



South
Africa -
Netherlands Research
Programme on
Alternatives in
Development

**The South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on
Alternatives in Development (SANPAD):
A Response to the Internationalisation of Higher Education
and Human Resource Development in South Africa**

**Paper
for the**

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AFRICA (IEASA)
7TH International Conference
'Internationalization and Human Resource Development in the African Union/NEPAD:
Challenges for the Tertiary Education Sector'**

**3-6 September 2003
Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education,
Potchefstroom, Northwest Province, South Africa**

**by
Paul Hoebink / Nelke van der Lans /Anshu Padayachee***

* Paul Hoebink is associate professor at the Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen (University of Nijmegen), Chair of the SANPAD NL-Committee and Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of SANPAD; Nelke van der Lans is Coordinator of the SANPAD programme in the Netherlands; Anshu Padayachee is Programme Director of SANPAD in South Africa.

Summary

There is some reluctance among researchers in developing countries to go into cooperation with Northern researchers and research institutions. There is a fear for academic neo-colonialism and academic tourism. Still international cooperation seems to be a way out to overcome the global divide in knowledge building and knowledge creation

SANPAD is a unique research cooperation programme that recognises the need for corrective action in enabling especially researchers from previously disadvantaged communities to make a full and meaningful contribution to research and research development in South Africa. Whilst the programme is funded solely by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the emphasis of the programme is within South Africa with collaborative partnerships with researchers from the Netherlands. The thrust of the SANPAD programme is based on identified research themes which seeks to promote social development in South Africa.

The objectives set by SANPAD respond to the *Education White Paper 2: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education* (July 1997), the CHE Report *Towards a Higher Education Landscape* (June 2000), and the *National Plan for Higher Education* (February 2001). These policy documents and the SANPAD Programme Document recognize that national growth and development is dependent on a well organized and vibrant research and development system which integrates the research and development capacity of higher education with the needs of social reconstruction. The National Plan for Higher Education emphasizes the role of research as the most important vehicle to deepen the South African democracy and SANPAD's thematic approach is a response to this objective,

Against this background SANPAD developed its programme (Phase 1) and we will describe this as follows:

- Details of the programme
- Outputs in Phase 1
- Nature of research in Phase 1
- Spin offs from the programme
- Motivation for Phase 2 and the review of its themes

As we will show, spin offs of SANPAD projects go beyond the SANPAD budget itself. They involve student exchange, information exchange and combined use of facilities.

In its first phase (1997-2002) SANPAD financed **83** projects and it trained **93** students in three RCI-courses. In this first five years it had a budget of € 5.7 million. In its second phase 2002-2007 this will be € 10.7 million.

SANPAD has published annual reports and two newsletters in 2001 and 2002.

In doing all this the authors believe that SANPAD could be seen as a model answer to the questions and challenges that globalisation and internationalisation pose to South Africa's tertiary education and research. International cooperation indeed could be a way out to answer to these challenges.

**The South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on
Alternatives in Development (SANPAD):
A Response to the Internationalisation of Higher Education
and Human Resource Development in South Africa**

by

Paul Hoebink / Nelke van der Lans / Anshu Padayachee*

Introduction

Internationalisation is, undoubtedly, the most revolutionary development in Higher Education at present. But at the same time it is a major challenge: those with most funds and other resources are the first to profit of this globalisation of knowledge production and distribution. They are in the centre of 'knowledge networks', controlling the strings and the streams. Globalisation of research and knowledge production in this way could contribute to a new global divide in this new 'Global Age' where knowledge-led transformation is said to bring is in the new era of 'globality'.

Badat (2002) in a paper entitled 'Globalisation and South African Higher Education' emphasizes that a key challenge, at the level of both policy and practice, in the reconstruction and transformation of South African society is how to respond to changes in the world that have been captured by the concept 'globalisation' and internationalisation. He goes on to say "like it or not, globalisation is not a process that one can ignore or avoid". Badat (2002) points out that the challenges facing Higher Education in South Africa must therefore address the following: How do South African academics engage with globalisation in a manner which is proactive, and how do they integrate themselves into the global order in a way that is as far as possible beneficial to South Africa and South Africans and that enables them to pursue the reconstruction and transformation of their society and overcome the ravages of apartheid?

Bussieres (2000) is of the opinion, that this can be quite easily achieved through international co-operation programmes, but, researchers and academics in South Africa are still divided on the issues related to globalisation and internationalisation of Higher Education and the role of co-operation programmes in South Africa.

Cooperation in research and support for research projects has been an element of development co-operation from the beginning. This development support for research went through several phases afterwards. SANPAD then could be said to belong to the fourth generation of research cooperation programmes. Looking at several research programmes sponsored by European donors SANPAD is a rather unique programme. This is due to three things that make it special:

1. It is a collaborative programme between North and South but the focal point is clearly in the South
2. It is trying to promote high quality research in a combination with research capacity building

* Paul Hoebink is associate professor at the Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen (University of Nijmegen), Chair of the SANPAD NL-Committee and Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of SANPAD; Nelke van der Lans is Coordinator of the SANPAD programme in the Netherlands; Anshu Padayachee is Programme Director of SANPAD in South Africa.

3. It tries to focus in particular on (historically) disadvantaged researchers.

We will sketch the first phase of SANPAD and its results in the paragraphs to follow and we will end by giving some indications of SANPAD's future. This serves to demonstrate that the model that SANPAD is implying could be an answer to the internationalisation of research and capacity building for research in South Africa.

