

e d i t e d b y

M C R O S S

N **O EASY ROAD**

Transforming Higher Education
IN South Africa

No Easy Road

Transforming Higher
Education in South Africa

Edited by
M Cross

Critical Issues in South African Education
AGUDEPRO Book series: Vol 1

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1	
THE AFRICAN UNIVERSITY AND ITS CHALLENGES IN TRANSFORMATION	7
MW Makgoba <i>Department of Human Genetics, SAIMR School of Pathology University of the Witwatersrand</i>	
Chapter 2	
THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA	21
VN Vera Deputy <i>Vice-Chancellor and Vice-Principal University of Venda</i>	
Transformation as a process	21
Brief background	22
Current higher education in South Africa	23
Challenges to transformation	24
National performance indicators	24
Liberal universities and rationalisation	24
Political rhetoric and restless students' governments	25
Financial aid: a contested area	26
Funding universities	27
Proposed new initiatives	29
Summary	30
Conclusion	32
References	34

No Easy Road Transforming Higher Education in South Africa

Copyright © Maskew Miller Longman 1999
Howard Drive, Pinelands, Cape Town, South Africa

Offices in Johannesburg, Durban, Port Elizabeth, Kimberley, King William's Town, Pietersburg,
Nelspruit, Bloemfontein and Mafikeng, and representatives throughout southern Africa.

First edition, first impression 1999/02

Typeset by Positive Proof, Johannesburg
Cover designed by MML Design Studio, Cape Town
Printed and bound by CTP Book Printers (Pty.) Ltd.,
Caxton Street, Parow 7500, Cape Town.

ISBN 0-636-04201-4

© All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Chapter 3

THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA: RHETORIC AND REALITIES IN POLICIES FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Isaac M Ntshoe 35

Vista University, Soweto Campus

Introduction	35
Rhetoric and authenticity in the transformation	37
Admission and selection procedures	42
Equitable distribution of resources and transformation of higher education	44
Efficiency and the transformation process	46
Notes and references	48

Chapter 4

TRANSFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION: MOVING SUBJUGATED DISCOURSE FROM THE PERIPHERY TO THE CENTRE

Louis S Jeevanantham 54

Department of Education

Vista University

Introduction	54
Context of argument	55
Outline of argument	56
On discourse	56
On subjugated discourse	58
Black discourse	60
Homogenised black discourse?	61
The genesis of a particular black discourse	62
Power relations in South Africa	63
The Africanisation of curricula	64
Africanisation as discourse	65
In support of black discourse	66
Some implications of Africanisation	67
Notes and references	69

Chapter 5

"NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES?": THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION DEBACLE

Meshack M Khosa 77

Centre for African Research and Transformation

University of Natal

Introduction	77
Inequality in the higher education sector	78
Racial inequality in student composition	79
Racial and gender inequality in staff composition	80
Governance	81
The National Commission on Higher Education	81
Origins	81
Process and content of the National Commission on Higher Education	82
Heated debates	84
Universities as an integral part of civil society	87
Concluding remarks	90
References	91

Chapter 6

A FEW THOUGHTS ON QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

Cecil Abrahams 92

Rector and Vice-Chancellor

University of the Western Cape

Chapter 7

DEMOCRACY IN AN AGE OF GLOBALISATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mzamo P Mangaliso 98

University of Massachusetts

Introduction	98
--------------	----

Globalisation	98
Why globalisation?	99
Stakeholders affected by globalisation	102
Global capital	102
Multinational corporations	103
National governments	103
Wage-earners	104
Toward a framework of scholarship	104
Scholarship of discovery	104
Scholarship of integration	104
Scholarship of application	105
Scholarship of teaching	105
My vision of the university	106
Access	106
Excellence and innovation	107
Economic development and global competitiveness	107
Public service	108
Quality of life	108
Conclusion	108
References	109

Chapter 8

NETWORKS AND NET-WORKS: A REVIEW OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES IN SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

M Cross

*Department of Education
University of the Witwatersrand*

Why do institutions co-operate?	112
Which factors contribute to a successful partnership?	113
Contextual areas of contestation	114
The RICP scenarios and interinstitutional collaboration: limits and possibilities	116
Interinstitutional co-operation and dependence	118
National and regional networks in the context of south-south co-operation	120

Forms of interinstitutional co-operation	121
Forms of linkages in South African universities	123
Why networking between HDIs and HAIs should be encouraged	123
Notes and references	124

