

12-13-2013

The Issue of Mutuality in Canada-China Educational Collaboration

Phirom Leng

University of Toronto, phiromleng99@gmail.com

Julia Pan

University of Toronto, julia.pan@utoronto.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci>

Recommended Citation

Leng, Phirom and Pan, Julia (2013) "The Issue of Mutuality in Canada-China Educational Collaboration," *Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale*: Vol. 42: Iss. 2, Article 6.

Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol42/iss2/6>

This Research paper/Rapport de recherche is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact kmarshal@uwo.ca.

The Issue of Mutuality in Canada-China Educational Collaboration

La question de mutualité dans la collaboration éducative Canada-Chine

Phirom Leng, University of Toronto

Julia Pan, University of Toronto

Abstract

This paper examines the power relationships in two major Canada-China university linkage programs which ran between 1989 and 2001: the Canada-China University Linkage Program [CCULP] (1989-1995) and the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program [SULCP] (1996-2001). The study adopts the cosmopolitan concept of mutuality as a theoretical lens and employs the analytical method of constant comparison of qualitative data to explore the context surrounding the mutuality evidenced in CCULP/SULCP. The findings show that both programs manifested the four characteristics of mutuality identified by Johan Galtung: equity, autonomy, solidarity and participation. Human values or cultural agency were identified as the key factor making mutuality possible, as well as nurturing and sustaining the relationships between Canadian and Chinese participants. This study suggests that cosmopolitanism be given more attention in this increasingly interconnected world. Its primary emphasis is on human relationships, and this dimension needs to be given more space in international academic relations.

Resumé

Cet article examine les relations de pouvoir existant dans deux grands programmes de liaison universitaires entre le Canada et la Chine qui se sont déroulés entre 1989 et 2001: le Programme de Liaison Universitaire Canada-Chine [PLUCC] (1989-1995) et le Programme Spécial de Consolidation de Liaison Universitaire [PSCLU] (1996-2001). L'étude adopte le concept cosmopolite de mutualité comme cadre théorique et utilise la méthode analytique de comparaison constante des données qualitatives afin d'explorer le contexte entourant la mutualité mise en évidence dans les PLUCC/PSCLU. Les résultats dévoilent que les deux programmes démontrent des quatre caractéristiques de mutualité identifiées par Johan Galtung: équité, autonomie, solidarité et participation. Les valeurs humaines ou pouvoir culturel ont été identifiés comme étant le facteur clé rendant possible la mutualité, de même qu'entretenir et soutenir les relations entre les participants Canadiens et Chinois. Cette étude suggère que davantage d'attention soit accordée au cosmopolitisme dans ce monde de plus en plus interconnecté. L'emphase première est placée sur les relations humaines, et l'on doit accorder davantage d'espace à cette dimension dans les relations académiques internationales.

Keywords: international academic relations, development assistance, constructivism, cosmopolitanism, cultural agency, mutuality

Mots-clés: relations académiques internationales; aide au développement; constructivisme; cosmopolitisme; pouvoir culturel; mutualité

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the degree of mutuality manifested in two Canada-China university linkage programs which ran between 1989 and 2001: the Canada-China University Linkage Program [CCULP] (1989-1995) and the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program [SULCP] (1996-2001). It begins with an overview of the development of CCULP/SULCP, followed by a discussion of the theoretical concept of mutuality within Johan Galtung's structural theory of imperialism and David Held's cosmopolitanism. Then, the study's methodology is introduced and emerging themes from the interviews are presented, using the

four characteristics of mutuality as a framework of analysis: equity, autonomy, solidarity and participation.

Canada began to offer large-scale development assistance to Chinese higher education in the early 1980s, immediately after the country opened itself to the outside world and re-established relationships with Western countries. In October 1983, a General Agreement on Development Cooperation was signed by Canada and China which provided the basis for all Canadian government development programming in China. Coordinated by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Canadian assistance focused on helping China develop its higher education system, which had been devastated by the chaos of the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) (Wilson, 2001). Between 1983 and 2001, CIDA provided CDN\$ 250 million in funding to support a wide range of education and human resource development activities between the two countries, including the two major programs that will be discussed in this paper: the Canada-China University Linkage Program [CCULP] (1989-1995); and the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program [SULCP] (1996-2001) (Jackson, 2003).

CCULP and SULCP were seen to have a profound impact on the development of Chinese higher education institutions and their surrounding communities in a wide range of knowledge areas, including education, health, agriculture, environment, and engineering (the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada [AUCC], 2000). Both programs were part of a sustained relationship between the two countries in that SULCP was created as a continuation of CCULP, which had been, in turn, established, as a result of improved relationships between universities in both countries, and the experience of the early Canada-China Management Education Program (CCMEP 1983-1988) (Wilson, 2001). Hence, the central premise of this study is that the success of CCULP and SULCP can be ascribed to an approach emphasizing mutuality, which was distinct from the traditional development aid models adopted by most Western countries in their relationships with the developing world following the era of decolonization.

An Overview of CCULP and SULCP

Canada-China diplomatic relationships were restored in 1970 and have, since then, improved significantly through trade, family reunification programs, and Canada's support for China at the international level, including its voting for China in the UN (Wilson, 2001). Academic collaboration between the two countries was initiated at the same time in order to promote educational and cultural exchanges. More than 2,500 Chinese students and scholars came to Canada for both short-term and long-term study between 1970 and 1983 (Singer, 1986, p. 8). However, large-scale academic collaborative programs between the two countries had not taken place until the early 1980s, when Canada informed China that it was eligible for Canadian official development assistance, immediately after the country began to be reintegrated into the world.

