



A Comparative Analysis of Higher Education Systems in the United States and Sweden: Lessons and Implications for Pakistan

Zul Ul Ane Fatima¹, Tabassum Shairwani² & Syeda Aqsa Bint a Zafar³

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Teacher Education, International Islamic University, Islamabad,
Email: syedaanie123@gmail.com

²PhD Scholar, Department of Teacher Education, International Islamic University Islamabad,
Email: sherwani.tabassum@gmail.com

³PhD Scholar, Department of Teacher Education, International Islamic University Islamabad,
Email: aqsasubhanshah@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: February 14, 2025
Revised: March 13, 2025
Accepted: March 15, 2025
Available Online: March 19, 2025

Keywords:

Higher education systems, institutional structures, funding models, accessibility, pedagogy, United States, Sweden, Pakistan

Corresponding Author:

Zul Ul Ane Fatima

Email:

syedaanie123@gmail.com



ABSTRACT

This paper presents a critical comparative analysis of the higher education systems of the United States and Sweden, with a focus on institutional structures, funding models, accessibility, and pedagogical approaches. Anchored in a qualitative research design and systematic literature review, the study examines how both countries address contemporary challenges and opportunities in higher education. The analysis highlights the strengths and limitations of each system, offering valuable lessons for reforming Pakistan's higher education sector. While the United States emphasizes institutional autonomy, research, and innovation, it faces persistent issues related to affordability and equitable access. Conversely, Sweden's centralized and publicly funded model promotes inclusivity and social equity but raises concerns regarding long-term financial sustainability and institutional flexibility. Drawing on the comparative insights from these two models, the paper outlines practical recommendations for Pakistan to develop a more inclusive, innovative, and globally competitive higher education system that supports national development and socio-economic progress.

Introduction

Higher education plays an important role in shaping not only individual lives but also the path of entire societies. It serves as a Launchpad for economic growth, innovation, and social progress by building a skilled workforce, promoting critical thinking, and advancing various fields. A well-educated population is fundamental to a thriving economy. People with higher education usually earn more, leading to higher tax revenue and increased consumer spending (World Bank, 2018). This, in turn, drives economic activity, creates jobs, and enhances national prosperity. Higher

education encourages entrepreneurship, modernization and innovation, with graduates more likely to start new businesses and develop new technologies, contributing to ongoing economic vitality.

In the 21st century, there is a need for a workforce with diverse skills and the ability to adapt quickly. Higher education provides this essential skillset by imparting critical thinking, problem-solving, and analytical abilities (“Supporting Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Higher Education in Italy”, 2019). This equips individuals to navigate complex challenges and make meaningful contributions to society. Moreover, higher education fosters creativity and innovation, which are crucial for addressing global issues like climate change and technological disruptions.

Besides the economic advantages, higher education plays an important role in social development. It gives individuals the knowledge and skills to actively engage in civic life, advocate for positive change, and promotes tolerance, understanding, and intercultural dialogue, contributing to a fair and just society (Trinh, 2023). Likewise, higher education is connected to better health outcomes, lower crime rates, and increased social mobility, creating positive impacts on society.

To sum up, higher education is more than a personal pursuit; it is an investment in the future of societies. By nurturing skilled individuals, encouraging innovation, and promoting social well-being, higher education becomes a foundation for sustainable and fair development (Trinh, 2023). In navigating the complexities of the 21st century, ensuring equal access to quality higher education remains more critical than ever. This sets the stage for comparing the higher education systems of the United States and Sweden.

The United States and Sweden serve as distinct examples of how higher education shapes national development. The U.S.A. has a lively and diverse higher education landscape, emphasizing research and innovation. However, concerns linger about accessibility and affordability, as increasing tuition fees and student debt pose challenges to social mobility (Hanson et al., 2020). On the other hand, Sweden prioritizes fairness and inclusivity, providing free tuition at public universities and promoting access for everyone (Wilson & Shaari, 2023). While concerns about funding sustainability exist, Sweden's model illustrates how higher education can be a potent equalizer and driver of social progress.

1.2 Research Question

1. What are the key similarities and differences between the higher education systems of the United States and Sweden in terms of institutional structures, funding mechanisms, accessibility, and pedagogical approaches?
2. How do the higher education policies and practices of the United States and Sweden address issues of equity, affordability, and innovation, and what implications do these have for improving higher education in Pakistan?

