Volume 2, Issue 1 (2026), Article ev2i1.1030.
Journal of Global Higher Education
https://journal.libraries.wm.edu/global_higher_education/index

CRITICAL REFLECTION

Should We Still be Talking about 'Global' Higher Education?

David Mills*
University of Oxford, United Kingdom
david.mills@education.ox.ac.uk
ORCiD: 0000-0002-2573-1171
*Corresponding author

Abstract

Can the higher education research community find a new language to describe 'global' higher education'? In the 1990s, the 'global' adjective captured the effervescent expansion of international university provision and student mobility across the planet. Powered by a strong sense of normative purpose, as well as by the neoliberal restructuring of universities as corporations, 'global higher education' was promoted by the imaginaries and investments of entrepreneurial Australian, North American, and European universities. Rendered visible by rankings and citation data, 'global higher education' is now seen for what it is: an artefact of flows of data and capital. As the neoliberal order begins to fracture, other models of the university become more visible. Radical philosophers remind us that there is a place for creative study and reparative thought hidden within, and against, the university. Higher education researchers from across the majority world are decentering and diversifying the field, offering place-based alternative perspectives. There are new data sources for mapping science, fresh analytical languages, and radically transdisciplinary visions for knowledge-making. Is it finally time to say goodbye to the g-word?

Keywords: globalisation, global higher education, capitalism, neoliberalism

Introduction

The scholarly phrase, 'global higher education' emerged in the 1990s as a powerful shorthand for understanding the market-led acceleration of higher education provision across the planet. It helped researchers conceptualise, and critique, this rapidly changing landscape and its normative promises (Marginson, 2000). They were not the only ones. A protean politics of *altermondialisme* (Agrikolinasky et al., 2005) began to organise and push back against 'globalisation,' viewing it as the seductive mantra of a new political, economic, and political elite, the so-called 'globalists' (Slobodian, 2018). Their calls for deglobalisation were amplified by the World Social Forum of 2001 and the financial crisis of 2008. As the utopian promises of free movement and wealth creation morphed into a decade of austerity politics,

the public mood across Europe and North America has increasingly turned against the global, increasingly suspicious of unaccountable business elites and transnational tech companies. Populist politicians then harnessed this antipathy, blaming the loss of manufacturing jobs, stagnant wages, and economic outsourcing on globalisation (Berman 2021).

Amongst intellectuals, Spivak (2012) offered a particularly bracing critique: “Globalisation takes place only in capital and data. Everything else is damage control” (p. 1). In her reading, all other aspects of life (including education) struggle to keep up with globalisation’s destructive force: they are left to manage the collateral damage. Writing in 2026 in a Trump world of oil imperialism and zero-sum geopolitics, as well as of AI-led disruption, this damage is rendered violently clear.

The politics of antiglobalisation has not stopped scholars, research centres, and journals from continuing to use the ‘global’ as an analytical shorthand. In some fields it has served to pluralise Eurocentric canons and disciplines: the fields of ‘global history’ and ‘global IR’ come to mind (Acharya 2014). In others, like anthropology, the ‘global’ was always contested, a space of debate and critique.

Meanwhile, universities continue to promote their own position within a global hierarchy of prestige. My own institution, like Harvard and other supposedly ‘world class universities,’ has benefitted from the widening reputational stratification powered by university rankings (Hazelkorn, 2025). The normative promise of ‘global higher education’ has been overshadowed by what seems to be its consequence: a “neoimperial, neoliberal globalization, Euro-American cultural hegemony and the privileging of Whiteness” (Marginson, 2022, p. 16). If so, is it time for scholars of higher education to promote an alternative set of terms and tools to that of the ‘global’ when analysing trends in higher education and research across our fragile planet?

In this essay I trace the rise and fall of ‘global higher education’ as a policy imaginary and analytical framing. Despite the repeated use of the singular (such as in the title of this journal), there has never have been ‘one’ global higher education. Beyond the noisy flows of capital and data, there are multiple, multiplex, and overlapping higher education and science ecosystems, each of which has its own dynamics and complexity (Hobson, 2021). The best response to the ‘view from nowhere’ promised by globalisation is a grounded and place-based (Tuan, 1979) attention to the diversity of educational relationships and knowledge systems hidden in the shadow of capital.

