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ABSTRACT

Policymakers and academe around the globe are deeply concerned about maximizing benefits of localized aspect of higher education for the development of an individual local community. Considering benefits of localization in higher education, this study examined the existence of localization for the implementation of triplization at policy and practice level. With problem statement in alignment of the aims of National Education Policy Pakistan 2009, this research study is particularly aimed to analyze present state of higher education in Pakistan in terms of focus on local networking, technological, economic, social, political, cultural, and learning localization, decentralization to the local site level, indigenous culture, community needs and expectations, local involvement, collaboration and support, local relevance and legitimacy, community-based needs and characteristics, social norms and ethos as the key characteristics of localization referred to by Cheng in his theory of triplization. A mixed method exploratory approach was acquired to meet the objectives of the study. Sample of the study were policy and provision documents for the content analysis and 1429 students and 140 faculty members from 15 universities of Punjab and KPK as the respondents of survey. Findings at both policy and practices in aspects of HE revealed an agreement on the presence of localization at the institutional process level; localization of curriculum reflected inadequacy in policies whereas practices too, reflect an average level presence; localization of student and learning occurred in policies and practices at above average level whereas localized teacher and teaching aspect is catered to some extent in policies and provisions and precise average presence is responded by survey respondents.
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1. Introduction

There is an increasing international concern about outcomes of globalization upon indigenous and national development in all countries but with a particular focus on developing countries (Beeson, 2014; Hall & Fenelon, 2015). The prime concern here is to maximize the benefits of localization and minimize the drawbacks of overwhelming of globalization for development of a local community (Commers, 2016; Relph, 2016).
Localization is referred to as transfer, adaptation and development of related values, knowledge, technology and behavioral norms from and to the local context as mentioned by Cheng (2000) in his theory of triplization. Cheng (2000) further argued that globalization in education is one of the most significant features of new millennium as well as localization and individualization too needs focus in educational reforms. All the three processes can be given a composite term named as triplization process (i.e., triple + izations) that can be used to go by the side of varied setting for tertiary students. Major identified characteristics of localization are networking in local setting; advancement in indigenous culture; fulfillment of community needs and requirements; adaptation of social, economic, political, cultural and technological learning interventions from outer world to local community; inter-institutional collaborations; community support; local involvement; local legitimacy and support and the concern for social norms and culture (Cheng, 2000; 2006; 2016). Localization in the higher education can bring in diverse resources and academic riches from local community and around the world to support higher education. Higher education in Pakistan now days, is a targeting the production of quality human resources for national capacity building (Siddiqui & Khan, 2016), a focus on higher education sector for building flagship national capacity and setting future direction of a country invites localization to be worked on.

The proposed study has following objectives:

- To spot the existence of localization in current educational policies and provisions for higher education in Pakistan.
- To spot the existence of localization within the current educational practices of HEC and universities in Pakistan.

2. Research Methodology

This research was concurrent equal status (concurrent) mixed method design (Creswell, 2007; 2012). Qualitative part of study used a summative approach to qualitative content analysis of 43 policies, documents, and charters of sampled 15 HEC approved universities, followed by two surveys for quantitative aspects of study. It started with identification and quantification of identified words in text with an aim of understanding the related use of themes (GrBich, 2012), referred to as manifest content analysis (GrBich, 2012; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), and leading to latent content analysis which is referred to as process that interprets and discovers underlying meanings of the words (GrBich, 2012; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). For quantitative part of study, two survey questionnaires; questionnaire from 1429 students and questionnaire from 140 teachers served as tools for analysis of practices of HEC and universities regarding existence of localization in practices of universities.

3. Theoretical background and Literature Review

Localization is taking strengths and advantages from the internal and external environments and maximizing opportunities from the local contexts to achieve the goal of higher education (Cheng, 2003). Cheng (2000) in his theory of triplization emphasized that education should create and maximize opportunities for teaching, learning, and institutional development from internal and external environments and local communities (Cheng, 2000; Cheng 2001; Pachi & Santos 2013). Figure 1 depicts detailed conception and characteristics of localization along with its implications for higher education.

