CHAPTER 5

UP AND THE INTERNATIONALISATION IMPERATIVE

...the best universities in the world recognise that they don’t become good by dwelling simply on their national aspects and people. You just don’t become a university of substance...like that. So, it’s very very clear to me that unless I draw on the best brains in North America, Western Europe, North Africa, wherever, that I’m dead in the water. It’s as simple as that. (I: Jansen).

5.0 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed two of UP’s strategic and transformational imperatives that relate to my study, namely: becoming an internationally competitive and nationally relevant university, as well as an internationally recognised research university. The aim of this chapter, then, is to present data concerning the third transformational imperative at UP that is relative to my study, namely, internationalisation. This chapter therefore presents data that addresses the internationalisation imperative at UP, and specifically such questions as: why is internationalisation a strategic imperative at UP and why is it occurring at the institution? In addressing these questions, the connections between the three transformational imperatives become clearer and provide the next building block toward my analysis of the key research questions. Additionally, through this exploration of UP’s internationalisation imperative, and particularly its rationales behind internationalisation, light is shed on the pressures, influences and trends (PITs) that are impacting on UP’s decisions with regard to internationalisation. All of this will play a major role in my analysis in the final chapter.

5.1 UP and the imperative of internationalisation

Earlier in this study I analysed arguments concerning the various conceptualisations of internationalisation and, based on the shortcomings in those arguments, presented the following working definition for the purposes of my study: internationalisation, at the institutional level in this case, is the process of more intensively and/or strategically engaging in international activities to prepare individuals and institutions to participate and survive in an increasingly interdependent and interconnected global environment (see Chapter 1). Several questions arise here, including: is internationalisation an imperative of UP (which as I will show, it is); and, how and why is UP more intensively and/or strategically engaging in international activities?

Regarding the first question – is internationalisation an imperative of UP? – it is easy to answer in the affirmative, at least in terms of my reading and analysis of strategic texts and in
the responses given to me by interview respondents. In addition, other non-textual and non-oral signals of the importance of internationalisation for UP include directives from its leadership to engage in specific international activities, and the reorganisation of its organisational structure to handle international activities at the “corporate” and management levels. These all signal that there is at least a serious ambition for internationalisation to play a major role at the university.

The ambitions of internationalisation as an imperative for UP are linked to the scholarly arguments which contend that the process is a method utilised by HEIs to engage with intensifying and changing global pressures and trends. Thus, UP, as I will shortly demonstrate, recognises that this process of internationalisation is an imperative within the global environment and wishes to engage actively with that process. Additionally, internationalisation is a process that UP’s leadership believes will assist with its transformation from the legacy of apartheid, into the modern internationally recognised university that it seeks to be. Even given that the ambitions of internationalisation are an imperative at UP, this does not, however, mean that the practices of the process follow those ambitions completely. As will be shown at several points in this study as I present the evidence of internationalisation at UP, there are several contradictions that characterise internationalisation at the university.

With respect to strategic and policy texts at UP, we can for instance look at its 2002–2006 Strategic Plan, where the institution’s internationalisation is listed as one of six transformations (UP, 2002, pp. 29–31). In addition, proof that internationalisation is to play a role as one of the strategic drivers in UP’s transformational agenda can be found by its inclusion in the “Strategic intent and strategy drivers” section (1.6) of UP’s Strategic Plan (ibid, p. 27–36). In addition, the university’s various faculties and functioning parts stress the importance of internationalisation. For instance, UP’s 2004 annual review features sections dedicated to outlining the nine faculties’ internationalisation activities. These references to internationalisation in UP’s policy text lend validity to the importance of internationalisation (at least in policy terms) as a current strategic focus of both UP as an institution, as well as of its various faculties and departments as part of the overall institution.

It is important to note that UP is not only “preaching” that internationalisation is a strategic objective through the drafting of policy and strategic texts; there is also evidence which demonstrates that the institution is at least attempting to engage in the process. For instance,
there have been several directives from the UP executive to staff of the Department of International Relations, which have included requests for them to perform specific tasks that underscore UP’s drive toward internationalisation. These tasks include: the drafting of a written institutional policy on internationalisation; surveying structures of existing international offices both domestically and internationally; the creation of a database to track more efficiently UP’s institutional and faculty international agreements; and an ongoing audit of UP’s international institutional contracts.\textsuperscript{12}

Earlier, in 2003, UP began an attempt to establish an organisational framework to spearhead its internationalisation process. In doing so, it realigned its international affairs office into two new divisions: one to facilitate international student movements and needs; and a second to focus on its strategic process of internationalisation. According to its 2003 annual review the “…new alignment of the University’s strategic initiatives on the international affairs front is linked to the University’s stated vision of becoming an internationally competitive institution firmly rooted on the African continent” (UP, 2002, p. 105). The strategic texts and management’s actions demonstrate some commitment to internationalisation by the UP management. However, one must further question the reasons behind these types of directives and ask why UP feels a need to internationalise, especially within the globalising world discussed earlier.

Statements by a UP council member, who is also its former vice chancellor, and by one of the faculty deans, highlight the imperative of internationalisation at UP:

\ldots to my mind one of the key cornerstones of what has to be done is the whole issue around internationalisation being part of our wider international framework. Even though we have to address, very much local issues, it has to be within a sort of framework that is acceptable and that is the norm and that is not insular or secluded (I: Van Zyl).

\ldots the best universities in the world recognise that they don’t become good by dwelling simply on their national aspects and people. You just don’t become a university of substance…like that. So, it’s very very clear to me that unless I draw on the best brains in North America, Western Europe, North Africa, wherever, that I’m dead in the water. It’s as simple as that. (I: Jansen).

Although there is an ambition for internationalisation as an imperative at UP, as outlined above, it is useful to delve deeper into the rationales for the engagement with the process that are specific to UP, over and above that of addressing globalisation’s pressures and trends,

\textsuperscript{12} As a postgraduate student assistant in the Department of International Relations, particularly in 2005, I was involved with much of the research and some of the drafting for many of these documents.
which are given as a broad rationale. This will help to better understand and discuss in later chapters how UP is internationalising to address challenges that it sees as critical to its development and contribution, and will also later point to some of the contradictions that characterise its internationalisation process.

5.2 Rationales for internationalisation at UP

Rationales for internationalisation of HE that have been argued for and expanded upon in existing scholarship were outlined in Chapter 1.6. Broad rationales in terms of HEIs around the world were discussed, as well as some that have been argued for specifically in the case of South African HEIs. Rationales in terms of the latter included: to undo past imbalances and insularity in the system created by years of apartheid and to break from the resultant academic boycotts and isolation; fears that globalisation will by-pass it; the international nature of knowledge; economic and financial realities; the importance placed on enhancing relations with countries of strategic importance; human resources development; quality as measured by international standards; and research and knowledge production (Mavhungu, 2003; Hall, 2004; Rouhani and Kishun, 2004; Welch, et. al, 2004).

Indeed, UP has been engaging with internationalisation for many of these reasons, but some with more intensity and vigour. In addition, the rationales for internationalisation at UP seem to have changed over the past ten years from social-cultural rationales to more political, economic and academic rationales. As such, the social and cultural development rationales for internationalisation do not seem as strong at UP. The term “internationalisation” first began appearing in UP’s strategic and policy documents in the mid 1990s. Its 1995 Annual Review, for example, states that:

[i]nternationalisation ensures that the universal nature of teaching and training is continuously taken into account. Economic and political integration are increasing worldwide. This requires greater intercultural understanding and knowledge...With South Africa’s return to the international community there is a greater need and more opportunities for international scientific cooperation (UP, 1996, p. 19).

