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Abstract

Since its founding in the Middle Ages, the university has become one of the greatest world institutions and its missions have evolved. Whereas the earliest medieval universities began as teaching-only institutions, the university has adopted two new missions—the generation of knowledge (research) and application of knowledge (Third Mission). Therefore, the university is widely expected to embrace three missions: teaching, research and the Third Mission. Notwithstanding the near universal acceptance of the three missions of the university, the first and second missions—teaching and research respectively—are more established, researched and understood than the Third Mission. In fact, teaching is still the central responsibility of the university and research has become a defining feature of top-tier universities. Nonetheless, the importance of the Third Mission is acknowledged by universities, governments, higher education agencies and so on. A review of the “Government White Paper on Education Policy Review Commission Report,” for example, shows that the Ugandan government expects all higher education institutions to engage with, and provide outreach services to, external communities. Likewise, a review of the mission statements of Ugandan universities shows that besides teaching and research, the universities aspire to engage with external communities and to contribute to the socioeconomic transformation of society. However, such declarations and aspirations reveal less about the state of the Third Mission at the universities; accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine the institutionalisation of the Third Mission at universities in Uganda.

To carry out this study, the researcher utilised a qualitative case study approach and purposively selected a single case (university)—Makerere University—that explicitly acknowledges the Third Mission as one of its core function. The researcher generated data through (1) reviews of government and institutional documents and (2) qualitative semi-structured face-to-face interviews with 24 key informants—22 academic and administrative staff at Makerere University, 1 official from the Ministry of Education and Sports and 1 official from an organisation that works with public universities to link knowledge to its application within communities. The interviews were conducted in March and April of 2012. All the data were analysed and interpreted thematically, paying attention to issues that were raised in the literature and those that emerged from the data. The analysis focused on eight aspects of the university that are crucial to the institutionalisation of the
Third Mission: university mission, faculty hire and promotions practices, organisational structure, faculty involvement and commitment, student involvement, community involvement, campus publications and communication, and leadership and support.

The analysis reveals that Makerere University acknowledges the Third Mission as a core function, has organisational structures and personnel to coordinate Third Mission-related activities and has integrated some Third Mission-related activities into its academic programmes at the undergraduate level. The Third Mission is also widely accepted as a worthy function of the university and is rather integrated into the university’s budget, faculty recruitment and promotions policy and processes and faculty roles. The review also shows that the essence of the Third Mission at Makerere University is shifting from an outreach perspective—viewing the external communities as \textit{pockets of need}—to a bidirectional engagement perspective—recognising that the external communities have knowledge and other resources from which the university can benefit. Thus, although the Third Mission is not yet fully integrated into all the policies, programmes, actions and organisational structures at Makerere University, the university recognises the Third Mission as an integral aspect of its mission. It is imperative to note, however, that the Third Mission is vaguely defined, poorly evaluated and insufficiently funded and that many Third Mission-related activities and projects are largely unsupported, unrewarded, unrecorded and personal in nature.

\textit{Keywords:} Third Mission; institutionalisation; institutional commitment; higher education; Uganda; Makerere University
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1 Introduction

1.1 Research background

Since the establishment of the first university in Europe in the eleventh century, the university, as an institution, has evolved, and so has its missions. Although the earliest medieval universities, established mainly through religion, were intended to be teaching-only institutions that disseminated rather than advanced knowledge, the beginning of the nineteenth century—largely through the influence of the Humboldtian university ideal, which emphasised synergies between teaching and research—saw the emergence of the latter as a legitimate function of the university (Etzkowitz, 2003). Later, the enactment of the Morrill Act of 1862 in the United States of America (USA), which allowed for the creation of the land-grant institutions, broadened the functions of the university to include community outreach and engagement, herein termed the 'Third Mission' (TM), despite the fact that universities had historically been responsive (often indirectly) to their external communities (Boere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Duderstadt, 1999). The TM gained further prominence at the beginning of the twentieth century when six civic universities were established in six provincial cities in England—Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield (Vernon, 2009)—to promote scientific research, practical professional training, more open access and regional development universities (Barnes, 1996).

The importance of the TM was further echoed in the mid-twentieth century with calls upon African universities to serve as key instruments for national development (Ajayi, Goma, & Johnson, 1996; The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 1963). Thus, although colonial higher education institutions (HEIs) in Africa were largely oriented towards the culture of foreign peoples (UNESCO, 1963) and less towards the needs of their own countries (Ajayi et al., 1996), calls that African

---

1 Places for convenient interaction between the master and scholar (Clark, 1983; Perkins, 1972).
2 Universities and colleges founded to meet the explicit agricultural and later the industrial needs of their locales (Martin & Etzkowitz, 2000).
3 Because of their distinctive origins, locations and mission, these universities derived considerable sustenance from their localities, particularly industrial, commercial, professional and other civic bodies, and, in return, they offered technical and vocational training for the professional classes; developed disciplines relevant to their urban economic life; and offered advice, consultancy and other expert services to firms and local authorities (Vernon, 2009, p. 31).
universities should be relevant to the external communities became more pronounced as African countries attained and/or approached independence. Many African leaders and commentators criticised the colonial university colleges for their elitism, the narrowness of their curriculum and their separation from the wider community and, thus, sought to end the affiliation of the colleges with the metropolitan universities; widen access to higher education (HE); reform the curricula of HEIs and transform the HEIs into key instruments for national development (Ajayi et al., 1996, pp. 74–75). In his speech at the University of Ghana on 24 February 1963, President Kwame Nkrumah, for example, commented as follows:

The role of a university in a country like ours is to become the academic focus of national life, reflecting the social, economic, cultural and political aspirations of the people. It must kindle national interest in the youth and uplift our citizens and free them from ignorance, superstition and may I add, indolence. A university does not exist in a vacuum or in outer space. It exists in the context of a society, and it is there that it has its proper place. (Nkrumah, 1963.)

The developmental role of African HEIs was propounded explicitly at the 1962 UNESCO conference on the “Development of Higher Education in Africa” in Antananarivo, Madagascar. During the conference, it was agreed that HEIs in Africa had, until then, “paid greater attention to [their] standing in the eyes of foreigners” (Ajayi et al., 1996, p. 67) and, thus, that the African universities should adapt their teaching and research content towards African problems. In their activities, the universities were urged to desist from being detached from their external communities but rather to be “in close and constant touch with society, both through their extra-mural departments and through all those activities which can contribute towards preserving the African heritage” (UNESCO, 1963, p. 11). These ideas were reiterated at the 1972 Accra Workshop on “Creating the African University: Emerging Issues of the 1970s,” which urged African universities to incorporate the needs of the common person in Africa into their teaching and research activities (Ajayi et al., 1996). It was noted that the truly African university of the 1970s was one that drew “its inspiration from its environment; not a transplanted tree, but one growing from a seed that is planted and nurtured in the African soil” (Ajayi et al., 1996, p. 191).

The above discussion reveals that the idea that universities should advance the frontiers of knowledge through teaching and research, share knowledge with the surrounding communities and contribute to their social and economic development is not a novel one. The “Government White Paper on Education Policy Review Commission Report” (Republic of Uganda, 1992), for instance, states that the government expects universities and other HEIs to participate in grassroots-level development and provide consultancy and public lectures, among other services. Each HEI, the “White Paper” states, “should have carefully planned and coordinated public service programmes relevant to the needs

---

4 See http://nkrumahinfobank.org/article.php?id=507&c=46
of various organisations, ministries and parastatal bodies as well as of the private sector and the local communities, through extension activities beyond its campus” (Republic of Uganda, 1992, p. 110).

1.2 Statement of the problem

Even though the TM is not entirely a new theme in HE (Schuetze, 2010), universities across much of Africa have been more concerned with producing and disseminating knowledge for its own sake and less with addressing the pressing social and economic needs of their localities and the productive sector, such as industry and medium- and small-scale enterprises (Ssebuwufu, Ludwick, & Béland, 2012; Tagoe, 2012). However, there are growing calls upon HEIs to cease to behave like “castles without windows” (Kerr, 2001, p. 8); instead, they are expected to engage with, and respond to the urgent needs of, the external communities (UNESCO, 1998) lest they be “consigned to a sort of academic Jurassic Park—of great historic interest, fascinating places to visit, but increasingly irrelevant” (McDowell, 2003, p. 32).

Globally, calls for such interactions are increasingly evident in the scholarly literature, national policies and plans and the media. The “Government White Paper on the Report of the Visitation Committee to Public Universities in Uganda,” for example, urges Ugandan public universities to create strong partnerships with the public and private sectors through research and development, collaboration in capital-building projects and the sharing of facilities, among other activities, to promote national development (Republic of Uganda, 2008). Likewise, the National Science, Technology and Innovation Plan (2012/2013–2017/2018) emphasises that the existence of effective linkages in cooperative research and development activities among industries, academia and research institutions plays a critical role in enhancing development and the transfer of new technologies (Republic of Uganda, 2012b). Correspondingly, a report of the proceedings of the 2004 stakeholders’ consultative meeting at Makerere University (MUK) raises three pertinent questions: (a) Outside its lecture rooms, what does MUK do for national development? (b) What is MUK doing with Ugandan nationals in regard to nation building? (c) What is MUK doing with the government in regard to nation building? (MUK, 2004, p. 4).

In addition, a growing number of organisations and institutional networks that accentuate the importance of engagement and promote research about engagement between universities and the external communities, particularly regions, exists. Key examples are Engagement Australia,5 the African Institute for Capacity Development (AICAD)6 and the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM)7.

---

6 See http://www.aicad-taku.org/
7 See http://www.ruforum.org/
At the same time, HEIs in Africa are increasingly emphasising the importance of the TM (often referred to as outreach, community service, engagement, etc.) in campus mission statements, development plans and evaluation reports (Ntseane, 2012; Preece, Ntseane, Modise, & Osborne, 2012). A brief review of the mission statements of some Ugandan universities reveals that, besides teaching and research, the universities generally aspire to provide outreach for socioeconomic transformation and sustainable development—especially of the vulnerable, poor and marginalised groups—and to respond to national and global needs. The review also shows that the focus of the interactions between universities and the external communities is shifting from being mostly outreach in nature—treating external communities “as pockets of need, laboratories for experimentation, or passive recipients of expertise” (Tagoe, 2012, p. 179)—to the acceptance of some aspects of engagement. MUK, for example, states that the focus of its TM has shifted from extension and outreach to partnerships and networking, which is an acknowledgement that the external communities also have knowledge from which the university can learn (MUK, 2008a). Hence, although campus–community partnerships at HEIs in Uganda might not be as entrenched an activity as it is at American land-grant universities and European technical universities and polytechnic-type institutions (Benneworth, Conway, Charles, Humphrey, & Younger, 2009; Ssebuwufu et al., 2012), all Ugandan universities recognise—although for the most part implicitly—the importance of the TM. However, this is not an isolated case; globally, universities are increasingly redefining their roles (Rutten & Boekema, 2009)—making changes in teaching and research, acknowledging the TM as a core function and adopting hitherto ignored or unimagined TM activities—partly due to growing calls upon universities to serve as co-producers of knowledge.

Assertions by universities about the importance of the TM, however, could be misleading with regard to the commitment of the universities to the TM because, as Graham (2010) notes, “Carefully managed statements of commitment … do not necessarily tell us anything about institutions’ actual commitment” (p. 2). This is complicated by a shortage of research that systematically examines the status of the TM and the nature of TM activities at African universities. With the exception of a few case studies—for instance, the project “Implementing the Third Mission of Universities in Africa (ITMUA),”8—most studies on HE and development in Africa focus on mainstream teaching and research (Bloom et al., 2006). Much of the existing literature about the TM (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Inman & Schuetze, 2010; Percy et al., 2006) focuses on HEIs in the USA, Australia and Europe (Rutten & Boekema, 2009) and the findings thereof, despite their relevance, might differ from what pertains to African universities in general and Ugandan universities in particular. Last, as Gunasekara (2006) observes, some contemporary literature about the

---

8 A Pan-African action research study (2010–2011) funded by the Association of African Universities to explore the extent to which university community service missions were addressing, and could be developed to address, national priorities in relation to some of the Millennium Development Goals. The project focused on four HEIs—the Universities of Calabar (Nigeria), Botswana (Botswana), Malawi (Malawi) and Lesotho (Lesotho) (Preece et al., 2012b).
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TM takes the normative position that universities should share and/or develop knowledge with the external communities without examining what the universities are already doing and the challenges to the TM.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the institutionalisation of the TM at Ugandan universities. However, although all the universities somehow underscore the importance of the TM, it is only MUK which explicitly states that the TM—knowledge transfer, partnerships and networking—is its core function; accordingly, the study will focus on MUK only. Previous studies—for example, Bailey, Cloete and Punday, 2011; Cloete, Bailey, Bunting and Maassen, 2011; Nabudere, 2009; and Ssebuwufu et al. 2012—show that MUK carries out some TM-related activities. Accordingly, the researcher is interested in finding out not only whether the university engages with, and reaches out to, the external communities but also importantly about the main TM-related activities, the existence/absence of supportive institutions (policies, programmes, practices and structures), the (in)coherence of the institutions and the existing challenges to the TM at the university. Hence, the study will focus on the internal actors—essentially the staff—of the university. The study also focuses—although not entirely—on the 1980–2014 period.

1.4 Research questions

In relation to the above-mentioned purpose, the study is guided by two interrelated research questions, namely: (1) How has the Third Mission been institutionalised at Makerere University? (2) How committed is Makerere University to promoting the Third Mission? The first question addresses three interrelated issues: (a) the main TM activities carried out at MUK, (b) the rationales for the TM and (c) the approaches employed by the university to institutionalise the TM. The second question focuses on the institutional commitment of the university; it addresses two interrelated issues: the existence/absence of key organisational features, such as policies, structures and programmes, and the connectedness among the key organisational features as well as their alignment with the TM.

1.5 Significance of the study

This section addresses the expected contributions of the study. The study is expected to make academic and practical contributions to HE research. First, the study is projected to contribute to HE research on, and academic knowledge about, the institutionalisation of...
the TM by broadening the existing literature and analytical tools. Second, it is expected to provide useful suggestions for further research and deeper institutionalisation of the TM to HE researchers and leaders, respectively. Hence, although the study concerns a single university, its conclusions, recommendations and observations are expected to be rather useful for HE researchers and leaders from other HEIs (particularly Ugandan universities) because they are based on not only its findings, but also on the findings, recommendations and observations of prior studies.

1.6 Definition of selected terms

This section provides definitions of key terms to ensure consistency and understanding of the terms throughout the study. The definitions are largely based on the existing literature.

1.6.1 Community

The term ‘community’ is fundamentally a fluid concept that means different things to different people and situations and has various dimensions. For instance, to some people, it is a feeling; to some people, it is relationships; to some people, it is a place; and yet to other people, it is an institution (Committee on Community Engagement, 1997). The term ‘community’ can be used to define/denote a group of people who share all, or at least one, of the following characteristics: geographical boundaries; a sense of membership; culture and language; and common interests, norms, experiences, traditions, risks or conditions (Committee on Assuring the Health of the Public in the 21st Century, 2002). Yet again, it can be seen as a system composed of individual members and sectors that have a variety of different characteristics and interrelationships—for instance, schools, the transportation sector, economic entities and faith organisations, which are part of the general community system (Committee on Community Engagement, 1997).

In relation to HEIs, the term ‘community,’ then, denotes “a cluster of households or an entire region, as an organisation ranging from a provincial government department to an NGO, as a school, clinic, hospital, church or mosque or as a part of the university itself” (Hall, 2010, p. 23). Accordingly, HEIs have two types of communities: (a) internal communities, including staff, students and so forth, and (b) external communities, such as industry, local and central government agencies, schools, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), indigenous and ethnic communities and groups of local citizens with whom a university interacts (Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance, 2008). This study focuses on the external communities (close, distant, local and national) with which MUK collaborates.

---

* These are conceived in terms of geographic location (community of place), similar interest (community of practice) and affiliation or identity—for example, industry or sporting club (State of Victoria, 2008).
1.6.2 Outreach

The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (2008) defines outreach as “an organisation’s involvement with or influence in the community” (Oxford Reference Online). Referring to it as one of its principal missions, Auburn University (2011, 2010) describes outreach as the application of the university’s academic expertise for the direct benefit of audiences beyond the traditional campus setting through ways that support the university and unit missions. Likewise, Michigan State University (1993) states that when universities generate, transmit, apply and preserve knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences, they are doing university outreach. Outreach, then, denotes “a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research and service that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions” (Lynton, 1995, p. 19). It occurs when universities make their expertise available to respond to the pressing learning needs, problems or issues identified by local communities, citizens groups, business or industrial firms, schools, health organisations, non-profit organisations and so on (Michigan University, 1996).

Herein, the term ‘outreach’ denotes university activities that (a) are carried out purposely to benefit external communities; (b) utilise knowledge and other academic resources of universities; and (c) support university and unit missions. Although such activities vary from one university to another, they include technology transfer, technical assistance, policy analysis, programme evaluation, professional development, expert testimony and public information (Lynton, 1995, p. 17). Outreach activities, then, represent an ongoing relationship between universities and the larger society; take place in a variety of forms and places; and focus on generating, transmitting, applying and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of the external communities (Lynton, 1995). Although it is possible for HEIs to conceive outreach in terms of two-way flows of knowledge and other scholarly resources, the term often assumes a one-way flow of knowledge from HEIs to external communities.

1.6.3 Engagement

The term ‘engagement,’ the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance (2008) states, denotes partnerships that yield mutually beneficial outcomes. To the State of Victoria (2008), however, the concept represents a range of interactions, such as one-way communication or information delivery, consultation, public participation, collaboration in decision-making and empowered action in informal groups or formal partnerships. According to Holland (2001), the term ‘engagement’ in HE vocabulary has been used since 1994 to refer to and/or define (a) a variety of relationships between HEIs and communities and (b) institutional strategies intended to link the work of the academe with public action and societal priorities. Herein, the term ‘engagement’ denotes partnerships, communication and/or collaborations that are and/or should be mutually beneficial to the parties involved.
1.6.4 Community engagement

The State of Victoria (2008) defines community engagement as a planned process in which government agencies purposely work with identified groups of people, connected by geographic location, special interest, identity or affiliation, to address issues that affect their well-being. Such engagement can take many forms and involve activities such as informing the communities about the policy directions of government, consulting communities as part of a process to develop policy, collaborating with communities to articulate options and to provide recommendations and empowering communities to make decisions and to implement and manage change (State of Victoria, 2008). However, these activities are not exclusive to government and government agencies; they also mirror some forms of engagement between universities and external communities.

In HE, the term ‘community engagement’ refers to collaboration between HEIs and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). It embodies various ways in which HEIs connect and share their work with the public, which, when done well, engenders reciprocal learning through the sharing of knowledge and experiences and ultimately increases the relevance of HE to society (National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, 2013).

An engaged university, then, is one that is fully committed to direct, two-way interactions with the external communities through exploration, development, exchange and the application of knowledge, information and expertise for mutual benefit (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 2002; Holland, 2001). Such a university embraces partnerships in its teaching and research functions (Civic Engagement Task Force Report, 2002; Goddard, 2009; Kellogg Commission, 1999) and responds to community-identified needs, opportunities and goals in ways that support and correspond to its mission, academic strength, history, culture and values. Thus, although an engaged institution must “put its critical resources (knowledge and expertise) to work on the problems faced by the communities it serves” (Magrath, 1999, p. 5), an effectively engaged university provides educational services in partnership with the external communities.

Thus, unlike outreach, which emphasises a one-way process of transferring knowledge and technology (Kellogg Commission, 1999), engagement emphasises partnerships, reciprocity and commitment to sharing; it takes HEIs beyond simply addressing the communities of need (Preece, Biao, Nampota, & Raditloaneng 2012). In short, it recognises the idea that “the best organizations learn externally as well as internally ... [and that] to prosper, organizations must be actively plugged into their environments responding to and contributing to issues of the day” (Fullan, 1993, pp. 38–39).
1.7 Organisation of the dissertation

The dissertation is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 is the introductory chapter. It contains information about the research problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the significance of the study and the key terms. Chapter 2 is a review of (a) the key literature and concepts related to the TM—specifically the institutionalisation of, and the institutional commitment of universities to, the TM and (b) the framework that was used to analyse the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM. In Chapter 3, the researcher discusses the research methodology utilised in the study, the methods employed to generate data, the management and analysis of the data and the trustworthiness of the study. Chapter 4 is an overview of HE in Uganda, specifically the history, size, composition, aims and goals of HE and the financing and governance of HEIs. In Chapter 5, the researcher describes the case institution—MUK—and discusses the past and recent developments regarding the TM, the rationales for the TM and the main TM activities at the university. In Chapter 6, the researcher discusses the organisation of the TM at MUK, analyses the institutional commitment of the university to the TM and discusses the approaches utilised to institutionalise the TM, the benefits of the TM and the challenges to the further institutionalisation of the TM at the university. In Chapter 7, the researcher summarises the study and discusses the key observations, suggestions for the further institutionalisation of the TM, the contributions of the study, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.
Figure 1. Structure of the Dissertation
2 Literature and Analytical Framework

This chapter contains a review of the key literature on the TM—specifically, institutionalisation of the TM and institutional commitment to the TM—and discusses the analytical framework that was used to analyse the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM.

2.1 Historical background

Since the establishment of the first university in Europe in the eleventh century, universities have undertaken a number of essential roles and endured revolutions in the ways in which their roles are conceived; thus, they can be described as evolving institutions. This section briefly discusses the three functions of the university—teaching, research and the TM.

2.1.1 Teaching

The term ‘teaching,’ notwithstanding its defiance of strict definition, refers to the interaction of a student and a teacher over a subject (Davis, 1997) and has the aim of making student learning possible through attempts to alter students’ understanding to enable them to conceptualise phenomena and ideas in the way that scientists, mathematicians, historians, physicians, or other subject experts do (Ramsden, 1992). The principal elements of teaching, therefore, are the ways of transmitting certain desirable qualities of human character, as well as knowledge, to student(s) (Banner, 1997), who can be young or old, bright or below average intelligence and the teacher may not be physically present, as with televised or computer-assisted instruction (Davis, 1997).

When the search for knowledge moved from the monastery and the Church to secular institutions in the Middle Ages, the university came into being. The earliest medieval universities in Europe, established mainly through religion, were designed as teaching institutions to diffuse and extend, rather than to advance, knowledge, thus, creating some of the organisational features apparent in universities today (Clark, 1983; Perkins, 1972). Newman (1852) justified teaching as the sole function of the university and thus postulated that “a university should be a place of education, religion, the training of the
mind, and the development of the whole person” (Schuetze, 2010, p. 14). In his justification, Newman (1852) emphasised, “If its object were scientific and philosophical discovery, [then] I do not see why a university should have students” (as cited in Svaglic, 1966, p. xxxvii). Universities existed as teaching-only institutions until the mid-nineteenth century when a new university model, the research university, emerged. Teaching, nonetheless, still predominates in the work of every national system of HE (Clark, 1983) and has become more complex than ever before, ranging from general education for undergraduates to advanced doctoral instruction and supervision in the most specialized fields (Altbach, 2008). According to Gleeson (2010), “The most important measure of this mission is a steady flow of graduating students who have earned degrees in prescribed fields of civilized study” (p. 123).

2.1.2 Research

The term ‘research’ can be used to denote a “systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions” (Oxford Dictionaries Online). Likewise, it can be defined as “the systematic search for answers to certain questions, often using empirical evidence but also using logical arguments and reflection on social understandings ... [with the aim of] discovering facts, putting forward theories, increasing understanding, and/or changing practice” (A Dictionary of Education, 2009). Although the term ‘university’ has been used since medieval times to refer to institutions for the preservation and transmission of knowledge, the roots of the modern research university can be attributed to the founding of the University of Berlin in 1809 by von Humboldt. Humboldt, just like Newman, saw education as the principle mandate of a university, but unlike Newman, Humboldt emphasised unity between teaching and scientific research. Therefore, the Humboldtian university ideal, in contrast to Newman’s notion of a university, regards universities as both teaching and research institutions and university academics as teachers and scholars (Schuetze, 2010). According to Ben-David (1992),

The idea that research had to be an important part of higher education was the distinguishing characteristic of the nineteenth-century German university. From there the idea spread to other countries, and by the end of the nineteenth century it was accepted practically everywhere. (p. 93.)

In fact, it has become conventional wisdom that universities are teaching and research institutions (Martin & Etzkowitz, 2000) that produce not only graduates but also publications, patents, exhibits and performances, among other tangible products (Gleeson, 2010). This paradigmatic shift from a teaching-only to a teaching-and-research university is what Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt, and Terra (2000) term the “first academic revolution.” However, even before the nineteenth century, research was an ongoing activity within
universities though its goal was different. “Before the nineteenth century,” Perkins (1972) observed,

The primary rationale for scholarship or research was its impact on teaching. Private study, reflection, and writing were almost viewed as vital ingredients in preparing the teacher for his job—in keeping his mind sharp, his lectures fresh, his students intellectually alert. Scholarly effort outside the classroom was therefore considered a necessary adjunct to teaching. (p. 683.)

However, when research progressively entered the university, academics in many countries became committed to the discovery and creation of new bodies of knowledge (Clark, 1983), without regard to the impact of the new knowledge on teaching (Perkins, 1972). Research is currently a common feature and function of top-tier universities in almost all countries. It has gained increased prominence, especially as the single most important criterion in the evaluation and ranking of academics and institutions; the prestige of HEIs (including academic rewards for their academic staff) is defined largely by their research productivity (Altbach, 2008). However, as Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000) observe, the transition of a university from a teaching institution into one that combines teaching is still ongoing in many countries; “there is a tension between the two activities (teaching and research) but nonetheless they coexist in a more or less compatible relationship with each other” (p. 118).

Although the traditional European research university, typified by the Humboldtian model, saw no significant place for direct engagement, universities were, by implication, supposed to contribute to nation-building processes. For example, according to Benneworth et al. (2009), Emperor Frederick William III established the Humboldt University as part of the industrial competition with Britain and France to create technical knowledge embodied in students to propel Germany’s Industrial Revolution. According to Gleeson (2010), it is fair to say that, in most countries today, there is strong consensus about the centrality of teaching and research missions. Indeed, Gleeson (2010) notes,

The complex calculus of status within the vast network of colleges and universities throughout the world today is assessed mostly in reference to these two missions. Lofty status is reserved for those institutions that achieve high levels of performance in each mission, and that fuse the two missions together whenever possible. Education at the doctoral level is expected to achieve this goal. (pp. 123–124.)

2.1.3 Third Mission

Although the university was initially conceived as a teaching-only institution and later as a teaching and research institution, universities have, since the Humboldtian reforms in Germany and the rise of the land grant universities in the USA (Altbach, 2008), had a long history of working with government, industry and the wider society (Etzkowitz, 1998). Such interactions, and, thus, the involvement of universities in the environmental, social
and economic development and decision-making in the wider society, constitute the TM of universities. However, there is no single definition of the TM of universities (see Table 1 for some of the definitions). Molas-Gallart, Salter, Patel, Scott, and Duran (2002), for example, analyse the TM based on (a) physical facilities and knowledge capabilities—such as libraries, laboratories, teaching facilities and different forms of knowledge stock (e.g., patents, software and tacit knowledge and skills embodied in university researchers)—of universities and (b) university activities—research, teaching and communication. Accordingly, Molas-Gallart et al. (2002) developed 12 categories of TM activities, namely: technology commercialisation, entrepreneurial activities, advisory work and contracts, commercialisation of facilities, contract research, collaboration in academic research, staff flow, student placements, learning activities, curriculum alignment, social networking and non-academic dissemination (p. vi). TM activities, then, Molas-Gallart et al. (2002) observe, are “concerned with the generation, use, application and exploitation of knowledge and other university capabilities outside academic environments” (pp. iii–iv).

The basic understanding derived from Molas-Gallart et al.’s (2002) framework is that the TM is based on teaching and research missions and that it utilises the knowledge capabilities and physical facilities of universities to serve society. The framework also shows that the TM includes not only the commercialisation of academic knowledge, patenting and licensing and creation of spin-off companies but also the contributions of universities to policy-making and social and cultural life (see also Adamsone-Fiskovica et al., 2009; Ca, 2009; Gregersen et al., 2009; Krücken, Meier, & Müller, 2009; Montesinos, Carot, Martinez, & Mora, 2008; Schoen et al., 2006). Montesinos et al. (2008), for example, note that the TM comprises of three dimensions—the social third mission, enterprising third mission and innovative third mission. Thus, any approach to the TM that focuses solely on commercial activities is likely to (1) miss large and important parts of the picture (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002) and (2) cause universities to offer less value to society (Florida, 1999). Besides, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to defining the TM that applies to all countries, even countries with similar levels of development or sociocultural structures. Expectedly then, TM activities and policies range from Germany’s heavy emphasis on knowledge and technology transfer ... to the Latin American broader concept of extension of the university to serve community needs, [through] for example, activities in support of regional and national policy, in urban planning, [and] health services. (Göransson, Maharajh, & Schmoch, 2009, pp. 157–158).

10 Social third mission denotes services such as non-academic dissemination, contributions to public policy and cultural activities that universities offer to external communities with no cost or little cost to the final service user. Enterprising third mission involves activities such as consultancy, patent registration, commercialisation of intellectual property and lifelong learning activities through which HEIs try to diversify their revenues by providing services to society, industry and other institutions. Innovative third mission involves services, products or processes such as consulting for governments, joint ventures with industrial sectors and creation of companies for patent exploitation that research units transmit to society (Montesinos et al., 2008, pp. 262–263).
Institutionalisation of the ‘Third Mission’ of the University

Table 1. Selected Definitions of the Third Mission of Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asplund &amp; Nordman (1999)</td>
<td>A formal obligation to interact with surrounding society and economic life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca (2009)</td>
<td>Activities of the university (besides teaching and research) that try to reach out to society at large, via its provision of research, technology transfer services and other kinds of linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan (2012)</td>
<td>The economic use of research, knowledge, intellectual property rights, patents, spin-offs, technology transfer and, in a broader sense, everything in the direction of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleson (2010)</td>
<td>The mission to engage communities beyond the campus gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunasekara (2006)</td>
<td>The contribution of universities to regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göransson et al. (2009)</td>
<td>The relationship between higher education and society beyond the first and second missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin &amp; Etzkowitz (2000)</td>
<td>The function of contributing to the economy and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montesinos et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Services to society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predazzi (2012)</td>
<td>The mission of fostering dialogue between science and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raditloaneng (2013)</td>
<td>Community service and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoen et al. (2006)</td>
<td>A university’s relationship with the non-academic outside world—industry, public authorities and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore &amp; McLauchlan (2012)</td>
<td>Activities geared towards knowledge transfer, forging links with industry and commercialising university research and teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the author

Nonetheless, the heart of the TM in all HEIs should be the same as for any other part of the academy—to discover, develop, transfer and indeed to exchange and apply knowledge. Accordingly, the term TM, as used here, denotes “the institutional imperative of the university to engage in a variety of exchanges with non-academic domains” (Nedeva, 2008, p. 94). It includes intentional and direct creation, transfer, dissemination and utilisation of the knowledge and/or other academic competences of a university for the benefit of the external communities as well as the involvement of the external communities in the activities of a university through ways that promote the mission of that university. It denotes:

A meaningful and mutually beneficial collaboration [of HEIs] with partners in education, business, public and social service. It represents that aspect of teaching that enables learning beyond the campus walls; that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community; and that aspect of service that directly benefits the public. (Ray, 1999, p. 25.)

It embraces three broad categories of activities—technology transfer and innovation, continuing education (CE) and social engagement (Carot et al., 2012)—that deliberately “take resources and expertise [of a university] to off-campus locations and bring the public
or subsets of the public onto the campus” (Beere et al., 2011, p. 14). It recognises (1) that “the pursuit of knowledge is not fully realized unless it can contribute to productivity [that is, that] the responsibility of the scientist begins with discovery and ends with application” (Krimsky, 1988, p. 35) and (2) the importance of bidirectional relationships and interactions between HEIs and external communities (Roper & Hirth, 2005). Accordingly, the question is whether the TM is a new function of universities.

Is the Third Mission a new mission?

Although most universities have always served society through teaching and research, the TM is often considered a new function in which service to external communities is interpreted mostly in terms of greater direct contributions to economic development and the translation of research findings into intellectual property and marketable products (Etzkowitz, Webster, & Healey, 1998; Martinelli et al., 2008). For instance, whereas the Robbins Report on HE in the UK (1963) identified the transmission of a common culture and common standards citizenship as one of the objectives of university education, the Dearing Report (NCIHE, 1997) defined outreach mostly in terms of its economic utility (Macfarlane, 2005). Therefore, the emergence of the term TM reflects the condition of the world around us; society has never, until now, experienced such great a need for the rapid and effective application of knowledge (Gregersen et al., 2009). There is an increasing number of societal problems, which, despite HE alone being unable to address them, call for new modes of knowledge production and dissemination (Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott, & Trow, 1994) and a shift towards closer interaction between science, technology and society (Gregersen et al., 2009). As Wangenge-Ouma and Fongwa (2012) rightly observe, African universities have not escaped such demands. Thus, the TM has been conceptualised as follows:

- A shift in the modes of knowledge production (Gibbons et al., 1994);
- The emergence of the Triple Helix Model (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997);
- A change in the social contract between the state and the university (Duderstadt, 1999; Vavakova, 1998);
- A second academic revolution and the emergence of an entrepreneurial university (Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Etzkowitz, 2004);
- A natural evolution of the teaching role—enlargement of the target population and diversification of curricula to establish non-traditional relations with industry and national and international institutions—and integration of some developments of research output (Montesinos et al., 2008);
- The enterprise or entrepreneurial university (Vorley & Nelles, 2008).

However, what is unfortunate, as Nedeva (2008) observes, is that current debates about the TM are, to a degree, framed by an implicit assumption that the idea of universities contributing to the achievement of economic and societal gains is a relatively recent
phenomenon that has become prominent in the last two decades. The engagement of universities with non-academic domains, particularly industry, is not a new phenomenon; university functions have always evolved to incorporate new tasks. “For the best part of their history,” Nedeva (2008) notes, “universities have been sensitive to the needs of society and economy and even the more basic ‘understanding’ knowledge that they produce has often been informed by practical problems” (p. 92). In addition, as Kearney (1970) indicates, “The very emergence of the university as an institution can be seen as a response to societal needs and imperatives—on the one hand, the need for educated clerical intelligentsia, and on the other the need for educated state administrators” (as cited in Nedeva, 2008, p. 92).

Likewise, Mwiandi (2010) observes that African universities have also always been involved in activities for and with the non-academic public, and therefore, few of the current TM activities are necessarily new. For instance, even prior to independence, departments of extension (known as extramural studies)—offering leadership training for mid- and lower-level leadership—had already been established at university colleges11 in British-colonised African countries to help them prepare for independence. In addition, all postcolonial African universities “were expected to help the new nations build up their capacity to develop and manage their resources, alleviate the poverty of the majority of their people, and close the gap between them and the developed world” (Sawyerr, 2004, p. 4). Therefore, postcolonial African universities have always been considered a vital component of national development (Sawyerr, 2004), and in many ways, “service to the surrounding community and to society at large has been another of the founding mandates given to African universities” (Saint, 1992, p. 26).

The question, as already stated, is whether the current set of activities and interactions between universities and non-academic domains is indeed new. If we view the TM as a set of activities, then it is not necessarily a new function because “the story of the university is inextricably intertwined with the story of its [the university’s] responsiveness to society and economy” (Nedeva, 2008, p. 93). Martin and Etzkowitz (2000), for example, observe that although the links between universities and societal needs were much weaker between 1945 and the late 1980s, a large proportion of government funded research in the USA was funded by mission-oriented agencies such as the department of Defence. In addition, in the context of African universities, activities such as field-based learning and/or service learning—for example, the Ethiopian University service12—are not entirely new. What is new, however, is the re-framing of this set of activities as the Third Mission of the university

11 Such as Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone (1951); University of Cape Town, South Africa (1952); University of Botswana, Botswana (1971); University College, Ibadan, Nigeria (1949); Makerere College, Uganda (1953); University of Nairobi, Kenya (1957); and University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (1960) (Mwiandi, 2010; Nafukho, Amutabi, & Otunga, 2005; Preece et al., 2012a; Russell, 1964; Sicherman, 2005; Tagoe, 2012).

12 A one-year service programme launched by the Haile Selassie I University (now Addis Ababa University) in 1964 that required Ethiopian undergraduate and specialised diploma students to spend one year of service among rural communities. The programme was a requirement for graduation (Wole, 1999; Ajayi et al., 1996).
2.2 Justifications for the TM

Having defined the TM and discussed its history in Subsection 2.1.3, this section discusses the benefits of, the justifications for, and the conceptual explanations of the TM. Thus, the section is divided into three subsections: the benefits of the TM, the empirical justifications for the TM and the conceptual explanations of the TM.

2.2.1 Benefits of the TM

The TM represents a convergence of public interest and institutional self-interest and, therefore, offers benefits to both HEIs and external communities. A project or program implemented as part of a university-community partnership should produce direct benefits for the community. However, communities derive many additional and sometimes less obvious benefits from collaborating with a university—for example, access to trusted academic expertise and knowledge, as well as the physical, financial and human resources of universities to address educational, environmental and political needs. Others include access to new ideas and learning because of working with students and academics (Beere et al., 2011). In essence, the TM helps to address the knowledge and human capital needs of government, industry and society in general with the knowledge, human capital, intellectual property and infrastructural resources of universities. Therefore, although universities are “quite weak in most SSA [Sub Saharan Africa] countries, they are still often the only national institutions with the skills, equipment and mandate to generate new knowledge, and to adapt knowledge developed elsewhere to the local context” (Liang, 2004, p. vi). This is a prerequisite for innovation. However, knowledge creation and partnerships have not been fully embraced by most African universities; this is possibly due to insufficient linkages between national economic development objectives and education policies (Cloete et al., 2011; MUK, 2010).

However, universities are not just givers; they also benefit from the TM. The benefits are both direct and indirect and are felt at different levels of the institution and by different institutional actors—students, staff, departments, centres, etc.—depending on the activities and their implementation. Participation in TM activities helps HEIs to establish and/or to enhance partnerships with, for instance, local communities, regions, the business sector and government agencies, and ultimately to secure more legitimacy and support. Because universities receive a great deal of public financial support, directly or otherwise, politicians and other observers are challenging universities to provide a return on investment—that
is, to prove their openness, relevance and accountability to society (National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement, 2013).

Therefore, university-community partnerships, with their attendant recognition that universities are a source of usable knowledge, appeal strongly to public and private organisations, individual citizens and governments (Lynton, 1995) and thus help universities to mobilise political support and to create more revenue streams (Beere et al., 2011). Universities in the developing world that urgently need extra financial support have, for example, discovered that involvement in TM activities can enrich their image and augment their financial support through increased legislative support and appropriations, donor support and support from public and private entities (CERI, 1982; Beere et al., 2011). In addition, in view of the fact that universities, with rare exceptions, almost never move location once established (Dubb & Howard, 2007), the TM offers universities opportunities to utilise their resource potential to build durable partnerships with neighbourhood communities. Therefore, since, at times, such neighbourhoods are saddled with problems, universities that collaborate effectively with their locales help to create safer neighbourhoods that ultimately enable such universities to attract and retain high-quality academics and students (Beere et al., 2011).

Furthermore, universities that involve students in TM activities—for example, field attachment, service learning and community-based research—provide students with a socially committed education that enriches students’ learning and learning experiences (National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, 2013; Magrath, 1999). “The learning we saw in our service learning students,” Eyler and Giles (1999, p. xiv) note, “was deeper than merely acquiring and spitting back a series of facts about a subject; it engaged our students’ hearts as well as their heads and helped them understand the complexity of what they were studying” (as cited in Beere et al., 2011, p.28). Although not all students benefit to the same degree, the above example alone provides sufficient reason to integrate the TM into students’ learning activities. Other benefits that the TM offers to students include an increase in awareness about current societal issues and cultural diversities, the development of better networking skills, an increase in self-confidence and the enrichment of career readiness (Beere et al., 2011). Active involvement of the academic staff in TM activities also benefits teaching by enabling the academic staff to relate what they teach with societal issues, to keep course contents up to date and to energise and enrich their teaching. As the University of Illinois (2008) stresses:

Much as the research (scholarship) of individuals may positively serve their teaching and public service, so too their involvement in public service may positively serve the purposes of their research and teaching. … This interaction … can contribute significantly to the vitality of the institution, its colleges, units, and departments, as well as to the vitality of its individual faculty members. (p. 20.)
In addition, the TM offers opportunities for new teaching and learning pedagogies that help to improve the quality of teaching and learning and to create avenues for students and staff to test the utility of previous scholarship (Cushman, 1999) to enable them to understand the current meaning and value of disciplinary knowledge. Therefore, the pedagogic importance of the TM, as Lynton (1995) observes, is

Not limited to the education of practitioners. If students, especially at the undergraduate level—are not only to learn the content of the disciplines but to become aware, as well, of how the disciplines are applied in actual practice, then, it is essential that the faculty themselves be knowledgeable about the utilization of what they teach. (p. 13.)

In that case, TM activities, particularly collaborative research, contract research and consultancy, are beneficial to academic research in that they enable academics to access new targets of inquiry, research sites and research data that cannot otherwise be easily accessible; to undertake multidisciplinary research; and consequently to enrich the knowledge bases of academic disciplines (Beere et al., 2011; Lynton, 1995; Mayfield, 2001). Active involvement in TM activities also raises important and interesting questions that vitalise on-campus research and teaching and consequently stimulate the intellectual life of the whole university (Michigan State University, 1993). TM activities, then, offer universities opportunities for fresh insights and knowledge discovery, a confirmation that external communities also possess knowledge from which HEIs can benefit (MUK, 2008a). Active involvement in TM activities, then, can enable universities to not only further the interests of society but also attract support and financial resources to further the discovery, dissemination and application of knowledge (Magrath, 1999).

2.2.2 Empirical justifications for the TM

The TM is justified by various factors that range from the need for new knowledge and the need to integrate existing knowledge, contemporary views about knowledge, cost concerns and the need for accountability, to the need for political and financial support as the discussion below shows.

Need for knowledge and integration of existing knowledge
The need for new knowledge and the need to integrate existing knowledge reflect the need for HEIs to develop new knowledge and integrate existing knowledge to address various societal needs. Even in countries in which universities have always existed, in part, to serve the needs of society, HEIs are being called upon to reclaim their historical commitment to public service (Wade & Demb, 2009). Therefore, although it is true that HE alone cannot alleviate all societal problems, HEIs have vast knowledge, human capital and other
resources, which—when used in partnership with those of external communities—can significantly contribute to the extenuation of societal needs. As Bush (1945) noted:

Science, by itself, provides no panacea for individual, social, and economic ills. It can be effective in the national welfare only as a member of a team, whether the conditions be peace or war. But without scientific progress, no amount of achievement in other directions can insure our health, prosperity, and security as a nation in the modern world. (p. 11.)

The complexity of societal needs creates pressure upon HEIs to not only produce new knowledge but also to synthesise it to make it more useful. Whereas academic knowledge continues to grow, it is highly characterised by a high degree of specialisation in narrow disciplinary domains, yet “most of today’s ‘real world’ problems (e.g., poverty, health disparities, environmental decay) are complex and will be ameliorated only when substantial partnering occurs across university units and between universities and the communities they serve” (Aronson & Webster, 2007, p. 274). Thus, more than ever before, universities are expected to be the principal sources of new knowledge but are also expected to be active in interpreting and synthesising disparate research findings and concepts into perspectives that defy disciplinary confines and bring new meanings (Brazeau, 2003; Popovich & Abel, 2002). According to Lynton and Elman (1987):

To the public-at-large, access to vast amounts of undigested facts is of little value. Society already suffers from a glut of data, an overabundance of information, which is usually fragmentary and often inconsistent. For knowledge to be useful, the bits and pieces of information need to be aggregated and synthesised into more coherent ideas, with apparent contradictions explicated. (p. 25.)

To fulfil this role, however, requires HEIs to restructure not only their approach to teaching and research but also their approach to knowledge and how they produce knowledge.

Contemporary views about knowledge

A powerful driver of this work centres on the concept of knowledge—both its creation and its dissemination. Traditional views suggest that knowledge is created by the objective, analytical and experimental work of the scientist—one who is working away from the real world and detached from the application of his findings (Beere et al., 2011). This is considered rigorous science. Accordingly, the academe has historically disseminated knowledge through publications in academic journals and presentations at conferences and other academic forums. However, Shulman (1997) observes:

Although a significant portion of the knowledge base of a profession is generated by scholars in the academy, it is not professional knowledge unless and until it is enacted in the crucible of ‘the field.’ The field of practice is the place where professions do their work, and claims for knowledge must pass the ultimate test of value in practice. (p. 15.)
This reasoning can be interpreted as a reaction to the dominance of the positivist epistemology, which emphasises value neutrality and objectivity rather than effectiveness as the criteria for assessing knowledge and has therefore had the unintended consequence of “idealizing distance from rather than engagement with the value-laden problems of politics and society” (Barker, 2004, p. 125). Based on this perspective, the TM is both (a) a process through which HEIs can create knowledge in the context of partnership and application and (b) an indicator of the changing views about knowledge and the nature of knowledge production in HE.

In an influential analysis of the changing nature of knowledge production, Gibbons et al. (1994) argue that we are witnessing a shift from the Mode 1 form of knowledge production to the Mode 2 form of knowledge production. “For many,” Gibbons et al. (1994) argue, “Mode 1 is identical with what is meant by science. Its cognitive and social norms determine what shall count as significant problems, who shall be allowed to practice science and what constitutes good science” (p. 2). Mode 1, then, is characterised by (1) disciplinarity—that is, knowledge is produced primarily within individual disciplines, mainly in universities and other academic institutes; (2) problems are set and solved in contexts governed largely by the academic interests of specific communities; and (3) rather limited societal accountability (Gibbons et al., 1994; Martin & Etzkowitz, 2000). By contrast, Mode 2 is characterised by knowledge production in the context of application; multi-disciplinarity or trans-disciplinarity; heterogeneity and organizational diversity—that is, an increase in the number of sites and connections among the sites, of knowledge production; social accountability and reflexivity; and broad-based quality control processes (Gibbons et al., 1994, pp. 4–8). Nonetheless, Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000) observe, “The so-called Mode 2 is not new; it is the original format of science before its academic institutionalization in the 19th century” (p. 116). What we are witnessing now is an apparent realisation that scientific development contributes greatly to economic and social development and, hence, there is a need for close interaction between the sites where knowledge is produced and where it is utilised.

