

SOCIOLOGY TRANSFORMED

Series Editors: J. Holmwood and  
S. Turner

palgrave▶pivot

# **SOCIOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Colonial, Apartheid  
and Democratic Forms

**R. Sooryamoorthy**



# Sociology Transformed

Series Editors

John Holmwood  
School of Sociology and Social Policy  
University of Nottingham  
Nottingham, United Kingdom

Stephen Turner  
Department of Philosophy  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, Florida, USA

The field of sociology has changed rapidly over the last few decades. Sociology Transformed seeks to map these changes on a country by country basis and to contribute to the discussion of the future of the subject. The series is concerned not only with the traditional centres of the discipline, but with its many variant forms across the globe.

More information about this series at  
<http://www.springer.com/series/14477>

R. Sooryamoorthy

# Sociology in South Africa

Colonial, Apartheid and Democratic Forms

palgrave  
macmillan

R. Sooryamoorthy  
School of Social Sciences  
University of KwaZulu-Natal  
Durban, South Africa

Sociology Transformed  
ISBN 978-3-319-40324-3      ISBN 978-3-319-40325-0 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-40325-0

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016943278

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover illustration: Pattern adapted from an Indian cotton  
print produced in the 19th century

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature  
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

*Dedicated to  
E.J. Thomas S.J*



## PREFACE

I feel much relieved now, after submitting the final version to Palgrave Macmillan. Not that I have the contentment of presenting each and everything about sociology in South Africa. But I had a rewarding journey through the past and the present and I had the chance to appreciate and value the works of both my predecessors and contemporaries.

I remember, so gratefully, everyone whose works I used in this book. The support I received from my colleagues in the library (Claudette Kercival, Seema Maharaj, Faith Bhengu and others) was great. They procured for me important sources that were crucial. A special word of thanks goes to Geoff Waters who has always been a source of ideas and encouragement. Sandra very carefully entered scientometric data. Tamsine O'Riordan, Judith Allan, Philippa Grand and the team at Palgrave Macmillan efficiently oversaw this project. I am thankful to Senthil Kumar and his team for the efficient production of the book. I greatly appreciate the constructive comments of the peer reviewers and series editors.

Renjini, my wife and companion, was the cause of this book in several ways. No word of thanks is adequate. E.J. Thomas, S.J., a Jesuit scholar, who taught me sociology and the first lessons of research methodology and statistics, was very generous in giving to me an immeasurable amount of his time for my personal and academic development. I dedicate this book to him, my guru.





# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>South African Sociology in Context</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Beginning: Sociology in Colonial Times</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>In Apartheid Times, 1948–1993</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Sociology in Democratic South Africa, 1994–2015</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Sociological Research: Contemporary Characteristics</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Current and Future Prospects</b>	<b>129</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>149</b>



## LIST OF ACRONYMS

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASSA	Association for Sociology in Southern Africa
CHE	The Council on Higher Education
CODESRIA	Council for the Development of Social Science in Africa
CREST	Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology
CRSS	Council for Research in the Social Sciences
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
FET	Further Education and Training colleges
HBU	Historically Black University
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
HWU	Historically White University
ISA	International Sociological Association
ISS	Indian Sociological Society
ISST	Institut des Sciences Sociales du Travail
NBESR	National Bureau for Educational and Social Research
NCSR	National Council of Social Research
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIHSS	National Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences
NIPR	National Institute for Personnel Research
NRF	National Research Foundation
PQM	Programme and Qualification Mix
PU	Productivity Unit
RU	Rhodes University
SAAAS	South African Association for the Advancement of Science

SABR	Suid-Afrikaanse Buro vir Rasseaangeleenthede
SAHUDA	South African Humanities Deans' Association
SAIRR	South African Institute of Race Relations
SAJS	South African Journal of Sociology
SAPRHS	The South African Plan for Research in Human Sciences
SAPSE	South African Post Secondary Education
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SARS	South African Review of Sociology
SASA	South African Sociological Society
SASO	South African Students' Organisation
SASOV	Suid Afrikaanse Sociologie Vereniging
SEPC	Social and Economic Planning Council
SSC	Social Sciences Citation index
SU	Stellenbosch University
UCT	University of Cape Town
UJ	University of Johannesburg
UKZN	University of KwaZulu-Natal
UNISA	University of South Africa
UP	University of Pretoria
Wits	University of Witwatersrand
WoS	Web of Science

## LIST OF FIGURE

Fig. 3.1 Map of South Africa

32



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Publications in sociology in the colonial period, 1900–1947	23
Table 3.1	Publications in selected journals, 1970–1993	50
Table 3.2	Research areas of publications in selected journals, 1970–1993	53
Table 3.3	Institutional and departmental count (mean) of all authors in the selected journals, 1970–1993	55
Table 3.4	Research areas across major institutions in publications in selected journals, 1970–1993	57
Table 3.5	Methodological orientation and institutions of publications in selected journals, 1970–1993	61
Table 3.6	Publications in the Web of Science, 1970–1990	63
Table 4.1	Publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	81
Table 4.2	Research areas of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	84
Table 4.3	Institutional affiliation of the first author of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	86
Table 4.4	Institutional count (mean and for selected institutions) of all authors of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	87
Table 4.5	Department of authors of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	88
Table 4.6	Research areas across major institutions of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	90
Table 4.7	Research areas across departments of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	92
Table 4.8	Research areas and methodology in publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	94



Table 4.9	Methodological orientation and institutions of publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	96
Table 4.10	Publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015	97
Table 4.11	Major research areas of publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015	98
Table 5.1	Specialization of NRF rated scholars, 2015	113
Table 5.2	Collaboration of authors as seen from the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	115
Table 5.3	Collaboration and research areas in the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	116
Table 5.4	Collaboration in selected institutions and departments as seen in the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	117
Table 5.5	Collaboration and authors in the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	118
Table 5.6	Relationship between year, gender and race in the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	118
Table 5.7	Correlation between year and institutions in the publications in the <i>South African Review of Sociology</i> , 1995–2015	120
Table 5.8	Collaboration of authors as seen in the publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015	121
Table 5.9	Overseas partners in publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015	122

## South African Sociology in Context

**Abstract** South African sociology has several distinctive features. It has developed a strand of its own, transforming from the colonial and apartheid periods. Under different phases in its history—colonial, apartheid and democratic—sociology in the country passes through exacting times. The political conditions are antagonistic towards an integrated sociology in the apartheid period. Some support the separatist apartheid regime while others oppose it. Some sociologists are in the forefront of promoting apartheid policies with the support of the discipline. There are contrasting views on the state of sociology in the three clearly marked phases. Different forms of sociology co-exist in South Africa over these years. This chapter presents some of the characteristic features of South African sociology that are examined in the book.

**Keywords** South Africa • Sociology • Apartheid • History

Globally, sociology has passed through challenging times and continues to do so. Sociologists often ask questions about its existence and survival, in both its structural and intellectual aspects (Abbott 2000). Some have been sceptical, predicting a dim future for sociology (Stinchcombe 1994). Others have thought that sociology will not lose its relevance at all, but rather that it is capable of making a greater impact than other social sci-

ence disciplines are currently having on society (Turner 2006). The discipline is surviving nevertheless. This is so even when market forces sway and determine the purposes, functions and *raison d'être* of universities and other centres of knowledge production where sociology has a home. In many societies, sociologists have survived against the forces of privatization and the commodification of knowledge (Burawoy 2011).