When Did Universities Go Global?

The globalisation of higher education in a recognisably modern form begins with the founding of the Humboldt University of Berlin in 1809. Amidst growing great-power rivalry, Germany began to attract doctoral scholars from across Europe to its new research laboratories and their links with industry and the state. The period from 1830 to 1930 is sometimes known as science’s ‘German century’ (Watson 2010). In response, Johns Hopkins was founded as the first American research university in 1876. It took the UK universities a hundred years, and a world war, before they created their own PhD degrees to attract US scholars and build research links across an “empire of scholars” (Pietsch, 2013). Initially these were mostly postgraduates. The first significant flows of undergraduates to the US were supported by Cold War scholarships. By the 1990s, the UK, Australia, and the US began to

compete as destinations for international students. From around one million mobile students in 1985, the number doubled over the course of the 1990s, and again during the 2000s, with an estimated four million by 2010.

The specific term ‘global higher education’ first entered the scholarly lexicon in the 1990s, as mobility boomed and scholars sought to make sense of a new world system of academic centres and peripheries (Altbach, 1995). In 1998 the US Institute of International Education hosted a Washington meeting entitled ‘New perspectives on global higher education challenges.’ US policy makers, the Open Society, World Bank, and university vice-chancellors gathered to ponder what were politely called ‘global challenges’: employability, technology access, expansion, faculty working conditions, privatisation and managerialism (Altbach & Davis 1999). Whilst commentators like Altbach and Davis were not confident that a global ‘system’ yet existed, US and Australian universities were busy imagining the academic world as global (Kamola, 2019). Globalisation became both an object of study and the organising logic through which disciplines and departments were being restructured.

Research universities across the global North rapidly reinvented themselves as attractive destinations for international students. Australia was a key testbed for globalisation, powered by student loans, neoliberal reforms, and the introduction of market logics (Marginson 2020). Monash led the way, setting up one of the first international campuses in Malaysia in 1998. Nottingham Ningbo and Chicago Barcelona were quick to follow, both founded in 2000.

Kamola (2019) offers the case study of New York University to show how US institutions began to “fully imagine — and work to embody — the academic world as a global market” (p. 179). Analysing how universities adopted the development imaginaries of the World Bank, he shows how they began to position themselves as cosmopolitan institutions. Kamola suggests that this imagineering distracted attention from the economic restructuring that enabled it: “how the world became imagined as global cannot be disaggregated from the material apparatuses in which such knowledge is produced, reproduced, and circulated” (Kamola 2019, p. 187).

The emergence of global higher education as an object of knowledge was enabled and accelerated by the aggregation and dissemination of institutional data on a planetary scale (Mills, 2023). Where UNESCO and OECD had previously mapped international student mobility, the Shanghai Jiao-Tong AWRU rankings of 2003 created a global league table of universities. The following year Times Higher Education and QS launched their own ranking, all of which began influencing the mobility choices of students and their parents.

A Scopus search reveals that the specific term ‘global higher education’ has been used 811 times in Scopus-indexed journal titles or abstracts since the 1990s, nearly always in the English language, and primarily by scholars based in the US (152 times), the UK (140 times), China (97 times) or Australia (70 times). This is a small and interlinked community of scholars, many based in these recruiting universities. When researchers in South Africa (41 times) or India use the term (37 times), they are more likely to critique the concept, using it as a foil in debates around the importance of decolonisation.

Most scholars blame rankings for radically restructuring the higher education commons. In 2014, Marginson noted that “what is apprehended is not the material world but the artificial model-world of the ranker” (Marginson, 2014, p. 54). A decade later he was clear that “no development did more to normalise the global higher education space as a neoliberal market, while perpetuating Anglo-American hegemony” (Marginson, 2025, p. 19). Hazelkorn

(2025) was blunter still, seeing this as an example of "surveillance capitalism," arguing that governments and institutions "become easy prey, providing vast amounts of data to play the rankings game" (p. 19). There is less attention to the way that rankings underpin academic and student mobility and the reputation economy.