Globalisation, international research co-operation and development

We are presumed to live in the 'Global Age' (Albrow 1997), in times of the 'Network Society' (Castells 1996), in times in which rapid transformations in particular in the exchange of ideas and knowledge through the 'cyber-revolution' are taking place not only our societies and economies but also in knowledge production. If we really are in a new era or in a new phase of the old one, is still a matter of heated debate.¹ What is of importance here is that it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that also knowledge production is taking place more and more in global networks. Research too is more and more taking place in production networks that stretch over the globe, in which bits and pieces could be as well produced in Bangalore or Rio and assembled in Nijmegen as well as in Durban. In this global competition one has to be an active member in one or more of these networks to not to end in the pack of the 'losers'. Of course there has been a 'global divide' in knowledge production: the major part of patents, scientific articles, books etc. are produced in the North. The Internet is sometimes seen here as an 'equalizer', by giving a democratic access to the 'knowledge of the world' the 'have-nots' could become part of the 'knowledge-rich'. What then often is forgotten that capacity is needed to digest the enormous flow of (scientific) information floating over the Net. This means not only technical capacity, but also intellectual capacities, based on sound research experiences. The 'global divide' in wealth could well deepen itself in a new global divide in knowledge production when Southern researchers and research institutes are not able to become members of the global networks and thus are not able to build this research capacity.

As stated, Bussieres (2000) is of the opinion, that addressing globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education can be quite easily achieved through international co-operation programmes. But as indicated, researchers and academics in South Africa are still divided on the issues related to globalisation and internationalisation of Higher Education and the role of co-operation programmes in South Africa.

While Kulati (2002) agrees that there are common, even universal, responses to this broad challenge of globalisation and internationalisation of higher education, he cautions that the responses to these issues must be shaped by local, national and regional histories, contexts and priorities. He questions the validity of the notion of excellence in teaching and research if the curriculum does not engage with, and reflect on, the key social issues and the development agenda of the society in which the higher education institution is located. He goes on to argue that more fundamentally, excellence cannot be addressed independently of the specific missions and roles that individual higher education institutions have to play in realizing a higher education system of the 21st century. Kulati (2002), like Kaunda (2001) and Turner (2001) support the principle that to strike the right balance between the global and the local is critical, if we are to ensure that higher education institutions and systems do not become pre-occupied with responding to global trends and imperatives in a vacuum. All three researchers agree, that engagement with the global and universal must be guided by clearly articulated national principles and goals. They point out further that, if the processes involved in globalisation and internationalisation of Higher Education is not guided by national objectives, it risks the danger

¹ See Schuurman (2000) for an overview of different positions on globalisation.

of entrenching the unequal power relations that have characterized the relationship between the developed and developing worlds.

Turner (2001) and Kaunda (2001) argue that approaches to the role of higher education in globalisation and internationalisation need to reflect the fundamentally different realities of the South and the North. This, they say is necessary to ensure that international education does not result in a 're-colonisation of the African continent'. According to Turner (2001) there are still 'suspicions that internationalisation is a one way street and at times, looks like a new form of colonialism'. To avoid this 're-colonisation' would mean for research programmes that research themes and research proposals should come from the South and that the organisational structure would reflect that. It would further mean that the cooperation aspect or cooperation mechanisms emphasize research capacity building in the aid-receiving country. Of priority for much of South African higher education, is the need to make the system responsive to the needs of transformation from the dark years of Apartheid to an efficient system that services the need of all of society.

SANPAD, in developing its programme in South Africa, saw internationalisation as a vehicle for contributing to strategies aimed at equipping the capacity of people in the South to compete more favourably with the North. SANPAD recognises in its first Programme Document internationalisation as enabling us to 'work toward providing an experience for our students that will lead to their global competence and confidence to be as effective as possible, become productive workers, and contributing citizens of our nations and the world'. It is understood therefore that internationalisation is important in order that academic institutions can prepare their students for a world that is forever changing and that internationalisation requires collaboration, communication, integration, and partnering across disciplines, divisions, and being open to different ideas and views.

The real reason that South Africa's researchers must attempt to become more global in their thinking is this: the nations are different and develop differently, and their researchers are different because their cultures are different. Therefore, Ludeman (2001) says that it is 'important to understand the culture to understand the person'. Ludeman (2001) goes on to say that understanding the cultures of nations is critical to any understanding of internationalisation and globalisation. From this perspective Higher Education institutions have an obligation to educate future leaders to achieve global competence, so that they are able to be more effective and productive workers and better citizens of the world. Within the South African context the debate about the inequalities between universities in South Africa continues and there is a danger that any benefits of internationalisation will be fuelled off to the better-resourced institutions. It is these issues that research funders and international linkage and collaborative programmes need to give attention to.

Kulati (2001) in his paper emphasizes that the government's concerns are not motivated by narrow protectionist agendas or national chauvinism. On the contrary, there are numerous examples of genuine partnerships, especially between local and international higher education institutions. In fact, these partnerships, often supported through inter-governmental arrangements, have been critically important in assisting South African institutions to build their research and teaching capacities, especially after years of isolation from the international academic community in the early days of apartheid. Clearly, to be sustainable and intellectually rewarding, collaborations must be based on the potential for mutual benefit

Unfortunately, there is often the perception amongst researchers and academics in developing countries that for most foreign institutions seeking partnerships, locally, such considerations as the development agenda of the country are not paramount. The impression or suspicion among South African academics and researchers is that the international collaborators see South Africa and indeed other countries in the South, as simply offering new markets, offering a new huge database or creating opportunities for 'academic tourism.' Hence Kulati's

(2001) claim that there is a scant concern for development agendas, or even concern to promote the traditional values associated with higher education. Is this what the notion of a globalising higher education system been reduced to? Is this what the much-vaunted benefits of globalisation are all about?

SANPAD in developing its programme in South Africa, took into consideration all of these concerns and suspicions and carefully examined the hallmarks of successful collaborations, resulting in SANPAD being established as a, we think, unique research co-operation programme, with the thrust of the programme being based on identified research themes which seeks to promote social development in South Africa.

SANPAD's historical background, objectives and themes

SANPAD originated from a mission of the then minister for Development Co-operation of the Netherlands Jan Pronk in March 1996 to South Africa. He acknowledged the necessity of a research programme combining the aims of stimulating policy-relevant and development-oriented research with capacity building. The Indo-Dutch Programme on Alternatives in Development (IDPAD) served as an example here, but in contrast with that programme the initiative in SANPAD was from the beginning onwards clearly at the South-African side. The emphasis on capacity building within SANPAD was also present from the beginning, taking in account the huge differences, as a heritage from Apartheid-years, between historically advantaged and historically disadvantaged institutions. The historically advantaged institutions produce the large majority of scientific articles and masters and doctors graduates, while the disadvantaged institutions in terms of scientific infrastructure and staff remunerations are clearly lagging behind.

