CHAPTER 7
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

...South African higher education can achieve competing goals at the same time. This, in turn suggests that institutions can also address internationalisation while simultaneously achieving national development goals... (Kotecha, 2006, p. 108).

7.0 Introduction

In Chapter 3 I outlined how I would collect and organise my data; and in the previous three chapters I presented that data following those organisational and analytical methods. As such, I have attempted to present a clear picture of why and how internationalisation is occurring at UP and have discussed the role of the institutional constituents (in this case the faculties of EDU and NAS) in that process. In this final chapter I will present my interpretations and analysis of the UP case in order to address directly my key research questions. In doing so, I first place my data within the scope of a portion of the existing literature discussed in my study, to show how UP’s internationalisation conforms or differs from why and how the process is occurring elsewhere. Second, I place my data within the framework of the “developmental settlement” to help guide my findings and to understand and interpret these findings with regard to how UP is addressing the “dual development challenge” and what new knowledge this generates. In following this pattern, and through the examination of one university as my case study, I suggest that my conclusions have addressed the question as to how one HEI responds to internationalisation given the dual imperatives of national development and relevance on the one hand, and global integration on the other. Understanding and addressing this question within the context of UP provides a platform for me to discuss insights into the other key research question, namely: what can be taken from the meanings and motivations underlining the UP example which might provide insights for the broader internationalisation of HE scholarship and practice?

I found in my study that in pursuing its internationalisation ambitions, an HEI can mediate a developmental settlement; however, the terms of that settlement are not prescribable, are contested and often contradictory, and will differ according to their institutional context. In supporting my argument, I make two central points that can be explicated from the UP case because of how it is engaging with internationalisation within the context of the dual development challenge. First, as the method that UP chooses to pursue and mediate its own developmental settlement is via the ambitious and enthusiastic engagement with an international research agenda, I suggest that an HEI’s research pursuits and outputs may have
an impact on both the national development and global competitiveness ambitions of the institution.

Second, the mediating terms and thus outcomes (intended or unintended) of the developmental settlement within the context of the institution’s internationalisation are heavily dependent on individuals within an institution, and even more specifically on their collective thoughts and activities – what I term “collective individualism”, which is explained further in Chapter 7.3.2. These individual and collective individual thoughts and activities, in the UP case, are tightly linked to the university’s communal objectives of an ambitious and enthusiastic research agenda, which links my first point to this second one. This ambitious engagement with a research agenda is particularly evident in UP’s internationalisation; and even more specifically in the desired expressions of its internationalisation, which are predominately research related and are part of UP’s main strategic thrust. Thus, as the following analysis will show, UP’s response to internationalisation given the dual development challenge of national and global imperatives has taken the form of a conscious or unconscious pursuit of a developmental settlement via the ambitious and enthusiastic engagement with an international research agenda. The characteristics of these pursuits will become clearer in this chapter.

7.1 UP’s internationalisation from the lens of existing scholarship

Placing UP’s internationalisation within the scope of existing literature on internationalisation of HE and related topics is useful to my analysis for at least two reasons. First, it provides a context in which to understand UP’s internationalisation in relation to what scholars argue and theorise is happening at HEIs around the world. Second, it allows for an expansion of the literature by highlighting areas where the characteristics of UP’s internationalisation either contradict or unfold in ways not yet theorised in existing scholarship. These areas of conformity and/or contradiction between UP’s internationalisation and internationalisation elsewhere, provides some useful data and helps with my overall analysis.

Clearly, from what has been argued in existing scholarship, internationalisation is one of the methods that HEIs worldwide are using to address changing and intensifying global trends often referred to as globalisation (Teichler, 2004; Altbach, 2002; de Wit, 1999). For instance, Altbach (ibid) argues that “…internationalisation refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions or systems to deal with global trends” (p. 1).
UP is no exception, and, as I have shown, a significant part of its strategic agenda is internationalisation, largely due to its ambitions to address globalisation and its challenges.

Scholars have also theorised and conceptualised internationalisation in attempts to develop working definitions of it (Knight and de Wit, 1997; Ellingboe, 1998; Altbach, 2002; Bartell, 2003; Knight, 2003b; Cross et. al., 2004; and Knight, 2006). In the first chapter of this study I discussed several of those definitions of internationalisation, and based on some of their shortcomings, I built on and extended these scholars’ definitions. As such, the definition of internationalisation as utilised in this study has been: the process of more strategically and/or intensively engaging in international activities to help prepare HEIs and their constituents for participation and survival in an increasingly interconnected global environment. Thus, in the light of the evidence presented herein, the question could be raised: is UP internationalising according to this definition of internationalisation?

The university has high ambitions to internationalise and is at the least attempting to be more strategic with its international activities. However, according to my evidence and data, the strategies that the university wishes to utilise in terms of its international activities have not completely translated into more intensity in those activities. There are some signs of the intensity of its international activities picking up, according to what constituents have told me during interviews; however, the measurable signs of that intensity are not so transparent and available at UP. This then seems to signal that although UP wishes to internationalise, it is only doing so slowly. As such, its response to internationalisation has been to embrace the process as an imperative for the university. But more work needs to be done in terms of intensifying its international activities and systematically keeping track of those activities. In short, given the ambitions and some examples of new and strategic international activities which I have highlighted in various points in this study, there is evidence that the university is internationalising, albeit slowly.

I found several other areas where internationalisation as it is described in existing literature relates to UP, and specifically where some interesting points of intersection, interaction and contradiction can be noted. One primary area of intersection between UP and existing internationalisation scholarship is Davies’s (1992) theories of “institutionalising internationalisation”. Another area is the literature on internationalisation of HE and HE transformation (Chapter 2.3) as well as the literature on “comprehensive internationalisation”
discussed in Chapter 1.7. These three thematic areas found in existing scholarship resonated with my research and assisted me with the analysis of my research puzzle.

7.1.1 On the literature: Institutionalised internationalisation – Davies’s matrix

In Chapter 1.7, I discussed Davies’s (1992) theory of “institutionalised internationalisation” whereby the author argued that institutionalisation of a university’s internationalisation could be viewed along two continuums – one from ad hoc to marginal and another from systematic to central. In illustrating these two continuums Davies developed a matrix comprising four quadrants, which can be found as Figure 2 (see page 27). In leading toward addressing my main research questions, it is useful to interrogate where UP would fit in Davies’s matrix, as this might help ground the university and its internationalisation process more firmly in existing internationalisation scholarship.

In this regard, I did not find enough conclusive evidence to place UP firmly in any one of Davies’s quadrants. I found that UP had characteristics of several of the quadrants and particularly of quadrant A (ad hoc to marginal) and quadrant C (ad hoc to central), but it is difficult to place it fully in just one quadrant. A full description of each quadrant is provided in Box 1 (see page 28) and so it is not necessary to describe them here again. However, an illustration of how UP relates to some of the characteristics of quadrants A and C will demonstrate my point that it is difficult to place UP in just one quadrant.

