Greener Journal of Education and Training Studies
Vol. 9(1), pp. 1-20, 2026
ISSN: 2354-225X

https://gjournals.org/GJETS
DOI Link: https://doi.org/10.15580/gjets.2026.1.031526038

From Collaboration to Control: The Political Economy of Research Funding and its Implications for Sustainable Educational Innovation in Africa

Tani Emmanuel Lukong Ph.D.

Department of Educational Psychology,
Faculty of Education, University of Buea, Cameroon.

ABSTRACT

Over the past three decades, international research collaboration has become central to knowledge production in African universities, particularly in the field of education. While such partnerships have expanded access to funding, infrastructure, and global scholarly networks, they have also embedded African research systems within a political economy that subtly shapes what is studied, how it is studied, and whose knowledge counts. This article interrogates the evolving architecture of research funding through the critical question: when does collaboration shift into control? Drawing on political economy analysis and decolonial scholarship, the paper argues that contemporary funding regimes often reproduce structural asymmetries rooted in historical patterns of dependency. Financial flows from the Global North do not merely support research; they influence agenda setting, methodological preferences, impact metrics, and authorship hierarchies. As a result, educational innovation in Africa risks being defined by external priorities rather than locally grounded epistemic frameworks. Situated within the lived realities of African academia, the article reflects on how donor-driven project cycles, performance-based evaluation models, and standardized research templates may constrain epistemic autonomy while presenting themselves as neutral instruments of quality assurance. Building on decolonial critiques of the "coloniality of knowledge", the paper demonstrates how indigenous educational philosophies, community-based pedagogies, and African language epistemologies are frequently marginalized in favour of universalized Western paradigms. This dynamic, though often subtle, carries significant implications for the sustainability of educational innovation. Innovations that are externally framed, short-term, and insufficiently embedded within local institutions struggle to endure beyond grant cycles, thereby weakening long-term transformative capacity. The article does not position African scholars as passive actors. It acknowledges the strategic agency exercised within constrained systems and highlights emerging efforts toward epistemic self-determination, including African-led research consortia and calls for data sovereignty. The paper argues that sustainable educational innovation in Africa requires a reconfiguration of research partnerships toward genuine reciprocity, shared agenda setting, and institutional capacity strengthening. Collaboration need not imply subordination. However, without structural reform in the political economy of research funding, the promise of partnership risks perpetuating intellectual dependency. Reclaiming epistemic sovereignty is therefore not an act of isolationism but a necessary foundation for equitable and contextually grounded educational transformation in Africa.

ARTICLE'S INFO

Article No.: *031526038*
Type**:** *Review*
Full Text: *PDF, PHP, HTML, EPUB, MP3*
DOI: *10.15580/gjets.2026.1.031526038*

Accepted: *17/03/2026*
Published: *22/03/2026*

Keywords: *Collaboration, Control, Political Economy, Research Funding, Sustainable Educational Innovation in Africa*

Corresponding Author

Tani Emmanuel Lukong

Email: *elukongt@gmail.com*

Article's QR code

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades, the landscape of research in African universities has been profoundly reshaped by the expansion of international funding and cross-border collaboration. In institutions long constrained by limited public investment, fragile infrastructure, and heavy teaching loads, externally funded research has often represented more than opportunity it has represented survival. Laboratories have been equipped, doctoral students funded, mobility supported, and new research centres established largely through international grants and partnerships. Particularly in the field of education, where reform is frequently tied to national development agendas, global funding streams have significantly expanded the scale and visibility of African scholarship. Initiatives supported by multilateral agencies, bilateral donors, philanthropic foundations, and foreign universities have positioned African institutions within global research networks in ways that would have been difficult to achieve through domestic funding alone (Cloete et al., 2015; World Bank, 2020).

This growth has coincided with the rapid expansion of North–South research partnerships. Education research in Africa is now deeply embedded within collaborative consortia that span continents, bringing together scholars, policymakers, and development actors under shared project frameworks. These partnerships are often framed in the language of mutual learning, capacity building, and global knowledge exchange. In many cases, they have indeed facilitated scholarly exposure, co-authorship opportunities, and access to advanced methodological training. They are also situated within broader global inequalities in which financial capital, institutional prestige, and publication gatekeeping remain disproportionately concentrated in the Global North (Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Mamdani, 2016). As a result, while collaboration is formally structured as partnership, agenda-setting power frequently resides with those who control funding streams and institutional resources.

Concurrently, the discourse surrounding educational research has increasingly emphasized "innovation," "impact," and "evidence-based reform." Funding calls routinely prioritize scalable interventions, measurable outcomes, and policy-relevant outputs aligned with global development frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals. Randomized controlled trials, quantitative benchmarking, and standardized evaluation models have become influential markers of methodological rigor, shaping both what is funded and what is publishable (Banerjee & Duflo, 2011; Barrett et al., 2020). Within this paradigm, innovation is often equated with technological integration, performance optimization, or systems efficiency. While these priorities are not inherently problematic, they risk narrowing the conceptualization of educational transformation by privileging externally validated indicators of success over contextually grounded knowledge systems. Indigenous pedagogical traditions, community-based learning models, and African philosophical foundations of education may be acknowledged rhetorically, yet they are seldom positioned at the centre of large-scale funded research agendas.

For university researchers working within resource-constrained African institutions, these dynamic produces both gratitude and unease. We recognize that without international funding many research initiatives would not exist. At the same time, we experience how proposal templates predefine research problems, how methodological expectations subtly guide design choices, and how reporting frameworks shape outputs toward donor priorities. The political economy of research funding is therefore not neutral. Financial flows influence epistemic flows. What becomes researchable, fundable, and publishable is often mediated by priorities formulated beyond the immediate communities where

research is conducted (Ake, 1981; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Over time, these dynamic risks shifting collaboration into a form of soft control, where African scholars participate actively but within parameters largely established elsewhere.

This article argues that while international collaboration has undeniably enabled research growth across African universities, the political economy of funding increasingly shapes research priorities, methodological orientations, and knowledge outputs in ways that may undermine epistemic autonomy and the long-term sustainability of African educational innovation. Sustainable innovation requires more than short-term project success; it demands institutional ownership, cultural relevance, and intellectual self-determination. When research agendas are externally framed and temporally bound by donor cycles, innovations may struggle to take root within local systems once funding concludes. The concern, therefore, is not collaboration per se, but asymmetry embedded within collaboration.

Interrogating the structural conditions under which research funding operates, this article seeks to move the conversation beyond celebratory narratives of partnership toward a more critical and constructive engagement with equity, reciprocity, and knowledge sovereignty. Collaboration need not imply subordination. However, unless funding architectures are reimagined to support shared agenda setting and epistemic plurality, the promise of partnership may continue to reproduce subtle hierarchies within global knowledge production.

Historical Context: From Colonial Knowledge Extraction to Donor-Driven Innovation

To understand the contemporary political economy of research funding in Africa, one must return to the historical foundations upon which African educational systems were constructed. Colonial education across much of the continent was not designed to cultivate epistemic autonomy or intellectual sovereignty. Rather, it was structured to serve administrative efficiency and economic extraction. Schools trained clerks, interpreters, and low-level bureaucrats who could facilitate colonial governance. Knowledge was filtered through metropolitan priorities, and indigenous epistemologies were either dismissed or subordinated. As Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) powerfully argued, colonial education functioned not only as political domination but as cultural and epistemic displacement, privileging European languages and worldviews while marginalizing African intellectual traditions.

The colonial university model further entrenched this hierarchy. Institutions established in the mid-twentieth century often mirrored British or French academic structures, curricula, and examination systems. Their legitimacy was tied to their resemblance to European prototypes. While these universities produced generations of African intellectuals who would later challenge colonial rule, the structural architecture of knowledge remained externally oriented. Research priorities and theoretical frameworks were shaped by metropolitan academic trends, reinforcing what would later be conceptualized as the coloniality of knowledge (Quijano, 2000).

Independence in the 1950s and 1960s brought with it profound aspirations for intellectual sovereignty. Universities were reimagined as engines of nation-building, sites where African histories, languages, and development priorities could be studied on their own terms. Leaders and scholars envisioned higher education as central to economic modernization and cultural renewal. As Kwame Nkrumah (1964) asserted in his broader philosophy of decolonization, political independence was incomplete without control over knowledge production. Across the continent, there were deliberate efforts to Africanize curricula, expand public university systems, and align research with national development goals.

These aspirations confronted formidable structural constraints. Economic crises in the late 1970s and 1980s, compounded by declining commodity prices and debt burdens, ushered in a new phase of external intervention through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). Spearheaded by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, SAPs promoted fiscal austerity, privatization, and reduced public expenditure. Higher education systems, often perceived as costly and elitist, experienced significant funding cuts (Mkandawire, 2001). Public universities struggled with deteriorating infrastructure, declining staff salaries, brain drain, and limited research budgets. The very institutions once imagined as custodians of intellectual sovereignty became financially fragile.

This weakening of public funding had profound implications for research culture. As state support contracted, universities increasingly turned outward in search of survival. By the 1990s, a donor-funded research model had begun to crystallize. International agencies, philanthropic foundations, and bilateral development partners expanded their presence within African higher education, funding research projects aligned with global development priorities governance reform, poverty alleviation, gender equity, HIV/AIDS, and later digital transformation and climate resilience. These interventions undeniably revitalized research activity in many institutions. Laboratories were rehabilitated, postgraduate training expanded, and publication outputs increased.