A conference in November 1996 in Pretoria was organised by a South-African interim Committee, after consultation with and in presence of a Dutch interim committee, to discuss the goals of the programme, research themes and priority areas. Deans of Research of the South African universities and technikons, representatives of the research community, high ranking civil servants of the Ministry of Education and of research institutes were invited and present at this conference. A broad consensus resulted from this meeting, which led to a *Programme Document* in which the objectives, concepts, themes and modalities were further elaborated. The three broad objectives of SANPAD in its First Phase were:

1. Stimulating and promoting high quality, multidisciplinary, collaborative, policy-oriented research
2. Facilitating the building of research capacity in South Africa
3. Developing an institutional research culture and a culture of inter-institutional research collaboration.

Since SANPAD was committed to stimulate research on alternatives in development the identification of research themes got special emphasis. Sources for the selection of research themes were the specific South African policy documents and submissions of ideas written and verbally at the above-mentioned conference.

Five themes resulted from this and out of the discussions:

1. New approaches to economic development.
Under this theme research should focus on sustainable development, encouraging entrepreneurship and the transfer of technology and technical expertise. Appropriate attention should, as it was stated, also be paid to social and environmental aspects of this development.
2. Social development for empowerment.

The focus of research proposals under this theme should be on the excluded and particularly projects about social development within the context of the rapid urbanization processes were invited.

3. Natural resources and their management.

This theme invited for proposals at the interface between the physical and socio-economic systems. The sustainability of natural resources and resource management were regarded as strategic issues.

4. Governance for democracy.

The relationships between traditional and constitutional governance and the different tiers of governance are the main focus of this theme. Concepts of democratisation, equality and socio-economic rights, the relation within civil society were among the suggested topics.

5. Culture, identity and a new society.

The ethnical, cultural and linguistical diversity of South Africa is at the centre of this theme. Accommodating these differences should be at the centre of projects under this theme. Multiculturalism, education and curriculum development, value systems and cultural diversity could be subjects here.

These themes allow SANPAD to support research in the humanities (social sciences as well as history and cultural studies), but also interdisciplinary research between the sciences and the social sciences.

In August 1997 the *first call for proposals* was sent out and this can be seen as the real start of the programme. Since then SANPAD has funded 83 research projects, coming out of six calls for proposals. That the focus is in South Africa is best demonstrated in the origin of the proposals. All of them come from South African researchers answering to these calls for proposals in the major South African newspapers and communicated to the research institutes. In the next section we will go into more detail on the content and the origin of the proposals.

Apart from funding projects, SANPAD organised a *Research Capacity building Initiative (RCI)*, in particular for disadvantaged researchers. This is a structured training programme for young South African researchers, in particular from historically disadvantaged groups and particularly also for female researchers, with which we also will deal below.

In its organisational structure SANPAD resembles the spirit of partnership. Both in South Africa and in the Netherlands there is a National Committee (in the second phase a National Board in South Africa) supported by a secretariat. In the Netherlands SANPAD's NC is also supported by an Advisory Committee. But it is the Joint Committee, consisting of the three members of as well the South Africa as the Netherlands National Committees which takes the major decisions. It reunites in principle twice a year, once in South Africa, once in the Netherlands. Both Board and Committees consist of outstanding scholars, mainly from the social sciences, and in the Netherlands case with a clear and keen interest in (South) Africa. The major part of the South African National Board is chosen by an independent selection commission, the other members are proposed by the main South African research bodies. The Netherlands Committees are co-opted as to get a good representation of Dutch universities and research institutes in the Committee.

As well as the preparatory costs as the programme costs from 1997 to halfway 2003 were financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands from the development co-operation budget. This budget forms the major part of the foreign affairs budgets and has a special budget line for cooperation in research and the funding of research programmes. The total budget for SANPAD for the first five year period was Dgld 12,5 million (€ 5.6 million).

When the end of the First Phase was approaching, in the first half year of 2002, a new Programme Document was drafted between the National Committees of SANPAD South Africa and the Netherlands. It was submitted to the Dutch government and approved at the end of 2002.

This paper will mainly follow the outcomes of SANPAD's First Phase and give a short perspective into the Second Phase at the end.

Objective 1: Promoting high quality research

SANPAD approved and funded 9 projects out of its 1997 call for proposals, 15 out of the 1998 call, 19 out of 1999, 15 out of 2000, 10 out of 2001 and (up to now) 15 out of 2002, adding up to a total of 83. In total 448 project proposals were received, meaning that 13% of the proposals was funded outright and another 9 % got funded after reformulation (see Annex, Table 7). In particular in the first two years a large number of projects was rejected. It obviously did cost time to set the standards. SANPAD gives the possibility and the means to organise workshops to formulate and reformulate project proposals, with help of South African and Dutch collaborators, in particular for formerly disadvantaged researchers.

It is visible in Table 1 that in particular the theme of social development was popular among researchers with some 42 % of all the projects. Also prominent were projects with applied research to natural resources and those under the banner of culture and identity. This means that SANPAD finances projects on the Khoisan Revival Movement as well as on fog water collection on the West Coast in South Africa. All research projects turned into the actuality of today's South Africa.

Table 1:
Number of projects per theme for the years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002

Themes of First Phase	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total	%
New approaches to economic development	2	2	4	4		3	15	18%
Social development for empowerment	4	5	8	4	7	7	35	42%
Natural resources and their management	2	5	6	3	1	3	20	24%
Governance for democracy		1	2	3	1	2	9	11%
Culture, identity and a new society	2	3	8	1	1	3	17	20%
Totals	10	16	28	15	10	18	97	
<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>15</i>	83	100 %

N.B. Ten projects are classified in 2 themes and two projects in 3 themes.

