

“Opportunities and Challenges of a ‘Double Identity’ Model”

Jeffrey S. Lehman

China Annual Conference for International Education

**Symposium on Cross-Border Education
High-Level Dialogue on Sustainability and Excellence of
Chinese-Foreign Cooperative Universities**

Beijing, China

October 23, 2015

I am truly honored to have been invited to speak with you this morning alongside my colleague, President Xi Youmin of Xi’an Jiaotong Liverpool.

Over the past decade, scholars from Richard Nisbett to Gish Jen have been discussing how the culture in which one grows up frames how one sees the world. At our essential cores, we are all wired up the same. But we have been trained to look for different things as important, and we have been trained to express the same values in different ways.

These differences help to enable international alliances to accomplish things that a single institution cannot do alone. At the same time, however, these differences can lead to misunderstandings that put such alliances in jeopardy.

For the past two decades, I have been involved in different forms of cooperation between Chinese universities and American universities, and for the past seven and a half years I have made my home in China: four years in Shenzhen helping Peking University to launch its School of

Transnational Law, and the past three and a half years serving as the founding Vice Chancellor of NYU Shanghai.

This morning I would like to speak primarily about some of my own experiences with NYU Shanghai and its particular model of international cooperation, which we call the “double identity” model. I will speak about the special opportunities that come from a model like this one, as well as its unique challenges.

NYU Shanghai, 上还有纽约大学, is a sino-American joint university, created through a partnership between NYU and East China Normal University. It is not focused on a single school or academic discipline. It is a comprehensive research university, offering undergraduate training in the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, engineering, and business, as well as graduate and Ph.D. programs. Graduates receive degrees from New York University in the US, accredited by the Middle States Association in the United States, and they also receive degrees from上还有纽约大学 itself, accredited by China’s Ministry of Education.

In the design of NYU Shanghai, some things were clear from the beginning. Half the students would be from China, and half would be from the rest of the world. They would receive what is called a “liberal education” – one that is broad as well as deep. They would be taught using an “active learning” pedagogy instead of “passive learning.” They would choose their own majors, after they completed a core curriculum. The school would be tiny and elite, aimed at the top students in the world.

In addition, since students are getting degrees from NYU, NYU would be in full control over the curriculum, who joined the faculty, and all the dimensions of the student experience. We would have full academic freedom. Students would spend their first two years in Shanghai, and then they would spend between one and three semesters on other NYU campuses all around the world. We would be focused on the importance of helping students to develop the qualities of cosmopolitanism – the ability to be effective members of multicultural communities.

As for finances, the school would not be subsidized by NYU. At the same time, the school not be a source of profits for the rest of NYU. It would operate on the basis of tuition, gifts from donors, and support from

the Shanghai government. All of those funds would be invested in the school itself, here in Shanghai.

We also knew that we would be expected to participate in the ongoing development of the city of Shanghai as an international center. We would not be a shy, isolated ivory tower. Instead, we would be a school that can properly describe itself as being “in and of the city.”

Of course, there were many things that were not so clear. What would we do if the parents of our Chinese students all wanted their children to become business and finance majors? How would we deal with social and cultural differences between Chinese students and foreign students? How much support would we receive for scientific research from the city and national governments?

In these areas, we decided to move forward on the basis of trust. NYU had faith in its partners and their desire to see this school succeed. And those partners had the same faith in NYU.

So what are the lessons I would draw from my experiences?

My primary lesson is one of balance. I believe that these partnerships are, every step of the way, an example for the world – for students, for teachers, for governments, and for societies – of how multicultural cooperation can be successful.

To be successful, a multicultural cooperation should begin by recognizing and respecting cultural differences. Cultural differences are real. Only if you understand them can you be sure that they will not become the basis for misunderstanding and conflict.

One of the most important cultural differences between American culture and Chinese culture, and especially between American legal culture and Chinese legal culture, has to do with the relative importance of intellectual, conceptual agreement, on the one hand, and emotional connection and trust on the other.

In the United States, there can be no contract, no legal agreement, if there is not what we call “a meeting of the minds” on the essential terms. What is the price? What is the quantity? What will happen under certain predictable circumstances.

In China, it has been my experience that there can be no contract, no effective agreement, if there is no “meeting of the hearts.” The parties need to have come to a stage of mutual trust and appreciation, in which they are prepared to enter into an unknowable future together. They need to feel a degree of confidence that one hard challenges arise, as they certainly will, they will be able to move forward and face those challenges in a cooperative way.

So how can a Sino-American joint venture be successful? I do not believe it can be successful if the Chinese side simply says, “we will do it in the American manner,” or if the American side simply says, “we will do it in the Chinese manner.” To be successful, it is important that each side acknowledge that something new is being created, and it should be created in a way that respects that fact.

What does that mean in practice?

It means understanding the cultural differences in understanding two notions: clarity and changed circumstances.