From the outset, Canada's educational programs in China were based on the strategic concept of "the multiplication of contacts at the thinking level", suggesting that with its scarce resources, Canada would focus its assistance programs on helping China develop its human resources, particularly at the higher education level (Wilson, 2001). From 1983 to 2001, a significant part of CIDA's funding went to supporting university linkage programs between the two countries (Jackson, 2003). The first major CIDA-funded program was the Canada-China Management Education Program (CCMEP), with its first phase operating from 1983 to 1988. CCMEP's purpose was to help strengthen China's management education after the country began to be integrated into the world capitalist system, moving away from a centrally-planned

economy (Ryan, Falkenheim, & Hayhoe, 1987). Due to the chaos of the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), China had lagged far behind other countries by the late 1970s, especially in science and technology. Also, more than two thirds of Chinese managers at the time lacked technical and entrepreneurial skills (Falkenheim, 1987). Up to 1983, China had only five institutes for management training, with a total of 100 teachers and 2,000 students (Hayhoe, 1989). Hence, CCMEP was designed to respond to China's urgent need for new knowledge and skills to participate in the world economy.

By the mid-1980s, relationships between Canada and China, as well as between higher education institutions in both countries, had significantly improved and greatly matured. With its rapid economic growth, China requested Canada to help develop its human resources in other areas, in addition to management education (Wilson, 2001). Those areas included education, minority studies, agriculture, forestry, health, energy, and engineering. Responding to China's request, the Canadian government set up a new development plan for China in 1986, which not only expanded CCMEP into the second phase (1990-1996), but also established a new program, namely the Canada-China University Linkage Program (CCULP) to be started in 1988-89. CCULP – composed of 31 projects (see Appendix) – was managed by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), a not-for-profit, non-governmental institution whose major role is to promote the interests of Canadian universities at home and abroad (AUCC, 2000). It is important to highlight that in CCULP, CIDA paid considerable attention to three major development priorities, including sustainable development, the participation of women and minority groups, and environmentally sound development. Thus, compared to CCMEP, CCULP projects were more widely dispersed to cover small and hinterland institutions. Chinese municipalities and provinces in which those projects were carried out included Beijing, Guangdong, Hainan, Shanghai, Tianjin, Hubei, Zhejiang, Shaanxi, Jilin, Jiangsu, Sichuan, and Gansu (Pan, 1995).

The success of CCULP led to the establishment of the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program [SULCP] (1996-2001) – a five-year program comprising 11 projects, each of which linked a Canadian university with one or more Chinese institutions (AUCC, 2000). SULCP projects were selected from CCULP, and expanded to include more participants, especially from the Chinese side. For instance, the SULCP project entitled “Partnership for Good Health for Children and Mothers” was expanded from the CCULP linkage project between the Children and Women's Health Centre of British Columbia (C&W) and Guangzhou Children's Hospital (GCH) to include six new partner hospitals in China. In total, SULCP included 25 Canadian and more than 200 Chinese universities, teaching hospitals, schools, and other agencies (Zha, 2010).

CIDA's three development priorities in China remained the major focus of SULCP. In fact, all SULCP projects placed more emphasis on the development of human resources at the grassroots level, believing that in China, “sustainable development occurs when individuals, families and communities work toward their own development within a larger regional or national framework” (AUCC, 2000, p. 2). Thus, the selection of all SULCP participating institutions was made on the basis of their relevance to the development of their surrounding communities (AUCC, 2000). Like CCULP, SULCP activities involved faculty exchanges, collaborative research, training of Chinese students and scholars in Canada, program and curriculum development, conferences, seminars and study tours in both countries (Pan, 1995). Overall, both CCULP and SULCP had a profound impact on Chinese higher education and its surrounding communities in a wide range of knowledge areas, including education, health,

engineering, agriculture and environment. It is against the successful backdrop of CCULP/SULCP that this study aims to examine the mutuality approach adopted by both countries in their international academic collaboration.

Theoretical Framework

This study employs the concept of mutuality as a theoretical framework and examines the degree of mutuality in CCULP/SULCP. The concept is rooted in the World Order Models Project (WOMP) theory, particularly Galtung's structural theory of imperialism. Galtung (1980) defines imperialism (or dominance) as "a type of relationship whereby one society (or collectivity in more general terms) can dominate another" (p. 107). According to him, there are four mechanisms of imperialism or structural violence (Galtung 1975, 1980). They include: (1) Exploitation, meaning a vertical division of labor which produces an asymmetrical distribution of the net benefits between researchers from the center and peripheral participants; (2) Penetration, meaning the exploiters from the center are able to penetrate "under the skin" of the exploited, creating a bridgehead at the periphery; (3) Fragmentation, meaning peripheral participants are separated from each other; and (4) Marginalization, meaning peripheral participants or researchers play only a subordinate role in creating new theories or knowledge.