Chapter 9

PARTNERSHIPS IN RESEARCH AND SUPERVISION IN SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

..... 128

Sepideh Rouhani

*Faculty of Education
University of the North West*

Background	128
Growth in student numbers	130
Lack of adequate resources	130
Student : lecturer ratios	130
Lack of a research climate	131
Lack of a research culture	132
Lack of a research-based reward system	132
Lack of research capacity	133
Partnerships	134
Interinstitutional partnerships	135
Intra-institutional partnerships	136
Multidimensional partnerships	136
Gender imbalances in higher education	137
Obstacles to women researchers	137
Female-female research partnerships	137
Partnerships in research and postgraduate supervision	138
References	142

Chapter 10

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: OLD PROBLEMS AND NEW CHALLENGES

Professor A F Ogunrinade
Deputy Vice-Chancellor – Academic
University of the Witwatersrand

Prologue	144
Old issues and old problems	146
The challenge of the 21st century	151
Meeting the challenges of the 21st century	153
Expanding access	153
Research and development	154
Funding	155
Academic standards and quality	156
Policy and institutional framework	156
My vision for Wits in the 21st century	156
Epilogue	158
References	159

Chapter 11

KNOWLEDGE AND INNOVATION:

BUILDING BRIDGES OF COMMUNICATION

162

Sibusiso Sibisi
Massive Inference Techniques Ltd
Cambridge, England

Introduction	162
The challenges of education and innovation	163
A new culture of communication	163
The impact of the Internet	163
An Institute of Ideas	164
Universities and innovative enterprise	166
Conclusion	166

Chapter 12

RESEARCH AND TRANSFORMATION AT WITS

168

T S Mvamwenda
Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor
University of Transkei

Introduction	168
Research	168
Transformation	171
Student enrolment	173
Academic staff	174
Conclusion	175
References	176

Chapter 13

BLACK EXCLUSION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND: THE SLOW PACE OF CHANGE

178

Kilemi Mwirira
Education Policy Unit
University of the Witwatersrand

Introduction	178
Exclusion of black students and staff	180
Black student enrolments at Wits	180
Underrepresentation of black staff	184
Opening the doors to more blacks	187
Finance	187
A favourable teaching climate	187
Physical facilities	188
Some changes that have taken place	190
Reforms aimed at widening inclusion	190
Measures aimed at promoting the retention of students	191
Measures aimed at promoting the inclusion of black staff	193
Curriculum changes and outreach	193
Obstacles to change at Wits	195

Governing structures and governing methods	195
The Wits institutional culture	198
A hostile external environment	201
Accelerating the process of change at Wits	202
Representative governing structures	202
Accelerated access of black students to Wits	203
Retention and enhancement of quality education	204
Affirmative action in employment policies	206
Reorientation of the curriculum	207
Conclusion: Negotiating the change process	208
References	211

Introduction

This book represents the first volume of the series on *Critical Issues in South African Education* launched by the Authorship Development Project (AUDEPRO) under the sponsorship of UNESCO. The purpose of the series is to provide a platform for dissemination of research work and promote debate on critical policy issues in South African education. The objectives of the series are concomitant with the aims of AUDEPRO, namely:

- ❖ To increase awareness of the importance of research and publications
- ❖ To promote and support networking, interdependence, and the building of research and publications relationships
- ❖ To encourage and promote scholarship, self-help, and self-development in the area of research and publications
- ❖ To facilitate role modelling and mentoring for novice academics and post-graduate students
- ❖ To set high standards, professional excellence and competitiveness in the production and dissemination of knowledge in tertiary institutions
- ❖ To promote diversity in scholarly publishing
- ❖ To mentor new scholars into the culture of publications.

In his keynote address at the Summit on Transformation of Higher Education, held at Indaba Hotel, Fourways, in July 1996, the Minister of Education, Professor Sibusiso Bengu, categorically and emphatically declared **transformation** as non-negotiable:

I want to stress therefore that where institutions do not indicate willingness to transform in line with the democratic values of our society, I will be forced to intervene to ensure that transformation happens. Institutions that are still resisting change must then know that they are forcing us to intervene and to drive them towards transformation, and we will not hesitate to do so if it becomes necessary.

