Working Paper

19 .3 .e



Higher Education for Self-Reliance: Tanzania and Africa

By Joel Samoff

hakielimu

Higher Education for Self-Reliance: Tanzania and Africa

By Joel Samoff

Higher Education for Self-Reliance: Tanzania and Africa

By Joel Samoff

A Celebration and a Challenge

Education for self-reliance. To many, Julius Nyerere's call to re-think education in Africa seemed obvious. To some, even simple. Yet, more than a half century later, much of Africa retains education for dependence.

The 50th anniversary of the perceptive and critical analysis produced in the 1960s, Education for Self-Reliance (ESR), stimulates both a celebration and a challenge.[1] The celebration is the enduring power of Julius Nyerere's insights, articulated in ESR and other papers and speeches. Nyerere set the pace for Africa in the 1960s, and in important ways, his focus and thinking continue to do so today. The challenge is to use those insights not only to look back—to explore what went wrong—but also to look forward—to explore the continuing and new obstacles to the desired future. In the 21st century, the task is not to hunt for villains, but to make education liberating.[2]

My concern here is to extend the thinking of Education for Self-Reliance by focusing it on higher education and research. ESR thus becomes a prism through which to examine several threads in the evolution of post-colonial higher education and research in Tanzania and more generally, Africa.[3] Put sharply, as we observe the common conservative construction of education, how has education research incorporated that orientation even as some of its practitioners have sought to challenge it?

Frustrated by the slow expansion of primary school and challenged by university students protesting their National Service obligations, Nyerere focused on basic and adult education. Distressed by the elitism of the small group selected to proceed beyond basic education and by what he saw as the detachment of higher education, he insisted that the university must be a developmental institution.[4] The current task is not to ask what were Nyerere's instructions, but rather, what can we learn from Nyerere's analyses and insights that helps us understand better the evolution of higher education since the 1960s and thereby assert initiative and take responsibility for shaping the future.

[1] Convenient sources for *Education for Self-Reliance*, the framing document, *The Arusha Declaration*, and related papers are Julius K. Nyerere, *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism* (Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968) and the larger collection, Julius K. Nyerere, *Freedom and Socialism/Uhuru na Ujamaa* (Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968). The extended literature on Nyerere and ujamaa in Tanzania is beyond the scope here. For Nyerere on education, see especially Elieshi Lema, Marjorie Mbilinyi, and Rakesh Rajani, editors, *Nyerere on Education/Nyerere kuhusu Elimu: Selected Essays and Speeches Volume I 1954-1998* (Dar es Salaam: Hakielimu, E & D Limited, Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation, 2004) and Elieshi Lema, Issa Omari, and Rakesh Rajani, editors, *Nyerere on Education/ Nyerere kuhusu Elimu: Selected Essays and Speeches Volume II 1961-1997* (Dar es Salaam: Hakielimu, E & D Limited, Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation, 2006).

[2] This paper began as a presentation to the Annual Convocation Symposium on 'Tanzania Towards Industrialization: Rethinking Education For Self-Reliance Policy,' A Joint Symposium organized by the University of Dar es Salaam Convocation and HakiElimu, University of Dar es salaam, 20-21 November 2017.

[3] I use post-colonial here to refer to the transition from European rule across Africa. Tanzania's (Tanganyika's) (German) colonial rule ended early in the 20th century, succeeded by League of Nations Mandate status and then United Nations Trusteeship.

[4] Julius K. Nyerere, "The Role of Universities," in Nyerere, *Freedom and Socialism/Uhuru Na Ujamaa*, 179-186, and "The University's Role in the Development of the New Countries," *News on the Hill* no. 11 (January 1967). James S. Coleman, "The Idea of the Developmental University," in Atle Hetland, editor, *Universities and National Development* (Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International and Oxford University Press for the Association of African Universities, 1984).

How, then, can we apply the insights of Education for Self-Reliance to higher education and research? The link between the two is the recognition that the education system is an integrated whole in which improving any segment requires strengthening all its components. Consider primary education, which has been shown not to be achieving even its own modest objectives. Improving primary education clearly requires competent, indeed outstanding, teachers with solid subject competence and pedagogical mastery. That in turn requires an outstanding teacher education system that provides both pre-service and in-service opportunities for teachers to develop and refine their skills. And that in turn requires a continuing source of imaginative, innovative, and well prepared teacher educators, that is, outstanding higher education and research. Improving basic education by shifting resources from higher education—earlier a regularly repeated recommendation from the World Bank and other external agencies—cannot succeed.[5] Reducing African universities' resources precipitated their decline, over the longer term weakening, not improving, basic education.

Exploring education research and especially its deep assumptions and analytic orientation is thus to address the quality of education more generally.

Starting Points

Three starting points are important here. First, as I have noted, ESR was a radical analysis, insisting on a reconceptualisation of education—its role, its content, and its process. In Nyerere's view, Tanzania required what today would be termed a disruptive departure. Even more than skilled personnel to replace departing Europeans, democracy required a literate citizenry. Achieving that required refocusing the education system.

Second, though much of Africa remains poor, it has periodically set the global pace, especially in education. Through ESR in the mid 1960s Tanzania led the world in re-thinking education in poor countries. It was Nyerere and TANU, not the World Bank, that rejected the manpower planning orthodoxy in favor of basic education. Clear to Nyerere in the 1960s, the critical importance of basic education became central to UNESCO analyses a decade later and to the World Bank still later. The global attention to basic education became the campaign for Education for All with its initial conference in 1990 and remains for some countries still a distant goal.

Nyerere insisted on Africa's abilities to create new paths and take the lead. In an early interview a British journalist asked about his strategy for developing Tanganyika, then a new and very poor country. "Unlike you,' 'referring to the British journalist, Nyerere said, "we cannot have an empire. We don't have the options that Britain or France or Germany or Portugal had. They all had empires and secured development through the management, that is, exploitation, of their empires. We cannot develop by exploiting others' resources. That cannot be our development strategy. Instead, we must run while others walk."[6]

As he talked further, it was clear that he meant that Tanzanians not only must do more, but they must also do it better, more thoughtfully, more creatively, more imaginatively, more consistently. Indeed, as he talked about running while others walk, he was not envisioning catching up, which is what often comes to mind when people describe development in Africa. Catching up can never work, Nyerere explained through many interviews and speeches. When you try to catch up, you work on getting to where some-

[5] Joel Samoff and Bidemi Carrol, *From Manpower Planning to the Knowledge Era: World Bank Policies on Higher Education in Africa.* UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series, No. 2 (Paris: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, 2003).

[6] William Edgett Smith, *We Must Run While They Walk; a Portrait of Africa's Julius Nyerere* (New York: Random House, 1972).

one else is. But when you get there, you find that the someone else has already moved on. So, you go on catching up, chasing after whoever is in front. The challenge, Nyerere insisted, is not to catch up, but to leap ahead, to set the pace.

A higher education example makes the point. Consider research on African history. Until the 1960s research on Africa's history was entirely focused on written records. Since written records were sparse, some prominent historians insisted that Africa had no history. A contrarian and some others argued that there was more to be studied, which then required developing and refining a new method: oral history. While that initiative was debated and elabourated in the Global North, there was also a prominent role for the young University of Dar es Salaam, where both faculty and students debated and experimented with oral history, crafting its tools and setting standards for its use. What came to be termed the Dar es Salaam school of history was a vibrant intellectual environment that attracted and engaged both international and national researchers. That radical challenge to conventional disciplinary wisdom provided a foundation for subsequent debates about the role of the disciplines in higher education and initiatives to reorganise the institution. That is, a poor country in Africa set the pace for academia globally.

For a third starting point, let us step back for a moment from the content and details of Education for Self-Reliance and note one of Nyerere's own starting points. Nyerere warned Tanzanians about the foreign influence embedded in the education system Tanganyika inherited at its independence and, beyond broadened access, had left largely unchanged. Problematic was the uncritical importation and adoption of foreign standards that were neither sensitive to nor adapted to the local context. For example, Tanzania retained uncritically the model of how a school should be organised and what should be the teachers' role. Tanzania retained the sorts of examinations common in the earlier era and more generally the role examinations should play. That is, while the curriculum content was changed, the persisting philosophy and structure of schooling did not support the egalitarian and democratic society Tanzania sought to build. The events of the early 1960s, outside the scope of this paper, highlighted for Nyerere the significance and consequences of visible and not-so-visible foreign influences and thereby the ways in which the uncritical adoption of externally set standards contributed to underdevelopment and dependence, not development.

Patterns and Forms of Influence

My focus here is education research. Heeding Nyerere's caution about foreign influence, I am intrigued by the process through which particular values, assumptions, ideas, perspectives, and analytic tools become the norm. To explore the domestication and internalisation of research cannons, I find useful the notion of framing, the generally unstated context that shapes how research problems are posed and how they are addressed, and then how research is applied to public policy.

How we frame issues shapes how we address them. For example, when we frame alcohol-induced unacceptable behavior as a problem of individual deviance, we focus on the offending individual. If counselling and advice do not succeed in changing the behavior, we recast what is unacceptable as illegal, and we turn to laws, police, courts, and prison. When we frame that behavior as the consequence of an illness or an addiction, we turn instead to treatment rather than arrests and incarceration. Many people adopt the first frame, never considering the second. Framing is powerful, especially because we do not notice it. I begin with framing as an analytic prism. I then explore forms of framing in education research. Understanding external influence requires recognising that the uncritical adoption of guiding ideas and

constructs is far more powerful and enduring than direct control. More critical attention to framing has implications for education research and researchers. To reiterate, my concern is not to hunt for villains in Africa's underdevelopment and dependence but rather to explore what is needed for education to be truly liberating.

Framing Education in Africa

It is Nyerere's sharp insight—that education in Tanzania was sorely troubled by its uncritical adoption of the inherited European schooling model—that we must apply to higher education and research over the past six decades. That legacy framed education in ways that were so deeply embedded in everyday practice that they were hardly noticed and certainly not systematically reviewed and evaluated.

That notion of framing and its invisibility is an important analytic tool. Its core idea seems simple and unexceptional. Yet, since it focuses on the unseen and unstated, framing is also a difficult tool to employ effectively. Understanding framing as a metaphor may help. Think of the education system as a complex set of institutions and relationships set within what appears to be an ordinary picture frame.

On one side of the frame are assumptions about and understandings of the learning process. For example, are some students naturally quick learners and others slow? What are the learning consequences of rewards and punishments in the classroom? Does repetition achieve or reinforce mastery? In what circumstances is learning an individual or collective activity? At what age do learners assume active responsibility for learning? These assumptions and understandings, though rarely articulated explicitly, profoundly shape what happens within the frame.

On a second side of the frame are assumptions about and understandings of the role of schooling. At its core, is schooling preparation for the world of work? Should schooling concentrate on the skills deemed necessary, beginning with basic literacy and numeracy? Or, is the primary task of schooling socialisation—transmitting to young people the values, customs, rules, and expectations of the larger society? Or is schooling's primary objective the development of learners' capabilities? What is schooling's role in preparing citizens, with attention focused on national identity, citizen obligations, active participation, and leadership accountability? Or in promoting and supporting nationally asserted values, say equality and democracy? Since schooling is generally expected to address all of those, what are the priorities and the proportions? These assumptions and understandings, too, influence and direct the education system.

