CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

Salient Issues in the Internationalization of Higher Education in The Global South

Concluding Observations

JULIET THONDHLANA, EVEYLYN C. GARWE, AND HANS DE WIT

INTRODUCTION

This concluding chapter uses a cross-case analysis of the twenty-four countries explored in this handbook to crystalize emerging issues and provide a comprehensive typology for Internationalization of Higher Education (IHE) in the the four regions: Global South (Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), North Africa and the Middle East (MENA), Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). This will go a long way in building upon the current National Tertiary Education Internationalization Strategies and Policies (NTEISP) typology described by de Wit et al. (see Chapter 3, this volume). This is in response to: (i) the clarion call for institutions, nations, and regions to position IHE strategically in order to derive its full benefits; (ii) the need for an analysis and typology for IHE inclusive of the hitherto "silent" contexts/nations of the Global South considering the diverse backgrounds, rationales, approaches, and priorities that would feed into policy formulation and strategy development for implementation, and (iii) the need to identify new directions for internationalization.

As observed by Hegarty (2013: 931), "Producing a handbook in any domain of education is an ambitious task." Certainly, doing so in internationalization of higher education with its dynamic nature, contestations, multiple frames of reference, and more so in the context of the Global South with its diverse and conflicting geo-political, conceptual, historical, and socio-economic terrains and dynamics is a complex endeavor. This handbook explores practices and also provides an IHE "mapping" of a selection of countries from each of the main Global South regions that can act as a key reference and starting point for information, argument, and inspiration for further work on this broad context. It provides an overview of policies, understandings, approaches, practices, and trends in diverse countries, some of which not much is known. In doing so it also presents

a general cross-cutting picture of the internationalization of higher education in the Global South, touching on what is already known about the field, vastly different situations, and also rich more nuanced accounts of specific contexts. These include perspectives about what has been achieved to date as well as some clarity and insights into what is yet to be done through identifying particular specificities, current weaknesses, knowledge gaps, and tensions needing to be addressed and offering recommendations for potentially productive pathways for future direction.

One preliminary observation has to be made. This handbook was written before the Covid-19 crisis hit the world and higher education. The crisis placed all international dimensions of higher education at the forefront: international students, study abroad for credits, international partnerships and networks, international collaboration in research, internationalization for society, collaborative online international learning, and internationalization at home. The crisis demonstrates the risks and challenges related to internationalization abroad, but also provides new direction and opportunities for internationalization at home in teaching and learning and in research. Given that internationalization abroad over the past decades has had mainly a South to North direction, the challenges and potential implications for the North are manifest. The dependence on international students from the South is at serious risk and will have major financial and human capital implications for countries and their institutions of higher education in the North. The crisis will for sure also have serious financial implications for higher education in the South. But it also creates opportunities for higher education in the South, as it has been less dependent on international student revenue and study abroad, allowing a focus on internationalization at home and collaborative online international learning, as well as developing its own paradigms.

At the time of writing this concluding chapter, it is too early to predict all the implications of Covid-19 for internationalization of higher education, but in our view this handbook and the concluding remarks in this chapter will provide a good foundation for the internationalization of higher education in the Global South, post Covid-19 crisis.

KEY EMERGING ISSUES

Internationalization of higher education has taken root in the Global South with all the case countries exhibiting active engagement with the outside world, albeit in varying degrees. IHE has further diversified as evidenced by a noticeable global shift from largely looking North to increasingly looking South. This finding is consistent with contemporary literature which highlights the increasing importance by countries in the Global South as sources of knowledge and manpower development largely for fellow developing countries, thereby effectively taking over this role from the developed world (Cross, Mhlanga, and Ojo, 2011). Welch (Chapter 11, this volume) uses the example of Confucianism to argue that this signifies a renaissance, wherein contexts such as the Arab world, India, and China are bouncing back to their former glory as economic giants featuring centers of excellence in education, thereby attracting students and staff from across the globe. To buttress this point, Welsh uses the fact that currently over 60 of the top 500 global research universities are in the East, according to the 2019 league tables by the Academic Ranking of World Universities.