Figure 1 presents the conceptions and characteristics in all four processes of higher education, namely, student and learning; teacher and teaching; curriculum and institutional environment (Bustillo, 2014; Cheng, 2001; 2003). Furthermore, the detail of every individual process in terms of localization is given below.

3.1 Localized Tertiary Learning

Learning process of every student can be boost up with national and international resources, support and associations at varied places inside or outside HEIs, in local settings. The outlook and gained by students will be a combined experience from several national and international institutions (Cheng, 2000; 2003; Education and Manpower Bureau, 1998; Ryan, Scott, Freeman, & Patel, 2000).
3.2 Localized Tertiary Teaching
Localized aspect of teaching asserts that teachers should improve teaching learning process in manner that they can utilize all academic resources locally and globally, can fetch national and international support in networked environment to enhance their contribution in learning process. Regional and global outlook of teachers get enhanced through their involvement in national or international research programs beyond their institutions (Cheng, 2000; 2003). Furthermore, their teaching is a type of networked teaching through mutual sharing and inspiration.

3.3 Localized Tertiary Curriculum
Localization reveals that the curriculum also includes local resources, materials, and concerns to ensure the local relevance and community involvement for maximizing opportunities for students’ localized learning. Community-based curriculum is one typical practice to increase the local relevance and support in the field (Breslow, 2015).

3.4 Localized Tertiary Institutions
New century paradigm shifts assume that educational environment must have self-initiative and autonomy of educational institutions to improve a self-learning cycle in the context of globalization and localization in education (Cheng, 1996). The fostering of local knowledge at institutional level can also be considered as the growth of institutional knowledge because this knowledge is generated, accumulated and owned by the educational institution through the institutional thinking, planning, action, experience, evaluation and reflection.

4. Findings of the Qualitative Aspects of the Study
The review of policies and provisions for higher education in Pakistan regarding the existence of localization reflected enough evidence to support localization. Themes and sub themes mentioned in Table 1 were traced in the documents through content analysis. Findings of manifest content analysis reflected that almost all the indicators of localization exist at policy level with following frequency.

The results of latent content analysis of abovementioned aspects of localization in Figure 1 can be viewed as evidence of existence of themes of localization in policies and provisions for higher education. The proceeding paragraphs present documentary evidences for themes such as local networking; technological, economic, social, political and learning localization; decentralization of higher education to the local site level; local involvement collaboration and support; community needs and expectations and bench marking with in all processes of higher education.

Table 1: Existence of themes and sub themes on localization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localization in HE themes</th>
<th>Sub themes</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local networking</td>
<td>Local networking</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local intellectual sharing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.1 Local Networking

Different policies and provisions for HEC in Pakistan reflect existence of local networking within HEIs in the domains of all three sub-themes. For instance, vision and mission of HEC in MTDF 2005-10, 2011-15 confirms that Pakistan Education and Research Network (PERN) is a reality, connecting almost all universities, and when fully deployed will connect all of the public and private sector universities of Pakistan to each other. The vision 2025 is to provide “LAN/WAN facilities at universities and to computerize all departments of the universities so that students and faculty members can access internet and intranet resources for the education and research purposes”.

MTDF 2005-2010 exhibits that “Higher Education Commission has initiated a video conferencing…, so that the students of such universities, who are not in a position to benefit from high profiled teachers, may have the opportunity to learn from them, share their ideas and views to enhance their productivity for local intellect sharing.”

### 4.2 Technological, Economic, social, Political, Cultural, and Learning Localization

Evidences for curriculum content in local languages were only traced in provisions for higher education in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority Act, 2012 which says to, “Consider ways and means for promotion of regional languages and to make all necessary arrangements in this regard for teaching, promotion and use of regional languages. Local socio-economic compatibility can be traced in various stances. NEP (2009) states, “Research linked to local industry, commerce; agriculture etc. shall be encouraged to support these areas through indigenous solutions and create linkages between academia and market.” Keeping in view the importance course of Information Communication Technology, it was introduced in all disciplines with an aim in (Syllabus for ICT in Education, 2012) that “this course will help students and teachers to understand use and apply a range of Information Communications Technologies (ICTs).

