African Diaspora and its Multiple Academic Affiliations: Curtailing Brain Drain in African Higher Education through Translocal Academic Engagement

Patrício V. Langa*

Abstract

Scholars with multiple affiliations have become more visible by assuming their particular role in redressing global knowledge production inequities. This article explores multiple academic affiliations (MAAs) as one way to curb the effects of brain drain, particularly in African universities. It argues that MAAs, is an effective way to reverse the effects of brain drain and promote brain circulation and sharing. The article proposes the concept of translocal academic engagement (TLAE) as a form of international academic exchange and brain-sharing which is not limited to physical mobility (circulation) from one geographical location to the other, but which includes virtual exchange and knowledge-sharing through blended learning delivery methods, e-pedagogies and the use of digital communication technology platforms such as Communities of Practice. The article concludes by suggesting that MAAs, if properly managed, can be a success factor in TLAE activities, particularly in the age of Web 4.0, in mitigating or shifting currently dominating knowledge production flows. TLAE offers possibilities for a win-win situation of academic exchange between higher education institutions in emerging systems.
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Résumé

Les chercheurs ayant de multiples affiliations ont acquis une plus grande visibilité en assumant le rôle spécifique qu’ils doivent jouer pour remédier aux injustices dans la production mondiale des connaissances. Cet article examine les affiliations académiques multiples (AAM) en tant que moyen pour atténuer les effets de la fuite des cerveaux notamment dans les universités africaines. Il fait valoir que les AAM, en tant que moyen efficace pour inverser les effets de la fuite des cerveaux et promouvoir la circulation des cerveaux et les partages, n’a pas encore été examinées en profondeur ni partagées. Cet article étude propose le concept de l’engagement académique translocal (EATL) comme une forme d’échange académique et de partage des connaissances qui n’est pas limitée à la mobilité physique (circulation) d’un lieu géographique à un autre, mais qui inclut les échanges et le partage des connaissances virtuels par le biais de méthodes pédagogiques combinées, de pédagogies en ligne et l’utilisation de plateformes de technologies numériques de la communication telles que les communautés de pratique. Cet article conclut en suggérant que si les AAM sont correctement gérées, elles peuvent contribuer à la réussite des activités d’engagement académique translocal, pour atténuer ou déplacer les flux dominants de la production du savoir, notamment à l’époque du Web 4.0. L’engagement académique translocal offre la possibilité d’avoir une situation gagnant-gagnant pour les échanges entre les établissements d’enseignement supérieur dans les systèmes émergents.
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Introduction

Ugandan academic, Mahmood Mamdani, has been dividing his academic activity between Columbia University in the United States of America (USA) and Makerere University (MAK) in Uganda for a long time. Mamdani has been the Herbert Lehman Professor of Government at the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, as well as professor of anthropology, political science and African studies at the same institution. Concomitantly, Mamdani has been director of the Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR), a social sciences institute whose space he has used to focus his academic energies to train a new generation of social science and humanities academics. In other words, Mamdani holds at least two formal academic appointments in two countries on two continents.

In 2018, years following a clash over his proposed core course on Africa at the University of Cape Town in South Africa in 1997, dubbed the ‘Mamdani Affair’ (Kamola 2011), which led to his resignation, the
distinguished scholar was reappointed as an honorary professor at the Centre for African Studies (CAS). In addition, Mamdani is a respected political commentator on Africa and a widely published author. He can therefore be acknowledged as an African diaspora scholar (ADS) with multiple translocal scholarship engagements. While Mamdani might epitomise the prominent public intellectual and ADS, the literature shows a growing tendency of scholars – some less publicly visible – holding multiple academic appointments (Hottenrott and Lawson 2017). In the era of the so-called global academic marketplace, possibilities for multiple international academic appointments have increased significantly (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2009).

As exemplified by Mamdani in the case of Uganda, most African countries have their own class of translocal academics. These scholars can either be African-based diaspora scholars (ABDS) taking up appointments in a country other than their country of origin, or ADS based outside the continent but collaborating, through temporary appointments, with universities in Africa.

The elements uniting these scholars are international leadership in their respective disciplines, high productivity in terms of scientific publications and impact measured through citations, and their status as global public intellectuals (Mamdani 2016). These particular academics possess high levels of scientific and symbolic capital (Langa 2010). Academics with multiple appointments and affiliations are no longer an uncommon phenomenon in the global higher education context (ESF 2013; Hottenrott and Lawson 2017). While on a global level, academics display high local and international mobility, the data on academic mobility, particularly in Africa, remain inaccurate and insufficient (Ogachi 2015) and, consequently, a persisting challenge. Despite the growing tendency to collect data on student mobility, a paucity of data on academic staff mobility in general, and MMAs in particular, remains the norm on the continent.

