

Chapter 6

Academia in the context of constraint and a performative SDG agenda: A perspective on South Africa

Suriamurthee Maistry and Erlend Eidsvik

IN THIS CHAPTER, we first examine the context within which academics, operating in a globalised academic space, have to give effect to their work. In the rapidly altering world of educational globalisation and the emerging global knowledge economy, we argue that there is a need to examine afresh what it means to function as an academic in an environment that is increasingly shaped by rightist neo-liberal ideology. The June 2017 withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change indicates the resurgence of the neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism of the Reagan and Thatcher regimes. Although this resurgence has received some resistance from the left in the UK and the US, the extent to which this will be sustained remains uncertain. Significantly, the rightist movement (and new nationalism) necessarily traverses a 'slippery slope' as it attempts to augment the dominant neo-liberal agenda, and the inherent contradictions involved in this are likely to play out in unpredictable ways (Harvey 2007). Although individual freedom (including economic freedom) marks a defining (and appealing) feature of neo-liberalism, an increasingly dominant role for government might constrain this freedom.

As the neo-liberal agenda strengthens its hegemony over how society 'measures' development, it may pave the way for even narrower measurement regimes. Thus, our second focus highlights our concern for the performativity infused ideological subtext of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially as the goals relate to educational 'performance'. We draw implications for what this could mean for academics in the SDG era. We also offer a critical perspective on SDG 4 (quality education) through a post-political lens, and explore what it means to engage the socially inclusive concept of the 'pluriverse' within the SDG debate.¹

As a third area, we raise a few issues around mentoring and building

capacity in higher education with a particular focus on South Africa and the role it plays (and doesn't play) in Africa's economic and educational development. In this section, we touch on the potential for North–South collaborative initiatives in relation to academic mentorship and development.

Finally, we consider the likely impact of the SDGs on the development of academics working in a global space. We depart from a critique that the targets and indicators related to SDG 4 are linked into a universalistic apparatus that obstructs 'pluriversal knowledge' within education. We begin, however, by reflecting on some of the contextual factors influencing and shaping higher education.

The academic space as a smouldering milieu

The transformation of higher education systems often happens in a somewhat contradictory space, especially in contexts where democratic and social justice priorities clash with market-driven imperatives for economic growth (Singh 2012). In South Africa, for example, following the abandonment of the Reconstruction and Development Programme, the adoption of the Growth, Employment and Redistribution policy failed dismally to alleviate poverty, create employment or fairly distribute economic gains (Habib 2013). Instead, neo-liberal and 'business friendly' policies favour corporations at the expense of poor citizens, allowing the upper-classes across all races to thrive while offering only marginal gains for the poor majority. Žižek's (2011) notion of 'inclusive exclusion' has relevance here as it speaks to a condition in which the majority of South Africans enjoy superficial political inclusion but are excluded economically. The promised post-apartheid dividends have not accrued. So, while democratic participation occurs, the values of equality, participation, redistribution, access to information and transparency, and gender parity remain merely at the level of political rhetoric.

Like in many other parts of the world, the South African education system has also failed to respond efficiently to market imperatives (ASSAF 2010), although this is one of its declared intentions in the National Development Plan (National Planning Commission 2012). This failure appears congruent with Stronach's (2010) critical assessment of the higher education system's inability to respond effectively to the needs of global capital. Stronach argued that while some claim that market responsiveness is the objective, in reality, such attempts have remained at the level of mimicry.

The global swing towards self-preservation, renewed nationalism, the securing of the physical boundaries of the nation-state (for example, Brexit), the election of a neo-conservative leadership in the United States, and the rise

of right-wing political parties in Europe (for example, in Austria, Hungary and Denmark) present particular challenges for higher education globally. New patterns and modus operandi in international terrorism as well as in retaliatory measures adopted by global superpowers have begun to impact on the previously 'open' international movement of students and academics.

The tension between insularity and globalisation, and what this might mean for education and academic work in an evolving space, requires investigation. This, coupled with a dramatic change in the ways in which the world conceives of education's purpose, renders the international higher education project even more complex. That is, as Nussbaum (2010) and Sen (2009) point out, a distinct shift has occurred away from the concept of education as serving a social good to a performativity-driven and instrumentalist conception of education for economic profit.

