

Researching research culture.
A case study of Rhodes university humanities faculty
research culture.

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Social
Sciences in Political and International Studies**

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

Rudo Hwami

Supervisor

Prof. Louise Vincent

January 2017

Abstract

This thesis explores the idea of research having organisational characteristics which are affected by the institutional culture but can not be defined as a subculture of the institutional culture. In particular, it examines how research culture(s) can be exclusionary and reproduce discriminatory practices. Using quantitative data in the form of Rhodes University Annual Reports and interviews conducted with 11 participants, the thesis documents the current research practices of the Faculty of Humanities at Rhodes University. Such practices incorporate multiple dimensions, including how research is done, who does research, what research is done and research funding rituals. The purpose of this study is to reveal how research cultures are constructed through the seemingly mundane and everyday research practices within a research community. Through the analysis of these everyday practices, participants' experiences and theoretical arguments, this thesis found that research culture and institutional culture are separate entities, and that research culture plays a vital role in the formation of research practices.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Prof. Louise Vincent, for her patience, advice and valuable input. I am humbled by the experience that you have given me. From my honours degree to my Masters you have always encouraged me even in times I had lost all hope. Thank you for believing in my capabilities and for helping me make them shine. Most importantly thank you for the personal relationship you afforded me.

To my parents: my mother Patricia Mashoro, you are my rock and I thank you for helping me remove all fears and doubts. I see your hand in everything I do and although it was sometimes hard to see, your way is and will always be for my betterment. My step father, the Honourable Mudha Ncube, your pride in my achievements has never gone unnoticed and your beaconing has helped me in times I have wanted to give up. I love you both eternally.

I would like to thank everyone who encouraged me along the way and gave me the strength not to give up. Thank you to my colleagues Grace Idahosa and Chipso Munyuki for taking the time to read through my work and giving me advice. All your efforts and support did not go unnoticed. To my best friend Chipso Jakachira, although you are miles away you always managed to remind me in our 4 hour skype conversations that I am not alone in all my struggles. I love you and Cherish you beyond words can express.

I would also want to give a standing ovation to my little sister for being herself. Through all my mistakes and shortcomings you have managed to always see inspiration within me. You have never ceased idolising me and this encourages me to become what you see in me. Always with positive words and not one negative word toward me, you are a shining star in my life and unreplaceable.

To my Son Ethan, thank you for being.

Lastly, thank you to Mr. Chingombe for helping me believe in myself. It was you who first saw potential in me and groomed me. I have never forgotten how you told me I was the best until I became the best. Although I doubt myself at times it is in contact with educators like you that helps a young mind grow. Thank you for the personal relationship you afforded me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Context.....	6
Introduction	6
Academic Research as a research site	7
South African Context	12
Academic Research culture	17
Building a research culture.....	17
Access to research culture	19
Research culture and productivity	20
Research Cultures and Funding.....	21
Conclusion	24
Chapter Three: Research Methods and Procedures	26
Quantitative Data	27
Qualitative data	29
Data Analysis	30
Chapter Four: Theoretical Framework.....	33
Introduction	33
Organisational Culture and Postcolonial Theory.....	34
Defining Research Cultures.....	40
Academic research cultures and the Humanities faculty.....	42
Conclusion	44
Chapter Five: Funding.....	46
Introduction	46
Performance based Research funding.....	48
The construction of an academic identity	55
Power and knowledge production	56
Accountability.....	59
Conclusion	62
Chapter 6: How	64
Subcultures.....	64
Silos.....	70
Student/junior academic- Supervisor/senior co-authorship	74
Conclusion	76
Chapter Seven: What.....	77
Knowledge production, culture and power	78
Knowledge production, Subjectivity and obedience	84
Knowledge production and the knowledge economy	88
Conclusion	93
Chapter Eight: Who	94
Academic Ranking.....	96
Age.....	101
Gender	106

Conclusion	110
Chapter Nine: Conclusion	112
References	117

Chapter One: Introduction

The post-apartheid university in South Africa has been challenged by transformation discourses that raise various institutional problems that need redress and changing such as, discrimination, homophobia and inadequate pedagogic imperatives. One of the key debates on transformation is the question of institutional culture and more specifically its role in shaping academic identities and facilitating social cohesion. Transformation discourses are not a South African phenomenon but a global one, however the debates within this discourse vary according to historical and geographical context. Transformation discourses have drawn attention to the university as a space laden with power relations. Contrary to the university being a neutral place for academic pursuits recent studies on transformation have shown that, globally, the university can be an exclusionary space that is antagonistic to alternatives (Meek, 1991; Sojo, Ottone and Espíndola, 2007; Niemann, 2010; Cloete, 2014; Pyke, 2014). Dominant perspectives have been framed within the South African context to mean racial (Wilkins, 2004; Taylor and Taylor, 2010), western (Tikly, 2001), masculine (Reay, 2004; Vincent, 2006) and heteronormative discourses (Barker, 2007). These discourses are argued in literature to have shaped university norms that govern everyday life, management, pedagogy and knowledge production. Ridding the university of such violences has become one of the core missions within the transformation plans of all universities in South Africa

Institutional culture has been discussed in literature as the vehicle for the production and reproduction of exclusionary discourse. According to Higgins (2007: 97),

There is a growing sense that institutional culture may well be the key to the successful transformation of higher education in South Africa. Or – to frame the matter as forcefully as do many recent analysts – it is simply the massive fact and bulk of institutional culture that may be the main obstacle in the way of the successful transformation of South Africa's higher education system.

The study of the culture(s) of the university is seen as important to effecting institutional change. It is argued that by disrupting these everyday norms and going into a process of defamiliarisation (Prasad, 2003) an institution is able to transform its institutional culture whose dominant framing in higher education has come to mean whiteness (Higgins, 2007).

The 21st century has been coined as a knowledge society, what this means is that within the 21st century knowledge and the acquisition of knowledge has been given a privileged role as the vehicles of innovation, economic progress and development. In light of the findings from the studies in higher education transformation and institutional culture- that the institution houses exclusionary discourses- it becomes vital to study if these discourses also affect knowledge production practices.

The university is seen as the core site for the production and dissemination of knowledge. This use of the university has become its most prominent in the 21st Century and this necessitates a close analysis on the practices and structure of knowledge production sites. According to Hill (1999: 1) “the term research culture remains ambiguous. Do we mean an organisational culture in which research plays a significant role? Do we mean “the way we do research round here?” Or do we mean a culture of the type found in a petri-dish – an environment in which research grows and multiplies?” The questions raised by Hill are vital to this study as most research on research culture identifies research culture as an institutional culture in which research plays a significant role. This thesis is a deviation from this interpretation of a research culture and an endeavor to view research culture as the “cultural characteristics of the research process and research choices” of a research community within the institution (Hill, 1999: 1).

Much of research on research culture has treated research culture as a subculture of the institutional culture (Marie and Sherlyne, 2007; Nosek *et al.*, 2015; Brew, Boud and Malfroy, 2016). However, with the high value being attached to research and also literature highlighting that research teams operate as quasi firms (Ylijoki, 2003) within the institution, it is then important to see research as a site of knowledge production that functions as an organisation within institution possessing its own set of norms and values. However, it should be noted that exclusionary discourses such as racism, masculinity and heteronormativity, that have been highlighted within institutional culture transformation discourses can operate within the norms and practices of a research community. An analysis of the research culture conducted in this study revealed that there are other forms of exclusionary discourses that

exist and are particular to the culture of knowledge production (research). This thesis advances that, as more previously teaching only institutions within South Africa find themselves having to be more research intensive it is vital to have a firm understanding of the meaning of research culture and its influence on research productivity.

There is a paucity of literature on research culture particularly in South Africa. Most of the literature on research culture focuses on the development and promotion of a research culture. This framing of research culture sits well within the 21st century where knowledge is seen as a commodity and is thus studied for its instrumental value and utility (Ball, 2012). According to Silver (2003) within the utility rationale knowledge is seen as an exchangeable good whose value can be measured in monetary value. The increased demand for research intensive institutions is a ripple effect of performance based funding measures that associate a vibrant research culture with high publication output statistics (Giroux, 2002). This rationale has been problematized by various academics who argue that the study of a research culture only to effect utility and productivity can run the risk of neglecting the more social role and influence a culture has (Apple, 2005; Olssen and Leons, 2005; Aiston and Jung, 2015). As a social construct culture is agreed to be non-static and subjective (Andreotti, 2011). Even within scientific research that claim to be context free it is argued that research cultures are undoubtedly embedded within social, geographical and historical phenomena which support the production and reproduction of research cultures (Lawn et al., 2010).

Literature highlights that research practices are implicated in power relations (Davies and Thomas, 2002; Thaver, 2009). The interactions within a research community are not neutral but reveal the existence of a dominant culture and sub-cultures. According to Silver (2003) research cultures can be alienating and exclusionary. Various factors have been noted as influencing research cultures: disciplinary power, academic culture and excessive focus on performativity (Kahu, 2016). Other factors noted in literature are age, gender and academic ranking (Rorstad and Aksnes, 2015). In South Africa the dominant deployment of the term culture in institutions “is used to refer to what is perceived as the overwhelming ‘whiteness’ of higher education in South Africa” (Higgins, 2007: 97). The dominant discourse thereby constructs the norms and values within a research community that is passed down from one year to the next until it becomes normalised and accepted as ‘how we do things around here.’ Research culture is thus a social construct which is reflective of the dominant culture with instances of alternatives arising from the existence of subculture(s).

Due to the lack of literature on research cultures, especially in South Africa, these exclusions and violences within research cultures go unchecked. According to Ntuli (1999), one cannot speak of transformation without addressing the previous state or condition one was in before the need to transform. Higher education institutions have conceded that their very make-up was informed by a system whose prerogative was to alienate African knowledges. Hill (1999) also argues that before one can promote a research culture one has to be able to define what is already there and then use what is there to promote and build a research culture. Most universities, especially research intensive universities in South Africa, claim that their mandate is to create and promote a vibrant research culture. There is little discussion about changing or transforming research cultures -- only institutional cultures. It is taken as a given that once an institutional culture is transformed so will be the research culture. This thesis argues that this point of departure is erroneous. As alluded to in previous paragraphs there are practices and norms that are particular to research as a site of knowledge production which require an in-depth understanding of the organisation of research practices if they are to be transformed.

There remains a wide gap in literature regarding research cultures that cannot be fully covered within a Masters research thesis. Research communities have generally operated with the constructed normative assumption of neutrality and equal access to meaning making. Most literature on knowledge production focuses on the disruption and deconstruction of 'what it is to know' (epistemology). The question of how we know (ontology) and the practices and norms of doing research are taken as global norms. Transformation debates need to challenge these taken-for-granted norms and need to involve the transformation of research cultures. As will be shown in this study a research culture can influence who is considered as a valid knower, what is considered as valid knowledge and how research is done. In turn these three factors along with funding also influence the research culture.

The aim of this study is to study the research culture of Rhodes University Humanities faculty as an independent form of organisational culture. The purpose of this study is to reveal that a research culture functions with norms and values that are particular to it rather than merely being a reflection of a wider institutional culture. These norms and values are socially constructed and can be deconstructed and transformed. Furthermore this study aimed to reveal that research cultures are implicated in various power relations such as the

relationships between student and lecturer, supervisor and supervisee and junior staff member and senior staff member. This study found that institutional culture functions as the context for a research culture and influences the norms and values of a research community. Other external factors that influence the research community is funding and government policies. The research culture of a research community is partly constructed as the community adapts and negotiates its context and external factors. On the other side a research culture is seen to be constructed by the interactions between a dominant culture and subcultures.

Research cultures determine who is excluded from knowledge production and whom is seen as a valid knower. Within South Africa and in line with transformation discourses, it is imperative to understand the explicit and implicit forms of culture and how they reproduce certain violences which the university seeks to rid itself of. This study positions itself as a pilot study in South Africa on the question of research cultures – including how to characterize them and, by implication, how to change them.

Chapter Two: Context

Introduction

The university is defined as a hub of knowledge where information is discovered, processed and advanced (Gray, 1888). According to Gray (1888), there are various approaches one can take in the study of the university: the study of the corporate institution, the study of the university in history from a comparative perspective and the study from the large and complicated vantage point of the history of knowledge itself. These approaches work together to offer a holistic definition of the university. This study mainly focussed on research and knowledge production within higher education. In the past four decades, the higher education sector has been perceived as a vital part of innovation and knowledge production around the world (Georghiou and Harper, 2006). According to Marginson (2008), the role of the university as a research institution was developed during the industrial era; prior to this, the university was mainly regarded only as a teaching institute.

Literature highlights that post-Cold War the world was being shifted towards a ‘new world order’ through economic and political restructuring (Lee, 1996,). According to Lee (1996), the political events at the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the communist regimes and the increasing political hegemony of neoliberal market ideologies outlined the contours of the new world order. These political and economic changes established an environment for socio-economic and political changes during the 1990s that would assert considerable reform pressures on all sectors of society, higher education included. Higher education restructuring has been widely researched; mainly as an introspective analysis on the use and role of the university as a social institution, but there has also been a wide body of research on the idea of research itself (Coleman, 1988; Deem, 2001; Delanty, 2001; Altbach, 2015). The study of university-led research (academic research) has occupied a privileged position in the 21st century, which has come to be coined as a knowledge driven society.

The purpose of the university has always been a highly debated topic throughout the ages. Although the university has traditionally been conceived as a site of ‘independent intellectual inquiry’, this enlightenment model has also been contested as being affected by wider socio-

economic policies within a given country (Holligan, 2016). Holligan also points out that most recently “the university as a culture of enquiry has been subjected to a sustained modernisation process” (Holligan, 2016, 56). Over the past two decades in English-speaking western countries, many new universities and new departments within existing universities have been created in response to perceived needs for a more highly educated society and skilled workforce (Pratt, Margaritis and Coy, 1999). Holligan (2016) argues that there are various policy contexts which higher education cannot escape from. With the commodification of knowledge and the focus on research intensive institutions, global research trends have changed in the past two decades. Meek and Davies (2009: 76), quoted in Méndez & Reyes (2014: 139), point out that:

Higher education institutions must provide a supportive environment if research is to flourish. In some developing countries, higher education institutions were originally established mainly to engage in teaching and it will take a good deal of effort and an appropriate policy environment to nourish a research culture.

In international contexts, literature highlights that there has been increased pressure on teacher educators to become more research intensive, mainly due to research performance funding measures (Hill & Haigh, 2016). The authors note that research capacity building has become a national initiative in some countries such as New Zealand, Norway, South Africa and Australia.

Academic Research as a research site

Education, research and teaching are considered to be the three central functions of the university as an academic institution (Simons & Masschelein, 2009). The university has been traditionally discussed to have two missions, the first being teaching and the second mission being curiosity driven research, which started in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the United States. According to Slaughter & Leslie (1997), a third mission was added post-World War II due to the intricate relationship between knowledge production and transnational corporate requirements and modalities. It is within this context that the 21st-century society is discussed in literature as a ‘knowledge based’ society.

According to Maton (2000), research conducted within universities is one of the core sites of the production of knowledge. Brown (2005: 393) defines research as “an activity which is concerned primarily with knowledge acquisition on the part of the researcher, and secondarily with knowledge dissemination to academic peers and students.” Research has also been described as

a habit of the mind, an attitude that can be developed or neglected. It is a response to curiosity and doubt. It constructs new knowledge, makes for critical thinking and is part of citizenship and democracy... Research is not a solitary activity, but a process of relationships and dialogue (Rinaldi & Moss, 2004)

Cheetham (2007) adds to this definition by asserting that research entails cognitive processes which an individual can be trained to learn. The author also adds that members of a research community are socialised into research processes, and that the practices that formulate these research and socialisation processes make up the normative culture. Cheetham argues that culture “works as the structure that gives research behaviours their significance and allows for the study and analysis of research activity” (2007: 19). According to literature, the processes that surround research activity are shaped by the geographical location (Vaillant & Lafuente, 2007), historical context (Muller, 1997) and within the 21st century- global phenomena (Altbach, 2015). According to Ball (2012), there have been changes within the research context in terms of accountabilities and expectations due to the emergence of a new political economy of higher education. According to Giroux (2002), neoliberalism as a political economy has spread the gospel of the market and the value of corporate culture in the universities and outside of the classroom through privatization and commercialization. Globalization has further spread these ideologies, which are now being accepted as the global normative reality and have restructured research policies and practice (Altbach, 2015).

A vast amount of literature deals with the massification (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Education, 2010; Gumport, 2000; Kistner, 2008; Cloete, 2014; Muller, 2005) of higher education and the shift of the university from a primarily teaching institute to a research institute post-World War II (Edgar, 2010; Imenda, 2005; Hill, 1999). Between 1988 and 2001, the annual number of scientific articles, which are mostly produced in universities, rose from 466 419 to 649 795 (Marginson and Wende, 2007). There was also an increase in cross-

border collaboration amongst OECD countries, with published articles that had authors from two nationalities rising from 8% to 18% between 1988 and 2001 (Marginson and Wende, 2007). The United States accounted for 44% of global citation in scientific literature and had 200 870 published papers from the sciences and Social Sciences fields. However, by 2006 this percentage had dropped to 30.9% (Marginson and Wende, 2007). Most of the published articles in 2001 are from OECD countries, with Japan, the United Kingdom, Germany and France following closely behind the USA in terms of articles published. They published 57 420, 47 660, 43 623 and 31 317 paper respectively (Marginson and Wende, 2007). There are only two third world countries that managed to publish more than 100 papers in 2001. South Africa showed a decline in the number of papers published, publishing 2 523 papers in 1988 and 2327 in 2001. This accounted for only 0.4% of the global published papers. Egypt published 1 130 papers and Nigeria published only 332 (Marginson and Wende, 2007).

American research universities house 3 614 of the High Confidence level researchers, compared to 224 in Germany, 221 in Japan, 162 in Canada, 138 in France, 101 in Australia, 94 in Switzerland, 55 in Sweden, 20 in China and none in Indonesia (Marginson and Wende, 2007). Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTUIHE) and the Times higher education Supplement have measures of research performance that include publication and citation of leading journals and the number of highly cited researchers (Marginson, 2006). According to Rhoten and Calhoun (2011: 108), these measures “favour large, research-intensive, universities with comprehensive research performance in a range of fields, universities and nations that invest in scientific infrastructure at scale, and English-language nations.” Their data shows that the USA holds the global institutional power, exceeding the scientific output of any other nation. In 2006 the United States housed 54 of the SJTIHE world’s top 100 research universities, including the leading university, Harvard. The United Kingdom ranks second after the USA with 11 universities within the top 100, including the University of Cambridge, which occupies the number two spot on the list. English-speaking nations constitute 71% of this group. A further 22 are in Western Europe, six in Japan and one in each of Israel and Russia. Other leading European nations that have universities on this list are Germany (five), Sweden (four), France and Switzerland (three each) and the Netherlands (two) (Marginson and Wende, 2007). There is no African university that sits amongst the elite 100 universities, but in 2005 South Africa was the only African country contributing two universities to the top 500 universities list. According to Rhoten and Calhoun (2011), this

ranking culture only reinforces the dominance of American and English-language universities.

The changes in research output are mainly due to political decisions and the changing global context that both determine the restructuring of the tertiary sector. According to Hill (1999), the western world, mainly the UK and the USA, have limited the role of the government within HEI's to that of a passive supervisor. Universities in the UK in the 1960s were almost completely publicly funded, but there has recently been a complete shift that has left government spending on higher education only contributing to two thirds of the total income (Hill, 1999). Such changes are happening at a global scale, with Australia and the Philippines also recording a decrease in the government expenditure towards higher education (Pratt *et al.*, 1999; Marie & Sherlyne, 2007). There has also been a growth of cross-national research projects, and some pluralisation of funding sources across borders.

Traditionally, research played a secondary role in universities and was mainly linked to the graduate training of young scientists and scholars. The strengthening of the research function has contributed to organizational changes that go along with increased research capacity. Leydesdorff (2012) has argued that there is a “triple helix” of university/government/industry linkages that has resulted in important organizational changes within the university. The most dominant change is a focus on entrepreneurial thinking aimed at the generation of new income streams for the university. Between 1981 and 2003, the percentage of research funding through general university funds dropped from 78 percent to 65 percent in the 16 OECD countries (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). The government has, in turn, encouraged the collaboration of public universities and research centres with public companies to create an alternative revenue stream for higher education institutions. In Africa, the universities have been theorised as developmental instruments and positioned as vehicles for societal, economic and political change, thereby linking them more directly to the government. Julius Nyerere of Tanzania argued that:

The University in a developing society must put the emphasis of its work on subjects of immediate moment to the nation in which it exists, and it must be committed to the people of that nation and their humanistic goals.... We in poor societies can only justify expenditure on a University--of any type--if it promotes real development of our people... The role of a University in a

developing nation is to contribute; to give ideas, manpower, and service for the furtherance of human equality, human dignity and human development (Coleman, 1984: 478).

However, this relationship between government and the society is in decline, and there are changes in the mechanisms for disbursing public funds, both to providers and consumers. Giroux (2002) has highlighted that as large amounts of corporate capital flow into universities, those areas of study in the university that do not easily yield profits or instrumental outcomes, such as the Humanities, are at risk of being marginalized, underfunded or eliminated (Bigalke & Neubauer, 2009: 58). Because knowledge is judged by its exchange value alone, the implication is to devalue the less instrumental knowledge produced in the Humanities and Social Sciences in favour of knowledge that is seen as providing specific skills and technical competencies with direct economic benefits (Sorlin & Vessuri 2007; Pusser, & Turner, 2006; Sit 2010).

Research funding has shifted from block grants to a process that links research assessment with further research funding to concentrate efforts in the most productive departments. This processes of decline in funding is also linked to a dramatic increase in regulation and compliance requirements (Altbach *et al.*, 2009). Mainstream academics, who are mostly western, act as drafters of these regulations and requirements for what is considered valid research. They act in accordance to values and norms of research developed in the western world and in accordance to the western context. Researchers in economically affluent countries thereby play the key role of gatekeepers of inclusion and exclusion of knowledge (Andreotti, 2011). This positioning as gatekeepers can be understood to operate within a micro-regime of governmentality, which functions as a set of unwritten rules of conduct for sanctioned or prohibited actions (Tremain, 2005). Conflict arises between publishers, reviewers of manuscripts and other gatekeepers of knowledge around what can be published. Chilisa (1994: 411) discusses how, as a writer theorizing on postcolonial indigenous methodologies, she was confronted with the monopolies on knowledge production when one of the reviewers of her manuscript had difficulties in opening space for research methodologies informed by African worldviews. The reviewer noted,

There are difficulties in getting Africans involved in the theorising and building of knowledge on ways of conducting research. You have to address questions such as how do you test the validity of your findings . . . by African or Western standards. What language

do you use to build a research community and how do you research, store, and transmit the accumulated knowledge? Arguably, the whole idea of research belongs to the north/western paradigm, so probably some Africanness will have to be sacrificed in the process(1994: 411).

A large body of literature highlights that academic research within African universities has to negotiate various factors such as colonial legacy, globalization and neoliberal restructuring (Tikly, 2004). Assié-Lumumba (2006) argues that the countries within the south remain in the periphery both as knowledge producers and within mainstream academia. Women and minority racial groups remain the most secluded from the privileged sites of knowledge production (Tikly, 2004). Connell (2013) accepts the universality of public good as a goal within higher education, but refutes the universality of the values attached public goods that are exported from western realities into the global south. He argues that within the Social Sciences “ideas, terminology and research technologies get “exported from the metropole to the periphery” (Connell, 2013: 74). The ranking system within higher education shows how language is also used as a tool of power. Alexander (2003) argues that the language question is the central problem within Humanities and Social Sciences. He argues that African languages end up delegitimized as irrelevant academic languages, and indigenous knowledge ends up labelled as unsatisfactory. He further argues that the main aim of African higher education transformation and knowledge production should be to counter this marginalisation.

South African Context

According to Abrahams and Melody (2005), South Africa’s national imperatives of transformation – as outlined in the White Paper (1997) that address the inequalities and discrimination of the past – are slowly being side-lined as South African universities increasingly succumb to the pressures of the knowledge economy. A sizeable amount of research has been conducted to highlight the effect of commodification of knowledge on universities within the global north and south (Nissenbaum, 2009; Shattock, 2009; Sit, 2010; Sorlin & Vessuri, 2007), and this research has drawn universities to look at public good as a viable alternative to the commodification of research and knowledge production (Singh, 2014; Vincent, 2014; Dill, 2012; Calhoun, 1996; Giroux, 2002; Marginson, 2011).

According to Vincent (2014), without an understanding of research cultures, academic research could house the reproduction of exclusion and discrimination that characterized the apartheid tertiary education.

Esakov (2009) and Fiske & Ladd (2004) argue that higher education institutions in South Africa are not immune from the legacy of apartheid which was aimed at subjugating the mind into believing that the racialised ideologies that othered blackness as incapable and inferior to whiteness were pre-ordained truth. Literature shows that these institutions are spaces which can facilitate the reproduction of racialised discourses in the South African contemporary context (Stevens 2007; Modiri 2011). In various ways, all of the 23 South African universities are argued to be products of colonialism and apartheid; their staffing profiles, student bodies, institutional culture, curricula and assessment practices bear the traces of their racialised histories (Erasmus 2010; Fiske and Ladd 2004). It has therefore been argued that the transformation of South African higher education institutions must be aimed at ensuring that the histories of oppression, policies of emasculation and practices of segregation that have informed and constrained the intellectual and social mandates of these institutions are confronted through pedagogy, the scholarship of research and public engagement (Makgoba 1998; Ramose 2004; Pityana 2014; Badat, 2010).

In South African higher education, a new funding framework implemented from 2003 (Higher Education & training, 2013) allows the government to fund those teaching-related and research-related services which lead to improvements in the social and economic conditions of the country. This framework has resulted in less than 13% of government funding for research and development being allocated to the Social Sciences and Humanities (SAccess, 2007-2013), despite student enrolment in these disciplines standing at 40% of all university enrolments in 2011 (DHET, 2011: 3). The Humanities and Social Sciences disciplines received only 20% of National Research Fund allocated scholarships for Masters and Doctoral students in 2014, while 80% went to Science, Engineering and Technology (NRF, 2014).

While these figures refer to the sector as a whole, there are enormous inequalities between universities in relation to research. For instance, 65% of research outputs recognised for government subsidy purposes are produced by only six of the country's 23 universities, and

these same six universities produce some 70% of all Master's and PhD graduates. Despite considerable financial investment by government in the development of research capacity at historically black institutions, less than 10% of research outputs are produced by these institutions (Vincent, 2014). Woodiwiss (2012) points out that in a context in which a university's share of government funding is heavily dependent upon research outputs, defined as subsidy-earning publications and Masters and PhD graduates, the university faces the challenge of encouraging research and postgraduate registrations in departments where these have traditionally been lacking. Some 48% of Rhodes University's research units are generated in the Science Faculty, while the Humanities Faculty, its size notwithstanding, contributes just 22% (RU, 2014). Within the faculty there are also large disparities, with a single department, Psychology, contributing 20% of the faculty's research output (RU, 2014).

The White Paper 3 (1997) defines transformation as a process of re-thinking all existing practices, institutions and values in a bid to examine their ability to conform to the rules of the new democratic society. Racism during apartheid informed the structure of education, and it has been argued that its effects are embedded and institutionalised in the pedagogical choices that continue to marginalise many in the contemporary period (Singh 2001; Higgs & van Wyk 2007). The White Paper further defines transformation as the deliberate intervention by the government, through policies, that directly address the inequalities that were created during apartheid that led to the displacement of many blacks, and black women in particular (Ramose 2004). Emphasis has been placed on institutions to not only promote structural reformations, but also the development of 'institutional cultures which will embody values and facilitate behaviour aimed at peaceful assembly, reconciliation, respect for difference and the promotion of the common good' (White Paper 3, 1997; Department of Education, 2008).

Transformation and institutional restructuring was also set to promote academic campus atmospheres that are peaceful, co-operative and multi-cultural. The White Paper also advocates that higher education has:

To contribute to the socialisation of enlightened, responsible and constructively critical citizens. Higher education encourages the development of a reflective capacity and a willingness to review and renew prevailing ideas, policies and practices based on a commitment to the common good (1997: 4).