Sociology remains very much alive although the pressures facing it come from different directions, often from unexpected quarters. The lack of supportive patronage from political leaders and policy-makers works against the discipline. Structural changes in academia and curricula add to the current woes of sociology. Evidence from several countries where sociology exists is not easy to reject.<sup>1</sup>

Africa is yet to appear prominently on the international sociological scene. This is more so for South Africa. The presence of African sociology, and its South African form, in particular, has not been adequate to create the impression that sociology exists on the continent. This certainly appears to be the case when the research publications carried in prominent sociological journals are taken into account. Only three articles about Africa appeared in two distinguished sociology journals between 1990 and 2005.<sup>2</sup> Debates on African sociology, despite its potential for the discipline globally, eluded scholarly contemplation for a very much longer period of time. This is a missed opportunity, not only for African sociology, but specifically for sociology in South Africa. However, it has now turned the corner and matters are moving towards change. Sociology in Africa has entered the global stage.

As a young and dynamic democracy, South Africa is a prominent country on the continent. It is striving to revive from its troubled past of colonialism and apartheid.<sup>3</sup> The legacy of its past is intertwined with its sociology. South Africa can claim to have a strand of its own sociology and has a shared identity among the community of thousands of sociologists in the world. It was South Africa that led other African countries in introducing sociology to the universities.<sup>4</sup> It is credited with being the strongest sociology in the global South, following only India and Brazil, and of leading on the African continent<sup>5</sup> (Alexander and Uys 2002; Burawoy 2009).

Differing in key respects from sociology in other countries, South African sociology possesses its own characteristic features. However, its subjects and topics are not totally dissimilar to other societies. They are manifest in its abundance of social issues and phenomena, and is evident in the rainbow<sup>6</sup> of sociologists and their approaches to study. Spread across

nine provinces in an area of 1,219,090 km<sup>2</sup>, it is the home to 54.96 million people (RSA 2015) of different ethnic and racial backgrounds.<sup>7</sup>

Like any society, South Africa has good reasons for having a sociology of its own. South Africa went through a devastating past, a past that tore apart its social fabric. Its past fragmented the society and gave rise to problems of varying magnitudes that were presented to sociologists to address. Sociology thus came into being in the early years of the twentieth century. Any examination of the discipline in South Africa unavoidably has to be related to the society's past (Schutte 2007).

Sociology in South Africa formed and developed with some salient characteristics (Pavlich 2014). It evolved from the racial differentiation and linguistic separation which continued to influence the nature of sociology and the sociological research produced in the country. Like the society, South African sociology was also highly racialized (Hendricks 2006) and divided. The division was obvious in the methodological preferences and the types of sociologies pursued and practised in universities and research institutes. The main sources of the division were language (Afrikaans and English) and the varying resources. The historically white universities (HWUs) were long favoured while historically black universities (HBUs) were disadvantaged.

This book is concerned with sociology in South Africa, its past and present. It traces the history of sociology in distinctive phases. The history of sociology is a main field of enquiry in social science research (Maia 2014). It focuses on the questions asked and the answers given (Lyon 2015). Sociology is deeply rooted in its historical moorings precisely because the discipline was created by its founders to study historical changes (Lachmann 2013). Why is this history important? The concerns and methods of historical sociology can serve to invigorate the broader discipline of sociology as a discipline of social change (Lachmann 2013). In looking into the history of sociology and its contemporary state, this book generates more questions than answers, but this is to be expected. Such questions are pertinent and are part of the process of achieving a better understanding.

Historical sociology employs a range of perspectives, either stressing the linearity of time and the progressive order of history or attempting to study it non-linearly and in the uneven stages of history (Lundborg 2016). In this book a clear linearity of time and order is stressed, covering three marked phases: the colonial, apartheid and democratic. As in other social

realities, both colonialism and apartheid have embedded their perspectives and structures in knowledge production (Schutte 2007).

As to why we should undertake such an exercise, Fanning and Hess (2015) in their study of Irish sociology eloquently state the need for historical understanding. They maintain that an understanding of the pluralist disciplinary history is unavoidable for those who study and practice sociology. The issues and contemporary debates on South African sociology, as Mapadimeng (2009) remarks, help understand not only the historical evolution but also the nature and challenges sociology faces in the society. This book therefore presents sociology in South Africa and the historical paths it has traversed in the past 100 years. The intention is not to analyse the works of individual sociologists but to gather the collective and cohesive works of sociologists, past and present. They have all contributed to South African sociology in various ways. It is their teaching and research that made South African sociology develop through the first two phases and enter the current democratic phase. Whether South African sociology, in these phases, has declined, stagnated or grown is pertinent and needs to be considered with the support of evidence. The evidence presented here is gathered from several sources. The writings of scholars that include both South Africans and non-South Africans, reports, records and figures are indispensable in this analysis. More importantly, new empirical evidence has been relied on, drawing from the bibliometric records of the publications of scholars during all three phases.

South African sociology emerged and gained acceptance in response to nationalist sentiments. South Africa had episodes that were strong enough to evoke and disturb the very structure of the society and sociology is intertwined with the nature of the society in which it is embedded. South Africa had clearly marked transitional periods in its political history. This makes it necessary to select the distinctive phases on the basis of the historical phases the society went through and sociology grew, adapted or transformed according to these transitional phases. Thus different sociologies developed in the colonial period, apartheid times and in the democratic era.

Sociology in South Africa has, for the last few years, been a centre of attention from both within the country and in the community of sociologists outside the borders. It has become the epicentre of sustained debate and deliberations on a range of issues. The debates cover historiography, the shifts in practice, methodological forays and the foci of sociological research (Mapadimeng 2012). South African sociology is varied

and complex, in its institutional, organizational and theoretical features (Groenewald 1991). This book seeks to capture these features and the trajectories of South African sociology.

There are two contrasting views on the existence of sociology in South Africa that have survived under trying political conditions. One relates to its decline over its clearly distinguishable periods while the other relates to its revival in the contemporary South African society. South African sociology experienced decline, stagnation and growth, but not in an orderly fashion. For instance, since 1990 it has undergone several changes including a battering from the state regulation, from the deterioration of conditions in universities and the rise of contract sociology (Burawoy 2009). It is not unique to South African sociology alone. Sociology all over the world had stints of these, due to the effects of similar or dissimilar causes. There were crises, as reported from many parts of the world (Abreu 2003; Connell 2015; Deflem 2013; Masson 2012; Miguel and Moyer 1979; Mukherjee 1977; Osipov and Rutkevich 1978; Patel 2011; Turner 2012; Yazawa 2014).

How can one decide that a discipline is strong and doing well? Potentially, a set of measures can be used as a yardstick. The acceptance of the discipline at university level in terms of the number of students, number of academics and researchers, and the quantity and quality of research outputs are the major ones in this measurement. These are relative and can be measured only in relative terms, not in comparison to that of other contexts. The material presented in this book relates to the genesis, challenges, development and growth/decline of sociology in South Africa.