If we look at these figures more in detail (Annex, Table 8) we will see that up till the last project round of 2002, 46 % of the project leaders were from historically disadvantaged groups (which includes blacks and females), meaning that white males are still dominating (54 %). This is of course conform the present situation in South Africa's tertiary education institutions in which the large majority of tenured academic posts are occupied by white male academics. One

could say that it is nevertheless comforting that 46% of the project leaders is coming from other, historically disadvantaged, groups and more than 21% from black researchers. Furthermore those last numbers are growing over the years. It reflects the effort SANPAD is giving - in its training, in its sponsorship for pre-proposal workshops - for those groups of researchers.

Table 2:
Project leaders by race and gender

YEAR	BLACK FEMALE	WHITE FEMALE	BLACK MALE	WHITE MALE	TOTAL
1997	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	9 (100%)
1998	0 (0%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	9 (60%)	15 (100%)
1999	1 (5%)	4 (21%)	4 (21%)	10 (53%)	19 (100%)
2000	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	9 (60%)	15 (100%)
2001	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	10 (100%)
2002	4 (27%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	15 (100%)
TOTAL	7 (8.4%)	20 (24.1%)	11 (13.3%)	45 (54.2%)	83 (100%)

In terms of institutions, more than two thirds of the SANPAD projects up till 2002 are coming from Historically Advantaged Universities, 22 % are from Historically Disadvantaged Universities and 8 % from Technikons (see Annex, Table 9). It should be said here, that due to the major shifts in the South African universities since the end of Apartheid and looking at the shifts still to come, it is not SANPAD policy to help in particular Historically Disadvantaged Institutions, but historically disadvantaged and promising researchers. Still, by promoting co-operation inside South Africa between HAUs and HDUs SANPAD also tries to address some of the problems that HDUs still experience. In effect the provincial and institutional breakdowns of project leaders hides the co-operation between HAUs and HDUs that is most of the times behind it. One should thus keep in mind that in many of the programmes with project leaders from historically advantaged institutions collaborative relations between the advantaged and disadvantaged institutions were set up. This can be seen in the numbers of collaborators from HDUs and historically disadvantaged groups in SANPAD projects (see Annex, Tables 10 and 11). That is not to say these figures do reflect the real content of the collaboration, that in some cases might be genuine and going deep, and in other cases might be mainly symbolic.¹

The regional spread of the projects (see Annex, Table 12) reflects these figures. 60 % is in the Western Cape and Gauteng (the Johannesburg/Pretoria region) and only 6 % in the North and 4 % in the North-West.

¹ As the involvement of collaborators (institutions and students) within the projects of 2002 is not yet finalised, we present in this case statistical data up to the projects of 2001.

Objective 2: Facilitate research capacity building

Besides the promotion of research that positively contributes to South Africa's socio-economic development, the next main objective of SANPAD is capacity development of researchers particularly from disadvantaged backgrounds.

SANPAD builds capacity by supporting and involving individuals, and through collaboration between institutions and between South Africa and the Netherlands. Although the target groups for capacity building are mainly post-graduate students and underprepared researchers, particularly those from under-represented groups and institutions, interaction with South African and international experts also develops the capacity of more senior researchers.

The Research Capacity Building activities of SANPAD contain three components. These are:

1. Each project has researchers from historically disadvantaged groups who register for higher degrees under the umbrella of the project;
2. Funds are provided for proposal improvement workshops where the entire research team as well as a Dutch collaborator come together to work on improving the proposal;
3. A Research Capacity Building Initiative (RCI) is implemented where academics from historically disadvantaged groups (mainly from SANPAD projects) are invited to attend a series of residential workshops.

SANPAD continued to insist on a demonstrable element of research capacity building in research projects as a requirement for subsidy. Beneficiaries must include representatives from historically disadvantaged groups (notably black and female scholars), both at historically disadvantaged and historically advantaged institutions. SANPAD's focus is on people, but one of the positive implications of this selection criterion is a growing number of inter-institutional research links in South Africa, where groups at historically advantaged institutions and at historically disadvantaged institutions team up for SANPAD project implementation.

One of the most successful results of SANPAD's First Phase is the high number of students involved in the projects who come from historically disadvantaged backgrounds.¹ Tables 3 and 4 below give breakdowns of students for disadvantaged and advantaged backgrounds (Table 3) and for race and gender (Table 4). It appears that white male students, considered to form the advantaged group, are in the minority (8 %). Of the disadvantaged group (92 %) the majority is black male (44 %), followed by black females (34 %).

Table 3:
Students in SANPAD projects from historically disadvantaged and historically advantaged groups

YEAR	HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED		HISTORICALLY ADVANTAGED		TOTAL	
1997	23	(88 %)	3	(12 %)	26	(100 %)
1998	52	(88 %)	7	(12 %)	59	(100 %)
1999	35	(95 %)	2	(5 %)	37	(100 %)
2000	20	(100 %)	-	(0 %)	20	(100 %)
2001	26	(96 %)	1	(4 %)	27	(100 %)
TOTAL	156	(92 %)	13	(8 %)	169	(100 %)

¹ As the involvement of collaborators (institutions and students) within the projects of 2002 is not yet finalised, we present in this case statistical data up to the projects of 2001.

Table 4:
Students in SANPAD projects by race and gender

YEAR	BLACK FEMALE	WHITE FEMALE	BLACK MALE	WHITE MALE	TOTAL
1997	12 (46 %)	1 (4 %)	10 (38 %)	3 (12 %)	26 (100 %)
1998	12 (20 %)	5 (9 %)	35 (59 %)	7 (12 %)	59 (100 %)
1999	10 (27 %)	8 (22 %)	17 (46 %)	2 (5 %)	37 (100 %)
2000	11 (55 %)	3 (15 %)	6 (30 %)	- (0 %)	20 (100 %)
2001	13 (48 %)	6 (22 %)	7 (26 %)	1 (4 %)	27 (100 %)
TO- TAL	58 (34 %)	23 (14 %)	75 (44 %)	13 (8 %)	169 (100 %)

SANPAD also has facilitated a series of workshops to come to more concise research projects. Particularly these workshops are seen as an innovative instrument to build research capacity, in the very down to earth exercise of working out a project proposal in fine detail. SANPAD donated workshops for promising but still weakly formulated projects in 40 cases up till the project proposals round of 2002, of which in 65 % of the cases the project leader was of a historically disadvantaged group (see Annex, Table 13). This reflects the idea of building research capacity in particular among these researchers. In 30 % of the reformulation cases the project leaders were female, more than half of them black.