Contrasting with those four parameters of imperialism, Galtung proposes four opposite parameters as structurally-oriented goals of international relations that together make up the concept of mutuality. They are equity, autonomy, solidarity and participation. In using Galtung's framework to study international cooperation in Chinese higher education during the 1980s, Hayhoe (1989) nicely summarized the four values, as follows:

Equity suggests aims and forms of organization that are reached through full mutual agreement. Autonomy suggests a respect for the theoretical perspectives rooted in peripheral culture that would require center participants to gain a thorough knowledge of this culture. Solidarity suggests forms of organization that encourage maximum interaction among peripheral participants and growing links between them and their fellow researchers. Participation intimates an approach to knowledge that does not stratify in a hierarchical way but assumes the possibility of a creative peripheral contribution from the very beginning. (p. 134)

Galtung's concept of mutuality emerged during the Cold War period when the global political economy was largely controlled by two hegemonic powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. Since the collapse of the latter in the early 1990s, the world has moved toward a multi-polar economic and political system, no longer controlled by Western countries. This has been manifested in many ways, one being the rapid economic development of countries in East and Southeast Asia over the last two decades (Held, 2010). China, for instance, has become the world's second largest economy after the United States, and accounted for one third of the world's economic growth in 2008 (IMF, 2008, cited by Held, 2010). Furthermore, emerging global issues, like environmental deterioration, have recently demanded new forms of collaboration among countries, regardless of their economic-political backgrounds and ideologies (Held, 2010). Since CCULP/SULCP emerged during the period of these major changes, this study will employ the cosmopolitan concept of mutuality, which might be seen as a refinement of the earlier efforts of WOMP scholars.

Like WOMP, cosmopolitanism views world events or phenomena as socially and historically constructed, highlighting the important role of people and their social interactions in creating meaning (Held, 2010; Mundy, 2007). As Held (2010) puts it, this paradigm is concerned with "the ethical and political space which sets out the terms of reference for the recognition of

people's equal moral worth, their active agency and what is required for their autonomy and development" (p. 49). Hence, cosmopolitanism sees human values and dignity as more important than nation-states or other human organizations. This, however, does not mean it ignores the important and constructive role of nation-states and other organizations. As Held (2003) remarked:

States can be conceived as vehicles to aid the delivery of effective public regulation, equal liberty and social justice, but they should not be thought of as ontologically privileged. They can be judged by how far they deliver these public goods and how far they fail; for the history of states is, of course, marked not just by phases of corruption and bad management but also by the most brutal episodes. (p. 470)

Overall, cosmopolitanism accepts diversity and aims to promote mutuality and equality among nations and communities in the world. It is important to note that although cosmopolitanism has long existed, it has been enriched by WOMP concepts and theories. Thus, David Held's four principles of contemporary cosmopolitanism share basic core characteristics with Galtung's four mechanisms of mutuality. (Held, 2003, 2010)

In his first principle of egalitarian individualism, every human being, regardless of their ethnicity and socio-economic background, is the primary focus of moral concern, not states or other forms of human association. This position, which emphasizes equal moral values and accepts cultural diversity and differences among countries and communities, is complementary to Galtung's notion of autonomy. The second principle of reciprocal recognition highlights the importance of the status of equal worth, suggesting that everyone follow agreed judgment about rules, laws and policies. This principle is related to Galtung's concept of equity.

Held's third principle of consent supports the basis of non-coercive collective agreement and governance, suggesting that everyone have an equal status in the decision-making process. The last principle of inclusiveness and subsidiarity seeks to clarify the fundamental criterion of drawing proper boundaries around units of collective decision-making. It suggests that those significantly affected by public decisions, issues or processes should have an equal opportunity, directly or indirectly, to participate in those decisions through elected representation. Held's third and fourth principles expand Galtung's notions of solidarity and participation. It is important to highlight that Held's third and fourth principles do not suggest the elimination of the centralized system inherently existing in many societies, as opposed to the decentralized one. Rather, the notion is to find the right balance of power appropriate in a particular context and society. Overall, Held's principles, while built upon the works of various scholars, including Martha Nussbaum, Charles Beitz, Thomas Pogges and Robert Dahl, among others, represent a progressive approach in cosmopolitan thought. Especially, moving beyond the basic ethical, religious and liberal aspects of his cosmopolitan predecessors, Held puts forward the notion of creating global democratic governance that would serve the interests of every individual, community and nation.

Table 1 presents a refined framework of mutuality in international university relationships, based on the cosmopolitan paradigm within the context of Canada-China academic relationships. This framework might be seen as a coherent ideal, against which the degree of mutuality in CCULP/SULCP is measured.

There are three major reasons for adopting the cosmopolitan concept of mutuality, instead of dependency or center-periphery theory, which has been widely used to study North-South academic relations. First, China was not a post-colonial society, but had its own established economic and political systems when opening itself to the outside world in the late

1970s (Hayhoe, 1989). This was different from the situation of many Southern countries which continued to depend on economic support from developed countries, often their former colonial masters, in the era of decolonization. Hence, dependency or center-periphery theory would be less applicable to the study of power relationships in international academic collaboration between China and Western countries, including Canada. The use of these theories in the Chinese context would also overlook the cultural factor, especially the Confucian ethos, which played an important role in Chinese higher education and the larger society for centuries (Hayhoe, 1989).

Table 1: Mutuality Framework for CCULP/SULCP

Equity:	Aims and forms of international programs between Chinese and Canadian universities were mutually reached.
Autonomy:	Both Chinese and Canadian participants were willing to learn about and show respect for each other's culture, values, system of knowledge and belief system.
Solidarity:	Chinese universities, faculty and researchers were connected with one another within and outside their own institutions, and gained institutional, local and national government support.
Participation:	During the programs, Chinese faculty, researchers and administrators participated fully in all activities and contributed to knowledge production on an equal basis.

