Developing Institutional Co-operation Strategies: The Rhetoric and Reality of Academic Linkages with Nigerian Higher Education

Abdalla Uba Adamu
Department of Education
Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria

Paper presented at the 4th Education UK Exhibition organized by the British Council, on Education Partnerships for Community Development, and held at the Royal Tropicana Hotel on 14th November, 2006.

Introduction

I would seek your indulgence to digress a little from the core concern of this meeting. While I will eventually be discussing the mechanism of linkages between Nigerian and principally British universities, I would also like to provide a historical vista on the relationship between Nigerian higher education and higher institutions in the United States and the U.K. In this survey of historical antecedents, I would wish to draw attention to the political forces that determine the nature of such linkages and their root origins.

Part I: Historical Antecedents to Overseas Linkages with Nigerian Universities

The greatest challenge faced by the Nigerian university in the years after independence from Britain was whether to retain its British legacy — the *gold standard* of Lord Ashby of Brandon (Ashby 1965 p. 82) — or open itself to other influences — as is the case with universities all over the world — and gradually evolve a distinct character of its own.

The desire to retain the British framework predominated quite simply because the Nigerian labor market — civil service, private sector and the industries — has not developed a system of assessing prospective employees except through their education and examination outcomes. And since the entire employment superstructure is based on British patterns, retaining British educational framework had the comfortable currency of predictability. An almost paternally condescending relationship between Nigeria and Britain also helps to retain Nigeria within the British ambit for a considerable period after independence.

Gradually, however, a crack began to appear in the relationship between Nigeria and Britain in the 1970s over geopolitical issues and this had the effect of orienting Nigeria gradually away from British influences, for as Gambari (1989) argued,

> Nigeria shares with Britain the use of English as the official mode of communication, but the two countries rarely speak the same language on political issues. In spite of close historical, economic, trade, cultural, institutional, and other ties between independent Nigeria and the former colonial power, serious political discord has seldom been far from the surface (Gambari 1989 p. 139).

This "serious political discord" (between Nigeria and Britain) appeared almost immediately after independence when, in 1962, Nigeria abrogated a defense agreement with Britain which was part of the independence package. But despite this move, Nigeria remained dependent on Britain for military supplies until 1967 when

the Nigerian Civil War broke out (Ate 1987). The British policy towards the war — neutrality — deeply disappointed Nigerian leaders "and had a chilling effect on Nigeria-British relations" (Eke 1990 p. 133). This chill continued until 1973 when attempts were made by the two governments to normalize relationships on somewhat warmer levels. But the change in government in 1974 in Britain set in another chill when in that year the British government reduced its general aid package to Nigeria based partly on Nigeria's unexpected windfall in oil revenue following the rise of oil prices after the Yom Kippur War of October 1973 (see *The changing emphasis in British aid policies: More help for the poorest*. London: HMSO, 1975; and Hewitt and Sutton, 1980). This, of course, affected any British aid to Nigerian universities. Coupled with subsequent frosty relationships as a result of increasingly differing political standpoints regarding global issues such as South Africa, Angola, Palestine Liberation Organization, independence in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Namibia, competition between the British North Sea Oil and Nigeria's oil, (see Galloway 1987 for a detailed analysis of this development), the impact of British academic system on Nigerian universities went steadily into decline.

On the other hand, relationships between Nigeria and the United States, since the 1970s have been considerably warmer than with Britain (see, for instance, Montgomery 1961, United States 1980). The relationship between Nigeria and America was contextualized by Professor Jibril Aminu, a one time Minister of Education in Nigeria who noted that,

> Nigeria, in spite of its clear policy of non-alignment, has demonstrated in the last few years, its genuine desire for strong links with the United States, especially after 1977 when the U.S. policy in Southern Africa showed a somewhat favourable shift. There will also be need to show genuine appreciation, not only for the uninterrupted supply of oil, but for the more profound political development of Nigeria largely and freely adopting, in its first post-military era, a constitution modelled largely on the U.S. constitution. (Aminu 1986 p. 270).

