So this book is coming out and there my perspective is to look at universities as part of the societies: how the relationship with society has changed, what kind of students they have had, what kind of academics they have had, how the decisions have been made in the universities. I look at universities as social institutions in societies, which have been influenced by society, but which have also influenced the society. This is my perspective and I have plans to publish it also in English. This is my main work during the last ten years. Then, I will edit an open access journal on equality and access to higher education. I will edit a special issue on the nature of educational research in Finland. Because our institute will celebrate its 50 years of existence in 2018. So, this is what I do academically. And some small writing.

Thank you.

Jussi Välimaa: Thank you.

Acknowledgements

The interviewer thanks professors Célia Caregnato and Denise Leite, from the Graduate Program in Education at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), as well as the anonymous reviewer "A", for their suggestions in the betterment of the Portuguese version of this interview.

He also thanks the Finnish people, through the Finnish National Agency for Education (EDUFI), and the Brazilian people, through the Coordination for the Enhancement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes), for supporting his doctoral studies, as this interview is part of them.

About the interviewee and the interviewer

¹ Bernardo Sfredo Miorando

E-mail: bernardo.sfredo@gmail.com / ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7556-1684>

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) - Brasil; University of Jyväskylä - Finlândia
Mestre e Doutorando em Educação pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)

² Jussi Välimaa

E-mail: jussi.p.valimaa@jyu.fi / ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0907-1238>

University of Jyväskylä - Finlândia

PhD in Social Policy by the University of Jyväskylä

NOTES

ⁱⁱ Differently from Brazil, in Finland, what is called “licentiate degree” is a postgraduate degree, between the master’s and the doctorate. In previous decades, it was usual to obtain the licentiate degree before the doctorate. Currently, the pursuit of this degree is decreasing.

ⁱⁱⁱ Here, the interviewee is not simply describing his physical constitution, but hinting that he acknowledges the importance that the practice of self-reflexivity on positionality for Brazilian critical scholarship in social sciences and humanities. In this sense, he is stressing in a self-critical way how the coming together of categories of race, gender and age has favored his achievements and marks his current leadership position.

^{iv} *Écoles normales supérieures* are a specific type of French higher education institution known for its high selectivity and low intake, as well as for conducting top-tier research and research-training in the country. There are only four institutions pertaining to this category and the alumni are expected to command an excellent literary and scientific culture and to occupy leading positions in the public sector.

^v Simon Marginson is Professor of International Higher Education at the University College London’s Institute of Education and Director of the Centre for Global Higher Education. He is known for his studies on the sociology of global higher education.

^{vi} The irony in the sentence is that there are only five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The ‘Nordic model of university’ would, then, be comprised by an ensemble of exceptions.

^{vii} The first university in Finland was founded during the Swedish rule, in 1640. Since then all through the 20th century, Finnish higher education was connected to the Lutheran church, thus being an institution linked to Christendom.

^{viii} The Fennomans were a cultural-political nationalist movement in Finland, developing in the 19th century, when the country was a Russian Grand Duchy.

^{ix} The Finnish Publication Forum categorization works more or less like the Brazilian Qualis system. It classifies academic journals, book series, conferences and book publishers in a three-tier rating as: 1 (basic level), 2 (leading level) e 3 (highest level). Publications not meeting the criteria are rated 0. There are 23 area panels.

^x The Finnish higher education system is binary, comprised by both universities and polytechnics, also called ‘universities of applied sciences’. These institutions focus on applied areas, granting only bachelor’s and professional master’s degrees.

^{xi} Universities Finland (UNIFI) is a co-operational organization for Finnish universities succeeding the Finnish Council of University Rectors and congregating all 15 Finnish universities.

^{xii} SOTE comes from the words *sosiaali* (social) and *terveys* (health) and the SOTE reform refers to changes in the system of regional government, health and social services in Finland.

^{xiii} The referred FIER academic project is titled Exiting academics in networked knowledge societies (EANKS) and investigates how researchers and teachers who have left universities have networked in the Finnish society and economic life.

^{xiv} One of the lines of the song Be-Bop Tango, by Frank Zappa, is ‘Jazz is not dead, it just smells funny’.

^{xv} Manuel Castells is Professor of Sociology at the Open University of Catalonia; Professor of Communication Technology and Society at the University of Southern California; Professor Emeritus of Sociology and of City and Regional Planning at the University of California-Berkeley; fellow of St. John’s College, University of Cambridge; and holds the chair of Network Society at the Collège d’Études Mondiales. He is known for his theorization of the networked society.

^{xvi} According to Manuel Castells, from the 1970s on, an age of information developed from the industrial society, structuring social relations around the flow of information through networks supported by digital technology and putting information at the center of economy and culture.

^{xvii} David Hoffman is a Senior Researcher at the Finnish Institute of Educational Research at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. He works in themes of international comparative higher education such as migration, mobilities and internationalization.

^{xviii} HOFFMAN, David M.; VÄLIMAA, Jussi (Eds.). **Re-becoming universities?** The changing academy – the changing academic profession in international comparative perspective. Dordrecht: Springer, 2016.

^{xix} Vocational training is not a commonly usually used term in Brazilian higher education context. The idea somewhat translates into the Brazilian context through the ideas of technical and technological education.