



DL4D
DIGITAL LEARNING
FOR DEVELOPMENT



Responses from the Global South

CONTEXT MATTERS: AN AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE ON INSTITUTIONALIZING LEARNING ANALYTICS

Paul Prinsloo

1. Introduction

This paper is an invited response to Dragan Gašević's (2018) paper entitled, "Include us all! Directions for adoption of learning analytics in the global south." Gašević proposes that:

the implementation of learning analytics in developing countries has significant potential to support *learning at scale*, to provide *personalized feedback* and *learning experience*, to *increase the number of graduates*, to *identify biases* affecting student success, to promote the development of *21st century skills*, and to *optimize the use of resources*. (p. 2; emphasis added)

He acknowledges that most of the current literature (both scholarly and popular) on learning analytics "originates from the Global North" and does not necessarily speak to "a number of specificities of the Global South" (p. 3).

"Making space" for a voice from the Global South recognizes, firstly, that some voices are excluded or absent from the discourses on learning analytics (for whatever reason) but also recognizes that

this exclusion and/or absence points to a certain "invisibility" (Sheared & Sissel, 2001). Inviting voices from the Global South and "making space" for their voices to be heard also points to the fact that the one who offers the invitation has the power (or capital in the Bourdieusian sense) to invite, and thereby to include and exclude. We, therefore, need to recognize the invitation's terms and conditions that signify an asymmetrical power relationship between the one who invites and the one who accepts the invitation. Despite and in recognition of the fact that an invitation to contribute and respond is embedded in a range of issues of power, voice, silence, and opportunity; I hope I can both honor and do justice in my response to Gašević's invitation to "Include us all!"

The invitation to respond also needs to be seen as an invaluable opportunity to engage, to question and contest, to contribute, voice, disrupt, and amplify the explicit and implicit values embedded in the proposal. The title of the paper – "Include us all!" – therefore points not only to an invitation but also signifies a demand to be heard and to be recognized.

I acknowledge that I cannot speak on behalf of the Global South or even on behalf of the African

continent. It is impossible to provide an *African* perspective on the adoption of learning analytics, considering that the African continent comprises 54 sovereign states, each with its unique regulatory framework, development agenda, information and communications technology (ICT) infrastructure, and state of adoption of online learning.

2. Why Context Matters

Gašević (2018) is *partly* correct when he states that the “ever-growing use of technology in education has resulted in an unparalleled collection of data on various aspects of learning, teaching, and education systems” (p. 2). As I will point out later on, claims such as these may disregard the specifics of a context, or even a continent. *The world is not flat.*

Castells (2009), for example, points out that what “characterises the global network society is the contraposition between the logic of the global net and the affirmation of a multiplicity of local selves” (p. 37). We, therefore, need to understand the collection of data in the context of attempts to articulate the links, overlaps, and contestations between the global and the local. We have to consider evidence that with the growing access to

the Internet and to wireless communication, abysmal inequality in broadband access and educational gaps in the ability to operate a digital culture tend to reproduce and amplify the class, race, age, and gender structures of social domination between countries and within countries. (Castells, 2009, p. 57)

Networks, therefore, do not only include but also *exclude*, and “the cost of exclusion from networks increases faster than the benefits of inclusion in the networks” (Castells, 2009, p. 42).

In response to Gašević’s (2018) proposal, I offer a number of counter-questions: What is the potential of learning analytics in data-poor environments where individual or institutional access to the Internet and wireless technologies may be non-existent, poor, intermittent and/or expensive? If we accept that models for understanding student success and retention may not be appropriate in contexts in the Global South (see Subotzky & Prinsloo, 2011), what are the implications of utilizing these models uncritically “as-is” in the Global South? What capacities, skills, infrastructure, and human resources are needed to not only institutionalize a context-appropriate, ethical approach to learning analytics but also to respond to identified needs and risks?

Gašević (2018) acknowledges the need for a process of modeling in learning analytics to “account for relevant contextual, political, cultural, educational, and individual factors in order to produce actionable insights for education” (p. 11). In light of the fact that data modeling approaches from the Global North may not be appropriate for application in the Global South, we have to welcome his proposal that models be critically interrogated:

Of particular relevance for the adoption of learning analytics could be insights from postcolonial, socio-political, multicultural research that can inform research that may uncover strengths of the Global South for the implementation of learning analytics. (p. 12)

In support of Gašević’s proposal, we have to ask:

How do we collect, analyse and use student data recognising that their data are not indicators of their potential, merit or even necessarily engagement but the results of the inter-generational impact of the skewed allocation of value and resources based on race, gender and culture? (Prinsloo, 2016)

As Kitchen's (2014) asserts, data are "framed technically, economically, ethically, temporally, spatially and philosophically. Data do not exist independently of the ideas, instruments, practices, contexts, and knowledge used to generate, process and analyse them" (Kitchen, 2014, p. 2).