Cognizant of the perceived (or real) uneven playing field in the global internationalization arena, Abdulrahman et al. (Chapter 35, this volume) argue that a cautious (decolonial) approach to IHE in the Global South, particularly in Africa, is critical as opposed to the

current attempts to play the catch-up game of importing foreign language, ideas, culture, and supposedly superior standards and forms of existence. The authors recommend that "horizontal internationalization" (connection of Global South nations with each other) should take precedence over "vertical internationalization" (interactions with countries in the Global North). If this accession holds true, then the contestations against the "look East" policy as an exemplar might appear as an enigma. African internationalization scholars have questioned the motives behind the shift to the East, perceiving it as another unwelcome "scramble for Africa" by emerging players with the potential to erode the capacities of local institutions. However, we view this as a clear indication of vigilance against what Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) refers to as the trap of normalizing and universalizing coloniality as a natural state of the world.

In the context of LAC, the Caribbean colonialism, in particular, is blamed for the fragmentation of the region into many small countries, and internationalization of higher education is seen as a viable tool for the much needed integrating the sub-region needs for sustainable development. The Global South thus generally views regionalization as a critical "subset of internationalization" (Sehoole and De Wit, 2014: 223), all regions conforming to Ndlovu-Gatsheni's (2018) "horizontal first" approach. This is evident from the way all the four regions in the Global South highlighted the importance of regional cooperation and exchange, to strengthen their regional higher education space. In Asia-Pacific for example, the introduction of branch campuses, regional university agreements, and networks supported by quality assurance frameworks have resulted in quality research as well as teaching and learning and a surge in intra-regional student mobility. This emerging drive towards strengthening intra-regional collaboration and harmonization of higher education systems is consistent with the developments in the Global North. The LAC region has also exhibited a growing intra-regional focus in addition to inter-regional internationalization.

In a bid to facilitate IHE, most countries in the Global South have adopted and promoted the use of English (and in some regions, e.g., SSA, LAC, MENA, also German, Spanish, Italian, French, Portuguese, Arabic, Turkish, Persian) as the main or alternative language of instruction, instead of resisting it as would have been consistent with the de-colonization drive. In addition to promoting student and staff mobility, the use of English and other foreign languages enhances international collaboration in teaching and research.

There is unanimity amongst all case countries in embracing a strategic approach to IHE because of its critical importance in advancing knowledge-based societies and for sustainable national development. Despite this awareness for developing and implementing harmonized national and institutional policies and strategies, very few of the case countries have these national policies in place. Many of the countries still approach IHE in a piecemeal, un-coordinated, and ad hoc way. Issues of colonial histories, economic problems, political turmoil, civil strife, and other local challenges result in resistance towards an ostensible "international" foreign perspective that perpetuates tensions between indigenization and globalization. To mitigate the potential harmful effects of internationalization, countries are in agreement that there should be a balanced interplay amongst issues of globalization, regionalization (e.g., Emiritization; Africanization), and nationalization. In addition, issues of decolonization, deracialization, and de-imperialization are necessary for healthy international interdependence and mutual respect of sovereign nations. This is an important issue in the context of debates and discourses of "global coloniality" and the continuity of the "colonial power matrix" and

decolonization as an unfinished project (Quijano, 2000; Grosfoguel, 2007). De Wit (Dell, 2019) formulates it as follows for the African context:

> Africanisation should not be seen as opposite to internationalization but as two sides of the same coin. Exclusive focus on Africanisation would mean isolation while exclusive internationalization would imply ongoing dependency and copying of Western approaches to internationalization, not embedded in the local context.

NTEISP TYPOLOGY FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

We used the data from the twenty-four case countries in the four regions of the Global South explored in this handbook to populate the NTEISP framework, explained in Chapter 3 of this handbook. In superimposing and benchmarking the data against the NTEISP, we are aware that the handbook did not set out to provide a typology of IHE as described by De Wit et al (Chapter 3, this volume). In addition to a common general outline, our approach enabled each region and each case country to take a unique and specific focus rather than attempting to include every aspect of IHE. Given that all cases purposely included information on IHE with respect to understandings, agendas, challenges, strategies, theoretical and methodological developments, processes, as well as policy developments at national and institutional levels, it became possible to use the NTEISP framework. This typology provides a helpful framework for thinking about productive future directions for IHE in the Global South and its inevitable interaction with IHE in the Global North. Table 36.1 shows the mapping of national internationalization strategies for the Global South.