First, clarity. On the Chinese side, success begins with appreciating that an American partner needs to have greater clarity than might seem absolutely necessary. To feel comfortable, an American partner will need to spend time talking about and imagining a broad range of situations that might happen or might not happen. The American partner will want to talk through in great detail how such situations will be handled if they do come about. These conversations will be matters of great importance and seriousness for the American partner. If there is not sufficient “clarity,” the American partner will be an unhappy partner.

On the American side, success begins with appreciating that the Chinese partner needs to develop a much greater degree of personal trust and confidence than might seem absolutely necessary. Such trust and confidence is not built quickly, and it is not built through discussions of how problems will be dealt with if they come up. It is built through sharing meals and laughter and visiting places that feel special.

If a strong partnership is going to be built, it will need to incorporate both American and Chinese elements. Each side will need to feel com-

fort and confidence, and each side will need to understand how it is that the other side came to have such feelings. The ultimate agreement needs to be celebrated ritually. There should be a signing ceremony, and there should be photographs, to recognize emotionally the nature of the relationship that has been forged.

A successful partnership, however, is about much more than just “getting to yes.” The reason for this is a second critical element of cultural difference.

The second concept is “changed circumstances.” In both American and Chinese legal culture, agreements can be broken and reformed if both sides’ assumptions about how the world work are shattered. If you agree to drive me to work every day, we will reformulate the agreement if my office building burns to the ground.

But there are dramatic differences between the two cultures concerning what counts as the kind of “changed circumstances” that mean either party to an agreement can properly insist that the agreement be modified. Americans tend not to like to agree that circumstances have changed that much. They prefer to know that every party to an agreement will do everything they can to keep their promises. Even if it is a huge challenge, Americans believe they should be able to count on others to fulfill their contractual commitments.

Chinese culture is much more fluid. There is much more of an expectation that things will change with the times. The assumption is that people who enter an agreement are forming a relationship that is flexible and adaptable, that they are committed to working together as friends to minimize the burdens of the relationship on either side, consistently with capturing the all benefits of the relationship.

Bridging this gap is not as easy as bridging the gap on clarity. Conflicts over understanding of “changed circumstances” are likely to arise in moments of stress. What approach might work?

I think the best approach is for each side to commit to doing their best to see the world through the other’s eyes. For the American partner, it means being open to thinking more flexibly about changed circumstanc-

es, being willing to consider whether it might be possible to modify things in a kind of win-win spirit. And for the Chinese partner, it means being open to thinking that there are subtle costs associated with constantly rethinking commitments, costs that ultimately can weaken the trust that lies at the heart of a relationship.

At NYU Shanghai, we have chosen to express this commitment by using the term “double identity.” We say that our university is not simply a Chinese university, although it is a Chinese university. And it is not simply a degree-granting campus of New York University, although it is a degree-granting campus of New York University. It is both of those things at the same time, and we are fully committed to being successful in both of our identities.

Our Chinese identity requires us to be actively committed to serving as a vehicle for experimentation – new approaches to teaching, new approaches to research, and new approaches to university operations – that can be examined and evaluated by other Chinese universities to see if they would like to adopt them in whole or in part.

Our NYU identity requires us to be actively committed to helping NYU reconceptualize itself, not as a university based in New York with satellites distributed around the world, but rather as a true global network that includes three degree-granting campuses and eleven study-away campuses, in which students and faculty are all expected to circulate and promote an ethic of cosmopolitanism.

What happens, you might ask, when these two identities come into conflict? What happens, for example, when Chinese norms of administration, which are committed to governance according to clearly specified policy rather than individual discretion, conflict directly with NYU’s norms of administration, which are committed to flexibility and discretionary adaptation?

One technique that Yu Lizhong and I use is what I call, “Searching for More Abstract Common Ground.” When we find ourselves in a situation where it is clear that Chinese universities usually do X, and NYU usually does Not-X, it is often helpful to move the discussion away from the specifics of X and Not-X. We move back to the more important gen-

eral principle: “Both China and NYU are looking for ways to improve on existing practices.” In the specific context of a 21st century global university whose students and faculty circulate back and forth between China and the U.S., is there a third way, let’s see if we can find a third way, neither X nor Not-X, but rather Y, that best expresses our new ambitions to nurture students’ capacities for creativity and innovation, as well as their capacities to be effective leaders of multicultural teams. It doesn’t always work, but it has worked more often than one might have expected.

Over the past 20 years, it has been my great good fortune to be involved in quite a few partnerships between China and the U.S. where these kinds of cultural differences have been successfully overcome. Partly, I think that is because I was lucky enough to have the right partners: people of intelligence and integrity who are good people and good friends. But partly I think it is because we were aware that these differences are real, and that we needed to acknowledge them in order to be successful.

International partnerships hold enormous potential at this moment in global history. I wish each and every one of you the chance to work in them, with the right partner, and with just the right balance of luck and of skill.