Chapter 1

——————

Theorising decolonisation, globalisation and internationalisation in higher education

Kehdinga George Fomunyam[1]

Introduction

The higher education landscape in South Africa is complicated with a rich dose of challenges and opportunities. From apartheid South Africa to democratic South Africa, the higher education system has been dramatically influenced by several isomorphic forces that have led to the current educational call for decolonisation, which scholars in the higher education sector are trying to handle. Amongst these forces are colonialism, globalisation and internationalisation. While the nation has moved passed colonialism, its legacies still hold the higher education sector hostage creating the need for decolonisation.

Globalisation has a complicated history dating back centuries. Vincent-Lancrin and Kärkkäinen (2009) argue that globalisation is a comparatively new term used to describe an old process that began with our human ancestors moving out of Africa to spread across the globe. They continue that the term has been used differently by different people owing to its different facets. Marginson and Rhoades confirm this by defining globalisation as meaning 'becoming global.' They provide an alternative definition by looking at it as 'the development of increasingly integrated systems and relations beyond the nation' (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002, p. 288) . Globalisation, therefore, moves towards making nations become more and more entangled with

———————

1   Durban University of Technology

one another. The systems of globalisation are more than economic and encompass the educational, political, cultural and technological spheres. Globalisation seeks to establish the international or the global village where nations are consistently absorbed in global agendas. Jeong-Kyu Lee adds to this by asserting that as a concept, globalisation refers 'both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole' (Lee, 2004, p. 1).

Unpenchant hegemonic global mechanisms

Globalisation ensures that the global is seen first, before the local, and ensures that the world is rapidly being moulded into a shared social space by educational, econwomic and technological forces, and that developments in one region of the world can have profound consequences for the life chances of individuals or communities on the other side of the globe. This means that the global North's rapidly growing development can affect the global South by stampeding its development. Hans de Wit argues that globalisation and internationalisation cannot be completely separated since internationalisation seems to have grown from globalisation. He maintains that they are complex phenomena with many overlapping characteristics (De Wit, 2011). This is supported by Singh, Kenway and Apple (2005, p. 1), who argue that internationalisation has globalising tendencies, such as marketisation, universalisation, westernisation and deteriorisation, which entrench a top-down perspective. This top-down perspective most often results in Africa being the receiver and the West being the designer. The continuous existence of such tendencies within the South African higher education sector, coupled with the legacies of colonialism, has made higher education unresponsive and created the need for decolonisation. Decolonising in South African higher education becomes a way of responding to these challenges. It is an opportunity to move away from the global and focus on the local in the bid to enhance national development and higher education responsiveness.

This chapter attempts to theorise that decolonising the higher education sector is the pathway to cutting the excesses and workings of globalisation and internationalisation as isomorphic forces in the higher education sector in South Africa. To this end, the chapter is divided into two parts. The first part deals with globalisation and internationalisation as isomorphic forces in South African higher education. The second centres on decolonising higher education as a response to globalisation and internationalisation.

Globalisation and internationalisation as isomorphic forces in South African higher education

Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009a) and Reisberg, and Rumbley (2009a) argue that globalisation has grown to be a defining reality in the 21st century higher education landscape. This is because education is a crucial arena in which globalising processes modulate material place, space, cultures, identities and relationships. Globalisation is not a dormant force, but a mutilating and dominating one, which aims at producing a higher education landscape common to all. Altbach supports this assertion and argues that globalisation can be understood as 'the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable' (Altbach, 2004, p. 5).

Politics, scientific communication, information technology in its various manifestations, a common language and culture are also part of the new global realities. The higher education sector is, therefore, moving towards standardisation and the creation of a single platform, which would give higher education institutions worldwide a common platform or framework to deal with. This manifests itself in things like publishing (especially patterns in the ownership of multinational publishing and internet companies) and research funding worldwide. Altbach and Knight (2007) point out that globalisation has precipitated the use of English as the lingua franca for scientific communication. They also suggest that globalisation has led to an increasingly growing international labour market for scholars and scientists, the efficient storage, selection, and dissemination of knowledge, and the increasing provision of academic programmes through e-learning.

