

Research Group Transformation Report, July 2017

ABSTRACT

The research working group's recommendations (emerging from a panel discussion and a survey as read with the Snowball and Shackleton Research Report 2015) are divided into five interrelated themes: funding, collaboration, epistemology, language and research methods, accountability and research participation. The recommendations emanating from their investigations are summarised as follows:

1. Researchers who have been successful at obtaining grants should be connected to new researchers or those who have had less success in order to provide advice and guidance on the framing of proposals.
2. Factors which improve research outputs will lead to improved access to funds, and these are discussed below under other themes.
3. Where senior or established researchers can demonstrate mentoring or collaboration of newer researchers, this should lead to a reward. This reward may not necessarily be financial, but could include reduced teaching load, additional post-graduate funding, or additional exposure.
4. In order to facilitate increased interdisciplinary research, the university could sponsor or assist in the organization of themed symposia for the development of regional (Eastern Cape) or local (Grahamstown) conversations. There are some sources of funding which require partnership within the region.
5. The higher degrees committees, along with the supervisors, act as guardians/gatekeepers of what is considered knowledge within post graduate studies at Rhodes University. They have the power to forbid or allow – and even encourage – researchers to take risks in creating new knowledge. They should be encouraged to do so. Where necessary for the sake of rigor, the submission of proposals should be a dialogue.
6. As recommended above, students and researchers who venture into new territory in knowledge production should be given support and encouragement. This is particularly important where frameworks and theories are untested and/or unclear.
7. As African scholars there is a need to value and develop research in African languages and ontologies.
8. Research published in local or African journals should be valued for its own sake and not simply as having lower impact. A researcher must be able to choose their audience.
9. Publication in international journals is often challenging because we have an African address – researchers with a global “message” should be encouraged to develop a global voice (through international conferences and collaborations) in order to be able to publish in top journals.
10. Those with decision making power need to be made aware of these statistics. Both qualitative and quantitative data need to inform the distribution of responsibilities, so that women do not receive the bulk of the teaching or administrative work because they are better at it, or don't complain (or don't trust the men to do it properly!).

Introduction and process

This working group was set up in preparation for the Transformation Summit at Rhodes University. The group comprised of volunteers from various faculties consisting of Dr. Rosa Klein, Gladman Thondhlana, Helen Kruuse and Rudo Hwami.¹ The group saw its mandate as providing recommendations to the transformation summit participants regarding the research culture at Rhodes University. In order to achieve its mandate, the research working group obtained data through a panel discussion and a qualitative survey, which was combined with the report from a quantitative survey published by Shackleton and Snowball in 2015. The results of their analysis and their recommendations have been divided into five interrelated themes: funding, collaboration, epistemology, research methods, accountability and research participation. In its activities, the group were cognizant of certain limitations regarding their membership,² resources, time and funding. As such, the group could not engage meaningfully with the Rhodes University Research Office regarding their actual practices or evidence of collaboration, funding, etc.³ Notwithstanding, the group thought it was important to consider how staff and students experience the research culture at Rhodes, with a view to changing these perceptions through evidence of existing practices, or making actual changes to untransformed practices.

National context on the need for a transformed higher education practices, including a transformed research culture⁴

Recent studies have shown that 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 which the committee saw as relevant to its mandate, was the question of institutional culture and more specifically its role in shaping academic identities and facilitating social cohesion. 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 (Niemann, 2010 and Cloete, 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, particular to the committee's mandate: knowledge production. The committee supports the conclusions of scholars who see one of the core missions of South African university transformation plans as ridding the University of such forms of violence.

¹ There was student representation in the form of Rhodes student, Kate Matoane, early on in the working group, but she did not participate in the activities of the committee after the second meeting – we assume due to exam and other commitments.

² The membership of the committee did not include a researcher higher than the level of senior lecturer. While we recognise that this may be seen as a shortcoming in terms of research experience, the group were limited by the structure of the committee, which relied on volunteers. Further, the panel discussion and survey sought out the views of senior researchers, mitigating this shortcoming.

³ See <http://www.ru.ac.za/researchatrhodes/> for the research office's take on their research philosophy and research environment.

⁴ We are grateful to committee member, Rudo Hwami, for providing this context.