Quadrant A is characterised by a relatively small amount of international business (i.e. just some overseas students, a small amount of consultancies, a small amount of international institutional agreements), while quadrant C is characterised by a considerable amount of international business. I believe that UP is engaging in a considerable amount of international business. In utilising international business as a characteristic, I do not interpret Davies to mean only international activities that bring in money or involve only financial transactions. As Davies’s entire theory of institutionalised internationalisation, and thus the development of his matrix, is premised on a university engaging in several types of international activities that include but are not limited to those that are financial in nature, I find that he is more generally referring to international “business” here as all of the international activities of a given university.

In terms of the types of international business or activities at UP, I found that there were a significant amount of international activities across different sectors of the university, but
primarily, as indicated elsewhere, keeping in line with its research agenda. One of these is its international institutional agreements, of which UP has a significant amount (96 as of 2007). However, as is characterised by quadrant C, although there are a large number of agreements, according to UP constituents many of these are not operational. However, as I have noted, it is difficult to fully interrogate which agreements are active and which are inactiveness given UP’s lack of systematic and coordinated methods of monitoring and evaluating its international agreements.

Additionally, the university’s international business is a significant portion of its research collaboration, as international research collaborations have accounted for 55% or more of its total collaborations on research since 2002, as showed in Table 14 (see page 159). Finally, in terms of its international business, UP does have a significant amount of international publication as is indicated by the fact that more than 75% of its credited, published journal articles have appeared in journals found in international publication indices. These are some examples of the international business or activities in which UP is engaged, which give it characteristics of quadrant C of Davies’s matrix.

However, Davies characterises quadrant A as having research linkages that are largely confined to motivated individuals. This adequately describes the research linkages at UP, as I have attempted to highlight in this study. The majority of UP stakeholders seem to hold the view that it is through the connections and actions of its individual researchers that it will best be able to take advantage of internationalisation. As such, the support that is offered in terms of financing, for instance, is geared toward supporting individual researchers’ international mobility. This support for and ultimately the attitudes of UP stakeholders toward individual researcher international mobility and research output, seems to follow with the characteristics of quadrant A of Davies’s matrix. The issue of individual researchers and their international activities is an element of UP’s internationalisation that I will focus on more shortly.

Another area where UP is best characterised by the factors in quadrant A as opposed to quadrant C, is in terms of the financing of international activities and what Davies describes as their variable and unsystematic nature. As demonstrated in Chapter 6.2.2 while discussing the academic and professional mobility of UP staff, the university claims various amounts of financing that go to support international activities of its staff. However, the financial monitoring and tracking systems and databases that would allow for a more thorough interrogation of and/or reporting on the quantities of UP and international researchers taking
advantage of such financing, points toward variability and unsystematic financial systems in place at UP. These unsystematic systems are characteristics of quadrant C of Davies’s matrix.

UP also has the characteristics of quadrant C with regard to its curriculum. There was no sign of any coordination of the international elements of UP’s curriculum. In fact, only one of the UP stakeholders that I interviewed brought up the issue of the curriculum as an important element to the university’s internationalisation when she told me that:

Even something as basic as your curriculum needs to be addressed because that is an area that is totally neglected at the moment in terms of internationalisation (I: Rajah)

Ms Rajah’s comment and the silence of other UP stakeholders on the issue of curriculum as an element of the university’s internationalisation support my notion that this aspect of internationalisation at UP holds true with Davies’s characterisation of curriculum in quadrant C.

In terms of the support services for internationalisation as they are characterised by Davies in quadrant C, UP does not seem to have fully geared its support services toward international efforts. For instance, in terms of its international student support, as I was told by international student advisors, the university does not have systematic ways of supporting international students at UP. There are international student orientations and an international student organisation is supported by the university; however, the orientation is a once per term event and the international student organisation was largely inactive during my stay at the university. UP stakeholders, particularly in the NAS faculty did tell me though that they offered a significant amount of support to the postgraduate international students studying in their faculties. Nevertheless, this support did not seem to translate well as a systematic or coordinated service for international students outside of a particular faculty.

These illustrations show that UP has characteristics of at least two of Davies’s quadrants – A and C. As such, this points to a potential pitfall of using Davies’s matrix, which might occur when a university does not meet the specific criteria for any one quadrant. In a case such as UP when several characteristics match one quadrant while others match another, one might be left asking where the university should be placed. However, given that the quadrants are based on continuums and not specific points in time, Davies’s matrix is still a useful model to help scholars and practitioners gauge movements in a university’s internationalisation process because it helps to demonstrate what levels of specific international activities a university
might be at. This then might help a university to determine if it is meeting its own
international ambitions (whatever those might be) or if it needs improvements in some areas.
If improvements are needed, a university can then move along one of the continuums in
whatever direction might be most appropriate to its own international ambitions.

7.1.2 On the literature: Internationalisation and transformation; campus-wide and
comprehensive internationalisation

In addition to placing UP within the context of Davies’s (1992) matrix, two other areas of
interest for my study in terms of internationalisation literature, and where UP fits in among it,
are the issues of internationalisation of HE and transformation of HE and the literature
(related to Davies’s theories) on campus-wide or comprehensive internationalisation. I argued
in Chapter 2.3 that it is useful to place internationalisation of HE within the context of
education change theory in order to better understand it as one of the responses to the many
challenges faced by HE in a globalised world. This argument holds true in the case of UP as
it engages with internationalisation in both word and deed, in order to address these
own respective terms, internationalisation is “contributing to, if not leading the process of
rethinking the social, cultural and economic roles of higher education…” (Enders, 2004, p.
362). This rethinking of social, cultural and economic roles is characteristic of the
transformation agenda in South Africa as a whole, and at UP specifically in the case of my
study.

