

The scalar logics of universities as part of statehood transformation in Finland, 1970–1990

MIKKO KOHVAKKA



Kohvakka, Mikko (2015). The scalar logics of universities as part of statehood transformation in Finland, 1970–1990. *Fennia* 193: 1, pp. 117–133. ISSN 1798-5617.

In Finland, gradual state restructuring from a Nordic welfare state towards a more international competition state began in the mid-1980s. This transformation affected discourses and spatial ways of thinking about the primary scales of social action. As the strategies of the welfare-state regime emphasised major public investments for the development of infrastructure and equal opportunities across the country, the emerging competition state strategies put less stress on territorial and social equalisation processes and focused, instead, on economic growth through privatisation, specialisation and national and regional competitiveness. Universities took part in this process by instituting socio-political and political-economic practices that were differentially scaled.

This article aims to investigate the evolution of two Finnish universities, the University of Joensuu and the Lappeenranta University of Technology, and the role of these institutions in the state's transformation and scale reconstruction in the 1970s and 1980s. The present analysis is based on the official statements and action plans of the examined universities, as well as individual interviews with their key administrators. The article concludes that the embedded scalar logics of both universities either fostered or hindered their respective abilities to adapt to the prevailing form of state space. It also suggests that the aforementioned universities were more than mere pawns in the transformation process. Indeed, these universities chose divergent symbolic and self-seeking strategies for promoting the scalar relations and state formation each preferred. In regards to these universities, then, the present article seeks to assess the tensions that arose between the processes connected to regional spaces and more deterritorialised practices.

Keywords: universities, history, scale, scalar logics, state-building, qualitative textual analysis

Mikko Kohvakka, Department of Geographical and Historical Studies, University of Eastern Finland/South Karelian Institute, Lappeenranta University of Technology, PO Box 20, FI-53851 Lappeenranta, Finland, email: mikko.kohvakka@lut.fi

Introduction

Universities are resilient and flexible organisations that mediate different scalar and political-economic interests but can also transform such interests (Delanty 2001: 150–151). In a geographical sense, universities operate within a framework of “multiple spatialities” – which is to say they can employ various, yet sometimes overlapping, socio-spatial strategies. This means uni-

versity activities have national, as well as local, regional and global, dimensions (cf. Mansfield 2005: 459). And yet, it is also possible to find hierarchies amongst these scales (Smith 1993; Jonas 1994; Swyngedouw 1997; Brenner 2001; Paasi 2004). At particular times, certain universities have been more involved in the production of ‘national’ or territorialised space, while at other times, deterritorialised practices have prevailed amongst certain universities.

Finland is known for higher-education policy decisions emphasising the intensive regionalisation of its universities. From the late 1950s to the late 1970s, six multidisciplinary universities, two technology universities and one business school were established alongside Finland's eight existing institutions as part of the country's creating a centrally led, but regionally decentralised, "Nordic welfare state" (Jalava 2012; Moisio 2012). Despite national peculiarities, the extension of the university network followed pan-European policy choices of the period; throughout Western and Northern Europe, centre-left governments were implementing a Keynesian, welfare-state ideology and, thus, incorporating nation-states into transnational processes (Kettunen 2001; Brenner 2004a).

The major social factor leading to this policy change was that post-war cohorts and a large number of individuals from subsequent generations began coming of age around the time when the new universities were established. The new universities were seen as crucial tools in the process of bridging potential conflicts and replacing the 'academic-traditionalist' oversight system with a state-led higher-education policy (Trow 2007; Rüegg 2011; Jalava 2012). The reform was part of a broader political ideology that emphasised social and regional equality as a means of seizing the state space and its inhabitants (Brenner 2004a; Moisio & Leppänen 2007; Ahlqvist & Moisio 2014). European governments at the time created nationally standardised frameworks for science and higher education in order to establish balanced social and regional development throughout their national territories.

Socially entrenched liberalism, as a manifestation of a Keynesian, welfare-state ideology, entered a crisis period in Western Europe in the early 1970s. The dual crises of 'stagflation' and mass unemployment forced European governments to raise taxes to cover growing social-entitlement costs. During these crises, the prevailing brand of state-led regulation was challenged by a new way of thinking that called for labour-market liberalisation and new public-management methods (Brenner 2004a; Harvey 2005). Political sociologists and geographers have claimed the gradual shift from a Nordic welfare state, or state-centred cartel polity, to a "Schumpeterian competition state", or corporate polity, began in Finland in the mid-1980s (Heiskala & Hämäläinen 2007; Moisio 2008; Ahlqvist & Moisio 2014). The resulting adoption of new market-driven and decentral-

ised-governance and -administration systems as part of standard political practises was also reflected in the policies pursued in higher education. In Finland, as elsewhere in Western and Northern Europe, it became more common to discuss the need to increase universities' quality assurance and accountability to society (Neave 1988; Hölttä & Nuotio 1995; Kogan et al. 2000). This emphasis on private benefit over public enrichment entailed a redefinition of the social contract, and abstract principles of egalitarian rationality, stability (or prudence) and procedural legitimacy were challenged by discourses valuing economic rationality, competitiveness (or efficiency) and legitimacy by results (Neave & van Vught 1991; Meyer & Hammerschmid 2006; Benneworth & Jongbloed 2010).

This article's primary aim is to participate in the aforementioned discussion on the transformation of the Finnish state space and Finland's higher-education system from the 1970s to the early 1990s. To be more precise, the present article will analyse the interaction between universities and the Finnish state space, arguing that it is the ways universities produce "scale effects" (Kaiser & Nikiforova 2008) or craft scalar practices (Fraser 2010; MacKinnon 2011: 22) in formulating their scalar logics that is an essential point of contention between them and their stakeholders. Using the University of Joensuu (UJO) and the Lappeenranta University of Technology (LUT) as case studies, this article applies the thinking of Neil Brenner (2004b) and Sami Moisio (2012) by arguing that universities are strategic actors that attempt to shape the geographies of socio-economic development, material and immaterial investments and political discourses into a certain state form and mode of polity. Hence, the following research questions are posed: 1) How did the studied universities conceptualise the meaning of various scales and construct their scalar logics, and were there any hierarchy changes amongst scalar logics during the chosen time period?; and 2) To what extent did the evolution of the studied universities and changes in their scalar logics reflect changes in discourses on state space more broadly?

By answering these questions, this article seeks to determine whether the scalar logics and scalar strategies of the studied universities were inward-looking (stressing national and regional scales) or outward-looking (tending towards an international scale). Furthermore, the results seek to illustrate whether the studied universities supported

territorial cohesion or more deterritorialised forms of space (cf. Moisió & Leppänen 2007: 66).

This article, then, proceeds as follows: in the next two sections, scale and the performativity of scalar logics, as well as empirical material, methodologies and an explanation for choosing the time period, will be introduced more thoroughly; next, the proceeding empirical sections will analyse the meanings the studied universities gave to the various scales, scalar logics and spatial structures of state space and the strategic efforts they implemented in various scale performances during the 1970s and 1980s. Finally, the concluding section will examine whether the universities were relevant agents capable of reconfiguring socio-spatial order or were more passive, constrained by materiality and structural properties that operated “behind their backs”. It will also discuss whether it is fruitful to discuss universities generally and take them as pre-existing categories or if it is more appropriate to see them as unique entities representing various disciplines, scalar logics and strategies.