The National Commission on Higher Education (1996) became the policy platform for the development of higher education in South Africa. A sufficient statement of policy on higher education in South Africa can be found in the White Paper on Higher Education (1997). The White Paper sets out a policy framework and purposes of higher education:

To address the development needs of society and provide the labour market, in a knowledge driven and knowledge dependent society, with the ever-changing high level competencies and expertise necessary for the growth and prosperity of a modern economy. Higher education teaches and trains people to fulfil specialised social functions, enter the learned professions, or pursue vocations in administration, trade, industry, science, technology, and the arts.

To contribute to the creation and evaluation of knowledge. Higher education engages in the pursuit of academic scholarship and intellectual inquiry in all fields of human understanding, through research, learning, teaching (1997:7-8).

According to Abrahams and Melody (2005), the South African policy landscape is favourable towards the knowledge economy. The authors note how reports such as the one produced by the Higher Education Task Team in 2002 conform to the knowledge economy when they make reference to terms such as “knowledge society and knowledge intensive production and services”. The task team goes on to state that it is an imperative for African universities seeking growth and development to “create a growing return on investment in knowledge production” or else run the risk of structural irrelevance.

The South African context has shaped science and technology as the critical knowledge producers that will secure South Africa a future in the knowledge economy (Magubane, 2002; quoted in Abrahams & Melody, 2005). Abrahams & Melody argue that placing this hope on those sectors of higher education in South Africa will not tackle the immediate public needs such as good governance of institutions and countries, HIV/AIDS, poverty and the need for consistently strong growth rates. According to Abrahams and Melody (2005), South Africa’s national imperatives of transformation, as outlined in the White Paper that addressed the inequalities and discrimination of the past, are slowly being side-lined as South African universities are increasingly succumbing to the pressures of the knowledge economy.

Rhodes is one of the smallest universities in South Africa, comprising of approximately 7500 students. At its conception, Rhodes University was a University College and functioned as a teaching only institute. There was little to no research being conducted within the institute, and what little research took place did so at an individual level and was not a priori to the institute. As the university and the student population grew, Rhodes started being more research-intensive, and there was further development of departments to accommodate the new research focus of the university. According to Maylam & Vale (2005), Rhodes has been affected by various government policies that have led to organisational and curricula restructuring. In 2004, Rhodes University still derived over 50% of its income from the government, but public spending on higher education has declined by over 40% since then. Rhodes University has inevitably been affected by these external pressures, which have placed enormous demands on the institution to generate its own income. Rhodes University is also subject to external auditing by the higher education quality committee, and this audit culture demands efficiency and accountability.

There were originally two different faculties at Rhodes university that catered for the departments now housed under the Humanities faculty and these were the faculty of social science and the faculty of Humanities. Presently, one can graduate with a Social Sciences degree by a combination of subjects that lead to that route but all departments, whether social science or Humanities, are incorporated under the Humanities faculty. This change had implications for the way research is done and the approach towards knowledge production in the faculty. It generally meant that the faculty does not take a positivist approach to knowledge production and in terms of methodology departments within the faculty do not generally do mathematical modeling and quantitative approaches to research. The context is more philosophical and broadly contextualized from a philosophical perspective that also draws on sociology and being open to influences from interpretivist social science rather than a positivist approach. In 2015 Rhodes University conducted a research activity survey which aimed to understand the detriments to research activity. One of the key findings was that;

fostering a more pervasive and ‘formally’ accepted research culture at departmental and faculty levels, especially in support of Emerging researchers, was seen as pivotal for widening and entrenching a research ethos. This would include some departmentally designed mechanism that accounts for and allocates research time, especially

postgraduate supervision time, in a manner similar to teaching time (2015: 49).

Academic Research culture

Building a research culture

Much of the literature on research cultures focuses on the building or development of research cultures (Ferguson, 1999; Pratt, Margaritis and Coy, 1999; Ebbutt and Ebbutt, 2016). According to Brew, Boud, & Malfroy (2016), most of these studies focus on how the building of a research culture can benefit the institution and the departments and academics. Much of this research concentrates on new universities seeking to develop a research culture within their departments or universities seeking to develop new disciplines. Cheetham (2007: 2) argues that it is not only new universities that are interested in research cultures but “post-1989 Universities have a problem as they need to build this culture from a lower base. But...it is a matter not just of building but also of changing a culture; this is much more difficult.” According to Ferguson (1999: 5), developing a research culture in an institution that previously conducted little to no research is a process which requires “rapid acquisition of research skills”. Ebbutt & Ebbutt (2016) argue that there are three main categories that characterise a research culture development: emergent, established and established-embedded. The authors argue that these categories have implications in government funding policy. Hill (2002) argues that to develop a research culture there are two levels of focus, namely the individual and the institution. According to Hill,

At the level of the institution a research culture maybe fostered when research actions are cohesive and when the institution makes research easy for researchers (an “enabling” environment). This involves: (a) sharing expertise and knowledge, (b) having research direction, niche or strategy, (c) having institutional support including commitment at top level, researcher's perception of that support and administrative support, and (d) provision of research facilities and resources. Research culture may develop when at the level of the individual consideration is given to (a) motivation and incentive, (b) developing the institution's endowment of research skills through recruitment and/or education and training and (c) the parallels between the study of research culture and organizational culture per se (2002: 2).

Ferguson (1999) notes that the context also affects the development of research cultures, highlighting that within the 21st century research cultures have to negotiate the marketization of education. Ridley (2016) argues that academic norms that are indicative of a thriving research environment go beyond the building of quantifiable skills and infrastructure to also encompass academic and intellectual virtues and values.

According to Hill & Haigh (2016), literature on the development of research cultures and research productivity has been necessitated by research performance funding measures that have placed pressure on teacher educators to become active researchers as part of their employment. The authors argue that cultivating a culture of research practice is vital to the development of a stronger and vibrant research community. Holligan (2016) adds that neoliberal policies that deal with education restructuring characterise the feudal order where academic autonomy to pursue critical and independent thought is limited. The authors coin the 21st century academic landscape as the ‘new feudalism’, a landscape which is characterised by corporate ideology and that thwarts academic creativity and alienates academics. Contemporary academic research culture in this regard is discussed as symbolizing feudal subjugation, and this culture is argued to have developed through historical transformation driven by capitalist market economics (Holligan, 2016). Lawn *et al.* (2010: 357) highlight that scientific research cultures are a-historical, and although they can reflect their local historical context they are “organic and systematic, network based, non-hierarchical, public and national”. According to the authors, institutionalized scientific research cultures are free from their national contexts. The authors note, however, that in social research, research cultures cannot escape their historical context. Research cultures are argued to be embedded within social, geographical and historical phenomena which support the production and reproduction of these cultures (Lawn *et al.*, 2010).

Managerial practices and leadership are also discussed in literature as being a vital force to the creation and the reinforcement of a research culture. According to Marchant (2008), the development of a research culture requires leadership that can spearhead goals aimed at the creation and disseminating of new knowledge. Hill (1999) also argues that culture is grown from the rituals and behaviours of staff and students, and that leaders play a crucial role in the development, change and cultivation of habitual ways. Lawn *et al.* (2010) note that there was a consolidated interest in research during the 1920s in Scotland, and during this processes, the development of a research culture was led by professors, senior researchers and heads of

department. Pratt *et al.* (2016) argues that the research culture is usually a mirror reflection of how the senior researchers behave, their values and their ethos, as they act as idealised influence by being role models of successful research. Pratt *et al.* (2016: 43) also add that a “decentralised university management structure and strong leadership at the dean level [are] critical elements in developing the research culture”.

Muller (1997) notes that the promotion of a research culture is multidimensional, but that the overall objective of a culture is the promotion of scholarship in higher education institutions. The author argues that there is a great demand for the creation of a research culture in South Africa, and most teaching only institutes find themselves having to become more research oriented. Muller discusses the development of a research culture as capacity building. The author acknowledges that in contemporary academia, research excellence correlates directly with career development, research grants and formalisation.

Access to research culture

A small body of research on academic research cultures is devoted to access to research cultures. The main focus of this research is on student engagement with research cultures (Kiley, 2005) and access to research cultures (Deem and Brehony, 2000). Kiley (2005) argues that student engagement with a vibrant research cultures can improve research productivity. Brew, Boud, & Malfroy (2016) add that inadequate involvement with research cultures can have the negative impact of a wider isolation from research communities outside their own departments. This alienating effect of research cultures is also discussed by Deem & Brehony (2000), who note that access to research cultures is not equal but varies between full-time and part-time students, international and local students and also between different genders. The authors argue that all these factors affect a student’s experience of research culture, and can also limit their access to research cultures. According to the authors, there are three distinctive cultures that affect access: peer cultures, academic culture and research training culture.

Kahu (2016) discuss that there are various institutional factors that affect student engagement within higher education: disciplinary power, academic culture and excessive focus on performativity. The author argues that a lack of integration of students into the university

culture can result in culture shock which can lead to poor performance. Kahu (2016) argues that students who are viewed as lacking social, cultural and academic capital will find themselves alienated from the the university culture. Nosek *et al.* (2015) argue that the present research reward system that emphasises on productivity and innovation undermines transparency and openness. According to Nosek *et al.* (2015), the incentives from publishers and stakeholders can help in the development of a research culture, and it takes a co-ordinated effort to promote a culture of transparency and openness.

Research culture and productivity

Literature highlights that change in funding mechanisms and national research assessment has placed a lot of pressure on academics to strengthen and improve their research activities. According to Boud & Brew (2013: 2), a lot of institutional structures have been developed to try and improve research capacity such as “graduate schools and, more recently, new doctoral education leadership positions in faculties, schools and departments”. Ridley (2016) has linked research cultures to the capacity building ability in educational research. The author argues that capacity building is not a technique that can be fully taught in a workshop “but is about the importance of developing a research culture which engages with the underlying attitudes that derive from the country context”.

Billot (2010) argues that research cultures have a very vital role to play in research productivity. Literature has also confirmed that high research performance depends on a conducive environment within institutions (Bazeley, 2016). Brew, Boud, & Malfroy (2016: 3) argue that in this context research cultures are not much about shared values, but instead have an instrumental use for “building critical mass of researchers in a given area, and creating expectations of academics towards publishing and obtaining research grants”. However, Lucas (2009) argues that research cultures are implicated in various power relations that influence their development and production. The author problematizes the concept of culture, but concludes that a strong research culture needs both research management and research nurturing.

Edgar & Geare (2013) link research productivity to managerial practice and cultural characteristics within university departments. According to Edgar & Geare (2013: 774),

“autonomy and egalitarianism, along with a strong cultural ethos supporting achievement and individualism, are characteristics of high functioning departments. These comprise core features of commitment-oriented work settings, but we find them to be largely absent from the work environments of low performers.” Hill (2002) argues that there are institutional variables that correlate with research productivity. According to the author, research productivity is not a measurement of the presence of a research culture and is also not indicative of research quality, but it gives light to the variables that may constrain the emergence of research culture. Holligan (2016) also adds that research cultures that place emphasis on productivity position research output and external grants as the critical facets of research practice and devalue academics. Brew *et al.* (2016) assert that performativity literature only considers a research culture as being instrumental to research performance, negating the sociological aspect of research culture that is aimed at the development of knowledge production.

Wennberg, Pathak, & Autio (2016) link economic creativity and innovation to three dimensions of culture: power proximity, uncertainty acceptance and individualism. According to the authors, these three dimensions can be interpreted as contributing to the development of a national entrepreneurial culture. According to Wennberg, Pathak, & Autio (2016), the entrepreneurial culture within higher education has effects on individuals’ self-efficacy. The authors argue that institutional cultural practices, such as collectivism and performance orientation, can help individuals avoid feelings of inadequacy and failure. In this regard, culture is argued to play a vital role in individuals’ high or low self-efficacy, which can have effects on their productivity. Raaper (2016) argues that there is a change in higher education culture and ethos in terms of assessment, performance indicators, knowledge production and quality assurance. He argues that the neoliberal reforms rooted in western public policy contexts have brought about three globalised educational cultures: the audit culture, measurement culture and performativity culture.

Research Cultures and Funding

According to Hicks (2012), higher education research funding has always been one of the core businesses of the state. Public funding for higher education was meant to maintain the sacred relationship between the institutions of higher learning and the society. Ideologies of

public good and civic participation were taken as values entrenched in the very fabric of higher education (Marginson, 2015). With the passing of generations, literature on the genealogy of the university reveals that there have been many changes to universities that have brought into question traditional values. The era of globalization has brought about a new dimension to the debate of higher education: public expenditure on higher education had never been questioned until the industrial era, and has been more intensely questioned within the era of globalization. Marginson & Rhoades (2002) has referred to the potential danger of research being policy-led and research identities being colonised as a result of the new research economy. There are several factors that have been argued to be catalysts for the disintegration of the traditional role of the university. A vast amount of literature on research funding highlights the growth of new commercial and private providers (Altbach *et al.*, 2009; Schuller, 1995) the commodification of education (Naidoo, Shankar and Veer, 2011; Gumport, 2000; Marginson, 2011) and the prospect of new trade policy frameworks (Tilak, 2008) as the core factors that necessitate an introspection on social commitment, and funding of public higher education institutions in society.

Castells (2001) argues that because economic success in the knowledge economy is rooted in the high production of competitive and value added end products and services, higher education success will depend more and more on technological knowledge, and on continual innovation. Knight (2007) discusses how the changing nature of funding agencies from funding institutions to funding individuals and productive disciplines fits in the discourse of the knowledge economy.

According to Levy (2003), private investors are quickly replacing public funding initiatives as the main contributors to research funding. According to Parker (2013), the decline in public funding has induced high participation of universities in the 'knowledge economy'. Parker argues that higher education has become a prime source of export earnings that contributes to the engine room of national economies. This trend has been stimulated by governments' restrictions in real levels of funding to the higher education sector, their requiring universities to seek a greater degree of financial self-sufficiency, their regarding universities as export earning businesses, their remit to universities to become providers of mass education for employment and their demands that universities respond to contemporary community values and concerns (Parker, 2013). Due to massification, overall participation and outputs have increased, and this can be judged a success. However, Greenaway &

Haynes (2003) argue that due to the decline of funding in the same period, performance has deteriorated and the social make-up remains exclusive.

Dill (2012), a major contributor in this field, argues that concerns regarding the negative impacts of market-based higher education policies on research identities have been particularly acute in the UK because of massification and the substantial reduction of public funding allocated to every student. Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley (2009) add that funding shortages due to massification have also meant that higher education systems and institutions are increasingly responsible for generating larger percentages of their own revenue. Literature highlights that the debate around massification and research funding has intensified with the increased political inclination toward greater privatisation of services that were once provided by the state. The growing emphasis on cost recovery, higher tuition and university-industry links distracts from the traditional social role and service function of higher education (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Mamdani (2008) argues that the World Bank is mainly responsible for the binaries of private and public, the market and the state, as two competing alternatives rather than two complementary concepts. Mamdani argues that the bank did this through positioning the rate of investment in primary education higher than that in higher education, concluding that the beneficiaries should share a significant part of the cost of higher education and that the state should reduce funding to higher education.

According to Marginson & Wende (2007), marketization of higher education has manifested in two main forms: firstly, more and more research activities and researchers have had to sort for alternative revenue streams. Secondly, research generated within universities and public research institutes is increasingly being valued in terms of its immediate market return as universities become conscious of the value of intellectual property and patenting. Weber & Bergan (2005) argue that the economic exploitation of intellectual property challenges the idea of science as a public good, and states that if intellectual property is considered to be a valuable asset, it cannot be given away freely by open publication in peer-reviewed journals. Vast literature would agree that market-based research threatens the institutions of open science.

According to Weber & Bergan (2005), the widening difference between basic research and industrial innovation is the growing commodification produced by university research. Patenting of research began in the USA with the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 which allows US

universities to patent the results of research. According to Press and Washburn (2000), this change in legislation has had a huge impact and has boosted university patenting so that even publicly funded research results don't remain in the public domain any more. Weber & Bergan (2005) further argue that while funding from private sources is valuable and a much-needed supplement to public finance, it should be subject to conditions. According to Weber & Bergan (2005), the implementation of private funding should not be wholly excluded from higher education financing, but the priorities and values of the institutions should not be sacrificed for the economy-driven funders. Likewise, private funding initiatives should also avoid setting rules that would deter potential funders.

Conclusion

A vast amount of literature agrees that the surge in the concern about research culture can be attributed to the rise of the notion of the knowledge economy and the commoditisation of higher education (Deem and Brehony, 2000; Cheetham, 2007; Brew, Boud and Malfroy, 2016; Ridley, 2016). The focus on higher education research cultures has been discussed in relation to this context of neoliberal restructuring. According to Wyk and Jacobs (2012), institutional culture is an important focus for knowledge production and can be used to create a more research-oriented culture. In this explanation, the authors view research culture as being part of the institutional culture. However, Hill (1999) notes that most of literature treats research culture as a sub-culture within an organizational culture. Hill argues that research culture is a form of an organizational culture in its own right which can be studied, not for capacity building and development but for a more enlightened understanding of research cultures. Maton (2000) emphasizes that knowledge should be studied in its own right. He argues that too many studies on knowledge have been done in the backdrop of other phenomena such as race, culture and gender. This has resulted in knowledge being side-lined as a secondary subject while this society demands a much deeper understanding of knowledge as a primary site of study. In South Africa, there is paucity of literature on the study of research cultures as an organisational culture, and most literature studies the development of research cultures within universities as the backdrop of institutional cultures. This approach proves to be more quantitative and instrumental to the university in terms of performance and productivity, but yields little towards a deeper understanding of knowledge and sociology of knowledge.

Trowler (1998) suggests that there are two main stages of generation of new knowledge: research first occupies the privilege position as the core site of knowledge production and this is followed by teaching and learning. Literature emphasises that although there are given norms and practices in research,

higher education researchers have stressed the distinctiveness and separateness of academic culture from the wider community seeing it as united by a common culture involving guiding principles, codes and myths as well as a deeply-rooted occupational ethos which transcends these divisive elements, the 'small and different worlds', and integrates the profession (Trowler, 1998).

The aim of this study is to address this gap, studying research cultures as independent forms of organisational culture within the university. It is an important study in light of the transformation debates that argue for change in the production, acquisition and dissemination of knowledge within Higher Education. Hill (1999) argues that although seeking to develop a research culture might work in new research institutes, it is inadequate to address research cultures even in institutions that have little research activity. The key, according to Hill, is that there is always an inherent research culture, and much can be gained from deciphering the research culture already in existence, and then analysing its value and potential for transformation.

Chapter Three: Research Methods and Procedures

This study used theory-driven thematic content analysis as its approach to its data. Content analysis is a partially quantitative method which involves categorisation of ideas and counting frequency of occurrence. “Content analysis describes a family of analytic approaches ranging from impressionistic, intuitive, interpretive analysis to systematic, strict textual analysis” (Rosengren, 1981) cited in (Kaur, 2016: 206). Content analysis can be data driven or theoretically driven. In a data driven content analysis the researcher is guided by the data, searching for key words, main themes and the dominant ideas to guide their analysis, making the data the main guide for the structure of the analysis (Krippendorff, 2004). In theory driven content analysis the researcher approaches the data with a set hypothesis that has been generated from theory without any consideration of the data (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis has the disadvantage of not being context sensitive and instead over-relying on summarizing the data collected. In contrast, thematic analysis goes beyond a mere categorisation of explicit ideas to unearth implicit ideas using theory (Yardley, 2008). Content analysis is one of the most used method among social scientists as it has systematic procedures that can easily be validated and replicated.

According to Krippendorff (2004), traditional content analysis infers only one meaning to data, but in reality, it is now recognised, data is not analysed objectively as a researcher is always affected by context. The use of thematic analysis in research bridges this gap within content analysis by offering the systematic element that characterises content analysis while also allowing the researcher to code themes in context. Braun & Clarke (2006: 7) describe thematic analysis as a “theoretically flexible approach because the search for, and examination of, patterning across language does not require adherence to any particular theory of language or explanatory meaning framework for human beings, experiences or practices.” According to the authors, thematic analysis can be used in a positivist way, but can also be used for in-depth interpretative studies. Contemporary content analysis has also been discussed as offering a rich interpretation of data which involves a balance between ‘complexity and systematicity’ (Marks & Yardley, 2004). Thematic content analysis is without deep theoretical commitments and is described as an analytic method rather than a methodology (Clarke and Braun, 2014). Codes and themes are important in thematic analysis; a theme refers to a specific pattern found in the data in which one is interested.

While content analysis will only reveal themes that are manifest (directly observable) in data, theoretically driven thematic analysis can also unearth the more latent themes (Potter and Donnerstein, 1999). Coding involves taking large chunks of data and categorising them into themes for later analysis. Marks & Yardley (2004) argued that codes need to flow from the principles that underpin the research, and from the specific questions the researcher seeks to answer rather than adopting a purely inductive approach where one codes whatever one observes in the text.

Theory driven thematic content analysis, which is chosen in this study, uses subject-specific theory to inform the qualitative analysis (Fereday, 2006). I chose to employ this approach as a rigorous thematic approach can produce insightful analysis that answers particular research question (Fereday, 2006). My study involves an interaction of quantitative and qualitative data; because thematic analysis has no strict theoretical underpinnings it allows a researcher to move between positivist and qualitative data to answer the same research question. In this study, quantitative data in the form of Rhodes University annual reports and qualitative data in the form of 11 interviews were used to obtain various insights on research cultures within the Rhodes University Humanities Faculty. Theoretically driven thematic analysis complemented the research question as it allowed for both data driven analysis and theoretically driven analysis. Themes within the data were drawn from frequently occurring categories that manifested as key ideas in relation to the research question. Marks & Yardley (2004) illustrate that what one chooses to code depends on the purpose of the study, and state that the coding frame must have coherence to reveal 'high-order ideas'. Coding is described as "noting patterns in the data and dividing up the data to give greater clarity regarding their detailed content" (Marks & Yardley, 2004)

Quantitative Data

This study investigates research cultures in Rhodes University's Humanities Faculty by examining the Rhodes University annual research reports and the research practices of academics within the faculty. The quantitative data in the form of annual research reports was taken from between 2010 and 2014. During these years, transformation debates on institutional culture within higher education institutions were heightening, making them a prime data-collecting period. There was also a rise in epistemic and ontological questions

within the university, especially vital as the epistemic use of the university has come under enormous scrutiny within the past ten years. According to Ball (2012), the decades post-Cold War have re-defined the use of the university. In South Africa, organisational and epistemic transformation have become a preoccupation and priority of most universities (Eckel, 2001; Badat, 2010; Horsthemke, 2009). In light of this, the years 2010 to 2014 were chosen because their data would contain the most recent trends and practices within the Rhodes University Humanities Faculty research community. This data collection stopped in 2014 because this was the latest publication of the annual reports Rhodes University had available at the time. The annual research reports contain information about the overall research performance of individual researchers, research institutes, departments and faculties. The reports also highlight members of the research community who hold the most achievements and who have received prestigious awards.

The study of the research reports was approached by asking how research is done, what sort of research is done and by whom research is done by. The annual research reports were analysed using theoretically driven thematic analysis. The themes How, What and Who were drawn from Hill's (1999) value laddering approach. According to Hill (1999), the technique of value laddering reveals the cognitive maps of individuals by asking "people what research they do, why they do it, and then looking for common or shared features". The same questions were applied to the quantitative data to provide a quantitative answer to who is doing research, what research they are doing and how this research is being done. Statistics and tables were drawn from the annual research reports to answer the questions. To answer the question of who does research, the annual reports were manually torn apart and the publications from across the years were grouped together by department and then stapled together. This was done for all six of the departments that were part of the project. These six departments were chosen in correspondence to the participants that took part in the study. I went on to highlight and count the names of the authors for frequency, and then categorized authors according to one time authors, low publishing authors and high publishing authors. To answer the question about what research is done, I compared articles published in accredited journals and those published in what the research reports call 'other' or unaccredited journals, and cited the research topics that were favoured in accredited journals and those that were favoured in 'other' journals. To answer the question about how research is done, I inserted tables of the data into NVivo and counted how many researches were done in collaboration and how many were done by a single author. In doing this, the quantitative

data became far more than just quantitative statistics: the annual research reports also highlighted the most performing individuals, where researchers chose to publish their work and what work is being published. In asking all these questions, the research reports became pieces of written documents that highlight publishing trends, who gets most funding and high performing individuals.

However, it should be noted that the annual research reports are heavily dependent on individual academics and departments submitting their full publication manuscript. In the absence of such cooperation from the individuals and departments, the annual research reports are an incomplete representation. The participants in this study highlighted that some researchers do not submit their publications toward the annual reports as only the university and not the individuals gets any financial gain from the effort. Although the amount of work that is omitted is minimal, it is still a limitation when one is performing research that is solely dependent on such statistics.

Qualitative data

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Academic Rank
Portia	Female	White	Professor
Leon	Male	White	Professor
Arthur	Male	White	Professor
Oscar	Male	Colored	Masters student
Sinazo	Female	Black	PHD Candidate
Bradley	Male	White	Senior Lecturer
Kelly	Female	Colored	Senior Lecturer
Vuyo	Male	Black	Professor
Nandi	Female	Colored	Masters student
Andile	Male	Black	Junior lecturer
Luke	Male	White	Professor

The qualitative data was drawn from participants who were invited to participate in the research via email. A total number of 25 emails were sent to eligible participants and 12 participants were interviewed. The pool of participants spanned across the Humanities Faculty, comprising of master's students, PHD candidates, junior lectures, senior lecturers and Professors. Only 11 interviews were used in the study as one of the participants withdrew from the study.

I employed in-depth interviews which were a minimum of 35 minutes long and a maximum of one hour and 50 mins long. Interviews are described as “a potentially rich source of information concerning how people’s experiences are structured by their subjective and socio-cultural perspectives and environmental circumstances. The data enables the investigator to explore how people actively makes sense of their lived experience and how that experience is interpreted through linguistic, cultural and historical means of expression” (Marks & Yardley, 2004: 55). Although focus groups are another way of achieving these results, I did not utilize this method as the research topic involved some questions that could elicit criticism of heads of departments, Professors, supervisors and management. In the beginning it seemed plausible to hold a focus group with the junior members of the research team, but it later became apparent that these junior members belonged to different subcultures which they would not freely interrogate in a focus group. Due to the nature of the research topic it did not seem a focus group would have helped participants to open up. Another thing to note is that even in the one-on-one interviews participants, especially those in leadership roles, seemed hesitant to answer questions which I had assumed to be without complication before going into the field.

Data Analysis

I chose to familiarise myself with the data by transcribing the 12 audio recordings of interviews myself. I first transcribed using the software Dragon, and then listened to them again and reread the transcription for accuracy. The transcripts were then loaded onto NVivo. In the beginning of the processes I had four codes drawn from Hill’s (1999) conceptual framework on research cultures. Adding to the three already discussed, Who, What and How, Hill argues that funding rituals also contribute to the practices that develop a research culture. Therefore funding became the fourth code. The interviews were analysed

and text from each interview was then divided into the four main codes comprised of the four categories discussed above. After a thorough examination of the four main codes, the analysis moved into a more data driven coding. Nodes were developed by identifying the patterns of meaning that were relevant to the research topic (Fereday, 2006). For example, within the code that centred around who does research there was the node teaching vs research and within this node there was a sub-node in the form of a memo, namely time as currency for research.

NVivo was a very useful tool for my analysis, but Ishak and Bakar (2012: 95) remind us that,

NVivo is just another set of tools that will assist a researcher in undertaking an analysis of qualitative data. However, regardless of the type of software being used, the researcher has to dutifully make sense of all the data him or herself, without damaging the context of the phenomenon being studied. Inevitably, the software cannot replace the wisdom that the researcher brings into the research because at the back of every researcher's mind lies his or her life history that will influence the way he or she sees and interpret the world.

Consequently, the coding frame was printed directly from NVivo, and I worked with the data manually until I got coherent broader patterns. For example, the same teaching vs research node was integrated under a broad node of academic ranking that was found within the code that dealt with who does research. The combination of manual analysis and computer assisted data analysis improved credibility and validity.