Although Mode 1 and Mode 2 are used to conceptualise changes in knowledge production and are, therefore, not mutually exclusive concepts, they are useful when analysing the nature of university-community interactions. As highlighted above, HEIs are not the only, but are among the various, sites for knowledge creation, and therefore, the TM offers universities an opportunity to develop knowledge in partnership with external communities—for instance, policy institutes, government agencies and industrial laboratories. Therefore, “the older linear view process [that is] connecting discoveries and inventions to the production process is displaced by a more interactive one” in which “technology transfer looks more like a soccer game in which the university is a member of

---

13 Characterised by networks and invisible colleges, connections between science and interests of society and scientists as engaged rather than isolated individuals (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000).
the term “technology interchange is deemed more appropriate a phrase than technology transfer” (Gibbons et al., 1994, p. 87).

Cost concerns and calls for accountability
In addition to the need for, and contemporary views about, knowledge, persistent increases in the cost of education have drawn scrutiny from governments and taxpayers who cannot understand what HEIs do with public money (Ward, 2003). Shrinkages in public funding for HE, especially in real terms, have compounded the situation by compelling HEIs to seek out private funds through tuition fee charges, user fee charges, consultation fees and external research grants, among other things. Consequently, universities, as major public institutions, are under pressure to justify their public service performance, their high tuition costs, their demand for public resources and their management of these resources (Melody, 1997). Cost concerns, however, often mask the real problem—the perception that universities are “aloof and out of touch, arrogant, and out of date” (Kellogg Commission, 1999, p. 20) and unresponsive to current problems. Although the allegations may not be entirely correct, much of the critical perception arises largely because the academe has, most often, tended to be internally focused and has consequently failed to adequately communicate what it does (Ajayi et al., 1996; Sicherman, 2006; Ward, 2003). Therefore, more than ever, HEIs are under pressure from students, governments, donors and society in general to be more accountable—to hold costs down, provide quality education, produce more graduates and contribute actively to the alleviation of societal ills (Beere et al., 2011; Wergin, 2006). In essence, HE seems to have lost its insularity, if it ever had it; it cannot be tolerated to function as a sanctuary.

Accordingly, the message, as Nyden (2003) observes, is clear—“simply educating future workers is not enough anymore” (p. 579). Consequently, some HEIs have adapted their curricula in different ways, including giving greater emphasis and visibility to university-community engagement through service learning and collaborative research not only to meet the educational interests and needs of various student groups but also to prepare students for a better future and build a strong sense of civic responsibility (Vidal, Nye, Walker, Manjarrez, & Romanik, 2002). It is worth noting that the demands for accountability and the concomitant changes in HEIs are not restricted to the global north; similar developments can be witnessed in Africa and at African universities. Modise (2005), for example, observes that African universities, especially in southern Africa, are creating new, and/or expanding the existing, professional training programmes at a time when “those same universities are under pressure from governments to justify expenditures in terms of enrolments and actual contributions to development and when the nature of social demand for human service professionals is itself [changing]” (as cited in Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012, p. 57).

In addition, there is concern, both inside and outside the academe, about the quality of university education and university graduates. Business leaders, for example, complain that today’s graduates do not possess adequate knowledge and skills to address existing problems
(Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012). Accordingly, some in HE advocate new pedagogies, such as service learning, field-based learning and collaborative research, which involve communities in students’ learning. Therefore, whereas the concerns, as argued above, emanate largely from external audiences, they have permeated the internal structures and operations of most universities. The TM, then, offers universities an opportunity to create new activities, collaborate with external communities (Mayfield, 2001) and, thus, justify their existence.

Need for political and financial support
Because universities, especially in the developing world, desperately need more financial support and are eager for new ways to attract public and private funding, they have discovered that greater university-community engagement can build such support (CERI, 1982). Therefore, although the TM can, in some countries, be attributed to explicit government policies, in others, it is more of a survival mechanism for universities to secure funding from non-governmental sources to compensate for declining or insufficient state allocations. In cases in which governments provide full or near-full financial support to HEIs, engagement only occurs as a matter of national or regional policy. In this context, HEIs are state creations and hence engage with their external communities mostly because national policies demand this. In his analysis of the exceptionalism of American higher education, Trow (1991) noted that besides its commitment to research and teaching,

American higher education has a broad commitment to service to almost any organised interest group that asks for it, and can pay for it. This is necessarily so since American colleges and universities are supported by the society broadly and not just by the state. ... By contrast, European universities [by then did not] ... have this same kind of general commitment to serve society; they are creatures of the state and do what the state asks them to do in return for full funding (or near it) by state agencies. (p. 163–164.)

Nevertheless, whether driven by internal institutional pressures or external institutional pressures, such as government policy, adopting the TM is then an important strategy by HEIs to attract private funds and to enhance “local goodwill and political support in competition for government funding” (Hölttä & Pullainen, 1996, p. 122). In a sense, the TM could be interpreted as an ideological weapon employed by HEIs to overcome opposition, to acquire legitimacy and allies and to garner resources from the environment (Scott, 1992).

Although the aforementioned issues are either new or have always dogged the academe, what is clear from the scholarly literature and popular commentary is that public endorsement of HE budgets and public confidence in the value of HEIs have waned (Coor, 1999; Ward, 2003). Therefore, the TM could be interpreted as (a) a demand that “our universities should be seen, felt and understood by the greater non-university community and that the universities themselves should see, feel and understand their communities”
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(Russell, 1963, p. 43) and (b) a means to create responsive HE systems. Accordingly, as Holland (2001) observes, the TM reflects institutional mechanisms by HEIs to address external and/or internal pressures, such as pressing regional or national social, economic, cultural, or political challenges; internal crises such as enrolment shifts or budgetary problems; and/or the need to transform teaching or research performance (Brukardt, Percy, & Zimpher, 2006). Responding to such calls, Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008) note, affects the ways in which universities justify their excellence and relevance, manage and control their internal operations and engage with their stakeholders. Nowadays, Jongbloed et al. (2008) observe:

Their [universities] corporate social responsibility extends beyond producing graduates and research outputs. It requires them to engage in public debates, to enter into close working relationships with private actors and to be part of multiple networks and alliances with multiple actors on various levels. (p. 321.)

However, this is not to imply that calls for universities to be responsive to societal needs is unprecedented; universities have always been expected to be relevant to the needs of the day. Ajayi et al. (1996), for instance, observe:

In the mid-19th century, in the transition from the slave trade to the imposition of colonial rule, those who were asking for an African University saw the mission of the university as the mental liberation of the African from the shackles that slavery and religious dogma had imposed. ... In the colonial period, they saw the mission of the university as the renaissance of Africa, emancipation from colonial rule and the establishment of African nations able to take their place in the ‘comity’ of civilised nations of the world. In the period of decolonisation, they saw the university as part of the efforts to bring the nation into being. (p. 187–188.)

The issue, then, as Boyer (1990) noted, is that the need for connecting the work of the academe to social and environmental challenges beyond the campus has never been greater. The educational and social issues confronting the academe have increased profoundly, and, therefore, there is a deepening conviction that the role of HE and the concerns of the professoriate must be redefined to reflect new realities.

2.2.3 Conceptualising the TM

Conceptually, the TM can be understood in terms of two notions—specifically, the scholarship of engagement and the entrepreneurial university. This subsection, therefore, discusses both concepts and utilises them to explain the TM.
The scholarship of engagement

The term ‘scholarship of engagement’ is a fairly new concept coined by Boyer (1996) to denote collaboration between academics and individuals outside the academy—knowledge professionals and the lay public (local, regional, national and global)—for the mutual exchange of knowledge and other resources (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2013). In proposing the concept; Boyer (1996) observed that, despite an expansive network of research universities, regional campuses and community colleges, American HEIs were suffering from a decline in public confidence and a feeling that they were no longer at the centre of the nation’s work. “Increasingly,” Boyer (1996) observed, “the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems” (p. 23). To regain public confidence, Boyer (1996) recommended that the academy should “become a vigorous partner in the search for answers to … [the] most pressing social, economic, and moral problems—and must reaffirm its historic commitment to [what he termed] the scholarship of engagement” (Boyer, 1996, pp. 18–19). The scholarship of engagement, then, reflects attempts to broaden and deepen the public aspect of the academic scholarship. It involves the creative ways in which scholars “communicate to public audiences, work for the public good, and most importantly, generate knowledge with public participation” (Barker, 2004, p. 123).

Earlier, in a Carnegie Foundation report, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, Boyer (1990) observed that, for HE to remain vital, the work of the professoriate should be redefined, and, thus, he proposed four general categories of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching. The scholarship of discovery, Boyer (1990) observes, “comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of research. … The scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university” (p. 17). It seeks to explore the unknown; typically exhibits dedication to free inquiry, disciplined investigation and pursuit of knowledge; and includes, but is not limited to, basic research (FHSU, 2008). Besides the scholarship of discovery, Boyer (1990) proposed the scholarship of integration, which underscores the need for scholars to give meaning to isolated facts, to make connections across disciplines and to produce data in ways that are clear even to non-specialists. The scholarship of integration, then, entails, but is not restricted to, the active involvement of academics from different disciplines in various applied and externally oriented professional activities and the scholarly efforts to interpret and/or synthesise different concepts and/or findings in ways that bring new meaning to existing facts (FHSU, 2008; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Popovich & Abel, 2002).

Whereas the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of integration of knowledge reflect the investigative and synthesising traditions of academic life, Boyer (1990) noted, “the third element, the application of knowledge, moves toward engagement as the scholar asks, (1) How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? (2) How
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The scholarship of application, then, encompasses scholarly activities that make existing knowledge/information accessible to the public and/or seek to draw upon existing academic knowledge to address societal needs (FHSU, 2008; Popovich & Abel, 2002). “By making knowledge useful,” Boyer (1996) observes, “we mean everything from building better bridges to building better lives, which involves not only the professional schools but the arts and sciences as well” (p. 28). Last is the scholarship of teaching, which Boyer (1996) terms, the scholarship of sharing knowledge. It involves the communication, transmission, transformation and extension of knowledge, including the results of other forms of scholarship, not only to one’s peers; but also to students in a way that enhances lifelong learning and promotes scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Nora, Pomeroy, Curry, Hill, Tibbs, & Wilson, 2000; Popovich & Abel, 2002).

How, then, does the scholarship of engagement differ from the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of sharing knowledge? Yes, it is true that the scholarship of engagement encompasses practices that cut across the discovery, integration, sharing and application of knowledge, which are activities that connect the rich academic resources of universities to pressing social, civic and ethical problems (Barker, 2004; Boyer, 1996). Ultimately, however, the scholarship of engagement means “creating a special climate in which the academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge ... the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us” (Boyer, 1996, p. 33). The scholarship of engagement, then, Barker (2004) observes:

Consists of (1) research, teaching, integration and application scholarship that (2) incorporate reciprocal practices of civic engagement into the production of knowledge. It tends to be used inclusively to describe a host of practices cutting across disciplinary boundaries and teaching, research, and outreach functions in which scholars communicate to and work both for and with communities. (p. 124.) Accordingly, Barker (2004) concludes that the scholarship of engagement constitutes a distinct, important and emergent movement in HE that serves to broaden and deepen connections between HEIs and the public, based on the notion the “the public can itself contribute to academic knowledge” (p. 127). For this reason, Barker (2004) offers five emergent approaches to the scholarship of engagement:

- Public scholarship—academic works that incorporate planned face-to-face practices, such as forums, to enhance scholarship and/or address broader issues;
- Participatory research—face-to-face collaboration with specific publics in the production of knowledge;
- Community partnerships—collaboration between scholars and intermediary public entities, such as public agencies, local schools and community organisations;
- Public information networks—organisation and provision of databases of public resources to solve certain problems; and
- Civic skills or civic literacy—communication with the public.
The entrepreneurial university

Although universities were initially founded as teaching-only institutions, they, in time, have assumed new functions, endured revolutions regarding the ways in which their roles are conceived, and must currently, attend to the diverse needs of their stakeholders and address various issues, both external and internal—for instance, the insufficiency of public funds and the internal changes in academia. Echoing the above concerns, Clark (1998a; 1998b) observes that universities around the world are under serious pressure to transform to address the numerous endless and enlarging streams of demands and expectations. Clark (1998b) outlines four such demands: (a) more and different types of students seeking access to HE and, therefore, an endless clientele that is entitled to various types of education, (b) the expectations by university graduates that university programmes should guarantee employability and career success, (c) the increase in, and diversification of, patrons’ expectations of HE and (d) the unprecedented growth of knowledge (Clark, 1998b, p. 6).

In the face of such demands and expectations, Clark (1998a) observes, universities are “pressured to change their curricula, alter their faculties, and modernize their increasingly expensive physical plant and equipment—and to do so more rapidly than ever” (p. xiii). The complexity and the sheer number of demands render traditional response mechanisms by HEIs inadequate; instead, they call for an entrepreneurial response, meaning that “in fast-moving times the prudent course of action [for universities] is to be out in front, shaping the impact of demands made upon them, steering instead of drifting” (Clark, 1998a, p. 5). This, as Glancey and McQuaid (2000, p. 159) note, may include “generating and acting on new ideas, or providing new services or ‘old’ services in a new way” and creating new organisational elements or ways of delivering services (Clark, 1998a; Glancey & McQuaid, 2000). Thus, the question is, what does the term ‘entrepreneurial university’ mean?

To understand the concept ‘entrepreneurial university,’ it is necessary to first understand the term ‘entrepreneurship.’ Entrepreneurship, as Low and MacMillan (1988, p. 140) observe, is “a multifaceted phenomenon that cuts across many disciplinary boundaries” and has been defined differently by different writers (Glancey & McQuaid, 2000). Cole (1968), for instance, defined entrepreneurship as a purposeful activity to initiate, maintain and develop a profit-oriented business. Contrastingly, Leibenstein (1978) argued that firms do not necessarily operate at the outer limit of their production function; therefore, entrepreneurship is the ability to work smarter and harder than your competitor (as cited in Low & MacMillan, 1988, p. 140) Hisrich and Peters (1998, p. 9), however, define entrepreneurship as “the process of creating something new with value by devoting the necessary time and effort, assuming accompanying financial, psychic, and social risks, and receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction and independence” (as cited in Glancey & McQuaid, 2000, p. 5). Although each of these definitions captures some aspect of entrepreneurship, none captures the full picture because, as Low and MacMillan (1988) note:
Entrepreneurship is intertwined with a complex set of contiguous and overlapping constructs such as management of change, innovation, technological and environmental turbulence, [and] new product development. ... Furthermore, the phenomenon can be productively investigated from disciplines as varied as economics, sociology, finance, history, psychology, and anthropology, each of which uses its own concepts and operates within its own terms of reference. (p. 141.)

Although there is no consensus in academic thought regarding the definitions of entrepreneurship, there are common themes of which innovation, proactiveness and risk taking are the foremost organisational-level dimensions of entrepreneurship (Wiklund, 1999). Thus, entrepreneurship may occur in business structures, such as public or private corporations; not-for-profit sector bodies, government, or educational institutions; and other organisations, for example, community businesses. In fact, as society continually undergoes social, economic, and political changes, new needs that call for innovative solutions, often with limited resources, emerge (Glancey & McQuaid, 2000, p. 159).

In his book *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, which is based on data from five European universities\(^\text{14}\) that were considered entrepreneurial at the time, Clark (1998a) introduced the concept ‘entrepreneurial university.’ In his book, Clark (1998a) discusses five elements, which he deems an irreducible minimum of conditions (pathways) for organisational transformation by means of entrepreneurial action.

The first is a **strengthened steering core**—strong decision-making structures and relationships that are quicker, more flexible and particularly more focused in reaction to expanding and changing demands. Although unambitious universities and/or universities that serve as flagships or elite institutions in their own national or state systems of HE can ignore the absence of strong steering capacities, ambitious universities and/or universities concerned about their marginality cannot survive without strong steering cores. The second is an **expanded developmental periphery**—the growth of units\(^\text{15}\) that, more readily than traditional academic departments, reach across old university boundaries, link the university with outside organisations and groups and help it to cope with societal demands. The third is a **diversified funding base** characterised by increased funding from third-stream sources, such as industrial firms, local governments, royalty income, student fees and alumni funding, instead of reliance on declining government support. The fourth is a **stimulated academic heartland**—that is, core academic units and the academic staff adopt entrepreneurial ethos and reach out more strongly to the outside with new programmes that generate third-stream income. The fifth is an **integrated academic culture**, which is the

---

\(\text{14}\) The University of Warwick in England, University of Twente in the Netherlands, University of Strathclyde in Scotland, Charmers University of Technology in Sweden and University of Joensuu in Finland.

\(\text{15}\) Such as interdisciplinary project-oriented research centres and professional outreach offices that handle knowledge transfer, industrial contact, intellectual property development, CE, fundraising and alumni affairs (Clark, 1998a).
development and diffusion of a university-wide culture rooted in beliefs and practices that embrace change (Clark, 1998a, pp. 5–8). An entrepreneurial university, then,

Carries overtones of enterprise\textsuperscript{16} ... actively seeks to innovate in how it goes about its business ... seeks to work out a substantial shift in organizational character so as to arrive at a more promising posture for the future ... [and] seeks to become a “stand-up” university that is a significant actor on its own terms. (Clark, 1998a, p. 4.)

However, as Clark (2004) observes, “Universities seeking an entrepreneurial evolution embark from different launching platforms established by inherited capacities and societal conditions” (p. 99) and, therefore, not all entrepreneurial universities are necessarily the same; they embrace the above-mentioned core practices but go about them in different ways.

Contrastingly, Etzkowitz et al. (2000) observe that the concept of the entrepreneurial university encompasses a ‘third-mission’ of economic development and envisions an academic structure and function that is revised through the alignment of economic development with research and teaching. In short, serving society is becoming a coherent domain of the university and entrepreneurial universities are universities that are active in that process (Mets, 2009). Such universities, Mets (2009) notes, interlink three missions: education, research and serving society. Institutionally, they are characterised by the creation of technology transfer offices, the active patenting of university research, the creation of entrepreneurial competences and mind-sets among university members, the active position to produce and utilise university knowledge for the socio-economic transformation of society and the creation of an entrepreneurial environment inside and around the university (Mets, 2009, pp. 2–3).

The transformation from a teaching-and-research institution to an institution that pursues teaching, research and economic development, Etzkowitz (2003) observes, denotes a second academic revolution (see Table 2). The university, Etzkowitz (2003) notes, has, since its foundation as a teaching institution undergone two academic revolutions: first, the transformation of the university from a teaching-only institution into a teaching-and-research institution in the nineteenth century, and second, the transformation of the university into an institution that embraces three functions—teaching, research and economic development (entrepreneurial).

\textsuperscript{16} Characterised by taking risks when initiating new practices whose outcome is in doubt and a willful effort in institution building that requires much special activity and energy (Clark, 1998a, p. 4).
Table 2. The Expansion of the Mission of the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and dissemination of knowledge</td>
<td>First academic revolution</td>
<td>Second academic revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New missions generate conflict of interest</td>
<td>Two missions: teaching and research</td>
<td>Third mission: economic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social development; old missions continued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The transformation from a teaching-and-research institution to an entrepreneurial university, Etzkowitz et al. (2000) observe, arises from both the internal development of the university and the external influences on academic structures associated with emergence of the knowledge-based innovation.17

Drawing from the transformation of Stanford University in the early twentieth century, Etzkowitz (2003) points out five key elements of an emergent entrepreneurial university: the organisation of group research, the creation of a research base with commercial potential, the development of organisational mechanisms to commercialise research and the integration of academic and non-academic organisational elements into a common framework. “The first two elements,” Etzkowitz (2003) notes, “are within the framework of the research university; the next two are part of the transition from the research to entrepreneurial academic models; and the last element is a feature of the entrepreneurial university” (p. 113).

However, Etzkowitz (2004) emphasises the importance of institutional autonomy and the ability of institutions to build strong linkages with the environment, and accordingly, highlights five interrelated norms of an entrepreneurial university: capitalisation of knowledge to enhance socioeconomic development and the role of the university in society; interdependence and close interaction with government, industry and other local organisations; independence from other institutional spheres; hybridisation of organisational formats; and reflexivity or continuous renovation of internal structures as/when relations with the environment change (p. 66).

Similarly, Etzkowitz and Klofsten (2005, p. 246) point out three vital, although not sufficient, conditions towards creating an entrepreneurial university: the ability to set a strategic direction, the orientation to seek out the practical and theoretical implications of research and the organisational means to support technology transfer and firm formation and the creation of training programmes to introduce students to entrepreneurship, especially if it is not yet part of the academic culture. Contrastingly, Sporn (2001) uses the concept ‘adaptive university,’ a term she links closely with the notion of the entrepreneurial university, and emphasises seven factors critical for creating adaptive universities, namely:

17 Despite differences in academic systems, industrial development, and stages of development, governments in virtually all parts of the world are focusing on the potential of the university as a resource to enhance innovation environments and to create a regime of science-based economic development (Etzkowitz et al., 2000, p. 314). Science has emerged as an alternative engine of economic growth to the triumvirate of land, labour and capital—the traditional sources of wealth (Etzkowitz, 2003, p. 110).
• Environment, which could be defined as either a crisis or an opportunity by universities;
• Clear mission and goals that guide decision-making, planning, orientation and integration of all members in a traditionally decentralised and loosely coupled academic organisation;
• Specific organisational culture—for example, an entrepreneurial approach that emphasises individual responsibility and rewards creativity;
• A differentiated but coordinated institutional structure that permits universities to respond quickly to various environmental demands;
• Professionalization of university management;
• Shared governance or integration of university stakeholders in the decision-making process; and
• Committed leadership. (Sporn, 2001, pp. 128–130.)

Summary

Based on the above discussion, it is important to note that although there is little consensus about the term ‘entrepreneurial university’ and its definition, at the heart of the concept is the need to cope with uncertainty and complexity; diversify funding sources and increase institutional autonomy; capitalise knowledge and other intellectual property; interact closely with government, industry and the wider society; create and sustain an innovative culture; streamline leadership and management; enhance human resource capacities; and strengthen a sense of mission (Clark, 1998a, 1998b, 2004; Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Etzkowitz, 2004; Etzkowitz & Klofsten, 2005; Gibb, Haskins, & Robertson, 2009; Gjerding, Wilderom, Cameron, Taylor, & Scheunert, 2006; Sporn, 2001). In essence, as Gibb et al. (2009) observe, the concept of entrepreneurial university has emerged largely to prescribe and describe effective institutional mechanisms and processes with; and through; which universities can/do cope with high levels of institutional complexity and environmental uncertainty. However, it is imperative to note that an entrepreneurial paradigm is not confined to newly invented technologies and/or research-intensive universities; “it can be enacted at teaching as well as research universities through innovations in undergraduate education and continuing education” (Etzkowitz et al., 2000, p. 314). In addition, although the notion of entrepreneurial universities is conceptually adjacent to neo-liberalism, which emphasises (a) the power of the market, (b) organisational adaptation, (c) institutional discretion and (d) a process of incremental change (Yokoyama, 2006), it is much more than academic entrepreneurship and technology transfer (Yusof & Jain, 2010).

18 Existing definitions are quite broad and rely on references to practices from several different universities within different national contexts (Gjerding et al., 2006).

19 The involvement of academic scientists and organisations in commercially relevant activities in different forms, including industry-university collaborations, university-based venture funds, university-
2.3 Institutionalisation

To understand the term ‘institutionalisation’ and consequently the institutionalisation of the TM, it is imperative to first understand the term ‘institutions,’ and the theoretical idea—institutional theory—that undergird institutionalisation. Accordingly, this section discusses some of the literature about institutions, institutionalisation and the institutionalisation of the TM.

2.3.1 Institutional theory

Up to the mid-1970s, Scott (2003) observes, prevailing theoretical perspectives within organisation theory, such as the contingency, the resource dependence and transaction cost theories, focused primarily on the technical (material-resource) environment, examining its effects on organisational structure. They essentially described organisations as “agentic actors responding to situational circumstances [, that is] senior managers steered organizations by interpreting their contexts and taking appropriate actions” (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008, p. 3). Structural contingency theory, for instance, “saw organizations adapting to circumstances of scale, task uncertainty and strategic scope by approving selection of structural arrangements. Resource-dependence theory, [contrastingly] analysed “how organizations sought to affect the supply of critical resources by managing their dependencies on other organizations” (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 3). Each of these theoretical perspectives focused on the relationship between an organisation and its environment and examined how each organisation adapted or attempted to adapt to its environment to secure an appropriate fit (Greenwood et al., 2008). It was within this context that institutional arguments, through the works of Meyer and Rowan (1977); Zucker (1977); Meyer and Rowan (1983); DiMaggio and Powell (1983); Tolbert and Zucker (1983); Meyer and Scott (1983), emerged (Greenwood et al., 2008). Accordingly, the institutional theory emphasises that organisations are:

Open systems—strongly influenced by their environments—but that it is not only competitive and efficiency-based forces that are at work. Socially constructed belief and rule systems exercise enormous control over organisations—both how they are structured and how they carry out their work. (Scott, 2003, pp. 119–120.)
Organisations conform to—that is, become isomorphic with their institutional environment—to “signal their social fitness and gain legitimacy in the eyes of critical constituencies” (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 4). Institutional theory, therefore,

[Examines] the processes and mechanisms by which structure, schemas, rules, and routines become established as authoritative guidelines for social behavior. It asks how such systems come into existence, how they diffuse, and what role they play in supplying stability and meaning to social behavior. It also considers how such arrangements deteriorate and collapse and how their remnants shape successor structures. (Scott, 2004, p. 408.)

It emphasises that institutions are a critical component of the environment, and it is interested in understanding the bases of stability of social forms and the meanings associated with them (Scott, 2003). Institutional theory, then, Orrù, Biggart, and Hamilton (1991) observe, has attracted attention as an alternative to, or significant modifier of, the resource dependency (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and organisational ecology (Hannan & Freeman, 1977) approaches, both of which, despite their differences, share a common concern with technical environments. Although all institutional arguments emphasise that institutions are governance structures that embody rules for social conduct and that groups and organisations that obey these rules are accorded legitimacy (Scott, 2004) and thus represent a rather “distinctive approach to the study of social, economic, and political phenomena” (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991, p. 1), institutional theory is a paradox (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). The theory, Scott (2004) notes, is not “a single, unified system of assumptions and propositions [instead, it is] an amorphous complex of related ideas—a broad theoretical perspective or family of approaches” (p. 408). Accordingly,

It is often easier to gain agreement about what it is not than about what it is. ... Institutionalism has disparate meanings in different disciplines; and even within organizational theory, “institutionalists” vary in their relative emphasis on micro and macro features, in their weightings of cognitive and normative aspects of institutions. (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991, p. 1.)

For instance, economists, such as North (1990), tend to emphasise the importance of legal and rule-based systems that are externally enforced by third parties, such as nation-states. Early sociologists stress the importance of normative controls—values and norms that are internalised by actors and reinforced by others in social situations (Scott, 2003). Contemporary ‘neo-institutional’ approaches stress the role of cultural cognitive controls. Nonetheless, all institutional arguments cohere around the central tenet that institutions matter in accounting for social behaviour—that is, “most institutional theories see local actors—whether individuals, organizations, or nation states—as affected by institutions built up in much wider environments” (Meyer, 2008, p. 792). The question, then, is, what are institutions?
2.3.2 Institutions

The term ‘institution,’ Jepperson (1991) observes, is a core concept of general sociology that scholars across the social sciences reach for to connote “the presence of authoritative rules or binding organization” (p. 143). To North (1990), the term institutions denotes “the rules of the game in a society or, more formally ... the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction” (p. 3). Contrastingly, Friedland and Alford (1991) define the term ‘institutions’ as “simultaneously material and ideal, systems of signs and symbols, rational and transrational ... supraorganizational patterns of human activity by which individuals and organizations produce and reproduce their material subsistence and organize time and space” (p. 243). According to Scott (1995), the term institutions consists of “cognitive, normative, and regulative structures and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behavior” (p. 33). Scholars supporting the regulative pillar, Scott (1995) observes, emphasise “explicit regulative processes—rule setting, monitoring, and sanctioning activities—the ability to establish rules, inspect or review others’ conformity to them, and as necessary, manipulate sanctions—rewards or punishments—in an attempt to influence future behaviour” (p. 35). The regulative pillar, then, views institutions as a stable system of rules backed by surveillance and sanctioning power (Scott, 1995). Economists, including economic historians, such as North (1990), are particularly likely to view institutions as resting primarily on the regulative pillar (Scott, 2004, 2003, 1995). In this pillar of institutions, institutionalisation occurs as “individuals find it expedient to comply with the rules” (Colbeck, 2002, p. 398).

Theorists who espouse the normative aspect of institutions emphasise that institutional systems rest on shared norms and values that introduce “a prescriptive, evaluative, and obligatory dimension into social life. [In short,] rules are not simply externally enforced, but internalized by actors” (Scott, 2004, p. 410). This conception of institutions is embraced mostly by early sociologists perhaps because sociologists have tended to focus on institutions such as kinship or religious systems where common beliefs and values are more likely to exist (Scott, 1995). The normative approach to institutions emphasises how values and normative frameworks structure choices—that is, “actors conform not because it serves their individual interests, narrowly defined, but because it is expected of them; they are obliged to do so” (Scott, 1995, p. 39). Hence, normative processes, too, involve a sense of following rules. For example, when members of the academic staff believe their colleagues’ assertions that participation in collaborative learning enhances student learning, “they may modify their courses to incorporate group projects” (Colbeck, 2002, p. 398). Individuals follow normative rules, however, because they perceive that doing so is morally and legally correct (Scott, 1995). In this pillar of institutions, institutionalisation occurs as individuals deem it socially responsible to honour informal obligations (Colbeck, 2002).

A third set of theorists, particularly anthropologists and sociologists, underscore the “centrality of cognitive elements of institutions: the rules that constitute the nature of reality and the frames through which meaning is made” (Scott, 1995, p. 40). The cognitive
structure denotes the beliefs and understandings that participants share about the nature of the situation and interests. In this paradigm, what a creature does, D’Andrade (1984, p. 88) observes, “Is, in large part, a function of the creature’s internal representation of its environment” (as cited in Scott, 1995, p. 40). However, this is not necessarily to insist that all reality is socially constructed. Thus, instead of focusing on norms, cognitive theorists emphasise “scripts: guidelines for sensemaking and choosing meaningful actions” (Scott, 1995, p. 44). However, as Cai (2007) notes, normative and cognitive elements of institutions are usually intertwined and the boundaries between the two are not clear-cut. For instance,

The idea of academic freedom in HE can be seen as a basic norm, meaning that academics feel that they should have freedom to pursue their research interest. On the other hand, academic freedom entails cognitive meanings, in that it has been taken for granted that academic freedom is essential to university life. (Cai, 2007, p. 52.)

In this view of institutions, institutionalisation involves the processes by which “social processes, obligations, or actualities come to take on a rule-like status in social thought and action” (Meyer & Rowan, 1991, p. 42). Indicators of cognitive institutionalisation include (a) the widespread belief that a given activity or structure is conceptually correct and (b) adoption of the activity by other individuals in the organisation (Colbeck, 2002). In short, activities and behaviours become institutionalised when people take them for granted as fundamental aspects of social life (Colbeck, 2002).

The differences among the regulative, normative and cognitive pillars of institutions are summarised in Table 3. The columns contain the three pillars identified as making up or supporting institutions, and the rows define some of the principal dimensions along which assumptions vary and arguments arise among theorists emphasising one element over the others (Scott, 1995).

Table 3. Three Pillars of Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulative</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms</td>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Rules, laws, sanctions</td>
<td>Certification, accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of legitimacy</td>
<td>Legally sanctioned</td>
<td>Morally governed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notwithstanding the differences among the three pillars of institutions, the term ‘institutions,’ as used herein, denotes deeply embedded rules, structures, practices, norms and or beliefs of a given organisation—for instance, a university and/or society (Dictionary of
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Thus, the analysis herein will focus on the internal formal institutions of the university, paying attention to not only their existence/absence but also, importantly, their connectedness and whether they work.

2.3.3 Definitions and previous research

To institutionalise, Oxford Reference Online states, means to “establish (something, typically a practice or an activity) as a convention or norm in an organisation or culture.” Stated slightly differently, to institutionalise means to “make something become part of a particular society, system, or organization” (Cambridge Dictionaries Online). Drawing on the work identified with the philosophical tradition of phenomenology, Berger and Luckmann (1967) identified institutionalisation as a core process in the creation and perpetuation of enduring social groups (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). Accordingly, Berger and Luckmann (1987) observe that institutionalisation occurs when there is “a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors” (p. 72). In this definition, habitualised action refers to behaviours that have been developed empirically, repeated frequently, cast into a pattern and adopted by an actor or set of actors to solve recurring problems (Berger & Luckmann, 1987; Tolbert & Zucker, 1996). Colbeck (2002), however, views institutionalisation as “a process by which a significant new structure or practice is incorporated into a system of existing structures and practices” (p. 398). Ekholm and Trier (1987) note that it denotes:

A stabilized modification, aiming at improvement of an institution or parts of it—its processes, products or capacities. It, thus, denotes a developmental process that appears during and after the implementation of an innovation. When the new process, product, or capacity is used in a routine manner and is accepted by the users as something normal that is expected to continue, it is incorporated into the organizational framework and its regulations as a “natural” pattern. (as cited in Saxl, Miles, & Lieberman, 1989, pp. 6–19.)

Pankratz et al. (1980), however, regard institutionalisation as both a goal and a process. As a goal, it denotes a “stage at which a new program or practice becomes a regular feature of the culture of an organization” (as cited in Emory, 1981, p. 52). As a process, it refers to “a set of actions consciously and deliberately taken to improve the performance and operation of an organization by impacting structures, processes or behaviors in the unit” (Emory, 1981, p. 54). Likewise, Zucker (1991) defines institutionalisation as both a process and property

---

21 For example, policies, structures, programmes, mission statements, formal positions and organisational rules that control how people coordinate their actions and use resources to achieve the goals of the university (Cai, 2007).

22 Because, as Meyer and Rowan (1991) observe, organisations do not necessarily function according to their formal blueprints: “Structural elements are only loosely linked to each other and to activities, rules are often violated, decisions are often unimplemented, or if implemented have uncertain consequences” (p. 43).
variable. It is, Zucker (1991) notes, “the process by which individual actors transmit what is socially defined as real, and at the same time, at any point in the process the meaning of an act can be defined as more or less a taken-for-granted part of this social reality” (p. 85). Herein, the term ‘institutionalisation’ is used to denote a process and/or stage through/at which “new norms, values, and structures [regarding a practice] become incorporated within the framework of existing patterns of norms, values, and structures” (Kimberly, 1981, p. 31).

Accordingly, Jepperson (1991) identifies three primary carriers of institutionalisation: formal organisation, regimes and culture. The term ‘regimes,’ Jepperson (1991) notes, denotes “institutionalization in some central authority system—without primary embodiment in a formal organizational apparatus” (p. 150). 23 With regard to regimes, “expectations focus upon monitoring and sanctioning by some form of a differentiated, collective, center” (Jepperson, 1991, p. 150) Institutionalisation by culture denotes “those rules, procedures, and goals without primary representation in formal organization, and without monitoring and sanctioning by some “central” authority. These rules are, rather, customary or conventional in character” (Jepperson, 1991, pp. 150–151). 24

Previous research

Research by Manring (1987) shows that institutionalisation involves three stages: trial, regularisation and formalisation. Trial, Manring (1987) notes, refers to the initial experimentation of an innovation. Contrastingly, regularisation refers to the way in which the innovations become accepted into regular use and formalisation includes the ways in which the innovations are codified and described by some form of policy statement, statute and so forth. The above definition suggests that programmes, behaviours, etc. have varying levels of institutionalisation and that “institutionalization is not an all or nothing concept” (Edelman, 1984, as cited in Manring, 1987, p. 2)—that is, that there are degrees of institutionalisation; “acts are not simply either institutionalized or not institutionalized” (Zucker, 1991, p. 86). Correspondingly, Goodman and Dean (1982) explain institutionalisation in terms of specific behaviours or acts that cannot be described by the simple labels of ‘success’ or ‘failure.’ “An act,” Goodman and Dean (1982) note, “is not all or nothing […] it may vary in terms of its persistence, the number of people in the social system performing the act, and the degree to which it exists as a social fact” (p. 229). Accordingly, Goodman and Dean (1982) identify five facets, the presence or absence of which explains the degree of institutionalisation:

- **Knowledge** – the extent to which organisational participants have common cognitive representations of the behaviour;

---

23 For example, a legal or constitutional system, a profession and a criminal syndicate (Jepperson, 1991).
24 Institutionalising in culture produces expectations about the properties, orientations, and behaviour of individuals, as constraining “others” (Mead) in the social environment (Jepperson, 1991, p. 151).
• Performance – the extent to which the behaviour is performed across the participants in the social system;
• Preferences for the behaviour – whether organisational participants like or dislike performing the behaviour;
• Values – the degree to which organisational participants have common social ideas of the desirable or statements about how one should or should not behave; and
• Normative consensus – the extent to which (a) organisational participants are aware of others performing the required behaviours and (b) there is consensus about the appropriateness of the behaviour. This facet represents the extent to which the behaviour has become part of the normative fabric of the organisation.

Likewise, Berger and Luckmann (1987) stress that in investigating any concrete institutional order,

One may ask the following question: What is the scope of institutionalization within the totality of social actions in a given society? In other words, how large is the sector of institutionalized activity compared with the sector that is left uninstitutionalized? … An important general consideration is what factors determine a wider as against a narrower scope of institutionalization. (p. 97.)

Drawing on earlier phenomenological analyses of institutions, Tolbert and Zucker (1996) delineate three sequential processes involved in the formation and spread of institutions: habitualization, objectification and sedimentation. Similarly, Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) in their study, “Institutionalizing a Broader view of Scholarship through Boyer’s Four Domains,” note that institutionalisation occurs at three levels: structural, procedural and incorporation. At the structural level, the authors note, “a change is represented in several ways throughout the institution. There is a basic knowledge of the behaviors associated with the innovation, and those involved understand how to perform the behaviors” (Braxton et al., 2002, pp. 5–6). Besides new or changed behaviour, it is possible that the structure of the organisation will also change to accommodate the new programme or innovation. At the procedural level,

Behaviors and policies associated with the innovation become standard [—that is,] they become part of the standard operating procedure of the disciplinary department or the entire institution. As for individuals in the organization, this level shows their preferences for behaviors identified at the structural level. (Braxton et al., 2002, p. 6.)

Because the realisation of the procedural level of institutionalisation occurs when behaviours and policies associated with the object of institutionalisation become the standard operating procedures of a college or university, Braxton et al. (2002) note, the extent to which organisational actors participate in an innovation or a programme can be used as an indicator of the procedural level of institutionalisation. Incorporation, Braxton
et al. (2002) stress, is “the most in-depth level of institutionalization ... where the values and norms associated with the innovation are incorporated into an organization's culture” (p. 7).

Contrastingly, Goodman and Steckler (1989) consider institutionalisation to be the final stage in the diffusion process, during which programme innovations attain long-term viability and settle into organisations. However, the authors also observe that institutionalisation consists of three levels—passages, routines and niche saturation. Goodman and Steckler (1989) note that passages represent the incipient, first degree, or rudimentary measures, of institutionalisation intensity. They establish benchmarks for a programme’s stability. Examples include the formalisation of programme plans, methods, evaluations and outcomes. Routines characterise a programme's increasing permanence. “When a program becomes routinized,” the authors note, “it no longer stands out as new ... [it] achieves greater persistency, or permanence” (Goodman & Steckler, 1989, p. 66). Although routines, such as programme funding, budgeting, planning and evaluation, often operate on annual cycles, other routines, such as public relations strategies, agency staff and lobbying efforts for the programme, can be more intermittent. The longer the routines remain persistent, Goodman and Steckler (1989) note, the greater the degree of institutionalisation. To emphasise the significance of differences in the level of institutionalisation denoted by passages and routines, Goodman and Steckler (1989) observe,

In a public school system that implemented a substance abuse prevention program, formalization of the program, a passage, occurred through official approval by the school board. This act was highly symbolic of the status the program was accorded. ... However, the program was not incorporated into that school district’s routine enforcement mechanisms. For instance, no supervisors were assigned to monitor the program. ... Consequently, its implementation in the classroom was sporadic, and its institutionalization was shallow. (Goodman & Steckler, 1989, p. 67.)

Just as routines signify a degree of institutionalisation that is greater than passages, niche saturation represents a degree of institutionalisation that goes beyond routines. Niche saturation, Goodman and Steckler (1989) note, “can be defined as an institutionalized program’s maximum feasible expansion within a host organization. When an innovation is fully institutionalized, it permeates an organization's subsystems” (p. 67). It becomes, as Hord and Hall (1986) put it, “locked into the organizational setting ... [and] part of the normal day to day routine” (p. 9). Passages and routines, then, are insufficient indicators of institutionalisation. Goodman and Steckler (1989) further observe that an innovation is institutionalised when, through mutual adaptation, it comes to equilibrium with an organisation. According to Kanter (1983, p. 229),

It is when the structures surrounding a change also change to support it that we say that a change is ‘institutionalized’—that it is now part of legitimate and on-going
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practice, infused with value and supported by other aspects of the system. (as cited in Goodman & Steckler, 1989, p. 60.)

Just like Goodman and Steckler (1989), Eiseman, Fleming, and Roody (1990) stress that institutionalisation symbolises a final transition of a project or programme to an acceptable part of the regular operation of an organisation. It is the critical last step in the process of change, the end result of prior phases, initiation and implementation, but not a natural result of these phases. What, then, characterises institutionalisation? Goodman and Dean (1982) point out three defining features of an institutionalised act: performance of the act by multiple actors, persistence of the act and existence of the act as a social fact. Likewise, Miles and Louis (1987) suggest seven characteristic features, namely:

1. Acceptance by relevant actors—a perception that the innovation legitimately belongs
2. Stable, routinised implementation; widespread use of the innovation;
3. Firm expected continuation, usually accompanied by negotiated agreements;
4. Legitimacy, normality;
5. Change is no longer seen as a change, but has become “invisible,” and is taken for granted;
6. Person independence—that is, continuation does not depend upon the actions of specific individuals but upon organisational structures, procedures or culture; and

2.3.4 Institutionalisation of the TM

Based on the review of the literature on institutionalisation provided in subsection 3.3.2, the term institutionalisation of the TM can be defined as a process and/or a stage through/at which structures, values, norms, practices and beliefs regarding the TM become “incorporated within the framework of existing patterns of norms, values, and structures [of a university]” (Kimberly, 1981, p. 31). Hence, when the TM becomes institutionalised, community outreach and engagement become widespread and meaningful aspects of “faculty work, student life, institutional identity, and external partnerships” (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000, p. 282). In essence, the academic institution, then, values not only the transfer of knowledge but also “working in collaboration with organizations and groups that represent and give voice to the concerns and goals of community residents” (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 72). However, as indicated in the preceding subsection, institutionalisation is a multi-stage process, and therefore, institutionalisation of the TM is a continuous process that varies among HEIs.

Nevertheless, the literature on university–community partnerships reveals various formal institutions—aspects of campus organisation, infrastructure, policies and practices—that may signify institutionalisation of the TM. Vidal et al. (2002), for instance,
identify nine organisational aspects that denote the institutionalisation of the TM at the institutional level: campus mission statement, presidential leadership, policy, publicity, budget allocations, broad staff understanding of and support for the TM, infrastructure, faculty roles and rewards, and integration of TM activities into other aspects of institutional work (pp. 82–83). Institutionalising the TM, therefore, implies embracing the TM as a university-wide activity that can survive changes in funding, academic staff and campus leadership. In short, it involves (a) accepting the TM as a core rather than a peripheral function, (b) tying the TM in with the curriculum and university policies and structures, (c) providing routine administrative support, (d) widespread involvement of staff and students and (e) existence of organisational structures to coordinate and/or to support TM activities, among others (Brukardt et al., 2006a; Furco, 2002; Holland, 1997; Lazarus, Erasmus, Hendricks, Nduna, & Slamat, 2008; Saxl et al., 1989). Therefore, although the institutionalisation of the TM would look different across different universities,

[It] usually entails a redefinition of the university culture,\textsuperscript{25} includes curricular change, involves and empowers faculty and staff, and necessitates new institutional infrastructure and accountability mechanisms. (Brukardt et al., 2006a, p. 10.)

In essence, full institutionalisation of the TM is envisaged to involve regulative aspects (e.g., policies, structures and programmes), normative aspects (e.g., consensus about the appropriateness of the TM) and cognitive elements, such as the active involvement of staff, students and external communities in TM activities (Colbeck, 2002). However, as Hollander, Saltmarsh, and Zlotkowski (2002) observe, “It is unlikely that all [the above-mentioned indicators] will be apparent on any one campus. [In addition] these indicators should not be regarded as prescriptive; their value lies in the possibilities they suggest” (p. 35).

Challenges to institutionalisation of the TM

Although discussions in the foregoing sections show that the TM is a vital function that every HEI should embrace, Jongbloed et al. (2008) observe that day-to-day practices show that HEIs usually interact with traditional communities of students, researchers, funding organisations and research sponsors, among others, but encounter challenges to a wider type of community outreach and engagement. Therefore, institutionalising the TM so that its practice, forms and supporting structures become sustainable and integral aspects of cultures of HEIs faces various challenges. In their study, “Institutionalization of Computing in Complex Organizations,” Perry, Kraemer, King, and Dunkle (1992) note:

\textsuperscript{25} A rather stable set of taken-for-granted assumptions, shared beliefs, meanings, and values that form a kind of backdrop for action (Smircich, 1985, p. 58, as cited in Scott, 2003, p. 318).
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The failure of the organization’s members to conform to and embrace the values embedded in [the innovation] … raises the interesting research question of why even carefully planned … reforms often do not meet the critical expectation of institutionalization, wherein … [an innovation] becomes a routine and background part of everyday organizational life. (p. 48.)

Thus, for both academic and practical reasons, there is a need to examine issues that challenge the institutionalisation of the TM at universities. Because the institutionalisation of the TM entails the adoption of new norms, more interdisciplinary and applied work and forms of scholarship and pedagogy (Vidal et al., 2002), one of the challenges to the institutionalisation of the TM is the longstanding traditions of the academe. First, although academic culture, standards and norms can differ significantly among universities and among academic departments on the same university campus, certain traditions—for instance, the structuring of universities along academic disciplines and professions—are broadly shared (Jongbloed et al., 2008; Vidal et al., 2002). One problem of structuring HEIs based on academic disciplines is that advocating the autonomy of HEIs and the independence of academics to decide what to teach and what to research “runs counter to the multi-disciplinary nature of many community problems and the collaborative approach that partnership-based responses require” (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 75). Disciplines and professions also exercise control over academics by “defining reality—devising ontological frameworks, proposing distinctions … and fabricating principles or guidelines for action [e.g., what counts as significant problems, what constitutes good science and academic beliefs that are biased towards research]” (Scott & Backman, 1990, as cited in Scott, 1995, p. 95). Such frameworks, especially frameworks for knowledge production, often treat universities as the sole creators, conservers and transmitters of knowledge, skills and values (Duke, 2010); thus ignoring the relevance of external communities in the production of knowledge.