We, therefore, cannot disregard the uses of data during colonialism and in the South African context to "classify humans according to those worthy of humanity and dignity and those who were, somehow, less human, less worthy, and of lesser merit" (Prinsloo, 2016). In considering the proposed directions for the adoption of learning analytics in the Global South, we have to consider, as point of departure, that data collection, analysis, and use are "political acts and serve declared and hidden assumptions about the purpose of higher education and the masters it serves" (Prinsloo, 2016). (See also Apple, 2004, 2007; Grimmelman, 2013; Kitchen, 2014; Watters, 2015.)

Learning analytics, like all (educational) technology, must be "understood as a knot of social, political, economic and cultural agendas that is riddled with complications, contradictions and conflicts" (Selwyn, 2014, p. 6). We, therefore, have to map the current and future adoption of learning analytics as an integral part of "the complex ways that social, economic and political tensions are 'mediated' in educational settings" (Selwyn, 2014, p. 4). We should, therefore, guard against a certain "techno-romanticism" and claims of "truthiness" (Selwyn, 2014, p. 10) formulated in the Global North or in the corridors of venture capitalism and/or Silicon Valley (Selwyn, 2014; Watters, 2015). While a certain skepticism is not only in order but also necessary, we should also not be self-righteous in our questioning of any particular educational technology, including learning analytics, and critically and actively engage with its claims and proposals.

While the opportunities, challenges, and concerns regarding learning analytics are well-documented in scholarly and popular publications, it is noteworthy that the discourses surrounding learning analytics have originated and have been and continue to be shaped by mostly North Atlantic centers of knowledge production. Contemplating the current shape, scope, and content of the discourses on learning analytics, it would be disingenuous to discount the historical and persistent effects of the global asymmetries of knowledge production and dissemination (e.g., Epstein, Boden, Deem, Rizvi, & Wright, 2008; Hoppers, 2000; Stack, 2016). On the other hand, it would be simplistic to blame such asymmetries entirely for the relative silence pertaining to indigenous learning analytics discourse on the African continent. Rather, we must also consider the effect of current homogenizing narratives regarding the potential of ICT in education (Selwyn, 2014); the role of Silicon Valley and venture capitalism (Watters, 2015) amid persisting and increasing global socio-economic inequalities (Piketty, 2014), and the impact of networks of inclusion/exclusion and resource allocation in African economies, and specifically in African higher education (Fosu, 2013; Jerven, 2015). We also cannot ignore the skewness of the digital revolution and the evidence that the majority of people in the Global South do not necessarily share the dividends of the digital age (World Bank, 2016).

Considering that we are "condemned to context" (Tessmer & Richey, 1997, p. 88), we simply cannot reflect on learning analytics' potential and challenges in the Global South without considering a range of deeply complex, often intergenerational and mutually constitutive and generative mechanisms indigenous to the Global South. The proposal of Jonassen that "[c]ontext is everything" (Jonassen, 1993, in Tessmer & Richey, 1997, p. 86) serves as a timely reminder to consider learning analytics – its potential, challenges, and paradoxes – in context.

3. Learning Analytics on the African Continent

Since the emergence and growth of learning analytics as a discipline, research focus, and institutional practice, there has been a distinction made between academic analytics and learning analytics. For purposes of this response, academic analytics refers to the collection, analysis, and use of aggregated student data by administrators, funders, marketers, governments, etc., at institutional, regional, national, and international levels for, inter alia, resource allocation, comparisons between systems, and quality assurance. Learning analytics, in contrast, focuses on the individual performance of students at the course and departmental levels, and is used by teachers, students, and support staff to inform teaching and learning (Siemens et al., 2011).