This revival carried structural consequences. Research agendas became progressively shaped by externally defined thematic calls. Funding cycles dictated timelines and reporting structures. Accountability shifted from national ministries and local communities to international

donors and evaluation panels. As Thandika Mkandawire (2001) observed, the shift from state-led development to donor-driven governance reconfigured the locus of policy authority across much of Africa. In the research domain, a similar reconfiguration occurred: intellectual priorities increasingly followed donor frameworks.

This historical trajectory from colonial knowledge extraction to post-independence aspiration, through structural adjustment austerity, to donor-funded revitalization illuminates the contemporary dilemma embedded in your core argument. International collaboration has indeed enabled research growth in Africa, particularly in contexts where domestic funding remains constrained. However, the political economy of that funding reflects deeper historical continuities. Where colonial systems once aligned education with imperial administrative needs, contemporary funding structures may align research with global development agendas that are not always locally generated.

The shift is not identical, and it would be reductive to equate donor partnerships with colonial domination. Many collaborations are genuinely reciprocal and capacity-enhancing. Nevertheless, the structural pattern is instructive: when financial leverage resides externally, agenda-setting power often follows. Sustainable educational innovation, therefore, cannot be disentangled from this historical inheritance. To build durable, autonomous research ecosystems, African institutions must reckon with how past dependencies colonial and neoliberal—have shaped present funding architectures.

The movement from collaboration to potential control is not abrupt; it is layered upon decades of evolving external influence over African knowledge systems. Recognizing this genealogy does not diminish the value of partnership. Rather, it underscores the urgency of rebalancing power within research financing so that educational innovation in Africa emerges not merely as a response to global funding tides, but as an expression of long-deferred epistemic sovereignty.

Today's grant architecture is often presented as technical, meritocratic, and globally benevolent. Calls for proposals emphasize innovation, excellence, accountability, and impact. Yet beneath this procedural language lies a structure shaped by historical and economic hierarchies that have long positioned Africa at the periphery of global systems of power. Funding mechanisms do not emerge in isolation; they are embedded within geopolitical economies in which capital accumulation, institutional prestige, and agenda-setting authority remain concentrated in the Global North.

World-systems theorists such as Immanuel Wallerstein (2004) describe the global order as organized into core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral zones, with capital and decision-making power disproportionately located in the core. Although originally formulated to explain trade and industrial production, this framework is strikingly applicable to contemporary knowledge economies. Research funding flows largely originate from high-income countries whose universities, philanthropic foundations, and bilateral agencies possess the fiscal surplus to invest in global research. African institutions, often constrained by limited domestic research budgets, become recipients within this architecture. The asymmetry is not simply financial; it is structural.

Grant architecture encodes this asymmetry in subtle ways. Proposal templates, thematic priorities, reporting frameworks, and evaluation metrics are typically designed in funding capitals rather than in the contexts where research is implemented. Even when African scholars serve as principal investigators, they operate within parameters defined elsewhere. The very categories through which problems are framed "learning poverty," "capacity building," "resilience," "innovation ecosystems" reflect globally circulating policy vocabularies shaped by institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These vocabularies carry intellectual assumptions about development, governance, and measurement that are treated as universal standards.

To say that grant architecture is not neutral is not to suggest intentional domination in every funding relationship. Rather, it is to recognize that funding systems are embedded within historical trajectories of colonial extraction, postcolonial dependency, and neoliberal restructuring. As Samir Amin (1972) argued, peripheral economies are often integrated into global systems in ways that reproduce dependence rather than autonomy. When applied to research funding, this insight suggests that the structure of financial flows can reproduce epistemic dependence even in the absence of overt coercion.

Capital confers agenda-setting power. Those who control funding cycles influence what becomes urgent, measurable, and legitimate. When African institutions rely heavily on external grants to sustain research infrastructure, postgraduate training, and publication output, responsiveness to donor priorities becomes rational and often necessary. Over time, however, such responsiveness can reshape intellectual landscapes. Research questions are framed to align with funding calls; methodologies are selected to satisfy donor evaluation criteria; outputs are tailored to international dissemination platforms. The hierarchy of capital thus becomes a hierarchy of knowledge.

Moreover, the competitive nature of global grant systems intensifies this dynamic. African scholars must compete within funding environments where institutional capacity, grant-writing support, and established research reputations are unevenly distributed. Core institutions often serve as lead applicants, while African universities

are positioned as implementing partners. Even in collaborative consortia, financial management and intellectual coordination may remain externally anchored. The architecture itself—who holds the grant, who controls disbursement, who reports to whom—reflects global economic stratification.

In this context, neutrality becomes an illusion. Grant systems are shaped by histories of accumulation that privileged certain regions as producers of theory and others as sites of application. The persistence of these hierarchies means that research in Africa is frequently evaluated according to standards developed outside it, even when addressing deeply local challenges. Educational innovation, therefore, risks becoming calibrated to global funding logics rather than grounded in community-defined priorities.

Recognizing that grant architecture is embedded within global economic hierarchies is not an argument for disengagement from international collaboration. It is an invitation to interrogate structure. If sustainable educational innovation in Africa is to flourish, funding arrangements must evolve toward more equitable agenda-setting, co-design of priorities, and strengthened domestic financing mechanisms. Only then can collaboration move from structurally conditioned dependence toward genuinely reciprocal partnership.

Statement of the Problem

Research and educational innovation in Africa operate within a complex landscape shaped by both opportunity and constraint. International collaboration has undoubtedly catalysed growth in African research, providing access to funding, technical expertise, infrastructure, and global academic networks that would otherwise be unavailable to resource-constrained institutions. This very collaboration is embedded within broader political and economic structures that systematically influence how knowledge is produced, disseminated, and valued. African scholars often navigate a terrain where the availability of funding is contingent on alignment with external priorities, adherence to prescribed methodologies, and compliance with administrative procedures designed outside their institutional and cultural contexts. The structural dependence on external funding creates an environment in which research agendas are subtly shaped by global economic hierarchies, sometimes at the expense of local relevance and epistemic autonomy.

This structural dependence has profound implications for the sustainability of educational innovation. Many externally funded projects operate on short-term cycles, emphasizing measurable impact and policy alignment with donor objectives rather than systemic, long-term transformation. Innovative educational interventions whether curriculum reform, teacher training, or digital learning programs are often imported or modelled on experiences from other contexts, with limited adaptation to local linguistic, cultural, and infrastructural realities. Indigenous knowledge systems, community-centreed pedagogies, and local epistemologies are frequently relegated to supplementary roles, treated as data points rather than as foundational sources of insight. This dynamic produces a dual vulnerability: African institutions risk becoming implementers of externally defined projects rather than generators of knowledge, and local educational innovation remains episodic, fragile, and insufficiently embedded in national and institutional frameworks.

The problem is compounded by administrative and procedural structures that concentrate decision-making power outside African institutions. Financial management, data governance, and authorship hierarchies often privilege Northern partners, leaving African researchers with limited control over project design, execution, and knowledge outputs. Even when scholars strategically navigate these systems, aligning proposals with donor priorities for institutional survival, the underlying structural asymmetry persists. This creates a subtle but pervasive form of control in which collaboration appears beneficial but, in effect, reproduces dependency and constrains the ability of African institutions to innovate independently. The ethical, intellectual, and institutional implications of this dynamic are significant, calling into question whether current models of collaboration genuinely support African-led knowledge production or merely channel African intellectual labour toward externally defined goals.

Addressing this problem is critical not only for sustaining educational innovation but also for ensuring that African scholarship can participate in global knowledge production on equitable terms. It requires an interrogation of the political economy of research funding, recognition of the historical and structural roots of dependency, and the development of strategies that strengthen institutional capacity, assert epistemic autonomy, and foreground local knowledge systems. Without such structural recalibration, international collaboration risks evolving from a vehicle of opportunity into a mechanism of subtle control one that shapes what is researched, how it is researched, and whose voices are amplified in ways that may compromise the long-term sustainability and relevance of educational innovation across Africa.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Political Economy of Knowledge Production

The political economy of knowledge production rests on the premise that knowledge is not produced in a vacuum; it is generated within material, institutional, and geopolitical structures that shape what questions are

asked, how research is conducted, and whose knowledge gains legitimacy. Drawing on political economy traditions, this framework understands research as embedded in systems of power, capital accumulation, and global inequality (Harvey, 2005; Wallerstein, 2004). In this view, universities, funding agencies, and publication outlets function not only as academic spaces but also as nodes within a global economy of knowledge in which financial flows, institutional hierarchies, and geopolitical interests' structure epistemic outcomes.

Within this framework, African research institutions operate largely at the periphery of the global knowledge system. While collaboration has expanded access to resources and networks, the asymmetrical distribution of funding power often positions African scholars as implementers rather than agenda-setters. As Altbach (2013) argues, global knowledge production reflects a centre–periphery dynamic in which dominant institutions in the Global North disproportionately define research standards, priorities, and evaluation metrics. Thus, the political economy of knowledge production compels us to interrogate not only how research is funded, but how funding architectures reproduce epistemic hierarchies.