Conceptualising scale and the performativity of scalar logics

The viewpoint on scale presented in this article combines both post-structuralist and political-economy approaches (MacKinnon 2011). As per post-structuralism (Brubaker & Cooper 2000; Mansfield 2005; Kaiser & Nikiforova 2008; Moore 2008), one might see scale as a category of meaningful practice that illustrates how university activities constitute scales, scalar logics and other socio-spatial phenomena. On the other hand, one might rely on a political-economic approach that says universities can seek to harness, manipulate, transform and organise hierarchically scalar relations (Smith 1993; Jonas 1994; Swyngedouw 1997; Brenner 2001; Harrison 2008) in order to shape the surrounding social environment into a certain “spatio-temporal fix” (Jessop 2000). This refers to the build-up of spatial and temporal boundaries around a particular state form or mode of polity (Ahlgqvist & Moisió 2014) that favours some interests, spaces, territories and places but often excludes, or at least undermines, others (Jessop 2008; see also Harrison 2008: 936). In effect, the present paper follows Mansfield’s thinking (2005: 468; see also Vainikka 2014) in arguing that university practices have scalar dimensions and

repercussions that are simultaneously global, national, regional, local and even bodily. However, somewhat contrary to Mansfield’s assertions, this paper posits that, within this multidimensionality, it is still possible to find hierarchies amongst scalar relations without arriving at an unproductive either-or situation.

This article uses the term “scalar logic” to describe how the examined universities respectively defined and experienced scaled processes and associated logics like academic profession, state, market, community and region. Scalar logics are, to apply Thornton and Ocasio’s (1999: 804) definition of institutional logics, socially constructed historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs and rules by which individual actors, like universities, produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organise time and space and provide meaning to their socio-spatial reality. As we are talking about as complex organisations as universities, pluralism in these scalar logics is likely (cf. Kraatz & Block 2008; Howells et al. 2014). However, the degree of pluralism and whether these logics coexist peacefully, compete and hierarchically organise with one another, supersede each other, provide an opportunity for hybridisation or result in a temporary compromise (Meyer & Höllerer 2010: 1251), are questions that need to be studied empirically.

Because scalar logics are socially produced, this article applies the concept of ‘scalecraft’ (Fraser 2010) to clarify the performativity of scale and scalar logics. Kaiser and Nikiforova (2008: 541, 543) have aptly noted that scales are instituted by sets of actors through the “scale talk” they engage in and scalar stances they take within particular socio-spatial contexts. By using this performativity approach, the present paper claims that scalar logics, as naturalised ways of seeing and valuing the socio-spatial environment, are produced through ‘scalecraft’, which, according to Fraser (2010: 344), “is the often highly skilful, yet sometimes unsuccessful, fashioning and refashioning of geographic scale to suit particular needs”. Scalecraft can include efforts that are geared towards arranging and rearranging socio-spatial conditions in ways that emphasise the meaning of particular geographic scales and scalar logics while undermining some others (cf. Jonas 2006; Harrison 2008). What is certain, however, is that these processes can never be perfected. All attempts last for only a brief period and some fail at once (Fraser 2010; see also Kaiser & Nikiforova 2008).

Methodology and research materials

The analysis presented in this article is from the university's perspective; it uses qualitative textual analysis (Warren & Karner 2010), especially rhetorical analysis (Dillon 1991; Billig 1996), to interpret a set of operational and financial action plans, official statements and rectors' speeches through which the studied universities discursively operationalised their scalar strategies and scalar logics in the 1970s and 1980s. Also, ten supporting interviews with key administrators from the studied universities were conducted and official histories analysed in order to scrutinise the contemporaries' viewpoints, opinions and interpretations of key events related to scale and statehood. These documents and narratives are treated both as widely shared, persuasive, political-economic expressions that highlight the fluctuating scalar strategies and logics of the studied universities during the given periods and as descriptions that are disputed or in conflict with competing, alternative, rhetorical descriptions (Potter 1996: 106). By comparing this information with the changing governmental and ministerial strategies of these periods – specifically, with the Higher Education Development acts of 1967 and 1986 – one can learn a great deal about the changing and, more or less, conflicting notions of spatiality and scalar relations. In this sense, the present article applies the thinking of Cerny et al. (2005) as well as Moisio and Lepänen (2007) by claiming that scales and scalar logics are greatly shaped by and through hybrid interactions amongst universities' own ambitions and agency and governmental rule structures.

Additionally, this article makes an equally important point of avoiding the common conceptualisation of the university as a universal, pre-existing category of analysis. Rather, so as not to presume that all universities are alike, this article concentrates on the dimensions that differ between the universities examined. Consequently, the present paper adopts the stance that universities are social spaces with distinctive epistemic traditions, disciplinary cultures, national heritages and local institutional conditions (Välimaa 2008: 11). In other words, there are numerous universities of varying types (representing different disciplines) and sizes, and each is located in a different place. Universities might, therefore, define their environments and missions differently and apply differing scalar strategies and logics; consequently as well, their research and teaching focuses might alterna-

tively be on local, regional, national or universal issues (cf. Tierney 1988). The purpose of this cultural frame of analysis is related to epistemological, methodological and philosophical discussions on cultural variation in society as they pertain to academic institutions, disciplines, national traditions and university-operation environments (Välimaa 2008: 9).

Again, in this study the Lappeenranta University of Technology and Joensuu University are juxtaposed to examine the similarities and differences between them (della Porta 2008: 214–217). The studied universities are similar in several ways, with both being located in Eastern Finland¹, close to the Finland–Russia border. They situate in areas that have shared state practices from 1617 to 1743 and again from 1812 onwards. Moreover, these universities are both newer, public institutions established in 1969 to promote more balanced regional development and they both faced the same kind of (governmental and regional) expectations during the 1970s and 1980s. In the 1970s, the strongest claim was for better-qualified labour and the ideal of an egalitarian society with equal regional and social rights; in contrast, the 1980s saw the nascent spirit of a highly competitive “information society” – in which scientific knowledge and high technology seemed to be the most important assets for nations and regions in international economic competition (Husso & Raento 2002; Kohvakka 2009; Nevala 2009; Jalava 2012: 59–60, 162) – come to the fore.

The contrasting facets of the studied universities include their differing types, sizes and strategies. From the onset, UJO's offered programs in a broad spectrum of disciplines in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences (Table 1). And yet, while it did strive from the very beginning to become a comprehensive, ‘Humboldtian’ research university, UJO would not realize this aim until 1984 and, early on, served primarily as a pedagogical institution. The university's first step towards becoming research-intensive came with the establishment in 1971 of its specialised research unit, the Karelian Institute, whose original aim was to carry out basic and applied research to support material and intellectual development in Eastern Finland and North Karelia. The institute also had strong connections to the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Karelia, where it sought to promote the cultural heritage of the historical province of Karelia – then divided between Finland and the Soviet Union (Nevala 2009).

Table 1. Basic figures for the case universities in 1970–1990.

University	Univ. Joensuu			Lappeenranta Univ. Technology		
	1970	1980	1990	1970	1980	1990
<u>Faculty/staff</u>						
Professor/Associate professor	5	38	76	3	25	36
Other research and teaching staff	13	177	243	19	65	168
<u>Students (total)</u>	298	2943	4963	135	981	2178
From the same county as the univ.	56%	29%	25%	44%	36%	32%
<u>Graduates settled in the same county as the univ.</u>	27% (1975)	20%	34%	28% (1975)	25%	28%
<u>Disciplines</u> (in 1991)	Natural sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physics • Chemistry • Mathematics • Statistics • Biology • Geography (physical) • Computer science • Forestry (1981) Social sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economics • Human geography • Psychology • Education • Sociology • Social work (1986) • Public policy Humanities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History • Finnish language • English • Russian • Swedish • Literature • Cultural studies • Orthodox theology (1987) 			Energy technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental protection engineering (1989) • Power plant engineering • Energy economics • Heat and mass transfer • Electrical power engineering Chemical technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applied chemistry • Chemical process engineering • Chemical engineering • Paper technology (1988) Mechanical engineering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production technology • Machine design • Steel structure Information technology (1985) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information processing science • Data communication Industrial engineering and management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industr. and tech. management • International operations • Materials handling and logistics Business studies (1991)		

LUT, in contrast, strove from the start to be a small, highly specialised and industry-oriented ‘entrepreneurial’ university; consequently, it evinced only the slightest intention as an institution to grow structurally. LUT sought to present itself in this way by exclusively offering the combination of engineering and business studies. The first of LUT’s programs, in fact, were exclusively in mechanical engineering, chemical engineering, energy technology and industrial engineering and management, and it was not until the early 1990s that it expanded its offerings to include general business studies (Table 1). Moreover, LUT has, throughout its history, emphasised the study of foreign languages. And yet, the university’s close proximity to the Finland–Russia border and its general interest in Russia and the Russian economy only lent itself to the university’s instituting study programs after the collapse of the Soviet Union – as north-eastern Europe’s evolving geo-political situation placed new demands on international businesses (Kyläheiko 1998; Kohvakka 2009).

