CHAPTER 4

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA: SOME PERSPECTIVE

The University of Pretoria has embarked upon a remarkable path of transformation. The journey is by no means complete but continuing and determined progress is being made. The university has transformed itself from a predominantly White Afrikaans university to a truly South African university in the sense that it is accessible to all South Africans, reflects the rich diversity of South African academic talent on its campuses, and supports and promotes national goals and priorities, including those of equity, access, equal opportunities, redress and diversity (UP, 2002b, p. 3).

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter I provide a historical and contemporary context in which to better understand the case study HEI (namely, UP) as I proceed toward analysing my research puzzle. Here, a presentation of UP in its historical context gives way to an exploration of specific manifestations of the institution's current transformational agenda which stems from that history. This is relevant to my study because, as will be seen, several aspects of UP's transformation agenda are tightly linked with (and even include) the central themes of my study, which is the internationalisation of HE.

4.1 UP past and present

UP is one of South Africa's 23 public universities. Originally part of the Transvaal Technical Institution in 1904, it became the Transvaal University College in 1906. The *Private Act on the University of Pretoria* (Act No. 13 of 1930) officially established UP as an independent university with the official opening date of the university following on 10 October 1930. During these early years, specifically in 1932, it was officially decided that the university should become a predominantly Afrikaans language medium institution, serving the needs of the Afrikaner community.[6] From this point until the early 1990s UP served almost exclusively as a home for educating the Afrikaner community. This translated directly into the demographics of students who were admitted to the university prior to 1990. Table 4, which presents data on the makeup of UP's student body from 1989 to 1993, shows the white population of UP at above 90%. This indicates that the university catered almost exclusively to a white population, and owing to its language policy of being an Afrikaans-medium university during this time, it can also be assumed that the majority of these white students

---

[6] Afrikaans is one of the 11 official languages of South Africa. It is a West Germanic language primarily spoken in South Africa and Namibia. The name *Afrikaans* comes from the Dutch word for "African". It was originally used by the Dutch settlers and indentured workers brought to the Cape area in southwestern South Africa by the Dutch East India Company in the 17th century. For a more thorough history on Afrikaans and Afrikaners, a useful resource is *The Mind of South Africa,* by Allister Sparks (1990).

were from the Afrikaner community. In keeping with and supporting this notion, one finds in UP's comprehensive history, *Ad Destinatum IV 1993–2000*, that:

> *At the beginning of the 1990s the general perception of the university, seen externally, was that it was an extremely conservative, mainly white and Afrikaans-medium institution, largely oriented toward tuition with less emphasis on research, fairly introverted and, in its community service, oriented mainly towards the needs of white and more specifically Afrikaans-speaking people. Seen internally, there was a large measure of self-satisfaction that the university's size in student numbers and sustained growth automatically presupposed a high academic status* (Van der Watt, 2002, p. 7).

As part of its early history, and keeping with its service of a predominantly Afrikaans clientele, UP's medium of instruction was Afrikaans. This policy of Afrikaans as the official language at UP continued until it came under review in 1997 when the university began the process of shifting to a joint medium of language (Afrikaans and English) for conducting business and for in-class instruction. The current language policy was approved by the Council of UP on 7 October 1997 as an interim language policy. It was revisited in February 2001, as a result of which the guideline document entitled *Medium of Instruction: Practical Implementation of Existing UP Language Policy* was approved at the Senate meeting of 17 July 2001. The policy was eventually reaffirmed as part of the *Statutes of the University of Pretoria*, which was published in *Government Gazette* 25852 on 24 December 2003, making it the official language policy of UP. This new language policy sets Afrikaans and English as the official languages of business and instruction at the university.

As Table 4 shows, UP accommodates over 38,000 residential students. In addition it recently had over 13,000 distance education students and over 16,000 participants in its non-subsidised continuing education programmes (UP, 2006c, p. 21). This means that more than 675,000 individuals are being educated and/or trained in some capacity annually by UP. Since its inception it has graduated over 160,000 students at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels (UP, 2002b, pp. 21–22). Given the number of residential students, the number of black students (over 13,700) and the number of students preferring Afrikaans as their medium of instruction (over 50% of its residential student population), UP is the largest residential university in South Africa as well as one of the largest black residential universities, and the largest residential Afrikaans university (with more courses being offered in Afrikaans than at any other university) in South Africa (UP, 2005, p. 19; UP, 2002b, p. 30). In addition to the domestic students, UP also accommodates approximately 2,241 international students as part of its student body (UP, 2006a, p. 5).

Year	Whites		Indians		Coloureds		Blacks*		
	Number	% of total	Number	% of total	Number	% of total	Number	% of total	Total students
1989	23 205	98.67	28	0.12	86	0.37	199	0.85	**23 518**
1990	22 905	98.21	33	0.14	92	0.39	293	1.26	**23 323**
1991	22 865	97.82	45	0.19	106	0.45	359	1.54	**23 375**
1992	22 607	96.71	59	0.25	132	0.56	577	2.47	**23 375**
1993	21 916	94.42	94	0.41	176	0.76	1023	4.41	**23 209**
1994	21 500	88.94	161	0.67	220	0.91	2293	9.49	**24 174**
1995	21 119	81.49	321	1.24	236	0.91	4239	16.36	**25 915**
1996	20 041	77.20	397	1.53	256	0.99	5266	20.29	**25 960**
1997	19 494	74.97	547	2.10	246	0.95	5717	21.99	**26 004**
1998	19 370	72.59	684	2.56	274	1.03	6356	23.82	**26 684**
1999	19 145	71.64	866	3.24	270	1.01	6442	24.11	**26 723**
2000	20 032	71.31	1031	3.67	325	1.16	6705	23.87	**28 093**
2001	20 862	68.92	1235	4.08	408	1.35	7767	25.66	**30 272**
2002	21 848	67.93	1395	4.34	472	1.47	8448	26.27	**32 163**
2003	22 464	65.69	1625	4.75	502	1.47	9605	28.09	**34 196**
2004	22 977	58.97	1683	4.32	589	1.51	13 714	35.20	**38 963**
2005	22 960	59.64	1708	4.44	646	1.68	13 185	34.25	**38 499**
2006	23 060	60.07	1684	4.39	684	1.78	12 961	33.76	**38 389**

Table 4: Total number of enrolments (contact) by population group from 1989 to 2006

* Listed as African in Van der Watt, 2002 and BINEB

Sources: UP, 1994 Annual Report, p. 6 (1989–94 stats); Van der Watt, 2002, p. 356 (1995– 96 stats); Office of (BINEB) (1997– 2006).