In terms of size, South African sociology is relatively small, certainly in comparison to it in many other countries such as India.<sup>8</sup> Different kinds of sociology prevailed in South Africa, each typical of its particular historical period. These were labelled following Burawoy's (2009) classification of critical, policy, public and professional sociologies. This classification is based on two key components: audience and knowledge (Burawoy 2004). The audience is differentiated into academic and extra-academic, while knowledge is instrumental and reflexive. These interdependent types of sociology emerge as a result of the combination of audience and knowledge. Professional sociology develops an abstract body of knowledge that is accountable to the community of peers; public sociology is dialogic and relevant to some public; policy sociology calls for concrete knowledge and accountable to its clients; and critical sociology is built on both foundational knowledge and on a moral vision accountable to a community

of intellectuals (Burawoy 2004). Although these kinds were not equally distributed there were general trends under this classification. Following these, the chronological emergence of the different kinds of sociology can be elucidated, at least in some prominent departments in the country where research in sociology was taken seriously. These forms of sociology were largely influenced by the unique sociopolitical and economic realities of the respective periods.

Sociology in the country was disconnected from the rest of the world for a long spell of time. The political ideology of apartheid led to the international community of scholars disassociating themselves from their South African counterparts. Sociologists were affected by this ‘closed-off’ period and academic boycott for a longer stint. Some parallels can be drawn from other countries. Sociology in Finland had similar intellectual isolation from the international academic community in the 1940s, during and after the Second World War (Allardt 1977). Indian sociology had a similar long history. Indian sociology had a colonial heritage and the colonial influence on the discipline continued for some time, even after India obtained political independence in 1947. The structural and institutional forces within India shaped the discipline and its development (Welz 2009) in later years.

Inherent challenges have to be overcome in any study that endeavours to synthesize the past and contemporary history of a discipline. This is true when an examination of the contribution of an individual discipline to the literature is carried out. Hare and Savage (1979) caution that it is not easy to mark the South African sociological literature from that of other social science literature. As they correctly note, a decisive demarcation of sociological literature from other social science disciplines is problematic.

Sociologists do not invariably produce knowledge that can be classified rigidly as purely sociological. They may fall under other branches of the social sciences. Scholars in other disciplines also engage in researching sociologically relevant topics. It is important to know what sociological literature has been generated in the country, not only by sociologists alone but also by those in allied social science disciplines. When an analysis of the publications of scholars is undertaken it is hard to segregate the works of sociologists from that of non-sociologists. If the affiliation details are known then it is possible, but this may not be the case all the time. A safer way is to include the publications of the sociological topics that have added value to the sociological literature. The difficult task of isolating may be circumvented. One way to get around the problem is to focus on

the South African sociological material produced by both South African and non-South African sociologists and social scientists. The experiment in this book takes this approach—analysing the sociological material, both in terms of bibliometric records and content, that is available in key databases and papers published in prominent national and international sociology journals and stored in databases like the Web of Science (WoS).

However, the methodological problem is not over yet. Any study of sociology and sociological knowledge is bound to be incomplete when some sociologists are excluded for political reasons, and when they are divided into two camps. Such an eventuality would cause the outlets of publication for sociologists to be controlled and closed for some. This has, as the first issue of the journal of Association for Sociology in Southern Africa (ASSA) stated, removed the work of an active community of sociologists from the academic and public eye (*South African Sociological Review* 1988).

Using scientometric methods in mapping the course of growth of disciplines is common in science. Despite limitations regarding the extensiveness of coverage, scientometric methods remain the most widely and successfully used tool to map the growth and decline of disciplines and subjects. Analyses based on scientometric data are useful in measuring the quality and visibility of research publications as well. Governments, universities, ranking institutions and funding agencies alike make use of this method for their assessment of a discipline and its research productivity. Sociology is subjected to this type of assessment (Phelan 2000). Some (Collyer 2014; Farrell et al. 2012) have used the content of publications to study certain branches of sociology.<sup>9</sup>

In South Africa too there have been attempts to study the history of sociological research, analysing the publication records drawn from prominent sociology journals (Basson and Prozesky 2015; Sooryamoorthy 2015; van Staden and Visser 1991). There have also been critiques of these analyses (Botes et al. 1991; Groenewald 1991) adding value to the understanding. Van Staden and Visser (1991) considered the publications in the prominent journal of the times, the *South African Journal of Sociology*, for a ten-year period between 1980 and 1989. They examined the research contributions of theoretical versus empirical, the issues of sampling in research, cross-cultural research and the statistical procedures employed in the research reported in the journal. Sooryamoorthy (2015) provided a scientometric analysis of the papers published in the official journal(s) of the association of South African sociologists for the post-apartheid period.



Basson and Prozesky (2015) mapped the methodological trends in South African sociological literature, examining the papers published during 1990–2009.

Universities in South Africa now lay stress on the production and dissemination of African knowledge. The mission statements of many universities in the country underline the importance of Africanization in knowledge production and its use in teaching and research. How far have these values and directions influenced South African sociology? Local sociologists, by and large, conduct research in their own immediate surroundings and on subjects around them. The knowledge thus produced is South African. Quite often, this production of sociological knowledge uses the tools—theories, for instance—that are not African, but customized for African situations and contexts. This constrains the Africanization programme in the discipline of sociology. The indigenization of sociology has a long way to go in South Africa. In the book we explore this aspect of sociology.

Sociology and sociologists assumed a decisive role both in supporting and opposing the separatist ideology of apartheid. This gave rise to two competitive strands of sociology—apartheid and anti-apartheid sociologies. Rivalry prevailed even among academics within sociology departments on the methodological leanings they followed, leading to career setbacks (Jubber 2006). The proponents of apartheid philosophy used the discipline to rationalize and build an apartheid state. A group of them, led by sociologists like Hendrik Verwoerd and Geoffrey Cronjé applied sociology and sociological concepts to substantiate the racial supremacy and separatist development pursued under apartheid.<sup>10</sup> The sociological perspectives held by the advocates of apartheid aided in driving the bureaucratic and policy-focused programmes of the apartheid administration (Pavlich 2014). Sociology served well for their social re-engineering purposes to build up the theoretical basis for a segregated racial society. Sociological knowledge produced back then was functional for the maintenance of the existing power relations which has been achieved by the fragmentation of reality, concealment of the real relations of production, and the reification of ideological categories (Human 1984). A more alarming situation is when sociologists give up scientific activities and explanations for positions in the state, and in foundations, councils and committees (Human 1984). Was there a sociology to oppose these divisive trends or one that ran parallel to these to continue with the neutral and objective standing of sociology? While the ardent proponents used sociology and its

scientific tools to crystallize the foundation of apartheid rule, the actions of sociologists in the other camp were indiscernible.

As noted earlier, the material on which this book is based is drawn from two major sources. The first consists of all available and accessible material that dealt with any historical and contemporary aspects of South African sociology. Some of it goes as far back as 1903. Reports, government gazettes, documents and proceedings of conferences fall under this category. The second source is an extensive and intensive scientometric analysis of the research publications of South African and non-South African sociologists (and social scientists) accessed from a number of sociology or social science journals and databases. This includes the publication records preserved in the WoS database, from all the available years since 1968–2015.