Internationalisation, on the other hand, is ideological in nature with a political, economic and social intent. Knight defines it as 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education' (Knight, 2015, p. 2). This definition of internationalisation indicates that it predominately aims at moving local barriers and establishing the global. The focus, therefore, is on making higher education global. Altbach et al. (2009a) provide an alternative definition by looking at it as the variety of policies and programmes that universities and governments implement to respond to globalisation. Internationalisation, therefore, aims at establishing the global or responding to global demands. Increasingly, the global

is seen as the future, while the local is sabotaged as outdated and non-competitive. In line with this, Dzvimbo and Moloi argue that internationalisation is inherently

> *a left-of-centre political ideology with a heavy emphasis on economic cooperation… an ideology that is similarly geared toward a decrease of international barriers but with the aim of the economic betterment of the planet, not the perpetuation of power and privilege in the hands of the western-dominated economies we see at work with the forces responsible for globalisation. (Dzvimbo & Moloi, 2013, p. 4)*

To Dzvimbo and Moloi, internationalisation, though similar to globalisation, does not aim to push dominant economies, but rather to ensure the common good and a better planet for all. Brandenburg and De Wit concur with this by arguing that 'today internationalisation has become the white knight of higher education, the moral ground that needs to be defended, and the epitome of justice and equity' (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2011, p. 15). However, its appearance as the white knight doesn't directly translate to the betterment of human life and the redressing of the society against the ills of globalisation. Brandenburg and De Wit continue that globalisation has by and large been loaded with negative connotations and is considered more predominant than internationalisation. This makes globalisation 'evil' and internationalisation 'good'. But this approach of seeing internationalisation as the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits (globalisation) is flawed in diverse ways because it ignores the fact that 'activities more related to the concept of globalisation (higher education as a tradeable commodity) are increasingly executed under the flag of internationalisation' (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2011, p. 16). This is illustrated by the increasing commercialisation shown at the NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the Asia Pacific Association for International Education, and the European Association for International Education conferences.

In recent times, academics have tended to become advocates rather than drivers of internationalisation. Control of the internationalisation process has been lost to the global sphere. Brandenburg and De Wit concur that the higher education sector has lost sight of innovative developments, such as the emergence of new ways of mobility like digital citizenship. They warn that if we do not 'leave the old concepts of internationalisation and globalisation and move on to a fresh unbiased paradigm, higher education would seize to become a public good or

tool for social transformation' (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2011, p. 17). With this understanding, it is critical to consider some of the mitigating roles globalisation and internationalisation play in making higher education unresponsive.

Vincent-Lancrin and Kärkkäinen (2009) argue that a diversified cross-border higher education landscape has been one of the selling points of globalisation and internationalisation. However, while this idea appeals to the mind, the mobility of students, faculty, programmes and institutions has brought untold misery or consequences to nations in the global South, such as South Africa. In addition, the appeal for better quality and pay has increasingly led to a brain drain and loss of talents. The drive to diversify and make higher education open and across borders has also led to an increase in standardisation and a multiplicity of frameworks, for which South Africa and the rest of the global South are not yet ready (Fomunyam, 2018). This has made higher education largely unresponsive.

The application of such foreign benchmarks and standardisation procedures, coupled with a lack of funding, has ensured that higher education remains relatively stagnant in the drive to compete against universities that have been in existence for centuries. Butucha (2012) adds that globalisation imposes uniform requirements for professional certification and thus some form of curriculum standardisation in higher education in order to produce graduates who can compete in the world market. While these graduates are being trained for the global market, the local economy suffers (Fomunyam & Teferra, 2017). Universities are seeking new ways of facilitating exchanges of staff, faculty, students and graduates across borders. While this comes with the promise of improvement in institutional culture, curriculum and academic experience, Jane Knight argues:

> *[The] reality often paints a different picture. In many institutions international students feel marginalised socially and academically and often experience ethnic or racial tensions. Frequently, domestic undergraduate students are known to resist, or at best to be neutral about undertaking joint academic projects or engaging socially with foreign students... While this is a well-intentioned rationale, it often does not work out that way and, instead, serves to mask other motivations – such as revenue generation or desire for improved rankings on global league tables. (Knight, 2011, p. 14)*

The seemingly glaring advantages of globalisation and internationalisation may be considered to be merely facades often masquerading real intentions of damages that the higher education landscape is to endure.