Second, CCULP and SULCP were shaped by Canada's post-World War II international development policy toward developing countries. Like Norway and Sweden, Canada tried to establish its role as a middle-power country, rather than a center dealing with peripheries (Trilokekar, 2009; Weiler, 1984; Pharo, 2003). Instead of imposing its own ideology on developing countries or following that of the U.S. capitalist bloc, the Soviet communist bloc or even such multilateral agencies as the World Bank, Canada oriented its international assistance to meeting the development needs of Southern countries at the time. In the Chinese context, Canada's development assistance, particularly through CCULP/SULCP, aimed to help China develop its human resources at the higher education level, in key knowledge areas, including education, agriculture, health, forestry and engineering. This made Canada different from many Western countries and international organizations which had tended to focus their international education assistance for the developing world mainly on basic education and at certain points, on non-formal and technical/vocational education between the 1970s and the 1990s (Banya & Elu, 2001; King, 1990, 2009). Hence, dependency or center-periphery theory would be inappropriate to the study of power dynamics in Canada-China academic relationships, including CCULP/SULCP.

Last, but not least, as indicated earlier, CCULP/SULCP emerged just before the end of the Cold War at the dawn of globalization, as the world began moving towards a multipolar political-economic system. In international development programs, the rhetoric of equal partnerships between developed and developing countries was more widely discussed than ever before at this time (Crossley & Watson, 2003). Researchers and scholars from both developed and developing countries called for a "genuine partnership" in tackling issues within the

developing world. They acknowledged that disparities between higher education systems in the North and those in the South had widened over years, due in large part to limited Southern involvement in international project activities (Crossley & Watson, 2003). Many developing countries were critical of the continued dominance of positivist thinking, in both policy and scholarship, in international development programs – the factor which had been seen to contribute not only to the failure of knowledge transfer from the North to the South but also to the marginalization of local knowledge in the latter. This, along with changes in the world's geopolitics and economy, has significant implications for research in comparative and international education. Crossley & Watson (2003) claimed that there needed to be a fundamental theoretical and methodological reconceptualization of comparative and international research, in which considerable attention must be paid to differing cultural perspectives among nations and communities. Hence, cosmopolitanism, with its emphasis on human values, would be most appropriate to the study of power relationships in CCULP/SULCP.

Methodology and Themes

This study follows a qualitative research method, which emphasizes the importance of people's values, their experience and the meanings they have constructed in the world (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2009; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). The method is most appropriate for this study, whose purpose is to examine the context surrounding the degree of mutuality in CCULP/SULCP. Adopting this method, the study collected data from July 2011 to October 2012, through semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 20 Canadians and 30 Chinese who had participated in these programs, as students, visiting scholars or administrators. They were selected from six knowledge areas, including education, culture and minority studies, health, engineering, agriculture, and environment. All digitally recorded interviews and field notes were transcribed. Through an analysis that involved the constant comparison of qualitative data, the emerging context was discussed, in relation to the core concepts of equity, autonomy, solidarity and participation, which together form an ideal type of mutuality. This is used as the frame for the analysis of the interviews data that follows.

Equity

Interviews indicated that at the initiation and planning stage, the Chinese side made every effort to ensure that collaborative projects with Canada would respond to China's development needs at the time. As one Canadian participating in the Shanghai-Montreal partnership explained, Chinese people were very enthusiastic about CIDA's programs and were willing to do everything to get the right people and skills for the transportation project (Interview with Université de Montréal participant, September 24, 2012). Similarly, another Canadian participant recalled his impression that his Chinese colleagues approached SULCP with "a long-term goal and a clear sense of future direction" (Interview with AUCC participant, October 4, 2012). He further commented that they wanted CIDA's programs to have long-lasting benefits for China and thus, worked closely and collaboratively with their Canadian counterparts to plan and design the programs from the very beginning.

China's keen involvement in CCULP/SULCP during the planning stage was also pointed out by Chinese interviewees. For instance, a participant in the CCULP education project between the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and East China Normal University (ECNU) emphasized that "agreements can be very simple, but planning the projects with details must be done carefully together in order to establish long-term relationships" (Interview with ECNU

participant, July 1, 2011). Although only a few Chinese interviewees in the study explicitly mentioned China's early involvement in the planning of CCULP/SULCP, all of them claimed that both programs responded in a timely way to China's development needs. None mentioned any aid conditions or project agenda imposed by Canada at the expense of China. Hence, it can be concluded that Chinese participants were as actively involved in the design and planning of CCULP/SULCP as their Canadian counterparts. This is thus clear evidence of equity in both programs.

Autonomy

The study found that CCULP/SULCP manifested a strong degree of autonomy. Participants from both sides saw human values as the basis of their relationships and thus paid considerable attention to learning about each other's culture, values, and the academic norms embedded in their education systems. As one Canadian participant in the Alberta-National Academy of Educational Administration (NAEA) relationship under CCULP explained:

Although cultural, language and pedagogical differences posed enormous challenges for me, I was able to gain better understanding of China, through observing and learning from my Chinese colleagues. For instance, in relation to decision-making in the Chinese context, I learned that unlike in the West in which you get straight answers to things, in China you don't get all the answers automatically, or you get answers in a superficial way, and you have to figure out all the answers by yourself. (Interview with University of Alberta participant, May 18, 2012)

Other Canadian interviewees expressed similar feelings about their fondness for and understanding of Chinese cultural values. In fact, the study revealed that promoting intercultural understanding had been strongly embedded within the mission of many Canadian universities. As a Canadian participant in the Jilin-Regina relationship noted, "at the University of Regina, people need to know about or have the ability to understand the protocol, etiquette, cultural understanding, etc. when dealing with others. Such understanding will enable them be flexible when dealing with different cultures." (Interview with University of Regina participant, October 6, 2011.)