Most of the published research on the collection, analysis, and use of student data from the African context falls under the category of academic analytics and institutional research (Lemmens & Henn, 2016). There is, however, an increasing number of examples of the institutionalization of learning analytics, albeit mostly from South Africa. For example, Visser and Barnes (2016), as well as Muller, Siphon, and Philiswa (2016), report on learning analytics in the context of institutional research. Walji, Deacon, Small, and Czerniewicz (2016) report on learning analytics in the context of a massive open online course (MOOC) provided by the University of Cape Town, while Lourens and Bleazard (2016) report on the use of predictive learning analytics by the Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

At the time of writing of this response, only one example of published research could be found on the adoption or practice of learning analytics by an African university outside of South Africa. Oyerinde and Chia (2017) report on the use of predictive learning analytics in the Department of Computer Science

at a Nigerian university. Other examples report on African students as part of a sample for research (e.g., Cohen & Shimony, 2016) but not specifically undertaken in an African context.

In setting the tone for this response, I will refer briefly to the overview and findings of Lemmens and Henn (2016) in regard to learning analytics in the *South African* context. The authors refer to the fact that “[s]everal South African higher education institutions (HEIs) have started to appropriate critically the notion of ‘data-driven decisions’, in the hope of using the insights from analytics to reduce potential risks” (p. 231). Most of the analytics in the South African higher education context still fall within the broader definition of academic analytics, with the emphasis on institutional reporting to the South African government and a range of regulatory and funding bodies, as well as for the purposes of, for example, marketing (Lemmens & Henn, 2016). Using student data for the sake of informing learners and faculty about student progress is “still in its infancy” (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 236). Nonetheless, it is encouraging to find that learning analytics has been part of the institutional research discourse in South Africa since as early as 2013 (Lemmens and Henn, 2016), only two years after the first Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference took place in Banff, Alberta (Canada) in 2011.¹

Since South African HEIs do not have “a common framework that allows for the internal evaluation of their analytics systems nor for scientific comparison or replication among institutions” (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 239), Lemmens and Henn (2016) used the Greller and Drachsler (2012) framework to map the state of learning analytics in six of the 25 HEIs in South Africa. While Lemmens and Henn’s sample is not representative, it does provide a snapshot of the three types of South African HEIs – traditional universities, technology universities, and comprehensive universities (a hybrid of the first two types).

¹ <https://tekri.athabascau.ca/analytics/>

Of particular interest in writing this response to Gašević (2018) is Lemmens and Henn's (2016) finding that *students* as beneficiaries of the collection and analysis of data are positioned at the lowest rung in the ladder of stakeholders, below institutional planning departments, professional and support services, and faculty. They found that most of the current analytical practices support institutional reporting and reflection rather than prediction: "The system has not yet matured to include a predictive model that actively tracks and provides feedback to the stakeholders in a real-time fashion" (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 248).

With regard to constraints, all six institutions reported "exhaustive" internal ethical frameworks and full compliance with the South African Protection of Personal Information legislation (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 247). Access to data was not considered a constraint either; all the institutions reported "proxy access by user." In addition, two institutions reported "advanced analytical competence" (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 247). It is important to note that survey respondents were limited to "senior management, managers and staff from Learning Technology and Institutional Planning departments" (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 243) from "six institutions that presented papers at the 2013 SAHELA conference and two of the institutions that form part of The Kresge Foundation's Siyaphumelela (We succeed) project" (Lemmens & Henn, 2016, p. 242).

Despite the limitations of the Lemmens and Henn (2016) study in terms of the sampling of institutions and individual respondents, it does point to the relative immaturity of learning analytics in the South African higher education context.

4. Challenges in Learning Analytics Adoption in African Higher Education

There is ample evidence to suggest that Africa in general, and South Africa in particular, is not immune to the challenges faced by HEIs worldwide.

According to Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley (2009), the most important trend in higher education in recent years has been massification. Various sources on higher education on the African continent refer to the impact of massification on resources and infrastructure, and underscore the need for data-informed decision-making (e.g., Badat, 2005; Baijnath & Butcher, 2015; Maasen & Cloete, 2006; Mohamedbhai, 2014; Teferra & Altbach; 2004). Despite considerable diversity among African HEIs, Teferra and Altbach (2004) point to several commonalities around issues such as access, funding, governance and autonomy, privatization, language, the "role of research and the problems of scholarly communication," and the "brain drain" (p. 21).