WoS is one of the most widely used databases for scientometric analysis.<sup>11</sup> The WoS database accessed was the Core Collection of the Social Sciences Citation (SSC) Index. It had a total of 26,118 articles (1968–2015) in all languages (as many South African sociologists published in Afrikaans as well) grouped under various subject categories of the social sciences. From these records, sociology publications were extracted for further analysis. The database does not allow for detailed statistical analysis beyond the groupings under countries of authors, language, year, organization and research areas of publications. More useful information can be gleaned only if each publication record is downloaded individually and processed. In view of the large size of these records, all publication records for a few sampled years were captured. Thus we have records for the years of 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015. The starting year of 1970 was chosen as there were not many publications between 1968 and 1970. Once the data was captured it was processed to enter them into a software programme. Analysis of this data followed the three timelines of colonial, apartheid and democratic periods and is presented in respective chapters.

The problem with the WoS database is that all publications of South African sociologists, mainly those in the initial years, might not have been stored in it. This situation has changed in the recent years when more and more South African journals were listed in this database. One option to counteract this problem in analysis and to have a representative data is to use the publications in prominent sociological and social science journals themselves. Note that academic publishing varies from country to country on the specific development of sociology (Morato 2006). A highly

developed sociology in a country therefore will have a substantial amount of publications. This is a tedious task of collecting data but unavoidable for a study like this. Important journals have thus been selected for this purpose in which sociologists preferred to publish their research. They are *Humanitas*, *Social Dynamics*, *South African Journal of Sociology*, *South African Sociological Review*, *South African Review of Sociology* (previously *Society in Transition*), *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa* and *Development Southern Africa*. In the same way as the WoS data had been treated, the variables taken from the publications of these journals were keyed into a data management programme. One more dataset was used for the analysis. It is the *A bibliography of the South African sociology*, which compiled all sociological publications for a particular period. From this source, the details of the publication records were gathered and processed for analysis referring to the colonial period.

The book is organized into six chapters. Chapter 2 is concerned with sociology during the colonial period, from 1900 to 1943. Sociology in the apartheid period (1948–1993) is elaborated upon in Chap. 3. Chapter 4 focuses on sociology in the new democratic South Africa. This chapter encapsulates the distinguishing features of sociology since 1994 when South Africa became a democracy. In all these four chapters the focus is on both sociology as a teaching discipline and the sociological research conducted in the specific and respective periods of analysis. Chapter 5 discusses contemporary sociological research in the country. Chapter 6 relies on the conclusions drawn from the experience of South African sociology and expands them onto a broader canvas. This is to keep the case of South African sociology in perspective and to understand its relevance for sociology.

## NOTES

1. Sociology in Australia did not flourish under the long years of the conservative government of John Howard (1996–2007), or British sociology under Margaret Thatcher (1979–1990) (Turner 2012). The development of sociology in Spain was impaired by dictatorships (Miguel and Moyer 1979). American sociology struggled with the changes in the degree structures that caused a decline in the degrees in the humanities and the social sciences (Turner 2012).
2. This refers to the journals, the *American Sociological Review* and the *American Journal of Sociology* (Dodoo and Beisel 2005).

3. Apartheid as a political ideology propagated and rationalized the principles of separateness on the basis of race. The National Party used this ideology to come to power in 1948. Through several legislations, affecting all walks of life of the population, this separateness between races was reinforced in the society which made South Africa a sharply divided society along racial lines. The years of struggle ensued thereafter, often in violent forms, and the opposition to apartheid by the international community culminated in South Africa becoming a democracy in 1994.
4. In many African countries sociology made its presence only after their independence from colonial powers. The first department of sociology in another African country, for example, was established in Ghana only in 1951 (Chachage 2004).
5. Nigeria has the largest number of sociologists (Burawoy 2009). The number does not always show the strength.
6. To borrow the term from Archbishop Desmond Tutu who first called South Africa as a rainbow nation, referring to its varied ethnic population.
7. According to the 2015 mid-year figures South Africa has a population of Africans (80.5%), coloureds (8.8%), whites (8.3%) and Indians/Asians (2.5%) (RSA 2015).
8. The Indian Sociological Society lists 3900 plus life members (<http://www.insoso.org/membership.html>, accessed 28 December 2015). As of December 2015, the South African Sociological Association (SASA) had a membership of 178 members (<http://www.sasaonline.org.za/> accessed on 28 December 2015). The membership also includes members who are not sociologists.
9. Farrell et al. (2012) used a few journals that published papers on family sociology during 1993–2011. Collyer's (2014) study is a quantitative analysis of selected sociology journals published between 1990 and 2011.
10. For instance, the works like '*n Tuiste vir die Nageslag* (A Home for the Future Generation), *Afrika Sonder Asiaat* (Africa without the Asian), *Regverdigte Rasse-apartheid* (Justifiable Race Separation or Legitimate Race Apartheid) and *Voogdyskap en Apartheid* (Guardianship and Apartheid) by Geoffrey Cronjé in 1945, 1946, 1947 and 1948 respectively contributed to the development of apartheid as a political programme (Davenport 1977; Jubber 2007).
11. Some of those who have used it include Adams et al. (2005), Glänzel et al. (1999), Jacobs (2006), Ma and Guan (2005), Narváez-Berthelemot et al. (2002), Pouris (2003), Sooryamoorthy (2009a, b) and Wilson and Markusova (2004).

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. (2000). Reflections on the future of sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(2), 296–300.
- Abreu, A. R. d. P. (2003). A (strong?) voice from the South: Latin American sociology today. *Current Sociology*, 51(1), 51–72.
- Adams, J. D., Black, G. C., Clemmons, J. R., & Stephen, P. E. (2005). Scientific teams and institutional collaborations, evidence from U.S. universities, 1981–1999. *Research Policy*, 34(3), 259–285.
- Alexander, P., & Uys, T. (2002). AIDS and sociology: Current South African research. *Society in Transition*, 33(3), 295–311.
- Allardt, E. (1977). Sociology in Finland. *Current Sociology*, 25(1), 29–56.
- Basson, I., & Prozesky, H. E. (2015). A review of methodological trends in South African sociology, 1990–2009. *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(3), 4–27.
- Botes, L. J. S., van Rensburg, H. C. J., & Groenewald, D. C. (1991). Reply to van Staden and Visser: Perhaps something more and something else happened in the SAJS of the 1980s. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 50–52.
- Burawoy, M. (2004). Public sociology: South African dilemmas in a global context. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 11–26.
- Burawoy, M. (2009). From earth to heaven: South African sociology in the international context. *South African Review of Sociology*, 40(2), 219–224.
- Burawoy, M. (2011). Meeting the challenge of global sociology: From Gothenburg to Yokohama. *South African Review of Sociology*, 42(1), 143–147.
- Chachage, C. S. L. (2004). Sociology and the future: Resistance, reconstruction and democracy. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 42–60.
- Collyer, F. (2014). Sociology, sociologists and core–periphery reflections. *Journal of Sociology*, 50(3), 252–268.
- Connell, R. (2015). Setting sail: The making of sociology in Australia, 1955–75. *Journal of Sociology*, 51(2), 354–369.
- Davenport, T. R. H. (1977). *South Africa: A modern history* (2nd ed.). Johannesburg: Macmillan South Africa (Publishers) (Pty) Ltd.
- Deflem, M. (2013). The structural transformation of sociology. *Society*, 50(2), 156–166.
- Dodoo, F., & Beisel, N. (2005). Africa in American sociology: Invisibility, opportunity and obligation. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 595–600.
- Fanning, B., & Hess, A. (2015). Sociology in Ireland: Legacies and challenges. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 23(1), 3–21.
- Farrell, B., VandeVusse, A., & Ocobock, A. (2012). Family change and the state of family sociology. *Current Sociology*, 60(3), 283–301.
- Glänzel, W., Schubert, A., & Czerwon, H. J. (1999). A bibliometric analysis of international scientific cooperation of the European Union (1985–1995). *Scientometrics*, 45(2), 185–202.