Higher education researchers are wedded to the normative possibilities of knowledge as a global public good, whilst recognising that there are marked geographical, racial, and gendered inequalities of access and participation, as well as constant market pressures to privatise and enclose knowledge (Marginson 2025). Public goods are always contingent: Some benefit more than others.

As an influential commentator on global higher education, Marginson (2018) has done the most to promote the case for protecting 'global' knowledge flows, arguing that global science "constitutes a vast joined up zone of free critical inquiry" (p. 2). Marginson and Xu (2023) suggest that 'national' and 'global' science are two "orthogonal" systems, with the national driven by a "zero-sum" logic where the priority is "national security and economic capability," and "where neoimperial Western configurations of power openly influence the whole" (p. 35). Developing a critique of overly structuralist centre-periphery theorisations, they end up dividing 'good' global science from the more problematic agendas of 'national' science. This leads them to advocate for an "autonomous global system of science" emerging with its own logic, grounded in "collegial networks of science," albeit "limited by inequalities and cultural homogeneity" (Marginson and Xu 2023, p. 37).

Marginson and Xu (2023) cleave to the normative promise of the global even as they recognise the importance of what they call post-global ecologies of knowledge. In their vision, 'global' science becomes the answer to the problems facing national universities. Can scholars have it both ways: Critiquing the current topographies of globalisation whilst also holding out for a more equal global science system? An attention to data capitalism suggests otherwise. In the current research economy, the knowledge flows of 'global science' are enabled by the digital platforms of the major commercial publishers. This publishing oligopoly is reducing linguistic diversity and embedding epistemic inequalities (Asubiaro et al., 2024; van Bellen et al., 2025). AI looks set to reinforce these logics.

This returns us to the question Kamola (2019) asks: As scholars of higher education, should we focus on the broader economic, ecological, and political forces within which the world university system is embedded, or attend more narrowly to the evolving dynamics within the 'field' itself? The best empirical research seeks to do both. The very existence of 'global higher education' was made possible by the restructuring of Euro-American universities into market-oriented corporations. The financial situation of many UK universities in 2026 is deeply concerning, with unprecedented staff job losses caused by plummeting international student revenues (Harvie & Harrison 2025). To use Spivak's (2012) language, marketized global higher education brings a great deal of "collateral damage" (p. 3): Growing indebtedness amongst students and their parents, a reliance on precarious faculty, carbon-intensive scholarship and student mobility, the rise of corporate managerialism, and the loss of academic freedom.

The paradox is that the scholarly study of higher education – along with our critiques of current global trends - is funded by its continuing growth. The reputational fortunes of universities depend on the rankings and citation metadata produced by transnational publishing corporations and European data analytics companies. It is easy to write coruscating analyses of university league tables and their corporate owners, but the same

league tables dominate the thinking and choices of students, parents, administrators, and faculty alike. The values of so-called 'global science' and 'global higher education' may indeed be different from the logics of neoliberal capital, but it is hard to imagine a world in which they are entirely separate.

Conceptualising Higher Education Differently

In this journal's founding issue, the editors critique the "narrow framings of higher education globally, in both research and practice." They instead argue for the importance of providing a "'disruptive' platform for 'critical perspectives,`" as well as the "scholarship, views, values and positionalities of the 'global majority'" (Lomer et al., 2025, p. 2). The journal's commitment to problematising "common understandings, practices, and modes of higher education existing globally" (p. 5) is long overdue and much welcome, as are its foregrounding of perspectives from the majority world. In championing the work of Stein (2025a), Ibrahim and Heleta (2025), and Shahjahan (2025), amongst many others, the journal sets out an exciting vision for 'critical global higher education' scholarship, albeit one that retains the g-word.