According to Mark & Yardley (2004), when the researcher is using qualitative and quantitative methods in tandem the meaning can become fragmented because the two sets of data convey different texts. In this project, the data from the quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis seemed like different pieces of work. On one hand, whilst counting frequency seemed to work for the quantitative data, the sample size of the interviews was too thin to perform rigorous counting measures that would yield any valid results. On the other hand, the data from the quantitative texts could not be reduced to nodes. However, my data started to take a different form when I started writing it up. The themes from my two separate data texts complimented each other and contributed to one coherent broader meaning. For

example, the quantitative data revealed that members of the research community that are highly ranked published more than those with lower positions, and the qualitative data revealed that highly ranked staff members have lesser teaching hours in some departments so they had the time currency to conduct intensive research. When read together, these two findings highlight that high-ranked staff have some sort of privilege within the research community. In the beginning it seemed like the quantitative data was going to be of no use for my thesis and in the later stages of my coding it seemed like I was not going to have any use for the qualitative data. However, in the end the two could not exist without each other as they contributed in different ways to answer the same parts of my research question.

I admit from the onset that I approach this thesis from a certain social context. I am a young researcher within the Rhodes University Humanities faculty, I have shared experiences with the younger researchers within the faculty and this is both an advantage and constraint. Hill (1999) suggests that it is difficult for an external investigator to decipher the research culture of an organisation because they only see the observable artefacts and rituals and not the latent practices that make up the research culture. An internal investigator like myself would be able to quickly discern abnormalities and regularities. However, as an internal investigator one must also be aware of their own position within the research community; either one belongs to the dominant culture or to a sub-culture, in which case one will privilege the position they subscribe to. I should state, however, that this topic was something I had never personally thought of until this project and my ideas have been formulated by the project and within handling the data. I had no idea that some of the trends this project has unearthed existed, so my bias, if it were present at all, was minimal.

This study followed ethical procedures as stipulated by the university ethic committee. Participants signed a consent form before the beginning of the interview and were made aware of their ability to rescind their consent at any stage of the project. The participants regarded this subject of study as being very sensitive and asked me to omit several stories from my written transcript. I have honoured their wishes and privacy and will continue to do so even past the submission of my thesis. I maintain that I respect and do not betray my sources, either in disclosing their identities or being derogatory about their experiences.

Chapter Four: Theoretical Framework

The term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, ‘research’, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary ... The ways in which scientific research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world’s colonized peoples (Smith, 1999: 1).

Introduction

Knowledge as a subject of study is widely discussed by Maton (2000), who emphasizes that knowledge should be studied in its own right. He argues that studies on knowledge have been done in the backdrop of other phenomena such as race, culture and gender. This according to the author has resulted in knowledge becoming a secondary subject, while in the 21st century it demands much deeper understanding as a primary site of study. Post-Cold War, the role of the university as a research institute attracts more attention than its role as a teaching institute. The influx in academic research is linked to the rise of the knowledge economy that has arguably reshaped the role of the university within society. The university is at the centre of knowledge production and processing, and it is argued that it has contributed to the development of a new market where knowledge is a good which can be sold and consumed (Giroux, 2002). There have been several questions about the impact this has had on the use of the university as a public institution and on the traditional teaching role of the institution (Marginson and Rhoades, 2002). Most research on academic research also questions how issues of funding, quality assessment and accreditation affect the research that is conducted within institutions and the choices that academics make in their research (Ball, 2015; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; M. Singh, 2014). Institutional culture theorists link transformation in universities to cultural change (Billot, 2010; Niemann, 2010), and institutional culture has also been widely discussed as an important focus for knowledge production.

According to Maton (2000), research conducted within universities is one of the core sites of the production of knowledge. Brown (2005) defines research as “an activity which is concerned primarily with knowledge acquisition on the part of the researcher, and

secondarily with knowledge dissemination to academic peers and students.” This process is facilitated by practices and rituals of knowledge production that have been constructed in space and time and are not devoid of context. Understanding these practices requires one to understand that research is a site or organisation of knowledge production which is subject to organisational controls that have been constructed in context.

Organisational Culture and Postcolonial Theory

Organisational culture was first introduced as early as the 1930s in the Hawthorne studies, which focused on work group studies conducted by Mayo in 1933 (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2008). However, organisational culture only became the major domain of organisational research at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, with the most notable research being Ouchi’s Theory Z (1981) and Schein’s *Organisational Culture and Leadership* (2010). In western countries, the study of organisational culture was conducted so as to initiate organisational change within national and private organisations. “Organisational culture analysis, however, tended to look for regular or symbolic ‘laws’, not for the intricacies of meaning” (Silver, 2003: 157). According to Smirch (1983; quoted in Gumpert, 2000), culture and the study of culture could be seen through two broad directions, one viewing culture as a variable and the other viewing it as a root metaphor. As a variable, culture is seen as something the organisation has, and as a metaphor it is something the organisation is. Farmer (1990; quoted in Hill, 1999) describes culture as what is done, how it is done and who is doing it. Edgar (2010) describes organisational culture as “the way things are done around here”.

According to Alvesson & Sveningsson (2008), an organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication, both on an instrumental and a symbolic level. The anthropologist, Clifford Geertz, writes that traditionally culture “denotes a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life” (Geertz, 1973: 89). According to Schein (2010), the culture of an organization is grounded in the shared assumptions of individuals participating in the

organization. Often taken for granted by the actors themselves, these assumptions can be identified through stories, special language, norms, institutional ideology and attitudes that emerge from individual and organizational behaviour. Tierney (1988) adds that culture does not refer to social structures and behaviour, but refers to mental phenomena such as how individuals within a particular group think about and value the reality in similar ways and how this thinking and valuing is different from that of people in different groups. Organisational culture has been directly linked with organisational performance and effectiveness in literature (Fellows and Liu, 2013). Social constructivist phenomenologists and interpretavists have rejected the idea that culture can be managed. The theories argue that culture is shaped by agency and power, and that attempts to effect cultural change through imposed change may have various unintended consequences such as “ritualization of culture change, hijacked processes, cultural erosion, cultural reinvention, ivory tower cultural change, inattention to symbolism, uncontrolled and uncoordinated efforts, and behavioural compliance” (Fellows and Liu, 2013: 410).

Throughout the ages, organisational characteristics such as formal, task-centred research practices and bureaucracy have been treated as being normative realities rather than constructed identities (Mir; Mir; & Upadhyaya, 2003). These characteristics have been taken for granted as being applicable “elsewhere, including to education, especially as universities were seen to be becoming increasingly managerial, centralised, market oriented and commercialised” (Silver, 2003: 158). Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya (2003) also argue that the discourses of organisational studies have a relationship with discourses of colonialism. According to the authors, the study of organisational culture should be aware of:

- (a) the linkages between colonialism and industrialisation, (b) the creation of the colonial subject as a ground for the creation of the docile worker, (c) the relationship between colonial practices and organising practices and (e) the similarity between colonial regimes and modern international regimes of control systems (Mir, Mir & Upadhyaya, 2003: 49).

Prasad (2003) argues that the development of organisational studies must be viewed in context. The colonial history is argued to have influenced the practices and discourses that inform organisational studies. Prasad (2003) argues that practices and discourses that inform

organisational studies have to be understood as emerging from the colonial encounter between the west and the non-west. Organisational culture as a social and political construct is not just a reproduction of western values but emerges through the colonial encounter.

According to the definition of postcolonial theory provided by Andreotti (2011), there is a productive potential within postcolonial theory to interrupt normative discourses that are grounded within western canons. Postcolonial theory is argued to be a analytic tool which does not point to the end of colonisation but to the creation of alternatives and resistances of western ideologies (Kwek, 2003). Embedded within western canons is hostility towards difference and a narrow outlook of the world. Andreotti (2011: 2) states that postcolonialism contributes to social and educational thinking by creating the conditions for “the possibility of theorising a non-coercive relationship or dialogue with the excluded ‘Other’ of western humanism”. Prasad (2003) argues that the colonial encounter created historical imbalances and cultural inequalities that have led to institutional suffering and systematic epistemic exclusion.

Western or Enlightenment humanism, which is based in western epistemologies, has separated the world into binaries of normative west and barbaric other. The ‘Other’ is viewed as empty without ability to rationalise or know (Mbembe, 2015). Knowledge becomes a tool of western domination as western contextual histories and teleology are posited as global formative ways of knowing (Andreotti, 2011). This violence towards the Other exists within institutionalised theories and formal philosophies. Prasad (2003) argues that organisation theories and studies have been theorised in ways that have normalized certain practices within organisations that make it difficult to unearth the latent practices that inform organisational culture. Andreotti (2011) asserts that the first defining step of postcolonialism is to unearth the epistemic arrogance and parochialism within western hegemony. According to Foucault (1979), discourses have the power to exclude, and these discourses exist in discursive spaces. Discourses are socially constructed truths that privilege specific realities, cultures and truths. Maton (2000) argues that research as a site of knowledge production is a discursive space, and as such is controlled by hegemonic discourses.

Andreotti (2011) argues that it is through ethical solidarities that a disruption of western contextual realities that are masqueraded as universal are unearthed and potentially successfully challenged. Critics of ethnocentrism often argue that it promotes paralysis of

analysis and absolute relativism. However, it is within western normative rationalities that such violence lingers by denial of existence of other form of knowing and being (Rabaka, 2012). Western realities force opposed schools of thought into an enclave of banished theories that cannot be practically realized, and academic philosophy is reduced into a reiteration of western ideologies. Postcolonialism argues that the “Cartesian subject has projected his local worldview as global, foreclosing the local roots of his epistemological and ontological choices” (Andreotti, 2011: 2). The production of meaning and establishment of laws and institutions has been globally rooted in western ethnocentrism.

Academic research is seen as a universal necessity for universities, and as such is seen to be governed by universal organisational norms. Andreotti (2011: 2) argues that universal norms that advocate for consensus, a common cause and common identity offer two fundamental problems for the Other; “(a) the standardised norm will see any opposition to it as deficient or antagonistic usually followed by the need to fix deficiency or difference to promote cohesion and (b) the advocating of difference blindness depoliticise difference whilst pushing its hegemonic ethnocentrism agenda.” Neoliberal ideologies in universities advocate for co-operation for the greater good and they have been argued to push for market ideologies, sacrificing decolonizing and democratization imperatives (Marginson and Rhoades, 2002). Andreotti (2011) argues that there are two main ways for the Other to respond to the violence, the most common one being internalised oppression which sometimes manifests itself as overt guilt over their supposed insufficiency and lack. The second reaction is a taking up counter-penetration and defiance toward western hegemony.

According to Andreotti (2011), a relationship or dialogue with the Other that contains no coercion entails a provisional paradoxical construction of a general epistemology that announces the impossibility of general epistemologies. In higher education, neoliberal restructuring has been mainly characterised by the commodification of knowledge (Giroux, 2002). The commodification of knowledge, which started Post-Cold War in western countries, has been gradually accepted globally as a normative reality. Nandy (2007: 28-29) argues that

The conceptual range of human potentialities and happiness has shrunk. While consumerism has widened our choices in trivial matters, conformism has narrowed our choices in vital matters. We have more shampoos and cuisines to choose from; we have few

options in matters such as visions of a good society and a healthy person. Our journey through the twentieth century has created the conditions for a drastic abridgement of our ideas of dissent and diversity, too.

Andreotti (2011) argues that systems of knowledge production are, at their worst, diseased with arrogance and hostility that denies its own socially, culturally and historically situatedness. The acceptance, or indeed the denial, of this ignorance and ontological foreclosure to other forms of knowledge rooted in other contexts lies in the ability to redefine terms of knowledge construction. Prasad (2003) argues that there are truths within different ways of knowing and being and that there should be equality within difference, highlighting that each knowledge system is situatedly produced and has equal worth in its own right. According to Mbembe (2015: 7),

Universities have always been organizational structures with certified and required programs of study, grading system, methods for the legitimate accumulation of credits and acceptable and non acceptable standards of achievement. Since the start of the 20th century, they have been undergoing internal changes in their organizational structure. Today, they are large systems of authoritative control, standardization, gradation, accountancy, classification, credits and penalties. We need to decolonize the systems of management insofar as they have turned higher education into a marketable product bought and sold by standard units.

There are various points of departure when trying to theorise culture and how it plays a role in the discourses and the institutions of knowledge production. The relationship between cultures and research within postcolonial Africa has been influenced by the colonial encounter and the hegemonic cultural imperialism (Andreotti, 2011). This domination is present in the question around economy and knowledge and how both are used in the construction of western cultural supremacy. According to Seidman and Alexander (2001: 26), the construction of the Other is in essence “both a condition of, and an integral aspect of, the dynamics of political and economic colonialism.” It is within this discourse of subjugation that decisions on who is a valid producer of knowledge, who is a valid knower and owner of knowledge and who is merely a consumer, regurgitater, summariser and reproducer is decided. Mbembe (2015) argues that a valid knower, according to the hegemonic notion of

knowledge production, is one that claims to know independent of context. This notion of knowledge production represses alternatives that fall outside its interpretive frames.

The processes that facilitate and preserve a culture within an institution or an organization lay within a relationship of cultural injustices routed in economic imbalances (Andreotti, 2011). According to Baba, the colonial discourse is the discourse of the coloniser. “To construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and inclusion” (Bhabha 1994: 70). He argues that the postcolonial context is characterised by the unequal and uneven forces of cultural representation. Western modes and institutions of knowledge production, such as university and cultural theory, have embedded in them general systems of western exploitation.

A postcolonial lens offers a definition of knowledge production as power relations that are biased towards colonial ethnocentric, paternalistic, and cultural supremacy and that have a depoliticizing and ahistorical approach to institutionalised cultures of knowledge production (Andreotti, 2011). There is an inherent epistemic privilege within the producers of knowledge – researchers, educators and dispensers of rights – and the theoretical and methodological tools they chose to use in their research. The methods and dominant theories of research form part of the research rituals of an institution and can work to exacerbate violations or can act as strategies of transformation or resistance. Research culture, like institutional culture, is much a mirror image of the context that created it. Mbembe (2015) argues that the measurement of productivity of research in numbers per capita is an overt manifestation of research practices, but does not entail a progressive or transformed research culture. He agrees that one cannot completely do away with the statistics and quantitative measurements but insists that a vibrant research culture must be measured according to the needs of the context. In a South African context, Mbembe suggests that transformation and decolonisation goals must be the epitome of measuring a progressive knowledge production framework. Mbembe also argues that universities are now characterised by the heavy policing and control of cognitive maps of the students by curricula and knowledge systems that are foreign to them. Furthermore, new ideas that contest the dominant knowledge production framework continue to be silenced.

Prasad (2003) argues that defamiliarisation is an organisational analysis tool that enables one to deconstruct the taken-for-granted norms of an organisation and discover injustices that are otherwise latent and normalised. Andreotti (2011: 61) defines culture as a “dynamic (and incommensurable) process of reproduction/contestation of meaning in the act of survival, hybrid by nature and thus rendering claims to purity, authenticity, and origination untenable.” She argues that,

strategic essentialism is recognized as an important strategy of resistance albeit remaining within the logic of the oppressor and potentially reproducing ethnocentrism and hegemony internally. Third, cultural supremacy is the projection of a local (European) epistemology as universal, unmarked, and neutral, which resulted in the creation of myths of modernity, which dictate that the modern (Western) civilization is the most developed culture and has an obligation to civilize, uplift, educate, and develop the lesser (barbarian) cultures (2011: 61-62).

African universities’ research practices have been the site of western ethnocentric reproduction and cultural supremacy, and have been passed down from academic to academic through the institutionalized discourses. Mbembe (2015) argues that notions of a universal or traditional academic are regarded as ahistorical and neutral creations which academics in all countries have to aspire to. He further argues that representations of a traditional academic are inescapable as success is measured via international ranking systems and accreditation. Hill (1997) argues that a research culture is also characterized by territorial boundaries that are not physical but epistemic and cognitive. In Africa, this struggle has been between the violent epistemic and cognitive territorial expansion of western cultural supremacy and opposing perspectives of thought.

Defining Research Cultures

One of the first attempts to define research culture was undertaken in a clinical nurse study in 1989 by Polk. In this study, Polk reached a conclusion that there are three essential elements to developing a research culture: knowledge, values and lastly material artefacts (Hill, 2002). Knowledge is acquired in the form of ‘individual research skills and experience’, and values and norms are rooted within the concepts of motivation and support. The material artefacts

are the overt facilities and tools for research (Brown, 2005). Hill (1999: 2) defines research culture as “the way we do research around here”. He argues that research culture is not a sub-culture of an institutional culture but is a standalone phenomenon which reflects the shared meaning of research ascribed to by a group. To Hill (1999), a research culture comprises of the cultural characteristics of the research processes and research choices within the institution. Schulze (2009) has also defined research culture as being formed by practices that include recognition and reward for qualitative research and the identification of models of good research process and administrative support. Hill (1999) suggests that the six common characteristics that literature gives to define and study of organisational culture should be translated to research culture: (1) overt behaviour and rituals, (2) dominant research related values, (3) the guiding philosophy when approaching research, (4) the rules of how to research, (5) the climate about research that is conveyed in an organisation and (6) norms adopted in the research group. According to Hill (1999), research culture goes beyond what researchers do and asks why researchers do it, meaning that research culture is a notion that can be tested and changed. Hill (1999) argues that most literature that talks of establishing or developing a research culture fails to see that culture is inherent in an institution, and that the main concern is to identify and decipher it to get it to work optimally for that particular institution.

Hill (1999: 2) quoting (Schein (1985) sums up the definition of research culture as

A pattern of basic assumptions about research - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with the external and internal problems of research - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to research problems.

Cheetham (2007: 4) argues that because research is a learned behaviour, “culture works as the structure that gives research behaviour the significance and allows for the study and analysis of research activity.” The culture is grown from the rituals and behaviours of staff and students. Hill (1993) adds that the role of leaders also plays a crucial role in the development, change and cultivation of habitual ways. Hill argues further that for there to be a research culture, there needs to be a cognitive map which conceptualises behaviour generally accepted by the group.

Hill (1993), drawing from Polk, identifies that there are conflicting mind-sets that exist regarding research cultures within institutions: the research oriented culture and the client-attention culture. According to Ball quoted in Billot (2010), this conflict is fuelled by the changes within the research context where accountabilities and expectations have been raised and a new political economy of higher education has emerged. Gumpert (2000) argues that there is a growing tension between two dominant perspectives on higher education: the first interprets higher education as a social institution while the second sees higher education mainly as a part of the national economy, in other words as an industry. Several authors suggest that this is the predicament research and indeed research cultures, fall into.

Research cultures locate themselves within this global conflict within higher education: where a research oriented culture will be fostered through the interpretation of higher education as a social institution, a client education would view a university as an industry. According to Gumpert (2000), the dominant perspective in this debate, especially in the USA, is the interpretation of public higher education as an industry. Maassen & Cloete (2006: 10) argue that there are three mechanisms that have led to this development; “first, the rise of academic institutional managers and professional administrators; second, the idea of the sovereignty of the consumer, especially students; and third, the re-stratification of academic subjects and academic staff on the basis of their use-value.” Hill (1993) argues that a research culture can be faced with problems of survival and adaptation because of external factors such as the government’s role, funders and competition with other institutions. It is within this context that Hill suggests that problem solving is one of the core values of a research culture. He further argues that issues surrounding problem solving are essentially the difficulty of research.

Academic research cultures and the Humanities faculty

Vincent (2014) has framed culture as a critical component in understanding the process of planned change and transformation of tertiary institutions. The meaning of knowledge and its role and function in education and society as a whole has changed throughout history. Knowledge production, use and distribution are some of the core uses of the university. In an era where the university is being transformed by neoliberal imperatives of profit and vocationalism, the aspiration of the university as a producer of a liberal and well-educated

citizenry is slowly fading (Gibbs, 2014). The choice of what to research in the fields of Humanities and Social Sciences is slowly becoming divorced from free intellectual inquiry and is instead conforming to the market-driven *raison d'être* of innovation. This is seen because of the argument that there is less cumulative knowledge building within the arts and Humanities. Cumulative knowledge has become the heart of knowledge, with policy makers proclaiming that education must prepare students for living and working within a knowledge society and in globalised contexts.

Knowledge and the study of knowledge is important in the knowledge society. Knowledge has largely been studied through constructivist, sociological and cultural lenses. Constructivism views knowledge as being informed by the cognitive processes of the knower (Maton and Moore, 2010). This approach reduces knowledge to being dependent on the learner or knower. Sociology and cultural studies emphasise how power relations manipulate knowledge and inform knowledge production (Maton & Moore, 2010). These perspectives seek to deconstruct the social power that influences our epistemic and ontological canons, thereby reducing knowledge to a reflection of social power. These perspectives do not aim to study knowledge itself, but offer a descriptive analysis of the operation of knowledge in society. Knowledge in these perspectives is not an object of study (Maton, 2000). In the debate of knowledge economy and knowledge society, where knowledge itself becomes a commodity, there is need to make knowledge an object of study.

Regardless of its centrality to the discourse of knowledge economy, the meaning of knowledge seems to be suffering a loss. Research within the discursive framework of the knowledge economy is mostly focused on what Maton calls relation to rather than relation with knowledge (Maton, 2000). Young has argued that

a problem that is perhaps better expressed as a contradiction. On the one hand 'knowledge' has undoubtedly become the major organising category in the educational policies of the international organisations and many national governments... On the other hand, the category knowledge appears to be used in an almost rhetorical way, the meaning of knowledge is at best implicit and at worst virtually empty of content (Young, 2009: 193).

A vibrant research culture within Humanities and Social Sciences entails more than the utility of the knowledge produced. Vibrant research within these disciplines has traditionally meant the commitment to the production of knowledge that has moral worth and is guided by free intellectual inquiry. According to Maton (2000), the notion of a knowledge knower can be framed in these debates of knowledge economy (science and technology) and knowledge society (liberal arts and Humanities). The scientific culture has, through history, received meteoric rise in stature due to its strong knowledge codes, as opposed to the liberal arts and Humanities that have strong knower codes. This is to say that there are several dichotomies which have come to resemble the two cultures. These are abstract/concrete, active/reflective, cultural/cognitive, effective/ineffective, context-independent/context-dependent; and conceptual/contextual. Maton argues that these dichotomies are a fallacy that position liberal arts, social science and the Humanities as insecure and on the decline. According to Maton, the difference between the two cultures is found within their knowledge structures, and that both disciplines are as functional and important as the other. Maton argues that the crises within the Humanities and its current tendency to try and conform to the market imperatives of innovation have caused research within these fields to focus less on the pursuit of knowledge. Maton argues that the difference in knowledge structures of the two cultures does not mean the incapacity of the Humanities to produce cumulative knowledge. The knowledge-knower structures in intellectual fields highlight how cumulative knowledge can be built within a field.

Conclusion

This study is both a study of culture and knowledge production within the Humanities faculty at Rhodes university. As proven by the vast literature on institutional culture, culture informs organisational behaviour and in turn organisational context, demographics and history informs culture. The culture of knowledge production is intrinsically linked to the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the research community. Because culture is a social phenomenon which is constructed by the normative realities of dominant discourses it can be biased, exclusionary and antagonistic to alternatives. As Prasad (2003) notes in postcolonial contexts the study of an organisational culture must remain context sensitive with particular attention being paid to the colonial encounter. Organisation studies that are ahistorical can facilitate the reproduction of alienating research cultures. The institutional culture, like the

broader outside community, is the context a research community is located within. The research community like any other organisation has to adapt and negotiate its contextual realities. It is within these negotiations characterised by problem solving that shared norms and values on the meaning of research and how to do research are developed. Prasad argues that problem solving can be characterised by problem denial where a problem has become so normalised and familiar within an organisational culture that it is not seen as a irregularity of the culture.

This study takes cognisance of the fact that beyond the postcolonial realities there are other phenomena such as globalisation and neoliberalism that have affected and influenced the research culture. To understand the interplay of such phenomena and how knowledge is acquired and disseminated within the research community involves looking beyond numbers of research productivity and decipher the implicit norms and values of the community. This was the approach of this thesis in a bid to unearth the research culture of the Rhodes University Humanities faculty.

Chapter Five: Funding

Introduction

According to postcolonial theory, there is a dynamic nature in the production of culture, which is to say that culture is not static and unchanging but is always negotiating various variables. The participants in this study highlight that the issue of funding and access to funding within an African context is a major determinant to research and research culture amidst the historical context. Historically African universities were regarded as development agents whose main aim was to produce a skill force for the economic development of a country. Universities were thus heavily dependant on state subsidy and their management was heavily linked to government policies (Kweik, 2010). Participants also raise that funding not only affects the research productivity but also helps to shape the research culture of the faculty. According to Hill (1999), there are several ways in which funding affects research culture; the rituals that are necessary to gain approval for funding and the fact that funding is an external constraint create problems of survival and adaptation as well as competition and contingency constraints. According to Andreotti (2011), the processes that facilitate and preserve culture, in an institution or an organization work to create a relationship of cultural injustices rooted in economic imbalances.

According to Benner & Sandström (2000), the norms of an institution are shaped by research funding, as its reward structure influences the performance and evaluation of research. According to literature, research funding highlights the growth of new commercial and private providers (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009) the commodification of education (Gumport, 2000) and the prospect of new trade policy frameworks (Tilak, 2008) as the core factors that necessitate an introspection of the implications of funding of public higher education institutions on other core values of university research. Within the Rhodes University Humanities faculty there exists funded research and non-funded research. Funded research is externally funded and most of the researchers who are unfunded draw from the internal grant provided by the institution. Staff members who are considered highly productive have external funding, which they generate on their own and use it towards personal research. This money, therefore, is personalised to the individual researcher who is

accountable only to the funders and not the department or the institution. As Remler and Pema (2009) point out, it is no secret that research is a marketable good for faculty and members of a research community who engage in funded research. The authors also note that this is also true for unfunded research as it acts as an income generator for the institute. Non-funded research along with funded research can attract subsidies from the government which directly translates to university income via subsidy earning research output.

Through the development of subsidy earning research output, the post-apartheid government has juxtaposed autonomy and accountability by developing a funding formula and a process of quality assurance that pushes for explicit declarations of performance in the academic enterprise. Jansen (2004: 310), argues that this is a new regime of “performance management systems, quality assurance protocols and institutional benchmarks” on research outputs that make accountability a part of the academic career, academic identity and academic culture. Jansen also points out that this accountability is performance related and also determines promotion, remuneration and retention. The quantitative data and participants in this study reveal how funding formulae and the rewards mechanism of the institution affect their research careers and is also a strong determinant of the research culture.

A vast amount of literature highlights that funding policies of higher education institutions resemble a cut and paste of western liberal policies (Ball, 2015; Harris, 2005; Shahjahan, 2011; Zarkov, 2015). According to Giroux (2002), neoliberalism has spread the gospel of the market and the value of corporate culture in the universities and outside of the classroom through privatisation and commercialisation. Globalisation has spread these ideologies, which are now being accepted as the norm, and they restructure funding rationales. Giroux (2002) problematizes corporations joining with universities to privatise services that used to be the sole responsibility of the university. Slaughter (2001: 24) observes that “professors in fields other than science and engineering who attract funds usually do so from foundations which account for a relatively small proportion of overall research funding.” Giroux (2002) also adds that those professors who are rewarded for bringing in outside money will be more heavily represented in fields such as science and engineering, which attract corporate and government research funding.

Castells (2001) argues that because economic success in the knowledge economy is rooted in the high production of competitive and value added end products and services, higher

education success will more and more depend on technological knowledge and on continual innovation. However, Clark (1996) disputes this view, arguing that the creation of market driven research agendas should not be seen as parallel to the traditional role of the institution but rather as complimentary. He further argues that “knowledge-based institutions” should be more conscious of possibilities for risk-taking investment in new fields along with recombination’s of old fields. He further stresses that “certain ways of organizing knowledge offer the possibility of sustained insight, even to the point of a systematic claim on wisdom” (Clark, 1996, 430).

Performance based Research funding

The new performative worker is a promiscuous self, an enterprising self, with a passion for excellence. For some, this is an opportunity to make a success of themselves, for others it portends inner conflicts, inauthenticity and resistance. It is also suggested that performativity produces opacity rather than transparency as individuals and organizations take ever greater care in the construction and maintenance of fabrications (Ball, 2003: 215).

According to Kelly:

So you need to be seen as a productive researcher. So there are two tiers to it, the more money you get in terms of research funding you need to be seen spending it so need to be producing publications but you also need to be producing students. So they push for masters and PHDs because at the end of the day when we go for promotion, what are they going to ask us, who have you supervised to completion not how many people are still in the supervision processes but how many have completed.