The salient findings from the IHE mapping exercise in the Global South case countries are discussed below.

TRENDS FROM GLOBAL SOUTH COUNTRIES IN THE PREVIOUS NTEISP TYPOLOGY STUDY

Eight of the twelve countries that were included in the NTEISP typology by de Wit et al. (Chapter 3, this volume) and also formed part of this analysis are Brazil, Egypt, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, South Africa, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, and India. It is interesting to note that most of these countries have already moved on from their previous statuses. This finding may be attributed to the power of information dissemination in helping nations to make informed decisions on issues critical to national growth; for example, Ethiopia previously had no explicit focus on internationalization but this has since changed and the country now has a stand-alone policy for internationalization, as reported by Tamrat in Chapter 29 of this handbook entitled "Internationalization of higher education in Ethiopia: From a fragmented dispensation to a cohesive path." In addition, the role of government/ministries and higher education institutions in IHE is stronger than before. In terms of priority action lines, the country now has a stronger focus on: program and/or institutional mobility; research and publications collaboration; internationalization and information technology; and financing of internationalization. Even for countries like Brazil, Malaysia, South Africa, and India that already explicitly focus on internationalization, there has been positive movement towards a stronger focus on the existing IHE action lines

TABLE 36.1 Mapping national internationalization strategies for the Global South

	Global South region and case countries																								
	Asia-Pacific						*Latin America and the Caribbean*					*North Africa and the Middle East*							*Sub-Saharan Africa*						
Policy characteristics	*China*	*Japan*	*Korea*	*Kazakhstan*	*Malaysia*	*India*	*Brazil*	*Caribbean*	*Chile*	*Colombia*	*Mexico*	*GCC region*	*Jordan*	*Libya*	*Morocco*	*Egypt*	*Tunisia*	*Palestine*	*Ethiopia*	*South Africa*	*Zimbabwe*	*Ghana*	*Kenya*	*Nigeria*
Approaches to policy articulation																									
• Implicit focus on IHE																						x	x	x	
• Explicit focus on IHE	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x		xx	x	x	x				
		x	x				x		x			x	x	x		x			x	x	x				
Approaches to policy formulation																									
• Stand-alone policy for IHE	xx	x	x		x		x													x	x				
		x	x		x		x													x	x				
• IHE policy embedded in a broader policy				x	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x			
								x	x							x	x				x				
Key actors																									
• National governments/ministries	xx	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x			
		x					x		x							x	x		x	x					
• Non- or quasi-governmental actors							x	x		x	x	x	x			x		x	x	x	x				
																					x				
• Higher education institutions	xx	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	xx		x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	x	xx	
		x		x			x	x					x			x	x		x	x	x		x		
• International organizations	x	x		x	x		x	x						x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
																	x								

Geographic priorities																								
• Explicit geographic focal points	x	x			x	x	x	x				x				x		x	x		x			
Priority action lines																								
• Incoming student mobility	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x			
		x	x		x	x						x				x	x		x	x				
• Outgoing student mobility	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	x	xx
		x	x		x	x	x		x			x			x	x	x		x	x	x		x	
• Incoming academic staff/faculty mobility	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
			x													x	x		x	x		x		
• Outgoing academic staff/faculty mobility	xx	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x		xx	x	x	x	x	x	x
			x				x									x			x	x	x	x		
• Visa and immigration processes																		x			x			
• International student/faculty services	x	x						x			x	x				x		x		x		x	x	
												x												
Priority action lines																								
• Program and/or institutional mobility (includes cross-border and transnational education, educational hubs, international branch campuses, joint and dual degrees, online delivery)	x	x		x	x	xx	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	x	x					x		x			x				x	x		x					
• Research and publications collaboration	x	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	x	x					x		x		x					x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
• Joint doctoral supervision	x						x	x	x							x	x	x					x	x
	x																x							
• Partnerships, networks, and consortia	x	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	x	x					x	x				x	x			x	x	x			x			