A further influence of globalisation and internationalisation of the higher education sector in South Africa is the global convergence in university governance models. Vincent-Lancrin and Kärkkäinen (2009) and Fomunyam (2017c) suggest that this convergence is particularly visible in higher education funding mechanisms, quality assurance and governance. The competitive allocation of research funding is a practice that is increasingly gaining grounds in Africa, as has been the case in Europe and America for the past decades. Most of these funding institutions, which are situated in Europe and America, provide funding to institutions based on performance criteria. Many government bodies and funding institutions in South Africa and in Africa in general have adopted this model, which is being applied in contexts and is skewed by a lack of sufficient data for effective performance management.

Adding to this, Jarvis argues that in the contemporary university these neo-liberal managerial practices situated around 'performance-based evaluation are efforts to frame, regulate and optimise academic life'. He writes:

> [R]esearch assessment exercises, assessments of academic output quality (esteem, grant revenues generated, consultancies awarded and research 'impact'), the intensity of research productivity, teaching quality and other performance metrics increasingly define tenure, promotion and career trajectories. Regulation of the higher education sector is thus equally a politics of surveillance where quality assurance serves as an instrument of accreditation and a mechanism to prise compliance. (Jarvis, 2014, p. 156)

When these convergence mechanisms are added to a higher education system, which is yet developing and plagued by the legacies of colonialism, it becomes increasingly disempowering and disenfranchising. This is supported by Yingqiang and Yongjian (2016), who argue that global convergence of university mechanisms are most often driven by multiple stakeholders who lack understanding of all the context they are influencing and that this often produces a complex mixture of ideology, power relations and interest considerations. They state:

[Through] theoretical examination and observation of the everyday practices of institutions, we, therefore, find these mechanisms are no longer purely technological methods used to enhance education… but have evolved into a power mechanism, with accountability as the core ideology… ensuring continual power struggle for control of high-status knowledge… that reflects the positional relationships of different interest groups. (Yingqiang & Yongjian, 2016, p. 12)

Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009b) argue that the necessity or urgency that universities (especially those in South Africa) face to internationalise the higher education sector to keep pace with both economic and academic globalisation-presents many challenges at institutional and policy levels. They suggest that to be meaningful and sustainable,

internationalisation requires access to some amount of resources (human and financial) as well as their effective deployment and management. For the world's poorest countries and most resource-deprived institutions, the opportunities to engage internationally can be extremely limited or fraught with worrisome trade-offs. (Altbach, et al., 2009b, p. 31)

This has resulted in inadequate resources and student funding for the growth of higher education in South Africa. Access is still poor and attrition rates remain high. Decolonisation becomes a way of regularising the functioning of the system and ensuring that it is responsive. Teferra (2008) adds that in Africa, for example, the reliance on massive amounts of foreign funding for research and other activities have long placed African universities at a disadvantage on several levels, not the least of which is having to cope with a foreign donor's unpredictable and shifting priorities, as well as serious disconnects between non-local-funder priorities and local needs and interests. South African universities are being driven into an interface where students are continuously robbed of the benefits and proclivities higher education has to offer. Adding to this, Altbach(2004) argues that the most disconcerting characteristic of globalised higher education is that it is currently highly unequal. The North benefits and the South keeps labouring. He observes that 'existing inequalities are reinforced while new barriers are erected' (Altbach, 2004, p. 7). With a highly racialised higher education system, such as in South Africa, these isomorphic forces simply enhance its consequences and create new challenges for the dilapidating high education sector to deal with. Altbach et

