

# INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

## Issue #100

Unprecedented  
Challenges, Significant  
Possibilities?

HANS DE WIT AND PHILIP G.  
ALTBACH ————— **3**

Higher Education in  
the Age of Populism:  
Public Good and  
Civic Engagement

ELLEN HAZELKORN ————— **6**

Tertiary Education  
is Indispensable to  
Achieve the Sustainable  
Development Goals

JAMIL SALMI ————— **14**

For weekly global higher  
education news and  
comment see our partner

University  
World News



facebook.com/Center.for.  
International.Higher.Education



twitter.com/BC\_CIHE

Private Higher  
Education Globally: A  
Distant Second Place?

DANIEL C. LEVY ————— **17**

Internationalization of  
Higher Education and  
the Future of the Planet

LAURA E. RUMBLEY ————— **32**

### The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the *International Higher Education* quarterly publication, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at the Lynch School of Education and Human Development, Boston College. The Center offers an M.A. and a Certificate of International Higher Education.

For additional information see:  
<https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA>  
<https://www.bc.edu/IHECert>

**Editor** Philip G. Altbach

**Associate Editors** Hans de Wit and Rebecca Schendel

**Publication Editors** H el ene Bernot Uller o and Tessa DeLaquil

#### Editorial Office

Center for International Higher Education  
 Champion Hall  
 Boston College  
 Chestnut Hill, MA 02467–USA

**Tel:** +1 617 552-4236

**E-mail:** [ihe@bc.edu](mailto:ihe@bc.edu)

[www.internationalhighereducation.net](http://www.internationalhighereducation.net)

*We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports.*

#### Subscription:

*If you would like to subscribe, please do this via: [www.internationalhighereducation.net/en/newsletter](http://www.internationalhighereducation.net/en/newsletter). There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of €32/year applies to a subscription to the print version which can be purchased from the publisher: <https://shop.duz-medienhaus.de/international-higher-education.html>.*

**ISSN:** 1084-0613 (print),  
 2372-4501 (online)

## INTRODUCTION

- 3\_\_\_ Unprecedented Challenges, Significant Possibilities?  
 HANS DE WIT AND PHILIP G. ALTBACH

## UNPRECEDENTED CHALLENGES, SIGNIFICANT POSSIBILITIES

- 4\_\_\_ Do We Share a Common University Identity?  
 AKIYOSHI YONEZAWA
- 6\_\_\_ Higher Education in the Age of Populism: Public Good and Civic Engagement  
 ELLEN HAZELKORN
- 7\_\_\_ Higher Education and the New Cold War  
 SIMON MARGINSON
- 9\_\_\_ The Critical Role of Communication in a Post-Truth World  
 MARCELO KNOBEL

## HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- 11\_\_\_ Developing Disability-Inclusive Higher Education Systems  
 STEPHEN THOMPSON
- 12\_\_\_ Higher Education Values and Social Responsibility  
 EVA EGRON-POLAK
- 14\_\_\_ Tertiary Education is Indispensable to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals  
 JAMIL SALMI
- 15\_\_\_ Higher Education and the SDGs in Africa: More of the Same?  
 DAMTEW TEFERRA

## PUBLIC/PRIVATE TENSIONS

- 17\_\_\_ Private Higher Education Globally: A Distant Second Place?  
 DANIEL C. LEVY
- 19\_\_\_ Public Trust and the Public Good  
 PATTI MCGILL PETERSON
- 23\_\_\_ The Free-Tuition Movement  
 ARIANE DE GAYARDON AND ANDR ES BERNASCONI

- 24\_\_\_ Developing Globally Competitive and Inclusive Higher Education in India  
 N. V. VARGHESE

- 26\_\_\_ Publish or Perish  
 MARIA YUDKEVICH

## INTERNATIONALIZATION

- 28\_\_\_ The Dilemma of English  
 PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND HANS DE WIT
- 30\_\_\_ How Can We Extend the Boundaries of Our Own Knowing?  
 BETTY LEASK
- 32\_\_\_ Internationalization of Higher Education and the Future of the Planet  
 LAURA E. RUMBLEY
- 34\_\_\_ International Students at Chinese Institutions: Trends and Implications  
 NIAN CAI LIU
- 36\_\_\_ China–Africa Higher Education Engagement: A Win–Win Situation?  
 GOOLAM MOHAMEDBHAI
- 38\_\_\_ Knowledge Diplomacy: What Are the Key Characteristics?  
 JANE KNIGHT

## INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION AT #100

- 39\_\_\_ *IHE* at 100: 25 Years of Evolution in International Higher Education  
 REBECCA SCHENDEL, AYENACHEW A. WOLDEGIYORGIS, AND ARAZ KHAJARIAN

*International Higher Education* is pleased to announce its collaboration with DUZ Academic Publishers in Berlin, Germany, as our new publisher. Our publication is still owned by the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College and we retain our editorial independence and orientation. Our electronic edition remains free and available to anyone.

## Unprecedented Challenges, Significant Possibilities?

Hans de Wit and Philip G. Altbach

Perhaps the most fundamental realities of higher education in the past 25 years have been the joint effects of the massification of worldwide postsecondary education, on the one hand, combined with the contradictory force of the emergence of the global knowledge economy, on the other. We have also experienced the development and maturing of information technology, including the Internet, artificial intelligence, and a myriad of related aspects.

The effects of these seismic shifts have been dramatic and have introduced new challenges into higher education systems around the world. Massification stimulated the rise of the private sector and commercialization. The global knowledge economy contributed to the dominance of English as the global scientific language, dramatic increases in student and faculty mobility, and internationalization in multiple forms.

Yet we must recognize that higher education has failed in some ways to meet these important challenges. While offering unprecedented access, universities have also contributed to social divisions and inequalities. In many countries, large numbers of students do not complete their degrees, and the cost of study has greatly increased in most places. Higher education is also facing worldwide challenges of increased nationalism and populism. For the most part, universities have failed to emphasize social responsibility.

We are devoting Issue #100 of *International Higher Education* to critical analyses of some of the key challenges and possibilities for the coming decade and beyond. We have asked experts to reflect—and perhaps to point to solutions. We have also asked the next generation to look at the future, by soliciting entries to an essay contest from current students and postdoctoral scholars. We are publishing the winning entry in this issue, and four other ones will be published in *University World News*. Finally, we have taken the opportunity presented by this issue to reflect on 25 years of contributions in *International Higher Education*.

### **America Abdicates Leadership in International Higher Education**

For our part, this issue gave us an excuse to look back on our own work, thinking about the time of the journal's founding. In the first issue of *International Higher Education*, Spring 1995, we wrote that America was abdicating leadership in international higher education. Our argument was that "internationalism is mandatory for any higher education system in the 21st century." What was amazing to us was that "while the rest of the world's universities are becoming more international, the United States shows signs of de-emphasizing internationalism in its higher education system." We stated that "higher education is a major 'export industry'—one that deserves stimulation and not contraction." We concluded that "the slide has begun, and growing insularity will mean that the United States will fall behind its competitors. Internationalism in higher education permits us to understand the rest of the world, as well as to function in the new international economy of the 21st century. Others understand this—Americans must too."

*Looking back with today's perspective, we might have been too pessimistic back then, but we are also not very optimistic now.*

In this issue #100, 25 years later, we could write nearly exactly the same words—as the broader political atmosphere in the United States has become highly nationalistic. But, in the past quarter-century, there has been massive change. The numbers of international students in the United States have grown from 450,000 in 1995 to one million in 2019, and international education now produces over US\$40 billion for the US economy, compared to US\$7 billion in 1995. Many universities have adopted international strategies to try to ensure that their students have greater opportunities for overseas study and to understand diverse cultures. Yet, throughout this period, the United States has lagged behind much of the rest of the world. The United States' "market share" of international students has been declining, as has its share of universities at the top of the rankings. Knowledge of other cultures, languages, economies, and societies has also declined. This was already the case before the Trump administration came into office in 2017, but has become even more obvious in the past three years.

#### Looking Ahead

Looking back with today's perspective, we might have been too pessimistic back then, but we are also not very optimistic now. These negative trends are not limited to the United States but reflect broader worldwide threats to higher education, internationalization, and autonomy and academic freedom. Several of our contributors to issue #100 write about how important it is that higher education takes a leading role in addressing the Sustainable Development Goals, while others express concern about autonomy and academic freedom, and other pressing issues for the future of higher education worldwide. ▲

## Do We Share a Common University Identity?

Akiyoshi Yonezawa

#### Abstract

The rise of East Asian knowledge economies has driven national leaders and higher education researchers to seek identities for their own universities and higher education systems. This trend may, in the end, lead to a crisis of the identity that universities have in common, as autonomous academic bodies.

Except for Al-Azhar University, all universities in the world share a common origin: they stem from universities in medieval Europe. This famous observation by Philip Altbach conveys a strong message that all institutions claiming to be universities should be autonomous communities of academics, independent from both religious and secular authorities. Unfortunately, anyone familiar with the long and diverse history of universities around the globe knows this claim to be a myth. Universities throughout the world have frequently faced crises when religious or secular powers have challenged their academic freedom and autonomy.

#### In Search of a Distinct University Identity

Especially in regions far from European traditions of civilization such as East Asia, modern university systems were launched, developed, and transformed after the mid-nineteenth century in close association with nation building. In this process, the articulation of universities as concepts imported from the West, but with Eastern intellectual traditions and identities, has been a constant and central issue. When Japan established its first modern university in 1877, it chose the term *daigaku* 大学 as a translation for "university"—notably, as in *Daigaku-Ryo*, which was the name of a college for training national administrators that existed until the twelfth century. In 1898, the Qing Dynasty in China transformed its traditional institute for training senior administrators into the

modern university *Dà Xué Táng* (大学堂), renamed *Peking Dà Xué* (北京大学) in 1912, just after the establishment of the Republic of China. In 1946, South Korea founded its first university, Seoul National University, as *Daehakgyo* (대학교; 大學校), based on a concept of national university identity distinct from the abolished Keijo Teikoku Daigaku, an imperial university under the Japanese colonial regime. In the nineteenth century, modern East Asian states searched for, and introduced, university models inspired by national higher education systems in modernized Western nation states. These *Daigaku*, *Dà Xué*, and *Daehakgyo* were conceptualized and reshaped differently in their particular national languages and historical contexts, but can all be translated into the common English term “university.”

In recent decades, the rise of national East Asian economies based on science and technology has driven national leaders and higher education researchers to seek identities for their universities and higher education systems that are distinct from the West and present similarities and differences within the region. The emergence of globally top-ranked universities in East Asia has accelerated this trend. For example, the achievements of Singapore’s highly ranked universities indicate that it is possible to establish a world-class university on a strong national basis. In the process, while substantial changes are taking place to decentralize university governance, a clear consensus on academic freedom and university autonomy is still missing.

Today, top universities in China seek to dominate regional rankings, backed by huge national investments and talent concentration driven by national motives. The strategies and profiles of Chinese universities, therefore, are strongly influenced by the connection between university governance and party leadership and by systematic support to both top universities and top disciplines (“Double First Class”) by government projects. Higher education systems within and surrounding Greater China have, to varying degrees, been influenced by regional geopolitics in higher education, including student and faculty mobility within the region and beyond, for example with Africa.

### Will Nationalism Lead to a Crisis of University Identity?

In recent years, the rise of nationalism has changed the landscape of global higher education. In particular, growing self-confidence among East Asia’s own university models may ultimately result in the claim that *Dà Xué* and other concepts of leading East Asian higher education institutions are different from the notion of universities originating from the specific political setting of medieval Europe.

History indicates that national demand for science and technology and highly skilled human resources does not always result in supporting universities as autonomous academic communities—as shown by the closure of universities under the French Revolution. The global development of universities is stimulating an “arms race” in terms of knowledge, and close connections with national governments and industry tend to link academic exchange and collaborations with national interests. Even in Japan, whose national constitution guarantees academic freedom, there are occurrences of legal actions to prevent international collaborations with researchers from certain countries.

It is high time for universities around the world to start a dialogue in order to seek a common understanding of the contemporary university, based on a mutual respect for diversity and a need to address common global and regional challenges. This dialogue on a contemporary concept of university may be linked with postcolonial discourses, but, more importantly, it should be led by academics engaging in self-reflection across nations and institutions. Universities around the world can share a common identity only through the willpower of academics working on this exercise together. ▲

*Even in Japan, whose national constitution guarantees academic freedom, there are occurrences of legal actions to prevent international collaborations with researchers from certain countries.*

*Akiyoshi Yonezawa is professor and vice-director, International Strategy Office, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan. E-mail: akiyoshi.yonezawa.a4@tohoku.ac.jp.*



# Higher Education in the Age of Populism: Public Good and Civic Engagement

Ellen Hazelkorn

## Abstract

The last few years have been a rude awakening for higher education. Rising frustration with the unequal distribution of globalization's benefits and growing disparities between urban centers and their rural hinterlands has given way to the age of populism. Universities have become caught up in this polarizing battle, too often seen as centers of privilege and elites disengaged from the publics that host and fund them, rather than upholding the public good. Today's challenges mean the university cannot sit on the sidelines—nor can its students. There is a lot at stake. Is civic engagement the path to regaining public trust?

*Research shows universities often choosing collaborators geographically distant from companies or organizations on their doorstep.*

The past few years have been a rude awakening for higher education. The Brexit vote in the United Kingdom, the election of Donald Trump as US president, changes in government in Hungary, Poland, Italy, and Brazil—to name just a few, along with policy and legislative changes in these and other countries, have highlighted growing tensions between higher education and the communities that host them. Colleges that prided themselves on working across borders of country and culture now find themselves dealing with governments and communities campaigning to keep out “foreigners.”

Education and geography, overlaid with race, ethnicity, and gender, were key factors contributing to people's viewpoints in the US election, and early polling for 2020 suggests the greatest tension is between college-educated white women and non-college-educated white men. Education level was also decisive in the UK Brexit vote. So is mobility, or rather the lack thereof. People less likely to have left their hometowns are more likely to be concerned about societal and economic changes. As people flock to the cities, so has political and economic power, leaving behind growing disparities in opportunities.

For people in developed countries and my generation, the underlying belief was that each generation would be better off than the previous one; progress was a birthright. But this is changing. As more people participate in higher education, universities are becoming more hierarchically organized, and access and life chances are correlated accordingly.

## Part of the Problem or the Solution?

Universities say they are part of the solution, that their door is open, and that their research and international pursuits make positive contributions to society. But they are regularly accused of being insufficiently accountable for learning outcomes, graduate attributes, and life-sustaining skills, in exchange for the funding and/or public and political support received. While universities pursue internationalization and study-abroad programs, the local community often sees international students reducing the number of places available for domestic students and the switch to English-language programs as undermining their own national language.