Beyond JGHE, the research landscape is changing rapidly. Across a multipolar world, a growing number of researchers based in the lower and middle income countries (LMICs) are investigating south-south educational mobilities, policy flows and decolonial collaborations. As two geographers of higher education put it, "What happens when we start from Nigeria?" (Craggs & Neate, 2020, p. 899). Nigerian scholars have rather different concerns – austerity, strikes, and underfunding. The framing of 'global higher education' is rarely used by scholars on the African continent, except for scholars in South Africa when they critique the concept, or offer a more radical decolonial vision.

Semantics matter. Do we have concepts that can usefully replace the 'global'? Latour (2017) called out the limits of a "single provincial vision of globalisation that leads to the imposition of a small number of interests, limited to a few instruments, standards and protocols" (p. 26). Rather than "globalization-minus," he called for "globalization-plus": "Multiplying viewpoints, registering a greater number of varieties, taking into account a larger number of beings, cultures, phenomena, organisms, and people" (p. 55). Mbembe suggests pluriversalism, a concept first used by the Afrocentric scholar Tseholane Keto (Keto, 1989), and the need for "openness to dialogue among different epistemic traditions" (Mbembe, 2016. p. 38). Partiality and incompleteness (Nymanjoh, 2017) may be more useful tools than the invocation of difference, place more generative than space (Massey, 2003; Tuan, 1979).

There are many conversations for higher education scholars to tap on. These include a rich archive of anticolonial, postcolonial, and decolonial critiques of knowledge making, from the dynamics of academic "extraversion" (Hountondji, 1990, p. 149) to the implications of academic dependencies for intellectual autonomy (Alatas, 2003). Working in the tradition of radical black philosophy, Moten and Harney (2004) rethink the generative 'undercommons' of the university, an idea taken up by la paperson (2017) in "a third University is possible." The Latin American school of decolonial scholars attend to the situated nature of knowledge production (Mignolo, 2021; Rodriguez-Medina & Harding 2025). An important stream of feminist research reveals how race and gender harassment are domesticated and silenced by universities (e.g. Ahmed, 2017). Others document race privilege (e.g. Bhopal & Myers, 2024)

or use place-based methods to decolonise the curriculum and rethink the canon (Tuck & McKenzie, 2016). Growing calls for reparative higher education, including material reparations, offer another way into debates around university reform (Sriprakash, 2026; Stein, 2025b; Walker, 2025). Within science studies, there are exciting new visions of transdisciplinary research in dialogue with excluded communities and their knowledges (Ludwig & Charbel, 2025).

To track these emergences, the subaltern higher education researcher can no longer rely on the avowedly 'global' research mappings offered by commercially owned citation indexes. Instead, they need to map their systemic effacements and erasures. This means turning to Open Science resources (such as Open Alex), regional databases and grey literatures, recognising that each has its limits and drawbacks. Each helps to explain the contradictions, blockages, and hierarchies created by globalisation, and can highlight the educational worlds created in the 'global shadows' (Ferguson, 2007). We may not yet be able to escape globalisation's centripetal power, but the shadows offer partial autonomy.

One research project carried out at the Oxford-based Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE) explored the potential for an alternative language of 'supranational' higher education (Chankseliani, 2022): Universities operating at a supranational level (such as through joint degrees between global North and global South); supranational agencies (such as UNESCO and OECD); supranational spaces (such as the European Higher Education Area); and supranational networks (such as the International Association of Universities or the African Research University Association (ARUA)). One could also track the supranational flows of higher education data and capital, and subaltern counter-imaginaries. Each has different infrastructures, imaginaries, scales, and frictions (Tsing, 2005). From the field of International Relations, Amitav Acharya envisions a future 'multiplex' order of state, non-state, and private actors (Acharya, 2025). Concepts like 'supranationalism' and 'multiplex' help move the conversation beyond a local/global/national framing and avoid the reductionist heuristics of glonacalism (Marginson, 2022).