Rhodes context on the need for transformed higher education research practices

The issue of what ‘transformed higher education research practices’ are is the subject of intense debate and contestation – as we found in the survey (discussed below). For the purposes of fulfilling our mandate, the committee took its point of departure from the literature which focused on the possibility of skewed power relations in a research culture. The committee thus accepted that untransformed research practices could be indicated by interactions within a research community revealing the existence of a dominant culture and sub-cultures. The committee further accepted that an alienating and exclusionary research culture could be said to be one that is untransformed (Silver 2003).⁵ In its meetings, the committee debated the following factors as possibly influencing research cultures: disciplinary power, academic culture, funding and excessive focus on publication metrics. The committee also noted other factors such as age, gender and academic ranking.

Methodology of the research group

As indicated above, the working group established a two-fold approach to understanding staff and student perceptions about the research culture at Rhodes University:

1. A panel discussion involving academics representing each faculty
2. A qualitative survey

These were reviewed and considered in conjunction with the quantitative findings of Snowball and Shackleton (2015). The panel was structured around diverse researchers in both experience and subject areas. The panel was selected to represent researchers from each of the different faculties, representing a range of experiences. They were invited to ‘imagine research at a transformed South African institution of higher learning’. The topic suggested a positive discussion on what could be possible. A committee member took minutes of the panel members’ presentations and the discussions that followed, which have then been incorporated into the section that follows.

Our survey used open-ended questions given that the debate around the meaning of what a ‘transformed research culture’ means. In this context, we thought that open-ended questions would reveal how staff and students think and frame their ideas around a research culture. Further, we did not want to limit staff and student’s views on what committee members thought of as transformed/untransformed research practices. In order to deal with the possible disadvantages of open-ended questions (namely, the difficulty of coding answers, too much/irrelevant details etc.), we adopted a thematic content analysis to the data. We also chose this analysis as it is known as an approach which provides ‘insightful analysis that answers particular qualitative research questions’ (Fereday 2006). Finally, thematic analysis allowed us to code responses from participants to revealing ‘high-order ideas’ (Marks & Yardley 2004) while recognising that there were many divergent ideas around the practice. In all, the survey was answered by 88 staff and postgraduate students. We felt this number was sufficient for the

⁵ There are currently 479 academic staff employed at Rhodes. Given that the study did not differentiate between postgraduate students and staff members, we were unable to gauge the response rate as a percentage of staff/student make up. However, given the nature of the answers, we suspect that the majority of the respondents were staff members.

purposes of validity,⁶ although we recognise that it may not reflect the range of experiences of all staff and students.

The committee ensured that the collection of data in the form of a survey followed all ethical procedures as stipulated by the university ethics committee, particularly in response to consent and confidentiality provisions.

Findings, Discussion and Recommendations

As noted in our abstract, we found five major themes emerging from the panel discussion and the survey, as read with the findings of the Snowball and Shackleton Research Report in 2015. This findings and recommendations section is accordingly structured around these coded themes.

Before reflecting on these themes, it is important to state up front that – while these themes occurred frequently enough to comply with Marks & Yardley’s ‘high-order ideas’ – the research survey also revealed deep distrust of the discourse of transformation, which some respondents perceived as vacuous and/or politically expedient.. Examples of such distrust include statements such as:

- ‘There is no point in this conversation.’
- ‘Research is transformative by definition.’
- ‘It’s all just hot air.’
- ‘The problem is with someone else.’
- ‘The discourse of transformation serves the purposes of perpetrating a psychology of blame. ... At its core it is disingenuous and dishonest’
- ‘The whole “transformation” issue has become an exercise in the proliferation of academic-cum-bureaucratic discourse. Or political posturing.’

However, such statements were in the minority or qualified by the need for clarity and direction from university management and/or a call for less antagonism in critical engaging on the subject. For the majority of the participants, the survey showed that many were either still grappling with the meaning of a transformed higher education research culture (for example: ‘I have no idea whether I am transforming anything’) or focusing on particular (and differing) dynamics that they see as making up a transformed research culture, for example:

- Involving people of different colour.
- Promoting people of different colour.
- Publishing research on alternative forums (viz. not the typical research forums).
- Doing transdisciplinary work.
- Doing research that has a ‘real world’ application.
- Doing ‘real world’ research with an African application or focus.

In addition to these different foci of a transformed research culture, several participants hinted at two macro issues that impacted on staff and students' ability to contribute to transforming the research culture and practice at Rhodes.