This statement clearly demonstrates that once the shackles of apartheid were broken, this historically Afrikaans-serving university immediately recognised the importance of engaging with the rest of the world outside of its traditional partners. What I also take from the above statement is that the reasons for UP’s internationalisation in those early days were mainly due to social and cultural development rationales, such as “intercultural understanding and knowledge” and the “universal nature of teaching and training”. While these rationales for
internationalisation are still relevant at UP, they are less important. Even so, I see an acknowledgement of these social and cultural development rationales for internationalisation in some statements made to me by UP stakeholders.

[UP’s rationales for internationalisation include]...to broaden and diversify the sources [of income], create an international profile and reputation, strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production, promote curriculum development and innovation, increase students’ international knowledge and intercultural understanding, and contribute to academic quality...(I: Vil-Nkomo).

...there is an issue about expanding peoples’ views. And having a group of international students actually creates a set of relationships at home. That they understand that there’s actually an international dimension (I: Crewe).

In addition, the Faculty of EDU’s dean expressed something that demonstrates awareness that these social and cultural motivations for internationalisation are still important. While we were discussing the potential dangers of not instilling an international mindset into students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the dean argued that:

...it does mean that there will be large numbers of students...who never understand how to think comparatively, how to value people from different cultures, how to think ethically in a global context, how to understand the international basis for social justice, etc. etc. That really worries me (I: Jansen).

Even given these statements by UP constituents, which demonstrate a recognition of the importance of internationalisation for reasons related to social and cultural development, UP’s current rationales for internationalisation have lost their focus on these issues. According to my findings there are three broad and primary motivations for internationalisation at UP, namely:

- global integration
- continental and regional integration and development
- national development

I discuss each in turn below.

5.2.1 Global integration as a rationale for internationalisation at UP

One of the most visible rationales for internationalisation which I found is what I term “global integration”. Global integration in this instance as a rationale for internationalisation at UP refers specifically to UP’s desire to undo past imbalances and insularity in the system
created by years of apartheid, to break with the resultant historically created incapacities of that system (Mavhungu, 2003; Rouhani and Kishun, 2004), and thus to incorporate itself into the global knowledge economy as “a member of the international community of scholarly institutions” (UP, 2007a, p. 2). As such, UP has found it necessary to reconnect with the global village, and in many instances to connect for the first time with “non-traditional” partners outside of Europe. HEIs in Belgium and The Netherlands, particularly in the latter, often partnered with UP primarily due to language links because of similarities between Afrikaans and Dutch. These partnerships still exist and are being pursued, but added attention is being paid to diversifying away from just these traditional partnerships to connect with the rest of the academic world. This need to reconnect, and in other instances to connect for the first time, with the global village as a rationale for internationalisation at UP was evident to me in many statements, including the following:

...what underpins all of that [internationalisation] is the opening out of South Africa. Once South Africa moved from being an isolated country, it became very important for our institutions of higher learning to also open up to the rest of the world. And, with globalisation, if we are not part of a global village, you become very marginalised. And it became very obvious that our institutions had to become part of the global wave (I: Vil-Nkomo).

In terms of the opening up of UP to the rest of the world and moving away from just its traditional partners, there is a pull toward the East (i.e. Asia). UP stakeholders, as the following statements demonstrate, seem to be of the opinion that Asia is an untapped market for them and that there are benefits to the institution creating and growing more partnerships with institutions in those countries.

Another one, is for people to try and break into Asia. And I think we’ve been more successful with most others, having a formal relationship with the National Training Centre for Secondary School Principals in Shanghai, working with Hong Kong University, working with the national education institute in Singapore and some other places. So it’s part of the global pattern now since China has become an economic giant, everybody wants to play where the giant is (I: Beckmann).

In addition to countries in the East, there is also recognition and desire to engage with other developing countries because of similar developmental problems and issues faced in those countries:

13 Although this desire to be part of the international community was stated in various forms in UP’s early post-democracy South Africa strategic documents, it is in its 1998 Annual Review (UP, 1999, p. 1) were it clearly states as part of UP’s mission that it is to “be a member of the international scientific community”. In the 1999 Annual Review (UP, 2000, p. 1) and in subsequent reviews and other documents, the “scientific” portion is removed from that mission statement, which gives a sense of UP’s desire to be integrated with the rest of the world in broader terms than only science. Its current mission statement thus includes that “[t]he mission of the University of Pretoria is to be an internationally recognised South African teaching and research university and a member of the international community of scholarly institutions...”.
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The university currently would like to focus more on developing research programmes with countries in the East like China and India... Also important is to include various South American countries. Countries that mainly have similar research questions like us, we have to see if we can’t assist each other in our findings (I: Ströh).

As UP seeks to take advantage of the opening up of South Africa to the rest of the world, and thus to integrate with the rest of the world, this has also created opportunities for UP to obtain international funding for its research and other activities, such as international conferences, which did not exist during the apartheid era.

I think with the changes came...enormous opportunities...in terms of international funding opportunities...with international organisations actually extending arms to South Africa...So, I’ve seen enormous shifts in opportunities to participate internationally. Our university responded well by, for instance, organising international conferences in South Africa, in which people from all over the globe came to attend and participate. Significant international interactions started to happen after the changes in the country (I: Ströh).

This is not to say that the opening up of UP (and South Africa in general) and its desire to integrate with the global community did not come without its problems. In fact, many with whom I spoke believed that the many opportunities that became available to UP and its staff, researchers and students were overwhelming. Thus for some time UP seemed to enter into any international agreements and engagements that came its way.

I would say, we suffered from some kind of syndrome, I don’t know how to call it, but maybe its being “overawed” by all the opportunities that opened up. And so we listened to everybody; we received everybody; we tried to keep contact with everybody. And its only recently that we’ve become a lot smarter in that we are now very careful with our selection of people that we want to coordinate or cooperate with...But initially we were “overawed” by all opportunities, we tried to use all of them, and some of them were quite frankly not good contacts (I: Beckmann).

Most of the institutions post-1994 were so excited to come into the international arena, that after years of isolation, just being able to link with their partners and send their academics abroad etc. was wonderful (I: Rajah).

Even given that there was this period characterised by an “overawed” syndrome in relation to UP and its international engagements, there does seem to be a move, as Prof. Beckmann suggested, toward being more selective with international engagements. This move does not, however, detract from the fact that UP is an institution in transformation which sees it as an imperative to integrate with the rest of the world, and uses internationalisation as a means toward that integration. This resultant global integration rationale for internationalisation at UP, as I use it, is a broad rationale that can be broken down into separate yet interrelated
components, and thus rationales, for internationalisation in the UP case. Thus in essence, UP is using internationalisation to pursue its global integration ambitions through the following interrelated and often overlapping motivations:

- global competitiveness, profile and recognition
- the pursuit and transmission of knowledge

I contend that each of these interrelated rationales for internationalisation as subsets of its global integration ambition drives UP to internationalise in a particular manner and is also reflected in each of the individual faculties and in the minds of UP stakeholders. There seems to be a communal ambition among the UP community to ensure that it (and its functioning parts and individuals) is globally integrated, and this is reflected in these two dimensions.

5.2.1a Global integration through competitiveness, profile and recognition

UP seems to believe that in order to attain the global competitiveness that it desires, it must have an established international profile and thus be recognised as (and among) one of the top universities in the world. This competitive drive is one of the key forces at the institution which reflects in its internationalisation ambitions and activities. Thus, to be competitive, UP believes it must improve and increase its profile and recognition in the international academic community. Some of the issues with regard to global competitiveness were discussed in Chapter 4 (section 4.5), but the relationship to this issue and internationalisation is what is expanded upon here.