That higher education should play a role in advancing world peace, international camaraderie and social cohesion is beyond question. How such an agenda can be realised is, however, worthy of careful thought. How might the curricula and pedagogy of higher education institutions embrace such a role? One possibility is to integrate this value orientation across the curriculum, as opposed to retaining it in its current location in certain social science programmes. However, it is likely that higher education institutions that offer programmes that are out of sync with international developments could lose currency and favour among students. This applies especially to students seeking relevant intellectual competencies applicable in the rapidly changing international context. The SDGs could perhaps serve as a globally 'approved' point of departure in the development of new higher education curricula. The higher education field certainly offers a fertile space for robust engagement with the SDGs, in which pressing issues, such as poverty alleviation and the creation of meaningful employment, could receive the strategic political and economic consideration they deserve.

In a context where higher education institutions market their courses in terms of the 'abundant' lifestyles that students might derive from success in such programmes, rather than as offering a space for high-level intellectual activity, the tension between 'hedonism and utility' (Haywood et al. 2011) plays out in particular ways. Of concern is the absence of dissent that might disrupt the status quo. While sporadic dissent is common among academics and students in many parts of the world, in our view, this is not widespread or consistent enough to trigger substantive disruption of the current value system. Also of concern is the lack of awareness about the current system's nefarious undertones and how these shape conceptualisations of the work of academics in a global space.

It is thus reasonable to presume that the development and delivery of robust, contemporary and cutting-edge higher education programmes, and research agendas underpinned by social justice imperatives, will depend on the availability of highly skilled academics with a global consciousness and social sensitivity. However, it is unrealistic to imagine that many senior academics, who often find themselves trapped in neo-liberal performativity, will prioritise the development of a 'radicalised' research and teaching agenda for young academics working in a global space. For this development to gain traction, it might have to follow the traditional manner through which knowledge is vetted in academia, that is, via platforms such as research conferences, colloquiums, seminars and publications.

The frailties of South Africa's higher education sector

Historically, South Africa has played a significant role in Africa's economic, political and educational development (Gelb 2001). However, there is uncertainty and scepticism among higher education professionals in many African countries as to exactly what this role should be. The country's status as hegemon in the African region also deserves interrogation. In our view, South Africa occupies a precarious and conflicted position in Africa as it grapples with the frailties arising from its past.

A major factor limiting South Africa's influence in Africa has been its inability to address its own debilitating structural problems, including its dual economy, persistently high rates of unemployment (30 per cent) and its inability to grow its GDP beyond 2 per cent per annum for the last two decades (Statistics South Africa 2017). Ineffectual political leadership has compounded these problems (Habib 2013; Jansen 2017), making the need for mentorship among South African and African academics all the more compelling.

Certainly, South African higher education is in a vexed position in terms of its own capacity to conduct, promote and supervise research. This is a fault line that has a profound impact on the country's ability to promote and sustain high-level knowledge production (Teferra 2015). For example, less than 35 per cent of tenured professors in South Africa hold a PhD (ASSAF 2010), and a sizeable proportion of these are close to retirement. This represents a significant challenge for South Africa's ability to maintain a core group of high-calibre academics.

Damtew Teferra (2015) rightly cautions that South Africa's limited research capacity has similarly significant implications for the country's neighbours whose future intellectuals consume its 'knowledge commodities'. He posits that while South Africa remains the foremost knowledge producer

on the African continent, it is naive and even perilous to overstate this position, as inherent frailties threaten the ability of the system to continue to deliver high-quality post-graduate education.

This kind of precariousness makes the need for debate about academic training increasingly urgent. For example, the political imperatives to fast-track young academics from previously disadvantaged communities could well result in PhDs being seen as outcomes or commodities as opposed to a process of deep, rich, independent and high-level conceptual development. To add insult to injury, fast-tracked PhD graduates are often quickly burdened with high numbers of research students whom they are expected to mentor, despite having received very little meaningful mentoring themselves.