- Groenewald, C. J. (1991). The context of the development of sociology in South Africa: A response to Visser and van Staden. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 46–49.
- Hare, A. P., & Savage, M. (1979). Sociology of South Africa. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 5, 329–350.
- Hendricks, F. (2006). The rise and fall of South African sociology. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 86–97.
- Human, P. (1984). *The South African crisis: Sociology and reform*. Johannesburg: ASSA.
- Jacobs, D. (2006). Analysis of scientific research in selected institutions in South Africa: A bibliometric study. *South African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 72(1), 72–77.
- Jubber, K. (2006). Reflections on canons, compilations, catalogues and curricula in relation to sociology and sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 321–342.
- Jubber, K. (2007). Sociology in South Africa: A brief historical review of research and publishing. *International Sociology*, 22(5), 527–546.
- Lachmann, R. (2013). *What is historical sociology?* Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Lundborg, T. (2016). The limits of historical sociology: Temporal borders and the reproduction of the ‘modern’ political present. *European Journal of International Relations*, 22(1), 99–121.
- Lyon, E. S. (2015). Sociology and its publics: Fresh perspectives from the history of sociology. *International Sociology*, 30(5), 457–466.
- Ma, N., & Guan, J. (2005). An exploratory study on collaboration profiles of Chinese publications in molecular biology. *Scientometrics*, 65(1), 343–355.
- Maia, J. M. (2014). History of sociology and the quest for intellectual autonomy in the Global South: The cases of Alberto Guerreiro Ramos and Syed Hussein Alatas. *Current Sociology*, 62(7), 1097–1115.
- Mapadimeng, M. S. (2009). *The South African sociology, current challenges and future implications: A review and some empirical evidence from the 2007 national survey of sociology departments*. Paper presented at the ISA Conference of the Council for National Associations, Taipei, Taiwan, 23–25 March. Retrieved March 13, 2013, from [www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/3b\\_Mapadimeng\\_2.pdf](http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/3b_Mapadimeng_2.pdf)
- Mapadimeng, M. S. (2012). Sociology and inequalities in post-apartheid South Africa: A critical review. *Current Sociology*, 61(1), 40–56.
- Masson, P. (2012). French sociology and the state. *Current Sociology*, 60(5), 719–729.
- Miguel, J. u. s. M. d., & Moyer, M. G. (1979). Trend report: Sociology in Spain. *Current Sociology*, 27(1), 5–138.
- Morato, A. R. (2006). Spanish academic publishing in sociology: A critical view. *International Sociology*, 21(3), 335–348.
- Mukherjee, R. (1977). Trends in Indian sociology. *Current Sociology*, 25(3), 1–147.

- Narváez-Berthelemot, N., Russel, J. M., Arvanitis, R., Waast, R., & Gaillard, J. (2002). Science in Africa: An overview of mainstream scientific output. *Scientometrics*, 54(2), 229–241.
- Osipov, G. V., & Rutkevich, M. N. (1978). Trend report: Sociology in the USSR, 1965–1975. *Current Sociology*, 26(2), 1–82.
- Patel, S. (2011). Sociology in India: Trajectories and challenges. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 45(3), 427–435.
- Pavlich, G. (2014). Administrative sociology and apartheid. *Acta Academica*, 46(3), 151–174.
- Phelan, T. J. (2000). Bibliometrics and the evaluation of Australian sociology. *Journal of Sociology*, 36(3), 345–363.
- Pouris, A. (2003). South Africa's research publication record: The last ten years. *South African Journal of Science*, 99(9 & 10), 425–428.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2015). *Mid year population estimates, 2015*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, The Republic of South Africa.
- Schutte, G. (2007). Looking to the future: Crossing disciplinary borders in South Africa. *International Sociology*, 22(5), 564–567.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2009a). Collaboration and publication: How collaborative are scientists in South Africa? *Scientometrics*, 80(2), 419–439.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2009b). Do types of collaboration change citation? Collaboration and citation patterns of South African science publications. *Scientometrics*, 81(1), 171–193.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2015). Sociological research in South Africa: Post-apartheid trends. *International Sociology*, 30(2), 119–133.
- South African Sociological Review. (1988). Editors introduction. *South African Sociological Review*, 1(1), ii.
- van Staden, F., & Visser, D. (1991). The *South African Journal of Sociology* in the eighties: An analysis of theoretical and empirical contributions. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 2(22), 33–43.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1994). Disintegrated disciplines and the future of sociology. *Sociological Forum*, 9(2), 279–291.
- Turner, B. S. (2012). Sociology in the USA and beyond: A half-century decline? *Journal of Sociology*, 48(4), 364–379.
- Turner, J. H. (2006). American Sociology in chaos: Differentiation without integration. *The American Sociologist*, 37(2), 15–29.
- Welz, F. (2009). 100 Years of Indian sociology from social anthropology to decentering global sociology. *International Sociology*, 24(5), 635–655.
- Wilson, C. S., & Markusova, V. A. (2004). Changes in the scientific output of Russia from 1980 to 2000, as reflected in the *Science Citation Index*, in relation to national politico-economic changes. *Scientometrics*, 59(3), 345–389.
- Yazawa, S. (2014). Internationalization of Japanese sociology. *International Sociology*, 29(4), 271–282.

## The Beginning: Sociology in Colonial Times

**Abstract** Sociology originally develops as a teaching discipline as part of other disciplines during the colonial period. Sociology in the early years does not have an independent existence. It serves disciplines like social work. It is hard for sociology to develop as an independent discipline. Towards the end of this period sociology becomes detached from other departments and independent sociology departments are established at universities. There are nascent attempts to produce a sociological literature. Research publications of sociologists begin to appear towards the end of colonialism. The social situation after the Second World War provides the opportunity for sociologists to turn their attention to numerous social problems. Sociologists are mainly concerned with race, poverty, crime, delinquency and other social problems.

**Keywords** Colonial South Africa • History • Teaching • Research • Sociology • Poverty

South African sociology is now more than a century old. International sociology has a similar 100-year-long history (Sorokin 2016). The genesis of South African sociology coincided with a similar discipline trend in many advanced countries, or even prior to them in some instances.<sup>1</sup> The recorded history of sociology in South Africa goes as far back as 1903.