Thus the disenchantment with Britain in Nigeria led to a scramble for alternative educational structures immediately after independence. The United States government aid policies, together with major US. philanthropic foundations proved catalytic in the quest for what seemed to be such an alternative framework for Nigerian education. This was realized through well developed programs of institution building and linkages between Nigerian universities and various American institutions. But perhaps the most significant US. impact was the training Nigerians received from the US. as compared to the United Kingdom.

What made the US. institutions quite attractive to the Nigerian students at the time (early 1950s to mid 1970s — the formative period of Nigerian university development) were the less restrictive admission procedures of US. institutions, coupled with a far more diverse curricular offering. Nigerian students were used to strict and centralized restricted access to university education with limited curricular choices characteristic of both the Nigerian and British educational systems. As a result, more Nigerian students tended to study in the US. than in Britain. For instance, in 1961 there were only 552 Nigerian students in the United States, while there were 1,124 in the United Kingdom. By 1964 the US. share had gone up to 2,945 while the number of Nigerian students in UK. was only 1,382 in the same year (UNESCO, 1966). Certainly, figures available seemed to indicate a growing American influence on choices of places to study among Nigerian students, and this may have a bearing

on the reform process that took place in Nigerian education from mid 1960s to the 1980s. Table 1 indicates a sample of the trend in the mid 1970s.

Table 1

Nigerian Students in American and British Universities, 1975-89

Year	U.S.A.	U.K.
1975	11440	2762
1976	11870	3690
1977	13510	4312
1978	16220	4192
1979	16360	3875
1980	N/A	4136
1981	15651	4306
1982	N/A	N/A
1983	N/A	3999
1984	15703	2868
1985	11770	2704
1986	10324	N/A
1987	8340	N/A
1988	5337	1169
1989	4040	N/A

(Source: *UNESCO Statistical Year Books 1976-1991*)

This trend in American preference by Nigerian students prompted the editors of *West Africa* Magazine (London) to comment, as late as 1980,

> That Britain is in second place to the United States could be attributed to the stagnating British technology, [and] dwindling influence in world affairs (West Africa, February 11, 1980 p. 276).

Eventually those who received early training in the US. either by personal sponsorship or through aid agency process especially immediately after the Second World War returned to Nigeria in the early 1950s and 1960s. These *returnees* soon occupied positions of power and authority and created context situations around which the continued relevance of the British educational legacy in Nigeria that neither emphasized science, technology or agriculture, nor was it developmentally oriented, was continuously challenged.

The impact of such returnees, both explicit and implicit had been nothing less than spectacular in many developing countries, and perhaps no region in the world vividly illustrates the impact of these American returnees on the adoption of American educational traditions than South-East Asia. For instance, in Thailand, the transformation of the educational system at all levels was initiated by American trained returnees from Minnesota, Oregon, and SUNY-Buffalo (Fry 1984). And although the Japanese educational system was a quilted mosaic of influences from Germany, France, and Britain, nevertheless the American influence was more sustaining (see Nakayama, 1989). The Philippines, a former American colony, has retained its definite American educational heritage (Gonzales, 1985). Even Malaysia, a showcase of British educational tradition in the South-East Asian sea of reform, had at one stage contemplated the *relevance* of American higher education to the country (Ahmat, 1985). And dramatically, in Indonesia a group of government officials and

policy makers became dubbed *The Berkeley Mafia* on account of the fact that in 1968 virtually the entire cabinet of the Indonesian government was dominated by American trained individuals, most of them alumni of University of California, Berkeley (Ransom 1970).

In Nigeria, Coleman (1958) had also argued that Nigerians trained in the US. during the second world war have been leading figures in postwar nationalism. And upon their return to Nigeria, they

> became crusaders for American practical ("horizontal") education, as contrasted to the British literary ("vertical") tradition. Their agitation in behalf of American education...was one of the principal reasons for the post war migration of hundreds of Nigerians to America. Their propagation of the American educational ideal and their positive nationalism contributed to the antipathy of both British and British educated Nigerians toward American education and American-educated Nigerians (Coleman 1958 p.243).

The influence of the Nigerian returnees, while quite explicit in political affairs (the first President of Nigeria, Dr. Nmandi Azikwe was an alumni of Lincoln University) was rather subtle in educational matters, but nonetheless, effective.