However, transforming institutions of higher education in South Africa is not an easy task. This is complicated not only by the challenges posed by the

Chapter 8

Networks and net-works: A review of interinstitutional linkages in South African university education

M Cross
Department of Education
University of the Witwatersrand

The end of apartheid brought about the end of the intellectual isolation of South African academics and it has resulted in an increasing development of national and international networks, and interinstitutional collaboration and co-operation. Three major patterns of development have emerged in this process. First, historically black universities (HBUs) have been privileged by the international world and have entered into a complex network of north/south linkages with overseas universities. Secondly, Afrikaans-speaking universities, using their traditional aggressiveness and proactiveness in the South African educational and political arena, have successfully responded to the challenge posed by the transition. With pragmatism they have ordered massive restructuring, repositioning and expansion of new regional and national networks with governmental and non-governmental education agencies. Finally, English-speaking universities have been increasingly losing ground while struggling with profound internal crises, aggravated sometimes by lack of vision and uncertainty about their role in the future South Africa.

This chapter scrutinises the new trends in interinstitutional networks and linkages and assesses their significance for a sustainable, transformative

development of university education. Increased co-operation and partnerships constitute one of the attributes of the "New Policy Framework for Higher Education Transformation" proposed by the National Commission on Higher Education. The Commission stresses that "the tendency towards insularity and institutional self-reliance will have to make way for a recognition of the functional interdependence between multiple actors and interests with a stake in Higher Education".¹ The Commission suggests that there will have to be new linkages and partnerships between higher education institutions and commercial enterprises, parastatals, research bodies and NCOs, both nationally and regionally. It suggests that "in order to do with less, there will have to be new partnerships and co-operative ventures among regional clusters of institutions; human and infrastructural resources will need to be pooled for optimal use".² It foresees the growth of transdisciplinary, transfaculty and transinstitutional programmes and schools.

Linkages between universities and government, NCOs and the private sector have been dealt with extensively elsewhere.³ My focus is on institutional linkages among institutions of higher education, that is between universities, technikons, colleges and training programmes. My argument is that educational networks are not necessarily a sign of progress for participating institutions. In this sense, I use the concept of networks to distinguish mutually beneficial co-operative interinstitutional linkages from those which tend to reinforce the already established unequal and dependent relations between institutions of the south and north. These linkages, which are more likely to strengthen the international web of dependency, are referred to as networks. I would like to make a case for emphasising the knots – individuals involved in a co-operative arrangement – and not the nets, which may hinder successful co-operation.

Attempts to overcome institutional and national isolation were accompanied nationally with the pursuit of scholarship, collaborative engagement and co-operation between South African universities, particularly historically black universities, and their international counterparts. This paper suggests that the drying-up of funds, linkages between South African universities and international institutions can only have a meaningful impact on South African higher education if linked to the development of national and regional institutional capacity and the maximised use of local resources. This requires a more dynamic and creative approach to national and regional co-operation, the development of effective mechanisms of interinstitutional co-operation in capacity building, particularly in the area of training

and skills transfer, and optimisation of national and regional research and communication systems. To put it differently, the concept of south-north partnerships for university education should be directly linked to the concept of south-south partnerships, particularly at national and regional levels. South-south partnerships are necessary to rationalise efforts and avoid duplication and wastage. In its submission to the National Commission on Higher Education, the Community College Association of South Africa stresses the need for developing a collaborative paradigm:

The Community College Association proposes that institutions of Higher Education seek to develop a collaborative and co-operative partnership/s with providers in the post-further education certificate sector in their immediate geographic and provincial environment. Only in such a way can a coherent policy regarding access, programme development, qualifications, accreditation and articulation, transfer and optimum utilisation of resources be addressed to the benefit of all South Africans.⁴

Similar sentiment was expressed by the Foundation for Research Development which regretted the lack of co-ordination and co-operation between departments and universities and also between universities and industry. It argued that such co-operation could capitalise on the substantial intellectual resources that lie within higher education institutions. It particularly emphasised the role the HWUs could and should play in co-operative efforts with HIBUs and the contribution they could make to the development of the latter.⁵ It seems timely to review some key criteria for successful interinstitutional partnerships and suggest ways in which these kinds of partnerships may have significant national and regional impact.

Why do institutions co-operate?

Partnerships involve two or more individuals or groups within the same, or between two or more institutions or divisions of institutions working together for a common purpose. As such, members of a partnership share risks and benefits. Partnerships are based on the knowledge that "together is better" and that each partner's share of benefits will be greater while the share of risks will be less.⁶ As in a marriage, each partner must contribute

to the endeavour with full faith in the synergy of the common effort.

However, as Beder puts it, in recent years the rhetoric of institutional development has been replete with exhortations to co-operate "as if co-operation was a virtue in itself, an axiomatic social good".⁷ The question implicit here is this: why do institutions co-operate? Educational institutions co-operate because through co-operation they can achieve vital ends that they cannot achieve in other ways. In this sense, co-operation is the process of working with other institutions and individuals to achieve mutual benefits.