UP is aggressively seeking to increase its profile and reputation among the international HE community and to become what it would consider a global player in that regard. For instance, UP’s 2002–2006 Strategic Plan states that “[t]he University of Pretoria has a determined strategy to increase its role as an international player” (UP, 2002, p. 31). It is this communal ambition, and thus belief, that global competitiveness comes through an institution’s international profile and reputation, that serves as a primary rationale for its international activities and thus internationalisation at UP.

I was given much insight into the relationship between international competitiveness and international profile and recognition, and discovered that the two are not viewed as necessarily the same from a UP perspective. Prof. Melck indicated to me that they are slightly
different, but linked. As such, I contend that the two are strongly linked and in UP’s case are two sides of the same coin, as does Prof. Melck:

*They are strongly linked, but that previous slogan (internationally competitive and locally relevant) didn’t refer to the research aspect. So I think the difference lies in the research, the emphasis on research. And like I said in the beginning, the world academic standing, international academic standing, is very much based on research. So that internationally competitive slogan, I think was an intermediate step. It’s related, but not exactly the same (I: Melck).*

My take on what this means in the UP case is that UP still has a motivation to be globally competitive, but this motivation is now (and perhaps has always been) mediated with a belief that in order to achieve that competitiveness, UP must increase its profile and its recognition among the top universities in the world. This is seconded and supported by the following:

*Well, one of the desirables of the executive is to be an international player. We had a conference two days ago, where we were fashioning a new management model for the university and one of the design principles for it is an aim that in another 10 years, this university will be among the top 100 universities, according to the Shanghai report (I: Mogotlane).*

Given this desire to be an international player, and thus for international recognition, there is a very strong desire by the UP leadership to ensure that the institution becomes one of the top universities in the country and in the world, and in effect, as I have described elsewhere, to become an “internationally recognised research university”. In achieving this competitiveness through its profile and recognition, several elements were raised during my study. Some of these elements at UP included: competition for students; ensuring that students received the type of education that would make them internationally competitive and their qualifications internationally accepted; competing with foreign and/or private providers of HE and with industry for human and non-human resources; and the competitiveness and recognition of individual researchers’ outputs via publications.

In terms of students and their relationship to UP’s competition, recognition and profile ambitions, the issue relates both to domestic and international students as evidenced by the following:

*Because in essence, in order to be attractive to students and postgraduate students it has to be seen…as a player in the international field of higher education. And I think being a player, it has to ensure that it is attractive to its local student base because that’s where it depends for its survival, but at the same time it also has to be attractive to international students as a place where they can come and pursue their studies and develop their careers (I: Crewe).*
...for research also, it’s good to have international students because a lot of students are doing PhDs here and doing their research. And for the reputation of the university it is very important to have international students (I: Mphahlele).

When I followed up with a question on the latter quote by asking the interviewee if she felt that international students at UP contributed to it being globally competitive or increased the university’s international profile, I was told that they do, especially in terms of postgraduates who are doing research for the university. Additionally, linked somewhat to the issue of students was the issue of competing with other providers of HE inside and outside of South Africa, as is evident in the following statement:

...there has been an entry into the South African market of a number of universities from Australia and a number of universities from other places. And I think if you look at that trend, you see that in essence what has happened is that there is a global market for students to choose from...So, unless you’re actually able to maintain your competitiveness in relation to that global group of universities in an international arena, then essentially you’re going to be relegated to a secondary position...So, a student who is thinking globally is asking, if I do my graduate training at the University of Pretoria where is that going to position me. So, from that point of view there’s a strong need for us to be in a position where a student can say this university is one of the top institutions globally and if I do my work here I’m going to be able to do other things (I: Crewe).

The pressure of competition is not only felt from other HE providers, but from industry as well:

And what is also happening in South Africa to a very large extent, is that a number of the South African-based companies are seeing that they need to become global players, otherwise they are going to be gobbled up by some other multinational and disappear. And so they see it as important to have a resource which they can use to assist with their R & D, so that they can remain in a globally competitive position (I: Crewe).

The students themselves, as well as the university’s competition with industry for those same students, is not the only manifestation of this competitive drive at UP. It also relates to ensuring that the faculty and staff are competitive and thus recognised internationally. When discussing some of the motivations for internationalisation at UP, Prof. Mogotlane stated that some of the key elements are:

Getting our academics to interact internationally and do research collaborations and stuff like that, and join research projects and groups, and raising the profile internationally of UP. That is important (I: Mogotlane).

Additionally, with regard to individual staff member competitiveness and recognition, two others argued the following:
The fact that there are staff members in the department that are participating in international conferences, that are asked by international organisations to be on international boards, to be representatives on international organisations and to lead international programmes on behalf of the university, tells me that there is some acknowledgement of our competitiveness and standing (I: Kirsten).

Our [research] publications provide evidence that we have very good individual researchers here which are well known in their area of expertise. That’s being globally competitive. I don’t think there’s another way to understand that. There are colleagues who are invited overseas for conferences to be keynote speakers and things like that, and that’s clear (I: Lubuma).

This evidence demonstrates that at the institutional level, there is a strong desire to be competitive globally and that this can be achieved through the establishment and raising of UP’s profile and recognition on both an institutional and individual researcher level. However, does this communal ambition also translate at the faculty level? In other words, does the desire for global competitiveness through increasing and establishing an international profile and recognition also serve as a primary rationale for the international activities of the Faculty of EDU and the Faculty of NAS? The short answer is yes, but in slightly different ways. Evidence that the ambition does apply can be summed up in the following statements from the leadership of the two faculties:

...when you talk about a university, it’s do or die on the basis of internationalisation. For example, when you look at the great universities of the world, how much money they bring in. How much you know, simply revenue from international students and activities. South Africa has exactly the same problems. The state subsidies have declined so you have to get the money from elsewhere. So, it’s in fact a profoundly national outlook. A national development outlook, to make the international case...If you don’t get internationalisation right, you will go nowhere (I: Jansen).

You have to live the notion of internationalisation, it is a mindset. And the way in which you do it is to start at the researchers’ and people’s level...It becomes truly exciting when other researchers start referring to your work in their presentations at conferences and within publications... (I: Ströh).

In spite of these two statements and the strong competition motivations expressed by UP’s leadership at the institutional level, this feeling was less in the Faculty of EDU. For instance, when I asked one centre director in the Faculty of EDU if her centre buys in to the strategic motto of being internationally competitive and nationally relevant, she said:

Absolutely! I want to be one of the top international centres. But I don’t want to be that with the exclusion of being a top centre here... I want the centre to be in a very strong position internationally but not at the cost of the local position (I: Centre director).
Another person argued that:

…it [internationalisation] is very much on the front burner, the question of internationalisation because it is something that is very critical, because it is something that gives you a competitive edge, if you’re seen to be doing these things (I: Onwu).

Although it seems that the issue of competition is less a primary motivation in the Faculty of EDU, their comments related to international profile and/or recognition, follow the same line of thinking that emanates from the institutional comments made earlier that profile and recognition are key elements in terms of the faculty’s internationalisation. As such, although the perception might be that competition is not a prime driver, I contend that it is; however, it is thought of less in terms of competition in an “us versus them” manner and more on a basis of the “good” work being done by a centre or faculty, being recognised internationally as such.

The issue of competition is alive and well in the Faculty of NAS, and has also taken on a desire to be internationally competitive through international relevance. For instance, when I asked how his department’s activities make it globally competitive, one HOD stated that:

I don’t know whether we’re globally competitive, but I’d like to think that we’re globally relevant, because of the mere fact that we interact with a number of overseas institutions…and the only way that you can actually claim that you can be internationally competitive is by engaging in activities that are also engaged with by overseas institutions (I: Ferguson).