The theoretical manifestos of the Open Science movement, as well as others committed to public good visions of higher education, offer a vision beyond neoliberal globalism. But here too there is a risk of espousing one-size-fits-all normative principles, and new forms of Euro-fetishism (Hobson, 2020). For example, the European policymakers promoting 'diamond open access' see this as the answer to the current challenges facing scholarly publishing. Such technocratic 'solutionism' runs in the face of the very real material and technical constraints faced by diamond Open Access journals, even in well-resourced European research ecosystems (Taubert et al., 2024). We need new conceptual tools, but we also need to carefully analyse existing configurations of data and capital. The utopian promise of a 'global republic of science' is not enough.

Through a place-based attention to multiplex higher education ecosystems and their institutional 'undercommons,' we best disrupt our existing epistemic framings and normative attachments. It may be time to sunset the 'global' when writing about higher education and move beyond its universalising horizons.

References

Agrikoliansky, E., Fillieule, O., & Mayer, N. (2005). *L'altermondialisme en France: La longue histoire d'une nouvelle cause*. Éditions Flammarion.

Acharya, A. (2014). Global international relations (IR) and regional worlds: A new agenda for international studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, *58*(4), 647-659.

Acharya, A. (2025). *The once and future world order: why global civilization will survive the decline of the West*. Hachette UK.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.

Alatas, S. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, *51*(6), 599-613. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003

Altbach, P., & Davis, T. (1999). Global challenge and national response: Note for an international dialogue on higher education. *International Higher Education*, (14). https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.1999.14.6471

Altbach, P. G. (1995). Research on higher education: Global perspectives. *Educational Practice and Theory*, *17*(2), 3-18.

Asubiaro, T., Onaolapo, S., & Mills, D. (2024). Regional disparities in Web of Science and Scopus journal coverage. *Scientometrics*, *129*(3), 1469-1491. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04948-x

Berman, S. (2021). The causes of populism in the west. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24(1), 71-88.

Bhopal, K., & Myers, M. (2023). *Elite universities and the making of privilege: Exploring race and class in global educational economies*. Routledge.

Chankseliani, M. (2022). International development higher education: Looking from the past, looking to the future. *Oxford Review of Education*, 48(4), 457-473. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2022.2077325

Craggs, R., & Neate, H. (2020). What happens if we start from Nigeria? Diversifying histories of geography. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *110*(3), 899-916. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2019.1631748

Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global shadows: Africa in the neoliberal world order*. Duke University Press.

Harney, S., & Moten, F. (2004). The university and the undercommons: Seven theses. *Social Text*, *22*(2), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-101

Harrison, R., & Harvie, D. (2025, June 11). *Universities degraded: Staff experiences & employer practices of redundancies in UK higher education*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15638922

Hazelkorn, E. (2025). Rankings in the age of surveillance capitalism. *International Higher Education*, *123*, 19-20. https://doi.org/10.6017/895b9e0d.31dea0fe

Hobson, John M. (2020) *Multicultural origins of the global economy': Beyond the Western-centric frontier*. Cambridge University Press.

Hountondji, P. J. (1990). Scientific dependence in Africa today. *Research in African Literatures*, *21*(3), 5-15. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3819631

Ibrahim, H. B., & Heleta, S. (2025). Scholasticide in Gaza and Palestine as a portal: A duoethnography on silence, silencing and the struggle for a better world. *Journal of Global Higher Education*, *1*(1), 39-68. https://doi.org/10.25774/jghe.v1i1.4