TABLE 36.1 Continued

	Global South region and case countries																								
	Asia-Pacific						*Latin America and the Caribbean*					*North Africa and the Middle East*							*Sub-Saharan Africa*						
Policy characteristics	*China*	*Japan*	*Korea*	*Kazakhstan*	*Malaysia*	*India*	*Brazil*	*Caribbean*	*Chile*	*Colombia*	*Mexico*	*GCC region*	*Jordan*	*Libya*	*Morocco*	*Egypt*	*Tunisia*	*Palestine*	*Ethiopia*	*South Africa*	*Zimbabwe*	*Ghana*	*Kenya*	*Nigeria*
• Internationalization of the curriculum		x x	x					x	x		x	x								x	x	x		x
• Internationalization at home		x x	x					x x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x			
• Promoting teaching in non-local languages		x x	x x	x x	x		x	x x	x x				x x	x x	x x	x x		x x	x x	x					
• Requiring or encouraging foreign language study or proficiency		x x	x x	x x	x		x	x x	x x				x x	x x	x x	x x		x x	x x	x					
• Leveraging diaspora and/or returnees		x x		x x	x x	x				x	x								x			x			
• Enhancing quality and/or aspiring to international quality standards		x x	x x	x x				x x		x x		x x					x	x	x	x	x				x
• Aiming to develop world-class universities		x x						x x				x						x			x	x	x		
• *Internationalization training*		*x*	*x*						*x*				*x*												
• *Internationalization and the role of ICTs*		*xx*									*xx*			*xx*	*xx*		*xx*	*xx*	*xx*						

• *Intercultural competence*	*xx*	*xx*	*x*	*x*	*xx*	*x*	x	*xx*	x		*x*	
• *Decolonization*										*xx*	*xx*	*x*

* *Note: An "xx" designation denotes that this specific policy characteristic is especially "strong" or evident in the particular NTEISP or national context.*

** *Note: The shaded areas in italics indicate emerging priority action lines that were added to the NTEISP typology by de Wit et al., Chapter 3 of this handbook.-*

including adopting new activities. This further buttresses Crăciun's (2018) assertion that, when governments strategically position IHE at national level in the form of cohesive policies, IHE activities and outcomes will be enhanced at institutional, national, regional, and international levels.

Approaches to Policy Articulation and Policy Formulation

Of the twenty-four case countries, twenty (excluding Palestine, Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria) have explicit IHE policies. The quest to enhance the quality of higher education for national development and global competitiveness features among the reasons for developing and implementing the IHE policies. Six of these twenty countries have a stand-alone IHE policy while the other fourteen have it embedded in broader education policies. The four countries without explicit IHE policies cite political instability, socio-economic challenges, and civil unrest as the major reasons for this state of affairs. In the case of Nigeria, Oyewole (Chapter 34, this volume) concedes that: "Nigeria has one of the largest higher education systems in Africa with over 800 tertiary institutions. . . . Nigeria is therefore expected to be a model of internationalization in the continent. Unfortunately, the level of internationalization in Nigeria's institutions is rather low. . . . As of today, there is no national framework for internationalization of higher education in Nigeria."

For Ghana, Gyamera (Chapter 32, this volume) notes: "Until November, 2018, Ghana had no comprehensive national policy on Higher Education. Subsequently, there was no comprehensive national policy on International Higher Education (IHE) to regulate and direct internationalization. . . . In 2019, a comprehensive Higher Education policy, developed in 2018, was launched . . . but did not transcend into a comprehensive policy on international education."

Oanda (Chapter 33, this volume) reports "the lack of a coherent national government policy to moderate institutional practices to the advantage of Kenya in a context where the commercial and political imperatives of internationalization would be the overriding motivation from external partners."