Political Economy of Research

The political economy of research foregrounds the relationship between financial capital, institutional power, and epistemic authority. Research agendas are rarely neutral; they are shaped by donor priorities, national development strategies, multilateral policy frameworks, and global crises narratives. Funding bodies whether bilateral agencies, multilateral institutions, philanthropic foundations, or international NGOs operate within their own political and economic mandates. Consequently, the research they support often aligns with strategic interests, measurable outcomes, and global policy discourses rather than locally generated epistemic needs (Stein et al., 2020).

In the African educational context, this dynamic manifests in the prioritization of themes such as access metrics, standardized learning outcomes, digitalization, and impact evaluation methodologies. While these themes are not inherently problematic, their dominance can marginalize locally grounded inquiries into indigenous pedagogies, community epistemologies, and context-specific educational innovation. The result is a subtle but consequential shift: research becomes responsive upward to funders rather than outward to communities. The political economy lens therefore challenges the assumption that international collaboration is purely benevolent or purely extractive. Instead, it invites a nuanced understanding of collaboration as structured by uneven bargaining power, where financial leverage can shape intellectual direction.

Research Funding Within Global Economic Structures

Research funding is embedded within broader global economic structures characterized by uneven capital accumulation and dependency. Africa's limited domestic research financing capacity often below 1% of GDP in many countries renders institutions structurally dependent on external grants (UNESCO, 2021). This dependency situates African research within what dependency theorists would describe as externally oriented development patterns (Amin, 1972).

Global research funding systems mirror global economic hierarchies. Capital is concentrated in high-income countries, and funding agencies there distribute resources according to strategic priorities tied to innovation competitiveness, geopolitical influence, or global governance frameworks. When African institutions rely predominantly on these flows, research trajectories become tethered to external economic cycles and policy shifts. For example, when global priorities pivot toward climate change, pandemics, or digital transformation, funding streams rapidly follow, reorienting research ecosystems accordingly. This structural embedding means that educational innovation in Africa may expand or contract not solely on the basis of local urgency but in response to global funding climates. Sustainability, therefore, becomes precarious, contingent upon external economic stability and shifting donor interests.

The Flow of Capital Shapes the Flow of Knowledge

Capital does not merely enable knowledge production; it directs its pathways. The distribution of research grants determines which institutions build laboratories, which scholars access doctoral training, which conferences are attended, and which journals publish findings. In practical terms, funding defines methodological possibilities, sample sizes, timelines, and dissemination channels.
Bourdieu's (1986) notion of capital—economic, social, and symbolic—helps illuminate this dynamic. Economic capital (research grants) translates into symbolic capital (prestige publications), which in turn reinforces institutional hierarchies. When Northern institutions manage grants and control publication pipelines, they accumulate both material and reputational advantages. African institutions, often positioned as subcontracted partners, may receive financial resources but not equivalent epistemic authority.

In educational research, this can manifest in the privileging of quantitative, impact-driven methodologies favoured by international donors, sometimes at the expense of qualitative, participatory, or indigenous approaches that require longer-term relational engagement. Thus, the flow of capital shapes not only what is studied but how it is studied and how findings are validated.

Financing and the Construction of the "Researchable"

Who finances research significantly influences what becomes "researchable." Funding calls define thematic priorities, acceptable methodologies, and measurable outputs. Topics that align with donor categories become legible within global academic discourse; those that do not may remain underexplored or unfunded.

This process is subtle. It does not typically involve explicit censorship but operates through incentive structures. Scholars in resource-constrained institutions, aware of funding realities, strategically frame proposals in ways that resonate with donor language. Over time, this adaptive behaviour can reshape intellectual cultures, privileging externally validated questions over locally emergent ones.

The concept of epistemic dependency captures this condition: knowledge production becomes oriented toward external validation and recognition (Alatas, 2003). In the sphere of educational innovation, this may marginalize grassroots innovations that lack scalability metrics or global policy appeal but are deeply transformative within local communities. The long-term implication is that epistemic autonomy the capacity of African scholars and institutions to define their own research trajectories may erode even as research output increases. Collaboration thus risks shifting from partnership to soft governance, where funding structures subtly regulate knowledge systems.

Integrative Implication for Sustainable Educational Innovation

Sustainable educational innovation in Africa requires more than episodic project funding; it requires institutional capacity, intellectual independence, and locally grounded research agendas. The political economy framework advanced here does not reject international collaboration. Rather, it situates collaboration within global structures of power and calls for recalibrated partnerships characterized by co-creation, equitable agenda-setting, and strengthened domestic financing ecosystems.

For African scholars working within resource-constrained institutions, the challenge is navigating necessity without surrendering epistemic sovereignty. Recognizing the political economy of research is the first step toward designing funding architectures and collaborative models that sustain, rather than subordinate, African educational innovation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Dependency Theory Applied to Knowledge Systems

Dependency theory emerged as a critique of global economic arrangements that positioned formerly colonized regions in structurally subordinate roles within the world economy. Scholars such as Andre Gunder Frank (1967) and Samir Amin (1972) argued that underdevelopment was not a natural stage of growth but the outcome of historically produced patterns of extraction and unequal exchange. While initially formulated to explain trade, industrialization, and capital flows, dependency theory offers a powerful lens for examining contemporary knowledge systems. If economies can be structured into centres and peripheries, so too can epistemic systems. Knowledge, like capital, circulates through hierarchically organized networks in which agenda-setting power remains concentrated in dominant institutions.

Applied to African research systems, dependency theory suggests that structural reliance on external funding is not simply a temporary funding gap but a patterned relationship embedded within global academic capitalism. Many African universities operate with limited domestic research budgets, compelling scholars to seek grants from Northern governments, philanthropic foundations, and multilateral agencies. These partnerships are often framed as collaboration, and indeed they have facilitated doctoral training, laboratory development, and increased publication outputs. Structurally, the financial architecture remains externally anchored. Decision-making authority over thematic priorities, funding cycles, evaluation criteria, and reporting frameworks frequently resides outside the continent. This configuration mirrors classic dependency dynamics: capital originates from the centre, while intellectual labour is often performed in the periphery.

The structural reliance on external funding produces a condition in which research ecosystems become sensitive to shifts in global priorities. When donor interests pivot toward digital transformation, climate resilience, global health security, or learning metrics African research agendas recalibrate accordingly. This responsiveness is not necessarily opportunistic; it is often necessary for institutional survival. However, dependency theory reminds us that necessity can gradually normalize asymmetry. Over time, institutions may invest more in aligning with donor frameworks than in cultivating autonomous, long-term research programs rooted in local epistemic traditions and community-defined educational challenges.

Financial dependency can subtly evolve into intellectual dependency. This transition rarely occurs through overt coercion. Rather, it operates through incentive structures and professional socialization. Grant calls define "priority areas." Proposal templates prescribe methodologies. Evaluation criteria privilege certain forms of evidence often quantitative, impact-oriented, and short-term measurable. Scholars, aware of these expectations, strategically frame their research to enhance

competitiveness. In doing so, they internalize external standards of relevance and rigor. The risk is not that African scholars lack originality, but that the space for intellectual risk-taking outside donor-defined categories narrows.

The Malaysian sociologist Syed Farid Alatas (2003) describes this phenomenon as "academic dependency," in which scholars in peripheral contexts rely on theories, validation systems, and publication platforms controlled by dominant centres. Within African educational research, this can manifest in the privileging of imported theoretical frameworks over indigenous knowledge systems, or in the pressure to publish in internationally indexed journals that may not prioritize locally grounded innovation. Financial structures thus influence epistemic hierarchies: what receives funding gains visibility; what gains visibility acquires legitimacy.

Importantly, intellectual dependency does not imply intellectual incapacity. Rather, it signals constrained autonomy within unequal systems. African scholars working in resource-constrained institutions often demonstrate remarkable creativity in navigating these constraints. Yet the structural conditions matter. When core research infrastructure, postgraduate scholarships, and conference mobility depend heavily on external grants, the freedom to define research questions independent of donor logics becomes limited. Educational innovation, in this context, risks becoming project-based and externally evaluated rather than institutionally embedded and community-owned.

Dependency theory applied to knowledge systems therefore reframes the question from whether international collaboration is beneficial to how collaboration is structured. The concern is not partnership per se, but asymmetrical dependence. Sustainable educational innovation in Africa requires gradual movement from externally driven research cycles toward strengthened domestic financing mechanisms, regional research consortia, and policy environments that value long-term epistemic sovereignty. Without such recalibration, the growth enabled by international funding may remain expansive yet fragile—productive in output but vulnerable in autonomy.

Sustainable Innovation Framework: Reclaiming Educational Futures

To speak of sustainable educational innovation in African contexts is to move beyond the excitement of pilot projects and externally funded interventions and to ask a more difficult question: what endures when the grant cycle ends? A sustainable innovation framework insists that innovation is not merely about novelty, scalability, or technological sophistication. Rather, it is about rooted transformation change that grows from within communities, resonates with their histories and aspirations, and remains viable without perpetual external subsidy.

The language of "innovation" has often been imported into African educational systems through global development discourse, where it is frequently associated with digital platforms, randomized impact trials, and policy reform packages (World Bank, 2020). While such initiatives can generate measurable improvements, sustainability in African contexts must be defined more expansively. It must consider structural inequalities, fragile funding ecosystems, and deeply embedded cultural knowledge systems that shape how learning is understood and practiced.