According to Altbach et al., ‘the academic profession will become more internationally oriented and mobile, but will still be structured in accordance with national circumstances’ (2009:1). Hence, although academic profiles similar to Mamdani’s are becoming more common and more visible – especially in the context of the globalised academic marketplace (Altbach et al. 2009) – not all institutions and academics have the ability to attract and engage in such appointments. In general, globalisation tends to concentrate wealth, knowledge and power with those already possessing these elements (Altbach and Knight 2007). By and large, in developed countries, institutions and corporations own most knowledge, knowledge products and information
technology infrastructure, though South-to-South collaborations and networks are increasing, especially in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

Different circumstances might determine whether the mobility of scholars is classified as brain drain, particularly when there is departure to the diaspora, or brain gain – when an academic returns to his or her country of origin after a position abroad. In general, academics go from developing countries to North America, Western Europe and Asia-Pacific. There are also significant flows from sub-Saharan Africa to South Africa, from South Asia to the Middle East and Africa, from Egypt to the wealthier Arab countries, and from the United Kingdom to Canada and the USA (Zeleza 2014).

A key motivator for the direction of this flow is the level of salaries, but, among other factors, improved working conditions, research support infrastructure, opportunities for advancement and academic freedom may also play a role. Those in the diaspora can exert a strong influence by keeping in contact with the academic communities in their home countries and by sharing research and experience (Ogachi & Sall 2015; Zeleza 2014). However, the global flow of academic talent works to the disadvantage of emerging countries, although there are indicators that this status quo is changing. More Chinese scholars are choosing to return home after sojourns elsewhere, for example. Universities in Singapore, Hong Kong, China and elsewhere are attracting Western academics with high salaries and favourable working conditions (Altbach 2004).

In fact, the volume of South–South cooperation in higher education and research has significantly increased in the past decade (ECOSOC 2008; OBHE 2001–10). One common argument for South–South cooperation by southern countries is their similar phase of development, and, hence, their mutual capability to develop practices relevant to each other’s contexts (OBHE 2001–10). Compared with North–South partnerships, South–South cooperation is often also cheaper to implement in terms of mobility and is based on fewer prerequisites, thus facilitating the start as well as ongoing administrative procedures. However, developing countries in sub-Saharan Africa are rarely involved in intra-African cooperation. Accurate growth data on South–South, including intra-African, cooperation are often unavailable because they are not systematically collected at the national or international level. Initiatives and programmes, largely financed by the North, are focused on the South. Additionally, international academic mobility favours well-established education systems and institutions, thereby compounding existing inequalities.

The international mobility of African academics, particularly to developed countries, has been regarded as a negative consequence of global market
forces. Since the early 1990s, there has been an almost uncontested narrative that developing countries have been losing higher-level skilled professionals each year to the developed world (Adams 2003). This alarming description of a dangerous human capital exodus from Africa to the developed world has dominated the political and academic discourse. The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) claims that between 1960 and 1989, some 127,000 highly qualified African professionals left the continent. According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), Africa has lost 20,000 professionals each year since 1990 (Tebeje 2011).

The idea that Africa suffers from brain drain thus became the conventional wisdom in media and academic circles. There are no indications to date that scholarly opinion has shifted significantly. However, in the era of relatively easy air travel and ever-increasing digitalisation, many internationally mobile academics retain close links with their home countries or continent. A more optimistic approach regards the current status quo as brain gain or brain circulation, and can offer many opportunities for developing countries (Teferra 2005; Tung 2008).

The article argues that the concepts of MAAs and brain-sharing, particularly in the age of digitalisation, broaden both the scope and the possibility of a win-win situation by sharing the academic and intellectual capacity of highly productive (African) academics through capitalising on MAAs and collaboration between (African) universities and their diaspora scholars. While the article provides insight into the extent and structure of MAAs, further research into the contractual and organisational nature of MAAs in Africa is needed to inform policy and decision-making on the issue. The article concludes by suggesting that, if properly managed, MAAs, together with the effective use of information and communication technology (ICT) and e-learning platforms, can offer an opportunity to curtail the undesired consequences of brain drain.

Literature Review

Brain Drain: A Bleak Picture of African Diaspora at the Transition into the Twenty-First Century

The body of literature on the African academic diaspora has grown significantly in the last two to three decades (Ogachi & Sall 2015; Zeleza 2013, 2014, 2016). However, there continues to be a paucity of literature and research on the kinds of appointments diaspora academics occupy in their collaboration with African institutions. Even literature which presents the notion of brain circulation as an antidote to the undesired effects of
brain drain, does not elaborate on the actual forms of engagement diaspora academics undertake with their partner institutions (Tung 2008). Often, examples provided from those countries which are considered to have adopted strategies to curb brain drain, such as China and India, do not provide the particularities of the contractual agreements these academics make with both the home and host institutions. Likewise, studies on the contractual nature of MAAs are still rare (Hottenrott and Lawson 2017).