In 2005 UP awarded over 11,000 degrees and diplomas, which included 2,911 undergraduate diplomas, 188 postgraduate diplomas, 5,002 undergraduate degrees and 3,378 postgraduate degrees (UP, 2006a, p. 7). In addition, a total of 12,500 certificates were awarded by UP's Continuing Education department (ibid). Table 6 below shows the number of degrees and diplomas awarded from UP, broken down into its nine faculties.

Table 5: Number of contact students registered by faculty in 2006			
Faculty	**Undergraduate**	**Postgraduate**	**Total**
Humanities	3591	1264	4855
Natural and Agricultural Sciences	3438	1427	4865
Law	1539	315	1854
Theology	212	505	717
Economics and Management Sciences	6119	2056	8175
Veterinary Science	503	199	702
Education	2340	855	3195
Health Sciences	3296	1093	4389
Engineering, Built Environment and Information Technology	5 57	2443	7800
TOTAL	**26 395**	**10 157**	**36 355**

Source: Adapted from UP, 2006a, p. 5.

Table 6: Number of degrees and diplomas awarded by each faculty in 2005			
Faculty	**Undergraduate**	**Postgraduate**	**Total**
Humanities	781	416	1197
Natural and Agricultural Sciences	646	416	1062
Law	379	107	486
Theology	33	183	216
Economics and Management Sciences	1456	903	2359
Veterinary Science	126	41	167
Education	3134	627	3761
Health Sciences	551	225	776
Engineering, Built Environment and Information Technology	808	782	1590
TOTAL	**7914**	**3700**	**11 614**

Source: UP, 2006a, p. 5.

With respect to academics and research, UP houses nine faculties and two business schools in which there are approximately 132 departments and 43 centres and institutes. These together offer 371 undergraduate and 1,522 postgraduate study programmes (UP, 2006a, p. 4), which lead to over 1,804 approved academic qualifications (UP, 2005, p. 115). As of 2004 UP employed over 1,250 academic staff and 2,380 support staff (UP, 2002b). In 2005, compared with other South African universities, UP produced 12% of all bachelor's degrees, 13% of all

professional bachelor degrees, 16% of all masters degrees and 18% of all doctoral degrees in the country (UP, 2006a, p. 4). As a major research university, UP has significant research output that contributes to the solving of problems and addressing of social, political and economic issues in South Africa and abroad. As I will demonstrate and discuss shortly, this research output is of major importance to UP's ambitions as a university both domestically and internationally.

In terms of the governance, leadership and management of UP, the university follows the principle that "modern business principles should underpin the management practices of the university. They must be driven by a quest for innovation and a constant drive to be better, cheaper, and faster. There must be a sharp focus on increased efficiency, effectiveness and productivity in academic as well as the business function of the university" (UP, 2002b, p. 6). To this end, UP's governance structure currently includes its council, senate, faculty boards, institutional forum, executive management, senior management, and the Office of the Registrar. The highest in the governance structure is the UP Council, which comprises 30 members, 18 of which are external members (persons not employed by UP) and 12 of which are staff members and students of UP (UP, 2005a, p. 5). The UP Council is responsible for the overall corporate management and guidance of the institution. "This responsibility entails *inter alia* that the university should account for and report on all assets, liabilities, income, expenditure and other financial transactions on an ongoing basis" (UP, 2000, p. 6). The next governance artery is the Senate which is responsible for UP's focus on academic planning and for regulating the core business of teaching, research and community service at UP (UP, 2005a, p. 10). It comprises two categories of members: those who are members by virtue of their position at UP, which mainly include those holding various management positions; and appointed or elected members. Of the latter category, four are appointed by the Student Representative Council, two are employee representatives from the permanent academic staff, two are employee representatives from the permanent non-academic staff or support service staff, and two are representatives of other educational organisations (ibid). In addition, with the incorporation of the Vista University campus in Mamelodi, the Senate appointed two Mamelodi academic staff members as full members of the UP Senate in 2004 (ibid).

The faculty boards advise the UP Senate on issues of teaching, research and community service relevant to the respective UP faculties. They therefore serve as a place from which UP's basic academic programmes are developed (UP, 2005a, p. 10). The Institutional Forum

is an inclusive and representative structure that provides the UP Council with advice on HE policy and issues pertaining to employment, equity, mediation, procedures for the resolution of disputes and the fostering of a culture of tolerance and respect for basic human rights at UP (UP, 2005a, p. 10).

The senior management at UP comprises the academic deans, heads of departments, and those with similar status. Their responsibilities include the leadership and direction of their respective faculties and departments in accordance with UP's strategic guidelines, mission and vision.

The responsibilities of the Office of the Registrar, the final leg of UP's governance structure, include general institutional supervision with a view to compliance with the provisions of the *Higher Education Act, 101* of 1997.

The part of UP's governance structure most relevant to, and impacting upon, the central theme of this study, internationalisation, is UP's executive management. The executive management comprises ten individuals including the vice chancellor and principal, the vice principals, the executive directors, the registrar and the advisor to the principal. In the past the executive was made up of only white males, but currently there are two black males and one black female in the ranks of the UP executive management. The executive is charged with oversight, management and carrying out the strategic direction of the university, and in essence the day-to-day functioning and running of UP. As such, it is the governance body that mostly carries out the university's strategic objectives and activities, and the responsibilities of the various members of the executive are thus divided accordingly. In terms of the central theme of this study – internationalisation – the responsibility for the process at an institutional level falls mainly under the executive management, with the overall guidance and monitoring of it coming from one particular member of the executive.

When I began this study the member of the executive management who had been directly charged with overseeing UP's internationalisation process from a management and strategic perspective was an executive director, Prof. Sibusiso Vil-Nkomo. As executive director he was responsible for institutional advancement, which included fundraising, marketing, internationalisation and the NEPAD initiative. However, as alluded to earlier in this chapter, as of 2007, the internationalisation responsibilities shifted from the executive director to the vice principal in charge of overseeing UP's research activities, Prof. Robin Crewe. This move

to Prof. Crewe underscores the emphasis put on research by UP and signals the new emphasis of research on the majority of UP's activities, including its international activities (an issue which I will elaborate on shortly). However, even though Prof. Crewe is now charged with overseeing the internationalisation process, the entire executive shares the responsibility for how the process of internationalisation unfolds at UP, as each member is responsible for varying portfolios representing UP constituencies, which will ultimately impact on the grass roots expression of internationalisation at the university. As such, the role of the executive in driving UP's internationalisation process, as expressed to me by several members, is to set the broad agenda with respect to how the institution should engage with internationalisation via international linkages and international research.