American Aid Agencies and Nigerian Educational Development

While the British *gold standard* was entrenched as an essential value in the premier Nigerian university, there were dissenting voices as far back as 1955 advocating for an alternative, decidedly American, framework for higher education at least for Nigeria. As Philip Coombs (1964) noted,

> Nigeria, like several other new African nations, has turned to the United States for help. Even more than money they want imaginative ideas and access to talent. While valuing highly the considerable good that came to them — and is still coming to them — from British education, they want to fashion a more relevant curriculum and more efficient and effective teaching methods (including very unconventional ones if necessary) which will serve far more students, better and sooner (p. 109).

The new advocacy was aimed at harnessing American experiences in *higher* education for African situations, for as Ashby (1966 p. 263) observed "a period of study in America frequently nurtures a dissatisfaction with the British system." Early advocates, at least in giving some consideration to American educational ideas to Nigeria, included Ojike (1944), Okeke (1955), Ukpaby (1956) and Okongwu (1964). This was to have far reaching consequences in Nigeria, for as van den Berghe (1973 p. 64) noted,

> The international orientation of Nigerian scholars is strikingly evident in the fact that in a number of academic issues such as reforms in the curriculum or in the structure of department, the place where a person received his higher education is often a much better predictor of alignments than nationality, ethnicity or any other factor...Thus we frequently see an alignment between Britons and British trained Nigerians versus Americans and American-trained Nigerians. Since [the University of Ibadan] was modelled after British universities, the first group tends to be conservative, while the latter tends to be reformist.

The American approach to education — lack of centralized bureaucratic control, universal access to mass higher education (provided one can pay for it), relevant and flexible curriculum, modularity which encourages mobility — had certain appeals to a

nation in a hurry to throw off the yokes of imposed colonialism. Further, in describing African approaches to higher education, Howe (1964 p. 172) had noted that

> whereas the preference of those African academics who had not been exposed to more than the British system in Africa or elsewhere was for no basic change, those who had studied under both American and British systems — including those in Africa — favored change.

Thus although American tendencies appearing in the early American educated Nigerians has shown preference for American education for Nigeria, it was of course expected that the British colonial government would treat such development with extreme caution. A typical reaction was given by de Kiewiet (1959 p. 140) who warned against "a brash and unwanted intrusiveness on the part of American education" in making inroads in Africa by cautioning that

> The American educational system is the costliest in the world. We are told that it is also the most wasteful...Not all the technical aid, loans and investments that are realistically in sight can do more than correct a proportion of the grim facts of poverty. A doctrinaire offer of even the very best and most superior achievements and discoveries of American education would be no more than a mirage unless there is a balance with trade and taxes, industry and investment, profit and progress (p. 135).

Again admittedly not all Nigerian students in the 1950s and 1960s studied at the "proper" American universities, thus giving further leeway to a belief that American education was inferior to British. For instance, the earliest African students in America were confronted with the double standard of segregation, and

> the American-educated African leaders who emerged during the struggles for independence attended [these] segregated colleges. Dr. Nmandi Azikwe, former President of the Republic of Nigeria, was one of the first, and he was followed by many fellow-Ibos. There was a greater wealth among the Yorubas of Western Nigeria, which enabled Yoruba students to journey to the more prestigious institutions in England. Being also more involved with the colonial government at Lagos in the West, they received more encouragement and financial assistance from the British (Henderson 1967 p. 49).

Consequently the admission pattern of Nigerian students in the American universities indicated that from 1928 to 1958, about 56% of the 171 located students attended historically black colleges, 26% went to "third rate teachers colleges and similar institutions, and 18% studied at Ivy League schools" (Henderson 1967 p. 50). It is the products of these systems collectively that eventually molded the destiny of Nigerian nation as a whole.

The end of the Second World War made it clear that colonialism has also ended. The new international agenda was shifted to curbing the tide of Soviet communism, especially in African countries with the United States at the forefront of the attack with the major assistance of the big three foundations: Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation and Ford Foundation. As Berman (1979 p. 146) argued,

> the foundations accomplished this primarily by funding programs linking the educational systems of the new African nations to the values, *modus operandi*, and institutions of the United States.