4.1 Collection, analysis, and use of student data

Subotzky and Prinsloo (2011), in the context of a mega distance education institution in South Africa, make the point that intergenerational inequalities and macro-societal factors (past and present) have severe negative impacts on students' preparedness for and engagement in higher education. These impacts often fall outside of the loci of control of students and institutions. Should learning analytics in the context of the Global South collect, combine, analyze, and use data regarding *who* students are (in terms of race, gender, culture, employment, marital status, home language, home address, etc.) and what they *do* (in terms of class attendance, submissions of assignments or the taking of exams, participation in online fora, etc.), there is a danger that the data may not necessarily be representative of the potential of students but rather serve as an indication of the intergenerational legacy of economic and political exclusion. This danger is even more acute where, as is the case with many African HEIs, student data is often fragmented, incomplete, of varying quality and integrity, governed by often competing rules and regulations, and stored in different formats that impact on its integration with other data sources.

The solution for Africa may not be to harvest more (or different) data (Prinsloo, Archer, Barnes, Chetty, & Van Zyl, 2015; Prinsloo, 2017a), or at least not without, as Gašević (2018) suggests, “policies and codes of practice relating to the ethical use of learning analytics, privacy protection, and algorithmic accountability to support a healthy adoption of learning analytics” (p. 2). The formulation of such policies and standards, and the institutional operationalization of learning analytics itself, would require political will and the allocation of resources, both of which may be in scarce supply owing to competing claims and needs.

As a way forward, Prinsloo (2017a, slides 45-46) suggests the need to consider the following:

1. What are our (management, administrative, faculty, and support staff’s) beliefs about knowledge, learning, assessment, data, and evidence?
2. What student data do we already have, why was it collected, in which format is it stored, who has access to the data, how is the data used and by whom, and do students know this, have access to it, and know how it influences our and their choices?
3. What data do students currently have access to about their learning and about our choices pertaining to their learning?
4. What data don’t students currently have access to, *but we have*, that will help them to plan their time and resources in order to maximize their chances of success?
5. What student data *don’t we have* but need in order to teach better, allocate resources, and support students? Is this data available, under what conditions will we be able to access it, how will we govern its storage/combination with other sources of data, who will have access to it and under what conditions?

4.2 ICT access and technical skills

In light of the fact that much of the international learning analytics discourses (including elements in this paper) increasingly focus on student *online* engagement and the collection and analysis of student online and *digital data*, it is important to consider the unequal distribution of access to the affordances of ICT. A recent report by the World Bank (2016) points to evidence that increased access to digital technologies did not necessarily benefit those who most needed the affordances of access to digital technologies. More than 60% of the world’s population is still offline, and “some of the perceived benefits of digital technologies are offset by emerging risks” such as “polarised labor markets and rising inequality” with technology “replacing routine jobs, forcing many workers to compete for low-paying jobs” (World Bank, 2016, p. 3). Those who benefit the most from having access to the Internet are “the better educated, well connected, and more capable... [thus] circumscribing the gains from the digital revolution” (World Bank, 2016, p. 3). While there is a commitment to make the Internet available and affordable, “[w]orldwide, some 4 billion people do not have any internet access, nearly 2 billion do not use a mobile phone, and almost half a billion live outside areas with a mobile signal” (World Bank, 2016, p. 4).

There are signs, however, that the connectivity landscape is changing. A report published by Pew Research Global shows an increase from 45% in 2013 to 54% in 2015 in the median percentage of the population, across 21 emerging and developing countries, who occasionally accessed the Internet or who owned a smartphone (Poushter, 2016). Increased access, however, is *not equally shared amongst genders*. The report notes that “...in 20 nations, men are more likely than women to use the internet. These differences are especially stark in African nations” (Poushter, 2016, p. 6). Only 39% of women in South Africa have access to the Internet compared to 46% of men (Poushter, 2016, p. 13).

There is also evidence of the correlation between per capita income, on the one hand, and Internet access and use, on the other, in emerging economies; only 22% of those in the lower income group have access to the Internet compared to 52% of those in a higher income group (Poushter, 2016, p. 11).

Gašević (2018) points to the possibilities of using social media both for student support and for collecting student data to inform institutional strategies in providing more effective and equitable support. While increasing numbers of students may have access to technology and use social media (World Bank, 2016), a huge issue, at least in the South African context, is the cost and sustainability of access to the Internet (Smillie, 2016). Students' use of social media will also depend on the extent to which social media are integrated into course design and assessment strategies. There are also several ethical considerations to account for when institutions harvest student data from disparate sources outside of the institutional fiduciary and operational domains (Prinsloo & Slade, 2015; Prinsloo & Slade, 2016).

Beyond the question of access to data, few African HEIs have the capacity to collect student data of the scope, variety, velocity, and volume necessary for fine-grained analysis. Thus, those keen to take up learning analytics are likely to invest in commercial providers and platforms (Prinsloo, 2017a) and may find themselves exposed to exactly the dangers Gašević (2018) points to in regard to the inappropriateness of models developed in the Global North.