Which factors contribute to a successful partnership?

Hughes points out that "effective partnerships are based on mutual understanding and sharing of values, a high degree of trust, rigorous challenging of critical ideas and jointly creative solutions to tasks and problems".⁸ For interinstitutional co-operation to be effective, basic conditions have to be fulfilled. These include *mutuality or reciprocity, system openness, trust and commitment, and structure*.⁹ To these factors we can add the *viability of the partnership, adequate resources, transfer of technology, skills at know-how, and development of local capacity*.

The basis for establishing co-operative relationships is, first of all, *mutual reciprocal benefit*. If one or both parties fail to benefit, the relationship will certainly crumble. As the level of interdependence and mutual influence increases, so does the satisfaction of participating members as they come to share through interaction, common norms and perceptions of reality.¹⁰

The principle of *system openness* used by Beder relates to Archer's concept of *penetrability of the polity*. For Archer the degree of openness of a political centre determines the nature of the compromises made in systemic change.¹¹ For Beder all organisations establish boundaries which are more or less permeable. Open organisations relax their boundaries to permit as many inputs as possible, which facilitates co-operation.

In the same vein, an atmosphere of *genuine trust, constructive interaction and commitment* must prevail for substantial collaboration to occur.¹² Given the disparities between institutions of higher learning, it is important to be sensitive to the question of institutional autonomy and dependency of a southern partner to avoid Junior/Big Brother situations, the result of which

may not be a partnership, but net-works.¹³

For collaboration to be effective it may also be necessary to have suitable *organisational structures and financial, human and technical resources*. Matching resources to needs is essential for successful networking. These should be highly fluid, flexible and compatible. A major challenge in this case has to do with the definition of what should constitute a fair share for the southern partner, given the disparity of resources which separate northern from southern institutions. A classical example of bad partnership is the tendency to overwhelm southern institutions with technical resources, which require considerable input of human expertise from the north, and result in further marginalisation of local expertise, little institutional capacity building and increasing dependency. Certainly, these are not the kinds of linkages that most South African universities need. Partnerships should also facilitate the transfer of appropriate technologies, skills and know-how in order to enhance local capacity.

Networking works when there is an understanding of its inherent value, that there is very little that can be achieved without working with other people or institutions, and that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Modelled on this basis, interinstitutional networking and co-operation could be instrumental in enhancing capacity by maximising utilisation of national and regional resources, minimising extravagance, and providing the university community with effective channels of communication and interaction.¹⁴

Particularly in South Africa, the need to *think globally and act locally* could be a useful principle. To be effective, institutions will have to pursue their co-operative goals within a framework, whilst planning for the sector as a whole. The Regional Institutional Co-operation Project represents a good example in this regard.

Contextual areas of contestation

Certainly the factors contributing to successful national and regional interinstitutional co-operation cannot be understood outside the context in which the African university operates and the views that the different constituencies of the South African society have about its role and mission in society. These conflicting views are well singled out by Mwiria (1995) who distinguishes three major attitudes towards the university.

First is the traditional liberal view of the university, shared predominantly within historically white universities such as the Witwatersrand, (hereafter Wits), University of Cape Town (UCT), Rhodes and Natal, based on the notion of universities as self-governing institutions with the right to teach what they want without regard to the needs of their respective societies. Subject to quality control and financial audit, the universities have the right to make appointments and to organise their own teaching and research programmes. According to the university of Natal it is essential "for academics to operate in an unfettered environment".¹⁵ This view revolves around the so-called five freedoms as outlined in the Wits submission to the National Commission on Higher Education, which defines academic freedom as:

Consisting of the four basic freedoms for which certain universities, both historically black and historically white, fought during the apartheid years – the freedom of universities to determine for themselves **who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study**. These freedoms are necessary because only academics of the university have the **appropriate and regulated expertise** to make the judgements necessary to sustain the quality of teaching, learning and research by which universities are defined. To the four freedoms we have added a fifth – **freedom of speech**.¹⁶

The question of academic freedom is, however, covered by the present Constitution Bill which states that "every person shall have the right to freedom of conscience, religion, thought, belief and opinion, which shall include academic freedom in institutions of Higher Education".¹⁷