Sustainable educational innovation, therefore, begins with local relevance. Educational reforms that respond primarily to donor priorities or international benchmarking frameworks may generate outputs, but they do not necessarily address the lived realities of learners and teachers. In many African communities, issues such as multilingual education, rural–urban disparities, teacher workload, and community participation in schooling are not abstract policy themes but daily struggles. Innovation that is locally relevant emerges from participatory engagement with these contexts. It recognizes communities not as beneficiaries of reform but as co-architects of educational futures. As Amartya Sen (1999) reminds us, development must expand people's capabilities to define and pursue lives they value. Applied to education, this means that innovation must reflect locally valued knowledge and aspirations rather than externally imposed metrics of success.

Cultural grounding is equally central. African educational philosophies such as Ubuntu's emphasis on relationality, communal responsibility, and moral formation—offer rich epistemic resources for reimagining schooling. These philosophies are often sidelined in reform initiatives framed by global competitiveness narratives. A sustainable innovation framework insists that educational change must draw strength from indigenous pedagogies, oral traditions, intergenerational knowledge transmission, and community ethics of care. The Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) argued that cultural domination persists when local languages and knowledge systems are displaced by externally valorized ones. In the same vein, educational innovation that neglects cultural foundations risks alienation rather than empowerment. When innovation is culturally grounded, it affirms identity and enhances legitimacy within communities, increasing the likelihood of long-term adoption.

Economic viability is another pillar of sustainability, particularly within resource-constrained institutions. Many educational innovations in Africa flourish during donor-supported phases but falter when funding ceases. Sustainable innovation must therefore be designed with financial realism. This involves building models that can

be supported through domestic budgets, regional partnerships, or community contributions. It may require incremental reform rather than large-scale, capital-intensive transformation. Economic viability also demands investment in human capital—training local researchers, teachers, and administrators to manage and adapt innovations without external technical dependence. Without such embedded capacity, innovation becomes episodic and externally tethered.

Institutional ownership completes the framework. Sustainable educational innovation cannot remain project-based or externally administered; it must be absorbed into the normative structures of universities, ministries, and schools. Institutional ownership implies that policies, curricula, and research agendas are shaped and governed by African institutions themselves. It requires strengthening governance systems, fostering leadership continuity, and embedding innovation within long-term strategic planning rather than short-term grant cycles. As Achille Mbembe (2016) suggests in his reflections on decolonizing African universities, genuine transformation occurs when institutions reclaim intellectual authority and define their own trajectories within global conversations.

Critically, a sustainable innovation framework does not reject international collaboration. Rather, it reframes collaboration as a means of strengthening local ecosystems rather than substituting for them. The goal is not isolation but balanced interdependence—partnerships that build endogenous capacity, respect epistemic plurality, and gradually reduce structural reliance on external funding streams.

When the political economy of research funding privileges short-term outputs, externally defined impact metrics, and donor visibility, it may inadvertently undermine the conditions necessary for sustainability. Educational innovation in Africa becomes durable not when it is globally celebrated, but when it is locally meaningful, culturally anchored, economically maintainable, and institutionally owned. Sustainability, in this sense, is not merely a financial condition; it is an epistemic and structural one. It is about ensuring that innovation remains alive in classrooms, communities, and research cultures long after the applause of international partners has faded.

Mapping the Political Economy of Research Funding in Africa

To map the political economy of research funding in Africa is to ask a deceptively simple question: who pays, who decides, and who benefits? Funding is never merely financial; it carries with it authority, legitimacy, and the power to define intellectual direction. While international collaboration has undoubtedly expanded research capacity across African universities, the architecture of funding reveals an uneven geography of power in which agenda-setting authority often resides outside the continent.

A significant portion of research funding in Africa flows through multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as well as United Nations bodies. These institutions operate within global governance frameworks shaped by member-state contributions that are disproportionately drawn from high-income countries. Their research funding priorities are closely aligned with macroeconomic reform, poverty reduction, governance indicators, and measurable development outcomes. In the educational sphere, this has translated into strong emphasis on learning metrics, system efficiency, accountability frameworks, and scalable policy reforms (World Bank, 2020). While such priorities can drive system-wide improvements, they also reflect global policy discourses that may not fully capture localized epistemic and cultural concerns. The power to define problems at the global level subtly influences which research questions are considered urgent and fundable within African contexts.

Bilateral development partners constitute another influential funding source. Agencies such as USAID, the UK's Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (formerly DFID), Germany's GIZ, and others allocate substantial resources to research and higher education partnerships across Africa. Bilateral funding is frequently embedded within foreign policy strategies, diplomatic relations, and strategic national interests. As a result, research themes may align with donor-country priorities—whether related to migration management, security, economic partnerships, climate adaptation, or digital innovation. Collaboration agreements often emphasize capacity building and co-creation, yet financial control and reporting accountability typically remain anchored in donor-country institutions. This arrangement does not negate partnership, but it situates power asymmetrically, as ultimate funding authority can shape timelines, outputs, and evaluative standards.

Northern universities occupy a particularly complex position within this political economy. They are not merely collaborators; they often function as intermediaries and gatekeepers of large research grants secured from national research councils or philanthropic sources. In many consortia, African institutions participate as implementing partners, while lead coordination, financial management, and publication dissemination are handled by universities in Europe or North America. This arrangement can provide access to networks, infrastructure, and prestige publication outlets. Yet it can also reproduce what Immanuel Wallerstein (2004) conceptualized as core–periphery dynamics within the global knowledge system. The symbolic capital accumulated through grant leadership and high-impact publications often consolidates within already well-resourced institutions, reinforcing global hierarchies of academic visibility.

Philanthropic foundations add another layer to this funding landscape. Organizations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York have played transformative roles in supporting higher education and research initiatives in Africa. Their flexibility and long-term grant models have often enabled innovative programming and institutional strengthening. Philanthropic funding is also shaped by board-defined missions, strategic visions, and measurable impact frameworks. Unlike public institutions, foundations are not democratically accountable in the same way national governments are; their priorities reflect organizational philosophies and leadership agendas. When such actors finance large segments of research ecosystems, they inevitably influence the intellectual terrain.

Mapping these funding sources reveals a pattern: financial capital is largely concentrated outside Africa, and with capital comes agenda-setting influence. Even where collaborations are equitable in spirit, structural imbalances persist in who defines thematic calls, who controls disbursement schedules, and who evaluates success. For scholars working within resource-constrained institutions, this configuration generates both opportunity and vulnerability. External funding can sustain laboratories, postgraduate scholarships, and international mobility. At the same time, reliance on externally located capital may narrow intellectual autonomy, as research agendas adapt to funding landscapes rather than emerging solely from local educational priorities.

International collaboration has undeniably enabled research growth across the continent. However, the political economy of funding reveals that growth occurs within hierarchically structured systems in which power is unevenly distributed. Sustainable educational innovation in Africa will depend not only on continued collaboration but on recalibrating these power relations strengthening domestic research financing, fostering regional funding consortia, and ensuring that African institutions increasingly serve not merely as sites of implementation but as centres of agenda-setting authority. Without such shifts, collaboration risks drifting toward subtle forms of intellectual control, even when framed in the language of partnership.

When we examine the political economy of research funding in Africa, the most revealing questions are not only about how much funding exists, but about who designs the architecture through which funding flows. Calls for proposals often appear technical and neutral structured around eligibility criteria, thematic areas, evaluation rubrics, and timelines. These design elements are deeply political. They determine what counts as a legitimate research problem, what methodologies are preferred, and what forms of knowledge are rewarded.

In many externally funded research schemes, calls are designed within institutions located in the Global North whether national research councils, development agencies, multilateral organizations, or philanthropic foundations. Even when African scholars are consulted, the ultimate framing language frequently reflects strategic documents developed elsewhere. Thematic calls may be shaped by global policy agendas, economic forecasts, or diplomatic priorities rather than by locally generated educational debates. As Immanuel Wallerstein (2004) suggests in his world-systems analysis, core regions tend to exercise agenda-setting authority within global structures, while peripheral regions adapt to externally defined parameters. In research funding, this dynamic manifests in the subtle power embedded in drafting documents deciding which problems are urgent, which outcomes are measurable, and which conceptual vocabularies are acceptable.

Closely related is the question of who sets thematic priorities. Thematic framing is not innocent; it narrows the field of imagination. When funding cycles emphasize digital transformation, learning poverty metrics, resilience, or governance reform, scholars are incentivized to align proposals accordingly. This alignment is rational, especially in resource-constrained institutions where grant success sustains careers and infrastructure. Over time, repeated alignment can recalibrate intellectual cultures. Locally grounded inquiries such as community-based pedagogies, indigenous knowledge systems, or culturally specific curriculum reform—may struggle to compete if they do not fit within globally circulating development lexicons. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) argues, modern knowledge systems often privilege certain epistemologies as universal while rendering others invisible. Thematic control thus becomes epistemic control.

Financial management structures further illuminate power distribution. In many international consortia, lead institutions often based in Europe or North America—hold primary responsibility for grant administration, reporting, and disbursement. African partner institutions may receive sub-awards, subject to compliance requirements set by the lead organization and ultimately by the funder. While such arrangements are frequently justified in terms of fiduciary accountability or capacity assurance, they also consolidate authority. Control over funds entails control over timelines, budget reallocations, staffing decisions, and, at times, authorship positioning. Financial architecture becomes a mechanism through which strategic direction is maintained.