Research shows universities often choosing collaborators geographically distant from companies or organizations on their doorstep. This varies according to mission group, with newer or lower/nonranked universities more likely to be engaged locally—but it speaks to growing criticism that universities prioritize international reputation over being good neighbors.

We might argue that these times will pass. But many of the changes being sought and/or implemented reflect genuine concerns and are substantive. Higher education has historically had a close relationship with the city and country of its founding. Today, the public is asking whether it is still serving its interests. These challenges mean the university cannot sit on the sidelines—nor can its students.

## Enhancing and Deepening Engagement

Recent years have seen a significant number and range of initiatives being undertaken by universities, university associations, and governments—often in partnership with each other. They aim to rethink and reboot the university for the twenty-first century.

The UK Civic University Commission has promoted the idea of the “civic agreement” to be cocreated and signed by key stakeholders, including universities and other educational institutions, within a city/region; so far, over 30 universities have signed up since it was launched in January 2019. The European Union is pursuing “smart specialization” policies as a place-based approach characterized by the identification of areas of strategic significance, which build sustainable capacity and overcome regional disparities between and within countries; higher education and research, along with vocational education, are central to these actions.

Many universities across Europe are beginning to shape their academic profiles in response to the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals. In its sixth report on the *Socially Responsible University*, GUNi, a UNESCO network, advocates that universities adopt a “glocal” perspective, linking the local and the global. The Magna Charta Organization is seeking to rewrite and capture the fundamental tenets of higher education for the twenty-first century. I am involved with the “21st Century Lab,” organized by the University of Lincoln (UK), which is drafting a call to action for higher education for the twenty-first century.

It is clear that there is no single blueprint, but there are probably three broad approaches for enhanced engagement. The *social justice* model focuses on students, curriculum, and pedagogy. At the other end of the spectrum is the *economic development* model, which focuses on the commercialization of research through intellectual property deals, technology transfer, etc. The *public good* model, in contrast, sees engagement as wholly embedded within and across all functions and units of the college/university. It is a bridge across teaching and research and not a “third mission.” In this model, the university adopts a systematic, systemic, and strategic approach, based on an analysis of the needs of the place. And this is not just for low/nonranked universities, although universities will develop different and distinct approaches.

### What Are Universities Good for?

Ultimately, the agenda is bigger than grandstanding about what the university does for “the public good,” and implies deeper changes to the university’s vision and mission. What is required is for higher education to be holistically engaged and to reflect this engagement in its vision and mission and in its daily activities. Universities need to be key institutions at the regional level. They must also aspire to being globally engaged institutions that educate open-minded, critical, and aware citizens, and through their research activity help to define global lines of action leading to a fair and sustainable world. We sit at a historic junction. There is no time for complacency. ▲

*Ellen Hazelkorn is professor emerita and director, Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland, and partner, BH Associates, Education Consultants. E-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie.*

## Higher Education and the New Cold War

Simon Marginson

**A**fter a long period of collaboration with China, American foreign policy has changed. US policies and institutions are gearing up for a long geostrategic battle for global primacy, especially, but not only, in East Asia. This is rightly tagged the “New Cold War.” It shows in the Trump tariffs on Chinese exports, the battle over leadership in 5G technology, the US attempt to break the global position of China’s telecommunications company Huawei, and hostile moves elsewhere, including science and higher education.

### Abstract

For the past 40 years, there has been a high level of collaboration in science and technology between the United States and China. This cooperation has played a key role in China’s modernization and in research that furthers the global common good. This cooperation is now severely threatened by unilateral American moves.

While the Democratic Party opposes much of Trump's agenda, there is broad US consensus on "containing China." The justification often given is China's lack of liberal democratic forms, but this is not new. The centralized Chinese system never shared the Western political heritage, based on separation between state, market, and civil society and the division of powers between executive, legislative, judiciary, and military. The notion that an internationally open China would morph into an Americanized society was always a delusion. The reason for the New Cold War is not so much that the United States has given up on Americanization, as that the United States does not want to share global leadership and is willing to suffer its own short-term economic pain in the attempt to block China's rise.

### **Collateral Damage**

When a hitherto dominant position is under threat, leading powers often make moves that later look counterproductive (neoimperial Britain is still making counterproductive moves like Brexit long after losing global primacy!) Unfortunately, this time, universities and science are collateral damage. Global communications, deeply integrated, face the prospect of two separated systems led by the United States and China, dubbed the "splinternet." This might suit the national security apparatus in both countries, but will harm cooperation in higher education. The threat to research collaboration is similar. Recent months have seen:

- Shortening of the duration of American visas for Chinese graduate students in high-tech fields from five years to one year.
- Selective investigation of numerous scientists in the United States, all of Chinese descent, for alleged security breaches for sharing information about National Institute of Health funding applications. Some scientists lost their positions. These investigations can only be described as based on racial profiling.
- Numerous instances in which Chinese scholars have been denied entry into the United States (even scholars in geo-military-strategic fields like education!) There are signs of retaliatory visa denials affecting Americans who seek to enter China.

These US moves radically reverse the policies of the last 40 years. After Deng Xiaoping initiated China's opening up in 1978, a thick infrastructure of US-China scientific collaboration developed. The US-China Agreement on Cooperation in Science and Technology involves 50 interagency agreements and supports thousands of US-China cooperative programs. The volume and quality of joint work has expanded rapidly. US National Science Board data from Scopus shows that in 2016 there were 43,968 joint China-American papers, compared to 5,406 joint papers in 2006.

### **Are American Scientists "Naïve"?**

Some American critics argue that coauthorship on this scale merely shows that American scientists are "naïve." Under the cloak of cooperation, China has "used" and "stolen from" US science. Marvel comic polemics like this show how the same real-world phenomena can take on opposite meanings depending on the ideological narrative used to interpret them.

All healthy cooperation in science is based on open sharing, without regard to the individual purposes that might be applied to the common stock of knowledge. Unilateral claims about "spying" politicize scientific relations, break free exchange, and destroy trust.

There is no question that China's internationalization strategy with the United States has been used to build China's R&D capacity. Both parties at the time saw this as a good thing, though they might have had differing expectations. For example, between 1995 and 2015, 68,379 students from China received US doctorates. Those same Chinese graduate students also contributed to American research at their US universities. Some stayed, others went back.

However, the partnership is no longer a one-way street, if it ever was. China's science, especially in STEM, is now very strong. A paper in development by Jenny Lee and John Haupt at the University of Arizona shows that among the 500 most highly cited China-US papers in 2014-2018, more first authors were China-based than US-based. Further, of the 10 leading government research grant agencies financing the research that



generated collaborative papers, seven were from China and they financed 3.5 times as many papers as their US counterparts. The National Natural Science Foundation of China supported 74,827 papers while the US National Institutes of Health, in second place, supported 15,489.

### We All Lose

In other words, US science stands to lose as much as China's science if China-US collaboration evaporates. The rest of the world also loses. China-US collaboration, some involving scientists from other countries, greatly advances research on global problems.

Most who remember the last Cold War, in which the rivalry was an end in itself, will not want to return to two hostile camps, with no human rights between them; a world of massive military spending with the constant threat of catastrophe; where free scientific communication was overwhelmed by ideological stereotypes and national security.

Once aggressive moves begin, they can trigger an escalating process of moves and countermoves in which hostilities become entrenched. Early stages set later patterns. At this time, it is vital to protect existing links, foster mutual understanding, and keep the borders open—to minimize the extent to which universities and science, not just in the United States and China but everywhere, are dragged into the vortex of a senseless zero-sum conflict. It is especially important that universities and science outside the United States refuse to become enlisted in Cold War boycotts, and maintain and strengthen free and open relations with universities and science in both countries. ▲

*In other words, US science stands to lose as much as China's science if China-US collaboration evaporates.*

*Simon Marginson is professor of higher education at the University of Oxford, director of the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education in the United Kingdom, a leading researcher with the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, and editor-in-chief of Higher Education. E-mail: [simon.marginson@education.ox.ac.uk](mailto:simon.marginson@education.ox.ac.uk).*

## The Critical Role of Communication in a Post-Truth World

Marcelo Knobel

**H**igher education institutions are facing a fierce campaign across the world that questions their value and significance. In Brazil, for instance, accusations against universities vary from ridiculous claims that they are “nests of Communists” and “lawless places” (where drugged, drunk, naked people party continuously) to more sophisticated assertions concerning their autonomy, management, and activities.

This is not the first time that universities have been in such an uncomfortable position. Among the oldest institutions in society, they have actually resisted several attacks over the last millennium. However, the advent and increasing importance of social media, combined with the consolidation of the so-called “post-truth era,” have added a new element to the current wave of criticism, raising its potential impact to unprecedented levels.

### The Danger of Pseudoscience, Conspiracy Theories, and Other Fake News

The ongoing assault on universities must be taken seriously. From presidential elections to the rise of deniers and conspiracy theorists, there are numerous examples of contemporary events that have been strongly influenced by social media. Indeed, recent studies indicate that online enthusiasts of pseudoscience hold an edge over those who believe in real science. Most YouTube videos related to climate change, for instance, oppose the scientific consensus that it is caused by human activity. The majority either

### Abstract

We are currently living in a world where it is extremely hard to separate nonsense from truth, opinion from grounded arguments. The consequences for society can be disastrous, together with long-term damage to science, technology, and higher education institutions. A more robust and aggressive communications strategy, with modern language and strong messages, is more necessary than ever to face the so-called “post-truth” era.

*Most YouTube videos related to climate change, for instance, oppose the scientific consensus that it is caused by human activity.*

deny this fact or claim that the climate change thesis derives from a conspiracy. Those touting conspiracy theories are the ones that receive the highest numbers of views.

Unfortunately, climate change is far from the only topic about which scientific dishonesty triumphs online over scientific facts. The same applies to issues such as infectious diseases and the measles–mumps–rubella (MMR) vaccine, just to mention a few examples. Although there is plenty of information online about the vaccine’s safety, false allegations that it causes harmful effects have spread extensively across the internet. As a result, vaccination levels have dropped in many countries around the world, opening the doors for the return of diseases that were almost eradicated.

### **Building Defenses in the Post-Truth War**

Social media plays a major role in spreading misinformation. Scientists and higher education institutions need to be more proactive in developing creative and compelling ways to communicate research findings to broader audiences. More importantly, it is crucial that they bear in mind how maliciously manipulated information can affect people’s behavior, either individually or as a group.

Confronting this problem is a complex task. By providing corrective or educational information on a given topic, one can simply reinforce people’s awareness of the existing untruths about it. An important step is to overcome resistance to people’s ideological beliefs and biases. Another one is to develop people’s ability to think critically, so they can tell the difference between real information and misinformation. Scientists and faculty also need to become more involved in the conflict, in order to make sure that their work is understood and valued—and not misused. They must use innovative and persuasive strategies to communicate with the public. This includes creating compelling social media content (both at the institutional and the personal levels), aimed at shifting beliefs and influencing behaviors. Otherwise, the voices from the academy will continue to be smothered by the frequency and ferocity of non-evidence-based messaging.

From the institutional viewpoint, higher education institutions must recognize the strategic importance of communication to reinforce the value of evidence-based information to society. Faculty must be trained to learn and develop new skills to engage with their students and the public, using social media and other contemporary communication strategies. On the one hand, universities should reconsider their information diffusion strategies, to justify the importance and value of public investment. This last aspect is already well developed in private higher education institutions and large research facilities that depend directly on tuition or government resources to survive. On the other hand, public institutions in many countries need to develop better channels to inform society (including politicians) about their fundamental role in the progress of their region and country, explaining the sometimes peculiar ways in which they operate. Otherwise, the fundamental principles of academic freedom and autonomy will be in real danger, lacking supporters in what has become a rather incomprehensible, but really scary, antieducational, and anti-intellectual reality that is increasingly taking shape. ▲

*Marcelo Knobel is rector of the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp) and full professor at the Gleb Wataghin Physics Institute, Unicamp, Brazil. E-mail: [knobel@ifi.unicamp.br](mailto:knobel@ifi.unicamp.br).*

# Developing Disability-Inclusive Higher Education Systems

Stephen Thompson (Winner of the *IHE* #100 Essay Contest)

It has been 25 years since the first issue of *International Higher Education* was published. By coincidence, it is also 25 years since the Salamanca Statement called on the international community to endorse the approach of inclusive education, including at the tertiary level. The past quarter century has witnessed the global massification of postsecondary education, yet this explosion of facilities and enrollment has largely entrenched and exacerbated the exclusion of people with disabilities from the sector. This is particularly the case in low- and middle-income contexts, where university completion rates for students with disabilities are worryingly low compared to those of students without disabilities. Evidence from 35 low- and middle-income countries indicates that for students between 25 and 54 years old, the average university completion rate for students with disabilities is 4.5 percent, compared to 7.9 percent for those without a disability. For students aged 55 and above, evidence from 34 countries found that the completion rate of people with disabilities was 1.8 percent, compared to 3.7 percent for those without disabilities.

Approximately 15 percent of the world's population lives with some form of disability. The higher education sector needs to realize the educational potential of those 15 percent of students. In order to ensure that such a significant proportion of society is not excluded from higher education, and their potential realized, various elements must be in place. These include developing suitable disability-inclusive policies, governance and finance systems, curricula, staff, buildings, and supportive communities (UNESCO, 2018).

Higher education systems must become disability inclusive in order to meet international obligations and global frameworks. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) was adopted in 2006 and the majority of countries in the world have signed up to it. Article 24 of the UNCRPD focuses on the right to education and, among other commitments, requires states to ensure equal access to vocational training, adult education, and lifelong learning. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are a plan to build a better world for people and our planet by 2030. SDG 4 aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Target 4.3 aims to ensure that equal access to affordable and quality technical, vocational, and tertiary education, including university, is achieved. Target 4.5 aims to ensure equal access to all levels of education for vulnerable people, including persons with disabilities. Developing disability-inclusive tertiary education is also relevant to SDG 1 (poverty); SDG 3 (health); SDG 5 (gender); SDG 8 (economic growth); SDG 12 (responsible production); SDG 13 (climate change); as well as SDG 16 (peace and strong institutions). The SDGs will not be achieved if the needs of people with disabilities are not considered and their rights not recognized. Unless action is taken to make the higher education sector disability-inclusive, we will fail to achieve an environment where no one is left behind.

Higher education has a dual role with regard to knowledge production, involving both research and learning/teaching. Disability-inclusive higher education will be essential to allow an academic environment to develop that can contribute to addressing societal inequalities and finding solutions to global challenges (including the SDGs). If researchers with disabilities are not included in research processes, the voices of people with disabilities are more likely to be excluded from outputs, recommendations, and implications. "Nothing about us without us" is a key philosophy of the disability movement. For higher education to be truly disability-inclusive, this philosophy must be embedded into teaching and research within higher education institutions.