First, some participants questioned whether there was a research culture at Rhodes at all, whether transformed or not (for example: 'Transformed research can't be expected when no research is happening anyway'; '[f]ewer and fewer staff are doing research'; and '[t]he best solution I can see is the inculcation of an ethos of research'). Several participants questioned whether staff took their research obligations seriously within the university context with one participant seeing research as an 'undeniable moral obligation' of academic life, while another participant calling for 'harder performance management' in this respect. In particular, some participants pointed to the decline of a 'seminar culture' at department or Faculty level as indicative of a failing research culture in general.

Second, some participants expressed their willingness to contribute to a transformed research culture at Rhodes through mentoring, modelling and subject area, but expressed scepticism at their ability to adopt an alternative epistemology (for example) where their field of research falls within the pure sciences. One participant called this issue, 'the communication gap between arts and sciences'. In terms of this dynamic, these participants were not negative about the idea of a transformed research ethic per se, but highlighted the need for both staff and students to appreciate that existing discipline-specific methodologies may be able to, in the words of a participant 'make the world better, easier to survive' on both the local and global stage. Related to this communication gap but moving away from the 'arts vs science' issue, were various views by participants in their ability to engage on the issue of transformation. Some participant expressed their fear of engaging in debate on the issue, either because the institution was perceived as being closed to critical engagement and only accommodating of its 'loyal critics'. On the other hand, some participants expressed their fear of engaging due to being told why their way of research was 'wrong' (viz. untransformed).

Having covered these important aspects, the themes emerging from our research is set out as follows:

Theme 1- Funding

In our literature review, we found that funding is seen as playing a fundamental role in the formation of research identities, as well as its ability to alter the norms within research. For example, Kwiek (2015) argues that academics associate obtaining a grant with academic success. Further, that the academy measures excellence by publishing in subsidy-earning journals and attracting external research funds.

The views in the literature were largely replicated in the survey. Funding was cited as a major aspect which influenced the research culture. Some participants responded positively regarding research funding at the institution, noting that funding for previously disadvantaged groups/new researchers was ample and sufficient to forge a research career. However, there was a sizeable amount of respondents who believed that a lack of funding impeded their ability to research. These respondents criticised funding policies such as the PhD funding period, the bureaucratic constraints regarding funding for students to attend conferences despite their research track record, and to a lesser extent, the institution's approach to rewarding and

incentivising research (viz. a cash incentive for published work vs soft support for those who publish) as impediments to their research.

In considering a transformed research culture, some participants suggested that funding models should favour young, emerging researchers (particularly black and black women researchers). Along these lines, one participant's view mirrored many other respondents when he/she stated that the university must 'make more funding available for research, particularly to young new academic staff; expand curricula and academic staffing in new interdisciplinary areas of science; target previously disadvantaged talented students with attractive funding propositions, instead of making them feel that the university is doing them a favour by funding their research; and reward quality and not quantity in research.' While these participants focused on the researcher him or herself, other participants focused on the type of research to be funded, suggesting that funding models should be directed at funding research to answer 'questions ... coming out of the black intellectual traditions' or should be focused on issues in the global South.'

In yet another sizeable portion of the participants, the institution's funding formula on the internal grant (perceived as accessible only after proving performativity) was seen as problematic in transforming the research culture. Some participants considered this model as creating 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 gave rise to this binary. Other participants considered that the precarious environment of soft funding and the drying up of funding from main funding streams impacted on the research culture.

Factors which improve research outputs will lead to improved access to funds, and these are discussed below under other themes.

Recommendations

- **Researchers who have been successful at obtaining grants should be connected to new researchers or those who have had less success in order to provide advice and guidance on the framing of proposals.**
- **New researchers should also be taught how to write a funding proposal for both internal and external funding. As some participants revealed that funding is available but people do not know how to access it.**

Theme 2- Collaboration

In our literature review, collaboration is seen as a boon in higher education research. 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.

In the survey, a few participants indicated feelings of being alone and unsupported in the research task. It was hard to assess whether these participants were staff or students, but we

assume that these feelings are found in both groups. There were two to three participants whose views implied bad faith on those that researched alone. These participants perceived that researchers who tend to work alone did so out of self-interest viz. out of preservation of their own voice and ideologies; protecting their cognitive territorial boundaries. In elaborating on this issue, one participant stated: ‘I have found that access to information, access to avenues for collaboration, access to resources, are kept within a small group of researchers at the university. If you have access to resources, then you can access information, you have the ability to go to collaboration events, you get included in publications.’ Some participants raised that collaboration and sharing of information and ideas also happens within a closed network, which is not accessible to all. While these views are not shared by the majority of the participants, they are cause for concern and action.