As statements and UP strategic documents highlighted earlier indicate, as part of its
transformation imperatives, internationalisation is an important element at UP. This is
particularly evident as the institution continues to try and distance itself from its historical
legacy and moves toward an agenda of transformation that seeks to be “globally competitive
and locally relevant” and an “internationally recognised research university”. Both of these
are transformational goals that UP is pursuing in large part through internationalisation. In
this sense, UP’s internationalisation follows a path similar to what these scholars have argued
concerning the process and its role as both an agent of and for transformation. More
specifically, the areas of UP’s transformation agenda that include internationalisation
manifest themselves in a strong research ethos at the institution, which is tied closely to
capacity building vis-à-vis its individual researchers, its functional parts, and ultimately of
South Africa, the rest of Africa and globally.
In terms of this research ethos, one can draw at least two conclusions that will help to position UP’s internationalisation within and then beyond the context of existing scholarship. First, much of the institution’s research, according to my data, is tied to ambitions of both global competitiveness and of national development (the two sides of my dual development challenge), as well as a desire to contribute to continental and regional development and integration. Table 15 below illustrates how UP is pursuing part of its transformation agenda through internationalisation, manifested in specific means of achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UP’s TRANSFORMATION AGENDA</th>
<th>CHOSEN INTERNATIONAL MEANS OF ACHIEVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global integration</td>
<td>Competitiveness, profile and recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursuit and transmission of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental/Regional development and integration</td>
<td>African empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing of African developmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting know Africa and Africans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National development</td>
<td>Human resources and capacity building to contribute to addressing South Africa’s developmental issues/problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources and capacity building to contribute to a national system of innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second related point that helps to position UP’s internationalisation within the context of existing scholarship, and which allows me to expand upon that scholarship, is that the institution’s research is primarily carried out and supported via the activities of individual researchers at the institution and is designed to improve individual capacities, which would ultimately lead to institutional and eventually country-wide capacity improvement. This follows the thoughts of scholars as found in the Conference Report (1998), where it was argued that internationalisation can and does often play a significant role in building these capacities. However, it differs from the underlying arguments of campus-wide or comprehensive internationalisation (Lutabingwa, 2006; Welch, 2004; ACE, 2003; Knight, 2003a; Hamrick, 1999; Ellingboe, 1998; Johnston and Edelstein, 1993), in that instead of focusing on institution-wide programmes, policies, etc., at UP the overwhelming majority of the people who took part in my study indicated that it is through the strength of the individual that UP’s research is helping it to internationalise in the ways it needs to.

One HOD summarised this when we talked about how internationalisation, and particularly international research collaborations and partnerships in the Faculty of EDU, were having an impact:
We leave it up to the individuals. Like in our case...what does happen [in terms of international research collaborations] is mostly people driven (I: Beckmann).

Countless other similar statements were given to me as I probed the process of internationalisation at UP and through its faculties. These statements all led me to conclude that UP stresses the development of individual researchers and their abilities to establish, lead and carry out international research collaborations and projects, as opposed to an institution seeking to create institution-wide policies on internationalisation to guide and direct whole faculties/departments or the institution itself. Also, it is the use of its research – and particularly its international research collaborations and activities led and carried out by its individual researchers – that UP believes will lead to the building of individual and institutional capacities, and thus contribute to the success of its transformation agenda. As such, internationalisation and transformation, as has been shown elsewhere in this study and as argued by scholars (Enders, 2004; Johnson and Rowen, 2004), are tightly linked at UP. However, conversely to what scholars argue about campus-wide or comprehensive internationalisation and its characteristics (Lutabingwa, 2006; Welch, 2004; Knight, 2003a; Hamrick, 1999; Ellingboe, 1998; Johnston and Edelstein, 1993), internationalisation at UP is not occurring through those means but through individual and collective individual agency, and particularly through the research activities of these individuals and groups.

7.2 UP and a “developmental settlement theory for internationalisation”

In following these arguments about UP’s internationalisation process and its relations to existing scholarship on the topic, my study foregrounded that UP is indeed engaging with the process (albeit slowly) and that it is in fact one of the areas of transformation at the university. Internationalisation at UP is a strategic imperative aimed at helping the university to achieve several transformational objectives, including global integration, continental and regional development, and national development, through the various means summarised in Table 15. UP’s internationalisation as an imperative of its transformation agenda manifests in the motivations for the university to be: internationally competitive and nationally relevant; and an internationally recognised research university. These dual motivations signal UP’s desire to address both sides of the dual development challenge and thus to achieve some form of a “balancing act” between the national and global imperatives.

In attempting to interrogate how UP is working to achieve such a “balancing act” as it responds to internationalisation within the context of the dual imperatives of national and
global development, I had to choose an appropriate theoretical vehicle that would help to understand, analyse and explain my data. Thus, as described in Chapter 2.7, the primary theoretical vehicle used to make sense of my data was an expanded version of Smyth’s (1995) and particularly Subotzky’s (1997a and b, 1999a and b) notion of a “settlement”. My utilisation of their settlement theory has been extended and is framed as a “developmental settlement theory for internationalisation”. In providing an understanding of a developmental settlement I have already described in this study the two sides of the developmental challenge (national and global) in which my study is concerned. Thus, in the context of my study the pursuit of a “developmental settlement” consists of an HEI’s attempts to address, through specific activities, actions and policies, national developmental needs at the same time as global integration and competition ambitions.

In following this understanding of a developmental settlement, according to my expansion of Smyth’s and Subotzky’s usage of it, I probed what I saw as the primary intellectual underpinning of their settlement theory. Subotzky particularly argued that a “settlement” is an unstable truce characterised by many contestations and contradictions (1997a and b, 1999a and b). There were many illustrations of this unstable truce at UP, evident in the many contestations and contradictions between the ambitions and practices of its internationalisation in the pursuit of its “developmental settlement”. By interrogating these contested and contradictory elements of UP’s pursuit of a developmental settlement, I was able to make sense of the volumes of data I gathered and thus to provide answers to my key research questions.

However, before moving on to discuss the contested and contradictory nature of UP’s internationalisation during its pursuit of both global and national development, I find it interesting to look at UP’s perception of this pursuit. When explaining in an earlier chapter my use of the development settlement as my theoretical framework for this study, I listed as one of the shortcomings of Smyth’s and Subotzky’s settlement theory, the issue of whether an HEI even believes one was possible and/or should be pursued. What I learned concerning whether or not UP stakeholders feel that the pursuit of a settlement is something they should be engaged in, is thus a crucial part of my analysis. In addressing the perceptions of a developmental settlement from a UP perspective, there was a common thread throughout my conversations with stakeholders, which seemed to be supported by the documentary evidence I collected, that a settlement could and should be pursued by the university. It was clear that the majority of individuals I spoke with believed that a developmental settlement is both
possible and necessary for HEIs to pursue. An appropriate and good representation of the thinking of those I spoke with can be deduced in this comment from one UP leader as we discussed whether or not UP’s international pursuits would negatively impact on its national ones:

I don’t think there is a conflict at all...every country needs really, expertly trained people. And you can only really train world-class people in a world-class institution. So, the fact that some of the research may be in fields that are not that specifically “South Africa”, and there may be fields that are not [specifically “South African”]. I don’t think that’s the issue. The issue is that most of this research is done in the training of excellent South Africans (I: Melck).

Comments such as this demonstrate that UP believes its research endeavours, even when they seem globally focused, still have an impact on national development, and in this case, in terms of training of individuals and their individual capacities being strengthened. This demonstrates that UP does not find the global and national imperatives to be in conflict with one another. This reinforces UP’s belief that its strategic focuses of being an “internationally known research institution” that is “globally competitive and nationally relevant” are intimately tied to the international research activities of its individuals and departments. As such, while engaging in international research activities in partnership with fellow researchers, postgraduate students and, to a lesser degree, undergraduate students, UP is able to interact with global research knowledge production, while at the same time using that knowledge to address national needs, and vice versa.