Key Actors

National governments are leading actors for IHE with the exception of Korea, the Caribbean, Palestine, and Nigeria in all countries. In all countries higher education institutions are strong actors although in countries where policies do not exist or where policy coordination is weak, some higher education institutions are doing much more than others. While in ten of the countries non- or quasi-governmental actors are indicated to play a role in IHE, only Zimbabwe mentions these to play a critical role, citing the key role played by the Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE—a national quality assurance agency) and its international partners in the development and implementation of the internationalization of higher and tertiary education policy framework. Garwe et al. (Chapter 31, this volume) note:

> In this regard the role of a respected, trusted, as well as strategically positioned body such as ZIMCHE, in terms of its overseeing mandate of HEIs and its links with the responsible Ministry as well as other related sectors, has been critical for success. ZIMCHE has been able to access HEIs in the scoping sample, interview high-profile staff, and mobilize HEIs to productively participate in the project.

Similarly, in fourteen of the countries international organizations play a role in IHE with only Tunisia mentioning them as strong players.

Geographical Focus Points

Ten of the twenty-four countries (China, Japan, Malaysia, India, Brazil, Caribbean, GCC region, Egypt, Ethiopia, and Zimbabwe) indicated that they provide explicit geographical focus points with a growing South–South trend in addition to the traditional South–North orientation. The absence of mention of explicit geographical focus points by the other fourteen countries does not necessarily indicate that these are not in existence. It might point to the fact that, as earlier indicated, this handbook did not deliberately set out to provide a "common" typology of IHE, hence authors might simply not have prioritized the mentioning of this particular issue.

Mobility of Staff and Students

Almost all countries have a strong focus on outgoing mobility whilst the focus on incoming mobility is emerging but stronger in Asia-Pacific countries (China, Japan, Korea, India, and Malaysia) as well as in South Africa, GCC Region (Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates (UAE), and Qatar), Ethiopia, Egypt, and Tunisia. Destinations that are attractive to students and academics include: China, Japan, Korea, India, and Malaysia, which are seen as emerging economic giants; and Egypt and Tunisia, due to their geographical positioning close to Europe. In addition to economic stability, deliberate policies to attract students and staff explain the emergence of South Africa as a major destination for regional/international students and academics/faculty.

The majority of IHE strategies in the case countries focus on student mobility, with limited focus on academic/faculty mobility. Program and/or institutional mobility was quite strong in China, Japan, India, GCC region, Egypt, Tunisia, and Ethiopia with emerging presence in Malaysia, Chile, Mexico, Jordan, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Kenya, and Nigeria.

Partnerships and Collaborations

Partnerships in teaching and learning, as well as in research and publications collaboration, were evident in almost all countries except probably in the few that did not mention them by omission. Partnerships and collaborations were mentioned in the form of memoranda of understanding/agreement as well as South–South and South–North networks and consortia. In the case of Egypt, for example, largely because of its strategic positioning in relation to Europe, Asia, Africa, etc., it:

> is actively participating in such international organizations and programs as: UNESCO; OECD; USAID and Fulbright; TEMPUS; Erasmus Mundus and Erasmus+; DAAD of Germany; British Council UK; JAICA of Japan; the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization—ALECSO; the Islamic States Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—ISESCO; and the Africa–EU strategic partnership, Tuning Africa. . . . Egypt has also established "bilateral cooperation with universities in the EU countries, Arab world, Africa, USA, Canada, countries in Asia and all over the world" and its universities are members of several regional and international networks, including the Association of Arab Universities and the Universities of the Mediterranean.
>
> —Bekele and Ibrahim, Chapter 24, this volume

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM

Internationalization at home and of the curriculum is rather limited across all regions with ten of the twenty-four case countries making mention of it mostly by indicating awareness of the need to internationalize the curriculum. There is however no clarity whether this translates into actual understanding and practice of internationalizing the curriculum. This point notwithstanding, China has a strong focus on internationalizing its curriculum. As Han and Shen (Chapter 5, this volume) note: "Higher Education Institutions in China have gradually revised their curriculum design, adopting English as the teaching language to help students become competitive globally." But primarily focusing on the use of English as the teaching language is a very limited form of internationalizing the curriculum, even to the extent that it might be counter-productive from a Global South perspective.