By examining two structurally and culturally distinctive universities, this article seeks to avoid some of the analytically and culturally biased assumptions about universities that might arise when studying only one university, a single type of university or certain cohorts of actors (cf. Vainikka 2013: 28). In other words, the present analysis intends to study the various meanings signified by differing scalar processes at dissimilar universities during various periods, rather than merely provide examples of the shared visions of scales and statehood. Periodisation offers one means of measuring our distance from the past; of course, this article also accepts that historical periods are no more than labelling constructs later devised by historians and other scholars (Tosh 2010: 10, 24). In accordance with Heiskala and Hämäläinen’s (2007) conceptualisation, then, the present study utilises two distinct spatio-temporal fixes: the period of “Keynesian welfare state-ism” (from the 1970s to mid-1980s) and the period of “Schumpeterian competition state-ism” (from the mid-1980s onwards); these two fixes have discernible, distinctive scalar logics setting them apart from each other (Wishard 2004: 306; see also Ahlqvist & Moisio 2014).

Whereas the scalar logics of welfare state-ism stress social and regional equality and a spatially dispersed network of ‘nationally’ and ‘regionally’ responsive universities, the scalar logics of competition state-ism place more emphasis on achieving international competitiveness and the greatest pos-

sible academic and economic returns with cost-effective, differentiated, specialised action (cf. Kangas & Moisio 2012: 201). How the above-mentioned universities responded to these logics is the question this paper now addresses.

From criticism to adaptation: two Finnish universities and spatial equalisation in the 1970s

In the 1960s and 1970s, Finland went through a rapid transformation from a poor agrarian nation to a wealthy Nordic welfare state. It relied on export-oriented industries and an investment-driven growth strategy that created a large public sector, brought in new technological capabilities and further developed the national education system (Heiskala & Hämäläinen 2007: 80–81). International influences played an important role in the process, although welfare state-ism took a less comprehensive form in Finland compared with its implementation in other Nordic countries (Esping-Andersen 1990; Kettunen 2001). From the late 1950s to the early 1980s, the so-called Keynesian politico-spatial transformation was based on direct government regulation aimed at comprehensively increasing state power and presence. According to Moisio (2008: 5), governments during this period created nationally standardised production and consumption frameworks to establish balanced social and regional development throughout national territories.

When UJO and LUT were established in 1969, the Finnish higher-education system was in turmoil. By applying the Swedish model to the Finnish context, Finland replaced the old, academic-traditional doctrine – which gave professors most of the formal decision-making power within relatively autonomous universities – with a new, government-led system. During the 1970s, all Finnish universities were nationalised and the tuition fees annulled (Jalava 2012: 70). Decision-making and administration powers were invested in the Finnish parliament and the Ministry of Education (MoE). The state’s normative regulation system entailed the national parliament’s creating frameworks for universities’ activities through goal- and resource-outlining acts. In this sense, Finland resembled other Nordic countries (Dahllöf & Selander 1994; Hölttä 1999). Spatially speaking, the Act for the Development of Higher Education,

1967–1986, fostered social and regional equality by facilitating access to universities and guaranteeing resources in higher education during an era when several new universities across the state space were about to begin operating (Hölttä 1988; Välimaa 2005). In summary, higher education was considered key for the state building through regional policy (Hölttä & Pulliainen 1996; Jalava 2012; Moisio 2012). These government decisions were a double-edged sword for many universities because increased funding “legitimised the government’s endeavour to reform universities, or ... to interfere with the internal life of universities in ways that had not been seen before” (Välimaa 2005: 248). Many universities perceived the governments’ paternalistic policies as treating universities as mere subjects of governance who needed external steering to learn what was in their respective best interests (Table 2).

LUT: defending outward-looking competition strategies

Analysis of the studied universities reveals that prevailing scalar logics influenced how each university dealt with external pressures. In the 1970s, LUT had difficulty adapting to the left-leaning Ministry of Education’s heavy-handed directives. Along with other technology universities and business schools, LUT fiercely opposed the decision made in 1971 that cut its ties to the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MoTI) and brought them under control of the MoE, where civil servants were more than eager to interfere in university–industry collaborations (Jalava 2012: 70). In particular, the rector, who was a former high official in the MoTI, took part in several initiatives that were contrary to “state monopoly capitalism” and favoured “institutional autonomy of universities and interests of economic life” (Michelsen 1994: 145–146). In addition, LUT also adopted a critical stance towards the government’s argument for harmonious and equal territorial development of the state space (cf. Moisio & Lepänen 2007: 73). In 1973, it sent a memo including the following statement to the MoE:

“LUT is the child of a policy whose aim has been to balance learning opportunities regionally and emphasise the quantitative development of a higher education system. The university, however, takes the view that in the future its operations should be developed in the qualitative direction” [taking into account the quality of its operations]

(LUT 1973a, translated from Finnish).

The university justified its arguments further by appealing to its particular identity and structure. LUT saw itself as a small but highly specialised and efficiency-oriented university with only a few departments and a minimal number of regionally scaled tasks. Its small size and avoidance of multiple logics and tasks were, according to LUT, the best ways to avoid organisational overload and ineffectiveness (LUT 1973b). The rector’s statement in his opening speech for the 1972–1973 academic year highlighted the importance of competitiveness to technology universities:

“Universities for engineering and technology form a different kind of entity compared with other universities. The special needs of the surrounding region must not influence these universities’ teaching and research plans too much. The work opportunities and skills of graduating engineers cannot be territorially restricted” (LUT 1974, translated from Finnish).

LUT defied inward-looking and equalising state strategies and scalar logics for two reasons:

1. Past experience acted as a structural constraint to the institutionalisation processes (cf. Pinheiro 2012); key players at LUT had more positive experiences cooperating with the MoTI than with the MoE during the initial years, and this retarded LUT’s adapting to the new institutionalisation process. In the eyes of LUT, the MoE was a powerful stakeholder with vast resources, but it was still a new, non-institutionalised actor in the higher-education system.
2. The symbolic and strategic significance of identity-based action gained the upper hand, and a university’s own identity or sense of self and the need to affirm this identity became a desired aim. This meant that the expression of LUT’s outward-looking scalar logic, through its evasive attitude towards the MoE, was a desired end for the university in itself, despite the knowledge that the expected normative or economic benefits were low or non-existent (cf. Rowley & Moldeveanu 2003).

There were, however, two locally and regionally scaled projects that came to fruition during this time: LUT decided to establish a regional advisory board to provide enhanced trust and communication across the stakeholder network, and it also established a specialised research unit to carry out applied research tasks concerning Finnish–Soviet

Table 2. The case universities and science and higher education policy in Finland (Husso & Raento 2002; Kohvakka 2009; Nevala 2009).