Generally, it was highlighted by survey respondents that an impediment to collaboration was the small size of the institution together with the limited number of staff working in very diverse fields (for example, one respondent stated: [There is] zero [collaboration] in my field, ... our mass is subcritical’). In spite of these difficulties, the survey respondents recognised that there are existing loosely constructed collaborative teams around themed research involving researchers with different skills and knowledge. One such example is the Centre for Chemico- and Biomedicinal research in the Science faculty. The existence of these research teams was also a topic at the panel discussion. Although the existence of these research teams was discussed in positive terms, some discussants raised the concern that, in a bid for corporate sector funding, these teams could begin to act like “quasi-firms” adopting neoliberal characteristics of competition, in which emphasis is placed on freedom to compete rather than freedom of exchange.

From a reading of the data then, one finds that there is generally a desire to collaborate by researchers, and a recognition of the advantages that collaboration brings to produce high quality research. However, there is a concern that an individualistic research culture may be the preferred choice of academics – at least within the Arts. This may explain why young or emerging researchers can feel isolated and alienated by other members of the research community.

Recommendations

- **Where senior or established researchers can demonstrate mentoring or collaboration of newer researchers, this should lead to a reward. This reward may not necessarily be financial, but could include reduced teaching load, additional post-graduate funding, or additional exposure.**
- **In order to facilitate increased interdisciplinary research, the university could sponsor or assist in the organisation of themed symposia for the development of regional (Eastern Cape) or local (Grahamstown) conversations. There are some sources of funding which require partnership within the region.**

Theme 3- Knowledge – power relations

Literature points the influence that power relations can have on manipulating knowledge and informing knowledge production (Medina, 2014). In this vein, the literature emphasises the importance of understanding forms of social power that influence our epistemic and ontological

canons. In this way, researchers are able to understand the ways in which knowledge and knowledge production reflect social power.

In line with this sentiment, one respondent argued that a transformed research culture ‘recognizes the huge global inequalities in knowledge production, and promotes and supports local scholars so that they are able to participate and compete internationally in all fields.’ In both the survey and the panel discussion, a considerable amount of respondents/discussants questioned the heavy dependence on western rationalities to validate and legitimate knowledge. A theme which pervaded the panel discussion, in particular, was the need to ‘produce knowledge by Africans for Africans’. In the first panel meeting some speakers lamented the lack of an African-focused research route for researchers. The panel discussion (as well as a few respondents) also questioned whether there should be a shift in funding research which focused on local rather than global publishing – again by Africans for Africans. Related to the issue of power relations in knowledge creation were the issues of publishing for local or global audiences; and whether to publish in local or global publishing houses. No clear consensus emerged from the survey with respondents’ arguing both for and against an emphasis on local or on global publishing/audiences.

Trans-disciplinary research was also raised in the panel discussion and the survey within the context of knowledge production in a transformed research culture. While there was no consensus in the survey relating to whether or not the institution was doing enough to promote trans-disciplinary research, the general view is that this aspect of research should be promoted in the university. One participant pertinently stated that the institution needed to ‘pay careful attention to a range of necessary transformations including geographical location, religious conviction, disability and gender, as well as race.’ The participant further stated that what we research, and how we research, and with whom we research counts in order to produce ‘[a] transformative research culture [that is] open, adaptive, inclusive, responsive and brave.’

In all, as gathered by the committee, power relations featured prominently in the panel discussion (less so in the survey) but certainly it is a ‘high order’ idea that needs serious consideration.

Recommendations

- **Higher degrees committees, together with supervisors, should be encouraged to hold discussions on issues of power relations and where possible, HDCs should encourage dialogue in the preparation of proposals. This could also be extended to staff seminar events etc.**

Theme 3- Language and Method

The issue of language featured prominently in the first panel meeting, with methods featuring in both the panel and survey. Certain panel speakers highlighted that the choice of methods and language used in research is predetermined, asserting that the operation of the university in terms of these predetermined methods and language is privileged and still resembles that of the colonial and apartheid era. One speaker went so far as to call language, in the context of research, as [t]he elephant in the room’. It was also emphasised that the dominant discourses within the educational system have been carried through from the apartheid and the colonial era. As a result, it was argued that students were disadvantaged within postcolonial Africa as

they were taught in a language and through methodologies that remain foreign to them. It was further discussed how this ‘disavowing of other ontological frameworks’ has been normalised within academia. Speakers at the panel discussion suggested that recognising African languages within the dominant discursive framework was a way to legitimise African knowledge.