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design based on a comparative analysis of secondary data gathered through a systematic literature review. The choice of a literature-based comparative method is appropriate for exploring complex and multidimensional aspects of higher education systems, particularly in relation to institutional structures, funding mechanisms, accessibility, and pedagogical strategies in the United States and Sweden.

The literature review approach enables the examination of a broad range of scholarly articles, policy reports, official government documents, and reputable institutional studies. Sources were

selected through an organized search of academic databases such as JSTOR, ERIC, Springer, and Google Scholar. A set of well-defined inclusion criteria guided the selection of literature to ensure relevance, quality, and recency, focusing on publications that address governance, funding, accessibility, and teaching practices in higher education systems. Priority was given to sources offering critical insights into current reforms, policy debates, and ongoing challenges within both national contexts.

The comparative analysis framework facilitated the identification of similarities and differences between the two higher education systems, allowing for a critical evaluation of each system's strengths and weaknesses. This method also provided a basis for drawing contextually relevant lessons for Pakistan's higher education sector. The selected qualitative and comparative literature review approach is well-suited to generate a comprehensive understanding of the systemic characteristics of higher education in both the United States and Sweden, offering informed perspectives that can guide policy recommendations for Pakistan.

Data Collection

This involves a thorough and organized exploration of academic databases, journals, and other reputable sources to identify literature pertinent to the comparative analysis of higher education systems in the United States and Sweden. The search criteria were carefully crafted to ensure the inclusion of studies that contribute valuable insights into the chosen aspects of institutional structures, funding models, pedagogical approaches and accessibility. This systematic and criteria-driven approach ensures that the literature selected for review is both comprehensive and targeted, enhancing the robustness of the comparative analysis.

Results and Discussion

The landscapes of higher education in the USA and Sweden present captivating contrasts, offering valuable insights into how governance, funding, and accessibility shape the educational experience. Let's embark on a journey through these key pillars, uncovering the distinct threads woven into each nation's system.

Institutional Structures: The US higher education system champions a decentralized, market-driven approach. Individual institutions, particularly private universities, wield significant autonomy in decision-making, shaping their curricula, research agendas, and funding strategies. This environment fosters innovation and diverse academic perspectives (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018). However, critics express concerns about potential inconsistencies, unequal access to resources, and a lack of centralized oversight. Sweden, on the other hand, embraces a centralized model, with the national government playing a dominant role in allocating funds, setting curriculum guidelines, and overseeing quality standards (Geschwind, L. 2020). This ensures greater uniformity and alignment with national needs, but critics argue that it may stifle institutional autonomy and potentially limit academic freedom. The US model fosters innovation and autonomy but grapples with challenges related to equity and accessibility. On the other hand, Sweden prioritizes equity and quality control through centralized governance but risks compromising institutional flexibility.

Challenges and opportunities: Both systems encounter distinct challenges. The US model contends with problems related to affordability, accessibility, and social mobility, as increasing tuition fees and student debt put at risk the inclusion of talented students from underprivileged backgrounds (Stuber, 2018). Sweden, while achieving greater fairness through its centralized

approach, grapples with concerns about sustaining funding and upholding quality education under government control. Additionally, both systems must continuously adapt to the evolving demands of the 21st century, incorporating new technologies and teaching approaches while preserving their core strengths (Marginson, 2016).

In conclusion, the US and Sweden present differing models of university governance and organization, each offering valuable insights for the future of higher education. While the US model encourages innovation and autonomy, it requires addressing equity and access issues. Sweden's centralized approach emphasizes inclusivity and quality control but necessitates careful attention to maintain academic freedom and institutional flexibility. Ultimately, the key lies in striking the right balance between these competing priorities, establishing systems that empower universities to educate future generations for a complex and interconnected world. An examination of the role of government and autonomy in higher education institutions supports this perspective.

Funding Models: The financial landscape of higher education across nations displays a rich array of threads. A comparison of funding mechanisms between the USA and Sweden reveals a captivating contrast, exposing distinctive approaches to public funding, tuition fees, and private investments. These mechanisms wield significant influence on accessibility, quality, and the overall higher education environment (Marginson, 2016). In contrast to the US, Sweden champions a public-oriented system, where the national government bears the majority of the financial responsibility for higher education. Public universities offer tuition-free access, promoting equitable enrolment irrespective of socioeconomic background (Jonsson, 2020). Funding allocation often depends on student enrolment and program needs, ensuring consistent distribution of resources across institutions. While concerns about sustainability amid budgetary constraints persist, Sweden's model notably prioritizes social mobility and equal access, serving as a compelling benchmark for inclusivity.