An illustration of these global research partnerships that are impacting on the capacity and recognition of national individuals (and thus the country) can be seen by looking at the research being done by the Faculty of EDU’s CAAC, highlighted in Chapter 6.3.1. This centre’s research entails that department and its researchers working with researchers abroad in efforts to find solutions to “help people find a way to communicate” where they cannot communicate verbally. By engaging in these international partnerships, the researchers involved (some South African others non-South Africa) are addressing a problem that is relevant to South Africa as well as elsewhere. In the research process, postgraduate students involved in the project are being trained (with hands-on experience) in research methods and are developing ways to address these communication problems. The capacity of the researchers involved is also being built up through their participation and exchange with other researchers and research methodologies.
There are, of course, many other examples of this type of international research partnership that is having a global and a national reach, as well as a local one in that it is benefiting UP as well through name recognition and profile, and even in terms of research funding coming into the institution for projects such as these. The point to be made through the communications research illustration is that UP does believe this type of “developmental settlement” is possible; and the primary method it seems to be using to make this a reality is via the university’s international research partnerships and activities. Thus, the perceptions of a developmental settlement at UP are that one can and should be sought. In fact, the perceptions of it are that it is unavoidable on the part of UP, and that the university must address both global and national developmental imperatives.

One might argue that if the institution sees global and national developmental imperatives as not being in conflict with one another, then there is no need for them to “settle” anything. However, my counter argument to that would revolve around the practicality of an institution’s ability to actually address both national and global developmental imperatives. It is well and good for an institution to say that it needs to and will address both national and global imperatives, but what that actually means and looks like in practice is another issue. Thus, this study sheds light on how this is possible in practice, through the examination of one university’s pursuit of national and global developmental imperatives, or what has been termed a “developmental settlement”.

Since UP believes that such a developmental settlement is possible and that one should be pursued by the university, the question that arises is: what are the contested and contradictory elements of that pursuit? In addressing that question in the case of UP and its internationalisation, as I gathered my data, I found several key contested and contradictory elements having effects on and characterising UP’s internationalisation and the pursuit of its developmental settlement. These contested and contradictory elements were something that I alluded to at varying points in Chapter 6 during the presentation of data concerned with the characteristics and expression of internationalisation at UP, but are something that I would now like to focus on as a significant point in my analysis. Each of these contested and contradictory elements plays some part in UP’s pursuit of its developmental settlement and, as I will illustrate, its ability to address the dual development challenge. In the UP case, these contestations and contradictory elements of its internationalisation process as it pursues its developmental settlement also follow with what Davies (1992) argues concerning internal tensions that may arise at a university while determining its path toward internationalisation.
However, I discuss these tensions as contestations and contradictions, as will be seen in the next two sections. Additionally, as will be seen, there are some areas of overlap where contested elements at UP could also be viewed as contradictory. I first turn to discussing the contested elements of UP’s internationalisation and the pursuit of its developmental settlement.

7.2.1 Contested elements of UP’s pursuit of a “developmental settlement”

In terms of contestations I am referring to the differing opinions and ideas of individuals at the institution in terms of how one says something should be occurring versus how another says or perceives that something to be occurring. I found two principal areas of contestation within UP’s pursuit of a developmental settlement via its internationalisation ambitions. The first major area of contestation is around the need for a written institutional policy on internationalisation. The second area of contestation is the issue of where the leadership of internationalisation at UP should come from.

As I talked with UP stakeholders it became evident that some believed there needed to be a written institution-wide policy to help guide and regulate the university’s internationalisation, while others did not believe this would be a useful exercise. These counter-arguments are summarised in the following “pro-policy” statement, followed by an “anti-policy” statement given to me by two UP stakeholders. The first comment, which I highlighted elsewhere in this study, was in response to my question as to whether the interviewee believed that UP needed a comprehensive institutional policy on internationalisation. This comment is repeated below as it demonstrates the pro-policy mentality at UP:

*Yes, because otherwise every person X in Faculty X, decides oh, I can do with a link here, then off they go, but there’s no one to actually, I hate the word control, but there’s not monitoring and control of that link, to say is it good for the institution, or what value is it to us, how does it add value to our programmes, our academic programmes, etc.* (I: Rajah).

Another stakeholder’s view, however, epitomises the anti-policy school of thought on the issue of an institutional policy:

*I think that we must leave academic freedom of what they want to do (staff and faculty) how they want to do, so that they can develop themselves. And I don’t think this can be regulated. You cannot say, if I asked you, now I want you to be a famous composer, can you do this? Probably not. Me neither. So it doesn’t help. You cannot plan that* (I: Cukrowski).
What this demonstrates are the different schools of thought at UP concerning the need for a written internationalisation policy. There is currently no such policy at UP, although, as stated elsewhere, the institution has intentions to develop and put one into practice. However, the contestation over its need is one of the main reasons that the policy does not currently exist. This contestation has led to it being difficult for stakeholders to buy in to the idea of an institute-wide policy, for fear, as is indicative in Prof. Cukrowski’s comment, that there would be a loss of autonomy when it comes to the international engagements of the individual faculties and their researchers. The current discussions about an institution-wide policy have been going on for quite some time, and numerous draft and policy frameworks have been developed. If a policy is ultimately completed and adopted at UP, there will still be those who believe that it is an unnecessary step and who will not regard it as the best move for the institution and its internationalisation efforts. Thus, the contestation around its need will more than likely prevail.

Another critical area of contention at UP with respect to its internationalisation process that is impacting on its pursuit of a developmental settlement concerns the need for top management leadership and guidance. Some believe that it is necessary for top management to take the reigns of internationalisation and lead the institution to the “promised land” of all that is good with internationalisation, while others believe the process cannot be facilitated wholly and only by top management. Demonstrating the notion that top management (UP’s executive) should have the “power” when it comes to internationalisation, is the comment made to me by Prof. Mogotlane that he was “uncomfortable with initiative being taken by anybody, by every Tom, Dick, and Harry” (refer to Chapter 6). Ingrained in Prof. Mogotlane’s comment is the notion that the leadership for such critical areas as internationalisation needs to come from the top. He was not the only senior UP official with this belief. It was even seconded by others not in senior management, who sometimes quoted the “lack of leadership” as being a hindrance to the institution’s internationalisation efforts.

