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ABSTRACT

Forming part of post-colonial discourse, Africanisation is often described as a renewed focus on Africa and entails salvaging what has been stripped from the continent. Applied to higher education it can be viewed as a call to adapt curricula and syllabuses to ensure that teaching and learning are adapted to African realities and conditions. Given the decontextualised state of curricula and dependent nature of knowledge production and dissemination in South African higher education, the concept of ‘Africanisation’ may be worth revisiting. This article reviews the literature in the debate on the Africanisation of higher education highlighting the strengths and weaknesses in the discourse; the paper also makes a case for endogenisation as an alternative to indigenisation.

INTRODUCTION

The debate on the Africanisation of higher education forms part of the larger discourse on the restructuring and transformation of these institutions. Issues of transforming higher education institutions have been on the agenda of the government and other key players, particularly in the decades following colonial independence. The driving forces, goals and effects have not been uniform over the years and some authors (Singh, 2001; Gibbons, 1998) have argued that the discourse on higher education transformation is being watered down and reduced to terms of market responsiveness.

In the South African context the transformation agenda was largely driven by the need to undo decades of injustice caused by apartheid as well as the need to align higher education institutions with the principles and philosophies outlined in the constitution, which took effect in 1997 (Pityana, 2012). Infiltrating the discourse on higher education transformation have been issues around curriculum reform, internationalisation, the role of higher education in a newly democratic country and, at crucial moments, the issue of Africanisation.

CONCEPTUALISING AFRICANISATION

Different authors writing on Africanisation offer varied viewpoints on what they understand Africanisation to mean or entail. Makgoba (1997: 199), for instance, emphasises culture and identity, noting that
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Africanisation is a process of inclusion that stresses the importance of affirming African cultures and identities in a world community. He \textit{ibid} states:

[I]t is a learning process and a way of life for Africans. It involves incorporating, adapting and integrating other cultures into and through African visions to provide the dynamism, evolution and flexibility so essential in the global village. Africanisation is the process of defining or interpreting African identity and culture. It is formed by the experiences of the African Diaspora and has endured and matured over time from the narrow nationalistic intolerance to an accommodating, realistic and global form.

One of the most commonly cited definitions of Africanisation by proponents of the process is offered by Ramose (1998) in his foreword to \textit{Black Perspective(s) on Tertiary Institutional Transformation}. He states that Africanisation embraces the understanding that ‘the African experience’ is not only the ‘foundation’ of all forms of knowledge, but also the ‘source’ for the construction of that knowledge. Ramose (1998) goes on to assert that while the ‘African experience’ is non-transferable it is indeed communicable, but only by the African. Having made this assertion he goes further, stating:

Africanisation holds that different foundations exist for the construction of pyramids of knowledge. It disclaims the view that any pyramid is by its very nature eminently superior to all others. It is a serious quest for a radical and veritable change of paradigm so that the African may enter into genuine and critical dialogical encounter with other pyramids of knowledge. Africanisation is a conscious and deliberate assertion of nothing more than the right to be African.

Ramose’s conceptualisation of Africanisation has come under scrutiny from Horsthemke (2004a), who argues it is lacking in clarity as to the meaning and content of the ‘right to be African’ and may lead to a false sense of belonging. Secondly, he argues this characterisation fails to do justice to diversity. This definition is not only confusing but contradictory as well. While proclaiming that there are no superior pyramids of knowledge, Ramose seems to suggest that the knowledge held by Africans is indeed superior. His version of Africanisation appears to warrant a need to define who or what is African, a process that can easily lead to marginalisation and exclusion which proponents of Africanisation are trying to avoid. It is also important to note that Ramose offered this definition 15 years ago, and while a radical and veritable change of paradigm may have been necessary then, the conceptualisation would require some revision if it is to be applied in the current context.

Higgs (2003) suggests a much more inclusive approach stating that if we turn to the notion of ‘Ubuntu’, a southern African philosophy focusing on human allegiances, we might move towards a better conceptualisation of Africanisation. This suggestion is challenged by Parker (2003) who holds that it results in a lack of understanding of what Africanisation in education entails. Parker proposes instead that Africanised scholarship ought to include the notion of a ‘critical activism’ concerned with justice and human rights. These descriptions of an African philosophy of education are similar as they both accentuate collectivism and humanistic ideals.