In the governance structure of UP described above, the strategic management of the day-to-day activities of the university is primarily in the hands of the UP executive management, with the other organs playing guiding, oversight, advisory and/or support roles. Additionally, as of April 2007, there was a new head of the International Relations Office at UP, which was a position vacant for more than a year after the previous head's departure. The head is now called the director; however, given that there is a new person in this position as I was writing this dissertation, it is yet to be seen what type of influence, if any, the new director will have in UP's internationalisation efforts and/or if that person will lead the direction of UP's internationalisation or only carry out the mandates from the UP executive management. Thus, in its current state, internationalisation at UP is under the broad and direct authority of the executive, and they exercise tremendous authority with respect to the direction of the institution's overall internationalisation process.

4.2   UP's Faculty of Education

The Faculty of Education (EDU), one of the two faculties at UP that I engaged with for my study, claims the distinction of being the largest such faculty in South Africa (UP, 2006c and UP, 2005a). This claim is supported by its 13,000 plus registered contact and distance education students in 2005 (UP, 2006c). As Table 7 shows, the EDU faculty accommodated over 3,400 contact students in 2005. In addition, its distance education programmes educate close to 10,000 practicing educators (UP, 2006c, p. 42) from South Africa and other African countries.

The Faculty of EDU is led by a dean, who during most of my study was Prof. Jonathan Jansen.[7] In addition to providing overall leadership and guidance of the faculty, Prof. Jansen also served as a member of the UP Senate's representative on the UP Council and held other UP leadership positions. The faculty itself comprises two schools: the School of Teacher Training and the School of Education Studies (see Table 8). Within these two schools are four and three departments respectively. Each school is overseen by a chair and each department by an HOD. In addition, the faculty houses five research and development centres and/or institutes. A major distinction between the two schools in the faculty is that the School for Teacher Training serves mainly an undergraduate student population, while the School of Education Studies serves mainly the postgraduate student community (although there are undergraduates and postgraduates enrolled in both schools). This difference has a significant impact on the topic of this study (internationalisation) for reason which will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 7: Faculty of Education (contact) enrolments by race (2001–2005)											
YEAR		Black	% of total	Coloured	% of total	Indian	% of total	White	% of total		Total
2005											
	UG	1182	45.9	34	1.32	37	1.4	1320	51.3		2573
	PG	496	54.5	38	4.18	30	3.3	346	38.0		910
	Total	1678	48.2	72	2.07	67	1.9	1666	47.8		3483
2004											
	UG	1376	45.2	33	1.08	35	1.2	1598	52.5		3042
	PG	594	56.8	26	2.49	32	3.1	394	37.7		1046
	Total	1970	48.2	59	1.44	67	1.6	1992	48.7		4088
2003											
	UG	730	32.5	7	0.31	27	1.2	1482	66.0		2246
	PG	596	60.0	19	1.91	32	3.2	347	34.9		994
	Total	1326	40.9	26	0.80	59	1.8	1829	56.5		3240
2002											
	UG	747	34.0	10	0.45	18	0.8	1425	64.8		2200
	PG	553	58.6	15	1.59	32	3.4	344	36.4		944
	Total	1300	41.4	25	0.80	50	1.6	1769	56.3		3144
2001											
	UG	412	24.0	6	0.35	9	0.5	1291	75.2		1718
	PG	451	57.9	12	1.54	18	2.3	298	38.3		779
	Total	863	34.6	18	0.72	27	1.2	1589	63.6		2497

Source: UP, 2006c, p. 43; UP, 2005a, p. 42; UP, 2004a, p. 27

---

[7] Prof. Jansen resigned his post as dean as of April 2007 and an interim dean was appointed until the university completed its search for a permanent new dean.

Table 8: Faculty of Education's schools, departments, centres and institutes	
SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING **Departments:** • Science, Mathematics and Technology Education • Social Studies Education • Arts, Languages and Human Movement Studies in Education • Early Childhood Education	**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STUDIES** **Departments:** • Curriculum Studies • Education Management and Policy Studies • Educational Psychology
FACULTY-WIDE CENTRES, INSTITUTES AND UNITS • Centre for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) • Centre for Education Law and Policy (CELP) • Joint Centre for Maths, Science and Technology Education (JCMSTE) • International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) • Centre for Augmentative and Alternative Communication (CAAC) • Unit for Distance Education	

Source: Adapted from UP, 2006c, p. 41

As Table 6 shows (see earlier in this section), the Faculty of EDU also awarded the highest number of degrees (3,761) of any of UP's faculties in 2005. Part of this distinction of degrees awarded includes the fact that in 2004, it produced 27 doctoral graduates, which was the highest produced by a single faculty at UP in one academic year (UP, 2005a, p. 42). It also has become a significant contributor of research output. According to one UP document "published research outputs in scholarly journals increased yet again by a margin of 25% in one year (49 units) and by 78% (28 units) against the 2001 baseline" (UP, 2006c, p. 44). As such, the Faculty of EDU is one of the leading producers of both educators and education policy contributors in South Africa, as well as one of the major producers of new knowledge via educational research outputs throughout South Africa and beyond. However, as I will show later, the support for its research (and particularly international research activities) is not as strong as it is for the second faculty that my study uses as part of my case study.

4.3   UP's Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

The other faculty with which I engaged for this study was the Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (NAS). This faculty is also managed by a dean (Prof. Anton Ströh at the time of writing). It is managed according to a decentralised system, whereby the faculty is divided into four schools that house various departmental programmes and approximately 24 centres and institutes. Included in these are four inter-faculty centres/institutes (see Table 10)

that work with other faculties and departments at UP on various research and development issues.

In terms of its research, the Faculty of NAS boasts many researchers and scientists that have received high-level research recognition both nationally and internationally. Its significant interaction with research and new knowledge production – which is partially evident by the inclusion of many of the faculty's research work that is highlighted in UP's 2005 Research Report – makes it similar to that of the university as a whole as well as to the other faculty (Education) discussed in this chapter. As an example, of the 14 academics who received UP's Outstanding Academic Achievers Award, as reported in this Research Report, half (seven) were from the Faculty of NAS (UP, 2006b, p. 12).