This configuration does not imply bad faith on the part of funders or partners. Many collaborations are genuinely committed to equity and mutual learning. However, the structural design of funding systems often reproduces hierarchies rooted in historical economic asymmetries. As Samir Amin (1972) observed in his analysis of

dependency, peripheral actors may participate actively within global systems while remaining structurally constrained by external control over capital. When applied to research funding, this insight underscores how intellectual autonomy can be limited not by overt restriction but by embedded governance mechanisms.

For African scholars navigating these systems, the experience is often paradoxical. International collaboration expands networks, provides access to cutting-edge resources, and enhances publication visibility. The deeper mapping of funding architecture reveals how decision-making power is unevenly distributed across stages of the research cycle from call design to thematic framing to financial oversight. The political economy of funding thus operates less through explicit control and more through structured influence.

International collaboration has undeniably enabled research growth in Africa. Laboratories have been built, doctoral students funded, publication outputs increased, and global scholarly networks expanded. These gains are real and should not be minimized. However, growth that unfolds within externally designed funding architectures is never neutral. Over time, such architectures can subtly recalibrate intellectual direction. When calls for proposals, evaluation criteria, reporting formats, and performance metrics are designed outside the continent, they begin to shape not only what research is funded, but what research is imagined as fundable. Scholars, operating within resource-constrained environments, adapt rationally to these structures. Repeated adaptation can gradually narrow epistemic horizons.

The influence is rarely coercive or explicit. It is procedural. Thematic priorities are pre-defined. Methodological preferences are embedded in assessment rubrics. Impact is measured through indicators aligned with global policy frameworks. In this way, research priorities, methods, and outputs become aligned with donor logics, sometimes at the expense of locally emergent questions, culturally grounded methodologies, and long-term institutional agendas. What begins as partnership can, if structurally unexamined, evolve into patterned responsiveness. The result is not overt control, but governance through design.

Sustainable educational innovation, therefore, cannot be reduced to the volume of funding secured. It depends on who shapes the terms of engagement. It requires a recalibration of funding governance structures so that African institutions exercise meaningful leadership in designing calls, defining thematic priorities, managing resources, and determining evaluative standards. Without such structural shifts, collaboration risks becoming asymmetrical in practice even when it is symmetrical in rhetoric. Control is then exercised quietly—not through directives or prohibitions—but through templates, timelines, financial reporting systems, and performance frameworks.

The central question is not whether collaboration should continue, but whether it can be transformed. For educational innovation in Africa to be genuinely sustainable, funding relationships must evolve from externally steered architectures toward co-governed systems rooted in shared authority. Only then can growth translate into autonomy, and partnership mature into intellectual self-determination rather than procedural dependence.

Conditionalities and Performance Metrics: The Subtle Governance of Research

One of the least visible yet most powerful dimensions of the political economy of research funding lies in conditionalities and performance metrics. Funding agreements rarely present themselves as instruments of control. They are framed as mechanisms of accountability, transparency, and efficiency. Yet embedded within these mechanisms are normative assumptions about what counts as success, what forms of knowledge are legitimate, and what timelines are appropriate for intellectual work. In resource-constrained African institutions, where external grants often sustain research ecosystems, these conditionalities shape not only administrative practice but intellectual culture.

A central feature of contemporary grant regimes is the emphasis on measurable “impact.” Impact is typically defined through quantifiable outputs—policy briefs produced, stakeholders trained, datasets generated, articles published in indexed journals, or measurable improvements in specified indicators. This managerial logic reflects broader global trends in results-based governance and audit culture (Power, 1997). While accountability is necessary, the privileging of measurable impact often narrows the scope of what research is valued. Educational transformation, particularly in deeply unequal or culturally complex contexts, is rarely linear or immediately quantifiable. Community trust, shifts in pedagogical practice, or the revitalization of indigenous knowledge systems may unfold gradually and resist numerical capture. Projects that cannot demonstrate rapid, metric-driven outcomes risk being deemed unsuccessful.

For African scholars, this emphasis can create a tension between depth and deliverability. Research questions may be framed in ways that promise clear indicators rather than in ways that reflect the complexity of local educational realities. Methodologies may tilt toward what is fundable rather than what is contextually appropriate. Over time, the logic of measurability can subtly privilege technocratic interventions over relational or culturally embedded innovations. As Shore and Wright (2015) argue, audit cultures reshape institutional behaviour by redefining value through performance indicators. In

research funding, these indicators do not merely evaluate knowledge—they help produce it.

Short project cycles further intensify this dynamic. Many externally funded educational projects operate within two- to three-year timelines, occasionally extending to five years. While such cycles align with donor budgeting and political accountability frameworks, they often sit uneasily with the temporal realities of educational change. Curriculum reform, teacher professional development, institutional culture shifts, and epistemic transformation require sustained engagement across generations. When funding cycles are brief, research design tends to prioritize interventions capable of demonstrating visible outputs within constrained periods. This can encourage pilot projects that generate impressive reports but lack long-term institutional embedding.

The temporality of funding thus shapes the temporality of innovation. Scholars may hesitate to pursue longitudinal studies or slow, participatory methodologies if such approaches do not align with funding timelines. In contexts where core institutional funding is weak, the end of a grant can mean the dissolution of a research team or the abandonment of promising initiatives. Sustainability becomes contingent upon renewal rather than institutional consolidation. The result is a projectized research culture, where continuity depends on successive external calls rather than endogenous strategic planning.

Policy alignment constitutes another layer of conditionality. Donor-funded research frequently requires explicit alignment with national or international policy frameworks Sustainable Development Goals, national education sector plans, or global development strategies. On one level, alignment ensures coherence and relevance. However, policy frameworks themselves are often shaped by multilateral institutions and transnational policy networks (Mundy & Menashy, 2014). When research funding mandates alignment with these frameworks, it indirectly channels scholarly attention toward globally endorsed priorities. Questions that fall outside prevailing policy narratives may struggle to secure support, even if they hold profound local significance.

In this way, conditionalities and performance metrics function as instruments of soft governance. They do not prohibit certain research; rather, they incentivize particular forms of inquiry. The effect is cumulative. Over time, scholars internalize expectations about impact, timeline feasibility, and policy relevance. Intellectual autonomy becomes constrained not by censorship but by structured incentives. The political economy of funding thus operates through managerial rationalities that shape research cultures from within.

International collaboration has indeed expanded research capacity in Africa, enabling participation in global conversations and strengthening institutional infrastructure. When collaboration is mediated through tightly defined metrics, short funding cycles, and policy-aligned conditionalities, it risks narrowing epistemic space. Sustainable educational innovation requires more than measurable outputs within grant periods. It requires temporal depth, cultural grounding, and institutional continuity conditions that cannot always be captured in quarterly reports or impact dashboards.

To move from collaboration toward genuine co-creation, funding governance must evolve. Metrics should accommodate qualitative transformation alongside quantitative indicators. Project cycles should allow for long-term institutional embedding. Policy alignment should remain dialogical rather than prescriptive. Only then can accountability coexist with autonomy, and performance frameworks support rather than circumscribe the imaginative possibilities of African educational research.

Administrative Control: Governance Embedded in Research Funding

One of the most significant yet understated aspects of the political economy of research funding in Africa lies in administrative control. While financial resources enable laboratories, scholarships, and knowledge production, the mechanisms of managing those resources often remain structurally anchored outside the continent. In many international collaborations, lead institutions frequently based in Europe or North America—retain primary responsibility for financial oversight. Budget approval, disbursement, and expenditure monitoring are centralized, leaving African partner institutions to operate largely as implementing units rather than as co-governing entities. This concentration of fiscal authority is rarely framed as restrictive; it is justified in terms of accountability and fiduciary responsibility. The effect is to position African institutions as dependent recipients, obligated to conform to externally imposed procedures and timelines.

Reporting structures exacerbate this dynamic. Grants often require progress reports, financial statements, and evaluation submissions to be routed to funders' headquarters or to lead Northern institutions. These reports follow templates, metrics, and deadlines crafted for a different institutional and socio-cultural context. African researchers and administrators must navigate unfamiliar financial coding systems, compliance language, and audit calendars. Even minor deviations from funder expectations—often arising from local logistical realities—can trigger corrective measures or delay disbursement. The authority to interpret adherence is rarely localized, subtly shifting power toward institutions that control reporting oversight. In this way, the management of knowledge production becomes

entangled with administrative hierarchies that extend beyond national boundaries.

Audit and compliance frameworks further illustrate the asymmetry of control. Standards designed for institutions with extensive bureaucratic capacity and well-resourced finance offices may not translate seamlessly into African contexts characterized by limited staffing, underdeveloped financial systems, or infrastructural constraints. Compliance checklists, procurement rules, and reporting cycles may inadvertently impose operational burdens, drawing energy away from intellectual work and innovation. While adherence to financial regulations is critical, the one-size-fits-all approach often privileges procedural correctness over contextual appropriateness. This misalignment is a form of soft governance: African institutions may nominally participate as partners, but the conditions of engagement are shaped by external administrative imperatives rather than co-created operational protocols (Mouton, 2019).