Louw (2010) views Africanisation as a way of transcending individual identities, seeking commonality, as well as a way of recognising and embracing our ‘otherness’. In so doing we might be able to connect with the broader African experience and establish curricula that bind us together.

Pointing out that the debate on Africanisation has been ongoing for several decades, Nkoane (2002) interprets an Africanised educational system as one which maintains African awareness of the social order and rules by which culture evolves; fosters the understanding of African consciousness; facilitates a critical
emancipatory approach to solve the problems of their lives; and produces the material and capacities for Africans to determine their own future(s). Such an educational system would result in the production of knowledge which is relevant, effective and empowering.

While various scholars offer different conceptions of the notion of ‘Africanisation’ there appears to be similarities in emphasis, such as the need to seek out our commonalities, affirm African culture, traditions and value systems, foster an understanding of African consciousness and finding ways of blending western and African methodologies.

The kind of Africanisation argued for in this paper is essentially part of generating and redefining educational standards in South African higher education to ensure that teaching and learning occurs within appropriate contexts of relevance.

Greenstein (1997) argues that Africanisation poses what may well prove to be the greatest challenge to the renewal of education in general and curriculum policies in particular. While this may be true, it is important to note that until the processes of knowledge production and dissemination are consistent with the contexts and cultural orientation of the people our universities represent, the transformation of higher education institutions remains incomplete. Crossman (2004) contends that such a process would entail transforming not only the external factors but also the internal principles and priorities that define orientation, values and practices of our universities.

Having begun the article with an attempt at conceptualising the notion of ‘Africanisation’, this paper proceeds to examine the rationale behind the calls for Africanisation, followed by an interrogation of the implications of Africanisation for internationalisation. It examines the renewed focus on Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) and questions whether this focus adequately addresses the problem that proponents of IKS are trying to address. In this paper IKS is understood as local knowledge, which is unique to every culture or society, embedded in community practices, institutions, relationships and rituals, and is commonly held by communities rather than individuals (Battiste, 2002). The article concludes with the suggestion of an alternative to indigenisation in the form of endogenisation.

**HIGHER EDUCATION CURRICULA: CHARACTERISTICS OF ACADEMIC DEPENDENCY**

The discourse on African higher education that has appeared in the last decade depicts the inappropriateness and irrelevance of current curricula, which was introduced during the colonial era. This has led to various calls for Africanisation of higher education, which can be understood as the adaptation of the subject matter, and teaching methods geared to the physical and cultural realities of the African environment. Moulder (1995) contends that the Africanisation of higher education encompasses four kinds of changes:

1. changing the composition of student, academic and administrator bodies
2. changing the syllabus or content
3. changing curricula
4. changing the criteria for what is excellent research.

This paper argues for the transformation of higher education curricula and is therefore focused on ‘changing curricula’. The conception of the curriculum offered by literature and discourses on educational theory contain a number of similar elements. Some authors refer to the curriculum as a formal course of study, emphasising content or subject matter (Phenix, 1962; Pinar, 2012). Others define it in terms of experiences of each learner (Teba, 1962; Reid, 2012). Here the stress is on how subject matter is learned, the process outcomes and behavioural objectives (Bloom 1956; Odendahl, 2011). Behavioural objectives are typically identified within some framework such as the subjects offered in school curricula. Some
authors (e.g. Goodlad, 1994) describe the curriculum as a plan for instruction specific to a particular school or student population. Others (e.g., Luckett, 2001) advocate a wider conception of curriculum - a non-technical and more philosophical, social, and personal approach.

In the higher education context, curriculum refers to what knowledge is included or excluded in university teaching and learning programmes (Le Grange, 2004). The concept of ‘teaching/learning’ according to the Council for Higher Education [CHE] (2004: 93) encompasses the activities of teaching and learning in the classrooms of higher education institutions. It also encompasses policies, strategies, plans, and infrastructure both at the higher education system level, and at institutional level, to support these activities (CHE, 2004).