4.3 Ethics and privacy protection

Considering the increasing attention awarded to issues of ethics and privacy in learning analytics (Prinsloo, 2016; Prinsloo & Slade, 2017; Slade & Prinsloo, 2013), it is clear that there are still a number of unresolved issues with regard to, for example, the role of institutional oversight on ethical considerations and unintended consequences in

learning analytics (e.g., Willis, Slade & Prinsloo, 2016). In the context of this response to Gašević's proposal, we need to consider how ethical considerations in the Global South may differ or have different nuances from approaches and concerns in the Global North (See for example Callaway, 2017; Kukutai & Taylor, 2016; Prinsloo, 2017b).

In the Global South, we are and should be, more aware of how individuals' data were used during colonialism and apartheid to classify humans and award different individuals levels of dignity, resources, and humanity depending on criteria shaped by ideology. While it falls outside of the scope of this response to formulate what a Global South context-appropriate approach would be to address issues of ethics and privacy, the "agenda" proposed by several authors in Kukutai and Taylor (2016) may provide some tentative pointers for further consideration:

- Data subjects should determine which criteria and variables matter. Their data belong to them and they have vested interests in determining what data are collected and for what purposes (Morphy, 2016; Sinn, 2016).
- The data collected should, therefore, reflect "the interests, values, and priorities of native people" (Sinn, 2016, p. 52).
- Data subjects "must have the power to determine who has access to these data" (Sinn, 2016, p. 52).
- We should acknowledge how North Atlantic and colonial epistemologies underpin the determination of criteria and variables (Pool, 2016).
- Data collection and definitions should be based on how data subjects and their communities see themselves and not on how those who have the power to collect data define them (Pool, 2016).

- Indicators and categories flow from specific North Atlantic, commercial, and neoliberal assumptions and epistemologies. For example, taking “age” and “dependents” as proxies for indicators of socioeconomic class or potential to contribute to the economy stand in stark contrast to how individuals in the Global South see these categories (Morphy, 2016).
- Indicators and criteria simplify complex phenomena (e.g., “family” and “household”). These indicators “do not just shape the way the world is understood, but also contain embedded value judgments” (Morphy, 2016, p. 108). Often the categories used by institutions and those who collect and analyze data silence that which matters for those whose data is collected.
- “In intercultural contexts, seemingly objective data and their interpretation as information can become misguided political, policy and ideological instruments. For that reason, both the data and information may have limited validity or usefulness when externally imposed as constructions of indigenous behaviors and social formations” (Smith, 2016, p. 120).
- “In every society, there are cultural determinants of what constitutes leadership, decision-making, representation, group membership, participation, legitimacy, and accountability. And different behaviors, standards and measures may apply” (Smith, 2016, p. 128). Smith (2016) refers to this as “culture-smart information” that asks, “Whose voice is given priority in determining the meaning, validity, and values attached to data?” (p. 128).

The above may serve as an illustration of the hypothesis that ethics and privacy are about power – the power to define what is regarded private and ethical (Prinsloo, 2017b).

5. Towards the Operationalization of Learning Analytics: Policy and Practice

There is ample evidence that the main function of the collection, analysis, and use of student data on the African continent has been, until recently, for purposes of reporting to various stakeholders on student success and throughput, and as such, can be categorized as *academic analytics*. Considering the constant challenges in the African higher education context to offer high quality and well-supported educational opportunities at *scale*, it would be irresponsible to disregard the huge potential of *learning analytics*.

I propose the following broad principles for consideration in the operationalization of learning analytics in the Global South/Africa.

1. The first step towards institutionalizing learning analytics would be to establish the scope of political will and available resources. While many institutions in the Global South may have a sense of the potential of learning analytics, there is evidence that institutions lack the necessary data infrastructure and/or human resources, with the necessary skills and access to the necessary software and analytical tools, to implement learning analytics. It is in this aspect that institutions in the Global South/Africa may be the most vulnerable when they decide to make use of outsourced solutions. Outsourcing the collection, analysis, and use of student data raises a number of issues such as cost, sustainability of the outsourcing, licensing agreements, ownership of the data, and adherence to institutional and national frameworks for the protection of student privacy and data. On the other hand, we also have to consider the implications of developing in-house capacity and providing the necessary hardware and

software capability. While it falls outside the scope of this response to fully engage with the different aspects of this decision, it may be sufficient at this stage to point to the issues and potential dangers in both of these options.