Associated with such frameworks is the notion that universities are “special precisely because they are separated from the passions of the moment, the fads of the day, the flavour of the month, and those shifting political winds that so readily dominate the media” (Shulman, 2011, p. ix). Likewise, since academic disciplines tend to devalue research that aims to address local problems, and peer review systems also tend to reward scholarship in familiar forms (Hartley et al., 2005), the TM is often treated as a noble but not necessarily a central function of universities. Therefore, despite wide enthusiasm about the TM, academic traditions and disciplinary practices often do not support the TM, and, hence, interactions among various disciplines and between HEIs and external communities are not as frequent as they perhaps should be (Jongbloed et al., 2008).

In addition, since the institutional and individual success of universities and academics depend on prestige,26 university rankings and evaluation systems often reduce the social

---

26 For instance, a highly competitive and qualified student intake, big research budgets from prestigious sources, a high profile in the most prestigious research journals and a position in league tables and ranking
impact of universities on society to financial and bibliometric measures (Benneworth et al., 2009), which, in turn, leads universities to prioritise league table standings to the TM. Thus, the key barrier to the involvement of the academic staff in TM activities is not necessarily poor promotion practices and reward structures; instead, the problem is more basic—the TM, just like teaching on some university campuses, is viewed at best as “a laudable deed but not as an intellectually challenging [and rewarding] scholarly activity” (Lynton, 1995, p. 53). However, this is not to denigrate the importance of formally recognising the significance of the TM in university policies for the recruitment and promotion of the academic staff. Such recognition, in fact, has the potential to boost the involvement of academic staff in TM activities and to ensure that such involvement does not impede their career development (Lynton, 1995). Therefore, transforming the TM into a core function and, consequently, an integral aspect of the mission of any university necessitates a fundamental change in the culture of that university.

The second challenge to the institutionalisation of the TM, then, concerns the reward systems for the academic staff. In most universities, academic reward structures, including criteria for hiring and promotion, generate strong pressure towards research publications in peer-reviewed academic journals (Lazarus et al., 2008; Mwiandi, 2010; Preece et al., 2012b; Vidal et al., 2002). The chances of an academic staff member being promoted or getting a salary increase, then, often depend on his or her research productivity, which is measured in terms of the number of refereed journal publications and the volume of competitive research grants won or his or her workload and responsibilities in terms of teaching (Jongbloed et al., 2008). Therefore, whether it is in a prestigious research university or in a more teaching-oriented university, recruitment, promotion and salary policies often create dissonance with, and subsequently deter academics from participating in, TM activities (Gunasekara, 2006).

Third, institutionalising the TM is also hindered by the lack of clarity about the term ‘Third Mission’—that is, it is composed of multifaceted concepts that are based on the history and disciplinary profile of a university as well as the nature of the community, its needs and its enunciated demands (Charles, Benneworth, Conway, & Humphrey, 2010). The problem with such vagueness is that even when universities attempt to articulate strategic goals for the TM, some academics simply do not see the link between the institutional mission and their own work (Gunasekara, 2006). In addition to its multifaceted meaning, the measurement of the TM is fundamentally complex and is still at a formative stage (Lall, 2010). The TM, whether defined as community service, outreach, or engagement, embraces various activities and intentions—such as strategies for economic and social regional development, service learning, collaboration with business, social and cultural activities and support for local health and physical urban development (Charles et al., 2010)—that systems (Duke, 2010). Despite their growing influence, ranking systems, such as the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), the QS World University Rankings and the Times Higher Education World University Rankings, have attracted extensive criticism for their relatively partial methodologies, which, for the most part, focus on research output (Benneworth et al., 2009; Schuetze, 2010).
create deep-seated difficulties for the definition, assessment and documentation of the TM (Finkelstein, 2001). In teaching, for instance, there are standard units of work (lectures, seminars) and outputs (students, graduates, degrees or modules examined). Research also yields some standardised performance measures in the form of research grants, levels of income, publication outputs and so forth. Whilst there are problems with assessing quality, which are only partly addressed by citation counts, at least all universities are seeking similar kinds of inputs and outputs. For the TM, outputs may be extremely diverse and the engagement process very varied (Charles et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the insufficiency of, and/or difficulties in mobilising, dependable and sustainable streams of resources, such as human, financial and structural, affects the institutionalisation of the TM at most universities. First, as a by-product of their training, experience and reward structures, Vidal et al. (2002) note that academics usually have little or no experience in community outreach and engagement and that some may not even be aware of the possibilities it offers. Those trained in traditions that emphasise the primacy of individual scholarship often do not have opportunities to develop the types of skills required for collaboration and shared leadership, and many are unfamiliar with roles as co-creators of knowledge. Second, although communities tend to perceive HEIs as wealthy, their resources are frequently fully committed to research and/or teaching, not to the TM (Vidal et al., 2002). At most universities, academic staff members teach, research, advise, serve on standing committees, write letters of recommendation, mentor young scholars and participate in peer review for academic journals, while at others, academic staff members have heavy teaching loads that make it difficult for them to participate in TM activities or to integrate TM-based activities into their teaching and research activities. Unsurprisingly, therefore, academic staff members often see themselves as having little time to pursue any activity the purpose of which may be construed as contrary to their core duties (Hartley et al., 2005) or peripheral to their academic careers.

In addition, since heavy teaching loads are a consequence of very tight budgets, forcing academic staff to participate in TM activities or to incorporate some TM activities into their teaching and research activities could require buying out one or more courses—that is, hiring someone else to teach the course or offering students fewer course options (Vidal et al., 2002). The absence of sustainable financial and human resources to fund and support the TM, particularly in the early stages, therefore, inhibits full the institutionalisation of the TM at many universities (Furco & Holland, 2004; Wergin, 2006).

2.4 Institutional commitment to the TM

This section discusses the term ‘commitment,’ the relationship between commitment and institutionalisation and the analytical framework utilised herein to examine the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM.
2.4.1 Commitment

Cambridge Dictionaries Online defines commitment as the “willingness to give your time and energy to something that you believe in, or a promise or firm decision to do something.” In essence, it refers to “the binding of the individual to behavioral acts” (Kiesler & Sakamura, 1966, p. 349). For example, in a context in which one holds beliefs about the necessity to conserve energy, Goodman et al. (1980) note, commitment would refer to “behavioral acts such as buying a small car, reducing fuel usage, shutting off lights ... that bind the individual to the social object of energy conservation” (p. 221). Although commitment is mostly viewed in terms of individuals’ psychological bond to organisations (Salancik, 1982), this study focuses more on university-wide actions and less on the behavioural acts of individual actors that demonstrate commitment to the TM. This is because the literature (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Brukardt et al., 2006a; Hollander et al., 2002; Holland, 1997) shows that the institutionalisation of the TM requires time and other resources as well as organisational adjustments, all of which call for much more than the dedication and actions of individuals. Therefore, institutional commitment to the TM will be examined in terms of selected organisational attributes, such as plans and publications (expressed commitment) and actions—policies, structures, activities and processes (Fox, Goldberg, Gore, & Bärnighausen, 2011).

In their research paper “Conceptual and Methodological Challenges to Measuring Political Commitment to Respond to HIV,” Fox et al. (2011) point out three common criteria used to define and operationalise commitment, namely: what people say, the presence of institutional structures that facilitate response and service delivery outcomes. Accordingly, Fox et al. (2001) outline three broad components of commitment: expressed commitment, institutional commitment and budgetary commitment. Expressed commitment is based on implicit criteria—for example, inferring the commitment of an institution based on how often its key leader(s) makes public statements about certain issues. Leaders who talk about, and support, certain issues openly and candidly are generally treated as committed (Fox et al., 2011). With regard to the TM, expressed commitment can be inferred from a university’s publications and speeches by the university’s chancellor and vice chancellors. Contrastingly, Fox et al. (2011) note that institutional commitment focuses on the existence or absence of basic ‘institutions’—that is, “infrastructure and procedures that are hard to undo once established. Institutional commitment [then, is a critical form of commitment that] goes beyond mere proclamations of commitment [to] creating mechanisms that credibly ‘lock in’ ... [a practice or behaviour]” (Fox et al., 2011, p. 4).

However, expressed commitment and institutional commitment alone cannot offer a complete picture of commitment unless tangible resources are committed to supporting public pronouncements and policy enactments (Fox et al., 2011; Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action, 2005). In this case, the commitment of an institution is measured in terms of “whether [resource] commitment lives up to verbal rhetoric and institutional commitments” [because commitment is] “signalled not only as a promise
about the future, but also as the matching up of words with action through resource allocations” (Fox et al., 2011, p. 4). According to Salancik (1982), “a statement of a belief is a less committing action than the signing of a petition in favor of the belief, which in turn is less committing than actively advocating the belief to a hostile or skeptical audience” (p. 4).

Despite the importance of each of the three components of commitment (expressed, institutional and budgetary), examining a university’s commitment using either one of the components cannot provide a complete picture. Thus, to obtain a holistic picture of commitment, this study focuses on and utilises the term ‘institutional commitment’ to embrace all three components of commitment (Fox et al., 2011) because they are part of the internal institutions of the university.

2.4.2 Relationship between commitment and institutionalisation

Goodman et al. (1980) observe that commitment and institutionalisation are similar in that “they both focus on behavior. Both concepts also relate to resistance to change; [that is] once there is high commitment to a particular act or an act becomes institutionalized, the likelihood of changing that act diminishes” (p. 221). However, the two concepts differ in that whereas a single individual can make a commitment; institutionalisation requires the behaviour of two or more individuals. Institutionalisation also implies the transmission of acts across generations of group members; this is not true in the case of commitment. In addition, although commitment may lead to persistence, it is not defined by persistence—that is, “commitment can precede institutionalization, but it should not be considered a necessary condition” (Goodman et al., 1980, p. 221). Whereas these differences hold true at the individual level, for institutionalisation to occur, the behaviour must be part of the social structure of the whole organisation. However, since the institutionalisation of an act does not guarantee its persistence, measures such as the allocation of rewards and the socialization of new organisational members should be evoked to preserve the institutionalised act (Goodman et al., 1980). In the absence of institutional commitment, however, such mechanisms cannot exist and, therefore, the future of the institutionalised act cannot be guaranteed.

The assumption here, then, is that although it is possible for individual staff members to be committed to the TM, it is improbable for such individual efforts to spread across the whole university in the absence of institutional commitment. After all, factors, such as reward allocation systems, sponsorship, transmission and group forces (Emory, 1981; Goodman et al., 1980; Goodman & Dean, 1982), which affect the degree of institutionalisation, are some of the organisational aspects that evince the presence or absence of commitment to the TM (Furco & Holland, 2004; Holland, 1997; Hollander et al., 2002; Vidal et al., 2002). Therefore, for deep institutionalisation of the TM to occur, universities must be sustainably committed to supporting the TM; institutionalisation of the TM cannot occur spontaneously. For instance, Huberman and Crandall (1982) note,
In the chronicle of research on dissemination and use of educational practices, we first put our chips on adoption, then on implementation. It turns out that these investments are lost without deliberate attention to the institutional steps that lock an innovation into the local setting. New practices that get built into the training, regulatory, staffing and budgetary cycle survive; others don’t. Innovations are highly perishable goods. Taking institutionalization for granted—assuming that it will happen by itself ... is naïve and usually self-defeating. (Miles, 1983, p. 14.)

In fact, the findings from a study of improvement processes in schools (Huberman & Miles, 1982) show that different levels of institutional commitment led to different levels of institutionalisation and that institutionalisation must be approached by “providing supports and by warding off threats” (as cited in Miles, 1983, p. 18). Such supports, Miles (1983) notes, include (a) administrative commitment, which is a necessary but insufficient condition for high institutionalisation; (b) administrative support; and (c) organisational change, such as the appointing of permanent coordinators and the allocation of budgets. The above observations demonstrate that institutionalisation is likely to occur if there is commitment (Saxl et al., 1989) and, therefore, the contribution of institutional commitment to the institutionalisation of an innovation, a programme, or an act cannot be overemphasised. However, this does not mean that institutional commitment guarantees institutionalisation; the existence of supportive policies and structures cannot guarantee deeper institutionalisation of the TM unless there is normative support for the TM and widespread involvement of the staff, students and the external communities (Colbeck, 2002).

2.5 Analysing institutional commitment to the TM

A review of the literature about the TM (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Furco 2002; Hollander et al., 2002; Weerts 2005) reveals that the institutional commitment of any HEI to the TM is largely evinced and framed by organisational factors, such as the policies, structures and programmes of that institution. Thus, although various tools for assessing the institutionalisation of engagement exist—for instance, checklists, indicators, benchmarks,

---

27 The schools were sorted into four groups corresponding to the level of institutionalisation. The high-institutionalisation group, Miles (1983) observes, was characterised by a powerful central office administrator, the director of curriculum and special projects, working from a centralised power base, placing considerable pressure on and providing substantial assistance to, users; a great deal of user commitment; organisational rearrangements; and stability of leadership. The second group, moderate to high outcomes, did not mandate the innovation and dedicated a great deal of effort to assisting users and developing their commitment. In the third, less effective scenario, called vulnerability, the innovation had no guarantee of durability even though users were reasonably skilled and committed. In this scenario, the innovation had no protection when funding crises struck or key advocates left office. The fourth group, the non-institutionalisation scenario, was characterised by administrators’ indifference towards the innovation—they did almost nothing to help the users (pp. 17–18).
rubrics and matrices (Burack & Saltmarsh, 2006; Furco & Miller, 2009), they all emphasise, to a certain degree, the importance of a university mission, genuine faculty involvement and support, broad range of opportunities for student participation and supportive institutional infrastructure (Furco & Miller, 2009). In essence, all the assessment tools, at least, “direct attention to aspects of the academic organization that are essential to quality engagement, and [help] to identify specific areas of weakness where organizational change and capacity improvements are needed to support quality engagement” (Holland, 2009, p. 88). Therefore, the true test of institutional commitment to the TM is the organisational attributes that characterise a university’s TM activities (Weerts, 2005). To analyse the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM, this study utilised a slightly modified matrix of institutional commitment to service (Holland, 1997).

2.5.1 Matrix of institutional commitment to service

The matrix of institutional commitment to service is an assessment tool developed by Holland (1997) to help HEIs to (a) assess their current conditions regarding service learning,28 (b) monitor their progress towards desired levels of implementation and (c) understand the extent to which service is an integral component of their academic missions. The matrix arose as:

A way to categorize the different organizational forms of interpreting the role of service and the relationship to the organizational factors that were found to be most significant in explaining the presence or absence of a commitment to service as an academic activity. (Holland, 1997, p. 32.)

The X-axis of the matrix lists seven key organisational factors, namely: mission; promotion, tenure and hiring; organisation structure; student involvement; faculty involvement; community involvement and campus publications (Holland, 1997, p. 33). The Y-axis outlines four levels of commitment: low relevance, medium relevance, high relevance and full integration (Anderson & Callahan, 2005; Holland, 1997). For each organisational factor, the matrix offers indicators of four levels of institutional commitment (see Table 4).

---

28 A credit-bearing educational experience through which students participate in an organised service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222).
Table 4. Levels of Commitment to Service and Key Organisational Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational factor</th>
<th>Level One</th>
<th>Level Two</th>
<th>Level Three</th>
<th>Level Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Relevance</td>
<td>Medium Relevance</td>
<td>High Relevance</td>
<td>Full Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>No mention or undefined rhetorical reference</td>
<td>Service is part of what we do as citizens</td>
<td>Service is an element of our academic agenda</td>
<td>Service is central and defining characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion, Tenure, hiring</td>
<td>Service to campus committees or to discipline</td>
<td>Community service mentioned; may count in certain cases</td>
<td>Formal guidelines for documenting and rewarding community service/service-learning</td>
<td>Community based research and teaching are key criteria for hiring and rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization structure</td>
<td>None that are focused on service or volunteerism</td>
<td>Units may exist to foster volunteerism</td>
<td>Centres and institutes are organised to provide service</td>
<td>Flexible unit(s) support; widespread faculty and student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>Part of extracurricular student activities</td>
<td>Organized support for volunteer work</td>
<td>Opportunity for extra credit, internships, practicum experiences</td>
<td>Service-learning courses integrated in curriculum; student involvement in community based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement</td>
<td>Campus duties; committees; disciplinary focus</td>
<td>Pro bono consulting; community volunteerism</td>
<td>Tenured/senior faculty pursue community-based research; some teach service-learning courses</td>
<td>Community research and service learning a high priority; interdisciplinary and collaborative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Random or limited individual or group involvement</td>
<td>Community representation on advisory boards for departments or schools</td>
<td>Community influences campus through active partnership or part-time teaching</td>
<td>Community involved in designing, conducting and evaluating research and service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus publications</td>
<td>Not an emphasis</td>
<td>Stories of student volunteerism or alumni as good citizens</td>
<td>Emphasis on economic impact, links between community and campus centres/institutes</td>
<td>Community connection as central element; fundraising has community service as a focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The matrix was developed out of data from two different, but related, studies that “explored the degree to which service and service-learning were accepted as an academic priority, [and] looked for explanatory factors related to the potential for sustained or expanded efforts” (Holland, 1997, pp. 31–32). Both studies employed site visits, interviews and document analysis to develop deep and rich case studies of institutions professing some degree of commitment to service. The first research involved four in-depth case studies of
institutions that had identified themselves as adopting a unique mission with community-based scholarship as a central mission. It captured data about each institution in areas related to organisational goals, structure and flexibility, faculty composition and rewards, research and service orientation and educational approach. The aim of the first study was to assess the “match between stated academic priorities and the actual working priorities of the faculty, and to explore factors that helped to explain the presence or absence of a strong match between the two” (Holland, 1997, p. 32). The second research involved the evaluation of 19 institutions funded by grants to support the adoption and institutionalisation of service learning. The 19 institutions were a “highly diverse blend of size, mission, geographic region, local context, and history, and as such provided an opportunity to test the proposed matrix in a wide variety of settings” (Holland, 1997, p. 32).

The seven organisational factors outlined in the matrix represent important aspects of organisational infrastructure, policy, communication and participation that together characterise institutional choices and actions, frame an institution’s service-related activities and reflect an institution’s commitment to service. These factors are discussed briefly below.

**Mission**

According to Holland (1997), “Many of the problematic issues experienced at institutions striving to implement and sustain service-learning [are] linked to real or perceived mis-alignment of the campus mission and institutional actions regarding service” (p. 35). Accordingly, universities that wish to make significant progress in institutionalising the TM must ensure that their missions, often expressed in the form of mission statements, mirror their priorities, that is, correspond to institutional planning and vision for the TM (Beere et al., 2011; Holland, 1997; Ivanov, 2008). Clear mission statements enable universities and colleges, which are traditionally decentralised and loosely coupled, to plan and to choose among competing goals (Beere et al., 2011; Sporn, 2001). Literature, however, shows that mission statements alone, no matter how clear they might be, cannot promote the TM; that is, that the mission statements must be complemented by policies, programmes, structures and activities, which, together, define and support the mission of a university. Hartley et al. (2005), for example, accurately observe:

> An institution that eloquently redrafts its mission statement and publicly touts a renewed commitment to service but assumes that faculty and staff will carry the burden of sustaining the effort because of the intrinsic worth of the project has built a Potempkin [sic] Village—an elaborate façade that, while impressive, and apt to fool an outsider for a short time, will ultimately produce quite negligible results. (p. 220.)

**Promotion, tenure and hiring practices**

Promotion, tenure and hiring practices that are compatible with the other organisational attributes are a critical factor in the institutionalisation of the TM (Furco & Holland,
Therefore, any university that intends to develop the TM must create supportive promotion, tenure and hiring policies and practices because whereas members of the academic staff are at the core of any HEI, faculty roles and rewards are at the core of faculty life (Hollander et al., 2002). Accordingly, as Hollander et al. (2002) stress:

No matter how genuine a school’s commitment to engagement as articulated in its mission, that commitment will probably amount to little, at least in the long run, if the school is unwilling to address the specific ways in which it formally recognizes a faculty member’s contribution to that commitment. (p. 41.)

Galaskiewicz’s (1991) study “Making Corporate Actors Accountable: Institution-Building in Minneapolis-St. Paul.” shows that by recognising companies that gave 5% or 2% of their pre-tax earnings, “the Chamber of Commerce formally proclaimed to all that corporate contributions were acceptable, proper, and expected corporate behavior and that businesses were worthy of public acclamation because they had met this standard” (p. 307). Accordingly, being an engaged university, as Peterman (2005) observes, does not mean that a few academic staff and students do work in and with the community; it implies a commitment to promoting the TM and necessitates creating structures and policies that recognise and reward those involved in TM activities and incorporate the TM into the fabric of the university. Goodman and Dean (1982) also regard rewards as essential to institutionalisation, and, accordingly, they outline three ways in which the allocation of rewards can affect the degree of institutionalisation:

- The degree of equity of the reward system—that is, a system with perceptible imbalances or minimum levels of inequities—can correspondingly hinder or perhaps facilitate the acquisition of beliefs and preferences and the development of norms and values;
- A combination of rewards—for example, extrinsic and intrinsic—would have an effect on the level of institutionalisation; and
- The nature of the reward schedule over time affects the level of institutionalisation, that is, the distribution of similar rewards over time could be correlated with declining values. (pp. 239–240.)

Regarding the TM, rewards can be in terms of favourable tenure and promotion policies, facilities for interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research and the funding of release time for academic staff to engage with external communities, develop new curriculum and teaching methods and carry out joint research (Vidal et al., 2002).

Organisational structure

Although academic departments are still important academic units in most universities, they alone “cannot do all the things that universities now need to do” (Clark, 1998a, p. 6). In his book “Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation,” Clark (1998a) notes, “Enterprising universities exhibit a growth of units that, more readily than traditional academic departments, reach across old university
boundaries to link up with outside organizations and groups” (p. 6). Examples of such units, Clark (1998a) notes, are:

Professionalized outreach offices that work on knowledge transfer, industrial contact, intellectual property development, continuing education, fundraising, and even alumni affairs. [Yet] in another larger, and more basic, form they are interdisciplinary project-oriented research centers that grow up alongside departments as a second major way to group academic work. (p. 6.)

Unlike traditional academic departments, “such units do not express nondisciplinary definitions of problems. They bring into the university the project orientation of outsiders who are attempting to solve serious practical problems critical in economic and social development” (Clark, 1998a, p. 6). Such specialised organisational structures, then, promote the TM by not only organising TM activities and, consequently, facilitating university-community engagement, but also serving as an indicator of the institutional commitment of a university to the TM. Thus, besides their location on organisational charts, such coordinating centres and/or offices should not be isolated from ordinary academic units—for example, departments and schools—and programmes (Furco & Holland, 2004; Hollander et al., 2002); otherwise, the TM might lose appeal to the academic staff who might question its scholarly relevance. In addition, TM activities should not be limited to the specialised units.

**Faculty involvement**

Although supportive organisational structures and rewards play an important role in furthering the institutionalisation of the TM, the TM cannot become accepted as a worthwhile university function and an academic practice without the hard work, dedication and expertise of the academic staff (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Furco & Holland, 2004; Holland, 1997). Ramaley (1996), for example, points out:

Change—especially the change involved in creating engaged institutions—is not administrative work. An engaged university cannot be created by appointing a vice president or amending institutional policy, it requires a scholarly approach that draws on the core strength of the faculty. (as cited in Brukardt et al., 2006a, p. 16.)

Notwithstanding its importance, the involvement of the academic staff alone cannot create sustainable TM practices at any university. Literature shows that besides their involvement and commitment, the academic staff must feel that their TM efforts are (a) viewed positively by peers and administrators, (b) congruent with their own professional image and (c) professionally rewarding and recognised in the tenure and promotion processes (Aronson & Webster, 2007).
Student involvement
The full institutionalisation of the TM cannot be achieved without the active involvement of students and the integration of the TM into the learning experiences—both inside and outside the lecture room—of students. As an indicator of the institutional commitment of a university to the TM, the involvement of students in TM activities can be understood in terms of (1) the availability of opportunities, incentives and rewards (Furco, 2002) for students and (2) a campus-wide system that informs students about the importance of the TM and the available TM-related opportunities. Nonetheless, as Bloomgarden and O’Meara (2007) observe, creating sustainable partnerships with communities as well as institutionalising the TM within HE goes beyond students’ volunteer services and internships.

Community involvement
Establishing and maintaining meaningful partnerships between universities and external communities requires trust, lasting commitments and formal obligations on the part of all involved parties (Hollander et al., 2002). Hence, one indicator of the institutional commitment of a university to the TM is the level of meaningful and purposeful involvement of external communities in the activities of a university (Holland, 1997; Ivanov, 2008). Therefore, “community partnerships are not the university seeking a community collaborator to complete a project but rather a reciprocal relationship where university and community together decide what is important and how it is to be accomplished” (Brukardt et al., 2006a, p. 13).

Campus publications
Universities that are committed to the TM often publish and celebrate the TM; thus, the presence or absence of institutional commitment to the TM is a revealing component of the publications—strategic plans, annual reports, newsletters, etc.—of a university (Holland, 1997; Ivanov, 2008). The inclusion of TM-related matters in the publications of universities helps such universities to (1) demonstrate their commitment to the TM and (2) promote the awareness of their staff and students and the external communities about the priorities of the universities and the TM. Therefore, although “not all institutions tell their service stories effectively ... [campus publications can] be used as a check for consistency and evidence [of the institutional commitment of a university to the TM] in many cases” (Holland, 1997, p. 40).

Appropriateness of the matrix for assessing institutional commitment
The matrix of institutional commitment to service, as Holland (1997) emphasises, was developed to help HEIs to assess their performance in service-learning by comparing their goals for, with their actions towards, service learning. Therefore, it is intended to be a useful diagnostic tool for describing and interpreting the dimensions, approaches and...
institutional commitment to service to facilitate institutional planning, decision-making and evaluation (Compact, 2003). The challenge associated with the potential use of the matrix as an analytical tool, then, is its weak conceptual support, and, how to adapt it to the purpose and focus of this study. Although the matrix is a recognised instrument (see Anderson & Callahan, 2005; Burack & Saltmarsh, 2006; Furco & Miller, 2009; Mohrman, 2010; Weerts, 2005) for assessing institutional commitment, it has not been widely utilised; hence, some of its potential practical and conceptual limitations have not been widely explored.

In addition, since most HEIs would exhibit, to varying degrees, traits of all four levels of commitment (Holland, 1997), establishing the actual level of commitment is not just difficult; it is virtually impossible. However, since the purpose of this study relates, to a greater extent, to the issue addressed by the matrix, the matrix, with minor adjustments, is an appropriate tool with which to carry out a detailed and descriptive analysis of the key policies, structures, practices and programmes of MUK to ascertain the match between its goals and priorities regarding the TM and the existing realities. After all, the intention of the matrix, as Holland (1997) points out, is not to judge the correctness or goodness of the efforts of a university but rather to serve as a framework for assessing the current location of that institution on the matrix to create coherent institutional planning and decision-making.

Thus, the decision to use the matrix was based on the comprehensiveness of the tool (Furco & Miller, 2009) and, as such, the fact that it would enable the researcher to examine the commitment of the university to the TM in a detailed and descriptive way, ascertain the existing challenges to the TM and offer suggestions towards deeper institutionalisation of the TM. After all, the importance of the organisational aspects that constitute the matrix has been confirmed by other studies (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Carot et al., 2012; Charles, Conway, & Benneworth, 2009; Mohrman, 2010; Vidal et al., 2002; Weerts, 2005). Thus, although the matrix focuses on one aspect of the TM—service learning—and lacks a deep theoretical foundation, the relevance of its constituent elements to the institutionalisation of the TM has been verified.

### 2.5.2 Modified analytical framework

Besides the seven organisational factors that constitute the matrix of commitment to service (Holland, 1997), one more key indicator of institutional commitment that is emphasised

---

29 One, service learning is an aspect of the TM. Second, the importance of the organisational factors, which the matrix underscores, is confirmed by other studies—for example, Campus Compact (2003); Furco (2002); London (2002); Weerts (2005).

30 Because matrices focus on broader dimensions than the levels of development for individual engagement components and are more streamlined, they are useful for more comprehensive engagement assessment (Furco & Miller, 2009, p. 50).
by other studies (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Brukardt et al., 2006a; Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2006; Mohrman, 2010; Wergin, 2006) is organisational leadership and support, especially budgetary commitment (Fox et al., 2011). Brukardt et al. (2006a), for example, note that the institutionalisation of the TM requires the support of the top leaders, such as the university president, chancellor and academic leadership team, including faculty deans and heads of departments. Although supportive leadership alone is insufficient, it plays a critical role in the institutionalisation of the TM because “administrative leaders are the voice for the campus and can use their positions to rally support, connect to the community and identify engagement as an institutional priority” (Brukardt et al., 2006a, p. 18). The existence of supportive institutional leadership, then, can serve as a signalling mechanism to the internal and external communities that the university is committed to community issues and to promoting the TM (Weerts, 2005).

However, since organisational policies are believed to come into existence not because of the strong initiative of individual leaders alone but due to a confluence of various factors at the right moment (Fox et al., 2011), the presence of strong and committed leaders alone cannot guarantee the support of an issue. In addition, reliance on the personalities of institutional leaders could be harmful; it might foster dependence, limit the involvement of staff and students and curtail the sustainability of the TM when such leaders leave or are no longer in charge. In fact, in most cases, university-wide initiatives fail because leaders assume that everyone has the same understanding of, and commitment to, what should be (Wergin, 2006).

The above discussion shows that institutional commitment to the TM can be inferred from the policy, structural and cultural characteristics of an institution, namely: mission; hire and promotion policy and practices; organisational structure; faculty involvement and commitment; student involvement; community involvement; campus publications and communications; and leadership and support. These organisational factors correlate, in some way, with the five pathways for organisational transformation by means of entrepreneurial action: a strengthened steering core, an expanded developmental periphery, a diversified funding base, a stimulated academic heartland and an integrated academic culture (Clark, 1998a). Thus, to analyse the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM, the researcher will focus on eight organisational factors (see Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational factor</th>
<th>Level 1: Low relevance</th>
<th>Level 2: Medium relevance</th>
<th>Level 3: High relevance</th>
<th>Level 4: Full integration</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>No mention or rhetorical reference to outreach and engagement in the mission</td>
<td>Outreach and engagement is part of what we do as educated citizens</td>
<td>Outreach and engagement are an element of the academic agenda of the institution</td>
<td>Outreach and engagement are central and defining characteristics</td>
<td>Beere et al. (2011); Brukardt et al. (2006b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hire and promotion policy and practices</strong></td>
<td>Service to campus committees or to discipline</td>
<td>Community outreach and engagement mentioned and included among the criteria</td>
<td>Formal guidelines for defining, documenting and rewarding outreach and engagement</td>
<td>Community outreach and engagement are key criteria for hire and promotion</td>
<td>Cloete et al. (2011); Hollander (2002); Preece et al. (2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational structure</strong></td>
<td>No units focus on outreach or engagement</td>
<td>Units may exist to foster community service and/or engagement</td>
<td>Various separate centres and institutes are organised to advance outreach and engagement</td>
<td>Infrastructure (with base funding) exists to support widespread involvement of staff and students</td>
<td>Clark (1998a); Hölttä &amp; Pulliainen (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty involvement and commitment</strong></td>
<td>Service defined only as campus duties; little interdisciplinary work; no training or development opportunities for staff</td>
<td>Pro bono consulting and community volunteerism acknowledged</td>
<td>Senior academics pursue community-based research and/or teaching</td>
<td>Community-based research and teaching intentionally integrated across disciplines; Interdisciplinary &amp; collaborative work supported</td>
<td>Beere et al. (2011); Brukardt et al. (2006a); Charles et al. (2009); Clark (1998a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student involvement</strong></td>
<td>Outreach and engagement are part of students’ extracurricular activities</td>
<td>Limited opportunities and organised institutional support for volunteerism and community-based learning</td>
<td>Opportunities for internships and other community-based learning activities exist</td>
<td>Community-based learning integrated into curriculum; linked to learning goals</td>
<td>Gelmon et al. (2005); O’Meara &amp; Jaeger (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community involvement</strong></td>
<td>Occasional, symbolic or limited individual or group involvement</td>
<td>Community representation on advisory boards for departments or schools; limited external representation</td>
<td>Community influences campus through active partnerships and participation in teaching and research</td>
<td>Communities involved in defining, conducting and evaluating teaching and research; sustained partnerships</td>
<td>Charles et al. (2009); Hollander (2002); Ivanov (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conceptually, as Table 6 shows, the above-mentioned organisational factors can be categorised into three groups—regulative, normative and cognitive institutions (Scott, 1995). Regulative, as used here, denotes the procedures and regulations that guide organisational and individual behaviour (Colbeck, 2002) at the university. These include the faculty hire and promotion policy and practices, organisational structure and campus publications and communications. The normative pillar denotes values and norms that provide a social framework for appropriate action (Colbeck, 2002). In this case, the aspects of the normative pillar are the mission, leadership and support and faculty hire and promotion policy and practices. The cognitive pillar denotes the beliefs, understandings and actions of the academic staff, students and external communities. The cognitive indicators of institutional commitment to the TM are the following: faculty involvement and commitment, student involvement and community involvement. However, these categories are not mutually exclusive; some of the organisational factors—for example, faculty hire and promotion policy and practices—can fall into more than one category.
### Table 6. Categories of the Indicators of Institutional Commitment to the TM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bases of compliance</th>
<th>Regulative</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expedience</td>
<td>social obligation Values</td>
<td>Taken for granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement mechanisms</td>
<td>Rules and sanctions</td>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Cultural support Prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Faculty hire and promotion policy and practices</td>
<td>Mission Leadership and support Faculty hire and promotion policy and practices</td>
<td>Faculty involvement Student involvement Community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational structure Campus publications and communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on Colbeck, 2002; Scott, 1995).
3 Research Methodology and Design

This chapter describes and discusses the research methodology, the methods used to generate and analyse data and the trustworthiness of the study.

3.1 Research methodology

The study was carried out using a qualitative research methodology. Although there is no single right way of doing qualitative research, qualitative research is often defined in terms of either sets of characteristics, key aspects, or what qualitative research is not (Snape & Spencer, 2003). Merriam (1998), for instance, defines qualitative research as “an umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that help us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (p. 5). Accordingly, Merriam (1998) categorises qualitative research into five types, namely: basic or generic, ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory and case study. Qualitative research, then, as Punch (2005) notes, “is not a single entity, but an umbrella term which encompasses enormous variety” (p. 34). However, the key philosophical assumption that underlies all types of qualitative research, Merriam (1998) notes, “is the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting in their social worlds” (p. 6). In other words, it is “naturalistic, preferring to study people, things and events in their natural settings” (Punch 2005, p. 141).32

In addition, qualitative research is characterised by a desire to understand, describe and discover meaning and to generate hypotheses; flexible and emergent designs; small and purposefully selected samples; the researcher as the main instrument for data collection;

---

31 The way in which researchers carry out research and the methods they use echo a “particular mix of philosophy, research objectives, participants, funders and audiences relevant to applied policy research” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p. 2).
32 Although much of quantitative research—for instance, experiments—is not at all naturalistic, quantitative research can also be naturalistic in studying people in their natural settings without artificially contriving situations for research purposes. Some observational studies and correlational surveys fall into this category, but they are likely to have a prefigured conceptual framework and design with prestructured data (Punch, 2005, p. 141).
inductive analysis; and comprehensive and richly descriptive findings (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). Hence, the decision to use a qualitative research methodology was influenced by the nature and the purpose of the study and the appropriateness of the qualitative research methodology—the belief that it would allow the researcher to (a) carry out a comprehensive study, (b) make adjustments where necessary and (c) present detailed data (Patton, 1990; Punch, 2005).

Table 7. Characteristics of Qualitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of research</th>
<th>Quality (nature, essence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical roots</td>
<td>Phenomenological, symbolic interactionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated phrases</td>
<td>Fieldwork, ethnographic, naturalistic, grounded, constructivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of investigation</td>
<td>Understanding, description, discovery, meaning, hypothesis generating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design characteristics</td>
<td>Flexible, evolving, emergent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Small, non-random, purposeful, theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Researcher as primary instrument, interviews, observations, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of analysis</td>
<td>Inductive (by researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Comprehensive, holistic, expansive, richly descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.2 Research design

Within the broader qualitative research methodology, the researcher used a case study approach and focused on a single case—Makerere University. Case study research, Simons (2009) observes, can be broadly defined as a “process of conducting systematic, critical inquiry into a phenomenon of choice and generating understanding to contribute to cumulative public knowledge of the topic” (p. 18). The basic idea is, as Punch (2005) observes, that one case—for example, a particular situation, event, programme, or phenomenon (or perhaps a small number of cases)—will be studied in detail, using whatever methods are deemed appropriate, with the general objective of developing as full an understanding of that case or those cases as possible. Accordingly, case studies are not uniform; they can be differentiated based on the purpose or focus of each study. Stake (1995), for instance, categorises case studies into three types: intrinsic, instrumental and collective case studies.

In intrinsic case studies, researchers choose cases because they want to learn about those particular cases, not the other cases or some general problem. In an instrumental case study, a researcher chooses a case to explore a research question, to gain insight, or to develop a general understanding based on ground(s) other than the case itself. In a collective case study, a researcher studies several cases to understand an issue or a question (Stake, 1995). Merriam (1988) also categorises case studies into three types: descriptive, interpretive and evaluative. Descriptive case studies are entirely descriptive—they present
detailed accounts of the phenomena being studied and move in a theoretical vacuum. They emphasise description over theory building or hypothesising. Such studies are useful in providing information about areas in which minimal research has been conducted. Interpretive case studies also emphasise the description of data but use the data to develop conceptual categories or to illustrate, support and/or challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to the study. Evaluative case studies involve description, explanation and judgment (Merriam, 1988, pp. 27–28). These categories are not mutually exclusive; a case study can be instrumental and interpretive at the same time.

Case study research, then, is a research-based and evidence-led approach that encompasses different research methods with the aim of generating an “in-depth understanding of a specific topic (as in a thesis), programme, policy, institution or system to generate knowledge and/or inform policy development, professional practice and civil or community action” (Simons, 2009, p. 21). Qualitative case studies, then, can be described as follows:

1. Particularistic – they focus on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon. The case itself is important for what it reveals about the phenomenon and for what it might represent;
2. Descriptive – the end product of case study research is rich, “thick” description [that is], the complete, literal description of the incident or entity being investigated;
3. Heuristic – case studies illuminate the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon under study. They can bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader’s experience, or confirm what is known. (Merriam, 1988, pp. 11–13.)

The purpose of using a qualitative case study approach, then, is to explore and understand the complexity of the case(s), which, for the most part is/are appealing for its/their particularity/ uniqueness or its/their commonality (Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995). Nonetheless, references are often made to other cases.

3.2.1 Case selection

Within every study, including this one, “there probably exist numerous sites that could be visited, events or activities that could be observed, people who could be interviewed, documents that could be read” (Merriam, 1998, p. 60); hence, researchers must consider where to observe, and in this case, which institution to focus on. For this study, being an instrumental case study focusing on a single case, the selection of the case was based on a single criterion, explicit institutional acknowledgement of the TM as a core function of the university. The selection of the case, then, was performed using a purposive sampling technique (Patton, 2002; Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003) or criterion sampling (Patton, 2002)—that is, “the selection was done in a deliberate way, with some purpose or focus [the criterion mentioned above] in mind” (Punch 2005, p. 187).
3.2.2 Appropriateness of the qualitative case study approach

By virtue of its characteristics (discussed in Section 3.2), the case study, just like other research approaches, is appropriate for some, but not all, studies. For this reason, it is imperative to examine the appropriateness of the case study approach for this study. One of the strengths of case studies, particularly those using qualitative research methods, is that they enable researchers to study in detail the experience and complexity of programmes and policies and to interpret the precise socio-political contexts in which the policies and programmes are enacted (Simons, 2009). In addition, they enable researchers to document multiple perspectives, to explore contested viewpoints and to demonstrate the influence of key actors and interactions between them in telling a story of the programme or policy in action.

Thus, through the careful description, documentation and interpretation of events as they emerge, case studies uncover huge data sets that are crucial to exploring, understanding, implementing and evaluating programmes and policies. Importantly, the case study is also a flexible approach; it allows for shifts in focus and unanticipated changes in the study and permits researchers to use a wide range of research methods (e.g., interviewing, document reviews), as is the case herein. Nonetheless, there are concerns about the appropriateness of the case study approach.

The first concern is that case studies often contain substantial masses of data that may be difficult or impossible to summarise into scientific formulae, general propositions and theories (Flyvbjerg, 2004); reports that are too long and detailed to read; and narratives that over-persuade (Simons, 2009). However, as Flyvbjerg (2004) observes, “thick and hard-to-summarise narrative is not a problem; rather, it is often a sign that the study has uncovered a particularly rich problematic” (p. 430). In addition, by using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS)—for example, the use of NVivo 10 herein—a case study researcher can manage all the data sets, including their sources and contexts, and consequently theorise without necessarily summarising the data.

The question, then, is whether summarising and generalising, which the critics of the case study regard as ideal practices, are always desirable (Flyvbjerg, 2004). The second criticism relates to the personal involvement and/or subjectivity of the researcher—that the approach is biased towards verification of researchers’ preconceived notions (Flyvbjerg, 2004; Simons, 2009). Although the above claim is erroneous, it reminds qualitative case researchers that they should always be meticulous—that is, report how decisions are made, use multiple methods and communicate the research process clearly so that their subjectivity can be monitored. The third concern is that the case study approach cannot contribute to scientific development—that is, researchers cannot generalise and draw inferences from individual cases. However, Flyvbjerg (2004) stresses that formal generalisation, based on either large samples or single cases, is considerably overrated as the main source of scientific progress,
That knowledge cannot be formally generalized does not mean that it cannot enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field or in a society. A purely descriptive, phenomenological case study without any attempt to generalize can certainly be of value in this process and has often helped cut a path towards scientific innovation. (Flyvbjerg, 2004, p. 424.)

In addition, in many situations in which the case study approach is used, formal generalisation is not the aim; the aim is “particularization—to present a rich portrayal of a single setting to inform practice, establish the value of the case and/or add knowledge of a specific topic” (Simons, 2009, p. 24). Besides, although one cannot generalise from single cases or very small samples, one can learn a great deal from them and possibly make inferences that are applicable to other contexts (Patton, 2002) even though such inferences cannot be stated as generalisations as in random sample surveys (Simons, 2009).

Although the above-mentioned concerns are not necessarily limitations of the qualitative case study approach, discussing them helps qualitative case study researchers to understand what case study research embraces, examine the appropriateness of the approach to their studies and avoid compromising the quality of their studies. Thus, based on the fact that this study focuses on insight, discovery and interpretation—rather than hypothesis testing and measurement—the qualitative case study was deemed the most appropriate approach largely because of its flexibility and support for details.

3.3 Data collection methods and sources

Research data are not out there awaiting collection by the researcher; instead, “they have to be noticed by the researcher and treated as data for the purpose of his research” (Merriam, 1998, p. 70). Accordingly, the data for this study were generated through document reviews and face-to-face semi-structured interviews (see Subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 respectively for details). The choice of methods was influenced by the conceptual orientation, the research problem, the purpose of the study and the desire to generate detailed data.

3.3.1 Document reviews

The term ‘document,’ Merriam (1998) observes, broadly refers to “printed and other materials relevant to a study, including public records, personal documents, and physical artifacts” (p. 70). Herein, the term denotes policy documents or public records and anything else written or produced about the context or site of the study. The documents that were used in this study can be grouped into three types:

1. Internal documents of the case institution, such as the current and past strategic plans, the recruitment and promotion policy for the academic staff, guidelines for
field attachment, statutes, intellectual property management policy and annual reports;


3. External documents, such as the mission statements of other HEIs (both within and outside Uganda) and reports from AICAD, pertinent to the study.

The documents were obtained through website searches, the source institutions and purchases. Because documents are “contextually relevant and grounded in the contexts they represent ... [and] are often legally unassailable ... especially in the case of records” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 276), the reviewed documents were helpful in two major ways. First, they enabled the researcher to learn about certain topical issues, such as the recruitment and promotion of the academic staff, which were explored further in the interviews. Second, they offered a context for interpreting the interview data (Simons, 2009)—that is, they served as a valuable resource for confirming the insights that emerged from the interviews.

Hence, although Merriam (1998) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that formal reviews of documents are not as commonly used in evaluation and case study research as are interviews and observations, the decision to use document reviews was based on the conviction that they would enrich the context of the study and supplement data from the interviews. One key aspect of document reviews that was particularly beneficial to the study is that the process of collecting and reviewing the documents did not “intrude upon [the case institution] or alter the setting in ways that the presence of the investigator often does. Nor [did it depend] ... upon the whims of human beings whose cooperation is essential for collecting good data through interviews and observations” (Merriam, 1998, p. 112). In addition, since documents are ready-made sources of data, the researcher obtained all the documents either freely or cheaply.

However, since some of the documents had not been produced for research purposes, the information they offered was often incomplete or incomprehensible from a research perspective. In addition, it was difficult to ascertain the accuracy of some of the documents (Yin, 2009) because, as Merriam (1998) observes, “Even public records that purport to be objective and accurate contain built-in biases that a researcher may not be aware of” (p. 125). Thus, none of the documents was considered a literal recording (Yin, 2009); they were treated as records and corroborated with the interview data.
3.3.2 Interviewing

In all forms of qualitative research, the interview, especially the person-to-person encounter, is one of the key tools used to generate data. Qualitative interviews, Rubin and Rubin (2005) note, are “conversations in which a researcher gently guides a conversational partner in an extended discussion. The researcher elicits depth and detail about the research topic by following up on answers given by the interviewee during the discussion” (p. 4). An interview, then, is a purposeful conversation in which an interviewer selects people with knowledge pertinent to a topic of study, asks questions, listens attentively and records their responses to find out what is in and on their minds (Patton, 1990) to get answers to stated questions. Thus, as a research method, interviewing is mostly appropriate in situations in which researchers aspire to access “people’s perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations, and constructions of reality” (Punch, 2005, p. 168). It is also an ideal research method in situations in which it enables researchers to get better or more data at lower costs (Merriam 1988).

Types of interviewing

Although interviewing is essentially about asking questions and receiving answers, three types of interviews, differentiated largely by the degree of structure in, and the depth of, the interviews (Punch, 2005), can be identified: structured, unstructured and semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998; Punch, 2005). Structured interviews, at times referred to as standardised interviews, are questionnaire-driven, oral forms of the written survey in which the interviewer asks all respondents similar questions in the same order with a narrow set of predetermined response categories (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Punch, 2005). One advantage of structured interviews is that their inflexibility and standardisation makes them less prone to errors. However, adherence to “strictly predetermined questions may not allow a researcher to access participants’ perspective and understanding of the world” (Merriam, 1997, p. 74). In addition, since structured interviews are based on “shaky assumptions that respondents share a common vocabulary and that the questions are equally meaningful to every respondent” (Denzin, 1970, p. 123, as cited in Merriam, 1997, p. 74), they minimise flexibility and variation (Punch, 2005).