The cumulative effect of these administrative arrangements is subtle yet profound. Control is exercised not through explicit direction over research questions, but through the mechanics of procedure. Lead institutions and funders retain authority over financial flows, reporting interpretation, and compliance verification. African scholars and institutions adapt to these parameters, often internalizing them as operational norms. Over time, this can influence strategic decisions: which projects to prioritize, how to allocate institutional staff, and even how research is conceptualized to fit funder expectations. Administrative control, therefore, becomes a mechanism through which epistemic space is circumscribed indirectly.

Recognizing the dynamics of administrative control does not negate the value of international collaboration. External partnerships have enabled significant capacity building, global networking, and access to high-impact publication venues. However, for sustainable educational innovation in Africa, collaboration must be coupled with structural recalibration. African institutions should have meaningful authority over financial management, reporting systems, and compliance adaptations, ensuring that administrative mechanisms support rather than constrain intellectual autonomy. Only by aligning administrative governance with local capacities and strategic priorities can the transformative potential of international collaboration translate into sustainable, contextually grounded educational innovation.

From Collaboration to Control: Subtle Mechanisms

The shift from collaboration to control in African research contexts often unfolds through mechanisms that are procedural, epistemic, and institutional rather than overtly coercive. One of the earliest points of influence is agenda framing. In many international projects, thematic priorities are pre-defined by funders or lead Northern institutions before African scholars are formally involved. This sequencing shapes the intellectual terrain: African researchers often enter as implementers or collaborators rather than as originators of the research question. While their expertise is critical for contextualization and execution, the framing of the agenda subtly constrains the range of inquiries deemed fundable or legitimate (Amsler & Shore, 2019). As a result, the scope of research becomes aligned with externally set priorities, and local epistemic autonomy is circumscribed from the outset.

Methodological standardization further consolidates external control. Funding agencies and lead institutions often privilege specific methodologies—randomized controlled trials, quantitative benchmarking, and Western evaluation frameworks—that are considered globally rigorous. While these methods offer comparability and measurable outputs, they frequently marginalize indigenous methodologies, oral knowledge systems, and community-based epistemologies that are critical for understanding educational realities in Africa (de Sousa Santos, 2014). The privileging of particular methodological paradigms shapes both the kinds of knowledge produced and the ways in which interventions are conceptualized. Practices rooted in communal knowledge, intergenerational learning, or local pedagogical traditions may be sidelined because they do not easily conform to externally endorsed standards of "rigor."

Authorship hierarchies represent another subtle mechanism of control. Decisions about who is listed as first author, whose institution hosts the primary data repository, and who accrues citation capital are often influenced by institutional power and grant management structures. Lead Northern institutions frequently retain oversight of publication processes, including journal selection and submission rights. Consequently, intellectual recognition and visibility in the global academic arena disproportionately favour Northern partners, even when African scholars have led fieldwork, developed context-specific instruments, or generated critical insights (Smith et al., 2020). This uneven distribution of academic credit reinforces structural asymmetries and affects career trajectories and institutional prestige for African researchers.

Intellectual property and data ownership are further arenas where subtle control manifests. Data collected in African contexts are often housed in servers located at lead Northern institutions, with governance frameworks that restrict long-term access for local universities. Extractive data collection models where field teams gather information that is then analysed, interpreted, and published primarily by external partners—can limit the capacity of African institutions to conduct secondary analysis, develop locally relevant policy briefs, or build sustainable research infrastructure (Mkandawire, 2001).

In this way, knowledge production becomes decoupled from local epistemic communities: the very data that emerge from African classrooms and communities are effectively externalized, constraining both ownership and intellectual sovereignty.

These mechanisms—agenda framing, methodological standardization, authorship hierarchies, and data control operate collectively to shift collaboration into subtle forms of control. They do not always involve overt restriction, yet they create enduring patterns of dependency. African scholars may gain skills, networks, and publications, but these gains often exist within architectures that privilege external priorities, validate specific methods, and centralize recognition and authority. Understanding these dynamics is essential to envisioning funding governance reforms that restore epistemic agency, balance authorship and data ownership, and allow African institutions to set research agendas that resonate with local educational imperatives.

Control in international research funding rarely manifests as overt domination. It does not require a hand imposing directives or forbidding lines of inquiry. Instead, it often takes subtler forms templates for proposals, standardized reporting guidelines, compliance checklists, and codified "best practices." These instruments are presented as neutral, technical, or helpful, but they carry embedded assumptions about what constitutes legitimate research, rigorous methodology, and acceptable outputs. Scholars and institutions adapt to these structures, framing questions, selecting methods, and planning timelines in ways that align with the expectations encoded in these formats. Over time, this procedural guidance becomes a mechanism of soft governance: it shapes what is fundable, how knowledge is produced, and who is recognized for it. In this sense, control operates quietly through the architecture of collaboration, influencing research outcomes without ever appearing coercive. Understanding this subtlety is crucial: domination in research funding often wears the guise of administrative templates and compliance structures, yet its impact on epistemic autonomy and local innovation is profound.

Implications for Sustainable Educational Innovation

The political economy of research funding in Africa carries profound implications for the sustainability of educational innovation. One immediate consequence is short-termism. Many externally funded projects operate within brief funding cycles often two to three years—after which support ends and research teams dissolve. While outputs such as pilot programs, workshops, or publications may be achieved, the initiatives rarely become institutionally embedded. Innovations designed for rapid demonstration of results can leave little enduring impact on the structures, curricula, or practices of the institutions they were intended to benefit (Mouton, 2019). This projectized approach risks creating a culture of episodic engagement rather than sustained transformation, where the longevity of educational change is contingent upon the next external call rather than strategic national or institutional planning.

Another critical dimension is the misalignment of imported innovation with local realities. International collaborations frequently introduce models of curriculum reform, digital education platforms, or teacher evaluation systems derived from Northern contexts. While these models may be technically sound and evidence-informed, they often fail to account for rural schooling conditions, linguistic diversity, and community structures that shape learning in African contexts. In such cases, well-intentioned interventions can produce superficial adoption rather than meaningful change. Innovation divorced from local social, cultural, and material conditions risks becoming a procedural exercise rather than a tool for genuine educational transformation (da Costa & Harley, 2018).

A deeper, long-term implication is epistemic erosion. Indigenous educational knowledge—including oral traditions, communal learning practices, and local pedagogical philosophies—is frequently treated as ancillary: data to contextualize a project, cultural colour to illustrate a report, or a supplement to "global best practices." This marginalization positions African knowledge systems as curiosities rather than foundational intellectual resources, undermining their role in shaping locally relevant innovation. Over time, repeated external validation of imported frameworks can subtly recalibrate scholarly and institutional understanding of what counts as credible knowledge, weakening epistemic autonomy (de Sousa Santos, 2014).

Institutional fragility compounds these challenges. Many African universities operate with weak internal grant systems, underdeveloped financial management capacity, and minimal policy ownership of research agendas. Reliance on external calls for resources creates vulnerability: institutional priorities are often subordinated to donor timelines and thematic foci. Staff, infrastructures, and research cultures are oriented toward fulfilling externally defined criteria rather than building durable internal capacity for educational innovation. Consequently, the sustainability of reforms is uncertain, as their continuation depends less on internal strategic commitment than on the availability of external funding (Mkandawire, 2001).

Taken together, these dynamics suggest that while international collaboration can catalyse research growth and provide much-needed resources, the sustainability of educational innovation in Africa depends on rebalancing authority and aligning interventions with local realities. Long-term impact requires embedding innovations within institutional structures, respecting and leveraging indigenous knowledge, and strengthening

internal capacities for research management and policy ownership. Without such recalibration, collaboration risks producing episodic, externally dependent innovation rather than durable, contextually grounded transformation.

AFRICAN AGENCY: COMPLEXITY AND NUANCE

It is essential to recognize that African scholars are far from passive recipients within the global research funding landscape. While much of the literature emphasizes dependency, short-termism, and external control, such framing risks oversimplifying the realities of agency on the continent. African researchers often engage strategically with funding structures, navigating institutional requirements, donor priorities, and administrative protocols to maximize both local relevance and personal or institutional benefit. Adaptation does not necessarily signify acquiescence; it can represent tactical negotiation, the cultivation of networks, and the translation of external priorities into locally meaningful research (Mouton, 2019).

Many African scholars demonstrate remarkable ingenuity in aligning research agendas with external funder requirements while simultaneously embedding indigenous knowledge, culturally grounded methodologies, and contextually relevant innovations. For example, fieldwork designs may incorporate local pedagogical practices within frameworks demanded by randomized controlled trials or evaluation metrics. Similarly, researchers may leverage partnerships with Northern institutions to access high-impact journals, technical infrastructure, or international policy forums, all while asserting intellectual leadership over locally significant questions. In this sense, engagement with externally defined structures can be a form of pragmatic agency rather than simple compliance (Smith et al., 2020).

Genuinely equitable partnerships do exist and are growing in number. In such collaborations, African institutions participate from the outset in defining research questions, determining methods, and managing resources. Decision-making is shared, authorship is fairly distributed, and data stewardship remains locally anchored. These partnerships challenge hierarchical models of research and demonstrate that co-creation, mutual respect, and intellectual reciprocity are possible within transnational funding arrangements. Such examples highlight that dependency is neither total nor uniform; it is contextually mediated and negotiated.