However, the other side of the coin is that the top leadership cannot force internationalisation upon the institutional stakeholders, which is what Prof. Ströh meant when he said that:

_The rector can’t say, we should be international. It [internationalisation] should be driving those mechanisms within some of the units that are already there and expanding that step by step to other units that you see the potential in... (I: Ströh)._
It is interesting that UP’s top management feels that they should be guiding the process of internationalisation, while other university stakeholders (and in this case one of the university’s senior managers) believe the process should be driven from individual researchers and eventually through the faculties as a result of the collective efforts of the researchers. As I began to argue earlier in Chapter 4, although UP does have a CIR director who in theory is supposed to be leading the internationalisation efforts, most would agree that the “power” is actually still in the hands of top management to determine the actual internationalisation path that the institution should take. As the comment above from one of those top managers shows, this is how they feel internationalisation must get done in order to properly benefit the institution as a whole. On the other hand, others believe that no matter how much top management direction or policies are developed from “above”, it is the individual researchers and faculties that will have the most impact on the institution’s internationalisation and the positive outcomes emerging from that internationalisation.

7.2.2 Contradictory elements of UP’s pursuit of a “developmental settlement”

In addition to these two primary areas of contestation in UP’s internationalisation and its pursuit of a “developmental settlement”, I also found several areas where there were contradictions among and between the international ambitions, thoughts and actions at UP. Contradictions refer to areas where there is a strategic or general consensus of what and/or how something should happen, but the evidence does not point to it happening in the way it was intended. In other words, contradictions in this instance are areas of inconsistency where, for instance, one thing is said, understood or expected to happen and something completely different actually occurs. These contradictions in terms of UP’s pursuit of a developmental settlement while engaging in its internationalisation include:

- the issue around the need for a written internationalisation policy
- questions concerning whether UP needs a central office to guide its internationalisation or not
- issues relating to how internationalisation is occurring across disciplines in the “hard” sciences versus those in the “soft” sciences
- internationalisation across the African continent versus outside of Africa
- UP as an institution in a developing country, while historically being an institution resourced like those in a developed country
• inconsistencies and shortcomings in UP’s databases and tracking and monitoring systems that do not allow for effective analysis and reporting on its actual international activities

The dilemma around whether there needs to be an institutional internationalisation policy or not at UP, discussed above as a contestation within UP’s pursuit of a developmental settlement, also falls in the area of contradictions. This is so in terms of those proponents of the need for a policy and the reasons they argue it is necessary, such as their argument that internationalisation is happening on an “ad hoc” basis at UP, and the perception that this is a negative thing. However, there was not enough evidence to support the notion that the ad hoc nature of internationalisation is bad. On the contrary, internationalisation at UP via the international partnerships and international postgraduate students (as demonstrated by some of the financial and other statistics in Chapter 6) is flourishing, even given the lack of a comprehensive, institution-wide policy regulating and/or guiding those partnerships.

The institution is receiving funding for its research activities, which is allowing individual researchers to travel abroad and engage in work with their international counterparts. Likewise, the institution is receiving and working with international postgraduate students and international faculties, bringing them to UP to conduct research and to engage with the UP community on various areas. These activities benefit not only the researchers and students involved, but also the greater UP community through the increased elevation of the institution’s profile and research outputs. Even if these relationships do seem ad hoc to some, the engagement of the individuals internationally and the resultant research findings and outputs are just as important to the institution as research outputs that would come from institution-wide and centrally planned and organised research partnerships. Additionally, the increase in the number of international postgraduate students at the university is also a sign that internationalisation at UP is moving forward (even if only slowly), despite what some say is an ad hoc and/or non-existent policy on internationalisation.

Although some believe that increased policy and coordination over UP’s internationalisation activities (particularly international research activities) would be of benefit to the institution, this belief is contradicted by the fact that, despite the lack of policy and coordination, UP is seeing a growth in international research activities and outputs resulting from those activities, and an overall growth in the internationalisation process as a whole. Thus, prescriptions on how international research partnerships and activities should be occurring, versus allowing
the individual researchers to continue pursuing partnerships that relate to their individual research interests, whether they be ad hoc or not, does not seem like the best move for an institution like UP.

Related to the issue concerning the need (or lack thereof as I argue) of an institution-wide policy to coordinate and regulate internationalisation at UP, is the issue of a potential centrally located office to coordinate internationalisation. As I have shown, many in the institution’s leadership believe that such a central office is needed and they have indeed established a CIR office to guide UP’s internationalisation. However, this office operated for one year without a director, and even after the selection and hiring of a director, the office is still in transition and is not well equipped for “guiding” internationalisation on the campus. Yet, as I have shown throughout this study, internationalisation particularly in terms of established and flourishing research partnerships with international researchers and institutions is happening and growing at UP. This fact thus contradicts the thinking that a central office is needed to coordinate such activities. Repeating part of what Prof. Ströh said earlier, the successful portion of UP’s internationalisation is “…really from our researchers who start mentoring our younger people to go that direction” (I: Ströh). Thus, a central office to coordinate and lead UP’s internationalisation, although it may have its benefits, does not seem to be what UP actually needs.

Another major area of contradiction that I discovered in terms of UP’s internationalisation was in the reasons given for supporting internationalisation of the “hard” sciences versus the “soft” sciences. There was common agreement that the hard sciences such as engineering and mathematics were being given more attention than were the soft or social sciences such as the humanities and education. This is demonstrated in the following comment:

*At the moment, the majority of the attention has gone into the hard sciences...That also is because of the priorities in the country. So, at the moment, government is prioritising natural sciences and engineering. And that is reflected in the planning also, so there is some emphasis given to those. But not exclusively. In the humanities, people tend to work as individuals to a large degree, and that has been, I’d say, a weakness in the past that it’s very fragmented. Each one following his own particular interests (I: Melck).*

Where I see the contradiction is in terms of what Prof. Melck says about the work as individuals being a weakness. Throughout my field work, and thus throughout this study, it was shown that stakeholders credit the work of individual researchers and collective groups of researchers for UP’s (and the various faculties’) successful internationalisation. As such,
Prof. Melck’s statement that the individualistic nature of research in the humanities is a reason why they have received less funding and support seems to contradict even what people in the soft sciences, like education, argued. For instance:

...we leave it up to the individuals...What does happen is mostly people driven. Maybe it’s something that the university itself should actually look at... (I: Beckmann).

This is seconded by members of the “hard” sciences at UP. For example, to repeat Prof. Cukrowski’s comment:

The researchers that are good quality are individuals. And you cannot tell somebody, now you’re going to be a pianist, world class pianist, or you will be the world class painter. Either you will develop yourself, or you won’t be. You just cannot be organised or pre-programmed, this can only be facilitated (I: Cukrowski).

The point to be made here is that some believe it is not highly effective to focus on individuals and groups of individuals, and/or to allow individuals to engage in international activities that may seem fragmented from some greater plan. However, in terms of the evidence I gathered, it is indeed these individual efforts that are allowing UP to engage with internationalisation to the benefit of the faculties involved and ultimately to the benefit of the institution itself. It is thus not a weakness in the soft sciences that much of the research is individually driven, as it is also mainly individually driven in the hard sciences as well. Given this, what people such as Prof. Melck believe are the reasons why the soft sciences receive less attention and funding for their international activities than do the hard sciences, contradicts what is actually happening. People in both disciplines in fact claim that the main way in which international research activity occurs is via individual international engagements.