al. (2009b, p. 32) concur by adding that this aptly describes a world dominated by the influence of Northern and largely English-speaking paradigms for producing knowledge and setting scientific and scholarly agendas. The elite universities in the world's wealthiest countries hold disproportionate influence over the development of international standards for scholarship, models for managing institutions, and approaches to teaching and learning. These universities have the comparative advantage of budget, resources and talent, which sustains a historic pattern that leaves other universities (particularly in lesser-developed countries) at a distinct disadvantage. Undoing this political and ideological carnage in the higher education sector in Africa becomes the primary focus of the decolonisation movement.

Altbach (2004), Altbach et al. (2009b), Mulumba, et al. (2008) and Teferra (2008) argue that the dominance of a specific language or languages for scholarship represents one of the greatest challenges in a globalised higher education world. While there is a distinct advantage in using a common language (currently English), learning this one language provides access to most of the world's research and teaching materials. Yet, the use of a single language results in limited access to knowledge and hinders the pursuit of scholarship in other languages. In South Africa, the use of non-native languages (English and Afrikaans in this case) also carries with it the heavy history of colonialism and has greatly affected quality in contexts where faculty, students and researchers are generally unable to operate with high levels of fluency (Fomunyam, 2017b). Altbach et al. (2009b) emphasise that students and scholars most likely to take advantage of the range of a globalised higher education environment are typically the wealthiest or otherwise socially privileged. This ensures that the poor remain poor or become poorer by keeping and maintaining them at a state of disrepair. The language challenge in the globalised higher education environment defeats the purpose of making international higher education opportunities available to all equitably.

Adding to this, Knight maintains that the globalised higher education landscape is couched in global perspective like 'commercialisation of higher education,' 'foreign degree mills,' and 'brain drain', all of which South Africa and Africa are not ready for (Knight, 2006, p. 63). Knight continues that cross-border education, in this perspective, presents particular threats, including:

> *an increase in low quality or rogue providers; a decrease in public funding if foreign providers are providing increased access; non-sustainable foreign provision of higher*

education if profit margins are low; foreign qualifications not recognised by domestic employers or education institutions; elitism in terms of those who can afford cross-border education; overuse of English as the language of instruction; and national higher education policy objectives not being met. (Knight, 2006, p. 65)

Globalisation and internationalisation ensure the continuation of a skewed distribution of the world's wealth and talent. The global migration of talent makes it possible for wealthier nations and institutions to attract and retain human capital desperately needed elsewhere. Altbach et al. conclude that 'national autonomy in regard to education is certainly at risk and closely related to the concerns about the increasing commodification of higher education' (Altbach et al., 2009b, p. 34).

From the aforesaid, it is apparent that the decolonising and cleansing of higher education in South Africa from the legacies of colonialism and from the influence and intricacies of globalisation and internationalisation becomes a test this generation of scholars must pass.

Decolonising higher education as a response to globalisation and internationalisation

Decolonising higher education is not a new phenomenon in the higher education sector globally. Countries like Canada, Australia and New Zealand, just to name a few, have all gone through this process. In recent times, the United Kingdom, the Caribbean and Hong Kong, amongst others, have also taken up the challenge of decolonising education and are beginning to engage with it practically to ensure higher education is effective as a public good.

In South Africa, the call for decolonisation reached its peak in 2015 with the defacing of the Cecil Rhodes statue at the University of Cape Town. The wave spread across the nation like wildfire and before long it became a national call or movement. The ills and legacies of apartheid South Africa are glaring for all to seeing owing to the failures of the higher education transformation agenda (Fomunyam, 2017c).