Kelly raises that there is a lot of emphasis being placed on performativity, human capital and the viewing of students as consumers. The emphasis on such values have been problematized by Archer (2008) who asserts that present in academia are contested identities of what it means to be an academic. Archer (2008) sustains that, academic identities involve a process of becoming and unbecoming, a process inseparable from personal and political identities. In

her narrative Kelly states that one has to be able to be 'seen as' a productive researcher. In this she highlights how performativity has restructured the goals of researchers from free intellectual inquiry to the counting of publication output and graduates. So one has to be seen producing publications even at the expense of quality. Kistner (2008), highlights that performance-based research funding threatens the institutions of open intellectual inquiry and creates various problems for the university namely; the erosion of research culture, massification, marketization, privatization, casualization and the notions of students as private clients. Archer (2008: 388) points out that the neoliberal funding imperatives which are organized around "constant surveillance, auditing and assessment of performance" creates inauthenticity within the performative worker who has to constantly "produce particular products within specified timescales and parameters" (2008: 389).

The secondary data of this study, which is in the form of yearly research reports, reveals that funding is the fuel of research and that research outputs provide resources and income for the institution. There are two main avenues for researchers within the Humanities faculty to access research funding: external funding, which is money from donor, companies and other non-governmental agencies, and through the internal funding via the research office. The internal grant only provides a maximum of 30, 000 rand per individual. The internal grant is money from the government paid out per research output capital. Therefore, government grants are monies allocated according to the research productivity of the institution. This money is then converted into the research grant, which is provided to the most productive researchers within the institution. According to Arthur,

The 30000 is contingent upon showing on-going research in terms of graduates and your own publications. So you have to be accountable for it; it has been happening in part because of the financial crisis within the university and it has been tightening up in the last 2-3 years so it is no longer a guarantee you have to prove your academic record to get the 30000, the same as getting more for travelling for conferences, if you make an application for an international conference and you have a weak research record they won't give it to you.

The rationale for performance-based research funding within the institution is that funds should flow to researchers who perform well, as this makes them more competitive, and also stimulates members of the research community who don't perform as well to rise to the

occasion (Knight, 2008). When Arthur refers to the need to prove your academic record he alludes to accountability being a major driving forces of funding mechanism as strategies to improve the capacity of university-based research. Performance is thus not judged by quality of work produced but productivity in countable publications. Ball (2012) argues that the effect of this is that, professionals are re-invented as calculable units of resources whose performance and productivity must constantly be audited for enhancement. The changing nature of funding agencies from funding institutions to funding productive individuals and productive disciplines fits in the discourse of the knowledge economy which negates the societal role of university based research (Knight, 2007).

There is an assumption within the performativity culture, that all individuals within the community have the same access to resources if they are competitive. Bourdieu (1984), however, points out that the notion of a level competitive field is fiction as competition is better at creating private goods than public goods and is in favour of individuals and researchers with the adequate amount of social and cultural capital that enables them to be competitive. According to Andreotti (2011), this argument for filtering away money from non-performing members of the research community is a form of sanctioned ignorance which disguises the fact that it is rather a lack of control over production of resources and knowledge production, and not an inability to perform, that creates non-productive researchers.

The culture of performativity is described as “a powerful and insidious policy technology that is now at work at all levels and in all kinds of education and public service, a technology that links effort, values, purposes and self-understanding to measures and comparisons of output” (Ball, 2012: 19). This has positioned performance based funding as the best practice in promoting excellence and good-quality education. According to Andreotti (2011), the re-direction of the government and the institutions to performance based funding is a neoliberal initiative that reproduces the ideology that the lack of prosperity within African countries is because there is a lack of valid knowledge for the creation of wealth, and this prevents them from growing economically. As performativity acts as a moral system that reconfigures the academic culture to its ends, the institutions reproduce such claims when they focus on productivity and self-sufficiency; notions which de-politicise the poor performance of other researchers by labelling researchers as lazy or lacking valid knowledge (Ball, 2012).

According to Kelly,

Funding primarily affects young academics because they have no reputation to go on because funders also look at what have you published. Are you a public intellectual, in other words do you have the academic currency and that is not courses you have taught it is what you have published.

Kelly highlights that the capital value of academics is measured according to the number of publications produced by an academic. Academic currency in the form research outputs constructs the identity of an academic- either as a performing or non-performing individual. However, Andreotti (2011) argues that, the neoliberal funding that assumes a levelled competitive field to attain the status of productive researcher is a sanctioned ignorance of a global community that pretends that there is a free flow of commodities and cultures within an epistemologically homogeneous and power free global space. Andreotti, discusses that there are other forms of capital, such as navigational capital, which one needs in order to manoeuvre through a racially hostile institute. The framing of the new performative worker racially signifies normalized beliefs about backwardness inherent within blackness. In her narrative Kelly highlights that young academics which in a South African context is mainly young black academics are excluded from access to funding. The yearly research reports revealed that most of the productive staff members with the most access to both internal and external funding are white academics. Although this is not a deliberate racial discrimination, the funding system if not hyper-sensitive to the apartheid history ends up facilitating the reproduction of exclusion based on race.

A study of the research reports shows that in the years preceding 2012 all research was considered equal, but now there is a differentiation between peer reviewed subsidy earning research and peer reviewed non-subsidy earning research. An analysis of the staff members that are considered the highest achievers and most productive within the faculty reveals that they have access to external funding which they generate on their own and use towards personal research. This money is personalized to the individual researcher, who is accountable only to the funders and not the department or the institution. In this regard, external funding facilitates research groups that are affiliated to the departments or faculty

but are not under the stipulations that appear in internal grants. In the Humanities faculty there are various research groups and institutes that are funded by external funding which can operate as sub-cultures. On several instances, Leon mentions how funding opportunities mostly lie outside the department and faculty: “So these kind of opportunities lie outside the department, but we assist and recommend that students get support.” Elsewhere Leon, speaking about external funding, states:

But in this department there is a Prof who has a research project which combines scholarships, bursaries and research funding from field work but that is isolated from the department and does not go through the department, so that is not a departmental thing. So it is organized by the faculty but not of the faculty in the sense that those around the centre make their own decisions; they report to a board and not to the faculty, but the funding is not faculty funding, it is outside American Funding.

Literature discusses that another characteristic of academic capitalism is that research teams and centres aim to produce tangible, measurable outcomes that will enhance their attractiveness for further funding from the corporate sector, and begin to create ‘quasi-firms’ within the university (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). This, according to Washburn (2008), manifests itself in two ways: firstly, senior researchers are transformed into research managers who focus on winning resources, employing junior researchers and developing a successful research enterprise. And, secondly, there is a shifting balance between research conducted for the public interest versus research conducted for the private interest. Slaughter & Leslie (1997) argue that academics employed in public institutions have moved away from curiosity driven research and have adopted market-like behaviour which makes them resemble tender entrepreneurs whose main aim is to make a profit and enhance their profiles.

This notion is supported by Portia who argues that, “it very much depends on the individual if they are attracting funding or if they are getting it and who it is then used for.” Elsewhere, the participant goes on to say,

Yeah, so then obviously the more money I attracted in my own capacity the easier it got to apply for more, so I actually became affiliated to the research Institute. They didn't employ me; I generated all my own funding and I did that until, but somewhere along the line I did do my Masters, I cannot remember exact dates but I did do the Masters.

Kwiek (2015) highlights that funding is playing a fundamental role in the formation of research identities, and it has also altered the norms within research. He found in his research that academics associate having a grant with academic success, and the pursuit of excellence is measured by publishing in subsidy earning journals and attracting external research funds. The same funding formula is used on the internal grant within Rhodes university, which one can only access after proving performativity. In her narrative Portia also highlights that the context of research funding has changed, whilst as a young academic without a masters degree she was able to access funding in the early 90s the same is not possible in the current context. Like Kelly alluded to, one has to have a reputation. This funding system creates a binary of productive/hardworking academics with funding and non-performing/lazy academics without funding without being attentive to the historical and contextual realities that give rise to this binary. Marginson and Considine (2000) argues that, the new funding formula has singled out the research grant income as the new primary measure of research achievement/success by university management.

According to Down (2009), funding mechanisms that are based on a corporate culture have been constructed as though they are value neutral and inevitable. The assumption made is that success is hinged on individual merit and hard work used to acquire credentials and rewards (Down, 2009). The neoliberal imperative makes a globalised assumption about equality and access within the world, and in doing this neoliberalism serve to uplift the cultural supremacy of western worldviews as being neutral and universal (Andreotti, 2011). These universality claims restructure the academic society along western neoliberal norms and expectations to the detriment of local goals and ambitions. According to Andreotti (2011), notions of communalism are replaced by individualistic notions. Participants in this study reveal that there is a highly individualistic culture within the faculty. According to Nandi,

A lot of the time as a researcher you are having to learn things you have not done before: in terms of teaching, like how you put a funding proposal together; no one tells you that. So we assist each other in creating research proposals, not funding proposals, and the institution does not provide that either. So if you do not learn that stuff soon it is an obstacle, you block yourself, you are already blocked.

In this regard, participants explain that while funding is certainly an obstacle in doing research, the silence surrounding sharing ideas becomes a barrier against new members entering the research community. Kelly states that,

you have to keep your network as small as possible because within that network if someone is quicker in terms of writing a funding proposal then you lose out, so the competition becomes around funding because I need money, particularly in the Humanities to go and do research just like in the sciences. So funding becomes a big obstacle. Time as well... So we keep hearing that we do not have the money, we do have the money but we are not telling people how to access that money.

Leon discusses this, stating that research funding applications are done,

individually, because everyone has their own research focus and projects but there are limits to what they can ask for – it's not very much; it's maybe around up to 30 000 a year and that pays for some country travel. The other thing is conference funding, which is now subject to some sort of conditions; you need to have graduated a number postgraduate students, you need to show that you have published recently and you need to show you published out of the previous conference you attended so it is now fairly conditional on you having to show productivity towards research outputs in the form of articles, books, chapters or contributions to conferences or in terms of post graduate output.

Ball (2012) highlights that there is a tension between collegiality and performances as academics cannot care about both simultaneously. Members of the research community are rewarded by making themselves convincing spectacles through research outputs, and this makes it hard for them to work together. The identities of academics are constructed or fabricated with an eye on the competition which is usually colleagues and junior staff members. Marginson & Rhoades (2002) has referred to the danger of research being policy led and research identities being colonised as a result of the new research economy. So as brought up by Leon research focus is diverse and because Rhodes University departments are relatively small and has small numbers which makes it difficult for a formidable amount of collaboration to take place. There is a need to recognise that individual assessment of researchers also makes the goals of research personal to the individual researcher and not the goals of the research community, and this destroys a collegiality culture (Kemp, 2013) and breeds the culture of entrepreneurialism (Ylijoki, 2003). This over-emphasis on human

capital reinforces meritocratic ideologies of individual responsibility which assert that the lack of progress and productivity is a product of the individual, not social structures (Andreotti, 2011).

The construction of an academic identity

The participants in this study recognised the importance of professionalism, criticality, academic freedom and collaboration as part of the faculty's research culture. However, there were opposing accounts to the construction of an academic identity. Kelly raises the fact that:

If I look at the way an academic is scripted, it is somebody in contemporary South Africa and it is somebody who has a PhD and publishes a lot. But the research is more important than the teaching and is intent on creating a reputation for himself and understands that that reputation is not built on teaching but research because the reputation is not only local, it has to be international. So to me, an academic pushes that. His or her research, publications, funding, writing funding proposals, getting funding and having post-graduate students so that's an academic and I am not that. I find myself in the academy but my focus is not only on research; I enjoy research as much as teaching and the more I have established myself more in the academy the more I [am] shifting to want to do more research so this is where I share some compatibility with an academic.

Archer (2008) found the same kind of academic contestation in one of her studies. Her participants spoke of valuing the traditional construction of an academic identity embedded in collegiality and intellectualism. However, she later discusses that the notion of traditional academic identity was discussed by participants as being part of a golden age before the entry of capitalism and neoliberal agendas. The author found that the process of being an academic has changed in the neoliberal dispensation, and that the academic identity is scripted in accordance to performativity, accountability and funding grants. Participants also highlighted that teaching as part of an academic identity is declining because it does not yield any tangible rewards and does not lead to career advancement.

Power and knowledge production

Access to educational resources translates to access to meaning making, and this serves to reproduce or contest already existing discourses. Globalisation and the neoliberal funding mechanism within the globalization discourse are blind to difference. Postcolonial theory problematizes this, arguing that there are historically constructed inequalities in power, mobility and resources within the global South , and these affect culture and facilitate culture reproduction. The notion of equal access makes assumptions of equal cultural and social capital. According to Luke

the whole idea of Rhodes [is that] there are certain people who bring in the bulk of the subsidy, but that subsidy is used more strategically to enable, because often the people who are doing most research have access to all sorts of external funding and they often do not need the internal grant.

However, data reveals that the productive staff, which are mostly senior members, are usually the ones privy to the internal grant despite their access to external funding. The institution's demographics highlights that white males over the age of 30 are the ones who do most of the publishing, followed by white females and then black males. Quantitative findings show an unequal demographic representation of productive staff members, which are here depicted as representing middle aged white males. Although junior or incoming researchers are given the opportunity to apply for funding, the neoliberal funding mechanisms attach progress to those that have privilege over those that were disempowered (Tikly, 2001). Research culture has been highlighted as having a tribal nature of “academic disciplines and specialisms and the relationship between academic cultures and forms of knowledge” and “power relations which inform and shape academic cultures, noting the ways in which ‘dominant’ academic culture tends to privilege and reflect masculinity, white, middle-class, etc. values, identities and assumptions” (Archer, 2008: 265) .

Participants also mention the impact of external funding on what research is done and how research is done. Participants highlight that, when searching for funding, one is confronted with the conditions of the funders. Bradley states that

there is always implications on funding in the sense that the funders want you to do certain kinds of things in certain ways, so there is

always negotiations with the funders also. So you try and find funders who leave you with the opportunity to do the kind of things you want to do, and you try and find funders who agree with what you are trying to do. So...ideally you need to diversify your funding from all sort of different places.

According to Altbach (2015), knowledge production consists of centres and peripheries. According to the global world order, powerful universities with access to more resources have higher academic standards and are internationally recognized and are the centres. Andreotti (2011) asserts that these peripheries fall within undeveloped and developing countries, which are viewed as not having cumulative knowledge. According to Teferra & Altbachl (2004), between 70%- 90% of the research conducted in Africa depends on external support. According to the author, this limits autonomy and independence of African researches regarding what is researched. Apart from being influenced by bodies such as nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), the World Bank and other such bodies, Africa is a major recipient and consumer of knowledge distributed from the large industrialised nations. According to Tikly (2004), this funding mechanism requires historically disadvantaged researchers, who form the bulk of new researchers, to become more entrepreneurial while negating the fact that their counterparts, who they compete with, have an added advantage of cultural and social capital.

Mbebme (2015) is sceptical about inventions from the west that have developmental agendas that seek to provide opportunities to Southern institutions to combat prejudices and inequalities. According to Andreotti (2011), these funding agencies have the effect of depoliticising the transformation agenda within the institute, and making it ahistorical. They are usually paternalistic in nature, highly regulated and end up creating deficit theorizing policies and practices. According to findings from a study conducted by Andreotti, there is usually a pre-determination of the problems that need to be addressed which is simplistic in nature. The researcher, in this case the person that individually submits the research proposal to funders, is the determinant of what is valid knowledge that needs to be interrogated. The postcolonial theory “problematizes the epistemic privilege of producers of knowledge, dispensers of rights, educators, researchers, and representatives of the oppressed, and challenges unexamined benevolence and charity (i.e., help as the burden of the fittest)” (Andreotti, 2011: 49).

Participants also highlight that access to funding dictates what kind of topic students choose for their PhDs; funding that is accessed through external agents are given to individual professors who have research topics, and students are limited to explore ideas within these research areas. Another aspect that was raised surrounds the fact that government funding is limited to scholarships or bursaries that cover tuition and living expenses, but it does not facilitate the long-term goals of the student. This includes those whose desire is to become academics once the PhD is attained; for this, the young researcher has to compete for resources with senior staff members. Research topics and areas are thus chosen in accordance with accessibility, not interest. Oscar also discusses how funding affects work that is produced in the academy, arguing that,

I was mentioning about the power of different groups in the academy: so for instance certain things do not count as proper academic work because the people who are deciding [are] the ones have the power, and the ones who have the power are determined by our history... so you have the problem of how you will get funding how you will convince people that your project counts as research so that they can fund you.

Assié-Lumumba (2006) argues that the postcolonial era plunged universities in Africa into a crisis intensified by complex global issues and by the main issue of funding. To Assié-Lumumba (2006), transformation of higher education has to be led by an assessment of funding systems and funding agencies. She points out that there are two main dimensions of funding relevant in analysing the African higher education crises. Firstly, for the ability of the university to fulfil its mandate to society and realise its educational goals there has to be an availability of resources. And, secondly, the agencies that are able to provide financial resources also end up with full decision-making authority to determine management and research policies. She argues further that transformation is thus thwarted because sources of higher education funding inevitably control the learning and intellectual output, and the limitations of the production of knowledge and access to publications.

Transformation in African universities is argued to mean Africanisation, racial equality, gender equality and social cohesion. What is raised here is that funding facilitates certain traditions according to who has the resources to do research. These traditions in turn determine what knowledge is produced. Oscar also goes on to say that,

certain individuals, certain departments, certain groups which have kind of positioned themselves in which they do kind of look... they have the resources and funding and they have been positioned in that way but what they are doing is precisely this kind of inward looking; engaging with academics... which makes the academy this ivory tower which has nothing to do with people around them.

Tracking individual contributions in publications, citations, external grants and patents within the faculty and institution give individualistic prestige to a faculty or individual members of a faculty (Shaker and Plater, 2016). As governments and external funders use accountability to track time allocated to funded projects, faculties engage in these efforts of individual advancement through peer review and marketability (Shaker and Plater, 2016). As highlighted previously by Luke, there is a small community of productive researchers within the faculty of Humanities research community that bring in most of the subsidy. Kelly also mentions that,

the research demands are increasing as I go forward. Broadly speaking, Rhodes is the highest per capita research output institution, the smallest but we publish the most and a lot of that comes from the sciences. But we also get a lot from the Humanities and Social Sciences, so if we look at the understanding around fees at the moment, we are going to have to get government subsidy, which is dwindling. One of the only ways to get government subsidy is to publish, so the demands are higher because the money is not just going to come from somewhere and we are a small institution; we do not have the numbers, so the subsidy that is given to students is not going to make the short fall, we are going to have to publish more.

According to Shaker & Plater (2016), these individual contributions are reported in national statistics as the overall contribution of the institution towards national economic and social development. However, this paints a very erroneous picture of intensive research productivity versus transformation and equity goals within the institution.

Accountability

Previously, it was my decision as head of department to invite someone provided the money was available; I would simply inform the administration. Now I have to seek permission and it has to be

checked and controlled by various people in HR what I am proposing and that is not always a smooth process and it involves also the finance division of the university (Leon).

The controlling mechanisms within the university are reflective of the need to create accountable academics that produce, as opposed to the unsurveilled autonomous academic; the academic who does not produce (Archer, 2008). This audit culture creates a lot of pressure on academics, and participants reiterated that the university is placing increasing pressure on them to produce measurable outputs. According to Leon,

there used to be a teaching culture, but it is now balanced with an emphasis on research and publications because that is also a source of funding for the university. It had to do that because it relies on the income from publications...publications in recognized journals and books give the university an income from government.

The external pressures of the new funding frameworks from the South African government, from the block grant to research per output capita, has lead the institutions and faculties to re-adjust their goals and motives for research. Governments are increasingly requiring universities to develop new funding rules and accountability systems for maintaining a tighter linkage between resourcing and research output (Jansen, 2004). According to Billot (2010), the pressure to perform according to prescribed international standards that is placed on institutions by external pressures has led to closer scrutiny on research activities and research performance. According to Ylijoki (2003), the result has been that academics have greater accountability but reduced autonomy. Research funding strategies that nurture accountability and competition for resources amongst institutions and individual research have transformed research norms from the neutral, unbiased pursuit of knowledge, to the capitalization of knowledge for business and economic purposes (Ylijoki, 2003). Byrne (2016) states that the funding framework based on incentive has had tremendous negative effects. He says that

although many academics who had never produced anything suddenly started publishing [with the incentive of subsidy], I am not convinced that standards have improved because much academic writing published in South Africa does not have enough basic research in it. The motive of writing articles for money is wrong, wrong, wrong! It's morally wrong and it is not likely to produce anything of any standard (2016: 1).

He further argues that this framework has produced “academics who, spurred by the desire for money, sit in front of their computers and bring poorly researched pieces into existence” (2016: 2). According to Byrne, truly valuable basic research ought to be conducted in archives, and he claims that the accreditation of poorly researched work deteriorates quality research. Geuna (2001) argues that the new post 1990s funding rationale stimulates cost efficient behaviour from universities insofar as it creates incentives for productivity increases and cost minimization. Reiterating the importance of funding, Leon stated that

in this point in time money is the stumbling block towards transformation. This is also due to the fact that there has been a high neglect of the higher education. It is an issue now of does this country continue to be able to contribute to research in the world and in this continent or not, because there has been a relative decline of the commitment to funding research in this country that we have really reached this point and you know it is possible that we go back just a teaching university, most of the universities in the developing universities are just teaching universities... At one point, the World Bank was saying why do developing countries need universities, why not send the students to Australia and close the universities; they cost too much money. I feel that governments in the developing world make a commitment to the higher education sector and to research output because at the end that makes us either subjects or objects in the world. If we can promote our own ideas and create solutions to our own problems an analysis of our own history and where we are as a society and it does not allow others to determine us and say who we are, it allows us to say who we are and where we are and where we want to be going. Universities are receptors and producers of knowledge, and the more it is indigenous based, based on our situation now regarding our issues and our context, the better. So promoting a research culture is not a given to make it sustainable; you need to attract people, keep them motivated and incentivize them and South Africa is at that point and they need to put resources towards universities.

This importance of funding, which was echoed throughout this study by participants, is summarised in Leon’s narrative. Funding is discussed a major contributor to the success of transformation imperatives. Funding mechanism can colonise knowledge production systems and give importance to market rationales at the expense of intellectual scholarship and academic freedom. As Shahjahan comments,

In higher education, neoliberalism is a primary actor in the colonization of our ways of being, namely, what seems thinkable and practicable in the neoliberal context structures and limits our lives and social relations as educators and administrators... We

perpetuate the assumption that students are consumers who should enhance their human capital to secure jobs in a volatile labour market. In this field of constraints and limits, resistance becomes a crucial means to meaningful self-actualization in learning/work experiences, more equitable social relations, human dignity and connection, and establishing a space for radical possibilities to experiment with a future vision of society in HE (Shahjahan, 2014: 4).

Although there are contestations on the meaning on indigenous knowledges that are raised by Leon, such debates offer alternatives and promote spaces for radical possibilities. Funding in a postcolonial Africa thus places a pivotal role in the development and transformation of research cultures.

Conclusion

Literature suggests that funding is increasingly coming from private investment rather than from public funding (Levy, 2003). The lack of research funding determines who researches what, and this becomes a barrier for new academics. The increase in reliance on funding agencies has also been linked to a dramatic increase in regulation and compliance requirements (Altbach *et al.*, 2009). The mainstream academics, who are mostly western, act as the drafters of these regulations and requirements for what is considered valid research. The mainstream academics from affluent countries act in accordance with values and norms of research developed in the western world and in accordance with the western context, and these determine how they play a key role as gatekeepers of inclusion and exclusion.

In this study a key finding on the effects of funding is that market-driven funding has not only affected the relationship amongst academic disciplines, but has also affected the relationship between teaching and research. The mechanisms of funding and quality assurance, have created tensions between the traditional roles of teaching and research of the university. Kweik (2010) asserts that the two missions once complemented each other but now compete for resources, and states that universities have been forced to choose a mission statement that includes either research excellence or teaching excellence at the cost of the other. Neumann & Guthrie (2002) argue that performance based funding strategies have created a binary between teaching and research, where academics are forced to either choose

one as opposed to being able to merge the two. Consequently, this has the negative effect of creating narrow academics who neglect their teaching responsibility, and furthermore places institutions into groups: either “teaching” or “research” universities, with a third group predominately “teaching” but undertaking some “research”. The changing funding formulae is also highlighted by participants as affecting how research is done.

Chapter 6: How

According to Hill (1999), one of the ways of deciphering an organisation's research culture is by studying and understanding how research is conducted. The culture is revealed in the shared goals, norms and values that drive research agendas. Literature on higher education research highlights that most practices surrounding how research is conducted within higher education have shifted in the past years. According to Ball (2012), research used to be guided by traditional values such as ideas and results sharing, collegiality and individual research, but these have been replaced by market-oriented research practices that encourage competition and entrepreneurship. The impact of these global changes on universities varies due to contextual differences that are brought about by geographical location in accordance with faculty and department within the university. How research is done was shown in this study to be affected by external variables and university policies.

Subcultures

According to Hill, counter-cultures and subcultures operate as an alternative of, or in opposition to, the dominant culture while contributing to the overall research culture of the organization. Hill (1999) suggests that the subcultures and counter cultures can exist in the form of research groups, departments, or various academic disciplines. Drawing from this description of subcultures, it is a given that within any university faculty there will be subcultures that exist mainly in the forms of different departments and academic disciplines. The six departments in the Humanities faculty that are involved in this study have varying research philosophies. Even though they all feed into the dominant qualitative way of doing research within the Humanities, participants highlight that approaches towards qualitative research differ between departments. The Anthropology department, for instance, emphasises intensive field work, while Philosophy involves in-depth study of written or secondary material. The quantitative data in the form of Rhodes University's yearly research reports from 2010-2014 shows that within the Humanities faculty there are various research groups:

the Institute of Social and Economic Research, the Institute of the Study of English in Africa, the Allan Gray Centre for Leadership Ethics and the Unit for Humanities at Rhodes University. These research institutes have their own sources of funding and they report to their funders, meaning that the faculty has little to no say in the practices and way these research institutes are structured. As previously noted by Leon, these centers get American money and they are isolated from the Faculty as “those around the center make their own decisions; they report to a board and not to the faculty.”

The Humanities faculty has individual academics who procure external funding which they use to source their own students. Although the students have to meet academic standards set by the department, the decisions on study criteria, including which students get funded and what they research, rest solely with the individual academic and funders. These groups are affiliated to the faculty or to certain departments within the faculty, but they have absolute autonomy. According to participants, these groups and individuals have more funding than the departments and the faculty. They have the ability to fund field work and conference attendance which the faculty cannot afford. There are contested views on the impact of such external funding within literature. On one hand, there are academics who argue that new commercial and private providers have caused the erosion of the traditional role of research (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Gumpert, 2000; Marginson, 2011). On the other hand, there are those who argue that the creation of market-driven research agendas should not be seen as parallel to the traditional role of the institution, but rather as a complimentary phenomenon (Clark, 1998). Leslie *et al.* (2016) note that external university research funding is bound by contract that states that the university must enhance national economic development through the strengthening of competitiveness, and that the university needs to increase the short-term efficiency of the institution. Participants in this study highlight that the growth of external funding has affected quantity of research and practices surrounding how research is done.

The quantitative data and an introspection of the research history of the Humanities faculty reveals that prior to 2014, research within the Humanities faculty was done mainly by individual researchers and not in collaboration. The surge of external funding, however, has changed the research landscape by creating research centres where academics come together and find a common field of study, attract funding and conduct research in teams. According to Connell (2004), these research institutes act as quasi-firms whose primary objective is

bidding for resources, making an impact and improving productivity. The scope of funding on faculty level is very limited as it heavily relies on the university and government. The research teams and institutes have a wider income range, which gives them autonomy and independence from the faculty and departments. As previously alluded to by Leon, these firms operate outside the parameters of the department, which makes them sub-cultures with different values, objectives and goals. Portia also highlights that,

I mean, early in the onset of my career I worked at a research institute and, ironically, even before that the whole thing of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary of research became popular I was already involved in it. I have been extremely lucky in terms of that because I think it is very, very difficult to break into that mould, because institutionally we are not aligned to embracing interdisciplinary research. Because I have not been in a department, I have been able to avoid these institutional factors of who gets the credit, where students come and all that, you know they are not aligned to embracing multidisciplinary research at all. Not at all.