1970–1980	<p>Science and HE Policy in Finland: A period of state-steering in higher education and science policy planning and ‘experimentation’ gets underway. The Ministry of Education (MoE) seeks firmer control over the contents and direction of research and teaching. In 1971, universities of technology and business schools are brought under control of the MoE. Former ties to the Ministry of Trade and Industry are cut and university–industry cooperation becomes more difficult. Many universities protest against the loss of power in decision-making. In the late 1970s resources for science and higher education policies are in decline and the need to reform the policy lines are debated.</p> <p>University of Joensuu: After a slow start, the UJO pursues stable but firm growth. It aims to become (at least) medium-sized comprehensive university. New disciplines in seeking are forestry, law, social work, cultural studies and orthodox theology. In the late 1970s, an important step towards the comprehensive university is taken. Several new chairs (professorships) are established and the whole organisation diversifies. The focus is on teaching. Karelian institute (1971) is established to provide research on regional nature, economy and culture.</p> <p>Lappeenranta University of Technology: The LUT seeks only slim growth. It sees itself as a small but highly specialised university with (inter)national ambitions. In the late 1970s, first signs on growth willingness are occurring. The establishment of new professorships is progressing steadily, although the level of wages is lower compared with the industry and commerce. The biggest shortcomings in staff are among postgraduate students and auxiliary staff. Thus, teaching outnumbers research. A separate research group on Finnish–Soviet trade is established in 1975.</p>
1980–1990	<p>Science and HE Policy in Finland: New technology-driven science policy emerges. Several determined efforts to strengthen research and international academic cooperation are conducted. R&D expenditures in universities increase twofold but the majority of growth comes from outside funding. Universities are more dependent on external stakeholders and industrial-economic steering. A new steering philosophy (management by results) is put into effect. Every university sets up its own continuing education centre as the driving force of regional higher education policy.</p> <p>University of Joensuu: Plans for new disciplines are realised when forestry, cultural (folklore) studies, social work, and orthodox theology begin their research and teaching activities. Internal organisation is transformed in 1984 as departmental structure is replaced by five faculties: education, natural sciences, forestry, social sciences, and humanities. The university continues to grow steadily: more students, degrees, funding and (international) research projects in fundamental research. The Centre for Continuing Education (CCE) is established in 1984 for coordinating the academic engagement with external parties. Technology Centre (Joensuu Science Park) is founded in 1990 for promoting university–region interaction on selected key technological areas.</p> <p>Lappeenranta University of Technology After a longer period of rather slow development, LUT experiences a jump upwards. Information technology, paper technology, environmental protection technology and finally business studies are added to the organisational structure as new disciplines, departments and subjects. Applied research takes a step forward, the role of internationalisation increases and university–Industry cooperation in research and product development is gaining ground. The CCE is founded in 1987 and Technology Centre (Kareltekn) in 1984.</p>

trade relations and their impact on South Karelia Province and Kymi County (LUT 1978). These concessions, however, were merely symbolic. The regional advisory board had no formal role in decision making and mainly served to improve the university's image (LUT 1977). The research unit, on the other hand, did not coincide with the university's strategic areas of focus; although LUT established plans and procedures that, at regular intervals, communicated to the public a desire to increase the size of the small research unit, there was no actual intention to implement them (Kohvaka 2009: 98–99).

“The research unit was, before anything, a ministry and city [Lappeenranta] project, and it never had an important role in our profile” (Rector 1, translated from Finnish).

All this indicated that LUT's fundamental scalar logic, which was a desire to be a deterritorialised (outward-looking), efficiency-oriented and highly specialised university with carefully selected, industry stakeholders, remained fixed throughout the 1970s. It was argued that LUT should operate as a real enterprise with the objective of becoming as effective as possible:

“I believe that university productivity can be measured and, particularly, improved. LUT has to show an example in this regard. I will do the alignment: the university equals business enterprise. ... We have chosen differentiation as our asset” (Rector's inaugural speech, September 7, 1977. See Jaakkola 1998: 196–201).

UJO: adapting to inward-looking state strategies

For UJO, it was easy to adapt to the ideologies and scalar logics of the welfare-state era. The argumentation of harmonious and equal territorial development of one nation was highly visible in the policies and strategies implemented by the government and MoE (Moisio & Leppänen 2007: 73–77). Far-reaching measures to construct a large and well-balanced public sector were thus highlighted, which were in line with UJO's prime purpose. The rector mentioned the institutionalisation process in a public memo in 1973:

“The development program of the university takes into account not only the legislation but also the objectives of social policy, education policy and regional policy. The University has two key tasks:

the first task is to increase the supply of qualified civil servants and teachers in fields where there is the greatest national and regional demand; the second task is to participate in development projects in which poor regions of Eastern Finland are being revived” (Kirkinen 1973, translated from Finnish).

The university's size and type, as well as its organisational heterogeneity, affected the way UJO saw the environment and its different stakeholders. According to the then rector, “the university had to have sufficient structural diversity in order to be useful in its many environments” (Rector 2). The expansion of students and staff was relatively steady throughout the 1970s, which inevitably diversified the structure of the organisation (UJO 1975, 1978). The growth of different departments, each with its own scalar logics, was both advantageous and disadvantageous to UJO because of the multiple needs and interests it engendered in a now-complex organisational environment. For example, the Natural Sciences Department included several ambitious young academics who did not want to confine their work to the local or regional scale. Much to the dismay of many governmental and regional stakeholders, they expanded their professional aims to the international scale (Arbo & Eskelinen 2003), as this statement shows:

“The negative side is that Joensuu is a small city in a remote location with no stakeholders in your own field. Partners had to be found elsewhere, often from abroad” (Professor 1, translated from Finnish).

On the other hand, a plurality of scalar logics meant that departments, such as the Department of History, Geography and Other Regional Studies and the Karelian Institute also conducted teaching and research activities on the region's economic and social conditions (KTL 1991; see also UJO 1978). Through these units, the university was able to placate (at least somewhat) those stakeholders who thought the university was not regional or territorial enough.² This was important because, according to the rector, “UJO needed all the resources and support it could get when it reached the status of a comprehensive university” (Rector 2).

The university realised that the only realistic way to implement organisational growth was linked to resources the MoE administered. Unlike LUT and many other universities, UJO was rather keen to acknowledge the prevailing state building strategies and the supervisor–subordinate relationship between the ministry and universities. For

UJO, strong state control was not a threat but a guarantee that the regional decentralisation policy, which favoured UJO's growth ambitions, would continue in the future.

"We were attuned to the times and we wanted to ensure that our actions complied with the prevailing [state] projects" (Director of administration, translated from Finnish).

UJO took a decisive step towards becoming a comprehensive or 'Humboldtian' research university at the turn of the 1970s and 1980s. Many new department chairs were established in already-existing departments. In addition, decisions were made during this period that eventually led to the establishment of four new disciplines and subjects: forestry, social work, folklore studies and orthodox theology (Nevala 2009). The success in structural growth was possible because, to some extent, UJO was able to use its diversified structure and plural scalar logics to build relationships between multiple scales or scalar processes. This generalisation strategy led to the territorialised university model, which was strongly biased towards the needs of the public sector, especially regionally oriented teacher education.

Rethinking scalar relations: combining inward- and outward-looking strategies in the 1980s

In the late 1970s, the prevailing order was challenged in Western Europe by restructuring-oriented political blocs and interest groups. They promoted strategies and scalar logics in which socio-economic regulation was relocated to supra- and subnational institutional levels and economic assets were redirected to the most competitive entities and regions (Brenner 2004a). As Allen et al. (1998: 2) assert, the 1980s were, quintessentially, a period of unbridled free-market capitalism, and while this took different forms in different countries and regions, it was evidently an international phenomenon. In Finland, from the mid-1980s onwards, the gradual rise of international competition logic, based on a belief in individualism and the efficiency of a free and open market, challenged the old, institutionalised principles of collectivism, conservatism and protectionism (Heiskala & Hämäläinen 2007; Moisio & Lepänen 2007). The most far-reaching manifesta-

tions of the new mental paradigm were the liberalisation of capital markets, the growth of direct investments, both inward and outward, and the rise of high-technology industries as new engines for economic growth (Heiskala & Hämäläinen 2007; see also Husso & Raento 2002). Furthermore, the adoption of corporate concepts and managerial ideals at the public-sector institutions, including universities, were implicit in the new philosophy (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2012: 351).