In terms of research methods, survey respondents generally agreed, that whatever ontology used, it should be grounded in good research ethics that not only preserves the dignity of those researched but it must also avoid exploitative practices against research assistants and students. There were also some respondents who implied that bullying was a feature of research culture, with one participant’s comment being indicative of this view: “[A]ll researchers should be able to work in an environment in which they are not disparaged, threatened or intimidated (the bullying at this university – especially by those who occupy positions of power needs to end).’

Recommendations

- **As recommended above, students and researchers who venture into new territory in knowledge production should be given support and encouragement. This is particularly important where frameworks and theories are untested and/or unclear.**
- **As African scholars there is a need to value and develop research in African languages and ontologies.**

Theme 4- Accountability

Ball (2012) argues that performativity is a moral system where knowledge production is 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’. As a result, Ball (2012) argues that universities emphasise measurable outcomes and 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. In the words of Ball: ‘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).

In line with this literature, we discerned a particular concern by some participants about how and what research was valued by the institution (for example: ‘The research culture can’t be fixated on the outputs that bring in subsidy only, it need to take into account that research is multi-faceted and model that’). This concern appears to have been raised in the context of perceived lack of support by the institution in terms of funding and mentoring. Participants also highlighted that the demands to publish are increasing and their research activity is what acted as the main measure of success, promotion and tenure. While this was seen as problematic by these participants, other participants equally argued that (as mentioned above) it was important to simply do some research – with some participants calling for research in any area

whether it global or local issues, using African or ‘global’ methodologies – as long as increased knowledge in rich and interesting ways.

Recommendations

Some recommendations were made with the greater picture of publishing research.

- **Research published in local or African journals should be valued for its own sake and not simply as having lower impact. A researcher must be able to choose their audience.**
- **Researchers with a global “message” should be encouraged to develop a global voice (through international conferences and collaborations) in order to be able to publish in international journals which are respected in their field.**

Theme 5 - Research participation

Callaghan (2015) argues that research and teaching are not always complimentary roles, and in some cases they compete for time and resources. In the Snowball and Shackleton Report (2015), staff indicated that teaching load was one of the main constraints to research productivity and could perhaps be disproportionately be given to young and/or female researchers.

This theme is evident in our survey where some respondents indicated that teaching was prioritised over research with either more resources allocated to teaching, or funding streams in general drying up due to cost-cutting mechanisms. However, there was general agreement among survey respondents that it was an imperative of the institution to support new and emerging researchers in order to inculcate a transformed research culture. Respondents recognised that this would be difficult for a number of reasons. Some participants felt that the performativity culture of funding meant that established researchers (generally white and male, followed by white female academics according to the Snowball and Shackleton Report) ate up most of the funding. As a result, some participants complained that it was hard for new academics within this funding dispensation to access large grants. A few participants also observed that the numbers game in publication led the institution away from valuing transformation, public good and social cohesion (for example, one participant stated that the ‘publication philosophy ... rewards numbers rather than quality’. Second, some participants felt that the bureaucracy in finding support, and in going through, for example, ethics protocols impeded research by young, emerging researchers.

When one looks at the statistics from the Snowball and Shackleton report to determine who does most of the research, there are two responses one can possibly give: white academics or older academics. This reveals the interplay between funding, age and research performance. Notably absent among the ranks of the highly productive researchers within the Humanities faculty are young researchers. Participants brought 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. 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. According to some respondents teaching is prioritized over research and more resources and time are allocated for teaching which makes it hard for staff members to have an adequate balance between teaching and research. The research

activity report mentions teaching loads as one of the constraints to research productivity (Snowball and Shackleton, 2015).

Ultimately, while teaching and funding and ethics processes impeded participation, the panel meeting also highlighted how a lack of diversity in the composition of the research community presently, especially regarding gender, impeded a transformed research culture. This impediment could largely be seen through the lens of modelling, mentoring and breaking through what one respondent called ‘male brashness, clubbiness and traditions’. The panel meeting highlighted that the least represented group in research at Rhodes is black female academics who also occupy lower positions within the academic hierarchy. This led one participant to refer to this phenomenon as ‘the missing black female academic’.