On a third side of the frame are assumptions about and understandings of the institutions of the education system and their organisation. What sorts of schools are essential? Should classrooms and perhaps schools be organised around academic achievement, with differentiated settings and opportunities for higher and lower achievers? Under what circumstances should learning settings be organised around task (reading; science), rather than by age or grade or perceived ability? What are the paths of accountability, including teacher selection, assignment, and promotion? What are the authority and responsibilities of local, district, and regional education institutions? What roles are communities and parents expected, and permitted, to play? The institutional arrangements clearly matter, for example, whether or not teachers are accountable to local communities, or urban schools are managed and perhaps funded by city councils, or curriculum and examinations are developed with little contact with classroom teachers.

On the fourth side of the frame are assumptions about and understandings of the role of educators and especially classroom teachers. Is the teacher the master of knowledge and dispenser of wisdom? In

what circumstances should teachers assert, or share, authority? What of the pedagogical philosophy that expects teachers to be coordinators and managers of learning environments rather than unchallenged authorities within it? How are educators expected to deal with the multiple roles of schooling, including preparing citizens, redressing inequality, shaping social behaviours, addressing HIV and sex? Here, too, it is clear that assumptions about what educators should do and understandings of what educators can do inform and orient the education system.

The education system thus operates within a multidimensional frame. Understanding what the education system does and does not do and why requires exploring its framing, all the while recognising that the framing may be neither explicitly stated nor discussed, even by those most influenced by it.

For simplicity here, our frame has four sides. In practice, identifying and examining the framing must address its complexity and may reveal even more fundamental framing ideas or, even better, a multidimensional set of interactions that include space and time.

Let us make that concrete. Consider a primary school class where examinations show that some students are not mastering basic reading skills to the level and at the pace expected. How to explain those failures? What is to be done? Most often educationists assume they understand the contours of the problem and move quickly to consider alternative remedies. Doing so, however, accepts the framing uncritically. To understand the framing, ask what is the issue?

The teacher's expectations provide one frame. The teacher's starting assumption may be that all students are capable of mastering the reading skills that have been taught. The issue, then, is why have some students failed to do so? Alternatively, the teacher's starting assumption may be that in every class some students are more intelligent than others and that, therefore, some failures are to be expected. Within that frame, the issue is sifting and sorting among students. Tracking (differentiating among students of different ability) is necessary for effective teaching. Within that frame, as long as some students are successful, there is no problem to be addressed. Clearly, framing matters. Within one frame tracking is a solution, while within another, tracking is a problem.

The general understanding of the education environment provides another frame. Teachers, head teacher, parents, even the education ministry may regard class sizes as too large for effective instruction. Accordingly, some failures are unavoidable consequences of the impossible setting. Alternatively, some teachers may see large class sizes as a stimulus for pedagogical innovation, perhaps increased peer-assisted learning, or special forms of group work. Within that frame, the observed failures are not inevitable, but rather can be reduced and must be addressed by modifying the teaching strategy.

Very common is the framing focused on students as the cause of failure. If some students are not mastering the skills, what is wrong with those students? Perhaps the problem is physical, say weak eyesight or hearing, which can be resolved with glasses or a hearing aid. Perhaps the problem is nutrition: hungry students do not learn well. If so, there is a case for a school meals programme. Perhaps the problem is student behavior, surely the most frequent explanation. Students do not attend regularly, or do not listen carefully, or do not follow instructions, or do not do homework, or are distracted or disruptive in class. If so, then reducing failure requires changing student behavior, generally with some combination of incentives and sanctions. Or perhaps the problem is a variant on the student focus, the students' home setting. Work and family expectations leave no time for homework. Or students from homes with better educat-

ed parents, more exposure to reading materials, and greater parental involvement in their schooling are more successful than peers whose homes do not provide those supports. Whatever the proximate cause, failure is attributed to students and their families and homes, and the remedy focuses on students. An alternative frame starts with the expectation that the school can teach all the students and that, therefore, the observed failures are failures of the school, not the students and their living conditions. Within that frame, the search for remedies looks not to students but rather to curriculum, pedagogy, the classroom environment, and teacher support.

In this example, the framing determines whether or not there is a problem to be addressed, and if so, what is the problem and what should be the focus of efforts to improve mastery. Note that since each framing is self-contained, from within the frame the frame itself seems simply to be what is normal or natural or inevitable. When students do not do well, of course we explore what is wrong with those students, schools might say. Deficiencies of schooling remain largely outside the search.

To return to higher education, for our purposes here, the essential ideas are that understanding higher education and research require exploring their often difficult to discern framing and that major dimensions of that framing have been and continue to be rarely discussed imports.

We turn next to the overlapping and intersecting forms of framing that have influenced education research in post-colonial Africa. The roots of contemporary research framing lie in the colonial era study of Africa and the creation of Africa's higher education institutions.

That external influences have shaped and regularly marginalised research in post-colonial Africa is of course not a new idea. Among others, Hountondji, Mkandawire, Mamdani, Zeleza, and Shivji have been especially clear and insightful.[7]

If unchecked, the current trends will reinforce the international intellectual division of labour, whereby African universities and social scientists will continue to import appropriate packages of 'universal' theory and, at best, export empirical data; to be consumers of advanced research conducted in universities of the North.[8]

My concern here is to build on that work and at the same time to recognise that "external" itself is a potentially confusing notion. As I use it here, the notion of external influence has to do with context and content, not nationality. Rate-of-return analysis, for example, emerged as an analytic approach and technique in a specific setting and within a particular theoretical orientation. It reflects the interests of investors and allocators of resources, whether foreign or local, who seek to choose among alternate uses of their funds. While using the tool may (or may not) prove useful in prioritising competing education demands in Africa, it was not the creation of those responsible for education in Africa. Its proponents may be citizens of the United States, England, Hungary, Japan, Chile, or Ghana. Characterising it as "ex-

[7] Paulin J. Hountondji, "Global Knowledge: Imbalances and Current Tasks," in Guy Neave, editor, *Knowledge, Power and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2006), 41-60; Thandika Mkandawire, "Running While Others Walk: Knowledge and the Challenge of Africa's Development," *Africa Development* XXXVI, 2 (2011): 1-36; Mahmood Mamdani, *Scholars in the Marketplace: The Dilemmas of Neo-Liberal Reform of Makerere University 1989-2005* (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2008); Paul Tiyambe Zeleza, "The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28, 1 (March 2002): 9-23; Issa G. Shivji, "The Politics of Liberalisation in Tanzania: Notes on the Crisis of Ideological Hegemony," In Horace Campbell and Howard Stein, editors, *The IMF and Tanzania: The Dynamics of Liberalisation* (Harare: Southern Africa Political Economy Series (SAPES) Trust, 1991), 67-85.

[8] Zeleza, "The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa," 21.

ternal," therefore, highlights not the nationality of its advocates but rather the particular setting, including assumptions, ideas, interests, theory, and ideology, in which it was developed and refined. While it is important to address the marginalisation and exclusion of African researchers, it is also important, indeed essential, not to regard African research and African researchers as homogeneous categories. What is at issue is the location of the generation of knowledge and the creation of ideas, not the nationality or location of their articulators.

Traditional and Modern Become Part of the Frame

Over many years, research on Africa was deeply enmeshed in and framed by the colonial process. An academic organisation, the British Royal Geographic Society funded David Livingstone, the missionary and explorer who became an icon for Europe's scramble for Africa, and facilitated his contacts with the government, which provided additional funding and appointed him its roving consul in southern Africa. Research, trade, and proselytizing, he argued, were integrally linked. Tracing its major waterways and mapping the continent were an essential foundation for European settlement, exploitation of its resources, and trade. The resulting disruption of local societies, like the community decline caused by the slave trade, created opportunities for converting heathens. Commence here

The framing had a compelling purpose: creating moral legitimacy for immoral practices. Beginning with the slave trade and then continuing as colonial rule developed, a major ideological challenge for the Europeans was explaining and defending their treatment of the African communities they encountered. Critical to that was the asserted distinction between barbarian and civilized, which scholars refined into traditional and modern. That core idea and its associated stereotypes motivated and informed a good deal of the research on what were termed primitive societies and contributed to the differentiation between sociology and anthropology as academic disciplines. Among the most influential academic work was Talcott Parson's analysis of pattern variables: traditional/modern, affectivity/affective neutrality, diffuseness/specificity, ascription/achievement, collectivity orientation/self-orientation.[9] Traditional and modern became scientific terms, ostensibly detached from colonial motives, exploitation, and abuses. By clothing the traditional vs. modern distinction in scientific language and credibility, social science provided a foundation for the notions that backward is a property of Africa—that is, a cause, not an effect—and that the humane task of colonialism was to overcome that backwardness. Those ideas persist. Both inside and outside Africa, a good deal of the effort to study Africa, from the older themes (chiefship and succession; the African family) to more recent concerns (electoral outcomes; the gendered nature of power and authority), assumes a necessary tension between traditional and modern. With that assumption, explanations for backwardness—in contemporary terms, poverty, ignorance, disease—must lie in Africa, not in the interactions between Africa and the rest of the world and certainly not in the actions of countries and companies in the external environment.

Here we have an instructive example of framing. That assumption became the foundation for a very wide range of analytic efforts. Yet, the assumption itself is regularly obscured as researchers' focus and readers' attention shift to, say, the uses of big data or the interpretation of regression lines. That starting point assumed a political, economic, and intellectual context, regarded it as natural and inevitable, and then sought to explain what was observed in terms independent of that context. Yet, not only does that context need explanation, but even more important, the context may itself offer the most powerful explanation for what is observed. The framing controls what we do not see.

[9] Talcott Parson, *Structure and Process in Modern Societies* (New York: Free Press, 1963).

Certainly this perspective has been contested. As Mudimbe explains, research during the colonial era helped to institutionalize the understanding of Africa as the Other. Mudimbe explores how those who saw themselves as modern required an Other to define themselves—we are the civilized, the Other are the barbarians—inventing it as necessary. Fanon and Memmi, earlier, and more recently, Depelchin and Mbembe have developed that perspective.[10] Critical and insightful work? Surely. Yet traditional vs. modern marches on.

What do we learn here? Experts advance and legitimate political interests in universal terms, not only justifying decisions but undertaking the research and analysis that shapes the space for decisions. Often, as researchers do not address critically foundation ideas rooted in the exploitive context, they themselves remain unaware of the extent to which they embed and entrench the assumptions and stereotypes. Important for our purposes here is that a core idea with roots in the colonial enterprise was imported into Africa and continues to inform and shape contemporary research, often with little or no critical assessment. It has simply become an unexceptional and unnoticed part of the research frame.

Maintaining the Discipline(s)

How, then, is research framing institutionalized? A second form of framing is established and maintained by the organisation, and thus power dynamics, of higher education institutions.

Independent Africa's universities have had two important legacies that are periodically in tension. On the one hand, they were heavily, sometimes formally, linked to European institutions, mirroring their organisation and subject to their quality assessment. For most, that organisation and external assessment constituted their legitimacy and credibility. On the other was the call by Nyerere and others to be development institutions, responsive to the circumstances and needs of their societies, with the highest priority to the skills development deemed essential. Africa's decolonization jarred the study of Africa globally—the focus on primitive and tribe were no longer sufficient—and created space both for the evolution of Africa's universities and for efforts to influence them.

Charged with preparing teachers, education faculties regularly found it difficult to do much else. Notwithstanding the usual expectations that academic staff undertake and publish research and the attention to publications in the promotions process, university resources available to support research were sorely limited. The result has been dependence on external funding for research. Since, with few exceptions, African countries do not have a reliably funded national scheme for supporting research and researchers, external funding has been truly external. Scholars seek support from philanthropic foundations and largely, from the funding and technical assistance agencies—the foreign aid system—active in their countries. Researchers become consultants, a frame to which I shall return.