In higher education, particularly within countries with a tradition of strong governmental control like as France, the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland, the rise of the competition-state logics led to increased flexibility, decentralised administration and dismantled state regulation (Neave 1988). As a result, universities had an obligation to show quality, efficiency and effectiveness to a growing number of stakeholders, and this forced them to seek a new balance between spatially contradicting expectations held by the government, the market and the academic profession (Clark 1983; Hölttä & Pulliainen 1996; Jongbloed et al. 2008). In Finland, the new Higher Education Development Act of 1986 was tightly coupled with an emerging science and technology policy (Husso & Raento 2002); together, these served to underscore the importance of international academic cooperation, productivity in research and teaching and, above all, technological innovations for the sake of the national economy. According to Välimaa (2005), Finnish universities strongly supported the policy change because it ensured a significant increase in their basic resources, encouraged them to cooperate with firms in applied research and reasserted their autonomy in resource allocation. In fact, the burden on Finnish universities in the 1980s grew heavier than ever; however, they had never before enjoyed such a large and diversified pool of resources as they did in the late 1980s, when Finland experienced a period of strong economic growth (see Table 2).

LUT: reintegrating 'regional' with the idea of international competitiveness

The 1980s proved a fruitful decade for LUT. According to the then vice-rector, "especially the second half of the decade was the golden age for LUT" (Vice-rector, translated from Finnish). The preferential treatment technology universities and

business schools received from the state and the government's decision to decrease restrictions on university–industry cooperation meant LUT had more leeway to act. It also had vast public and, more importantly, private resources with which to respond to multiple stakeholder pressures. An even more significant development was that the scalar logics LUT had already spoken for in the 1970s, such as the freedom of enterprise, competitiveness and productivity, became more widely institutionalised in Finnish society.

LUT viewed these changes in the organisational environment as positive and they increased the organisation's willingness and capability to meet the expectations of stakeholders with different scalar logics. Regionally, the management of new ideals and expectations was steered towards the new service units; the most important of these were the Centre for Continuing Education (CCE), which began to operate in 1987, and the technology centre, Kareltek, which was established in 1984. An important example came from the University of Oulu, which was a pioneer in this sense in Finland (Salo 2003).

The CCE's purpose was to channel the university's expertise into adult training and service to develop the region and raise its inhabitants' education levels. However, because the CCE held strong regional logic, it was separated from departments whose scalar logic was grounded more in national or international activities. Thus, the CCE's definition as an "independent service centre" was a clear indication that LUT implemented compartmentalisation strategies using both spatial and symbolic means to separate the CCE from the research and teaching units (LUT 1984):

"The departments were interested in the CCE only if it were of benefit to them, for example, in the form of research funds or doctoral dissertations. This, however, happened rarely, so our operations diverged sharply from one another" (Planning Officer of the CCE, translated from Finnish).

The CCE was a light and cost-efficient way to respond to increasingly important, but still secondary, regional needs, so the departments could focus on their main tasks: research and teaching with national and international relevance (Jaakkola 1998: 84–93, 112–120).

Kareltek, for its part, was an effort on the part of regional actors to benefit from the applied technology produced at LUT. The university was ready to support this kind of technology transfer

because it could address two aims simultaneously through the technology centre: first, Kareltek, which was funded and administered by the city of Lappeenranta, cost-effectively appeased the most pressing demands on LUT's regional effectiveness; even more important, though, was how Kareltek offered facilities to the first large, expensive international research project, which was threatened with delay because the university's own buildings were too small and overcrowded (LUT 1984; see also Kohvakka 2009: 162). In other words, LUT manipulated the regional technology centre as a resource to support the university's most desired scalar logic: national and, later on, international quality in research and teaching activities (cf. Sillince 2006: 201).

"The research and teaching units should be built upon the basis of national need. [...] Unlike the Helsinki University of Technology and the Tampere University of Technology, we are not surrounded by a powerful and demanding economic life. We can build a society considerably on our own terms. It seems selfish, but we believe this is the best way to serve the environment" (The rector's opening speech for the 1989–1990 academic year, September 6, 1989. See Jaakkola 1998: 88).

Considering the above-mentioned events, LUT managed to preserve its specialised outward-looking profile. Throughout the 1980s, LUT's main strategic goal was to create contacts and engineering demand nationally and internationally, especially in the Helsinki metropolitan area, where most of the globally scaled firms were located (Kyläheiko 1998: 12). This objective was reached primarily because approximately half of LUT's graduates found employment in the Helsinki metropolitan area, while only about one fourth remained in Kymi County (Haapakorpi 1989: 81–82; Table 1), where there was no great demand for highly educated engineers and, otherwise, nothing but 'low-tech' paper-industry jobs were available. Likewise, about half of its professors lived outside the South Karelia/Kymi area (Dahllöf et al. 1998: 48). Hence, LUT highlighted its role in promoting the competitiveness of domestic production and state strategies concentrating specifically on southern parts of Finland (cf. Moisio & Leppänen 2007: 79). This indicated that scalar logics of the emerging 'Schumpeterian' social order, which emphasised competition, specialisation and a more centralised state space, was something with which the university was willing to identify.

UJO: balancing regional constraints with international ambitions

The gradual growth of UJO, which lasted through the 1970s and into the early 1980s, culminated in 1984 when its experimental department structure was replaced with a standard faculty system (Nevala 2009). When the framework was ready, UJO's previous, development-stage resource dependence on regional stakeholders decreased. From then on, its scalar logics and activities were changed and more emphasis was placed on strengthening scientific output and credibility amongst the international scientific community. The new rector of UJO emphasised the need for a course change in his inaugural speech in 1982, stating:

“The university needs universal applicability, and it has to set out its duties and performance in line with international standards. Otherwise it is not a university” (Mälkönen 1982, translated from Finnish).

Five years later, the new scalar hierarchy was expressed even more directly by the rector:

“The university is not a consulting firm but a research and teaching institute, which does not need to do everything the region wants” (Pulliainen 1987a, translated from Finnish).

UJO was, as the rector stated in 1985, worried about how various ministries directed their attention and resources towards the applied field of technology and product development (Pulliainen 1985). The disciplines taught at UJO, which had previously supported building a regionally decentralised welfare state, proved to be rather unsuitable for the growing demands for new technology and industrial innovations. In order to prevent itself from being side-tracked, UJO wanted to show its willingness to adapt to the new order. The university ensured a tight relationship with the MoE by volunteering as a ‘pilot’ university for new ‘entrepreneurial’ management and administrative practices, including lump-sum budgeting, discretion in resource allocation and decentralised decision-making (Hölttä & Pulliainen 1996: 125). Through these measures, UJO showed that it was ready to adapt to the new type of university–state alliance characterised by semi-competitive logic and quasi-market mechanisms for promoting cost-effectiveness and internationalisation:

“We, at the University of Joensuu, take for granted that we will get our fair share of the increasing future resources because we have shown our willingness and ability to adapt to more efficient resource management. Our planning system has been created quite recently, and we have switched over from optimistic resource planning, which is still the system at most universities, to realistic planning practices” (Pulliainen 1987b: 2).