In her narrative, Portia highlights how research teams and institutes offer an alternative to the dominant way of conducting research which, according to Portia, is very limiting. According to Ylijoki (2003: 328), the university research environment is not homogeneous but comprises of a diversity of 'small worlds' and 'academic tribes'. Hill (1997) notes that because different members of a research community are drawn to various ways of conducting research – such as quantitative research vs. qualitative research and, in Portia's case, disciplinary research vs. multidisciplinary research – subcultures make a lot of sense. The departments offer a mainstream way of conducting research and are unable to finance intensive research. Although Portia argues that the departments are not aligned to embrace inter-disciplinary work, Leon argues that "in this point in time money is the stumbling block towards transformation". With the university offering a maximum of 30,000 per year per individual researcher, funding becomes the driving incentive to create an alternative research arena that the departments are not financially capacitated to develop and nurture.

Some sub-cultures operate as counter-cultures that aggressively confront the dominant culture. Some participants in this study highlight that it is very hard to critique or formulate independent thought within the departments; they use words such as mainstream, formal and dominant to describe faculty and departmental research. According to Bradley,

in this research group we are trying to provide conditions for the creation of different ways of thinking. We are trying to provide in this particular organization conditions for both staff and students in order for them to think critically, in a context where there is not that much critical thought in the Humanities faculty at present. Most universities seem to follow certain academic trends and overwhelmingly to think within existing parameters and work within existing narratives. What we are trying to do here, in this research group, is to try and transform modes of thought in order for people to try and emancipate their thinking as a first step towards thinking more broadly human emancipation. In this research group we are providing an environment where people can think independently for themselves outside of the narrow mainstream paradigms which come from the west, which we are trying to transcend. We are not saying they are hopeless; we do not want to dismiss the west. Of course we want to learn but we have to have a critically attitude towards and we have to also look at literature which emanates from Africa, other countries, from other third world countries so that we provide a broader experience of thinking so we are doing it in practice. So we are trying to transform thinking in practice here, in terms of our day to day activities.

Within the African context, counter-cultures have been discussed as vital to the higher education system due to the colonial and apartheid legacy. Counter-cultures are discussed as counter-hegemonic, falling under resistant theories such as decolonisation, postcolonisation and Africanisation theories. Arthur describes these theories as formulating a “small community” of individuals who are trying to effect change. In this regard, counter-cultures are not seeking to offer a mere alternative of conductive research, but view the practices within mainstream research practices as questionable and in need of transformation. In Bradley’s narrative one notes that ontological and epistemological resistance is a major facet of the Humanities faculty research culture. The question of ontological factors – how research is done – as alluded to by Oscar:

I am very critical of these institutional hurdles that one has to jump through, ranging from the processes via which the proposal goes through. The system for it to be accepted emphasizing on methodology and ethics, they can be very useful as they have prevented very unethical research from being done before, but I find them always problematic... So you spend X amount of time doing your proposal, and once you are done then you can start whereas in my view if you genuinely committed to doing useful research that is both innovative in a theoretical sense and committed to the people you are working with, questions around ethics, around method, around language, around power relations -- they need to be

continuous processes. It is not something you write in your introduction and you are done with it; it must run throughout even after your project is completed.

Within these counter-cultures there is a rigorous confrontation of the taken-for-granted processes of doing research. According to Hill (1997), a counter-culture can be an agent for change if it continuously receives adequate support. Ylijoki (2003) argues that due to the over-reliance on external funding, these research institutes – whether operating as sub-cultures or counter-cultures – only run as short-term projects. This is a grave limitation, as members of research institutes cannot then have long term-goals. In his narrative, Bradley has utopic long-term goals, but his research team is reliant on external funding which is subject to review and renewal so continuity is not guaranteed. Ylijoki (2003) notes that the uncertainty of externally funded short-term projects can also affect quality of work that is produced, as substantial research goals cannot be met within short-term projects. Arthur alludes to this when he laments his inability to continue with his research project which had been running for three years. He states that although he has requested more funds and has shown evidence that there is still more work to be done he cannot get further funding as the funder's emphasis has changed.

Although there is a sizeable amount of research groups and research centres that are affiliated with the Humanities faculty, a study of the Rhodes University yearly research reports released between 2010-2014 highlight that there is little to no collaboration between these groups, even between research groups with closely aligned research topics. Collaboration is mainly limited to the student-supervisor relationship, and there is also no information sharing amongst the groups. Connell (2004) describes research teams and centres as driven by the production of tangible, measurable outcomes that will enhance their attractiveness for further funding from the corporate sector, and which begin to act like “quasi-firms”. According to Connell (2004), one of the characteristics of neoliberalism is competition, in which emphasis is placed on freedom to compete rather than freedom of exchange. This competition is seen in nuances participants of this study made reference to when referring to other research groups that then manifest as overt tensions between individuals heading the research groups and individuals belonging to different research groups. When describing the work done by another research group, Bradley questions if their research focus is even a “real thing”. He

further claims that people are just coming up with “fancy names” to get funding. Portia claims that,

I just saw issues of nepotism and things of people being given opportunities or positions when they were not necessary qualified or had capacity to be in a position that they were. In my case, a review showed my research program should be allowed to stay by an external review; I mean they spend heaps of money, took huge amounts of time and then they just ignored all the recommendations then stuck to what, well, did what I knew it was going to do anyway.

In their narratives, these participants position their work and research focuses as being of more value than that of other research programmes; this is seen in the way they question the validity of work that is being conducted by other research groups. According to Ylijoki (2003), “academic capitalism refers to all sorts of actions intended to attract external revenue for higher education institutions as well as for individual university researchers.” Academic capitalism manifests as “market-like behaviour characterised by competition for external funding such as grants, research contracts and donations. In both senses academic capitalism promotes market-orientation and competition in university research.” Individual researchers act as entrepreneurs promoting their products and positioning themselves as experts in order to be competitive and attract funding. The lack of collaboration and the tendency to look down upon each other’s’ work is a reflection of the culture of competition which leads research groups to operate as quasi-firms competing and fighting for resources. This has changed the nature and practices of research in the faculty. Describing the Humanities context, Oscar argues that,

there is a lot of beef between academics, between groups of academics and between departments. I joke about this sometimes, but there is some truth to it. So to me there is a lot of resemblance between the academy and a primary school playground where so and so played with so and so today so they are not my friend any more. So the kind of social interaction between young children is very often replicated in the academy. So if you ask what I struggle with it is precisely that there is kind of factionalism sometimes routed in actual disagreements between people about ideas. But, unfortunately, that kind of disagreement is a result in people being dogmatic on both sides so you have people that are not militantly but extremely committed to their positions. Rhodes Humanities in particular are positioned in that people kind of like have set themselves up specific corners and are not really interested in moving out of those corners... So I was supervised by person so and

so and you were supervised by another one we each then tend to, because we have now come up in this different sides of the track now then you and I are now are also at odds with one another. Again, it has nothing to do with production of ideas but has everything to do with your position in the academy so it is toxic and it carries on and it makes the academy redundant because we are busy with in fighting instead of genuinely engaging the world around us.

Ylijoki (2003: 308) argues that market orientation has given rise to a new post-academic research culture which displaces traditional research values: “intellectual property displaces communalism of results, universalism in research is turned into problem solving in local contexts, disinterestedness is transformed into a mix of commercial, political and social interests, disciplinary context is giving way to multidisciplinary context and individualistic working patterns are replaced by working in entrepreneurial teams.” The corners that Oscar speaks of in his narrative are what Hill (1997) refers to as cognitive territorial boundaries. Individual academics and groups of academics position themselves as experts in certain fields and specific way of doing research, and their aim is to safeguard these corners or cognitive territories. These corners as alluded to in Oscar’s narrative become a source of prestige, reputation and position-taking. These positions enable individual academics to exude a certain amount of power which they can use to compete for resources and status. These corners are highly classified and secretive and there are no idea or result sharing between members of the different groups. This, as Oscar states, has “nothing to do with production of ideas but everything to do with your position in the academy”. The results of this are seen in the Rhodes University yearly research reports, where research institutes with the same research interests and same theoretical stance protect their cognitive territories by simply not collaborating.

Silos

Is it better for me to work alone and create a name for myself as an innovative scholar who has carved out a recognizable niche for myself, or do I collaborate with my colleagues from this institution and other institutions to combine specialties and increase productivity at the expense of individuality and personal acclaim? Which avenue will prove to be most beneficial to my career and my aspirations to become a full professor at some point in the probably distant future? (Kemp, 2013: 1).

But we need to break free as well if we are to be seen as having flair. Teamwork is not going to count for much unless we 'emerge' from 'teams' as autonomous with 'our own' intellectual sexiness. Being a good team player is not sexy! Being seen as a member of a team means that we can only ever be recognized as its subordinate term as the 'leg workers' ± the 'gofers'? (Hey, 2001: 80)

Participants highlight that there is a Lone Ranger culture within the faculty, and they refer to the Rhodes context as the main cause of this culture. Literature describes a lone ranger as an individual who is working alone without the support of administration or peers, but in some circumstances with the assistance from students (Bates, Bates & Sangra). According to some participants, because Rhodes is a small institute and the Humanities faculty comprises of departments with a small number of staff that work in very diverse fields, collaboration is difficult. According to Leon,

our department; we are a mixed kettle of fish. There are departments that has distinct disciplines; we basically have three traditions in this department, so across those divides people do talk to each other but it does not necessarily lend itself to joint research. People are in their own corners, and we are small as well so we do have those different approaches. And then we have very few members of staff so that means that people do not find it easy to engage in joint projects because we do not have the critical mass and we also have different approaches and are in different corners of political and international studies. If at all people would collaborate it would be outside but not within.

Another reason members of a community might choose to work alone is for the preservation of one's own voice and ideologies; an action that is also part of cognitive territorial boundaries discussed in the previous section. Leon's narrative normalises this individualistic culture as a choice of academics within the faculty. However, literature has highlighted that compliance with a given organizational culture does not entail agreeability (Prasad, 2007). The commonality on how research is conducted is indicative of a dominant culture which in its practice can isolate and alienate other members of the research community. According to Gill (2016), the individualistic culture is toxic as it diminishes "kindness, generosity and solidarity". Individual academics, especially junior academics, become isolated from support structures and shared experiences that can possibly improve their quality of scholarship. Gill argues that shared experiences such as rejection of a paper by a journal can diminish feelings

of failure, shame and discouragement. When normalising this culture, Leon declares it as the dominant culture. Other participants, however, reveals that the lone ranger culture can be toxic. Luke claims that,

the trouble is, people come in with very specific research interests. When I think of some of the junior staff members, some are very able to work with more senior staff but some have very specific research interests that are not shared by other staff so collaboration becomes less likely. Students publish here and there with supervisors, and I do witness a lot of people are doing research on their own or with a few students and up until now there had not been many opportunities to look at ways of incorporating people. I mean, people are supported in various ways, like senior staff will read junior staff work, so it is a kind of mentoring but it is not the same as collaboration.

The narrative of people belonging to specific research areas was a common response among participants. Like Leon's narrative, it reveals the normalisation of the culture of silos within the faculty, which is contrary to the quantitative data, which reveals that there is high convergence of research areas and theoretical stand points within departments and between departments in the faculty. Later on in the interview Luke also adds that,

with the emphasis I think on research outputs, which is the real measure in academia despite what they say about the other pillars; it really often comes out to numbers of research outputs, that becomes a commodity that people do not necessarily want to share. There will be people that think well why have two authors on a publication when I could have my own because that's what the university values and that's what people get rewards for. So there is a bit of perverse incentive in the kind of collaboration; it is not exactly a collegial thing, because academics are not exactly collegial. So how you change it; the incentives would have to be different and there will have to be less emphasis on the number of outputs and more emphasis on demonstrating collaborative research where you involve students and junior staff members. There is a bit now where they ask if you have published with students, but maybe there should be something in the promotion criteria where you can demonstrate research outputs which you have done with junior members of staff. That would shift things immediately, I think.

Literature highlights that scholars are mostly concerned about promotion and tenure. According to Kemp (2013), at the heart of discussions regarding rise in academia is the question of whether it is best to work in collaboration or as an individual. These concerns are

further heightened by the performativity culture which demands rigorous auditing and accountability of academic performance (Hey, 2001). According to Ball,

Individualism rather than collaboration in research is given impetus by what may be termed a research culture driven by the imperative ‘performance.’ Performativity is a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of ‘quality’, or ‘moments’ of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgment (2003: 216).

Luke makes reference to the neoliberal restructuring of academia when he speaks of performance-based rewards such as tenure, promotion and funding. Neoliberal restructuring has created an environment where status, reputation and tenure is built on quantity of research instead of quality of research, thus when one considers collaboration there are issues of authorship and who gets the credit. The quantitative analysis provides an aggregated picture of a vibrant research culture, but when one asks with whom and how these collaborations are done, one notes that collaboration is mostly inter-disciplinary or with other senior colleagues from other universities. The Humanities faculty itself creates a very individualized picture. Kwiek (2015) argues that collegiality within the research community can be viewed as a collegiality of senior academics which junior academics have little to no access. Drawing from the participants in this study, there seem to be two explanations of the lack of collaboration within the Humanities faculty: one seems to be the first formal response and the other is reflective of a culture of individualism rooted in competitiveness.

Kemp (2013: 4) defines collaboration as “the act of working collectively with other individuals for an agreed upon mission. The collaborative individual seeks to not only work toward individual goals, but toward mutual goals.” The author further defines individualism as “the act of working alone with the goal being to win. The goal of the individual is to focus on individual accomplishments over the goals of the/a group. The individual is competitive”(Kemp, 2013: 4). Kelly claims that,

we know why people work in silos; they are afraid of losing their next idea. So even with data, who do you share your data with? So I know of incidents where students give their supervisors their data and they publish an article with no co-authorship of the student, nothing... nothing. Because she understands she has to build a reputation.

Kelly describes the choice for individuals to work alone being rooted in the knowledge that ideas are capital within the intellectual economy. According to Kwok (2005), authorship is a reward in academia and is also academic currency for accessing resources and future research. The author argues that collaboration is a very insidious area amongst senior researchers and more especially for junior researchers due to the increased need to publish; personal ambition, vanity, and the desire for fame and greed linked to direct financial gains (Kwok, 2005). Changes in post-industrial societies have resulted in knowledge becoming more like a tangible commodity, and this in turn contributes to the replacement of collegiality with exploitative individualism (Holligan, 2016: 57).

Student/junior academic- Supervisor/senior co-authorship

An important heading that comes under the topic of silos is the complex relationship of co-authorship, especially between junior and senior academics. The quantitative data drawn from the Rhodes University yearly research reports reveals that there is a sizeable amount of collaboration taking place within the Humanities faculty. Although publication by individual academics is still the standardised norm, between 2010 and 2014 an average of 30% of the papers published were collaborations. Most of these collaborations were with external academics (for the purpose of this section external refers to collaborations made with academics outside the Humanities faculty) and scarcely any were collaborations within the student-supervisor relationship. There are various factors that come up from the qualitative data that are implicated in the paucity of student and junior academic participation in research. According to Portia,

we don't have the same kinds of numbers of students, but also the way in which the Honours projects are designed, they are often very much individual pieces of research. They don't feed into a bigger picture kind of thing, so you know it's difficult to then published that kind of research...whereas if it fitted into something bigger, you know that possibility would be made easier.

Oscar states that

when I was actively in the department there were people doing research but I did not see efforts to draw the students into the research that is produced. Perhaps it was happening at Masters and PhD level, but I do not consider it. The environments continued to be one of the regurgitate thing even at Honours level, the way the department was structurally operating was also encouraging that kind of approach to learning. So in my case the department utilises the banking model towards education instead of the problem solving one, in which case we would have collectively done research.

Portia and Oscar regard the current practices of postgraduate studies as not being aligned with goals of a career in academic research. Nandi explains how she has spent three years attempting to complete her Masters degree because she felt that the work demand increase from Honours level was overwhelming. Mamdani (2008) argues that one of the major reasons for the lack of young black academics is that research is not made an integral part of higher education on the onset of their careers, and without this young academics are unable to make meaningful choices and become independent academics that are not in need of policing and tutelage. The lack of mentoring and the regurgitating teaching philosophy is seen as a contributing factor to the lack of student and junior academic participation in research. Kemp (2013) describes co-authorship as a form of mentoring and nurturing students and junior academics. According to Kemp (2013), co-authorship, especially between junior academics and senior academics, plays a vital role for the development of the scholarship of young academics. However, the author also highlights that co-authorship can be done at the expense of junior researchers who become mere collectors of data and labourers for senior academics who give themselves first authorship and all the credit. Kelly claims that,

There is this understanding – and I learnt this early on – so in academia because I had a bad experience where in this institute a senior staff member I trusted and confided in stole my whole research proposal and submitted as their own. So, there is the ideas capital, if you have an idea do not discuss that idea because someone else will take it and present it as their own, so you have to be very suspicious as an academic. You must be very open to now that others might take your ideas and present them as their own. Which means that you have to keep your network as small as possible because within that network if someone is quicker in terms of writing a funding proposal then you lose out, so the competition becomes around funding because I need money, particularly in the

Humanities to go and do research just like in the sciences. So funding becomes a big obstacle, time as well.

Suspicion and distrust of peers and colleagues become learned behaviour within the academic community due to competition for various resources . According to Kwok (2005: 554), junior researchers “can be abused or bullied by unscrupulous senior collaborators”. The author argues that unfortunately aspirational activities of young academics can be sabotaged by senior academics who seek to make a name for themselves through fraudulent behaviour. Kelly claims that in order for young academics to survive this, a level of distrust has to be maintained. Because of this, research activities are shrouded in secrecy and lack of transparency. Participants raise that this secrecy, though implemented for self-preservation, is to the detriment of young academics who are still trying to learn the process.

Conclusion

The proliferation of research units and research groups within the Humanities paint a picture of a vibrant culture of ideas sharing. According Ylijoki (2003), one of the effects of research centres is that individual work is replaced with the work of teams. However, this is not true in the Rhodes context; members of research teams do not engage in team oriented research, and idea sharing is rarely found in the student-supervisor relationship. The same trend is seen within the yearly research reports where collaboration is mainly between senior academics and very scarcely within the student-supervisor relationship. This has various implications on what research is done within the faculty. Participants raise that there is a culture of individualism and silencing of ideas in some departments. These cultures undoubtedly affect what research is produced in the faculty and what knowledge is excluded and the extent of this is studied in the next chapter.

Chapter Seven: What

The question of *what* knowledge is produced, reproduced and transferred is central to the study of a research culture. The knowledge that is produced by an academic community in many ways resembles the personality and the values that are enshrined within the community. Knowledge production in itself is a site of contestation and debate, and the question of what research is done within a research community is packed with just as many contestations (Medina, 2014). The quantitative data (annual research reports) upon which the present study is based, reveal a number of trends of knowledge practices in the Humanities Faculty. These trends surround the published works themselves, choice of publishing journals, co-authorship and collaboration patterns in the faculty. This data, read together with the findings from the interviews with participants, reveals the values and underlying assumptions that facilitate knowledge production within the Rhodes University Humanities Faculty as a particular academic community.

The culture of a research community is a socialized norm that is familiar to members of the community (Prasad, 2003). An organization's research culture is the expression of the silent management of rationality within that organisation. According to Hill (1999), the philosophy that guides an organization's policy towards research is an important aspect of the research culture of that organisation. Hill theorises that amongst other things, this philosophy is influenced by what he calls 'territoriality'. According to Hill (1999), territoriality refers not only to physical territories but also psychological territories that delineate what research is done and by whom it is done. Hill also notes that this philosophy is not necessarily unitary but that there are usually a variety of sub-cultures and counter-cultures in operation alongside a dominant culture. Such sub-cultures and counter-cultures offer alternatives to members of the community who feel alienated by the knowledge of the dominant culture (Cutajar, 2008).

The post-Cold War era has placed emphasis on knowledge as a tool for development and economic growth, which has made knowledge and the study of knowledge a major pre-occupation of the state and knowledge production institutions (Giroux, 2002). The influence of neoliberal market imperatives that view knowledge as a marketable good was widely noted

by participants and was also reflected in the content of the research reports. The commodification of knowledge has been widely discussed (Andreotti, 2011; Ball, 2015; Deem, 2001; Giroux, 2002; Marginson, 2011; Shahjahan, 2014), and literature reveals that neoliberal policies on knowledge production have, to a great extent, altered the values and ethos within institutions tasked with the production and transfer of knowledge (Shahjahan, 2011).

Power relations manipulate knowledge and inform knowledge production (Medina, 2014). It is therefore important to understand the forms of social power that influence our epistemic and ontological canons in order to understand the ways in which knowledge and knowledge production reflect social power. Participants in the present study echoed this, arguing that there is heavy dependence on western rationalities when it comes to what knowledge is recognized as valid and legitimate. The research reports studied also show evidence of this impression. Andreotti (2011) argues that western ethnocentrism promotes universal norms that advocate for consensus, a common cause and a common identity, which offer two fundamental problems for the Other. Firstly, the standardised norm will see any opposition to it as a marker of deficiency or antagonism, usually followed by the need to fix the deficiency or difference to promote cohesion. Secondly, the advocating of difference-blindness depoliticises difference while pushing a hegemonic ethnocentric agenda. Andreotti (2011) argues that there are two main ways for the Other to respond to this violence: the most common one is internalised oppression, which manifests itself sometimes as overt guilt over supposed insufficiency and lack. The second possible reaction is a taking up of the task of counter-penetration and defiance of western hegemony.

Knowledge production, culture and power

Several participants argued that understandings of what research is about were heavily infused with the colonialist origins and assumptions surrounding research, and that for research cultures to be transformed a new conceptualisation of assumptions concerning rationality and subjectivity is required. According to Nandi,

research back in the day started as studying the exotic Other, so it's like white men comes in to study tribes and I think that grain of thought is still kind of instilled in people's minds. So when it comes to deciding the research, they think they have to do the Other. But

insight into her own conditions and predicament, and this is also the underlying assumptions of place-based knowledge: that Africans have privileged insights about their own predicament. Spivak argues that this thinking is an unattainable claim of a “pure or essential form of self-consciousness independent from the colonial discourses and practices that have constructed her as a social category” (cited in Andreotti, 2011: 41). The claim that autonomy is impossible outside the construction of hegemonic cultural imperialism is supported by Oscar, who argues that

the deconstruction of these things is actually a requirement for academic research to take seriously the people that are existing outside of the privileges of the university. And I think that and whatever follows from that change of definition of what the academy is, that change in my view would bring about the kind of environment that would be fundamentally linked to the world around it, engaging with the world around it and actually concerned with what is going on in the world around it. A lot of research does engage people but that engagement is coming from an ideological perspective; from the view of your own theories, so you have a theory and you just need quotations to substantiate your theory. That is the problem of research.

Disciplines within the Humanities and Social Sciences have stronger knower codes, which means that their cumulative knowledge building is highly connected to the knower and producer of the knowledge (Maton, 2000). Maton argues that certain texts are accorded the authority of academics, institutions and governments and can create not only knowledge but the very reality they appear to describe. Although the quantitative data shows a positive account of knowledge production that is focused on addressing immediate social condition, it is still implicated in power relations which in time become a tradition or discourse which can inform knowledge practices. A study of the yearly research reports shows that most of the work within the Humanities is informed by resistance theories that address social categories such as homophobia, gender, race and class. The discourse of resistance is an integral part of the culture of research within the Humanities faculty.

Participants in this study described having to negotiate power relations even when it comes to the knowledge that they produce as individual academics. According to Oscar,

You do not want to do stuff that is not considered proper academic work, so you want to do your research in a certain language and

style so it is seen as proper academic work. For me that ties into earlier discussions when I was mentioning about the power of different groups in the academy; so, for instance, certain things do not count as proper academic work because the people who are deciding are the ones who have the power and the ones who have the power are determined by our history. So if you do escape the infighting you have the problem of how you will get funding, how you will convince people that your project counts as research so that they can fund you. So that raises questions about what counts as knowledge and what doesn't and again that is an area where the academy has been limited in that it continues to narrow what constitutes knowledge.

Oscar highlights that power relations rooted in the apartheid legacy continue to determine, now through financial control, what knowledge is produced and who can produce valid knowledge. Ideologies of rationality that are infused in intellectual thought have been said to produce an illusion of universality in knowledge production cultures (Grosfoguel, 2007). The research culture of an organisation, like the institutional/organizational culture, is suffused with colonial and apartheid practices which have been rechanneled into the postcolonial, post-apartheid higher education milieu. Apple (2005) has argued that traditional norms and values within higher education entailing virtues such as humanism, morality and intellectuality see the legitimate members of the academy as those who share these norms and values rooted in the western traditions of what counts as legitimate knowledge. The failure to abide by these traditional rules is viewed as a failure to teach real knowledge. According to Apple (2005), the dominant group with financial authority, which translates to cultural superiority, articulates its provincial western values as universal. Bradley raises that there is fear associated with change and that "people do not want to be want to be challenged" because they have built their reputations and careers on a specific "mode of thought". According to Kalua (2014), this anxiety comes from the need to control embedded in western cultural supremacy. According to Prasad (2003: 53),

It is important to be introspective about the manner in which euro-modern organizing and control systems represent a way in which multiplicities of organizational and economic realities have been denied, and singular systems have been installed as being most efficient. Unless we find, identify and try to understand other ways of organizing and control, we are in danger of perpetuating organisations and organizing systems that will sustain and exacerbate the imbalances and systems of exploitation that have already created their own logic, epistemology and justification.

Ball (2012) writes that dominant discourses operate on strict boundaries and predefined rules of validation which reduce other forms of knowledge as abnormal, marginal and irrelevant. This disavowing of other modes of knowledge production has been naturalised within academia. Oscar highlighted that the choice of methods and language used in research is predetermined. Mbembe (2015) emphasises that the dominant discourses within the educational system have been carried through from the apartheid and colonial era and that students within postcolonial Africa are taught in a language and through methodologies that remain foreign to them. The educational system, according to Mbembe, is thereby a site of privilege which excludes all members of its community that are alien to western/white knowledge. Portia asserts that the operation of the university in terms of the language that is used and the knowledge that is privileged still resembles that of the apartheid era. Foucault (1979) argued that knowledge is not innocently produced but is affected by what he calls the “relations between discursive formations and non- discursive domains (institutions, political events, economic practices and processes).” Ball (2012) argues that this effect is predominantly seen in the transfer of knowledge, which involves states with cultural and geographical supremacy having the power to decide what is communicable knowledge and who is a valid knower. Foucault (1979) argues that knowledge is interlinked with power such that power and knowledge are inseparable. Spivak (cited in Andreotti, 2011) has argued that in the global South this power takes the form of cultural imperialism, which works by foreclosing counter-dominant knowledge from access to knowledge production and through the appropriation of all forms of rationality. Participants pointed to higher education’s dependence on western scholars as the only legitimate knowers; a dependency that perpetuates the legacy of devaluing all that is not in this tradition. According to Bradley,

that’s a general problem – in South Africa there is a problem in that in the post-apartheid period the universities have not really transformed. They are trying to emulate the west. Most of them, they think that all knowledge and all truth come from the west; they have not been able to think of themselves as part of the continent.

A review of the of Rhodes University annual research reports shows that within the Humanities faculty over 90% of the work that appears in subsidy-earning journals is done by white male academics. According to some participants, these dominant academics become

the voice of the academic community that sets the criteria of validity and legitimation. Sinazo speaks to this when he says that,

part of the problem is precisely the idea of expert knowledge. Say I am an expert in this particular field, I make that the main issue that is all I am producing on and interested in. The purpose does not seem to be the production of new ideas or doing something new; it is about maintaining the power that you have or stroking the ego that you already have. So it is a limitation in the academy that I consider something toxic which in turn spills over in the next generation easily.

According to organizational theorists, the culture of an organization is guided by unspoken, traditional and taken-for-granted practices and rituals (Prasad, 2003). According to Andreotti (2011), discursive practices are permeated with power and are contaminated by culture. The research frameworks that have the power to construct parameters of validity cannot escape cultural bias. Postcolonial theory argues that if these taken-for-granted assumptions are not challenged, there will be a culture of ideological closure within a research community where spaces of production of meaning are not open to other modes of meaning outside the dominant rationalities (Andreotti, 2011).

Research as a site of knowledge production is theorised by resistance theories as a site of struggle between racialised, western ethnocentric views and local ethnocentric views. According to Ball & Olmedo (2013), the modern intellect has been theorised with racial and Eurocentric definitions, and the global west has the power to make these definitions stick through cultural imperialism. Participants constantly referred to phrases such as publishable research, proper academic work and relevant ideas. According to Andile,

another thing might be the general stupidity of human nature, in the sense that when you are trying to put up the theory that is not coherent with the traditional theories in the field you face having to deal with the idea that, you know, things must be done in a particular way.