Alongside those colonial legacies were two new major actors in post-colonial higher education. Both the Soviet Union and the United States energetically sought access to Africa's resources. Recognising its immediate and enduring significance, both focused attention on higher education. As the U.S. and its allies strongly opposed its efforts and with a small number of new national leaders responsive to its overtures,

[10] Valentin Y. Mudimbe, *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), and *The Idea of Africa* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994). Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967). Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (New York: Orion Press, 1965). Jacques Depelchin, *Silences in African History: Between the Syndromes of Discovery and Abolition* (Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers, 2005). Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

Soviet direct support for higher education initiatives was limited. Important for individual scholars was Soviet funding for overseas education.

In extending U.S. influence, both foreign aid, addressed more fully below, and philanthropic foundations played pivotal roles.[11] One example was the Rockefeller Foundation, whose vision was strong and its reach broad. For West Africa, major support went to agricultural research—the green revolution—with a major programme in Nigeria.

For East Africa too the vision was broad and deep, brash and daring. The Rockefeller Foundation supported an energetic effort to reform the social sciences in East African Universities. At the core of that effort was the recruitment of academic staff, initially mostly expatriates and then increasingly local scholars, selected to transmit and institutionalize a largely U.S. social science model. The reform included university organisation (the disciplines), quality assessment (publications), and governance (faculty authority and autonomy). For cooperating universities, the rewards were substantial.[12] Note that during this period the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations also supported the recruitment of Africa specialists to elite U.S. universities.

A Carnegie Corporation research initiative in Africa with a long history focused on poverty. Both Carnegie and Ford provided significant support to South African scholars and institutions. Several foundations, including Carnegie, Ford, MacArthur, and Rockefeller, subsequently joined by Mellon, Hewlett, and Kresge, formed the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA) to coordinate their activities.[13] While PHEA had several cooperative programmes, each foundation maintained its own starting point, assumptions, objectives, and priorities (including focus countries) and generally guided the use of the funding it provided. Overall, South Africa had the largest single-country volume of PHEA support, followed by Nigeria (14%) and Uganda (10%). Much of the foundation funding was focused on institutional support. The modest resources allocated to research remained a small part of total research funding.

The philanthropic foundations thus provided a second sort of framing for post-colonial higher education and research in Africa. Here was another, somewhat updated, manifestation of the deep assumption that development requires overcoming Africa's backwardness. Since explanations for poverty and what came to be termed underdevelopment were still firmly rooted in Africa, strategies to mitigate and reduce poverty focused on Africa and things African. Within that frame were the advice and support for modernizing higher education. Still tied to older models and to their British and French patrons, Africa's universities had to be modernized. How should the social sciences in a modern university be organised? Around the disciplines that had come to dominate higher education elsewhere, especially in the U.S. How should a modern university be staffed? By scholars with doctoral degrees from foreign universities and publications in highly regarded journals, all edited outside Africa. What constitutes knowledge? Which research is substantial? What methodologies are scientifically rigorous? How should individual and institutional achievements be assessed? To address those questions, too, African universities should look to

[11] Decolonization released funding. James Coleman, a U.S. scholar at the center of the expanded interest in Africa, estimated spending on university development in the Third World in the 1950s and 1960s at more than US$ 1b by USAID and more than US$ 200m by the Ford Foundation. Cited in Daniel J. Paracka, Jr., *The Athens of West Africa: A History of International Education at Fourah Bay College, Freetown, Sierra Leone* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 135.

[12] James S. Coleman and David Court, *University Development in the Third World: The Rockefeller Foundation Experience* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1993); Edward H. Berman, *The Ideology of Philanthropy: The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983); Robert F. Arnove, editor, *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980); David Court, *Financing Higher Education in Africa: Makerere, the Quiet Revolution* (Washington: World Bank and Rockefeller Foundation, 2000).

[13] Suzanne Grant Lewis, Jonathan Friedman, and John Schonenboom, *Accomplishments of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, 2000-2010* (New York: Partnership for Higher Education in Africa; Carnegie Corporation, 2010).

the world's elite universities for models, both content and process. At the center of those models were the academic disciplines.[14]

Note here a related consequence of the widespread acceptance of this framing—ideas about what constitutes high quality education and about which institutions and which sorts of institutions can provide it. Graduates with degrees from universities in socialist countries were regularly regarded as less well educated and thus lower status job applicants than their counterparts with degrees from Europe and the U.S.

Studies of higher education in Africa have regularly noted the powerful role of the disciplines. My concern here is to explore what is less visible: how they have been institutionalized. While the post-colonial foundation funding created some space for education research to escape its colonial roots, mostly it centered on the disciplines and maintained their general orientation toward specifying what is problematic and how to address it. With rare exceptions, research had to meet quality standards that reflected the North Atlantic academic world's notions of discipline and explanation and the approaches and methods specified by the quality arbiters in the high status universities of the affluent countries and their academic journals. Funded research in Africa was also expected to be practical, focused on improving policy and programmes, with little space for basic research on, say, learning, or pedagogy, or human development.[15] That research support was always characterized as scrupulously apolitical and oriented around notions of academic quality facilitated rejecting on scientific grounds research proposals deemed challenging or radical.

Financial-Intellectual Complex

Since direct funding for education research is so limited and since foundation research support is at best a modest supplement, foreign aid has become, directly and indirectly, the major source of funding for education research in post-colonial Africa—a third form of framing. At the same time, in the era of evidence-based policy and practice, research, or claims about research and research findings, have become especially important in development discussions. In that setting, foreign aid funds research and in doing so, frames its content.

Research on education in Africa has become inextricably intertwined with the needs, interests, and preferences of external funding and technical assistance agencies. Currently, directly and indirectly those organisations employ more researchers and commission more studies than any African research institution and perhaps more than nearly all of them combined.

Implicit in the provision of foreign assistance to education in Africa are several broad propositions about the relationships among research, knowledge, and public policy. Generally accepted uncritically,

[14] Striking is a 1958 Ford Foundation report to U.S. Africanists that insisted that post-graduate education be located in the disciplines rather than in cross-disciplinary programs. L. Gray Cowan and others, *Report on the State of African Studies* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1958), cited in William G. Martin, "The Rise of African Studies (USA) and the Transnational Study of Africa," *African Studies Review* 54, 1 (April 2011): 59-83.

[15] Over several decades I have been struck by the responses of scholars in U.S. and European universities on this issue. What are the grounds for assuming that there is nothing important and useful to be learned from basic research in Africa and by Africans about, say, language learning and mastery, or environments conducive to learning, or pedagogical strategies, or social maturation? Consistently the response has been: "That never occurred to us." That is, expertise resides in the North, to be transmitted to the South. Though the current terminology is cooperation and partnership, since there is little or no expectation of reciprocal benefit, external support is clearly simply another form of technical assistance. On partnership with little partnership, see Johnson Ishengoma. "Strengthening Higher Education Space in Africa Through North-South Partnerships and Links: Myths and Realities From Tanzania Public Universities," *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée Et Internationale* 45, 1 (2016), and Joel Samoff, "Cooperation, But Limited Control and Little Ownership," in Association for the Development of Education in Africa, *Partnerships for Capacity Building and Quality Improvements in Education* (Paris: ADEA, 1999), 175-204.

those propositions seem unexceptional, so obvious that they hardly require systematic presentation and supporting evidence. Perhaps not. Indeed, embedded in those propositions is an increasingly influential conjunction of funding and research that has far reaching consequences for African education, and for African development in general.

The understanding implicit in the assistance relationship begins with two related assumptions: education is essential for development, and education in Africa is currently in such disarray that it cannot fulfill its developmental role. From that starting point comes a third widely accepted proposition: foreign assistance is required to support new initiatives in education, to rehabilitate African education systems that have deteriorated in recent years, and even to meet recurrent expenditures. Another set of propositions informs the determination of just what sort of support is to be provided. Although foreign assistance is of course negotiated and thus subject to the exigencies and vagaries of politics, priorities and targets for foreign aid to education should be determined, it is generally assumed, on the basis of careful research on education and development. That is, reliable knowledge about education, both in general and in its role in African development, ought to be the primary standard against which specific proposals and projects should be assessed. Finally, it is taken for granted that the most reliable knowledge is the product of research undertaken according to the canons of western social science by individuals educated and socialized in the universities of the North Atlantic.[16]

Informed and well grounded policy is, of course, desirable. So indeed is dialogue between policy makers and researchers. Yet, just as their funds seat foreign aid organisations at the African education policy table, so too do those funds secure powerful influence over research and the research process. Though clearly consequential, this conjunction of external funding and education research has itself had limited research attention.[17] The major outlines of this relationship have become sufficiently clear, however, to warrant concern among both researchers and policy makers.

This conjunction and the framing it carries reflect the evolving role of the funding and technical assistance agencies. Criticized for a history of heavy-handed interventions and frustrated by their apparently limited impact on persisting poverty, they have increasingly sought to assume the role of development advisory services and knowledge brokers. The World Bank's self-presentation has reiterated this theme over more than two decades.

[The World Bank's] main contribution must be advice, designed to help governments develop education policies suitable for the circumstances of their countries.[18]

[The World Bank's knowledge management system] . . . aimed at making the Bank a clearing house for knowledge about development—not only a corporate memory of best practices, but also a collector and disseminator of the best development knowledge from outside organisations.[19]

[16] My concern here is not to explore all the assumptions that inform the provision of foreign assistance to education in Africa, nor to address all of their defects, but rather to highlight the generally unchallenged propositions that both reflect and reinforce the conjunction of funding and research—their framing. As is always the case, generalizations that focus attention on major relationships and the trajectory of change at the large scale necessarily omit and distort at the small scale. For the purposes of this discussion, it is reasonable, I think, to consider broadly shared orientations while recognizing the diversity and disagreements among scholars and practitioners concerned with education in Africa and development.

[17] A recent overview includes useful sources: Diana Jeater, "Academic Standards or Academic Imperialism? Zimbabwean Perceptions of Hegemonic Power in the Global Construction of Knowledge," *African Studies Review* 61, 2 (2018): 8-27.

[18] World Bank. *Priorities and Strategies for Education* (Washington: World Bank, 1995), 14.

[19] Stephen Denning, *What is Knowledge Management? A background document to the World Development Report 1998/99* (Washington: World Bank, 1999).

There are many situations in which what our member countries want most of all is our technical expertise. . . . There are so many sources of capital these days in the world that that's not going to be our role, but our role will be to provide technical assistance. [20]

If knowledge is what matters for development in Africa, even more than land, labour, and capital, how is the important knowledge to be generated? If knowledge about learning and about education is key to expanded access and improved quality, who are to be its imaginers, creators, and midwives? If foreign agencies are to be the managers of development knowledge, what is the role of African researchers and their institutions?

To understand more fully the power of this framing carried by the conjunction of foreign aid and education research, we need to disentangle and pursue several of its threads.

Politics, Policy, and Science

First, consider the expectations of research-based policy. Everyone who has been involved in development discussions has encountered the claim: "Research shows that . . . ." Entering development discussions requires a ready stockpile of research that can be cited as needed. Research is offered as the necessary rationale for proposals and programmes, the necessary support for their justification and funding, and the necessary basis for their evaluation. In practice, research becomes the quick-draw pistol in the policy shoot-out. Relying on evidence is of course not a problem. Researchers welcome that. What is problematic here is the narrow and misleading construction of both how education policy is made and how education policy should be made.

