

# **Internationalization of Higher Education in the Era of Xenophobic Nationalisms**

Paul Tiyambe Zeleza  
Professor of the Humanities and Social Sciences and Vice Chancellor  
United States International University-Africa  
Nairobi, Kenya

Essay specially prepared for Africa Forum Keynote Address, NAFSA 2017 Annual Conference and Expo, Los Angeles, USA, May 31, 2017.

© Not for citation or distribution without the explicit permission of the author.

## **Introduction**

Let begin by thanking the organizers for inviting me to present on a topic that means so much to me in my personal and professional life, as a scholar and an administrator. My entire academic life since I went to university in 1972 has been defined by internationalization, as a student, faculty member, and an administrator who studied and has worked at a dozen universities in six countries on three continents. Internationalization has been a growing and important feature of global higher education, although it now seems under threat from the rise of xenophobic nationalisms in different parts of the world including some of the major exporters of higher education services.

For the proponents of internationalization, including me, the forces that drive it, its rationales, and the activities that constitute it, competencies it promotes, and the values it fosters remain as compelling as ever. In this presentation, I seek to show the changing dynamics of internationalization, which has always been both critical and problematic for the Global South, especially Africa. While the specter of xenophobia, rising out of the deepening inequities of neoliberal globalization, does indeed pose dangers, this moment offers us an opportunity to reflect and construct better models and systems of internationalization for the future.

The presentation is divided into four parts.<sup>1</sup> First, I briefly discuss some of the rationales for the internationalization of higher education. Second, I focus on the main dynamics and dimensions of contemporary internationalization. Third, I examine the threats posed by the rise of xenophobic nationalisms. Finally, I conclude with a short examination of the divergent and shifting regional interests on internationalization. I conclude with reflections on the opportunities for Africa that lurk behind the current moment of xenophobic nationalisms in parts of the Global North.

## **In Praise of Internationalization**

The growth of internationalization as a critical aspect of higher education in the last few decades is often attributed to the latest cycle of globalization that emerged at the turn of the 1980s, which now appears in retreat in the aftermath of the Great Recession of 2007-2008. The globalization cycle of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century ought to be understood both as a historical process and an ideological project. The first encompasses the rise of new information and communication technologies and their propensities to compress time and space and intensify the velocity of flows from capital to commodities to cultures, images to ideologies to institutions, values to viruses to violence, and people to pathologies to pollutants. The rise of China and the other emerging economies as major players in the world economy is an equally important part of the process of globalization. As an ideological project, globalization has been marked by neoliberalism, the triumph of the gospel of free market fundamentalism that was articulated in various regional and national idioms.

The internationalization of higher education was embedded in the process and project of globalization. It was propelled by the massification and commercialization of higher education. Internationalization presented new opportunities for countries in the Global North undergoing demographic decline and for their increasingly underfunded universities, while it offered an important outlet for unmet demand in the rapidly growing developing countries with their bulging youthful populations. A series of idealistic, instrumentalist, and ideological rationales have advanced in support of

higher education internationalization comprising of various economic, political, sociocultural, and academic imperatives.

Economically, it is said internationalization prepares students for careers in a globalized economy, enhances national development and competitiveness, and serves as a means of generating extra-institutional income. Employers place increasing premium on graduates with internationalized education and skills. Politically, it is asserted, internationalization promotes understanding so essential for peace and security in a conflict-ridden world and the development of global citizenship. The sociocultural imperative lies in the need to cultivate interculturalism so critical for the social wellbeing of multicultural societies. The internationalization of teaching, research, and service activities of universities also enhances the quality of higher education by compelling institutions to rise to international academic standards.

Claims abound about the benefits of internationalization for students' learning and development. Internationalized curricula is expected to provide students what is variously called intercultural sensitivity, competence, maturity or literacy, global learning, consciousness, and citizenship, or 'grounded globalism'. Others set their ambitions even higher and urge the creation of curricula and experiences that cultivate planetary citizenship. It is argued such an education can produce cosmopolitan planetary citizens able of coping with an interdependent, multicultural, and environmentally vulnerable world.