Oscar also states that

what constitutes as knowledge in the academy tends to be very similar; might use slightly different language but it is operating in the same way. For me, I think there are cultures of knowledge production that exist in the world, but the academy only represents one of those. So that is the problem; that not all research cultures

and cultures of research production have a place in the academy. So the university presents itself as the universal site of knowledge and knowledge production when it fact only represents one such site. So when we talk of decolonizing and lack of transformation or people being continuously being excluded it is precisely that conflict between an academy which represents one version of knowledge and knowledge production. It parades as though it encompasses all forms of knowledge production but they are actually silencing certain kinds of people and certain kinds of knowledge.

The yearly research reports have various demarcations or categories for work produced. The categorisation that is important for the purpose of this study is the demarcation of publications according to their instrumental value, which is determined by whether they are peer reviewed or non peer-reviewed and subsidy earning or non-subsidy earning. In his narrative, Andile highlighted that these demarcations are the yard-stick of relevance and excellence where one's personal work must be able to fit into these parameters. According to Mbembe (2015), education has been constructed through a culture of marginalization. This culture is present due to uneven and incomplete production of meaning and values within the academy that have been naturalised to pose western cultural values and epistemology as superior. Quijano (2007) argues that compromise and acceptance of other forms of knowledge within the Eurocentric canon is only possible when there is a convergence of interests that place other forms of knowledge in positions where they are not seen as subordinate or inadequate. Formal and dominant epistemological discourses have constructed knowledge relations where other forms of knowledge collate with humanism/human rights, while, in contrast, knowledge generated from the global South is seen as rational.

Knowledge production, Subjectivity and obedience

I feel like our department favours certain topics, and then you are limited in terms of topics and who is going to supervise you. So you might find out that my interests and what I want to pursue, the one supervisor who is expert in that field refuses to supervise my interests because they are not his focus although they fall in his area of expertise, so you end up having to do a project because the supervisor does not want to deal with what you want so you end up settling. So you may find that you have a topic and because you can only be supervised by someone who has a PhD or a professor, so you may find that the topic you want to do the lecturer who is an expert or a specialist in that topic they don't have a PhD or they are

not a professor, so the department refuses for that person to supervise you simply because they are not a doctor or professor and you end up going to those doctors or profs and doing a topic that they want you to do. The research community does not accommodate everyone, only students who listen to what their supervisors are saying. Yeah, so if you are obedient then it will accommodate but if you are not obedient then it does not accommodate (Sinazo).

According to Ball (2015: 1131), “the individual is the site of power, where it is enacted or resisted/refused but never in an absolute sense, rather within multiple ‘strategic skirmishes.’” Foucault (1979) argues that subjectivity has a dual side: the tie to someone else through control and dependence and his identity of self through consciousness and reflexivity. Prasad (2003: 256) argues that the colonial discourse was a racial discourse in which existed created binaries of the oppressed and the oppressor with the main aim of producing subordinate subjects who “reproduce its assumptions, values and behaviours”. According to Kreber (2013), although both students and teachers have the ability to exercise power, their relationship is always hierarchical. The teacher is described as having positional power over the students. This power is due to the teacher having expertise and knowledge, which are resources that students do not have. The author argues that a teacher’s personal interest in both knowledge and the student empowers the student to make their own initial sense making and validates them. Sinazo raises the point that the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is characterised by constant subordination where the student is a docile, subjected, un-opinionated and voiceless. Kreber found that “students who feel that they are listened to by the teacher, that their ideas and contributions matter, and that they are recognized as legitimate members of the learning and knowledge community are more likely to convey to the teacher that he or she is in a safe place also” (2013: 52) The author argues that students must be allowed to come into awareness of their own abilities to construct and reconstruct knowledge and to think outside the controls of tutelage. The author argues that fostering authenticity is a critical part of the development of students in which “students experience a process of subjective reframing stimulated by critical self-reflection on assumptions... which were uncritically assimilated at an earlier age and have powerful consequences for how we think and act” (2013: 126). The author also argues that self-authorship is an integral aspect of higher education research.

According to Foucault (1979), power works in micro-relation that define everyday life, which

in. Within the institution are the day to day taken-for-granted practices (Prasad, 2003). Within discourses, the rules of validation of knowledge as a knower and dispenser of knowledge can be found. These discourses, according to Andreotti (2011), are an imagining of the Cartesian subject's projection of his local worldview as universal and his foreclosure of epistemic choices. The organisational discourses of the modern university in Africa and including within post-apartheid South Africa are argued by Mbembe (2015) to be untransformed from the one constructed during the apartheid and colonial times. In addition, there now exist as a dominant framing of academic life, neoliberal tenets that define students as consumers. According to Andreotti (2011), the power of western/Enlightenment humanism to control and define production of meaning makes other forms of knowledge embodied in other forms of knowers dependent on them for self-recognition. Sinazo states that,

honestly speaking, it's the black lecturers who try to fight against it but they never win because the majority are white lecturers and they also are the ones in higher positions. So you can come as a black lecturer but you just do not even have a say and because they now know they are not going to win they do not even bother because the main lecturers in the department, and when I say the main lecturers I am speaking about the white professors in the department, if they say no then it is a no. In my stay at Rhodes I do not recall any day when a student wanted to do something and a black lecturer stood up for that student and the student won, I do not recall it. You can't speak because there is no platform for you to do it and the lectures available for supervision will not even look at those people so you have no chance. You have no chance! They control everything, they control the teaching, the research.

Sinazo highlights that conflict between authorities and students manifest themselves as racial struggles between black and white members of the academic community. In a study by McGregor (2009: 342), she found that in neoliberal education systems obedience and flexibility become the major components that cause conflicts between students, and that "school authorities were not the consequences of violent and abusive acts, but the result of varying levels of non-compliance coupled with bold assertions of their right to 'be free'...Denying students opportunities to challenge the hegemonic assumptions of social status and age inherent in school rules also teaches them to accept similar hierarchies in society as a whole." In her narrative, Nandi states that,

I think some supervisors in this department are very stubborn – they have a style of a thesis, the kind of the theories that should be used. So you get supervisor that are very heavy handed to the point that there is no essence of the student in what they have written any more because they have just taken away that. So you know staff members get points for every student that they graduate, so they need to make sure that every student graduates but I do not think it should be to the point where the student hasn't grown as an academic themselves because it has been so heavy handed. I mean, how is that going to assist them when they leave. But I think such things are negotiated by open communication. So it is just a lot of conversation and if the conversation is not working it has to go to the HOD because the HOD can say clearly this combination is not working so let us try and figure out if someone can take over.

In his study of the purpose of education within modern society, McGregor (2009) also found that narratives that question are narratives of resistance and that such narratives of resistance show that students are developing critical subjectiveness. Resistance becomes a major component of the research culture. As one of participants in McGtregor's study comments, "control is a God and categorization is the son of control" (2009: 352). Andreotti (2011) argues that there are two main categories in the world: the Cartesian subject and the Other\subaltern\orient. The stereotypes about the Other are created within heavily policed cognitive systems which both control and delimit both the mode and the means of representation of a given society. According to Andreotti (2011),

In denying the capacity of the colonized for self-government, independence, and Western modes of civility, colonial discourse uses this disjunction or separation to justify the authority of the mission of colonial power. The differences of race, culture, and history elaborated by stereotypical knowledges, racial theories, administrative colonial experience, and other political and cultural ideologies create racist stereotypical discourses that present the colonial subject as knowable and inferior, justifying authoritarian forms of political control.

For Arowosegbe (2008), within the Social Sciences the Other is viewed as a data gatherer for others; a labourer for the west in the global division of intellectual labour. Mbembe (2015) argues that students have also been objectified in the same manner; as empty vessels meant to be filled with expert information. This truth about the subject Other is a misrepresentation of the black body which perpetuates the assumptions of a lack, an absence and an incompleteness embodied in blackness. This in turn creates a feeling of perpetual inadequacy and inferiority.

Knowledge production and the knowledge economy

I think that the first thing that should be made clear is that research is generally done for the benefit of the researcher in a very personal way. I am also implicated in that...So it's not limited to personal determination of the researcher, but is the large component. So in my experience at Rhodes when people do research it is generally for the purposes of publishing, which in turn leads to promotion which basically it is part of the career. It's part of your job to do research. As a result, the fact that research is generally motivated by personal commitment to yourself in many ways, that has led to certain limitations of research at least the priorities of research being skewed...I mean, we often pretend that our research is more about making an intervention whilst it is about just getting a publication out and that is why you sometimes read an article that does not really say much. So what is the point of it if it is not contributing to knowledge in any way? And then you realise that perhaps the emphasis is just getting a publication out there rather than what is getting published (Oscar).

According to Shahjahan (2014), the culture of neoliberal performativity has affected academic expression and thought. Productivity and performance are linked to the recognition of individual academics both locally and internationally. Research productivity also plays a major role in academics attaining successes and is related to the promotion, tenure and success of academics (Okiki, 2003). In his narrative, Oscar highlights how individual economic gains and recognition are what drive academic work. Shahjahan (2014) discusses this, arguing that neoliberalism promotes the ideology of individualism which thrives on self-preoccupation rooted in individual economic survival, competition and distrust. Ball (2003) argues that this new culture of competitive performativity relies on an organisation's ability to produce bodies that are docile and capable. Within this performativity regime there is the commodification of knowledge and service commitments are cast aside in favour of commercial and market driven values. According to Ball (2003: 217), within this neoliberal regime "teachers are represented and encouraged to think about themselves as individuals who calculate about themselves, 'add value' to themselves, improve their productivity, strive for excellence and live an existence of calculation." He further argues that within higher education there is a process of ethical retooling, "which is replacing client 'need' and professional judgment with commercial decision-making."

The neoliberal regime gives a semblance of autonomy for self-governance whilst colonising or shutting down the ethical codes and moral language. Ethical codes and moral judgment within higher education have been traditionally linked to common goods, academic freedom and autonomy. Leon raises that,

administratively, it has become much more onerous than before because of the operating culture of the university changing, especially the corporatization of the university. There is far more administration, you have to account; you are subject to controls that you were not subject to before.

Leon raises the point that academics are being subjected to auditing and reviewing, where they spend most of their time reporting on what they are doing instead of actually engaging in intellectual pursuits. In this, knowledge that encompasses a moral code and commitment to public goods is, in day to day practices, being replaced with inauthentic and meaningless values and purposes.

Teachers are rewarded by being able to relinquish their claims to authentic authorship, which are now seen as naïve knowledge, disqualified knowledge or inadequate knowledge. One of the participants laments about this conflict between teaching and productivity:

So you need to be seen as a productive researcher. So there are two tiers to it; the more money you get in terms of research funding, you need to be seen spending it so the need to be producing publications but you also need to be producing students. So they push for Masters and PhDs because at the end of the day when we go for promotion, what are they going to ask us, who have you supervised to completion not how many people are still in the supervision processes but how many have completed... It's crap, right (Kelly).

Sinazo argues that

I feel like the department does not really facilitate your goals; the only time they are supportive is for you to complete your thesis because obviously their name is going to be on the thesis. So I feel like their goal is for people to do their research and completing their research.

Andreotti (2011) argues that the discourse of productivity is ahistorical and depoliticises the estrangement of some knowledge from the dominant framework. Within an ethnocentric neoliberal perspective, production of knowledge is directly and exclusively associated with the production of wealth; creating a universal capitalistic epistemology embedded in the marketization rationale is the exclusionary component of western cultural imperialism. The 'push, push, push' to output culture that participants highlighted is reflective of a performativity culture where students are regarded as human capital whose main aim is to produce economic rewards. The goals and aspirations of the student are sidelined and relationships in the academic sphere become merely contractual and infused with economic strategies rather than nurturing and supportive.

The neoliberal agenda positions itself as a global system which can advance development. However, within this regime, western knowledge becomes the cornerstone and only possible epistemology able to effect development and advancement in the world. Recognition of success lies within the set parameters of the ethnocentric neoliberal regime which emphasises human capital. Ball (2012) argues that performativity is a moral system where knowledge production is thus steered away from critical thought and toward rewarding research activities. He argues that the performativity culture has altered scholarly and pedagogical activities, forming a culture where academics are not only accountable for finances but are also accountable for the substance and content of what is produced. Ball argues that neoliberalism within higher education creates "complex relationships built upon contract rather than collegiality and aimed at profit generation rather than knowledge for its own sake or public service, enfolding public universities into the field of commerce."

According to Andile, within higher education there is an obsession with international journals and international collaboration. As he argues,

I see that universities here tend to look more towards the west and not within and around. This is tragic, because most of the problems of Africa can only be solved in collaboration with other African scholars but because of factors such as money... money has become a very big issue for research in the universities and this money comes from the west in most cases and people tend to look more from the west and not around them and not within. It seems to me it transcends South Africa, because you go to other African countries and you find people making efforts to be linked with the global north. So this is not a localized problem but it is a problem that has

been there and partly has to do with the structure of the global capital and the other side of globalisation. I think that a lot more can be done to make international collaboration more meaningful. A researcher shouldn't be under some sort of illusion that he is an important scholar only when his research is published in the United States or in Europe or in some journals.

The research reports reveal a correlation between highly accredited professors and a preference for peer-reviewed subsidy earning journals. Although there are a number of accredited researchers who publish in international journals, almost the same amount publish in subsidy earning African journals. The preference seems to lie within peer-reviewed subsidy earning accredited journals. However, it should be noted international publications still seem to occupy a privileged space in academia. Andile argues that this is an African condition, and according to Andreotti (2011), this is because of the cultural branding of western education *vis a vis* southern education, where a degree from the west, regardless of quality, still weighs more than a degree from the global south. Thus participants in this study highlight that in order to gain accreditation, one needs to be performing what Oscar called 'proper academic work' and what Andreotti refers to as valid knowledge which counts for economic growth. Bradley asserts that the criteria of validity of knowledge lies not in the rigour placed by the researcher towards intellectual pursuits, but rather in pandering and conforming to expectations:

You have to be able to do several things; you have to be able [to provide] those that judge you with what they want. You have to produce publications, books, articles or whatever the case maybe. But if you just give people articles regardless of content just for the sake of getting a promotion it is surely not self-satisfying because you just write stuff for the purposes of promotion. So you have to combine that with writing stuff that you are interested in and it becomes difficult to do both. Because not everyone wants to publish stuff you are writing; some of the material that you are writing may be extremely valid intellectually and research wise but you have to find appropriate places for it to be published ...so people are concerned with making money and that has affected the kind of teaching that is taking place.

The development and utility theory for the purpose of the university operates on a binary where development equates to western knowledge and regression equates to alternative knowledge. According to Shahjahan (2014: 222), the neoliberal regime diminishes "the relationships, ideas and subjectivities that maintain critical spaces external to pervasive and

increasingly hegemonic rationalities”. The rhetoric of creating knowledge that enables a university to compete in the global economy is theorised as being a colonial rhetoric that eliminates all other forms of knowledge as irrelevant. Furthermore, Andreotti (2011) asserts that the association of valid knowledge with the creation of wealth is a rejection of the capability of knowledge building within poor and developing countries. In her study, Andreotti notes that the obsession with western education is due to affluence and power being a parameter of evaluation of useful knowledge in the neoliberal regime. Andreotti asserts that within an ethnocentric and globally hegemonic epistemology, knowledge is conceptualised as cumulative and strongly associated with economic growth (i.e., wealth comes from increased knowledge). What is considered “best practice” is defined according to these standards; and, one can only learn from equally advanced/affluent countries. Similarly, to demonstrate one’s worth one must demonstrate that one is able to compete with scholars from the global north.

The research reports show a shift in the ranking of academic work over time. Prior to 2012, the research reports were structured in a manner which only delineated the type of work published. However, the knowledge that was produced from 2012 was differentiated between subsidy earning and non-subsidy earning academic work. Participants in the study stated that this has had a tremendous impact on the research culture within the academic community. Participants stated that the new framework created a “push, push, push” environment where there is a high premium placed on publishing in accredited, subsidy-earning journals. Mbembe (2015) notes that the university as an organization has “large systems of authoritative control, standardisation, gradation, accountancy, classification, credits and penalties.” According to Mbembe (2015), these standards are used as a measurement of excellence for all members of the academy even though this dominant academic model is based on a Eurocentric epistemic canon from which many feel alienated. Mbembe cites that the current hegemonic knowledge production is racist and exploitative in nature because of its apartheid and colonial history. According to Cutajar (2008), the articulation, production, consumption and dissemination of knowledge are affected by the context and audience(s) implicated at particular moments in time. As Apple (2005) argues, the principles within modern rationality are fundamentally neoliberal, and that they seek to change the very meaning of social need and public goods.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that all knowledge is contextual and subjective, and that equality of knowledges and access to knowledge production can be restrictive or expansive. According to Andreotti (2011: 79), “expansive equality focuses on the eradication of the present effects of historical oppression and subjugation of black people, while a restrictive view forecloses historical outcomes and focuses on preventing wrongdoing against.” The view that knowledge is objective and universal and views knowledge production as neutral, ahistorical and apolitical is restrictive, narrowing the bounds of possibility in the academy, and denying the epistemological violence of the apartheid and colonial era which subjugated non-western knowledge and ways of knowing as inferior..

Survival within this context is discussed by participants as necessitating obedience and conformity. Obedience and conformity also become a way of socialising new members into the research culture of the various departments in any given faculty. Although this, according to the participants, is not applicable to all departments, new entrants into the research community are often confronted with strong pressures to be obedient to seniority and to conformity to the existing research rituals of the dominant members of the research community. In this the participants highlight that the demographic composition of the research community affects what knowledge is produced, what is taught and the overall knowledge production practices – because those in positions of influence and seniority are mainly, for historical reasons, white and male.

Chapter Eight: Who

		Anthropology	History	English Language and linguistics	Philosophy	Phycology	Politics and international relations	Sociology
Race	Black		1 male 2 Female	2 females 1 Male	1 female	3 females 2 Males	3 female 3 Males	6 females 3 males
	White	3 Females 3 males	4 males 7 females	9 Females 5 males	3 females 5 males	15 Females 8 whites	7 females 11 males	3 females 10 males
	Other	1 colored female 1 Indian Male	1 Indian female	1 Asian female		2 Indian females 1 female colored	1 Indian male	1female Indian 2 female Asian
Gender	Female	4	10	12	4	20	10	12
	Male	4	5	6	5	11	15	13
Role	Professor	2 White Males 1 colored Male 1 White Female	5 Males (1 HOD) 1 females white	(Associate) 2 white males (Associate) 1 black male (HOD)	1 white female 2 white males 1 white male (Associate)	5 white females 4 white males (1 HoD)	1 white female 4 white males (visiting) 1 Indian male (visiting) 2 white maless (HOD)	1 black male 8 white male (HOD) 1 white mlae (visiting)
	Fellowship/ Research Assistant	1 white male				4 white Females		1 female Asian
	Doctor/PHD candidate	2 white Females. (1 HOD) 1 coloured female.	2 black females 4 white females 1 Indian female	3 white females (1 senior lecturer) 2 male white (1 senior lecturer)	2 white females	3 white females 1 Indian female	2 black female 1 white female 4 white male 2 black males (1 visiting)	4 black females 2 white females 1 female Indian 1 female Asian (visiting) 1 white male Doc visiting 2 black males

	Masters		2 white females	1 Asian female 2 black female 5 white female 1 white male (Senior Lecturer)	1 black female 2 white male	3 white females (1 junior lecturer) 3 black females 1 Indian female (senior lecturer) 5 white males (1 junior lecturer & 1 senior lecturer) 1 black male (junior lecturer) 1 colored male (junior lecturer)	1 black female 5 white female 1 white male 1 black male	2 black females 1 white female
	Honors			1 female white				

The environment of universities has changed radically post-apartheid, and one of the major changes is in the composition of the academic staff. Transformation debates around research in higher education have centred on the impact of the knowledge economy on research (Giroux, 2002; Sorlin and Vessuri, 2007; M. Singh, 2014), the tensions around teaching and research (Marsh and Hattie, 2002; Brown, 2005) and the changing nature of research due to globalisation and the knowledge economy (Deem, 2001; Zeleza, 2002; Altbach, 2015). The question of who does research within a faculty is important as it relates to the boundaries of entry to knowledge production, who gets access to this privileged space and the roles that those within this community fulfil.

According to Hill (2003), the roles that members of a research community play can illustrate the common values entrenched within their community. Hill (1999) has put forward that the roles that people play within the faculty are important because they determine the extent to which people value research as part of their academic career. The culture of a community sets up the rules surrounding entry or exclusion in order to constantly police the entry and socialisation processes of new members. Literature on academic participation has highlighted academia as an exclusionary space that is in most cases governed by elitism and hierarchy (Weber and Vandeyar, 2004; Gill, 2016). The underrepresentation of minority groups has been widely discussed in literature. With regards to who does research, participants reveal

various practices within the faculty that allow for the perpetuation of the skewed demographic composition that we see within the institution. These practices are the taken-for-granted assumptions that form part of the research culture of the Humanities faculty.

The table above was data drawn from the yearly research reports illustrating the general composition of the research community; their ranking within the institutional hierarchy, race and gender. A published Rhodes University report on research productivity within the university found that there is no significant difference in overall terms in relation to gender representation within the university. Instead, difference was mostly in academic ranking, where there was an over-representation of highly qualified and ranked staff as compared to junior staff members and students (Snowball and Shackleton, 2015). In the table above one notes that adding to the over-representation of senior staff members, there is also the under representation of black academics, especially female black academics. The report also revealed that the members of the university research community have four self-classification stages for their position in the research community and these are: do not produce, emerging researcher, advanced researcher and established researcher. The participants in this study also used the same categories to identify themselves and their own position within the research community.

Academic Ranking

The quantitative data collected from yearly research reports that were released between 2010 to 2014 show that in these five years there were 138 papers published in accredited subsidy earning journals. Of those, over 70% were written by highly ranked staff members and the rest by junior staff members and students. The qualitative data also correlates with the statistics from the quantitative data, as most participants highlight that it is much harder for young academics to pursue and meet research goals. Oscar states that,

it is true that a senior academic who has been here for 30 years who in the Rhodes context who is likely to be white and male is much more likely to get sabbatical, get funding vs someone who might be working on their PhD or that has just received their PhD, who is more likely going to be black, is not going to necessarily going to get the funding for publishing and doing extensive research. So research output is not equal at Rhodes, and the reason why this

output is not equal... the general trend of research output and who is producing most research is also representative of an untransformed academy that remains untransformed so a lot of the resources, if you look the race question there is definitely like white academics, and I am using race in the kind of black consciousness sense, are largely outnumbered.

The participant's narrative speaks to a culture of performativity that facilitates the continual support of productive researchers whilst not adequately nurturing the growth of upcoming academics. Performativity is defined as a "powerful and insidious policy technology that is now at work at all levels and in all kinds of education and public service, a technology that links effort, values, purposes and self-understanding to measures and comparisons of output" (Ball, 2012: 19). Within the performativity culture reinforced by the neoliberal regime, production is valued above quality and experience, and resources and funding are allocated according to publication per-capita, reducing academic professionals to measurable units whose worth is governed by numbers (Ball, 2012). The emphasis on rewarding the quantity of postgraduate students who graduate under a person's supervision and the amount of publications one produces favours academics with established research careers. When one contextualises this to the historical context of South African universities, it amounts to saying that the current system of rewards favours white academics -- who occupy most of the senior positions, as Oscar noted. According Apple (2005), the neoliberal regime claims that inequalities arise simply as a result of a lack of resources or talent on the part of the individual. Apple (2005: 271) argues that it would be too simplistic to merely reduce inequalities to being only about the economy as struggles over race, gender and sexuality also coincide with class alliances and class power. Oscar is aware of this link between access and research output. Given the historical context of the institutionalisation of systematic exclusion along racial lines within academic institutions in South Africa, the black population had no access to the academy. This historical context created a binary of affluent whites and poor blacks and with the impediment of neoliberal performativity culture, those characterised as productive and high ranking staff members are white and the unproductive low ranking staff members are black.

Although there was a detailed discussion on the links between funding and research productivity in the chapter on funding, it is worthwhile to raise some issues regarding the link between funding, productivity and academic ranks here. The numbers drawn from the

research reports show that high ranking positions are mostly occupied by white male academics followed by white female academics. The participants in this study, both senior and junior academics, expressed that opportunities for growth and development as an academic have been affected by the change in the funding framework. Participants expressed that because access to funding grants heavily depends on number of publications, it is hard for new academics within this funding dispensation to access large grants. Research success and activity within the Humanities faculty is judged according to numerical values which diverts attention from values such as transformation, public good and social cohesion. This is also evident in Andile's remarks at the beginning of the interview when he commented that, "I hear research is going well here at Rhodes" before later alluding to the lack of black female professors in the Humanities faculty which lead him to question the prevailing orthodoxy that 'research is going well here at Rhodes':

If research is going well, why are you saying it is somehow in need of some sort of contextualisation; that means that it might not be going well really. I am saying that things could be going well, but it depends what exactly the society is aspiring to. So, for instance, the development of my swimming skill could be going very well but then what is required, maybe because there aren't any swimming competitions where I live and my target is to win a gold, so that is the problem of the society which I live in that there must be a gold medal if not everyone is going to perish. So I shouldn't spend my time trying to develop my swimming skill because there isn't any gold medal to win in swimming; there is no competition for swimmers. Maybe what would bring the gold medal is looking at football, developing my skills as a footballer.

Like Oscar, Andile notes that the judging of success according to publication output misses the inequalities that are inherent within the institutional practices that are present because of the apartheid era. Andile uses a metaphor of football as the transformation aspirations of civic society encapsulated in the universities' policies, and where swimming is neoliberal aspirations that favour productivity and efficiency. Andile argues that if the goal is transformation of the research culture (football) then numerical measurements of research success (swimming) cannot bring about the goals of equity and transformation and neither can they be used to measure the success of universities' transformation mandate from civic society. According to Bentley, Habib, & Morrow (2008), the neoliberal imperatives, such as excellence and quality assurance, are a myth as they create the culture of elitism that is self-defeating in the context of South African universities that still have a civic responsibility. In

his analogy, Andile speaks of the need for a contextualisation of the university's research goals in relation to the wider aspirations of society. In the context of South Africa, the mandate of the universities is drawn from the White Paper (1997) to create equality in the composition of the academic staff of universities. Beyond this, when one looks at research there should also be equality in the composition of productive researchers. In his metaphor, Andile illustrates that societal aspirations such as transformation and the neoliberal performative culture work against each other.

Participants with access to large funding grants describe the ability to access funds as luck or good fortune. According to Portia,

I think it was also very fortunate. I began my career in the early 90s, and it was an exciting place to be because, I mean, it was the advent of democracy and everybody was euphoric and South Africa was this golden place. And in particular being a woman made that career path, I think, or the possibilities that were presented to me very easy... So then I really enjoyed the Honours project that I did. I did not want to do a Masters; I wanted a break. I mean, at that point I really did not think I wanted to be an academic at all but even at that young age it was possible for me to get, after an internship, to get funding in my own capacity, so I applied for funding from the Department of Water Affairs... I don't know what it's like now, you know, to be a young person but now in many ways I have established a career in a direction, so it's much easier.

In her narrative, Portia describes an environment where as a young academic without a Master's degree she was able to source funding for a large project. The dwindling of public funding and the encroachment of neoliberal restructuring of the education system has affected not only what knowledge is produced but who can produce this knowledge because it has created a paucity of opportunities for younger researchers who have not yet been able to build a long record of publications (Giroux, 2002). Funding thus becomes a driver of who can do research and how productive they can be. Within the South African context, which continues to be structured along unequal racial lines, white people continue disproportionately to access resources and race continues to predict who is excluded from parts or all of such access (Archer, 2008b). As Andreotti (2011: 78) describes, "powerful whites who already utilise this socially inherited racial privilege, view it as normal and not related to race and deny their complicity in the maintenance of inequalities." The dominant

themes that have been associated with racial privilege and white-centric rationalities are objectivity, neutrality, colour-blindness and merit. By suggesting that her funding was due to luck, Portia exhibits racial blindness by failing to link her ability to access resources to her whiteness and not only her luck. Portia also gives reference to her hard work in grabbing the opportunities presented by this era. This suggests that black women were not able to take advantage of opportunities provided, despite finding themselves in the neoliberal democracy which is supposed to bring opportunity to all. Colour-blindness has been theorised as the denial of privilege, power and inequalities associated with colour; it masks the systematic, patterned historical and political disenfranchisement of black people. Liberalism has reproduced these inequalities (Andreotti, 2011). As highlighted by Andile, there is an absence of black females in the higher ranks of academia such as full or associate professor, and this is to be explained by the historical and social context rather than attributed to individual explanations such as ‘luck’, merit, ability, or hard work along.