Table 9: Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences enrolments by race (2003–2005)*

YEAR		Black	% of total	Coloured	% of total	Indian	% of total	White	% of total		Total
2005	UG	1328	35.85	34	0.92	151	4.08	2191	59.15		3704
	PG	479	35.25	22	1.62	48	3.53	810	59.60		1359
	Total	1807	35.69	56	1.11	199	3.93	3001	59.27		5063
2004	UG	1343	37.26	28	0.78	134	3.72	2099	58.24		3604
	PG	529	38.70	23	1.68	53	3.88	762	55.74		1367
	Total	1872	37.66	51	1.03	187	3.76	2861	57.55		4971
2003	UG	688	25.80	19	0.71	110	4.12	1850	69.37		2667
	PG	530	39.23	28	2.07	50	3.70	743	55.00		1351
	Total	1218	30.31	47	1.17	160	3.98	2593	64.53		4018

*It was my intention to include figures for 2002 and 2001 in this table for better comparison with the Faculty of Education figures presented in Table 8, however, the figures from those two years were conflicting in UP annual reviews from which this information was taken.
Source: UP, 2006c, p. 77; UP, 2005a, p. 84

Table 10: Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences' schools, departments, centres and institutes

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SCIENCES	SCHOOL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES	SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES
Departments: • Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development • Animal and Wildlife Science • Consumer Science • Food Science • Plant Production and Soil Science **Centres and institutes:** • Postgraduate School of Agricultural and Rural Development • Centre for Wildlife Management • South African Institute of Agricultural Extension • Hatfield Experimental Farm • Centre for Environmental Economics and Policy in Africa • Centre for Nutrition • SADCV Centre for Land Related, Regional and Development Policy	**Departments:** • Biochemistry • Botany • Genetics • Microbiology and Plant Pathology • Zoology and Entomology **Centres and institutes:** • African Vegetation Plant • Diversity Research Centre • Centre for Environmental Biology and Biological Control • Conservation Ecology Research Unit (CERU) • Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI) • Mammal Research Unit • Nitrogen Fixation Unit • Centre for Water Biotechnology • Bioinformatics Unit • African Centre for Gene Technology (ACGT) • Centre for Applied Mycological Studies • Centre for Environmental Studies (CFES)	**Departments:** • Insurance and Actuarial Science • Mathematics and Applied Mathematics • Statistics **Centres and institutes:** • STATOMET (Bureau of Statistical and Survey Methodology)	**Departments:** • Geology • Chemistry • Physics • Geography, Geoinformatics and Meteorology **Centres and institutes:** • Centre for Geoinformation Science • Centre for Research on Magmatic Ore Deposits • Institute for Applied Materials • Laboratory for Microscopy and Micro Analysis • Sci-enza • UP Foundation Year • Joint Centre for Science Mathematics and Technology Education

INTER-FACULTY CENTRES AND INSTITUTES (and faculties involved)*

- Centre for Nutrition (Faculties of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Health Sciences and Veterinary Sciences)
- Centre for Environmental Studies (Faculties of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Law, Humanities and Education)
- Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education (Faculties of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and Education)
- Centre for Wildlife Studies (Faculties of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Sciences)

* Some are a repeat of the centres associated with the various schools of this faculty as they are associated with specific schools within the faculty.

Source: UP, 2006c, p. 75

4.4   UP and the transformation agenda

Since 1994, the buzzword among South African institutions, including its universities, has been transformation. This is also the case for UP, which during the same period began a systematic process of transformation. This transformation is taking place as a result of the transformation which is occurring in the broader South African society, and also because of UP's desire to "address the real needs of the community by means of the graduates which it produces, the research it undertakes and the community service it renders" (UP, 1995, p. 4). According to its 2002–2006 Strategic Plan, UP's transformation is stated as follows:

> *The university's vision of becoming the premier national university has…driven it to transform from a historically predominantly white Afrikaans university to a truly South African university – truly South African in the sense that it is accessible to all South Africans, reflects diversity of South African academic talent on its campuses, and actively supports and promotes national goals and priorities, including those of equity, access, equal opportunities, redress, transformation and diversity* (UP, 2002b, p. 29).

As highlighted earlier in the chapter and supported by the above statement, UP's history follows a path of serving the Afrikaans community in South Africa almost exclusively. This catering to the Afrikaans community was reflected in its language policy, discussed earlier, as well as in the racial makeup of its student body, which was predominantly white (see Table 5 above) and Afrikaans speaking. During my field work, one UP executive member stated that:

> *…the history of this university* [was]…*white, male dominated, apartheid, right wing, and the only black people you saw here were the cleaners, and garden boys and messengers and things; the garden people, what we call garden boys. And now suddenly, we are in this era, the post-Mandela era, the post-apartheid era and our people have not forgotten, and neither have I forgotten. We've not forgotten. And, there is a serious wish in the university to address those deficiencies* (I: Mogotlane).

This statement epitomises the historical culture of UP as one that catered to a specific clientele and was directed by a specific group – white males, particularly Afrikaners – to the exclusion of a significant portion of the South African population, which consisted of black South Africans and other non-whites. These feelings are also supported by other members of the UP leadership and its constituents, illustrated by the following:

> *Coming back into the university as vice chancellor I was really amazed at how slow it was. Totally left off in a major way from the major realities in South Africa. And not connected with anything international at all. It was created by white Afrikaans-speaking people for themselves and for an apartheid state, cutting off what is happening in the rest of the country and living within themselves, and being the best, but really extremely outrageous* (I: Van Zyl).

Owing to these issues, one obvious and visible manifestation of UP's transformation agenda was the need for changing the demographic of the student body to reflect a "truly South African university". The university thus set about doing just that. For instance, in 1990 the total student population at UP was recorded at 23,323, of which 98.2% (22,904) were white students (Van der Watt, 2002, p. 8). However, these numbers and demographics of students have changed significantly since the early 1990s. During 2005, 38,499 residential students were registered for contact teaching at UP. This number included 28,252 undergraduate and 10,247 postgraduate students. It also included a gender composition comprising 47% male and 53% female students. Sixty per cent were white students and 40% black students. Regarding language preference, 60% of undergraduate and almost 70% of postgraduate students preferred to take their courses in English (http://www.up.ac.za/up/web/en/up/ about/ student_profile.html).