Likewise, many Chinese interviewees who had been to Canada under CCULP/SULCP expressed great respect for and were keen to learn about Canada's educational values and perspectives. For instance, the Chinese participant in the OISE-ECNU relationship commented:

We need to have a cultural understanding of how one or another nation looks at problems. Canadians look at educational problems in a different way from China, which is excellent for learning. Also, in terms of methods, China used traditional ones, while Westerners gave a lot of good ideas about different methods and different ways of thinking rooted in their culture. There is a great need for communication among participants from both sides to understand each other. (Interview with ECNU participant, July 1st, 2011)

Furthermore, Chinese interviewees emphasized that understanding each other's values not only led to the success of CCULP/SULCP but also was the key to maintaining the relationships between Canadian and Chinese academics after both programs ended. As one Chinese participant in the Laval-Norman Bethune partnership pointed out, "our relationships remained strong, and in fact, became even closer, like brothers and sisters" (Interview with Norman Bethune/Jilin University participant, July 11, 2011). He further noted that both sides were willing to put up funds for any possible collaborative programs in the future. It is evident that CCULP/SULCP embodied the autonomy aspect of intercultural understanding.

Solidarity

In relation to solidarity, the study found that government officials from both sides showed strong support for CCULP/SULCP. To quote from a Chinese participant in the SULCP Saskatchewan-Jilin education project, “provincial leaders of Saskatchewan and Jilin were very active in supporting all CIDA’s projects” (interview with University of Regina participant, October 6, 2011). Likewise, the Chinese participant in the Laval-Norman Bethune health project agreed on the key role of government officials in supporting and sustaining the relationships between Université Laval and Norman Bethune University of Medical Sciences as well as between Jilin Province and Quebec City. According to him, the support by government officials from both sides created a favorable condition for CIDA’s projects and collaborative programs between the two regions and cities (Interview with Jilin University participant, July 11, 2011).

The Canadian participant working at the AUCC also emphasized the AUCC’s important role in coordinating CCULP/SULCP:

With its well-established mandate and reputation, the AUCC represents Canadian universities internationally, since Canada does not have a Ministry of Education. In CCULP/SULCP, its role was to ensure that the quality of higher education at the international level would meet the key standards. (Interview with AUCC participant, October 4, 2012)

While most interviewees from both sides made positive comments about the role of those external agencies, a few Chinese participants felt a little disappointed that faculty did not gain enough support at the time from their respective institution or local government for their international activities. As an interviewee in the OISE-Shaanxi Normal University project noted, “the president was not very enthusiastic in international activities because of his background in ancient history, and the government at the time did not see much value in international work either” (Interview with Shaanxi Normal University participant, May 9, 2012). As a result, she continued, the dissemination of new knowledge and skills was limited to her own department of education. Regarding this issue of not receiving enough institutional and government support, several Chinese interviewees concluded that in the 1990s, they were constrained by the system and enjoyed relatively limited academic freedom, compared to their Canadian counterparts.

The 1989 Tiananmen incident was mentioned in the study as another negative factor impacting CCULP at the time. The Chinese participant in the Laval-Norman Bethune health project noted that 15 Chinese from the Norman Bethune Faculty of Medicine at Jilin University, who were ready to leave for Canada after completing their French training at Beijing Normal University, were delayed after the event. The troubled political atmosphere also created a non-returnee problem among Chinese who went to Canada (interview with Norman Bethune /Jilin University participant, July 11, 2011). The resulting situation, according to another Chinese participating in the OISE-Beijing Normal University relationship, was that the Chinese government no longer wanted to send doctoral students abroad and CIDA-supported training programs at Normal Beijing University were also shortened from 15 to 8 months (Interview with Beijing Normal U participant, July 6, 2011).

Despite the above-mentioned problems, Canadian and Chinese interviewees indicated that both sides were serious and determined to overcome difficult political and economic barriers. To quote from the Chinese participant in the Laval-Norman Bethune relationship:

The Canadians had a clear five-year plan, from which they never deviated. This was different from the Chinese way and realities. Many changes in society and politics affected them, so it was not easy to follow the original plan. However, for the most part, they [the Chinese side] only

changed if they got CIDA's and AUCC's approval; otherwise, they would not." (Interview with Norman Bethune/Jilin participant, July 11, 2011)

Obviously, while the quote above illustrates the collaborative efforts of participants from both countries to overcome the challenges they faced, it suggests, at the same time, that during the program implementation, the Canadian side was less willing to adjust its partnership models to the realities of the Chinese context. This issue tends to have slightly undermined the level of autonomy in university linkage programs between the two countries.