In the South African context, the National Education Policy Initiative (NEPI) attempted to put the issue of Africanisation onto the curriculum agenda in 1992, but the theme has been practically absent in succeeding policy documents. In the introduction of the NEPI report, the authors note that in the post-secondary sector only 12% of the staff was black and mostly male, with the result being:

The type of knowledge disseminated could be ‘white male knowledge’ because it either reflects the cultural heritage of white males or serves mainly their interests. In Foucaultian terms, white knowledge, connected to European ‘universal’ knowledge, has become a ‘totalising discourse’ that has silenced and marginalised local knowledges. ...The vast majority of students in South African PSE, who are in the humanities and social sciences, receive this white European cultural knowledge, which in most cases contributes to alienation and separation (NEPI, 1996: 6).

Making a case for curricula that mainstream local relevance and vocalise silent voices, Lebakeng, Manthiba and Dalindjebo (2006) note that African intellectuals in their teaching continue to be enslaved to the preoccupative benchmarks of the dominant Western scholarship and its methodological paradigms. The result is that African intellectual representations are inconsistent with the lived experiences of the majority of the students for whom the curriculum has been designed. Such curricula continue to be a source of alienation as they do not speak to the experiences of learners nor do they reflect the philosophical, social realities of their communities. While there are institutions of higher learning that have made strides in contextualising their pedagogical structures, curricula still exist that privilege western ways of knowing despite the space offered by the new constitution for retooling educational discourse.

The acceptance of imported curricula incorporates accepting the philosophy of the education from which it is has been copied. In the words of Nyerere (1971: 27):

The ideas imparted by education, or released in the mind through education, should be liberating ideas; the skills acquired by education should therefore be liberating skills. Nothing else can properly be called education. Teaching which induces a slave mentality or a sense of impotence is not teaching at all.

Adésínà (2006) makes a similar observation, stating that a curriculum which honours one spatial zone in the globe as the foundation of knowledge production fails not only in the task of effectively educating students; it generates schizophrenia in most learners - particularly those whose antecedents do not stem from Europe or those who find no significance in imperial heritage. He notes that such a curriculum replicates a form of eradication in which the non-western collective memories that certain students bring to the classroom are declared as non-knowledge. In South Africa the task of a curriculum that is fit for post-1994 is to open the space for ‘diverse ontological narratives’, not to insist on ‘erasure or a Euro-ethnic mono-discourse’ (Adésínà, 2006: 144).
Matos (2000) argues that a major ‘disease’ of education and research in Africa is the systemic attempt to dismiss the intrinsic value of African culture, language, customs, and practices from the curriculum. While it is agreed that ‘curricula in higher education should be firmly anchored in the cultural and intellectual environment in which it is located’ and that ‘it is important to ask critical questions about the knowledge included in curricula’ (Van Wyk & Higgs, 2011: 177), it is also important to do this in a way that refrains from further marginalisation.

Reporting on research conducted by The Department of Anthropology, KULeuven on the issue of Africanisation, Crossman (1999) points out that even in the post-independence period, African universities have been effective in Africanising their personnel but not their curricula or pedagogical structures to any real extent. The KULeuven study was based on the observation that African universities have been founded on European models and despite the widespread talk of Africanisation since the 1960s, most African universities maintained fundamentally Western curricula and structures (Crossman, 1999). The study involved consultation of faculties of the human sciences at six universities across the continent in 1996 and 1997. The investigation was based on the calls made by scholars like Ali Mazrui, Joseph Kizzerbo, Paulin Hountondji and others for the adaptation of education to the African context. The aim of the research was to look for new schools of thought reflecting this objective on the continent.

In the study most academics in the human sciences faculties of the six universities across the continent, recognised this problem and saw it to be an important issue, and yet stated that little has been, and can be, done due to insufficient resources or due to demands to participate in the global system of education and research. The result has been that the type of tertiary level education developed in many African universities has only allowed scholars on the continent to develop a dependent scholarship, which does not encourage independent thinking and theory building resulting in the current peripheral and marginalised position.