The negative legacy of apartheid on South Africa's education system is well documented (see, for example, Jansen 2009, 2017), and the contemporary crises make it clear that apartheid continues to haunt the country two decades into democracy. In fact, it can be argued that both democracy and the equitable provision of education are under threat in South Africa. In an incisive analysis of the Fees Must Fall protests, Jonathan Jansen, a former vice chancellor of the University of the Free State, offered a scathing criticism of the state's leadership inertia and their abdication of responsibility (Jansen 2017).

The year 1994 was a watershed moment in South Africa's history. As a 'darling' of the international community following its unprecedented peaceful transition to democracy under the leadership of Nelson Mandela, powerful Western nations looked to South Africa to show leadership and innovation in relation to education provision. Instead, the newly democratic state somewhat blindly borrowed policy, adopting an outcomes-based education system, which has since been roundly criticised as inappropriate to the country's severely under-resourced schools. To their credit, through the efforts of Nelson Mandela and his successor Thabo Mbeki, South African leaders attempted to assert their vision of an African Renaissance, which sought to better position Africa, and African education, for engagement with the international community. However, these good intentions were not sufficient. Decisive action was required, and its absence has had consequences that the naive South African polity did not adequately anticipate.

In a paper on the relationship between South Africa and its neighbours, Zimbabwe and Swaziland, Lalbahadur (2015) argued that South Africa's attempt to advocate for transformation in governance has been largely benign and wholly ineffective. Similarly, attempts to develop a regional educational qualification framework failed to gain traction in the region. The enormous potential for substantive regional collaboration on education and higher education remains untapped.

Mentorship and collaboration in a flammable and schizophrenic environment

Shore (2010) traced the emergence of the ‘schizophrenic university’ – marked by confounding imperatives and the overloading of responsibilities – that is, the university that tries to do and be too many things at the same time. Globally, the dominance of neo-liberal discourse has altered the traditional Humboldtian vision of higher education, making it increasingly market-driven. The international rankings that epitomise the globalisation of the higher education enterprise are stoking the conflagration (Haywood et al. 2011). The effect is a constant reshaping of the knowledge economy into one in which ‘profitable’ knowledge takes precedence over ‘soft’ knowledge that is not readily convertible into forms that serve economic ends. As a result, a narrowly defined economic utilitarian mentality shapes the higher education market and its offerings in particular ways, leading to increasing competition for financial and human resources.

While healthy collaboration does still occur within and between some higher education institutions, neo-liberal forces often detract from the vision of community and the social pact that has guided the academic community for centuries. Meanwhile, prescriptive funding criteria, such as a cross-regional collaboration requirement, can create contrived relationships that are seldom based on pre-existing and sound foundations. Contextual issues, such as differing research cultures, data-collection constraints and financial-accountability mechanisms pose real challenges to cross-regional collaboration. This raises the issue of how universities can constructively align with international partners, with a view to developing and strengthening collaboration in relation to mentoring novice academics to respond to global challenges and opportunities. Included in this are how such academics navigate this competitive environment, the gains that can accrue from healthy competition as well as the costs of this competition for the higher education sector. For academics to thrive and function effectively, a particular kind of mentorship is necessary.

In acceding to the demands of a neo-liberal environment, higher education institutions begin to subject their human resources to stringent demands and particular types of performance (Maistry 2012). Accordingly, the human resource departments then impose performance and accountability models from the corporate world onto academics in an attempt to measure productivity levels. This often occurs at the expense of social justice, and is likely to subvert the achievement of the SDGs.

What kind of mentorship is required to avoid the systematic suffocation of the academic as institutions react to the neo-liberal squeeze? Of significance

in answering this question is to achieve clarity about the expectations and roles of academics as they help to shape research agendas and course curricula, as well as guiding students. In the discussion that follows, we attempt to open a debate about how this question might be addressed by signalling key issues worth consideration.

The assumption at many higher education institutions is that existing academic staff (faculty members) will autonomously work out the competencies necessary to educate future global citizens (albeit within a neo-liberal performative frame). This is a somewhat risky assumption. Tacit knowledge and anecdotal experience indicates that the experiences of novice academics, as they attempt to come to terms with the teaching, research and community service dimensions of their job descriptions, are not well-understood or acknowledged.