Furthermore, SANPAD introduced a workshop programme in May 1999 in order to intensify its efforts to support research capacity building. This programme is now known as the RCI (Research Capacity Building Initiative) and was approved for funding by SANPAD's JC and the Netherlands' ministry in 1999. The RCI aims to develop individual researchers with the knowledge and skills to conduct good research and to transfer their expertise to others.

Since the introduction in 1999, three series of RCI courses have been organized, for which 97 candidates were selected. The first course was a pilot programme, attended by 40 candidates, and organized in the north and the south of the country. The second and third course were based on the outcomes of evaluations, a round table workshop in the Netherlands and meetings of the RCI steering committee. The statistics (Annex, Table 14) originate from the data of the second and third course with respective 27 and 28 candidates. All RCI-students in 2002 and 2003 come from historically disadvantaged groups. Black female researchers form a clear majority, also because the programme reserves some places for black females, who might not necessarily be part of SANPAD projects.

The actual RCI programme is built on seven modules:

1. Thematic Seminar I, and Introduction
2. The Philosophy and Design of Social Research
3. Quantitative Research
4. Qualitative Research
5. Participatory Research
6. Evaluation Research, and
7. Thematic Seminar II, and Conclusion.

Each module is presented by both South African and Dutch researchers in mutual co-operation. The Dutch Research School, CERES, is contracted to deliver suitable Dutch researchers for teaching.

Objective 3: Stimulate Inter-institutional Research Collaboration

One of the objectives of SANPAD is to develop a culture of inter-institutional research collaboration, with other institutions in South Africa as well as research institutions in the Netherlands.

The tables 10 and 11 in the Annex give an indication of the backgrounds of the collaborating institutions in South Africa.¹ While 70% of the project leaders is coming from HAUs (Table 9), this applies to 46% of the collaborators. 32% of the collaborators come from HDUs (compared with 22% of the project leaders). Other collaborators come from Technikons, NGOs or Community Based Organisations. The large majority of the collaborators come from historically disadvantaged groups (70%), 26% being black male and 17% black female. As said above the actual content of the collaboration is difficult to measure. Project visits learn that sometimes only data collection and exchange is involved, but it is more common to have combined seminars and also tutoring of students by staff of HAUs at HDUs.

Looking at the partnerships with the Netherlands (Annex, Table 15) we see a concentration in Leiden, Utrecht, the Free University and Wageningen. In particular the high number of projects of the Free University, given the small size of this university, is remarkable and also that all these projects are with HAUs. The universities of Eindhoven, Nijmegen and Maastricht are clearly underrepresented. Wageningen's, Delft's, and the Free University's collaboration is more or even exclusively with the Historically Advantaged Universities, while the Universities of Amsterdam, Utrecht and Leiden collaborate also with the Historically Disadvantaged Universities. One can not evade the conclusion that the old relations from the Apartheid years still prevail here: those universities that in the Apartheid years entertained contacts with South African universities seem to be in an advantageous position over those universities adhering to the cultural boycott in those years. The latter still have to build new contacts and networks and are thus put at a distance here in comparison with universities that only after the end of Apartheid gave a honourable doctorate to Nelson Mandela.³

It should be stated here that SANPAD does not pay salaries of staff or fees, nor from South African universities, nor from universities in the Netherlands. Co-operation thus has to come out of mutual research interests and/or a genuine dedication to capacity building and training.

¹ As the involvement of collaborators (institutions and students) within the projects of 2002 is not yet finalised, we present in this case statistical data up to the projects of 2001.

³ Like Leiden University, never prominent in the Anti-Apartheid movement in the Netherlands, did.

Table 5:
Collaboration with institutions from the Netherlands specified

1. Sort of involvement of NL collaborators	Nr of respondents	% of total (=45)
• Give feedback on project documents	36	80 %
• Assisting in writing parts of the documents	27	60 %
• Participation in workshops	26	58 %
- as presenter (of own research experiences)	23	51 %
- as organizer of the workshop	12	27 %
• Guidance of junior researchers (usually SA students, but in a few cases also NL PhD candidates involved in the project)	25	55 %
2. Sort of input of NL collaborators		
• Methodology of the research project	39	87 %
• Problem analysis	36	80 %
• Theory formulation	26	58 %
• Relating the research to other research		
- linked to own research	17	38 %
- linked to other comparable research	11	24 %
• Planning of the project	13	29 %
• Dissemination and implementation	13	29 %
3. Sort of communication		
• Email	40	89 %
• visit to project leader and team in SA	38	84 %
- only once	18	40 %
- regularly	20	44 %
- one week or less per visit	21	47 %
- more than 1 week per visit (if contact is long established or visit is combined with other visits)	13	29 %
• visit SA project leader to NL	18	40 %

This genuine and sincere collaboration is reflected if one looks at the character of the contacts and collaboration between Dutch and South African researchers. Early 2002 a survey was held amongst the Dutch researchers who were involved in SANPAD projects, at that time about 75 in 54 projects. The response was 67 %: 50 questionnaires were returned, of which 45 turned out to be useful for analysis. From the answers a profile can be made of the common Netherlands contribution to individual SANPAD projects. Often the Dutch collaborators are linked to projects in South Africa through their own universities, due to existing ties between these institutions. That is why about 60 % of the NL collaborators have already assisted at the beginning of the project in the formulation of the project idea and/or the proposal and the real start of the project. By pre-proposal workshops and start-up workshops SANPAD stimulates this.

Table 5 shows the ways in which the NL researchers are involved in projects. In most cases the researchers pay regular visits to the project team in South Africa, usually at the start and at the end of the project, sometimes also in between. Mostly the visit is combined with a workshop for the whole team. Day-to-day communication is done per email.