For my department it has become more and more crucial to be relevant internationally. It’s become all the more crucial to make sure that we see the students obtain degrees that are relevant on an international level. And secondly to see that international links are built into the training that we give the students. Because the playing ground is just so much larger (I: Ferguson).

This desire for global relevance spoken of here translates into the Faculty of NAS producing students and research that has an international profile and thus is competitive with what is going on internationally. Another way that this is often expressed in the NAS faculty is through the use of the term “word-class”, as the following demonstrates:

…that word world-class, you must understand it in the following way. We do our work as individual researchers. We have a research problem in which we are working and the recognition which we get for that work…that recognition comes through publication. And our publications are in the best journals, so our colleagues who are in developed countries…they publish in the same journals…That is what we say, when we say we are comparable to our colleagues overseas and that we are world-class (I: Lubuma).
5.2.1b Global integration through the pursuit and transmission of knowledge

The second dimension of UP’s global integration rationale for its international activities is the pursuit and transmission of knowledge. This ambition manifests itself in a strong desire by UP to contribute to the global pool of new knowledge production. As such, part of the UP mission is to “promote scholarship through the creation, advancement, application, transmission and preservation of knowledge and the stimulation of critical and independent thinking” (UP, 2007a, p. 2). The pursuit and transmission of knowledge from the UP perspective is an imperative because there is a strong belief that a significant part of the university’s role is knowledge generation. Furthermore, UP believes that through its contribution to knowledge production it can contribute to addressing pressing national and global concerns such as the provision of quality education, poverty alleviation, hunger and global health issues, such as HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases. This is evidenced in many of UP’s strategic publications, including its 2005 Annual Review where it highlights several of the research projects that address domestic and international issues (UP, 2006C, p. 104–105) some of which I illustrate later in the study.

The need to contribute to the production of knowledge is best encapsulated in UP’s drive to innovate. This resulted in its strategic plan for 2002–2006 and the student body of UP both to be dubbed “The Innovation Generation”. For UP, the meaning of innovation is: “innovation = new ideas + market acceptance” (UP, 2002b, p. 35). Of particular relevance to my study and to the argument I am making in this section concerning this particular rationale for internationalisation at UP (the creation and production of new knowledge rationale), is what the same document goes on to say:

Innovation is a creative force by which new concepts are generated and implemented...Innovation is also a multifaceted process. It can be applied to all fields and endeavours, such as organisation, technology, marketing and education, to name but a few relevant examples (ibid).

Additionally:

The University of Pretoria is a South African academic institution that has its roots firmly in both the international world and African soil. As such it owes allegiance to South African society as a whole as well as the worldwide community of scholars, those involved internationally in the pursuit and transmission of knowledge...It is our aim to contribute to international scholarship (new knowledge) and to the development of our nation and continent (UP, 2007a, p. 7).
Further supporting the pursuit of knowledge ambition behind UP’s internationalisation – as well as linking it with the issue of global competition through raising its international profile and recognition (spoken of in the previous section) – is the following statement:

...globally competitive relates to the fact that your research has to be of international standards...globally competitive relates to the fact that we publish in the best journals internationally, have top researchers that are contributing to world knowledge (I: Jeenah).

These beliefs also stem from the desire to ensure that faculties and students have knowledge and awareness of what is happening in their field on a global scale, as indicated by the comment below:

...you want to make sure that the kind of education our students are getting is at global level. So that means that your staff must be globally oriented. In other words, what they need to do is maintain a set of international networks which will make them familiar with what is happening in their field, which will allow them to reflect that in what they teach their students (I: Crewe).

A member of the Faculty of EDU argued that:

...it is essential for your makeup as an academic to be aware of everything that goes on in the world, and whatever knowledge and skills you pick up will be beneficial to your own country (I: Beckmann).

Although I did not get many statements from members of the Faculty of NAS directly related to the contribution and production of new knowledge as a rationale for internationalisation, their international activities were discussed in ways that demonstrated that this rationale indeed holds true there. As with the institution as a whole, the constituents of the two faculties (EDU and NAS) also seem to follow the same line of thinking, namely: that contributing to and producing new knowledge comes mainly in the form of research output, which comes in the form of the production of research texts and publications. For instance, while discussing whether or not, and how, a university through its international activities can be both nationally relevant and globally competitive, an HOD argued that:

I think by doing essentially what we are supposed to do, which is research. There will always be this symbiosis between research and teaching in universities, but I think our primary function should be research and knowledge creation...so that we are the instigators for that [knowledge production] (I: Eloff).

As demonstrated earlier when quoting the Faculty of EDU’s dean’s message in UP’s 2005 Research Report (UP, 2006b, p. 97), the Faculty of EDU is proud of its increased research
production and output in academic journals. This strongly supports the contention that
research output through publications is a prime motivator of the faculty; and as the statement
above demonstrates, also relates directly to its motivations for international engagements:

I think we were virtually unknown outside of Europe in 1990 or 1991, but now we have a
strong presence internationally I guess, in areas like policy studies, education law, education
finance and those areas of this department. People really get genuine invitations to come and
speak, to contribute papers, people have co-edited international journals, people have been
invited to be guest lecturers, we’ve had many people work here on foreign research
fellowships, scholarships, etc...So I think we are better known now (I: Beckmann).

In terms of the Faculty of NAS, when I asked the interviewee how his department’s
international activities made it globally competitive, I was given an answer which indicates
the knowledge pursuit and transmission rationale behind international engagements:

That [international] exposure brings the latest and the best techniques that are available
internationally...And that is basically the biggest sort of advantage in terms of being
internationally competitive...So, I think that makes us globally competitive. And the things
that we publish; publications become a yard stick, your quality assurance parameter. And we
publish very often with our international partners (I: Cloete).

Additionally:

...we have a research problem in which we are working and the recognition...comes through
publications. And our publications are in the best journals, so our colleagues who are in
developed countries...they publish in the same journals. So we publish in the same places as
them. That is what we mean when we say we are comparable to our colleagues overseas
(I: Lubuma).

As can be seen in many of these statements, this issue of producing new knowledge through
research output (i.e. journal publications) is tightly linked with the previous aspect of global
integration that I discussed – global competition through international profile and recognition.
Thus, it is clear that the desire to be integrated with the rest of the world (i.e. global
integration) is a prime motivator for UP’s internationalisation ambitions, and ultimately its
internationalisation process. This global integration motive, as I have shown here, manifests
itself through a desire to be globally competitive, internationally recognised and have a more
established international profile, as well as through a desire to contribute to, and be a part of,
the global production of knowledge. Given these clarities with regard to UP’s motivations for
internationalisation, I surmise that these issues – global competitiveness via profile and
recognition, and contribution to global knowledge production – all support the fact that UP
wishes to be integrated with the rest of the world, and are thus dimensions of that desire for
global integration. This global integration is the first of the two key broad motivations for internationalisation at UP as I found in my investigation.

5.2.2 Continental/regional development as a rationale for internationalisation at UP

The second major rationale behind UP’s internationalisation is its desire to contribute to the development of the African continent, and particularly the Southern African region. Although I could discuss continental and regional developmental issues separately, as this is not the central focus of my study (it could be another PhD study all on its own), I choose to discuss the two together. As such for the remainder of this study, continental and regional developments as they relate to UP’s internationalisation will often be discussed together as the African or continental development rationale for internationalisation. However, when I am speaking specifically of protocols, policies or actions intended for the Southern African region (where South Africa is located) I will indicate such.