### 4.3 Decentralization of Higher Education

Decentralization took place when constitution (18th amendment) Act, 2010 transferred legal and administrative authorities from federal control to the provinces for higher education by enhancing provincial autonomy of HEIs. It exhibits that “Universities, despite depending on government funding to manage their affairs enjoy both substantive and procedural autonomy to a large extent. In many cases senate/ or syndicate help universities reach at any meaningful decision”. MTDF 2005-2010 states “Campuses of existing universities shall be established in second and third tier cities to facilitate the spread of higher education” for addressing regional disparities and ensuring flexibility of available options for higher education. Sensitive to the importance of local needs and resources, locally produced curriculum may serve an engine for bringing in the global intellect. Annual Report of HEC (2013) reflects that, “Realizing the dearth of locally produced reference reading material and textbooks at graduate and the post-graduate level, a project on “Monograph and Textbook Writing” has been developed with the view to encourage authorship amongst university professors and researchers.”

### 4.4 Local Involvement, Collaboration and Support

The Higher Education Commission is supporting initiatives of promotion of local industry, protection of local heritage, provision of education and training addressing local needs, and industrial sector development. NEP 2009 pinpoints that “specific program is designed to push universities/HEIs to integrate their research and teaching activities to address local issues, by community involvement, to provide on ground solutions. Different types of
local alliances among educational institutions and market or industry are observed during process of review. MTDF 2005-10, 2011-15 exhibit that “The Higher Education sector is a major binding force for universities and colleges through local, regional, national and international partnerships to support socio- economic regeneration and growth”. Pakistan University Sports Board is set for participation of students in the National Championships and Games. It is to: “encourage, promote and develop Sports in Universities of Pakistan. To organize and hold different sports activities in order to provide opportunities for healthy competition and develop a sense of sportsman spirit in students of Universities of Pakistan.

4.5 Community needs and Expectations
Vision of HEC Pakistan considers “institutions of higher learning as knowledge repositories whose faculty and students accrue knowledge and apply it to understand and address “local” issues.” It was found out during review of MTDF-I and II that the support of high quality 4-year undergraduate programs in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences are very central to the promotion and growth of the core issues of communication, culture, history and religion. MTDF 2011-15 reflects that the “Institutions of higher learning have a responsibility to understand, preserve and promote this culture and heritage”, NEP 2009 and MTDF 2011-15 depict that “… universities over the world serve as local resource centers providing training and support to industries along with trained manpower. When combined with the spirit of entrepreneurship, these academic institutions can change the economic destiny of entire regions, as well as the country”. Over the past few decades, issues of ethnic and language diversity have moved from their peripheral positions to become central concerns of institutions of higher education. NEP, 2009 states that “As the national educational systems also evolve as a response to particular demands of distinct ethnic, social, economic, religious, political groups and communities, there is always room for diversity. This diversity can lend strength to the educational outcomes, especially in a federation like Pakistan, if this does not work at cross purpose with the harmonizing uniformities”.

4.6 Bench marking
To stay competitive among other institutions and to learn from each other by sharing aspects of good practice, HEC emphasize bench marking in MTDF 2005-10, MTDF 2011-15, NEP 2009 and Annual reports. Quality Assurance Authorities were setup by the HEC in MTDF 2005-10, MTDF 2011-15, NEP 2009 to “develop practical guidelines and policies for establishing Quality Enhancement Cells, for monitoring and evaluation of the educational activities and uniformity of pace and standards across country.”

So, at the policy level, the themes identified for localization mark their concrete presence within policies and provisions, but required force and direction still needs point of attention. Among all the indicators of localization, decentralization of the HEIs to local site level with institutional based management and accountability, local campuses, internet services (LAN), provision of PERN by HEC to all universities and DAI’s bring an impression of localization of institutional aspect. Student and learning, teacher and teaching and the most particularly curriculum aspects of higher education need a deeper focus to make higher education relevant to the local needs.

5. Findings of the Quantitative Aspects of the Study
Responses of students were obtained through questionnaire from students about the localized aspects of higher education whereas teachers responded about the same in responses from the teachers.