## Abstract

It is 25 years since the Salamanca Statement called on the international community to endorse the approach of inclusive education, including at the tertiary level. The past quarter century has witnessed the global massification of postsecondary education, yet this explosion of facilities and enrollment has largely entrenched and exacerbated the exclusion of people with disabilities from the sector. Higher education systems must become disability-inclusive in order to meet international obligations and global frameworks.

**The SDGs will not be achieved if the needs of people with disabilities are not considered and their rights not recognized.**

*Stephen Thompson is a postdoctoral research fellow at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK. E-mail: s.thompson@ids.ac.uk.*

As the first two decades of the twenty-first century come to an end, achieving progress in disability-inclusive higher education is particularly pertinent, given the progress that has been made in improving attendance in both primary and secondary education. While concerns over quality persist, access has largely improved. As this bulge of children with disabilities passes through the education system, higher education institutions need to catch up to ensure that they offer disability-inclusive education by the time children finish their secondary education. If higher education continues to marginalize those with disabilities, finishing secondary education will be the terminus of the educational journey for many youth with disabilities, regardless of their potential and desire to continue to higher education.

Despite this bleak outlook, there are glimmers of hope. Data shows that countries, including the Gambia and Colombia, have managed to buck the trend and are making great strides toward delivering disability inclusive higher education. As we enter the mid-twenty-first century, approaches to disability inclusion present both challenges and possibilities for international higher education. The challenges involve implementing reasonable accommodation within the tertiary education sector to ensure that no one is denied access due to their disability. The possibilities are reflected in the potential that a fairer, more inclusive higher education sector has to offer, if only we can turn it from an aspiration into a reality. ▲

## Higher Education Values and Social Responsibility

Eva Egron-Polak

### Abstract

Current political, social, and economic turbulence has brought about a resurgence of attention to essential principles and values needed for higher education to flourish. However, the threats and mistrust faced by higher education today require a response that goes beyond the promotion of traditional operational values, such as academic freedom and institutional autonomy, to focus also on the values that drive higher education's mission and purposes.

Each epoch is marked by a few events and trends that define opinions and impact on the general policy narrative and framework. The current era is no different, though the impact of such events and trends is often felt globally. Increased populism and attractiveness of authoritarian leadership threaten democracy. Sustainable development imperatives are changing behaviors and attitudes. Massive migrations bring population diversity to many nations, while persistent and growing economic gaps within and between nations raise social unrest. The use of social media brings a more participative approach to information sharing, but precludes control over its content. The power of global, private sector actors such as Google, Facebook, and others, is felt at every level. The still unpredictable effect of artificial intelligence adds new challenges.

To differing degrees in different contexts, these developments impact on higher education and are accompanied by a resurgence of attention to values and principles that need to be protected and promoted. They bring new opportunities, responsibilities, expectations, and constraints on higher education institutions. No longer having a monopoly on knowledge creation, let alone information dissemination, universities' very relevance is being questioned. Simultaneously, the conviction that only a knowledge-based path leads to economic competitiveness for nations and well-being for individuals, raises pressure to provide access to higher education to an ever-growing proportion of the population. Wider but also successful participation in higher education is required for social cohesion and in order to avoid marginalization due to gaps between "those who know" and "those who know not."

The complexity of societal challenges and moral dilemmas are among the reasons for university leaders, faculty, and students to reflect on the purpose of higher education and the values that drive and underpin the process.

### Principles and Values

This is not the first time that fundamental principles guiding higher education have attracted attention. For example, several decades ago, two international organizations of higher education articulated and underlined their commitment to fundamental values. In 1988, on the occasion of the 900th anniversary of the University of Bologna, the Magna Charta Observatory (MCO) adopted its *Universitatum*. As a contribution to the 1998 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, the International Association of Universities prepared its statement on “Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy and Social Responsibility.” The two organizations continue to promote these values and encourage universities to adopt and integrate values into their mission and functions.

Both organizations focused primarily on academic freedom and institutional autonomy. These two principles continue to be seen as a condition *sine qua non* of strong and well-performing universities fulfilling their social responsibility.

Today the discussion concerning higher education values needs to—and often does—go beyond these framing operational principles. It focuses on the values that guide the very purposes of education and research.

### Values to Frame the Goals of Higher Education

The choice of values can determine the goals of higher education and define the kind of graduates a university seeks to produce. The responsibilities that universities adopt as their own are defined by the values they, as a community, adopt and implement through policy, programs, and curriculum. Indeed, in 2019, a Global Forum on Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy, and the Future of Democracy, hosted by the Council of Europe, adopted a declaration in which the first paragraph states: “Education, including higher education, is responsible for advancing and disseminating knowledge and developing **ethical and able citizens.**” Such a focus on the qualities of graduates is significant and essential.

Former President of the European Council Herman van Rompuy, speaking about values and human rights, once said that frequently, what we evoke most often is in reality what is most lacking. Could renewed attention to values in higher education be a sign that the sector has lost its commitment to them? Have values and social responsibility been forgotten or ignored? How much is the commitment to values such as integrity, solidarity, inclusiveness, etc., actually about marketing and feeling good, and how are these concepts applied and lived in universities around the globe?

Ideally, universities are spaces, both real and virtual, where truths and new knowledge are sought and freely shared, where reasoned and respectful dialogue is promoted and protected, where openness to other perspectives prevails, and where discrimination is banished. Academic freedom and institutional autonomy alone are insufficient to create such spaces. Protecting only these values may not suffice to regain trust for higher education institutions. Values such as equity and fairness, integrity, truthfulness, honesty, ethics, openness, respectful dialogue, and critical analysis must also become the visible and actioned hallmarks of these institutions. This requires ongoing dialogue to develop a consensus about shared values and a commitment to action by all stakeholders. Several universities around the world, working with the MCO, are taking this journey.

### Responsibility and Obligation

Today, scientific knowledge is questioned and fake news is spreading fast, old hatreds such as racism, xenophobia, and religious intolerance are growing, and humanity is threatened by the continued abuse and exploitation of the planet’s resources for economic gain by a few. In times such as these, universities and other higher education institutions have the obligation to speak truth to power and to serve the collective interests of society. Their functions, operations, and most importantly, their purposes and mission must be framed by values and principles. ▲

*The choice of values can determine the goals of higher education and define the kind of graduates a university seeks to produce.*

*Eva Egron-Polak is former secretary general and senior fellow, International Association of Universities. E-mail: [e.egronpolak@gmail.com](mailto:e.egronpolak@gmail.com).*



**Abstract**

For a long time, the crucial contribution of tertiary education to economic and social development has been understated by the international community. But the global commitment to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) has made it harder to ignore that strong and dynamic tertiary education systems are indispensable to make substantial progress on the 17 SDGs.

# Tertiary Education is Indispensable to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals

Jamil Salmi

The Brazilian aviation company, Embraer, is the world leader in the production of regional jets. The success of the country's emblematic firm can be traced back to the creation of the Instituto Tecnológico de Aeronáutica (ITA, the National Aeronautic Engineering School), in the early 1950s. Established in close partnership with MIT (the first president of ITA was an MIT professor), ITA has trained the scientists, engineers, and technicians who helped build Embraer into a leading global company.

Typhidot is a revolutionary technique to diagnose typhoid fever. Invented by researchers from the Malaysian University of Science in Penang (USM), Typhidot is credited with saving thousands of lives. Compared with traditional methods for detecting the disease, Typhidot is faster, more reliable, cheaper, and it does not require cold storage. USM's Center for Medical Innovations, from which Typhidot originates, is dedicated to finding innovative ways of diagnosing infectious diseases in an affordable manner.

Until the beginning of this decade, most practicing teachers in Palestinian primary schools were poorly prepared and did not have a university degree. After new regulations required all teachers to have both a university degree and a professional teaching qualification, three West Bank universities worked together with support from a renowned British teacher training institution, to radically overhaul their preservice teacher-training program, introducing a competency-based approach and a school experience element.

## Recognizing the Value of Tertiary Education

These are but three examples to illustrate the unique and vital contribution that tertiary education makes to economic and social development. Recognizing this important role, the pathbreaking 2000 report entitled *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* called for scaling up investment in tertiary education and research to equip developing countries with the knowledge and the qualified manpower needed to fight poverty and accelerate economic growth. Written by a distinguished group of independent experts with financial support from UNESCO and the World Bank, the report had an important impact at three levels. First, it helped reorient donor policies to give greater attention to tertiary education in partner countries. Second, it unleashed reform initiatives in several developing countries. Third, it paved the way for increased South-South collaboration.

Fifteen years later, in September 2015, the launch of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by the United Nations gave a new impetus to the recognition of the key role played by tertiary education. Indeed, it is doubtful that any low-income country can achieve the SDGs without a strong and dynamic tertiary education system. In addition to the essential contribution that tertiary education can make to the goals of sustainable economic growth (SDG 8) and poverty reduction (SDG 1), advances on all the other 15 dimensions, from developing a strong agricultural sector and building up a resilient infrastructure to mitigating the devastating effects of climate change and preserving the environment, cannot happen without the participation of scientists and well-trained professionals and the application of leading-edge research in the search for appropriate solutions to the big challenges faced by the planet.

### No Progress toward the SDGs without Tertiary Education

With respect to the goal of diminished inequality (SDG 10), tertiary education plays a critical role in promoting social mobility through equal educational opportunities for all groups, especially underprivileged students from low-income groups, minorities, and people with special needs. Achieving the SDGs also requires strong institutions for policy design and implementation and well-aware citizens who care about social and economic inclusion and environmental sustainability.

The contribution of tertiary education is crucial, in particular, for achieving real progress in basic and secondary education. A recent study found that more than a quarter of all primary school teachers in 31 countries had not achieved the minimum education standards themselves. Tertiary education supports the rest of the education system through the training of effective teachers and school principals, the involvement of highly qualified specialists in curriculum development and educational research, and the design of appropriate tests to assess student learning outcomes. The symbiotic linkage between tertiary education and the lower levels of schooling has the potential to stimulate a virtuous circle of capacity building, in the sense that the quality of tertiary education affects the quality of primary and secondary school education and is, in turn, directly influenced by the quality of secondary school graduates.

A similar argument applies to the fundamental role of medical education and research for meeting the health sustainable development goal (SDG 3). Universities train the medical doctors, nurses, technicians, epidemiologists, public health specialists, and hospital managers who form the most important pillar of any health system. Universities and associated health institutes conduct the fundamental research and a significant share of the applied research that condition any significant progress in the fight against diseases and health hazards.

Developing countries must build their capacity to deal with serious health threats not only because of domestic safety needs, but also in order to contribute effectively to the resolution of global health crises through collaborative research. Indeed, research production has moved from being discipline driven to problem focused, with diverse teams of scientists from several disciplinary areas collaborating on the resolution of complex problems, which often correspond to shared challenges that affect humankind as a whole, regardless of political boundaries. This evolution is best illustrated by the global health issues that have come up in recent years, from SARS to MERS to the latest Ebola epidemics in West Africa. ▲

*With respect to the goal of diminished inequality (SDG 10), tertiary education plays a critical role in promoting social mobility through equal educational opportunities for all groups.*

*Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert, professor emeritus of higher education policy at Diego Portales University in Chile, and research fellow at Boston College's Center for International Education, US. This article is adapted from his 2017 book *The Tertiary Education Imperative: Knowledge, Skills and Values for Development*. Boston and Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. [jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org](mailto:jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org) — [www.tertiaryeducation.org](http://www.tertiaryeducation.org).*

## Higher Education and the SDGs in Africa: More of the Same?

**Damtew Teferra**

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the predecessor of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), have been widely criticized for overlooking higher education as an important factor in the development process. After decades of neglect by international organizations and domestic governments alike, the higher education sector across Africa has struggled to regain its footing, and the lack of attention to the sector within this international campaign further exacerbated the damage.

Prior to their unveiling in 2015, many commentators anticipated that the SDGs, the internationally agreed-upon framework for tackling poverty, inequality, disease, and

### Abstract

There has been much talk about the increased focus on higher education in the Sustainable Development Goals. Yet, when compared with the preceding Millennium Development Goals, the new framework actually includes very few references to higher education. Africa would do better to focus its development efforts around other, more relevant, local and regional policies, which recognize the crucial role of higher education in development.

climate change, would finally acknowledge higher education's rightful role in realizing social, economic, and technological advancement, poverty reduction and wealth creation, and sustainable global development. But it became clear that the SDGs were only a minor rehash of the MDGs.

In contrast, local campaigns and policies, initiated by organizations on the continent, have a better focus on the crucial importance of higher education and, perhaps, should be leveraged as a way to direct necessary funding toward institutions across Africa.

### The Assumed Importance of the SDGs

In 2015, shortly before the launch of the SDGs, a comprehensive set of policy actions was proposed by UN Member States under the groundbreaking agreement of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, with a package of over 100 concrete measures to finance sustainable development, transform the global economy, and achieve the SDGs. This agreement stipulated a strong foundation to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It provided a new global framework to finance sustainable development by aligning all financing flows and policies with economic, social, and environmental priorities. The wording of the agreement, which will affect the funding of nearly all countries in sub-Saharan Africa, underlines the fact that resource flows across the continent will be directly aligned to the priorities of the SDGs—in which, unfortunately, higher education has once again been given a very tenuous place.

### Higher Education in the SDGs and the Reality on the Ground

When analysing the 17 goals and 169 targets of the SDGs, it is striking to note that the words “higher” and “tertiary” education, and “university,” appear just once each, and, in the case of “university,” in fact rather tangentially. The only goal in which higher education is explicitly mentioned is Goal 4, which stipulates inclusive and equitable education and lifelong learning opportunities. There are also serious oversights in terms of particular issues related to higher education. For example, the document speaks only of ensuring equal access, not about expanding access or strengthening the sector. Despite higher education's critical role in meeting all of the goals, the lack of active and seasoned lobbyists for higher education during the process leading to the SDGs is starkly evident in the virtual absence of higher education from this grand scheme.

As would be expected, given the impact of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, there is evidence that this absence is already having an effect on funding decisions on the ground. The minister of science and higher education of Ethiopia, for example, noted recently that, while support to other sectors of the education system is growing, the sector under her portfolio is still considered a luxury by most and garners only marginal support.

Meanwhile, what gives some hope is that other organizations are taking up the cause of higher education.

### Another Perspective on Higher Education

Meanwhile, what gives some hope is that other organizations are taking up the cause of higher education. In early July 2019, during a global event organized by the Higher Education Sustainability Initiative, three university organizations representing more than 2,000 universities globally (the Association of Commonwealth Universities, the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie, and the International Association of Universities) used their collective weight to champion the importance of higher education for the SDGs. During that event, they declared that, despite the relatively limited references to higher education within the SDG framework, none of the SDGs can be achieved without the contribution of higher education through research, teaching, and community engagement. Likewise, during their respective conferences in 2019, the Association of African Universities and the International Network for Higher Education in Africa had a special focus on higher education and the SDGs in their deliberations.