ISSUES ADDED TO THE NTEISP TYPOLOGY

The additional issues emerging from the mapping exercise that were not in the NTEISP framework described by De Wit et al. (Chapter 3, this volume) are internationalization training, internationalization and the role of ICT, intercultural competence, and decolonization. These are discussed below.

Intercultural Competence

All chapters show an awareness of the importance of the intercultural aspect in internationalization of higher education. Indeed, the key definitions of internationalization cited by the authors position the intercultural dimension as being criterial to internationalization, thereby underscoring the critical need to pay attention to intercultural competence for all stakeholders, particularly students, to realize genuine internationalization experiences. Yet the complexity of this key aspect is often neglected and, as is highlighted in the Malaysia chapter:

> The common assumption is that. . . . students acquire intercultural and international competencies naturally if they study or complete their internship abroad or take part in an international class (Knight, 2011). In reality, it is more complicated. International students can completely seclude themselves from sharing experiences with other students and other sections of the population. As research findings have shown, some international students do not integrate easily and are inclined to seek the company of their compatriots. Students also tend to seclude themselves from sharing experiences with other sections of the population and therefore exclude themselves from the culture.
>
> —Azman and Da Wan, Chapter 9, this volume

The chapter further notes how lecturers experience difficulties building on their students' cultural diversity and knowledge to create an environment conducive for knowledge exchange and international experience. In addition, policymakers and institutions do not evidence intercultural competence/internationalization foci in their curricula.

Internationalization Training

Given the challenges of gaining intercultural competencies raised above, the issues of strengthening the capacities of academics and students were highlighted in four chapters.

We found this to be an important aspect of internationalization and quality assurance (De Wit and Knight, 1999). Gacel-Ávila (Chapter 12, this volume) sees the training of teachers as "a strategic imperative to promote relevant and quality learning in the twenty-first century . . . to offer students an education that enables them as competent citizens and professionals, involved in the development of their communities, country, and the world at large . . . which in turn require substantive transformations in the ways and means of teaching, learning and training." In addition, is the issue of training for mobility to prepare students for a productive and successful international academic experience.

Decolonization

Much of the Global South has had a colonial experience with some contexts among our cases such as South Africa and Zimbabwe having emerged from colonial rule more recently. It is perhaps not surprising that the issue of decolonization strongly features in SSA chapters while it is hinted at in some LAC (specifically the Caribbean) chapters. The knotty issue here is on the role of internationalization in the reintegration of a sub-region torn apart by colonialism. Notwithstanding, the issue of decoloniality and related coloniality is increasingly being debated in the context of internationalization as issues of knowledge ownership, production, distribution, and related topics are debated. These issues are important in the context of debates and discourses of "global coloniality" and the continuity of the "colonial power matrix" and decolonization as an unfinished project (Quijano, 2000; Grosfoguel, 2007). The concluding chapter of the SSA region aptly summarizes the critical need to pay attention to these debates in the process of internationalizing universities in the Global South, and Africa in particular:

> While in many ways globalization can make access and collaborations easier, in other ways existing inequalities can also be reinforced with new barriers erected. Models of internationalization moving forward must take into cognizance the globalization context within which internationalization processes are being developed and within which they invariably exist—with many universities in the so-called "Global South" still playing "catch-up" in a game where the rules are set by others and are constantly shifting; and where they are constantly trying to conform to Western performative ideals.
>
> —Abdulrahman et al., Chapter 35, this volume