UP’s African development ambitions are underscored by its understanding of its positioning on the African continent and specifically its potential to undertake a leadership role in that regard, as the following indicates:

*Situat ed in the diplomatic capital of Southern Africa, the University of Pretoria is ideally placed to forge links between Africa and the other continents, to be the interface between excellence in Africa and excellence elsewhere, and to be the cutting edge in research between excellence, relevance, and impact* (UP, 2007a, p. 21).

African development is also premised on the notion of location (that South Africa is on the African continent) and position within the developing world. Thus, there is a responsibility for UP to contribute to the development of the continent and the region.

*...we are a South African University in Africa. This university has never traditionally been seen that way...as a South African university, yes, but not of Africa; a South African university of Europe. But that is absolute nonsense, of course, and therefore, being part of a South African university in Africa, we’re part of the developing world. And if this university and others of its ilk do not do something about development and catching up and participating on a global stage, we will remain a developing country [author’s emphasis], instead of a developed country. The responsibility of this university is to make an imprint on the local society here, and in terms of agitating for development and showing the way and good practice and so forth, and not only local, but even out there to the rest of the society in South Africa and to the rest of the society in Africa* (I: Mogotlane).
UP’s desire (and responsibility) to contribute to African development and thus to play the leadership role in “forging links between Africa and other continents”, is pursued through at least four major channels, namely:

- African empowerment
- capacity building and training
- addressing of development issues relevant to Africa
- “getting to know” Africa and Africans

Each of these four motivations and thus UP goals plays a major part in UP’s rationales for engaging with African institutions. As such, I present evidence to this effect below.

5.2.2a Continental/regional development through African empowerment

In keeping in line with NEPAD and SADC policies and protocols, UP has accepted the call to contribute to a “do it yourself” mentality for Africa. What this means is that UP, in line with these agreements, has adopted the stance that Africans must take Africa’s destiny in its own hands and ensure that the countries of the continent address the major African challenges such as poverty, hunger, disease and economic development through partnerships and interactions with one another. This is supported by the following:

...I have always insisted that [many of Africa’s] problems are NOT the problem of the West. They are the problem of Africans. And unless WE initiate projects; put thick proposals on the table; insist on not being junior partners in negotiations, etc., etc...Unless WE get our act together, of course, you’re putting yourself in [a vulnerable] position (I: Jansen).

This comment underscores that UP (and South African and other African institutions in general) must understand that they should take ownership of problems in Africa, and thus there must be African leadership and involvement in the solutions to those problems. It also demonstrates a desire for less dependence on the West/North, and more on UP and other African institutions to take the lead in solving problems facing the continent. This is seconded by others at UP, as the following shows:

And what is happening in Africa is that the development agenda is not being led by Africans, but it’s being led by the developed nations...what is happening at the moment...is that...entities in the Western world will come into Africa and will identify a problem, that THEY believe is a problem in Africa. They’ll get Africans together, put in a proposal for money, and then involve Africans in the development of that agenda. Okay, and billions of dollars have been wasted in Africa because those initiatives are usually not sustainable, there’s not truly an African ownership of that, and because the purse is still in the hands of
the so-called masters. What we need to do in Africa...is to get Africans to talk to one another, so that WE sit down and say hey listen, what do WE want to do, what do WE want to take ownership for, and THEN, WE identify partners out there in the Western world, and WE approach funding institutions in the world to fund OUR initiatives (I: Hendrikz).

Linked to the issue of African empowerment and self-reliance, which also relates to the dependency on the West/North, is the notion that there are good things that come out of Africa which can and should be engaged with to address its issues, as the following two comments show:

... we need to have an African focus that is world class. And this is my problem, that conceptually we sit with a problem that we think that world-class is only American or European. There are many things that we do in Africa that are world-class and that is what we need to sharpen and focus on and get great people together in Africa to sort of develop those world class African programmes and so on (I: Hendrikz).

It’s not so much that we say that UP is fantastic and that we’re going to help those other universities [across Africa], because there is lots of learning that we can glean from the regional universities for example (I: Mogotlane).

Both comments support the notion that UP values the expertise on the African continent and that utilising and engaging with that African knowledge, according to UP, is a key motivator and contributor to the empowerment of the African continent, and thus a prime component of its continental/regional development rationale for internationalisation.

5.2.2b Continental/regional development through capacity building and training

In order to reach its goals of promoting and encouraging the empowerment of the African continent, UP believes there is a need to build human and institutional capacities and to train individuals on the continent. The university is contributing to this through various types of activities, which I will highlight further in the next chapter. What is important to note here is that capacity building and training of Africans and African institutions is a major driver behind UP’s engagements with the rest of the continent. Underscoring this desire to build capacity and train is that UP (and South Africa) is located on the African continent and thus has responsibilities to contribute to the capacity building of its neighbours, especially those that lack strong universities and other institutions which can develop capacity and train their own people.

For example, if one has to look at an Africa strategy, one has to look at the fact that we are a university based on the continent, and what are we doing to enhance the capacity building within this continent, and how are we aiding in terms of offering of educational programmes where they don’t exist for our immediate partners around, let’s say the SADC. Some don’t
even have a national university of repute, so how are we then aiding our partners just next to us...to build that gap within their own countries (I: Rajah).

UP’s contribution to building capacity on the African continent is largely in the form of training activities. In other words, UP is involved in numerous training activities on its campuses and elsewhere, where it believes it is contributing to the building of capacity on the continent. Although I will discuss specific activities in the next chapter, a practical example will help to illustrate and support this point. For instance, in areas around agriculture, which is a dominant industry and source of livelihood in Africa, UP is heavily involved in research and in the training of individuals and institutions from across the continent.

...I would say that if you think of international engagement in the region and in the continent, it’s perhaps more on the training of people in Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi and their universities as well as people doing their masters or PhDs here. I think our PhD group is about 30 and of that 30, 20 of those are from countries in Africa. So, that illustrates to you the engagement with the continent, which I feel is a very important contribution that we make (I: Kirsten).

This training of Africans to build capacity also contributes to African empowerment, as discussed in the previous section. UP has a strong interest in continually building African capacity, and the primary method seems to be now, and in the future, training Africans in some form or another. As the above comment suggests, the training of research students (masters and PhD) is one form of capacity building, but as the comment below demonstrates, there are other methods tied to this rationale.

There is a strong capacity building component in our postgraduate programme. Many of our masters and doctoral students are from other African universities/research institutions. We see our role in this regard as very important. We are indeed the trainers of the trainees! In addition, we also expose our postgraduate students to internationally renowned scientists from overseas by having them attend workshops and conferences (I: Minnaar).

As can be seen in many of the comments already discussed in this section on African development, UP believes that its contributions through empowering Africa and building its capacity are going to assist the continent with addressing its own developmental issues and problems. Further supporting this notion, the Faculty of EDU houses the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Centre for Africa-wide Capacity Building, which, as the name suggests attempts to assist Africans and African institutions to develop the necessary capacity to lead and address African and global development challenges.
5.2.2c Continental/regional development through addressing development issues

The desire to contribute to addressing the many development issues on the continent is yet another aspect of UP’s continental development rationale for its internationalisation. The issues of concern include such problems as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and other diseases plaguing Africa. Other issues include underdeveloped educational systems, literacy, water resource management, food science and additional areas where UP has the human resources and expertise to research and address such challenges. UP believes that the majority of these developmental problems can only be addressed appropriately through interactions among African countries, as the following demonstrates:

A lot of the diseases and things that we see in Africa, can only be addressed this way. So there is a big role. If you think about agriculture, specific issues like vet science, health, they have a very big role to play in the broader regional context and they can never be known to only be a national or even local institution. Education and commerce are other areas (I: Van Zyl).