Second is the view shared by many African governments that the university is expected to generate manpower in accordance with national concerns and to contribute to regional and social balance.¹⁸ Against this view, many South African universities would agree with the university of Natal about "the need which any society has for universities as centres of discursiveness in which current ideas and practices are continually reexamined and reassessed".¹⁹ As Wits university puts it: "Universities pursue a variety of ends other than purely academic ones, such as critical and innovative thinking and research on matters of broad significance to society, focusing their choices to harmonise with the needs of the economy and the labour market, transmitting values relevant to society and many others".²⁰ Meanwhile,

the University of Stellenbosch, although recognising the key developmental role of the modern university in society, states that the essence of a university's task "is to deal with knowledge as science in contrast to knowledge as a tool, the handling of which is the main task of other sectors of Higher Education".²¹ These conflicting views between universities and the government create suspicion and militate against collaborative engagements between universities and state departments.

There is also the view popular within student circles which associates the present university system with the "ivory tower" image, a view of the university as elitist with an emphasis on merit considerations. As expressed through their organisations, many students from historically disadvantaged backgrounds would like to see free university education in South Africa. This is in contrast to the views of most black parents who either have no real concerns with what goes on in the universities or would like to have their children at Wits university in spite of all the criticisms levelled at universities like that because of their Eurocentric orientation.

There is also a particular view which places the university within the framework of Christian Nationalism. One example is Potchefstroom University, which formulates its present vision as that of a "university of high quality based on a Christian foundation with an entrepreneurial and service commitment to the time, the country and the nation".²² It sees its "educational mission as a timeless commitment in response to the Christian calling of its inception, which formed its inspirational and legal basis throughout its history and which will continue to do so during its future".²³ Given this contextual complexity, no simple formula can be prescribed for promoting interinstitutional co-operation in higher education. The Regional Institutional Co-operation Project (RICP) of KwaZulu-Natal has developed a useful framework.

The RICP scenarios and interinstitutional collaboration: limits and possibilities

What these considerations seem to suggest is that co-operation will only be successful in South Africa within a framework of what the Foundation for Research Development (1995) calls a "mosaic of Higher Education institutions", where no single model of scholarship for the entire higher education enterprise should be imposed, that is partnership in diversity (institutional

missions and programme mixes), not conformity, should be encouraged as higher education goes through a period of transformation.

However, institutions as navigators will certainly need a guiding map or a national higher education framework.²⁴ This is to ensure what the National Commission on higher education describes as "diversification within the single co-ordinated system".²⁵ Otherwise, under the present circumstances, institutions which have been involved in vociferous competition over access to resources and retention of privilege would certainly rely on their current strategies to retain privilege with autonomy, diversity and standards as their banner. This would deepen divisions and imbalances in the higher education system and would lead to what the RICP Scenarios has labelled a "traffic jam", where each institution would be faced with the impossibility of trying to do everything on its own, with its own means, without consideration for its counterparts. According to the RICP document, the traffic jam scenario represents a managements crisis, an "image of individual motorists attempting to reach a destination without any outside assistance or consideration for other motorists".²⁶ In this process, "expedient and erratic decisions get taken, congestion and frustrations increase, tempers flare, vehicles stop and start and overhear, and a traffic jam occurs".²⁷

Interinstitutional collaboration would facilitate what the RICP Scenarios document calls "fleet management", a multimodal, integrated, customer-centred system, shaped by the joint ventures the partners create. According to the document, the fleet management scenario relies on common standards and procedures, large-scale rationalisation and co-ordination. As such, it is a resource-efficient method of operating.²⁸

"Fleet management" should not be considered as the only alternative to the "traffic jam". There are also what the authors of the document describe as the "airlines" and the "railway system" scenarios. Briefly, the "airlines" scenario represents a situation whereby the government stays out of the game and higher education is shaped by market-inspired concepts, structures and forces:

It is about being free to choose what one can afford. Here the image is one of more order. There are both public and private airlines and passengers can choose between these as well as between first class, business or economy. Airlines choose their individual destinations, but they travel within given parameters and rules; plan long-distance flight routes; and carefully calculate just how much they can carry in order to stay aloft and stay

profitable. Despite this planning, the occasional crash or bankruptcies still occur.²⁹

In such an environment, very little co-operation occurs among institutions due to fierce competition as collaboration is driven strictly by economic concerns. The "railway system" scenario, on the other hand, is about running smoothly under central, expert control:

The image is that of the well-run railway system with destinations, schedules, types of trains and loads all centrally co-ordinated. The government sits in the signal box throwing levers to co-ordinate the system.³⁰

With such direct state intervention the government would collide with individual institutions which would see this as an infringement of institutional autonomy and there is no assurance that, against the historical background of institutional opposition to state interference, the government would be in a position to successfully manage institutional resistance to such a system. Further, increased state involvement would curtail initiative and motivation for interinstitutional collaboration.