Also crucial, and often permeating the various economic, political, sociocultural and academic rationales for internationalization, is the consuming drive between a growing number of institutions for international recognition and branding. Needless to say, the articulation of these rationales has shifted over time and varied across and within countries and regions at the national and institutional levels. On the whole, the economic rationale gained ascendancy. The proponents of internationalization trumpet its benefits for countries and institutions faced with dwindling support from the neo-liberal state. Its opponents are prone to see internationalization as a vehicle for exploitation and marginalization of the poorer classes and countries. Critics in the global South have been particularly suspicious of shoddy programs set up by unscrupulous providers from the Global North and the negative implications of the regime of trade in educational services under the General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS) undertaken in global trade negotiations.

At the national level, internationalization is often largely justified in terms of its potential to develop domestic human resources to enhance national competitiveness, create strategic geopolitical alliances and economic relationships, promote income-generating and commercial trading opportunities, and for nation-building. Sociocultural rationales often rank quite low. At the institutional level, emphasis tends to be placed on the need to enhance an institution's international profile and reputation, improve the quality of its programs, raise the international and intercultural skills of students and staff, and as a means of generating badly needed income, developing energizing linkages and networks, and strengthening capacities to deal with pressing global issues and challenges.

Needless to say, emphases vary among countries and institutions depending on their histories, locations, resources, ideologies, and ambitions. It is safe to say that even when the political, cultural, and academic benefits are proclaimed such is the grip of academic capitalism that these rationales are often trumped by economic rhetoric and realities. These trends reflect the growing importation of business practices, discourses, and values into academe. In many countries this has been translated into the exponential growth of business, vocational, and professional programs at the expense of the basic

liberal arts and science disciplines. The decline of public funding and growth of the for-profit sector reinforce perceptions and expectations of the financial benefits of recruiting international students who in many of the developed countries are charged much higher fees than domestic students.

### **The Markers and Markets of Internationalization**

Among the many markers of internationalization, three stand out: first, flows of students; second, export of institutional models; and third, internationalization of publications. According to UNESCO data, the number of outbound tertiary students studying abroad rose from 1.82 million in 2000 to 3.55 million in 2013, which translates into an average annual growth rate of 7.28%. Asia boasted the highest numerical increase and rate of growth, from 790,203 in 2000 to 1.97 million in 2013, or 148.70%. This resulted in the region raising its share of global student outbound flows from 43.29% to 55.45%.

The number of students from the other regions increased as well, although their percentage share of outbound global student flows dropped. South America, which enjoyed the second highest rise in percentage terms (of 91.00%), saw its global portion dip slightly from 3.67% to 3.60% between 2000 and 2013. Africa enjoyed the third highest rate of increase (56.08%) as its number of students studying abroad rose from 239,179 to 373,303, but the continent's global proportion dropped from 13.12% to 10.53%. Similarly, the increase of 49.56% for Europe (from 574,159 to 858,713 students) turned into a fall in its global stake from 31.51% to 24.21%. The same was true for Oceania that saw its regional portion drop from 1.21% to 0.92% despite increasing its numbers of study abroad students from 22,110 to 32,680.

Altogether, during the 2000-2013 period there were 82 countries that had more 10,000 outbound students. Asia boasted the largest number (32), followed by Europe (30), Africa (9), and South America and the Caribbean (7). The largest exporters of international students in Asia in 2013 included China (712,157), India (181,872), and the Republic of Korea (116,942). In Europe, the leading countries in 2013 were Germany (119,123), France (84,059), and the Russian Federation (50,642). In Africa, they included Nigeria (52,066), Morocco (38,599), Algeria (20,695) and Egypt (19,744). In South America and the Caribbean, Brazil (32,051) led, followed by Colombia (25,509), Peru (14,204) and Venezuela (11,915). In North America, the United States boasted 60,292 studying abroad in 2013, Canada 32,051, and Mexico 27,118. For Australia the figure reached 11,650, and New Zealand 5,370.

Despite its growth, the number of students studying abroad remained a tiny fraction of global higher education enrolments, which stood at 99.6 million in 2000, rising to 181.7 million in 2010, and to 198.6 million in 2013. In comparison during the same years 1.82 million, 3.27 million, and 3.55 million students, respectively, studied abroad. This converts into 1.83%, 1.80%, and 1.79% of the gross global enrolments, respectively. By 2013 in no region had the gross outbound enrolment ratio, that is the number of students studying abroad as a percentage of the region's population of tertiary age, reached 2%. The ratio was highest in Europe at 1.85%, followed by Oceania at 1.20%. Asia came third at 0.52%, North America at 0.43%. Africa and South America were even with a ratio of 0.37%.