In general, the literature tends to focus on brain drain in the context of human capital losses or gains (Tafah 2004). This trend is related to a perspective from the discipline of economics, which diaspora studies have frequently embraced. Hence, while human capital gains enhance economic growth, losses generate important problems in the growth process of any country. Notwithstanding this recognition, research attention on the international movement of economic resources has focused more on the physical movement of people across borders and continents as opposed to the virtual exchange of human capital via ICT and e-learning platforms, in a world increasingly characterised by virtual connectivity and the rise of the network society (Castells 2010).

The recurring definition of the international movement of human capital as loss, brain drain, is generally accepted, as it is perceived as the drainage of talented people from one country, region or continent to another in search of better professional and personal opportunities. Usually, the concern with brain drain becomes relevant in the context of competition amongst nations, which may lead to scarcity of skills and talents. In this sense, brain drain constitutes a great loss for the country from which migration takes place, because it is the exodus of the most educated stratum of a particular society. The concept of brain drain is therefore used to describe the loss of advanced professional and technical skills, such as scientists, academics, doctors, engineers and other professionals with university training. In that sense, it alludes to the most trained fraction of a particular society (Giannoccolo 2009, 2010a, 2010b).

The literature on the African diaspora denounces the academic mobility of high-level, skilled personnel from emerging countries, for example in Africa, to Western countries. This view assumes that the diaspora negatively affects the socioeconomic and sociocultural prospects of developing nations, since they lose human capital to the developed world (April 1998; Obia 1993; Smyke 2001). Literature produced in the late 1990s and early 2000s proposed remedial measures to deal with brain drain, which was regarded as a national threat to developing nations (Commander, Kangasniemi and Winters 2004). This dreary picture was often based on imprecise figures and presented a worrisome situation.
**Figures on African Brain Drain**

In the case of Africa, the idea that the best and brightest are fleeing the continent has been documented and supported with figures provided by various sources including organisations such as the International Organisation of Migration (IOM), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), The World Bank and researchers (Tafah 2004; Mohamoud 2005; World Bank 2007; Capuano and Marfouk 2013; Chukwudum Oforka 2015). According to the IOM, Africa had already lost one-third of its human capital and continues to lose its expert personnel at an increasing rate, with an estimated 20,000 doctors, university lecturers, engineers and other professionals leaving the continent annually. According to the IOM, over 300,000 African professionals live outside of the continent, and approximately 20,000 African professionals migrate to Western countries every year (Ite 2002). The IOM estimates over 300,000 highly qualified Africans were in the diaspora, 30,000 of whom were PhD holders (Boyo 2013; Chukwudum Oforka 2015). At the same time, Africa was spending US$4 billion per year (representing 35 per cent of total official development aid to the continent) to employ some 100,000 expatriates performing functions generically described as technical assistance. While skilled Africans leave the continent, non-Africans work in skilled jobs on the African continent (Barka 2000).

In Figure 1 below Capuano and Marfouk (2013) use a dataset (DMOP) developed by Docquier, Marfouk, Özden, and Parsons (2011) to compare the highly skilled emigration rates when emigration to non-OECD countries is also considered. The figure shows that the brain drain is mostly underrated in sub-Saharan African countries, such as Burkina Faso, Chad, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Niger, and Mali. For instance, “for Lesotho, the high skilled emigration rate to the OECD and non-OECD countries (23 per cent) is approximately six times higher than the high-skilled emigration rate to the OECD countries (4 per cent)” (p.309). Capuano and Marfouk (2013) also in Figure 1 show that “the magnitude of the brain drain is also underrated for non-African countries. In fact, DMOP only considers 76 receiving countries. Due to the low quality of the data, the information on sending countries is partial” (p.310), but enough to give an overall idea of the immigration trends of high skilled people.
Furthermore, in the year 1999, Africa as a whole counted only 20,000 scientists (0.36 per cent of the world total) and its share in the world’s scientific output had fallen from 0.5 per cent to 0.3 per cent as it continued to suffer a brain drain of scientists, engineers and technologists (Deen 1999, Anonymous (n.d). Reports based on figures from IOM and UNESCO show that the problem of brain drain has reached quite disturbing proportions in certain African countries, with Ethiopia ranked first on the continent in terms of rate of loss of human capital, followed by Nigeria and Ghana. Over the past 10 to 15 years, about 50 per cent of Ethiopians who went abroad for academic training did not return after completing their studies. According to the IOM, Ethiopia lost about 74.6 per cent of its human capital from various institutions between 1980 and 1991. The report states that, while Ethiopia had only one single full-time economics professor, there were more than one hundred Ethiopian economists in the USA (Deen 1999, Barka 2000, Anonymous [n.d.]). This bleak brain-drain scenario resulted in the United Nations recognising that the emigration of African professionals to the West was an obstacle to Africa’s development. Studies in the first 15 years of the new millennium show that research collaborations between African scholars and international academics recorded a slight improvement in African research output, a major area of
underperformance when compared to other continents. Africa is at the bottom of almost every indicator-based ranking and league table in science and higher education. For instance, in the early 2000s, Africa’s share of publication output was 1.6 per cent and of researchers by region/continent, 2.2 per cent. By the first decade of the new millennium, Africa’s share of publications had risen to 2.5 per cent, although the share of researchers declined slightly from 2.2 per cent to 2.1 per cent (Zeleza 2014). Central to the problem of academic emigration from Africa are issues of supply, demand and mobility, as well as limitations in specific areas of postgraduate education and career development, and comparatively poor working conditions for scientists in Africa. More specifically, these issues include large differences in remuneration and living conditions for those working in low-income countries, alongside a demand for skilled workers in high-income countries. Political persecution, repression and instability are among the other reasons for emigration (Kerr and Mapange 2002; Mbiba 2012; Zeleza 2013).