Another area of contestation concerns what people (and policies) say about the need for more engagement on the part of UP with African institutions and African researchers, versus what is actually happening in terms of these engagements. I have already described African development and empowerment as one of the rationales behind UP’s internationalisation, particularly in terms of internationalisation with the rest of the African continent, and have given many quotes from UP stakeholders supporting the notion. However, what seems to be happening at UP is that although there are some programmes and research engagements with African institutions and individuals, there is not nearly as much as one would expect. The rhetoric concerning the importance and value of these engagements thus seems to contradict
what is actually happening at UP. I was told on several occasions that the level of African engagement between UP and UP researchers and the rest of Africa was not sufficient, and that more needed to be done in this regard to help develop and empower the rest of Africa.

There are several reasons why the rhetoric concerning the need for more African engagement and the actual facilitation and actions around that engagement are not happening. For example, to repeat a Dr Hendrikz quote from earlier in this study:

_You know, one of the biggest problems in Africa is that we in Africa don’t know one another; don’t share with one another; don’t aggressively network with one another…What we need to do in Africa, and this is part of OUR vision, 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)._ 

This point was seconded by many others at UP. In essence, they believe that there is not a lot of African engagement in line with policy and the perceived need for it, because of the lack of knowledge on the part of South African, and specifically UP, researchers about what their African counterparts are doing. There is also not enough knowledge of who is doing what and how to best coordinate and work with other African researchers. Although UP researchers are undertaking projects and research partnerships with their African counterparts, as highlighted in previous chapters, there was common agreement among most UP stakeholders that this is not happening as the policies and discussions around it would suggest.

The final major area of contradiction in terms of UP’s internationalisation and its interactions with dual development relates to the previous discussion of the African internationalisation issue. It has to do with the attitudes of UP stakeholders and South Africans in general. The issue here is what some perceive as a “big brother” mentality on the part of South Africans and South African institutions such as UP, toward the rest of Africa. The contradiction lies in UP being an institution that considers itself part of the “developing world” but with an attitude of a “developed world” institution. In other words, while UP is often mentioned in the same sentence with other institutions in developing countries and South Africa is often mentioned as a developing country, the tones and words of the UP stakeholders I interviewed, to my mind, carried with them a developed country mindset. The stakeholders often spoke in terms of how they could “help the African continent” and not necessarily how the “African continent can work together to help build itself collaboratively”. Although there was talk of the need for collaboration, the tones, words and attitudes were paternalistic and did not
convey a sense of equal partnership. This is not to say that all UP stakeholders believed they would be the saviours of the continent, rather it highlights that in the tones and words of UP stakeholders, my perception was that many of them had a mindset that was not necessarily one of needing assistance (as would be expected of a developing country institution), but one of being the institution that would deliver the assistance and support (as would an institution in a developed country when working with an institution in a developing country). Repeating a quote from Ms. Rajah demonstrates this mentality and tone:

*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 that 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 or on our borders virtually, to build that gap within their own countries (I: Rajah).*

Words such as “aiding” and “offering” were used by many others in my conversations with UP stakeholders and they give important insights into the mindset of UP stakeholders. These types of words demonstrate to me that although many do acknowledge that there is much to learn from African universities, the dominant discourse was that of UP (and South Africa) being in a position to be the “donor” institution to needy institutions around the continent. I do not mean donor in a sense of providing financial resources to other institutions, but rather in terms of providing training, capacity building and expertise to others. Although Ms Rajah and others with whom I spoke about this issue did not say explicitly that UP sees itself in this manner, the dominant discourse and tone of our discussions suggested this to me. This positioning of UP in South Africa is indicative of the “big brother” or paternalistic attitude of many South Africans toward other Africans and African institutions discussed above. One of my respondents even went so far as to warn that these attitudes and the resultant collaborations between South African and other African institutions could lead to a “new neo-colonialism” where South Africa could be considered the coloniser of a less developed African country, if the nature of the partnerships and the accompanying attitudes were not shifted to a more equal partnership.

There are reasons for, and specific characteristics of, this contradiction of a developing country with a developed country mindset that UP carries. First, UP is one of the traditionally advantaged HEIs in South Africa. Throughout its history it has been financially stable and well endowed compared to many other South African HEIs and institutions throughout Africa. Thus, it has the facilities and resources that many other South African and African
HEIs do not have. Second, UP is located in South Africa which, as a middle developed country by UNESCO standards, is also more financially and politically stable than many other African countries. For this reason, it is often looked upon as one of the leaders on the African continent in terms of development. All this translates into fewer partnerships with Africa that start on an equal footing, and more training and capacity building in terms of UP researchers and individuals leading that training and seeking to impart knowledge and expertise on their African counterparts. Although the training and capacity building (assistance) coming from UP does allow the institution to have an impact on African development, the question that remains is how the institution can curb what some insiders view as an arrogance toward the rest of Africa, which ultimately gets in the way of true partnership and true collaboration, as some in the institution believe. The answer to this question is another study altogether, but the nature of the contradiction between what is thought and said about the need and value of equal African partnerships, and what is actually happening with UP and those partnerships, is what is most relevant for my study.

7.3 Answering the research questions and summarising the key findings

Given that most UP stakeholders that I interacted with believe that the university can and should pursue a “developmental settlement” as it engages in its internationalisation process, and that there are many contested and contradictory elements to its settlement, I can now begin to answer my key research questions more directly.

In the light of the findings in my study and the analysis presented in this chapter, I found that UP’s response in addressing the first of the key research questions (namely, how an HEI responds to internationalisation, given the imperatives of national development and relevance and global integration and competitiveness [dual development challenge]) has two primary components:

- A conscious or unconscious pursuit of a developmental settlement via an ambitious and enthusiastic engagement with an international research agenda
- Support for and emphasis on individual and collective individual research agents and activities

As I have shown, UP’s internationalisation ambitions are slow to be realised in terms of significant increases in its three primary strategic internationalisation expressions, namely: international collaborations, networks and partnerships; faculty and researcher international
mobility; and postgraduate student mobility. However, as the university grapples with increasing and intensifying its primary internationalisation expressions, it nonetheless enthusiastically continues to encourage its constituents to buy in to ideas of an ambitious international research agenda. Thus, their response to internationalisation within the context of the dual development challenge is one of a communal ambition to pursue a developmental settlement between global and national imperatives, primarily through the strategic mechanism of an ambitious and enthusiastic international research agenda.