Additionally:

...we talk about internationalisation being a fantastic thing and globalisation and things like that, but if you can’t feed your people, there’s no way you’re going to participate in things like that. So, the [African] universities decided to meet in Maputo and decided that we need to be in a position as universities in the region to help put adequate protein, clean protein, safe protein, sustainable protein in the households in our region...So, that becomes important in feeding, and in getting our kids reasonably fit... They [other African universities] work with us in to-ing and fro-ing. This is the way I think the University of Pretoria and the regional universities...can act to try and make a difference in the region (I: Mogotlane).

In terms of this to-ing and fro-ing, and involvement in research and training across the African continent, there are specific types of developmental issues which the EDU and NAS faculties seek to address and contribute to through their research and training activities. In the Faculty of EDU, for instance, issues such as large and under-resourced classrooms and under-prepared teachers are prevalent throughout the African continent, and the faculty sees a need to contribute to addressing this. In this regard, the Faculty of EDU is engaging in research projects and training programmes to prepare African educators to deal better with these problems.

...we’ve tried to maintain these links in terms of trying to access grants around a large classes project, an initiative being supported by the African Forum for Children’s Literacy in Science and Technology (AFCLIST), of which I am the director of the Large Classes Node, which is looking at teaching and building capacity of researchers and practitioners in the area of teacher development and change in the context of teaching large under-resourced classes (I: Onwu).
Likewise, the Faculty of NAS understands that it is in a position to contribute toward addressing developmental issues on the African continent. Some of the areas it is involved in are issues around water resource management, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and other diseases that are prevalent on the continent, and food science, including food security. The following illustrates such activities:

*With SADC countries actually we do food security. Particularly on a regional level that influences trade, exports and regional diseases. We have some tropical and subtropical diseases here, not only in our plants but in our animals and so on. So it’s high on our agenda to actually do research on this. And it’s locally relevant but also internationally relevant. Let’s take rabies for instance. The CDC [Centres for Disease Control] is very interested in our research there and so are we. And malaria is another one, which is really an African problem...Tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS are other ones, which are big problems regionally, but also internationally (I: Cloete).*

*Food Science academics are involved in many international projects...An international project that I’ve been involved with since 1991, is the Research Coordinated Programme of the FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency...what happens in this programme is that the agency identifies an area in food irradiation that they believe needs to be explored and researched. As an individual from a particular country one can then submit a project proposal and collaborate with other scientists over a period of five years and work on respective projects. On three occasions the secretariat organises coordinated meetings where research findings are reported and discussed. The most recent one which I’ve attended dealt with scientists in developing countries, including China. So, in this particular instance we were looking at how we could improve the safety and sensory quality of prepared meals through the use of food irradiation where we worked on ethnic meals. Scientists from various parts of the world, including Africa and South America, identified local prepared meals to work on (I: Minnaar).*

This evidence demonstrates that while these problems are not unique to Africa, UP believes that it can and must engage with its African counterparts to try and develop the knowledge and skills to address the continent’s developmental issues. The need to address continental problems is thus another aspect of the continental development rationale for UP’s engagement with internationalisation. However, in order to engage fully with its African counterparts, there must be some knowledge of what other African countries and HEIs are doing concerning these and other developmental issues.

5.2.2d Continental/regional development through getting to know your neighbours

While trying to address the continental development problems spoken of above, one of the interesting hurdles to such interaction was that South African academics (and thus institutions) are not familiar with their African counterparts. In other words, I learned that South African academics and researchers often turn to their counterparts from the North and the West to engage in international research activities and exchanges, largely because they
simply do not know their African counterparts or the type of research and research capacity that their counterparts engage in and/or possess. There is also a sense, as I began to discuss under the “African empowerment” section above, that as Africans are doing it for themselves there is often still a Western influence, that the West is even driving Africa to work together, and that African partnerships are sometimes not even driven by Africans. Part of the reason for this, as the comment below demonstrates, is the lack of knowledge of Africa and the African researchers and of what they are doing in terms of research and development.

>You know, one of the biggest problems in Africa is, and it is actually so sad that us in Africa don’t know one another; don’t share with one another; don’t aggressively network with one another. So, what is happening is a fundamental problem, and that is the Western world, the developed world, coming to Africa very aggressively with, in most cases very good intentions, and try to bring Africans together. So it’s actually a third party, because they’ve got the money and they’ve got the resources and they’ve got the expertise, but it’s not supposed to work like that (I: Hendrikz).

Similarly, another HOD stated that:

>And I must say, one of the problems was getting into the rest of Africa. Because I think there’s still this strange perception that South Africa is not part of Africa, it’s a part of Europe in Africa. But we are now also making breakthroughs in that regard. Working with people in Ghana, Tanzania, Zanzibar, Botswana, Namibia and Uganda. But I think we haven’t focused enough on engaging with Africa. Funnily enough, it’s our international engagements that have said to us that we need to bring more of our African colleagues on board (I: Beckmann).

What this evidence underscores is that UP researchers do not know enough about their African counterparts or their research. Engaging more with them (via internationalisation) is thus one primary way to learn more about what others are doing in terms of research that can contribute to continental development. It also shows that there is still a belief among South African researchers (including those at UP) that the knowledge gleaned from the West is more valuable than the knowledge gleaned from Africa. Underscoring this belief is the notion that South African researchers (including those at UP) do not know enough about what their African counterparts are doing, and thus do not engage with them and break away from the perception that the knowledge from the West is best. This evidence demonstrates that the need to get to know its African counterparts is yet another aspect of UP’s continental development rationale for internationalisation. This need supports the previous aspects of the continental development rationale, including African empowerment, continental capacity building and training, and the desire to contribute to addressing African developmental issues and problems. It also relates and speaks to a desire to follow governmental and continental
policies and protocols, which supports the notion of African development in the manners spoken of herein.

As the evidence in this entire section shows, thecontinental development rationale for UP’s internationalisation is clearly one whereby UP has both an ambition and a feeling of responsibility that it must contribute to the development and thus greater good of the African continent. However, as we shall now see, this continental development does not negate the desire or need for UP to contribute also to the development of South Africa.

5.2.3 National development as a rationale for internationalisation at UP

In addition to its global integration and continental development rationales for internationalisation, there is a third and final broad and key rationale for internationalisation at UP – national development. In speaking of this national development rationale for internationalisation, my contention is that it is closely linked with what Knight (2006) calls the “nation building rationale” for internationalisation. As I described earlier in this study, Knight (ibid) argues that “an educated, trained and knowledgeable citizenry and a workforce able to do research and generate new knowledge are key components of a country’s national building agenda” (p. 50). This key component of nation building is particularly relevant in terms of UP’s desire to make a contribution to South Africa’s development.

As already discussed (in the global integration rationale for internationalisation section), UP possesses a strong desire for generating and contributing to the transmission and production of knowledge, and it is keen on accomplishing this through research and research output. Thus, like the global integration and continental development rationales for its international activities, UP’s national development rationales for internationalisation are also linked tightly with its research ambitions. Individuals at UP therefore agree that its international activities and engagements can be used to assist the country with its national developmental needs, as is evidenced by the following statement:

...that [internationalisation] it is essential for your makeup as an academic to be aware of everything that goes on in the world, and whatever knowledge and skills you pick up will be beneficial to your own country (I: Beckmann).

In seeking to address national needs through its internationalisation – and particularly the pursuit of knowledge garnered through international engagements – UP’s primary vehicle is its individual and collective human resources. As such, and in keeping with Knight’s (2006)
stance on these as primary dimensions of nation building, UP is utilising its international engagements to build human resources and capacity to address the imperatives on the national agenda (which I will elaborate on shortly). In this regard, UP is focusing on several areas.