African governments’ higher education policies have tended to respond to the migration of African professionals, including academics, to the North in one of three ways. First, they admonish the brain drain and engage in mutual accusations with the diaspora. Governments of originating countries may view their migrants as unpatriotic for leaving their countries when they are needed the most. Attitudes can also shift from positive to negative if migrants gather resources, become more organised and hence become politically influential, implying a potential threat to the status quo (Mohan 2008).

Second, some governments have pursued the brain gain argument to encourage the diaspora to return permanently. For instance, Ghana’s main concern has been the health sector and it acts to prevent the departure of its health professionals. At the same time, it encourages Ghanaians abroad to provide temporary service in the national health system (Vezzoli and Lacroix 2010). Furthermore, policies can be developed as ways to promote the extension of rights of (former) citizens residing outside national boundaries. Relevant policies include the political incorporation of migrants, either by allowing dual citizenship and providing expatriates with passive and active voting rights or by granting migrants access to civil and social services (Gamlen 2006, 2008). In this respect, the government of Ghana passed a dual citizenship law in the year 2000 and, more recently, provided Ghanaian migrants with the right to vote in elections in Ghana. Another example is the government of India, which has created a systematic method to attract the skills and human capital of its diaspora for the development of various sectors of the Indian economy (Vezzoli and Lacroix 2010).
The third governmental response is the ‘diaspora’ option, which recognises migrants as new diasporas. Efforts are made to build effective strategies of brain mobility or brain circulation between them and their countries of origin as well as the continent as a whole (Mensa-Bonsu and Adjei 2007). The latter requires developing innovative strategies for knowledge and skill circulation, such as the creation of national, regional and continental knowledge networks facilitating brain mobility through academic exchanges, consultancy assignments and temporary return migration movements.

**Changes in the Academic Profession in the Knowledge Society**

Globally, substantial research has been produced on the changes taking place in the academic profession in the era of the knowledge society (Balbachevsky, Schwartzman, Novaes Alves, Felgueiras dos Santos and Birkholz Duarte 2008; Brennan 2006; Cummings and Arimoto 2011; Finkelstein, Walker and Chen 2009; Henkel 2007; Higgs, Higgs, Ntshoe and Wolhuter 2010; Höhle and Teichler 2011). However, with the exception of South Africa (Higgs et al. 2010; Wolhuter 2015), Africa has generally been neglected in such studies. In the new era, the framework of higher education has experienced major changes. Similarly, the backgrounds, specialisations, expectations and work roles of academic staff have undergone transformation (Teichler, Arimoto and Cummings 2013).

The academy is expected to become more professional in teaching, more productive in research and more entrepreneurial (Harman and Meek 2007). Concomitantly, knowledge has come to be identified as the most vital resource of contemporary societies (Arimoto 2010). To respond to the multiple demands and challenges of the knowledge society, academic work has been adapting itself by developing new content and reshaping its forms. Translocal and transnational institutional affiliations and engagements with multiple stakeholders, both face-to-face and online, have become part of the portfolio of many academics as an integral part of their academic work. Thus, academic affiliation is becoming an elusive home (Orduña-Malea, Ayllón, Martín-Martín and López-Cózar 2017).

However, in some cases the academic profession still maintains certain features that are not always compatible with the new demands on the translocal context of higher education. This is the case particularly in the African context, where academics still tend to be employed on manual worker-type contracts which require physical presence in the workplace. This situation is amplified whenever academics are remunerated on the basis of the number of hours they are supposed to dedicate to teaching activities and research, and where outreach is not specified as part of their work. In an era marked by increasing globalisation and internationalisation of the academic profession and
scholarly work, with academics engaging in multiple international institutional affiliations, certain traditions and practices in academic management, such as single institutional contracts, are being challenged.