The emphasis on measurable outcomes makes demands for accountability not only of the money spent but also of the knowledge produced. Academics are required to not only produce marketable products, but they are also supposed to present themselves as marketable instruments within the academy worthy of funding. “There are new sets of skills to be acquired here – skills of presentation and of inflation, making the most of ourselves, making a spectacle of ourselves” (Ball, 2012: 19). Apple (2005) argues that neoliberalism is conservative in nature and legitimises inequalities. Beyond her luck, there are other political and cultural factors that enabled Portia to benefit from the new democratic dispensation: firstly, as she herself reveals, access to resources, knowledge structures and academia was easier and, secondly, the funding framework favoured knowledge as an end in itself not as a measurable outcome. The performativity culture only benefits the academics who were able to have access to the privileges of the apartheid era and the 10 years post-apartheid. Performativity shifts emphasis from transformation ideals to market-based agendas, which present the academic environment as one characterised by equal opportunity – a presentation which is both ahistorical and apolitical. It occludes the unequal representation and racially biased academic composition, where high positions are associated with white scholars who have enough academic currency to attract funding *vis a vi* low ranking black academics who are viewed as non-productive and who are unable to not attract high the funding that would enable them to increase their productivity.

Age

My challenges are less; I have funding and my involvement in academia is unusual. I mean, colleagues who came into the academia from Master, Juniors, I already came in the academy already with opportunities to write publications and already have a PhD, so when I came in I had some useful experience so I didn't have the pressure many new academics have. So I came in already as a senior lecturer and I was expected to get on with it. I am also fortunate that I can tie my research with my teaching, so my research feeds into my teaching. So I am lucky that I have more say in where I am and where I teach than very junior staff members who are just brought in and just have to feel the gaps (Luke).

When one looks at the statistics from the research reports to determine who does research, there are two responses one can possibly give: white academics or older academics. In Luke's remarks he touches on the interplay between funding, age and research performance. Notably absence among the ranks of the highly productive researchers within the Humanities faculty are young researchers. Luke brings out one aspect which burdens young academics: the clash between teaching and research. Literature notes that while teaching is an important aspect of an academic's role, it is not the most important determinant of promotion into the higher ranks of academia, particularly the professoriate. According to Callaghan (2015), an adequate balance between teaching, research and service is required to ensure progression in the academic careers of individual academics. The research activity report mentions teaching loads as one of the constraints to research productivity (Snowball and Shackleton, 2015). Teaching is described as time-consuming and the task that is placed first before one conducts personal research. Callaghan (2015) argues that research and teaching are not always complimentary roles, and in some cases they compete for time and resources.

The more teaching individuals do, the less productive they are in the research role. Luke regards himself lucky as his teaching compliments his research role. However, his luck is due to bureaucratic structuring of higher education which protects individuals who have publishing records from any internal or external constraints that would impede their productivity and negatively impact the income the university and faculty generate from their research outputs. The burden placed on new staff members and junior lecturers impedes their career progression. Neoliberalism positions academics as self-governing agents with self-efficacy. Individual academics who fail to produce are viewed as inefficient and lacking and

thereby non-competitive (Callaghan, 2015). This system is to the disadvantage of younger academics who do not have a reputation or the intellectual currency to protect and advance their research productivity in the form of publication outputs.

Arthur highlights that,

The capacity is even more difficult because of teaching, especially for young academics, who are trying to get a PhD with a teaching load. When I came in, I had already completed my PhD so I could focus on my own research... I have heard complaints of how younger academics are overloaded with teaching at undergraduate level and senior academics tend to have a reduced teaching load or do more post-graduate courses and supervision. And in our department we have a policy of an academic who is coming in has a reduced teaching load and once they have established themselves everyone has the same amount of teaching up from first year level to Honours level. So we do not want to overburden young academics with too much teaching so they have time to work on their PhDs and to publish as well.

Literature on research productivity within higher education highlights that new academics now have to contend with various existing barriers to academic advancement which were not present 10 years ago. Such barriers include the demand for a PhD in order to be recognised as an academic or senior lecturer, the pressure to publish in order to be recognised as an academic and neoliberal education restructuring and research audits such as the Research Excellence Framework (REF) (Kwiek, 2015b). The ranking and audit system acts as a system of hierarchies which celebrates productive researchers as elite research stars and demonises low performers (Bentley-Townlin, 2002). Although the research reports have different categories, the most important segments are the peer reviewed subsidy earning and peer reviewed non subsidy earning columns, books and book chapters, not only because they generate income for the university and faculty but also because publication in premier journals offer more rewards in terms of the academic careers of individual researchers. The categorisation within research reports categorises individuals into two main groups: those that produce and the ones that do not produce. This culture of hierarchy and ranking promotes senior academics who already have established careers, have international connections and have a reputation to enable them to publish within these premier journals. Junior academics are a minority group whose needs are not seen as an immediate priority as their measurable outputs are minimal. Kwiek (2015) has found that in affluent western countries, junior

lecturers seem to flourish under the new performativity imperative as resources are equally distributed according to productivity, and because junior lecturers have lesser teaching hours. This approach in South Africa has proven to be detrimental to empowerment, as bureaucratisation has created top-down rankings which are biased along the lines of race, gender and age. The younger academics lack access to resources to be competitive and lack time to devote to personal research.

The growth of new academics is heavily dependent on the support and guidance of faculty and senior academics (Teferra, 2016). The research reports highlight that the student researchers and most junior academics that publish within the Humanities faculty do so with the co-authorship of senior academics who are usually their supervisor or a mentor. Although this is a good practice, Sinazo claims that,

opportunity in our department it is also based on who you know; for example my supervisor tries, he lets me know of 'some' of the opportunities that are available in the department regarding teaching, job opportunities and I am going to publish with him at the end of my PhD both from my Master's thesis and PhD. So it depends on your relationship with your supervisor; he can help you in many ways. But, I mean, you get people who do not have that kind of relationship with their supervisors and they cannot even, like, approach their supervisors and say is there anything -- opportunities in attending conferences, teaching and jobs. In the department some supervisors are not interested and even if they know of opportunities they will not tell them.

Kelly also claims that,

as a high ranking member of staff I have been on the receiving end of bad stories, not good stories, about supervisors not caring... This it is a disservice to postgraduate students but also to you as a supervisor this push, push, push to output because at the end of the day you do not get solid relationships with your students. The problem is that when people are supervising, they do not think that they are grooming the next generation of researchers and if you do not see that then people will always be pawns in your strategy; your research strategy. So it's bullshit.

On one hand there are supervisors who devote their time and effort to nurturing students and who allow first authorship to the students they publish with. Macdonald (2015) has described that neoliberal principles, such as individualism and competition, view such acts as

unproductive as caring lecturers perform mentorship at their own peril because time spent in mentorship could be time devoted to personal research. Individualism and competition erodes collegiality as academics seek to protect personal interests and the system is set up to reward those who do so most effectively. The research environment in higher education is then reduced to a competitive game of winners and losers. Kelly speaks to this when she speaks of senior academics strategically viewing their postgraduate students and junior academics as future collaborators who they will use for their data.

Some participants characterise their experience within the Humanities faculty as one of resilience, where one has to either choose between financial needs or research. The constant balancing between teaching and research and the inability to access resources due to lack of productivity thereby stifles the growth of young academics. According to Macdonald (2015), this top-down approach within higher education makes the knowledge that is produced by a certain group of people more valuable than another group, but not because of the quality of what is produced. The senior academics who are also white continue to be the dominant group within academy, to the detriment of young academics, because they continue to attract more resources as they are seen as a vital source of income for the university and faculty. The neoliberal system in South Africa is retrogressive because it does not look beyond profitability and does not nurture a new generation of academics. According to Kelly,

firstly you are a woman and you are young... So for me at conferences, like we have a tradition of tea where we share things -- I silence myself, and I do not blame anyone for that but because the academic space is intimidating and you do not feel like you have something to contribute as well. That was a personal thing I had to go through as a young academic. So people do not realise just how ageist academia is in a way because age means wisdom; it means knowledge. So when you are younger people question you.

The bureaucratic nature of the academy positions senior academics as professional elites that junior academics have to respect and be accountable to (Hicks, 2012). Junior academics are thereby under constant surveillance by senior academics and themselves. Resilience and self-policing becomes a major component of their academic careers. Kelly parallels age with wisdom and, in doing so, she judges herself as inadequate and lacking intellect because of her age. Her age and gender become the measurement of her intellectual boundaries, and within these self-constructed boundaries she is in constant surveillance of her actions. "Within higher education elite forms of power and their ideological and material manifestations

persist even though their origins lie in traditional as opposed to post-traditional social forms of power... when women gain admission to the academy they do so mainly in their role and through their (partial) recognition as teachers. It is predominantly men, who are still more likely to hold the knowledge positions as the authors of knowledge” (Hey, 2001: 69). The constant auditing and measuring has made academics intimidated by their own ideas, and they limit themselves in relation to how far they can speak and act for fear of censure and isolation from the senior elites. Throughout her narrative, Kelly blames herself for her inability to fit in because she feels that, in light of the equity and transformation policies, the system must be working. Therefore, the only conclusion she can draw is that the inability to fit in is her own fault. This leads her to doubt over her own abilities as an intellectual, and she blames her lack of performance on her own insecurities and inadequacies.

According to Andreotti (2011), the question of who is a valid knower is also a question of the embodiment of rationality. Oscar claims that part of the problem within academia is the traditional construction of what an academic is. He states that,

as a starting point I do think that there is, not necessarily colonialism, but a colonial way of thinking, or colonial mindset tends to underpin the ways in which the university tends to operate. In terms of simple administrative ways, my argument for a long time has been that at Rhodes, when we talking about the student body or the Rhodent and the policies that we introduce and the ideas that we have and the kind of mechanism that we have in place for the Rhodent, what we imagine as the Rhodent is a white middle class student.

The imagining of an average Rhodes student as a white male has been argued in literature as the traditional construction of intellect which is masculine and racially biased (Assié-Lumumba, 2006; Morley, 2001). The culture of whiteness operates as property, where a possessor of whiteness has the right to authentic validation and also the right to exclude others. Within education, whiteness has been theorised as an ideology that is used to justify “unequal out-comes by placing the blame on the students and their families, using the argument that (a) students enter school without the normative cultural knowledge and skills, and (b) parents neither value not support their children’s education” (Andreotti, 2011: 80). These socially-constructed assumptions, as indicated by Oscar, are imagined realities. These imagined realities expresses themselves as inadequacies which in Kelly’s narrative

delegitimise particular members of the research community as valid knowers and possessors of knowledge.

Gender

The data generated from the annual research reports creates a bleak picture regarding diversity in the composition of the research community, especially regarding gender. White male academics are heavily represented, contributing to more than 80% of published articles within the Humanities faculty. They also occupy seniority and decision making roles. The least represented group is black female academics who also occupy lower positions within the academic hierarchy. Participants' direct experience as reported in the qualitative interviews conducted for the study also echo the lack of visibility of black bodies, particularly black female researchers, within the research community. Most participants cited the lack of diversity as a problem common to the academy in South Africa. Andile argued that there is a lack of black women in the academy, and further stated:

I should definitely want to see more women in this department; not just more women but more black women take to Humanities. Not just in South Africa, there is a very big problem in the Humanities in the whole world. I would want to see more women; it is not say that others should go away or encourage mediocrity. I know that a lot of them are capable, but maybe the environment just does not appeal to them and if the academy is so open for everyone then there is always that bias towards privileging the wishes and aspirations of the middle class in every society.

From post-apartheid the number of women enrolled in higher education, and specifically in the Humanities, has grown twice as quickly as men. However, women are still heavily underrepresented in higher ranking positions and productive researchers (Assie-Lumumba, 2006). According to the human capital theory advocated within the neoliberal theoretical framing, there is a lack of visibility of women within the academy simply because women choose not to take up promotions and advance their careers using the opportunities that are open to everyone (Assié-Lumumba, 2006). Embedded in Andile's views that there are opportunities women do not claim are broader societal structural issues which have been occluded by what Meyers (2013) calls post-feminism. The post-feminist theorists make the assumption that women, through feminism ideologies and gender equality policies, have

managed to attain equality (Meyers, 2013). Meyers (2013), drawing from Gill and Scharff (2013: 279), asserts that post-feminist sensibility emphasises “the constant surveillance, monitoring, and disciplining of the self, with an emphasis on the re-sexualisation of women’s bodies, individualism, empowerment, and choice, as well as consumerism and the commodification of difference.” This discourse, whilst praising the achievements of women, has the effect of denying sexism. Andile does not see the lack of visibility of women as being a result of sexism within the institution which limit women’s participation, but rather attributes lack of visibility to the dominance of the middle class. Women are forced to contend with traditional leadership stereotypes, which are exacerbated by the preeminence of a neoliberal framing that assumes that lack of productivity and competitiveness results from individual choice rather than being shaped by larger social forces, gendered expectations, sexist norms and historical legacies.

The demands of neoliberalism (such as individualism and competitiveness), many have argued, impact more negatively on female academics than their male counterparts. Due to the context of gender discrimination, women are positioned differently than their male colleagues when it comes to being able to compete as equals on an ostensibly level playing field (Morley, 2001; Teelken and Deem, 2013). Andile’s narrative reveals forms of gender blindness that are common within the context of neoliberal doctrines which claim to be objectively meritocratic while presenting definitions of excellence that are often gendered. Although South Africa’s post-apartheid education policies offer a vision of equality based on redistribution of both power and resources, the neoliberal landscape has organised equality along the lines of individual recognition and productivity, which work against structurally disadvantaged groups when it comes to career advancement. Women have lower salaries and are less represented in top positions, which makes it difficult for them to attract funding and in turn makes it very difficult for them to conduct the substantial research projects that are a requirement for tenure and promotion.

Mazibuko (2006) argues that the universities in South Africa have centres of power which express themselves through “male-male influential groupings, pockets of resistance amongst academics, which take racial or former institutions (boys club) forms.” According to Kelly,

as everywhere, there are clubs in academia and if you spoke to a feminist scholar she will tell you that those clubs we are divided along gender lines and there is a male club. So it is very easy if you

just walk around campus, you will see that there is a male club, because you will see men having secret conversations. But you will see that there is also a female club, and sometimes the women in the female club have husbands in the male club, so if you think about it that husband and wife when they are at home they do talk about their clubs so those two people have access on both sides. So if you are single, there is no single club and you sometimes cannot access the female club or the male club because you are not a particular kind of male or you are not a particular kind of female, so you have to decide what you are going to do. Do you decide to be the anomaly, and say I do not have to belong to any club or push yourself in?

These clubs become subtle forms of exclusion within the academy; outside of a club, one feels no sense of belonging. Kelly highlights that the presence of clubs is a common cultural practice within the faculty. The clubs are secretive and very closed up groups which have the effect of isolating some members of the research community from important research networks. Teelken & Deem (2013: 526) refer to the notion of closed recruitment which is “essentially a subjective search for suitable candidates involving formal and informal networks of academics in key positions, and which often proved gender-biased.” These networks become an entry barrier for new academics and an impediment to the rise of female academics as information is passed within this groups, privileging known associates, which, according to Kelly, are usually male or married women. Another participant, Portia, speaks of how working with her husband helped her grow within academy and opened opportunities for her to pursue more interdisciplinary studies which is “the in thing”, thereby helping her to attract more funding. Portia also states that,

a colleague of my husband has actually set up a group and we meet maybe only twice a year or three times a year. And we just share and talk. And through those simple meetings I have put together a project proposal with somebody for over 2 million rands. Just platforms that you learn about each other's work but not in a forced way in a more sharing way. So all we do is just talk about possible papers we've been working on or things that we have found interesting and I cannot tell you how valuable it is.

Portia has privileged access to a network which enables valuable sharing of information and support. In contrast, all-male networks from which women are often routinely excluded, undermine transparency and promote a “divisive atmosphere that valorises competitiveness,

instrumentality and individuality” (Teelken and Deem, 2013: 527). As a single woman, Kelly feels like an anomaly and she thus operates as a form of resistance to the dominant club culture. Although assuming the role of an empowered agent, she has been forced into this role by the hostile environment. These clubs also have an impact on males that are not the right fit, and can have a major impact on how much research one is able to produce and how much funding one is able to attract. Networking and reputation are important forms of academic currency which play a vital role in determining an individual’s ability to climb up the academic ranks, to maximise their publication outputs and to be successful in securing research funding.

Neoliberalism is grounded in western ethnocentrism which forecloses on alternatives and limits the freedom of choice of individuals. However, one of the main ideologies in neoliberalism is the claim that it furthers individual freedom and ability of choice. According to this narrative, the academy is open and individuals choose to be productive or unproductive. Oscar’s account challenges this notion of choice when he argues that members of the community are driven out. He reveals that the academy is a foreclosure of other knowledge systems, which in turn lead to frustration and flight of people of colour.

I think without a doubt the problem of the academy is an exclusionary space, the argument is always that the academy is open to everyone who wants to participate but people make the choice to not enter the academy and I frankly think that that’s nonsense what is the case the academy is exclusionary, so there are people who want to enter or who want to remain here but are driven out because they are not the right kind of person or are not doing the right kind of thing and do not have the right kind of ideas. I personally know young academics who are disillusioned with the academy who are likely to take jobs that are not going to be half as prestigious and are not going to remunerate them well and the reason they are leaving the academy to take these jobs is they often do not get these jobs in the academy because like I said they are not the right fit by the kind of narrow definitions and because they feel excluded and have been excluded and they end up being driven out.

Ball (2015) has interrogated the ability of agents to exercise choice and self-determination within the neoliberal globalised general rationality. Choice is described by Andreotti (2011) as the ability to have alternative outside the confines of dominant ethnocentrism and coercion that have characterised institutionalised processes of modern schooling and education in

general (including “progressive” strands). The quantitative data provides a statistical snapshot of the composition of the Humanities faculty research community, but this snapshot cannot be viewed in isolation from the historical context. The traditions and practices of the Humanities faculty influence the demographics of the Humanities faculty and in turn the demographics also influence the research culture. In his narrative, Oscar shows how certain institutional practices can act to foreclose the participation of black and women academics in patterned ways. As Oscar points out,

young black academics struggle to feel comfortable given the institutional practices in this university, and that there is a sense of discomfort on their part quite often. So they have to struggle with that in the first place; to feel part of the university and so it’s very difficult for them... it is very difficult when you feeling discomfort in a particular place of employment. It is difficult to concentrate to pursue other things like teaching and research if you somehow feel not fully wanted or as a full member of the community, just sort of very implicit forms of racism that exist in this university which are not really spoken of but are felt by young academics.

The discomfort of feeling unwanted that Oscar experiences as existing within the Humanities faculty and in the institution at large is experienced both at the level of material cultural practice that affect who feels adequate enough to participate and engage in knowledge production and at the level of what is ‘not spoken of’. Andreotti (2011) argues that there is a relationship between discursive and material practices and the politics of exclusion. The research community is both discursively produced and governed by material practices which in turn shape and are shaped by what occurs at the level of the discursive. Thus what is referred to as the ‘culture’ of research is a set of practices both materially and discursively produced in ways that are intertwined and impinge on one another.

Conclusion

There is a privilege attached to who is able to participate as a full member of the research community, and this privilege is attached to various attributes of an individual researcher. The possessor of these attributes, such as seniority, being high ranking, being experienced, having a track record of publications, being seen to be productive, being white, being male, being recognised as a legitimate ‘knower’, and having access to privileged networks, are

structural features that work together to produce the individual who is seen as being a typical knowledge producer. While the ideology of neoliberalism gives rise to the assumption that opportunities to thrive as researchers are afforded all equally, in patterned ways there are those who are excluded by virtue of age, gender, race and academic ranking. Although these exclusions do not manifest themselves in overt forms of discrimination, they operate as the salient features of the research culture and the ideology of individualism and equal opportunity serves to occlude how these structural and historical features shape the possibilities for individuals in uneven ways. It is thereby important to unearth these latent forms of culture within the research community to be able to decipher the injustices that inhere in the existing research culture and also to be able to recognise the ways in which it needs to be challenged, resisted and changed.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

Culture is a construct of human existence, and its conceptualisation is highly contested. Culture is not static, but is influenced by the contextual realities of a given era. Culture pervades all our lives: we experience and 'do' culture every moment; culture conditions our behaviour and, in turn, our behaviour modifies culture (Fellows and Liu, 2013: 401). In this study, a community was taken to mean the Rhodes University Humanities faculty, whose shared norms and practices concerning how to conduct research were analysed as a particular 'culture' of research. A particular culture – in this case the research culture of a particular faculty – must be analysed in the context of the time and space in which it exists. The historical realities and the influences of an era affect the development of culture as a group tries to negotiate and adapt to the exigencies and demands of a specific historical time.

It is debated whether culture can be accurately measured and quantified. However, organisational management theories argue that culture is a product of the mind which can be manipulated, managed and changed. In this regard, culture is seen as something an organisation has (positivist, functionalist) or "the view that a culture is something the organisation is" (social constructivist/interpretivist) (Fellows and Liu, 2013: 418). In this study, culture was analysed as both something the organisation has and something the organisation is. The view that culture is something the organisation has is what has dominated the study of research culture as a quantifiable subject which can bring instrumental value and utility to the university. According to Hill (1999), the research culture of a university goes beyond utility or the view that it is part of an institutional culture. To Hill (1999) the culture of research is something which the community of research is, and although influenced by the dominant institutional culture(s), it cannot be reduced to the institutional culture. It needs to be understood – its practices, discourses, legacies and norms – in its own right. The culture of research has here been viewed as a social construct which cannot be managed or understood quantitatively alone but must also be seen through the prism of the experiences and perceptions of actors embedded in the culture. Thus this study took the approach of drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data as necessary to the in-depth understanding of what a research culture is in a particular time and place.

Literature highlights that quantitative signifiers in higher education studies do not always accord with the picture produced by qualitative signifiers. According to Morley (2003), “in taxonomies of effectiveness the organisational world is presented as an orderly, rational surface, untainted by the mess and chaos of unequal power relations in which the lived world constitutes.” In contrast, the participants in this study revealed that the audit culture and all its performance indicators, for all their purported completeness, numerical exactness and minute detail, are an incomplete and biased representation of the day-to-day lived experiences that real academics have of the research culture that they find themselves embedded in. In South Africa, universities have within their mandate from government the imperative of fostering a more equitable environment which is not sexist, racist, ageist or homophobic. According to the quantitative data that the present study drew on, Rhodes University is amongst the most research-intensive universities in South Africa, with the highest publication per capita rate of all universities in the country. This quantitative picture is thus one of an institution that is thriving at least from the perspective of research. However, the participants in this study highlighted that such statistics do not take into account the social goals, such as transformation and equity, of the institution and of the wider polity. The transformation of society from the injustices of the past is a central goal of higher education in South Africa. Higher education is seen as a pivotal social institution to effect social transformation towards democratisation, social cohesion and equity.

The qualitative data and quantitative data read together gave a wholesome picture of research activity, practices and norms within the faculty that was the focus of the study. There were major prevailing themes which came from both the qualitative data and the quantitative data. Funding as a major component that influences the culture of research was one of these common themes. Morley (2016) argues that a professional identity is socially mediated, and that the contemporary university is a space where an academic is more than a skilled knowledge producer but must also be seen as entrepreneurial, innovative and be seen to add value to one’s organisation. Funding regimes and funding mechanisms are important determinants of an individual being able to meet the extra set of characteristics academics need to exude. Money and resources are the backbone and drivers of research, and they have a tremendous impact on who does research, what research is done and how research is done.

A second significant theme that was emergent from the data and which helped characterise the nature of the research culture in the faculty that was the focus of the study was individualism. The culture of individualism was discussed at length in the three analysis chapters of the thesis, firstly, in the funding chapter the question of individualism and knowledge production was raised; secondly in the how chapter individualism was discussed in relation to what the chapter referred to as ‘silos’; and lastly in the what chapter individualism was discussed in relation to knowledge production and the knowledge economy. In these chapters, the culture of individualism in research was discussed as being stimulated by funding mechanisms which have had the effect of making people less intellectually generous. The value of research is increasingly being “financialised and technologised, producing a chain of effects that can be metricized, audited and used for performance management in the global academy” (Morley, 2016). The participants whose stories about research and academic life formed part of the data set that the thesis drew upon, paint a picture of an academic world which has been constructed as constituting “winner vs. loser academic identities” (Morley, 2016: 31). Hey (2001) asserts that neoliberal regimes have created a hyper-individualistic culture where academics are motivated by personal gain and individual pursuits. As the present study reveals, academics may choose to work in silos, at times because of academic pursuits that do not align with those of others and, as revealed by participants, because in academia information is currency. Higher education policies such as performance based funding have encouraged individualism and completion as desirable academic attributes. The normalisation of this culture within the Humanities faculty is a symptom of the knowledge economy and, as alluded to by participants in this study, it is retrogressive from the perspective of transformative imperatives. Shahjahan (2014) argues that “as faculty and administrators we can move beyond neoliberal models of personhood rooted in individual economic survival, competition and distrust by coming to terms with how parts of ourselves are excluded” but what was shown here is that wider transformation initiatives in higher education have done little to challenge the culture of individualism in research.

Both more senior and younger academics highlight that performance is a prerequisite for success, recognition and promotion within academia – in their experience. To be productive is described by Kelly as the ability to be seen as a busy academic who is always publishing and attending conferences, especially international conferences. Access to funding from the

university and from external funders is granted upon proof that one can perform according to these criteria. Singh (2014: 366) argues that as a legitimation discourse, performativity is a terror which “replaces invention and prescription with target setting, accountability, and comparison” and that the performativity culture “refers to the production of knowledge not as representation, but as the constant act of performance, fabrication and construction, that is the constitution of worldly configurations in and through the production of knowledge.” A research culture that is informed by a these definitions of performance and successes colonises other forms of knowing. This culture is perpetuated through constant surveillance of the day-to-day activities of academics and constant measurement of academic achievement according to criteria which parade as neutral and universal but which are in reality particular constructions emanating from a wider neoliberal impulse which defines higher education in particular, market-driven ways. In turn notions of social needs, research in service of the public good and the imperative of challenging taken for granted assumptions about who the legitimate knowers are, what counts as legitimate knowing and what is worth knowing are excluded from the dominant research culture and they become alternative discourses of resistance.

Subcultures are seen by Hill (1999) as the overt manifestation of contesting cultures within a research culture. Some participants in this study identify themselves as offering alternatives to the dominant westernised system of knowledge production. Alternative systems are theorised as tools to unearth the latent forms of colonisation exposing the imperialistic cultural assumptions of colonial authority within dominant knowledge production frameworks. Some participants in this study find themselves implicated in this work of providing alternatives that oppose and rewrite dominant cultural values, codes, narratives and behaviours (Shahjahan, 2014). Resistance is also discussed by participants as a work of coming into being and self-actualisation. Self-actualisation is defined by Shahjahan as a form of resistance that redefines the neo-liberal personhood narrative. But, as one of the participants in the present study, Sinazo, argued, resistance within some departments is seen as disobedience, which carries consequences such as being disavowed and estrangement from the centres of power and the rewards on offer when dominant norms are conformed to. It is only when these issues are brought to the fore and the existing research culture is described and characterised that one can begin to understand their implications. The culture of resistance challenges the culture of obedience that some participants like Sinazo describe. Participants highlight that power relations are at play in every aspect of their academic life,

and they negotiate these relations with a high level of care. At the very heart of it, participants highlight that within the formal system one has to be obedient to its norms if one is to advance one's career, and develop and progress as an academic. Beyond measures and metrics then lie cultures of research whose characteristics have been scantily described or understood, much less the ways in which such cultures marginalise and exclude some while serving the interests of others. In understanding a research culture as a social construct with a history and informed by particular ideological precepts rather than as timeless and naturalised, one can begin the work of deciphering, and transforming such a culture.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2015) 'Globalisation and the University Myths and Realities in an Unequal World', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3883(October), pp. 2–26.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. E. (2009) 'Trends in Global Higher Education : Tracking an Academic Revolution Trends in Global Higher Education', *Higher Education*, p. 22.
- Alexander, N., (2003) *The African Renaissance and the use of African languages in tertiary education*. Cape Town: PRAESA.
- Andreotti, V. (2011) *Actionable Post Colonial Theory in Education*. 1st edn. Edited by P. Mayo, A. Hickling-Hudson, and A. Darder. New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- Apple, M. W. (2005) 'Doing things the “right” way: legitimating educational inequalities in conservative times¹', *Educational Review*, 57(3), pp. 271–293.
- Archer, L. (2008) 'The new neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics' constructions of professional identity', *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3), pp. 265–285.
- Archer, L. (2008) 'Younger academics' constructions of “authenticity”, “success” and professional identity', *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), pp. 385–403.
- Arowosegbe, J. O. (2008) 'Decolonising the Social Sciences in the global South : Claude Ake and the praxis of knowledge production in Africa', 43, pp. 333–351.
- Assie-Lumumba, N. (2006) 'Empowerment of Women in Higher Education in Africa: The Roles and Mission of Research', (11), p. 78.
- Assié-Lumumba, N. (2006) *Higher Education in Africa: Crises, Reforms and Transformation, CODESRIA Working Paper Series*. Dakar.