Closely connected with avowed non-political and technocratic involvement in African education by the foundations was the more explicit objective of increasing the United

States economic expansion, continued access to raw materials abroad and control of markets for American exports. “These themes mark the prologue to the African programs of the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations since 1945” (Berman 1979 p. 149).

To all intents and purposes, therefore, a new colonial path was being carved out in African countries even as the old one was dying. In Nigeria, for instance, the process of bonding the country to British structural framework started with the United Africa Company which was a purely commercial venture later taken over by the British government and provided a convenient vehicle for colonization. It would seem the new American strategy would follow different patterns, but achieve the same goals: loyalty to the interests of the United States, for as Berman (1979 p. 151) further analyzed,

> it should come as no surprise that the foundations whose boards of trustees and administrative ranks were dominated by men sharing this common ideology, sought to create circumstances in the developing world that would ensure change that was predictable, manageable, and consonant with the perceived economic and strategic interests of the United States.

While the foundations representatives themselves have denied these motives (see “Responses to Edward H. Berman” in *Harvard Educational Review* Volume 49 Number 2 1979 p. 180) nevertheless the mere presence of the facilities made available by the foundations — training in the U.S., establishment of projects, setting up linkages between Nigerian and American universities — all have contributed to make the elements of American education distinct features on the Nigerian educational landscape in the two decades after Nigerian political independence. And as Gruhn and Anthony (1980 p. 13) noted,

> the dominant type of assistance was the rural development project funded by the U.S. government carried out by a land grant institution, providing U.S. technical expertise and opportunities for study in the United States.

In Nigeria, the first of such elements was the establishment of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka in the Eastern Region of Nigeria patterned on the American land grant philosophy with the Michigan State University as the model.

On May 5, 1954 the Eastern regional government in Nigeria sponsored a mission led by Dr. Nmandi Azikwe who was then the Premier of the Region to seek the cooperation of Europe and America in the training and recruitment of technicians, and provide training for Nigerians in vocational higher education. This was necessitated by the inability of the University College, Ibadan to admit as many students as were qualified due to restrictive admission policies. The basic purpose of the mission was to attract investors to accelerate the economic development of the Eastern region. One significant result of the mission was a recommendation that the Eastern region should set up a full autonomous university which would emphasize not only the cultural values of the nation, but also vocational inspirations.

The Eastern Regional government accepted this key recommendation of the mission and on May 18, 1955 the University of Nigeria law was passed by the Eastern Nigeria House of Assembly, and later it received Royal Assent (Ijoma 1986 p. 4). The university was to be funded by the Eastern Nigeria Marketing Board. In 1958

technical assistance in respect to the new University was sought from Inter-Universities Council, the International Cooperation Administration (which later became the United States Agency for International Development), the latter contracting the Michigan State University into the process. As a result of these efforts, the University of Nigeria Nsukka was established, and opened on October 17, 1960 — just a few weeks after Nigerian political independence from Britain. It started with as closely American undergraduate degree structure as possible — complete with courses split up into credits, a general studies curriculum and in a sharp departure from the British degree patterns, did not create separate "honours" or "general" degrees for the students. Courses were offered in as many disciplines as possible and students make up their degree requirements by selecting those courses they want up a maximum number of 129 credit units before graduation, depending on the final degree. Eventually this format was adopted by the Nigerian Universities Commission, leading to the final Americanization of the Nigerian university curriculum.

Part 2: Institutional Linkages – Meanings and Mechanisms

According to Audenhove (1998), academic linkage in higher education is often seen in terms of co-operation between institutions in the North and South – principally developed and developing countries.

Audenhove further argues that it is through supporting and creating efficient linkages that academic clusters and communities can articulate their own development needs. Subsequently, support for linkages is often first targeted at institutional capacity building, more often also associated with human resource development, strengthening educational institutions and development of an efficient infrastructure for the planning of educational services (Morales-Gomez 1991).