Research influences policy in diffuse ways, but often, perhaps most often, research is used to justify policy, not make it. Research is never aseptically neutral. The assertion that something warrants research attention always emerges from a concrete political, economic, and social context. Thus, politics and power influence research from its outset.

As research proceeds, its observations and findings are always situationally specific and contextually conditioned. The insistence that "research shows that . . ." is rarely unambiguously clear, though those making the claim in order to influence policy act as if it is. Even when research finding are very clear, policy makers and citizens often ignore them. Consider, for example, research on language of instruction. Nearly all the relevant research shows that young learners learn all subjects more effectively when they are taught in the language used at home. Yet across Africa citizens and policy makers insist that instruction be in a language thought to improve subsequent life chances and deemed to have higher status. Public policy must address and manage conflicting interests. Thus, even where researchers differ little, their analyses are only one component of the policy process. Claimed research findings regularly become a tool for winning policy arguments, not for linking the content of research to the specifications of policy.

Since public policy is an effort to reconcile conflicting interests, making public policy is necessarily a political process. Effective public policies must be both desirable and feasible, which in democratic settings requires negotiation and compromise, and which in practice means more muddling through and

[20] World Bank President Jim Yong Kim on his first day in office in 2012, quoted in Annie Lowrey, "World Bank Sees Role as Consultant," *New York Times* (2012.07.03). (http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/03/business/global/jim-yong-kim-takes-over-world-bank.html [2018.09.04]).

satisficing than optimizing.[21] Making education policy is not and cannot be a linear path from problem specification to research to policy. Quite simply, to insist that research is or should be the primary driver of public policy is to misunderstand both research and policy.

Arbiters of Research Quality

Still, claims about what research shows do matter, especially where external funding is sought. A second thread in the framing carried by the conjunction of education research and foreign funding concerns the specification, or more important, the specifiers, of what constitutes credible research.

Funding and technical assistance agencies both commission research directly and support research indirectly. For the former the external agencies recruit African scholars to undertake research on topics and themes of special interest, generally related to current or proposed aid programmes. For the latter, the external agencies periodically support research programmes led by an institution in the Global North that then recruits collaborating institutions and individuals in Africa. For that research as well, the sponsoring agency specifies the domains of interest, though researchers may have some latitude in determining specific topics, sites, and approaches.

Even more important than specifying research topics and themes is the determination of what is research and how it should be done. Here we find the assumption that the most reliable research approach is an effort to reproduce in the field a laboratory experiment in which independent and dependent variables are clear and distinct and in which claims of reproducibility and falsification require quantification. The embedded assumptions of this social science perspective have several powerful consequences. They favor quantification over deep and detailed observation. They seek broadly applicable law-like patterns and in the process devalue roots, context, and the insights derived from unique circumstances They insist on reproducible linear causality, dismissing explanatory frameworks that focus on intersections and interactions and that recognise that an institution or relationship can be simultaneously both cause and consequence. Best rewarded are approaches that dissect events and relationships from their settings—in technical terms, holding other variables constant or randomizing their consequences. Regularly devalued and dismissed as uninformative or non-scientific are approaches that emphasize context and complexity and that insist that it is isolation from setting that provides a weak foundation for observations and findings. The primary actors, students and teachers, are regarded as the objects of observation, not subjects whose agency is critical and who can be effective research collaborators.

Within that methodological frame large scale sample surveys are preferred over detailed observation, ethnographic investigation, and panel or cohort tracing. Other research strategies are rarely supported and regularly dismissed as not research at all, for example action research intended to support a social transformation objective (say, reducing discrimination against students from a racial, ethnic, or religious minority) and legal action to compel disclosure of critical information (say, details of school or district education spending).

This focus on evidence-based policy and programmes has blurred the distinction between research and evaluation. One result is the current strong preference for evaluations that meet some general criteria of

[21] Public policy has a rich literature. Lindblom and Simon develop analyses critical of policy-as-optimizing. Charles E. Lindblom, "The science of 'muddling through,'" *Public Administration Review* 19, 2 (Spring 1959):79-88, and "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through," *Public Administration Review* 39, 6 (November-December 1979): 517-526. Herbert A. Simon, "Rational choice and the structure of the environment," *Psychological Review*, 63 (1956): 129-138, and *Models of Bounded Rationality* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1982).

research rigor but that ignore development as process and development as politics. As well, that orientation generally devalues the assessments and participation in evaluations of those whose activities are being reviewed. Claiming to strengthen them, the focus on apparent scientific rigor distorts evaluations, both raising their costs and reducing their utility.[22]

The claim is that notwithstanding its limitations, the scientific reliability of quasi-experiments yields the information needed for effective public policy. Perhaps not. The insistence that if the method is sound then the findings and recommendations warrant high confidence may mask the extent to which ostensibly scientific conclusions reflect the method used rather than the phenomena being studied. An analysis of several reviews of evaluations highlights the consequences of presuming that method validates findings.[23] The analysis examined the findings and recommendations of six systematic reviews. All of the reviews began with the same large set of evaluations. Yet the reviews came to strikingly divergent conclusions and associated recommendations—dramatic discord where we expect consensus. How was that possible? It turned out that the reviews each applied a quality filter, generally focused on the methodology employed in the evaluations, to reduce the large number of evaluations to a smaller set to be included in the review. Different quality filters led to different subsets of reviews, which in turn led to different conclusions. All of the reviewers insisted that they considered only high quality, that is, scientifically rigorous, evaluations. That their differing specifications of science and rigor led to different conclusions shows clearly the powerful influence of the quality specification. Suppose our search for relevant research to support evidence-based policy led to only one of the reviews, with its careful attention to approach and method. Likely we would find it persuasive. That characterizes what most often happens. The methodology convinces us that the findings are well-grounded, even if another study, equally attentive to methodology, comes to the opposite conclusion.

The framing here has to do with method rather than content. Once the method has been validated by conformance to disciplinary standards, the research findings are deemed reliable. That framing dismisses alternative interpretations and counter-arguments based on historical experience, independent expertise, participants' observations, text and discourse analysis, even, sometimes, common sense.

If science were itself independent of context, relying on methodology to render findings credible might not be problematic. But since the specification of science and rigor are shaped by context (think Galileo), the central role of aid agencies in specifying credible and acceptable methodology has an enormous influence on education research in Africa.

In sum, where external agencies become the principal research funding source, they exercise control over research topics and methods. As they do so, they reinforce the standard-setting process imposed by the disciplines and the high-status disciplinary journals.

Multiple Sources, Multiple Pathways

A third thread in this complex is cautionary. While it is essential to explore the consequences of the dependence on external aid to support research, foreign aid is not a monolith. Agencies that directly support research, whether national (DFID; Sida) or international (UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank),

[22] Joel Samoff, Jane Leer, and Michelle Reddy, *Capturing Complexity and Context: Evaluating Aid to Education* (Stockholm: Expertguppen för biståndsanalys/Expert Group for Aid Studies, 2016), 47-58.

[23] David K. Evans and Anna Popova, *What Really Works to Improve Learning in Developing Countries? An Analysis of Divergent Findings in Systematic Reviews* (Washington: World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper, 7203, 2015).

have their own mission, agenda, priorities, and procedures. Research on teacher education, for example, may be funded within a programme intended to reduce girls' attrition, or to improve the effectiveness of primary school science, or to facilitate pedagogical innovation, or to reduce costs.

The funding agencies' research efforts vary in size and range. As I have noted, many of Africa's education researchers rely on direct or indirect support from the external funding and technical assistance agencies. While some fund many studies across multiple domains, others support a few studies on a limited set of topics. The pathways of support may be complex. For example, some of the funding that is identified as World Bank support may be national funds drawn from a trust fund administered by the World Bank (Norway and Japan are examples). Some research funding is routed through organisations that the World Bank has created or significantly influenced, for example the Association for the Development of Education in Africa. Major African research organisations depend on funding from those sources.

Understanding this framing, therefore, requires attention to the broad aid environment and then to the detailed interactions among agencies, objectives, and activities.

Readily Apparent and Difficult to Discern

A fourth thread in this complex concerns the visibility of the framing, which may be conscious and explicit or so deeply embedded that those who set out to challenge the frame in practice reinforce it.

Most visible are the explicit conditions attached to foreign aid. Two examples among many. A higher education loan to Mozambique specified not only the financial management and monitoring systems to be used for the education sector but also the creation of specific degree programmes at Eduardo Mondlane University.[24] World Bank loans to higher education in Ghana and Kenya required increased student fees, strongly opposed in both countries and ultimately implemented in Kenya but not Ghana.[25] That foreign aid carries conditions is well known. Far less clear are the ways in which lending agreements frame the research process. Research on the consequences of the requirement to impose or raise student fees has generally focused on reducing costs and exclusion due to inability to pay fees, with attention to remissions, bursaries, and loans. Far less common has been research focused on increasing access and inclusion (rather than exclusion) and on strategies for increasing revenue (rather than decreasing expenditures), perhaps through revision of the tax code.

Similarly, less apparent are clear but not formally stated expectations for education policy and thereby for research on education policy, for example at the origins of vocationalised secondary education in Tanzania. Even more difficult to discern are the influences of external support for particular research organisations and models. For example, nearly half the funding for the African Economic Research Consortium in 2015/2016 came from non-African governments, international institutions, and foundations, compared to 28% from African governments.

Understanding framing thus requires both surface observation and deep diving. For the most part, that self-reflective work is yet to be done.

[24] The formal conditions are specified in the World Bank Project Appraisal Document, Report No. 22962-MOZ, 4 February 2002, available through the World Bank's online project database: http://www.worldbank.org/projects. Supporting information is available in the Project Information Document, Report No. PID10008, 22 February 2001.

[25] Samoff and Carrol, *From Manpower Planning to the Knowledge Era*, 20-24.

Critiques and Challenges

Reliance on foreign aid funding to support higher education and research thus frames how universities in post-colonial Africa are organised and the research their scholars undertake. That observation does not lead to the conclusion that research supported by foreign funding is a mindless mimic of the expectations and preferences of those providing the funding. Not at all! There are certainly incisive critiques and strong challenges. In a few domains, research in Africa leads the world—recall the development of the theory and methodology of oral history. Rather, my argument here is that foreign funding and especially the foreign aid relationship frames education research in post-colonial Africa and thereby influences and shapes it. What makes the exploration of that framing especially interesting and challenging is that some, perhaps many, of the scholars whose research is dependent on external support (periodically I am in that group) set out to challenge that dependent relationship but in practice may help to reinforce and entrench it. The governing ideas are powerful and deeply rooted. Their accompanying language, constructs, and methods are normal everyday stuff. Most often, there is no direct manipulation. Where ideas are hegemonic, there is no need for puppeteers and marionettes.

Counter-hegemonic initiatives arise at many levels. At the small scale they simply insist on alternative frames. More broadly focused on the links among knowledge, knowledge creation, and power, they are at once educational and political.

HakiElimu (Education Rights) in Tanzania stands out. Over its long history it has organised around the notions that official statements may be partial, misleading, or incorrect, that Tanzania's populace are active participants, not passive recipients, in the learning process, and that re-framing is a generative and empowering process. Its spark has stimulated other initiatives, including the regional organisations Twaweza (We can make it happen), focused on active learning, empowered citizens, and transparent and responsive government, and Uwezo (Capability), which uses periodic household-based assessments to engage parents and improve learning. There are similar organisations in other countries, for example, Equal Education in South Africa, each with its specific focus and approach.