This was when sociology first attracted the attention of scholars in the country at the first annual congress of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS) held at Cape Town (Jubber 2007). A paper on sociology was read at this congress (Fremantle 1903).<sup>2</sup> The presenter, H.E.S. Fremantle, was not a sociologist but a professor of philosophy. Since then calls for the study of social problems and for the establishment of sociology at universities was a recurring theme at subsequent congresses of the SAAAS (Jubber 2007). In a resolution passed in 1919, SAAAS called for a systematic, ethnographic, philological, anthropological and sociological study of the nation's indigenous people (Groenewald 1984, cited in Jubber 1983: 51).<sup>3</sup>

This chapter deals with sociology in the colonial period, between 1900 and 1947. It has two main aspects: Firstly, sociology was a teaching discipline in the universities, where it started as part of other cognate disciplines. Secondly, sociological research was produced by sociologists and other social scientists during this period.

### THE EARLY YEARS: SOCIOLOGY IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD, 1900–1947

Despite the long history of sociology in South Africa, not much effort was made to apply this knowledge in the early years (Groenewald 1989). The accounts were more descriptive than analytical. Starting in the 1920s, several colleges in South Africa began to offer sociology as a subject of study. The University of South Africa (UNISA), as an examining institute, had been the first institution to teach a course in sociology in 1918 (Alexander et al. 2006; Cilliers 1984; Jubber 2007). Inspired by the appeal and support of the SAAAS, UNISA taught courses in ethnographically based sociology (Jubber 1983).

However, sociology did not have an independent existence. Sociology departments in universities were part of other departments, most notably social work. It was offered along with other social sciences and was allied to many other disciplines. In the 1920s, courses in sociology at undergraduate level were taught in universities under the auspices of disciplines such as anthropology, philosophy and social work (Cilliers 1984).<sup>4</sup> From the 1920s onwards, sociology at the University of Pretoria (UP) functioned in a joint department of sociology and social work. In 1932 Stellenbosch University created its combined department of sociology and social work

(Miller 1993). At the University of Witwatersrand a joint department of sociology and social administration came into being in 1937.

Teaching sociology as an independent discipline at universities began only during the 1930s (Cilliers 1984). While UP started offering courses in sociology in the late 1920s, it established a separate department of sociology only in 1931 (Pollak 1968, cited in Jubber 1983: 52). Eventually departments of sociology were established at other universities—Stellenbosch in 1932, Cape Town in 1934, Witwatersrand in 1937, Potchefstroom in 1937, Natal in 1937 and Orange Free State in 1939 (Jubber 2007). Slightly later, sociology was offered as an independent discipline at the universities of Stellenbosch, Pretoria, Cape Town, Witwatersrand, Potchefstroom, Natal and Orange Free State (Cilliers 1984).

Sociology in South Africa did not begin with sociologists who were trained to teach sociology or conduct sociological research. As noted earlier, the first scientific paper on sociology was presented by a non-sociologist. At that time many who were hired to teach sociology had other disciplinary backgrounds and training. They came from disciplines such as psychology, economics and education, and were leading sociology in the departments of sociology at universities.<sup>5</sup> When the first courses in sociology were offered at UNISA, lecturers were social anthropologists (Jubber 1983). However, this tendency was not unique to South Africa.<sup>6</sup>

In colonial times, sociology served social work rather than itself. There was a great demand for social workers in the aftermath of the Second World War and the accompanying social needs of South African society. The contents of sociology courses focused mainly on social problems and social issues. The curricula adopted for the courses in sociology were influenced by other disciplines and subjects. Social work, welfare matters and practical issues and problems shaped sociology courses at that time (Jubber 1983). At the University of Cape Town, the first course of sociology was ‘primitive sociology’ which covered aspects of social morphology, family and kinship, social functions, mythology, animism and totemism (Jubber 1983). Sociology departments trained social workers, which served the interests of sociology as it received acceptance for its utilitarian value.

Nevertheless, since its inception in the colonial period, sociology gained recognition for the sociological research conducted at several universities and institutions. Even before sociology was taught at universities, the importance of sociological research was appreciated. In 1911, M.S. Evans published a sociological study, *Black and White in South East Africa: A*

*study in sociology* (Ally et al. 2003). Some other sociological works during the period appeared: *The colour problem of South Africa* (1910; C. Philips), *The Blackman's place in South Africa* (1922; P. Nielsen), *Education and the poor white* (1932; E.G. Malherbe) and *The Bantu in the city* (1938; R.E. Philips). Early in 1918, SAAAS, which was responsible for commissioning social research, called for an anthropological or sociological study of native populations in the country (Ally et al. 2003).

At university level, the production of sociological research remained moderate in the colonial period. After the Second World War, the interests in seeking new approaches to study developmental and social reconstruction issues became important (Cilliers 1984). The constitution of the Social and Economic Planning Council (SEPC) was a landmark at this point. In its later years, SEPC produced a series of reports on the socioeconomic standards of various sections of people in the country (Cilliers 1984). At the behest of the SEPC, regional-centred studies were carried out at universities, which involved sociologists (Cilliers 1984). The National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR), founded in 1946, was initially part of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and functioned under research divisions to conduct research in the area of occupational psychology, with much of it falling under industrial psychology (Hare and Savage 1979). The involvement of students in these research studies at the University of Natal, Stellenbosch University and the University of Cape Town drew students to sociology (Cilliers 1984).

The state remained as the major funder for social science research during the colonial period. Two institutions were formed to support social science research: A Research Grant Board in 1918 and the National Bureau of Educational and Social Research in 1929 (Welsh 1981). Funding for research which flowed from these sources was insufficient for social science research, and this limited it at universities. Referring to the official reports for the three consecutive years from 1938 to 1940, Welsh (1981) confirms this state of social research in universities. The main reason attributed to the poor emphasis on research was the shortage of staff, limited research funding and the inadequate infrastructure such as well-equipped libraries (Welsh 1981). Nationally, there were no major outlets such as journals for social scientists and sociologists, to publish their research. All sociology journals that are analysed in the following chapters appeared only in the 1970s or thereafter. No publication during the colonial period was stored in the extensive database of the Web of

Science (WoS). Professional associations that could unify and advance the publication opportunities were not active at this point in time of the life cycle of South African sociology.

The Second World War and its fall-out gave rise to unexpected social circumstances necessitating the study of relevant social problems. Sociologists were enticed towards these problems which triggered their research interests and fascination. Among them were those related to demobilization, divorce, prostitution, urbanization, industrialization, housing, rural development and others (Cilliers 1984). There were some opportunities for South African sociologists to meet for professional activities. The South African Inter-University Committee for Social Studies,<sup>7</sup> founded in 1938, provided opportunities for social scientists, including sociologists for regular meetings and conferences (Cilliers 1984).

In the colonial period the presence of the discipline was not very impressive. It had not been able to develop as a discipline during its initial years. Cilliers (1984) records some valid explanations for this limited state of sociology. Firstly, there were not many sociologists at this time. When sociology transitioned into a phase of being an independent academic discipline, disassociating it from other disciplines, there were only a few sociologists who had obtained training in sociology. Most of them came from other disciplines such as psychology, education or economics. Secondly, the Second World War and its consequences were not favourable for South African sociologists to travel overseas to obtain advanced training in the discipline. This situation remained until the early 1950s when a new generation of sociologists was given exposure to international sociologists and sociology.