Interinstitutional co-operation and dependence

A major concern in interinstitutional co-operation is the need to reduce the uncertainty induced by a newly-felt or potential dependence upon the "big brother" for status and legitimation. The National Commission on Higher Education recognises that at all levels of co-operation and partnership there should be a recognition of complementary and competing interests and an acknowledgement of interdependence.³¹ This would require, for example, identifying and removing structural impediments which exist in the present system. It is extremely important to understand the difficulty in building linkages between colleges and universities or between HBUs and HWUs. Drawing on Thompson and McEwen,³² Nias suggests that:

organizations which perceive themselves to be dependent in respect of specific resources upon one or more elements in their task-environment will resort to contracting, co-opting or

coalescing, the choice between these strategies being determined by the perceived concentration of these and other resources within the system. When institutions are fairly equally dependent on each other, contracting will be the favoured strategy. When dependence is more clearly one-sided, but not without scope for re-negotiation, the organization which is threatened with uncertainty may resort to co-opting those elements in its task-environment which control its most vital resources. When dependence appears to be extreme, and therefore threatening, groups within the organization or even the organization as a whole may form one or more goal-directed coalitions: (i.e. members with a common aim will agree, formally or informally, to act together for as long as is necessary to achieve that end. The support they give one another may also be formal – e.g. voting – or informal, and the coalition may be stable or transitory).³³

Despite these constraints, regional co-operation remains an important strategy in overcoming the imbalances inherited from apartheid and clustering historically black institutions. Regional non-statutory structures negotiate between institutions could facilitate this process and offer a forum for negotiating mergers, rationalisation, programme distribution, sharing of resources and the development of institutional capacity as well as regional needs planning.³⁴ The fear experienced by the historically white universities would no longer be justified in the future if these institutions engage in a meaningful transformation process.

Coalition formation has recently become very popular in many countries. Thrown together by common needs, higher learning institutions came to realise their interdependence, particularly for material resources such as equipment and specialist staff, and for information and support at meetings of boards and committees.³⁵ As Hanson has pointed out, centres of power within (and between) educational organisations tend to form or break out of coalitions depending on the particular issue confronting the organisation.³⁶ They represent the power sites around which intra-organisational politics take place. Coalition formation and co-optation introduce new forces into the decision-making machinery, and certainly can become an important factor in facilitating institutional transformation, with profound advantages for participating institutions.

National and regional networks in the context of south-south co-operation

A number of factors justify the need for local, national and regional partnerships. Firstly, criticised by the ineffectiveness of their funding strategies, major donors are increasingly expressing their preference to shift from traditional high cost funding of individual institutions to concentration on funding associations, partnerships or networks of institutions.

Secondly, linked to this, is the trend to privilege training delivered either in the country itself or in another developing country, which falls within the framework of a capacity-building rationale. A survey conducted by the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme (CHESS) has indicated that "many of the donors which have been traditionally associated with the support of **overseas training in the industrialised countries** are rethinking their policies".³⁷ They have realised that overseas training does not necessarily lead to stronger institutions in the countries of origin of the trainees:

Training is in many cases associated with the concept of institutional building: in allocating a group of foreign students to an institution for training we are in effect providing support in an indirect way to the UK institution. The same is true . . . if we support students in an institution within their own country. The present practice of bringing people to train in Britain could be read as a tacit acknowledgement of the inadequacy of their own country's training capability.³⁸

It is argued that increased use of local higher education facilities will result in the increase of graduate research and other training, discourage the "brain drain" associated with overseas training and enhance local capacity. This is certainly a major trade-off from international funding agencies.

Thirdly, there are undoubtedly formidable centres of excellent teaching, research and scholarship in the region.

Despite these reasons, the danger of a precipitous switch towards local capacity building has created some anxieties among recipient academicians, governments and institutions, which allegedly will cut further "on the already limited access to northern research and information resources, such as conferences, libraries and laboratories".³⁹ As an alternative, many donors

are looking for "new mixes of training" or sandwich arrangements, which offer at a lower cost some of the advantages of overseas training but with a link to a local institution.⁴⁰

Fourthly, the emphasis of donor agencies has also been shifting from individual awards to regional programmes, another consequence of the trade-balance between north-south or south-south exchanges, awards or research projects, and could provide space for regional institutional capacity building. Although university education in South Africa is not necessarily determined by donor agencies, with the increasing regional economic crisis, the legacy of anti-intellectualism and consequent governmental policies, the survival of higher education will certainly be bound up with the role of private and foreign funding.