Table 2 represents responses about localized aspect of higher education institutions in questionnaire from students and teachers in comparison. Questions are instrumented on the 5-point Likert scale between strongly disagree to strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Localized aspects of HEIs</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of locally available teachers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local alliances for collaborative learning/teaching</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of research facilities at local level</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative researches on local issues/problems</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic credit sharing among local universities</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Campuses of other national universities</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/intra provincial student enrollment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering of indigenous scholarships</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean values of localized aspect of institution as mentioned above in section questionnaire from students of Table 2 fall between mean 4.0 (SD=1.1) as agreement towards following of national standards and benchmarks till mean 2.7 (SD=0.8) between disagreement and a no idea note for academic credit sharing among local universities. The responses for utilization of locally available teachers, with mean 3.7 (SD=1.1), inter/intra provincial student enrollment with mean 3.7 (SD=1.4) and offering of indigenous scholarships with mean 3.7 (SD=1.3) went towards slight agreement. Provision of platforms for local research sharing was responded with mean 3.6 (SD=1.2) and provision of research facilities at local level with mean 3.5 (SD=1.2) reflect a very slight inclination towards agreement. Local alliances for collaborative learning with mean 3.4 (SD=1.3), collaborative researches on local issues/problems with mean 3.2 (SD=1.2) and existence of campuses of other national universities with mean 3.2 (SD=1.4) exhibit very low tendency of agreement towards the aspect of localization in the institutional process of higher education. However, total mean of localized institution aspect is 3.4 (SD=0.7) which validate the responses very slightly towards localization of institutions.

Mean values of localized aspect of institution as mentioned in section of questionnaire from teachers of Table 2 fall between 3.9 (SD=1.0) as nearly an agreement towards inter/intra provincial student enrollment till mean of 2.7 (SD=1.4) for academic credit sharing between disagreement and undecided note. Existence of campuses of other national universities with mean 3.5 (SD=1.0) and offering of indigenous scholarships, following of national standards and benchmarks along with provision of platform for local research sharing; all with mean 3.5 (SD=0.8) demonstrate a middle road somewhere between undecided note and agreement. Utilization of locally available teachers with mean 3.2 (SD=1.1) and collaborative researches on local issues/problems also follow the pattern of a low tendency from being indecisive to agreement. Whereas local alliances for collaborative teaching and research facilities at local each with mean 3.1 (SD=1.0) reflected just an inclination towards agreement. However, total mean of the localized institution aspect is 3.3 (SD=.6) which corresponds more the indecisive approach of respondents towards localization of institutions at the level of higher education than the agreement.

Table 3 below embodies responses about localized aspect of curriculum at level of higher education. Questions in this section are instrumented on yes and no basis to mark localization of curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locally produced curriculum contents</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum translated into local languages</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally developed curriculum on technology</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum that addresses local social needs</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum on community related cultural norms</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of dimensions of local politics</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum oriented to locally available jobs</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The localized aspect of curriculum in questionnaire from students has statements expressing localized curriculum process of higher education. Following responses were recorded as in Table 3. Towards agreement regarding themes of localized aspects of curriculum at the level of higher education, the highest response rate was 69.79% in favor of curriculum which is oriented to locally available jobs. While 52.8% favored curriculum that addresses local social needs and 52.5% agreed on the curriculum which embodies community related cultural norms.

On contrary, the rate of response for curriculum contents produced locally was 43.6%, followed by a response rate 43.4% for locally developed curriculum on technology. Inclusion of dimensions of local politics received 38.7% responses and curriculum translated into local languages was favored by only 20.9% respondents of Responses from students. These responses do not mirror presence of localization of curriculum in full swing.
The localized aspect of the curriculum in questionnaire from teachers has statements pointing towards localized curriculum process of higher education to be explored from teachers. The following responses are recorded as reflected from Table 3.

Towards agreement regarding themes of localized aspects of curriculum at the level of higher education, the highest response rate was 68.6% in favor of the locally available jobs. While 50% conveyed the presence of curriculum that is related to community associated cultural norms.