Similarly, despite their growth international students still represented a small percentage of the higher education students in the host regions. In fact, their share actually declined worldwide from 2.08% in 2000 to 2.04% in 2013, as it did in Asia from 0.83% to 0.77% during the same period, and in Africa from 1.52% in 2005 to

1.46% in 2013. The other regions witnessed a modest rise. In Europe the inbound mobility rate rose from 3.65% in 2000 to 5.13% in 2013, and in North America from 3.10% to 3.63%. The lowest inbound mobility rate was in South America, where it increased from 0.15% in 2005 to 0.16% in 2013, while the highest was in Oceania where it grew from 11.36% in 2000 to 17.83% in 2013.

The gender differences in the size and ratio of male and female flows are also quite evident. The mobility index for women was lower than for men in all world regions. Globally it remained stagnant at 1.89% in 2000 and 2013, while it dropped slightly for men from 2.26% to 2.20%. The widest gender gap in 2013 was in North America, where the female ratio was 2.98% compared to 4.45% for men. The lowest variance was in Asia, where the female and male ratios were 0.72% and 0.83%, respectively. The proportions in Europe were 5.13% for females and 5.96% for males, in Africa 1.09% to 1.77%, and in Oceania 0.13% to 0.20%.

Unsurprisingly, the developed regions and countries dominated the destinations of the outbound international students. The majority of international students went to North America and Western Europe, which increased their dominance as their collective share rose from 72.59 % in 2000 to 74.26% in 2013. Between 2000 and 2013, the percentages of international students studying in sub-Saharan Africa and South America and the Caribbean remained below 3%, while for South and West Asia, and Central Asia it was less than 2%. At a global level, the dozen countries boasting the largest net flows in 2013 were, in descending order, the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Japan, the Russian Federation, Germany, South Africa, the Netherlands, Austria, the United Arab Emirates, New Zealand, and Switzerland.

In the major student importing countries, international students brought billions of dollars to local economies. For example, in the United States the 886,052 international students in 2013-2014 contributed \$26.8 billion that created or supported 340,000 jobs. In Australia, education became the third largest export industry earning the country about \$17 billion in 2014 from 450,000 students. In Britain, in 2013-2014 there were 310,195 international students who contributed 18% of revenues for British universities, and £2.8 billion to the British economy, and supported 70,000 jobs. In Canada, the 218,200 international students in 2010 added \$8 billion and maintained 86,570 jobs.

The internationalization of higher education is of course not new. Indeed, the ancient universities of Africa, Asia, and Europe were designed and served as regional communities of learning and scholarship. In the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries universities established in the colonial world were by and large exports from the major European imperial powers. After World War II, the Soviet Union and United States exported their models as well. Clearly, models of higher education, as much else in the organization of global affairs, reflect the prevailing geopolitical hegemonies and international division of labor.

The most influential imperial European models were those of Spain, France, and Britain. The new universities created after independence often replicated the institutional structures, instructional practices, and intellectual values of their colonial predecessors and imperial models. Across much of Africa, at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century instructional languages, practices, and materials, as well as administrative systems and nomenclature, modes of academic organization, research methodologies, paradigms and themes remained tied to the patterns and trends in Europe. The same was true in several postcolonial Asian countries. To be sure, the persistence of the colonial and imperial models varied among countries, and struggles were waged for the decolonization of higher education with varying levels of intensity and success.

On the whole, as the grip of the European imperial model loosened in some of the independent African and Asian countries, the Soviet Union or United States models asserted themselves. The Soviet model had three key features. First, the higher education system was viewed as part of the nation's intellectual productive force and process and incorporated into the apparatus of the state. Second, it was subordinated to the needs of the economy as determined by state planning. Third, great emphasis was placed on the development of technological and technical higher education. Also, there was the creation of specialized mono-disciplinary universities and the delegation of fundamental research to the various disciplinary academies, which were linked to different ministries overseeing their respective areas of focus.

The Soviet model spread to the countries of the Soviet bloc in Central and Eastern Europe and Soviet allies in Asia, such as China, Vietnam, and Cambodia, as well as Cuba in the Caribbean, and Angola in Africa. Communist China restructured its system along the Soviet model by nationalizing all higher education institutions in the 1950s. The model remained intact during the early years of economic market reforms introduced in 1978. As the country's economic growth and transformations accelerated, structural reforms in higher education were undertaken. Universities were reorganized as control by the central ministries was eliminated.