Forms of interinstitutional co-operation

Today universities throughout the world are increasingly entering into new partnerships to increase collaboration between them and between universities, colleges and schools. These interinstitutional relationships can be:

- ❖ formal and informal
- ❖ of single and general purpose
- ❖ voluntary or statutory
- ❖ local or regional
- ❖ national and international.

They can assume the form of alliances, associations, commissions, consortia, linkages, networks, systems and task groups. They can deal with:

- ❖ **academic issues** (e.g. faculty exchange, joint appointments, disciplinary seminars or workshops, joint programmes, degrees and courses, research and curricula)
- ❖ **administrative issues** (e.g. policy procedures, common calendar, joint recruitment, admissions and purchasing, facilities sharing, service contracts, communication and information networks, library exchange)
- ❖ **student issues** (e.g. cross-registration, student exchange, internships, joint placement)

- ❖ **community or outreach issues** (e.g. regional involvement, cultural and arts exchanges⁴¹)
- ❖ **consultation** (the popularity of forums in South Africa as mechanisms for consultation and legitimisation should not exclude the processes of consultation which take place within and between institutions)
- ❖ **utilisation of resources** (e.g. Uninet, the South African academic network that provides access to the Internet for South African universities, technikons, science councils and research organisations, which could be improved through faster circuits, especially as the HBUs become more involved in research). National and regional networking could contribute to a greater access to regional libraries and more effective library co-operation. Given the shortage of funds to acquire the necessary technology (hardware and software) in some universities, efforts could be made to make available the HBUs' facilities. Increasing automation and computerisation of libraries would facilitate the networking process.

Expectations today are that universities must strengthen *vertical links* with schools and NGOs and *horizontal links* with other institutions of higher learning (colleges, technikons and universities) while breaking the academic/vocational divide. Some faculties are also considering franchising opportunities/agreements with institutions (the college of science) or other links which can be justified for sound academic reasons such as better access and better use of physical accommodation. A possible model for linkages with universities would, under present circumstances, assume the following features:

In Britain and Wales, the government expects all secondary and middle schools, sixth form and tertiary colleges, to have an opportunity to become partners in initial teacher training if they wish to do so. For this purpose, schools interested in partnership are advised to approach higher education institutions, which should set the criteria for the formation of partnerships.⁴² Partner schools and higher education institutions exercise joint responsibility for the planning and management of courses and the selection, training and assessment of students. Financial provision was made to support higher education institutions in the programme.⁴³

Forms of linkages in South African universities

National	International
Collaborative projects Collaborative research projects External examining Collaborative degree courses Research supervision Joint teaching programmes Exchange of students Exchange of staff Library use Share facilities Joint posts	Collaborative research Exchange of students Exchange of staff Publication exchange agreements Research supervision Exchange of information Joint courses

The creation of national and regional networking in the area of training, information, informatics and communication infrastructure could certainly revolutionise the process of collection, storage, dissemination and utilisation of data among scholars in the region.

Why networking between HDIs and HAls should be encouraged

It is vital that collaborative relationships be developed between historically advantaged institutions and historically disadvantaged institutions. It has been proved that the goal of networks is to overcome the isolation and frustration imposed by apartheid. After all, what is our main reason for networking, if not to gain access to resources and information, and influence, which these institutions possess.⁴⁴