Unstructured interviewing, contrastingly, is essentially (a) exploratory in that it is driven by a desire to gain sufficient information about a situation and (b) flexible in that the interview questions and the order of the questions are not set prior to the interview. A traditional type of unstructured interviewing, Punch (2005) notes, is “the non-standardized, open-ended, in-depth interview, sometimes called the ethnographic interview ... used as a way of understanding the complex behaviour of people without imposing any a priori categorization which might limit the field of inquiry” (p. 172). One of the strengths of unstructured interviewing is that it is very flexible—that is, the interviewee often steers
the direction of the interview through general rather than specific responses, and the interviewer follows and responds to points that seem interesting and/or need a follow-up. Unstructured interviewing is particularly useful in situations in which the researcher does not have enough information about the phenomenon to ask specific questions (Merriam, 1998). Unstructured interviewing, then, can offer greater breadth than do the other types of interviewing (Fontana & Frey, 2005). However, researchers conducting unstructured interviews might “feel lost in a sea of divergent viewpoints and seemingly unconnected pieces of information” (Merriam, 1998, p. 75).

In semi-structured interviewing, either all the questions are worded flexibly or the interview is a mix of more- and less-structured questions. The exact order and the wording of the interview questions are not predetermined—that is, the researcher can “respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic [as they emerge]” (Merriam, 1988, p. 74). Therefore, semi-structured interviewing is appropriate for studies that focus on clearly defined issues. All the interviews pertaining to this study were semi-structured in nature.

The decision to use semi-structured interviews was influenced by the appropriateness of the method—that is, the conviction that it would enable the researcher to (1) respond to situations as they arose—by probing and seeking clarification—and (2) generate specific but in-depth data (Punch, 2005). In essence, the decision was based on the compatibility of the method with the research purpose and questions and, therefore, its ability to generate the required data and to corroborate the documentary data. During the interview process, the researcher used a semi-structured interview guide—an outline of suggested questions and topical themes that deserved attention (Kvale, 1996). However, the interview questions were not necessarily asked in the order in which they appeared on the interview guide.

Table 8. Continuum of the Interview Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly structured/standardized</th>
<th>Semi-structured</th>
<th>Unstructured/informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wording of questions predetermined</td>
<td>Mix of more- and less structured</td>
<td>Open ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of questions predetermined</td>
<td>More like a conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral form of a survey</td>
<td>Flexible, exploratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Selection of the interviewees

Because the researcher could not interview everyone, a purposive sampling technique (Patton, 2002; Ritchie et al., 2003), guided by the need to select interviewees based on their potential to provide rich information about the research topic, was utilised. Prior to selecting the interviewees, the researcher chose five colleges, out of the nine that constitute MUK (see Table 10), largely because financial and time constraints could not permit the
researcher to interview people from all the colleges. To enable the study to generate data from as many and as dissimilar academic disciplines as possible, the researcher divided the nine university colleges into four categories, namely: hard-pure, hard-applied, soft-pure and soft-applied (see Table 10 for details). The categorisation was based on Biglan’s (1973b) classification of academic disciplines (see Table 9 below).

Table 9. Clustering of Academic Task Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task area</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Soft</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonlife system</td>
<td>Life system</td>
<td>Nonlife system</td>
<td>Life system</td>
<td>Nonlife system</td>
<td>Life system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Ceramic engineering</td>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Educational administration and supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
<td>Dairy science</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Secondary and continuing education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Special education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical engineering</td>
<td>Agricultural economics</td>
<td>Vocational and technical education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Biglan (1973b, p. 207).

While collecting data at the University of Illinois, Biglan (1973a) provided scholars with cards, each of which contained the name of one academic area, and instructed the scholars to sort the cards into categories based on the similarity of the subject matter of each area. Based on the research findings, Biglan (1973a) pointed out three themes that seem to typify the subject matter of academic areas in most institutions: the degree to which a paradigm (hard vs. soft) exists, the degree of concern with application (pure vs. applied, a dimension that distinguishes education, engineering and agricultural areas from hard sciences and humanities) and the degree of concern with life systems—nonlife vs. life system (pp. 201–202).

Quoting Kuhn (1962), Biglan (1973a) uses the term paradigm to denote "a body of theory which is subscribed to by all members of the field. The paradigm serves an important organizing function; it provides a consistent account of most of the phenomenon of interest in the area. Thus, fields that have a single paradigm will be characterized by greater consensus about content and method than will fields lacking a paradigm" (pp. 201–202). This distinguishes hard sciences, engineering and agriculture from social sciences, education and humanities.
Table 10. The Categorisation of University Colleges at MUK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task area</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Soft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>College of Natural Sciences (CoNAS)</td>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHUSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology (CEDAT)</td>
<td>College of Education and External Studies (CEES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES)</td>
<td>College of Business and Management Sciences (CoBAMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Health Sciences (CHS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine and Bio-Security (CoVAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Computing and Information Sciences (CoCIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on Biglan’s, 1973b; Becher & Trowler’s, 2001 taxonomies)

After categorising the colleges, five colleges were selected purposively (one from the hard-pure, two from the hard-applied, one from the soft-pure and one from the soft-applied) to ensure that at least each category was represented. The aim of selecting the colleges using this approach was to identify the central themes that cut across all the colleges (Ritchie et al., 2003) but also, though not essentially, to capture variations that exist among the units. Four of the selected colleges had organisational units responsible for carrying out certain TM activities, and therefore, in each of these colleges, the researcher interviewed four people—a college principal or deputy principal, two members of the academic staff and a centre coordinator who is also a member of the academic staff. From the fifth college, the researcher interviewed five people—the college principal and four members of the academic staff.

In addition to the academic staff, the researcher also interviewed (a) a university administrator responsible for initiating and sustaining partnerships between the university and the public and private sectors, (b) an official from the MoES and (c) an official from a regional organisation that works with public universities to connect knowledge with application within communities. In total, the researcher conducted 24 face-to-face, qualitative, semi-structured interviews (with 3 college principals, 2 college deputy principals, 12 other members of the academic staff, 4 coordinators of university centres, 1 administrator, 1 official from the MoES and 1 official from a bridging organisation), lasting between 40 minutes and 90 minutes each, in March and April of 2012.

Prior to the interviews, the researcher sent out electronic mail (e-mail) interview requests to five college principals (three accepted and were interviewed, one recommended his deputy and one turned down the request and his deputy was interviewed instead) and the members of the academic staff whose e-mail addresses were available on the university’s website. However, in the process of conducting the interviews, the researcher learnt about the existence of the bridging organisation and the centres, and thereafter, interview requests were also sent out to the heads of these units. All the e-mail interview requests contained information about the researcher, the research topic and purpose, the reason that particular person had been selected, assurances that the respondent’s identity would...
remain anonymous and a promise that the interview materials would be used for academic purposes only.

At the beginning of each interview, the researcher reminded the interviewee that his or her identity would be anonymous and then sought his or her consent to record the interview. All the interviews were audiotaped on a voice recorder and transcribed verbatim to capture the original responses of the interviewees because, as Patton (2002) notes, “no matter the style of interviewing you use and no matter how careful you word questions, it all comes to naught if you fail to capture the actual words of the person being interviewed” (p. 380).

The decision to interview the college principals and other members of the academic staff was based on the idea that since HEIs are loosely coupled systems34 (Birnbaum, 1991; Weick, 1976) with academic units and actors (e.g., academics) that have enough room for self-determination, it would be impossible to institutionalise the TM without the input of such units and actors (Ward, 1996). The college principals at MUK, for example, serve as heads of the establishment and appointments committees, which are sub-committees of the appointments boards that are responsible for appointing the academic staff below the rank of a university lecturer; therefore, they have knowledge about the hire and promotion processes and the potential to influence the institutionalisation of the TM through staff appointments. In addition, college principals are heads of their respective academic units and are members of the University Senate, which is the chief academic organ of the university, and for that reason, they play an active role in decision-making processes at the university. Thus, the decision to interview the college principals was influenced by (1) the belief that their leadership positions would enable them to contribute to the interviews from well-informed viewpoints and (2) the fact that they are in privileged positions to promote the TM and, hence, their knowledge and opinions deserved attention.

The decision to interview the academic staff was grounded on the notion that since members of the academic staff are the only active participants in all the three functions of the university, they are an indispensable component of the operation of the institution. Therefore, an exploration of the academic staff’s understanding of the TM and their involvement in TM activities was deemed critical to the understanding and institutionalisation of the TM. The decision to interview the coordinators/heads of the university centres was based on scholarly observations (e.g., Furco & Holland, 2004; Höltä & Pulliainen, 1996; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Weerts, 2005) that such centres play a significant role in the institutionalisation of the TM.

The interview process, as described above, illustrates that unlike in survey research for which the number and the representativeness of the sample are major considerations, herein, the primary concern was not “the number of respondents but the potential of each

---

34 That is, connections between organisational subsystems that may be infrequent, circumscribed, weak in their mutual effects, unimportant, or slow to respond (Birnbaum, 1991, p. 38). Loosely coupled systems, then, are characterised by elements that respond to each other but also preserve their own identities and some evidence of physical or logical separateness (Weick, 1976, p. 3).
person to contribute to the development of insight and understanding of the phenomenon [that was being studied]” (Merriam, 1998, p. 83).

Limitations of using the interview method

Because interviewing relies on the interviewer’s interpersonal abilities and skills as well as on the cooperation of the interviewees, there are concerns that it breeds bias. In addition, although the use of the interview method permits researchers to generate plenty of data, the data require a great deal of time to analyse. Thus, the decision regarding whether to use interviewing as a research method, as was the case in this study, should be based on the kind of information that a researcher needs and the fact that interviewing is the most appropriate method of getting that information (Simons, 2009).

3.4 Data management and analysis

Data management denotes the organisation of all data sources into a manageable data set to facilitate the coding, searching, retrieval and analysis of data. However, since qualitative data are, as Bazeley (2007) observes, “Voluminous and messy,” it is important to “consider tools for managing them, and for storing additional information about them (p. 131). Thus, in this study, the organisation of data sources, the creation of nodes, and the coding and searching of the data were carried out using CAQDAS, NVivo 10. After transcribing the interview recordings, the researcher replaced the interviewees’ actual names with respondent (R) numbers to ensure the anonymity of the interviewees and thereafter created a project in NVivo and imported all the data sources (interview transcripts and documents) into the project. In addition to the imported data sources, memos, the researcher’s field observations and assumptions, hunches and initial conclusions were made to enable the researcher to comment on the data during the coding process.

35 Internals—interview transcripts, university documents, government documents and academic literature; externals—web pages; and memos—recorded ideas, insights, comments and interpretations of the researcher.

36 A node is a collection of references about a specific theme, place, person or other area of interest (QSR International). The term represents an idea, theme, dimension, or characteristic of the data (Gibbs, 2007); thus, in this study, passages of text were coded at, or linked to, the same node to show that they represent the same idea, theme, or characteristic (QSR International http://help-nv10-en.qsrinternational.com/nv10_help.htm)

37 Documents containing a researcher’s insights, interpretations, or growing understanding of, and commentary on, the primary data or nodes of the project. They provide a way to keep one’s analysis separate from (but linked to) the material that is being analysed (see Gibbs, 2007; QSR International http://help-nv10-en.qsrinternational.com/nv10_help.htm).
3.4.1 Thematic data analysis

The notion of analysis, Gibbs (2007) observes, “Implies some kind of transformation” (p. 1). It involves “reading through your data repeatedly, and engaging in activities of breaking the data down (thematising and categorising) and building it up again in novel ways (elaborating and interpreting)” (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 2002, p. 140). Although there are different approaches to qualitative data analysis (e.g., grounded theory/constant comparison and discourse analysis), the data for this study were analysed using a thematic analysis approach (Boyatzis, 1998; Howitt & Cramer, 2011; Seidman, 2006). The process of analysing data using a thematic approach, Howitt and Cramer (2011) observe, involves three conceptually distinct but practically overlapping stages: the transcription of textual material, analytic effort and the identification of themes and sub-themes. Contrastingly, Braun and Clarke (2006) note that the process involves six phases: familiarisation with data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes and producing a report (see Table 11 below).

**Table 11. The Phases of Thematic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarizing oneself with their data</td>
<td>Transcribing the data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating initial [nodes]</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each [node]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for themes</td>
<td>Collating [nodes] into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing themes</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (level 1) and the entire data set (level 2), generating clear definitions and names for each theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing the report</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis; selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The analytic processes described by Howitt and Cramer (2011) and Braun and Clark (2006) illustrate that although the thematic analysis of data is a stage-by-stage process, it is also a back-and-forth process, a feature that fits well with NVivo 10.

After transcribing all the interview recordings and importing all the data sources into NVivo, the data were analysed in a four-stage process, namely: familiarisation with,
and immersion into data; creation of thematic nodes; coding of data at the nodes; and interpretation of data, searching for connections among excerpts and between themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Seidman, 2006; Terre Blanche & Kelly, 2002). Thus, the task of the researcher was to delve “deeper into the text … to identify a variety of themes which describe[d] significant aspects of the text” (Howitt & Cramer, 2011, p. 331) and to make sense out of the seemingly unrelated materials (Boyatzis, 1998). The creation of nodes and the coding of data involved (a) paying attention to differences among the text passages and (b) searching the data and literature for overarching themes because the coding of data was both a concept-driven and data-driven process (Gibbs, 2007).

In a concept-driven coding process, the categories or themes that the nodes represent “may come from the research literature, previous studies, topics in the interview schedule, [and the] hunches you have about what is going on” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 44). In a data-driven coding process, the researcher starts with no list of nodes. Likewise, Braun and Clarke (2006) use the terms inductive and theoretical analysis. In inductive analyses, themes are strongly linked to data—that is, the data are coded without trying to fit them into “a pre-existing coding frame, or the researcher’s analytic preconceptions” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 83). In a theoretical thematic analysis, however, the coding of data tends to be driven by the “researcher’s theoretical or analytic interest in the area, and is thus more explicitly analyst-driven” (Braun & Clarke, p. 84). However, as Boyatzis (2011) notes, themes can initially be developed inductively from raw information and deductively from theory or prior research.

Accordingly, herein, the development of nodes and the coding of data were carried out using both the data-driven and the concept-driven approaches. While perusing the source materials, the researcher selected passages of text and coded them at nodes that emerged from the reviewed literature and/or the documentary/interview data. The decision to use both the concept-driven and the data-driven approaches was based on the conviction that using both approaches would enable the researcher to discover emergent themes and to link the study with some previous studies. “The belief that an inductive approach to research requires that researchers come to their data without having been influenced by prior reading of the literature in their field and without bringing any theoretical concepts to the research,” Bazeley (2007) notes, “is generally no longer seen as realistic nor broadly supported” (p. 22).

38 Segments of data from across the whole data set, identified as relating to, or being an example of, a more general idea, instance, theme, or category, were placed together, retrieved later, and transformed into coherent data. Coding, therefore, "manages and orders qualitative data. It enables easier searching of data for similarities, differences, patterns and relations" (Lewin & Silver, 2007, p. 81).
Appropriateness of the thematic analysis approach

One of the strengths of, and the reasons for, using a thematic analysis approach is that, unlike most other qualitative techniques, the approach requires less knowledge of the intricacies of the theoretical foundations of qualitative research (Howitt & Cramer, 2011). Although having such knowledge is important, the theoretical flexibility of the approach was very helpful; it permitted the researcher to develop themes consistently and transparently without restrictions. Besides its theoretical flexibility, the approach permits researchers to “use a wide variety of types of information in a systematic manner [and, therefore,] ... increases their accuracy or sensitivity in understanding and interpreting [data]” (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 5).

However, herein, the decision to analyse the data thematically was based on not just the theoretical flexibility of thematic analysis and ultimately its ability to permit the researcher to use multiple data sources, but the conviction that the inherent features of the approach would support the study and enable the researcher to analyse the data flexibly and systematically. Notwithstanding its strengths, thematic analysis, just like other forms of qualitative data analysis, takes a lot of time and energy and is not easy to use (Boyatzis, 1998). The main challenge to analysing data using a thematic approach is that thematic analysis is not

A single, identifiable approach to the analysis of qualitative data. There is no accepted, standardised approach to carrying out a thematic analysis, so different researchers do things differently. While this is typical of qualitative methods in general, it, clearly, is an obstacle to carrying out thematic analysis. (Howitt & Cramer, 2011, p. 329.)

Therefore, unless researchers make efforts to counter these potential weaknesses, the “anything goes critique of qualitative research may apply in some cases [of thematic analysis]” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 78). In fact, many of the so-called weaknesses of thematic analysis, as Braun and Clarke (2006) note, “depend more on poorly conducted analyses or inappropriate research question [and less] ... on the method itself” (p. 27).

3.4.2 Analysing qualitative data using NVivo 10: A critique

Notwithstanding the consensus about the efficacy of using CAQDAS to analyse qualitative data (Bazeley, 2007; Gibbs, 2007; Gibbs, 2002), there are concerns about its appropriateness. The first concern is that the process of analysing data using computers can distance researchers from their data (Bazeley, 2007; Fielding & Lee, 1998; Gibbs, 2002) and subsequently disturb “the highly personal researcher–data relationship that has defined qualitative analysis” (Hoover & Koerber, 2011, p. 76). However, as Richards (1998) notes, the latest software “[has] been designed on the assumption that researchers need both closeness and distance; closeness for familiarity and appreciation of subtle differences, but
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In addition, since the CAQDAS does not carry out the analysis—that is, it assists the researcher to analyse data and its use frees the researcher from organising the data manually, thus enabling him to spend more time analysing the data (Bringer, Johnston, & Brackenridge, 2004).

The second concern is that the ‘code and retrieve’ methods that dominate CAQDAS, and are supported by NVivo 10, almost exclude other analytical activities (Bazeley, 2007; Gibbs, 2002). The third issue is that CAQDAS supports only grounded theory methodology (Bazeley, 2007; Bringer et al., 2004; Gibbs, 2007) and, hence, “Researchers may choose their theoretical perspectives and analysis techniques based on the capabilities of CAQDAS rather than adopting a theoretical perspective appropriate for exploring the research question” (Bringer et al., 2004, p. 249). However, it is imperative to note that although CAQDAS helps researchers to create manageable data sets and hence to analyse the data, analytical thinking (e.g., interpretation of the data, formation of concepts, examination of relationships and development of theory) is still a researcher’s responsibility (Bringer et al., 2004). “The real heart of the analysis,” Gibbs (2002) stresses, “requires an understanding of the meaning of the texts, and that is something that computers are still a long way from being able to do” (p. 10). Therefore, the choices available in NVivo return the power of analysis to the researcher who must choose from amongst a set of tools but is by no means required to use them all. In addition, although CAQDAS appears to be suited to grounded theory, it can also support other approaches to data analysis (Bringer et al., 2004).

Despite the above-mentioned concerns, within this study, the organisation of the data as well as their coding, retrieval and analysis were done using NVivo 10. Because of its well-developed ‘code and retrieve’ feature, which corresponded with the analytical approach used by the researcher, the software enabled the researcher to not only organise the data but to also create nodes and memos, code the data, explore relationships in the data and interpret the data. Thus, the decision to use NVivo 10 in the management and analysis of data was based on the appropriateness of the software to the study, the belief that it would help the researcher to manage the data and code the data effectively and thematically, access the nodes and data quickly and ultimately interpret the data effectively (Bazeley, 2007). In essence, the role of the software was to facilitate the researcher’s efforts to manage, access, analyse and interpret the data easily and thoroughly. After all, as Gibbs (2002) observes:

However, in much the same way as a word processor won’t write meaningful text for you, but makes the process of writing and editing a lot easier, using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) can make qualitative data analysis easier, more accurate, more reliable and more transparent. But the program will never do the reading and thinking for you. (pp. 10–11.)
3.5 Trustworthiness of the study

The essential issue regarding the trustworthiness of any study, Lincoln and Guba (1985) observe, is how an inquirer can “persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to and worth taking account of” (p. 290). Conventionally, inquirers have found it useful to pose questions about the (a) truth value, (b) applicability, (c) consistency, (d) and neutrality of studies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Most of the early ideas that emerged in response to the four issues raised above were in the context of quantitative research with a strong emphasis on ensuring internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity (Gibbs, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, various approaches and techniques, designed to ensure that research results are, as far as possible, valid, reliable and generalisable have been developed (Gibbs, 2007). However, such approaches often “rely on things like experimental design and random sampling, things that are inappropriate or rarely used in qualitative research and analysis” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 91). Even so, their inappropriateness cannot be used as an excuse for poor-quality research. “There may be no simple, absolute truth,” Gibbs (2007) notes, “but there can still be error in qualitative research. So the issue of how we ensure good quality research cannot be escaped” (p. 91).

Thus, instead of the positivistic terms, many naturalistic investigators use the terms ‘credibility,’ ‘transferability,’ ‘dependability,’ and ‘confirmability’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004) to “make clear the inappropriateness of the conventional terms when applied to naturalism and to provide alternatives” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 300–301). Accordingly, the trustworthiness of this study, as the discussion below shows, is examined in terms of the credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of the study.

3.5.1 Credibility

Credibility addresses the question of whether one’s findings match the reality—that is, whether the findings “capture what is really there” (Merriam, 1988, pp. 166) and whether the theories and explanations derived from the research data reflect what is truly happening (Gibbs, 2002). Herein, four strategies were utilised to ensure the credibility of the findings. First, the research process—the selection of the interviewees, the formulation of the interview questions, the interviewing process and the analysis of the data—followed and utilised well-established research procedures and methods that have been “successfully utilised in previous comparable projects” (Shenton, 2004, p. 64). In fact, the researcher reviewed some of the existing literature, created conceptual links between the study and the prior studies and drew inspiration from the literature to formulate the research questions and the interview questions to collect, analyse and interpret the data and to make conclusions and suggestions. “The ability of the researcher to relate his or her findings to an

Second, the researcher collected the data using two methods—document review and face-to-face semi-structured interviews—which enabled him to unearth various dimensions about the research phenomenon (Gibbs, 2007); to corroborate interview evidence with documentary data and vice versa; and ultimately to minimise the potential limitations of either method. “No single item of information (unless coming from an elite and unimpeachable source),” Lincoln and Guba (1985) observe, “should ever be given serious consideration unless it can be triangulated” (p. 283). However, the idea was to generate as much and as diverse evidence as possible to facilitate the drawing of meaningful conclusions, not that the accumulation of data from the two methods would produce a more complete picture (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008). After all, “threats are ruled out by evidence, not methods” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 158).

Third, the researcher utilised a descriptive writing style—the issues that were investigated, the contexts that surrounded the issues, the collection and analysis of data and the research findings are presented in a detailed way—to enable the potential readers to understand the process through which the study was carried out (Shenton, 2004). In addition, by corroborating the interpretation of the data with quotations from the interview transcripts and the reviewed documents, the dissertation (a) shows that the study and its findings are grounded in fact and (b) gives readers an idea about the milieu of the study—the people, the organisation and the documents that were studied. In short, it brings the reader “closer to the data and enables ... [the researcher] to show exactly how the ideas ... [he discusses] are expressed by those ... [he] studied” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 97). Last, the researcher had debriefing sessions with his supervisor and colleagues, which enabled him to test his ideas and interpretations, minimise biases and preferences, refine the methods and develop a greater explanation of the research design and strengthen arguments in light of the comments made (Shenton, 2004). It is worth noting that the above-mentioned strategies were utilised as ways to “eliminate obvious mistakes and to generate a richer set of explanations of ... data” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 94), not just to guarantee that the study would be a true picture of reality.

3.5.2 Transferability

Transferability is a qualitative researcher’s equivalent of the concept ‘external validity,’ which addresses the issue of whether or not the results of a study hold “true for a wide range of (specified) circumstances beyond those studied in the research” (Gibbs, 2002, p. 13) or can be generalised to other situations or a wider population (Merriam, 1997; Shenton, 2004). However, since qualitative research findings are often specific to individuals and small numbers of particular environments, it is impossible to generalise such findings and
conclusions to other situations and populations. In such studies, the concern, then, is the transferability, which is,

The extent to which the case study facilitates the drawing of inferences by the reader that may have applicability in his or her own context or situation (inference, however, not to be confused with generalizations, which are context-free and time-free laws regarding human behavior). (Lincoln & Guba, 1988, p. 18).

Thus, although scholars, such as Bassey (1981), propose that if readers believe that their situations are similar to that described in a study, they may relate the findings to their own positions, it is the researcher’s responsibility to provide ample contextual information about his or her study so that readers can compare the fit with their own situations (Merriam 1998; Shenton, 2004). Accordingly, this dissertation offers detailed information about the research milieu (e.g., the case institution) and the research process (e.g., the selection of the interviewees and the analysis of data (Shenton, 2004) to enable readers to find out whether the described research situation matches their situation and whether the research findings can be transferred to their situations (Merriam, 1998). In short, it is, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) observe, “not the naturalist’s task to provide an index of transferability; it is his or her responsibility to provide the [credible] database that makes transferability judgements possible on the part of potential appliers” (p. 316). In essence, research findings must be credible first before they can be transferable; otherwise, it would be pointless to ask whether meaningless information has any general applicability (Merriam, 1998).

3.5.3 Dependability

Dependability is the qualitative researchers’ equivalent of the term ‘reliability,’—that is, whether the results of a study are “consistent across repeated investigations in different circumstances with different investigators” (Gibbs, 2002, p. 13). To address reliability issues, positivists employ techniques to show that if the work were repeated in the same context, with the same methods and with the same participants, similar results would be obtained (Shenton, 2004). However, since what is researched in qualitative studies is flux, multifaceted and contextual—that is, information gathering is a function of who gives it and the skills of the one collecting it and the fact that qualitative case study design is highly emergent—achieving reliability using the traditional provisions is not only fanciful but also impossible (Merriam, 1998, p. 206). However, this should not be construed as an attempt to denigrate the importance of dependability in research or as an excuse for sloppiness. Thus, in this dissertation, the researcher presents the research process (e.g., the generation, coding and analysis of data) in a detailed and descriptive way (Merriam, 1998) so that the potential readers and future researchers can assess whether or not the researcher followed proper research practices (Shenton, 2004). Besides the detailed description of the research process, the researcher recorded and transcribed verbatim all the interviews and checked
all the interview transcripts to capture all the contexts and responses of the interviewees. However, the aim of these strategies was, for the most part, to maximise the credibility of the research findings and to provide information about how the study was carried out and how the conclusions were arrived at.

3.5.4 Confirmability

Confirmability in qualitative research is comparable to the term ‘objectivity’ in positivist research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton 2004). Accordingly, ensuring confirmability requires taking measures to guarantee that the findings of one’s study result from the experiences and ideas of one’s informants rather than one’s own characteristics and preferences. However, as Gibbs (2007) observes, qualitative researchers, like all other researchers, “cannot claim to be objective, authoritative, politically neutral observers standing outside and above the text of their research reports” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 91). Accordingly, the key test of the confirmability of a study is the extent to which an investigator admits his or her inclinations, reflexivity—that is, recognising that “the product of research inevitably reflects some of the background, the milieu and the predilections of the researcher [although] the scientific model claims that good research is objective, accurate, and unbiased” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 91). To this end, this dissertation contains detailed information about vital issues and processes, such as the grounds on which knowledge claims were justified (number and characteristics of the interviewees, length of the interviews and ethical issues); the coding of data; the analysis of data, including the framework used; and the strengths and limitations of the research design. In addition, the dissertation contains sufficient data extracts from documents and interview transcripts to enable its potential readers to confirm or to corroborate the issues raised therein. The researcher also acknowledges the beliefs that informed his choice of the research methods, the case institution and the interviewees (Gibbs, 2007; Shenton, 2004). Reflexivity, then, is an acknowledgement that since we cannot eliminate the effect that a researcher has on the research process, we should understand these effects and monitor and report them (Gibbs, 2007) so that readers of our reports can understand how our research findings were derived. In short, it demands of researchers more accountability and thoroughness.
4 Higher Education in Uganda

To understand fully the organisational practices and characteristics of any HEI, it is necessary to first understand the national system within which that institution operates. Accordingly, this chapter describes and discusses key features of HE in Uganda—specifically its history, size, composition, aims and goals, governance and financing.

4.1 History, size and composition

HE in Uganda refers to post-secondary studies, training, or training for research provided by universities and other tertiary institutions licensed and/or recognised by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE). It dates back to the founding of Katigondo National Major Seminary in 1911 and later the establishment of Makerere Technical College, currently Makerere University, in 1922 after revelations by the Phelps–Stokes Commission (1920) that the educational policies of the missionaries and the colonial government were inadequate (Nakanyike & Nansozi, 2003). The Ugandan HE system consists of 34 recognised universities (6 public and 31 private) and 112 other tertiary institutions (NCHE, 2012), with a combined enrolment of 196,390 students (Ministry of Education and Sports [MoES], 2012a) and a gross tertiary education enrolment ratio (GER) of 5.1% (MoES, 2012b).

39 A commission of inquiry undertaken by Phelps–Stokes, in cooperation with the Imperial Government and British and American missionary and philanthropic bodies, to enquire about the state of educational services and the needs of black Africans in British colonies in Africa, ascertain the extent to which the needs were being met and assist in designing plans towards addressing the needs (Bovet, 1926; Challiss, 1983).

40 For example, the technical colleges, teachers' colleges, agricultural colleges, theological colleges, the Law Development Centre, health colleges, business institutions, media institutes and degree-awarding non-university institutions (see MoES, 2012a, http://www.unche.or.ug/institutions).
Table 12. Higher Education Enrolments in Uganda since the 1970s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>85,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>108,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>124,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>137,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>174,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>183,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>196,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 110,255 (56.1%) males and 86,135 (43.9%) females (MoES, 2012a, p.87).
Source: Author (based on data from A: NCHE, 2006; B: Republic of Uganda, 2012a; C: NCHE, 2010; D: MoES, 2012a).

Table 13. Gross Tertiary Education Enrolment Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.2 Aims and goals

The “Government White Paper on the Education Policy Review Commission Report” stipulates that HEIs in Uganda have five functions: (1) teaching to produce high-level workforce; (2) conducting research, particularly applied; (3) engaging in public service through various extension activities; (4) publishing books, journals and research papers; and (5) serving as storehouses of knowledge and as centres of excellence in all fields of human endeavours (Republic of Uganda, 1992, p. 88). The “Government White Paper on Education Policy Review Commission Report” further states that in relation to the current and future social, cultural, political and economic needs of the country, HEIs should, among other things,
- Train high-level technical, managerial and professional personnel for all sectors of national life;
- Generate advanced knowledge and innovations through research and be able to translate or adapt them to local and Ugandan situations;
- Equip students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to enable them to join the world of work as useful members of their communities and the nation at large;
- Intensify the provision of public services through expanded extramural (should include long-distance and study-while-at-work education) or extension work and consultancy services; and
- Develop the indigenous scientific and technological capacity required to tackle development problems. (Republic of Uganda, 1992, pp. 88–89.)

4.3 Governance

The governance of HEIs, particularly their establishment, administration and accreditation, as well as the accreditation of academic programmes, is guided by the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions’ Act (UOTIA) of 2001 (amended in 2003, 2006). The Act serves to streamline the establishment, administration and standards of universities and other tertiary institutions and to provide for other related matters (Republic of Uganda, 2001). Its objectives are to (a) establish and develop a system of governance for HEIs, (b) equate qualifications of the same or similar courses offered by different HEIs, taking into consideration the autonomy and academic freedom of the institutions and (c) widen students’ accessibility to high-quality HEIs (Republic of Uganda, 2001). The Act provides for the establishment of the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE), a semi-autonomous HE supervisory agency that regulates and guides the establishment and management of HEIs. The Act empowers the NCHE to undertake the following among other functions:

1. Implement the objectives of the UOTIA;
2. Receive, evaluate and process applications for the establishment and accreditation of HEIs;
3. Register, monitor, evaluate and regulate all HEIs established under the UOTIA;
4. Evaluate—in collaboration with the relevant government departments, the private sector and/or different HEIs—the overall national manpower requirement and make the necessary recommendations;
5. Set and coordinate national standards for the admission of students to the different institutions of HE;
6. Guide and regulate the establishment, management and quality of HE;
7. Determine the equivalence of academic and professional qualifications obtained elsewhere with those awarded by Ugandan HEIs for recognition in Uganda;
8. Collect and disseminate information about HEIs and other aspects of HE;
9. Advise the Minister of Education and Sports and government in general on HE policy, the establishment and accreditation of HEIs and other HE issues;
10. Perform any other functions related to the objects of the UOTIA or other HE responsibilities conferred upon it by the minister or any other law. (Republic of Uganda, 2001.)

Thus, in accordance with Section 4 of the UOTIA (2001), the NCHE registers, accredits and supervises HEIs to ensure that the internal operations of HEIs conform to the provisions of the Act and that the HEIs provide education that is relevant and of a high quality. Nonetheless, HEIs have some relative freedom to determine their own courses of action. For example, they can own their buildings and equipment, borrow funds, spend budgets to achieve their objectives, decide the level of tuition fees, set academic course content, employ and dismiss academic staff (within the stipulated guidelines), set salaries and decide the size of student enrolment. However, the degree to which HEIs enjoy these freedoms varies between public and private HEIs. For instance, since public HEIs are state-owned institutions and, as such, are funded, though partly, by public funds, their operations are (a) largely, though not entirely, guided by the UOTIA and (b) at times, interfered with by the government. For example, the Act spells out guidelines about, inter alia, how the institutions should be governed; the composition, functions and power of governance organs; student admissions (particularly government-sponsored students); management structures; the hire and discharge of academic and other staff; funding; academic staff associations; student associations; and accountability.

The Act also stipulates governance structures for public HEIs, which, in the case of universities, includes a university council (executive body); university senate (academic authority); boards of faculties, institutes and colleges; and officers of a university—chancellor, vice chancellor, deputy vice chancellors, academic registrar, university secretary, librarian, bursar and dean of students (Republic of Uganda, 2001). Contrastingly, private HEIs have leeway in the setting of tuition fees, hiring and firing of academic staff and debt financing. However, all HEIs (public and private) must be established and must operate according to Sections 118 (article 1) and 123 (article 1) of the UOTIA and their staff

41 However, the government often restrains public universities—particularly Makerere University—from raising tuition fees and consequently limits their institutional freedom (Teferra, 2013; Ssempebwa & Ssegawa, 2013).
42 Section 28 of the UOTIA, for example stipulates that the admission committees of public universities should “take into consideration affirmative action in favour of marginalised groups on the basis of gender, disability and disadvantaged schools ... [and for admission of] persons with special talents in sports, music and other activities for their enhancement” (Republic of Uganda, 2001, p. 24).
43 “No person shall establish and operate a university or tertiary institution without the relevant provisional licence, charter or certificate granted under this Act” (Republic of Uganda, 2001, p. 80).
44 “The National Council shall, by regulations set institutional standards [such as minimum entry requirements for admission to certificate diploma or degree programmes; minimum number and duration of programmes to be offered HEIs; qualifications of lecturers; basic ethical standards etc.] governing the
recruitment practices and student admission policies must conform to Sections 11945 and 12146 of the Act respectively. The purpose of the guidelines and structures is not to constrain the governance of HEIs, but rather to avoid undue interference from government, donors and/or owners in the governance of the institutions.

Therefore, like in other countries where decisions about budget expenditure, the hire and discharge of staff, student admissions, level of tuition fees and academic structure and content are, to some extent, subject to national legislation (OECD, 2003), the freedom of HEIs in Uganda to govern themselves is somehow constrained. However, the role of government in the governance of HEIs is mainly supervisory rather than based on direct intervention (Liang, 2004). A summary of the institutional autonomy enjoyed by Ugandan universities is provided in Table 14 below.

Table 14. Extent of Institutional Autonomy of Ugandan Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Institutional autonomy in selected areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spend budgets to attain set goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire and dismissal of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision on student admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciding level of tuition fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but programmes must be accredited by the NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but students must have minimum requirements set by the NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but programmes must be accredited by the NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but students must meet the minimum admission requirements set by the NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on OECD, 2003).

4.4 Financing

Prior to the emergence of private HEIs and the introduction of tuition fees in public universities and other tertiary institutions, HE in Uganda was considered a public good to be provided free of charge by public HEIs; therefore, it was predominantly funded

performance of, operations and general conduct of universities and tertiary institutions” (Republic of Uganda, 2001, p. 81).

45 “No university or tertiary institution shall employ a lecturer, instructor or other person recruited for the purpose of teaching or giving instructions to students whose qualifications do not conform to the standards set by the National Council by regulations” (Republic of Uganda, 2001, p. 81).

46 “Universities or tertiary institutions shall admit, train, and assess students on merit” (Republic of Uganda, 2001, p. 81).
by the government. However, increases in demand for HE, coupled with an insufficient expansion of the public university sector as well as inadequate budget allocations to public HEIs, created ideal conditions for not only the emergence of private HEIs but also the proliferation of private funding for public HEIs. Hence, HEIs derive funding from a mixture of public, private and for some institutions, other sources (for example, donor support). Public universities receive government funding in two blocks: one for a recurrent budget and the other for a development budget. For recurrent budgets, the institutions receive block grants or subventions from the MoES, the amount of which is calculated based on the number of government-sponsored students in each institution and a unit cost set by the MoES for each institution (Liang, 2004).

Although the share of the education budget allocated to HE continues to increase, the amount of public funding available to public HEIs does not sufficiently cover the cost of inputs required by the institutions to produce good outputs (NCHE, 2010). All public HEIs, therefore, derive extra funding from private sources, the most common of which is tuition fees charged on privately sponsored students. All public HEIs operate a dual-track tuition policy,47 where the government sponsors free HE for a few students, and the rest (who qualify and can afford to do so) pay tuition fees to access HE. Currently, the share of contributions from private sources to budgets for public HEIs outstrips budget contributions from government for some institutions. At MUK, for example, money collected from students has progressively contributed a growing share of the institution’s budget—for example, from 17% in 1995/96 to 59% in 2005/6 (NCHE, 2010, p. 31). This trend is visible in most other HEIs (NCHE, 2010). Public HEIs, though not all, also receive budget support from external donors.

Contrastingly, private HEIs are not entitled to public funding; therefore, they depend, almost entirely, on tuition fee charges for funding. Although the government indirectly funds accredited private universities through a students’ loan scheme and, at times, allocates development assistance to some private HEIs, the accessibility of private HEIs to direct public funding is largely political in nature and, therefore, unpredictable.

Table 15. Allocation of the Education Budget by Sub-sector for Selected Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Financial year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006/07A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>64.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>20.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTVET</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


47 The system provides that students who qualify for university education but are not academically accepted into a small pool of students whose university education is sponsored by the state can join public universities on a tuition-fee basis (Johnstone, 2004).
5 The Third Mission at Makerere University

This chapter discusses the case institution—Makerere University—particularly the history, size, organization and financing of the university, the past and recent developments regarding the TM and the main TM activities at the university.

5.1 Overview of MUK

MUK is the oldest and largest university in Uganda. It started as a technical school in 1922, offering courses in carpentry, building and mechanics and later medical care, agriculture, veterinary sciences and teacher training. In 1937, it was transformed into a centre for HE in East Africa and started offering post-school certificate courses. In 1949, on the recommendation of the Asquith Commission Report48 of 1945, it was transformed into a university college with a special relationship with the University of London (Ajayi et al., 1996; Nakanyike & Nansozi, 2003; UNESCO, 1963). Within the framework of the special relationship, the University of London appointed academic staff, approved syllabi and examinations and awarded the degrees (Samoff & Bidemi, 2002). In 1963, Makerere became a constituent college of the University of East Africa, which was an independent external college of the University of London comprising three university colleges: Makerere (Uganda), Nairobi (Kenya) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). In 1970, Makerere University became an independent—by an Act of Parliament—with powers to award its own degrees (MUK, 2014a).

Currently (2013/2014), the university has three campuses—Makerere (the main campus), Jinja and Fort Portal—36,627 students (34,635 undergraduates and 1,992 postgraduates—see Appendix 3), 1,380 fulltime academic staff (see Appendix 4), 142 undergraduate programmes (diplomas and bachelors) and 131 postgraduate (diplomas

48 A commission of inquiry on HE that was established by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1943 to find principles that would guide the promotion of HE, learning and research in the colonies and to explore ways in which universities and other appropriate bodies in the United Kingdom would cooperate with the HEIs in the colonies (Mngomezulu, 2010). The report called for, among other things, a special relationship between colonial university colleges in British Africa and the University of London or other British universities (Ajayi et al., 1996; Samoff & Bidemi, 2002).
Institutionalisation of the ‘Third Mission’ of the University and masters) programmes (MUK, 2014a). All university colleges can run doctoral degree programmes. The vision of the university is “To be the leading institution for academic excellence and innovations in Africa” (http://mak.ac.ug/). The university consists of one school and nine constituent colleges (see Appendix 3), which are semi-autonomous academic units—they have the powers to create projects, implement the strategic plan of the university, plan and budget, execute the budgets and mobilise funds from sources that the University Council approves.

In terms of governance, the university chancellor—who is appointed by His Excellency the President of Uganda on the recommendation of the University Council—is the titular head of the university. The vice chancellor of the university coordinates the administrative, academic and public relations affairs of the university and serves as the main link between MUK and the government, the public, other academic institutions and its development partners. However, the University Council is the supreme governing body. Thus, in terms of governance, the university operates a college model with four tiers—university, colleges, schools and departments—headed by the vice chancellor, principals, deans and chairs respectively and supervised by the University Council (MUK, 2014a).

In terms of funding, the university derives financial support from three sources, namely: government subvention, appropriation in aid/non-tax revenue generated internally (mainly from tuition fees) and donor support—an institutional development programme that mainly comprises bilateral support, foundations and research grants to the academic staff and/or academic units (see Table 16 below).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total funding (UGX)</th>
<th>Sources of funding (%) of the total</th>
<th>Total expenditure (UGX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government recurrent funding</td>
<td>Private funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>81,465,284,647</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>86,758,933,777</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>105,774,453,212</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>108,803,238,335</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>115,752,881,588</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>116,507,215,632</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>118,151,073,461</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>132,757,115,311</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>152,179,150,077</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>182,323,000,000</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The Third Mission at MUK

5.2.1 History

One of the oldest recorded TM activities at MUK is continuing education—that is, adult education and extension lecturing activities that emerged at the university in 1953 when the university (then a college) opened a department for extramural studies to provide extension services (Russell, 1963; Sicherman, 2006). The motto of the department was “Taking the university to the people” and by placing resident tutors in upcountry locations, the department went some distance to the people, however, for practical reasons—for example, poor roads and low population density—the extramural courses were offered in or close to urban centres (Sicherman, 2006). The role of the department, in its early years, was to run courses and to sponsor lectures with the aim of promoting university-type education in society at large to meet the existing leadership and vocational needs. For instance, the department ran (a) an in-service course for Grade 1 teachers in 1967/68 and (b) a course for army officers in 1968 and advised government departments about courses for chiefs, local councillors and others (Sicherman, 2006). In 1968, the department was transformed into a centre for continuing education. In 1992, the centre was turned into an institute of adult and continuing education and its functions were reviewed and broadened (Sicherman, 2006). In 2011, as part of the university-wide reforms, the institute was transformed into a school. However, a new centre (Centre for Lifelong Learning), which provides extramural services, was created.

Therefore, to understand the emergence of the department of extramural studies, one must first understand the social circumstances that made extramural studies important. Russell (1963) notes that although the attainment of independence in Africa was mostly a process by which new nations emerged and assumed sovereignty and new leaders succeeded to power, it also opened up a need for secondary leadership that the department of extramural studies emerged to fulfil. Accordingly, the beneficiaries of the extramural courses were mainly the middle leadership group (such as government clerks, chiefs, social workers and semi-professionals) whom independence had thrust into positions of responsibility for which they lacked the necessary educational background and, therefore, wanted to make up the difference (Sicherman, 2006).

5.2.2 Recent trends

Makerere University strategic plan (2000/01–2004/05)

During the period covered by the plan, the mission of the university was to provide quality teaching, to carry out research and to offer professional services to meet the changing needs of society (MUK, 2000, p. 4). Accordingly, the focus of the university was on teaching and
learning, research and extension and consultancy, among other strategic areas. In relation to extension and consultancy, the plan states that the university is a:

Reservoir of the country’s intellectual elite in a broad array of fields of human endeavour [and that] as the immediate and remote community within its reach struggles to meet its social, political and economic needs, the university has to address these problems. (MUK, 2000, p. 15.)

Accordingly, the plan outlined three goals of providing extension and consultancy:

1. To increase public access to the competencies of the university, especially in areas in which there is the potential to generate funds. To this end, the university proposed to create a deliberate policy to encourage staff to undertake consultancies, capitalise consultancy units to strengthen their capacity to deliver services, organise and deliver short-term courses and make university consultancy services gender focused;
2. To increase and intensify extension services by creating guidelines for community service, instituting and/or strengthening student internships and encouraging openness in academic units through events, such as open days; newsletters and public lectures that inform the public about the activities and outputs of the university and
3. To increase the involvement and influence of the university in public policy. To this end, the plan outlined four strategies: strengthening the capacities of the existing policy research units (e.g., Makerere Institute of Social Research), strengthening linkages among the existing research centres, creating new centres and institutionalising programmes and activities on good governance, human rights and so forth (MUK, 2000, pp. 15–16).

Makerere University strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19)

For the period 2008/09–2018/19, the mission of the university is to “provide innovative teaching, learning, research and services responsive to national and global needs” (MUK, 2008a, p. 12). In line with this mission, the university emphasises that its core functions are teaching and learning, research and innovations and partnerships and networking (MUK, 2008a, p. 13). Accordingly, the plan acknowledges the importance of university–community partnerships and stresses that the transfer of knowledge between universities and the broader public and private sector should be a two-way street and symbiotic in nature. The plan outlines two goals of partnerships and networking:

1. To create an environment that would facilitate the involvement of the public and private sector in the promotion of education. The aims are (a) to increase the participation of the public and the private sectors in the activities of the university by the end of 2010 and (b) to promote increased joint research, technology innovation and transfer initiatives to address the needs of stakeholders by the end of 2011. To achieve these aims, the plan outlines three strategies—namely, the involvement of stakeholders in the policy agenda of the university, collaborations and networks
with public and private sector institutions and the establishment of technology innovation and business incubation centres; and
2. To provide a partnership framework for assessing and utilising university products in the value chain, with the objective of establishing a partnership for public and private sectors to utilise the competencies of the university by the end of 2010. To achieve this, the plan proposes three strategies: the involvement of the public and private sectors in curriculum development processes; stakeholder participation in the planning, supervising and evaluating of students’ field attachment; and the creation of a resource pool of expertise that can be accessed and utilised by the public and private sectors. (MUK 2008a.)

The trends discussed above demonstrate that MUK has historically emphasised, and continues to emphasise, knowledge transfer and partnerships. Accordingly, the question is: What are the rationales for the TM at MUK?

5.3 Rationales for the Third Mission

This section discusses the justifications for the acceptance of networking and partnerships as a core function of MUK and, accordingly, the involvement of the university in TM activities.