The United States model attained even greater influence around the world. Given the sheer size and diversity of the country's higher education system, it is not easy to succinctly define what constitutes the U.S. model. It is variously encapsulated in the preeminence of the research university, the prominence given to liberal arts education, or the primacy of market values. In its contemporary incarnation it is seen as a system whose institutions have become ever more commercialized, their governance corporatized, students consumerized, knowledge production commodified, learning credentialized, and faculty casualized. It is the malleability of this model that allows its exporters and importers to project attributes, both real and imaginary, that they wish to highlight and embrace in branding and bracing themselves in the global competition for resources, reputations, and relevance.

The model manifests itself in the establishment of American-style institutions, adoption of U.S.-centered academic cultures, and performance of U.S.-institutional identities. Its spread was fostered through the creation of U.S. institutions abroad, development of outposts, satellites or branches of U.S. universities, provision of accreditation for institutions in other countries by U.S. accrediting agencies, enactment of memorandums of understanding to promote inter-institutional partnerships and collaborations, incorporation of the name 'American' by foreign institutions, the export of tens of thousands of U.S.-educated graduates, and the seductive demonstration effects of the high global rankings of U.S. universities.

The importation of the United States model also involved the appropriation and performance of the institutional structures, styles, and symbols of U.S. higher education. This included the adoption of such things as U.S. degree and semester systems. This performance also included the importation of U.S. educated teachers and materials. But the result was usually ambiguous, sometimes parody and pastiche, even confusion and contestation. One of the great ironies is that the United States model was spreading fast at the same time as the dysfunctions of U.S. higher education were becoming more apparent domestically through the escalating crises of access, affordability, and accountability.

Claims have been made that education hubs constitute a new third generation of cross-border education activities. According to this schema, the first generation involved the mobility of people, primarily students, who went for full degree or short-

term study and research; and the second, the movement of programs and providers that comprised the creation of twinning, franchised, articulated/validated, joint/double award, and online/distance programs, or the formation of branch campuses and independent institutions. The third generation activities started in earnest in the 2000s. By 2012, they were confined to a few countries, mostly in Asia-Pacific and the Middle East. The most advanced education hubs were in Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and Singapore. Qatar Education City was founded in 1998, and the United Arab Emirates established Knowledge Village in 2003 and Academic City 2 in 2007. Singapore launched its Global Schoolhouse in 2002 and 'Singapore Education' in 2003, and Korea introduced its ambitious Brain Korea 21 project in 1999.

However, serious questions remain as to whether these initiatives constitute a new and sustainable higher education model. The predominance of English as a medium of instruction, widespread use of pre-packaged mass produced curricula materials, and preponderance of vocational programs, part-time faculty, and commercial values seem to suggest that these often sequestered university cities, clusters, or centers more often than not serve as glorified export zones for hegemonic Western institutions that are so assiduously courted, rather than as harbingers of a brave new world of higher education innovation and transformation.

The third feature of internationalization centers on the growth of international collaboration in research and publications. The trend was reinforced by the centrality accorded to research in rankings, in which the international impact and visibility of publications mattered greatly. Bibliometric studies showed that publications with authors from multiple countries had far higher rates of citation than domestic or single-country ones. The percentage of co-authored articles doubled between the early 1970s and early 1990s, and increased from 17% in 1981 to 29% in 1995. Further reinforcing international collaboration was the growing importance accorded to interdisciplinary scholarship and learning. It was also facilitated by the increased opportunities for interaction provided by the new information technologies.

All this led to what some have termed the emergence of 'global science,' a new geography of collaborative scientific knowledge production, which reflected "new global agencies, new global problems and an enhanced global network of science communicating practice."<sup>2</sup> Among the big global issues that attracted international collaboration were HIV/AIDS and other global epidemics, ecological issues including global warming, and vast scientific projects from building particle collider to mapping the genome to the brain project to international space exploration.

This was accompanied by the creation of multinational research facilities and projects in various world regions, although international research collaboration reproduced the uneven patterns of access to education and knowledge production evident in domestic settings. International collaboration also reflected and reinforced differences among disciplines in so far as research collaborations were more highly valued and less sensitive to undertake in the STEM fields as compared to many of the social science and humanities disciplines, notwithstanding differences among the STEM fields themselves. Equally pervasive and persistent were gender disparities despite the massive changes in women's higher education enrolments. Women's lower level of participation can be attributed to various factors including unequal gendered patterns of family obligations and pervasive 'glass fences' of academia embedded in institutional cultures in which teaching and service assignments, disciplinary orientations, and research resources and expectations were gendered.