These more recent arguments support the stance of a number of local organizations, which in recent years have been calling for support for higher education. In 2016, for example, the chairperson of the African Union announced the establishment of a Committee of Ten Heads of State and Government, or C-10, to champion higher education, science, and technology in Africa. In its first extraordinary meeting in 2018, the committee emphasized that higher education, science, and technology are primary instruments that will enable Africa to effectively implement its long-term vision of the transformative

Agenda 2063 (African Union), in spite of the challenges facing development on the continent. During this high-level meeting, African governments were urged—for the umpteenth time—to raise their research investment to 1 percent.

Other countries are also getting involved. As Africa has moved from “the Hopeless Continent,” as described by *The Economist* in 2000, to “A Hopeful Continent” and “the world’s fastest growing economy,” as described by *The Economist* in 2013, the landscape of development partnerships involved in African higher education has been expanding—with both “historical” and “emerging” players. Probably more driven by a geopolitical interest rather than by any particular regard to the SDGs, a number of countries are slowly entering the African higher education scene through an array of direct and indirect interventions. China is now one of the largest hosts of African students globally and is working hard to expand the number of Confucius Institutes on the continent, while also working (physically) to build institutions—a rare occurrence. India also hosts one of the largest contingents of African students, although it is struggling with keeping some of its pledges to the African Union, to contribute to the development of higher education on the African continent. South Korea is emerging as an active player on the scene, while others, such as Russia, which had been slumbering for over two decades following the demise of the USSR, is also showing growing interest.

### Conclusion

While a stronger global effort must be made to secure a more favorable place for higher education within the framework of the SDGs, Africa must concurrently be guided by the African Union’s Agenda 2063, particularly in sectoral, time-bound derivatives such as the Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA) and Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy for Africa (STISA 2024).

While the support of development partners—within the framework of the SDGs or as a result of geopolitical imperatives—may remain important, African countries cannot continue to outsource their development aspirations, ambitions, and goals in the sector of higher education or otherwise, to external entities, however benevolent, charitable, or altruistic they may be. ▲

*Damtew Teferra is professor of higher education at the University of Kwazulu-Natal and founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa at [www.inhea.org](http://www.inhea.org). E-mail: [teferra@bc.edu](mailto:teferra@bc.edu) or [teferra@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:teferra@ukzn.ac.za).*

## Private Higher Education Globally: A Distant Second Place?

Daniel C. Levy

**N**otwithstanding the spectacular global rise of private higher education (PHE) in the last half century, the public sector clearly remains the first sector in higher education. The public sector usually is first chronologically, often long the only sector; PHE just a recent reality. Public higher education remains easily the larger sector globally; it is significantly larger in most geographical regions, smaller in possibly none. Moreover, in almost all countries, the public sector remains stronger in most matters, both within and beyond academia. The public sector generally has the leading institutions, faculty, first-degree and graduate students, and research. It has the greater political power, impactful economic presence, and social extension.

But how distant is second place? In this article, we consider where PHE is exceptionally first, PHE’s frequent ascension from limited to ample second-place size, and common ways in which PHE shares part of first place.

### Abstract

Although remaining a decided second to the public sector globally and in most countries, private higher education has been rapidly expanding and now holds a third of the world’s enrollment—and continues to grow and diversify. It has achieved significance in a variety of qualitative respects and even leadership or coleadership in some. The private sector is a prominent second sector.

### Rare PHE Primacy: Where and How

Private is the larger sector in several countries, including large ones. Japan and South Korea are the only two developed countries, but private is also the larger sector in Brazil, Chile, India (with by far the world's largest private enrollment), Indonesia, Peru, and the Philippines, joined by many smaller examples (e.g., Burundi, Cambodia, El Salvador, Lebanon, Uganda, and the UAE).

An exception of a completely different nature is private supremacy in quality, not quantity. This exception characterizes only the United States, but that is the world's preeminent system. Especially at the system's pinnacle, private *on average* looms above public regarding quality, selectivity, and status of research, faculty, and students. Probably the only other country where private roughly matches public at the pinnacle is South Korea.

### From Limited to Large Second-Place in Size

As late as 1980, PHE was a distant second sector outside the Americas in both size and most other respects, with few exceptions outside Asia. Indeed, many countries still lacked a second sector, PHE being often banned, simply absent, or only marginal. Communism's demise brought an historic PHE breakthrough in Europe and Central Asia, while in China and Vietnam, Communism's market transformation paved the way for PHE. Elsewhere, private emergence resulted from various individual national mixes of academic, social, economic, and political conditions, as well as emulation and permission for the entry of international providers. Most of Africa established PHE only in the 1990s or after, most of the Arab region in the 2000s. More often, PHE's surge globally came mostly through rapid, diversifying growth within preexisting private sectors.

By 2000, PHE had 28 percent of global enrollment and by 2010, 33 percent. Much more impressive—given that the public sector has grown as never before—has been absolute private growth, more than doubling from some 27 million to 57 million during 2000–2010, and undoubtedly more than 75 million by 2019. In Latin America, PHE may no longer be second in size (49 percent, 2010), while its hefty second place in Asia (42 percent) is clearly a mammoth presence in what is easily the largest higher education region. Even elsewhere—the US private sector at just under 30 percent and other regions with lower private shares—each region has seen large absolute private growth in the new century, all but the United States seeing growth in private share. No region any longer has more than an isolated few countries without PHE. The private sector remains distinctly second in size but is nearly ubiquitous and globally formidable.

### Mostly Second, but Partly Tied for First Place in Performance

It is no longer rare for the public sector's general leadership, both in the higher education system overall and at its academic pinnacle, to be flanked by prestigious private institutions and even leadership or coleadership in notable endeavors. "Semi-elite" private institutions, now prominent in many countries and present in many others, not only lead most public counterparts, but often establish primacy in certain practical fields, such as business administration, management, economics, or computer studies, sometimes in teaching, though rarely in research. Not infrequently, venerable or entrepreneurial religious universities are close cousins of the semi-elite secular universities.

PHE also increasingly achieves a kind of primacy further away from the academic pinnacle, including through international or domestic for-profit chains and conglomerates. Often with a lower socioeconomic clientele than their semi-elite counterparts, "product-oriented" private institutions peg themselves to the job market. Accordingly, they forge work-study, employment, and applied analysis partnerships with businesses, providing counseling to students and to institutional managers alike.

A different kind of niche primacy appears when institutions serve particular social groups, or we might say individuals who seek meaningful association with their social group. By far the most common type of "identity" institution, both historically and today, is religious. Women's and ethnically oriented institutions, however, also are first choices for some. Though gender, ethnic, and religious institutions can be public, private primacy is clear for gender and especially for religious institutions.

PHE also increasingly achieves a kind of primacy further away from the academic pinnacle, including through international or domestic for-profit chains and conglomerates.



**Into the Future**

As usual, the best prediction is both iffy and based on recent trends. Accordingly, we expect PHE to remain the second sector globally, but a significant second, with some quantitative or even qualitative country exceptions and more common mixing of public primacy with private eminence and even leadership in certain important pursuits. Perhaps the safest prediction is that many of the global developments highlighted in this *IHE* anniversary issue will influence the shape of PHE's second-sector status. In turn, this second sector of higher education will influence those global developments. ▲

*Daniel C. Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor, University at Albany, Department of Educational Policy & Leadership, and director of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE), which contributes a regular column to IHE. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu.*

## Public Trust and the Public Good

**Patti McGill Peterson**

**H**igher education in the United States is facing a loss of public trust. This is troubling because strong support for higher education is an important characteristic of a well-functioning civil society. Like the free press and independent courts, universities and colleges are an essential part of the infrastructure of democracy. Their status, however, is dependent on the public's view that they, along with other societal institutions, contribute to the public good.

The polls generally confirm declining support. A Gallup survey indicated that from 2015 to 2018, public confidence in colleges and universities dropped by nearly 10 percent. Many Americans still aspire to enroll in higher education, but their eroding confidence grows from concerns about its accessibility and outcomes. The cost of higher education and its perceived value are central factors in their loss of trust. The combination of tuition prices and student debt has tested the faith of students and their families. Ultimately, this has prompted a critical question, "Is it worth it?"

### **Cost, Value, and Accountability**

The question of value for price has played a central role in the accountability movement in the United States. Greater accountability is also cited as a way to restore public trust. Whereas only 48 percent of adults in the Gallup poll were confident about higher education, 76 percent thought that requiring institutions to report graduation rates would help. Whether at the institutional level, with the provision of more information to applicants, or through the government, with such vehicles as the College Scorecard, the aim is to make higher education more customer friendly and trustworthy.

New iterations of accountability will focus on student debt by academic program and short-term earnings of graduates. These disclosures are designed to enhance transparency as well as public confidence. The result is not only a narrow view of the intended outcomes of higher education, but also an indication that its compact with the public is increasingly built upon the premise that it is a private good based upon individual return on investment.

Rapidly rising tuition and debt must be addressed, but sustainable societal trust will need to be linked to more than individual benefits. This will be a challenge. A survey from Columbia University's Teachers College offers sobering insights. It shows how the current demographic and political landscape in the United States complicates the linkage between public trust and the public good.

### **Abstract**

Higher education in the United States faces a loss of trust. Much of the response to the public's decreasing confidence has been through the accountability movement's focus on individual, private benefits. Public trust, however, will require proactive societal engagement that provides a compelling case for the contributions that higher education makes to the public good. While these challenges are discussed from a US perspective, there are global implications.

### Bridging the Divides

Political divisions have not benefited public trust. Conservative critics have attacked colleges and universities on issues of free speech, politically biased faculty, and politically correct curricula. They have labeled higher education “the clubhouse of the elite,” out of touch with average citizens. The data confirms a deep political divide, but there is just as deep a fissure based upon respondents’ educational attainment. On questions related to higher education’s contributions to scientific advances that benefit society, national prosperity and development, and graduates’ personal enrichment and growth, the gap between college graduates and those not holding a degree was significant. The latter group had a much more negative view of higher education’s benefits.

Higher education’s relationships are mainly with those who are directly involved with the provision or receipt of its benefits. For traditional brick and mortar institutions, those relationships are built upon institutional culture that is often mysterious to the public at large. Outsiders do not readily comprehend much of the practice and language reflecting that culture. Admissions and financial aid practices in selective institutions need much more explanation in light of recent scandals. Compounding the problem, the denizens of higher education often speak in codes. Terminology such as institutional autonomy, peer review, academic freedom, internationalization, and the liberal arts tends to magnify the mystery.

### Building Trust

Trust, based on an appreciation of higher education’s contribution to the public good, starts with recognition that what institutions do and why they do it require a clearer explanation and a better conversation with the public. This begins in the communities where colleges and universities reside, but it needs to go beyond building local relationships to a national dialogue.

Some of the criticism about higher education is well deserved and should be acknowledged as part of the discussion with the public. The moment for a more compelling conversation is now. Climate scientists are a good example of academics writing and speaking about an urgent and complex issue in ways that nonacademics can understand. They realize how important reaching a broad audience is for creating a narrative that counters the denial proponents. There is much that higher education needs to discuss with the public. The elements of that engagement will be based on strong, transparent institutional relationships that ultimately form a coordinated, collective voice at the national level about the value that colleges and universities bring, not only to individuals, but also to the common welfare.

### Global Implications

The United States has its own challenges, but it is not alone in facing questions about higher education’s value and loss of public confidence. The social compact with higher education is fraying in other countries. Those that once heavily subsidized postsecondary education and have turned to increased cost sharing with students have entered the realm of commodification and value for price. In this scenario, outcomes, transparency, and ethical practices are important and legitimate expectations, but they fall short of making a robust case for higher education’s myriad connections to the public good. While institutions everywhere have an obligation for accountability to individual students, it cannot substitute for a more comprehensive narrative about the ways in which all aspects of institutional mission—research, teaching, and service—contribute in positive ways to the society as a whole.

Dominant national narratives that characterize higher education as elitist, irrelevant, or a danger to the public require a robust response. In the face of attacks on democratic institutions, rising nationalism, and antiglobalism, the counternarrative may mean much more engagement with the public than has traditionally been the case for colleges and universities. The global imperative for higher education is to be proactive in making the connection between its work and the public good, in order to keep the public trust. ▲

**Dominant national narratives that characterize higher education as elitist, irrelevant, or a danger to the public require a robust response.**

*Patti McGill Peterson served as presidential advisor for global initiatives at the American Council on Education from 2010 to 2016. She previously headed the Council for International Exchange of Scholars and is president emerita of Wells College and St. Lawrence University.*

# Internationalisation of Higher Education

Developments in the European Higher Education Area and Worldwide

- ✓ **4 issues per year**  
in English  
with 6–7 articles per issue
- ✓ **Unlimited access**  
to the publication's website
- ✓ **268 €**  
for a 1-year subscription
- ✓ **Campus licences**  
also available



*Internationalisation of Higher Education – Developments in the European Higher Education Area and Worldwide* is a publication for practitioners and policymakers in higher education. It examines internationalisation processes in countries all over the world with a special focus on the developments in Europe resulting from the Bologna Process.





Available  
in the DUZ  
web shop!

## Internationalization of Higher Education: *An Evolving Landscape, Locally and Globally*

### IAU 5th Global Survey

by Giorgio Marinoni

Since 2003, the International Association of Universities (IAU) has conducted regular Global Surveys on Internationalization of Higher Education to gain a thorough understanding of the potential benefits, risks and challenges associated with internationalization processes at HEIs around the globe. These surveys have proven extremely helpful, providing the required support to governments, institutions and individuals as they develop or update their internationalization strategies, approaches, policies and activities.

Based on input from 907 HEIs in 126 different countries, the IAU 5th Global Survey Report is the most geographically comprehensive collection and analysis of primary data on internationalization of higher education ever undertaken. It covers all aspects of internationalization from policy and activities to research, human resources and staff development, student mobility and the design of curricula.

254 pages – 69,- €

For further information visit:  
[www.duz-medienhaus.de](http://www.duz-medienhaus.de)



# The Free-Tuition Movement

Ariane de Gayardon and Andrés Bernasconi

In recent decades, rising costs and massification in higher education have led to an increase in cost sharing, shifting the cost from governments to students. As a result, debates around the financing of higher education have focused on rising tuition fees, the use of student loans, and increasing student debt. In this context, it is surprising that the 2010s have seen a revival of the opposite policy: tuition-free higher education, with political decisions the world over to revert to solely, or dominantly, government-funded higher education.