However, higher education faces greater challenges and threats behind the legacies of colonialism. The continuous encroachment and domination of the global South by the North have ensured that the educational system remains unresponsive. Isomorphic-like globalisation has in many ways ensured the continuous subjugation of South African individuality and dream. It has largely ensured the articulation of the global, while failing drastically to address the local. Internationalisation, as a tool of globalisation, has brought mixed reactions, which have consequently let to contextual irrelevance. Decolonising higher education becomes a way of weeding out the excesses in these isomorphic forces and playing the higher education game on a contextual ground with consciousness and conscientisation as the moral fibre. According to Fomunyam and Teferra (2017), decolonisation in the South African higher education landscape is the untangling of higher education from all forces aimed at keeping it unresponsive contextually. While internationalisation and globalisation aim at making higher education more global and responsive to global trends, decolonisation aims at keeping it contextually relevant. To this end, decolonising higher education as a response to globalisation and internationalisation would be responding to three key issues: unpenchant hegemonic global mechanisms, language and convergence.

Unpenchant hegemonic global mechanisms

Globalisation and internationalisation bring with them a host of unpenchant hegemonic mechanisms, which are destabilising the South African higher education environment. Standardisation, quality benchmarking, performance matrixes, publishing frequencies, tenure and promotion trajectories, research productivity and output, and accreditation and rankings are some of the mechanisms that have affected South African higher education. For example, the focus on numbers (for instance, the number or position a South African university takes on the ranking table as a major of quality) has led to a reduction in the development of meaningful democratic procedures based on national values, which could lead to real transformation.

While access to higher education has improved numerically, epistemological access still remains a huge challenge. Waghid concurs with this and argues that we have to develop 'a shared group-interest in compromise, which can prevent us from pushing toward convergent interpretations of higher education. Rather, we need

to develop compromising understandings of higher education that can advance our shared interests in a diverse environment' (Waghid, 2001, p. 463). The global interest seeks convergence on terms defined and dictated to the financially weak South by the strong North. As a result, the higher education system is unable to sustain its growth and burdens. Decolonising higher education, if it is to be successful in dealing with these deep, powerful and long-lasting isomorphic forces, cannot but be itself as radical as its opponent. It must, therefore, eradicate not only its surface manifestations and the concomitant 'colonial system', but its epistemic roots as well (Dascal, 2009).

Globalisation and internationalisation have ensured that the conceptual range of human potentialities and happiness keeps shrinking. While globalisation and internationalisation have widened our choices in trivial matters, conformism has narrowed our choices in vital matters. According to Nandy, South Africa, or the global South, in general, has been given

> *more shampoos and cuisines to choose from and fewer options in matters such as visions of a good society and a healthy person. Our journey through the twentieth century has created the conditions for a drastic abridgement of our ideas of dissent and diversity. (Nandy, 2007, p. 15)*

The South African higher education landscape is in a period of continual crisis in different dimensions, such as social, ecological, humanitarian or economic. This has been enhanced mechanisms of globalisation and internationalisation, which ensures that Western philosophies of knowledge production and knowledge transfer increasingly remain hegemonic. Decolonisation deconstructs these mechanisms and challenges its hegemonic nature from a variety of theoretical and phenomenological perspectives. The uniqueness of the South African diversity and landscape is made null and void through the continuous proliferation of these mechanisms in all facets of the higher education system. Decolonising would be raising critical voices and rejecting the ongoing intellectual heritage of globalisation and internationalisation as neo-liberal artefacts and their political and economic ramifications. To grapple with the complex challenges of an increasingly interconnected world, it is necessary to decolonise and establish preliminary conditions and principles that enable a more lateral and polyvocal engagement with other ideas and practices as well as the notion of unity in diversity or diversely interconnected.