No less critical were the patterns of international collaboration between scholars from different regions, as well as within the intra-regional hierarchies of national power

and institutional prestige. By the mid-2010s, the position of many regions, sub-regions, and countries in the Global South as centers of knowledge production remained precarious. However, changes were taking place in the global knowledge economy. While the United States and Europe continued to be dominant, Asia rose to become a major player and other major emerging economies increased investment in their knowledge systems. North America's share of global research and development (R&D) declined from 37.9% in 1994 to 28.9% in 2013, while Europe's fell from 31.4% to 22.7% during the same period. In the meantime, it rose for Asia from 26.6% to 42.2%, and to a much smaller extent for Latin America and the Caribbean from 1.9% to 3.5%, and for Africa from 0.9% to 1.3%.

The proportions of the developed countries in the growth and distribution of researchers and publications also fell relative to the emerging economies, especially China. In terms of researchers per a million inhabitants, Africa had 169, compared to 786 in Asia, 416 Latin America, and 3219 for Europe and 4034 for North America. China more than doubled its share of world publications from 9.9 % in 2008 to 20.2 % in 2014. Asia as a whole raised its share from 24.2% in 2002 to 39.5% in 2014. For North America the decline was from 34.2% to 28.6%, and for Europe 45.5 % to 39.3% between 2002 and 2014. Thus, Asia emerged as the global leader both in the volume of knowledge production and number of researchers, while Africa remained at the bottom on all indicators. In 2013 Africa's share of world researchers was a mere 2.3%. In 2014, Africa claimed 2.6% of world scholarly publications.

But Africa enjoyed one dubious distinction. In 2014, 64.6% of publications by African authors were with international authors, up from 52.3% in 2008, compared to 23.7% to 26.1% for Asia, 34.8% to 42.1% for Europe, and 29.7% to 38.2% for the Americas. In nearly 30 African countries authors published more than 90% of their articles in collaboration with other countries, especially the USA, France and the United Kingdom. Clearly, African academic knowledge systems, like its economies, suffer from limited regional integration and high levels of external dependency.

### **Divergent and Shifting Regional Interests**

The dynamics and implications of internationalization varied quite considerably among different regions and countries depending on the history and structure of their higher education systems, national and institutional resources, and their respective geopolitical locations and aspirations. Reports by the International Association of Universities clearly show divergent regional perceptions of the rationales and risks of internationalization. A 2010 global survey by the IAU survey showed the leading rationales were, at a world level, to (1) 'improve student preparedness' (30%); (2) 'internationalize curriculum' (17%); (3) 'enhance international profile' (15%); (4) 'enhance research and knowledge production' (15%); and (5) 'broaden and diversify source of students' (9%). Similarly divergent were perceptions of the risks of internationalization. The top three threats worldwide were seen to be 'commodification of education programs' (12%), 'brain drain' (10%), and 'increase in number of degree mills' (9%).

IAU's 2013 survey of 1,336 institutions in 131 countries underscored growing commitment to internationalization. But the survey also revealed interesting regional differences. In terms of benefits, in Asia and Pacific and North America the top ranked institutional benefit was students' increased international awareness; in Europe and the Middle East it was improved quality of teaching and learning; for African respondents, strengthened knowledge production capacity; and in Latin America and the Caribbean



increased networking of faculty and researchers. As for risks, respondents in all regions except Europe ranked unequal international opportunities for students based on the possession of financial resources as the most important. Respondents in Africa and the Middle East considered brain drain the second most important risk; in Asia and the Pacific both excessive competition among higher education institutions and over-emphasis on internationalization at the expense of other priorities were ranked second; and in North American it was too much focus on recruitment of international fee-paying undergraduates.