**Research Approach and Data Sources**

Being an exploratory study, the information and data used in this article derive from multiple sources, including a literature review, conversations with African-based and African diaspora scholars, and reports of bibliometric databases on academic collaborations. The conversations with African-based scholars (ABS) and ADS took place in the context of their participation in the establishment of two postgraduate programmes and an academic staff exchange and mobility programme. The Council for the Development of Social Sciences Research in Africa (CODESRIA), through its programme African Diaspora Support to African Universities (ADSAU), sponsored seven academic exchanges between ABS and ADS from 2016 to 2018. Through these, a number of joint activities took place, including:

i) curriculum design of two new PhD programmes in Higher Education Studies at the University of the Western Cape (UWC) and Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM);

ii) co-supervision of postgraduate students;

iii) delivery of public lectures;

iv) seminars with doctoral and postdoctoral fellows at the Institute of Post School Studies (IPSS) of UWC and UEM;

v) joint grant applications; and

vi) reciprocal institutional visits between ABS and ADS.

The collaboration between ABS and ADS has since continued by means of another funding source, the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY), for the period 2016–2019. The CCNY also sponsored seven doctoral students and three postdoctoral research fellows in higher education studies at UWC’s IPSS. Enabled by CODESRIA and CCNY sponsorship combined, more than ten ABS and ADS visited the IPSS between 2016 and 2018. The article interweaves a theoretical research exploration together with the perspectives of those ABS and ADS who participated in the Doctoral Programme in Higher Education Studies (DPHES) at the IPSS. The main research objective is to explore the types of engagement and the nature of contractual arrangements diaspora academics engage in. All academics and visiting fellows in the DPHES display different contractual arrangements and MAAs with various African institutions as well as with their current or permanent universities in Europe or America.
A variety of topics are discussed in what follows, reflecting concerns and views regarding opportunities and challenges of engagement with the academic diaspora. The research focus was on multiple international appointments/affiliations (MIAAs), which are emerging as a global trend in the academic profession, with implications for African academia.

**Brain-Sharing: Exploring Multiple Academic Affiliations**

Studies by Paul Zeleza on engagements between ADS in the USA and Canada and African institutions of higher education shed much-needed light on possible roles that the African academic diaspora can play in supporting African universities (Zeleza 2004, 2013, 2014; Zeleza, Akyeampong and Musa 2017). Although Zeleza’s studies mostly turn a blind eye to intra-Africa or internal African academic diaspora, they are nevertheless an invaluable contribution to scholarship on the role of academic diasporas. A dimension that is largely absent in Zeleza’s research on diaspora, as in most literature on the African academic diaspora, is the specific forms of affiliation scholars engage in, including contractual arrangements. Indeed, as far as the African research community is concerned, little is known about the modalities of engagements and contractual arrangements to promote collaboration between African academic diasporas and their academic peers on the continent.

In fact, Zeleza (2013) acknowledges that many African diaspora academics have established vibrant, albeit largely informal, engagements with individuals and/or institutions across Africa. These engagements range from research collaboration to curriculum development and graduate student supervision. He also recognises that diaspora engagements frequently face institutional and attitudinal barriers. Zeleza’s work identifies some of the major obstacles that hinder engagement with the diaspora:

i) differences in resources and facilities;

ii) a mismatch in expectations between African-based and African diaspora academics;

iii) different academic status, teaching loads and institutional priorities; and

iv) scheduling around incompatible academic calendars between the sending and receiving institutions.

This study reinforces Zeleza’s observations, in that traditional structures, paired with a lack of knowledge about new trends in the academic profession, impede new, creative and flexible modes of promoting
collaboration between ADS and ABS. The next section explores the challenges and opportunities of MIAAs in the African context. For a comprehensive overview, see Table 1 below.

**Table 1:** Typical patterns of academic activities and types of affiliation by ABS and ADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions/mission</th>
<th>African-based scholars</th>
<th>African diaspora scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>• Teaching-intensive • Transmission of knowledge • Requires physical presence • Massive Restrictive Presence Courses</td>
<td>• Research-intensive • New knowledge generation • Blended learning (physical presence and e-learning platforms) • MOOCs – Massive Open Online Courses with and for international audiences (e.g. Webinars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>• Subsidiary function • Teach or perish</td>
<td>• Core function • Publish or perish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility/collaboration</td>
<td>• Local</td>
<td>• International collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment/Affiliation</td>
<td>• Single affiliation (local) • Turbo lecture – commuting between various local public and private institutions for teaching</td>
<td>• MIAAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Sports Contract Mentality**