2. Institutions' understanding of the potential of learning analytics is shaped by their conceptual understanding of the different variables impacting on student success. These understandings determine what data institutions will collect, analyze, and use. It is therefore very important that institutions reflect on their own understanding of student success. In considering the wide range of empirical and conceptual models for understanding student success (Prinsloo, 2009; Prinsloo, 2017b), institutions in the Global South/Africa should be mindful of the ontologies and epistemologies underpinning these models and to what extent these models are appropriate for their particular institutional character and geopolitical context (see, for example, Subotzky and Prinsloo, 2011).
3. It is crucial to determine what data an institution *currently* has access to, where the data is located, how the data is governed, the quality and formats of the data, how the current data sets are used to inform teaching and learning, who does the analysis, and who uses these data sets. Depending on the institutional and geopolitical context, the data (and learning) may be kept in digital or analogue form. All of these determine to what extent any institution can start to think about the potential of learning analytics to inform teaching and learning.
4. Depending on the level of maturity of the digitization of student information, as well as the digitization of teaching and learning, institutions may have to use whatever data they currently have to map and analyze student learning to inform teaching, the allocation of resources, and student support.

Some institutions may already have access to rich data sets regarding students' learning journeys, while other institutions may be data-poor/poor-data environments.

5. Students need information and feedback on their progress in order to make informed decisions. Often the quality and granularity of feedback and institutional responsiveness are shaped by departmental and institutional resources. Institutions, therefore, have to consult with their students in order to determine what information and analysis students would need in order to make informed decisions regarding their choices. We should not forget that students' learning is the main focus of learning analytics and, therefore, it is impossible not to consider students' need for information and feedback as central to any institutionalization of learning analytics.

6. (In)conclusions

Gašević (2018) states that it is of great importance “to develop new and to adapt existing learning analytics tools that can recognize needs, culture, social norms, economic development, and infrastructural limitations in the Global South. A straightforward adoption of existing tools (even if they are free and open source) may not be possible without considerable investment in language and cultural adaptations of the user interfaces, and the ways in which the results of analytics are interpreted, communicated, and utilized” (p. 14). I cannot agree more.

While the statement by Tessmer and Richey (1997) that we are “condemned to context” (p. 88) may sound overly deterministic, we ignore the impact of context on the institutionalization of learning analytics on the African continent at our own peril. Despite and amid the contextual constraints, there are, however, some glimpses of how to realize the potential of learning analytics on the African continent.

Operationalizing learning analytics will require African

HEIs to consider either using commercial providers/products or developing their own infrastructure and expertise. In either case, institutions should (re) consider their assumptions about and understanding of student retention and success, and the scope, characteristics, and quality of data they can and need to access given those assumptions and understanding. At the heart of learning analytics and underpinning institutional responses to constraints should be students – their learning, their aspirations, and their needs.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for having had the opportunity to reflect on Gašević's (2018) proposal and consider the implications from the perspective of the Global South. As acknowledged earlier, the Global South and Africa are not homogenous and it is impossible to speak "on behalf of" either the Global South and/or Africa. I do, however, hope that some of my reflections may be of value for various stakeholders in the broader context of the Global South.

I would also like to acknowledge the useful input I received from the reviewers and the commissioning editor, Professor Lim Cher Ping (Chair Professor of Learning Technologies and Innovation, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, The Education University of Hong Kong). Finally, I am indebted to Professor Pamela Ryan (Higher Education Consultant, South Africa) for her input, language editing, and guidance.