## The Free-Tuition Movement

The recent free tuition movement arguably started in 2011 in Chile, with massive student demonstrations requesting free tuition. This movement was the result of a high student debt burden and a call for the end of the marketization of higher education. The student movement's agenda permeated the presidential election of 2013, which Socialist candidate Michele Bachelet won, largely on the promise of making higher education free for all.

Similar events happened in South Africa in 2015–2016, with the #FeesMustFall movement that led students to the streets. Against the advice of his own experts, President Zuma announced a plan to introduce free tuition in 2017. Other countries followed suit. In 2017, New Zealand elected a prime minister whose electoral platform included free tuition. The Philippines signed free higher education into law in 2017. In 2018, Liberia's president announced the start of free public universities, followed by Mauritius in 2019.

Discussions around tuition-free higher education are also alive in the United States, where it is an issue in many 2020 Democrat candidates' programs, including Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren. The free-tuition movement is therefore an important trend to understand for the future of higher education.

## The Rebirth of an Ideology

Amid the cost-sharing trend, a few countries around the world, most with state-welfare ideologies, have maintained free higher education (in public institutions), including, but not limited to, Germany, Norway, Sweden, and most of Latin America. Only recently have countries that used cost sharing decided to reverse and embrace the tenets of free tuition.

In the majority of cases, student discontent seems to have been the reason for the shift to free tuition. This discontent was usually fuelled by equity concerns because of rising tuition fees. In Chile, high tuition fees and student debt were central to the students' claim that higher education was "marketized." As a result, one of the demands of the Chilean movement was better access to higher education for the poorest through free higher education. In South Africa, the #FeesMustFall movement focused on rising fees, but concerns about racism, decolonization, and equity underlied the demands. The Liberia announcement of free tuition also came after student protests over hikes in tuition fees.

From the various governments' perspectives, embracing this bottom-up idea seems to be politically motivated—aimed at gathering votes—rather than based on rigorous analyses of policy options. In Chile and New Zealand, free tuition was an argument on electoral platforms for elections. In Mauritius, the president's declaration happened at the beginning of an election year. In South Africa, the law was announced as President Zuma was mired in scandals. For many politicians, free tuition seems an easy to understand and powerful proposal that guarantees strong popular support.

## Abstract

This article gives an insight into the free-tuition movement observed globally. It analyses the forces that led to the adoption of free-tuition policies and questions their sustainability in light of recent events in countries that adopted such policies.



*Free tuition may be good politics,  
but it might be rather poor policy.*

*Ariane de Gayardon is senior  
research associate at the Centre  
for Global Higher Education,  
Institute of Education, University  
College London, UK.  
E-mail: a.gayardon@ucl.ac.uk.*

*Andrés Bernasconi is professor  
of education at the Pontificia  
Universidad Católica de Chile, and  
director of the Center for Advanced  
Studies on Educational Justice  
(CJE). E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.*

### The Reality about Free Tuition

Free tuition may be good politics, but it might be rather poor policy. It has led many of its supporters to power, while failing to consistently improve equity in higher education. In Chile, the promise of free tuition brought Michele Bachelet to power, but it did not improve participation of the most disadvantaged populations, since enrollment is conditional on prior academic achievements. Indeed, free tuition often benefits mostly high-income groups, while students from poorer backgrounds are kept out of free public institutions. Similarly, free-tuition policies have been linked to underfunding of universities and quality issues.

But the main issue with the current free-tuition movement is the inability of politicians who champion it to make it a sustainable reality. In Chile, only students from the 60 percent poorest households currently receive free-tuition higher education—and only in eligible institutions. Although the idea is to fund free tuition for all, difficult economic conditions have stalled progress. In South Africa, the proposed law also targets the poorest students. In New Zealand, university budgets have been frozen soon after the free-tuition announcement. In an age of massification, sustaining free tuition financially is difficult and scarce government resources need to be better targeted.

### Targeted Free Tuition

As a result, a new trend has emerged, somewhat accidentally in Chile, but more purposefully in other countries: targeted free tuition, where free higher education is limited to students from poor socioeconomic backgrounds. This solution has been implemented recently in the state of New York, and in Italy, Japan, and South Africa, among others. Targeted free tuition has the political appeal of a free-tuition policy, but with better economic efficiency. It provides financial resources to those who need them most, thus answering to both issues of equity and university funding. The future will tell if this approach succeeds and could be more widely adopted. ▲

## Developing Globally Competitive and Inclusive Higher Education in India

**N. V. Varghese**

### Abstract

The massification of higher education is a global phenomenon in this century. The market-led massification of higher education in India is accompanied by widening regional and economic inequalities and persisting social and gender inequalities. An inclusive approach and friendly strategies to provide quality higher education, enhance employability, and improve the global competitiveness of graduates are nonnegotiable elements on the agenda of higher education development.

**T**he global expansion of higher education is a phenomenon of this century, with an addition of nearly 7.5 million students every year. Developing countries account for a major share of this net addition. Flexible pathways and technology-mediated learning systems have expanded opportunities to pursue higher education globally. This fast expansion is very often led by market forces and accompanied by inequalities in access and wide variations in the quality of the educational offer.

India is no exception to these global trends. Indian higher education has developed from a slow growing, low enrollment sector to a fast growing, massified system in this century. Between 2000 and 2018, growth rates accelerated to reach two digits, gross enrollment ratios (GER) tripled to reach 26.2 percent, the number of universities more than tripled and reached 960, the number of colleges more than quadrupled (to 42,000), and student enrollments increased by more than 4.5 times to 36.8 million. The

Indian higher education sector has surpassed that of the United States to become second largest in the world.

Market-friendly reforms have helped private higher education institutions to proliferate, have shifted the financial burden of expansion to households, and have thus resulted in perpetuating inequalities in access and quality. There is no doubt that affirmative action policies have contributed to promoting inclusiveness. However, exclusionary tendencies persisting in the system have contributed to social and language inequalities in access to higher education and a widening of inequalities within disadvantaged groups.

There is evidence that regional and economic inequalities in access to higher education have widened and social inequalities have persisted, while gender inequalities, though rampant, have narrowed. The unplanned expansion of the private sector has led to a regional concentration of institutions. Between 2007 and 2014, the inequality in GER between the lowest and the highest income groups increased from 43.6 to 63.7 percentage points.

While English is the language of professions and business globally, in India it is the language of elite institutions. Students from high fee levying, private, English-medium schools account for a disproportionately high share of enrollments in elite higher education institutions. English has become an obstacle for disadvantaged groups to pursue higher education. To evolve into a more inclusive higher education system, India needs to address challenges related to equality of opportunity and diversity of the student body.

### **Quality of Higher Education and Employability of Graduates**

Higher education quality is central for institutional reputation, a basic criterion determining student choices, and an asset for employers competing in the global market. In India, higher education suffers from poor quality in general, and wide variations in quality among institutions. India has set up external quality assurance (EQA) mechanisms to accredit institutions and internal quality assurance cells (IQAC) to monitor quality at the institutional level. However, a large share of the higher education institutions in India remains unaccredited.

Ranking exercises and national initiatives to establish world-class institutions are evidence of an increased interest in quality issues. Indian institutions rank low globally. According to the latest QS rankings, nine Indian institutions are listed among the top 500 and only three institutions rank among the top 200. In 2015, India established its National Institutional Ranking Framework and has now embarked on developing world-class “institutions of eminence.”

The poor quality of higher education results in declining employer confidence in the competencies of graduates. To improve quality and employability skills, universities are expected to revise their curricula based on the National Higher Education Qualification Framework. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2019 envisages setting up a General Education Council to specify learning outcomes and graduate attributes.

### **Internationalization of Indian Higher Education**

Internationalization takes place at home through curriculum changes, and abroad through cross-border mobility of programs, students, institutions, and teachers. The curriculum revisions envisaged in NEP 2019 will promote internationalization at home. India ranks second in terms of sending students abroad for studies (300,000 yearly) and MOOCs enrollments. Initiatives are also taken to allow foreign universities to establish independent branch campuses in India.

The Indian approach to internationalization aims to extend soft power and diplomatic relationships rather than financial interests. The country envisages transforming itself into an education hub and a preferred study destination for foreign students. India has launched several programs to increase the number of international students from 46,000 currently to 500,000 by 2024. The Study in India program and a massive plan to fund 50,000 scholarships by 2023–2024 are good examples of this promotion of internationalization.

The Global Initiative of Academic Networks, the Scheme for the Promotion of Academic Research and Collaboration, and programs encouraging scholars to return to India are expected to stimulate global engagement. India plans to invest the equivalent

*The market-led massification of higher education in developing countries is accompanied by several forms of inequality and increasing commercialization, resulting in the exclusion of the poor and disadvantaged.*

*N. V. Varghese is vice-chancellor and director of the Center for Policy Research in Higher Education, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (CPRHE/NIEPA), New Delhi, India. E-mail: [nv.varghese@niepa.ac.in](mailto:nv.varghese@niepa.ac.in).*

of around US\$130 million on internationalization initiatives, which may help the country to emerge as an important global player in education.

### Looking to the Future

Developing countries have a higher potential than industrialized countries to expand their higher education systems. However, the market-led massification of higher education in developing countries is accompanied by several forms of inequality and increasing commercialization, resulting in the exclusion of the poor and disadvantaged. The challenge is to address issues of equity and diversity and provide inclusive quality higher education at an affordable cost.

While its youth bulge and low GER give scope for Indian higher education to expand to become the largest system in the world, the most recent trends indicate a decelerating rate of growth in the sector. Given the high share of secondary school graduates entering higher education in India (more than 90 percent), a fast growth of the sector seems difficult, unless there is an accelerated growth of secondary education in educationally backward states of India. The other possibility to overcome the shortage of graduates from secondary schools is increasing the enrollment of mature students. In any case, a further expansion of the sector may increasingly rely on private/household funding, open universities, and technology-assisted learning facilities. ▲

## Publish or Perish

Maria Yudkevich

### Abstract

This article considers the causes and consequences of the increasing role of the “publish or perish” principle in modern academic systems. In particular, it discusses how various types of universities interpret this principle and why its causes differ across academic systems.

**I**n recent decades, pressure to publish—the “publish or perish” principle—has become a signature feature of academic life. What does this principle mean and why it is considered harmful and destructive by the academic profession?

At top research universities and teaching institutions alike, faculty constantly complain about the increase of formal requirements and informal expectations about their productivity, for their academic careers, promotion, and academic well-being.

However, these complaints are distinct across universities and countries. In elite US universities, the stakes of accessing positions for life are getting higher and tenure expectations now require faculty to publish in a small number of top quality journals. Meanwhile, in many other institutions, “publish or perish” is associated with a growing pressure to publish *more*, with little respect to quality and impact. For a broad part of the academic profession, the signal that quantity is more important than quality in academic publishing is taking over.

This trend is harmful for the academic profession in general and for the individual academic in particular. With its ever-increasing loads and a growing student body, teaching is seen by many as inferior with respect to research. Next, as demand stimulates supply, mushrooming journals with no reputation and read by no one are now addressing this sole purpose—serving authors who need to report on published output. The pressure to publish causes atomization and individualization within the academic community: faculty tend to spend less time and effort on the provision of academic service, such as work in academic committees or faculty mentoring, shifting their priorities toward publishable output and external grants (which are also important for promotion and require publications, both to apply and as output). Finally, from their very first steps in their academic careers, young scholars may learn that the ultimate goal of

what they are doing is not to search for the truth, but to publish, as an end in itself. This may profoundly affect their academic morale, quality standards, and research practices.

*The pressure to publish causes atomization and individualization within the academic community.*

### Massification

Why this growing pressure on publishing in academia? There seem to be different reasons, depending on whether academic systems are market oriented or state controlled.

In market-oriented systems, massification is a key factor because it triggers several processes associated with publication pressure. The share of short-term contracts is growing and the number of academics without tenure prospects is increasing. To extend their contracts, they have to prove their productivity during each contract period—often, in a short-term perspective. As a result of short-term contracts and ensuing insecurity, faculty may opt to publish in a continuous flow, sometimes “faster” rather than “better.”

Moreover, there is an increasing demand for accountability in massified higher education systems: universities are required to report to society that they spend public funding for the common good. Publications (and in the first place, their aggregate numbers) seem to be a transparent indicator of this impact on society.

### Bureaucracy

Systems where the role of government prevails provide another imperative to “publish or perish.” Government agencies, ministries, and other bodies want to measure the success of higher education institutions, using preferably formal, easy-to-estimate, and easy-to-compare indicators, with minimum recourse to expert opinion. As a measure of how well a university functions, publication output is imperfect and rather limited, but measuring the quality of teaching is even harder. Since external bodies rely on formal indicators, quantity tends to play a more important role than quality. As formal rules and indicators can be manipulated, we see alarming signals of such manipulations in some countries where governments initiate, and financially support, initiatives to stimulate excellence. In a broader context, one can see that the academic profession, as an object of measurement, adjusts to the instruments of such measurements and that this adjustment profoundly affects individual researchers and institutional research practices and policies.

### Other Sources of Pressure

In both systems—market-oriented or government-controlled—the global ranking race creates substantial publication pressure on national institutions. The growing “ranking fever” increases the focus on publications, as they are a key indicator. The positions of universities in ranking lists depend on publications—with institutions often caring more about their aggregate quantity, not about quality. Such pressure pushes researchers to not only compromise on quality, but sometimes also to seek to publish in fields with higher impact factors and other formal credentials, adjusting their research topics and publication strategies to attain better prospects of being published and better ranking credentials.

This gets even worse in situations in which the “publish or perish” imperative comes “on top of everything else” and requires a publication effort also from faculty who are not supposed to do research—only to teach. Many teaching institutions nowadays have ambitions to become research institutions, or are forced by their governments to strengthen their research component.

### Conclusion

In broad terms, the “publish or perish” principle is often associated with a phenomenon of prevalence of nonacademic control over the academic profession. While we know why it happens and how harmful the consequences are, the question of what should be done to stop this pressure is still open. What we can say for sure is that many articles will be published on this topic. ▲

*Maria Yudkevich is associate professor of economics and vice-rector at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. E-mail: yudkevich@hse.ru.*

**Abstract**

English is and will remain the key global scientific language and an important language of instruction for the foreseeable future. Yet, at the same time, a worldwide debate is emerging about the role of English and about the role of languages in general in higher education. There are no easy solutions to what some call “English imperialism.” Understanding all the implications and the costs and benefits of the use of another language is crucial, and decision makers bear a heavy responsibility in doing so.

# The Dilemma of English

**Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit**

**B**y the mid-twentieth century, English had become the global language of science and scholarship. With the rise of the Internet and globalization in the latter years of the century and in the new millennium, this domination has only increased—with all of the top-50 scientific journals published in English and the large majority of internationally circulated scholarly articles in English.