The relative importance of regional stakeholders decreased because state authorities, including the MoE, stressed development areas and regional equality logics less and began to emphasise competitive logics (Moisio & Leppänen 2007: 79), which “favoured the city of Joensuu but left vast rural areas surrounding it to the wilderness” (Former governor of North Karelia County). However, the impact of path dependence, that is, the long history of engagement with regional stakeholders (Pinheiro 2012: 45), meant that UJO was not ready to take a risk and neglect institutionalised regional expectations and demands altogether. A professor of Forestry supported the multiscaled and segment-oriented strategy of UJO, stating:

“Only through manifold alliances and linkages can a young university maintain its ability to function” (Professor 2).

The establishment of the Centre for Continuing Education in 1984³ served regional demands in that it organised retraining courses tailored to the specific needs of local people. UJO also decided to support the establishment of the Joensuu Science Park technology centre in 1990 (Hölttä & Pulliainen 1996; see also Clark 1998). The Joensuu Science Park, along with the CCE, eased the “regional burden” UJO had to carry (Vartiainen & Viiri 2002) by providing space that was administratively separate from the university for university–industry cooperation in conducting applied research, product development and university-to-business technology transfers. Moreover, UJO buttressed the role of the Karelian Institute as an arena for university–region interaction by introducing three external members to the institute's board. At the same time, researchers at the Karelian Institute continued to focus on regional projects in North Karelia (KTL 1991). Regional logic was relatively easy to blend or hybridise with other scalar logics. According to one of the institute's researchers, “Regional issues sparked an interest at all levels and amongst various actors, from county administrators to the European Sci-

ence Foundation" (Researcher 1). Another former researcher from the institute noted the scalar logic issue more hierarchically: "I became more localist the more the university internationalised its functions" (Researcher 2).

All in all, even though the UJO's transformation was based on a gradually emerging 'Schumpeterian' regime of deterritorialisation, the spatial structures and scalar logics constructed in the 1970s still had their impact on the university's territorial practices. Put differently, the academic departments, especially in the international-oriented natural sciences, maintained their scale hierarchy and focus, both of which emphasised academic interaction within supranational disciplinary boundaries. On the other hand, UJO also had humanities and social-science departments and units in which activities were regionally scaled (UJO 1984, 1986). This guaranteed that the university's management still had a legitimate claim to a strong regional purpose. A professor of Human Geography stated, "UJO was, before anything, a strong educationally centred university with a tradition of fundamental research" (Professor 3). In short, despite its emerging entrepreneurial tendencies, the university's generalisation strategy and 'Humboldtian' profile, in which multiple scalar logics coexisted peacefully, prevailed in the early 1990s.

Discussion and conclusions

The Finnish university system spread all over the state space from the late 1950s to the late 1970s. New universities outside the Helsinki and Turku region were seen as a tool of Keynesian territorial management (Kangas & Moisio 2012: 206). Their primary role was to strengthen national and regional scales as the main dimensions of social and economic development. It was hoped that regionally responsive universities would increase the education levels of local populations and thereby improve the standard of living within the entire national territory (Jalava 2012). Starting in the mid-1980s, the emerging logics and practices of a 'Schumpeterian' regime, such as the New Public Management and the politics of international competitiveness, guided state reorganisation and were increasingly imposed on universities as well (Moisio & Leppänen 2007; Kangas & Moisio 2012: 206). However, as this article illustrates, common expectations did not produce common convergent tendencies amongst universities (cf. Hay 2000:

512). To explain this spatial variation, the article has paid attention to two universities with different scalar logics and strategies and their role in shaping statehood in Finland.

In LUT, a single scalar logic dominated and additional logics were more peripheral. The specialisation strategy LUT chose from the outset led to its departments becoming narrowly focused spatially. The university scaled its activities outwards as it tried to find educational and research niches or fields that were uncommon in Finland. LUT searched for globally scaled and privately funded industrial partners or stakeholders with significant research and development capabilities. Thus, it trained engineers mainly for large enterprises that were located in the Helsinki metropolitan area. Thinking about the scalar dimensions of LUT's practices, the university can be understood as having been simultaneously international, national and regional (Mansfield 2005: 468; Vainikka 2014). LUT aimed at 'Nordic-class' and, later on, world-class performance in carefully selected focus areas. Nationally, its strategy supported the construction of societal order towards an emphasis on competition, specialisation, privatisation and decreased governmental regulation. Regionally speaking, LUT was responsive above all to the needs of the Helsinki region, and hence, it promoted spatial strategies emphasising a few urban nodes in southern Finland. Later, in the 1980s, the plurality of scalar logics increased somewhat, as LUT more carefully took into account regional networks' effects on South Karelia by establishing the Centre for Continuing Education and by supporting the creation of the Kareltek technology centre. This did not, however, invalidate or supersede the previously established scalar logics and hierarchies but, rather, gave the university a piquant local flavour.

In contrast, UJO's generalisation strategy led to a more comprehensive, or 'Humboldtian', university model in which multiple scalar logics influenced the core mission. Through a broad spectrum of disciplines, UJO supported territorialised state strategies and the needs of the public sector both nationally and locally. However, due to its strong focus on teacher and public-servant education, UJO was highly dependent on public funding and territorially equalising welfare-state policies. Thus, the 1980s and the emerging 'Schumpeterian' competition regime caused some problems for the university. Many structures and practices had become so 'fixed' during the 1970s that the university

could not abandon them altogether. Still, some changes in scalar logics were needed in order to match intensifying competition from rival universities. University administrators saw that, while constructing an equalising welfare state, UJO and its core competencies had become too general and 'ineffective'. Consequently, UJO volunteered as a pilot university for new 'Schumpeterian' experiments in resource management but otherwise remained a traditional, 'Humboldtian' university that supported many attitudes, norms and practices created in the 1970s. From the viewpoint of the scalar structuration approach, new arrangements and structures originated from the interaction between inherited spatial or scalar structures and emergent socio-spatial strategies (Brenner 2004b; MacLeod & Jones 2007; MacKinnon 2011).

Here a concept of scale has been used to reveal the 'inbetween-spaces' (Jonas 2006: 402) of action. We should not think of universities as the pre-assigned and static arenas of universalistic, regionally embedded or 'glocal' activities. On the contrary, universities, like scales or scalar logics, are very much relational and political constructs (Jones & MacLeod 2004). Particular events and universities' practices can be seen as multidimensional and as evincing multiple scalar aspects and repercussions visible simultaneously. There may be situations in which regional, national or global distinctions are less important, but it is difficult to think of a situation in which a university produces or gives meaning to only one scale or set of scales at a time (cf. Mansfield 2005: 468; Vainikka 2014). Despite the multidimensional nature of academic activities, particular projects and university choices, as this article illustrates, tend to favour some scales over others and reshape statehood in line with their ideological and socio-political or politico-economic attitudes (MacKinnon 2011: 31; see also Brenner 2004b).

Creation of the basis for a territorially integrated welfare state through heavy public investments and state planning in the 1970s represented the policy UJO wanted to support actively, whereas increasing emphasis on technological development, competition and specialisation from the early 1980s onwards were something LUT had already proactively defended in the previous decade. Given that, historically, universities have played an important role in the development of Finnish territorial structures (Moisio 2012: 66–67, 135–136, 143, 146), further academic research should more thoroughly examine, for instance,

how other technological universities and business schools have taken part in the statehood transformation process compared with multidisciplinary 'Humboldtian' universities.

Hence, more empirical studies on universities of various sizes, offering programs in different disciplines are still needed to understand processes in which different spatial relations and state formations are produced at any given time and in any given place. In this regard, a concept of scale offers an interesting heuristic and analytical tool for spatio-historical analyses of higher education institutions. It engenders new research topics and makes it possible for historians to observe the evolution of university organisations from a viewpoint they would not otherwise have. As Jonas (2006: 404) aptly remarks, "scale is a lens through which to think about and act upon change". By entering the territory of human geography, university historians participate in the exciting efforts to bridge the divide between these two disciplines that offer different but closely related ways of looking at the same social interactions and power relations (cf. Baker 2003). In this sense, they could form yet another generation that cherishes the legacy of the divergent *Annales* movement by breaking down compartments and encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration (cf. Burke 1990). As Lucien Febvre, one of the two founders of the *Annales* movement in the 1920s, put it, "Historians, be geographers. Be jurists too, and sociologists, and psychologists" (Burke 1990: 2). To Febvre "it mattered little whether those who undertake research [on human societies] be labelled at outset geographers, historians or even sociologists" (Baker 2003: 20). This apt remark is certainly applicable to research on universities, too.