5.3.1 Need for additional funding

In situations in which universities are characterised by insufficient funding, Etzkowitz et al. (2000) note, the significance of funding shortages pushing such universities to carry out some TM activities should not be underestimated. Accordingly, the recent trends in the TM at MUK, particularly the explicit recognition of networking and partnerships as a core function of the university, could be interpreted as part of the wider organisational reforms carried out at MUK in the early 1990s to diversify funding sources to address a financial crisis that the university faced in the late 1980s (Clark, 2004; Court, 1999; Mamdani, 2007).49 Since until around 1990 MUK relied on the government for funding (Oboko, 2013), the character of its finances, Mamdani (2007) observes, “reflected the budgetary crisis in government—[that is] the university’s budget faced cuts whenever the government

49 By 1990, MUK exhibited, in extreme form, the resource constraints facing universities throughout Africa—a lack of new physical structures, a deferral of maintenance, a lack of journal subscriptions and laboratory equipment, limited government subsidy and minimal research output (Clark, 2004; Court, 1999). Although the national financial crisis was responsible for the financial crisis at MUK, the sharp decline in state funding of HE was a result of not only the national crisis but also a public policy based on the World Bank’s argument that the rate of return on investment in HE was much lower than that of primary and secondary education (Mamdani, 2007).
faced [an] unexpected budgetary problem” (p. 5). Besides the cuts, the relationship between the university and the treasury was characterised by the following:

1. The differences between the proposed and approved budgets (see Table 17 for details);
2. The difference between the approved amounts and the released amounts;
3. The change in the release of funds from quarterly to monthly instalments and
4. The decision by government to distinguish between the expenses it deemed core and compulsory—for which funds were released automatically—and those it considered discretionary—that is, those that necessitated extended correspondence between the university and the treasury. (Mamdani, 2007, p. 7.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>University proposed budget (UGX)</th>
<th>Government approved funding (UGX)</th>
<th>Approved funding as a % of proposed budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987/1988</td>
<td>953,376,840</td>
<td>621,397,000</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/1989</td>
<td>2,713,454,955</td>
<td>1,591,958,206</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/1990</td>
<td>6,920,898,437</td>
<td>2,426,369,000</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/1991</td>
<td>10,656,533,898</td>
<td>3,570,694,000</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/1992</td>
<td>13,240,824,584</td>
<td>6,285,819,000</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/1993</td>
<td>15,773,370,717</td>
<td>8,183,429,000</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>19,426,395,301</td>
<td>8,641,950,000</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>32,938,968,033</td>
<td>12,766,675,000</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>37,926,408,573</td>
<td>20,328,433,000</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>37,900,000,000</td>
<td>20,579,406,000</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/1998</td>
<td>47,800,000,000</td>
<td>21,041,938,000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/1999</td>
<td>51,700,000,000</td>
<td>23,300,000,000</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>51,700,000,000</td>
<td>22,900,000,000</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/2001</td>
<td>71,800,000,000</td>
<td>23,228,973,000</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>71,800,000,000</td>
<td>27,635,238,000</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mamdani (2007, p. 8).

To address the above situation, the university, starting in 1992, instated a number of financial, management and academic reforms that have enabled it to diversify its funding sources, to reduce financial reliance on government (Clark, 2004; Court, 1999) and to “move from a situation of hands-to-mouth dependency to one where autonomous initiative, planning and allocation are possible” (Court, 1999, p. 8). The restructuring process, Court (1999) notes, has had three key interrelated thrusts:

1. The implementation of alternative financing strategies—that is, the diversification of funding sources, for example, the introduction of a self-sponsorship scheme and tuition fees for self-sponsored students in 1992, the commercialisation of service units (e.g., the bookshop, bakery and guesthouse), the introduction of user fees, and
the institutionalisation of consultancy arrangements through the establishment of the Makerere University Consultancy Bureau50 (pp. 4–6);
2. The introduction of demand-driven academic reforms, for example, offering courses for which individuals and companies were willing to pay, and the introduction of multiple study schedules—day, evening and weekend; and
3. The introduction of decentralised and participatory management structures—moving from hierarchical top-down management towards more inclusive representation, including the recent transformation of MUK into a collegiate university.

Due to the above reforms, the university has shifted from a state of reliance on the state for funding to a situation in which a growing proportion of university finances is sought from auxiliary sources such as paid-for consultancy and continuing education. The above discussion shows that recent developments concerning the TM can be interpreted as part of the wider organisational changes undertaken at the university to diversify funding sources and to reduce dependence on state funding. In her commentary about the emergence of the School of Women and Gender Studies at MUK, Sicherman (2006), for example, noted that because the school was determined not to become an “Ebony Tower”—producing irrelevant knowledge—it, starting in 1995, developed three types of non-degree courses.51 The courses had three distinct goals: to bridge the town–gown divide, to generate income for the school, as mandated by the structural reforms of the early 1990s52 and to contribute to capacity building (Sicherman, 2006, p. 231).

The above discussion shows that some of the TM activities at MUK help the university to generate additional income and, therefore, it would not be imprudent to explain their existence using the need-for-funding argument. In fact, the university’s strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19) lists consultancy among a strategic mix of sources that the university intends to use to raise funding to augment its financial resources by the end of 2016 (MUK, 2008a). However, it would be foolhardy to assert that the TM is entirely justified by the need for extra funding; the interview data revealed that most of the TM-related activities carried out at MUK do not generate the university enough income. The most plausible explanation, then, is that the university looks at the TM as a mechanism through which

50 A limited liability company established to offer research, training and consultancy to private and public institutions. Makerere University and Makerere University staff as individuals owned 51% and 49% of the shares respectively. Unfortunately, the company no longer exists. Its creation, however, reflects an effort that the university undertook to explore the intellectual resources of its academic staff and to institutionalise consultancy.

51 Professional development training to serve Uganda and other African countries, evening short courses for Ugandans working in organisations in need of gender training and workshops tailored to the needs of the clients (Sicherman, 2006).

52 For example, demand-driven academic reforms, the decentralization of management, the diversification of funding sources, the admission of self-sponsored students, the institutionalisation of consultancy arrangements, the commercialisation of service units and cost-sharing (introduction of user fees and abolition of student allowances) (Clark, 2004; Court, 1999; Mamdani, 2007).
it can generate extra funding but also contribute directly to socioeconomic development, demonstrate accountability for the public and private funding it receives, enhance the relevance of teaching and research, boost its institutional prestige and exchange information with external communities (Lyytinen, 2011).

5.3.2 Accountability, relevance and excellence

Although it is true, in the broad sense, that HEIs have always served society by producing scholars, teachers and possibly a more educated population, among others (Perkins, 1972), HEIs are equally expected to make direct contributions to socioeconomic development. Such expectations can be justified on at least two grounds. First, universities and other institutions of HE receive heavy public subsidies in the form of public funds supplied by taxpayers or indirect assistance through tax relief; therefore, they are bound to acknowledge a reciprocal duty or a social contract (Duderstadt, 1999; Vavakova, 1998) to contribute towards alleviating societal problems (Bok, 1982). Accordingly, the relationship between HE and the government and the society in general can be described as an ongoing series of social contracts—an expectation that HE should provide a return to society for the public funding received (Duderstadt, 1999; Perorazio, 2000). This view holds true even on the MUK campus. R19, for instance, emphasised that, as a public university, MUK “receives financial support from government, and, in that respect, we [the university] also have to give back” (personal communication, March 29, 2012).

Second, universities have a near monopoly on certain types of valued resources; they alone (besides a few non-degree awarding institutions) can award degrees that are all but indispensable for a number of desirable careers. In addition, they possess forms of expertise and capacities for research and education—for example, huge libraries and research laboratories that cannot be readily duplicated by other institutions in society. They also have academic staff with “credentials in academic disciplines and professional fields—architecture and urban planning, social work and public health, nursing and medicine, law and business, sociology and psychology ... with the potential for problem-solving” (Checkoway, 1997, p. 308). Above all, a university is more than an educational institution; it is a major employer, a provider and consumer of goods and services and a powerful social and economic unit whose decisions affect the community.

Perhaps, then, universities should use their special resources and powerful social and economic positions to make active contributions to the socioeconomic development of the societies of which they are a part, in the same way that public utilities have a duty to make their services available to all customers who desire them (Bok, 1982). The situation is not different in Uganda; universities and other HEIs are expected to interact with government and industry, to create links with the public and private sectors, to render outreach to the public, to institute field attachment programmes and to make active contributions to national innovation and development (MoES, 2012; Republic of Uganda, 2008, 1992). It
is unsurprising, then, that MUK describes itself as a reservoir of the country’s intellectual elite with an obligation to champion social, political and economic change in society (MUK, 2010). Thus, as R2, pointed out, universities should,

Utilise the wealth of knowledge they have because knowledge that has not been put to application is of no use. Why should they continue to do research and come out with good technologies that remain unused or unexploited? So the only way through which knowledge is of value is when it is applied to solve the problems of human beings. ... They should be engaged in having the knowledge reach the final user. (Personal communication, April 19, 2012.)

Besides the above-mentioned expectations, there are growing calls upon universities and other HEIs to improve the quality of their academic services—particularly teaching and learning—to engage with external communities and to be more accountable. For instance, although universities are not solely responsible for the high levels of graduate unemployment in Uganda, they have been singled out as not doing enough to train employable people (Businge & Nanyondo, 2011; Bwogi, 2006; Kiyaga, 2012). They are being called upon to play an active role in alleviating graduate unemployment, especially by conducting tracer studies, involving relevant stakeholders in curriculum design and review processes and aligning their academic programmes with labour market needs (Babyetsiza, 2009a, 2009b; NCHE, 2010).

Similar accusations have been made against other African universities. Modise and Mosweunyane (2012), for example, observe that the University of Botswana “has been accused in some quarters of producing a crop of functionally unemployable graduates who possess certificates without relevant education” (p. 58). The issue of employability, however, “goes beyond that of simple graduate unemployment and employment prospects” (Gibb et al., 2009, p. 7); universities are being challenged to “demonstrate to employers and other stakeholders that their graduates bring to the field a set of skills and knowledge that are demonstrably useful for addressing contemporary issues” (Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012, p. 58). In essence, “There is an articulation by employers of the need for graduates to be equipped with a range of ‘enterprising skills’ with foci upon creativity, capacity for innovation, networking relationship management and risk taking” (Gibb et al., 2009, p. 7). In short, HEIs are being urged to strike a balance between theory and practical training in their programmes (NCHE, 2010) and to produce graduates who possess not only hard but also soft skills, to prepare students for a life of greater uncertainty and complexity to enhance their potentialities for lifelong learning, employability, job creation and relevance to the labour market (Gibb & Hannon, 2006). To respond to these pressures, universities must emphasise the scholarship of relevance and integration—that is, they must focus on (a) working in partnership with external stakeholders and (b) the need for interdisciplinary research and teaching (Gibb & Hannon, 2006). Therefore, for universities and colleges to survive and thrive, Keith (1998) observes,
Institutionalisation of the ‘Third Mission’ of the University

[They] will have to be responsive; responsive in the eyes of those [they serve]: students, parents, governments, businesses, non-profit organizations. ... To be responsive, institutions of higher education will need to be service oriented ... [need] new internal relationships ... [need] new external relationships, including social partnerships with the communities and regions they serve, partnerships with government policy makers, and joint ventures with other institutions. (p. 163.)

Therefore, although it is evident that there are calls upon MUK to be more responsive, such demands cannot be easily met within the traditional institutional systems and practices; they require changes in the academic and organisational policies, structures and practices of the university. Accordingly, recent developments, such as the adoption of field attachment as a university-wide activity, and the involvement of external stakeholders in curricula reviews, are not unexpected; they are part of the mechanisms employed by the university to boost the quality and relevance of its academic programmes and to enhance the employability of its graduates. According to Krimsky (1988), universities, like other complex institutions, adjust their goals and practices to changes in the broader political and economic environment within which they function. However, this is not to suggest that the recent developments regarding the TM have been forced upon the university by its external environment; instead, the developments reflect how the university has interpreted and responded to the institutional expectations. Thus, the drive towards deeper engagement with external communities and greater involvement in activities that promote socioeconomic development is largely part of the proactive measures adopted by the university to (a) respond to external demands (Bisaso, 211) and (b) transform itself into a leading institution for academic excellence and innovations. For instance, in its strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19), the university asserts that its decision to shift its focus from outreach to partnerships and networking was spurred by the realisation that “Much as knowledge, technology, and skills reside in universities like Makerere, the community, public and private sectors also command knowledge bases from which Makerere can learn and leverage her entrepreneurial and innovative capability” (MUK, 2008a, p. 13).

Summary

The above discussion demonstrates that the TM and TM activities at MUK can be understood in terms of four interrelated issues, namely: funding, accountability, relevance and excellence. Accordingly, TM activities at the university reflect and are driven by the following:

1. External normative pressures, such as policy recommendations and media commentaries that call upon the university to (a) be more accountable to its stakeholders, including students, (b) adopt instructional methods that can deliver quality outcomes that are relevant to the needs of those who live beyond the walls of...
the university (Keith, 1998) and (c) contribute more to socioeconomic development and
2. Proactive forces within the university aimed at enhancing the academic excellence, social relevance and institutional autonomy of the university.

5.4 Third Mission activities

This section discusses the main TM activities carried out at MUK. Drawing lessons from previous studies—for example, Benneworth et al. (2009); Carot et al. (2012); Molas-Gallart et al. (2002); Montesinos et al. (2008); Schoen et al. (2006)—this study categorises the TM activities at MUK into three broad, but not mutually exclusive, types: (1) knowledge transfer and innovation, (2) continuing education and (3) social engagement, as the discussion below shows.

5.4.1 Knowledge Transfer and Innovation (KTI)

KTI is closely linked to research and, therefore, encompasses a set of activities that facilitate (a) the dissemination of knowledge and the sharing of experiences and (b) the use, application and exploitation of the knowledge and R&D abilities of a university outside the academic area, whether by other R&D institutions, the economic sector, or society (Catalana d’Universitats Públiques [ACUP], 2013, p. 20). It can be defined as:

The movement of an idea, practice, object, tacit knowledge, know-how, technical knowledge, intellectual property, discovery or invention resulting from research conducted at universities (in cooperation with external partners or not) into a non-academic environment where it can lead to social and commercial benefits at local, regional, national or global levels. (Carot et al., 2012, p. 21.)

Accordingly, KTI consists of the following:

1. Specific KTI processes—that is, more specific mechanisms directly aimed at commercialising the knowledge and/or social innovation activities of HEIs (e.g., the formation of start-ups and spin-offs and the licensing of intellectual property rights) and
2. Generic KTI processes—knowledge transfer mechanisms that do not necessarily have a direct impact on industrial and commercial activities, but rather focus on the importance of formal infrastructures as well as informal links among individuals (e.g., consultancy, collaborative research and contract research). (Carot et al., 2012; Finne, Day, Piccaluga, Spithoven, Walter, & Wellen, 2011.)

Therefore, it is important not to equate KTI with technology transfer (e.g., the formation of start-ups and spin-offs), which is part of KTI, because non-technological fields, such as
social sciences and humanities, generate useful knowledge (ACUP, 2012) and, therefore, have a great deal of potential to contribute to KT1. In addition, universities do not usually generate technology but knowledge, which is later converted into technology by companies and other external users (ACUP, 2012). Although knowledge transfer takes place through informal activities (e.g., academic publications and university graduates) and formal activities, such as mobility of people, institutional cooperation in research and development and the commercialisation of research results (ACUP, 2012; Carot et al., 2012; Finne et al., 2011), the focus herein is on the formal activities.

Consultancy

The first aspect of knowledge transfer at MUK is academic consulting. Academic consulting involves academic staff’s utilisation of their factual knowledge and familiarity with research tools and/or theoretical understanding of the practical problems (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002) to provide advisory services that do not necessarily generate new scientific or technological knowledge, even though they may promote organisational innovation (ACUP, 2012). Academic consultancy, therefore, involves the utilisation of existing knowledge collated by university experts to provide advice, resolve problems, generate or test new ideas, solve a one-off problem, or design public policies on commercial terms (ACUP, 2012; Finne et al., 2011; Perkmann & Wash, 2008) depending on the needs of the clients.

However, as Molas-Gallart et al. (2002) note, such services can also be given free of charge—for example, when academics give expert testimony in court or provide evidence to parliamentary committees. Academic consultancy at MUK can be categorised into four broad types: consultancy by individual academics; consultancy by university-based, privately owned consultancy companies, such as Technology Consults; consultancy by specialised centres (e.g., the Centre for Language and Communication Services and the Food Technology and Business Incubation Centre); and consultancy by traditional academic units, such as departments and schools. Despite creditable efforts by the university and the academic staff at some of the colleges to establish consultancy centres and companies respectively, much of the consultancy work at MUK remains largely individualised and less coordinated.

Therefore, whereas academic consulting serves as a means through which university academic staff members interact, and consequently share knowledge, with non-academic professionals, it also offers opportunities for long-term knowledge transfer activities (e.g.,

---

53 For example, design and specific training, expert advice; preparation of feasibility, impact assessment studies and evaluation reports; and interpretation of test results (see ACUP, 2012; http://www.icfre.org/UserFiles/File/consultancyrules.pdf)

54 A private consultancy firm based at, and partly owned by some members of the academic staff of, CEDAT.
collaborative research, research contracts and licensing). In addition, it serves as a source of livelihood for the academic staff—that is, it offers the academic staff opportunities to supplement their salaries. In fact, this is what makes it difficult to centralise the coordination of academic consulting at the university. Thus, although consultancy is often viewed as a private concern of the academic staff, nearly all consulting is based on the academics’ disciplinary expertise, and therefore, it is one of the channels through which the academic staff at MUK share their disciplinary expertise with the external communities. “Just as teaching is a means that faculty use to share knowledge about the discipline with students,” Ward (2005) observes, “so too is consulting a means to share knowledge with larger audiences” (p. 224). Although consultancy is different from research, the difference between the two is not always clear; sometimes the results of consultancy work are published in academic journals.

One of the issues regarding consultancy that emerged from the interviews is that although all the interviewees appreciate the importance of consultancy, some opined that because consultants are paid whenever they provide consultancy services, one’s consultancy work should not be considered in the evaluation and promotion processes. What is important, however, is that by providing consultancy services (paid or unpaid), academics share knowledge with communities, which, in itself, is an important contribution to the public good.

Contract research

Contract research or research on demand (ACUP, 2012) refers to the research and/or regulated experimental development activities carried out by universities by means of a contract between the university or an individual member of staff of the university and a particular funding agency, such as government or an international organisation. In such cases, the funding organisations explicitly define the objectives of the work, finance its total cost and usually own the intellectual property rights (IPRs) therefrom (ACUP, 2012, p. 21; Benneworth et al., 2009). Because the clients play an important role in defining the research agenda, contract research, unlike consultancy, which does not necessarily generate new knowledge, involves the simultaneous production and transfer of knowledge with the aim of satisfying the needs of the client (ACUP, 2012; Finne et al., 2011). Contract research at MUK includes a great deal of research in the health sciences55 (but also in other fields) commissioned mostly by government, international organisations (e.g., UNICEF, the World Health Organisation and the World Bank), external development partners (e.g.,

55 For example, the Expanded Quality Management Using Information Power (EQUIP) project, an intervention study at the School of Public Health funded by the European Union to investigate the feasibility and community effectiveness of innovative intervention packages to improve maternal and new-born health outcomes in Africa (http://www.equip-project.eu/).
the Ford Foundation, the United States Agency for International Development and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), firms and NGOs.

However, just like consultancy, contract research at MUK is mostly carried out on an individual or group basis without much coordination by the university or its academic units, with the exception of the College of Health Sciences, which has an office that coordinates grants and contract-related activities at the college.\(^{56}\) Although contract research focuses on the needs of the external party, it is often valuable to society and academia and, accordingly, it is attractive to the academic staff because it contributes to career development.

**Mobility of people**

Another way in which the knowledge stock of the university is utilised to address societal issues is through the movement of experts from the university to external communities and vice versa. This could be in the form of academic staff doing temporary work assignments in industry and government (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002) and the involvement of the staff and/or students in voluntary activities, such as serving on the boards of parastatals, companies, NGOs, community associations, local councils, schools and churches. R17, for instance, noted:

> For us in gender, our kind of outreach is related to the women’s movement thing and my work is more linked to the women’s movement; we support women’s movement in research, in advocacy, in campaigns, in providing technical knowledge and even serving on their boards, serving on their committees, participating in some of these big advocacy campaigns. For us here, that is how I think we are addressing our Third Mission. (Personal communication, March 20, 2012.)

Another example pertains to cases in which staff members from the East African School of Library and Information Sciences go out to train school librarians and to help them to organise their libraries (Openjuru & Ikoja-Odongo, 2012). The flow of expertise from the university to the communities is the only element of the TM in which almost all the interviewees (academic staff) said they are involved. “We all [the academic staff] belong to communities,” R22 observes, “and we interact with, and contribute to, communities in one way or another” (personal communication, April 19, 2012). In addition, since the mobility of people is supposed to be bi-directional, the university, sometimes, invites experts from external communities, especially civil society organisations, government and industry, to give and/or participate in guest lectures, seminars, panel discussions and other dialogues. Notwithstanding its contribution to the flow and exchange of knowledge between the

---

\(^{56}\) The office works with individual researchers; principal investigators, the college principal’s office, the university’s legal office and funding agencies to ensure timely validation of research contracts and agreements. It also provides information and advice on funding opportunities; supports financial reporting and the management of ongoing projects and maintains a central registry of all grant applications and awards of the college (see http://chs.mak.ac.ug/content/grants-contracts).
university and the external communities, the mobility of people is largely uncoordinated. In addition, none of the interviewees reported cases in which members from the external communities are involved in classroom teaching.

Public debates and social life

This strand of the TM covers activities through which the university communicates its research findings, through annual open days, fairs and exhibitions and audio-visual and print media (Schoen et al., 2006), for the benefit of its non-academic audiences. It also involves a university’s participation in, and organisation of, public debates to contribute to and/or initiate public debate and policy-making. First, various academic units at the university organise public lectures and dialogues through which the university shares information with, and learns from, the public. Notable organisers of such events are the Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR) and the Human Rights and Peace Centre (HURIPEC), which, as part of their mandate, organise public dialogues and lectures on different topical issues. These dialogues and public lectures create an arena for discussions among academia, politics, civil society and the public. In a way, the different parties share knowledge and learn from each other. Besides the public lectures and dialogues, which are formal and recorded, the interview data reveal that some of, although not all, the interviewees have appeared on radio talk shows to discuss their research findings and/or other issues related to their areas of expertise. R13, for example, notes:

Personally, I am involved in my free time, which I get rarely, in radio programmes because while serving here I also work as ... [an official in a cultural institution]. So occasionally, I go for radio talk shows, meet different groups here and back home where we mobilise the community and for me, particularly, to promote education at all levels. (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)

Regrettably, media appearances and publications are largely individual initiatives of the academic staff and, thus, they are not well coordinated and monitored by the university. Other forms of involvement of the university in public debates and social life include:

- Participation in public shows and fairs—for example, the Source of the Nile Agricultural and Trade Show organised by the Uganda National Farmers Federation,
- Media days—organised by university colleges to share information about their strategic directions, challenges and ongoing projects with their external stakeholders,
- Open days and/or exhibitions, for instance, the Bi-annual Science and Technology Exhibition, 2011, organised by the School of Food Technology, Nutrition and Bio-Systems’ Engineering under the theme, “Applying Science and Technology to Job Creation and Improved Livelihoods” (see http://mak.ac.ug/documents/poster-e.pdf).
Such communication channels enable the university, its academic units and its academic staff members to share knowledge with the non-academic public and to contribute to public debate and policy-making.

**Collaborative research**

Although typical research collaborations occur in terms of partnerships between or among academics at the same and/or different institutions, they can also take the form of joint efforts between academics and community members, which, when carried out well, would allow local communities to influence the designs and scopes of research agendas (Tagoe, 2012). The involvement of communities in academic research is not new; researchers have always involved communities in research, especially during data collection. Nevertheless, the difference between traditional research and community-based research is that in community-based research, communities are involved not as the focus of the research, but as active contributors to the research, its design and its execution.

However, this is not to insinuate that traditional research cannot, and does not, address community needs; it can and often does. Nonetheless, the process of conducting traditional academic research often differs from the process of conducting community-based research. Research that addresses community needs and public concerns, Ward (2005) observes, can be distinguished in terms of content, process and outcomes. In terms of content, such research not only takes on important disciplinary topics (as in the case of traditional research) but also directly utilises disciplinary expertise to address existing societal needs. In terms of process, it involves community members in the research process, right from the identification of the research problems to the dissemination of the research findings. In terms of outcomes, its results are prepared in ways that are meaningful and disseminated through media that are accessible to the community. In this context, the aim of collaborative research could be to foster theoretical knowledge or to understand and/or address certain community issues, both of which necessitate the active participation of external communities. When people go to do research on animals or plants, R16 noted:

> They normally work with people. And within the humanities, if you are going to do research on the effects of malaria on people, for example, you still work with the communities and even have research assistants or respondents from the communities. So, that [involvement] should be considered a kind of outreach. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

One example of collaborative research projects carried out at MUK is the “Participatory Research for Technology Development on the Use of Molasses Urea Blocks (MUBs) and Local Feedstuff for Improved Dairy Cattle Production in Uganda,” a World Bank-funded Millennium Science Initiative (MSI) project aimed at utilising sugarcane industrial waste to improve dairy cattle productivity in Uganda. The project was carried out based on a
partnership among the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), Kakira Sugar Works Ltd., Kakira out-growers, the Rural Development Fund and the Dairy Development Authority (MUK, 2012c). Another example involves the academic staff from CAES working with farmer groups to demonstrate and extend appropriate pig-production strategies as a means to alleviate poverty among the resource-poor farming households (Openjuru & Ikoja-Odongo, 2012).

Therefore, besides their meaningful contribution to research, collaborative research and field-based research (e.g., on-farm research) facilitate the dissemination of research findings to, and the adoption of innovations by, external communities. Accordingly, it is important to note that the involvement of non-academic communities in university research does not imply that the issues, which the researchers address, have no academic relevance (immediate or otherwise). Academic research, as Molas-Gallart et al. (2002) observe, can “include problem-oriented research, in which the selection of theoretical topics is guided by present or future societal needs” (p. 24). One of the challenges to collaborative research at MUK is that the interactions are, at times, shallow and the contributions unequal. We usually involve people in research; but, unfortunately, R4 revealed,

We don’t involve them at the proposal-writing stage. ... If there is a call for proposals, you just get people whom you can manage, write a proposal, and if it succeeds, then you bring in the public. (Personal communication, April 13, 2012.)

Commercialisation of research results

Although all the aforementioned activities are performed purposely to foster knowledge transfer between HEIs and external communities to generate economic and social value (Cantaragiu, 2012), the commercialisation of research or the exploitation of its intellectual property corresponds to the traditional understanding of technology transfer, which involves the transfer of the right to use inventions made in HEIs to economic actors (Finne et al., 2011). It includes commercially relevant activities and/or services—for example, the patenting and licensing of intellectual property, the formation of spin-off companies to convert knowledge into value, university-based incubator firms, science parks and technology transfer—which universities and/or member(s) of their academic staff carry out or provide. (Finne et al., 2011; Molas-Gallart et al., 2002; Pilegaard et al., 2010.)

Although the commercialisation of research inventions is still low at MUK, the university has already established organisational structures (e.g., the Food Technology and Business Incubation Centre [FTBIC]; the Technology Development and Transfer Centre; and the National Software Incubation Centre) to support the development, transfer and/or commercialisation of technology. For instance, as part of its strategy for transforming research outputs into technologies that can be utilised by small and medium-scale enterprises, the FTBIC created a technology development programme (TDP) in
2010. By 2012, the programme had supported 17 projects,\textsuperscript{57} most of which were ready for commercialisation (MUK, 2012c). Besides the organisational structures, the university has an intellectual property management (IPM) policy, the aim of which is “to stimulate and support innovative thinking among students and staff and to enable ownership and efficient management of intellectual assets and innovations produced at Makerere” (MUK, 2008b, p. 8). The policy seeks to support (a) innovative ideas that can be transformed into useful products, (b) intellectual property management and coordination at the university, (c) knowledge transfer mechanisms to students and the wider public and (d) economic activity arising from the products of research and innovation (MUK, 2008b, pp. 8–13).

Furthermore, spin-off companies started by members of the academic staff based on their research activities and results are an emerging phenomenon at the university. One notable example is Technology for Tomorrow (T4T), a spin-off company based at the College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology (CEDAT). The company focuses on low-cost, easy-to-maintain, easy-to-apply and environmentally friendly technologies in areas such as housing and sanitation. T4T’s flagship product is MakaPad, a low-cost sanitary pad made from papyrus and waste paper. The company also manufactures products such as, incinerators, water heaters, hybrid stoves, granaries, bio-sand water filter, interlocking stabilised soil blocks for building purposes and latrines (see http://t4tafrica.co/home). Thus, although most of the knowledge transfer and innovation activities at MUK involve the movement of ready-made knowledge and knowledgeable people, the university (its staff and students) is equally involved in activities that generate new knowledge and commercialise existing inventions. However, these activities are not mutually exclusive.

5.4.2 Continuing education

Another major and established TM activity carried out at most colleges at MUK is continuing education. CE includes both intramural and extramural education offered by different academic units at MUK with the aim of “supplementing, improving or updating knowledge, skills and/or competences [of the participating adults] acquired during previous training” (European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training [CEDEFOP], 2008, p. 198). According to Apps (1979, p. 68), CE denotes:

The further development of human abilities after entrance into employment or voluntary activities. It includes in-service, upgrading and updating education. It may be occupational education or training, which furthers careers or personal development. ... It excludes most general education and training for job entry ...

\textsuperscript{57} For example, the production of weaning foods from potatoes and soya beans; the production of banana beer from locally grown bananas; the development of high-energy milk-based pudding for school-going children; the development of nutrient-dense bean-based products for the nutritionally vulnerable; the development and commercialisation of high-quality yoghurt stabiliser using locally available food materials; and the commercialisation of value-added tomatoes (MUK, 2012c).
is concerned with broad personal and professional development ... [and] includes leadership training and the improvement of the ability to manage personal, financial, material and human resources. (as cited in Jarvis, 1995, p. 31.)

In essence, CE refers to short and highly targeted education and/or training that (a) focuses on adults who have had initial education or training, (b) does not lead to degree awards and (c) responds to the expressed or perceived needs of the beneficiaries (CEDEFOP, 2008; Jarvis, 1995). Its aim is to help individuals to improve or update their knowledge and/or skills, to acquire new skills for a career move or retraining and/or to continue their personal or professional development (CEDEFOP & Tissot, 2004, p. 50). Examples of such education at MUK include recurrent professional development programmes and other short-term not-for-credit training programmes in areas such as computer studies, human rights and good governance that are offered at both on- and off-campus locations. At some of the colleges (e.g., CHUSS, CEES and CAES), CE programmes are organised and offered by special units, such as the FTBIC, the Human Rights and Peace Centre, the Centre for Language and Communication Services and the Centre for Lifelong Learning.

5.4.3 Social engagement

The term ‘social engagement’ is used here to denote:

[The] partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. (CIC Committee on Engagement, 2005, p. 2.)

Accordingly, it “involves a very different posture from (we do it to them) outreach” (Carot et al., 2012, p. 42); it includes the involvement of external communities or their representative in the teaching and learning activities of a university (through activities that enhance the educational experiences of students) as well as the sharing of university facilities with the public. It also includes the involvement of communities or community representatives in the decision-making processes of a university—for instance, having external representatives on administrative and/or academic boards of the university. Social engagement, then, occurs through (a) formal activities, such as field attachment, field-based learning, the involvement of external communities in the decision-making processes of the university and the sharing of the space, facilities and services of the university with the public and (b) informal activities, such as active involvement in activities of associations, religious groups

---

58 For example, the postgraduate certificate programmes in monitoring and evaluation, human resource management and procurement and logistics management offered by the College of Business and Management Sciences.
and political parties. The discussion here focuses on the former because the latter are largely personal efforts that do not necessarily draw on the academic expertise of the academics.

**Field attachment**

The term field attachment as utilised here refers to a credit-bearing “field-based practical training experience that prepares trainees for the tasks they are expected to perform on completion of their training” (MUK, 2011, p. 1). Although the practice—often termed internship, school practice and/or industrial training, among others—had always been part of the curricula of academic fields, such as education, engineering and medicine at MUK, the university adopted the term field attachment as an umbrella term to denote:

> Any approved field based practical work carried out by staff and students for the purpose of teaching and/or research in places outside the University control but where the University is responsible for the safety of its staff and others exposed to their activities. (MUK, 2011, p. 1.)

Field attachment pervades all the undergraduate programmes at MUK. The university has made it a policy, R15, notes, “that every student who passes through Makerere University must have an experience in the field ... So, in a way, you could say there is some kind of institutionalisation of students’ practice in the community (personal communication, April 17, 2012). Its purpose is to enhance the connections between MUK and external communities, especially the communities that utilise the services and/or products (e.g., graduates) of the university. Its specific objectives include the following:

1. To strengthen the linkages between Makerere University and various stakeholders;
2. To enable students to get hands-on experience and to apply theoretical principles and techniques to real-life problem-solving situations;
3. To provide the students and academic staff with opportunities to interact with external stakeholders, to appreciate field situations and to generate information for curricula review and improvement; and
4. To develop students’ understanding of work ethics and employment demands, responsibilities and opportunities. (MUK, 2011.)

Field attachment, then, is a planned and monitored pedagogy that links university learning and reality, involves external communities in the students’ learning, enables students to learn and apply theories to real-world situations and prepares students for the labour market—that is, to be active and problem-solving citizens (ACUP, 2012; Bogo, 2010).
Field-based learning

The term ‘field-based learning’ as utilised here refers to “a learning process that allows students to view and experience phenomena in the wider environment and thus better understand how such phenomena come to exist” (Scott, Fuller, & Gaskin, 2006, p. 161). It involves activities such as field teaching, field trips and field camps (Fuller et al., 2006) that utilise external environments as a learning resource (Scott, Fuller, & Gaskin, 2006). Accordingly, field-based learning is widely regarded as an essential part of undergraduate education in some academic fields (Kent, Gilbertson, & Hunt, 1997) because it enables students to learn through direct interaction with environments that reflect taught concepts (Queen’s University, 2012). For instance, when asked about the ways in which the university carries out its TM, R16 remarked,

First, I have to think of university courses, which have a component, which requires students to go to the field. ... I am thinking of courses like in agriculture, environmental management, tourism, urban planning ... development studies, of course medicine, forestry. Most of those courses, with a practical component that require students to go to the field we can consider them partly as outreach because the students go out, interact with the communities as far as their field is concerned. That should be called outreach because it is well structured and it is part of the degree or diploma programmes. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

Unlike field-attachment, field-based learning is not compulsory. However, it is utilised in some programmes as a teaching and learning tool for enabling students and staff to access learning resources, such as private and/or public laboratories, conservation centres and national parks that are not available on the university campus; to conduct research; to learn from external communities and to connect theory with real experience (Kent et al., 1997). In this regard, R21 noted that because they cannot offer proper practical exposure in the laboratories due to, for instance, a lack of equipment,

We would rather take them [students] out to outside institutions, people’s gardens, people’s farms, parks, zoos, etc. It came up as an alternative to our inability to offer proper laboratory training on the university campus but the whole process of getting it operationalised can be difficult. (Personal communication, April 16, 2012.)

Sharing of university facilities and services with external publics

MUK owns various facilities, such as the libraries, lecture rooms, incubation centres, hospital, guesthouse and sports facilities that are of interest; therefore, the other form of the TM at the university is the sharing of these facilities with external communities (Benneworth et al., 2009; Charles & Benneworth, 2008; Molas-Gallart et al., 2002). The classic way in which the university shares its facilities and services with the public, and from
which I have also benefited on several occasions, is by granting external users access to its library services for a small fee. Although the sharing of facilities and services is, in most cases, a standalone activity, in other cases, it is associated with other TM activities. For example, there are instances in which external organisations (e.g., East African Consult Networks Uganda and the Integrated Efforts in Culture for Development), together with a university centre, utilise the lecture rooms at the university campus to run continuing education courses.

Involvement of external publics in decision-making processes

The involvement of external stakeholders in the decision-making processes of the university is another form of the TM at MUK. It occurs through the participation of selected external members in the advisory, steering, review boards and other decision-making organs of the university. The first form of this type of engagement involves the participation of selected non-university members, representing off-campus groups, such as alumni, government, local government and people with disabilities, on the administrative and academic boards of the university—specifically, the University Council, Senate and the board of the Makerere University Private Sector Forum (MUPSF). Community involvement in decision-making processes also occurs during curriculum review and development processes. The interview data show that university departments engage some non-academic external stakeholders in curriculum review and development processes to enhance the practical relevance of the academic programmes and to bridge the gap between the university and society. Sometimes, when we are reviewing the curricula, R20 revealed,

[We do not do it alone]; we invite those out there in practice to participate with us ... we want to know [whether] a need exists for certain areas of study” (personal communication, April 2, 2012).

Unfortunately, the involvement of external stakeholders in curriculum review and development exercises is not well structured, and it is difficult to ascertain how far the views and contributions of the external stakeholders are considered. Despite these concerns, the involvement of non-academic interests in the review and design of academic curricula “represents an important [TM] activity as it fundamentally affects the most important of university activities” (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002, pp. 25–26).

Summary

The above discussion shows that MUK carries out various TM activities, which can be clustered into three broad, but not mutually exclusive, categories—namely (1) knowledge transfer and innovation; (2) continuing education; and (3) social engagement (Carot et
al., 2012)—that serve as vehicles for networking between the university and the external communities. In addition to the activities discussed above, the university interacts with, and serves, the external communities through various activities that are initiated and coordinated by individual and/or groups of students and members of staff.
Institutionalisation of the ‘Third Mission’ at Makerere University

Building on the discussion in Chapter 5, this chapter discusses and analyses the findings regarding the institutionalisation of the TM at MUK, specifically, the organisation of the TM, the institutional commitment of the university to the TM, the approaches utilised to institutionalise the TM, the benefits of the TM and the challenges to the deeper institutionalisation of the TM at the university.

6.1 Organisation of the Third Mission

This section discusses the organisation of the TM at MUK—specifically, the main organisational structures responsible for promoting and coordinating the TM and TM activities respectively.

Makerere University Private Sector Forum (MUPSF)

MUPSF is a semi-autonomous administrative unit in the office of the vice chancellor established by the University Council in 2006 to create and/or enhance partnerships between MUK and the public and private sectors. The goals of MUPSF are to increase private sector influence and participation in the policy agenda of the university, to build knowledge transfer partnerships with public and private sectors, to promote private sector competitiveness in the value chain and to receive, filter and provide information from/to the university and the public and private sectors. Accordingly, MUPSF intends to

1. Introduce private sector-funded research chairs, named after a private sector enterprise or person providing the fund, with the aim of responding to private sector-identified problems and mentoring students in preparation for employment;
2. Establish a national policy guidance project and think tanks to analyse existing policies;
3. Establish a technology innovation and transfer programme to promote the formation of technology parks and technology and business incubation centres and to assist small and medium enterprises in start-up and development; and
4. Promote student field attachments and internships. (Nabudere, 2009, p. 24.)

Uganda Gatsby Trust (UGT)

UGT is an NGO based at CEDAT. It was founded in 1994 with seed funding from the Gatsby Charitable Foundation (GCF) to support and enhance the competitiveness of small manufacturing and value-adding businesses with the potential to grow by facilitating their accessibility to expertise, productive capacity, finance and markets. Accordingly, the strategic objectives of the Trust are to

(a) Develop a network of micro-enterprises linked to CEDAT to increase the quality and value of their output;
(b) Introduce HE students to opportunities available in the small-scale sector and to assist them (students) to develop and to transfer technologies and business development services to assist small-scale enterprises (SSE) to overcome some of their problems and
(c) Enable SSE to access and acquire credit and technology. (see Nabudere, 2009; http://gatsbyuganda.com/.)

The Trust is governed by a board of trustees composed of members representing different stakeholders in the small-scale sector, and, therefore, it is independent of the college and the university except that the university vice chancellor sits on its board of trustees (Nabudere, 2009). Since its inception, UGT has established business enterprises, such as the Gatsby Demonstration Foundry and the Gatsby Garage; created tailor-made training courses for managers and artisans of small and medium enterprises [SMEs]; and facilitated student attachments to companies for industrial training that have boosted interactions between small and medium entrepreneurs and the staff and students of the college. In fact, the Trust has created over 1,000 student attachments, realised 270 student projects, provided 64 student scholarships, facilitated over 1,500 SSEs, started a microfinance company to deliver microfinance services to SSEs and established tree nurseries in different parts of the country (see http://gatsbyuganda.com/). Currently, UGT focuses on two projects:

1. The UGT Credit Programme, a revolving fund managed by a subsidiary company, Gatsby Microfinance Limited (GMFL), which offers affordable financial services to small and medium-scale enterprises, particularly, Gatsby club members, to enable them to meet their working capital needs and/or to acquire new technologies; and
2. The Gatsby Clubs Tree Project, a joint programme with the National Forestry Research Institute that was started in 2006 to improve tree productivity by
integrating biotechnology techniques in traditional propagation systems with three aims: to generate income for UGT club members, to cater for the domestic needs for wood and timber and (c) to create a sustainable tree-planting scheme. (see Nabudere, 2009; http://gatsbyuganda.com/)

Food Technology and Business Incubation Centre (FTBIC)

The FTBIC is a university-owned technology and business incubator established in 2009 at the CAES, with financial support from the Presidential Initiative on Science and Technology, to create new food value-addition business enterprises out of research conducted at MUK and to facilitate the university’s production of job creators (MUK, 2012c). The mission of the FTBIC is to “nurture and sustain new and existing food and allied business by providing innovative research, practical solutions, linkages, entrepreneurship development and outreach leading to wealth creation and nutritional enhancement” (see http://ftbic.mak.ac.ug/).

Accordingly, the centre offers the following services: comprehensive laboratory analysis and evaluation of food products; training, particularly in food production, marketing and management, to prospective entrepreneurs and SMEs; commissioned research; technical support, mainly in product development and refinement, to the food industry; technology transfers; development of knowledge-based food and food-processing enterprises; and the nurturing of entrepreneurship among staff and students (Kruss et al., 2009; MUK, 2012c; Nabudere, 2009). In fact, by 2012, 11 agro-processing enterprises (e.g., Dawn Industries, Smart Foods, Hamko), producing bottled pineapple juice, soya bean products, sausages, smoked meat and canned maize, among other products, had been established by incubation clients—mostly fresh university graduates (MUK, 2012c, p. 8).

The National Software Incubation Centre (NSIC)

The NSIC was established at the College of Computing and Information Sciences in 2008 to train fresh university graduates and/or third-year university students, in, for instance, computer science, software engineering and information technology, to equip them with the requisite skills to develop software solutions. The aim of the centre is to provide newly graduated software engineers and/or university students an opportunity to develop and to nurture projects using the centre’s facilities for one year and in special cases, two years, so that they can ably employ themselves. The students are organised into groups and assigned

59 A development initiative that is funded by the office of the president of Uganda to enhance the development of science and research in the country. The initiative is implemented in partnership with various bodies and research stations—for example, the Uganda Industrial Research Institute, the National Council for Science and Technology and the School of Food Technology, Nutrition and Bio-engineering, MUK (see http://www.statehouse.go.ug/presidential-initiatives/science-and-technology).
mentors who work with them on specific projects in partnership with industrial partners. The aim of this arrangement is to enable both the students and the industrial partners to engage with, and to benefit from, each other (http://cit.mak.ac.ug/nsic/index.php).

Technology Development and Transfer Centre (TDTC)

The TDTC was established in 2002 in the then Faculty of Technology to develop, apply and transfer innovative technology and research; to create partnerships between the faculty and external communities; and to support socioeconomic development. Its aims are to create capacity at MUK for the development/ adoption of intermediate technologies for rural and urban development; to spearhead applied research and commercialisation of research output and development of spin-off companies; to assess and transfer technologies; to develop a national human resource base for technology transfer; and to contribute to the alleviation of poverty (see Nabudere, 2009; http://tech.mak.ac.ug/research/tdtc/). The centre focuses on basic needs, such as water supply, housing and rural development. Accordingly, since 2010, with financial support from the Presidential Innovations Fund, the centre has supported the design and construction of solar water heaters and a hybrid solar drier, among other products. The centre also supports third- and fourth-year students, fresh graduates and academic staff to establish and manage self-created innovative projects or businesses. In fact, the centre houses the T4T, which is a spin-off company that manufactures low-cost, easy-to-maintain and environmentally friendly technologies in housing and sanitation (Nabudere, 2009).

Joint National Animal Disease Diagnostic Centre

The Joint National Animal Disease Diagnostic Centre is part of the initiatives by the College of Veterinary Medicine, Animal Resources and Bio-Security (CoVAB) to develop a university-led extension system. The centre was established in 2011 through collaboration between MUK, the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) to improve the diagnostic infrastructure at the university in particular and in Uganda in general. The centre comprises two epidemiology nodes, one at Entebbe (for the MAAIF) and the other at the CoVAB

---

60 Targeted funding (UGX 25 billion) from the office of the president of Uganda that supports innovative projects on—for example, low-cost irrigation, innovation systems and cluster formation, technology development and transfer, vehicle design, etc.—at CEDAT. The initiative was created in 2010 and covers five years. Its goal is to enhance the development of human resources, the exchange of technologies between HEIs and communities, the generation of knowledge and the relevance of the college (http://cedat.mak.ac.ug/research/presidential-initiative-project.html).
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(for MUK). The centre aims to strengthen the relationship between the university and the government through collaborative efforts to enhance the national capacity for diagnosing animal diseases. The initial stage of developing and strengthening the diagnostic system has been carried out in pilot districts. The process involved partnerships among academia, communities and public and private sectors and focused on improving the capacity of selected district veterinary officers in areas such as primary diagnosis and sample preparation, meat inspection, post-mortem examination and sampling, blood and faecal examinations and screening tests for diseases (see http://covab.mak.ac.ug/home.html).

Centre for Language and Communication Services (CLCS)

The CLCS is a semi-autonomous consultancy and CE unit at the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHUSS); it specialises in language training and language-related services. The centre offers short certificate non-credit-bearing courses in English, French and other languages; translation, interpretation, editing and proofreading services; teaching and training courses in communication skills, listening, speaking and reading and writing capability; and English proficiency tests for admission to universities outside Uganda.

Centre for Lifelong Learning (CLL)

The CLL is an extramural centre at the College of Education and External Studies (CEES). The CLL was created in 2011 as part of the university-wide reforms to take the University to the communities and to bring the communities to the University through flexible non-formal lifelong learning/educational programmes. The centre provides short, non-credit, multidisciplinary extramural training programmes and other non-academic interventions on request by external communities. For instance, upon request, the centre designs and delivers bespoke short training programmes on issues, such as the Local Government Act, leadership and management, planning and decision-making, for district councillors. Accordingly, all the training programmes run by the centre are extramural in nature and are demand-driven—that is, they are offered at off-campus locations and are based on the expressed needs of the trainees.