On contrary, response rate for curriculum that addresses local social needs was 40%, locally produced curriculum contents and curriculum translated into local languages received 39.3% responses each. The locally developed curriculum on technology was responded in favor by 29.3% while curriculum that included the dimensions of local politics could have 15.7% reactions by responses of teachers. These responses reflect a low level of localization of curriculum.

This segment presents responses in Table 4. Questions in this section are instrumented on 5-point rating scale between not at all to a great extent.

Table 4: Localized aspects of student and learning and teachers and teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Students M SD</th>
<th>Teachers M SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of local intellect via video conference/skype/media</td>
<td>3.0 1.4</td>
<td>3.1 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local alliances for learning</td>
<td>3.2 1.1</td>
<td>2.8 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities of education/professional grooming locally</td>
<td>3.8 1.0</td>
<td>3.4 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful member of society</td>
<td>4.1 1.0</td>
<td>4.6 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean and SD</td>
<td>3.5 0.7</td>
<td>3.4 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values of localized aspect of student and their learning process of higher education as mentioned above in Table 4, section questionnaire from students fall between 4.1 (SD=1) as agreement of feel for being useful member of society till mean 3.0 (SD=1.4) for sharing local intellect in the process of learning to a medium level between agreement and non-agreement. Whereas opportunities of education locally with mean of 3.8 (SD=1.0) and local alliances for learning with a mean of 3.2 (SD=1.1), are responded with moderate feedback. However, total mean of the items about the localized student process is 3.5 (SD=0.7) which confirms the responses more towards localization of student process in agreement to some extent.

Mean values of localized aspect of teacher and teaching process of higher education as mentioned above in Table 4, section questionnaire from teachers fall between 4.6 (SD=0.7) for being a useful society member till 2.8 (SD=1.1) in support of local alliances for teaching to a level between non-agreement to some extent. Whereas opportunities for the professional grooming locally with mean 3.4 (SD=1.2) and sharing of local intellect in process of teaching with mean 3.1 (SD=0.8) are responded with moderate feedback. However, total mean of items about localized student process is 3.4 (SD=0.6) which confirms the responses towards existence of localization of teacher and teaching process towards agreement to some extent.

So, at practices of higher education, the opinion of respondents of both questionnaires from students and teachers are more or less in consensus concerning existence of smaller degree of localization. Localization within institutional process exists but the extent is not powerful. Presence of localized curriculum is not supported to some noticeable extent by students and teachers and so as localization of student and teacher aspect; the existence of which was not supported by student and teachers. Therefore, there is no noticeable presence of localization aspect of triplization at the level of practices among all processes of higher education.

7. Discussion

To compare both results for existence of localization at policy level and practices of higher education: one common agreement is on presence of localization at the institutional process level as supported by the study of Khan (2017). Localization of curriculum did not show its presence in policies adequately whereas practices of higher education too, reflect an average level presence. The study of Rahman (2004) and Manan, Dumanig and David (2017) support results being evident of too less localization in terms of language and ethnicity in curriculum. Similarly, Khan
(2017) reveal that though localization of curriculum is the need of time but higher education in Pakistan still needs to work seriously towards it. Localization of student and learning aspect showed its occurrence in policies and provisions and in practices, this aspect had its evidence above average. Localized teacher and teaching aspect are catered to some extent in policies and provisions and exactly an average level presence is responded by survey respondents. These results are supported by Ghaus, Lodhi and Shakir (2017) who in their study too stress on provision of proper training and guidance of teachers as guide or mentors of tertiary students in local settings but find it in absentia within higher education Pakistan.

8. Conclusions
Localization, in this regard presents a concept which aims at taking education out of the traditional mode and placing it at the leading edge of the development process through adjustment and adaptations as per local needs (Cheng, 2006; Cheng 2016). It seeks to ensure that education should prepare both individuals and the local societies to be locally energetic and bound to their ideological roots (Cheng 2004; Payne & Askland, 2016) for sustainability and growth. In this regard the findings of the study reflect traces of localization in all aspects positively; induced with concern just with in the current decade with an exception only in curriculum aspect which appears to be slightly lagging behind in both policies and practices of higher education. So, it can be summed up that existence of localization is optimistically present but at an initial stage for implementation of triplization at level of higher education in Pakistan.
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