According to Nyamnjoh (2004: 160) higher education on the continent has mostly been a journey fuelled by an exogenously induced and internalised sense of inadequacy in Africans, and endowed with the mission of devaluation or annihilation of African creativity, agency and value systems. Such ‘cultural estrangement’ has served to reinforce in Africans self-devaluation and self-hatred and a profound sense of inferiority that in turn compels them to ‘lighten their darkness’ both physically and metaphysically for Western indulgence (Fanon, 1967: 169). This quagmire has been captured by Nyang’Oro (1994: 434) as ‘a pathological case of xenophilia’, whereby Africans are brought to value things Western ‘not for their efficacy but simply because of their foreignness, and persuaded to consume to death their creativity and dignity, their very own humanity’.

The Pan-Africanist leader, Nkwame Nkrumah (1956), alludes to the elements of an Africanised higher education when he states: ‘We must in the development of our universities bear in mind that once it has been planted in the African soil it must take root amidst African traditions and cultures’. For the African university to be truly useful to Africa and the world it has to be grounded in African communities and cultures (Makgoba & Seepe, 2004: 19).

The dependent and decontextualised character of the higher education curricula on the continent calls for a fundamental overhaul of the whole epistemological model underlying the current educational system. Given Africa’s history of colonial subjugation, the basic idea of Africanisation of education encapsulating a quest for relevance is not implausible. Moulder (1995) notes that while no one would ever envisage ‘Anglicising’ Oxford University or ‘Americanising’ Harvard University, the notion of ‘Africanising institutions in Africa’ makes sense, on the basis of past fundamental inequalities. Africanisation therefore makes sense not only because curricula are alienating, but also because of the past injustices of our society.
The curriculum has been partly blamed for prohibiting African universities from effectively contributing to the sustained socio-economic development of Africa, a role expected of them by governments. Njumbwa (2003) rightfully asserts that the curriculum designed for the postcolonial era has run its course. To meet the challenges posed by globalisation and ensure that students make a meaningful contribution in their societies it is imperative that academics rethink existing curricula.

**AFRICANISATION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERNATIONALISATION**

African higher education institutions are increasingly becoming defined by internationalisation, which is one of the dominant characteristics of modern existence. The proponents of the process argue that it brings with it opportunities, benefits and great prospects for prosperity to the marginalised regions and countries. The process is seen as having inherent enormous potential to enhance the rewards of sound social, economic, cultural and political policies (Lebakeng et al., 2006).

The imperatives of internationalisation and that of Africanisation are often portrayed in research and in the literature as diverged positions. According to this view, the more you Africanise the less you can internationalise, and vice versa. It is thus alleged that one contradicts the benefits of the other (Botha, 2010: 201). Crossman (2004: 329) notes that in engaging with the notion of ‘Africanisation’ there is a perception among many African scholars that in Africanising one has forsaken the pursuit of real intellectual activity or knowledge, inasmuch as these are perceived to be determined by international standards. The psychological trap, Crossman (ibid) notes is to confuse something of global currency for universal truth and this is difficult to resist. The African academic may even feel that he/she is betraying African scholarship by moving it backwards.

Neale-Shutte & Fourie (2006: 121) however contend that in order to be participants in internationalisation, African universities need to create their own identities and develop their own fortes; in other words if you do not know who you are then you do not have much to offer your international counterpart. It is only when we have a deep understanding of our experiences that we are able to conquer knowledge and concepts that are not part of that experience (Dowling & Seepe, 2003: 196).

Botha (2010: 208) states that some compatibility exists between the notions of ‘internationalisation’ and ‘Africanisation’. Internationalisation takes strong cognisance of the local culture, that, without the local, there would be nothing to offer the other and so a strong local culture would enhance the value of internationalisation. The ‘own’ and the ‘other’ culture are, therefore, cornerstones of both internationalisation and Africanisation, this being a strong point of compatibility between them. Le Grange (2007) argues that knowledge production is deeply heterogeneous, because different viewpoints are constantly being added and reconciled, but the common element of all forms of international knowledge systems is their localness. One of the categories of rationales of internationalisation involves the political, which includes national and regional identity. Once again, the implication is that without the regional and the national the purpose of internationalisation is pointless.