First, an important element for UP in developing this human resource capacity is “importing” expertise that is not currently available in South Africa, and thus imparting that expertise on South Africans.

*The advantage that we feel in bringing postdocs on is that it often brings with them, a set of expertise and a mindset which is different from the one that prevails in a department. And that kind of interaction is actually critical for the university. The research activities, it has a spin-off of course, and that is that it’s creating a set of networks which exist long beyond this particular postdoc. So, we’re establishing long-term networks* (I: Crewe).

However, while discussing national level obstacles to internationalisation at UP, an interviewee mentioned that a major issue is the obstacles placed by the government in getting researchers into the country (something I will discuss more later):

*If South Africa wants to become an international player, we have to ensure that our policies and processes to bring researchers into the country are much more streamlined. This will ensure people coming in to participate and actually building our knowledge framework and for our young staff to meet the standards that we want them to meet. So I think we have obstacles there* (I: Ströh).

Although this expertise and knowledge might not exist in South Africa and one of the desires to internationalise comes from the need to “import” some of this expertise, there is recognition concerning the potential downside of this, which would be the danger of imported expertise and knowledge and adopting it uncritically.

*And my strong feeling is that as long as that’s dominant in the mind of the researchers working with the instruments; as long as every attempt is made to validate the findings within the South African context, then personally, I don’t have a problem in taking instruments that are in a sense measuring the same as they would be measuring elsewhere. The point is, to be rigorous about the process of validation and of contextualisation* (I: Howie).

In addition, sending South African researchers abroad is being done to allow them to gather expertise and knowledge that can be put to use back in South Africa, which is also a form of “importing” knowledge. The importing of knowledge, skills and expertise also relates to UP’s desire to ensure that its researchers are able to attain new information, ideas and methodologies that can be utilised in the country. However, it is not simply about bringing in
new ideas, but also to allow South African (UP) researchers to share their expertise and methodologies with the rest of the world, which can (and more than likely does) contribute to the national profile of the institution and the country.

As stated earlier, this building of individual and collective human capacity and the “importing” of knowledge that UP is engaging with internationalisation to achieve, is being done to address South Africa’s national imperatives. Two of those imperatives are particularly relevant to what UP is trying to contribute to and both relate to the development of human resources and capacity building. These are:

- addressing South Africa’s developmental issues/problems
- building a national system of innovation (NSI)

While these two points are intimately linked, the developmental issues/problems are more broadly related to issues such as poverty, education, HIV/AIDS and other diseases, as well as other social problems that exist in the country, and the NSI seems to relate more to science and technology. Even so, in developing South African human resources and building both individual and collective capacity in this regard, as I have shown above, UP has many motivations for its international activities. These activities include: the importing of knowledge and expertise; attaining and sharing new knowledge and methodologies in specific areas of expertise; and ultimately being able to utilise this expertise and knowledge to address critical national issues such as HIV/AIDS, education and other needs. UP expects that all this will make it a contributor to building human resource and capacity, which will allow it to help South Africa address national developmental issues/problems and at the same time contribute to the NSI through the collection and transmission of knowledge.

5.2.3a National development through human resources and capacity building to address South Africa’s developmental needs

In South Africa, as is the case in developing countries the world over, there are many concerns about such issues as education, widespread poverty, HIV/AIDS and other diseases, managing scarce water resources, and so forth. UP sees the national developmental imperatives as:

...rural and economic development, crime prevention, job creation, and urban renewal. The provision of housing, telecommunications and other infrastructure...and combating
poverty...health issues...The HIV/AIDS pandemic is a national crisis in its own right even though there are many other health-related problems that are of equal importance. Social and economic transformation is high on the national agenda, and is manifested in the emphasis on equity, access, redress, and diversity...there can be few national needs with as high a priority as that of education...UP, 2002b, p. 14).

I have already discussed many of these developmental issues in terms of the African continent but as the comment below indicates, these are problems facing developing countries generally, including South Africa. UP thus believes it must build the capacity of its own, to address the issues in its own backyard as well as outside of it.

Research into malaria is not just South African, but South America, India, Asia; those are all areas that are intensely interested in malaria. So, it is a topic which is very important for us, but it’s not parochial. It’s of general interest to developing countries. AIDS, use of water, energy efficiency, all of these things are extremely important. Like water, in a country like this it has huge ramifications...So, we try to move into those sorts of areas, which is international, but of importance to countries like ours (I: Melck).

At the faculty level, for example, an interviewee spoke about the issue of assisting and training individuals with communication difficulties and the contribution of international knowledge drawn from internationalisation to South Africa’s situation. This illustrates a prime motivation for the international engagements:

...one of the intermediate partnerships that we have is Temple University, and they helped us to develop a programme to help young people to become self-advocates. And the whole idea is to develop the skill to enter into employment training. Now, these are people who don’t speak...What outside people do is they bring their expertise in, and having the benefit of the expertise that’s come in, of how to do it, you do have to translate it into Africa, but without that expertise coming in, it means you have to start from the bottom and who’s got that kind of resources (I: CAAC HOD).

Another example is Prof. Onwu’s statement in section 5.2.2c regarding large class-room sizes, which is a significant issue in South African education and throughout the African continent. I discussed UP’s interest in contributing to continental development as a rationale for its internationalisation. But this is also an issue relevant in South Africa and thus to national development as a rationale for UP’s internationalisation.

In the Faculty of NAS, the Bean Counting (CRSP) Programme discussed in section 5.2.2c illustrates the issue of food sciences and the contribution of international knowledge drawn from internationalisation to South Africa’s situation, and thus a prime motivation for the international engagements. As can be seen in that example, generating new knowledge through research and producing a workforce able to do just that (i.e. human resources
development and capacity building) is a key priority at UP and thus a key national rationale for its international engagements. As can also be seen, this generation of new knowledge is not always an actual generation of knowledge but often takes the form of importing knowledge that may exist elsewhere, and adapting it to South African situations. In this adaptation, new knowledge often can and is generated. The primary reason for this is because of UP’s desire to contribute to the development of new knowledge that can be used to address South African national needs (as I partially discussed in the previous section) and its social, economic and political development.

5.2.3b National development through human resources and capacity building to contribute to a national system of innovation

The other desired contribution with regard to national development for UP is its ambition to contribute to South Africa’s national system of innovation (NSI), which is seen as a primary stepping stone toward the type of development that the country hopes to achieve. Additionally, UP sees innovation as crucial to its international competitiveness. Its contribution to the NSI is thus a way for it to make itself and South Africa more competitive internationally. UP preaches that “the essence of innovation is renewal and continuous improvement” (UP, 2002b, p. 3). One way in which it seeks to renew and improve is through international engagements that allow it to develop the human and institutional capacity to produce and transmit knowledge through research and research outputs. I have demonstrated throughout this and the previous chapter that UP’s communal ambition of pursuing and transmitting knowledge, and building the human capacity in this regard, must entail individuals who are not only able to create new ideas and knowledge but also to take existing knowledge and to use it to create and innovate, as the following attests to:

*The concept of “new ideas” is manifested in the creation of a new concept, which in turn is often based on a new combination of existing concepts or new inventions. The not-invented-here syndrome can lead to arrogant short-sightedness and should be shunned. Ideas frequently originate elsewhere, and one requires an alertness to recognise and learn from them. However, it is also essential that the capacity and ability exist to generate one’s own ideas. This is the essence of creativity (UP, 2002b, p. 35).*

This institutional desire to be able to innovate and thus generate new ideas and concepts is particularly evident in areas of science and technology, which are seen as primary facilitators of development in South Africa. It is also encapsulated in the university’s motto and branding of its students as “the innovation generation”. This desire to generate new ideas and concepts, and thus to be “innovative”, is what is currently driving the majority of UP’s ambitions where
its international activities are concerned. It is also intimately tied to an earlier national level rationale that I discussed – the desire to generate and contribute to new knowledge.