The US system is characterized by a decentralized, private-driven landscape where institutions heavily rely on tuition fees and private donations to sustain their operations. While this fosters competition and has the potential to drive innovation, it also creates significant disparities. Soaring tuition fees and student debt pose threats to the affordability of higher education for low-income and minority students, perpetuating social inequalities (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018). Critics argue that this market-driven approach prioritizes economic gain over equal access and societal benefit. However, both systems recognize the potential benefits of private investments. In the US, private donations play a crucial role in supporting research endeavours, scholarships, and infrastructure development. This infusion of private capital fuels cutting-edge research and can enhance institutional prestige. Yet, concerns arise regarding potential donor influence and a focus on commercially viable research avenues (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018). In Sweden, while relying more heavily on public funding, there is also a welcome for private investments, primarily directed toward specific research projects and technology transfer initiatives.

This strategic approach leverages private expertise without compromising the overall public-oriented nature of the system. The challenge lies in finding a harmonious balance between these funding pillars. Sweden's emphasis on public funding undoubtedly promotes equity and accessibility but requires stringent budgetary control and innovative strategies for long-term sustainability. The US system, while fostering competition and innovation, risks exacerbating social inequalities and compromising access for the most vulnerable. Ultimately, the ideal funding model blends the strengths of each approach, ensuring sufficient public investment for equitable access while strategically leveraging private partnerships and investments for innovation and excellence (Zweig et al., 2020).

Higher education contends with evolving demands and aspirations, and a closer examination of diverse funding mechanisms reveals valuable lessons for future development. Both the US and Sweden, despite their differing approaches, offer insights into crafting sustainable and equitable systems that empower individuals and societies to thrive. The journey towards an optimal funding model involves weaving together the threads of public commitment, responsible privatization, and an unwavering commitment to social justice, paving the way for a future where knowledge truly becomes accessible to all. Exploration of the impact of funding on academic research and infrastructure supports this perspective. In conclusion, the US market-driven model fuels innovation but risks exacerbating social inequalities. Conversely, Sweden's public-oriented approach prioritizes equity and accessibility but necessitates effective cost-control measures.

Institutional Structures: The institutional landscapes of higher education in the USA and Sweden showcase fascinating disparities shaped by their unique historical and cultural contexts. Investigating these structures unveils distinct approaches to governance, funding, and academic culture, offering valuable insights into their respective strengths and challenges (Saunders, 2010). In the USA, a decentralized, market-driven system prevails. Private institutions enjoy considerable autonomy, possessing prestigious reputations and often attracting renowned faculty (Van de et al 2010). Public universities, although numerous, grapple with complex funding arrangements from individual states, which can impact their resources and standing. Admission heavily relies on standardized tests and high school grades, potentially creating obstacles for low-income and minority students (Stuber, 2018). While this system encourages competition and a focus on individual achievement, driving research and innovation (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018), critics express concerns about escalating tuition fees, student debt, and unequal access, questioning its commitment to social mobility. Conversely, Sweden embraces a centralized, public-oriented higher education system. Free tuition at public universities, along with generous student grants and loans, promotes equal access regardless of socioeconomic background (Jonsson, 2020). The national government assumes a predominant role, distributing funding based on student enrolment and program needs, ensuring greater consistency across institutions. Admission often prioritizes comprehensive assessments, giving weight to high school grades and personal essays over standardized tests (Ahlback & Boberg, 2023).

This approach cultivates a collaborative learning environment with a focus on critical thinking and student-centered approaches (Hydén & Nilsson, 2015). While concerns persist about the sustainability of funding and maintaining quality under government control, Sweden's model demonstrates a robust commitment to inclusivity and social mobility. The differences extend beyond overarching frameworks. In the United States, a culture of academic freedom flourishes, granting individual faculty substantial autonomy in curriculum design and research agendas. This encourages diverse academic perspectives and intellectual exploration. However, critics argue that it may result in inconsistencies and a lack of centralized quality control. On the other hand, Swedish universities prioritize national curriculum guidelines and standardized quality assessments, ensuring uniformity and alignment with national needs. This approach may reduce faculty autonomy but places emphasis on a cohesive educational experience and workforce readiness (Marginson, 2016).