Louw and Mayer (2008: 625-626) suggest a four-step process to determine future strategies to facilitate effective internationalisation at universities. These steps comprise (1) understanding the inter- and multicultural challenges at an institution, (2) using opportunities wisely, (3) clustering competencies/capacity to optimise these opportunities, and (4) learning and creating knowledge for continuous improvement of internationalisation. The first step implies that local culture(s) is (are) sufficiently embedded in all aspects of the university otherwise this step would not be possible (Botha, 2010: 210).

The internationalisation of higher education has become the norm not only in South Africa but across the continent. In pursuing internationalisation however, it is incumbent on institutions of higher education
on the continent to avoid the potential adverse consequence of marginalising local knowledge and the contribution made by local scholars. While partaking in internationalisation activities universities therefore need to take cognisance of the need to remain ‘African’ universities.

ACADEMIC DEPENDENCY AND INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS: A FEASIBLE SOLUTION?

While most of the scholars writing on Africanisation seem to agree on what Africanisation entails, there are differing views on its practical application. Over the years the Africanisation debate has been deliberately associated with the ‘African Renaissance’ movement. The term ‘African Renaissance’ was popularised by former South African president Thabo Mbeki in 1997, and captures his vision of a new wave of cultural and economic development. In a cultural sense African renaissance is closely connected with the revalidation of Indigenous Knowledge (IK). A number of scholars propose that incorporation is the first step in Africanising.

According to Hoppers (2002) the South African parliament asked the country’s higher education councils to reconsider indigenous knowledge, and launch a research agenda to correct the ‘epistemological disenfranchisement’ of local people. Suttner (2006) too has argued for indigenous knowledge, and notes that South Africa needs an inclusive culture that realises the suppressed creativity of African people.

Lebokeng et al. (2006: 76) also argue for the revival of indigenous knowledge and maintain that the reversal of academic dependency can be achieved through an inscription of indigenous African epistemology. Denying the existence of African philosophy as a basis of maintaining standards is to perpetuate epistemological injustice.

The imperative for the inscription of indigenous African epistemology into the curriculum and underpinning education with African philosophy is, in the first instance, a question of rights, and thus a matter of natural and historical justice. In advocating for the reversal of epistemicide, there is a need to place indigenous knowledge systems on the same level of parity with other epistemological systems in an effort to achieve formal and substantive equality (ibid).

While sympathetic to the basic concerns that inform the call/s for Africanisation, Horsthemke (2009) points out that the manner in which the debate has been framed thus far has its limits. He states that neither the idea of ‘an African essence, culture and identity’, nor the notion of ‘African ways of knowing’ constitute an appropriate theoretical framework for conceptualising the change required in higher education thought and practice. He notes instead that the transformation agenda can be better met by a different, human rights approach.

In relying on IKS the argument about forms of knowledge may intersect in a troublesome way with identity politics. In a dichotomous discourse that equates ‘African’ with indigenous ethnic identity, there is no place for significant groups of intellectuals whose African identity has other grounds. These include white writers who shared in the African cultural revival, and struggle against apartheid (e.g. Athol Fugard), members of the black African diaspora (Du Bois, Fanon), intellectuals from Arab Africa (Amin), and the many locally born intellectuals of European, Indian or interracial background who have a role in current projects of reform (Connell, 2007).

The dialogue on the Africanisation of higher education in South Africa (Makgoba, 1997; Matos, 2000; Van Wyk & Higgs, 2011) appears to be concerned with both knowledge and education. Horsthemke (2004) notes that while the two projects are connected it is possible to discuss the Africanisation of
education separately from the Africanisation of knowledge. For reasons of conceptual clarity this may even be advisable as the latter idea is considerably polemical.

Connell’s (2007: 105) critique of the indigenous sociology movement that arose in Nigeria during the 1980s can be applied to the indigenous knowledge systems movement. Connell (ibid) argues that the movement had a vagueness of method, an implausible assumption of homogenous and static cultures, complicity with nationalism and a difficulty in connecting with an international dialogue except on terms of unequal exchange.