Across the continent, CODESRIA's (Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa) programmes, publications, and funding have supported critical scholars and scholarship. Especially important have been CODESRIA's efforts to encourage and sustain new generations of scholars. Education research networks—ERNWACA (Educational Research Network for West and Central Africa), ERNESA (Educational Research Network in East and Southern Africa), and NORRAG (Network for international policies and cooperation in education and training)—have facilitated collaboration and supported scholarship with mixed results.

Important as these efforts are, to date they directly support a small part of education research in post-colonial Africa, and their critical orientation remains the minority perspective.

To reiterate, my concern here is framing. Foreign aid funding for research carries with it assumptions, agendas, priorities, and methods but is not an all-powerful straightjacket. Notwithstanding the exceptions, the conceptions that guide research, its framing, may defeat its intended purpose. Nyerere's 1967 analysis provides a caution. Where research on education focuses on literacy and numeracy skills without corresponding attention to equality and social justice, it may contribute to neither.

Authoritative Documents

Education research in post-colonial Africa has generated a large volume of studies and reports. They differ sharply in visibility and influence. Though potentially informative and insightful, many, especially those developed with limited funding within Africa, circulate little, are generally not included in reviews and databases, and are often difficult to access.[26] Among the most influential are those that emerge from the foreign aid nexus. Authoritative documents are a fourth form of framing.

Among its roles, the World Bank is a prolific publisher. In part because its lending strategy requires studies before, during, and after a development loan, in part because its reach is so broad, and in large part because funding is linked to its analyses and recommendations, major World Bank publications are go-to documents. With many of its publications available online, the World Bank is a ready reference, deemed reliable and credible, for people around the world on the state of education, on what are its problems globally and in particular settings, and what must be done. It is useful to consider the framing embedded in two recent World Bank documents. Both highlight the World Bank's regular reliance on its own and commissioned research.

Having commissioned many background studies and organised many consultations on draft texts, in 2011 the World Bank released its education analysis and projection: Learning for All.[27] Elsewhere, with colleagues I have addressed the content of that document.[28] Here I am concerned with how it sets the terms for understanding education and specifies what must be done. Learning for All lists 15 Background Notes and 117 references. Of those, most are from the World Bank itself (55%) and nearly three quarters are by or from funding and technical assistance agencies. That likely understates the reliance on aid agency sources, since of the quarter of the research that appeared in books or scholarly journals, some, perhaps many, of the authors were associated with the World Bank.

Thus, Learning for All continues a well established World Bank self-referential practice. It insists on evidence-based policy and practice. It presents the evidence to be used for policy and practice. The evidence that is reliable, the World Bank tells us, is from its own or its commissioned research. Research undertaken in the Third World or developed by Third World researchers outside the World Bank's research framework, we find, has nothing important to contribute. Especially troubling is that the World Bank sees this reliance on its own research as a great success and service to the world, not a profoundly disabling practice.

The framing here is thus very powerful, since it is embedded in what is presented as evidence, the facts on which to base policy and practice. The World Bank's objectives, priorities, political context, and required methodology guide the research it commissions. Shaped by those starting points, that research in turn embeds them in its observations and analyses. Presented in Learning for All, those observations and analyses then become the global reference on which people around the world rely, both researchers and others. Framing ideas come along: human capital theory as the authoritative starting point, rate of return

[26] Richard Maclure, editor, *Overlooked and Undervalued: A Synthesis of ERNWACA Reviews on the State of Education Research in West and Central Africa* (Washington: USAID, 1997), and "No Longer Overlooked and Undervalued? The Evolving Dynamics of Endogenous Educational Research in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Harvard Educational Review* 76, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 80-109.

[27] World Bank, *Learning for All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development. World Bank Education Strategy 2020* (Washington: World Bank, 2011).

[28] Joel Samoff, "More of the Same Will Not Do: Learning Without Learning in the World Bank's 2020 Education Strategy," 109-121, and "'Research Shows That . . .': Creating the Knowledge Environment for Learning for All," 143-157, in Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist, editors, *The World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives* (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012),.

analysis as a powerful tool for choosing among education options, and international tests as sufficiently accurate measures of learning to guide policy. In this way, the presentation of evidence largely obscures the framing ideas embedded in the evidence and with a few exceptions, forecloses critique of the framing.

Likely to be an even more widely consulted reference is the World Bank's 2018 World Development Report, Learning to Realize Education's Promise.[29] In the first of the annual World Development Reports focused entirely on education the World Bank might have charted new voices and highlighted the transformation that is education's potential. Or perhaps the human rights crisis—children around the world still do not have the right to education articulated in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and regularly reiterated since then. Or perhaps a central focus on the ability of education to reduce inequality rather than entrench it. Or perhaps a concentration on strategies for empowering learners and teachers to reform education itself. Instead, over more than 200 pages the world is exhorted to do more of the same, a bit better grounded, organised, and implemented, and managed with unthreatening incrementalism. As with Learning for All, we find no evidence here that doing more of the same will lead to different outcomes. As in Learning for All, the framing here is embedded in the presentation, neither identified as framing nor assessed critically.

One example from Learning to Realize Education's Promise concerns learning. We find reading scores presented as a definitive measure of learning. That role of tests of reading is assumed, not a claim presented and supported with evidence. The framing here is dual: what is learning and how to measure it. In the flow of the document, that seems so obvious that we do not wonder about what is being measured, about how, about why, and about how the measurements are used. Yet, when we simply note that the test results—low reading scores—show how weak is a country's education system, we risk misunderstanding the objective situation and its causes and thereby misdirecting efforts to achieve a different outcome.

Note that in this example there are several layers of framing. Underlying the assumption that reading scores effectively measure learning is the assumption that assessing learning requires quantitative measurement. Alternative assessment strategies, some employed in the countries whose schools are regarded as the most successful learning environments, are never considered. What cannot be counted simply does not count. Consequently, discussions of strategies for improving learning become discussions of strategies for improving reading scores, excluding strategies that cannot readily be captured in quantitative measures. Thus the power of the framing. Strategies for improving reading scores are even more distant from strategies for reducing inequality. It is not that education's role in achieving social justice is argued and then ruled out, but that the framing has no room for social justice as a high priority education objective. So obvious. So normal. Narrowing and muting education's focus is hardly noticed.

When Research Becomes Consulting

To reiterate, where direct national and institutional resources for education research are sorely limited, scholars regularly turn to funding and technical assistance agencies for support. Especially since there is little focused research on that process, it is useful to explore briefly how that occurs, both for institutions and for individuals. Here we find a fifth sort of framing.

[29] World Bank, *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise* (Washington: World Bank, 2017). Steven J. Klees, Nelly P. Stromquist, Joel Samoff, and Salim Vally, "The World Bank's World Development Report on Education: A Critical Analysis," *Development and Change* (forthcoming).

Many African universities have launched research centers or institutes, often with external funding. Building on earlier roots, in 1990 the University of Dar es Salaam created the Bureau of Educational Research and Evaluation (BERE) in the Faculty of Education. The initial vision was expansive and exciting: a major research center, with academic and support staff and a substantial five year budget. The initial funding was a World Bank (IDA) loan, routed through a ministry that had other uses for the money. In practice, the staff remained small, with teaching responsibilities that reduced the time available for research. Much of the promised funding went elsewhere. Through its formative years the academic staff of the Education Faculty both sought BERE's resources and disagreed about its priorities and practices. Ultimately, while BERE's accomplishments were significant, it was unable to play the envisioned generative role in initiating and nurturing research.

In many respects, BERE's experience was similar to that of other research units in Africa. From the outset it was dependent on external funding, with limited committed resources from its host university or government. Its base funding sustained only a small staff and was too limited to support major, even smaller scale, research projects. Its university library lacked the resources needed for systematic research. Heavy teaching demands left little staff time to generate proposals and compete for research funding and to maintain on-going research and publication.

In that environment, Tanzania's scholars, like their counterparts elsewhere, were obliged to look elsewhere for research funding.[30] Unencumbered research grants are few and difficult to obtain, especially for scholars whose libraries do not permit a comprehensive review of relevant research and for whom there is little time or support to develop effective proposals. More readily available are commissions and contracts from the World Bank and other funding and technical assistance agencies. The scholars most successful in that arena secure support not only for their research projects but also for attending conferences, purchasing computers and mobile telephones, and acquiring new vehicles. Education research becomes part of the aid relationship. Research becomes consulting.

In some respects, that is a very positive outcome. Quite reasonably, the funding agencies seek expertise on the issues of concern. From their perspective, they do not set out to control or manipulate education research. Scholars retain their independence. This arrangement enables some research to be undertaken. Senior scholars can provide field work opportunities and experience with data interpretation and analysis for younger colleagues and selected students. Without that funding, African participation in international conferences, collaboration with overseas partners, and publication in the most respected journals would be even more limited.

Yet, the conversion of research into consulting has several problematic consequences. (1) The range of topics and methods narrows. With rare exceptions, the funders specify the issues to be studied and the approaches deemed appropriate. As personnel change and political directions shift, research priorities can change rapidly, with more caprice and fad than sustained agendas. Uncommon are research initiatives that emerge organically from high priority issues specified by the national or local education community. (2) While researchers have some autonomy in developing their approach, particular methodologies are clearly preferred, regarded as more reliable, and sometimes required for findings to be credible. In practice, researchers may have little room to experiment with new methodologies or to develop critiques of the most common methods and approaches. (3) The reports that result from commissioned research generally have restricted circulation. Often they are considered proprietary rather than public. Rare-

[30] I draw here on Samoff, "Research Shows That."

ly are their findings and interpretations subjected to scrutiny by other scholars with relevant expertise and experience at open debates or discussions. In the absence of the ordinary confrontation of ideas and perspectives that increases the credibility of research, untested observations become authoritative conclusions. As well, a major consequence of that restricted circulation is that commissioned research cannot contribute to the cumulation and sifting and winnowing that are central to knowledge creation. (4) This strategy for funding research undermines the academic reward system. Active researchers with external support focus on satisfying their funders, with far less concern for the incentives and rewards of the institutional promotion and tenure system. University leaders find it difficult to develop a coherent research strategy, to link research projects to the instructional programme, and even to assure that researchers-as-consultants meet their classes and read their students' assignments. (5) In practice, research capacity may be undermined rather than strengthened. The effective privatization of research funding leads scholars to seek individual contracts and to create consulting firms entirely dependent on foreign patrons. While doing so may make more research possible, at the same time that privatization functions to undermine the institutional capacities and autonomy essential for high quality research programmes.

Conceptions and Constructs

I have noted the powerful role of the precepts of the academic disciplines, mediated through the preferences of the external funding agencies. It is important to elabourate the uncritical adoption of approaches and constructions embedded in that process, a sixth sort of framing. For our exploration of framing the focus is not the constructs themselves, though they may be deeply problematic, but rather the process that makes particular conceptions and perspectives the ordinary, or normal, or unavoidable way to do things, rather than orientations that must be subjected to systematic critical scrutiny. It is essential to examine several ways in which that framing shapes inquiry.