As I have shown herein, this pursuit of a developmental settlement is characterised by several contradictions and contestations between principle and practice. Additionally, the pursuit of the settlement via the international research agenda is primarily manifested in the support and faith in the abilities of individual researchers to develop international research collaborations, and then for those individually developed research collaborations to translate into outputs that benefit the university, the nation, the continent, and ultimately increase the international profile and reputation of the university. These two components – pursuit of a developmental settlement via an international research agenda, and the support of individual and collective individual agents – together make up UP’s response to internationalisation given the dual development challenge. I will discuss each component individually below.

7.3.1 Pursuing a “developmental settlement” via an international research agenda
This developmental settlement means that while engaging with the process of internationalisation, UP seeks to contribute to addressing national concerns and problems, seeking at the same time to make an imprint on the world stage and to address global concerns. UP sometimes unconsciously seeks this settlement, particularly when it engages in research activities that may on the surface seem only relevant to South Africa (such as research on a certain type of tropical disease that may not be a problem in other countries). However, the methodologies used in that research and/or some finding that results from it, may help other researchers in other countries to address a disease of some sort in their country. In this sense, UP researchers may not have set out to produce research with a national and global impact, but by the very nature of the research that pursuit of both (national and global) may have unconsciously occurred. Thus, UP has been able to address “dual development” and has been able to pursue a “developmental settlement” through many of its internationalisation expressions, such as these international research activities.
As discussed herein, UP’s pursuit of a developmental settlement is marked by several contestations and contradictions, which are at the root of its ability to address the dual development challenge. In essence, I am arguing that it is the very existence of these contested and contradicting elements of UP’s internationalisation processes as it pursues its development challenge that allow the institution to debate the need for certain policies and activities on an international level. The contradictions often produce unintended outcomes and outputs that allow the institution to re-think its international activities and strategies and/or expand those in efforts to better address institutional needs.

As an example, the contradictions discussed earlier around UP’s rhetoric toward more African engagements versus what is actually happening, allows UP researchers to debate why it is not happening. It also allows them to promote networks with their African counterparts and to seek out funding and other avenues to do so. However, even while they are attempting to correct the imbalances of their African engagements, UP researchers are still working with non-African partners and researchers and are still trying to solve global research concerns. The point I am making here is that even within the context of the contradictions between the perceived need for African engagement and the actual engagement that happens, UP is able to continually address developmental needs at national, regional and global levels, particularly through its pursuit of international research activities, which is the second component of UP’s three-part response to the dual development challenge.

My argument here is that through its aggressive pursuit of an international research agenda and the resultant international research activities specifically, UP can have an impact on national and global development (the two sides of the developmental challenge). For instance, most research is conducted by researchers with the assistance and involvement of research (postgraduate) students. Prof. Melck illustrates this quite well:

...most of the research is done by research students, like yourself. And you’re obviously under supervision and the academic staff members are doing their own research also. But, the research being done by research students, masters and doctoral, ties in very closely to what the academic, you know, the professors are doing themselves. So, the research, or a large percentage of the research is part of training or education as well. And, so, even if the outcome is possibly esoteric from a South African point of view, that’s only half of it. The other half is the training part of it (I: Melck).

Postgraduate student involvement in research projects, as Prof. Melck’s comment states, includes both domestic and international students, and leads to a national citizenry with some
research skills, training and knowledge. In terms of the international impact, student researchers who go abroad are able to take some of their research skills with them to their home countries. Additionally, when researchers and students present their findings and research activities at national, regional and/or global conferences, the knowledge that they may have gained locally or nationally, is then disseminated regionally and/or globally. In such instances, UP’s research can contribute to national and global developmental needs.

7.3.2 International research agenda via individual and collective individual agents

UP’s research is able to contribute to both sides of the dual development challenge due to the university’s enthusiastic and aggressive international research agenda. This is true because through its research activities and support, the institution is involving itself in activities that have a local (institutional), national, regional and global reach, as seen in previous chapters of this study. As a research institution, this is not surprising, nor is it necessarily a groundbreaking finding. What is interesting is that this enthusiastic and aggressive research agenda, and the resultant support of research activities, is focused most keenly on individuals and groups of individuals, as opposed to an institutional-level focus. This support of individuals and groups of individuals, which characterises UP’s international research activities and which takes on an air of individualism, is the second key component of UP’s response to internationalisation within the context of the dual development challenge.

In this manner, internationalisation funnelled through the international activities and support of such activities by and of individual agents, leads to collective action and broader campus internationalisation that takes into consideration varying aspects of development. This is summarised in the argument below:

...and if there is enough critical mass of your faculties that’s doing that [international activities], then the university can say, we’re truly there [internationally]. But it’s not going to happen from top down, it’s going to happen really from our individual researchers who start mentoring our younger people to go that direction (I: Ströh).

This comment epitomises what I termed earlier “collective individualism”. Although Prof. Ströh uses the phrase “critical mass”, it speaks to the notion of collective individualism as a means of understanding and describing a group of individuals and individual-minded researchers who make up the group of UP researchers and staff. My argument is that “collective individualism”, as it refers to UP and its internationalisation process, means that UP researchers and leadership carry the attitude that through the international activities and
engagements of individual researchers and staff, UP as a collective or whole will be strengthened and will benefit, and that this will effect its overall internationalisation process. In this sense, and as it relates to my study and what Prof. Ströh is stating, a “collective” would be the various individual agents that make up the group of UP researchers and staff engaging in international activities, and is what I argue is “collective individualism” in the UP internationalisation process as it pursues its developmental settlement.

In further supporting this notion of individual researchers and their role in UP’s internationalisation, I can cite comments such as that given to me by one UP leader who argued that “when we talk about internationalisation it really needs to be on a peer-to-peer basis” (I: Howie). Such arguments demonstrate the broad feelings which exist at UP that internationalisation can best occur and benefit the university through the actions and support of individuals engaging in international activities. This notion of individual researchers as the central point for UP’s internationalisation, and specifically the international research activities dimension of it, is strongly supported in the data presented in earlier chapters, and particularly the chapter on the expressions of internationalisation at UP (Chapter 6). It is also strengthened by what Prof. Ströh and Prof. Howie argued above, as well as by comments from other UP constituents:

*I can’t coordinate internationalisation, it must be the individuals in the faculty…it must be through good quality individuals* (I: Cukrowski).

*…it’s the individuals in this faculty that make it happen* (I: Jansen).

*It’s the individuals…who make the department competitive and known internationally* (I: Pienaar).

*Very often what makes those collaborations or those MOUs work is individuals. When you have two people that get on and they want to collaborate. Otherwise they’re dead.* (I: Cloete).

*…you have to live that internationalisation sort of mindset. And the way in which you do it is, it starts at the researcher’s and people’s level of the unit that buy in to this thing, to actually work toward a situation where you could truly and freely communicate internationally and your work is being recognised internationally* (I: Ströh).