In advocating for Africanising one needs to avoid a reliance on IKS because this tends to lead to IKS being characterised as an exotic subject or discipline (Pityana, 2012). We should rather aim to locate an African method of exploration and to inform the entire knowledge system, rather than to rigidify it as belonging to a part of the knowledge structure. The type of discourse on indigenous knowledge in South Africa and elsewhere often reflects a failure to come to grips with the essence of the problem of academic dependency that its proponents are attempting to address. The crux of the issue may better be evoked by the use of the term ‘endogenous knowledge’ (following Hountodji, 1997; Adésinâ, 2006; Ake, 1997).

Crossman (2004) argues that it does not help to racialise or ethnicise concepts of knowledge and one must therefore find other criteria and definitions for local or regionally-shared knowledge and practices. By making a case for endogeneity instead of indigeniety it is hoped to avoid what Crossman (ibid) characterises as counter-productive dialogues on identity – expressed in questions such as: what is African, native, local or indigenous? – or the irresistible tendency to position indigenous knowledge in an archaic, ahistorical and primitive past – as often transpires when one makes use of the term ‘tradition’ – as though current industrial societies did not possess their own, particular epistemologies.

AFRICANISATION AND ENDOGENISATION: FROM ALIENATION TO A RESTORATIVE PARADIGM

While the integration of indigenous knowledge into higher education curricula may prove challenging in the attempt to transcend academic dependency, there remains a need to identify an inclusive alternative discourse. Alatas (2009: 143) refers to the calls to transcend the Eurocentric and Orientalist elements that inform educational curricula as alternative discourses because they set themselves in contrast with what those who promote them would define as mainstream Eurocentric discourse. They can be understood as a collective term describing the set of discourses that has emerged in opposition to western educational discourse. Rather than being viewed as attempts to delink from metropolitan control these should be viewed as a contribution of non-western systems of thought to theories and ideas. These discourses are informed by local historical experiences and cultural practices in the same way as Western discourses.

Ake (cited in Arowosegbe, 2008: 11) suggests that in the African context a commitment to endogeneity might be a starting point in the reversal or transcendence of academic dependence. Endogeneity in the sense that it is used in this context, refers to an intellectual standpoint derived from a rootedness in African conditions; a centring of African ontological discourses and experiences as the basis of one’s intellectual work (Adésinâ, 2008: 135). This commitment to endogeneity involves not only deriving distinct epistemological insights from the locale but also ‘taking the locale and its ontological locations seriously as the bases of knowledge production’ (Adésinâ, 2005: 136).

While the term ‘endogenous’ has not been used much in the discourse on Africanisation, Crossman (2004) notes that it can assist one in avoiding some of the historical misinterpretations that have resulted with the use of the term ‘indigenous’ and its derivatives. The striking difference in the two terms can be seen in the field of botany where indigenous primarily refers to a species being native to a particular topography.
while ‘endogenous’ refers to a plant’s capacity to develop on the basis of its own resources, or growing or originating from within (Crossman, 2004). Explaining the difference between the two terms Crossman (2004: 324) notes that ‘topographical definition tends to portray the subject as static, its only descriptor being a (quasi-permanent) link to a geographic locality or area’, whereas the use of the term ‘endogenous’ allows for a more ‘organic and dynamic understanding in that it invokes autonomously orientated growth’.

In advocating for the revival of the ‘intellectual nerve’ Adésinà (2006) reminds us that from Economics to Sociology, from Philosophy to History, it was the profundity of endogeneity that gave the canonical Western works their vivacity. As much as many may think of Economics as a science, for instance, one cannot understand the distinction between David Ricardo and Friedrich List, outside of the specificity of their locales; neither can we understand the perspicacity of the scholarship of Marx, Weber or Emile Durkheim, in Sociology, outside of the depth of their endogeneity.