In addition to the significant support from the government at the national, local and institutional levels, the findings revealed that there was growing interconnectedness among Chinese participants at all levels. At the personal and professional level, a Chinese participant in the CCULP project between OISE and Northwest Normal University stated that:

Everyone who took part in the project in both the first and second phases kept in contact with each other in China. They became a group of scholars who worked together, like the Huangpu Military Academy – a kind of culture with a sense of belonging among them and all of them felt a connection to OISE – very special and unusual. (Interview with Northwest Normal University participant, July 4, 2011)

CCULP/SULCP projects also created links among Chinese institutions and provinces. According to the Canadian participant in the Jilin-Regina project:

The Education Management Training Center funded by CIDA played a key role in organizing workshops and seminars, particularly related to Educational Administration and Guidance throughout Jilin Province. The center also supported cooperation among Jilin, Liaoning, and Heilongjiang Provinces. (Interview with University of Regina participant, October 6, 2011)

There was further strong solidarity among Chinese academics and communities participating in CCULP/SULCP at all levels. Interestingly, the study found that although the main focus of knowledge transfer and dissemination was in China, CCULP/SULCP established linkages among Canadian universities and other relevant communities as well as between them and those on the Chinese side. To quote from the Canadian participant in the Shanghai-Montreal partnership:

During the transition to the second phase, the Transportation project was able to link many Canadian universities together, including Concordia, UQAM [Université de Québec à Montréal], McGill University, University of British Columbia and Victoria. On the Chinese side, the project linked Gansu University of Technology with Zhongshan. These links expanded and strengthened a network of research in China and among Canadians, bringing in experts from both Francophone and Anglophone universities, with various kinds of expertise, ranging from an economist to an anthropologist". (Interview with Université de Montréal participant, September 24th, 2012)

Hence, CCULP/SULCP manifested strong solidarity among and between Chinese and Canadian academics and communities. It is important to note however, that little was mentioned about connections among participants in different projects. Also, where institutional or governmental support broke down, it was not possible to sustain the cooperation. Neither programs involved any developing countries, other than China, at the time, largely because they were mainly designed for knowledge transfer in China. Interestingly, as part of the CCULP education project, however, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto organized a Conference on Knowledge Across Cultures in 1992, with the purpose of enhancing dialogue and promoting inter-cultural understanding among scholars from different civilizations, including

Arabic, Indian, Chinese, North American and European (Hayhoe et al, 1993, Hayhoe & Pan, 2001). This means that CCULP/SULCP, at least to a degree, built interconnectedness and engagement among different scholarly communities, beyond Canada-China relationships.

Participation

The study revealed that the flow of knowledge from Canada to China took the form of cross-cultural understanding and learning. This means that the Chinese side was able to engage fully in all aspects of project activities in both China and Canada. Chinese scholars went to Canada, either as visiting scholars or as graduate students. Canadian universities sent many professors to provide training and to strengthen Chinese research and teaching capacity. CCULP/SULCP helped many Chinese universities develop new graduate programs and research centers to bring in new innovative ideas and new technology to China. Some Canadian graduate students were also sent to China to participate in research and learn from China.

Interestingly, while most interviewees from both sides said Canada was more advanced than China in all areas of knowledge, one Canadian participant in the CCULP environment project commented that at that time, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Institute at the Shaanxi Institute of Soil and Water Conservation was already far ahead of the Geography Department at the University of Toronto (Interview with University of Toronto participant, November 26th, 2011). Clearly, Canadian graduate students also had a lot to learn in many CCULP/SULCP projects.

Overall, the majority of interviewees agreed that China was the main beneficiary of knowledge transfer between the two countries at the time. Again, they viewed the flow of knowledge as positive, arguing that Canada at the time was China's teacher. In the process, Canadians showed great respect for their Chinese counterparts and saw them as equal. It is interesting that a Canadian participant working for CIDA at the time claimed that Canada's development programs with China were completely different from its programs with other developing countries. To quote from him, "from inception to completion, we talked more about cooperation than aid with China. This was different from our relationships with African countries, which were clearly an aid relationship" (Interview with CIDA official, September 26, 2012). Thus, it can be argued that despite Canada's dominance in the knowledge transfer process between the two countries, genuine participation existed in CCULP/SULCP.

Another aspect of participation was the horizontal expansion of CCULP/SULCP. This took several forms, such as the inclusion of various types of higher education institutions, the increase in women participants, and the involvement of minority groups. The establishment of the Chinese Minority Women's Studies Center under the partnership between the Central University of Nationalities and Simon Fraser University (CUN-SFU) was a successful example of CIDA's promoting minorities and their culture as well as recognizing women's role in development (interview with Simon Fraser University participants, May 22, 2012). It is important to highlight that while there was an increased number of women participants in various CCULP/SULCP projects, a Canadian participant in the Lanzhou Railway Institute-Ryerson project was surprised that there had already been more female Chinese students in the engineering programs than in Canada (only 15%), even before CCULP (Interview with Ryerson participant, October 28, 2012).

Conclusion

The findings of this study showed that CCULP/SULCP manifested all four aspects of mutuality: equity, autonomy, solidarity and participation. From the beginning, Chinese participants were keenly involved in planning various program activities, demanding that new knowledge and skills be adapted to the Chinese context. Both Chinese and Canadian participants showed great respect for and were determined to learn about each other's culture, values, and academic norms. Government officials and institutional leaders on both sides played an important role in supporting and coordinating CCULP/SULCP. CCULP/SULCP projects were widely dispersed to include small and hinterland institutions. Increased participation of women and minority groups constituted another significant aspect of CCULP/SULCP mutuality. Chinese participants, including those at the local level, were allowed opportunities to get involved in various academic activities and in decision-making processes. Furthermore, Canada-China knowledge transfer through CCULP/SULCP took the form of cross-cultural understanding and mutual learning. Above all, the success of CCULP/SULCP indicates that CIDA achieved the three major priority goals for China, including sustainable development, participation of women and minorities, and environmentally sound development, in addition to a sustained improvement in relationships between the two countries.