Ultimately, both systems grapple with persistent challenges. The U.S.A. system faces increasing concerns about affordability, accessibility, and social mobility. Escalating tuition and student debt burdens pose a risk of excluding talented students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Stuber, 2018). In Sweden, despite achieving greater equity, there is an ongoing struggle to balance funding sustainability and maintain quality education under centralized control. In conclusion, the USA

and Sweden present contrasting models of higher education governance, with their own strengths and weaknesses. As both nations strive to optimize their systems, studying their unique approaches offers valuable lessons for shaping a future where higher education empowers all individuals to reach their full potential and contribute meaningfully to society

Standardized Tests and Holistic Evaluations: The entrance to higher education, promising numerous opportunities, can also be entangled in intricacies. A scrutiny of the admission processes and inclusivity endeavours in the USA and Sweden reveals divergent approaches, offering insights into their respective achievements and challenges in cultivating diverse and equitable student populations (Hursh, D. 2005). In the USA, standardized tests such as the SAT and ACT wield substantial influence in admission decisions, especially for competitive institutions. While advocates argue for a meritocratic selection process, critics highlight inherent biases that put low-income and minority students at a disadvantage, particularly those without access to quality test preparation resources (Stuber, 2018). Sweden's system embraces a more comprehensive approach, considering factors like high school grades, personal essays, and interviews alongside standardized test scores (Wikstrom, 2006). This multifaceted evaluation diminishes the emphasis on standardized tests and allows for the consideration of individual circumstances and potential beyond mere test-taking skills (Jonsson, 2020).

Financial Barriers and Accessibility: Affordability plays a pivotal role in shaping inclusivity. In the USA, the steep rise in tuition fees and the burdensome load of student debt act as formidable barriers for students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. While scholarship programs are in place, navigating their complexities and dealing with competing demands can be overwhelming, contributing to unequal access (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018). Sweden boasts free tuition at public universities, along with generous student grants and loans, significantly reducing financial hurdles and paving the way for equitable enrollment regardless of income (Forsström & Jacobsson, 2017). This commitment to financial accessibility sets a compelling example for fostering a diverse student body.

Promoting Equal Access and Diversity: Both nations employ policies to address these disparities. Affirmative action programs in the USA actively aim to increase the representation of historically disadvantaged groups in universities. However, these initiatives encounter legal challenges and concerns about reverse discrimination (Brubaker & Leitner, 2018). In contrast, Sweden focuses on outreach programs directed at underrepresented communities, offering additional support and guidance throughout the application process. This proactive approach seeks to address disparities before they influence admission decisions (Jonsson, 2020). Despite their distinct approaches, both systems grapple with ongoing challenges. The USA needs to move beyond a reliance on standardized tests and ensure greater financial accessibility through need-based scholarship programs and tuition reforms. Sweden must continuously assess the effectiveness of its outreach programs and ensure equitable representation within its universities beyond mere enrolment numbers (Stuber, 2018).

In conclusion, the landscape of higher education admission and inclusivity presents a tapestry woven with varying threads. While the USA deals with issues of standardized tests and affordability, Sweden's model emphasizes holistic evaluations and financial accessibility. The path forward involves learning from each other's strengths, prioritizing meritocratic yet holistic admissions, and ensuring sustained financial support for students from diverse backgrounds. By dismantling barriers and promoting equal access, higher education can truly fulfil its promise as a pathway to individual and societal advancement for all.

Contrasting Pedagogical Approaches in Higher Education - USA vs Sweden

The classrooms of higher education worldwide resonate with distinct voices, each shaped by unique pedagogical philosophies. Examining the teaching approaches of the USA and Sweden reveals intriguing contrasts, offering insights into their respective strengths and challenges in preparing students for the future.

Emphasis on Individual Achievement in Education System of USA: American classrooms often prioritize traditional lectures, independent research, and high-stakes assessments, fostering a competitive learning environment (Lumsden, 2019). Professors serve as knowledge disseminators, guiding students through established disciplinary frameworks. This approach cultivates critical thinking, analytical skills, and a strong sense of individual accomplishment. However, critics argue that it may emphasize competition over collaboration, potentially neglecting student well-being and creating pressure-filled learning environments.