The advent of mass student mobility increased the attraction of English (more than 5 million students now study outside of their home countries, with the majority choosing English-speaking countries). An increasingly mobile professoriate, including thousands of postdoctoral students, gravitate to English-speaking universities. In non-English-speaking countries such as Ethiopia, academic programs, and even entire universities, use English as a language of instruction—or even as the only language of instruction. In Africa, Rwanda moved from French to English as a country and in higher education, and recently, the minister of education of Algeria announced a shift from French to English in higher education. Indeed, most countries now have English-medium universities, branch campuses that use English, or complete graduate programs in English. For example, one can obtain an English-medium MBA degree from more than 30 universities in China. Universities in Russia are offering academic programs in English targeting mainly Russian students, who seek such degrees to boost their prospects in the local and international job markets. Chinese universities urge their faculty members to publish in high-prestige English language journals and offer them handsome financial rewards for doing so—while publication in Chinese journals yields few benefits. Indeed, the number of journals in English in China is growing exponentially. The same is true in other countries, such as South Africa. Without question, English will remain the key global scientific language and an important language of instruction for the foreseeable future—and even in these days of nationalism and populism, its role is likely to increase. Countries, institutions, and individuals seek to adjust and adapt to the impact of global English in academic life worldwide. Yet, at the same time, a debate is emerging about the role of English and about the role of languages in general in higher education.

## Questions Worth Asking

It is worth raising questions concerning the impact of the tide of English. In the broader sense, there is no use in rejecting it; just as globalization is an inevitable force, so is the role of English in higher education.

Language is more than just communication, it is also culture. The implications of using English as a key language for higher education in non-English-speaking countries may affect culture and ways of thinking. The French and the Italians, always protective of their culture, have long resisted the use of English in higher education, but even they have recently yielded and there are a growing number of English-medium courses in France and Italy, ignoring intensive protests not only by nationalists, advocates of safeguarding national cultural heritage, but also by academics.

Using English also has implications for research methodology, publication, and academic orientation. This is true for several reasons. The high prestige English-medium journals are almost exclusively edited by academics in English-speaking countries, and these editors rely in large part on reviewers also located in these countries. Even the most internationally minded editors will bring a bias toward methodologies and academic orientations favored in English-speaking academe, as will most reviewers. Studies show that the most highly cited journals and articles are in English. Academics from non-English environments are disadvantaged in several ways. Their facility in English, which is not their native language, will often be imperfect. More important, in general they will be influenced to conform to the methodological strictures of mainstream



English-dominated trends in their disciplines. This may be less important in the natural sciences, where methodologies may be more universal, but has considerable salience in the social sciences, where cultural and national realities shape scholarship. And in all fields, researchers and scholars may be tempted to orient their research topics toward what will appeal to journal editors and publishers in the dominant English-medium markets.

Another implication, especially for the humanities and social sciences, is that the pressure to publish in English-medium international journals limits the possibilities to contribute to the debate in local language media, and, by that, the possibility to contradict fake news, an argument expressed for instance by academics in the Netherlands against the international publication pressure. In *International Higher Education* #88, Winter 2017, Akiyoshi Yonezawa noted that “limited publication in English in these fields is becoming a serious obstacle to the further development of the humanities and social sciences in Japan,” and that “it is unlikely and undesirable that English as an academic language should continue to monopolize fields such as the humanities and social sciences, which are deeply rooted in multilingualistic and multicultural activities and values.”

A reality due to offering English-medium courses and programs in many non-English environments is the poor quality of the instruction offered by many faculty whose command of English may be rudimentary, or whose ability to teach in the language is limited. This, often combined with limited English comprehension by many local and non-Anglophone international students, creates an environment where little learning takes place. Additionally, knowledge of, and access to, current course materials and texts in English may be limited. In short, offering high-quality programs in English is complex and requires a high level of fluency by both faculty and students.

A little noticed consequence of the rise of global English in universities is the deteriorating status of learning other languages by students in English-speaking countries. Enrollments in foreign language courses and programs throughout the English-speaking world have declined, with many students (and faculty) feeling that they can communicate anywhere in English. This has meant that courses on world cultures and civilizations have also declined, thus reducing in-depth knowledge of cultures among native English-speaking students. An additional factor is the increasing sophistication of machine translation of academic materials of all kinds, further reducing the perceived need to learn foreign languages.

There is also a concern about the role of colonial languages in the developing world, and particularly in Africa. Local languages are used in public primary and secondary education, but, with some exceptions, not in higher education. The risks of such policies are high: elitism in access of higher education; deterioration of quality of education and research; lack of alignment with local needs; and dominance of western paradigms.

### The Debate in the Netherlands

The pushback against the use of English as a language of instruction in the developed world is increasing. In Italy and the Netherlands, academics have gone to court to stop universities from adding more English-taught programs. Arguments vary, from concerns for maintaining the national culture and the quality of education, to claiming that internationalization is only a source of revenue that is being promoted at the cost of good education for local students. These last two arguments are dominating the current debate in the Netherlands, where there is a general feeling that the spread of English as a language of instruction, with its lack of a strategic approach, has gone too far and has become a liability. Among the questions that are raised are the following: why should subject areas such as Dutch literature, history, or law be taught in English? Are disciplines like psychology taught in English in order to attract international students and compensate for a decline in interest among local students? Should the substantial contribution that international students make to the budget of institutions and to local and national economy count more than investing in quality education for local students? Why should local students have to compete with international students for limited student housing? And how does one counteract the declining interest of local students for Dutch language and literature? The Dutch minister of education, culture, and science and institutional leaders are caught between the pressure to compete internationally

*Another implication, especially for the humanities and social sciences, is that the pressure to publish in English-medium international journals limits the possibilities to contribute to the debate in local language media.*

*Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director, and Hans de Wit is professor and director, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu; dewitj@bc.edu.*

and the imperative of responding to these arguments—as well as those of nationalists in parliament. Finding a compromise is not easy. Other countries, like Denmark and Germany, are facing similar debates.

### Conclusion

There are no easy solutions to what some call “English imperialism.” It is a fundamental reality today that English is the dominant language of science and scholarship, and increasingly of communication, both formal and informal, among students and academics globally. Understanding all the implications of selecting the language of instruction of a program or an entire institution, and the costs and benefits of that decision, is crucial, and decision makers bear a heavy responsibility. ▲

## How Can We Extend the Boundaries of Our Own Knowing?

Betty Leask

### Abstract

Twenty-five years of research have taught us much about the internationalization of higher education. However, in this article I argue that the boundaries of our knowing have been limited by a number of factors. I suggest a need to refocus on creating an alternate social imaginary of the internationalization of higher education through *knowing differently*.

*What questions have we asked? What assumptions have driven us to ask them? And what has been the impact on what we know?*

I was reminded recently in an article by Tamsin Haggis in *Studies in Higher Education* (Vol. 34, No. 4, June 2009, 377–390), that what we know about student learning in higher education today is a direct result of the questions we have asked, and where we have looked for answers. And further, that what we have asked and where we have looked for answers concerning student learning has been influenced by our specific purposes and interests, themselves the products of our temporal and spatial contexts. She finds that a focus on a narrow range of possible perspectives and methodologies over 40 years has restricted what we know about teaching and learning today and led to certain conclusions and actions and importantly, *away from others*.

This is relevant to international higher education today for two reasons. First, because some of the teaching and learning research has been focused on matters related to teaching international students, on supporting their learning, and on matters including internationalization of the curriculum. Second, because over the last 25 years, the internationalization of higher education has developed and grown as a field of study, a branch of knowledge that is researched and taught, and about which scholarly papers and essays are published. At this point in time, it is important to consider: What questions have we asked? What assumptions have driven us to ask them? And what has been the impact on what we know?

### What Have We Asked? What Do We Know?

We have asked many questions about the meaning of internationalization and what it looks like in practice, and we have explored and discussed a range of different approaches over the last 25 years. In so doing, we have developed our own “internationalization” discourse, culture, and identity. As a growing community, we have discussed at length the meanings, affordances, and limitations of related concepts such as globalization, global citizenship, and intercultural competence. We have coined an abundance of new terms. Consider for example the plethora of adjectives that we have tacked onto the term “internationalization” such as, “comprehensive,” “transformational,” “inclusive,” “intelligent,” “forced,” “intentional,” and “unintentional.” We have researched various

processes of internationalization—for example, “of the curriculum,” “of teaching and learning,” “at home,” “abroad,” and the “globalization of internationalization” itself. We have explored a range of blockers to, and enablers of, internationalization. We have taken positions on many related issues, including for example equity of access to higher education, the recruitment of international students for profit, and massification. And we have concluded that the internationalization of higher education is itself a process that is complex, driven by different rationales, highly context dependent, both ubiquitous and contested, and connected to a diverse range of concepts, ideas, and theories. Our practices and our carefully argued positions have been informed by scholarship and research. So, we can confidently say that after 25 years, we know a lot about the internationalization of higher education, how it is practiced, and the challenges and opportunities it offers individuals, communities, and nation-states. Undoubtedly, there is more to know, and we should continue to undertake research that will inform and shape the future.

But could it be that the questions that we have been asking, the research that we have been conducting, and the conclusions that we have drawn are limited by the individual and collective linguistic and cultural resources that we have brought to the task of investigation and discussion? Have we, by oversight, limited the possibilities of our knowing? What might we gain, as individual researchers and practitioners in this field, and as a community, on turning attention back on the assumptions that we have made along the way, and where those have led us? Let me illustrate my point by discussing one example, a question that researchers across the world, myself included, have spent considerable time exploring over the past 10 years.

### **How Can We Engage Faculty in Internationalization?**

This question has driven large and small research projects. Blockers to and enablers of their engagement have been identified. It has been argued that when faculty do not want to get involved in internationalization activities at home or abroad, it is because they are not interested or lack the required skills and knowledge for international and intercultural work. Various strategies and resources have been developed to arouse faculty interest and develop their skills. Many have been applied and evaluated. And over time, it has become common knowledge among those working in the internationalization of higher education that faculty are the “problem,” a major blocker to internationalization, requiring a “solution.” But a couple of years ago, I became aware that in the university where I was working at the time, La Trobe University, there were faculty who were in fact deeply and meaningfully engaged (for instance working with migrant or indigenous groups), but in ways that were not recognized by the institution as “internationalization.” By positioning faculty as a group as being disengaged, as lacking the motivation, knowledge, or skills to engage, I realized that I was doing them a disservice and limiting the boundaries of my own knowledge. Indeed, it was liberating to challenge that very basic assumption, track it back to its source, and recalibrate my thinking. This has led me, with colleagues, to move from assuming a deficit toward looking for different ways in which faculty are engaged in international and intercultural work. We have found ourselves in different “places,” asking different questions, such as “What does faculty engagement look like?” “How can we recognize and learn from the work that faculty do in internationalization?” and “How can we position faculty as architects and agents of internationalization in our discourse and in our practice?” Exploring the answers to these questions led us to read new literature from a broader range of disciplines and to explore new theories and perspectives on engagement.

But challenging our own assumptions through critical reflection is difficult. Fundamentally, what we know and how we perceive—our epistemological and ontological stance—is imbued with and grounded in ourselves individually and collectively. So being critically reflective strikes at the very heart of our identity. It makes us feel vulnerable and exposed because it not only challenges the validity of what we think we know, but of who we are. In the end, though, it is liberating. It has opened up new theoretical and practical possibilities that can be further investigated. In this regard, it has helped us to become true to our own doctrine as educators, that we must ourselves be learners, critically reflective of our own practice.

*Betty Leask is professor emerita of internationalization at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, and visiting professor at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, United States. E-mail: leaskb@bc.edu.*

### And the Broader Field of Internationalization?

So, what about the broader field of the internationalization of higher education? Could it be that the questions we have been asking as a broader community, the research we have been conducting, and the conclusions we have drawn have been limited by tightly held assumptions? How have our responses to the questions we have asked been limited by the individual and collective linguistic and cultural resources that have been brought to the task of investigation and discussion—by who “we” are? As a circle of researchers, we are relatively limited in terms of age, ethnicity, language, nationality, and to some extent gender. And while we have argued for “inclusive internationalization” and the need to engage with “the other,” to what extent have we ourselves been inclusive and actively sought out new ideas and new ways of approaching research in our field? Are we ideologically homogeneous? Have we become too comfortable in our own cultural milieu? Have we engaged deeply enough with the ideas and perspectives of scholars who are “not like us”? Have we silently acquiesced to, through insufficient critique of, a neoliberal rationale for the internationalization of higher education? What would be the impact on the future of the field if we were to examine our individual and collective epistemological and ontological assumptions, and find them wanting? What would it mean to the future of the internationalization of higher education if in the next 25 years we were to refocus not only on knowing *more*, but on knowing *differently*? On creating what Rizvi and Lingard, in their book of 2010 on *Globalizing education policy*, call an alternate social imaginary?

So, I return to the questions that Haggis posed, but I ask them about the internationalization of higher education. What questions have we asked? To what extent do these questions reflect our own assumptions and value positions? How can we extend the boundaries of our own knowing? ▲

## Internationalization of Higher Education and the Future of the Planet

Laura E. Rumbley

### Abstract

International mobility, the hallmark activity of internationalization of higher education, relies heavily on air travel, which is contributing directly to the global climate crisis. Commitments to immediate and creative solutions to offset these detrimental environmental effects must be embraced by the international higher education community.

Climate scientists have been warning us for years about the shifting ecological realities of the planet, with the understanding now coalescing around the idea that we have a veritable climate emergency on our hands.

For higher education specialists who take a particular interest in matters of internationalization and global engagement, these developments highlight two profoundly important, and ironically contradictory, truths. Namely, the internationalization of higher education, as it is commonly operationalized globally, contributes directly to the climate degradation we are witnessing all around us. At the same time, international collaboration in higher education can and must play an active role in addressing this planetary crisis. How will this story unfold over the next several decades?

### Internationalizing with Purpose

There are a multitude of motivations to internationalize. Studies from the American Council on Education, the European Association for International Education, the International Association of Universities, and others, indicate that higher education institutions



around the world are keen to foster internationalization in order to do everything from enhancing student learning outcomes and employability prospects, to attracting top academic talent, advancing research agendas, and raising institutional visibility and prestige, among other rationales.

Meanwhile, a broader public good agenda, which has long been implied in relation to internationalization, is becoming more explicit. A widely used definition for internationalization—coined by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Eva Egron-Polak, and Laura Howard for the 2015 European Parliament study, *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, insists that internationalization should be a process undertaken “in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff and to make a meaningful contribution to society.”

Aspiring to exert a positive influence on key actors and society at large is laudable. However, the champions of internationalization of higher education cannot expect to succeed in improving the human condition without also attending purposefully to the realities of the faltering natural world around us.