Notes and references

1. NCHE. *An overview of a new policy framework for Higher Education transformation*. Press copy, 22 August 1966: 8.
2. *Ibid.*, 8.
3. See, for example, Mwiria, Kilemi. Enhancing linkages between African universities, the wider society, the business community and governments. Paper prepared for the Donors to African Education Working Group on Higher Education, April 1994, in *Proceedings of a Workshop held at Valley Lodge, Magaliesburg*, 13-15 January 1995.
4. CCASA. August 1995. Submission to the National Commission of Higher Education. NCHE, op. cit., D-25.
5. Foundation for Research Development. Higher Education Sector and the New South African Society – Cultivating a Shared Vision. July 1995. Submission to the National Commission on Higher Education. NCHE, op. cit.: E-53.
6. What makes a successful South-North publishing partnership? 1995 DAE Newsletter. January-March: 5.
7. Beder, H. (ed.). 1984. *Realising the Potential of Interorganizational Cooperation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 5.
8. Hughes, Ron. 1992. *Sustainable Human Resource Development: a background paper*. CIDA. August.
9. See Beder, H. 1984. Principles for successful collaboration, in Beder, H. (ed.), op cit.: 85-90.
10. Nias, J. 1976. Colleges of education: external pressures and the negotiation of internal power, in 1993. *Power and Authority in Higher Education*, edited by Moodie, G.C. et al. Gifford: The Society.
11. Buckland, P. and Hofmeyr, J. Education Governance in South Africa. Edupol Resource Document Series 1 (1), January: 11.
12. Beder, op.cit.: 87
13. DAE, op.cit.: 4.
14. Fraser, G.C. 1994. *Success runs in our race: the complete guide to affirmative networking in the African-American community*. New York: W Morrow and Company: 151.
15. University of Natal. 1995. Submission of the University of Natal to the National Commission on Higher Education. August. NCHE, op.cit.
16. University of the Witwatersrand. 1995. Submission to the National Commission on Higher Education. July. NCHE, op.cit.: 84. See Titlestad, P.J.H. 1995. Report on University Autonomy and Bills of Rights. NCHE, op.cit.: E-41. The view presented by Wits has been articulated in different forms by the historically English-speaking universities. Details see: *The Open Universities in South Africa* (1957); Malherbe, G. 1995. *The Autonomy of our Universities and Apartheid* (no date or publisher). Committee on Science and Freedom. 1958. Apartheid and the Threat to South Africa's Universities. *Science and Freedom*. February, no. 10, and April 1958. Threat to South Africa's Universities. *Science and Freedom*.
17. Constitution of South Africa Bill, 1993: 10.
18. Mwiria, op.cit.: 97.
19. University of Natal. op.cit.: 43.
20. University of the Witwatersrand. op.cit.: 84.
21. University of Stellenbosch. 1995. Submission to the National Commission on Higher Education. NCHE, op.cit.: 63.
22. University of Potchefstroom, 1995. Submission to the National Commission on Higher Education. NCHE, op.cit.: 9.

23. Ibid.:1.
24. Foundation for Research Development. Submission to NCHE, op.cit.: E.45.
25. NCHE. *An overview of a new policy framework*, op.cit.: 13.
26. Kahane, A., Moulder, J., Moja, T. and Gunthorp, J. RICP 1995. Scenarios for the Future of Higher Education. NCHE: G.36.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., G.43.
29. Ibid., G.39.
30. Ibid., G.46.
31. NCHE. *An overview of a new policy framework*, op.cit.: 8.
32. Thompson, J.D. 1967. *Organisations in Action*. New York: McGraw Hill.
33. Nias, Jennifer, 1976. Colleges of education: external pressures and the negotiation of internal power, in *Power and Authority in Higher Education*, edited by Moodie, C. et al: Gifford: The Society.
34. NCHE, "An overview for a new policy framework", p.15.
35. An interesting study of partnerships between schools and colleges is Maeroff, G.I. & Boyer, E.E. (Eds.): 1983. *School and College - Partnerships in Education contained in 1983*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; and Trubowitz, S. et al. 1984. *When a College works with a Public School*. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.
36. Bachart and Lawler characterise coalitions as "strategic devices to improve individuals' bargaining leverage against others in the struggle to protect or enlarge control over domains, policies or resources" (in Hanson, 1983: 77).
37. Commonwealth Secretariat. 1983. *Post-graduate Courses, Re-grants and Staff Development - A Guide to Opportunity*. Commonwealth University Personnel. C.S.
38. ODA, op cit.: 5.
39. Marchbanks, D., King, K. and Girdwood, A. 1983. An invitation to ment on staff development and related issues, in *A Guide to Opportunities for Commonwealth University Personnel*. Commonwealth Secretariat: 218.
40. Commonwealth Secretariat, op. cit.: 7.
41. For more examples see Patterson, L. D. *Survival through interdependence: assessing the cost and benefits of interinstitutional co-operation*. AAHE-ERIC Higher 1979. Education Research Report No Washington, DC:AAHE.
42. Circular No. 9/92 of 25 June 1992 and Circular No. 35/92 of 25 1992 to all Local Education Authorities, all institutions providing courses of initial teacher training, all head teachers and governing bodies of teacher associations and interested bodies, issued by the Department of Education.
43. Ibid.
44. Fraser, G.C. 1994. *Success runs in our race: the complete guide to effective networking in the African-American community*. New York: Will Morrow and Company. p.131.