Societal risks of internationalization were also perceived differently. Commodification and commercialization of education was the top risk in all regions save for Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean, where the unequal sharing of benefits of internationalization was ranked first. In the Middle East the risk of brain drain was on top. The second most important societal risk for African respondents was the dominance of a 'western' epistemological approach, while in the Middle East it was the loss of cultural identity, and in Asia and Pacific it was the increase in foreign 'degree mills' and/or low quality providers. Thus, for African universities and academics the decolonization of scholarly knowledges remains a pressing issue.<sup>3</sup>

As the cycle of late 20<sup>th</sup> century globalization recedes into angry and populist nationalisms, higher education internationalization faces increasing challenges. The most well-known examples of the anti-globalization wave are represented by Brexit in the UK and the rise of Trump in the US. The resurgence of xenophobic nationalism in these countries, which were previously the loudest champions and major beneficiaries of free-market global capitalism, reflects the chickens of neo-liberal globalization coming home to roost. It is a product of deepening and widening inequalities that have left growing segments among the white working and middle classes fearful and feeling disempowered. The dangerous brew of racism and nativism has fueled the rise of conservative jingoistic parties and moved the political pendulum rightward.

Universities are feeling the heat and internationalization appears in retreat. A report released a few months after Brexit showed that prospective students were reconsidering whether to study in Britain, and other countries, such as Canada, would benefit.<sup>4</sup> Universities in Britain and the European Union fear that the intricate ties of collaboration comprising student and faculty exchanges and joint research projects woven over decades of partnership will unravel after Brexit. At a conference in May 2017 convened by the British Council, *Going Global 2017*, "delegates were told that there are 5,000 research collaborations between the United Kingdom and France currently being funded by European Union money under Horizon 2020, the EU research program, at any one time – and they are all at risk."<sup>5</sup>

In the United States, one of the first acts by the new Trump Administration was the imposition of a ban on travelers from predominantly Muslim countries. This sent shockwaves across the country and among higher education institutions. A report published by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* a few days after the elections in November 2016 registered the concerns and worries among university administrators and academics about the impact of the incoming Trump Administration on "colleges' finances, international-student enrollment, the protection of students' civil rights, campus unrest, and other issues."<sup>6</sup> The latter included regulatory controls over sexual assault and affirmative action, and relief for for-profit colleges.

As several commentators noted, Trump appealed to less-educated white Americans and his populist agenda represented a repudiation of the elitist, liberal, and internationalist values of higher education. They variously called for reaffirmation of those values, introspection and abandonment of higher education's self-absorption,

renewed vigilance, creativity, and active resistance. In imminent danger, several warned, were undocumented students and students from majority-Muslim countries. Even before Trump's election, a survey of more than 40,000 prospective students in 118 countries, revealed 60% would be less likely to study in the United States if Trump was elected president.<sup>7</sup>

A report released in March 2017, showed that nearly one in three was reluctant to study in the United States, 69% cited the Trump presidency as the reason. These sentiments were expressed in some of the major markets, such as India where 43% showed less interest, second to Canada at 51%.<sup>8</sup> The latter stood to benefit greatly from the American debacle as its universities reported surges in applications and enrolments of international students while their US counterparts faced declines.<sup>9</sup> American universities responded to the travel bans and souring climate for internationalism in various ways, including efforts to create sanctuaries for undocumented students, refusal to release confidential records of international students, as well as enjoining legal cases, and redoubling efforts to recruit and reassure international students; at one university three professors even went on hunger strike.<sup>10</sup>

## **Conclusion**

What do these trends portend for Africa? African universities suffer from both too much and too little internationalization. Too much because they are modeled on the higher education systems of the Global North and many have yet to fully decolonize themselves in their structures, processes, governance, and curricula. As noted earlier, African academics remain excessively extraverted as they borrow methodological and theoretical perspectives, paradigms, and problems and seek intellectual legitimation from the Global North. But African universities exhibit too little internationalization in the composition of their faculty, students, and administrators. In some countries, many of new regional universities are no better than ethnic enclaves of dubious academic quality. Also, African universities are largely not globally competitive as evident in international rankings, whatever one may think of the validity of such rankings.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, African universities are far less integrated regionally and continue to serve as peripheries in the unequal international division of academic labor. Contemporary forms of internationalization represent what has been called 'global coloniality', that is, "the reproduction of coloniality on a global scale under neoliberal values and principles of education." The marginalized subjects of 'global coloniality' are implored to engage in 'epistemic disobedience and delinking' through relentless questioning, dismantling, unlearning, and inventing "decolonial categories of thought that will allow building non-capitalist and imperial values and subjectivities."<sup>12</sup> Part of the struggle has to be waged through efforts to strengthen South-South and intraregional partnerships and diasporic knowledge networks, and promoting education for integrated, inclusive, and innovative sustainable development.