Conceptions of Education

Foreign aid funding commonly brings with it a conception of education: what it is, what it does, and how it should be managed. Three examples make the point.[31]

Education as investment Amid alternative perspectives on education, those of economics and finance have come to dominate discussions of education and development. For the World Bank and others, the starting point is human capital theory and the major tool is rate of return analysis. At first glance, characterizing education as an investment in developing a country's human resources seems eminently reasonable. That approach, however, ranks education policy choices using the tools of investment banking. Allocate resources to pre-service or in-service teacher education? Select whichever strategy yields the highest expected rate of return, measured by learners' projected lifetime income. Beyond the critiques of the rate of return calculations, that focus on inputs and outputs ignores education as process, that is, most of what those involved in education do every day. As well, that approach has no room for many of the objectives regularly asserted for education in Africa but not directly linked to higher incomes: fostering curiosity and critical inquiry, eliminating discrimination, discouraging elitism, promoting national unity, preparing youth for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and developing among learners a strong sense of individual and collective competence, self-reliance, and self-confidence. Though progress toward those objectives may be more difficult to measure, conceiving of education as an investment effectively excludes them from the education agenda.

[31] I draw here on Joel Samoff, "Institutionalizing International Influence," in Robert F. Arnove, Carlos Alberto Torres, and Stephen Franz, editors, *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, Fourth edition, 2013), 55-87

Education as production A second conception in the aid funding package is education as production, that is, education as analogous to industrial conversion of raw material into a desired product. Universities regularly report the number of graduates and doctoral students they have produced in the preceding year. So common is that terminology that no one pauses or objects, even those whose individual accomplishments are characterized as institutional products. Regarding education as production, however, privileges a manufacturing metaphor that focuses on efficiency and that relies on an industrial manufacturing toolkit to guide education policy decisions. Repetition of a school year is recorded as wastage, even where there may be a compelling pedagogical rationale for according extra time to students required to miss school to harvest crops or care for siblings. The common use of efficiency as an analytic construct in education converts major issues of policy and pedagogy into ostensibly uncontroversial issues of management and administration amenable to technical solutions, effectively excluding them from both critical review and participatory decision making. Insisting on feasibility and practicality, that approach generally discourages innovations, which are inherently risky. Being poor becomes a rationale for not risking change, which in turn is likely to perpetuate the poverty.

Education as delivery system A third conception of education embedded in foreign funding is that education is something done to rather than by learners. Here we find what Paulo Freire termed the banking model of education. Learners are like empty bank accounts. More or less formally, teachers and others with the relevant capital, wisdom, make deposits into those accounts. Successful students save their resources and complete their education with heads full of knowledge on which they can subsequently draw. Certainly for younger learners and often as well for the most senior students, learning is understood largely as a passive process. Teachers give or provide or offer, and students receive. There is no room here for the perspective that what learners do is not simply listen and receive but actively generate, master, develop, and create knowledge.

Recall that my concern here is the conceptions of education—the framing—embedded in the approaches and constructs that accompany foreign funding for research. Each of these examples makes sense in its own terms. Each of these conceptions is regularly adopted uncritically. All three of these conceptions are hostile to or corrosive of the perspective that starts with learners, that insists that learners, not the education system or teachers, are responsible for learning, and that organises the education environment around learners. Within the frame the broader question—how is education conceived?—is simply never asked. Thus the power of the framing. It is inattention, not careful analysis and review, that leaves little room for education as process and learner-centered instruction.

Counting

To continue this exploration of the uncritical adoption of constructs and its consequences, it is important to return to quantification. As I have noted, in the current research environment, counting is favored over non-counting. The assumption here is that counting is more scientific, and therefore more legitimate and more likely to bring credible results, than observation or document analysis or intensive interviews or other non-quantitative methods. The insistence has been: if you cannot count it, it does not count. Though there are minority voices and critics within them, major social science disciplines that structure education research reinforce that perspective. In evaluation, quasi-experimental designs and especially randomized control trials are characterized as the gold standard against which to assess other approaches. A burgeoning field is developing strategies for converting rich non-quantitative evidence, say semi-formal and informal conversations with key participants, into quantitative evidence, often with the

loss of context specificity and with simplification that obscures conjunctions and contingencies. Notions of evidence and objectivity have become linked to quantification.

Here, too, my concern is not with quantification or with a particular research project that rests on quantified information. Rather, in our exploration of framing we must recognise the largely uncritical dismissal of the alternative perspective captured in the quotation mistakenly attributed to Einstein: "Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts." To reiterate, it is not quantification that is problematic but the uncritical adoption of the assumption that quantification increases reliability. Problematic is the risk of trivializing important events, interactions, and relationships by limiting attention only to what can be counted. Problematic is the ready dismissal of insights from the small scale observations and interviews, the synthetic review of texts, and the access available through personal contacts that are not amenable to, or worse, are distorted by quantification.

Causality

Accompanying the counting advocated with evangelical zeal is a particular notion of causality and therefore a constrained set of acceptable approaches to studying causality. Early in their study of the scientific method, researchers encounter the common causal model. A claim is that X causes Y. To confirm that causality, researchers must show that (a) X precedes Y, (b) Y co-varies with X (a change in Y is associated with a change in X), and (c) other causes can be ruled out (there is no Z, such that Z causes Y and perhaps Z causes X). To study real world phenomena with that causal model as the presumed explanatory goal leads to a preference for quasi-experiments as the standard research model ("quasi" because the world is not a fully controllable laboratory).

Here too my concern is not with a particular research project or its findings but rather with uncritical adoption of assumptions and understandings that reduce our ability to explain education policies, practices, and outcomes and thereby to change them. That framing—the assumption about what is causality and how it must be established and therefore what constitutes an explanation—diverts our attention from education experiences where it is interactions, rather than linear causality and temporal priority, that require attention. Put sharply, to make sense of education outcomes by studying the interactions of teachers and learners, we need tools that recognise that interactions are both causes and effects, that help us draw meanings and insights from observing relationships, and that engage teachers and learners as researchers on the learning process.

Consider a sharply contested arena, language of instruction. Explicit policy in every African country specifies the language to be used beyond the initial grades, generally the language of the former colonial power. Regularly, however, observers note that teachers use local languages in settings where English, French, or Portuguese is required. Researchers seek to understand why. Policy makers wonder what to do about it. In the standard causal model, the research starting point is a hypothesized causal chain that specifies an independent variable (say, school principal's behavior, or teachers' language competence) and a dependent variable (say, percentage of time local language is used in teaching history). Researchers then gather data to support or reject the expected relationship between cause and effect. There may be several independent and dependent variables, there may be attention to mediating factors and time lags, and the gathered data may refer to one or several settings. Whatever the complexities, independent and dependent variables must be distinct, and the temporal order, cause before effect, must be maintained. The causal model effectively determines what constitutes an explanation. An alternative approach takes interactions (principal/teachers, teachers/students/ school/community) as its primary focus, explores

reciprocal influences (students' expectations influence teachers' behavior, which in turn shapes students' expectations), and recognises that language use is simultaneously both cause and effect. Rather than a dissection strategy that focuses on the variables of interest and holds everything else constant, the alternative approach explores context and conjunction, also understood as simultaneously cause and effect. The common causality framing directs us away from interactions as the focus of analysis, attention to internal relations and reciprocal effects, and alternative notions of cause and explanation.[32] Perhaps the standard causal approach yields the richest and most useful information. Or perhaps the alternative proves more fruitful in helping those involved understand better the frequent use of local languages and the ways in which students and teachers are making public policy.

The point of this example is that the uncritical adoption of the standard causal model leaves little space for any alternative and regularly dismisses alternatives as unscientific. In sum, external funding for education research carries with it conceptions and constructs, methodological strictures, and deep notions of cause and explanation. Their uncritical adoption cripples efforts to develop and use other approaches to understanding the behaviors and outcomes that are central to education and its roles. Those involved may be little aware of their self-imposed blinders.

Validating Authorities

As we have seen, external influence on the framing of education research in post-colonial Africa takes many forms. Some are indirect, many are subtle, and most are not immediately perceived by researchers. A seventh, more formally organised form of framing, is structured into the career advancement process for university academic staff. Generally researchers must publish their results and often secure research funding for salary increases and promotion in their institutions. Effectively, a small set of internationally recognised journals in each discipline functions to impose standards and set the terms through which African scholars must establish their legitimacy.[33] In several countries, that process is formally integrated into the funding formula for academic units and institutions. Researchers who publish in the nationally maintained list of high status journals secure a supplementary allocation for themselves, their departments, and their universities. Journals and their editors become validating authorities.

As Jeater notes, "Global academic knowledge is primary constructed through journal articles." Accordingly, "University cultures in the Global North generate powerful definitions of what constitutes 'knowledge' and 'good research."[34] Currently, the dominant theory and methodology are positivist.

Those journals in turn influence the expectations of the organisations that provide research funding, both inside and outside Africa.

The requirements of funding agencies subtly discourage, if not exhibiting outright hostility to a historical, social and theoretical understanding of development, poverty, and discrimination.[35]

---

[32] Especially instructive on internal relations is Bertell Ollman, *Dialectical Investigations* (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1993), and *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003).

[33] This external validation has been clear and clearly noted for decades. Among others: Edmundo F. Fuenzalida, "The Reception of 'Scientific Sociology' in Chile," *Latin American Research Review* 18, 2 (1983): 95–112; Mamdani, *Scholars in the Marketplace*; Zeleza, "The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa."

[34] Jeater, "Academic Standards or Academic Imperialism?" p. 9.

[35] Issa G. Shivji, *Silences in NGO Discourse: The Role and Future of NGOs in Africa* (Nairobi: Fahamu Press, 2007), p. 35.

The power of these validating authorities can be seen in the sorts of questions scholars must ask as they plan their research and consider their academic careers. What sorts of research are most likely to be favored by the reviewers for research funding organisations and therefore most likely to receive resources? Of course, occasionally researchers will propose and pursue research that sits outside that framing and perhaps challenges it. Most often, however, researchers' formulation of their proposals will be closely guided by that framing. Similarly, what sorts of research are most likely to be regarded as appropriate and legitimate by the reviewers for professional journals and therefore to be required for research publication?[36] Clearly, the importance of publishing in the high status journals reinforces the framing.
Note that this form of framing is generally explicit and regularly sharply applied. Research support proposals and manuscripts that do not reflect expected approaches and methodologies may be rejected without review. The validating authorities become enforcers.

Market and Commodities

We have seen how constructs and methods directly and indirectly frame education research. The major academic disciplines set the standards, with the academic journals as the enforcers. When those constructs and methods are integrated into the funding process, itself embedded in the foreign aid relationship, they are regularly adopted uncritically, taken as ordinary, or normal, or simply the way things are. Of course there have been and continue to be critiques of quasi-experimental approaches and the development of alternative research strategies. I am not suggesting that all controversy has disappeared from education research or that there are no informed critics of mainstream ideas or that there have been no counter-current research innovations. Rather, I am working to understand how the mainstream becomes the mainstream and the consequences of remaining within its currents.

To this point, we have done our own dissection, exploring several forms of framing, considering each in turn. It is important to explore their influence as they combine, an eighth form of framing.

Over recent decades there has been an increasing inclination, both more broadly and within the research community, to regard society as a market rather than as a polity. That orientation has a longer history but has become more energetic and more persuasive, with its advocates and enforcers, in the era of the Washington Consensus and structural adjustment. From the perspective of African countries, the Washington Consensus is better understood as a Washington edict, a set of instructions about national policies applied to aid recipients but not aid providers, with implementation overseen by the international financial institutions. Important for our purposes here is the cluster of ideas associated with that edict and used to justify the conditions attached to foreign aid. What has come to be termed neoliberalism is presumed to be normal, natural—simply the way things are—and therefore not subjected to rigorous analysis and critique even as it frames inquiry, research, and recommendations.

Broadly, there is a set of claims about how issues should be framed and how decisions should be made that rest on a notion of society as a competitive market rather than a notion of society as a conflicted and contentious polity in which outcomes are, and must be understood as, the result of politics. The analysis of that broader process is beyond our scope here. A practical example in higher education makes the clustering clearer.