NOTES

¹ UJO was situated in the County (lääni) and Province (maakunta) of North Karelia, whereas LUT was located in the Province of South Karelia, which was part of a larger administrative entity: Kymi County.

² The bourgeois-minded press and conservative politicians in Joensuu were also worried about the alleged "red colour" of the university, that is, the political actions of the students and some university personnel. Juxtapositions emerged between the different values and ideas of territoriality, science and academic culture. In more detail, see Kuusisto 2014.

³ UJO had engaged in continuing training through the Open University already in the 1970s. The establishment of the CCE deepened this activity further.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and Sami Moisio and Arto Nevala for early discussions leading to the publication of this paper. The article was financially supported by the Suomen Kulttuurirahasto (Finnish Cultural Foundation) (Grant no. 00130408).

REFERENCES

- Ahlqvist T & Moisio S 2014. Neoliberalisation in a Nordic state: From cartel polity towards a corporate polity in Finland. *New Political Economy* 19: 1, 21–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2013.768608>.
- Alajoutsijärvi K, Kettunen K & Tikkanen H 2012. Institutional evolution of business schools in Finland 1909–2009. *Management & Organisational History* 7: 4, 337–367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1744935912457624>.
- Allen J, Massey D & Cochrane A 1998. *Rethinking the region: Spaces of neo-liberalism*. London, Routledge.
- Arbo P & Eskelinen H 2003. The role of small, comprehensive universities in regional economic development: Experiences from two Nordic cases. Paper for the 43rd ERSA Congress, Jyväskylä, August 27–30.
- Baker ARH 2003. *Geography and history: Bridging the divide*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Benneworth P & Jongbloed BW 2010. Who matters to universities? A stakeholder perspective on humanities, arts and social sciences valorisation. *Higher Education* 59: 5, 567–588. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9265-2>.
- Billig M 1996. *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brenner N 2001. The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human Geography* 25: 4, 591–614. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/030913201682688959>.
- Brenner N 2004a. Urban governance and the production of new state spaces in Western Europe, 1960–2000. *Review of International Political Economy* 11: 3, 447–488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969229042000282864>.
- Brenner N 2004b. *New state spaces*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Brubaker R & Cooper F 2000. Beyond “identity”. *Theory and Society* 29: 1, 1–47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007068714468>.
- Burke P 1990. *The French historical revolution. The Annales School, 1929–89*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Cerny PG, Menz G & Soederberg S 2005. Different roads to globalization: Neoliberalism, the competition state, and politics in a more open world. In Soederberg S, Menz G & Cerny PG (eds). *Internalizing globalization: The rise of neoliberalism and the decline of national varieties of capitalism*, 1–31. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Clark BR 1983. *The higher education system: Academic organisation in cross-national perspective*. University California Press, Berkeley.
- Clark BR 1998. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- Dahllöf U & Selander S (eds) 1994. *New universities and regional context*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Upsala.
- Dahllöf U, Goddard J, Huttunen J, O’Brien C, Román O & Virtanen I 1998. *Towards the responsive university. The regional role of Eastern Finland Universities*. Publications of Higher Education Evaluation Council, Helsinki.
- Delanty G 2001. The university in the knowledge society. *Organization* 8: 2, 149–153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082002>.
- della Porta D 2008. Comparative analysis: Case-oriented versus variable-oriented research. In della Porta D & Keating M (eds). *Approaches and methodologies in social sciences. A pluralist perspective*, 198–222. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dillon GL 1991. *Contending rhetorics: Writing in academic disciplines*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Esping-Andersen G 1990. *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fraser A 2010. The craft of scalar practices. *Environment and Planning A* 42: 2, 332–346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/a4299>.
- Haapakorpi A 1989. *Ylemmän korkeakoulututkimuksen suorittaneiden sijoittuminen työmarkkinoille*. Opetusministeriö, Helsinki.
- Harrison J 2008. Stating the production of scales: Centrally orchestrated regionalism, regionally orchestrated centralism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32: 4, 922–944. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00815.x>.
- Harvey DA 2005. *Brief history of neo-liberalism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hay C 2000. Contemporary capitalism, globalization, regionalization and the persistence of national variation. *Review of International Studies* 26: 4, 509–531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S026021050000509X>.
- Heiskala R & Hämäläinen TJ 2007. Social innovation or hegemonic change? Rapid paradigm change in Finland in the 1980s and 1990s. In Heiskala R & Hämäläinen TJ (eds). *Social innovations, institutional change and economic performance. Making sense of structural adjustment processes in industrial sectors, regions and societies*, 80–94. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Howells JRL, Karataş-Özkan M, Yavuz Ç & Atiq M 2014. University management and organisational change: A dynamic institutional perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 7: 2, 251–270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsu005>.
- Husso K & Raento P 2002. Science policy and research in Finland. *Fennia* 180: 1–2, 261–274.
- Hölttä S 1988. Recent changes in the Finnish higher education system. *European Journal of Education* 23: 1–2, 91–103.
- Hölttä S 1999. Regional cooperation in postsecondary education in Europe – the case of Nordic countries. *Journal of Institutional Research in Australasia* 8: 2, 31–46.