### Internationalization’s Dirty Little (Climate) Secret

Ironically, student mobility—the signature manifestation of internationalization around the world—is highly damaging to the planet. Recent estimates have put the number of internationally mobile students at around 5 million worldwide. The benefits of this activity are well documented. The Erasmus student mobility program in Europe, for example, shows evidence of a range of personal, social, academic, and professional advantages accruing to students who take part in Erasmus international study experiences. An extensive body of literature over the last several decades supports these findings. Meanwhile, the benefits of mobility can extend beyond those directly participating in the experience. For example, hosting international students can generate enormous revenue streams for individual institutions and entire economies; indeed, the impact of international students in the United States is estimated to have topped \$42 billion in 2017.

But is there a cost to the global student mobility phenomenon? When it comes to the health of the planet, there may very well be. A recent study published in the *Journal of Cleaner Production* looked at the international mobility figures for degree-seeking students as calculated by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, and specifically considered the likely air travel patterns connected to these movements. The study found that global greenhouse gas “emissions associated with international student mobility were between 14.01 and 38.54 megatons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year in 2014.” These figures are largely double the estimates for 1999 and, at the high end, at a similar level to the greenhouse gas emissions outputs of entire countries, such as Croatia and Tunisia. For a community of educators who believes in the overarching premise that internationalization helps to make the world a better place, this is bitter pill to swallow.

The study found that global greenhouse gas “emissions associated with international student mobility were between 14.01 and 38.54 megatons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year in 2014.”

### The Road to Redemption

Luckily, there is movement afoot to align higher education generally, and the aspirations of internationalization more specifically, with an Earth-friendly agenda. A range of organizations and institutions are galvanized around considerations of sustainability. These include the Higher Education Sustainability Initiative, the International Sustainable Campus Network, and the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. Individuals are offering creative solutions, as well. For example, the winning poster presentation at the 2018 EAIE annual conference, authored by Scott Blair and Laura Howard, issued a call for “the greening of comprehensive internationalization.” While small in scope yet in comparison to the challenges they aim to address, these efforts are raising awareness and securing commitments to action at the level of individuals and institutions in new and innovative ways. One clear sign of the traction that this topic has gained in recent years is the fact that, since 2010, Universitas Indonesia has overseen the UI GreenMetric international ranking of institutions, which aims to draw attention to efforts by universities around the world to foster green campuses and sustainability agendas.

Much more profound, however, is the game-changing potential that a commitment to internationalization at home may bring to this effort. Focusing on ways to reduce mobility,

*Laura E. Rumbley is associate director, Knowledge Development & Research, at the European Association for International Education (EAIE). E-mail: [rumbley@eaie.org](mailto:rumbley@eaie.org).*

yet still ensure transformational international and intercultural learning—through local community resources, technological innovations, and other creative strategies—offers a vitally important way forward.

Meanwhile, our collective thinking about international mobility for students (and academics) also needs to be carefully reconsidered. At a minimum, particularly in high-density/high-mobility regions, such as Europe, incentives for using alternatives to damaging air travel should be the norm. Increasingly, higher education institutions that foster student mobility consider and enact carbon-offsetting actions, and these efforts should be pursued widely and aggressively.

The internationalization of higher education—when designed and deployed intelligently and responsibly—can yield powerfully positive results in the world. However, the community of individuals, educators, policy makers, and others, who believe in the potential for internationalization to build bridges of deeper knowledge and foster human compassion, must work quickly and collaboratively to understand our planetary impact and change our habits. Our shared future is at stake. ▲

## International Students at Chinese Institutions: Trends and Implications

Nian Cai Liu

### Abstract

China, the world's largest source of international students, has now become one of the top destination countries for student mobility worldwide and will be a strong competitor in the provision of international higher education in the foreseeable future.

China has long been the world's largest source of international students, with outgoing Chinese students totaling 662,100 in 2018. Meanwhile, it is also quickly becoming one of the top destination countries globally: in 2018, the number of international students at Chinese institutions was as high as 492,185.

### Increasing Numbers

Before China opened up to the world in the late 1980s, the number of international students was limited to a few hundreds. In the first 20 years following the reform, the number of international students increased rapidly: in 2018, it was 10 times higher than in 1999 (44,711). Meanwhile, the number of institutions receiving international students soared from less than 100 in the early 1980s to about 1,000 currently— which is about one-third of the total number of Chinese institutions.

This rapid increase in the number of international students is a result of national strategies and targeted policies. For example, in 2010, the National Outline for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020) clearly stated China's commitment to strengthening international exchanges and cooperation and improving the level of internationalization of higher education. That same year, the Plan of Studying in China (2010) put forward a national policy of “expanding scale, optimizing structure, improving management, and ensuring quality,” aiming to promote the sustainable development of international education and build an international brand of higher education in China. The plan also reflected China's intention to become the largest destination country for study in Asia by 2020.

### Greater Diversity

In addition to the substantial increase in the overall number of international students, the number of source countries also expanded significantly, on all continents. In 2018, 196 countries and regions—about 90 percent of all the countries and regions of the world—sent students to China. Asian countries were the main sources of international students, with the proportion of Asian students in China remaining at about 60 percent in the past few years. African countries experienced the fastest growth as source countries, with the share of African students reaching 16.6 percent in 2018, second after Asian students.

The top 10 source countries in 2018 include South Korea, Thailand, Pakistan, India, the United States, Russia, Indonesia, Laos, Japan, and Kazakhstan. Eight among them are Asian, which appears relevant considering the sending countries' total population, economic level, education status, geographical location, ethnic composition, customs, and study abroad policies. The largest increases were from Thailand and Pakistan, which could be related to the Belt and Road Initiative. It is worth noting that until recently, Germany and France were among the top ten countries, which is not the case any longer.

For a long time, the study of Chinese was the most popular major for international students in China. Students studying Chinese language currently constitute about half of the total number of international students, most of them nondegree students. Although Chinese remains popular, the proportion of students studying Chinese literature, medicine, engineering, economics, and management keeps growing.

The proportion of degree students has been increasing steadily. In 2018, more than half of the international students were degree students. Among degree students, the proportion of graduate students has grown significantly. In 2018, about 10 percent of degree students were at the doctoral level, about 23 percent at the master's level, and 67 percent at the undergraduate level.

### Government Scholarships

In 1996, the ministry of education established the China Scholarship Council, which, in particular, specialized in organizing, funding, and managing international students. In 2018, 63,041 international students (12.8 percent of all international students) received Chinese government scholarships.

A large proportion of international students receiving Chinese government scholarships were degree students, and their share has been increasing in the past years. With the number of international students steadily increasing while the budget for government scholarships remains relatively limited, Chinese government scholarships are likely to be reserved for degree students in the future.

In addition to the government program, many Chinese institutions have set up their own scholarship programs for international students, as well as international companies targeting specific international student groups, many of them related to the Belt and Road initiative.

### Equal Treatment?

With the increasing presence of international students in China, questions arise about how the education system will adapt to multiculturalism, coupled with the difficulty, for the majority of international students, of learning Chinese. Chinese institutions and governments have been trying very hard to deal with these challenges. In the past, international students in China used to receive preferential treatment, which is still partly the case. But there has been strong advocacy—and even a public debate in 2019—in favor of enrolling international students on the same terms as Chinese students.

### Final Remarks

Although nationalism may have significant negative influences, the long-term trend of internationalization of higher education will not be changed, and while Chinese universities are becoming increasingly competitive, China is turning into a strong global competitor in the provision of international higher education. ▲

*With the increasing presence of international students in China, questions arise about how the education system will adapt to multiculturalism, coupled with the difficulty, for the majority of international students, of learning Chinese.*

*Nian Cai Liu is professor and director of the Center for World-Class Universities (CWCU), Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and dean of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, P.R. China. E-mail: ncliu@sjtu.edu.cn.*

# China–Africa Higher Education Engagement: A Win–Win Situation?

**Goolam Mohamedbhai**

## Abstract

China's economic activities in Africa have been accompanied by several initiatives to promote African higher education development. This forms part of China's soft power strategy. But does this lead to a win–win situation for Africa and China? And what does the future hold for Africa as a result of China's increasing engagement?

**I**nvesting in infrastructure and in higher education boosts the development of a country. However, necessary public funds in African countries are limited and aid from traditional Western donor countries has almost come to a standstill. China, an emerging global economic power, has capitalized on this situation, actively funding public infrastructure and assisting in human resources development in Africa while, in return, benefiting from Africa's huge mineral resources and markets for its manufactured goods.

From the perspectives of both China and Africa, this is a win–win situation. Western countries, however, express concerns, not only about China's poor human rights records and undemocratic practices, but equally that China is embarking on neocolonialism and that a large portion of China's investment in Africa is in the form of loans, not aid, leading African countries to be debt strapped. The West's concerns fall on deaf ears in Africa.

China's engagement with Africa in higher education is in line with its strategy of wielding not only economic power but also soft power. The Forum on China–Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) is a regular triennial event where Chinese and African leaders agree on a three-year plan for economic cooperation, including human resource development. China's higher education initiatives for Africa are embedded in the various FOCAC resolutions.

## Scholarships

The grant of scholarships to Africa under FOCAC, increasing from 30,000 in 2015 to 50,000 in 2018, has resulted in a dramatic rise in the number of African students studying in China, from just under 2,000 in 2003 to nearly 50,000 in 2015. China is now, after France, the second country hosting the largest number of African students.

Almost all African students return home after their studies, which is advantageous not only to Africa but equally to China in its quest to spread its influence in Africa. However, very little information is available on the areas of study of the African scholars, the acceptability of the Chinese degrees in African countries, or the employment of graduates upon their return.

## Partnerships

Under the 2009 FOCAC, China launched a “20+20” scheme linking 20 African universities with 20 Chinese universities and, in 2015, a similar “10+10” proposal to establish cooperation between 10 Chinese agricultural institutions and 10 African agricultural institutions was announced. There is hardly any information available about the linked institutions and the projects undertaken under these schemes, but it has been reported that the number of research papers in agricultural and biological sciences coauthored by African and Chinese academics has significantly risen, and that the number of Chinese postgraduate students at African universities has increased as a result.

## Confucius Institutes and University Infrastructure

Perhaps the most powerful instruments used by China in its soft power strategy are its Confucius Institutes (CIs). Launched in 2004, there are now over 500 CIs within universities worldwide and 54 of them are in Africa. Each CI is linked to a Chinese university and its main objective is to promote Chinese language and culture.



Although CIs have been criticized in the West, where several of them have been closed down on grounds of promoting China's ideology and propaganda or undertaking industrial espionage, no such criticisms have emerged from Africa, where they are warmly welcomed.

By providing soft loans, China has also assisted in building university infrastructure in Africa to increase access and improve quality. Two prominent examples are the Malawi University of Science and Technology, an impressive campus built near Blantyre and opened in 2014, and the library at the University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, completed in 2018 and the largest ever built by China in Africa. It would have been impossible for these two African countries to put up such infrastructure without China's support.

*By providing soft loans, China has also assisted in building university infrastructure in Africa to increase access and improve quality.*

### Win-Win?

The win-win question must be examined from two perspectives: one that relates to African countries generally, and the other specifically to their higher education sector. With regard to African countries, the concerns expressed by the West could be legitimate and need to be scrutinized. It is imperative for African academics to critically study the implications of China's access to Africa's natural resources and the consequences of massive Chinese loans. There is hardly any institution in Africa undertaking such research at present.

As to the higher education sector, the collaboration is heavily one-sided and Africa appears to be the main beneficiary, but since China's assistance to African higher education development forms part of its soft power strategy, one could argue that this is a win-win situation. However, there is sparse information on the scholarships being awarded and the activities under the various partnerships. Every CI in Africa, as part of its mandate, should collect data on the scholarships, undertake surveys of returning graduates, and record research activities under the partnerships. Only with such data can the real benefits to Africa be assessed.

### The Future

Because of its colonial heritage, Africa has inevitably been influenced in its development by Europe's values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, and it has adopted European languages as part of its culture. The United States and Europe have been regarded as role models by Africans ever since independence.

However, the perceived racism of the current US administration, and the recent rise in populism and anti-immigrant sentiment in Europe, now encourage Africa to look toward the East, China in particular. Africa admires China for its economic development but feels uneasy about its culture, values, and governance system. Will China's soft power strategy eventually win the hearts and minds of African people and inspire them toward a model of development akin to China's? What then would be the implications, positive and negative, of such a shift on African countries? These are issues that need to be debated by African academics in Africa. And these same issues need to be on the West's agenda for Africa's future development. ▲

*Goolam Mohamedbhai is former general secretary of the Association of African Universities. E-mail: g\_t\_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk.*

# Knowledge Diplomacy: What Are the Key Characteristics?

Jane Knight

## Abstract

Knowledge diplomacy is a new approach to understanding the role of international higher education, research, and innovation in strengthening relations among countries and addressing common global challenges. This article examines the key characteristics of the knowledge diplomacy approach—collaboration, reciprocity, and mutuality—and provides examples of how higher education and research can contribute to international relations and help to address global issues.

In today's globalized and turbulent world, there are new rationales, benefits, risks, and opportunities attached to the contribution that higher education and research make to international relations. Examining the role of international higher education in building relations between and among countries is not new. However, using a knowledge-diplomacy framework for analysis, rather than soft power or the traditional lens of cultural and science diplomacy, is a new approach.

There are different drivers pushing and pulling knowledge diplomacy. For instance, global issues are now national issues and many national issues are also global issues. Challenges such as climate change, food security, migration, epidemics, refugees and migration, poverty reduction, and water security know no borders.

Knowledge diplomacy is a two-way process. It refers to the role that international higher education, research, and innovation (IHERI) play in building and strengthening international relations and, vice versa, the role that international relations play in facilitating and improving IHERI. There are a number of terms used to describe international higher education's role in international relations. To help clarify the confusion among the different terms, this article focuses on the key characteristics of knowledge diplomacy, especially with regard to addressing urgent global challenges.

In identifying fundamental aspects of knowledge diplomacy, there is the risk of being too narrow and discriminating or too broad and inclusive. The following list of characteristics is a start. It is not a comprehensive list, but one that identifies important and strategic dimensions of knowledge diplomacy.