[36] Jeater, "Academic Standards or Academic Imperialism?" offers examples of rejection rationales. One reviewer's comment reflects clearly the journals' role in enforcing standards that are taken to be so clear that they need no explanation or rationale: "No one should be doing this type of research any more." (p. 17).

Proudly reporting to an academic conference on his university's attention to its students and their needs, in 2017 a senior African university official said forcefully "our students are our business." Not, our students are our citizens. Not, our students are our community. Not, our students are part of our polity. Nor was he referring to buying and selling or to his university as a commercial enterprise. "Business" was simply the term for "what we do." Thus, "business" and the market have become the standard way of doing things. More important, business and the market are taken uncritically as the standard way of conceiving of issues and interactions.

This is of course one example. The senior university official was not directly concerned with markets and polities but simply talking proudly about his institution. But that is the point. When business and market become the ordinary terms to describe what we do, rather than say political community or citizenship or accountability, we adopt uncritically and without an explicit decision the assumptions, values, constructions, and methodologies appropriate to business and market. Within that framing, vendor and consumer replace teacher and learner. Within that framing, it becomes quite reasonable to treat education as a commodity, to be valued and exchanged in market-like arrangements.

That, then, like "students are our business," is a cluster of ideas about education that influences not only education policy and practice but also education research. The transition is from regarding education as a public good to regarding education as a commodity, understood through the lens of market, vendors, and purchasers. Note the sharp differences. Education as a public good focuses on broad responsibility and accountability, on cooperation and collaboration, on widely shared funding, and on institutions and policies to manage the divergent interests that arise in a polity. Education as a commodity focuses on the price of access, on alternative education services on offer (assuming a link between quality and price), on the availability of information on alternatives and prices, and on individual interest, benefit, and resources. A school belongs not to a community but to a vendor. Accountability and redress are commercial, not political. Tools developed for markets and sales become the tools deemed appropriate to make decisions about education policies and programmes. Even where there is political oversight and regulation, both the provision of education and the uses of that provision are privatized. Most important for our purposes, education is understood differently.

Note that this example of framing, reconceptualising the polity as a market, is not defined by geography. In the United States, major conservative funders, seeking to entrench and reinforce their specification of capitalism—neoliberalism—support research institutions and research universities. Thus, the framing within Africa is incorporated in a global rethinking and retooling of education in which higher education, both inside and outside Africa, plays a central role. At issue are not just the organisation and orientation of higher education and education research in Africa but how knowledge is created and used.

Knowledge Management

Thus far we have been concerned with research as knowledge creation and the framing, explicit and implicit, readily visible and difficult to discern, that shapes that process. To conclude our review of forms of framing we must note the external efforts to manage the knowledge that is created.[37]

Poor countries—and poor people—differ from rich ones not only because they have less capital but because they have less knowledge. (1)

[37] I draw here on Joel Samoff and Nelly P. Stromquist, "Managing Knowledge and Storing Wisdom: New Forms of Foreign Aid?" *Development and Change* 32, 4 (September 2001): 631-656.

Knowledge is critical for development, because everything we do depends on knowledge. . . . . The need for developing countries to increase their capacity to use knowledge cannot be overstated. (16)

International institutions, country donors, and the broader development community are rapidly coming to understand that knowledge is central to development—that knowledge is development. (130) [38]

Introduced by management consultants and coined to characterize corporate efforts to exercise central control over information and its sources, storage, and uses, the term knowledge management has migrated from the private to the public sphere. The international financial institutions and especially the World Bank ascribe to themselves the central role in managing global development knowledge. While the term itself can suggest support for new initiatives and disruptive departures, it carries as well an element of control that should make researchers wary.

[The World Bank's] . . . main contribution must be advice, designed to help governments develop education policies suitable for the circumstances of their countries. [39]

Launched in October 1996, the World Bank's knowledge management system seeks to make the Bank a clearinghouse for knowledge about development—not just a corporate memory of best practices, but also a collector and disseminator of the best development knowledge from outside organisations.[40]

Thus, if we are to become a Knowledge Bank, we must define our main product more in terms of advice (i.e., our greatest source of competitive advantage) and less in terms of lending . . . .[41]

Note here the conflation of information management and knowledge management, that is, the tendency to equate information with knowledge. That usage favors attention to discrete assertions about objective reality, factoids in the popular expression, and devalues knowledge as processed information that results from thought, reflection, refinement, integration, and collective appropriation and validation of understanding. From a somewhat different perspective, knowledge generation is a complex process that is at least as much political as technical. Carefully distinguished, information management suggests large databases and sophisticated search engines, while knowledge management refers to the ways societies assign authority to maelstroms of information and oversee their recording and transmission. In practice, much of the literature on knowledge management explores what might more clearly be termed information management.

In part responding to critiques that it was systematically inattentive to knowledge generated outside the Global North, the World Bank asserted its role in managing the storage and dissemination of what it termed indigenous knowledge. To broaden the base for its development advisory role, it launched a programme to "collect, document and disseminate indigenous knowledge" to be incorporated into the World Bank's knowledge management system.[42]

---

[38] World Bank, *Knowledge for Development. World Development Report 1998/99* (Washington: Oxford University Press for the World Bank, 1999), pp. 1, 16, 130.

[39] World Bank, *Priorities and Strategies for Education*, 14.

[40] World Bank, *Knowledge for Development*, 140.

[41] World Bank, *Knowledge Sharing and Innovation in the African Region: A Retrospective* [prepared by Nicolas Gorjestani] (Washington: World Bank, Knowledge and Learning Center, African Region, 1998), 8-9.

[42] Denning, "What is Knowledge Management?" 10. Apparently no longer a major focus, the World Bank's Indigenous Knowledge

From the World Bank's perspective, if information is power and if the World Bank is to be the source of development advice, it is essential to dominate development knowledge management. From the perspective of the formerly colonized world, however, it is far from clear that a powerful international financial institution located in Washington is the preferred manager of knowledge the Third World generates and the information it needs. Ultimately, information affluence in Africa cannot result from digesting external imports but must emerge from a generative process with strong local roots.

Though their luster has dimmed a bit, knowledge management initiatives have gained new energy from the rapid diffusion of new technologies. Computers, the internet, and widely available mobile telephones offer the promise of democratizing access to information. The history, however, is otherwise. Those who are powerful and control economic resources are best situated to acquire, regulate, and dominate the new technologies and to turn them to their advantage.

Here we find another manifestation of the heady mix of (a) the assertion of the importance of information (knowledge is development), (b) the mystique and legitimacy of research (access and process controlled by elite universities and journals and implemented locally), and (c) research funding (external sources, especially the aid agencies) that I have termed the financial-intellectual complex.

Framing and Setting the Pace

The starting points for this analysis were two of Julius Nyerere's insights and injunctions. The uncritical adoption of the colonial model of schooling was ill suited to the mass education essential for achieving equality and building democracy in Tanzania. In very difficult circumstances Tanzania had to be willing to take the risk to develop its own approach, organically tied to its own circumstances and objectives and deeply linked to local communities. In education and other domains, catching up could never work since each gain would find that others had already moved on. Rather, the challenge for Tanzania, and Africa more generally, is not to catch up but to set the pace.

While both injunctions seem daunting, Tanzania's own history offers substantial evidence they are achievable. Recall the earlier discussion of studying Africa's history. The University of Dar es Salaam played a prominent role in developing an alternative approach, oral history, that is, in transforming the science. The debates were well attended, intense, and sometimes unruly and intemperate, but a poor country in Africa contributed to setting the pace of a global research agenda and methodology.

Beyond its colonial legacy, the study of African history had another major defect. With some exceptions, historians centered their work largely on the prominent and powerful and on men. Only when there emerged a set of frustrated and imaginative historians concerned with women's roles in that history did the focus expand. Along with that more inclusive focus came methodological insights and then new and revised methods that were essential for that re-tuning. The challenge to the prevailing practice stimulated feminist innovations in studying history. A parallel critique of the concentration on the prominent and powerful directed research attention to subalterns. That insistence on redirecting the focus facilitated the fuller development of approaches and methods needed to examine events and relationships through others' eyes. Critics, skeptics, and contrarians can seize the initiative and set the pace.

In education, the experiences of HakiElimu, Twaweza, and Uwezo make a similar point. Critical review of official statements and conventional methods stimulates new thinking about research and methodol-

overview is at http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website01219/WEB/0__CONTE.HTM [2018.08.02].

ogy. Willingness to confront authority and to try untested paths, especially when accompanied by strong community outreach and engagement, enables Tanzania to contribute to setting the pace in this domain as well. The recent challenges to the inherited education system in South Africa, calling for decolonized education, build on critical examinations of the post-colonial experience, analyses that have strong African roots. Organic origins and setting the pace.

What do we learn here? What occurred—productive challenges to prevailing wisdom, standards, approaches, and methodologies—helps us see more clearly why and how the framing for research is so important. We see too that developing an alternative framing required space for scholars (a) to be contrarian, (b) to challenge academic authority, (c) to take the risks and consequences of deviance, and (d) to proceed without significant external funding.

The broader observation here is straightforward. Of course Africa can play a role in setting the pace for developing new research perspectives and methodologies.

That said, we must return to the framing for post-colonial education in Africa, which has favored reproduction over transformation. At the end of colonial rule two major paths for education emerged, one focused on reproducing and strengthening a particular political, economic, and social order, and the other focused on radical transformation of education and society. Nearly everywhere, the conservative path prevailed. Nearly everywhere, when radical innovations and critiques have emerged, they have received little support or have been explicitly constrained or suppressed.

Education research has contributed to that political direction. For example, education research has generally focused on examination results as the primary measure of quality, with limited attention to the other roles of education, especially its social justice objectives. For example, education finance research has generally addressed managing limited resources but only rarely has explored tax reform and other strategies to generate additional education resources. For example, education management research has understood efficiency in education systems largely in terms similar to industries' practice of time and motion studies, with much less attention to enhancing learner and community participation in education management and governance.

The argument here is indeed complex, linking the structure and institutional arrangements of the global political economy through multiple pathways, some hazy even to those who are following them, to funding and framing education research. But if we do not explore those links, then research and researchers will be an enemy rather than ally in efforts to liberate Africans from their dependent roles in the global political economy. The challenge to researchers is regularly to step back from the necessary focus on particular research projects to consider the role of research, including its approaches, methods, participants, and uses.

Challenges for Education Researchers

In a resource starved environment external funding makes education research possible. That, surely, is positive. But the gain is troubled. External support is never simply the money. The focus here has been the framing for education research in post-colonial Africa. We have seen how education research has been significantly enmeshed in the foreign aid relationship, which has generated additional resources but which has also brought with it direct and indirect notions of what research should be conducted and how. I have sought to highlight the problems and risks to education research in that framing. To conclude

this analysis of framing, we must understand the insights of Education for Self-Reliance as challenges to education researchers. The task is not to ruminate on what Nyerere might say in a sequel to Education for Self-Reliance directed to higher education and research, but rather to explore what we learn from Nyerere's insights that can assist education researchers in the present to take the initiative and responsibility for shaping the future.