As has already been mentioned in this chapter, in addition to the over 36,000 residential students, UP also boasts an enrolment of over 10,000 distance education students – of whom 95% are black – who are mainly registered in the Faculty of EDU (ibid). In 2005 there were more than 2,200 international students on campus representing 60 countries, up from a reported more than 700 international students, as reported in the 1996 Annual Review (p. 13). More than 1,000 of these international students in 2005 came from SADC countries and approximately 500 were from other African countries (http://www.up.ac.za/up/web/en/up/ about/student_profile.html). This is a far cry from the demographic of students prior to 1994, as demonstrated earlier (see Table 5 above). This change in the types of students enrolled at UP is a significant manifestation of the university's transformation process.

UP's transformation agenda is also being undertaken by the two faculties of interest to my study – EDU and NAS. In terms of the changing demographic of students as a manifestation of transformation in the two faculties, tables 7 and 9 show that there have been increases in the real numbers as well as percentages of non-white contact students in both faculties at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This is because of the concerted effort on the part of both faculties to increase the diversity of their student population at these levels.

In addition to the manifestation of UP's (and the EDU and NAS faculties') transformation agenda discussed here – namely, the changing student demographics and the changing language policy – the transformation process also manifested itself in several other ways. These include the integration of facilities, staff diversity, development and labour relations,

cultural activities, community involvement, organisational culture and internationalisation (UP, 2002b, pp. 29–31). As the purpose of my study is not transformation itself, I will not discuss each of these varying manifestations of transformation at UP in any further detail, although those that have been highlighted in this chapter do help to provide a better historical picture of UP.[8] It is, however, also important to see the link between internationalisation of HE and HE transformation, given that the former is the central theme of this study. As demonstrated in Chapter 2.3, scholars (Enders, 2004; Johnston and Rowena, 2004) argue that internationalisation is an agent of and for HE transformation. This argument is supported in the case of UP, as internationalisation is a manifestation and method of addressing its transformation agenda.

In keeping with the above argument, three of the manifestations or imperatives of UP's transformation that its leadership and stakeholders seem to believe will transform it into the modern university that it seeks to be, are: its strategic motto of being an "internationally/ globally competitive and nationally/locally relevant" institution of HE; its new strategic vision of being an "internationally recognised research university"; and, finally, internationalisation. Each of these strategic drivers has played and will continue to play a part in UP's transformation agenda, as is obvious by their inclusion in the "Strategic Intent and Strategy Drivers" section (1.6) of UP's Strategic Plan (UP, 2002b, p. 27–36), as well as in UP's newest strategic plan (UP, 2007a). These strategic drivers are also tightly linked to one another and play a role in UP's following of a path of transformation that includes the internationalisation of the institution. I discuss the first of these two strategic drivers below and the third (internationalisation at UP specifically) in the chapter to follow.

4.5   Internationally competitive and nationally relevant

One of the primary areas of UP's transformational agenda that has bearing on this study is the university's strategic motto and vision of being a university that is "internationally/globally competitive and nationally/locally relevant". This strategic motto underpins UP's desire for international recognition, the achievement of international standards, and ensuring that its institutions and individuals are competitive with, and can integrate into, the rest of the world, while at the same time addressing the national and local community needs of its constituents and the broader South African society. Evidence of the importance of the motto to UP's strategic drive (and to South Africa in general), which also demonstrates its relationship to

---

[8] For more discussion on higher education transformation in South Africa refer to such readings at *Towards a New Higher Education Landscape,* a report of the Size and Shape Team, Council in Higher Education, 2000.

the transformation agenda, can be found in an open letter by Prof. Calie Pistorius, vice chancellor and principal of UP at the time of writing this study, who says:

> *The effect of the political transformation was not limited to the local level. The changed positioning of South Africa in the international community led to a normalized participation of South African universities in the international academic discourse. It is therefore understandable that the University during this time made concerted efforts to achieve two outcomes in all it endeavoured, namely being internationally competitive and remaining locally relevant* (Van der Watt, 2002, p. i).

Prof. Pistorius also tells us that:

> *The University's core business is its academic endeavours – excellent teaching and training of students and relevant research of the highest standards. The pursuit of excellence, quality, international competitiveness and local relevance is the prevailing hallmark of these primary tasks* (UP, 2002a, p. 5).

Further evidence of the importance of this strategic motto to UP's transformation agenda is found in the following statement:

> *The University of Pretoria's transformation process is an ongoing one, and spans a wide spectrum of aspects, which includes changing student and staff demographics, a changing organisational culture, the evolution of its language policy, equity and access, governance structures, as well as community engagement. Local relevance and international competitiveness play an important part in this process* (UP, 2005a, p. 12).

Finally, according to an earlier strategic document "the University of Pretoria strives to achieve its vision and mission within the context of international competitiveness and local relevance" (UP 1999, p. 1). On the very next page of the same review, Prof. Johan van Zyl, then serving as vice chancellor and principal, states that "to be internationally competitive and locally relevant will be the crux of the University of Pretoria's strategic focus and direction for the next few years" (ibid, p. 2).

All of these statements speak of the importance of these two strategic thrusts – international/global competitiveness and local/national relevance – to UP and specifically to its transformation agenda. However, what exactly do each of these two sides of UP's strategic vision mean for the university?

4.5.1 International/global competition and UP

In terms of international/global competitiveness from UP's perspective, its meaning to the university is best summed up in the following statement:

> *In order to survive and prosper it is necessary to be competitive, whether at national or institutional level. Many factors contribute towards the nation's competitiveness including the economy, government, infrastructure, the science and technology base and management ability as well as the "people" factor, where health and education are important issues…International competitiveness does not only imply that we must be able to compete with the world's best abroad – that too, of course – but it also implies that the world's best are coming into the country to compete with us right here. If we are to be competitive, we must be able to take on the world's best at any time and anywhere, whether inside South Africa or outside* (UP, 2002, p. 32–33).