From quantity to quality and back again: the lack of ‘pluriversal’ knowledge in the SDGs

Political and technocratic support for the SDGs is widespread. Like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the SDGs are likely to have far-reaching consequences for development practice globally, and for education in particular. In 2016, the Inter-Agency Expert Group on the SDG Indicators presented a global indicator framework to measure progress towards the SDGs (UN 2016). In many contexts, indicators are vital quantifying measures and constitute a key tool. However, not all knowledge is easily quantifiable.

In a development context, for example, Jerven (2015) has questioned the usefulness of quantifiable measures and shown how these supported consensus around dubious policy making processes. In terms of education in a post-political development context, local and indigenous practices – also known as ‘pluriversal knowledge’ – can be useful in challenging hegemonic knowledge, knowledge practices, as well the indicator apparatuses linked to the SDGs.

Considering how education shapes societies, such concerns are crucial. While MDG 2 was about universal access to *primary* education, SDG 4 concerns access throughout the educational span, and addresses education *quality* in particular. The key indicator for MDG 2 was the primary school net enrolment rate, which increased from 83 per cent in 2000 to 91 per cent in 2015, globally (UN 2015). This represents progress. However, education’s relevance for improving the economic, social and political aspects of a society is not taken into account when only inputs are measured and not outcomes or impact. While the strength of the MDGs was that they constituted straightforward and manageable goals, they were criticised for lacking focus

on the societal implications of their outcomes and impacts (Loewe 2012). Further, more data gaps than actual observations were recorded (Jerven 2017).

Consequently, the SDGs place a stronger emphasis on their own social implications. To paraphrase Le Blanc (2015), the SDGs aim to cover the entire sustainable development universe.

Measure what we treasure

Since the 1980s, quantitative methods have replaced qualitative and historical methods of learning assessment. This is a rising trend in low- and middle-income countries, supported, to a large degree, by donor agencies (Lockheed 2013). In line with this, the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) has affected education policies and curricula globally, and best practices as defined by the OECD have been adopted in several countries as blueprints for educational reform (Kamens 2013). One consequence of this is that a particular kind of education assessment has been embedded into the SDG agenda. This includes a general shift towards large-scale quantitative assessments.

Concerns about and critiques of this 'measurement dogma' can be addressed in different ways. One comes from the field of post-politics (see, for example, Swyngedouw 2007), which scrutinises where decisions are made, and focuses on the rising power of technocrats and the diminishing power of the education and research community. This is a productive framework for identifying stakeholders and decision-making processes as well as relative levels of power and legitimacy in relation to decision-making.

In the Nordic context, a vital debate challenging the PISA approach to education has taken place. Social media groups,² op-eds and newspaper articles³ have criticised and debated the role of testing, measurement and indicators within target-driven, neo-liberal education policies. This has taken the form of bottom-up resistance in which teachers, parents, researchers and some politicians have challenged the existing system. Meanwhile, the system has been defended by technocrats, neo-liberal politicians and conservative think tanks – the same actors who decided to adopt the PISA system and facilitated its implementation. Teachers and researchers in the education sector were to a large degree excluded from both the decision to adopt PISA and its implementation.

Another approach is evident in the concepts and tools of post-development scholars, such as Escobar (2012), who argued against the 'universal and homolingual thrust of modernity' evident in many development practices and agendas, including in our view, the SDGs. Escobar (2012) and Höne (2015) are highly critical of development based in universalist *modus operandi* that

overemphasise scientific methods. They argue that this 'path to modernity' involves the invention of the so-called Third World through education programmes, health programmes and industrialisation, and that development is little more than a strategy for cultural and social domination.

The concept of the pluriverse, on the other hand, offers a critique of neo-liberal policies and universalistic apparatuses such as the SDGs. It aims to reveal a plurality of alternatives, options and solutions instead of a single linear and universally applicable path to a singular, linear and universal model of modernity, development or sustainability.

It is important to note that a wide range of voices were included in the negotiations that led up to the formulation of the SDGs. However, the indicator framework for assessing the quality of global education has created a universalistic apparatus that excludes the pluriverse once again. This is a significant challenge, and one that the education sector must address, regardless of the SDG indicator apparatus. Multiple voices that problematise diverse aspects of education quality must be heard and respected.