What, then, is necessary for research and researchers to address the challenges of Education for Self-Reliance and the expectation that higher education will play a developmental role? Needed is research that (a) is sensitive and responsive to national and local contexts, (b) challenges conventional wisdom and the conventional way of doing things, (c) contributes to societal transformation, and (d) sets the pace, that is, that departs from the mainstream to create and establish new models, new methodologies, and new standards. Within that understanding, it is important to synthesize the challenges to education researchers. The first challenge is to recognise the frame and address it critically. Recourse to foreign funding will persist. Foreign funding will always come with expectations and preferences and sometimes explicit conditions. Foreign funding will also come with less visible and often more powerful notions of what is science and how research should be done. For all of those reasons, education researchers—I include myself—must address critically the frame within which we work.

The second challenge is to cross borders. In a review of published education research my colleagues and I found border crossers, that is, research that reached across disciplines and researchers who regarded precepts on good research and how it should be conducted as guides, not boundaries, indeed guides that should be evaluated and challenged.[43] But dependence in general and especially dependence on foreign funding has bred dependence in research, such that few African researchers seek to be border crossers and methodological deviants.[44] As I have noted, there are certainly important exceptions. For the most part, however, education researchers defer to borders rather than crossing or challenging them.

A third challenge is to create opportunities for research deviance. Education researchers must establish and protect space for departures, for innovations, for work outside the dominant frame.

Working toward that sets a fourth challenge, to recognise that at the larger scale, effective research is necessarily a collaborative activity. Effective research requires context knowledge. Effective research requires systematic review, critique, and cumulation. Effective research requires reducing the price of globally generated knowledge and the cost of retrieving locally generated knowledge. Effective research requires moving beyond noting the scarcity of research resources to organising actively to generate and use new resources. Put simply, effective education research in Africa requires a continental village. That village must include reliably funded research centers and institutes, libraries and laboratories that can support research, appropriate and regularly updated technology, periodic conferences and other opportunities to meet, debate, and create, education journals that have high standards and that meet the crediting requirements of higher education institutions, and strong incentives and rewards for collaborating and for sharing information and knowledge. New technologies can assist in developing that village, but they can also be used to impede and constrain it. Creating that village is thus necessarily both an intellectual and a political project that must be pursued in what are often inhospitable and discouraging settings.

43 Joel Samoff, Jesse Foster, and Nii Antiaye Addy, "Crossing Borders: Research in Comparative and International Education," *International Journal of Educational Development* 32, 6 (November 2012): 711-732.

44 Jeater's recent review provides strong confirmation: "Academic Standards or Academic Imperialism?"

If effective research is necessarily a collaborative active, so must be challenging the dominant framing. That suggests a fifth challenge to education researchers. As I have noted, education is the most contested of public policies. Education research can never be aseptic, conducted in sterile environments and completely shielded from its economic, social, and political context. Challenging its conservative charter and transforming education in Africa requires another sort of collaboration, that between education researchers and a mobilized community and its organisations.

My concern here is not an Africanist critique of external influence but rather an intellectual and political challenge focused on the process of creating and using knowledge. What is needed, I have been asking, for education researchers and education research to contribute to the societal transformation envisioned a half century ago in the Arusha Declaration and Education for Self-Reliance? Our concerns about how power creates information and shapes how we understand both what is and what is possible must not be a lament, or an expression of impotence and hopelessness. Rather, our understanding of information as power must support a generative process in which information challenges power and in which information supports the mobilization and cooperation needed to empower critique and innovation.
Making that possible requires education researchers to be much more self-reflective and much more self-critical.

References

Arnove, Robert F., editor, Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980).

Berman, Edward H., The Ideology of Philanthropy: The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983).

Coleman, James S., "The Idea of the Developmental University," in Atle Hetland, editor, Universities and National Development (Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International and Oxford University Press for the Association of African Universities, 1984).

Coleman, James S. and David Court, University Development in the Third World: The Rockefeller Foundation Experience (Oxford: Pergamon, 1993).

Court, David, Financing Higher Education in Africa: Makerere, the Quiet Revolution (Washington: World Bank and Rockefeller Foundation, 2000).

Cowan, L. Gray, and others, Report on the State of African Studies (New York: Ford Foundation, 1958).

Depelchin, Jacques, Silences in African History: Between the Syndromes of Discovery and Abolition (Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers, 2005).

Denning, Stephen, What is Knowledge Management? A background document to the World Development Report 1998/99 (Washington: World Bank, 1999).

Evans, David K., and Anna Popova, What Really Works to Improve Learning in Developing Countries? An Analysis of Divergent Findings in Systematic Reviews (Washington: World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper, 7203, 2015).

Fanon, Frantz Black Skin, White Masks (New York: Grove Press, 1967).

Fuenzalida, Edmundo F., "The Reception of 'Scientific Sociology' in Chile," Latin American Research Review 18, 2 (1983): 95–112.

Hountondji, Paulin J., "Global Knowledge: Imbalances and Current Tasks," in Guy Neave, editor, Knowledge, Power and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society. (Paris: UNESCO, 2006), 41-60.

Ishengoma, Johnson. "Strengthening Higher Education Space in Africa Through North-South Partnerships and Links: Myths and Realities From Tanzania Public Universities," Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée Et Internationale 45, 1 (2016).

Jeater, Diana, "Academic Standards or Academic Imperialism? Zimbabwean Perceptions of Hegemonic Power in the Global Construction of Knowledge," African Studies Review 61, 2 (2018): 8-27.

Klees Steven J., Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist, editors, The World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012).

Klees, Steven J., Nelly P. Stromquist, Joel Samoff, and Salim Vally, "The World Bank's World Development Report on Education: A Critical Analysis," Development and Change (forthcoming).

Lema, Elieshi, Marjorie Mbilinyi, and Rakesh Rajani, editors, Nyerere on Education/Nyerere kuhusu

Elimu: Selected Essays and Speeches Volume I 1954-1998 (Dar es Salaam: Hakielimu, E & D Limited, Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation, 2004).

Lema, Elieshi Issa Omari, and Rakesh Rajani, editors, Nyerere on Education/Nyerere kuhusu Elimu: Selected Essays and Speeches Volume II 1961-1997 (Dar es Salaam: Hakielimu, E & D Limited, Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation, 2006).

Lewis, Suzanne Grant, Jonathan Friedman, and John Schonenboom, Accomplishments of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, 2000-2010 (New York: Partnership for Higher Education in Africa; Carnegie Corporation, 2010).

Lindblom, Charles E., "The science of 'muddling through,'" Public Administration Review 19, 2 (Spring 1959):79-88.

Lindblom, Charles E., "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through," Public Administration Review 39, 6 (November-December 1979): 517-526.

Lowrey, Annie, "World Bank Sees Role as Consultant," New York Times (2012.07.03). (http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/03/business/global/jim-yong-kim-takes-over-world-bank.html [2012.07.03]).

Maclure, Richard editor, Overlooked and Undervalued: A Synthesis of ERNWACA Reviews on the State of Education Research in West and Central Africa (Washington: USAID, 1997).

Maclure, Richard, "No Longer Overlooked and Undervalued? The Evolving Dynamics of Endogenous Educational Research in Sub-Saharan Africa," Harvard Educational Review 76, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 80-109.

Mamdani, Mahmood Scholars in the Marketplace: The Dilemmas of Neo-Liberal Reform of Makerere University 1989-2005 (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2008).

Martin, William G., "The Rise of African Studies (USA) and the Transnational Study of Africa," African Studies Review 54, 1 (April 2011): 59-83.

Mbembe, Achille, On the Postcolony (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

Mkandawire, Thandika, "Running While Others Walk: Knowledge and the Challenge of Africa's Development," Africa Development XXXVI, 2 (2011): 1-36.

Mudimbe, Valentin Y., The Idea of Africa (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).

Mudimbe, Valentin Y., The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

Nyerere, Julius K., Freedom and Socialism/Uhuru na Ujamaa (Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968).

Nyerere, Julius K., Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism (Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968).

Nyerere, Julius K., "The University's Role in the Development of the New Countries," News on the Hill no. 11 (January 1967).

Ollman, Bertell, Dialectical Investigations (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1993).

Ollman, Bertell, Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003).

Paracka, Daniel J., Jr., The Athens of West Africa: A History of International Education at Fourah Bay College, Freetown, Sierra Leone (New York: Routledge, 2003), 135.

Parson, Talcott, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (New York: Free Press, 1963).

Samoff, Joel, "Cooperation, But Limited Control and Little Ownership," in Association for the Development of Education in Africa, Partnerships for Capacity Building and Quality Improvements in Education (Paris: ADEA, 1999), 175-204.

Samoff, Joel, "Institutionalizing International Influence," in Robert F. Arnove, Carlos Alberto Torres, and Stephen Franz, editors, Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, Fourth edition, 2013), 55-87

Samoff, Joel, "More of the Same Will Not Do: Learning Without Learning in the World Bank's 2020 Education Strategy," in Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist, editors, The World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012), 109-121.

Samoff, Joel, "'Research Shows That . . .': Creating the Knowledge Environment for Learning for All," in Steven J. Klees, Joel Samoff, and Nelly P. Stromquist, editors, The World Bank and Education: Critiques and Alternatives (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012), 143-157.

Samoff, Joel, and Bidemi Carrol, From Manpower Planning to the Knowledge Era: World Bank Policies on Higher Education in Africa. UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper Series, No. 2 (Paris: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, 2003).

Samoff, Joel, Jane Leer, and Michelle Reddy, Capturing Complexity and Context: Evaluating Aid to Education (Stockholm: Expertguppen för biståndsanalys/Expert Group for Aid Studies, 2016), 47-58.

Samoff, Joel, Jesse Foster, and Nii Antiaye Addy, "Crossing Borders: Research in Comparative and International Education," International Journal of Educational Development 32, 6 (November 2012): 711-732.

Samoff, Joel, and Nelly P. Stromquist, "Managing Knowledge and Storing Wisdom: New Forms of Foreign Aid?" Development and Change 32, 4 (September 2001): 631-656.

Shivji, Issa G., "The Politics of Liberalisation in Tanzania: Notes on the Crisis of Ideological Hegemony," In Horace Campbell and Howard Stein, editors, The IMF and Tanzania: The Dynamics of Liberalisation (Harare: Southern Africa Political Economy Series (SAPES) Trust, 1991), 67-85.

Shivji, Issa G., Silences in NGO Discourse: The Role and Future of NGOs in Africa (Nairobi: Fahamu Press, 2007).

Simon, Herbert A., "Rational choice and the structure of the environment," Psychological Review, 63 (1956): 129-138, and Models of Bounded Rationality (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1982).

Smith, William Edgett, We Must Run While They Walk; a Portrait of Africa's Julius Nyerere (New York: Random House, 1972).

World Bank, Knowledge for Development. World Development Report 1998/99 (Washington: Oxford University Press for the World Bank, 1999).

World Bank, Knowledge Sharing and Innovation in the African Region: A Retrospective [prepared by Nicolas Gorjestani] (Washington: World Bank, Knowledge and Learning Center, African Region, 1998), 8-9.

World Bank, Learning for All: Investing in People's Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development. World Bank Education Strategy 2020 (Washington: World Bank, 2011).

World Bank, World Bank Project Appraisal Document, Report No. 22962-MOZ, 4 February 2002. Available through the World Bank's online project database: http://www.worldbank.org/projects.

World Bank, Project Information Document, Report No. PID10008, 22 February 2001.

World Bank. Priorities and Strategies for Education (Washington: World Bank, 1995).

World Bank, World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise (Washington: World Bank, 2017).

Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe, "The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa," Journal of Southern African Studies 28, 1 (March 2002): 9-23.

P.O. Box 79401, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: (255 22) 2151852/3, Fax: (255 22) 2152449
Email: info@hakielimu.or.tz
Website: www.hakielimu.or.tz