Only by supporting or creating efficient institutions can communities identify their own development problems and elaborate and implement their own development policies. Support for the development process should therefore in the first place be directed at institution-building. Within the educational sector, institution-building is associated with the development of human resources, the development and strengthening of educational institutions and the development of an efficient infrastructure for the planning of education and educational services (Morales-Gomez 1991). Nevertheless, the term institution-building (or institution development) does not have a well-defined meaning. Although there seems to be overall agreement about the goal, there seems to be less agreement on the content of the term (Moore 1995). According to Alvarez and Gomez (1994), there are two types of definition. Definitions at the micro level refer to the development of ***individual institutions and to organisational processes***, while definitions at the macro level allude to the way in which ***institutional systems support development in a broad social and economic context*** (Alvarez and Gomez 1994). The notions of institution-building itself which are found in policy documents concerning linkage programs, can also be classified in terms of their focusing on a micro and macro level. Most collaborative partners and intermediate institutions refer to the micro level. More important, however, is the way in which partners define support to institution-building. Here, there seems to be much more controversy. In other words, although there is some agreement on what institution-building is, there seems to be less agreement on how and where support should be given.

The Micro Level

Institution-building at this level is perceived as strengthening the functioning of institutions. It focuses on the institution as such, on its functions, goals, policy, management, accounting system, curricula, etc., and on the complex functioning of its different constituents. Because of its focus on organisational aspects of the institution, some authors prefer the term organisational development to the term institution-building (Audenhove (1998).

An interpretation of institution-building as described above is to be found in the Dutch Joint Financing Programme for Cooperation in Higher Education (MHO) (Nuffic 1995), which started in 1993 as a follow-up of previous linkage programs, and the Canadian University Partnership in Cooperation and Development Programme (UPCD) (CIDA 1996), a new linkage program started in 1993 as the result of a restructuring of previous linkage programs by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). It is also apparent in the policy of the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). At the implementation level, these organisations restrict their action to the institution itself at both departmental and central level. In recent years mounting attention has been given to management, because of urgent deficiencies in this area. Within this interpretation there resides a danger of reducing institution-building to mere efficiency and management issues.

This approach has also been adopted by The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (United States) in its institutional support programs for Nigerian universities. The Foundation opened an office in Nigeria in 1994 and since then has made grants totaling more than $60 million in support of organizations and individuals working to improve the country. MacArthur makes grants in three main areas: 1.) strengthening African universities, 2.) population and reproductive health, and 3.) human rights. Subsequently the MacArthur Foundation has provided substantial support to four universities in Nigeria: the University of Ibadan; Bayero University, Kano; Ahmadu Bello University; and the University of Port Harcourt. The Foundation's approach to support for higher education in Nigeria is to help strengthen the core human and operational infrastructures of the universities in areas such as information technology, administrative operations, and staff development, and to help expand libraries and obtain up-to-date scientific equipment.

Taking Bayero University as an example, the Foundation has awarded grants to Bayero University totaling $5.4 million, used to increase staff development programs and upgrade university facilities, particularly in science and technology. With MacArthur support, Bayero University invested heavily in information and communication technology and recently opened a new center for information technology. The number of staff skilled in computers rose from 63 in 2000 to more than 300 in 2005. The university has expanded the number of staff with Ph.D. degrees, with the goal of having enough Ph.D. staff members in each department to gain accreditation by the National Universities Commission. Indeed so successful was this that the University was accorded the status of the best university in northern Nigeria in the recent NUC accreditation exercise. The university library had only six pieces of electronic literature available on its local area network in 2000, but today has over 6,000 items. Also, with MacArthur support, the university established a new department of agriculture, currently enrolling 109 students

The macro level

At this level, the notion of institutional development is perceived as the functioning of an institution, in its broad national educational and scientific context. It focuses not only on organisational aspects of the institution, ***but also on the functioning of an institution as part of a national educational scientific system and culture***. In actual implementation, actions are directed at several levels of the system, e.g., the institution, the national research council, the ministry of education, etc. The Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with Developing Countries (SAREC) holds to a broad definition of institution-building (Olsson 1992) and has worked out strategies which intervene at different levels of the system.