Sociologists in colonial times were primarily concerned with social problems such as poverty. But the focus was not on the problem of the majority of the population, namely, Africans.<sup>8</sup> Rather, their interest was limited to poverty among the whites. Poverty was then a serious issue for the white population in the country. The South African Dutch Reformed Church appealed to the Carnegie Corporation in the USA to finance a study on poverty among the whites. It became known as the Carnegie Commission on the Poor White Problem in South Africa (Carnegie Commission 1932). The voluminous report of the Carnegie Poor White Commission was both significant and controversial.<sup>9</sup> The Commission granted sociology a deserving place as it covered the sociological aspects of white poverty.<sup>10</sup> It also gave an impetus to the discipline when a series of lectures was delivered by an American sociologist, Charles Coulter,

who was part of the Commission. The lecture series, entitled ‘The rise of sociology as a college discipline and its application’, was organized by Stellenbosch University (Miller 1993). A series of congresses ensued in which the findings of the Commission were deliberated.<sup>11</sup>

The Carnegie Commission experienced dismay at the lack of facilities for social research and the absence of trained sociologists in the country (Ally et al. 2003). It made a recommendation for the creation of a department of social studies to train people to conduct scientific studies (Miller 1993). A call for funding applications was announced in 1937. However, the response to the call for funding from the Carnegie Corporation through the National Bureau of Education and Social Science Research was lukewarm (Welsh 1981). The reasons for this indifference were many: the relatively new fields of investigations for which grant applications were sought, the shortage of skilled and trained investigators and the lack of statistical information about the problems of investigation and about African and coloured populations (Welsh 1981). The lack of sufficient background information, statistical information in particular, was a great drawback for social science research.

The Carnegie studies continued to influence the social research scene even after the colonial period. A shift in the focus of sociological research occurred around this time, that is, after the 1940s, when the problem of white poverty was investigated (Hare and Savage 1979). The shift was evident in the branching out of two streams of research activities by sociologists. One group of sociologists was led by social problems such as poverty, housing and family pathologies that were prominent among Africans. The other group of sociologists pursued its interest in race relations and racial attitudes (Hare and Savage 1979).

Scholars from overseas influenced South African sociology. In the early years, the first professors of sociology who were appointed in South Africa had obtained training in countries like Holland, Germany, England and the USA (Paur 1958, cited in Groenewald 1991: 47). This had an effect on the discipline, bringing different traditions and practices to the country’s indigenous sociology (Groenewald 1991). Differing traditions and practices in sociological research were to be seen across the institutions. For instance, social economy was central to the University of Cape Town under Batson, comparative sociology at the University of Witwatersrand under Gray, cultural sociology at the University of Pretoria under Cronjé, and welfare and reformist sociology at the Stellenbosch University under Verwoerd (Groenewald 1991). Sociology thus had a basis for internationalization.

Later, during both the apartheid and democratic periods, sociology continued to establish linkages with the international community.

From the early years, when sociology was first institutionalized in the 1930s, sociological research in the country achieved empirical importance. Early sociologists employed quantitative approaches such as social surveys that were then common in both Europe and the USA (Cilliers 1984). Sociology departments in Stellenbosch, Witwatersrand, Natal and Cape Town were active in conducting research, mostly through quantitative surveys, on problems associated with economic expansion and urban growth (Cilliers 1984).

The detachment of sociology from other departments and disciplines and its existence on its own encouraged sociologists to spread and diversify their research into areas of sociological significance. Until then, most of the sociological research produced in the country did not have a purely sociological focus but was more of a social welfare nature (Hare and Savage 1979). Exceptions such as the call for a comparative sociology to find solutions to the problems of society were heard from sociologists like Gray, who was the first sociology professor at the University of Witwatersrand (Hare and Savage 1979). Sociology for Geoffrey Cronjé, on the other hand, had a different meaning, purpose and use. Grounded in theoretical issues, Cronjé's works followed a cultural approach at UP where he remained until his retirement (Coetzee 1991). Sociologists like S.P. Cilliers were in the forefront of liberating sociology from its links with social work (Ally et al. 2003; Jubber 2007) and expanded its scope to reach new horizons. Realizing the need for theory in sociology, he established a theoretical framework for the study of society and managed to overthrow the social engineering sociology of Verwoerd (Ally et al. 2003).

The sociology Hendrik Verwoerd pursued and practised was empirical and applied. Drawing inspiration from American sociology, Verwoerd advocated sociological research for practical solutions. Rooted in his positivist approach, Verwoerd treated sociology as an applied science to deal with the country's social problems. He found it useful in matters concerning social welfare of the population. Guided by these social work preferences, Verwoerd, who was based at Stellenbosch University, employed sociology for the investigation of social problems and in collecting information for social reforms (Ally et al. 2003). He took the initiative to organize the National Congress in Kimberley to deliberate on the issue of poor whites (Jubber 1983). Influenced by his work in the field of social welfare, the state established the Department of Social Welfare (Jubber 1983).

## RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

It was only after the Second World War, that is, in the beginning of apartheid (1948–1993), that universities in South Africa developed a stronger research ethos (Cresswell 1992).

Before moving on to the second phase, consideration of the sociological knowledge produced by sociologists and others is in order. A scientometric analysis of the publications listed in the *A bibliography of South African sociology* (Institute for Contemporary History 1978) has been undertaken. This compilation has the bibliographic information about all the sociological works done in the field by people having different backgrounds and covers both Afrikaans and English language publications. Grouped under themes, there were journal articles, reports, books, conference proceedings and theses submitted to universities available up to 1975. As a sample, only the bibliographic records of the works in English which were published until 1947 (the end of colonial period) were captured, processed and analysed.

The basic details of the publications gleaned from the above source present the characteristic features of sociology publications during the colonial period (Table 2.1). After cleaning and processing a total of 118 publications was left for analysis. These publications, excluding theses, produced 3529 pages of sociological literature (from a single page to a maximum of 452 pages).<sup>12</sup> This means there were 301 printed pages of journal publications (mean = 6.5 pages, S.D = 6.8), and 3228 pages of books, reports and conference proceedings (mean = 92.2 pages, S.D = 86.1). Except for a couple of publications, all authors were white. Save three, all were single-authored publications. Collaboration was yet to emerge among sociologists in the colonial period.