Sweden's Collaborative Focus: Swedish pedagogy leans towards student centered approaches, collaborative learning, and the development of critical thinking skills (Hydén & Nilsson, 2015). Active learning methods like group projects, discussions, and problem-solving activities are prevalent. Professors act as facilitators, guiding students to co-construct knowledge and engage critically with diverse perspectives. This fosters teamwork, communication skills, and a sense of shared responsibility for learning. However, concerns exist about potential limitations in knowledge coverage compared to traditional lecture-based methods.

Technology plays a significant role in both systems, albeit in distinctive ways. American universities often employ online platforms for supplementary materials and communication, yet the primary learning experience remains centered within the physical classroom. Conversely, Swedish universities actively embrace blended learning models, integrating online tools and resources with traditional classroom activities to enhance flexibility and engagement. This approach caters to diverse learning styles and encourages independent learning beyond the confines of physical classrooms. Examining graduate outcomes unveils the intricate interplay between pedagogy and societal needs (Brandström & Franke 1992).

US graduates boast higher early career salaries on average, likely benefiting from the emphasis on individual achievement and research skills (Hyde, et al., 2015). However, income inequality remains pronounced, raising concerns about the social and emotional well-being of graduates navigating a competitive environment. Swedish graduates, while earning slightly less initially, fare better in terms of income equality and social mobility across generations (Edin & Fredriksson, 2013). This suggests that collaborative learning and a focus on well-being may contribute to long-term societal benefits.

Ultimately, there is no "one-size-fits-all" approach to effective pedagogy. Both the USA and Sweden provide valuable lessons for optimizing teaching methods. The US system can benefit from incorporating more collaborative learning activities and prioritizing student well-being to foster holistic development. Sweden, while excelling in collaborative approaches, can explore ways to ensure sufficient knowledge coverage while leveraging technology for further educational innovation. In conclusion, the tapestry of higher education pedagogy across nations reveals a vibrant interplay of diverse threads. By learning from each other's strengths and addressing existing challenges, both the USA and Sweden can weave educational experiences that empower future generations to thrive in a complex and interconnected world.

Lessons for Pakistan from the Higher Education Systems of the U.S.A. and Sweden

Pakistan's higher education system faces challenges related to governance, funding, accessibility, outdated curricula, and limited research opportunities. By examining the higher education models of the United States and Sweden, Pakistan can adopt key strategies to enhance its system. From the U.S.A., Pakistan can learn the importance of institutional autonomy, diverse funding sources, and strong industry-academia collaboration. American universities thrive on decentralized governance, allowing institutions to innovate and set their own research priorities. Encouraging public-private partnerships, increasing research grants, and promoting university-led revenue generation can help Pakistan build a more sustainable education model. Similarly, the U.S.A. emphasis on diverse learning pathways, such as community colleges and online education, could be beneficial in expanding access for students across Pakistan.

Sweden, on the other hand, provides valuable insights into ensuring equity and accessibility in education. Its government-funded higher education model, which offers free tuition and holistic admissions policies, ensures that all students—regardless of financial background—can access quality education. While completely free higher education may not be feasible for Pakistan, increasing need-based scholarships, subsidized tuition, and structured student loan programs can help bridge socio-economic gaps. Additionally, Sweden's focus on student-centered learning, critical thinking, and collaboration rather than rote memorization is something Pakistan's universities should adopt. Encouraging project-based learning, integrating technology into classrooms, and fostering interdisciplinary studies will better prepare graduates for the demands of the modern workforce. Both U.S.A. and Sweden emphasize the role of research and development (R&D) in higher education. U.S.A. excels in fostering a research-intensive environment, with strong funding mechanisms and collaborations with industries. Pakistan needs to increase investment in university research, establish specialized research centers, and align academic research with national priorities such as agriculture, energy, and healthcare. Sweden, with its government-supported research initiatives and integration of research into policy-making, provides another model Pakistan can follow. Encouraging interdisciplinary research, international collaborations, and research commercialization will strengthen Pakistan's global academic standing and contribute to economic growth.

Incorporating the best practices from U.S.A. and Sweden, Pakistan can reform its higher education system to become more inclusive, innovative, and globally competitive. A balanced approach—offering greater university autonomy while maintaining quality standards, ensuring sustainable funding, modernizing curricula, and investing in research—can drive significant progress. By addressing these key areas, Pakistan can build a higher education system that not only meets the needs of its students but also contributes to national development and global competitiveness.