Language

Language is an incongruous challenge in South African higher education and is magnified by globalisation and internationalisation. While some universities use both English and Afrikaans as mediums of instruction, most universities use only English (Fomunyam, 2017a). This lack of development of local languages and the continuous proliferation of English as the global language has created a dire need for decolonisation. Lin and Martin (2005) argue that in almost all encounters Africa has had with the West (now manifested in various forms of global capitalism, global mass-media flows and global technological and communications penetration), English has often been perceived as an indispensable resource that many postcolonial peoples and governments must master in order to compete in the global landscape. This strategic marketing of English and its constituent reinforcement through forces such as globalisation and internationalisation has led to the collapse of indigenous languages. Lin and Martin add that this stylistic proliferation of English is often sold with captivating ideas/ideals, such as economic development, technological and material modernisation, and human-resource capital investment, for current and future successful participation in the new global economic order. These ideas/ideals have strongly contributed towards high attrition rates in South African higher education. Expounding on this, Brock-Utne argues that most African educationists and theorists have always felt that the greatest learning problem of African students is linguistic. Teaching and learning is enacted 'in a language that is not normally used in his immediate environment, a language which neither the learner nor the teacher understands and uses well enough' (Brock-Utne, 2005, p. 173).

Learning from the Chinese exportation of Mandarin and how this is gradually becoming a language of educational verisimilitude, it therefore follows that the development of local languages is paramount if all colonial legacies are to be completely gleaned off. Pennycook suggests that

> *viewing the global dominance of English not ultimately as a priori imperialism but rather as a product of the local hegemonies of English… for power is not something owned by some and not by others but as something that operates on and through all points of society... Any concept of the global hegemony of English must, therefore, be understood in terms of the complex sum of contextualised understandings of social hegemonies. (Pennycook, 2000, p. 117)*

A break in this dominance in South African higher education would mean a break in multiple social hegemonies kept in place by isomorphic forces like globalisation and internationalisation. To this end, the complex colonial legacy the South African higher education must deal with is made worse by the ripple effect of globalisation and internationalisation, which ensures that the language of instruction is that which is yet to be mastered. This means that those who possess rich social, cultural and political capital in this regard continuously benefit, while those who don't continuously wallow in their misery

With decolonisation came a new paradigm; one which seeks to liberate from the soporific vapours of colonialism, globalisation and internationalisation. In this light, Bauman couldn't be more right when he argued that

> the creation of wealth is on the way to finally emancipating itself from its perennial – constraining and vexing – connections with making things, processing materials, creating jobs and managing people. The old rich needed the poor to make and keep them rich. That dependency at all times mitigated the conflict of interest and prompted some effort, however tenuous, to care. The new rich do not need the poor any more. (Bauman, 1998, p. 72)

By decolonising, everyone is given the opportunity to use the same playing fields and reap the accordant benefits.

Convergence

Convergence, as the last artefact construed through the magnifying glass of globalisation and internationalisation, has done all except make higher education in South Africa and Africa in general independent. This has resulted in the failure of the higher education sector to address local needs and fulfil its mission of effective community engagement. Altbach concurs with this and considers the consequences of globalisation and internationalisation for universities in developing countries like South Africa. He argues that 'the three elements of this tectonic shift can be summarised as public good vs. private good, high tuition and high aid, and send the masses to the community colleges' (Altbach (2005, p. 8). In this light, higher education is seen to be a public good with increasingly high tuition fees, as demonstrated by the 'Fees Must Fall' movement, the increasing flow of higher education aid from the West and the increasing numbers of students

who cannot access university. This has remained so because 'the voices discussing internationalisation are largely Western' (Altbach, 2005, p. 7). South Africa, therefore, in an attempt to converge with the world ensures the degradation of the higher education sector and its sustained inability to meet local needs. Lowman and Mayblin (2011) add that the decolonisation of the university or the higher education system would only be said to be in process when the university conducts its affairs, owns its history, relates to the people and recognises its status in the students' land in such a way that no student will pass through its halls without being caught up in the process of decolonisation. The uniqueness of each South African university must be made to stand out from the madding crowd amidst the continuous cry to conform or converge. Walker (2005) concurs by saying that there is increasingly more recognition of the need for decolonising strategies and tactics in indigenous research and education to counter the effects of dominant policies and practices permeating social, organisational and governmental contexts.