Recommendations:

- Both qualitative and quantitative data need to inform the distribution of teaching responsibilities, so that young and/or emerging researchers do not receive the bulk of the teaching or administrative work.
- The tension between teaching and research needs to be acknowledged, with better policies put in place to ensure that academics can withdraw from teaching and administration for limited periods to engage in research.

Closing remarks

Despite challenges, difficulties and suggestions for improvement, more than half of the participants expressed a wish to actively contribute to the research culture at the institution. Respondents reported on a multitude of projects that they were currently undertaking which speaks to ‘social justice’, ‘responsiveness to context’ and local issues such as ‘ecological justice’, socio-economic issues, and political dilemmas. Where participants expressed skepticism regarding the concept of a ‘transformed higher education research culture’, these participants appeared committed to ‘advancing knowledge’, ‘improving ‘problems in South Africa’ and making ‘the world better’.

While the majority of the participants felt that collaboration could be improved, respondents provided examples of existing research teams, and positive mentoring and modelling that happen in parts of the institution.

In all, the participants see research, by definition, as a process that refuses to stand still and be satisfied with the status quo. Some are conducting blue sky research and others are engaged with research grounded in the reality of South Africa and/or Africa. Some are concerned with the natural world and others with poverty. Many feel isolated, like they are trying to do research in a vacuum. It is also clear that research culture and transformation are informed by one’s disciplinary background. The discussions on this concept are clearly not linear and highly contested.

Of course, the reality of a call to complete an online *research* survey is likely to attract respondents who have a commitment to research activities already. However, the committee believes that both the panel discussion and the survey managed to elicit a variety of views about the existing culture and what can be done to actively promote diverse research groups, subjects,

methods and funding models. Where researchers' experiences have been positive or negative, in the majority of cases, we believe that process of allowing researchers to reflect has been a positive one. In the words of Louis Brandeis, 'sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants'.

Bibliography

- Ball, S. J. (2012). Performativity, Commodification and Commitment: An I-Spy Guide to the Neoliberal University. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 60(1), 17–28. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2011.650940>
- Cloete, N. (2014). A new look at demographic transformation : Comments on Govinder et al . (2013), 110(1), 2–5.
- Fereday, J. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis : A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methos*, 5(1), 80–92.
- Gill, R. (2016). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia. *Feministische Studien*, 34(1), 39–55. <http://doi.org/10.1515/fs-2016-0105>
- 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), 1354–1376. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1060706>
- Medina, L. R. (2014). *Centers and Peripheries in Knowledge Production*. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203767016>
- Meek, V. L. (1991). The transformation of Australian higher education from binary to unitary system. *Higher Education*, 21(4), 461–494. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00134985>
- Niemann, R. (2010). Transforming an institutional culture : An appreciative inquiry, 24(Che 2007), 1003–1022.
- Pyke, K. D. (2014). CLASS-BASED MASCULINITIES The Interdependence of Gender , Class , and Interpersonal Power, 10(5), 527–549.
- Reay, D. (2004). Cultural capitalists and academic habitus: Classed and gendered labour in UK higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 27(1), 31–39.
- Silver, H. (2003). Does a University Have a Culture? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 157–169. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058118>
- Snowball, J., & Shackleton, C. (2015). *Research Activity Survey*. Grahamstown.
- Sojo, A., Ottone, E., & Espíndola, E. (2007). *Social cohesion: inclusion and a sense of belonging in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Santiago.
- Taylor, Y., & Taylor, R. (2010). Academic freedom and racial injustice : South Africa ' s former “ open universities ,” 24(6), 897–913.
- Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and Education in the Postcolonial World: Towards a conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, 37(2), 151–171. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03050060124481>
- Vincent, L. (2006). Destined to Come to Blows?: Race and Constructions of “Rational-Intellectual” Masculinity Ten Years After Apartheid. *Men and Masculinities*, 8(3), 350–366. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X05277694>
- Wilkins, A. C. (2004). Puerto Rican Wannabes: Sexual Spectacle and the Marking of Race, Class, and Gender Boundaries. *Gender & Society*, 18(1), 103–121. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0891243203259505>