Conclusion

This comparative analysis of higher education governance, funding, and accessibility in the USA and Sweden highlights diverse threads woven into their respective systems. Despite differing approaches, both nations offer valuable lessons for addressing the complex challenges and aspirations of higher education in the 21st century. The US system promotes innovation and diverse academic perspectives but faces concerns about equity and accessibility due to decentralized governance, market-driven funding, and reliance on standardized tests. Sweden prioritizes inclusivity and social mobility through centralized governance, public funding, and

holistic admissions practices but needs to ensure sustainable funding and maintain institutional autonomy

In USA, policymakers should explore alternative funding models to reduce student debt and promote equitable access, consider reforming standardized testing practices, and strengthen centralized oversight for improved national coherence. In Sweden, policymakers should focus on ensuring long-term funding sustainability, fostering collaborative initiatives to increase private investment in research, and continually evaluating outreach programs to ensure their effectiveness in promoting inclusivity. Educators can actively support students from diverse backgrounds by providing mentorship, guidance, and resources to help navigate the complexities of higher education.

References

1. Ahlack Öberg, S., & Boberg, J. (2023). The decollegialization of higher education institutions in Sweden. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 9(2), 126-143.
2. Brändström, D., & Franke-Wikberg, S. (1992). Steering higher education systems in Europe: the case of Sweden. *Higher Education in Europe*, 17(3), 78-88.
3. Brubaker, R., & Leitner, H. (2018). Higher education governance in a market-driven system: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Comparative Education*, 54(3), 267-283.
4. Edin, P.-A., & Fredriksson, P. (2013). Higher education and intergenerational mobility in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 115(2), 311-345.
5. Forsström, J., & Jacobsson, C. (2017). Centralized vs. decentralized higher education: A comparative analysis. *Nordic Journal of Education*, 42(1), 45-61.
6. Geschwind, L. (2020). higher education Systems and Institutions, Sweden. In *The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (pp. 1517-1527). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
7. Hanson, D., Perez-Felkner, L., & Thayer, D. (2020). Overview of higher education (USA). *Bloomsbury Education and Childhood Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350996489.0012>
8. Hursh, D. (2005). The growth of high-stakes testing in the USA: accountability, markets and the decline in educational equality. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(5), 605-622.
9. Hyde, J. S., Mezulis, A. H., & Abramson, L. Y. (2015). The gender wage gap and higher education outcomes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 381-400.
10. Hydén, G., & Nilsson, A. (2015). Pedagogical innovations in Sweden's higher education system. *International Review of Education*, 61(4), 421-438.
11. Jonsson, J. O. (2020). The impact of free tuition on access to higher education in Sweden. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 189-204.
12. Lumsden, E. (2019). Teaching approaches in higher education: A comparative study of the US and Europe. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 65(3), 233-250.
13. Marginson, S. (2016). The role of government in higher education funding: A global perspective. *Comparative Education Review*, 60(1), 1-27.
14. Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public higher education in the United States. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, 8(1).
15. Stuber, J. M. (2018). Student experiences in market-driven higher education systems. *Sociology of Education*, 91(1), 1-19.
16. Supporting Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Higher Education in Italy. (2019). In *OECD Skills Studies*. OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/43e88f48-en>

17. Trinh, N. T. H. (2023). Higher Education and Its Role for National Development. A Research Agenda with Bibliometric Analysis. *Interchange*, 54(2), 125–143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-023-09493-9>
18. Van de Werfhorst, H. G., & Mijs, J. J. (2010). Achievement inequality and the institutional structure of educational systems: A comparative perspective. *Annual review of sociology*, 36(1), 407-428.
19. Wikström, C. (2006). Education and assessment in Sweden. *Assessment in Education*, 13(01), 113-128.
20. Wilson, A., & Shaari, A. a. H. (2023). A review on the structure and priorities of the swedish education system. *International Journal of Education Psychology and Counseling*, 8(50), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.35631/ijepc.850018>
21. Zweig, J., Kaiser, M., & Nyman, A. (2020). Balancing public and private investments in higher education: A case study of Sweden and the US. *Higher Education Policy*, 33(2), 175-198.