The Human Rights and Peace Centre (HURIPEC)

The HURIPEC is a semi-autonomous department under the school of law. It was established in 1993 to foster teaching, research and activism for human rights and peace issues at the university with a vision to contribute to the establishment of an educated and active academic society with an in-depth understanding of human rights. The centre pursues and consistently engages in events aimed at promoting public understanding of and
respect for human rights, democratic governance and sustainable peace in East Africa in particular and Africa in general. Therefore, besides providing several academic courses that are intended for university students, the centre runs short courses (summer schools that focus on issues such as human rights, good governance and democratisation) that target government officials, NGOs, lawyers and academics from East Africa. The centre also often organises a series of dialogues about major constitutional developments in Uganda in particular and Africa in general. It also conducts interdisciplinary research on issues, such as information and communication technologies and governance and their relationship with human rights (see http://huripec.mak.ac.ug/).

Child Health and Development Centre (CHDC)

The CHDC is a multidisciplinary research and training centre at the College of Health Sciences (CHS). It was founded in 1989 to promote an all-inclusive response to children and women’s health needs, with an underlying philosophy that these needs go beyond biomedicine; they include complexities related to families, communities, institutions of care and public policies. Accordingly, the centre focuses on five core areas: multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral experiential research and training, undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, operational research with government and development partners and collaborations with communities and government to develop and evaluate community-based health strategies. Thus, the activities and programmes of the centre focus on university students and staff, health providers and practitioners, social workers, health educators and workers from health-related NGOs to enable the participants to gain knowledge and competence in population health-related matters using a multi-sectoral and multidisciplinary approach (see http://www.chdc.mak.ac.ug/).

Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR)

The MISR is a multidisciplinary research and teaching institute that was founded in 1948 as the East African Institute of Social and Economic Research. The aim of the institute is to improve academic knowledge, to inform public policy and to contribute to economic and social development. As part of its mission to respond to societal needs through professional research, publication, training and outreach activities, the institute runs an interdisciplinary postgraduate degree programme in social studies and conducts multidisciplinary research on governance and civil society, health, education, sexuality, environment and natural resources, migration, gender and development and economic policies, among other issues. The institute also organises numerous public lectures and panel discussions about various topical issues (see http://misr.mak.ac.ug/about-misr).
The organisational structures described above demonstrate the extent to which MUK has gone to institutionalise the TM and to make it an integral part of its organisational structure. However, it is worth noting that the existence of organisational structures does not necessarily mean that all interactions between the university and external communities are (and/or should be) initiated or sanctioned by such specialised units; academic units (e.g., departments) as well as individual (or groups of) staff and students are involved, and encouraged to participate, in TM activities.

6.2 Institutional commitment to the Third Mission

Having discussed the main TM activities and the rationales for the TM (see Chapter 5) and the organisation of the TM (Section 6.1), this section analyses the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM. The analysis utilises the modified matrix of institutional commitment (Holland, 1997; Mohrman, 2010) to micro analyse, rather than to ascertain the presence or absence of the organisational aspects that constitute the matrix, namely: mission, hire and promotion policy and practices, organisational structure, faculty involvement and commitment, student involvement, community involvement, campus publications and communications and leadership and support.

6.2.1 Mission

“A college or university that is clear about its mission,” Dominick (1990) observes, “can more easily choose among competing goals and can more readily establish its priorities than can one that is uncertain about its mission” (as cited in Beere et al., 2011, p. 51). Therefore, although the term ‘mission’ can be interpreted in different ways, it is widely regarded as an essential tool that organisations use to form and to convey their identities, purpose, values and direction to their stakeholders (Bartkus et al., 2000; Leuthesser & Kohli, 1997). Mission statements, then, and university mission statements in particular, are “tangible proclamations [of a specific function] whose content is likely to capture aspects of how organizations see themselves as well as how they want others to view them” (Palmer & Short, 2008, p. 454). In essence, mission statements help to “communicate a sense of ... direction and purpose [of an organisation], to serve as a control mechanism to keep the [organisation] "on track," to help in making a wide range of day-to-day decisions, and to inspire and motivate employees” (Bartkus et al., 2000, p. 24). However, as Morphew and Hartley (2006) observe, mission statements are, at times, “a collection of stock phrases that

For instance, a brief statement about an organisation’s central defining purpose and raison d’être (Drucker, 1973), a brief statement that outlines two things about an organisation, that is, “who it is and what it does” (Falsey, 1987, p. 3), or a statement that conveys an organisation’s nature and reason for being and outlines where the organisation is headed, how it plans to get there, what its priorities, values, and beliefs are and how it is distinctive (Williams, 2008, p. 96).
are either excessively vague or unrealistically aspirational or both” (p. 457) and they are important not for the direction they provide but rather for serving a legitimating function (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008; Morpew & Hartley, 2006). Either way, mission statements can be seen as the enduring statements of purpose and the ‘cultural glue’ that helps to unify internal stakeholders (e.g., the staff and students) behind the goals of an organisation to shape the perspectives of the external stakeholders and to allow the internal and external stakeholders to function as one (Palmer & Short, 2008).

Accordingly, it is unsurprising that the literature about the TM (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Brukardt et al., 2006b; Campus Compact, 2003; Furco, 2002; Furco & Holland, 2005; Hanover Research, 2011; Holland, 1997) considers the mission of a university to be an essential tool for rallying the internal and external support for the TM and a cardinal indicator of institutional commitment to the TM. Although the connection between a university’s mission and its institutional commitment to the TM is as complex as a university’s mission itself, the analysis, herein focuses on whether the TM is part of, and in fact central to, the mission or the academic agenda of MUK.

To begin with, the mission of MUK is, “to provide innovative teaching, learning, research and services responsive to national and global needs” (MUK, 2008a, p. 12). Hence, in terms of inclusion and definition, the mission statement does not spell out the term TM; instead, it uses the conceptually deficient, unstable and incoherent term, ‘service’ (Abukari, 2010), which does an injustice to the TM. By using an ambiguous term, service, the university falls short of affirming full commitment to the TM; after all, as Salancik (1988) observes, “A person who says, I sometimes think … is behaving more equivocally than one who says I think” (p. 4). In fact, the documentary and interview data show that similar ambiguities exist in, for example, the description and evaluation of the TM. Therefore, the issue is not whether the mission statement alludes to the TM, but rather whether it spells out the TM as an integral part of the mission of the university.

However, as Brukardt et al. (2006b) observe, having an engaged mission involves not only having the TM as one of the defining features of the mission statement of an institution but, importantly, also applying the TM across the whole institution. It also requires recognition of the TM, in words and actions, by university leaders, staff and students. Therefore, despite the ambiguousness of the mission statement about the TM, the strategic plan of the university (2008/09–2018/19) spells out partnerships and networking (including its meaning, goals, objectives, strategies and key performance indicators) as one of the three core functions of the university. In addition, the interview data show that most

---

62 By including the TM in its mission statement, a university not only “puts itself up for public scrutiny” (Falsey, 1989, p. 1), but also expresses to its internal and external stakeholders that it is committed to “responsible action” (Palmer & Short, 2008, p. 455). In an era in which universities are increasingly being held accountable, this has the potential to enable a university to attract students, motivate staff and secure more funding.

63 Focusing on issues such as the existence/absence of a clear definition of, and a university-wide plan for, the TM as well as the alignment of university policies and practices with the TM.
of the academic staff, even those who confessed that they are not actively involved in TM activities, recognises the TM as a vital component of the mission of the university.

Therefore, although the implicitness of the mission statement raises questions about the institutional commitment of the university to the TM, the strategic plan shows that the university values, and is committed to, the TM. Furthermore, since mission statements serve both utilitarian and legitimating functions (Morphew & Hartley, 2006), determining the institutional commitment of a university to the TM necessitates that we evaluate not only the stated mission but also, importantly, the other institutional elements (e.g., policies, structures, practices and beliefs), which together define the mission of that university. Thus, the concern should be not only whether a university’s mission statement spells out the TM but also, vitally, whether and how the policies and practices of that university support the TM.

The argument, then, is that a university that includes the TM in its mission statement and fails to create supportive policies, organisational structures and practices cannot claim full commitment to the TM. In short, a mission statement alone, no matter how inspiring it might be, cannot guarantee the commitment of students, staff and the external communities to the TM; mission statements must be accompanied by supportive university policies, organisational structures and institutional practices. A true test of a university’s commitment to promoting the TM, then, is whether that university commits resources and other organisational support to uphold its mission. Therefore, although the importance of the mission of the university cannot be trivialized the mission is not the only indicator of institutional commitment to the TM. Accordingly, the institutional commitment of any university to the TM should be analysed in terms of what a university states and what it does. Hence, the next subsections of this section discuss the other institutional attributes that signify and/or affect the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM.

6.2.2 Hire and promotion policy and practices

According to Ward (2005),

No matter how clear the mission statement or presidential proclamation to connect the campus with the community [is], if efforts to the public good are unrewarded or seen by faculty as distracting from the pursuit of the kinds of things that count on a dossier, either those public service efforts will be set aside, or the faculty member will be. (p. 228.)

Institutionalising the TM, therefore, necessitates that the institutional priorities for the TM are aligned with the recruitment, promotion and reward structures for the academic staff.

---

64 “A shared sense of purpose has the capacity to inspire and motivate those within an institution and to communicate its characteristics, values, and history to key external constituents” (Morphew & Harley, 2006, p. 457).
In this regard, the hire and promotion practices for the academic staff at MUK are guided by the university’s policy on appointment and promotion, which lays out guidelines for the appointment and promotion of different groups of academic staff (e.g., clinical scholars, research staff, academic library staff and general academic staff). The policy aims to do the following:

1. Promote the academic staff whose performance demonstrates particular merit in teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity, administration, service and leadership in the university and professional practice, including service to the community;
2. Provide a fair and equitable method of assessment to guarantee the appointment and promotion of a diverse range of applicants; and
3. Promote flexibility in assessment and create consistent reward standards for the various contributions by the academic staff to the realisation of the vision of the university. (MUK, 2009, p. 2.)

A review of the policy shows that besides the academic and professional qualifications, publications, teaching experience, research, administrative responsibilities and academic tasks, the appointment and the promotion processes for the academic staff should consider, evaluate and reward the academic staff for their innovations (e.g., the discovery of new seeds) and contributions to the community (MUK, 2009). In fact, all appointments to the top academic positions—senior lecturer, associate professor and professor—call for contributions to society, among other requirements. Similarly, all promotions to senior academic positions necessitate, among other things, the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities. In essence, the university’s policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff recognises and rewards the contribution of the academic staff to the TM and, therefore, demonstrates that the university is committed to the TM. This assertion is corroborated by the interview data, which affirm that the recruitment and promotion processes recognise the importance of the TM and reward the academic staff for their contributions to the external communities. R8, for example, intimated, “Yes we do [evaluate and reward it]. Definitely, it is part of the university-wide practice that every application, every promotion is graded and part of the points goes to someone’s contribution to service” (personal communication, March 20, 2012).

65 The policy, for example, provides for two tracks—the ordinary track and the fast track—through which the academic staff can be promoted. One the one hand, the ordinary track requires a number of publications and a number of years of teaching in a position. The fast track, on the other hand, requires at least twice as many publications or exhibits as the ordinary track minus the required teaching experience. The reason is that the previous policy, which required the academic staff to have taught for a number of years prior to their promotion, could have discouraged prolific researchers, writers and exhibitors from writing, publishing and exhibiting because such outputs could only be recognised after one had taught for a number of years (MUK, 2009, pp. 3–4).

66 Starting at the rank of lecturer (ordinary-track system), senior lecturer (fast-track system), research associate professor (research staff) and librarian archivist (library staff) (MUK, 2009).
Although all the interviewees agreed with the above assertion, they also concurred that the appointment and promotion practices undervalue the contributions of the academic staff to the TM. Therefore, the issue is not whether the policy recognises the TM and rewards the academic staff for their contributions to the TM but rather whether the rewards are sufficient. In this regard, a review of the policy shows that all the promotion tracks give priority to academic and professional qualifications and teaching and research achievements. In the ordinary track system, for example, members of the academic staff are evaluated using a points-based system that focuses on eleven parameters (see Table 18).

Table 18. The Points-based System for Evaluating the Academic Staff at MUK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defined parameters</th>
<th>Maximum points allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and professional qualifications</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching ability and experience</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of students’ research</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other academic activities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to the university and the community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of professional bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional practice/outreach services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation (e.g., patent)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on data from MUK, 2009, pp. 17–18).

The requirements and the allocation of points for the research staff and the academic library staff are not very different from those stipulated in Table 18; they all seem to underscore the importance of teaching and research. All the appointment and promotion systems, one could say, treat contributions to the TM as an addendum to the core roles and responsibilities of the academic staff. In short, although the TM is recognised as a core function, contributions to this essential function are not rewarded appropriately. In fact, as R7 observed:

Yes, it [the evaluation of TM] is practiced, but the problem is that it carries very little. ... I mean, you list so many things like farmer trainings; I have done farmer trainings in 25 districts. ... People have come up with innovations that help communities, [yet] innovations carry only 2 points, while a publication, just a paper in a journal, carries 5 or 10 points, a book carries 12 points. So, I think, it [the TM] is recognised, but

---

67 The University’s policy on the appointment and promotion of academic staff, for example, stresses that all “university men and women must accept the fact that they have an obligation to serve the University and the community ... [and] a good record of involvement in community and national affairs is desirable” (MUK, 2009, p. 33).
personally, I think that contributions to the community should take a big share—something bigger than 2 points. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

Another important issue is whether the appointments and promotions policy offers clear guidelines for defining, documenting and rewarding the contributions of the academic staff to the TM. The policy clearly outlines not only the requirements for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff but also the maximum percentage points allocated to each element. In fact, teaching and research, as well as their constituent activities, are spelled out in the policy; therefore, it was not surprising that none of the interviewees raised complaints about the evaluation of teaching and research. However, although providing services to external communities is included among the requirements for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff, the policy does not exhaustively spell out what constitutes service to the communities. Accordingly, it was unsurprising that the process of evaluating the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities is unclear and that the rewards for one’s participation in community service are meagre.

Therefore, although the university’s policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff acknowledges the importance of and rewards the contributions of the academic staff to innovations and service to external communities, it does not provide sufficient rewards and support to the involvement of the academic staff in TM activities. Surprisingly, however, the university itself admits that for it to champion social, political and economic change in society through a professional extension service, it must develop reward systems that motivate and encourage development-oriented services in the university (see http://mak.ac.ug/about-makerere/outreach). Therefore, the issue is not only that the university does not adequately reward the academics’ contributions to the external communities, but also that its policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff does not fully support partnerships and networking as a core function of the university.

6.2.3 Organisational structure

Studies (e.g., Clark, 1998a; Hollander, 2002; Wcarts, 2002, 2000; Weiwel & Lieber, 1998) show that organisational structures—for example, technology transfer offices, incubators, technology parks and business portals—act as entry points through which community

68 For instance, academic and professional qualifications, publications, teaching ability and experience, research, supervision of students’ research, other academic activities, service to the university and community and innovation.

69 In the ordinary track system, service to the community is divided into three activity areas: (a) membership of a national technical committee/commission, (b) membership of a national/district taskforce/mission and (c) other involvement in community activities (training, mobilisation, membership of executive committee of public or private organisation or local community). These activities carry a maximum of one point each (MUK, 2009, p. 18).
partners can obtain information about opportunities for collaboration with a university and vice versa, and, thus, they are essential for the institutionalisation of the TM (Lynton & Elman, 1987). By delivering information about opportunities for partnerships and networking, and by coordinating and/or offering TM activities, organisational structures transform the TM into an institution-wide activity that is recognised and supported as such.

In addition, since non-traditional functions, such as collaborations between universities and regional or industrial partners, tend to produce value contradictions within universities, the best policy conclusion would be to create specialised units to enable universities to interact with environmental subsystems, but also to “separate external collaboration from the basic academic activities” (Hölttä & Pulliainen, 1996, p. 122). Therefore, the importance of the organisational structures both as an indicator of institutional commitment to the TM and as a necessary tool for promoting the TM cannot be overstated. In fact, MUK itself recognises that in order for the university to promote social, political and economic change in society, it should, develop, among other things, well-defined, structured and coordinated outreach programmes and policies that serve the academic interests of the university as well as the development interests of society (see http://mak.ac.ug/about-makerere/outreach).

The above observations demonstrate that academic and administrative organisational structures are important for the institutionalisation of the TM. In this regard, MUK has established some specialised centres and multidisciplinary institutes, such as FTBIC, MISR, HURIPEC and TDTC, to provide particular TM-related services and to enhance partnerships and networks between the university and the external communities (see Section 6.1 for detailed information). In addition to the centres and the multidisciplinary institutes, there is an administrative unit, MUPSF, which is responsible for fostering partnerships and networks between the university and the public and private sectors. The existence of the forum somehow demonstrates that the university not only acknowledges the potential contributions associated with the involvement of the public and private sectors in the affairs of the university, but also that it is committed to such engagement. Therefore, despite the funding and staffing challenges that TM-related organisational structures, just like most other units at the university, face, the consensus among the interviewees was that these organisational structures have the potential (when sufficiently supported and coordinated) to create and enhance partnerships and networking between the university and the external communities. In fact, since the centres are spread across almost all the colleges, they are the single most widespread organisational arrangement—besides schools and departments, of course—through which the TM can be realised at the university.

Apart from the MUPSF, whose future seemed unclear at the time the interviews were conducted, the other organisational structures, particularly the centres, were, despite some challenges, actively involved in some TM activities. Therefore, although the empirical data reveal that, at the time when these data were collected, MUK had not yet fully realised
its TM objectives,\textsuperscript{70} the existence of the above-mentioned organisational structures helps the university to organise some TM-related activities develop and provide TM-related service. However, this is not to suggest that the coordination of the TM should be left to the specialised organisational structures (centres, institutes and administrative units) and/or disciplines that have had a long history of engaging with external communities—that is, isolated from the rest of the campus and other missions. Instead, the TM should, where possible, permeate the whole university. In addition, the institutional commitment of a university to the TM requires much more than just the creation of organisational structures. Instead, it calls for sustained financial support; appropriate recruitment, promotion and reward systems; other support mechanisms and links among the specialised units, administrative departments and academic units – departments, schools, colleges, etc. The empirical data, unfortunately, revealed that the MUPSF—an administrative unit responsible for creating and enhancing partnerships between the university and the public and private sectors—had not yet created enough links with the academic units at the university and, unsurprisingly, some of the interviewees were not aware of its existence. R1, for instance, confessed,

\begin{quote}
We have not been as active as you see it there [in the strategic plan for the forum]. When you read through ... it will talk about heaven in it, but the practice may turn out to be different and that has affected us. (Personal communication, March 22, 2012.)
\end{quote}

6.2.4 Faculty involvement and commitment

Universities, as Wanat (2006) observes, are “institutions that completely depend on and are defined by their human capital [particularly the academic staff]” (p. 214); therefore, the contributions of the academic staff to the TM cannot be overemphasised largely because many TM activities rely on the knowledge, involvement and connections of the academic staff. Because of their knowledge and active involvement in teaching and/or research, members of the academic staff are strategically positioned to contribute to the success of any community-oriented or joint teaching and research projects. Therefore, despite the importance of a mission, organisational structures and hire and promotion policies and practices, as the above discussion shows, the TM cannot flourish at any university campus without the active involvement and commitment of the academic staff (Beere et al., 2012; Furco, 2002; Holland, 1997; Mugabi, 2013). Hence, as Clark (2000) observes, “The most frequent mistake made in attempts to transform universities, is for a management team to proceed on its own without involving faculty and their department from the outset” (pp.

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{70} To increase the participation of the public and private sectors in the activities of the university by the end of 2010; promote increased joint research, technology innovation and transfer to address stakeholder needs by 2011; and establish a partnership for public and private sector utilisation of the university’s competencies by the end of 2010 (MUK, 2008, p. 18).
\end{footnote}
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176–177). Herein, the assessment of the involvement and commitment of the academic staff to the TM focused on three core issues: (a) the roles and responsibilities of the academic staff, (b) the presence/absence of support mechanisms and (c) the attitudes and knowledge of the academic staff about the TM.

With regard to the roles and responsibilities, the university’s policy on the recruitment and promotion of the academic staff outlines four responsibilities of the academic staff, namely: teaching, research, service and leadership in the university and professional service, including providing service to the community. In fact, all the interviewed academic staff affirmed the above-mentioned roles and responsibilities. As a member of the academic staff, R24, for example, noted:

I am supposed to teach, to do research, to provide consultancy services to the community, which we call community outreach and to be involved in other university activities like sitting on committees—research committees and appointment committees. (Personal communication, March 28, 2012.)

Therefore, the participation of the academic staff in some of the TM activities is one of the requirements for their appointment and promotion to senior academic positions at the university. However, the general feeling among the interviewees was that the evaluation process is skewed towards teaching and research achievements and that the rewards for one's involvement in TM activities are not commensurate with the time and effort expended.

In terms of the support mechanisms, the interview and documentary data show that, besides the above-mentioned organisational structures and policies, the university lacks a structured support system to incentivise and to reward the involvement of the academic staff in TM activities. R15, for example, noted:

Apart from those structured programmes like academic programmes where students have to go out … I am not aware of a well-structured system whereby we encourage our members. … It’s normally an individual initiative. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

Nonetheless, the interview data reveal that some informal or unstructured support mechanisms sometimes exist at the departmental level. Although such arrangements are not a formal practice at the university, some of the interviewees intimated that their heads of departments, at times, allow them to go out to carry out some TM activities. R15, for example, revealed:

The only support I receive could be in the form of my head of department giving me time because I can tell him that today I have to do this, and I can be away from office. (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)
Other interviewees also noted that sometimes when the members of the academic staff want to participate in some TM activities, they reach an agreement with their heads of departments, who then assign their teaching tasks to other members of the academic staff.

The above discussion shows that apart from their participation in field attachment, which is expected and supported, the involvement of the academic staff at MUK in TM activities is predominantly personal, less structured, encouraged but not sufficiently supported and expected and valued (it is the responsibility of the academic staff), but poorly rewarded. In this regard, R11 distinctly noted that,

If you are a member of staff and you want to be promoted to any position beyond the position of a lecturer, you must demonstrate that you have done some work relevant to communities or helped communities to improve their lives. Thus, in a way, even though we don’t have support ... it makes us hunt for that support so that we can demonstrate on our CVs that we have done something useful [for] the community as an outreach activity. (Personal communication, April 11, 2012.)

Regarding the attitudes of the academic staff about the TM, the general feeling among the interviewed academic staff was that the TM is a crucial function of the university because of not only its benefits to the university, university staff and students and the external communities, but also the notion that the university should create and share knowledge with communities. In fact, none of the interviewees had doubts about the importance of partnerships between the university and the external communities. R12, for instance, noted:

[The TM] is an important function of an academic institution [because once you have conducted research] the results of this research should reach the community. [The question, then, is] Do the people around you get an impact from your research? (Personal communication, March 29, 2012.)

The other interviewees concurred that the TM is an important function and that none of their colleagues views it negatively. The interviewees also pointed out that it is necessary for the university to interact with, learn from and utilise knowledge from the external communities. This attitude conforms to the notion that although the university contains knowledge, the external communities also contain knowledge from which the university can learn (MUK, 2008). These responses evidently show that members of the academic staff (the interviewed ones) have positive attitudes about the TM. Such positive attitudes, however, do not necessarily imply that all the academic staff members are actively or somewhat involved in TM activities. Although some of the interviewees stated that they were actively involved in TM activities, others revealed that they were yet to be actively involved.

In terms of knowledge about the TM, the interview data reveal that most of the interviewees were knowledgeable about outreach and engagement or community service. They also knew others (individuals and units) within and/or outside their colleges that
carrying out some TM activities. Therefore, there was normative agreement among the interviewees that the TM is a worthy function of the university and that the academic staff should actively participate in TM activities. However, there were variations regarding what constitutes the TM. The general feeling is that the TM or service to the community has not been defined clearly and, for that reason, members of the academic staff interpret the TM in slightly different ways.

The above discussion affirms that the key issue regarding the commitment of the academic staff at MUK to the TM is not whether members of the academic staff have positive attitudes about, and are involved and/or would like to be involved in, the TM but rather whether they are motivated and supported appropriately to carry out TM activities. Notwithstanding its centrality as an indicator of institutional commitment to the TM and as a necessity for the institutionalisation of the TM, faculty involvement and commitment alone cannot create sustainable TM efforts. The process of creating sustainable engagement, as Brukardt et al. (2006a) observe, “Requires [committed] leadership, institutional infrastructure, and financial support that smoothes the path for faculty and students [and external communities] and continually attracts more individuals to participate and contribute” (pp. 17–18). For that matter, the involvement of the academic staff in the TM should be planned, supported and rewarded, not left to chance and/or to individual academic staff because even in situations where the members of the academic staff have positive attitudes about the TM, such potential can only be fully realised in the presence of supportive policies, structures and practices. Otherwise, the involvement of the academic staff would be either an act of altruism or an obligation, and, either way, it would be “professionally compromising for the faculty” (Ward, 2005, p. 228). For this reason, it is unsurprising that while all the interviewed academic staff acknowledged the importance of the TM, some of them explicitly noted that it is meaningless to spend time and effort on TM activities when there are better career-rewarding activities. R6, for example, opined,

Most academics, including myself... feel that that is an important aspect of our role in society, but the system in which we find ourselves does not adequately reward it. It does not adequately reward that function, so people feel that it’s a waste of time. If I am going to spend so many years working with a community to help it to take up the technology or adopt something and it is not going to count much towards my promotion, whereas my colleague, who is not doing that, is spending his time publishing, tomorrow, he will be promoted and I will not be promoted on the basis of what I am doing with the community. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

6.2.5 Student involvement

Because students typically make up the largest part of the internal communities of universities, they are capable of networking and sharing knowledge with, and learning
(through curricular and co-curricular activities) from, various external communities, most of which have no opportunity to engage directly with universities. Hence, students’ awareness about the TM, as well as their involvement in TM activities, is both an indicator of institutional commitment to the TM and a prerequisite for the institutionalisation of the TM (Zlotkowski et al., 2006). Student volunteer programmes, though largely informal, are among the best ways through which knowledge exchange between universities and communities takes place; therefore, sensitising students to the TM, and developing programmes to inspire, support and reward students’ involvement in TM activities, is necessary for creating sustainable TM efforts at any university. Examples of such efforts include, but are not limited to, integrating the TM into curricular activities (e.g., creating opportunities for service learning, field-based learning, field attachment, projects or programmes centred in communities and other programmes that embrace engaged teaching and research) and providing institutional support and guidance to students’ volunteer/civic activities (Burkhardt & Lewis, 2005; Campus Compact, 2003; Gelmon et al., 2005; Holland, 1997).

Formally, the involvement of students in TM activities at MUK takes place through field attachment and, at times, field-based learning, both of which take students to the external communities. The interactions link the external communities to the learning activities and experiences of students, enable students to connect theory and practice, and consequently enable the university to produce graduates who possess subject-specific and generalist skills that are relevant to the labour market in particular and society in general. Unlike field attachment, which is rewarded, 71 compulsory for all undergraduate students, and is therefore an integral part of the undergraduate curricula at all the university colleges, field-based learning is part of only a few academic programmes.

In addition, the university, through the TDTC, FTBIC and NSIC, supports and encourages students to create new knowledge, to invent and to commercialise their inventions. Although these programmes focus on graduates, some student companies, such as Combined Efforts Uganda and High Peak Products have benefited from the FTBIC (MUK, 2012c). These companies produce processed products, such as ginger, coriander and cinnamon. Besides field attachment and field-based learning, the students participate in college open days and in university and college exhibitions (both on and off campus) where they, together with some members of the academic staff, display their innovations. “College exhibitions like that of last week [organised by the CAES],” R7 noted, “are led by students. ... Even in the main shows [e.g., the inter-university shows at Lugogo and agricultural shows in Jinja], we take students along because we want them to showcase what they have done” (personal communication, March 27, 2012). However, the very small

---

71 Students get credits for participating in field attachment; one cannot graduate without performing field attachment. Although this had been the practice in some disciplines—for example, education, medicine, and engineering—it became a university-wide practice in 2011. Despite its newness, all the interviewees appreciated its potential contributions to teaching and research but noted that the university must first address some of the existing challenges.
nature of these events and the fact that they happen infrequently means that they offer students limited opportunities to engage with the external communities.

Informally, students engage with the external communities through students’ associations, which, at times, organise and carry out various volunteer activities both on and off the university campus. Examples of such volunteer activities include (a) a yearly community outreach programme carried out in Kiboga district by the Makerere University Pharmacy Students’ Association and (b) a public dialogue, “Uganda at 50: Where is the Ugandan Teacher?,” organised by the Makerere Education Students’ Association on November 15, 2012 to deliberate on the status of the Ugandan teacher 50 years after independence (MUK, 2013). In fact, since university students come from different parts of the country, student associations, compared with the aforementioned organisational structures, can organise volunteer activities for, and exchange knowledge with, different external communities (e.g., rural schools, villages and ethnic groups), which might be difficult and/or expensive for the university to reach or to engage with effectively.

Although MUK, through the Department of the Dean of Students, encourages and allows students to form associations, the interview and documentary data show that the university offers neither financial support nor rewards (e.g., scholarships and awards) to motivate, support and/or reward the involvement of students in such activities. Besides, neither the university nor the colleges have well-structured and publicised support mechanisms to inform students about the opportunities for, and latest developments regarding, the TM. Therefore, while it is true that the university allows the formation and registration of student associations, and the associations network with, learn from and share knowledge with different external communities, such involvement is largely undocumented, unstructured and a one-off. In this regard, R16, for instance, revealed that,

Not long ago, students from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences took the initiative on the eve of independence or on the day after independence; they went to Katanga [a nearby slum], wearing their red gowns, and cleaned the area with a few politicians and academicians. But that’s ad hoc; we don’t have a systematic way of doing it—for example, that every first or last Saturday of the month, the university will go out to clean the town, or maybe every first Sunday of the month, the university will visit such and such a school. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

Although the active involvement of students in TM activities has the potential to enrich the students’ learning (O’Meara & Jaeger, 2006; Zlotkowski et al., 2006) and to expand avenues for knowledge exchange between universities and the external communities, the involvement of the students in TM activities (including the opportunities and support mechanisms) at MUK remains relatively weak. It is partly structured, supported, recorded, monitored and rewarded; therefore, its potential benefits are yet to be fully realised.

72 Created by students based on their disciplinary orientations, cultural and religious backgrounds, areas of origin, and so forth, and registered with the Department of the Dean of Students.
6.2.6 Community involvement

Community involvement denotes the active participation of the external communities in the academic, administrative, and other affairs of a university. Although the involvement of the external communities in the activities of universities often serves a ceremonial role (Greenwood et al., 2008), it also facilitates the exchange of knowledge between universities and communities, enables universities to mobilise external funding, and enriches the teaching and research activities of universities. Therefore, it is unsurprising that MUK recognises the importance of engaging the external communities in its academic activities and decision-making processes. In fact, the university’s strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19) stipulates that as part of its TM, the university intends to provide a structure for public and private sectors to contribute to its educational activities.

To this end, the university has created structures—for example, the MUPSF—and policies—such as the guidelines for field attachment—that (a) acknowledge the potential contributions of university–community engagement to the university, its staff and its students and (b) involve and seek to boost the involvement of external communities in all activities of the university. The guidelines, for example, stress that field attachment should link and/or strengthen linkages between the university and its external partners and those that consume its services and/or products; accordingly, they outline the roles and responsibilities that the university has allocated to the external partners (MUK, 2011). In fact, some of the interviewees revealed that during field attachment, students are assigned field supervisors (from the places where they carry out their field attachment) who work with students, assess their daily progress and write assessment reports. R10, for instance, noted,

Each student has two assessors—the firm or industrial assessor, who is appointed or is in the firm where he or she [the student] is stationed. They have to make an assessment because they are the ones working with that individual on a daily basis. Ours [college supervisors] go there to make that assessment—on-spot check on how things are going—and they interact with that individual during that time when they make the visits. (Personal communication, April 11, 2012.)

Besides their involvement in the supervision and assessment of students’ field attachment, the external communities, particularly some company employees, occasionally co-supervise or appraise students’ research theses, particularly when such theses concern certain organisations. In such cases, company employees who have master’s degrees or PhDs and extensive field experience can be selected to serve as external supervisors to the students’
master’s or doctoral work based on the idea that they can contribute to the students’ research. 74 If a student’s research concerns a certain organisation, R11 noted,

That company has to allocate somebody to that student and we can recognise that person as a supervisor. … The only thing is that they cannot be the main supervisor of the student; but they can be a second supervisor. The main supervisor must be a member of staff of the university. In addition, if someone in the field has a PhD, we use them in the external examination of our students’ dissertations. (Personal communication, April 5, 2012.)

Apart from their participation in the supervision and assessment of students’ field attachment and research projects, the external communities are also involved in some of the continuing education programmes—intramural and extramural—run by the university. Thus, although external communities are ordinarily involved in CE as consumers of CE services offered by a university, at MUK, the external communities do not just consume CE service; they sometimes participate actively in the planning, teaching and running of the courses. First, in some instances, the external communities (e.g., employers, local governments, or NGOs) express a need for training in certain areas, and the university develops programmes that meet such needs. In this regard, R14 intimated,

In our unit, courses are developed according to needs that emerge from the community; we normally call them demand-driven programmes. For instance, we are in the middle of our decentralisation policy implementation, and as we continue to decentralise, creating new districts and so on, there is a tendency for some of the new districts to not have people with expected [working and educational] experiences. So the chairpersons and principal personnel officers of the different districts normally write to me … that they would want us to orientate them [councillors] or draw up a programme that will teach them how council proceedings should be handled. (Personal communication, April 3, 2012.)

In such situations, just like in contract research, the external communities (though not necessarily the actual beneficiaries of the training) play an active role in the development of the training programmes. Besides the active involvement of the external communities in the planning of some of the CE programmes, the data show that some units that run CE programmes do not have adequate academic staff and that they often hire trainers from outside those units and, sometimes, from outside the university. 75 Lastly, some, though not many, of the centres that offer CE courses sometimes collaborate with external organisations (e.g., East African Consult Networks Uganda and Integrated Efforts in Culture for Development) in the planning, teaching and running of the CE courses. R19,

---

74 Emphasised by interviewees from the hard-pure and hard-applied colleges.
75 This is partly because most of the CE courses, particularly the extramural courses, are multidisciplinary or practice-oriented, and therefore, the specialised units at the university cannot run such courses without support from other units and/or trainers from outside the university.
for instance, intimated that an external organisation approached them (the centre) and decided to work with them to run their course at MUK.

They decided to partner with us, come and provide their courses where we provide them with the venue and we also add a few components of language. So it is really a symbiotic relationship—they come with certain components, which we cannot provide, and we add some bit of language. (Personal communication, March 29, 2012.)

In terms of leadership, the university involves the external communities in its decision-making processes by having representatives of selected external communities on the University Council\(^7\)\(^6\)—the highest decision-making organ of the university—and the University Senate—the chief academic organ of the university. In addition, the board of directors of the MUPSF consists of representatives from the university, the public sector and the private sector. In fact, in 2006, in a bid to open up to the private sector and to incentivise its participation in the affairs of the university, MUK bestowed honorary professorships on four people from the public and private sectors. The idea was that they (the honorary professors) would promote the MUPSF, mobilise financial and other resources for the university and facilitate the university’s efforts to respond promptly to societal needs. Nonetheless, much remains to be realised from this effort. First, the forum, though still in existence, is apparently not as active as it should be, and its future, at the time of data collection, seemed uncertain. Second, even though the honorary professors were attached to different colleges, some interviewees noted that their colleges had neither utilised nor benefited from the arrangement. R16, for instance noted:

Our spokesperson is supposed to be Mulwana [a Ugandan industrialist], but I don’t know how much he has done for us, and I don’t know how much we have tried to use him. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

Besides the University Council and the MUPSF, the interview data show that the university also engages some members of the external communities, particularly those with the appropriate experiences, in its curriculum development and review processes to ensure that its curricula are of good quality and relevant to society. “I think the only time when the community comes in,” R15 noted, “is when we are reviewing our courses. Normally, when we are reviewing courses, we have stakeholders’ meeting in which we bring the community on board” (personal communication, April 17, 2012). Although the interviewees from all four disciplinary groups confirmed this assertion, no university policies and documentary data could be found to verify the claim. However, the university has, in the past, held

\(^7\)\(^6\) Composed of university members and non-university members—two government appointees; representatives of the MoES (1), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (1), Ministry of Labour, Gender and Social Development (1), the district in which the university is located (1), alumni (1) and persons with disabilities (2)—in accordance with the guidelines of the UOTIA (Republic of Uganda, 2001).
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stakeholders’ consultative conferences, for instance, in 2004, 2009, and 2012, to share with its stakeholders—specifically, its development partners, government, and the private sector—information about its strategy and transformations and to create a platform for involving the external communities in the affairs of the university (MUK, 2013).

Lastly, some of the university colleges organise open days and/or exhibitions—for example, the Bi-annual Science and Technology Exhibition, organised by CAES—that attract members of the public to the university and enable the colleges and external communities (particularly firms) to exhibit their innovations and products/services respectively.

The above discussion shows that, in a way, MUK engages external communities in its academic and administrative activities and processes and, therefore, the issue is not whether and how the university engages the external communities, but rather whether the partnerships are deep, mutual, and sustainable. After all, effective partnerships between universities and external communities should be mutually beneficial, guided by institutional choice and strategy, and valuable and important to both partners (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). For MUK, the level of meaningful involvement is minimal. In fact, the interviewees stressed that although it is easy for the university to reach out to the external communities; it is difficult for the communities to come to the university. For instance, a review of the statute on the management of the constituent colleges of MUK shows that none of the college boards and committees (e.g., the academic boards; administrative boards; establishment and appointments committees; quality assurance, gender, and information communications technology committees; and boards of schools and institutes) comprises representatives from outside the university (MUK, 2012b). In short, the statute does not provide for off-campus representation; board and committee members are supposed to be from within the university—that is, representatives of the academic staff, administrative staff, support staff, and students.

However, the above revelation is not entirely surprising; the literature (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 1996) shows that community representation is often complicated by issues, such as who should be represented, which communities, and how they should be involved. In this regard, all the interviewees concurred that there are limited ways in which the university actively engages the external communities in its activities and processes. According to R17,

77 Under the theme, “Taking Stock of the Past and Reaching Out,” its objectives were to, among others, highlight the role of university education in the national context, provide a forum for the exchange of ideas between the university and its stakeholders and explore the ways and means through which the university could tackle its current and future challenges (MUK, 2004, p. 1).

78 For example, the second annual open day, 2012, “Promoting Youth Innovation to Boost Job Creation and Employment,” organised by CEDAT to share with the public and the rest of the university information about the progress and achievements of the projects financed under the Presidential Initiative for Technology and Innovations and to enable students and firms to exhibit their projects, innovations and products (see http://cedat.mak.ac.ug/).
On all our academic boards there is none [external representative], and we are not sure whether they would be relevant there. That’s something we might have to discuss. ... You see the other challenge would be how to select them. (Personal communication, March 20, 2012.)

6.2.7 Campus publications and communication

Although university publications and communication that target the internal communities of a university help to create awareness among university and students, the institutionalisation of the TM requires that the publications and communications pay attention to the external communities as well. Thus, the analysis herein focuses on the university’s publications and communications for both the internal and external communities. In terms of on-campus publications and communication, the university has developed a communications system to promote the quick flow of information between the university/colleges and the public.

First, some of the university colleges organise media days to share information (e.g., about their strategic directions and ongoing projects) with their external stakeholders. Second, the colleges produce annual reports, quarterly and/or monthly newsletters, handbooks and/or brochures that provide information about different aspects of the colleges. In fact, some of the publications, for instance, the Covabian and the Innovations Catalogue (2012), provide information about the latest developments in research, knowledge transfer and innovations, and ongoing projects and activities at the concerned colleges.

Such publications have the potential to serve as a medium for the university to inform its staff and students about the TM (e.g., goals, past and current projects, inventions, and opportunities) and to disseminate its research findings to the public in an appropriate way. College publications, then, have the potential to bring to light various TM activities and/or projects, which, in a way, would have remained unnoticed, unrecognised, and/or even unrewarded. Furthermore, each university college has a communications office responsible for coordinating public events (e.g., the open days and exhibitions) and for managing and editing the publications. Thus, although the college communications offices are quite a new organisational structure at MUK, created after the restructuring of the university into a collegiate university in 2011, their potential to bridge some gaps between the university and the external communities is recognised. R7, for instance, noted,

At each university college, there is a college communications officer, and I think this is a big position. You see all events being captured and communicated to the communities outside the university. We have had, actually, communities coming here to see our innovations under this new arrangement because part of the terms of their work is to mobilise and to communicate whatever is happening, especially in terms of research output. I know, like a month or two ago, there was a visitation here,

79 A newsletter published by CoVAB (see http://covab.mak.ac.ug/).
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Besides the open days, exhibitions, media days, and college publications, the university’s strategic plan (2008/9–2018/19), annual reports, and operational framework distinctly declare knowledge transfer and partnerships as a third function of the university and outline its goals and performance indicators. In fact, if any university publications at MUK are unequivocal about the TM and its importance, then it is the university’s strategic plan (MUK, 2008a), the framework for implementing the strategic plan, and the 2012 annual report (MUK, 2013).

The above discussion shows that some university/college publications and communications at MUK underscore the importance of the TM and, thus, have the potential to inform both the internal and external communities about the TM, the available opportunities, recent developments and ongoing activities, and consequently to enhance knowledge transfer and partnerships between the university and the external communities. However, it is worth noting that, at times, the publications do not demonstrate consistent support for the TM. For instance, although the university, through its policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff, recognises and rewards the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities, it unfortunately allocates a few points to the academics’ contributions to innovations and the external communities. In short, the policy rather fails to provide adequate justifications for the TM and, thus, it is unsurprising, as the interview data revealed, that all the interviewed academic staff concurred that participating in TM activities, notwithstanding its importance, does not contribute much to one’s career development.

In addition, although it is true, as the public relations office of the university pointed out, that partnerships and networking—the TM—is decentralised to the academic units and that each college, as previously mentioned, produces its own publications, there is a need for a strong, centralised communications system that promotes the TM. The literature (e.g., Mankin, 2000) suggests that institutionalising the TM necessitates a strong, centralised communications system, supported by a centralised database of outreach and engagement activities, which targets internal and external communities. The existence of such a communications system would not only help to reduce the risk of duplicating TM efforts and, therefore, promote the TM in a coordinated manner but also advance the public relations efforts of the university—that is, to demonstrate to the internal and external communities the commitment of the university to the TM (Holland, 1997).

6.2.8 Leadership and support

The literature (e.g., Beere et al., 2012; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Brukardt et al., 2006a; Furco, 2002; Holland, 2005; Kecskes, 2008; Lynton, 1995; Mohrman, 2010; Vidal et al.,
2002) shows that the TM cannot become fully institutionalised unless it is supported by university leadership. “In their roles as institutional innovators, motivators, and shock absorbers,” Wanat (2006) stresses, “... [university leaders] are expected to change the climate, encourage the faculty, and find the resources needed to make engagement happen” (p. 221). Organisational leadership and support, then, involve the presence of sustained administrative support from above and below—adequate staffing and communication and planned organisational changes; appropriate organisational infrastructure; and financial support, among other features (Beere et al., 2012; Brukardt, et al., 2006a; Furco, 2002; Mohrman, 2010; Saxl et al., 1989; Wergin, 2006).

Concerning the issue of attitudes and knowledge about the TM, all the interviewed college principals, just like all the other interviewees, had positive attitudes and were knowledgeable about the TM. However, since positive attitudes alone cannot support and/or remove barriers towards the development of sustainable networks and partnerships between the university and the external communities, the issue, then, is whether the university has adequate mechanisms to promote the TM. As mentioned in the foregoing sections in this chapter, MUK has created various policies (e.g., the guidelines for field attachment, the strategic plan, and the appointment and promotions policy) and organisational structures (e.g., FTBIC, HURIPEC, MUPSF, MISR, TDTC, and CLL) that support and/or carry out TM activities. In terms of financial support, the interviewees concurred that the university does not have a budget for the TM and that, most often, they mobilise funding from external sources. However, it is imperative to note that the university finances field attachment (from the money it collects from students) and, in some cases, field-based learning; therefore, it is true that the university has a budget for such TM activities. Nonetheless, accessing funding, even for field attachment and field-based learning, is still a complicated process. R21, for instance, revealed,

It becomes difficult to get funds to take these students out. Since we are not able to offer proper practical exposure in the labs here because of various constraints ... we would rather take them out to either institutions outside, people’s gardens, people’s farms, parks, zoos, but the university says we don’t have the money. So unless I, as an individual lecturer, push, chances are that I won’t get the money. ... It came up as an alternative to our inability to offer proper laboratory training on the university campus, but the whole process of getting it operationalised can be difficult. They are trying, but it is not enough. (Personal communication, April 16, 2012.)

The university, the interviewees stressed, encourages its staff and students to carry out TM activities, but it does not provide adequate financial support. However, as the interviewees pointed out, teaching and research are not well supported either; the insufficiency of financial support pervades all three functions of the university. R7, for instance, noted,

I think the university has tried its best, although not to the level you would really want; but we [the academic staff] would understand because there are so many
challenges. [Although] technology transfer is needed ... if you don’t have teaching materials, students will cause trouble. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

Connected with the insufficiency of funding for the TM is the shortage of human resources to coordinate the TM and to carry out TM activities, particularly in the specialised units (centres and institutes). Each of the units (centres) described in Section 6.1, apart from MUPSF, is headed by an academic member of staff whose primary responsibility is the welfare of the centre. Therefore, in addition to creating the specialised units and financially supporting some of the TM activities, the university employs centre coordinators. The above discussion reveals that MUK acknowledges the TM as one of its core functions; has organisational structures and employs people to support the TM and carry out TM activities; and has integrated the TM into its undergraduate programmes. In short, the above discussion, just like most of the interviewees observed, demonstrates that the leadership of MUK acknowledges the importance of, and is rather committed to promoting, the TM.

Summary

The institutional commitment of MUK to the TM discussed above reveals that although many TM activities and projects at the university remain quite personal, unsupported, unrewarded, and unrecorded, the university is committed to the TM—that is, it has policies, programmes, and structures that support the TM and/or provide TM services. In fact, the TM has been integrated into the operating budget, academic activities, hire and promotion processes, and the organisational structures of the university, and, as the interview data revealed, there is normative consensus among the academic staff about the appropriateness of the TM. In essence, the analysis illustrates that the TM has been fairly institutionalised at MUK—that is, (a) the TM is regarded as a legitimate function and an integral component of the university and (b) TM activities are rather expected, supported and widespread (Adams et al., 2011) at the university. Thus, the concern is how to create and/or strengthen synergies among the existing institutional mechanisms and, ultimately, how to create a university culture that fully supports the TM.