Some of the chapters such as the Zimbabwe and Ghana ones see internationalization as having a transformational aspect, which gives it some decolonial effects especially with curriculum redesign and indigenization. This is the greatest strength and possibility that internationalization presents when viewed as a decolonial project, a task which is not easy because the role of many African universities in the global knowledge economy is precarious at best. In addition to the many structural and systemic challenges that they have to deal with, they also must contend with the other complexities of internationalization.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Internationalization and information technology was specifically noted by some of the chapters as being critical to make internationalization work, partly for obvious reasons of distance learning, which is a focus for some universities, but also as a strategy to facilitate

internationalization in strife-torn, crises contexts such as Libya which makes them unattractive to students and academics, and also where outbound traveling may be a challenge. Certainly the current threat of Covid-19 to mobility as we have come to know it has brought virtual mobility and the role of technology to the fore if IHE is to maintain its gains so far and develop into the future.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

This handbook focused on a wide range of contexts from the four Global South regions, namely: Sub-Saharan Africa, North Africa and the Middle East, Asia Pacific, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The handbook has contributed in furthering our understanding of the developments, trends, and complexities of internationalization in the Global South. Some of the chapters provide cutting-edge knowledge of IHE and suggestively point to future developments by highlighting both challenges to overcome and pathways to follow. While inevitably a handbook of this nature can only focus on selected countries in each region, the cases were carefully selected to be representative of the regions at large. In addition, cross-cutting chapters providing more wide-ranging information on the regions presented. This creates possibilities for intra-regional and inter-regional comparisons as well as comparisons with the Global North in a way that enables a more holistic understanding of IHE. The handbook thus lays the groundwork for future research to develop the topic further given the constant and rapid changes in the contemporary environment that requires our understandings of IHE to be "emergent, contingent and necessarily situated" (Trahar, Green, de Wit, and Whitsed, 2015: 36).

The findings of the cross-country analysis of twenty-four different Global South contexts reveal a generalizable trend towards a strategic approach in defining IHE policies at national and at institutional levels to refocus IHE "from the periphery to centre stage" (Crăciun, 2018: 8). The NTEISP framework provided a systematic way of analyzing, making comparisons and deductions from data presented from different geo-political, historical, and socio-economic contexts; methodological developments; outcomes of IHE and other forces shaping internationalization. We were therefore able to build on the NTEISP framework to include issues that were not evident in the cases reviewed before. Our study therefore highlights and recommends further use and development of the NTEISP typology as a common comparative framework in future IHE studies of a similar nature.

Overall, we conclude that in the Global South, IHE continues to gather momentum as evidenced by the increased awareness of the need not only to use a strategic approach to it but also to be guided by the use of contextual lenses, for example the "decolonial" lenses suggested by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013). In addition, the trend towards enhancing regionalization and South–South cooperation shows a shift from the "copying and pasting" of the Western IHE paradigm and the strong propensity to "vertical internationalization" described by Jones and de Wit (2014).

REFERENCES

Crăciun, D. (2018). Topic modelling: A novel method for the systematic study of higher education internationalization policy. In Rumbley, L., and Proctor, D. (eds), *The Future Agenda for Internationalization in Higher Education*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 102–113.

Cross, M., Mhlanga, E., and Ojo, E., 2011. Emerging concept of internationalisation in South African higher education: Conversations on local and global exposure at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(1): 75–92.

De Wit, H.D., and Knight, J.A. (1999). Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Dell, S. (2019). Internationalization—Making it work for Africa. In *University World News*, August 23, 2019.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn. Beyond political-economy paradigms. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2/3): 211–223.

Hegarty, S. (2007). Special education and its contribution to the broader discourse of education. In Florian, L. (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Special Education*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 528–536.

Jones, E., and de Wit, H. (2014). Globalized internationalization: Implications for policy and practice. *IIEnetworker*, Spring, 28–29.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2013). Why decoloniality in the 21st century? *The Thinker*, 48: 10–15.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2018). *Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonization*. London and New York: Routledge.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepentla: Views from the South*, 1(3): 533–580.

Sehoole, C., and de Wit, H. (2014). The regionalisation, internationalization, and globalisation of African higher education. *International Journal of African Higher Education*, 1(1): 217–241. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi. org/10.6017/ijahe.v1i1.5648

Trahar, S., Green, W., de Wit, H., and Whitsed, C. (2015). The internationalization of higher education. In Case, J.M. and Huisman, J. (eds), *Researching Higher Education*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 23–41.