An important part of the collaboration is the guidance of junior researchers involved in the projects, South African as well as Dutch. In some cases one or more PhD candidates from the Netherlands (paid not by SANPAD, but out of Dutch university funds) work in the project

side by side with South African students, which often turns out to be a fruitful exchange of research experience and knowledge. This can be called a side effect of SANPAD since the Dutch students, as stated, are not paid out of the SANPAD funds. SANPAD's priority is with capacity building of South African researchers.

Results and products of the SANPAD projects

SANPAD itself organised an interim-evaluation in the year 2000. The long and critical report concluded that the strengths of SANPAD were amongst others in its sound concept, its focus on policy oriented and problem solving, multi-disciplinary research, its personal 'hands-on' involvement (due certainly to the work of the then South African coordinator), the size of its grants, the variety of its capacity initiatives. Weaknesses were seen in the often not very strong conceptualisation of projects, the little coherence between projects within one specific theme, the lack of articulation between the different SANPAD structures and the adequacy of administrative structures to ensure timely funding of projects.

At the end of its first phase SANPAD was positively evaluated by an external evaluators team, as requested by the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Although it was difficult to assess its results in research output (since most projects are still running), it was established that SANPAD had made a good start in fulfilling its main objectives. It was advised to replace the organisational structure even a bit more to South Africa by transferring most financial administrative functions from Amsterdam to Durban.⁴

The evaluators suggested that in due time some more programmatic changes should be realised, such as a redefinition of the research themes. SANPAD would have to adapt its objectives and research themes to the current situation in South Africa.

At the moment of writing this paper, 20 projects have finished their research by submitting a final report or a comparable document. The following table 6 shows what kinds of products the projects have produced, varying from academic papers to articles in local magazines.

Table 6:
Products of completed SANPAD research projects

Products of research projects SANPAD	Nr of projects out of total of 20 completed projects
Only final report	2 (10 %)
Academic papers, presentations at congresses or academic workshops	12 (60 %)
Articles in scientific journals; publication of papers	14 (70 %)
Books or chapters in books	4 (20 %)
Scientific posters, manuals, etc	1 (5 %)

⁴ The major part of the financial administration was in Amsterdam in Phase 1, while the major part of the project administration was in Durban. It means that in the second phase the Amsterdam office will mainly function as a liaison office between the Netherlands and South Africa.

Contribution to scientific knowledge Subtotal	18 (90 %)
Degrees completed	12 (60 %)
Development of specific courses	4 (20 %)
Presentations at non-academic workshops or meetings	4 (20 %)
Tv or radio interviews; newspaper articles; article popular magazine	4 (20 %)
Input to local politics	3 (15 %)
Posters, maps, brochures, handbooks, manual, etc.	5 (25 %)
Contribution to societal knowledge Subtotal	8 (40 %)

Only two SANPAD projects left their products at a final report only. All other show a wide variety of products and results. 18 out of 20 projects (90 %) have contributed to scientific knowledge by presentations and publications at academic forums. At least 8 projects (40 %) have also somehow influenced the local politics or provided information to the local communities through popular articles, interviews to TV and/or radio, newspaper articles, posters and brochures, and handbooks.

Results of the projects are difficult to measure, but subject to further evaluation. With regard to capacity building it is important to notice that in more than half of the projects students completed degrees, keeping in mind here that more degrees are still in the pipeline.

Phase 2: Objectives and Perspectives

Phase 2 will bring some changes to SANPAD. A Programme Document was drafted and submitted to the Dutch government in 2002 and approved at the end of the same year. Although the intention of the objectives is not changed, the objectives have been re-formulated to be more specific.

SANPAD's general objectives in the Second Phase (halfway 2003 – halfway 2008) are to:

1. stimulate and promote quality research;
2. produce research outputs intended and useful for development purposes;
3. promote co-operation between NL and SA researchers, and between institutions within South Africa; and
4. develop research capacity and a culture conducive to research, aimed particularly at researchers from historically disadvantaged communities.

These objectives are all equally important. They are also related, in that good research builds research capacity, while the development of South Africa is connected to the creation of an intellectually sound, quality academic research environment.

Specific goals for the SANPAD Second Phase are to:

1. finance in total approximately 100 research projects;
2. finance and assist in approximately 50 workshops to adjust and reformulate the research proposal, the so-called 'pre-project workshops';
3. finance and assist in approximately 36 workshops to identify the research objective(s) and formulate this into a research proposal, the so-called 'pre-proposal workshops' (this is a new instrument);

4. further build research capacity by annually organising the research capacity training course of approximately 7 weeks, aiming to train 25-30 scholars per year (in total 135) from historically disadvantaged backgrounds;
5. stimulate the dissemination of policy-relevant research outcomes by organising seminars and conferences and by stimulating publication of relevant material (this is a new instrument);
6. stimulate co-operation between SA universities/technikons to promote and extend capacity building within and among the SANPAD projects;
7. stimulate co-operation between the SANPAD research groups and institutions (governmental and non-governmental) which are considered to be the users of the research results; and
8. realise co-operation with NL researchers in such a way that every project will have effective NL collaboration aimed at SANPAD's objectives.

At the Conference in May 2003 where a main part of the SA Scientific Community participated, the following recommendation was given: that the following themes be considered as the themes to be funded individually, with 'Social Development' and 'Knowledge Society' being cross cutting themes. It was argued that although 'Poverty Alleviation' and 'Education and Development' could also be considered cross cutting themes, the conference maintained that these themes deserved to be given individual focus as these were priority areas on South Africa's Development Agenda. Hence the following themes were identified as individual themes under which research would be funded by SANPAD in Phase 2:

1. Poverty alleviation
2. Natural resources
3. Health
4. Culture, identity and society
5. Governance for Democracy
6. Economic empowerment
7. Education and development

In October 2003, the Joint Committee of SANPAD will make a final decision on this issue.

For the SANPAD Second Phase, the intention is to transfer the major part of the operational management to SA. This means that for the Second Phase the contracting and financial management structure will be turned around. The main financial responsibility will rest in South Africa. The financial resources will come again from the NL Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For the next 5 year phase a budget of Euro 10,6 million is envisaged .