Kamola, I. (2019). *Making the world global: US universities and the production of the global imaginary*. Duke University Press.
Keto, C. T. (1989). *The Africa-centered perspective of history and Social Sciences in the twenty first century*. KA publications.
La paperson (2017). *A third university is possible*. University of Minnesota Press.
Latour, B. (2017). *Down to earth: Politics in the new climatic regime*. Polity.
Lomer, S., Mathies, C., Mittelmeier, J., & Whatley, M. (2025). The community we seek, the community we build: The beginning of the Journal of Global Higher Education. *Journal of Global Higher Education*, *1*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.25774/jghe.v1i1.369
Ludwig, D., & Charbel, E.-H. (2025). *Transformative transdisciplinarity: An introduction to community-based philosophy*. Oxford
Marginson, S. (2000). *Monash: Remaking the university*. Allen & Unwin.
Marginson, S. (2014). University rankings and social science. *European Journal of Education*, *49*(1), 45-59. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ejed.12061
Marginson, S. (2018). *The new geo-politics of higher education: Global cooperation, national competition, and social inequality in the World-Class University (WCU) sector* (Working Paper No. 34). Centre for Global Higher Education https://www.researchcghe.org/publication/the-new-geo-politics-of-higher-education/
Marginson, S. (2022). What is global higher education? *Oxford Review of Education*, *48*(4), 492-517. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2022.2061438
Marginson, S., & Xu, X. (2023). Hegemony and inequality in global science: Problems of the center-periphery model. *Comparative Education Review*, *67*(1), 31-52. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/722760
Marginson, S. (2025). Space, power, and globalization: On the geopolitics of higher education. *ECNU Review of Education*, *9*(2), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311251352111
Marginson, S. (2025). Problems of the public good in higher education: Building the common amid sovereign individualism, capital and the state. *Higher Education*, 89(1), 29-52.
Mbembe, J. A. (2016). Decolonizing the university: New directions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 29-45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215618513
Mignolo, W. (2021). *The politics of decolonial investigations*. Duke University Press.
Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2017). Incompleteness: Frontier Africa and the currency of conviviality. *Journal of Asian and African Studies. 52*(3), 253-270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909615580867
Pietsch, T. (2013). *Empire of scholars: Universities, networks and the British academic world* 1850-1939. Manchester University Press.
Rodriguez Medina, L., & Harding, S., 2025. *Decentralizing knowledges: Essays on distributed agency*. Duke University Press.
Shahjahan, R. A. (2025). "Am I a scholar?": Time, knowledge, and decoloniality. *Journal of Global Higher Education*, *1*(1), 89-110. https://doi.org/10.25774/jghe.v1i1.7
Slobodian, Q. (2018). *Globalists: The end of empire and the birth of neoliberalism*. Harvard University Press.
Spivak, G. C. (2012). Introduction. In *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization* (pp. 1-34). Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1n1bsfh.4

Sriprakash, A. (2026). Reparative futures for international and comparative education? *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *56*(1), 1–15 https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2025.2587656

Stein, S. (2025a). Composting the university. *Journal of Global Higher Education*, *1*(1), 20-38. https://doi.org/10.25774/jghe.v1i1.3

Stein, S. (2025b). ‘Your rent is due, higher education’: Beyond apologies and towards reparations. *Comparative Education*, *61*(3), 442-460. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2025.2463810

Taubert, N. C., Sterzik, L., & Bruns, A. (2024). Mapping the German diamond open access journal landscape. *Minerva*, *62*(2), 193–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-023-09519-7

Thorkelson, E. (2016). Precarity outside: The political unconscious of French academic labor. *American Ethnologist*, *43*(3), 475-487. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12340

Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton University Press.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.

Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M., 2014. *Place in research: Theory, methodology, and methods*. Routledge.

van Bellen, S., Alperin. J. P., & Larivière, V. (2025). Scholarly publishing's hidden diversity: How exclusive databases sustain the oligopoly of academic publishers. *PLoS One*, *20* (6), e0327015. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0327015

Walker, M. (2025). Higher education and the public good as a repair project. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *57*(14), 1251–1267. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2025.2531939

Watson, P. (2010). *The German genius: Europe's third renaissance, the second scientific revolution and the twentieth century*. Simon and Schuster.

AI Statement

This article was not written with the assistance of any Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology, including ChatGPT or other support technologies.

Conflict of Interest

The author has no conflict of interest regarding this publication

Article History

Submitted: 2 January 2026
Accepted: 12 June 2026
Published: 6 July 2026

[SHOULD WE STILL BE TALKING ABOUT 'GLOBAL' HIGHER EDUCATION] © 2026 by MILLS is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0