- Badat, S. (2010) 'The Challenges of transformation in Higher Education and Training Institutions in South Africa.'
- Ball, S. J. (2003) 'The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity', *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), pp. 215–228.
- Ball, S. J. (2012) 'Performativity, Commodification and Commitment: An I-Spy Guide to the Neoliberal University', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 60(1), pp. 17–28.
- Ball, S. J. (2015) 'Education, governance and the tyranny of numbers', *Journal of Education Policy*. Routledge, 30(June), pp. 299–301.
- Ball, S. J. (2015) 'Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism?', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. Routledge, 5692(July), pp. 1–18.
- Ball, S. and Olmedo, A. (2013) 'Care Of the Self, Resistance and Subjectivity under Neoliberal Governmentalities', *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(1), pp. 85–96.
- Barker, M., (2007) 'Heteronormativity and the exclusion of bisexuality in psychology', *Out in psychology: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer perspectives*, pp.86-118.
- Bazeley, P. (2016) 'Studies in Higher Education Conceptualising research performance Conceptualising research performance', 5079 (December).
- Benner, M. and Sandström, U. (2000) 'Institutionalizing the triple helix: research funding and norms in the academic system', *Research Policy*, 29(2), pp. 291–301.
- Bentley-Townlin, T. (2002) 'Understanding University Students' Construction of their Hidden Disability Identity'.
- Bentley, K., Habib, A. and Morrow, S. (2008) 'Academic freedom, institutional autonomy and the corporatised university in contemporary South Africa', *Social Dynamics: A Journal of African studies*, 34(2), pp. 140–155.

Bhabha, H.K. (ed.) (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London / New York, NY: Routledge.

Bigalke, T. W. and Neubauer, D. E. (2009) *Higher Education in Asia/Pacific: Quality and the Public Good*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Billot, J. (2010) 'The changing research context: implications for leadership', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(1), pp. 37–46.

Boud, D. and Brew, A. (2013) 'Reconceptualising academic work as professional practice : implications for academic development', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(3), pp. 37–41.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology.', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77–101.

Breneman, D. W., Pusser, B. and E. Turner, S. (eds) (2006) *Earnings From Learning: The Rise of For-Profit Universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Brew, A., Boud, D. and Malfroy, J. (2016) 'The role of research education coordinators in building research cultures in doctoral education', *Higher Education Research & Development*. Taylor & Francis, 0(0), pp. 1–14.

Brown, R. B. (2005) 'Why link personal research and teaching?', *Education and Training*, 47(6), pp. 393–407.

Byrne, D. and Byrne, D. (1996) 'Research in a funding jungle: The South African research accreditation system', *The South African research accreditation system, Scrutiny2*, 1:1-2, pp1-18.

Calhoun, C. (1996) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Massachusetts,: The MIT Press.

Callaghan, C. W. (2015) 'Designation differences and academic career progression', *Acta*

Commercii, 15(1), pp. 1–12.

Castells M. (2001) *Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions*. In: J Muller, N Cloete & S Badat (eds) *Challenges of Globalisation. South African debates with Manuel Castells*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman, pp.206- 224

Chilisa, B. (2011) *Indigenous research methodologies*. Sage Publications.

Cheetham, A. (2007). Growing a research culture. *University of Western Sydney, Address*, 1-7.

Clark, B.R. (1998) *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Bingley: Emerald Group.

Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2014) ‘Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning.’, *The Psychologist*, 26(2), pp. 120–123.

Cloete, N. (2014) ‘A new look at demographic transformation : Comments on Govinder et al . (2013)’, 110(1), pp. 2–5.

Coleman, J. S. (1984) *The Idea of The Developmental University*. Hetland: Stockholm, pp. 1–19.

Coleman, J. S. . (1988) ‘Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure’, *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp. S95–S120.

Connell, H. M. (2004) *University research management: meeting the institutional challenge*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Connell, R. (2013) ‘The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences’, *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), pp. 99–112.

Cutajar, J. (2008) ‘Knowledge and Post-colonial Pedagogy’, *Mediterranean Journal of*

Educational Studies, 13(2), pp. 27–47.

Davies, A. and Thomas, R. (2002) 'Managerialism and accountability in higher education: The gendered nature of restructuring and the costs to academic service', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 13(January 2001), pp. 179–193.

Deem, R. (2001) 'Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the local dimension still important?', *Comparative Education*, 37(1), pp. 7–20.

Deem, R. and Brehony, K. J. (2000) 'Doctoral Students' Access to Research Cultures-are some more unequal than others?', *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(2), pp. 149–165.

Delanty, G. (2001) 'Challenging knowledge: the university in the knowledge society', *Organization*, 8(2), pp.149-153.

Department of Education (2008) *Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions*.Pretoria.

Department of Education (DoE) (1997) *Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education General Notice 1196 of 1997*. Pretoria.

DHET (2011) *Statistics on Post-School Education and Training in South Africa: 2011*.

Dill, D. D. (2012) 'Assuring the Public Good in Higher Education : Essential Framework Conditions and Academic Values', In *SRHE seminar on Higher Education as a Public Good: Critical Perspectives, New College, Oxford, July* (pp. 4-5).

Down, B. (2009) 'Schooling, productivity and the enterprising self: beyond market values', *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(1), pp. 51–64.

Ebbutt, D. and Ebbutt, D. (2016) 'The development of a research culture in secondary schools a Research Culture', *Educational Action Research*, 10(1), pp.123-142.

Eckel, P. (2001) 'A world apart? Higher education transformation in the US and South Africa', *Higher Education Policy*, 14(2), pp. 103–115.

Edgar, F. and Geare, A., (2013) 'Factors influencing university research performance', *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), pp.774-792.

Edgar, H. (2010) *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 4th edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Higher Education and Training. (2010) 'Report on the Stakeholder Summit on Higher Education Transformation', (April).

Erasmus, Z. (2010) 'Confronting the categories: equitable admissions without apartheid race classification', *South African Journal of Higher Education (SAJHE)*24 (2): 244–257.

Fellows, R. and Liu, A. M. M. (2013) 'Use and misuse of the concept of culture', *Construction Management and Economics*, 31(5).

Fereday, J. (2006) 'Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis : A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), pp. 80–92.

Ferguson, P. B. (1999) *Developing a Research Culture in a Polytechnic: An Action Research Case Study*. University of Waikato: New Zealand.

Fiske, E. B. and Ladd, H. F. (2004) *Elusive Equity Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Esakov, H.J. (2009) 'Reading race: The curriculum as a site of transformation', *South African Journal of Higher Education (SAJHE)* 23(1): 69–82.

Foucault, M. 1979. 'Governmentality', *Ideology and Consciousness* 6 pp 5–21.

Georghiou, L. and Harper, J. C. (2006) 'The Higher Education Sector and its Role in Research: Status and impact of Future-Oriented Technology Analysis', *Anchor Paper for Second International Seville Seminar on Future-Oriented Technology Analysis (FTA)*, 28 pp. 1–13.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Geuna, A., (2001) 'The changing rationale for European university research funding: are there negative unintended consequences?', *Journal of economic issues*, 35(3), pp.607-632.

Gill, R. (2016) 'Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia', *Feministische Studien*, 34(1), pp. 39–55.

Giroux, A. (2002) 'Neoliberalism , Corporate Culture , and the Promise of Higher Education : The University as a Democratic Public Sp here', *Harvard educational review*, 72(4), pp.425-464.

Gray, H. H. (1888) 'The University in History : 1088 and All That', In *Idea of the University Colloquium*.

Greenaway, D. and Haynes, M. (2003) 'Funding higher education in the UK: The role of fees and loans', *Economic Journal*, 113(485), pp. 150–166.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007) 'the Epistemic Decolonial Turn', *Cultural Studies*, 21(2), pp. 211–223.

Gumport, P. J. (2000) 'Academic restructuring : Organizational change and institutional imperatives', *Higher Education*, 39(Gumport 1993), pp. 67–91.

Harris, S. (2005) 'Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), pp. 421–433.

Hey, V. (2001) 'The Construction of Academic Time: Sub/contracting Academic Labour in Research', *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(1), pp. 67–84.

- Higgs, P. and van Wyk, B (2007) 'Lifelong learning revisited: an African educational discourse', *African educational discourse. Education as Change*. 11(1), pp111-123.
- Higgins, J., (2007) 'Institutional culture as keyword', *Review of higher education in South Africa: Selected themes*, 97, p.122
- Hicks, D. (2012) 'Performance-based university research funding systems', *Research Policy*. Elsevier B.V., 41(2), pp. 251–261.
- Higher Education and training (2013) 'Report on the Ministerial Committee for the review of the Provision of Student Housing at South Africa Universities'.
- Hill, M. F. and Haigh, M. A. (2016) 'Studies in Higher Education Creating a culture of research in teacher education : learning research within communities of practice.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(8), pp.971-988.
- Hill, R. (1999) 'Revisiting the term “research culture”', *Higher Education Research and Development (HERD)*, (July), pp. 12–15.
- Hill, R. (2002) *Establishing and sustaining a Research Culture*. Hamilton.
- Holligan, C. (2016) 'Feudalism and academia : UK academics ' accounts of research culture culture', *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 24(1), pp.55-75.
- Horsthemke, K. (2009) 'The South African higher education transformation debate: culture, identity and “African ways of knowing”', *London Review of Education*, 7(1), pp. 3–15.
- Imenda, S. N. (2005) 'The idea of a South African university and an implications for knowledge production. *South African journal of higher education*, 19(Special Edition 1), pp.1405-1418.
- Ishak, N., & Bakar, A. (2012). Qualitative data management and analysis using NVivo: an approach used to examine leadership qualities among student leaders. *Educ Res J*, 2(3), 94-

103.

Jansen, J. (2004) 'Changes and continuities in South Africa's higher education system, 1994 to 2004', *Changing class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*, pp. 293–314.

Wennberg, K., Pathak, S. and Autio, E. (2016) 'How culture moulds the effects of self-efficacy and fear of failure on entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*. Taylor & Francis, pp. 756–780.

Kahu, E. R. (2013) 'Framing student engagement in higher education', *Studies in Higher Education*, 38:5, pp 758-773.

Kalua, F. (2014) 'Revisiting postcolonial theory: Continuities and departures in the twenty-first century', *English Academy Review*, 31, pp. 66–76.

Kaur, k. (2014) ' Culture and Media', *International journal of Indian psychology*, 3: 4.

Kemp, A. T. (2013) 'Collaboration vs . Individualism : What Is Better for the Rising Academic ?', *The Qualitative Report*, 18:100, 1-8.

Kiley, M. (2005). *Engaging doctoral candidates in research communities. In Proceedings of the 2005 Australian universities quality forum: Engaging communities*. Sydney, NSW: Australian Universities Quality Agency pp. 73–77.

Kistner, U., (2008) 'Africanization in Tuition': African National Education', *Mediations: Journal of the Marxist Literary Group*, 24(1).

Knights, B. (2008) *Masculinities in Text and Teaching Edited by*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kreber, C., (2013) *Authenticity in and through teaching in higher education: The transformative potential of the scholarship of teaching*. Routledge.

Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis An Introduction To Its Methodology*. London: Sage Publications.

Kwek, D. (2003) 'Decolonizing and Re-Presenting Culture's Consequences: A Postcolonial Critique of Cross-Cultural Studies in Management', In *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement* (pp. 121-146). Palgrave Macmillan US.

Kweik, M. (2010) 'The Changing Attractiveness of European Higher Education : Current Developments , Future Challenges , and Major Policy Issues', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), pp. 218–235.

Kwiek, M. (2015) 'Academic generations and academic work: patterns of attitudes, behaviors, and research productivity of Polish academics after 1989', *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(8), pp. 1354–1376.

Kwok, L. S. (2005) 'The White Bull effect: abusive coauthorship and publication parasitism.', *Journal of medical ethics*, 31(9), pp. 554–556.

Lawn, M., Deary, I. J., Bartholomew, D. J. and Brett, C. (2010) 'Embedding the new science of research : the organised culture of Scottish educational research in the mid - twentieth century', *Paedagogica Historica*, 46(3), pp.357-381.

Lee, Y. S. (1996) 'Technology transfer' and the research university: a search for the boundaries of university-industry collaboration', *Research Policy*, 25, pp. 843-863

Leslie, L. L., Slaughter, S. and Taylor, B. J. (2016) 'How do Revenue Variations Affect Expenditures Within U . S . Research Universities ?' *Research in Higher Education*, 53:6, pp. 614-639.

Levy, L. C. (2003) *Profits and Practicality: How South Africa Eptomizes the Global Surge in Commercial Private Higher Education*. New York.

Leydesdorff, L. (2012) 'The Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations'.

Lucas, L. (2009) *Research management and research cultures: Power and productivity*. In A. Brew & L. Lucas (Eds.), *Academic research and researchers* (pp. 66–79). Maidenhead, UK: McGraw Hill, Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

Maassen, P. And Cloete, N. (2006) *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities*. (Vol. 10). Taylor & Francis.

Macdonald, S. (2015) ‘Emperor’s New Clothes: The Reinvention of Peer Review as Myth’, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(3), pp. 264–279.

Makgoba, M.W. (1998) ‘*South African universities in transformation: An opportunity to Africanise education*’, In: *Black Perspective(s) on Tertiary Institutional Transformation*. ed. Seepe, S. pp 1–12. Florida: Vivlia Publishers and The University of Venda.

Mamdani, M. (2008) ‘Higher Education , the State and the Marketplace’, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 6(1), pp.1-10.

Marchant, T. (2008) ‘Developing Research Culture – Overcoming Regional and Historical Obstacles’, *Professional doctorate research in Australia: commentary and case studies from business, education and indigenous studies*, p.55.

Marginson, S. (2006) ‘Putting “ Public ” Back Into The Public’, *Thesis Eleven*, 84(84), pp. 44–59.

Marginson, S. (2008) ‘Clark Kerr and The Uses of the University’, *CSHE Ideas and Issues in Higher Education seminar*, pp. 1–15.

Marginson, S. (2011) ‘Higher Education and Public Good’, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), pp. 411–433.

Marginson, S., (2015) ‘The Landscape of Higher Education Research 1965- - - 2015 Equality

of Opportunity : The first fifty years', *In SRHE 50th Anniversary Colloquium, 26 June 2015: Valuing Research into Higher Education*.

Marginson, S. and Rhoades, G. (2002) 'Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic', *Higher Education*, 43(3), pp. 281–309.

Marginson, S. and Wende, M. Van Der (2007) 'Globalisation and Higher Education', *OECD Education Working Papers*, (8).

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. (2000) *Enterprise university in Australia. Governance, strategy and reinvention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marie, R. and Sherlyne, A. (2007) 'Developing Research Culture in Philippine Higher Education Institutions : Perspectives of University Faculty', *UNESCO On Higher Education and Knowledge*, (September).

Marks, D.F. and Yardley, L. eds. (2004) *Research methods for clinical and health psychology*. Sage.

Marsh, H. W. and Hattie, J. (2002) 'The Relation Between Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness: Complementary, Antagonistic, or Independent Constructs?', *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), pp. 603–641.

Maton, K. (2000) 'Review of Andrew Sayer', *The Sociological Review*, 49(1), pp. 149–152.

Maton, K. and Moore, R. (2010) 'Coalitions of the mind', *Social Realism, Knowledge and the Sociology of Education: Coalitions of the mind*, pp. 1–13.

Mats Alvesson and Stefan Sveningsson (2008) *Changing Organisational Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Maylam, P. and Vale, P. (2005) *Submission to the council on higher education's task team on south african government involvement and regulation of higher education, institutional autonomy and academic freedom*. Grahamstown.

- Mazibuko, F. (2006) 'Women in Academic Leadership in South Africa: Conventional Executives or Agents of Empowerment?', *Alternation*, pp. 106–123.
- Mbembe, A. (2015) 'Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive', pp. 1–17.
- McGregor, G. (2009) 'Educating for (whose) success? Schooling in an age of neoliberalism', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(3), pp. 345–358.
- McInerney, P., Smyth, J. and Down, B. (2011) 'Coming to a place near you?' The politics and possibilities of a critical pedagogy of place-based education', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), pp.3-16.
- Meek, V. L. (1991) 'The transformation of Australian higher education from binary to unitary system', *Higher Education*, 21(4), pp. 461–494.
- Medina, L. R. (2014) *Centers and Peripheries in Knowledge Production*. (Vol. 115). Routledge.
- Méndez, E. H. and Reyes, R. (2014) Research Culture in Higher Education : The Case of a Foreign Language Department in Mexico. *Profile*, 16(2), pp. 135–150.
- Meyers, M. (2013) The War on Academic Women: Reflections on Postfeminism in the Neoliberal Academy. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 37(4), pp. 274–283.
- Ministry of Education (2004) 'A new funding framework: how government grants are allocated to public higher education institutions', (February 2004), pp. 1–20.
- Mir, R.A., Mir, A. and Upadhyaya, P. (2003) *Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control*. In Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement. Palgrave Macmillan US pp. 47-73.
- Modiri, J.S. (2011) 'The grey line in-between the rainbow: (re)thinking and (re)talking critical race theory in post-apartheid legal and social discourse', *SA Public Law (SAPL)* 26

(1): 177-201.

Mokadi, A. (2004) 'Conceptions of the transformed university : south-african / african engaged', *CHE Colloquium*, pp. 1–6.

Morley, L. (2001) 'Subjected to review: engendering quality and power in higher education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(5), pp. 465–478.

Morley, L. (2016) 'Troubling intra-actions: gender, neo-liberalism and research in the global academy', *Journal of Education Policy*. Routledge, 31(1), pp. 28–45.

Muller, A. (1997) 'PROMOTING a research culture and scholarship at a higher education institution', *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, 3(1), pp.88-102.

Naidoo, R., Shankar, A. and Veer, E. (2011) 'The consumerist turn in higher education : Policy aspirations and outcomes The consumerist turn in higher education : Policy aspirations and outcomes', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(11-12), pp.1142-1162.

Nandy, A. (2007). *Time Treks: The uncertain future of old and new despotisms*. Ranikhet: Permanent Black.

National Research Funding (2014) 'NRF Free-standing Masters and Doctoral Scholarships Call for 2014', pp. 3–6.

Neumann, R. and Guthrie, J. (2002) 'The corporatization of research in Australian higher education', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 13(5–6), pp. 721–741.

Niemann, R. (2010) 'Transforming an institutional culture : An appreciative inquiry', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(6), pp.1003-1022.

Nissenbaum, H. (2009) *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*. Stanford University Press.

Nosek, B.A., Alter, G., Banks, G.C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S.D., Breckler, S.J., Buck, S.,

Chambers, C.D., Chin, G., Christensen, G. and Contestabile, M., (2015) 'Promoting an open research culture', *Science*, 348(6242), pp.1422-1425.

Olssen, M. and Leons, M. A. (2005) 'Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism', *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), pp. 313–345.

Okiki, O. C. (2003) 'Research productivity of teaching faculty members in Nigerian federal universities: An investigative study', *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal*, 36(1986), pp. 99–118.

Parker L.D., (2013) 'Contemporary university strategising: the financial imperative', *Financial Accountability & Management*, 29(1), pp.1-25.

Parker, L. and Guthrie, J. (2005) 'Welcome to “the rough and tumble” Managing accounting research in a corporatised university world', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 18(1), pp.5-13.

Trowler, P.R. (1998) *Academics Responding to Change. New Higher Education Frameworks and Academic Cultures*. SRHE, Open University: Philadelphia.

Pityana, N.B. 2009) 'Higher education, transformation and Africanisation: A paradigm shift?', In: *The Guide to South African Higher Education*. 9th ed. South Africa: IEASA.

Potter, W. J. and Donnerstein, D. L. (1999) 'Rethinking Validity and Reliability in Content Analysis', *Journal of Applied Communication Research ISSN:*, 27(3), pp. 258–284.

Prasad, A. (2003) *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement*. Springer.

Pratt, M., Margaritis, D. and Coy, D. (1999) 'Developing a Research Culture in a University Faculty', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 21(1), pp. 43–55.

Press, E. and Washburn, J., (2000) 'The kept university', *Atlantic Monthly*, 285(3).

Pyke, K.D., (1996) 'Class-based masculinities the interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power', *Gender & Society*, 10(5), pp.527-549.

Quijano, A. (2007) 'Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality', *Cultural Studies*, 21(2), pp. 168–178.

Raaper, R. (2016) 'Critical Studies in Education Academic perceptions of higher education assessment processes in neoliberal academia', *Critical Studies in Education*. Routledge, 57(2), pp. 175–190.

Rabaka, R. (2012) *Against Epistemic Apartheid W. E. B. Du Bois and the Disciplinary Decadence of Sociology*. United Kingdom: Lexington Books.

Ramose, M. (2004) 'Transforming education in South Africa: Paradigm shift or change?', *South African Journal of Higher Education (SAJHE)* 17(3): 137–143.

Reay, D. (2004) 'Cultural capitalists and academic habitus: Classed and gendered labour in UK higher education', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 27(1), pp. 31–39.

Remler, D.K. and Pema, E. (2009) *Why do institutions of higher education reward research while selling education?*, *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Ridley, B. (2011) 'Educational Research Culture and Capacity Building : The Case of Addis Ababa University', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 59:3, 285-302.

Rinaldi, C. and Moss, P. (2004) 'What is Reggio? In *Children in Europe: Celebrating 40 years of Reggio Emilia-the pedagogical thought and practice underlying the world renowned early services in Italy*', Scotland.

Rorstad, K. and Aksnes, D. W. (2015) 'Publication rate expressed by age, gender and academic position - A large-scale analysis of Norwegian academic staff', *Journal of Informetrics*. Elsevier Ltd, 9(2), pp. 317–333.

SAccess (2012) 'Supporting the EU access to South Africa ' s research and innovation Programmes: Report on South African research and innovation capacity'.

Seidman, S. and Alexander, J.C. (2001) '*The new social theory reader: contemporary debates*', Psychology Press.

Schuller, T. (1995) *The Changing University?, The Society for Research into Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Schulze, S. (2009) 'Academic research at a South African higher education institution', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 22(3), pp. 629–643.

Shahjahan, R. a. (2014) 'From “no” to “yes”: postcolonial perspectives on resistance to neoliberal higher education', *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. Taylor & Francis, 35(2), pp. 1–14.

Shahjahan, R . A. (2011) 'Decolonizing the evidence-based education and policy movement: revealing the colonial vestiges in educational policy, research, and neoliberal reform', *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(2), pp. 181–206.

Shaker, G. G. and Plater, W. M. (2016) '*The Public Good , Productivity and Faculty Work : Individual Effort and Social Value*'. TIAA Institute: New York.

Shattock, M. (2009) *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy: Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Silver, H. (2003) 'Does a University Have a Culture?', *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), pp. 157–169.

Simons, M. and Masschelein, J. (2009) 'The public and its university: Beyond learning for civic employability?', *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), pp. 204–217.

Singh, M. (2014) 'Higher education and the public good: precarious potential?', *Acta Academica*, 46(1), pp.98-118.

Singh, M. (2001) 'Re-inserting the 'Public Good' into Higher Education Transformation', *Kagisano*, Discussion Series (1): 7–22.

Singh, P. (2014) 'Performativity and pedagogising knowledge: globalising educational policy formation, dissemination and enactment', *Journal of Education Policy*. Routledge, 30(3), pp. 363–384.

Sit, V. (2010) 'The Erosion Of The University As A Public Sphere', *Canada*, 48(4), pp.30-33.

Slaughter, S. (2001) Professional values and the allure of the market. *Academe*, 87(5), 22.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997) *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.

Snowball, J. and Shackleton, C. (2015) *Research Activity Survey*. Grahamstown.

Sojo, A., Ottone, E. and Espíndola, E. (2007) *Social cohesion: inclusion and a sense of belonging in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Santiago.

Sorlin, S. and Vessuri, H. (2007) 'Knowledge Society Vs Knowledge Economy: Knowledge, Power and Politics'. Palgrave: USA.

Stevens, G. (2007) 'Tactical reversal or re-centering whiteness? A response to Green, Sonn, and Matsebula', *Psychological Society of South Africa*, 37(3): 425–430.

Taylor, Y. and Taylor, R., (2010) 'Academic freedom and racial injustice: South Africa's former 'open universities'', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(6), pp.897-913.

Teelken, C. and Deem, R. (2013) 'All are equal, but some are more equal than others: managerialism and gender equality in higher education in comparative perspective',

Comparative Education, 68(January), pp. 1–16.

Teferra, D. (2016) ‘Conclusion: the era of mass early career academics and aging faculty – Africa’s paradox’, *Studies in Higher Education*. Taylor & Francis, 41(10), pp. 1869–1881.

Teferra, D. and Altbachl, P. (2004) ‘African higher education: Challenges for the 21st century’, *Higher Education*, pp. 21–50.

Thaver, B. (2009) ‘Diversity and research practices among academics in South African universities : race for the market’, *Perspectives in Education*, 27(4).

Tierney, W.G., (1988) 'Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials', *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), pp.2-21.

Tikly, L. (2001) ‘Globalisation and Education in the Postcolonial World: Towards a conceptual framework.’, *Comparative Education*, 37(2), pp. 151–171.

Tikly, L. (2004) ‘Education and the new imperialism’, *Comparative Education*, 40(2), pp. 173–198.

Tilak, J. B. G. (2008) ‘Higher education: a public good or a commodity for trade?’, *Prospects*, 38(4), pp. 449–466.

Tremain, S. (2005) *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Michigan: the university of michigan press.

Vaillant, Y. and Lafuente, E. (2007) ‘Do different institutional frameworks condition the influence of local fear of failure and entrepreneurial examples over entrepreneurial activity ?’ *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 19:4, pp 313-337.

Van Wyk, B. and Jacobs, A.H., (2012) Cultural change and the emergence of the knowledge-driven economy. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 26(6), pp.1170-1181.

Vincent, L. (2006) 'Destined to Come to Blows?: Race and Constructions of "Rational-Intellectual" Masculinity Ten Years After Apartheid', *Men and Masculinities*, 8(3), pp. 350–366.

Vincent, L. (2014) *Higher Education and the transformation of research cultures and practices in South Africa – A Qualitative Study*. Grahamstown.

Washburn, J. (2008). *University, Inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education*. Basic Books.

Weber, E. and Vandeyar, S. (2004) 'A site of struggle: Black academics at historically white universities in South Africa', *Africa Education Review*, 1(2), pp. 175–192.

Weber, L. and Bergan, S. eds., (2005) *The public responsibility for higher education and research* (Vol. 2). Council of Europe.

Woodiwiss, A.J., (2012) 'Publication subsidies: challenges and dilemmas facing South African researchers', *Cardiovascular journal of Africa*, 23(8), pp.421-427.

Wilkins, A. C. (2004) 'Puerto Rican Wannabes: Sexual Spectacle and the Marking of Race, Class, and Gender Boundaries', *Gender & Society*, 18(1), pp. 103–121. doi: 10.

Yardley, L., (2008) Demonstrating validity in qualitative psychology. *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, 2, pp.235-251.

Ylijoki, O. H. (2003) 'Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research', *Higher Education*, 45(3), pp. 307–335.

Zarkov, D. (2015) 'On intellectual labour and neoliberalism in academia - Or, in praise of reviewers', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 22(3), pp. 269–273.

Zezeza, P. (2002) 'African Universities and Globalisation'.