This study foregrounds the importance of human values and culture in international academic relations. It supports the WOMP and cosmopolitan argument that internationally the role of universities includes not only serving a nation's economic and political interests, but also acting as a cultural agent, bringing to the fore deep-rooted social and cultural values. Within this heterogeneous world, as Hayhoe & Phillips (1989) note, these different values need to be understood and appreciated if international university linkage programs between countries are to produce success, mutuality and sustainability. In effect, the fact that CCULP/SULCP's partnerships were built on human and cultural values means people have a key role to play in international relations, a role that transcends nation-states and other human organizations. This is reflected in the fact that universities in both countries could positively engage government officials in the knowledge transfer process. Although China was then a developing country, its relationship with Canada took the form of a genuine partnership, rather than a donor-recipient relationship. On this ground, the study suggests that the cosmopolitan paradigm, whose primary emphasis is on human relationships, be given more space in international academic relations, in both policy and scholarship.

This study may also contribute to the ongoing debate about China's future role and its relationships with other developing nations. The country has recently emerged as one of the world's leading economies, and increasingly become one of the key donors for many developing nations, mainly in South Asia and Africa. This raises the question of what future approach China will take in its international development programs with the developing world. Will it take a different approach from that of Western countries? Or will it follow the same path? This is an important topic for future research in the area of international academic relations.

References

- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). (March, 2000). *Canada-China university partnerships: Answering community needs*. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Banya, K. & Elu, J. (2001). The World Bank and financing higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *Higher Education*, 42, 1-34.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Crossley, M. & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education: Globalization, context and difference*. London, GBR: Falmer Press.

- Falkenheim, V. (1987). Management studies and economic reform. In D. Ryan, V. Falkenheim, R. Hayhoe (Eds.), *Evaluation of the Canada-China management education program: Final report* (pp. 1-15 [Part 3]). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Galtung, J. (1975). *Peace: Research, education, action; Essay in peace education*. Copenhagen, Christian Ejlers.
- Galtung, J. (1980). *The true worlds: A transnational perspective*. New York: Free Press.
- Hayhoe, R. (1989). *China's universities and the open door*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hayhoe, R. & Phillips, M. (1989). International academic relations: Some reflections on universities as cultural institutions in the world community. *Higher Education in Europe*, 14, 59-67.
- Hayhoe, R. et al (Eds.) (1993) *Knowledge across Cultures: Universities East and West*. Toronto: OISE Press, and Wuhan, PRC: Hubei Education Press. [Published in English and Chinese.]
- Hayhoe, R. & Pan, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowledge across culture: A contribution to dialogue among civilizations*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Held, D. (2003). Cosmopolitanism: Globalization tamed? *Review of International Studies*, 29(4), 465-480.
- Held, D. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals, realities & deficits*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Jackson, E. (2003). How university projects produce development results: Lessons from 20 years of Canada-China cooperation in higher education. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 24(1), 41-49.
- King, K. (1990). The new politics of international collaboration in educational development in Northern and Southern research in education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 10(1), 47-57.
- King, K. (2009). Higher education and international cooperation: The role of academic collaboration in the developing world. In D. Stephens, (Ed.), *Higher education and international capacity building: Twenty-five years of higher education links* (pp. 33-49). Oxford: Symposium Books.
- McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mundy, K. (2007). Global governance, educational change. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), 339-357.
- Pan, J. (1995). *The role of Canadian universities in international development: A case study of the Canada/China university linkage program* (Ph.D. thesis). University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.
- Pharo, H. (2003). Altruism, security and the impact of oil: Norway's foreign economic assistance policy 1958-71. *Contemporary European History*, 12(4), 527-547.
- Ryan, D., Falkenheim, V., & Hayhoe, R. (Eds.). (1987). *Evaluation of the Canada-China management education program: Final report*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. [Unpublished Report]
- Singer, M. (1986). *Canadian academic relations with the People's Republic of China since 1970* (Vol. 1). Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Trilokekar, R. (2009). International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 59, 131-148.
- Weiler, N. (1984). The political economy of education and development. *Prospects*, 52, 467-478.
- Wilson, J. (Sept., 2001). A history of CIDA's China program. *Draft Prepared for China Program, Asia Branch Canadian International Development Agency*.
- Zha, Q. (2010). Canadian-Chinese educational relationship: Looking back, around and beyond. *Academic Matters*.

Phirom Leng is a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education at the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. He is also a member of the affiliated Comparative, International and Development Education Center at OISE. His research interests include comparative higher education, internationalization, privatization, and governance of higher education, as well as education policy studies.