UP's need to be internationally/globally competitive cuts across its various disciplines and activities within the university. It is such that the university attempts to ensure that its faculties, staff and students are abreast of international issues and can contribute to the global production of new knowledge, which they seek to do primarily through research (which I discuss further in section 4.6). The need for this type of competitiveness can be seen in a statement made to me by one of UP's executive members:

> *…we are branding ourselves as an institution that has to be locally relevant and yet, internationally competitive. And when we say internationally competitive, we are saying that we need to be competitive so that we can be known for what we are doing best, and we need to attract some of the best people and attract some of the international resources because of our competitiveness. Now every university will tell you that that's what they want to do. I mean, that's what globalisation has done, and I think that it varies in the details (I: Vil-Nkomo).*

Regarding its students, international competitiveness can best be summed up with respect to UP's desire to produce "world-class" students. What this means is best captured in the following statement:

> *If we talk about being world class, or you say you want to produce world class people, how do you measure that? One way in which we could effectively measure that, is to determine what happens with our alumni in relation their jobs and how many end up working with top people around the globe and are viewed by such people as being world class* (I: Ströh).

International competitiveness from the UP perspective also includes the desire to be considered as one of the top HEIs in the world. This is specifically relevant in terms of the various international ranking systems that exist, such as Shanghai Tao Jiang University's Top 500 World Universities ranking. In terms of this specific ranking system, several members of the executive expressed to me that UP hopes to enter the top 100 universities as well as to move up in the ranking in other systems that rank global universities. For instance:

> *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 designed 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…And we're trying toward that end, we're trying to focus very much and encourage very much and attract funds for research. And we're trying to encourage EVERYBODY here to do research and to be rated in research and to travel. To interact with lots and lots of people on the international stage* (I: Mogotlane).

Owing to this evidence, international competitiveness at UP takes the form of the desire of the university to be seen as one of the top university's in the world, where it will attract the top personnel, researchers and students, and contribute to knowledge production. As an earlier quote states, the desire to be internationally competitive in this nature is not unique to UP, as most universities around the world have similar visions. However, the variation that differentiates UP from other universities is in the details of how it chooses to pursue this international competitiveness. I will discuss my findings concerning this pursuit of international competitiveness (through UP's various international activities and particularly international research activities, as noted in the quote immediately above) in greater detail shortly. For now, I turn to a discussion of the other side of this strategic coin, which is UP's desire to be a nationally/locally relevant university.

4.5.2   National/local relevance and UP

In conceptualising national/local relevance and national/local needs, my study utilises "national" to refer to both national and local. This is done for two primary reasons. First, due to the use of the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter 3 which will be used to analyse and understand my data, as I have already explained, "local" in terms of how it is used for that framework refers to the case study HEIs, in this case UP. In order to avoid confusion between local utilised in this sense (as an HEI and its functioning parts) and local in terms of its traditionally thought of reference to localities, municipalities, communities, provinces, etc., I place the latter in South Africa within their national context.

Second, in South Africa, given the structure of its government, the national policies and priorities are the guidelines from which all community (i.e. local and provincial) policies flow. This is unlike a country such as the US, where a federalist system is in place. Each of the 50 US states determines its individual policies, and there are 50 state constitutions drawn up by each individual state. In South Africa, provinces and municipalities depend on the national government for much of their policy guidance and direction, and must adhere to those policies of the national government.

Given these two primary reasons with regard to the use of the term "local", I will utilise the term "national" to signify both national and local when referring to the relevance, transformational and developmental needs and priorities of South Africa. In addition, when quoting documents and individuals that state "local relevance", "local priorities", "local needs", etc., unless that individual or document specifically differentiates national and local, their statements will be understood and utilised by me in this study in the same context as "national relevance", "national priorities" and "national needs".

Thus, having established that in this study "national" and "local" needs of South Africa are equated to one another, in terms of what South Africa's national needs are, and specifically how they are viewed by UP, one finds that:

> *Important national issues that need to be addressed include rural and economic development, crime prevention, job creation and urban renewal. The provision of housing, telecommunications and other infrastructure is important, and combating poverty is a high priority. The country faces many challenges with regard to 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 of equity, access, redress and diversity. South Africa faces many challenges with regard to its international competitiveness…Still, there can be few national needs with as high a priority as that of education, be it at the primary, secondary or tertiary level* (UP, 2002, p. 15).

The document also explains that UP is nationally relevant through:

> *…its contributions to the prosperity, competitiveness and quality of life in South Africa, and its active and constructive involvement in community development and service. The University must necessarily be sensitive to national needs and the societal contexts of the country as well as the demands of the time* (ibid, p. 2).

What these quotes say about UP's role in national and local developmental issues is quite important. They tell us that even given the previous section's discussion that UP wants to be globally competitive, its leadership and constituency recognises that there are specific issues of national development that must also be addressed, and that UP has a role to play in addressing them.

However, even given the evidence presented in this section and the previous one (4.5.1) that UP recognises that it must play a role in national development while also having a desire to be globally competitive, the question regarding how these two desires can be balanced (or if they even can be) still remains to be answered. But before exploring that question further I find it useful to link UP's strategic motto to what I have already described earlier as the "dual

development challenge". I will take up the question of how these priorities are mediated and with what motivations and meanings in Chapter 8.

4.6   An internationally recognised research university

The second aspect of UP's transformation agenda that is especially relevant to my study is its research agenda, which has led to a strong research ethos at the institution and within its functioning parts. As such, the university has made it a priority to become "an internationally recognised research university":

> *...the emphasis is very much on being internationally recognised and particularly in the field of research...The university has come through various phases...previously the university was very much a regional university, serving mainly the Afrikaans-speaking population in this area. And it's moved over the last couple of years to being a research university in the first place, and obviously serving the community much more broadly than it had done previously. And now the next step is getting international recognition. International recognition in academic spheres comes primarily through research activities and so that's where the emphasis is going to fall in the next period* (I: Melck).

In "selling" its research capacity, UP boasts that "the number of articles published in 2005 was 1,230. This is the highest output per annum ever recorded by the Department of Education for any university in South Africa" (UP, 2006C, p. 101). Although this is a significant achievement on the part of UP, the institution continues to have even higher research aspirations, which it hopes will lead it to its international recognition goals. These high research aspirations are evident on at least two fronts: first, the role of research in UP's strategic planning and initiatives; and second the funding put into research activities.

The role of research in UP's strategic planning as the first piece of evidence demonstrating the strong research ethos at the institution, can be seen in the attention given to it in UP's strategic planning and initiatives, particularly in its newest strategic plan (UP, 2007a). The plan itself is centred around the ideal that UP will be an "internationally recognised research university" and, as such, it dedicates a considerable amount of time and energy to explaining the rationales behind this dedication to research, which are tightly linked to national development issues. These national development rationales for a research focus are mainly summarised in the belief that new knowledge produced through research and development will lead to innovation and to social and economic development, which is needed for South Africa and within the so-called "developing world". In fact, UP believes that "the future of any country depends on its willingness to invest in basic scientific research as well as the people who dedicate their lives to the pursuit of knowledge" (UP, 2006b, p. 16).