These policies and practices, coming from renowned higher education funders such as the World Bank, IMF, UNICEF, European Union, Carnegie Foundation and DAADS go a long way to ensure that institutions converge and maintain a particular line of thought. This line of thought necessitates the urgency of the decolonisation movement and projects it as a long-term process involving the deconstruction and destabilisation of bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial and neo-colonial power.

Globalisation and internationalisation have made it increasingly possible for Western civilisation to masquerade as the geo-cultural retainer of a universal experience of modernity. Bhambra understands this when he argues that 'the Western experience has been taken both as the basis for the construction of the concept of modernity, and at the same time, that concept is argued to have validity that transcends the Western experience' (Bhambra, 2007, p. 4). Decolonisation becomes the process of asserting this validity and establishing the fact that modernity is not simply a Western experience, which South Africa must drink into, but a function of contextual experience constructed on the basis on contextual experiences.

Mignolo argues that the crooked rhetoric that naturalises 'modernity' (globalisation and internationalisation being facets of the same) as a universal global process and

point of arrival hides its darker side – the constant reproduction of 'coloniality'. Mignolo further declares:

> *[In order] to uncover the perverse logic underlying the philosophical conundrum of modernity/coloniality and the political and economic structure of imperialism/ colonialism, we must consider how to decolonise knowledge and being… This is because Modernity brings with it the exclusionary and totalitarian notion of Totality; that is a Totality that negates, exclude, occlude the difference and the possibilities of other totalities. (Mignolo, 2007, pp. 451-452)*

With the Western notion of modernity engulfed in globalisation and internationalisation, there is no room for contextual sovereignty or totality. Western totality takes pre-eminence to dictate the pace and circumstance for South Africa and Africa making decolonisation a necessary response. Mignolo (2007) adds that it is not the case that in non-European imperial languages and epistemologies (Mandarin, Arabic, Zulu, Bengali, Russian, Aymara, etc.) the notion of 'totality' doesn't exist or is unthinkable; it is that the growing dominance of Western epistemology continuously confront non-Western concepts of totality with a growing imperial concept of totality. Failure to confront this through the decolonisation movement would be a conscious decision to remain engulfed in the Western notion of modernity and what it means to be human in South Africa.

Conclusion

Theorising decolonisation, globalisation and internationalisation in South African higher education becomes critical to opening the debate in the continuous engagement to make higher education in South Africa responsive. While globalisation and internationalisation have offered some benefits (mostly to the developed world and in South Africa as a funding mechanism) their impact in a growing higher education sector battling with access and throughput makes higher education unresponsive. The constraints that globalisation and internationalisation bring to the South African higher education landscape and the resulting marginality in relation to different universities create more problems nationally than solutions. Overall, globalisation and internationalisation ensure

the continuous encroachment and enthronement of colonial thought processes and the hegemonic theories, policies and principles that have come to mark Eurocentrism. South African higher education is not ready and will not be ready to tangle with such forces unless the decolonisation process is driven by the appropriate capital and political will it requires to succeed.

Decolonisation will therefore lead to an epistemic shift, and brings to the foreground other epistemologies, other principles of knowledge and understanding, and consequently, other economies, other politics and other ethics. As post-colonialism, globalisation and internationalisation remain contested and ambiguous terms, they continue to serve as touchstones for some of the most contentious, difficult and powerful discourses occurring both in the academy and in social politics around the world.

References

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management,* 10(1), 3-25. https://doi:10.1080/13583883.2004.9967114

Altbach, P. (2005). Perspectives on internationalising higher education. *International higher education,* 27, 6-8.

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of studies in international education,* 11(4), 290-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009a). Globalisation and the university: realities in an unequal world. In J. Forest & P. Altbach (Eds), *International handbook of higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009b). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalisation: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bhambra, G. (2007). *Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociologicalImagination*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230206410

Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalisation. *International Higher Education,* 62, 15-17.