The rise of xenophobic nationalisms in some of the major destination countries for international students and academics, such as the United Kingdom, United States, and many others in the European Union and elsewhere, offers African universities unique opportunities to transform themselves into viable centers in global higher education. As key countries in the Global North become increasingly inhospitable to international academic flows and engagements, African universities should seek to attract some of the best or wealthy African students that flock to these countries. Also, they should strive to appeal to students from other regions of the Global unable or unwilling to go to the Global North. Finally, efforts should be redoubled to draw

African Diasporas in the Global North seeking respite from the growing specter of racism emboldened by the rise to power or the rightward drift of ruling parties wedded to anti-white and anti-immigration racism and bigotry. The role of the Carnegie African Diaspora Fellowship Program, which I lead, and its expected expansion into a consortium to bring 1,000 diaspora academics each year for ten years to African universities points to the immense opportunities of the Diaspora option.<sup>13</sup>

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Much of the analysis and data, unless stated otherwise, is derived from my book, *The Transformation of Global Higher Education, 1945-2015* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), Chapter 4.

<sup>2</sup> Michael Peters, "The Rise of Global Science and the Emerging Political Economy of International Research Collaborations." *European Journal of Education* 41, 2: (2006): 226.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Tiyambe Zeleza, "The Decolonization of African Knowledges," 9<sup>th</sup> Africa Day Lecture, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa, May 24, 2017.

<sup>4</sup> Karin Fischer, "How Britain's Brexit Could Benefit Universities Elsewhere," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 1, 2016. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Britain-s-Brexit-Could/237317>.

<sup>5</sup> Brendan O'Malley, "Universities set on building new bridges post-Brexit," *World University News*, May 26, 2017. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20170526214631649>.

<sup>6</sup> The Chronicle of Higher Education Focus, *How Trump Could Change Higher Ed*, November 11, 2016. [http://www.chronicle.com/items/biz/resource/ChronFocus\\_Trumpv2\\_i.pdf](http://www.chronicle.com/items/biz/resource/ChronFocus_Trumpv2_i.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Karin Fischer, "A Trump Presidency Could Keep Some International Studies Away," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 1, 2016. Available at: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Trump-Presidency-Could-Keep/236662>.

<sup>8</sup> Vimal Patel, "Prospective International Students Show New Reluctance to Study in the U.S." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 13, 2017. Available at <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Prospective-International/239468>.

<sup>9</sup> Elizabeth Redden, "Canada's Moment," *Inside Higher Education*, March 20, 2017. Available at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/03/20/canadian-universities-post-large-gains-international-applications>; Craig S Smith, "Canadian Colleges See Surge of Foreign Students. It's Not Just Politics," *New York Times*, May 19, 2017.

<sup>10</sup> Lindsay Mackenzie, "3 Professors Are Fasting to Protest Their University's 'Silence' on the Travel Ban," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 7, 2017. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/3-Professors-Are-Fasting-to/239133>; also see, Goldie Blumenstyk, "Universities Spoke Up in Case That Led to Ruling Halting Trump's Travel Ban," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 5, 2017. Available at: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Universities-Spoke-Up-in-Case/239128>.

<sup>11</sup> I discuss the debates about international rankings in the chapter from which this section is drawn. African universities do not feature well in three best globally recognized rankings. In *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, only two African universities appear in the top 200 global universities, namely, the University of Cape Town at 148, and the University of Witwatersrand at 184, another 3 in the 401-600 range, 4 in the 601-800 range, and 15 in the 801-980 range. In the *QS World University Rankings*, the University of Cape Town appeared in the top 200, University of Witwatersrand at 359, and another 14 in the top 980. In the *U.S. News and World Report 2017 Best Global Universities Rankings*, the University of Cape Town was in the top 200 at 112, the University of Witwatersrand at 222, and another 19 in the top 1000.

<sup>12</sup> Walter Mignolo, "Globalization and the Geopolitics of Knowledge." In *The American-Style University at Large: Transplants, Outposts, and the Globalization of Higher Education*, edited by Kathryn L. Kleypas and James I. McDougal, (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books 2012) 3-40.

<sup>13</sup> Karen MacGregor, "African academic diaspora mobilization scales up," *University World News*, May 24, 2017. Available at [https://www.universityworldnews.com/l.php?ID=1999951d433f88cfbdc815abdcc5be8\\_970abefd95ba501a47518bbc957c143f](https://www.universityworldnews.com/l.php?ID=1999951d433f88cfbdc815abdcc5be8_970abefd95ba501a47518bbc957c143f)