Although there is some disagreement about whether implementation should focus on: the department, the institution or government policy, there seems to be growing agreement on some basic principles of the mode of cooperation:

- Long term co-operation: practically all donor policy documents relating to linkages state that in order for institutional co-operation to be effective, long-term partnerships need to be developed. Though in practice project cycles of four to five years are not unusual, it is believed that at the institutional level the linkage arrangement should be targeted at periods of 10 to 15 years. Projects therefore can be extended more than once;
- Orientation in accordance with the institutional needs and priorities of the partner university in the South: collaborative partner support should start from the needs and priorities of the partner institution and needs to fit well into the local policy environment of the Southern partner institution. It is believed that only if the partner institution attaches high priority to the projects, will linkages achieve the necessary participation at all levels to be sustainable in the long run;
- Ownership: apart from their required participation in the process of project identification, partner institutions in the South also need to be fully involved in the process of implementation at all levels. Most collaborative agencies have come to acknowledge the plain fact that a lack of strong involvement on the part of beneficiary institutions has a negative impact on the successful implementation as well as on the sustainability of development cooperation;
- Sustainability: collaborative partners ultimately aim to build an institutional capacity which is sustainable in the long run, making external support redundant;
- Collaborative partner co-ordination: although there remains a tremendous gap between intentions and practice, all collaborative partner policy documents at some point indicate the willingness to co-ordinate more with other contributing partners.

Mechanism of Linkages

Thus academic linkages are long-term mutually-enriching relationships between two or more academic institutions, departments, schools or faculties. Occasionally, non-academic institutions may be involved in such linkages if they can play a valid role in teaching or research. Linkages often originate through informal staff contacts, but eventually evolve into formal agreements which may cover a variety of forms of

cooperation. The following are some of the academic linkage possibilities, although the names and titles given to the program varies amongst universities.

- student exchanges
- study abroad programs for students
- Visiting International Professor (VIP) program
- Visiting International Scholar (VIS) program
- University Mentorship (UM) program for international staff
- Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) amongst institutions

Why Establish Academic Linkages With Known Institutional Partners?
Academic linkages with known institutional partners have a number of advantages over 'open' exchanges:

- academic standards and curriculum content are well known
- credit equivalencies can be established in advance
- full credit load can be undertaken in partner institution
- recurring programs with known partners are easy to administer
- international program option can be used as recruiting tool for new students
- staff exchanges are facilitated

Linkages may take any of the following forms:

- student exchange programs, with related (complementary or congruent) academic units abroad
- year-abroad or term-abroad options for students, with full academic credit recognition
- recurring international co-op or internship positions
- ongoing staff exchange programs
- staff exchanges
- joint research
- library and documentation exchange
- exchange of pedagogical material
- exchange of scientific and laboratory equipment
- joint participation in seminars and conferences
- other forms of collaboration

Academic linkages can also evolve out of multilateral research and development projects. For instance, Brock International University (United States) administers large institutional development projects involving close cooperation between universities in Canada and one or more developing countries. These are highly structured and subject to guidelines set out by an external funding body such as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

How Are International Academic Linkages Established?
As mentioned previously, academic linkages often originate through informal contact between staff at two or more institutions who share some form of common interest. For short-term projects or academic interactions of limited scope or duration, then no formal linkage agreements are necessary. However, if there is sufficient interest,

support, and potential for long-term interaction, then informal arrangements may evolve into formal academic linkages.

Steps To Establishing A Successful International Academic Linkage
One of the best guidelines is given in the excerpts from a co-publication of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and The British Council entitled *Guide to establishing international academic links* (1993).

Step 1: Starting out
Ask yourself the following questions before proceeding:

- What is the degree of institutional commitment to a sustained link? There must be a strong base of grassroots support in the relevant academic and administrative units in order for the link to be effective.
- Will the link support the mission, needs and strengths of the university?
- Will the institution's academic and research standards be maintained or enhanced as a result of the link?
- What are the existing personal contacts between the institutions that could form the basis of a link?
- To what degree is the link dependant upon the interests and activities of a small number of people? If the base of support is very small, then the link is likely to become inactive as personnel and interests change.
- Is the proposed partner located in a region of the world in which the institution has a particular interest?
- Are there any natural affinities between the two institutions (size, linguistically shared experiences, etc.)?
- What would be the financial implications of the proposed link for the institution?
- How will the link be funded?