An internationally competing football player cannot perform in and be contracted by two national teams. Therefore, strict rules from football governing boards, such as the International Federation of Association Football, subscribed to by national football confederations, sanction and prevent players from double contracts with clubs. Obviously, the circumstances of professional athletes in high-performance sports, which imply physical engagements and presence, are decisive in contractual obligations. Unlike in professional sports, the academic profession and the nature of academic work is more flexible as it allows for virtual, non-face-to-face interactions. In the age of Web 4.0, even laboratories can be shared virtually. The rise of e-classrooms is no longer an imagined reality. There has been a profound structural and morphological transformation of the conditions under which learning and teaching, as well as research, take place (Berk 2009).
Downes (2007) argues that new technologies allow for the deinstitutionalisation of learning. The rise of virtual classrooms is well documented, as are various e-learning tools and technological resources – for example, Moodle, blogs, Facebook, wikis – which have revolutionised the meaning of a classroom. The rapid spread of ICT has changed traditional ways of communication and information-sharing. New technologies have brought innovations to different aspects of society and, of relevance here, to teaching and learning processes in higher education. These innovations have improved the types of communication, interaction and knowledge-sharing engaged in between individuals and groups (Avci and Askarl 2012).

A new generation of students – known as ‘digital natives’, the ‘Net Generation’ or ‘Generation Y’ – has not known the world without the internet (Oblinger and Oblinger 2005). Nowadays, it is possible to share the knowledge of ADS or any other international experts without them having to physically move to Africa. Likewise, it is possible for ABS to teach in universities in the North. Technology has become both a facilitating element and a tool to create bridges between African universities and institutions in other parts of the world.

Nevertheless, most African universities treat their academics as manual workers who have to be physically present at their workplace. This trend is related to the following factors:

i) most African (public) universities have seen an increase in student intake on campuses, therefore requiring the physical presence of lecturers in classes and lecture halls;

ii) academic work is mostly conceived of in the traditional way of teaching usually very large classes, thus requiring physical presence;

iii) some institutions have introduced attendance registration books to keep a record of the physical presence of lecturers in classes.

In some cases, fingerprint-enabled digital control of lecturers’ physical presence in class is taking place, particularly in private institutions that pay staff per hour taught.

The traditional idea of academic work being defined as teaching in class reinforces the predisposition of most African universities to oppose international collaboration and mobility. The professional athlete mentality therefore obstructs the mobility and ability of ADS to engage in multiple affiliations and international academic collaborations.

Academic staff managers and human resource departments in most African universities have set rules and regulations to control the ‘local’ mobility of academics. Although claiming to promote academic mobility,
university managers regularly apply restrictive regulations and measures which infringe on this principle. The digital fingerprint tool mentioned above, for instance, is utilised as a control mechanism to monitor academic staff’s class attendance, thereby reinforcing the prevalent physical presence-based, face-to-face teaching culture.

The ‘Turbo Lecture’: The Downside of Multiple Local Institutional Affiliation

African-based academics commonly teach in more than two institutions, or in different time shifts in the same institution, as a way to supplement their relatively meagre salaries. Usually, these lecturers carry a heavy workload, leaving little or no time for research. The absence of national and institutional databases facilitating staff administration contributes towards the poor management of academic affiliations.

In order to curb the so-called turbo lecture – that is, an individual with multiple teaching appointments – it would be necessary to establish ‘one-size-fits-all’ regulations which prevent academics from engaging in collaborations with other national and international institutions. While it may seem reasonable for universities to want to counteract the ‘turbo lecture’ – as denounced by Mamdani (2007) – as an unpleasant side effect of the commercialisation of higher education (a result of the transformation of African universities towards being more market-driven), they also need to promote the international mobility of their academic staff.

While turbo lectures may represent the decay of African academia, internationally mobile and engaged academics are outliers and represent the positive side of multiple international engagements. Global networks and multiple international engagements contribute to giving African institutions a positive reputation (Overton-de Klerk and Sienaert 2016). Outlier academics have profiles that are similar to those of their peers in research universities in the North, yet, unlike their counterparts, they do not usually receive the same recognition. Furthermore, they are usually confronted with the demands of a heavy teaching load and overcrowded classrooms in their home institutions, with their physical presence being required at all times. Despite the advantages that MIAAs can bring to African universities, most do not seem ready to explore their benefits.

In the context of changing incentives and reward systems, it is increasingly important for academics to cooperate and co-publish internationally (Abramo, D’Angelo and Di Costa 2009; Kwiek 2018). For instance, “Internationalists” increasingly compete with “locals” in university hierarchies for prestige and
for access to project-based research funding across Europe’ (Kwiek 2018:136). In Africa, despite the paucity of data, research shows that more productive academics are likely to engage in multiple networks of collaboration with international partners (Langa 2010; Overton-de Klerk and Sienaert 2016).