Another challenge concerns the collection of data for the indicators. Jerven (2017: 46) estimates that of the 230 indicators, half are lacking in 'acceptable country coverage, agreed-upon methodologies, or both'. Many countries lack the data (or the infrastructure required to collect the data) to measure progress on achieving the SDGs. This means that monitoring and implementing the SDGs will require enormous investment from the very countries that already have the fewest resources (Dunning 2016). Jerven (2017) argues that the total cost of measuring the indicators connected to each target, based on a modest estimation of the costs involved in measuring the 60 MDG indicators (\$24 billion), is unrealistic. With more than 200 indicators, the SDGs require complex methodologies to be followed in countries where data collection can be extremely difficult and highly contested. If the indicator framework is designed such that the costs of data collection alone are unrealistic, we should surely be very worried about the implementation of the SDGs themselves.

Of course, the education and development sectors are in need of statistical data to provide reliable information for policy implementation. However, it is crucial for us to engage in the SDG debate, especially around SDG 4. The ten targets under SDG 4 entail an all-inclusive approach to education, from primary to tertiary education and vocational training. The 11 corresponding indicators are designed to improve data collection by measuring: the proportion of learners at different levels in the education system; participation rates and parity indexes; and the extent to which global citizen education and education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in national education policies, curricula, teacher education and student assessment (UN 2017). Bexell and

Jönsson (2017) express a concern that the development of the quantitative indicators is a political process as much as a technical one. The indicators will have strong steering effects before and beyond the evaluation phase, and measurements will be a trade-off between poor statistical data availability on one hand, and addressing urgent needs on the other. Without clarity on what kinds of measurements will be taken, for whom, what purposes the data will be used for, and what kinds of policies are at stake, a range of unintended negative consequences may materialise (Jerven 2017), giving rise to exactly what Escobar (2012) warned against – a failure to take the pluriverse into account.

Opening up new conversations

In this chapter, we have attempted to offer some insights into the fragility and volatility of the higher education sector. We pointed out some of the complex challenges involved in developing and mentoring academics in a milieu of perennial conflict and contradiction, especially as the education project is increasingly held hostage to a neo-conservative and neo-liberal agenda. In addition, we touched on a possible approach to encouraging a range of approaches to understanding the world, and the world of education in particular.

As we wrote, a range of key questions emerged around the strategic competencies that need to infuse mentorship programmes for new academics as they construct their careers and envisage doing research in the context of the SDGs. In our view, challenging the universalistic nature of the indicators and integrating the notion of the pluriverse into education policy, invites further critical study. We offer the following questions in the hope that they might be useful in framing such studies:

- What competencies do academics need to avoid becoming merely a subject/instrument of the neo-liberal agenda?
- How can we develop higher education communities of practice or knowledge communities that serve the UN development agenda without being subservient to it?
- How might we deepen understandings and create higher levels of awareness of the threats posed by neo-liberalism, with a view to resisting and challenging it?
- How do we develop an epistemology of scepticism through the programmes and curricula we construct and deliver?
- How can we promote higher education as necessarily a political experience and disrupt the notion of training ‘human capital’?
- What should a new North–South social compact consist of?

- What might it take to re-centre the human subject at the heart of the educational enterprise?
- How can we shape and reshape the discourses around what it is to be an academic operating in a global space?

Notes

- 1 The notion of the pluriverse was coined to encapsulate ‘the coexistence of a rich multiplicity of moral languages, concepts and discourses’ (Esteva and Prakash 2014). Held within the concept is a strong critique of capitalism, patriarchy and imperialism, which identifies and targets conditions of coloniality (Höne 2015).
- 2 <https://www.facebook.com/groups/706685366093232/?fref=ts>, <https://www.facebook.com/Foreldreopp%C3%B8r-i-Osloskolen-420548688118979/?fref=ts>
- 3 Some examples discussing education and PISA in a Norwegian context: <http://www.dagsavisen.no/nyemening/nyemening-search-7.802117?sortby=date&q=skole+pisa>