The call for endogeneity is often met with ‘the charge of nativism’ or ‘cultural nationalism’ and its advocates are invited instead to embrace Western ideals; to become cosmopolitan. However, Ake (1979) notes that the call for endogeneity is not a question of parochialism or nationalism because even though the principles of science are universal, its growth points, applications and the particular problems which it solves are contingent on the historical circumstances. Adésinà (2006: 243) argues that taking into context the contents of our education and public discourse is rather peculiar because endogeneity of an epistemic kind may help to address the growing crisis within the classroom, where educators continue to make aliens of their students - who sit through courses and with teachers whose epistemic gazes are firmly planted on the global North (ibid).

For empirical substantiation of endogenous scholarship Adésinà (2006) gives as an example three schools of history, which offer important illustrations of the significance of endogeneity motivated by a commitment to locality: the Ibadan School, the Dakar School, and the Dar-es-Salaam School. The challenge of the Ibadan School of thought and its founder Onwuka Dike was about the content of scholarship and relevance to national objectives. The result of this was the Ibadan School of History, which gave second generation, post-colonial students a sense of connection. The ‘stories’ they encountered were their stories, told by their people for their people (Adésinà, 2006: 253).

The Dakar School of History, on the other hand, was not a pursuit for history as the stories of only great men and women but also that of ordinary people as well. The aim here was to write history in a counter-hegemonic manner; to do history with a class rooted in Africanity. The Dakar School of History was defined by the scholarship of Professor Cheikh Anta Diop (1923-1986) which was shaped by what he considered to be the falsification of Egyptian history. His concern was to utilise the tools of science to valorise African-centred historiography.

Adésinà (2006) points out that these three clusters, three methodological and epistemic foci; were all driven by a shared commitment to their locale; and for each, Africa is the locale, demonstrating that local relevance is never at odds with global and rigorous scholarship and being internationally reputable. The epistemological impact of doing African History, from the point of view of Africans - regardless of the location among these three schools of historiography produced not only a foundational impact but they changed the way in which historians approached their subject matter on a global scale.

While the term ‘endogenous’ undoubtedly cannot escape all the criticisms applied to the term ‘indigenous’ the use of the former term in the discourse on Africanisation is not only justified, it is more beneficial. Endogenisation is a process that is not related to geographical location, race or ethnicity. Applied to universities it refers to the development of African universities and their processes of production along lines consistent with the constantly changing cultural and material situation of the communities and learners they serve.
Higher education courses in the global South are often taught without due recognition of the historical context and cultural practices of the students enrolling in university courses. The emphasis is usually on the context of the rise of the various disciplines in Europe, dealing with issues that bear little historical relevance or meaning to students. In South Africa the recognition of this practice has led to various calls for curricula that are rooted in the African milieu and are reflective of the constantly changing realities of the communities and students our universities serve. This in turn has led to a robust and dynamic debate on the Africanisation of higher education, with different authors offering differing viewpoints on what the process is and what it should entail.

Africanisation has been wrongfully pit against the process of internationalisation, with many arguing that Africanisation has negative consequences for internationalisation. This paper has attempted to show that this assertion is unfounded and that the two processes are instead compatible. Scholars have made a strong case for the integration of IKS into curricula as a means of transcending or reversing the current situation. While IKS has its merits, its application to higher education can be considerably polemical. The issues that proponents of IKS are attempting to address may be better solved by making a case for endogenous knowledge, which is knowledge produced within the continent.

Higher education must be made relevant to the material, historical and social realities of the communities in which universities operate. This can be done by drawing on the philosophical traditions and discourses in these communities for relevant concepts and theories. This forms part of creating a learning environment free of academic dependency and ethnocentrism. The call for Africanisation is neither an advocacy to be anti-West, nor is it discouragement to learn from the West. It is rather an encouragement to learn from the West, but in a selective and constructive manner.

As an alternative discourse Africanisation is conscious of the relevance of its surroundings. Its implementation will require adaptation and reorganisation that will be arduous as professional self-images, academic identities, affiliations and publication strategies are all at stake. This retooling will also affect teaching and learning as the dominant perspectives from the global North have become embedded in the graduate programmes that produce the next generation of academics and scholars.
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