References

- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf>
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Apple, M. W. (2007). Education, markets, and an audit culture. *International Journal of Educational Practices*, 1(1), 4–19.
- Badat, S. (2005). South Africa: Distance higher education policies for access, social equity, quality, and social and economic responsiveness in a context of the diversity of provision. *Distance Education*, 26(2), 183–204.
- Bajjnath, N., & Butcher, N. (2015, September). *Enhancing the core business of higher education in Southern Africa through technology: Limits and possibilities*. Presentation at the Vice-Chancellors Leadership Dialogue on "Global trends in technology in higher education: Opportunities and challenges for African universities", Cape Town, SA.
- Callaway, E. (2017). South Africa's San people issue ethics code to scientists. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/south-africa-s-san-people-issue-ethics-code-to-scientists/>
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Cohen, A., & Shimony, U. (2016, November). Dropout prediction in a massive open online course using learning analytics. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education* (pp. 616–625). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/d/173988>
- Epstein, D., Boden, R., Deem, R., Rizvi, F., & Wright, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Geographies of knowledge, geometries of power: Framing the future of higher education* (Volume 1). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fosu, A. K. (2013). Growth of African economies: Productivity, policy syndromes and the importance of institutions. *Journal of African Economies*, 22(4), 523–551.
- Gašević, D. (2018). Include us all! Directions for adoption of learning analytics in the global south. In C. P. Lim, & V. L. Tinio (Eds.), *Learning analytics for the global south* (pp. 1–22). Quezon City, Philippines: Foundation for Information Technology Education and Development.
- Greller, W., & Drachsler, H. (2012). Translating learning into numbers: A generic framework for learning analytics. *Educational Technology and Society*, 15(3), 42–57.
- Grimmelmann, J. (2013, November 22). Anarchy, status updates, and Utopia. *Pace Law Review* 135, University of Maryland Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2014–4. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2358627>

- Hoppers, C. A. O. (2000). African voices in education: Retrieving the past, engaging the present and shaping the future. In P. Higgs, N. C. G. Vakalisa, T. V. Mda, & N. T. Assie-Lumumba (Eds.), *African voices in education* (pp. 1–11). Lansdowne, South Africa: Juta & Co.
- Jerven, M. (2015). *Africa: Why economists get it wrong*. London: Zed Books.
- Kukutai, T., & Taylor, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda*. ANU Press. Retrieved from <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/centre-aboriginal-economic-policy-research-caepr/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- Lemmens, J. C., & Henn, M. (2016). Learning analytics: A South African higher education perspective. In J. Botha & N. Muller (Eds.), *Institutional research in South African higher education* (pp. 231–253). Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.
- Lourens, A., & Bleazard, D. (2016). Applying predictive analytics in identifying students at risk: A case study. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(2), 129–142.
- Maassen, P., & Cloete, N. (2006). Global reform trends in higher education. *Transformation in higher education*, 7–33.
- Mohamedbhai, G. (2014). Massification in higher education institutions in Africa: Causes, consequences and responses. *International Journal of African Higher Education*, 1(1), 59–83.
- Morphy, F. (2016). Indigenising demographic categories: A prolegomenon to indigenous data sovereignty. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 99–115). ANU Press. Retrieved from <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/centre-aboriginal-economic-policy-research-caepr/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- Muller, N., Langa, S., Philiswa, D., & Dlamini, P. (2016). Institutional research units in higher education institutions in South Africa. Learning analytics: A South African higher education perspective. In J. Botha & N. Muller (Eds.), *Institutional research in South African higher education*, (pp. 57–73). Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS. Retrieved from <https://ir.dut.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10321/1760/9781928357186-04.pdf?sequence=1>
- Oyerinde, O. D., & Chia, P. A. (2017). Predicting students' academic performances – A learning analytics approach using multiple linear regression. *Perception*, 157(4), 37–44. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dantala_Oyerinde/publication/312512177_Predicting_Students'_Academic_Performances_-_A_Learning_Analytics_Approach_using_Multiple_Linear_Regression/links/5880967108aed72fe7cb2156.pdf
- Poushter, J. (2016). Smartphone ownership and internet usage continues to climb in emerging economies. Pew Research. Retrieved from <http://www.pewglobal.org/2016/02/22/smartphone-ownership-and-internet-usage-continues-to-climb-in-emerging-economies/>
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the 21st century* (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pool, I. (2016). Colonialism's and postcolonialism's fellow traveler: The collection, use and misuse of data on indigenous people. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 57–78). ANU Press. Retrieved from <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/centre-aboriginal-economic-policy-research-caepr/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- Prinsloo, P. (2009). Modelling throughput at Unisa: The key to the successful implementation of ODL. Pretoria, South Africa: University of South Africa. Retrieved from <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/handle/10500/6035>
- Prinsloo, P. (2016, October 27). *Mapping the ethical implications of using student data – A South African contextualised view* [PowerPoint slides]. Presentation at an Ethics Symposium as part of the Siyaphumelela Project, South Africa. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/prinsp/mapping-the-ethical-implications-of-using-student-data-a-south-african-contextualised-view>
- Prinsloo, P. (2017a). *Learning analytics: Opportunities and dilemmas* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/prinsp/learning-analytics-opportunities-dilemmas>
- Prinsloo, P. (2017b). Guidelines on the ethical use of student data: A draft narrative framework. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319013201_Guidelines_on_the_Ethical_Use_of_Student_Data_A_Draft_Narrative_Framework
- Prinsloo, P., Archer, E., Barnes, G., Chetty, Y., & Van Zyl, D. (2015). Big(ger) data as better data in open distance learning: Some provocations and theses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 16(1), 284–306. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1948/3259>
- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2015). Student privacy self-management: Implications for learning analytics. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge* (pp. 83–92). New York, NY: ACM.
- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2016). Student vulnerability, agency, and learning analytics: An exploration. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(1), 159–182.

- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). Ethics and learning analytics: Charting the (un)charted. In G. Siemens & C. Lang (Eds.), *Learning Analytics Handbook* (pp. 49–57). SoLAR.
- Sclater, N., Peasgood, A., & Mullan, J. (2016). *Learning analytics in higher education: A review of UK and international practice*. JISC. Retrieved from <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/learning-analytics-in-he-v3.pdf>
- Selwyn, N. (2014). *Distrusting educational technology. Critical questions for changing times*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sheared, V., & Sissel, P.A. (Eds.). (2001). *Making space: Merging theory and practice in adult education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Siemens, G., Gašević, D., Haythornthwaite, C., Dawson, S., Buckingham Shum, S., Ferguson, R., ... Baker, R. S. (2011). *Open learning analytics: An integrated & modularized platform* (White Paper). Edmonton, Canada: Society for Learning Analytics Research. Retrieved from <http://solaresearch.org/OpenLearningAnalytics.pdf>
- Siemens, G. (2016, May 22). What does it mean to be human in a digital age? [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.elearnspace.org/blog/2016/05/22/what-does-it-mean-to-be-human-in-a-digital-age/>
- Slade, S. (2016). *Applications of student data in higher education: Issues and ethical considerations* (Technical Report). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307855936_Applications_of_Student_Data_in_Higher_Education_Issues_and_Ethical_Considerations
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist* 57(1), 1509–1528.
- Smillie, S. (2016, July 20). SA's sky-high data costs. *TimesLive*. Retrieved from <http://www.timeslive.co.za/thetimes/2016/09/20/SAs-sky-high-data-costs>
- Smith, D. E. (2016). Governing data and data for governance: The everyday practice of indigenous sovereignty. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 117–138). ANU Press. Retrieved from <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/centre-aboriginal-economic-policy-research-caepr/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- Snipp, C. M. (2016). What does data sovereignty imply: What does it look like? In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 39–56). ANU Press. Retrieved from <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/centre-aboriginal-economic-policy-research-caepr/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- Stack, M. (2016). *Global university rankings and the mediatization of higher education* (Palgrave Studies in Global Higher Education). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Subotzky, G., & Prinsloo, P. (2011). Turning the tide: A socio-critical model and framework for improving student success in open distance learning at the University of South Africa. *Distance Education*, 32(2), 177–193.
- Teferra, D., & Altbach, P. G. (2004). African higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Higher education*, 47(1), 21–50.
- Tessmer, M., & Richey, R. C. (1997). The role of context in learning and instructional design. *Educational technology research and development*, 45(2), 85–115.
- Visser, H., & Barnes, G. (2016). Professional development for institutional research. In J. Botha & N. Muller (Eds.), *Institutional research in South African higher education*, (pp. 75–96). Stellenbosch: SUN PRESS. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Herman_Visser/publication/312529583_Professional_Development_for_Institutional_Research/links/58a5ce9592851cf0e39ce990/Professional-Development-for-Institutional-Research.pdf
- Walji, S., Deacon, A., Small, J., & Czerniewicz, L. (2016). Learning through engagement: MOOCs as an emergent form of provision. *Distance Education*, 37(2), 208–223.
- Watters, A. (2015, May 17). Ed-Tech and the Californian ideology. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://hackeducation.com/2015/05/17/ed-tech-ideology>
- Williamson, B. (2017, 29 May). Platform capitalism in the classroom. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://dmlcentral.net/platform-capitalism-classroom/>
- Willis, J. E., Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2016). Ethical oversight of student data in learning analytics: A typology derived from a cross-continental, cross-institutional perspective. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64, 881–901. <http://ink.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-016-9463-4>
- World Bank. (2016). *Digital dividends*. Washington: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank. Retrieved from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/01/13/090224b08405b9fa/1_0/Rendered/PDF/World0developm0I0dividends0overview.pdf