In addition, UP links its research agenda to its role as a national contributor, and specifically to the new Accelerated Shared Growth Initiative – South Africa, which is an initiative of the South African government to halve poverty and unemployment in the country by the year 2014.[9] UP's new Strategic Plan states that:

> *...it is clear not only that the national scarcity of skills must be addressed, but also that the national effort with regard to research and development must be enhanced significantly The Gross Expenditure on Research and Development (GERD) must be increased in order to enhance the country's competitiveness. As the university in the country with the largest number of research outputs, the University of Pretoria has a major part to play in the national research effort. Within the context of its vision of becoming a world-class, research university, the University of Pretoria will develop and implement its strategic plan in the coming period to support these national imperatives* (UP, 2007a, p. 8).

This statement demonstrates that UP has chosen to focus its attention on research as its contribution to national development, continental development and the "greater good" of the developing world. This commitment to national development via the national imperatives of research and knowledge production are key aspects of UP's research agenda and contribute to its strong research ethos. In the next two chapters, I will offer more concrete examples of UP's research and its contribution to national development as well as its global contributions.

Another significant sign of UP's commitment to becoming a university with a heavy research focus is its financial commitments to research and development. For instance, UP operates with a research budget of about R300 million made available to its staff for research activities, and in 2005 UP spent approximately R18 million on upgrading its equipment and maintenance of its research infrastructure (UP, 2006c, p. 101). According to the same document, UP has "for the past ten years had the highest research output amongst universities in the country as determined by the Department of Education's (DoE) subsidy for research publications" (UP, 2006b, p. 16). In continuing to support this commitment to research and research output, the postdoctoral programmes have received R3.4 million to support the participation of researchers from outside the university (many of whom are international) in research projects at the university (ibid). UP receives approximately R60 million from the South African Department of Education and more than R53 million from the National Research Foundation (ibid), which gets a significant amount of its funding from the South African Department of Science and Technology. These funds are utilised to further the

---

[9] More detailed information on this initiative can be found in the *Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative – South Africa (ASGI-SA), Summary Document*¸ Government Communications on behalf of The Presidency of the Republic of South Africa, March 2006. Available at: http://www.info.gov.za/asgisa/asgisa.htm.

university's research ambitions and to contribute to research projects and the development of individual researchers.

The attention given to research in the strategic planning process of UP, as well as the finances backing up this desire, demonstrate that UP places a high premium on its research production and output. This is because, as alluded to above, UP follows the premise that the future of the country (and even the region and the continent) depends heavily on its investment in basic scientific research, and the people who pursue this and other avenues of knowledge production. How this research orientation of UP relates to a study concerned with the process of internationalisation of HE, will be explored later in this study. What is important to note, though, is that increased emphasis on research has filtered throughout the institution and, as such, drives a significant amount of the university's actions relevant to my study, and serves as a significant portion of the university's financial well-being and stability.

As highlighted earlier in this chapter, UP is composed of nine academic faculties. The two faculties that I have chosen to utilise as part of my case study of the university, for reasons described in Chapter 3, are the Faculty of EDU and the Faculty of NAS. Both of these faculties seem to have bought in to and are contributing to the university's research ethos and thus its output. However, there are some differences between the two faculties in terms of research. These differences are mainly due to the perceptions that science and technology are the keys to national development, and thus government agencies and their subsidiaries are prioritising "hard" sciences. Education, on the other hand, does not receive the same policy attention and financial support as does the areas of science in the natural and agricultural sciences. This is despite the rhetoric surrounding education, which holds that there must be quality education for all citizens to help alleviate poverty, underdevelopment and so forth. Supporting this notion, one of UP's senior managers stated that:

> *At the moment, the majority of the attention has gone into the hard sciences as you call them. 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* [at UP] *also, so there is some emphasis given to those. But not exclusively* (I: Melck).

This is even recognised within the social sciences, as this statement by the dean of the Faculty of EDU indicates:

> *Yes, because somewhere in the logic of politicians, the discourse of science and technology is associated more strongly with national development and international competitiveness, than*

> *the discourse around the social sciences. So, people talk math, they talk science, they talk IT, that stuff, because they believe that their return on investment is much higher than if you talk philosophy, etc. Which, by the way I think is true. But the question is, what type of investments are we talking about? Are we simply talking about hard core economic investments? If so, then that might be true. But investment is a much broader concept and it also involves social development, citizenship, international justice, etc. And I think for that, you can't depend only on one side of the disciplinary spectrum* (I: Jansen).

In terms of specific differences between the two faculties, several examples concerning research were uncovered during the course of my study. One such example can be seen in the awarding of UP's internal awards to researchers.

While both the Faculty of NAS and the Faculty of EDU have received numerous awards and recognition for their research, individuals in the Faculty of NAS seem to have recently collected more such awards. For instance, of the 14 academics who received UP's Outstanding Academic Achievers Award, seven were from the Faculty of NAS while none were from the Faculty of EDU (UP, 2006b, p. 12). Likewise in 2004, of the 13 winners of the same award, five were from the Faculty of NAS and none from the Faculty of EDU (UP, 2005b, p. 8). In terms of the 2005 Established Researchers Award, of the nine Established Researchers, four were from the Faculty of NAS and only one from the Faculty of EDU (UP, 2006b).

Another area where there is an obvious difference between the two faculties in terms of research is in the rating of researchers by the National Research Foundation (NRF). The NRF rates researchers based on a peer review system whereby there are six categories of ratings (A, B, C, P, Y, L), which ratings committees use to assess the person applying for rating among his/her peers. These ratings are used for several things, including funding allocated by the NRF to researchers, promotions and the standing of researchers at their respective institutions and elsewhere. As such, a significant amount of stock is put into highly rated researchers. Many academics and researchers seek to be rated by the NRF and to gradually improve their rating, as it says a great deal about the respect and standing they have within their respective research fields.[10] UP researchers are no different. In 2005, of the 175 UP researchers that were rated by the NRF, 87 were from the Faculty of NAS and five from the Faculty of EDU.

---

[10] For more information and a description of the NRF rating system refer to http://www.nrf.ac.za/evaluation/.