This drive to innovate is motivated by a desire to contribute to the NSI, which can only be achieved through UP having the capacity and organisational wherewithal to make this contribution. As such, “[w]hatever the nature of a particular innovation, the ultimate goal must be to bring about an improvement in the University, its products and process” (UP, 2002b, p. 35). What this says is that before UP can actually contribute to the NSI, or to the developmental issues/problems of South Africa, it must first have its own house in order. It must have the systems and, more importantly, the individual and collective capacity to run itself efficiently and to continue to improve.

In summarising the national development rationale for UP’s internationalisation, the evidence above demonstrates that UP’s entrance into many types of international activities (i.e. internationalisation) for the purposes of sharing, gathering or transmitting knowledge is relevant to its own national development and contributes to its NSI. Internationalisation is thus used in this case not as a way to integrate with the rest of the world necessarily, but as a method of knowledge transmission that will contribute to developing skills and resources within South Africa’s borders and among its people and institutions in a way that tackles critical national needs. In building the human and institutional capacity through knowledge transmission for the purpose of national development, this rationale for internationalisation also links to the national development imperative of contributing to South Africa’s system of innovation.

5.2.4 Visible, yet less important rationales for internationalisation at UP
As I began to argue in the beginning of this section (5.2), the social and cultural development rationales for internationalisation at UP do not seem as strong as the political rationales. Since the three main rationales for internationalisation at UP have been discussed at length, it is useful also to highlight some of the rationales for internationalisation that are not priorities at UP (some of these were mentioned above and earlier in Chapter 1). Although these do find some space at UP and are in some cases acknowledged, many of them do not seem as crucial to UP as the three broad rationales just discussed. These “non-rationales” for internationalisation at UP include intercultural understanding, peace and mutual understanding, or social-cultural rationales as they are often referred to, and the sub-rationale economic rationale of income generation.
Regarding social-cultural rationales for UP’s internationalisation, some of the comments of UP stakeholders discussed above demonstrated that there is some recognition that internationalisation is a valid way of increasing these things. They are, however, of less importance than I discussed above. This became obvious to me particularly in my conversations concerning student mobility (a form of internationalisation which I will discuss further in the next chapter). In this instance, as I have shown in the previous chapter, UP is most concerned with becoming an internationally recognised research university and its primary concern is thus research and knowledge production. Thus, its encouragement and support of students coming into South Africa and those going out for academic endeavours is almost exclusively for students to engage in research activities.

*I mean, what is the university? A university, at least as I see it, is defined as an institution that is focused on new knowledge generation, and you don’t generate new knowledge at the undergraduate level. You generate new knowledge through research and that’s all at the postgraduate level. So, if you want to internationalise the university enterprise, the place to work is at the postgraduate level, and the undergraduate level should not be an issue (I: Wingfield).*

In fact, the exchange of students at the undergraduate level is seen primarily as a “marketing” exercise by some at UP, and as a lesser endeavour by others, as the two comments below show. For instance, when asked about the role of undergraduate students in internationalisation (and specifically the research aspect of it), one HOD stated that:

*...it would be much more in terms of a marketing exercise. Turning that into a market. I don’t see a major role for the undergraduate students. But masters and PhDs I do see a role, if we could attract masters and PhD students internationally (I: Jeenah).*

In addition, one HOD spoke of exchanges of undergraduate students versus that of postgraduate students in terms of levels, with postgraduate students being at a higher level.

*Well, they do have a role. As I said, with Utrecht it’s on a faculty-wide basis. There are student exchanges at the undergraduate level, but what we want to do is we want to upgrade that to make that higher, you know, because at that level [undergraduate] you’re really only visiting the schools and so forth, you’re not going to go into research... (I: Onwu).*

For me, these comments demonstrate that primarily because of its passion for research, UP has neglected the social-cultural rationales for internationalisation, and particularly this form of it (student mobility). In doing so, it has placed a premium on research related rationales for internationalisation, which contribute to the three broad and primary rationales discussed earlier.
While I am not suggesting that the social-cultural rationales for internationalisation are not important to UP, the data indicates that this rationale is at best a peripheral. Even given its peripheral nature, there is some recognition among UP stakeholders that social and cultural values of internationalisation do exist, as is evident by the following statement:

> Over the years, all these collaborations have had a very positive influence. First of all you get your students, that are exposed to other cultures, to other ways of thinking, and they interact with each another. They see that there is a different world and a different way of thinking outside of South Africa. And sending our students abroad has absolutely widened their horizon. Especially our students who come from previously disadvantaged communities, as well as those from advantaged communities. We send them overseas for two years...after coming from...one of the very rural areas they come back as different people. It’s a tremendous education, no doubt about it (I: Cloete).

Although there is evidence of the economic benefits of internationalisation through such areas as funding for international partnerships, I did not find direct evidence that UP engages in internationalisation for the sub-economic rationale of income generation, as some other universities do. Some universities charge significantly higher fees for international students and/or they develop various short-term study programmes that bring in international students who pay a premium to participate. This income helps sustain international offices and contributes to universities’ financial bottom lines. Although UP does charge international students outside of the Southern African region double tuition fees (and South African law requires a R2,000 international student levy), I did not find evidence that it engages in the fee-for-service short-term programmes that many universities around the world have developed. However, UP’s recognition that there are economic benefits derived from internationalisation can be seen in such statements as the following:

> ...one has to very carefully think about what you mean by money. Money is not just money paid. Money is money against publications, money that comes to the university through students’ graduations...The university gets full subsidies for PhDs irrespective of where they come from. So, that’s a source of cash flow. Money is not just money that people pay in green dollars in American terms or whatever you want to call it, in cash money. The product could be access to materials from other parts of the world...infusions of new cultures...different abilities and different experiences. And that’s all part of the money...I think people tend to forget that (I: Wingfield).

In another instance, and HOD argued that:

> ...because we also said that in our initiatives in Africa we will be very sensitive with regard to how we operate in a country. It is possible for us, for example, to go into Namibia and buy a full page advert in a local newspaper, where we urge those students to enrol in the University of Pretoria’s distance education programmes, and we will establish contact sessions in that country and we will establish examination centres in that country and they can just
enrol...And we might get a lot of students then they would enrol at our institution. But we believe if we go that route, it would be the wrong approach (I: Hendrikz).

Statements like these demonstrate that although there is recognition of the potential economic benefits of internationalisation, including the potential to make a significant amount of money from its international activities and its African initiatives specifically, the sub-economic rationale of income generation does not seem to be a primary motivation for internationalisation at UP. As shown here, this may be because of a desire to be sensitive to financial issues in other countries and/or to not permit economics to rule UP’s own international ambitions and activities. Another reason may be because the institution chooses to put more emphasis on other rationales for engaging in international activities, as already discussed herein.

5.3 Synthesis

This chapter has presented a significant amount of data concerning UP’s internationalisation imperative, why it is an imperative and, thus, why UP is internationalising. It is clear that internationalisation is an imperative at UP, at least as a strategic ambition, and mainly for reasons of “global integration”, “continental development” and “national development”. As demonstrated, there are also several layers to these three broad rationales as they apply to the UP case. Having discussed these primary rationales for internationalisation at UP, the next question that I must now address is: what action is UP engaging in to attain its goals of global integration, continental development and national development? In other words, what are the characteristics and expressions of UP’s internationalisation that are manifested, given these three broad rationales? The following chapter addresses this question.