Due to the successful implementation of the RCI Programme and the broadening of research management capacity during the First Phase of SANPAD, it is envisaged that there will be a significant increase in the number of fundable research proposals during the Second Phase. The increase in the overall budget is due to the increased numbers of research projects and workshops, higher ceilings for research projects and workshops, and the implementation of new instruments.

Conclusion

Every higher education institution and every researcher working in it is these day confronted with the problems and challenges of internationalisation and globalisation. The enormous enlargement of possibilities to travel and to enjoy the benefits of educations far from home, the electronic revolution which can bring scientific knowledge on the far outposts of the world, the liberalisation of education policies and the inroads that private education is making, the creation of more and more international research and knowledge networks are all parts of these globalisation of knowledge producing institutions, companies and networks. Once again this

could mean that those with large resources at their disposal will be the main winners, and those with scarce resources will be at the losing end. Even if one is reluctant and fears new forms of 'academic colonialism' one has to acknowledge that a transfer of resources – not only money, but in particular knowledge and skills – is needed to overcome this old and at the same time new divide. International cooperation could give an answer to that, but then it should be tailor-made and well-monitored and evaluated. Creating new networks is presented as the answer to these challenges of the globalisation of higher education and research. But networks itself want help: they have to be filled with content, by a real exchange of experiences, knowledge, training, by a sharing of mutual interests and benefits.

SANPAD with its emphasis on policy and development relevant research, with its emphasis on collaboration and capacity building tries to give an answer to the challenges of globalisation and the global divide in research capacity and knowledge creation. The first five years learn us that researchers from the North and the South and within South Africa itself can work together on a mutual basis and for the benefit in particular of historically disadvantaged researchers. Research capacity building takes years and in particular in HIV/AIDS stricken country one has to calculate the number of years more as 15 to 20, than to 10. SANPAD will have to monitor the different aspects of collaboration carefully, but the signs and evaluations of the first five years are truly optimistic. SANPAD also has to prove that it can give a contribution by policy and development relevant research to the main problems of South Africa. Most of its research projects are yet too young to come with results. But also here the first signs give cause for optimism: the production of most projects is high and varied, ranging from articles in scientific journals to CD-roms and newspaper articles. The years 2003-2008 will show if SANPAD is able to sustain this progress and to keep the momentum.

References

- Albrow, M., *The Global Age. State and Society beyond Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- Badat, S., Globalisation and South African Higher Education. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.
- Balintulo, M., The Role of the State in the Transformation of South African Higher Education (1994-2002): Equity and Redress Revisited. Paper for the CODESRIA-Conference 'African Universities in the 21st Century', Dakar, Senegal, April 2002.
- Banzon Bautista, M., Velho, L., and Kaplan, D., Comparative study of the Impacts of donor-initiated programmes on research capacity in the South. The Hague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2001.
- Bawa, A./Mouton, J., Research. In: Cloete, N. a.o., *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities in South Africa*. Lansdowne/Sunnyside: Juta and Company/Centre for Higher Education Transformation, 2002.
- Box, L./Mohammed, N., *SANPAD-1 Review Report*. The Hague, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2001.
- Bussieres, M., Globalisation and Higher Education. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.
- Castells, M., *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Volume 1*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Centre for Science Development, Report on Social Science Methodology Teaching at South African Tertiary Institutions. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, November 1997.
- Chetty, R., Research and development in technikons: lacunae and challenges. In: *South African Journal of Higher Education*, Vol.17, no.1, 2003, pp.9-15.
- Cloete, N., Is it possible to have a positive discourse on globalisation in higher education? Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.
- Cloete, N. a.o., *Transformation in Higher Education: Global Pressures and Local Realities in South Africa*. Lansdowne/Sunnyside: Juta and Company/Centre for Higher Education Transformation, 2002.
- Commission on Development-Related Research, Partnerships at the Leading Edge: A Danish Vision for Knowledge, Research and Development. Copenhagen: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, April 2001.
- ITAD Ltd/ODI, Evaluation of Danida's Bilateral Programme for Enhancement of Research Capacity in Developing Countries (ENRECA). Copenhagen: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 2000.
- Iya, P., Rembe, N., Balaro, J., *Transforming South African Universities*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa 2000.
- Kaunda, L., The Role of Students Affairs in Promoting Globalisation. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.
- Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. North-South Research Cooperation. Amsterdam: KNAW, 2002.
- Kulati, T., Globalisation and Internationalisation: Some South African Experiences. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.
- Ludeman, R., Bridging Nations: The Important Role of International Education in the Globalisation of Higher Education in the South. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.

- Mthembu, T./Naidoo, P., National Education's Research Benchmarks: Realistic Targets or Pie in the Sky. In: *Alternation*, Vol.9, no.1, 2002, pp. 176-203.
- Nair, K./Menon, V., Capacity Building for Demand-led Research : Issues and Priorities. Maastricht: ECDPM, November 2002.
- Nokkala, T., National policy responses to the globalisation of higher education. Paper for the Summer School 2002 of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (University of Twente), Barcelona, July 2002.
- Obakeng Mabokela, R./Lenease King, K. (eds.), *Apartheid No More; Case Studies of Southern African Universities in the Process of Transformation*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 2001.
- Ofir, Z., *SANPAD Formative Evaluation Report for the Period September 1997-March 2000*. Durban, April 2000.
- SANPAD, Programme Document. Durban/Amsterdam 1997.
- SANPAD, Programme Document Phase 2. Durban/Amsterdam 2002.
- SANPAD, Annual Reports. Durban/Amsterdam, several years.
- SANPAD, Newsletters 2001 and 2002.
- SANPAD, Workplans, several years.
- SANPAD, Research Capacity Initiative 2001-2002 Programme Document. Durban, May 2001.
- Schuurman, F. (ed.), *Globalization and Development Studies.Challenges for the 21st Century*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis, 2000.
- Turner, M., Internationalization/Globalization: Daunting Realities for Southern African Institutions. Paper for the Conference 'Globalisation and Higher Education: Views from the South', Cape Town, March 2001.