Dr. Julia Pan is a senior research associate in Department of Leadership, Higher Education and Adult Education of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Julia has led and managed Canadian government sponsored Canada-China University Linkage Projects in the areas of education and environmental studies which linked University of Toronto with many Chinese universities and research institutions of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

Appendix: List of 31 Projects of the Canada-China University Linkage Program (CCULP)

Projects Titles and Benefiting Sectors	Participating Institutions from Both Sides
Sichuan/Laurentian Mineral Sciences Cooperative Exchange (Mining and Metallurgy)	Canadian: Laurentian University of Sudbury Chinese: South West Institute of technology
A Program of Educational and Research Collaboration (Mining and Metallurgy)	Canadian: McMaster University Chinese: University of Science and Technology, Beijing
Land Use and Transportation Optimization Linkage Project Between the Shanghai Institute of Mechanical Engineering and the Université de Montréal (Transportation)	Canadian: Université de Montréal Chinese: Shanghai Institute of Mechanical Engineering
Establishing a Cooperative Education Program in the People's Republic of China (Education)	Canadian: University of Waterloo Chinese: Shanghai University of Engineering Science
University of Alberta-NAEA (formerly CIEA): Development Program in Educational Administration (education)	Canadian: University of Alberta Chinese: National Academy of Education Administration
*Educational Management Training Centre (A Joint Project of the Education Institute of Jilin Province and the University of Regina) (Education)	Canadian: University of Regina Chinese: Educational Institute of Jilin Province
Computer Applications technology Transfer in Transportation (Transportation)	Canadian: Ryerson Polytechnical University Chinese: Lanzhou Railway Institute
*Canada China Joint Doctoral Programs in Education (Education)	Canadian: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Chinese: Beijing Normal University, Nanjing Normal University, Southwest Normal University, Northeast Normal University, Northwest Normal University, East China Normal University, and Shaanxi Normal University
*Development of a Geographical Information System for Soil Erosion Management (SEMGIS) (Environment)	Canadian: University of Toronto Chinese: Shaanxi Institute of Soil and Water Conservation and Academia Sinica
Human Resource Development and Transfer of Circulating Fluidize Bed Technology for Utilization of Low and High Grade Chinese Coal (Environment)	Canadian: Technical University of Nova Scotia Chinese: Zhejiang University
Environmental Effects of Water Resource Development (Environment)	Canadian: Dalhousie University and Technical University of Nova Scotia Chinese: Beijing University and Tsinghua University
Biotechnology Exchange Project (Agriculture-Environment)	Canadian: McGill University Chinese: Nankai University
*An Educational Exchange Program Between University of Manitoba and Huazhong Agricultural University (Agriculture)	Canadian: The University of Manitoba Chinese: Huazhong Agricultural University
University Manitoba/Northwest Agricultural University, Sichuan University and the Shanghai Academy of Agricultural Sciences (Agriculture)	Canadian: The University of Manitoba Chinese: Northwest Agricultural University
Village Planning and Sanitation Project (Population and Human Settlements)	Canadian: McGill University Chinese: Chongqing Institute of Civil Engineering and Architecture
*Minority Area Development Research	Canadian: Simon Fraser University

and Training Project (Population and Human Settlements)	Chinese: Central University of Nationalists (formerly Central Institute of Nationalists)
Project de Coopération entre l'Université Laval et l'Institut de Diplomatie à Beijing (International Relations)	Canadian: Université Laval Chinese: Institut de Diplomatie à Beijing
A Joint Cooperative Project Between Carleton University and the University of International Business and Economics (International Relations)	Canadian: Carleton University Chinese: University of International Business and Economics
Human Resource Development for Nutrition in China (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: Ryerson Polytechnical University Chinese: Sun Yat-Sen University of Medical Sciences
Formation de Personnel Sanitaire et Chercheurs dans le Domaine Biomédicale (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: Institut de Recherches Cliniques de Montréal Chinese: Shanghai Second Medical University
Institutional Cooperative Infectious Disease Program (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: The University of British Columbia Chinese: You An Hospital
Postgraduate Training for Professionals in the Field of Health Care (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: Université de Montréal Chinese: Norman Bethune International Peace Hospital
*Tianjin Medical College, School of Nursing Faculty Development Project (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: University of Ottawa Chinese: Tianjin Medical College, School of Nursing
*Partners in Good Health: An Exchange of Medical Expertise and Technology (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: British Columbia's Children's Hospital Chinese: Guangzhou Children's Hospital
* L'Establishment d'une Unité d'Oncologie à l'Université Norman Bethune, Changchun (Health and Nutrition)	CAI: Université Laval CHI: Norman Bethune University of Medical Sciences
*An Educational Exchange Program Between the School of Nursing, University of Manitoba and the School of Nursing, West China University of Medical Science (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: The University of Manitoba Chinese: West China University of Medical Sciences
Burn Centre-Plastic Surgery Linkage: An Exchange of Surgical Expertise (Health and Nutrition)	Canadian: The Hospital for Sick Children Chinese: Gansu Provincial People's Hospital
Aid in modernization of a narrow focus institution to a university suited to current needs (Engineering)	Canadian: University of Toronto Chinese: Wuhan Iron and Steel University
*Model Joint Doctoral Training Program Between Southeast University and Concordia University in Engineering and Computer Science (Engineering)	Canadian: Concordia University Chinese: Southeast University
To establish a functioning training centre for failure analysis and prevention (Engineering)	Canadian: The University of Manitoba Chinese: Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics
* Jumelage Université du Québec à Chicoutimi/Institut de Géochimie de l'Académie des Sciences de Chine dans le Secteur des Sciences de la Terre (Mining and Metallurgy)	Canadian: Université de Québec à Chicoutimi Chinese: Institut de Géochimie de l'Académie des Sciences

***Those marked with an asterisk got continuing funding under the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program (SULCP)**