Step 2: Negotiating the Linkage Agreement

- A clear and shared understanding of the benefits and objectives of the proposed link must be arrived at between the two institutions.
- Detailed preparation for the link should include input from and be based on the solid commitment of affected departments. This is particularly critical in the case of student exchanges, where the issue of mutual recognition of degree credits would have to be seriously addressed.
- The initial formal contact may be between the presidents or other senior administrators of both institutions.
- An individual with overall responsibility for administration of the proposed link should be identified in the proposed partner institution. In Nigerian situations, this is often handled by specific units of the University charged with this responsibility.
- Following the exchange of correspondence between the presidents, the administrator would initiate contact with the counterpart in the partner institution. This contact would seek to develop in greater detail the parameters set out in the initial contact between presidents.
- A preparatory visit to or from the international partner, involving the administrator and/or staff, may be deemed appropriate by both partners.

Step 3: The agreement

- A written agreement should be prepared for signature by the president of each institution.
- Institutions lacking experience in developing links may find it desirable to make their linkage agreement as simple and single-purpose as possible, thus ensuring a greater chance of success.
- The agreement should contain the following provisions: mutual goals; definitions; a statement of who the expected participants are, and how many; payment of fees and other costs; mutual recognition of credits where student exchange is involved; responsibilities of each university; a clause providing for future rectification of weaknesses and problem areas in the agreement and renewal of the agreement subject to mutual satisfaction; a withdrawal clause (providing for advance notice).
- Regular contact between the institutions following signature of the agreement will help to ensure that the link will remain relevant, effective and free of serious problems.

Conclusion

It is very clear that academic linkages – which often lead to academic mentoring – is one of the most effective ways of ensuring quality assurance and internationalization of academic programs in developing countries. Through such linkages, quality staff and students are produced that would provide a global world-class perspective to education in developing countries and not only boost political relationships, but also invest greater confidence in institutions in developing countries.

One note of worry, however, is that such linkages tended to be predominantly vertical, rather than horizontal. By vertical linkages I am referring to the North-South linkages, where collaborative partners are drawn predominantly from either from North America (US and Canada mainly), or Europe (UK, Norway, Sweden, France mainly). In a way this is understandable because top research institutions and academic staff with world-wide reputation are located in the Northern countries. Naturally any "intellectual flakes" that rub on institutions in developing countries from such prestigious connections would be eagerly accepted.

However, this is at the detriment of horizontal linkages. By horizontal linkages I am referring to collaborative linkages and partnerships between institutions in developing countries. In this regard countries that have proved their nettle in impressive scholarship and research could serve as models of best practices that work in developing countries and could be facilitators for horizontal linkages. In this way, countries such as India, Brazil, Malaysia, Indonesia, Egypt have developed impressive scholastic and research tradition, share similar political and social and often cultural climates with each other, and therefore could serve as a nexus to a series of institutions in the South. Linkage partners from the North – UK, US, Europe – could serve as facilitators in the process, as well as providing support in areas of deficiency.

References

Ahmat, S. (1987) "The relevance of American Educational model for Malaysia," in Altbach, P. G. (ed) *An Asean-American Dialogue: The relevance of American higher Education to Southeast Asia.* Singapore: Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development.

Alvarez, B. and Gomez, H. (1994) *Laying the Foundation: The Institutions of Knowledge in Developing Countries*. Ottawa: IDRC.

Aminu, J. (1986) *Quality and Stress in Nigerian Education.* Maiduguri, Nigeria: University of Maiduguri and Northern Nigerian Publishing Company.

Ashby, E. (1966) *Universities: British, Indian, African.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ate, B. E. *Decolonization and dependence: The development of Nigeria-U.S. relations, 1960-1984* . Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1987.

Audenhove, Leo Van (1998) "Development Co-Operation and Linkages in Higher Education: Key Issues Concerning Policy and Organisation", *International Review of Education – Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft – Revue Internationale de Pédagogie 44(5/6): 531–548, 1998.*

Berman, E. H. (1979) "Foundations, United States Foreign policy, and African Education, 1945-1975." *Harvard Educational Review*, Volume 49, Number 2, May 1979, pp 145-179.