6.3 Approaches for institutionalising the Third Mission

In its effort to instigate and/or enhance networking and partnerships, MUK has adopted various policies, structures, programmes and practices, which, as the discussions in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 above reveal, can be divided into three broad categories: administrative, academic, and organisational approaches (Vidal et al., 2002). This section briefly discusses and summarises the three approaches and their constituent strategies (see Table 19).

The administrative strategies refer to the institutional efforts that seek to institutionalise the TM through administrative parts of the university—for instance, through institutional
policies, executive leadership, decision-making processes, resource allocation and administrative unit(s) to promote the TM. The administrative strategies that have been adopted at MUK include, but are not limited to, the adoption of the TM as a core function of the university, and the creation of an administrative unit—MUPSF—to initiate and/or support partnerships and networks for the exchange of knowledge between the university and the public and private sectors. The other administrative strategies utilised by the university are the allocation of financial and human resources (e.g., budgets and centre coordinators) to support and coordinate TM activities, particularly field attachment and field-based learning, and the representation of selected external communities in the top decision-making organs of the university.

The academic approach denotes the academic policies, actions and practices that the university has adopted to recognise the importance of partnerships and networks, formalise the contributions of the external communities to teaching and research, broaden the focus of teaching and research and reward the involvement of the academic staff and students in community-related activities. In this regard, the main academic strategies are the integration of field attachment into all undergraduate programmes, the inclusion of some external communities in the implementation of field attachment and the inclusion of the contributions of the academic staff to innovation and community service among the criteria for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff to senior academic positions.

The organisational approach refers to the structural arrangement of the university—that is, the existence of organisational structures that initiate and/or enhance linkage between the university—and/or its academic units—and the external communities. One example of organisational strategies adopted at MUK to institutionalise the TM is the existence of multidisciplinary research and education centres—for example, MISR and CHDC—that conduct research, offer education, organise public dialogues and inform public policy. Another example is the recent establishment of specialised centres—for example, FTBIC, TDTC, HURIPEC, CLCS and CLL—that facilitate knowledge transfer and innovation, support continuing education and facilitate social engagement.

The administrative, academic and organisational strategies highlighted above, and summarised in Table 19, represent a range of policies, programmes, practices and organisational arrangements at MUK that help to remove barriers to, and/or to enhance, partnerships between the university and the external communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Adoption of the TM as a strategic goal and function of the university</td>
<td>Partnerships and networking recognised as a core function of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of the external communities in decision-making processes at the university</td>
<td>Certain external communities represented on the University Council, University Senate, and the MUPSF board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of an administrative unit to initiate and support partnerships with the public and private sectors</td>
<td>Makerere University Private Sector Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of an intellectual property management policy to promote (a) innovative thinking among the staff and students of the university and (b) the commercialisation of research results/inventions</td>
<td>The policy seeks to stimulate and support innovativeness, knowledge transfer, and the development of economic activity out of the research products of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff that rewards innovation and service to the community</td>
<td>The policy rewards the academic staff for their innovations and service to the external communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of financial and human resources to support and coordinate the TM</td>
<td>Budgets for field attachment and, at times, field-based learning exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff responsible for coordinating certain TM activities exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Integrating the TM into the undergraduate curricula</td>
<td>Creation of guidelines for field attachment; Field attachment made compulsory for all undergraduate students; and Students receive academic credits on completion of field attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving the external communities in the learning activities of students</td>
<td>The guidelines for field attachment allot field attachment responsibilities to the external communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of the TM among the requirements for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff</td>
<td>The university’s policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff recognises the contributions of the academic staff to innovations and to the communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Establishment of specialised centres to facilitate knowledge transfer and innovation, continuing education, and social engagement</td>
<td>FTBIC: Created to promote innovative research, provide practical solutions, and support the development of food and food-related enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDTC: Mandated to develop, apply, and transfer innovative research and technology to promote development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HURIPEC: Created to promote teaching, research and activism for human rights and peace issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NSIC: Trains and mentors fresh graduates to enable them to develop software skills and solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLCS: Provides CE and consultancy services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLL: Offers short, non-credit bearing extramural courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary research and education centres that conduct research, provide teaching, and inform public policy</td>
<td>MISR: A multidisciplinary research and teaching institute that offers postgraduate education, conducts multidisciplinary research, and organises public dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHDC: A multidisciplinary research and education centre that focuses on children and women’s health needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on classifications by Vidal et al., 2002).

### 6.4 Benefits of the Third Mission

The interview and documentary data show that the TM is expected to be beneficial to the university, the academic staff and students and the external communities. Accordingly, this section discusses such benefits.

#### Benefits to the University

Although TM activities are often looked at as just a means through which universities transfer knowledge to external communities, the TM is equally important to universities because when it is coordinated appropriately, it has the potential to bring them academic and non-academic benefits. In this regard, MUK is not an exception; the data show that the university enjoys and/or envisages some of these benefits. The interview data indicate that the most important benefit of the TM is that it has enabled the university to transform itself from being an Ivory Tower—quite detached from its external communities and the concerns thereof—to being an engaged university—working in partnership with external...
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communities and, thus, contributing to socioeconomic development (AASCU, 2002; CIC Committee on Engagement, 2005; Civic Engagement Task Force Report, 2002; Holland, 2001; Kellogg Commission, 1999; Magrath, 1999). This transformation, the interviewees noted, signals to the external communities that the university produces not only graduates and research papers, but also consumable products\textsuperscript{80} that can be found on supermarket shelves. Therefore, by promoting the TM, the university demonstrates that it seeks academic excellence and relevance and that it recognises that external communities also have knowledge and other resources from which it can learn and benefit. Accordingly, this helps to boost the image of the university. In fact, all the interviewees believe that the image of the University has improved partly due to its involvement in TM activities. They, nonetheless, also concur that much remains to be done. According to R24,

The university benefits in [the] sense that the public now views that it is getting closer to them. In the past, even for a local to just come and visit the university, it would feel like [an] impossibility; he would feel that he would be chased away... just coming to consult someone. These days, as a result of that emphasis on community outreach, the locals feel that they are closer to the university; they are more associated with the university than before. (Personal communication, March 28, 2012.)

In addition to the enhancement of the public image of the university (Ajayi et al., 1996; Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012), the TM enables the university to network with the external communities—on which it depends for support and legitimacy—and to access and mobilise resources. In terms of mobilisation, the interviewees stressed that when a university values and promotes the TM, it becomes relatively easier for that institution to mobilise resources, particularly finances, from different sources and activities. When a university makes conscious efforts to promote the TM, it sends a signal to the government, the private sector and its development partners that it is pursuing excellence and relevance. This enables the university to mobilise complementary financial resources. R8, for instance, noted:

As long as you demonstrate that there is a conscious effort to do the Third Mission, then getting access to resources becomes very easy, because if somebody came here and you showed him what you are doing with the little resources, the kind of devices you are developing ... they will be motivated to give you more resources. (Personal communication, March 20, 2012.)

The mobilisation of resources concerns not only the ability to attract external funding, but also, importantly, the knack to diversify the internal sources of revenue. An institution that values and promotes the TM is able to generate revenue from some of its paid-for TM activities. MUK, for instance, generates some, although not much, funding from consultancy, CE, library services, and entrepreneurial activities such as the incubation

\textsuperscript{80} Especially through the university-owned FTBIC.
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centre. According to R19, “We [the university centre] use our expertise to provide a service, which people pay for, but because we are within the university, the university gets a percentage of that income, which we remit directly to the central administration” (personal communication, March 29, 2012). This source of revenue is not yet fully developed.

The TM also enables staff and students to access and utilise the teaching and learning resources that exist outside the confines of the university. Although this happens mostly at the individual level, at the institutional level, it can only happen when a university values the TM and supports TM activities, such as field attachment, and field-based learning and collaborative research, which recognise the importance of, and utilise, field-based knowledge and other resources in students’ learning. In such a case, university students and academic staff are encouraged and/or supported to visit, utilise, and learn from industrial, agricultural, and business facilities—laboratories, farms, and firms. In fact, getting an “opportunity to access training facilities and resources that are not available at Makerere University” (MUK, 2011, p. 2) is one of the benefits that MUK envisages to derive from field attachment. Last, but equally important, is that because the TM is, and should be, integrated into teaching and research, participating in the TM has enabled the university to enhance the relevance of its research and curriculum to the needs of society (Ajayi et al., 1996). Activities, such as field attachment, field-based learning, collaborative research, and sharing of expertise, for example, permit the university to gain access to the knowledge that exists outside the university campus and, consequently, to embed societal needs and aspirations (current and future) in its curriculum and research agenda. Active involvement in TM activities, then, as R6 observed, is expected to increase the relevance of the university in two ways:

First, the research that we do in the university would be informed by the problems we face or get from the field. We would develop our research agenda based on the issues that have been expressed and maybe issues that we have experienced ourselves if we worked with the community. Second, it would improve the relevance of the research in terms of how that research can be useful to the people. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

The above statement tallies with the policy expectations of the university regarding the potential benefits of the TM. For example, the field attachment policy of MUK states that field attachment would enable the university to “get an opportunity to appreciate client demands and the quality of graduates required to fulfill these demands [and that] as a result of the cooperation the potential for research will be enhanced and developed with the various partners” (MUK, 2011, p. 2). In addition, the university views an effective TM as (a) an interface between research and training that would make a university relevant to societal needs or national development and (b) the space for joint learning and change for the students, the academic staff, the university and the university’s partners (see http://mak.ac.ug/about/outreach).
Benefits to the academic staff

Although the members of the academic staff gain from the institutional benefits discussed above, they also derive personal benefit from participating in TM activities. The benefits are of an academic, pecuniary, and non-pecuniary nature. In terms of academic benefits, the interview data reveal that participating in TM activities enhances the academics’ opportunities to interact with, share knowledge with, and learn from the external communities. The interviewees concurred that there is a great deal of indigenous knowledge on medicine, literature, history, and culture, among other disciplines, that the academics cannot access, document, and learn from unless they interact with the external communities. Interactions such as collaborative research, therefore, enable the academic staff to interact with the external communities, to connect theory and practice, to acquire new knowledge, and to boost the quality and relevance of their teaching and research—for instance, by relating their research to societal problems and incorporating field examples and case studies into their lectures. In this regard, R11 observed,

To members of staff, especially us who are in fields that you really consider being practical, if you do just teaching then maybe you are too theoretical and may be you don’t know the real thing in the field. However, when you are involved in these problems through outreach, you actually get to know the reality and then maybe also how to teach things, which can be applied in real practice. (Personal communication, April 5, 2012.)

Besides contributing to the knowledge base, and the teaching and research activities of the academic staff, the TM also contributes to the promotion process of the academic staff. As stipulated in the university’s policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff, MUK recognises the contributions of the academic staff towards ‘community service’ in the promotion process. Just as is the case with teaching and research performance, TM contributions are valued and considered in the process of promoting the academic staff to senior academic ranks: senior lecturer, associate professor, and professor. Therefore, although the interviewees concurred that contributions to the TM minimally enrich their academic promotion—one can still be promoted as long as one excels in research and teaching—they also confessed that they still include contributions to the TM on their curriculum vitae when seeking promotions. To stress the contribution of participating in TM activities to the promotion process, R7 noted,

I think I was very lucky because I jumped a step in the promotion ladder – I was an assistant lecturer and was made a senior lecturer and part of that was because of the things [TM activities] I had been doing. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

The TM also benefits the academic staff financially in that those who participate in TM activities, particularly consultancy, CE, and the commercialisation of research results, earn...
some income that supplements their university salaries. Whenever we offer consultancy services, R17 pointed out, “we get paid, when we go to train we get paid, when we sit on the boards we get allowances. They [the payments] are not really so significant but at least there are some financial benefits definitely” (personal communication, March 20). Therefore, although such earnings might not be substantial, they supplement their salaries, which, the interviewees noted, are inadequate. Apart from the financial rewards, the interviewees revealed that participating in TM activities also brings them satisfaction, especially when they contribute to society—that is, help to advance a cause or to make a positive impact in/on people’s lives. According to R4,

> There is something you gain from doing your job to ensure that you are passing on the knowledge to other people. ... These courses really don’t bring in a lot of money; they are merely to meet the cost of managing them, but in terms of national development, they are important because they provide the basics [knowledge] that are required by our people. (Personal communication, April 3, 2012.)

Benefits to students

TM activities, particularly field attachment and field-based learning, offer students learning and career opportunities. First, because they bring students in contact with issues and developments outside the university in general and the lecture rooms in particular, they offer students opportunities for practical learning and subsequently enable students to widen their learning experiences. The interview data show that TM activities—particularly field attachment and field-based learning—help the students to put theory to practice, to gain context-specific experience and to appreciate classroom work more. R10, for example, pointed out that the involvement of students in TM activities enables the students to manage educational projects and assignments in the context of application to real-world problems—that is,

> They [students] see what they are going to be involved in [after graduation], they learn to work as a team, they learn to deal with the communities ... and they also see the actual conditions as they are. ... They also get the opportunity to understand things better when they are practically engaged. (Personal communication, April 11, 2012.)

By bringing students closer to the external communities, TM activities—particularly field attachment—enable students to (a) understand workplace demands and challenges in their future professions, (b) meet, work with, and be supervised by, potential employers (MUK, 2011), (c) make career choices, (d) develop entrepreneurial skills and (e) create labour market connections that would help them after graduation. The interviewees observed that, at times, the students are recruited by the organisations where they carry out field attachment. Because of the interactions created by field attachment, R24 noted,
Students tend to market themselves. If there is an opportunity—for example, an NGO comes to an area and they want to establish a project—the locals usually recommend a student who did field attachment with them. Most students have benefited by getting employment, by getting connections. (Personal communication, March 28, 2012.)

Benefits to external communities

Because the TM activities involve interactions between universities and external communities, the TM benefits not only a university (including its academic staff and students) but also the external communities. First, not only does the TM enable the university, staff, and students to learn from the external communities, but TM activities, such as CE and consultancy, also enable the external communities to access, acquire, and utilise the knowledge, skills, and knowledge capabilities of the university. Through its outreach centres, the incubation centre, and other units that facilitate interactions between the university and the external communities, MUK provides skills development or retooling programmes that enable the participants to acquire new knowledge and skills, to create their own business, to enhance their business and agricultural productivity, and so forth. The TM also enables the external communities to contribute actively to the decision-making processes at the university, particularly through participation in curriculum development, curriculum reviews, and field attachment. Although this form of engagement has not developed fully, it is envisaged that when it is completely developed, it will enable the external communities to contribute meaningfully to decision-making and to the development of solutions to some of the societal problems.

In addition, by bringing students in contact with the external communities, TM activities offer the external communities accessibility to a pool of potential employees from which to choose, which ultimately reduces the cost of the recruitment and induction of new employees (MUK, 2011). In addition, since students undertaking field attachment are not paid, field attachment offers organisations and/or communities additional and free human resources, albeit for a short time.

Most of the benefits discussed above may be associated with field attachment because at the time of data collection, field attachment had recently been introduced as a university-wide practice (the first round was carried out in 2011) compulsory for all undergraduate students. The above discussion shows that when a university engages with its external communities and integrates the TM into its teaching and research activities, both the university and the external communities benefit. The benefits to the university, including its academic staff and students, as discussed above, include positive relations with the external communities, increased opportunities for students’ experiential learning, increased academic vitality and public relevance of research and teaching activities, and access to and mobilisation of resources. The benefits to the external communities include accessibility
to research outcomes that are socially robust, quick access to human and other knowledge resources, and the development of human and social capital (Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012).

6.5 Challenges to deeper institutionalisation of the TM

The discussions in Chapter 5 and Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 show that MUK has undertaken various efforts to institutionalise the TM and that the TM has become rather integral to the mission and hence to the activities and practices of the university. Regulatively, the university recognises the TM as a core function, includes the TM among the criteria for the promotion of the academic staff, and has made the field attachment compulsory for all undergraduate students. Normatively, the TM has been integrated into the curriculum of the university and is considered in the evaluation of the academic staff. There is also widespread normative consensus among the members of the academic staff that the TM is an appropriate function of the university and one of their responsibilities. Cognitively, the TM is widely valued, and some members of the academic staff carry out TM activities. Nonetheless, the process of institutionalising the TM still faces various challenges, the most critical of which are (a) a lack and/or unsustainability of funding, (b) unfairly balanced academic promotion and reward policies, (c) work overload and (d) unclear guidelines regarding the TM.

6.5.1 Lack/unsustainability of funding

The first challenge, the one emphasised most by the interviewees, is the lack and/or unsustainability of funding for TM activities; yet, as the literature (e.g., Brukardt et al., 2006; Vidal et al., 2002) shows, the process of creating TM activities and, consequently, institutionalising the TM, requires consistent mobilisation and allocation of financial resources. Such resources are required to, among other things, establish and/or support outreach centres, TM-coordinating offices, consultancy units, incubation centres, and multidisciplinary research centres; support community-based learning and research activities; and provide seed grants to staff and students to initiate TM activities. The interview and documentary data, however, show that although MUK has created some academic and organisational programmes and units, and allocates financial and human resources to promote the TM, the efforts to fully institutionalise the TM are still constrained by the lack and/or insufficiency of funding. Internally, the insufficiency/lack of funding affects the TM by inhibiting the active involvement of the academic staff and students in TM activities, particularly field-based learning and collaborative research; the involvement of the academic units (e.g., departments and schools) and outreach centres in TM activities, especially those that require sustained funding; and the commercialisation of
research outputs. In short, it limits the smooth running of the centres, the implementation of the proposed TM activities, the continuation of the existing activities and the ability of the university to carry out research on topics that are relevant to its context (Modise & Mosweunyane, 2012). Thus, it is unsurprising that some projects and administrative units, particularly the MUPSF, that were created to promote networks and partnerships between the university and the external communities have more or less floundered. R13, for instance, noted,

What we [did] some years back, I think that was in 2005, 2006, and 2007, was to involve [secondary school] teachers in supervising our students [during school practice]. … We would identify a teacher in each school, and this teacher would orientate our students and supervise them. … Unfortunately, we ran out of money, and we stopped the project. (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)

Besides the insufficiency and unsustainability of funding, the interview data reveal that although the specialised centres expect to be semi-autonomous and self-sustaining units, they lack financial autonomy—they do not have their own bank accounts and they face delays when accessing their funds—and, hence, at times, they cannot react to opportunities quickly, provide services promptly and pay their consultants on time. The consensus among the interviewed centre coordinators was that since the centres do not have enough employees, they rely on part-time employees. However, the fact that most often they cannot pay their consultants, particularly trainers, on time makes it difficult for the centres to recruit the same people again. In this regard, R14 intimated:

We [the centre] collect funds, and these funds are channelled to the college account because all department accounts were closed, and what I seem to be seeing is that the moment these funds get into the university's account, their use now becomes very difficult. … That kind of delay in payment demotivates most of the people who are doing the work... Sometimes I feel that the people who work with us are patriotic, because when I look at the months they take to wait for refunds ... I personally feel the pain. (Personal communication April 3, 2012.)

The issue of limited financial autonomy that the centres face demonstrates the difficulties associated with running business-like activities in an academic institution with all its bureaucracy. However, the concern is how to create financially autonomous outreach centres without turning the institution into a “shopping mall” (Clark, 2004).

6.5.2 Work overload

Besides the insufficiency and unsustainability of funding, the interview and documentary data show that members of the academic staff have heavy workloads and, as a result, many of them cannot find adequate time to carry out meaningful TM activities. The university's
policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff states that the maximum workload for a teaching member of the academic staff is 40 hours (per week), distributed between teaching and research activities (see Table 18 for more details). For each member of staff, the minimum and the maximum teaching loads per week are 10 and 12 contact hours respectively. The teaching loads are based on visible and monitorable teaching activities, such as lecturing, tutorial seminars and practical or clinical work (MUK, 2009). In addition to the 40 hours, each member of the academic staff is supposed to commit some time to serving the university and the community (MUK, 2009). However, most of the interviewees noted that the allocated workload left the teaching staff with hardly any time to participate actively in TM activities. R21, for example, noted that even if the university helped them to link with the public and private sectors,

We really could not cope, we have too much to do—we are too few, maybe not too few, but we are overburdened by too many responsibilities ... Yes, the university has put that [knowledge transfer] in the strategic plan, but they failed to operationalize it because knowledge transfer, I think, is expensive and time involving. If I am expected to conduct according to the latest requirements from the VC’s [vice chancellor] office, I have to be in class a minimum of 10 hours disregarding my time in preparation of the materials. And then I am expected to research. When am I going to be out there to effect knowledge transfer? (Personal communication, April 16, 2012.)

Table 20. Distribution of the Teaching Load for the Academic Staff at MUK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time allocation (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture preparation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial/seminar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical/Clinical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MUK (2009, p. 31).

In addition to the heavy workloads, many interviewees pointed out that some members of the academic staff teach big classes, spend a great deal of time marking students’ assignment/examination scripts and, as a result, have little or no time to carry out research and/or meaningful TM activities. R15, for example, pointed out:

Although teaching is heavy, marking scripts complicates it; it is a nightmare. Ideally, you are supposed to mark coursework and give back the scripts before exams, but you cannot do that because the students are too many. (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)
The issue of work overload is exacerbated by the insufficiency of staff in the academic units and the specialised units. The interviews that the researcher had with the coordinators of some of the centres reveal that the centres are understaffed; some of the centres have only one permanent employee, a coordinator/manager, yet all centre coordinators are members of the academic staff and, therefore, they are occasionally involved in research and teaching.

6.5.3 Unfairly balanced promotion and reward practices

In addition to funding- and workload-related challenges, the full institutionalisation of the TM at MUK is constrained by the appointments and promotions policy for the academic staff. A review of the policy on the appointment and promotion of the academic staff for MUK reveals that the policy is unbalanced in favour teaching, research and academic qualifications. For instance, the university (as stated in the appointments and promotions policy for the academic staff) awards each member of its academic staff a maximum of 2 points and 3 points (out of 100) for his or her innovations and contributions to the external communities respectively. Contrastingly, the university awards each member of the academic staff a maximum of, for example, 25 points, 20 points, 8 points and 5 points for his or her publications, academic and professional qualifications, research and conduct (ethics, interpersonal relationships, etc.) respectively (see Table 18). The existence of imbalances in the appointments and promotions policy and practices of the university, the interviewees pointed out, signals to the academic staff that although the university values networking and partnerships and regards them as a core function, one can gain a promotion without being actively involved in TM-related activities. In fact, some of the interviewees regarded their involvement in TM-related activities as an unrewarding venture. R17, for instance, observed,

If I did not teach, if I did not research, I would fail to be promoted. [However] not engaging in outreach and community service cannot stop my promotion, my progression. (Personal communication, March 20, 2012.)

Thus, although the university emphasises the importance of the TM in its strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19), the distribution of points in the appointment and promotion policy for the academic staff indicates that the university still accords enduring value to teaching and research and less to networking and partnerships (Kruss et al., 2009). Such mixed messages about whether or not the university values and is committed to the TM hinder the involvement of the academic staff in TM-related activities. In fact, all the interviewees asserted that the rewards (the number of points allocated) to one’s contributions to the TM are disproportionate to the effort and amount of time each member of the academic staff needs to participate actively in TM activities.
6.5.4 Absence of clear guidelines and definitions

Related to the inappropriate appointments and promotions policy and practices is the lack of clear guidelines about the TM. Although the university’s strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19) outlines the goals, objectives, strategies, and key performance indicators for partnerships and networking, the interview and documentary data show that there is a lack of clarity with regard to the TM, particularly in relation to what constitutes community service. In addition, the university does not orient its academic staff about (1) what constitutes academic work (2) community service and (3) the evaluation of community service. Nobody tells you exactly what constitutes outreach, R6 intimated:

Whatever people are doing outside teaching and research, they consider it outreach; the whole university has no clear mechanism for doing that. It is a mandate of the university; everybody knows we have three functions: teaching, research, and outreach. The other two are very clear ... outreach is the most ill-defined function of the university, and it is very difficult to ask someone what constitutes outreach; probably people will tell you different things. (Personal communication, March 27, 2012.)

The insufficiency of clear guidelines affects the institutionalisation of the TM by not only limiting academic staff’s knowledge about, and involvement in, TM activities, but also complicating the process of assessing the contributions of the academic staff to the TM. The interview data, for instance, reveal that although the university evaluates and rewards the academic staff for their contributions to external communities, there are no clear guidelines regarding how such contributions are, and/or should be, evaluated; therefore, the process of evaluating such contributions is rather characterised by the ‘anything goes’ approach. In fact, none of the interviewed college principals, who, by their designation, head the establishment and appointment committees of their respective colleges, could explain clearly how they evaluate the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities. Commenting about how the university evaluates the contributions of its academic staff to the TM, R22 noted:

Frankly speaking, this is an area where you give everybody some mark because there is nobody who is useless to the community. In some specific areas, you can be very sure maybe someone is leading some section of the community, but I would say that maybe 60% or 70% of the times we just assume that you are useful to the community around you, not specifically stating how. (Personal communication, April 19, 2012.)

In fact, some of the interviewees remarked that the lack of clarity about what constitutes the TM explains why the processes of evaluating and rewarding the contributions of the academic staff to community service are ambiguous at the university. According to R23,

Service to the community is a broad thing, and the university has not come out to define properly what it should be. ... My individual participation in the scripture
union of my church, somewhere, is service to the community, [and so is] my individual participation in a local council in my area. (Personal communication April 17, 2012.)

Likewise, the evaluation process is complicated by the fact that (a) the quality of the TM activities is not always comparable and (b) not all service to, and interactions with, external communities can be documented and/or quantified (Mwiandi, 2010). Thus, the concern is that because members of the academic staff serve the external communities in different ways, using one system to evaluate and reward different forms of community service has the potential to discourage some members of the academic staff from active involvement in some TM activities, particularly those that require a lot of effort and time. Accordingly, R21—drawing from her experience as a member of the promotions board of her college—noted that if the university were taking the TM seriously,

Maybe, there would be separate categories [of contributions]. People have listed membership to rotary clubs, but if I said I am contributing to, maybe, assisting people to improve sanitation in communities, you only get one point—the same as somebody who says they are a member of their church choir. (Personal communication, April 16, 2012.)
The purpose of the study was to explore the institutionalisation of the TM at MUK. Accordingly, the study was guided by two research questions: (1) How has the Third Mission been institutionalised at Makerere University? (2) How committed is Makerere University to promoting the Third Mission? The first question addressed three interrelated issues: (a) the main TM-related activities carried out at MUK, (b) the rationales for the TM and (c) the approaches employed by the university to institutionalise the TM. To answer this question, the researcher utilised documentary and interview data as well as findings from previous studies (e.g., Benneworth et al., 2009; Carot et al., 2012; Clark, 1998a, 1998b; Molas-Gallart et al., 2002; Nabudere, 2009; Vidal et al., 2002). The second question focused on the institutional commitment of the university—that is, it addressed the issue of “whether and how the key institutional aspects of the university (e.g., policies, structures, and programmes) align with the TM.” To analyse the data and ultimately answer this question, the researcher utilised an analytical framework based on the matrix of institutional commitment to service (Holland, 1997) and other pertinent literature (e.g., Beere et al., 2011; Brukarth et al., 2006a, 2006b; Mohrman, 2010; Vidal et al., 2002).

The analysis focused specifically on eight key organisational features: mission; hire and promotion policy and practices; organisational structure; faculty involvement and commitment; student involvement; community involvement; campus publications and communication; and leadership and support (Beere et al., 2012; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Brukarth et al., 2006a; Furco, 2002; Holland, 2005; Holland, 1997; Kecskes, 2008; Lynton, 1995; Mohrman, 2010; Vidal et al., 2002). This chapter summarises the key findings of the study—the rationales for the TM, the typology of TM activities, the approaches to the institutionalisation of the TM, the challenges to the further institutionalisation of the TM, the institutional commitment to the TM and the key observations—and discusses the suggestions towards the deeper institutionalisation of the TM, the contributions of the study, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.
7.1 Rationales for the Third Mission at MUK

Although the TM is, at times, considered a challenge with which universities have to contend, the discussions in the preceding chapters have revealed that the TM is a complicated concept that can be understood in terms of not only the external pressures but also the pressures within, and the proactiveness of, the universities. The discussion in Chapter 5 shows that at MUK, the recent developments regarding the TM of the university can be understood in terms of four interrelated issues: funding, accountability, relevance and excellence.

In terms of funding, some of the current TM-related activities and structures can be traced to the changes that the university has made since the early 1990s. Up to around 1990, MUK was reliant on the government for funding (Oboko, 2013); therefore, it always experienced budget cuts whenever the government faced budgetary problems (Mamdani, 2007). However, in the early 1990s, the university initiated various reforms—financial, management and academic—to lessen its dependence on the government for funding. For instance, the university established a limited liability company to offer research, training and consultancy services, and it introduced demand-driven academic reforms, such as the commercialisation of service units and cost-sharing (Clark, 2004; Court, 1999; Mamdani, 2007). Accordingly, some of the recent developments regarding the TM at MUK can be understood partly in terms of the wider reforms that the university undertook to diversify its funding sources, reduce reliance on the government for funding and increase its institutional autonomy. The literature—for example, Etzkowitz et al. (2000)—shows that in situations in which universities are defined by insufficient funding, the importance of funding shortages pushing such universities to carry out certain TM-related activities should not be ignored. However, the interview data reveal that the university does not derive much funding from its TM-related activities; therefore, it would be wrong to claim that the TM and its associated activities at MUK are driven entirely by the need for funding.

In addition to the need for additional funding, the TM and TM-related activities at MUK are driven by institutional—regulative, normative and cognitive—pressures and the university’s need to enhance the academic excellence and social relevance of its programmes and services. Regulative pressures, in this case, refer to the need to act in accord with the relevant laws (Scott, 1995)—for instance, the UOTIA (Republic of Uganda, 2001) and the “Government White Paper on Education Policy Review Commission Report” (Republic of Uganda, 1992)—which urge universities and other HEIs to engage with, and provide outreach services to, the public and private sectors. Normative pressures, here, refer to the moral expectations that the university should share its knowledge with the external communities and contribute to the alleviation of societal problems. The moral expectations are driven in part by the belief that since the university receives public funding, it should, in return, demonstrate its relevance and usefulness to society. The cognitive pressures denote the desire to adopt a common frame of reference (Scott, 1995). In this case, normative pressures refer to the demands upon or attempts by the university to adopt organisational
structures and/or academic practices, such as field attachment, which exist at, or are practised by, other HEIs, particularly in Uganda. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the recent developments regarding the TM at MUK have been forced upon the university by its external environment; instead, it denotes the university’s interpretation of, and response to, institutional expectations.

It is also worth noting that the calls upon African universities to be useful and accountable to the communities, regions and countries in which they are located are not completely new. Claims about the detachment of African universities from their immediate environments—particularly in terms of the relevance of the academic programmes of the universities to the development needs of Africa—were raised shortly after the establishment of the first post-colonial universities (Wangenge-Ouma & Fongwa, 2012). In addition, some of the recent TM efforts at MUK are not exceptionally new; the history of the TM at MUK (see Section 5.2) shows that the connections between the university and the needs of the external communities, especially the government, are not a recent development. Although the earlier developments were part of the colonial and post-colonial development agenda of African universities to address the development needs of their home countries (Ajayi et al., 1996; Preece et al., 2012a; Sicherman, 2006; UNESCO, 1963), the current developments at MUK can be interpreted in terms of the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 1998a, 1998b, 2004)—that is, they are part of the wider initiatives undertaken by the university to respond to institutional pressures (mainly government expectations); revitalise its public image; interact closely with the external communities (government, industry and the wider society); strengthen its sense of mission; cope with uncertainty and complexity; diversify its funding sources and increase its institutional autonomy (Clark, 1998a, 1998b, 2004; Etzkowitz, 2004; Etzkowitz & Klofsten, 2005; Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Gibb et al., 2009; Gjerding et al., 2006; Sporn, 2001). Therefore, whereas some of the TM activities at the university are driven by the desire to provide a service and, consequently, to earn some revenue, others are, apparently, driven by the need to conform to legal mandates and collectively valued purposes and goals (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008)—that is, to demonstrate accountability to the stakeholders of the university.

7.2 Typology of Third Mission activities at MUK

One of the objectives of the study was to ascertain the main ways in which MUK networks and partners with its external communities. The previous discussion in Chapter 5 shows that the main forms of such networks and partnerships are consultancy, contract research, the mobility of people, involvement in public debates and social life, collaborative research, the commercialisation of research results, CE, field attachment, field-based learning, the sharing of facilities and services with external communities and the participation of external communities in the decision-making processes of the university (see Table 21 for a summary of the activities). These activities have been categorised into three broad
but overlapping types—knowledge transfer and innovation, continuing education, and social engagement—that together epitomise the process and ways in which the university (1) reaches out to communities, (2) utilises its knowledge capabilities to contribute to socioeconomic development and (3) involves the external communities in its academic activities and decision-making processes. Thus, although these activities differ, they are all characterised by the exchange of knowledge between the university and its various external communities. The typology of TM activities, discussed in Section 5.4 and summarised in Table 21, draws heavily on the classification of the TM by Carot et al. (2012) and relates to (a) the classification of third-stream activities by Molas-Gallart et al. (2002), (b) the typology of university engagement activities by Benneworth et al. (2009) and (c) the dimensions of the TM proposed by Montesinos et al. (2008), Schoen et al. (2006) and Doh (2012).

Table 21. Typology of Third Mission Activities at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Units involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer and innovation</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>MISR, CHDC, FTBIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract research</td>
<td>MISR, CHDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility of people</td>
<td>MUPSF, colleges and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public debates and social life</td>
<td>MISR, HURIPEC, colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative research</td>
<td>Colleges and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercialisation of research results</td>
<td>TDTC, FTBIC, NSIC and UGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>FTBIC, HURIPEC, CLL and CLCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social engagement</td>
<td>Field attachment</td>
<td>Colleges, schools and UGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field-based learning</td>
<td>Colleges/schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing of university facilities and services</td>
<td>University library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the external public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of external public in the</td>
<td>MUPSF, University Council, University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university’s decision-making processes</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (based on the classification of the TM by Carot et al., 2012).

The above-mentioned TM activities can also be categorised into four types:

1. Activities that are officially embedded in the programmes of the university—for instance, field attachment and partly field-based learning;

---

81 Engaged research, knowledge sharing and service and teaching.
82 Social third mission, enterprising third mission and innovative third mission.
83 An economic dimension (comprising intellectual property, spin-offs and contracts with industry) and a societal dimension (encompassing public understanding of science, involvement in social and cultural life, participation in policy-making and contracts with public bodies).
84 Commissioned research, advisory services and consultancy, industry-tailored programmes, capacity-building, advocacy and continuous and distance education and so forth.
2. Activities that are carried out, though not entirely, by specialised units—for instance, continuing education and consultancy;
3. Activities that bring external communities to the university and/or formally involve the external communities in the decision-making processes of the university; and
4. Activities initiated or carried out by the academic staff individually or in groups (e.g., media appearances and consultancy).

However, as in the case of the three categories presented in Table 21, these groups of activities also overlap and reinforce each other. For example, when the members of the academic staff carry out consultancy, contract research and collaborative research, they create connections that often facilitate field engagement, field-based learning and CE. In addition, these activities are not the only ways through which the university engages with, and/or reaches out to, the external communities. Staff and students at MUK engage with the external communities in a variety of personal ways that are quite helpful in connecting the communities with the resources of the university and vice versa. In fact, it is public knowledge that some of the academic staff at MUK are involved in teaching, consultancy and other off-campus activities, which bring the academic staff closer to the external communities and, accordingly, facilitate mutual learning between the university and the external communities. Unfortunately, such interactions do not necessarily constitute the TM because they are largely unintentional, unplanned, unsupported, unrecorded and unrewarded. Therefore, the TM is not just a set of unintentional and erratic activities through which universities engage with non-academic domains and contribute to socioeconomic development; the TM involves a necessary degree of obligation (Nedeva, 2008)—that is, it is expected, and its associated activities are intentional and institutional rather than personal in nature.

In addition, as the discussion in Chapter 5 demonstrated, some of the TM-related activities outlined in Table 21 are not necessarily new at MUK (Openjuru & Ikoja-Odongo, 2012; Russell, 1963; Sicherman, 2009); the university has historically reached out to, and, at times, engaged with, the external communities. However, whereas, in the past, these activities—for instance, consultancy, the commercialisation of research results and field attachment—were, for the most part, personal and part of some (not all) academic disciplines, they are currently regarded as an essential aspect of the university and have been fairly institutionalised. For example, field attachment, which, in the past, was restricted to undergraduate students in certain professional fields (for instance, education, engineering, agriculture and medicine), is now compulsory for all undergraduate students. Therefore, partnerships and networks between the university and the external communities are not new at MUK; what is new is the reframing of partnerships and networking as a core function of the university and, thus, the development of policies, programmes and structures to support it.
7.3 Approaches for institutionalising the Third Mission

To promote the TM as a core function and, thus, to integrate it among the other activities of the university, MUK has adopted various strategies. These strategies include policies, programmes, practices and structures which fall into three different categories: administrative, academic and organisational (see Section 6.3 for more details).

The administrative approach represents the institutional efforts at MUK that seek to institutionalise the TM through administrative domains—for example, institutional policies, leadership, decision-making processes, resource allocation and administrative unit(s) at the university. Examples of administrative strategies that have been adopted at MUK to institutionalise the TM are the adoption of the TM as a core function of the university, the creation of an administrative office (MUPSF) under the office of the vice chancellor to initiate and/or improve partnerships between the university and the public and private sectors, the allocation of financial and human resources to support and coordinate TM-related activities and the inclusion of some external communities in the decision-making processes of the university. Notwithstanding their insufficiencies, these strategies somehow enable the university to demonstrate institutional commitment to the TM and to address some of the challenges to the TM.

The academic approach denotes the academic policies, programmes and activities at MUK that recognise the importance of university–community partnerships, facilitate the involvement of external communities in the teaching and research activities of the university, support and reward the involvement of the academic staff and students in community-related activities, and broaden the focus of teaching and research to “include more attention to community needs and issues ... and to make knowledge available and accessible to external audiences” (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 85). Examples of academic strategies for institutionalising the TM at MUK include, but are not limited to, the university-wide integration of field attachment into all undergraduate programmes, the inclusion of external communities in the implementation of field attachment and the inclusion of community service and innovations among the requirements for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff to senior academic positions.

The organisational approach refers to the organisational structures at MUK that provide interdisciplinary research and outreach services and, thus, create and/or enhance partnerships between the university and/or its internal actors and the external communities. One example of the organisational strategies utilised by MUK to institutionalise the TM is the establishment of multidisciplinary centres—for instance, MISR, CHDC and HURIPEC—and specialised centres—such as FTBIC, TDTC, NSIC, CLL and CLCS—that collectively facilitate knowledge transfer and innovation; provide continuing education courses; facilitate social engagement; and, accordingly, help to connect the external communities with the resources of the university and vice versa. In short, they serve as:
A two-way portal between the community and the academic institution. They are the point of contact that makes the many parts of the academic institution more accessible to the community. Similarly, they provide academic people better connections to the community. (Vidal et al., 2002, p. 90.)

Combined, the administrative, academic and organisational approaches denote the various policies, programmes, practices and organisational structures at MUK that serve to remove barriers against, promote and institutionalise the TM.

7.4 Challenges to further institutionalisation of the TM

The discussions in Chapters 5 and 6 reveal that although MUK expresses commitment to the TM and has institutions—policies, programmes, practices and structures—to promote and/or eliminate barriers to partnerships and networking, the institutionalisation of the TM is faced with a number of challenges. For instance, the interview data show that although the academic staff of the university is aware of the TM and regards it as an essential function of the university, the culture of active involvement in TM activities is not yet fully developed. The main challenges, as the discussion in Section 6.4 shows, are work overload, the lack/unsustainability of funding, inappropriate promotion and reward policy and practices and the absence of clear guidelines regarding the TM.

In terms of funding, the data show that a number of TM activities at MUK are either underfunded or unfunded, yet creating and sustaining partnerships and networks with the external communities require sustainable funding to develop and/or support the coordinating units, multidisciplinary centres, activities of students and academic staff and community-based learning and research. Hence, although the university has organisational structures and employees to initiate, coordinate and carry out TM activities, some TM-related projects have floundered, and specialised units—for example, MUPSF—are barely active. The lack or insufficiency of funding affects the institutionalisation of the TM by curtailing the involvement of the academic staff and students, the academic units (e.g., departments) and the specialised units in TM-related activities, particularly those that require continued funding. In essence, it limits the continuation of the existing activities and projects, the implementation of the proposed activities and the ability of the university to carry out research that is relevant to its external communities.

The above discussion reveals that although MUK regards the TM as a core function, the full institutionalisation of the TM requires that the university further integrate it into its “long- and short-range planning, as well as into its resource allocation processes” (Lynton, 1995, p. 16). It is worth noting, however, that until 2012–2013, the university was spending much more than it was earning (see Table 16 for more details) and that the insufficiency of funding affects not only the TM but also teaching and research. The documentary data show that the university commits only 1% of its internally generated revenue to research.
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The data also show that a bigger portion—50%—of the research budget of the university is spent on staff development programmes, supporting the efforts of the academic staff to attain PhDs. The rest of the budget is spent on conference travels (22%), postdoctoral research (18%), the attainment of master’s degrees (8%), the hosting of conferences (1%) and the support of other research activities (1%) (MUK, 2012a). According to R15, "The university used to give money for research, and government was actually giving the university money for research, but Makerere University opted to train people for PhDs... Right from the time when Mujaju [author of an appointment and promotion report (1999) for MUK] made the recommendation [that to be appointed as a university lecturer, one must be a PhD holder], the focus has been on staff development—training people to get PhDs." (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)

The examples highlighted above show that the insufficiency of funding affects all the core functions of the university—teaching, research and the TM; therefore, it would be, as some interviewees noted, irrational for the university to fund the TM sufficiently when neither teaching nor research is adequately supported and developed. According to R4, "At Makerere, we only get a budget for training students; we don’t have a budget that says extend. We have a very small budget from government that says do some bit of research." (Personal communication, April 3, 2012). Although the government—through the Presidential Initiative on Science and Technology—funds some projects at CEDAT and CAES, the available funds are insufficient; hence, some of the outreach and engagement activities at MUK are still based on the goodwill of some members of the academic staff.

In addition to the lack and/or the inadequacy of funding, members of the academic staff at MUK have heavy teaching loads that leave them with insufficient time to carry out research let alone participate actively in some TM-related activities. Therefore, although some of the interviewed members of the academic staff appreciate the importance of partnerships and networking, some of them noted that they were not actively involved in TM activities partly because of their heavy workloads. The policy regarding the appointment and promotion of the academic staff at MUK states that the maximum workload for a teaching member of the academic staff is 40 hours (per week). These hours are distributed among the following activities: lecture preparation (12 hours), lecturing (6 hours), tutorials or seminars (2 hours), marking of scripts (6 hours), practical or clinical work (2 hours), students’ supervision (4 hours) and research (4 hours). Besides these activities, the academic staff is expected to serve the university and the external communities. Although some of the TM-related activities—for example, field-based learning and field attachment—could be covered within the 40 hours, the appointments and promotions policy fails to demonstrate

85 See http://mak.ac.ug/research/research-funding.
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the importance of the TM and, hence, fails to inspire and support the involvement of the academic staff in TM-related activities.

In addition to the heavy workload, the interviewees noted that some of the academic staff teach large classes, spend a great deal of time marking students’ coursework and examination scripts and, therefore, do not have sufficient time to carry out research let alone meaningful outreach and engagement activities. Accordingly, it is not surprising that some members of the academic staff, at times, participate in outreach and engagement activities in their free time. R19, for example, noted that although most members of the academic staff have heavy teaching loads,

I don’t think anyone who is interested in something can fail to find the time. The most important thing is passion and interest. When you have passion for something and you are interested, you will always create the time. At least I have found members here who create time for the centre’s activities; it has not been a problem. For example, when it comes to translation work, one can do that work in the evening or at night at home and bring the work in the following day. There is no contradiction with teaching; one can work in his or her free time after the lectures. (Personal communication, March 29, 2012.)

The issue of work overload is exacerbated by the insufficiency of staff in the academic and specialised units. The interviews that the researcher had with the coordinators of some of the centres reveal that the centres are understaffed; some have only one permanent employee—the coordinator/manager—but all centre coordinators are members of the academic staff and are, therefore, rather involved in research and teaching. In fact, some of the interviewees pointed out that unless the university recruits enough people—for example, extension agents, who are purposely responsible for the TM—it risks overburdening its academic staff and jeopardising its teaching and research activities.

Equally constraining to the TM are the academic appointments and promotions policy and practices of the university. The appointments and promotions policy of a university lays out the standards and procedures for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff and, accordingly, serves as an indicator of what that university values and expects of its academic staff. Thus, as Beere et al. (2011) note, “There is probably no issue as fundamental to institutionalizing public engagement as reappointment, promotion, and tenure [practices]” (p. 124). For MUK, the appointments and promotions policy for the academic staff is unbalanced in favour of research, teaching and academic qualifications. For example, whereas the policy awards 3 and 2 points (out of 100) to each member of the academic staff for his or her innovations and contributions to community service respectively, the policy allocates 20 and 25 points to the academic and professional qualifications and publications respectively of the academic staff (see Table 18 for more details). Although the participation of the academic staff in activities, such as field attachment and community-based research, is considered under teaching and research, the feeling among the interviewees was that the appointments and promotions policy and practices of the university do not adequately
support the involvement of the academic staff in TM activities. In fact, the literature shows that these concerns are not restricted to MUK. In their research paper, “Organizational Factors that Influence University-Based Researchers’ Engagement in Knowledge Transfer Activities,” Jacobson et al. (2004) reveal that their participants were particularly passionate about “the risks posed to an academic career by making a major commitment to knowledge transfer” (p. 248). In short, the importance of the policies and practices regarding the appointment and promotion of the academic staff to the institutionalisation of the TM cannot be ignored.

The literature also shows that the imbalances in the criteria for the promotion of the academic staff can be found at various universities in Africa. Mwiandi (2010), for example, notes that, at the University of Nairobi, “Staff members who have provided public service at [the] national level earn a maximum of 10 points in the promotion criteria, against 35 points and 25 points for publication and teaching respectively” (p. 161). Lazarus et al. (2008) also note that although a number of universities in South Africa include community engagement in their academic staff promotion and reward criteria, the percentage of points allocated to community engagement remains rather low in comparison to the percentage of points allocated to either teaching or research. At other universities, the challenge is not the existence of the imbalances but rather the exclusion of the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities from the criteria for the promotion of the academic staff. Findings from the study “Implementing the Third Mission of Universities in Africa” reveal that, out of four HEIs that participated in the study,86 only one university—the University of Botswana—recognised community service in its criteria for the promotion of the academic staff (Preece et al., 2012b).