Brock-Utne, B. (2005). Language-in-education policies and practices in Africa with a special focus on Tanzania and South Africa. In A. Lin & P. Martin (Eds), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, pp. 615-631. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9493-0_36

Butucha, K. G. (2012). The impacts of globalisation on higher education curriculum: Implications for educational practices. *University of Eastern Africa, Baraton*, 1-7.

Dascal, M. (2009). Colonising and decolonising minds. In I. Kucurandi (Ed.), *Papers of 2007 World Philosophy Day*, pp. 308–332. Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey.

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC),* 8, 241-248.

Dzvimbo, K. P., & Moloi, K. C. (2013). Globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education,* 33(3), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.15700/201503070808

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017a). Decolonising teaching and learning in engineering education in a South African university. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research,* 12(23), 13349-13358.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017b). Decolonising the engineering curriculum in a South African university of technology. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research,* 12(17), 6797-6805.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017c). Decolonising the future in the untransformed present in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education,* 35(2), 168-180. https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.13

Fomunyam, K. G. (2018). Deconstructing quality in South African higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 26(1), 44-59. doi:10.1108/QAE-11-2016-0072

Fomunyam, K. G., & Teferra, D. (2017). Curriculum responsiveness within the context of decolonisation in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education,* 35(2), 196-207. https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.15

Jarvis, D. S. L. (2014). Regulating higher education: Quality assurance and neo-liberal managerialism in higher education—A critical introduction. *Policy and Society,* 33(3), 155-166. https://doi:10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.09.005

Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalisation of higher education: New directions, new challenges. 2005 IAU global survey report*. Paris: International Association of Universities.

Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalisation. *International Higher Education,* 62, 14-15.

Knight, J. (2015). Updated definition of internationalisation. *International Higher Education,* 33, 2-3. https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2003.33.7391

Lee, J.-K. (2004). Globalisation and higher education: A South Korea perspective. *Globalisation,* 4(1), 1-28.

Lin, A., & Martin, P. (2005). From a critical deconstruction paradigm to a critical construction paradigm: An introduction to decolonisation, globalisation and language-in-education policy and practice. In A. Lin & P. Martin (Eds), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, pp. 1-19. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598265-003

Lowman, E., & Mayblin, L. (2011). Theorising the postcolonial, decolonising theory. *Studies in Social and Political Thought,* 19(1), 3-8.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A Glonacal Agency heuristic. *Higher Education,* 43(3), 281-309. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014699605875

Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies,* 21(2-3), 449-514. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647

Mulumba, M., Obaje, A., Kobedi, K., & Kishun, R. (2008). International student mobility in and out of Africa: Challenges and opportunities. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*, pp. 490-514. Accra: Association of African Universities.

Nandy, A. (2007). *Time treks: The uncertain future of old and new despotisms*. Ranikhet: Permanent Black.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology: From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*, pp. 107–119. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.6.09pen

Singh, M., Kenway, J., & Apple, M. (2005). Globalising education: Perspectives from above and below. In M. Apple, J. Kenway & M. Singh (Eds), *Globalising education. Policies, pedagogies & politics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Teferra, D. (2008). The international dimension of higher education in Africa: Status, challenges, and prospects. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*, pp. 44-79. Accra: Association of African Universities.

Vincent-Lancrin, S., & Kärkkäinen, K. (2009). Globalisation and higher education: What might the future bring? In CERI (Ed.), *Educational research and innovation higher education to 2030, Volume 2, Globalisation*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Waghid, Y. (2001). Globalisation and higher education restructuring in South Africa: Is democracy under threat? *Journal of Education Policy,* 16(5), 455-464. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930110071048

Walker, R. (2005). *Transformative strategies in indigenous education: Decolonisation and positive social change.* Doctoral thesis, University of Western Sydney, Sydney. Retrieved from http://handle.uws.edu.au:8081/1959.7/678

Yingqiang, Z., & Yongjian, S. (2016). Quality assurance in higher education: Reflection, criticism, and change. *Chinese Education & Society,* 49(1-2), 7-19. https://doi:10.1080/10611932.2016.1192382