- Hölttä S & Nuotio J 1995. Academic leadership in a self-regulative environment: A challenge for Finnish universities. *Tertiary Education and Management* 1: 1, 12–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.1995.9966850>.
- Hölttä S & Pulliainen K 1996. The changing regional role of universities. *Tertiary Education and Management* 2: 2, 119–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.1996.9966892>.
- Jaakkola J 1998. *Suuntaa ja synergiaa: Rehtorin puheita yliopiston alkuvuosikymmeniltä*. Lappeenranta teknillinen korkeakoulu, Hämeenlinna.
- Jalava M 2012. *The university in the making of the welfare state: The 1970s degree reform in Finland*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Jessop B 2000. The crisis of the national spatio-temporal fix and the tendential ecological dominance of global capitalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24: 2, 323–360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00251>.
- Jessop B 2008. *State power*. Polity Press, London.
- Jonas AEG 1994. The scale politics of spatiality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12: 3, 257–264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/d120257>
- Jonas AEG 2006. Pro scale: Further reflections on the 'scale debate' in human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31: 3, 399–406. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2006.00210.x>.
- Jones M & MacLeod G 2004. Regional spaces, spaces of regionalism: Territory, insurgent politics and the English questions. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29: 4, 433–452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.2004.00140.x>.
- Jongbloed B, Enders J & Salerno C 2008. Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education* 56: 3, 303–324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2>.
- Kaiser R & Nikiforova E 2008. The performativity of scale: The social construction of scale effects in Narva, Estonia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 3, 537–562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/d3307>.
- Kangas A & Moision S 2012. Creating state competitiveness, re-scaling higher education: The case of Finland. In Aalto P, Harle V & Moision S (eds). *Global and regional problems. Towards an interdisciplinary study*, 199–224. Ashgate, Farnham.
- Kettunen P 2001. The Nordic welfare state in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of History* 26: 3, 225–247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/034687501750303864>.
- Kirkinen H 1973. General principles on the development of the University, Memo, February 9, 1973. The archives of the Emeritus Professor Heikki Kirkinen.
- Kogan M, Bauer M, Bleiklie I & Henkel M 2000. *Transforming higher education: A comparative study*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London and Philadelphia.
- Kohvakka M 2009. *Kasvukertomus: 40-vuotiaan Lappeenrannan teknillisen yliopiston elämäkerta*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen yliopisto, Jyväskylä.
- Kraatz MS & Block ES 2008. Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In Greenwood R, Oliver C, Sahlin K & Suddaby R (eds). *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 243–275. Sage, London.
- KTL 1991. *Saimaalta Kolille: Karjalan tutkimuslaitos 1971–1991*. Joensuun yliopisto, Karjalan tutkimuslaitos, Joensuu.
- Kuusisto A 2014. Maakunnan ja tieteen välissä. Tutkimus Joensuun korkeakoulun politisoitumiskeskustelun diskursseista pohjoiskarjalaisessa lehdistössä 1969–1975. Suomen historian lisen-siaattitutkielma, Itä-Suomen yliopisto.
- Kyläheiko K 1998. *The regional role and the effectiveness of Lappeenranta University of Technology: Self-evaluation report*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lappeenranta.
- LUT 1973a. *Lausunto FYTT-toimikunnan mietinnöstä, 19 huhtikuuta 1973 (The report on the referendum of the FYTT Committee, 19 April, 1973)*. Minutes of LUT Senate, Archives of Lappeenranta University of Technology.
- LUT 1973b. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1975–1979*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lappeenranta.
- LUT 1974. *Vuosikertomus 1972–1973*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lappeenranta.
- LUT 1977. Alueellinen neuvottelukunta, 22 Kesäkuuta 1977. Minutes of LUT Senate, Archives of Lappeenranta University of Technology.
- LUT 1978. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1980–1984*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lappeenranta.
- LUT 1984. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1986–1990*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lappeenranta.
- MacKinnon D 2011. Reconstructing scale: Towards a new scalar politics. *Progress in Human Geography* 35: 1, 21–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132510367841>.
- MacLeod G & Jones M 2007. Territorial, scalar, networked, connected: In what sense a 'regional world'? *Regional Studies* 41: 9, 1177–1191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00343400701646182>
- Mansfield B 2005. Beyond rescaling: Reintegrating the 'national' as a dimension of scalar relations. *Progress in Human Geography* 29: 4, 458–473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0309132505ph560oa>.
- Meyer RE & Hammerschmid G 2006. Changing institutional logics and executive identities: A managerial challenge to public administration in Austria. *American Behavioural Scientist* 49: 7, 1000–1014. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002764205285182>.
- Meyer RE & Höllerer MA 2010. Meaning structures in a contested issue field: A topographic map of shareholder value in Austria. *Academy of Management Journal* 53: 6, 1241–1262. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.57317829>.
- Michelsen K 1994. *Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu 1969–1994*. Lappeenrannan teknillinen korkeakoulu, Espoo.
- Moision S 2008. Towards attractive and cost-efficient state space: Political geography of the production of state transformation in Finland. *World Political Science Review* 4: 3, 1–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/1935-6226.1053>.

- Moisio S 2012. *Valtio, alue, politiikka. Suomen tilasuhhteiden sääntely toisesta maailmansodasta nykypäivään*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Moisio S & Leppänen L 2007. Towards a Nordic competition state? Politico-economic transformation of statehood in Finland, 1965–2005. *Fennia* 185: 2, 63–87.
- Moore A 2008. Rethinking scale as a geographical category: From analysis to practice. *Progress in Human Geography* 32: 2, 203–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132507087647>.
- Mälkönen P 1982. Tieteen oltava kansainvälistä. *Karjalan Maa* 9.9.1982.
- Neave G 1988. On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: An overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986–1988. *European Journal of Education* 23: 1–2, 7–23.
- Neave G & van Vught FA (eds) 1991. *Prometheus bound. The changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Nevala A 2009. *Uudisraivaaja: Joensuun yliopiston 40-vuotishistoria*. Joensuun yliopisto, Saarijärvi.
- Paasi A 2004. Place and region: Looking through the prism of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 28: 4, 536–546. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph502pr>.
- Pinheiro R 2012. University ambiguity and institutionalization. A tale of three regions. In Pinheiro R, Benneworth P & Jones GA (eds). *Universities and regional development. A critical assessment of tensions and contradictions*, 36–55. Routledge, New York.
- Potter J 1996. *Representing reality. Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. SAGE, London.
- Pulliaainen K 1985. Rehtorin kirje kulttuuri- ja tiedeministeri Gustav Björkstrandille 7.8.1985, Archives of University of Joensuu.
- Pulliaainen K 1987a. Yliopisto ei ole konsulttitoimisto. *Karjalan Maa* 15.10.1987.
- Pulliaainen K 1987b. Reflections on the current problem of the University of Joensuu. *Sanansaattaja. Joensuun yliopiston tiedotuslehti* 5.8.1987, 1–2.
- Rowley TJ & Moldeveanu M 2003. When will stakeholder groups act? An interest- and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization. *Academy of Management Review* 28: 2, 204–219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2003.9416080>.
- Rüegg W (ed) 2011. *A history of the university in Europe. Vol IV universities since 1945*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Salo M 2003. *Pohjoinen Alma Mater: Oulun yliopisto osana korkeakoululaitosta ja yhteiskuntaa perustamisvaiheista vuoteen 2000*. Pohjois-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys, Rovaniemi.
- Sillince JAA 2006. Resources and organisational identities: The role of rhetoric in the creation of competitive advantage. *Management Communication Quarterly* 20: 2, 186–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0893318906293587>.
- Smith N 1993. Homeless/global: Scaling places. In Bird J, Curtis B, Putnam T, Robertson G & Tickner L (eds). *Mapping the futures: Local cultures, global change*, 87–120. Routledge, London.
- Swyngedouw E 1997. Neither global nor local: 'Glocalisation' and the politics of scale. In Cox K (ed). *Spaces of globalization*, 137–166. Guilford, New York.
- Thornton PH & Ocasio W 1999. Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 3, 801–843. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/210361>.
- Tierney WG 1988. Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education* 59: 1, 2–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1981868>.
- Tosh J 2010. *The pursuit of history. Aims, methods and new directions in the study of modern history*. Pearson Education Ltd, Harlow.
- Trow M 2007. Reflections on the transition from elite to mass universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. In Forest J & Altbach P (eds). *International handbook of higher education*, 243–280. Springer, Dordrecht.
- UJO 1975. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosiksi 1977–1981*. Joensuun korkeakoulu, Joensuu.
- UJO 1978. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1980–1984*. Joensuun korkeakoulu, Joensuu.
- UJO 1984. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1986–1990*. Joensuun yliopisto, Joensuu.
- UJO 1986. *Toiminta- ja taloussuunnitelma vuosille 1988–1992*. Joensuun yliopisto, Joensuu.
- Vainikka J 2013. The role of identity for regional actors and citizens in a splintered region. The case of Päijät-Häme, Finland. *Fennia* 191: 1, 25–39.
- Vainikka J 2014. A citizen of all the different bits: Emotional scaling of identity. *GeoJournal*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10708-014-9596-0>.
- Vartiainen P & Viiri A 2002. Universities and their local partners: The case of the University of Joensuu. *Industry & Higher Education* 16: 2, 83–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5367/000000002101296153>.
- Välimaa J 2005. Social dynamics of higher education reforms: The case Finland. In Gornitzka Å, Kogan M & Amaral A (eds). *Reform and change in higher education*, 245–268. Dordrecht, Springer.
- Välimaa J 2008. Cultural studies in higher education research. In Välimaa J & Ylijoki O-H (eds). *Cultural perspectives on higher education*, 9–25. Dordrecht, Springer.
- Warren CAB & Karner TX 2010. *Discovering qualitative methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Wishard D 2004. Period and region. *Progress in Human Geography* 28: 3, 305–319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph488oa>.