A study conducted by Kyvik and Reymerton (2017:951) shows that ‘Membership in a research group and active participation in international networks are likely to enhance publication productivity and the quality of research’. Collaboration is hence central to the viability of engagement with the diaspora. Collaboration in research can take different forms, from giving informal advice to colleagues to working closely together via institutional agreements. Teamwork can be undertaken between colleagues in a university department, between peers in different departments, with other universities or research institutes, with industry, and with research establishments in other countries. Collaboration can take place between two individual researchers or between many scientists as members of large teams (Kyvik and Reymerton 2017).

Paradoxically, in order for African academics to be more productive, they need the autonomy to engage in MIAAs and networks of collaboration with translocal research groups. This requirement often clashes with the inflexibility of their academic job descriptions and the contractual obligations at their home institutions.

**Joint and Double Degrees: An Opportunity for Reciprocity in MAAs**

A recent development in African higher education is the establishment of joint and dual or double degree programmes, particularly at postgraduate level, in collaboration with international universities in Europe, America and Asia. A joint degree programme, usually at master’s or PhD level, is offered jointly by two or more international universities and results in a joint diploma which is formally accepted by all degree-awarding partner universities. A double degree programme – also known as dual degree, combined degree, conjoint degree, joint degree, simultaneous degree or double graduation programme – involves students’ registering and studying for two different university degrees in parallel, either at the same institution or at different institutions, including in different countries at times, and completing those degrees in less time than it would have taken to earn them separately. The two degrees might be in the same subject area – applicable in particular when the course is split between countries – or in two different subjects (Fourie-Malherbe, Botha and Stevens 2016).
In Latin America and South-East Asia, the number of North–South double/joint degree programmes has grown, for example between a Latin American country and France, Spain, the USA or Germany, and between Japan, South Korea and Vietnam, Cambodia or Mongolia (Gacel-Ávila 2009). In Africa, joint degree programmes are also taking off. In Europe, the process of establishing joint degree programmes was started by the Bologna Declaration in 1999. It formulated a set of goals, including the development of a European Higher Education Area, to promote citizens’ mobility and employability, to achieve greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education, and to increase the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education, as well as its worldwide attraction for students and scholars (Bologna Declaration 1999).

Some North–South double degree programmes have received international funding, for example from the European Union (EU) or via the German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, or DAAD) programmes from Germany, aimed at promoting the development of these types of degrees. African universities have also benefited from such programmes, particularly through the EU-funded intra-Africa mobility programme. The number of North–South dual and joint degree programmes appears to be growing. Currently, dual degree programmes still dominate as they have to adhere to fewer regulations and are thus easier to establish. In addition, not all countries legally allow the creation of joint degree programmes.

Joint degree programmes are one example of promoting equal collaboration between ABS and ADS, where all sides have similar opportunities for academic exchange and MAAs. However, as it stands, European partners, including the African diaspora, regularly benefit more than their ABS partners from these programmes. In most cases, the engagement of African diaspora and northern partners is viewed by the latter as a generosity resulting in intellectual and academic remittances to African universities.

**African Diaspora as an Intellectual Generosity**

The idea that engagement with ADS results in intellectual and academic remittances to ABS raises some questions. This understanding leads to ABS being placed in a disadvantaged position when compared to their counterparts. Academic collaboration involves a free sharing of ideas and the possibility of co-production of new knowledge for mutual benefit. However, ADS frequently position their collaboration as an expression of intellectual generosity through nurturing the development of less experienced colleagues.
ADS thus position themselves as mentors providing a platform for the better visibility of ABS through joint publications.

The exploitation of junior researchers by those in positions of power and seniority – a constellation also referred to as collaboration-as-parasitism – is also sometimes observed in ADS and ABS collaborations. Whilst collaboration has always been at the heart of academic work, its paradoxes illustrate how individual and collective goals can conflict, through measuring academic performance, on the one hand, and the way in which such audits reduce the meaning of collaboration to absurdity, on the other.

**New Dynamics in African Diaspora Engagement with Africa**

In 2017, a consortium comprised of Harvard University, the University of Johannesburg, the United States International University-Africa, the Ford Foundation, CODESRIA, the CCNY and the Institute of International Education organised a conference entitled ‘Role of the Diaspora in the Revitalization of African Higher Education’ (Zeleza et al. 2017). The conference gathered some of the most prominent ADS, including the authors of the post-conference report.

The report is a comprehensive document featuring current debates and ideas about diaspora academics’ role in advancing Africa’s higher education to curtail the continent’s brain drain and introduce a cycle of brain gain and brain circulation (Zeleza et al. 2017). Some of the key conclusions extracted from the report suggest that ADS represent a huge asset for the continent in meeting the challenges of African higher education and exploiting all opportunities (Zeleza et al. 2017). South Africa, for example, is amongst those African countries that have benefited the most from the presence of intra-African immigrants, despite many of them being met with hostility (Kalitanyi and Visser 2010).