CIDA (1996) *University Partnerships in Co-operation and Development. Guidelines for Tier 1: Program Development, Selection Process and Preparation of Submissions*. Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency.

Coleman, J. S. (1958) *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coombs, P. H. (1964) *The fourth dimension of foreign policy: Educational and cultural affairs.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations/Harper and Row, Publishers.

Eke, K. K. *Nigeria's foreign policy under two military governments, 1966-1979: An analysis of the Gowon and Muhammad/Obasanjo regimes*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Fry, G. W. (1984) "The economic and political impact of study abroad." *Comparative Education Review*, Volume 28, Number 2, May 1984, pp 203-220.

Galloway, C. *Relations between Nigeria and Britain during the period 1970-1986*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, Scotland, 1987.

Gambari, I. A. *Theory and reality in foreign policy making: Nigeria after the second republic*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc., 1989.

Gonzales, A. (1985) "The legacy of American higher Education in The Philippines: An assessment." in Altbach, P. G. (ed) *An Asean-American Dialogue: The relevance of American higher Education to Southeast Asia.* Singapore: Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development.

Gruhn, I. V. and Anthony C. G. (1980) *U.S. Policy on science for development in Africa*. University of California Los Angeles Occasional Paper Number 19. UCLA: African Studies Center.

Henderson, J. P. (1967) "The African image of higher Education in America." *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Spring 1967, pp 45-56.

Hewitt, A. and Sutton, M. "British aid: a change of direction." *ODI Review*, 1-1980, pp 1-10.

Howe, C. W. (1964) "African approaches to the development of higher Education: A sampling of views of African academics," in Pier, D. C. and Cole, T. (eds) *Post-Primary Education and political and economic development*. Duke University Commonwealth Studies Center, Publication Number 20. London: Cambridge University Press/Duke University Commonwealth Studies Center.

Ijoma, B. I. C. (1986) "The origin and philosophy of the University." in Obiechina, E, Ike, C, and Umeh, J. A. (eds) *University of Nigeria 1960-1985: An experiment in higher Education.* Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press.

Kiewiet, C. W. de. (1959) "American Education and British Commonwealth." *Universities Quarterly*, Volume 13, Number 2, February 1959, pp 132-140.

Montgomery, J. D. *Aid to Africa: New Test for U.S. Policy*. *Headline Series*: Foreign Policy Association, World Affairs Center, Number 149, September 20, 1961.

Morales-Gomez, D. A. (1991) *Issues in Capacity-Building in Education Research Experiences from the Perspective of IDRC*. Nice: Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Working Group on Education.

Moore, M. (1995) *Institution Building as a Development Assistance Method. A Review of Literature and Ideas*. Stockholm: SAREC, Evaluation report 1995/1.

Nakayama, S. (1989) “Independence and choice: Western impacts on Japanese higher Education.” in Altbach, P. G. (ed) *From dependence to autonomy*: *The development of Asian universities.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Nuffic (1995) Co-funding Programme for Co-operation in Higher Education. Description of the programme and associated procedures). Den Haag: Nuffic.

Ojike, M. (1944) *Higher Education in American social order, with special application to Nigeria.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago.

Okeke, U. (1955) *Educational Reconstruction in independent Nigeria*. Unpublished PhD thesis, New York University.

Okongwu, N. J. (1964) *History of Education in Nigeria, 1842-1942*. Unpublished PhD thesis, New York University.

Olsson, B. 1992. *The Ownership and Cultivation of Knowledge. The Rationale for Swedish Support to Universities in Developing Countries*. Stockholm: SAREC.

Ransom, D. (1970) “The Berkeley Mafia and the Indonesian massacre.” *Ramparts*, Volume 9, Number 4, October 1970, pp 38-49.

Ukpaby, E. N. (1956) *American Education: a critical analysis and its possible implication for Nigerian Education*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Bradley University, Illinois.

United States, Department of State. *Sub-Saharan Africa and the United States*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State Publication 9112, 1980.

van den Berghe, P. L. (1973) *Power and privilege at an African university*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.