*Knowledge diplomacy builds on the fundamental functions of higher education—teaching/learning, research, knowledge production and innovation, and service to society.*

## Key Characteristics of Knowledge Diplomacy

- *Focus on higher education, research, and innovation:* Knowledge diplomacy builds on the fundamental functions of higher education—teaching/learning, research, knowledge production and innovation, and service to society. The process of knowledge diplomacy involves multiple forms of IHERI as dictated by the nature and complexity of the issue being addressed. Individual IHE activities (i.e., student mobility, scholar exchange, joint conferences) are correctly labelled as internationalization activities, but when they are networked to a larger series of activities involving multiple actors and strategies, they become part of knowledge diplomacy. As individual stand-alone IHE activities, they do not necessarily constitute knowledge diplomacy.
- *Diversity of actors and partners:* Knowledge diplomacy includes a diversity of actors. While universities and colleges are key players, there is a range of other actors involved. These include national, regional, or international centres of excellence, research institutions, foundations, think tanks, professional associations, nongovernmental education organizations and governmental departments/agencies. Higher education actors also work with other sectors and/or disciplines, depending on the nature of the initiative. Common partners include industry, civil society groups, foundations, and governmental agencies. A key feature of knowledge diplomacy is therefore a diversity of higher education actors working collaboratively with partners from other sectors.
- *Recognition of different needs and collective use of resources:* Because knowledge diplomacy brings together a network of different partners from various sectors to address common issues, there are often different rationales and implications for the individual countries and actors involved. Each country and actor has different needs and brings specific resources to the partnership. These need to be respected and negotiated, to ensure that the strengths and opportunities for each partner

are optimized. This is done through a horizontal cooperative type of relationship that acknowledges the different but collective needs and resources of the partners. Leadership to recognize and collaboratively address different needs and resources is critical, but not in the form of dominance or authoritarianism (which characterize a power approach.)

- ▶ *Reciprocity—mutual, but with different benefits*: Different needs and resources of actors will result in different benefits (and potential risks) for partners. Mutuality of benefits does not mean that all actors/countries will receive the same benefits. It does mean, however, that the principle of mutuality and reciprocity of benefits will guide the process. As the collaboration unfolds, there will be both collective and context-specific benefits accrued for actors and countries. This is based on negotiation and conflict resolution and is founded on a win-win approach fundamental to knowledge diplomacy.
- ▶ *Build and strengthen relations between and among countries*: Central to the notion of knowledge diplomacy is the role of IHERI in strengthening positive and productive relations between and among countries. This builds on, but goes beyond, the contribution made by bilateral and multilateral agreements between higher education institutions. Clearly, there is a sliding scale with regard to the breadth and depth of contributions that knowledge diplomacy can make to international relations, but working toward addressing pressing global issues that impact each and every country is an important way forward.

### Examples of Knowledge Diplomacy

The Pan African University, the United Nations' Sustainable Development Solutions Network, the Japan-UK Research and Education Network for Knowledge Economy Initiatives, and Brown University's Humanitarian Relief projects are a few of the knowledge diplomacy case studies discussed in a recent British Council report, *Knowledge Diplomacy in Action*. These initiatives are carefully chosen to illustrate the urgency and effectiveness of using a knowledge diplomacy approach and that it includes, yet goes far beyond, typical internationalization activities. Knowledge diplomacy involves a diversity of higher education actors working collaboratively with partners from other sectors to address pressing global and national issues through cooperation, negotiation, and mutuality of benefits, and not through a top-down, competitive, winner-takes-all kind of process. ▲

*Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: [jane.knight@utoronto.ca](mailto:jane.knight@utoronto.ca).*

*This article is adapted from Knight, J. (2019) Knowledge Diplomacy in Action. British Council. See <https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-policy-insight/research-reports/knowledge-diplomacy-action>.*

## IHE at 100: 25 Years of Evolution in International Higher Education

Rebecca Schendel, Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis, and Araz Khajarian

The publication of the 100th issue of *International Higher Education* (IHE) provides a unique opportunity to reflect on the contributions made by the periodical during its first 25 years in operation. In this article, we summarize key findings from a comprehensive analysis of all of the articles included in the first 99 issues of *IHE* (a grand total of 1,459 individual articles), focusing particularly on our geographic reach, our thematic coverage, and the profile of our contributing authors.

### Abstract

In this article, we summarize key findings from a comprehensive analysis of all of the articles included in the first 99 issues of *International Higher Education*. We find that the articles in *IHE* represent a very broad geographic reach, both in terms of article focus and author affiliation, and cover a wide variety of topics. However, some topics and regions have hardly been covered and deserve attention in future issues.

### Global in Reach and Authorship

The mission of *IHE* is to provide informed and insightful analysis of topical issues affecting higher education systems around the world. We have, therefore, always been very concerned with our global reach, aiming to include contributions from countries that are less frequently covered in the global literature, as well as discussion of the major players on the international stage. Analysis of the first 99 issues demonstrates that we have been successful in achieving this goal, with our 1,459 articles being well distributed across the various world regions. East Asia and the Pacific is the region with the greatest coverage (267 articles), with Europe and Central Asia following closely behind (with 253). We have also published more than 100 articles focused on countries in North America (145), sub-Saharan Africa (132), and Latin America and the Caribbean (125). A substantial number of our articles (more than 200) are also best classified as being “global” in their scope, given that they deal with issues of relevance to multiple regions of the world. Although East Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, and Latin American and the Caribbean have all been substantial sources of contributions since our founding, there have been some changes in our geographic distribution over the years, with the number of titles on North America declining and the number of contributions from Africa increasing, particularly in the last 10 years. This latter trend is in no small part due to the support for Africa-focused contributions that we have received from the Carnegie Corporation over this period. We have also seen an increase, in recent years, of articles that explicitly compare two or more regions of the world, in relation to a particular topic. However, there is still room for improvement, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa, a region that has only featured in 56 articles, less than 4 percent of our total output. South Asia is also less well represented, with 70 articles published in the first 99 issues.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the story is less balanced when it comes to specific countries within these broad regions. Certain countries tend to dominate the global literature on higher education, and the pattern is similar in *IHE*, with, for example, over 30 percent of articles on East Asia and the Pacific focusing on China; 75 percent of articles on South Asia focusing on India; 16 percent of articles on Europe and Central Asia focusing on the United Kingdom; 13 percent of articles on sub-Saharan Africa focusing on South Africa; and half of the articles on Latin America and the Caribbean focusing on one of four countries (Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and Mexico). The United States is also our most frequently discussed country, although this dominance was more pronounced in the first years of publication and has declined significantly in recent issues. However, despite the dominance of a small number of countries, it is important to profile one significant contribution of *IHE* over the years, which is the sheer range of countries represented. Our first 99 issues have included at least some coverage of most countries in the world, with 111 individual countries being explicitly represented in at least one article to date. We have also published a number of articles that are regional in focus and/or that profile particular groups of countries (e.g., the “BRICs”—Brazil, Russia, India, and China).

In addition to prioritizing coverage of a broad range of contexts, *IHE* has long been concerned with the global reach of its authorship. Whenever possible, the editorial team seeks to invite authors to contribute to *IHE* who themselves live and work in the countries under discussion, so as to avoid some of the clear global imbalances that exist in most international publishing. We have not always been successful in this regard, as evidenced by the fact that nearly 40 percent of our articles were written by an author based in the United States. However, the fact remains that over 60 percent of *IHE* articles were written by non-US-based authors, with more than 40 contributions coming from each region in the world (and some regions contributing very frequently, e.g., Europe and Central Asia with 296 contributions and East Asia and the Pacific with 176). The trends over time are also generally encouraging, as we have seen a marked rise in contributions from authors based in regions such as South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa in recent years. It is also important to highlight the fact that our analysis “counted” individuals in terms of their affiliation at the time of writing, so many of the authors counted as “American” are not American of origin but were, rather, contributing when working or studying at a US institution. However, there are also less encouraging trends

*Our first 99 issues have included at least some coverage of most countries in the world, with 111 individual countries being explicitly represented in at least one article to date.*

that must be acknowledged, particularly a dramatic decline in the number of contributions from authors based in the Middle East and North Africa since 2001.

### **Broad Thematic Coverage, With Some Important Gaps**

We also classified each article by primary theme, in order to understand the range of themes discussed in *IHE*, as well as any trends over time. The first finding in this regard is the broad diversity of themes represented in the first 99 issues. We have published articles on higher education finance; privatization; policy and governance; the academic profession; access and equity; quality and accreditation; rankings and world class universities; research and publication; students and student services; the “third mission”; types/models of university; and North–South relations, as well as a broad range of articles focused on topics that would broadly be classified as “internationalization” (i.e., mobility of students and faculty; internationalization strategies; cross-border and transnational education, etc.)

Many of these themes have been very well represented over the years. Internationalization has been our most popular topic, with 317 titles (over 20 percent) falling in that category, and has also increased quite significantly over the past 10 years. Other themes that have featured in a significant number of contributions include privatization (137), quality and accreditation (120) and finance (105).

Over time, we have seen an increase in articles on access and equity (although this was particularly pronounced between 2006 and 2010, rather than in the most recent decade), on research and publication, and on rankings and world class universities. Other themes, such as the academic profession and finance, have declined in popularity in recent years. Some of these peaks are likely historical in nature (e.g., a spike in articles about globalization in the years directly after the millennium; a rise in articles focused on the relatively new phenomena of rankings and “world class universities” in the past decade; a much more recent spike in the number of articles focused on the interference of politics in higher education). Others are likely to be due to trends in the broader higher education literature (e.g., the rising focus on access and equity). Others still are due to the activity of particular groups or authors, who have contributed significant numbers of articles on their topic of focus. One clear case of this is the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (based at the University at Albany – State University of New York), which has produced a considerable number of articles for *IHE* on private higher education over the years. However, not all of the trends can easily be explained, including trends of no change. There has not, for example, been any significant increase in the number of articles focused on higher education finance, despite significant attention devoted to the topics of student financing and the impact of budget austerity in many countries in recent years.

Our thematic analysis also showed some significant gaps. The theme of students and student services, for example, has hardly received any coverage in the first 99 issues (only 12 articles, which represents less than 1 percent of the total). There have also been very few looking at the “third mission” of higher education (35) or at North–South relations (39). These areas represent important topics for our field, so an increased focus in future years would be a welcome development.

### **An Increasingly Diverse Authorship**

The last area of focus for our analysis was the diversity of our authorship. Aside from geographic diversity, which was discussed above, we also investigated the institutional affiliation and gender of our contributing authors.

Although, unsurprisingly, the vast majority of authors are based at educational institutions (generally universities), roughly 25 percent of *IHE* articles have been written by authors from other kinds of institutions (i.e., nonprofit organizations, higher education associations, government agencies, and private companies). It is also significant to note that over 20 percent of *IHE* articles are coauthored. Of these coauthor pairs or groups, more than half represent multiple institution types (for example, one author from a university and one from a government agency). A sizable number of these include at least one author from a nonprofit organization. As a number of single-authored contributions



Rebecca Schendel is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), Boston College. E-mail: schendel@bc.edu.

Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis is a doctoral candidate at CIHE. E-mail: woldegiy@bc.edu.

Araz Khajarian is a master degree student in the International Higher Education program at Boston College. E-mail: khajaria@bc.edu.

(more than 75) have also been submitted by authors from nonprofits, it is clear that the nonprofit sector has featured substantially in our authorship over the years.

Another interesting trend to note is that the number of female contributors has increased over time. In total, roughly 30 percent of the articles submitted by authors with a known gender were authored (or coauthored) by women, and this proportion has grown significantly over the years. There is a regional dimension to this, however, with women being much more highly represented in certain regions than others. Nearly 50 percent of contributions from Europe and Central Asia, for example, come from women, whereas women contributed less than 15 percent of the articles from sub-Saharan Africa.

### Conclusion

In summary, we can conclude that *IHE* has done a remarkable job ensuring that its content has remained both geographically diverse and thematically rich over its first 25 years in operation. It has also provided an important contribution by giving voice to a broad range of scholars, policy-makers, and practitioners working in the field of international higher education, including a sizable number from outside the United States and Western Europe. Indeed, this diversity, both in terms of content and contributing authorship, has increased over time. However, there is more to be done in the future to ensure that we continue to diversify our work, representing countries that are less frequently discussed in the global literature, featuring topics, such as the “third mission,” which are crucially important but have received little coverage to date, and encouraging contributions from authors from all regions of the globe. The focus on higher education’s contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals in this issue is a promising start. ▲

## CIHE Publications

- Philip G. Altbach, Edward Choi, Mathew R. Allen, and Hans de Wit, eds. (2019). *The Global Phenomenon of Family-Owned or Managed Universities*. Global Perspectives on Higher Education, volume 44. Rotterdam, Brill Sense Publishers. The phenomenon of family-owned or managed higher education institutions (FOMHEI) is largely unknown as well as undocumented, yet there are literally hundreds of such universities around the world, both in the nonprofit and for-profit sectors. This book is the first to shed light on these institutions, which are an important subset of private universities—the fastest growing segment of higher education worldwide. FOMHEIs are concentrated in developing and emerging economies, but exist also in Europe and North America: we have identified FOMHEIs on all continents, ranging from marginal schools to well-regarded, comprehensive universities and top-level specialized institutions.
- Hans de Wit, Miguel J. Escala, and Gloria Sánchez Valverde. (2019). *Internationalization of Technical and Technological Institutions of Higher Education in the Caribbean/ Internacionalización de Institutos Técnicos y Tecnológicos de Educación Superior en el Caribe*. CIHE Perspectives No. 15. Boston College Center for International Higher Education.
- Rebecca Schendel, Hans de Wit, and Tessa DeLaquil. (2019). *Inclusive and Innovative Internationalization of Higher Education: Proceedings of the WES–CIHE Summer Institute June 19–21, 2019, Boston College*. CIHE Perspectives No. 14. Boston College Center for International Higher Education and World Education Services.

## CIHE News

As of July 1, 2020, we will welcome Gerardo Blanco, currently Associate Professor of Higher Education & Student Affairs, University of Connecticut, to the Center for International Higher Education as Associate Professor and Associate Academic Director.

As of the fall 2020, Rebecca Schendel, currently Associate Director of CIHE, will become Managing Director.

Founding Director Philip G. Altbach and current Director Hans de Wit will continue to be engaged with CIHE as part-time Academic Directors. ▲

**Project management:**

Alicia Heim & Hannah Pöhlmann

**Cover illustration:** [axeptdesign.de](http://axeptdesign.de)

To the best knowledge of the authors, editors, and publisher, the information contained in this issue is correct at the time of publication. However, they make no representation or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work or the materials included with it, and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose, and shall in no event be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damage, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

**Trademarks:** All brand names and product names used in this publication are trademarks, registered trademarks or trade names of their respective holders, and are used for identification purposes only.

**DUZ Verlags- und Medienhaus GmbH**

**DUZ Academic Publishers**

Kaiser-Friedrich-Straße 90  
10585 Berlin  
Germany

**Phone:** +49 (0)30 21 29 87-0

**Fax:** +49 (0)30 21 29 87-20

**Internet:** [www.internationalhighereducation.net](http://www.internationalhighereducation.net)



**International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education.**

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through International Higher Education, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide.

[www.internationalhighereducation.net](http://www.internationalhighereducation.net)