According to the report, ADS ‘are an indispensable player in Africa’s rapidly growing and increasingly diversified education sector. Their intellectual remittances are fundamental to the realization of integrated, inclusive and innovative sustainable development envisioned in numerous national and regional development agendas’ (Zeleza et al. 2017:4). The authors also indicate that there is ‘huge demand by African institutions for diaspora academics and there is need to expand beyond fellowships to other modalities of engagement to appeal to different stakeholders’ (Zeleza et al. 2017:4).

While the report highlights the role diaspora academics can assume as remitters of intellectual capital, it does not outline a role that internal African-based diaspora should or could take up. There is an implicit notion
that the African diasporic condition is restricted to those academics outside the continent, based in Europe, America and Australasia.

The report thus fails to acknowledge the intracontinental diaspora. In fact, it refers to the following Afro-diaspora categories as claiming ‘the entire African diaspora; Africa-Americans, Afro-Brazilians, Afro-Europeans, Afro-Asians and others’ (Zeleza et al. 2017:16). The report also does not extensively consider the forms of affiliation engaged in by African academic diaspora. The fact that some diaspora academics, especially those working in the USA, get three months unpaid leave – mostly during their holidays – is habitually presented as a window of opportunity to engage in academic mobility and exchange on other continents, including Africa. For instance, there are records of USA–German academic exchange, dubbed ‘elective diasporas’, occurring since the end of World War II (Jöns, Mavroudi and Heffernan 2014).

The notion of elective diaspora stresses the ‘elective nature of diasporic identities and belonging by emphasising that individuals can choose whether they wish to support diasporic networks of one or more communities and cultures they feel connected to’ (Jöns et al. 2014:113). It also suggests that this ‘civic rather than “ethno” territorial understanding of diasporic networks has wider relevance for theorisations of diaspora, for studies of transnational mobility and knowledge transfer, and for university and public policies seeking to attract talent from abroad’ (Jöns et al. 2014: 113).

The occasional affiliation, especially during holidays, may be complemented by new forms of joint, dual or multiple appointments. Academics who are based on the continent as well as in the diaspora can explore new forms of engagement which are mutually beneficial. New forms of research collaboration which include joint curriculum development, shared graduate student supervision, joint research projects and joint grant applications, require a much longer-term type of engagement beyond the duration of a summer holiday. Therefore, there is a need for new institutional arrangements and the removal of barriers, as well as research on the changes in the academic profession in Africa, including the new forms of academic work taking place.

**Conclusion**

The main discourse around the African academic diaspora follows a typical pattern of focusing on the wide-ranging costs of losing some of the continent’s best and brightest intellectual’s through brain drain. This focus on the disadvantages, however, obstructs the expansive and often innovative interactions that ADS and ABS have forged on both sides,
involving their home and host institutions. Emerging patterns of multiple institutional and international academic affiliations between both ADS and ABS are reinforcing scholarly and personal engagements. While there are still many challenges to overcome, particularly in African institutions, the collaborations between ADS and ABS are gradually gaining financial support from international funding agencies, with the aim to build capacity in African universities. Funding schemes such as the EU’s ERASMUS+ programme and the Intra-Africa Academic Mobility Scheme, CODESRIA and the Carnegie Corporation of New York African Diaspora Fellowship Program are crucial in promoting more equitable and fair ADS and ABS engagements, but also need to be aligned with revised contractual conditions for academic staff, allowing more flexibility and multiple affiliation. The professional athlete contract mentality exhibited by some academic staff managers at African universities is not compatible with the global trend of internationalisation of the academic profession.

There is evidence that a significant and growing proportion of scholars with multiple affiliations also display high levels of academic integrity and productivity. This evidence validates the need for African scholars to attribute the necessary importance to studying multiple affiliations in the context of scientific research and institutional capacity development. This article discussed multiple affiliations and their conditions as a possibility to curb the effects of brain drain, while promoting brain-sharing. It argued that multiple affiliations not only reflect the dynamics and competitive advantage of the higher education sector in specific countries, but also that they can make a valuable contribution in minimising knowledge production inequities globally. The use of ICT and associated e-learning platforms represents an advantage for all actors involved by promoting a more integrated culture of blended-learning environments.

In conclusion, MAAs have not been studied extensively, despite their enormous potential to redress knowledge and academic inequities globally, but specifically in emerging countries. By curbing the effects of brain drain and promoting brain gain, brain circulation and brain-sharing, it is recommended that MAAs be explored in more detail in future research and policy.
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Notes

4. Extracts of conversations with African-based and African diaspora scholars are presented in Chapter 8 of this Journal.

References


Docquier, F., Marfouk, A., Özden, C. and Parsons, C., 2011, Geographic, Gender and Skill Structure of International Migration, Mimeo, Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium.