Annex

Table 7:

**Nrs of proposals received, rejected, advised to reformulate, and funded.
SANPAD, Phase 1.**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	TOTAL
Total number of proposals received	101 (100%)	148 (100%)	52 (100%)	51 (100%)	43 (100%)	53 (100%)	448 (100%)
Number of proposals reviewed by Joint Committee	44 (44%)	63 (43%)	36 (70%)	24 (47%)	19 (44%)	29 (55%)	215 (48%)
Number of proposals rejected by Joint Committee	28 (28%)	34 (23%)	9 (17%)	7 (14%)	8 (14%)	8 (15%)	94 (21%)
Number of proposals funded outright	8 (8%)	15 (10%)	5 (10%)	7 (14%)	7 (14%)	14 (26%)	56 (13%)
Number of proposals awarded workshops for reformulation	3 (3%)	3 (2%)	17 (33%)	6 (12%)	2 (5%)	9 (17%)	40 (9%)
Final number of realised projects	9 (11%)	15 (18%)	19 (23%)	15 (18%)	10 (12%)	15 (18%)	83 (100%)

Table 8:

Project leaders from historically disadvantaged and historically advantaged groups

YEAR	HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED	HISTORICALLY ADVANTAGED	TOTAL
1997	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	9 (100%)
1998	6 (40%)	9 (60%)	15 (100%)
1999	9 (47%)	10 (53%)	19 (100%)
2000	6 (40%)	9 (60%)	15 (100%)
2001	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	10 (100%)
2002	10 (67%)	5 (33%)	15 (100%)
TOTAL	38 (46 %)	45 (54 %)	83 (100%)

Table 9:
Project leaders by type of institution

YEAR	HDU	HAU	Technikon	TOTAL
1997	5	2	2	9
1998	3	11	1	15
1999	2	15	2	19
2000	3	11	1	15
2001	2	8	0	10
2002	3	11	1	15
TOTAL	18 (22 %)	58 (70 %)	7 (8 %)	83 (100 %)

Table 10:
South African collaborators in SANPAD projects from historically advantaged and historically disadvantaged institutions

	HAU	HDU	HAT	HDT	Other	Total
1997	14	20	3	1	1	39
1998	16	23	-	1	21	61
1999	64	23	5	3	26	121
2000	27	25	-	1	8	61
2001	19	4	-	-	1	24
Total	140	95	8	6	57	306
%	46%	32%	3%	2%	19%	100%

HAU= historically advantaged university

HDU= historically disadvantaged university

HAT= historically advantaged technikon

HDT= historically disadvantaged technikons

Other = NGOs, Community-based Organisations (CBOs), companies and semi-government

Table 11:
Collaborators in SANPAD projects by race and gender

YEAR	BLACK FEMALE	WHITE FEMALE	BLACK MALE	WHITE MALE	TOTAL
1997	14 (36%)	3 (8 %)	12 (31%)	10 (25%)	39 (100%)
1998	9 (15%)	11 (18%)	15 (24%)	26 (42%)	61 (100%)
1999	13 (11%)	54 (44%)	25 (21%)	29 (24%)	121 (100%)
2000	11 (18%)	11 (18%)	22 (36%)	17 (28%)	61 (100%)
2001	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	11 (45%)	24 (100%)
TOTAL	51 (17 %)	84 (27 %)	78 (26 %)	93 (30 %)	306 (100%)

Table 12:
Project leaders by province

YEAR	KZN	WC	EC	NC	NW	FS	GAU	NP	MPU	TOTAL
1997	2	5	1				1			9
1998	2	4	2		1		4	2		15
1999	2	6	1		1	1	8			19
2000	5	3	2				3	2		15
2001		5	3		1		1			10
2002	2	5	1			1	5	1		15
TOTAL	13 (16%)	28 (34 %)	10 (12 %)	0 (0 %)	3 (4 %)	2 (2 %)	22 (26 %)	5 (6 %)	0 (0 %)	83 (100 %)

KZN - KwaZulu-Natal WC - Western Cape
 EC - Eastern Cape NC - Northern Cape
 NW - North West Province FS - Free State
 GAU - Gauteng NP - Limpopo formerly Northern Province
 MPU - Mpumalanga

Table 13:
Backgrounds of project leaders of research projects
awarded proposal reformulation workshops

Race + Gender	Nr	%
Black Female	7	17,5 %
White Female	5	12,5 %
Black Male	14	35 %
White Male	14	35 %
Total	40	100 %

Table 14:
Race and gender of RCI candidates

Race and gender	Number of candidates 2002	%	Number of candidates 2003	%
Black female	13	48 %	18	64 %
White female	3	11 %	2	11 %
Black male	11	41 %	8	45 %
Total	27	100 %	28	100 %

Table 15:

Number of HAUs, HDUs and Technikons supported by Dutch universities (projects up to 2002) in SANPAD

NL University *	Involvement with HAU	Involvement with HDU	Involvement with Technikons	Total
University of Utrecht	8	4	1	13
Free University, Amsterdam	10			10
University of Leiden	6	2	1	9
Agriculture University Wageningen	8	1		9
University of Amsterdam	5	3		8
University Delft	5		1	6
University Twente	3	1	2	6
Erasmus University Rotterdam	2	1	1	4
University Groningen	2	1		3
University Maastricht	3			3
University Brabant	3			3
University Nijmegen	2	1		3
University Eindhoven	2			2
Institute for Social Studies (ISS), Den Haag	1	1		2
Other institutions **	5	2		7
Total	65	17	6	88*
No. of projects up to 2002				83
<i>No. of projects without NL collaborator</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>

* Five projects work with more than one NL institution (2 with 3; 4 with 2 institutions).

** Other institutions are:

TME (Applied Environmental Economics), Den Haag
 Internationale Agrarische Hogeschool Larenstein, Deventer
 DLO Institute of Animal Science & Health, Lelystad

Leiden, NVSA
 Institute for the Deaf, Haren
 Instituut voor Doven, St.Michielsgestel
 SOMO