South–South collaborations further expand the terrain of agency. Increasingly, African scholars are engaging with colleagues across the Global South to share methodologies, co-develop research agendas, and strengthen regional knowledge networks. These collaborations often bypass some of the epistemic hierarchies associated with Northern-led funding, foregrounding local priorities and culturally congruent approaches. By pooling resources, expertise, and institutional influence, South–South networks offer pathways for innovation that are both contextually rooted and resilient to external conditionalities (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

African researchers often navigate a delicate balance between intellectual autonomy and institutional survival. In contexts where external funding sustains laboratories, scholarships, and staff positions, aligning research proposals with donor priorities is sometimes necessary. This alignment is not necessarily a reflection of intellectual acquiescence but a pragmatic strategy to secure resources essential for sustaining ongoing research and institutional infrastructure. In many cases, scholars internalize these priorities, framing their work in ways that resonate with funder expectations while still seeking to embed locally meaningful questions and methodologies. This honesty—acknowledging both structural pressures and tactical adaptation deepens the integrity of the analysis, highlighting the nuanced reality of African scholarship: it is neither wholly constrained nor entirely free, but dynamically engaged with global systems in ways that preserve both opportunity and survival (Mouton, 2019; Smith et al., 2020).

African agency in the research funding landscape is complex and nuanced. Scholars exercise tactical negotiation, selective engagement, and creative adaptation, asserting intellectual leadership within a structurally asymmetrical environment. Recognizing this agency reframes the discourse: Africa is neither a passive periphery nor wholly subordinated; it is an active site of knowledge production where strategic navigation, equitable partnerships, and emerging regional networks demonstrate the potential for sustainable, locally driven educational innovation.

REIMAGINING EQUITABLE RESEARCH ECONOMIES

Reimagining research funding in Africa requires a shift from externally dictated structures toward models that genuinely empower local institutions, scholars, and communities. The current landscape—dominated by Northern-led agendas, standardized methodologies, and short-term project cycles—has demonstrated both the potential and the limitations of international collaboration. While such partnerships provide access to resources, technical expertise, and global networks, they often reproduce dependency, marginalize indigenous knowledge, and constrain the scope of locally driven innovation. Equitable research economies would re-centre African agency, creating systems in which funding mechanisms, thematic priorities, and evaluation frameworks are co-designed to reflect both global and

local imperatives (de Sousa Santos, 2014; Mouton, 2019).

At the heart of this reimagining is the recognition that African institutions must hold meaningful authority over the research lifecycle—from conceptualization and methodology to data management, authorship, and dissemination. Financial management should be decentralized and capacity-enhancing rather than merely compliant, allowing institutions to build durable internal infrastructure and sustain long-term innovation. Co-governance of funds ensures that research agendas are informed by locally relevant questions while still contributing to broader global knowledge production. Such an approach transforms collaboration from a transactional arrangement into a partnership of mutual accountability, where African scholars are not only contributors but decision-makers with genuine intellectual sovereignty.

Equitable research economies also necessitate methodological pluralism. Western evaluation frameworks, quantitative benchmarking, and standardized interventions must be complemented by indigenous epistemologies, oral traditions, and community-centreed pedagogies. Recognizing these forms of knowledge as legitimate foundations for research fosters innovations that are culturally congruent, socially responsive, and institutionally sustainable. Importantly, such pluralism challenges the prevailing hierarchy of "universal standards," positioning African epistemic traditions not as supplementary curiosities but as central drivers of educational development and policy innovation (Santos, 2014; Smith et al., 2020).

Sustainability in equitable research economies is reinforced through South–South collaborations and regional networks. By pooling resources, expertise, and knowledge across the Global South, African scholars can mitigate over-reliance on Northern funders, assert thematic priorities, and develop models of educational innovation that are contextually grounded. Such networks enable the exchange of strategies for navigating structural asymmetries, creating a collective capacity to shape research agendas, advocate for policy change, and strengthen local infrastructures.

Equitable research economies are not merely about funding redistribution they are about restructuring relationships, authority, and knowledge flows so that African institutions can generate, steward, and apply research in ways that are both locally meaningful and globally engaged. In reimagining these economies, the aim is clear: collaboration becomes a vehicle for empowerment rather than control, producing educational innovations that are institutionally embedded, culturally relevant, and capable of enduring beyond the life of any single grant. By designing systems that foreground African agency, integrate local epistemologies, and build sustainable institutional capacity, the continent can transform the political economy of research from a landscape of dependency into one of equitable intellectual partnership.

Strengthening Domestic Research Funding

A central pillar of sustainable educational innovation in Africa is the development of robust domestic research funding mechanisms. Relying predominantly on external grants exposes institutions to volatility, donor conditionalities, and the subtle shaping of research agendas. To counter this, national research endowment funds can play a transformative role. By pooling resources from government budgets, domestic philanthropy, and industry contributions, such endowments can provide long-term, predictable funding that aligns with local priorities. These funds allow institutions to plan multi-year projects, embed innovations within organizational structures, and cultivate research cultures that are responsive to national educational goals rather than external imperatives (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

Equally important are public–private partnerships rooted in local contexts. When governments collaborate with domestic industries, civil society, and philanthropic actors, research agendas can be co-designed to address pressing social, economic, and educational challenges. Unlike externally defined partnerships, these locally anchored collaborations ensure that innovation is not only technically sound but socially relevant. By integrating local stakeholders in the governance of funds, African institutions can safeguard intellectual autonomy, strengthen capacity for long-term knowledge production, and ensure that educational reforms are grounded in community realities rather than imported templates (Mkandawire, 2001).

Strengthening domestic funding also fosters resilience against the short-termism and projectized culture characteristic of externally funded research. Institutions gain the ability to support longitudinal studies, iterative curriculum development, and the cultivation of local knowledge systems. Over time, such endogenous funding infrastructures can reduce dependence on donor-driven agendas while building the institutional confidence, capacity, and legitimacy necessary to engage with international collaborations from a position of strength. In essence, domestic research funding is not simply about securing resources; it is about reshaping the power dynamics of knowledge production, enabling African institutions to set their own priorities, and creating conditions for sustainable, contextually grounded educational innovation (Mouton, 2019).

African-Led Agenda Setting

A critical step toward sustainable educational innovation in Africa is the assertion of African-led agenda setting

within research collaborations. Historically, the framing of research priorities has been dominated by external funders, often defining the questions deemed "researchable" before African scholars are engaged. This dynamic limits local epistemic autonomy and channels intellectual effort toward externally defined goals. Rebalancing this relationship requires the development of continental research frameworks that articulate shared priorities, values, and methodologies reflective of African educational realities. Such frameworks provide a cohesive vision for research across the continent while ensuring that interventions are locally relevant, culturally grounded, and institutionally sustainable (de Sousa Santos, 2014).

Regional consortia driven by African institutions are emerging as an effective mechanism for operationalizing this agenda. By pooling expertise, infrastructure, and financial resources, these consortia can collectively define research themes, set methodological standards, and manage data governance in ways that privilege local knowledge systems. Collaborations across universities, research institutes, and policy organizations within Africa enable the alignment of projects with national development plans and continental strategies such as the African Union's Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 16–25). This model not only strengthens local ownership of research but also fosters long-term institutional partnerships capable of sustaining innovation beyond the life cycle of external grants (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

African-led agenda setting also creates opportunities to foreground indigenous pedagogies, oral knowledge traditions, and community-based approaches in educational research. When African institutions hold authority over thematic priorities and methodological frameworks, research is more likely to generate insights that resonate with classroom realities, linguistic diversity, and cultural contexts. It reduces the risk of imported models being imposed without adaptation and ensures that local innovations are not treated as peripheral but as foundational contributions to knowledge. Over time, these approaches can recalibrate global research networks to recognize Africa not as a site of implementation but as a hub of knowledge generation and intellectual leadership (Mouton, 2019).

African-led agenda setting represents both a strategic and an ethical imperative. By defining priorities, coordinating research across the continent, and asserting methodological sovereignty, African institutions can ensure that international collaboration becomes a genuine partnership rather than a conduit for externally imposed priorities. Such leadership is central to cultivating research that is contextually grounded, epistemically autonomous, and capable of delivering sustainable educational innovation.

Epistemic Pluralism

A key dimension in reshaping the political economy of research funding in Africa is the embrace of epistemic pluralism—recognizing multiple ways of knowing as legitimate and valuable. In much of the current funding landscape, Western paradigms of knowledge production dominate: quantitative metrics, standardized evaluation frameworks, and randomized controlled trials are often considered the gold standard. While these methods offer rigor and comparability, they risk sidelining indigenous methodologies that have sustained African educational practices for generations. Oral traditions, community-based learning, and culturally embedded pedagogies are frequently treated as supplementary or illustrative rather than as valid sources of evidence. Recognizing these approaches as foundational intellectual resources challenges the hierarchy of epistemologies and affirms the capacity of African scholarship to generate knowledge on its own terms (de Sousa Santos, 2014).

Integrating African languages into research and scholarship further reinforces epistemic pluralism. Language is not merely a medium of communication; it shapes how ideas are conceptualized, how experiences are understood, and how knowledge is transmitted across generations. Conducting research in local languages allows scholars to capture nuances, meanings, and culturally specific practices that may be lost in translation to dominant Western languages. Moreover, disseminating findings in African languages strengthens community engagement and ensures that research outcomes are accessible, relevant, and actionable within the contexts they intend to serve (Smith et al., 2020).