Comments such as these, and many others, speak of the strength of individual researchers and their international activities, and demonstrate a notion of individualism and collective individualism as a mindset among UP constituents. As such, my central argument with respect to the first of my key research questions, and resulting from the findings of my
research, is that UP responds to internationalisation within the context of the dual development challenge through the conscious or unconscious pursuit of a developmental settlement, consisting of sometimes contested and contradictory elements, but leading primarily to international research activities which are supported and led by individuals and collective individual agents. The university sees its global integration and competitiveness manifested in its research engagements and in the outputs of its individual researchers, while its national/local impact is measured in terms of its contribution to a national system of innovation and through its individual researchers’ interactions with national agencies which pursue such ends.

7.3.3 What the UP case says

With the above central argument in mind, the second principal research question guiding my study was concerned with what can be understood from the meanings and motivations behind an HEI’s responses to the dual development challenge. In other words, what can be understood and expanded to the broader higher education community and scholarship from UP’s responses to, and motivations for responding to, the imperative of internationalisation within the framework of the dual development challenge in the ways that it has chosen to do so? In addressing that second research question, the UP case brings up several important areas that may be of intellectual interest to scholars and practitioners of internationalisation. Specifically, I believe there are at least two broad areas where HEIs might benefit from an understanding of UP’s responses in this regard.

First, my argument is that HEIs are seeking a developmental settlement when engaging with internationalisation and the pursuit of that settlement is sometimes conscious and sometimes unconscious. Additionally, pursuing this developmental settlement means that an HEI will face contested and contradictory elements and role player agendas during its internationalisation process and its developmental settlement pursuits. However, these different agendas are not necessarily fatal for an HEI. A developmental settlement is possible even in the midst of contradictions and contestations of motives. In fact it is these contradictions and contestations that both define and characterise the mediation of this developmental settlement. As such, HEIs should acknowledge and embrace these contestations and contradictions as they internationalise and pursue their own developmental settlement. Doing so will open up spaces for conversation and interaction among a university’s stakeholders that might yield additional avenues of development for the university. Second, HEIs should embrace an air of individualism and support individual
researchers and collective groups of researchers, as opposed to focusing too much attention on institution-wide policies and strategies or centralised activities that standardise what its constituents can and must do internationally.

In supporting these two arguments I would like to make four central and interrelated propositions that are supported by the evidence presented throughout this study. These four propositions are where I believe my study challenges some existing notions of internationalisation of HE and where the study provides new intellectual insights that advance theories of internationalisation of HE.

First, given that internationalisation is a central ambition at UP, I give some credit to the ad hoc and individual-based nature of UP’s internationalisation and view it as a strength that indeed allows UP to address the dual development challenge. I believe that the contradictions and contestations found in its internationalisation process (as outlined in Chapter 7.2.1 and 7.2.3) provide some of the fuel by which it is able to internationalise and pursue a developmental settlement and do not believe that these contestations and contradictions hinder its internationalisation completely. As such, an embracing of the contestations and contradictions within an HEI’s internationalisation efforts might perhaps allow the institution space to debate and consider ways to allow its constituents to assist it to internationalise in ways that contribute to both national and global developmental imperatives.

Second, I suggest that it may not be wise for an HEI to over ambitiously seek standardised and closely managed internationalisation at the expense of its individual agents (i.e. not paying sufficient attention to its people and departments). This leads to the third proposition that I would like to make here, which is that it is through the research activities of individual agents that a university may be able to address explicitly or implicitly (by trying or not trying) national, regional and global development imperatives. This could be through globally funded research, national researchers participating in international research, local (university) researchers and local postgraduate students participating in and benefiting from research.

From this third proposition comes the fourth, which is that it is through the collective action of these individual agents at UP that the university is able to appropriate time, energy and support toward addressing national, regional and global developmental imperatives, while also strengthening institutional capacity and stature (a national development imperative). As such, “individual internationalisation”, particularly of the mindsets of individuals within an
HEI, is as important, if not more so, than standardising and tightly managing the international activities and actions of institutional constituents. This is because it is the actions of individuals that lead to collective individualism, and thus to collective internationalisation on an HEI campus.

As such, individualism and a focus on “the individual” is not a bad thing as UP pursues its internationalisation ambitions, and particularly the international research and collaborative elements of that internationalisation. I thus conclude that it is the focus and attention given to individual researchers and collective groups of individual researchers that are producing the results that UP wants from its internationalisation. As it does this, the capacity of the individual researchers involved improves, as does the capacity of the department or faculty to which the person belongs, and, ultimately, the capacity of the overall institution. In essence then, what this perhaps signifies for other HEIs is that attempts at comprehensive internationalisation are futile, if attention and support are not given to individuals and collective groups of individuals in the institution.

Additionally, with regard to individual research agents, their individually led local research can, and often does, have local, national, regional and global impacts. The motivation can be global, but the results and impacts can be national (or vice versa). The desired results can be national, but the means to achieving them can be global (or vice versa). It is these four propositions that I offer to the scholarly community and practitioners interested in internationalisation of HE and HE broadly.

7.4 Synopsis: An understanding and way forward

In moving toward a conclusion, my argument is that the ambition of internationalisation at UP has been institutionalised and is comprehensive, but those internationalisation ambitions are slow to be realised. This can be seen by examining UP’s primary strategic internationalisation expressions – such as international research collaborations, networks and partnerships, faculty and researcher international mobility, and international postgraduate student mobility – which have not shown significant increases. However, even though the realisation of its internationalisation ambitions are lagging behind expectation, UP is responding to internationalisation given the dual development challenge. Its response consists of a communal ambition of seeking a developmental settlement via the adoption of an ambitious and enthusiastic international research agenda, which is impacting on its ability to address both national and global imperatives. The adoption of internationalisation and the
pursuit of the developmental settlement are both characterised by contradictions between principle and practice. Additionally, the pursuit of UP’s developmental settlement is primarily manifested in the support and faith in the abilities of individual researchers to develop international research collaborations. Those individually developed research collaborations then translate into outputs that benefit the university, the nation and the continent, and ultimately increase the university’s international profile and reputation.

In the light of UP’s responses to internationalisation and its pursuit of a developmental settlement, scholars and HEI practitioners, and particularly those interested in the internationalisation of HE, should note the role of individual agents in the internationalisation process. In noting this role, a reformulation of such notions as “comprehensive internationalisation” and “institutionalised internationalisation” must provide space for these individual agents. Although I am not advocating that there is something inherently wrong with centralising or centrally managing internationalisation at HEIs, I am suggesting that when seeking to internationalise within an environment where there are both national and global imperatives, the focus of that internationalisation might best be reserved for individual and collective individual agents. This is particularly the case when the chosen path is the pursuit of an international research agenda aimed at producing and contributing to knowledge production – as is the case in HEIs around the world, and particularly in the case of UP. Internationalisation via the support and activities of individual and collective individual agents is thus a primary facilitator of a university’s ability to address and contribute to both national and global developmental imperatives.