References

- ASSAf (Academy of Science of South Africa) (2010) *The PhD Study: An Evidence-based Study on How to Meet the Demands for High-level Skills in an Emerging Economy*. Pretoria. Available online.
- Bexell M and Jönsson K (2017) ‘Responsibility and the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals’ *Forum for Development Studies* 44 (1): 13–29. doi: 10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424
- Dunning C (2016) *230 Indicators Approved for SDG Agenda*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development. Available online.
- Escobar A (1995/2012) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esteva G and MS Prakash (1998/2014) *Grassroots Post-Modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures*. London and New York: Zed.
- Gelb A (2001) *South Africa’s Role and Importance in the Development of Africa and the African Agenda*. Johannesburg: Edge Institute.
- Habib A (2013) *South Africa’s Suspended Revolution: Hopes and Prospects*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Harvey D (2007) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haywood H, R Jenkins and M Molesworth (2011) ‘A degree will make your dreams come true: Higher education as the management of consumer desires’ in M Molesworth, R Scullion and E Nixon (eds), *The Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. London: Routledge.
- Höne K (2015) ‘What quality and whose assessment: The role of education diplomacy in the SDG process – A new diplomacy for a new development agenda?’ paper presented at the 3rd Nordic Conference on Development Research, Gothenburg, Sweden, 5–6 November 2015.

- Jansen J (2009) *Knowledge in the Blood: Confronting Race and the Apartheid Past*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Jansen J (2017) *As by Fire: The End of the South African University*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Jerven M (2015) *Africa: Why Economists Get it Wrong*. London: Zed.
- Jerven M (2017) 'How much will a data revolution in development cost?' *Forum for Development Studies* 44 (1): 31–50. doi: 10.1080/08039410.2016.1260050
- Kamens D (2013) 'Globalization and the emergence of an audit culture: PISA and the search for "best practices" and magic bullets' in H-D Meyer and A Benavot (eds), *PISA, Power and Policy: The Emergence of Global Educational Governance*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Lalbahadur A (2015) *South Africa's Foreign Policy: Tempering Dominance Through Integration*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs. Available online.
- Le Blanc D (2015) 'Towards integration at last? The Sustainable Development Goals as a network of targets' *Sustainable Development* 23 (3): 176–187. doi: 10.1002/sd.1582
- Lockheed M (2013) 'Causes and consequences of international assessments in developing countries' in H-D Meyer and A Benavot (eds), *PISA, Power and Policy: The Emergence of Global Educational Governance*. Oxford: Symposium.
- Loewe M (2012) *Post 2015: How to Reconcile the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?* Briefing Paper 18, German Development Institute, Bonn. Available online.
- Maistry SM (2012) 'Confronting the neoliberal brute: Reflections of a higher education middle-level manager' *South African Journal of Higher Education* 26 (3): 515–528.
- National Planning Commission (2012) *National Development Plan 2030: Our Future Make it Work*. Pretoria: Office of the Presidency – Republic of South Africa. Available online.
- Nussbaum MC (2010) *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Social Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sen A (2009) *The Idea of Justice*. London: Allen Lane.
- Shore C (2010) 'Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university' *Social Anthropology* 18 (1): 15–29.
- Singh S (2012) 'Re-inserting the "public good" into higher education transformation' in B Leibowitz (ed.), *Higher Education for the Public Good: Views from the South*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.
- Statistics South Africa (2017) *Quarterly Labour Force Survey*. Pretoria: Stats SA. Available online.
- Stronach I (2010) *Globalizing Education: Educating the Local*. London: Routledge.
- Swyngedouw E (2007) 'Impossible/undesirable sustainability and the post-political condition' in JR Krueger and D Gibbs (eds), *The Sustainable Development Paradox: Urban Political Economy in the United States and Europe*. New York: Guildford.

- Teferra D (2015) 'Manufacturing and exporting excellence and "mediocrity": Doctoral education in South Africa', *South African Journal of Higher Education* 29 (5): 8–19.
- UN (United Nations) (2015) *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. Available online.
- UN (2016) 'UN Statistical Commission agrees on global indicator framework', United Nations website, 11 March 2016. Available online.
- UN (2017) *Sustainable Development Goal 4*. Available online.
- Žižek S (2011) *Living in the End Times*. London: Verso.