Epistemic pluralism also entails methodological flexibility that accommodates both quantitative and qualitative paradigms. By designing studies that allow for mixed methods, participatory research, and narrative inquiry alongside conventional metrics, African scholars can demonstrate that rigor is not synonymous with Western standards alone. This approach not only validates local knowledge systems but also produces insights that are more contextually grounded, socially responsive, and capable of informing sustainable educational innovation. In essence, epistemic pluralism reframes African scholarship as a site of creativity, legitimacy, and intellectual leadership, asserting that knowledge generated within African contexts holds intrinsic value and global relevance.

Institutionalizing epistemic pluralism, African research can move beyond dependency on externally imposed frameworks. It fosters a scholarly ecosystem where indigenous methodologies and local languages are not peripheral but central to educational research. Such a shift strengthens epistemic autonomy, enriches the diversity of global knowledge, and ensures that

educational innovations are culturally resonant, contextually appropriate, and institutionally sustainable.

Reforming Partnership Ethics

Reforming partnership ethics is central to transforming international collaboration from a system that subtly controls African research to one that genuinely fosters sustainable educational innovation. Historically, many research collaborations have operated under asymmetrical power dynamics, where external funders or lead Northern institutions define research questions, manage finances, and control data. Such arrangements, while productive in terms of outputs, often reinforce dependency and limit African scholars' ability to shape research in ways that are locally meaningful (Mouton, 2019). Ethical reform begins with co-designing research questions from the outset. When African researchers are involved in setting the agenda, they can ensure that projects address pressing local challenges, reflect cultural and contextual realities, and integrate indigenous knowledge systems alongside global methodologies (de Sousa Santos, 2014).

Shared financial control is another critical dimension of ethical collaboration. Rather than retaining budgetary oversight exclusively within lead institutions, equitable partnerships distribute responsibility for fund management, procurement, and disbursement. This approach not only enhances transparency and accountability but also strengthens internal institutional capacity, enabling African universities to develop sustainable systems for grant administration. Over time, such structures reduce reliance on external oversight while fostering institutional confidence and independence in research governance (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

Data sovereignty agreements form an equally essential aspect of reformed ethics. In many collaborations, data generated in African contexts are stored, analysed, and published primarily by external institutions, limiting long-term access and control for local researchers. Explicit agreements that safeguard data ownership, define access rights, and allow local institutions to manage repositories empower African scholars to engage in knowledge production on terms that respect intellectual autonomy and ethical stewardship (Smith et al., 2020). This ensures that data are not extracted as mere resources for external analysis but serve as foundational assets for local educational research, policy formulation, and institutional development.

Equitable authorship practices complete the ethical framework. Authorship hierarchies should reflect genuine contributions, with recognition distributed fairly across collaborators, including field researchers, data analysts, and project coordinators in African institutions. Such practices prevent the systematic undervaluation of local expertise and intellectual labour, ensuring that African scholars gain visibility, citation credit, and professional advancement within global academic networks. When co-design, shared financial control, data sovereignty, and authorship equity are institutionalized, collaborations evolve from transactional engagements into mutually respectful partnerships grounded in trust, accountability, and shared intellectual responsibility.

Reforming partnership ethics is not merely a procedural adjustment; it is a moral and strategic imperative. By embedding these principles, African researchers and institutions can assert leadership, safeguard epistemic autonomy, and generate educational innovations that are contextually relevant, culturally resonant, and institutionally sustainable, while still participating meaningfully in global knowledge networks.

CONCLUSION: COLLABORATION WITHOUT SUBORDINATION

The challenge for African educational research is not to reject international collaboration, but to engage with it in ways that do not compromise epistemic autonomy or local innovation. Collaboration becomes problematic when it subtly imposes priorities, methodologies, and administrative frameworks that shape African knowledge production according to external logics rather than local realities. Sustainable transformation requires a reorientation in which institutional capacity is strengthened, allowing African universities and research institutes to plan, execute, and manage projects independently of donor-imposed constraints. Robust internal grant systems, professionalized research administration, and long-term strategic planning enable institutions to absorb external funding in ways that complement rather than dictate local priorities (Mouton, 2019).

Respecting epistemic diversity is equally essential. African knowledge systems—including indigenous pedagogies, oral traditions, and culturally rooted curricula must be recognized as legitimate, valuable, and foundational to educational research. Integrating these epistemologies alongside global methodologies not only enriches the quality of scholarship but also ensures that educational innovations are socially, culturally, and linguistically relevant. Epistemic pluralism affirms the intellectual sovereignty of African scholars and counters the subtle dominance of external frameworks that prioritize universalized Western standards (de Sousa Santos, 2014; Smith et al., 2020).

Crucially, sustainable collaboration entails the transfer of decision-making power. African researchers and institutions should actively co-define research agendas, control budgets, manage data, and determine authorship, creating structures of accountability that are reciprocal rather than hierarchical. When African institutions lead thematic priority-setting, administer

funds effectively, and govern data repositories, they transform collaboration from a dependency-driven model into a partnership grounded in shared authority, mutual respect, and strategic autonomy (Altbach & Salmi, 2011).

Finally, sustaining innovation beyond individual grant cycles requires embedding research within institutional and national frameworks. Pilot programs, curriculum reforms, and teacher training initiatives must be designed for longevity, with mechanisms for scaling, adaptation, and continuous evaluation. By aligning projects with local policy priorities, cultural contexts, and institutional capacities, African universities can ensure that educational innovations endure, yielding systemic improvements rather than episodic outcomes contingent on external resources.

Collaboration need not mean subordination. When African institutions exercise leadership, embrace epistemic pluralism, and manage resources strategically, international partnerships can catalyse enduring, locally grounded educational innovations. The path forward is one of balanced engagement: leveraging the benefits of global collaboration while asserting African agency, knowledge sovereignty, and sustainable institutional capacity. In doing so, Africa can transform the political economy of research funding from a structure of control into a platform for empowerment and long-term educational transformation.

Acknowledgment

This study was made possible through the generous support of the International Research Scholarship Alliance (IRSA), whose research grant provided the resources necessary to undertake this inquiry. I am grateful for their commitment to advancing scholarly research and supporting critical conversations on education and development in Africa. The intention has been to engage thoughtfully and critically with the broader structures that shape research funding and knowledge production in Africa, including those that make such studies possible.

REFERENCES

African Union. (2016). *Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 16–25)*. African Union Commission.

Ake, C. (1981). *A political economy of Africa*. Longman.

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology, 51*(6), 599–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003

Altbach, P. G. (2013). The international imperative in higher education. *Sense Publishers*.

Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. World Bank.

Amin, S. (1972). Underdevelopment and dependence in Black Africa—Origins and contemporary forms. *The Journal of Modern African Studies, 10*(4), 503–524.

Amsler, S., & Shore, C. (2019). *Audit cultures and the governance of research: Implications for knowledge production in the global South*. Routledge.

Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor economics: A radical rethinking of the way to fight global poverty*. PublicAffairs.

Barrett, A. M., Chawla-Duggan, R., Lowe, J., Nikel, J., & Ukpo, E. (2020). *The concept of quality in education: A review of the "international" literature on the concept of quality in education*. EdQual Working Paper.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2022). *Annual report*. https://www.gatesfoundation.org

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2021). *Annual report*. https://www.carnegie.org

Cloete, N., Maassen, P., & Bailey, T. (2015). *Knowledge production and contradictory functions in African higher education*. African Minds.

da Costa, J., & Harley, K. (2018). *Global policy frameworks and local realities in African education: Bridging the gap*. African Education Research Journal, 6(2), 45–62.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers.

Ford Foundation. (2022). *Annual report*. https://www.fordfoundation.org

Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Mamdani, M. (2016). *Between the public intellectual and the scholar: Decolonization and some post-independence initiatives in African higher education*. Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, 17(1), 68–83.

Mbembe, A. (2016). Decolonizing the university: New directions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 15*(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215618513

Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 25*(3), 289–314. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/25.3.289

Mouton, J. (2019). *The changing dynamics of research funding in Africa: Challenges and opportunities*. African Minds.

Mundy, K., & Menashy, F. (2014). The World Bank and the global governance of education in a changing world order. *International Journal of*

Educational Development, 40, 9–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2014.11.021

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Coloniality of power in postcolonial Africa: Myths of decolonization*. CODESRIA.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Heinemann.

Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and ideology for decolonization*. Monthly Review Press.

Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford University Press.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South, 1*(3), 533–580.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2015). Governing by numbers: Audit culture, rankings and the new world order. *Social Anthropology, 23*(1), 22–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12098

Smith, L. T., Maxwell, T. K., Puke, H., & Temara, P. (2020). *Indigenous data sovereignty and governance: Toward a new research paradigm*. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 42(1), 22–41.

Stein, S., Andreotti, V., Bruce, J., & Suša, R. (2020). Towards different conversations about the internationalization of higher education. *Comparative Education Review, 64*(3), 421–442. https://doi.org/10.1086/708453

UNESCO. (2021). *UNESCO science report: The race against time for smarter development*. UNESCO Publishing.

Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.

World Bank. (2020). *Improving higher education performance in Africa: A review of donor-supported initiatives*. World Bank Publications.

Cite this Article: Lukong, TE (2026). From Collaboration to Control: The Political Economy of Research Funding and Its Implications for Sustainable Educational Innovation in Africa. *Greener Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 9(1), 1-20, https://doi.org/10.15580/gjets.2026.1.031526038.