The final issue is the lack of clear guidelines about the TM, particularly what constitutes the TM and how it should be documented and evaluated. For instance, although the university includes the contributions of the academic staff to innovations and community service among the criteria for the promotion of the academic staff to senior academic positions, it does not specify what constitutes service to the community and how such service should be evaluated. In addition, although the university’s strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19) outlines the goals, objectives, strategies and performance indicators for partnerships and networking, the interview data reveal that the guidelines for the TM and the evaluation thereof are quite ambiguous. Therefore, it was not surprising when one senior member of academic staff turned down my request for an interview, noting that (1) she knew nothing about community service, outreach, networking and partnerships and (2) her responsibilities were to teach, supervise postgraduate theses and carry out research. We talked for approximately 10 minutes about the focus of my study and about her responsibilities, after which she told me that she could not grant me an interview because she knew nothing about the TM and was not involved in TM-related activities.

86 Universities of Calabar, Botswana, Malawi and Lesotho.
The above discussion demonstrates that although MUK has integrated some aspects of the TM into its budget, academic programmes, appointments and promotions policy and practices for the academic staff and organisational structures, the full institutionalisation of the TM is yet to be achieved; the TM still faces a number of challenges at the university. Thus, for further institutionalisation of the TM to occur, the university must bolster its current TM efforts, enhance its support and commitment and address the existing challenges.

7.5 Institutional commitment to the Third Mission

The analysis of the key organisational aspects of MUK—namely the mission, hire and promotion policy and practices, organisational structure, faculty involvement and commitment, student involvement, community involvement, campus publications and communication and leadership and support—have revealed that MUK has some institutions—policies, programmes, customs and organisational structures—that support the TM and/or carry out TM activities (see Section 6.2 for more details).

In terms of its mission, the university (1) asserts that it intends to “provide innovative teaching, learning, research and services responsive to national and global needs” (MUK, 2008a, p. 12), (2) underscores the TM (partnerships and networking) as one of its core functions87 and (3) outlines clear goals, strategies and key performance indicators for the TM. In addition to the stated mission, the university has some policies, organisational structures, customs and academic programmes that support the TM and serve to integrate it into its teaching and research activities. The academic staff appointment and promotion policy of the university, for example, includes the contributions of the academic staff to the external communities among the requirements for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff to senior academic positions. The university has also integrated the TM into its academic programmes. Field attachment, for instance, is now an integral component of the curriculum of the whole university and is compulsory for all undergraduate students.

With regard to the organisational structures, the university has a number of specialised and multidisciplinary units—for example, FTBIC, TDTC, CLLS, CLL, HURIPEC, MISR and CHDC—that organise TM-related activities and provide TM-related services. Besides having policies, customs and organisational structures that support the TM, the university supports and rewards the involvement of its academic staff and students in TM-related activities. For instance, the university allows the students88 to form associations through which they interact with, learn from and serve the external communities. With regard to community involvement, MUK engages some members of the external communities in its decision-making processes and organs, particularly the University

87 Besides teaching and learning and research and innovations.
88 Through the Department of the Dean of Students.
Council and the University Senate. Accordingly, the university carries out various TM-related activities (see Sections 5.4 and 7.2) and is somehow institutionally committed to promoting the TM—that is, it values the TM, recognises the TM as one of its core functions, supports TM-related activities, has integrated the TM into its curriculum and evaluates and rewards the involvement of the students and academic staff in TM-related activities. However, as the analyses in Section 6.2 and Table 22 show, the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM is far from complete. In essence, there is a need for further support of the TM and for more attention to be paid to the existing challenges to the TM at MUK. A summarised analysis of the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM is presented in Table 22.
### Table 22. Institutional Commitment of MUK to the TM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational factor</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
<th>Unresolved issues</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The promotion of innovation and responsiveness to national needs is a core aspect of the vision and mission of MUK</td>
<td>TM not specified in the mission and vision statements of the university</td>
<td>Level 3: High relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The university’s strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19) defines and recognises partnerships and networking as a core function of the university</td>
<td>The TM is defined as an integral aspect of the academic agenda of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hire and promotion policy and practices</strong></td>
<td>The university’s recruitment and promotion policy for academic staff recognises, allocates points to and rewards the contributions of the academic staff to innovation and community service during recruitment and promotion to senior academic positions</td>
<td>Lack of clear guidelines about the meaning, documentation and evaluation of community service</td>
<td>Level 2: medium Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of a centralised coordinating office</td>
<td>Inappropriate promotions and rewards system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational structure</strong></td>
<td>Centres and multidisciplinary institutes that carry out TM-related activities exist</td>
<td>Insufficient staff in the specialised units</td>
<td>Level 3: High relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An administrative office, MUPSF, tasked with promoting partnerships exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty involvement and commitment</strong></td>
<td>Outreach and engagement are accepted as a role of the academic staff</td>
<td>Inadequate formal support, rewards, incentives and ceremonies</td>
<td>Level 3: High relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic staff is quite knowledgeable about outreach and engagement and recognise them as a core function of the university</td>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies to foster and support the involvement of the academic staff in TM activities exist (e.g., the IPM policy and the policy for the recruitment and promotion of academic staff)</td>
<td>Absence of clear guidelines and orientation programmes for the academic staff regarding the documentation and evaluation of innovation and community service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services to foster innovation and to commercialise inventions exist (e.g., incubation centres and TDTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative consensus about the appropriateness of the TM exists among the academic staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic staff is fairly involved in TM-related activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student involvement                      | Field attachment is integrated into undergraduate programmes and linked to students' learning goals
Volunteerism is encouraged as a co-curricular activity for students
Opportunities for field attachment and field-based learning exist
Incubation and technology transfer services to foster students' innovativeness exist
Exhibitions and open days for students to display their innovations and projects exist
Exhibitions and open days are part of the proposed students' support services | Lack of financial support for volunteer and community development work
Few opportunities for practical work and extra credit
Lack of a broad programme that promotes awareness about the TM among students | Level 2: Medium relevance
Opportunities and organised institutional support for volunteerism and community-based learning are limited |
| Community involvement                   | Community involvement is recognised and emphasised in the strategic plan (2008/09–2018/19)
Selected members of the public sit on the University Council and the University Senate
Communities participate in the supervision and evaluation of students' field attachment
University offers and shares some services and facilities with the external communities
An office tasked with creating and enhancing partnerships with the public and private sectors exists
Public lectures are an essential feature of the university
College open days and exhibitions are encouraged and open to the public | Lack of organised institutional support for collaborative research
Communities not represented on advisory boards for colleges, schools and departments | Level 1: Low relevance
Occasional, symbolic or limited individual or group involvement |
| Campus publications and communication   | Partnerships and networking are underscored in the strategic plan
The contributions of MUK to knowledge transfer partnerships and networking are emphasised in the annual reports of the university
Innovations and ongoing TM-related projects are highlighted in the newsletters, brochures, annual reports and other publications of the colleges
Media appearances and publications by some academic staff exist | Lack of an office to coordinate TM activities and to collect and relay TM-related information to the internal and external communities | Level 2: Medium relevance
Stories of staff and students' volunteerism and contributions to society are emphasised |
| Leadership and support                 | TM-coordinating units, such as centres and institutes, exist
Financial and human resources for the specialised units exist
Financial support for TM activities (e.g., field attachment) exists
Policies and procedures to guide and support the TM exist (e.g., the guidelines for field attachment, the IPM policy and the policy on the recruitment and promotion of the academic staff)
Informal support for the TM exists at the departmental level
Leadership is fairly committed to, and supportive of, the TM | Insufficiency of funding and staffing | Level 3: High relevance
Institutional support for organisational structures and some TM activities exists |

1 The assigned levels are on a scale of 1–4 (low relevance, medium relevance, high relevance and full integration respectively) and they are based on the researcher's evaluation of the strengths of each institutional attribute in supporting the TM; therefore, they are not objective measurements of the levels of institutional commitment of the university to the TM.

Source: Author (based on Holland, 1997; Mohrman, 2010).
The summarised analysis of the institutional commitment of the MUK to the TM presented in Table 22 shows that the university has some administrative, academic and organisational structures, policies, programmes and practices that foster the TM. Such policies, programmes, structures and practices have helped to transform the TM into a legitimate function of the university—that is, the TM is somehow supported and integrated into the budget, the recruitment and promotion of the academic staff, the undergraduate programmes and the organisational structure of the university. In addition, the TM is expected; there is consensus among the academic staff about the appropriateness of the TM, and some members of academic staff are rather knowledgeable about the TM and are involved in TM-related activities. Nevertheless, the TM and TM-related activities at MUK remain insufficiently supported and coordinated.

7.6 Observations

Despite the emphasis that has been placed on the TM of the university and the need for HEIs to engage with, and reach out to, the external communities, there are number of observations about the TM that deserve attention. These have observations emerged from the literature and the data.

First, much as the institutionalisation of the TM requires that universities create organisational structures that can promote community outreach and engagement and coordinate outreach and engagement activities, MUK should avoid creating a silo system that (a) restricts the TM to the specialised centres and disciplines that have historically engaged with or reached out to the external communities and (b) pits the TM against teaching and research. Instead, the university should integrate partnerships and networking into teaching and research and encourage interaction among the specialised centres and between the centres and the traditional academic units—departments, schools and colleges—to maximise the benefits of the TM to teaching and research and vice versa. Thus, as Nelles and Vorley (2010) note,

> While universities may approach the third mission by establishing structures (such as technology transfer offices), they must ultimately coordinate institutional strategies, systems of communication, leadership and cultures to ensure success on third stream [third mission] activities and the integration of these activities into teaching and research functions. (p. 347.)

Second, although the university should support the integration and application of knowledge as well as the production of socially and economically relevant knowledge,

---

89 Some of the units are rather new and understaffed; therefore, they do not have the capacity to carry out and/or coordinate all the TM-related activities at the university. In addition, some of the TM-related activities, such as field attachment and field-based learning, vary among academic disciplines; therefore, their implementation requires the involvement and cooperation of the academic units.
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its research agenda should embrace not only application-oriented research, but also basic research. The university should, as Mwiandi (2008) observes,

Conduct research that addresses the present problems while at the same time paying attention to innovation and research for tomorrow—basic research. Future developments rely on the basic research conducted through the university but which may not necessarily provide answers for present problems. (p. 152.)

In fact, some of the academics, particularly those from the basic sciences, pointed out that for the university to be more relevant, it should focus on generating knowledge which is not only directly relevant to society but also important to academia. R17, for example, opined as follows:

The Third Mission is good, but I hate the business of having to follow it completely. I think one should be able to balance, otherwise, as an academic institution; we need to generate knowledge, which other people might not generate, but which we might need for future generations. So, I think the university has to make sure that that part also remains solid and functional. (Personal communication, March 20, 2012.)

However, this is not to downplay the potential benefits of networking and partnerships to basic research. Instead, the argument is that because of its disciplinary focus, basic research is normally carried out in contexts that are largely governed by the academic interests of specific communities (Gibbons et al., 1994), and, thus, it is rarely carried out in partnerships between the academic and non-academic partners. In addition, because basic research often focuses on research topics that aim to expand the frontiers of knowledge within certain disciplines, it is largely characterised by limited societal accountability (Gibbons et al., 1994) and, at times, undervalued and less funded. Therefore, although it is vital for MUK to underscore and support the involvement of non-academic stakeholders in its research activities—basic and applied—the university should not leave the funding for basic research to market forces, which tend to favour applied research. Although it is true, as the “African Innovation Outlook, 2010” reveals, that the research productivity of African universities is low and that Africa’s share of the world’s research output is small90—and, for that reason, one might wonder whether the research productivity of African universities merits any conversation—the contribution of African universities to the scientific production of Africa cannot be ignored91 (AU-NEPAD, 2010).

90 The few African countries in which scientific output is substantial and even growing are not as productive as other developing countries elsewhere in the world (AU-NEPAD, 2010, p. 107).

91 The smallest science systems on the continent often rely heavily on the role and contribution of one (of a few) public universities as the main producers of knowledge. In countries such as Namibia, Botswana and Swaziland, there are no significant research institutes outside of the national universities, and 80%–90% of the small research output of these countries is generated by academic staff at these institutions. This is also true of countries such as Mali, Angola, Lesotho, Mozambique, Ethiopia and Uganda, in which one university—University of Bamako, Agostinho Neto, National University of Lesotho, Eduardo Mondlane
Furthermore, because much of the literature on the TM focuses on issues such as the transfer of knowledge or technology and the creation of spin-off firms, all of which underscore the immediate application and commercialisation of knowledge, discussion about the TM often ignores the importance of basic research and/or disciplines (hard–pure and soft–pure academic fields) and non-commercial TM activities. Yet, the TM embraces commercial and non-commercial activities and covers all academic disciplines although it can appear in different forms across disciplines. The concern, then, is how to promote the TM without necessarily neglecting basic disciplines—for example, arts and humanities and sciences—and non-commercial activities. Although the commercial aspects of the TM at MUK (for example, continuing education, consultancy and the commercialisation of research results) have the potential to generate substantial funds for the university to supplement its current revenue streams—government subvention, donor support and internally generated revenues—the aim of the TM, just as the interviewees stressed, should be to provide useful services, not to generate funds per se. In short, the commercialisation of research and education services should not end in themselves; although the university should be free to diversify its funding sources and to generate funds from some of its TM-related activities, it should not abandon the fundamental academic standards, values and missions for which it exists. In essence, the university should be market-smart but mission-centred (Zemsky et al., 2005). Accordingly, the agenda for the TM at any university should (a) correspond to the mission, academic strength, history, culture, values and priorities—for instance, teaching and learning goals and research agenda—of the university; (b) utilise and advance the knowledge potential of that university; and (c) consider the needs of the external communities.

Third, although each of the organisational factors that constitute the matrix of institutional commitment to service (see Tables 4 and 5) contributes to the “sticking power and staying power [of the TM]” (Lawson, 2002, p. 91), any attempts to meaningfully institutionalise the TM require us to treat these factors as interdependent aspects to avoid inconsistencies that could limit the involvement and commitment of the staff, the students and the communities. Likewise, any attempts to examine the institutional commitment of any university to the TM should consider the organisational attributes (see Tables 4, 5, 6 and 22) in their entirety to avoid mistaking strategic responses by universities to their external constraints (Greenwood et al., 2008; Zucker, 1991) for genuine efforts to promote the TM. Even so, it is difficult to find a university campus that has fully developed all the aforementioned institutional features, because becoming an engaged university is an evolutionary process; all engaged universities remain “works in progress” (Lawson, 2002, p. 92).

University, Addis Ababa University and Makerere University respectively—dominates the production of science (AU-NEPAD, 2010, p. 106).

92 The research agenda for MUK, for example, focuses on six thematic areas: research into education for development; food, nutrition and value addition; sustainable environment development; good governance, equity (including gender) and service delivery; health (infectious and lifestyle-related diseases) and the utilisation and conservation of natural resources (http://mak.ac.ug/research/research-agenda).
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In addition, even though each of the organisational factors discussed herein is essential for the full institutionalisation of the TM, the emphasis that HEIs place on each factor varies among institutions. Furco and Miller (2009), for example, note that whereas some institutions use the TM to advance teaching or to conduct more socially relevant research, others use it to “advance faith-based missions, improve town–gown relations, address local emergencies and crises, or develop an ethic of volunteerism and service among students” (p. 47).

Fourth, much as it is the responsibility of MUK to develop and share knowledge with, and learn from, the external communities, the focus of the TM of the university should not be on how much the university staff and students “share in the life of the village [external communities], but [on] how much their ideas, the knowledge and skills that they produce, can transform the life of the village” (Ajayi et al., 1996, p. 190). In essence, the university should pursue excellence not only with respect to teaching and research but also in regard to the TM. In addition, much as the TM of the university—networking and partnerships—requires that the university become part of, and more relevant to, the wider society, the university should not endanger its academic standards and values in order to serve and/or engage with society. To work together with, and learn from, society, R5, for example, opined as follows:

What we [the university] need most, I think, is to take what society has a notch higher, not to follow what they are doing as it is, because there are technologies out there in the villages that have remained there for centuries, and they are not taking us anywhere. Therefore, what the university needs to do is to bring those technologies into the laboratories, carry out research on them, improve them, and then industrialise them. … So that’s the way we can work with society but not going back to sleep with society. (Personal communication, April 12, 2012.)

Fifth, the successful institutionalisation of the TM at MUK requires the commitment of not only the university but also the external stakeholders, particularly the government. Such commitment can be in the form of funding and policy guidelines. Although the government should not directly interfere with the focus and nature of the TM at MUK and the other universities, it should create funding mechanisms, policy frameworks and assessment tools that support the TM at the universities. A review of the literature shows that although the key national policy documents—for example, the National Development Plan, the National Science, Technology and Innovation Policy and the National Science, Technology and Innovation Plan (2012/2013–2017/2018)—underscore the importance of HE and HEIs to national development, there is a lack of consistency between national and institutional policies regarding the expected role of HEIs in socioeconomic development (Cloete et al., 2011). Thus, the purpose of having clear national policies, plans and funding mechanisms should be to create a comprehensible and shared national agenda (rather than the same type of TM activities) that can be pursued by all HEIs in ways that reflect their missions, historical and geographical contexts and priorities. Therefore, although the
government should not necessarily drive the TM agendas of the universities, “it should provide the necessary encouragement, support, and direction” (Lazarus et al., 2008, p. 77). In addition, just as MUK should inform the external communities about its mission, activities, priorities, academic programmes, resources and innovations, the government should draw more on the knowledge potential of the university (and other universities) when designing or reviewing national policies, because much as these universities continue to be besieged by several challenges, they (particularly MUK) are the main sites for the production of knowledge and high-level manpower in Uganda.

7.7 Suggestions for deeper institutionalisation of the TM

The analysis of the institutional commitment of MUK to the TM shows that the university recognises the TM as a core function and has institutions—policies, programmes and structures—to promote the TM and to support TM-related activities at the university. In addition, it shows that (1) there is a normative consensus about the appropriateness of the TM and (2) TM-related activities are expected, fairly supported and widespread. Nonetheless, the analysis also shows that the institutionalisation of the TM at MUK is an ongoing process that is faced with various challenges (see Section 6.5 for details). Thus, although there is no single way to institutionalise the TM, this section presents some suggestions for the deeper institutionalisation of the TM at the university. The suggestions are a combination of administrative, academic and organisational strategies and are based on the findings of this study and the results of previous studies on the subject. Together, the suggestions aim to create and/or strengthen the regulative (policies and organisational structures), normative (e.g., incentives and sense of mission) and cognitive institutions (e.g., beliefs and symbolic gestures) of the university.

7.7.1 Administrative

Although most HEIs initially become involved in TM-related activities through the efforts of individual members of the academic staff (Lazarus et al., 2008), the deeper institutionalisation of the TM requires that HEIs render administrative support—for example, by providing executive leadership and committing financial resources (Vidal et al., 2002)—to the TM. The existence of such administrative support would demonstrate to the staff, the students and the external communities that the university recognises the TM as an integral part of its mission and treats it as such. The administrative strategies suggested here are supportive leadership, the commitment of resources and incentives and the development of a university culture and policies that support the TM.
Supportive leadership

Despite the existing institutional arrangements at MUK to support networking and partnerships between the university and the external communities, interview data show that some members of the academic and administrative staff were of the view that the top leadership of the university (e.g., the vice chancellor) was not doing enough to promote the TM, although the institutionalisation of the TM requires the support and vision of the top leadership (Beere et al., 2011; Brukardt et al., 2006a). In fact, since the top leaders of the university, especially the vice chancellor and the principals of the colleges, can influence the budget, the academic programmes and other aspects of the university and the colleges, their open support for the TM would help to address the concerns of the cautious, sceptical and resistant members of academic staff (Vidal et al., 2002) and the external communities regarding the commitment of the university to the TM. Therefore, although the top leadership of the university has other pressing issues to attend to, it should openly support the TM; offer guidance to the academic staff, students and the external communities; and mobilise funding to support and help to entrench the TM so that the relevant structures, policies and proposals can survive leadership changes. In fact, the university should initiate capacity-building programmes aimed to enlighten its current and future leaders about the TM, because, as the interview data show, some heads of departments and principals of colleges are not well acquainted with the TM yet are expected to guide, supervise and evaluate their fellow members of academic staff. According to R22, a head of a department,

When they appoint [a member of] academic staff, they tell her or him that the head of the department will give [him or her] other responsibilities, yet they never train a head of a department. ... I am supposed to act like an accountant, like a bursar, a policymaker, a decision-maker, an administrator and everything you can think of, but not once have they taken me to a workshop to at least enlighten me on how to deal with some of these responsibilities. It is really trial-and-error management on the part of the heads of departments of this university. (Personal communication, April 19, 2012.)

In addition to enhancing the capacities of its leaders, the university should enlighten its staff about the TM, particularly about what constitutes the TM; how to evaluate the contributions of the academic staff to the TM; and the existing policies and structures for supporting and/or coordinating the TM. Since the academic staff of any university are, as Beere et al. (2011) note, “the researchers, the advisors, the consultants, and the teachers who work with the community” (p. 96), their involvement is critical to the successful institutionalisation of the TM (Harkavy & Hartley, 2012). Accordingly, MUK should provide its academic staff with information about the TM because the institutionalisation of the TM starts “by making sure that the individuals who are part of the organisation understand the meaning of engagement and the challenges it will bring” (Brukardt et al., 2006a, p. 12). The aim of diffusing information to the academic staff would be to sensitise
those who are either uninformed about the TM and/or uninvolved in TM activities and to enhance the knowledge and understanding of those who are informed and/or involved in TM-related activities about the objectives of the TM, the priorities of the university, the available funding opportunities and so forth. To achieve these goals, the university could do the following:

1. Organise public lectures, symposia\(^{93}\) and presentations at departmental and college meetings and training workshops to engender necessary awareness among the university community (Ajayi et al., 1996) about the TM. TM-related issues could also be included in agendas for university meetings; and
2. Create communication channels—such as a website, an e-magazine, a brochure and newsletter—to disseminate TM-related information and ensure that the brochures, annual reports and news releases of the university and the university colleges accentuate and support the TM.

In fact, the interview data show that the university should familiarise its staff and students with the needs of the external communities and help them to understand the TM and its justifications, objectives, performance indicators and potential benefits before it can convince the external communities about its plans for, and commitment to, the TM. Accordingly, R16, a professor at the university, noted,

> We [the university] would need more workshops; in fact, I am going to propose it now. … First, [to] try to analyse what we have been doing, what we are involved in, and how best it can be fulfilled. I think, the onus is, first, on the university leadership, then from leadership to the staff generally, to the students and then we can see how best to implement [the TM]. (Personal communication, April 10, 2012.)

**Funding and incentives**

Although MUK has some personnel and organisational structures that carry out and/or coordinate TM-related activities, the data show that the university does not adequately finance the TM; yet community outreach and engagement requires funding to cover direct costs (the organisation of public lectures, the transportation of students to the field, field attachment-related costs and the production and dissemination of information) and indirect costs (e.g., course release time for the academic staff) (Jacobson et al., 2004). Therefore, although funding alone cannot address all the challenges to the full institutionalisation of the TM, the university should commit more and sustainable financial resources to the TM. Such budgets can be utilised to support field-based learning, field attachment and community-based research; fund release time for the academic staff to engage in TM-related activities; sustain and support the existing organisational structures;

---

\(^{93}\) For example, the lunchtime seminar series organised by the College of Education and External Studies (see http://cees.mak.ac.ug/cees-seminar-series.html).
organise training sessions for the staff and students; and initiate and sustain university–community partnerships. Otherwise, most TM-related activities will continue to be short-term projects that rely on external funding and the benevolence of the individual members of academic staff and students; yet, the institutionalisation of the TM requires that the university commit internal financial resources. According to Hollander et al. (2002),

Nothing is more common than for a college or university to recognize the benefits of engagement—and to try to capitalize on those benefits—without making any substantive investment in the resources such engagement requires. Many potentially fine programs have been initiated with the help of grants, only to crumble away once their external source of funding has dried up. ... Internal institutional funding is, therefore, one significant measure of an institution’s commitment to engagement. (p. 39–40.)

The researcher is cognisant of the fact that teaching and research are equally underfunded (see Section 7.4 for details); therefore, this suggestion does not imply that the university should focus its funding on the TM and ignore its other activities. Instead, the university should enhance some of the commercial aspects of the TM, for instance, consultancy and continuing education; fundraise for the TM; and set aside a fund, no matter how small it might be, to support the selected TM-related activities of the academic staff and the students. The funding should be reserved for activities and projects that conform to, and support, the TM agenda and targets of the university and the corresponding university colleges.

7.7.2 Academic

Realignment of staff evaluation and promotion practices with the TM

The discussion in Chapter 6 demonstrated that the policy for the appointment and promotion of the academic staff at MUK is unbalanced in favour of teaching, research and academic qualifications; therefore, unless the university addresses such imbalances, the TM will continue to be regarded as a vital function of the university but one that does not contribute much to the career development of the academic staff. In essence, the TM will remain unattractive to some members of the academic staff. Therefore, despite all the rhetoric about the TM, the continuing emphasis on research productivity and teaching as the main criteria for the promotion of the academic staff to senior academic positions will continue to constrain the involvement of the members of the academic staff in TM-related activities (Votruba, 1992). Therefore, for MUK to further institutionalise the TM, it should realign its staff recruitment, evaluation and promotion policy and processes with its three functions—teaching, research and networking and partnerships. It should specify the mission-related dimensions of the TM, develop measurement and evaluation systems
(Votruba, 1992) and provide detailed information about the TM—namely, its composition and evaluation—to the members of the academic staff, the heads of departments, the deans of the schools and the principals of the colleges. These suggestions have been emphasised by studies both within and outside of HE. Ikerd and Walker (2010), for example, observe that to achieve organisational change, organisations should include the essential elements of the reform in the promotion process, performance evaluations and reward system because “keeping the traditional performance measures sends the message that the old ways of doing things are still important” (p. 22).

The suggestion, then, is that for the TM to become an integral part of the university, it must cease being “at the margins, squeezed in as uncompensated overload either for the institution as a whole or for any individual faculty member engaged in [any TM-related activity]” (Lynton, 1995, p. 15). In short, the university should acknowledge the TM as a core function and consequently evaluate and reward it as such. Fortunately, MUK itself recognises the importance of appropriate rewards and evaluation systems to the institutionalisation of the TM and states that it is working hard to develop reward systems that motivate and encourage development-oriented services at the university.94 However, it is worth noting that the creation of an alternative evaluation and reward system alone cannot produce the desired result; such a system should be complemented by other support mechanisms—for example, supportive leadership, funding and incentives and further integration of the TM into the curriculum.

**Integration of the TM into the curriculum**

Since teaching is the main activity carried out at MUK, the further institutionalisation of the TM requires that the university place the TM at the heart of its academic activities—that is, to integrate the TM further into its curriculum and consequently to transform it from an add-on function into an integral function of the university. By further integrating the TM into its curriculum, the university will not only help its students to gain hands-on experience but also enable its staff, students and the external communities to participate actively in developing solutions to real-world problems (Harkavy & Hartley, 2012). Therefore, apart from field attachment—which is compulsory for undergraduate students—and few academic programmes95 that incorporate field-based learning or clinical experiences into their curricula, the university should explore and support the widespread use of methods—for example, service learning and field-based learning—that involve the participation of the external communities in its teaching and learning activities (Openjuru & Ikoja-Odongo, 2012; Vidal et al., 2002). In addition, the university should strengthen its existing partnerships (both formal and informal), create community-based learning

---

94 See http://mak.ac.ug/about-makerere/outreach

95 For example, in the natural sciences, health sciences, agricultural and environmental sciences and education and social sciences.
systems (Votruba, 1992), involve the external communities more in the evaluation and development of its curriculum and integrate some aspects of the TM—for example, service learning—into its postgraduate teaching and learning activities, particularly at the master’s level. Although a great deal of emphasis has been put on the field attachment programme for the undergraduate students, R24 noted,

> I believe it is also important for the graduate programmes. Yes, it is a requirement for undergraduates, but a master’s student, I believe, contributes more to the community than an undergraduate; a master’s student has matured both intellectually and in terms of thinking, and [thus] the public would benefit more [from a graduate student] compared with an undergraduate student. (Personal communication, March 28, 2012.)

Austin and Barnes (2005) note that because doctoral programmes tend to pay attention to developing the research skills of students, the students often complete their graduate studies with limited understanding about the full range of academic responsibilities. Conceptually, then, the integration of the TM into postgraduate programmes has the potential to enhance the students’ (prospective members of the academic staff) understanding of the TM and their involvement in TM-related activities.

### 7.7.3 Organisational

Although the MUK has organisational units (see Section 6.1) that provide TM-related services and help to take the university to the external communities and bring the external communities to the university, some of these units are quite new, small and restricted to specific disciplines, and many interactions between the university and the external communities are fairly individualised, ad hoc in nature, uncoordinated and unrecorded. The data show that the university lacks a central unit to coordinate the TM and provide up-to-date information about the TM—particularly about the ongoing activities and the available opportunities—to the external communities. Openjuru and Ikoja-Odongo (2012), for instance, note that various colleges and schools at MUK duplicate the provision of short continuing education courses. Therefore, despite their contributions to the TM, such uncoordinated activities and services often fritter away the resources of the university and hamper its usefulness to the external communities. For this reason, there is a need for a centralised office, preferably under the office of the vice chancellor, to coordinate and support the TM and TM-related efforts at the university, to collect and publish information about the university, to facilitate the transfer and commercialisation of inventions and to serve as the gateway to the university. In addition, such a unit could, as the interviewees noted, be responsible for searching for consultancies, contract research and other funding.

96 Research—for instance, Ajayi et al. (1996)—shows that the lack of information about African universities contributes to the marginalisation of the universities by external communities largely because the
opportunities—especially interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary projects—and selecting the most appropriate people to run them. R9, a university professor, noted, for example,

When I was studying in Australia, at our university, we had a unit called Unisearch. If you wanted a professor to do something, you would first go to it and they would get you the right person, so it was well coordinated. I think we need something like that. (Personal communication, April 17, 2012.)

The office could also be responsible for collecting and disseminating information about the TM to the staff and students; evaluating the existing TM activities, structures and policies; and disseminating information about the university—particularly its mission, knowledge capabilities, TM-related services and potentially exploitable inventions—to the external communities. The existence of such a coordinating centre and an effective communications system would enable (1) the university to interact with the external communities and to promote the TM in a coordinated way and (2) the external communities to learn more about the capacities and resources of the university. Such an office, however, should not supplant the existing centres and the initiatives of the academic staff and students; instead, it should supplement and support them. In addition, since almost every university college at MUK has a centre, an institute or an academic department that provides TM-related services, the proposed centralised centre should work in partnership with the centres, institutes and colleges to facilitate the smooth flow of information to the staff, students and the external communities; facilitate decision-making; and minimise the duplication of TM-related efforts and the wastage of resources. Alternatively, the university could strengthen some of its existing administrative units—for example, the MUPSF and the Planning and Development Department (PDD)\(^97\)—and/or expand their mandates to include the coordination of the TM. Currently, the PDD works closely with the college communication officers when compiling the annual report of the university. Accordingly, if the university expanded the PDD’s mandate and human and financial resources, it (the PDD) could serve as the coordinating centre for the TM at the university.

**Summary**

The suggestions discussed above underscore the need for the university to provide leadership and demonstrate institutional support to the TM; sensitise its staff and students to the TM; commit financial and human resources to the TM; align its recruitment, evaluation

---

97 Its mission is to coordinate planning and to provide support for strategic decision-making at the university through the collection, analysis and interpretation of institutional and externally sourced data. One of its mandates is to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the planned activities (see http://pdd.mak.ac.ug/). The PDD publishes the university’s annual report, which provides information about knowledge transfer partnerships and networking, among other things, at the university (MUK, 2014b).
and promotion policy and practices with the TM; integrate the TM into its curricula; and create a coordinating unit. Together, the suggestions aim to enhance the knowledge of the university staff and students about the TM; improve the attitudes of the academic staff towards the TM; facilitate the widespread involvement of the staff, the students and the external communities in TM-related activities at the university; improve the coordination and evaluation of the TM; and support the development of the culture of networking and partnerships that pervades the university. The notion here is that by creating new regulative institutions—policies, structures and programmes—and aligning the existing ones with the TM (Beere et al., 2011), the university would enhance its normative and cognitive institutions. According to Votruba (2010),

If higher education is going to produce outstanding public engagement, every element of the institution must be aligned to support that outcome. To what extent are campus leadership, faculty incentives and rewards, planning and budgeting, annual evaluations, awards and recognitions, and public policy aligned to support the scholarship of engagement? Absent such alignment, involvement will more likely be based on individual faculty commitment rather than institutional commitment. (p. xiv.)

Conceptually, the above suggestions also echo, to some degree, Clark’s (1998a) pathways—minimum conditions—for organisational transformation by means of entrepreneurial action, namely: a strengthened steering core, an expanded development periphery, a diversified funding base, a stimulated academic heartland and an integrated academic culture. The discussion in Chapter 6 shows that although MUK recognises the TM as a core function, some of the interviewed leaders expressed a lack of adequate knowledge of the TM. In addition, the interview data reveal that the leadership of the university does not provide sufficient support for the TM. Hence, in this case, the need for a “strengthened steering core” means that the leadership of the university (particularly the chancellor, vice chancellor, principals of colleges, deans of schools and heads of departments) should be knowledgeable about and openly—in words and actions—support the TM. The literature—for example, Ca (2009)—shows that faculty members tend to lack basic knowledge and skills about the intellectual property rights and commercialisation of invention and that the development of the TM requires the presence of strong management capacities that offer strategic guidance and resources. Thus, for MUK to enhance its TM, it must strengthen its management capacity by, for instance, creating capacity-building programmes for its academic and non-academic managers. The term “expanded developmental periphery” denotes an array of administrative offices and boundary-spanning academic units that reach across the boundaries of a university to take the university to the external communities and bring the external communities to the university (Clark, 1998a). In this regard, there is a need for the university to strengthen its existing TM-oriented units and to create more units.
Although funding is required to implement the TM, some TM activities (e.g., consultancy, contract research, continuing education and the commercialisation of research results) can generate funding for a university and, thus, enable it to diversify its funding base. Hence, the institutionalisation of the TM and the diversification of the funding sources are intertwined; further institutionalisation of the TM as well as the exploitation of the existing opportunities would enable the university to generate extra funds and, thus, diversify its funding base.\textsuperscript{98} which would, in turn, enable the university to support and further develop the TM. However, to further develop the TM and exploit the commercial benefits associated therewith, the university should provide budgets to sustain and strengthen its existing TM-related units and activities, support the involvement of the academic staff and students in TM-related activities and develop facilities for interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work.

The term “stimulated academic heartland,” as used here, denotes the input, support and commitment of the academic staff, which, as discussions in Chapters 2 and 6 show, are essential for the institutionalisation of the TM. Therefore, much as strong steering cores help to guarantee the necessary leadership and budgetary support for the TM, their ideas and programmes cannot, for example, become fully integrated into the curriculum without the support and commitment of the academic departments and staff. According to Leslie (1996), “Change in colleges and universities comes when it happens in the trenches; what faculty and students do is what the institution becomes. It does not happen because a committee or a president asserts a new idea” (p. 110). Thus, to further institutionalise the TM, the university should, among other things, align its staff recruitment, evaluation and promotion practices with the TM and create programmes to enhance the involvement and commitment of the academic staff regarding the TM.

The concept “integrated academic culture” is utilised here to denote the need for MUK to develop a culture of outreach and engagement (including mission, values and beliefs) that permeates all aspects of the university—its policies, practices, academic units, administrative offices, academic programmes, staff, students and so forth. However, the development of such a culture cannot happen suddenly; it takes time and requires the existence of a strong and supportive steering core, multiple funding sources and sustainable funding, a stimulated academic heartland and an extended developmental periphery (Clark, 2004)—aspects that are not yet fully developed at MUK. Thus, the idea here is that once these organisational features—not just one—have been developed, they will become “embedded in networks” (Zucker, 1991) and help the University to develop a set of beliefs and practices that are supportive of the TM.

Although the above-mentioned suggestions cannot guarantee the deeper institutionalisation of the TM,\textsuperscript{99} they have the potential to support current and future TM-related activities. The interview data, however, reveal that the income-generating TM activities are not yet fully developed and that the university does not generate adequate funding from this source.\textsuperscript{99} “Structural elements (e.g., more resources, new programmes and policies) alone are insufficient to alter the day-to-day behaviors of individuals, particularly those working in loosely coupled organizations like...”

\textsuperscript{98} The interview data, however, reveal that the income-generating TM activities are not yet fully developed and that the university does not generate adequate funding from this source.

\textsuperscript{99} “Structural elements (e.g., more resources, new programmes and policies) alone are insufficient to alter the day-to-day behaviors of individuals, particularly those working in loosely coupled organizations like...”

Henry Mugabi
activities and structures; boost the involvement of the staff, the students and the external communities in the TM; and facilitate the development of a university culture that supports and values the TM. Saxl et al. (1989), for example, observe, “Many implementation activities [for instance, a routine budget for the TM] are, in effect, preconditions for institutionalization” (pp. 6–20).

7.8 Contributions of the study

The study was expected to contribute to HE research and management, and, accordingly, its findings, observations and suggestions are relevant to HE researchers, HE leaders, academics and the external communities, particularly the government. First, the study provides an extensive review of the literature regarding the conceptualisation, dimensions, practices, challenges and institutionalisation of the TM in various countries. By reviewing and subsequently utilising the existing literature—findings, suggestions and conceptualisations—the study contributes to HE research by affirming the relevance of the previous studies and filling some of the existing gaps in the literature. In fact, although a great deal of research about the TM exists, much of the existing literature pertains to universities from regions that have achieved a high level of economic development—particularly North America and Europe—and, thus, it tends to focus on the transfer of technology from universities to enterprises; yet, as Göransson et al. (2009) observe, the TM encompasses a technological and a societal aspect. Such studies tend to ignore certain aspects of the TM—for example, the activities, organisation, approaches and challenges—that pertain or are peculiar to universities from regions with a lower level of economic development; therefore, their findings, notwithstanding their relevance, cannot be generalised to all universities. Thus, by focusing on a university from a country at a low level of economic development, the study brings new dimensions—detailed findings and observations—to the research on the TM of universities and provides conceptually and practically relevant suggestions that will be useful to HE researchers and HEIs and their stakeholders.

7.9 Limitations of the study

Although there is no such thing as a perfectly designed study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999), acknowledging the limitations of one’s study does not imply that one can do whatever one wants; instead, it means that the researcher understands the above reality and that “she will make no overweening claims about generalizability or conclusiveness relative to what she has learned” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 42). It also reminds readers about what colleges and universities (Harkavy & Hartley, 2012, pp. 31–32).

100 The suggestions are based on the findings of the study, the findings and observations of previous studies, the opinions and suggestions of the interviewees and the interpretations of the researcher.
the study is and is not; it delineates the boundaries “and how its results can and cannot contribute to understanding” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 42). Accordingly, this study is not an exception; it has its own limitations. First, by interviewing only selected college principals, centre coordinators, other members of the academic staff and representatives of external communities, the study failed to capture the views of students whose actions could promote or hinder the success of TM efforts at the university. Second, the notion of assessing institutional commitment to the TM based on the presence or absence of key organisational factors is not without drawbacks; although the presence of such factors and behaviours signals commitment, the absence of some of the factors and practices does not necessarily signal a lack of commitment (Heaver, 2005).

Third, by focusing on the formal internal institutions—organisational structures, policies and practices—the study overlooked, though not entirely, the informal ways in which the university (particularly its staff and students) engages with, and reaches out to, external communities. After all, as Baum (2006) observes, universities rarely act from the top: “Most often, university–community partnerships are initiated by an academic program, a few faculty, or even a single faculty member” (p. 2). In addition, the existence of formal organisational structures, policies and practices does not necessarily mean that an act will be deeply institutionalised. Selznick (1992), for example, observes that in the process of transforming organisations into institutions, “the formal structure of the organization is a long first step towards institutionalization. ... But this is only a beginning. Beyond, lies what we may call thick institutionalization. Formal systems act through people” (pp. 234–235). Therefore, having macro institutional measures does not necessarily deepen the institutionalisation of the TM. Although these observations are uncontested, the literature—for example, Cloete et al. (2011), Lazarus et al. (2008), Preece et al. (2012b) and Wagenga-Ouma and Fongwa (2012)—shows that most outreach and engagement initiatives at many African universities depend on individuals or groups of individuals and, thus, that the future of the TM is insecure. Accordingly, the importance of formal and institution-wide policies, programmes and structures regarding the TM cannot be overemphasised.

Therefore, although it is true that many successful outreach and engagement projects often rely on individuals or groups of individuals, it is equally true that such projects tend to be among the most vulnerable—that is, they die out when such individuals are no longer involved or around (Mohrman, 2010). The notion here, then, is that the institutionalisation of the TM, particularly in the initial phase, is a fragile process that necessitates not only the actions of individuals or groups of individuals but also the formal institutional support of a university. In fact, as Galaskiewicz (1991) observes, micro-level actions—for example, the support and involvement of staff, students and external communities—can be promoted or constrained by opportunities and limitations defined at the macro level. Hence, instead of focusing on the individual academic staff and projects undertaken by individual members of staff, TM agendas should focus on creating institutions—policies,
structures and practices—that would serve the whole university. Although such measures cannot guarantee the development of a normative consensus about the appropriateness of the TM, they can enhance the university staff and students’ knowledge of the TM; facilitate the widespread involvement of the staff, students and external communities in TM-related activities; and support the development of a culture of community outreach and engagement at the university.

7.10 Suggestions for further research

Much as the study explored the institutionalisation of the TM at MUK and, therefore, offered a glimpse into the institutionalisation of the TM of universities at Ugandan universities, the focus was on a single university; hence, its findings, notwithstanding their relevance, cannot be generalised to other universities. In fact, since HEIs differ—in terms of history, ownership, location, disciplinary focus, mission and so forth—and the TM depends mostly on the type of HEI to which it refers (Schoen et al., 2006), there is a need for more research about the TM at Ugandan universities. In addition, although global research and debates regarding the TM have focused mainly on research universities and the transfer of technology from universities to industries, most universities in developing countries primarily function as training sites for knowledge workers; they are not yet key players in cutting-edge innovation (Wu & Zhou, 2012). Thus, there is a need for more research about the TM—especially its forms and institutionalisation—at teaching-only universities and/or universities with an underdeveloped research function.

Furthermore, although TM-related activities range from institution-wide programmes and projects to isolated and one-off engagement and outreach activities—for example, projects/services that are initiated/provided by individual academics or academic units—the institutionalisation of the TM requires an institutional environment that is conducive to community engagement and outreach. Accordingly, the importance of institutional leadership to the institutionalisation of the TM—particularly in (1) supporting individual or group initiatives and (2) creating institutions (policies, structures, etc.) to guide and coordinate the TM and TM-related activities—cannot be overemphasised. Unfortunately, few studies—for example, Beere et al. (2011), Brukardt et al. (2006a) and Mohrman (2010)—underscore the importance of institutional leadership; therefore, there is a need for comprehensive research about the role of institutional leadership in the institutionalisation of the TM at universities.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Interview guide

Interview themes
(1) Mission and purpose
(2) Leadership and support
(3) Coordination of the TM
(4) Recruitment and promotion processes and rewards for the academic staff
(5) Roles, support, and involvement of academic staff
(6) Student support and involvement
(7) Community participation
(8) Publications and communications
(9) Financing of TM activities

A. Interview questions for academic and administrative staff at MUK
1. What are the functions of Makerere University?
2. What are the roles of the academic staff?
3. How do you understand knowledge transfer partnerships and networking? What does it involve? What are its benefits?
4. Do you participate in knowledge transfer partnerships and networking? Why and what activities are you involved in?
5. Does the university/college/department incentivise and/or support the academic staff’s involvement in knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking? How?
6. Does the university evaluate and reward the contributions of the academic staff to knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking? How? Are the evaluation processes and rewards appropriate?
7. How does the university coordinate knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking?
8. How are knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking financed? How sustainable is the funding system?
9. Does the university/college/department offer students opportunities to interact with, contribute to, and learn from the external communities? What are the opportunities, and how adequate are they?
10. Does the university foster, support, and reward the involvement of students in knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking? How?

11. Do you integrate knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking into teaching and research? How or why not?

12. Do external communities participate in the teaching, research or other activities in your department, college, and/or universities? How?

13. What is your assessment of the commitment of the leadership of your department, college, and university to knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking?

14. Are there any challenges to knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking at this university/college/department? What are they?

15. How can knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking be enhanced?

16. Do you have any comments or more information about knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking that you would like to share with me?

B. Interview questions for the Ministry of Education and Sports

1. What are the functions of higher education institutions, particularly universities, in Uganda?

2. As a ministry, what activities do you include under the TM?

3. How is the TM funded?

4. Do you think universities are doing enough to promote the TM?

5. What would you want them to do to promote the TM?

6. Does the government provide enough support to promote the TM among HEIs?

7. Does the ministry have policies and/or plans regarding the TM?

8. How can the ministry promote the development of the TM at universities?

9. Is the TM part of the proposed changes in higher education?

C. Interview questions for the external organisation

1. What is the rationale for this organisation?

2. What are your responsibilities?

3. What is the nature of your relationship with universities?

4. How do you promote the transfer of knowledge from the universities to the communities?

5. What achievements have you made?

6. What is the state of knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking on university campuses in Uganda?

7. Do you have programmes to support the universities?

8. What advice would you give to the universities to boost their knowledge transfer, partnerships, and networking function?

9. How supportive is the government of Uganda of your activities?

10. What challenges do you face?
### Appendix 2: List of the interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Academic title</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Centre coordinator</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Centre coordinator</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>Centre coordinator</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>Centre coordinator</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Centre coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MoES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>External organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Do not correspond to the respondent numbers mentioned in Chapter 3 and used in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.
### Appendix 3: Registered students at Makerere University (2013/2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/campus</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of agricultural and environmental sciences (CAES)</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of business and management Studies (CoBAMS)</td>
<td>5514</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>5966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of computing and information sciences (CoCIS)</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of education and external studies (CEES)</td>
<td>6780</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of engineering, design, art and technology (CEDAT)</td>
<td>3004</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of health sciences (CHS)</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of humanities &amp; social sciences (CHUSS)</td>
<td>7903</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>8395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of natural sciences (CoNAS)</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of veterinary medicine, animal resources and biosecurity (CoVAB)</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of law</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Portal (campus)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinja (campus)</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34635</strong></td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
<td><strong>36627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MUK (2014a, p. 24)

### Appendix 4: Full-time academic staff at Makerere University (2013/14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Academic rank</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Assistant lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBAMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoCIS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoNAS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoVAB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinja campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>411</strong></td>
<td><strong>570</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MUK (2014a, p. 35).