None of this comparison and contrasting between the two faculties is to suggest that the Faculty of EDU is not involved in research at the same level as the Faculty of NAS. I do agree, however, with the comments above that a premium (whether internally or externally) is placed on research in the natural and hard sciences. As such, the type of research being done in the Faculty of NAS seems to overshadow the social science research being done in the Faculty of EDU. However, even given these stark differences between research indicators at the two faculties, there are common factors between them that relate to research.

Although I quoted quantities of research awards and award winners in the two faculties as being skewed somewhat toward the Faculty of NAS, the Faculty of EDU has also collected its share of international and national awards with regard to research. Several members of both faculties have received prestigious international awards and prizes, such as the BMW Group Award for Intercultural Learning (a member of the Faculty of EDU staff), and the Fulbright New Century Scholarship Programme (another member of the Faculty of EDU staff). The receiving of such prestigious awards, fellowships and scholarships by members of both faculties speaks to their commonality in terms of a drive toward excellence, specifically in research.

Likewise, both faculties are keen on research as a means of contributing to national development in South Africa as well as to the university being an "internationally recognised research university". Both faculties also have strong leadership with extensive research credentials themselves, as well as with strong international backgrounds and connections that assist their respective faculties' international profiles and national contributions[11] (evidence of which I will present in subsequent chapters). The importance given to research can also be seen in the fact that of the eight Established Researchers in the 2004 Research Report, three were from the Faculty of NAS and three from the Faculty of EDU (UP, 2005b, p. 5).

Finally, to demonstrate some areas of commonality between the two faculties one can look at the establishment of the Joint Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, which has been involved in a number of outreach, research and community projects between the Faculty of EDU and the Faculty of NAS. In addition, as I will demonstrate later in this

---

[11] A review of the curriculum vitas of both deans (Prof. Ströh and Prof. Jansen) will support the claims that I am making here with regard to their research credentials as well as their international involvements. In addition, in support of my claim here that both faculties are making progress in the areas of global competitiveness and national development (i.e. making a national contribution), evidence is presented in subsequent chapters and particularly in Chapters 5 and 6.

study, both faculties seem to be engaging with international activities for similar reasons (intimately tied to research), which is another area where they have similarities.

In the light of these differences and similarities between the NAS and EDU faculties, the most significant commonality is the importance placed on research by both. Regarding research as a prime motivator and in further demonstrating its importance to the Faculty of NAS, its dean stated that:

> *It is very important that partnerships shouldn't just be relationships on paper. It should be a relationship where there are active research activities…and our faculty is known for being very strong in this regard* (I: Ströh).

One of the HODs in the Faculty of NAS seconds this notion of the importance of research. When we discussed the significance of his department's slogan "simply the best", he clearly stated that one of the measurements of successfully being "simply the best" is research productivity:

> *… if you are simply the best you must be world class. It's equivalent…what I have done is I have identified the areas of huge potential, and I said, why don't we strive to become simply the best initially in the country and then possibly internationally. Now, how do you measure this? It's very simple, you measure this by your output, not what you put in. And what are the outputs? There are two outputs in principle, significant outputs. There is the published work in the various journals and the graduates. So this is what we try to do. We want to increase our research productivity and increase the number of students and graduates* (I: Cukrowski).

The commitment of the Faculty of EDU to research can be seen in this abstraction from the dean's message in the 2005 Research Report (UP, 2006b):

> *In 2005 the Faculty of Education firmly established itself as the leading facility for educational research and scholarship in South Africa. First, published research outputs in scholarly journals increased yet again by a margin of 25% in one year (49 units) and by 76% (28 units) against the 2001 baseline. Second, a record number of scholarly books appeared, produced by both international and national publishing houses. Third, a record income of external research funding from international sources was secured in partnership with institutions such as Yale University…Fourth, the number of competitive grants won by postgraduate students increased sharply…Fifth, leading academics in the faculty won major research awards…The establishment of such a highly productive research culture was achieved by recruiting some of the most talented young scholars in education from around the world, by investing major funds in the development of new academics, by focusing research support on four high priority areas, and by setting high and uncompromising standards for performance for every scholar in the Faculty of Education* (p. 97).

In further support of the Faculty of EDU's strong stance on research, the faculty's acting dean, during my interview with her, 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 on research and knowledge creation...* (I: Eloff).

As can be seen, both faculties clearly possess a desire, in line with the university's broader objectives and desires, to continually increase research capacity and research output. There is a belief that research is the path toward reaching the country's and the university's developmental goals. It is this desire to be an "internationally recognised research university" that drives both the university and its faculties, and leads them to engage in various international activities. These international activities are primarily on an individual agency basis, but also occur institutionally, and take on various expressions ranging from individual researchers travelling abroad to international organisational collaborations. It seems that all of the international activities that are being emphasised at UP are designed to strengthen and further UP's research agenda, and I will speak further on these expressions of UP's internationalisation in the next chapter.

4.7   Synthesis

What is important to note from this chapter is that UP, and its functional parts such as its faculties, are engaged in an ongoing process of transformation that is also related to transformation in the broader context of the country. This transformation, as has been discussed above, has characteristics unique to South Africa as a result of its recent apartheid past. UP's response to this transformation agenda is to try and create an environment where its researchers, students and the institution itself will become internationally recognised (and thus competitive), while also contributing to continental and national development. The method that UP has chosen to pursue this international recognition and continental and national development is through a focus on research and research output, which would increase its international renown and at the same time address its, and the country's, transformational needs.

Although I have not analysed all of the various manifestations and imperatives of this transformation in South Africa and more specifically at UP, I said at the outset of this chapter that three particular manifestations of its transformation agenda relate directly to the central theme of this study. In this chapter, I have discussed only two of these manifestations of UP's transformation agenda, namely its strategic drive to be "internationally competitive and nationally relevant" and its newest strategic drive to be an "internationally recognised research university".

It is crucial to understand that in pursuing its transformation agenda in terms of the manifestations discussed herein, UP and its researchers are actively engaging in international activities that are designed not only to strengthen the university itself, but also to have global, continental and national impacts via capacity building, training and knowledge production. As the primary motivations behind UP's internationalisation, these ambitions are explored in greater depth in the next two chapters. The chapters expand on the third manifestation of UP's transformational agenda, which is central to my study – namely, internationalisation – through a presentation of my findings on the rationales for UP's internationalisation, followed by data on the expressions of this internationalisation imperative at UP.