The year of publication was grouped into three classes (up to 1935, 1936–1940 and 1941–1947) to track the trends in sociological research. Published years showed that most of them originated in the last few years of colonialism, that is, between 1941 and 1947 (63%). Whereas the percentages for the other two time periods (before 1935 and 1936–1940) were 19 each. Although sociology appeared on the South African horizon as early as 1903, it took a considerable while for it to make a contribution through publications. There were some publications that came out in 1903 and 1910. But it was only in 1922 that a book-length work like *The Blackman's place in South Africa* was published. Notably in the closing years of the colonial period, there has been a proliferation of sociological

**Table 2.1** Publications in sociology in the colonial period, 1900–1947

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Year of publication</i>			<i>All</i>	
	<i>Up to 1935</i>	<i>1936–1940</i>	<i>1941–1947</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Topics of research</i>					
General: social problems, children, youth and education	6	5	11	22	19
Race and population	5	3	11	19	16
Class, income and poverty	3	3	12	18	15
Juvenile delinquency and crime	4	4	10	18	15
Social security, social services, social work and housing	0	5	8	13	11
Urban studies, planning and development	2	1	5	8	7
African studies	2	1	4	7	6
Health, medicine and disease	0	0	7	7	6
Family, marriage and divorce	0	0	6	6	5
<i>Total</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>118</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Types of publication</i>					
Books, reports and conference proceedings	12	15	28	55	47
Journal articles	2	6	38	46	39
Theses	8	1	8	17	14
<i>Total</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>118</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Major journals</i>					
<i>South African Journal of Economics</i>	1	0	5	6	
<i>Race Relations</i>	1	0	4	5	
<i>SA Outlook</i>	0	0	4	4	
<i>South African Medical Journal</i>	0	0	3	3	
<i>Place of publication (books, reports and conference proceedings)</i>					
Johannesburg	3	6	16	25	49
Cape Town	4	3	7	14	27
Pretoria	3	2	1	6	12
Durban	1	1	2	4	8
Other locations	0	1	1	2	4
<i>Total</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>University (Thesis)</i>					
University of Witwatersrand	3	1	0	4	
University of South Africa (UNISA)	2	0	0	2	
University of Pretoria	1	0	1	2	
Stellenbosch University	1	0	1	2	

*(continued)*



**Table 2.1** (continued)

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Year of publication</i>			<i>All</i>	
	<i>Up to 1935</i>	<i>1936–1940</i>	<i>1941–1947</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>%</i>
Rhodes University	0	0	1	1	
<i>Thesis</i>					
MA, MSocSc,	5	0	6	11	
DPhil, PhD	2	1	2	5	

research publications in the form of books, reports, journal articles and theses. Books and reports made up most of the works, and journal publications followed closely. About half of the publications (47%) belonged to the first category of books and reports and 39% fell under the second category of journal publications.

As for the specific areas of research, there were three major sets of topics that interested sociologists during the colonial period. Publications in race and population formed 16% of the total; class, income and poverty formed another 15%; the juvenile delinquency and crime category claimed 15% of publications; and studies on social security, social service and social work had a share of 11%. One-fifth of the publications could be grouped under general social problems that dealt with alcoholism, children, youth and education. In these areas, over 50% were produced during 1941–1947. Interest was also shown in studies on urban issues, health and medicine, and family and marriage. A small percentage of publications (6%) pertained to issues of the black population. These findings are in line with the material presented earlier, particularly about studies on poverty and population.

Books and reports originated from a few key centres in the country: Johannesburg, Cape Town and Pretoria. The South African Institute of Race Relations was the leading publisher of books and reports. A number of theses, mostly masters, were submitted to the universities of Witwatersrand, UNISA, Pretoria, Stellenbosch and Rhodes. Most of these were prominent as having strong departments of sociology. The preferred journals for scholars in which to publish their research were the *South African Journal of Economics*, *South African Medical Journal* and *Race Relations*.

At least two inferences can be deduced from this analysis. Firstly, it relates to the yearly trends in the production of sociological research in the country. Only towards the end of the colonial period did the production of sociological research seem to have gained momentum. Over one-third of the total publications for the period was published in the last seven years of colonialism. Secondly, the analysis demonstrates the main focus areas of sociological research of the colonial times. As shown earlier from the literature, sociology was mainly concerned with issues such as race, poverty, juvenile delinquency, crime and other timely social problems.

In Chap. 3, South African sociology is examined in the context of apartheid.

## NOTES

1. The first department of sociology in England was established in 1903 at the London School of Economics while in the USA sociology began earlier before the American Sociological Society which was formed in 1905 (Harley 2012). Japan opened its universities to sociology courses in the nineteenth century and the Japan Sociological Society was inaugurated in 1924 (Yazawa 2014). Although sociological associations are not a measure to judge the origin of sociology they provide an understanding of the institutionalized existence of the discipline. In 1963 a conference was held in Australia to discuss the discipline of sociology and soon the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand was formed (Connell 2015). Soviet sociology originated in the 1920s, although it became active only in the 1950s (Osipov and Rutkevich 1978). Indian sociology began to offer courses in 1908 although a Department of Sociology was only officially formed in 1919 at Bombay (now Mumbai) University (Mukherjee 1977). In China sociology was introduced in the 1920s as a teaching and research discipline; banned after the Communist Revolution in 1949, all sociology programmes were terminated in 1952, and the discipline had a rebirth in the late 1970s (Bian and Zhang 2008).
2. This lengthy paper, 'The Sociology of Comte with Special Reference to the Political Conditions of Young Countries' provided an incisive analysis of the sociology of Auguste Comte but not about its relevance to South African society.
3. The discrepancy in the years of publications might be due to the reason that Jubber would have access to the work in progress of Groenewald before it was published a year later.
4. This was the case in some other African countries as well (Akiwowo 1980).

5. Hendrick Verwoerd was a psychologist. Edward Batson, an appointed professor of sociology in 1936 at the University of Cape Town, studied economics.
6. Australian sociology did not have qualified sociologists to teach sociology, but drew from other disciplines (Connell 2015). In the early years of sociology in Spain the borders between other disciplines were hazy (Miguel and Moyer 1979). In India the first courses in sociology were taught as part of the offerings of the Department of Political Science (Mukherjee 1977).
7. This Committee was later renamed as the Inter-University Committee for Social Science, before it changed to the Joint University Committee for Sociology and Social Work (Cilliers 1984).
8. Cilliers (1984) contests this stance and asks for the examination of facts in the light of the early sociological research. He affirms that the conditions in black communities and race relations were also studied at an early period in the development of sociology in South Africa.
9. Formed in 1928 and concluded in 1932, the Poor White Commission under the joint partnership of the Carnegie Corporation in the USA, the Dutch Reformed Church and the government investigated the economic, psychological, educational, health and sociological aspects of the poor white problem in the country. In the absence of trained sociologists to be part of this team two American sociologists (Kenyon L. Butterfield and Charles W. Coulter) were deployed to assist with the sociological side of this investigation (Ally et al. 2003; Jubber 2007; Miller 1993).
10. Foundations like this had a positive impact on the growth and development of discipline elsewhere. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Russell Sage Foundation played a fundamental role in the development of the American Social Sciences (Masson 2012).
11. Two prominent congresses were the Volkskongres (People's Congress) in 1934 and the Ekonomiese Kongres (Economic Congress) in 1939 (Jubber 2007).
12. It refers to publications whose page numbers have been given. There were some missing cases in regard to this variable. No page numbers were provided for theses.

## REFERENCES

- Akiwowo, A. A. (1980). Trend report: Sociology in Africa today. *Current Sociology*, 28(2), 3–73.
- Alexander, P., Basson, L., & Makhura, P. (2006). Sociology research in contemporary South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 218–240.

- Ally, S., Mooney, K., & Stewart, P. (2003). The state-sponsored and centralised institutionalisation of an academic discipline: Sociology in South Africa, 1920–1970. *Society in Transition*, 34(1), 70–103.
- Bian, Y., & Zhang, L. (2008). Sociology in China. *Contexts*, 7(3), 20–25.
- Carnegie Commission. (1932). *Carnegie commission of investigation on the poor white question in South Africa: The poor white problem in South Africa*. Stellenbosch: Pro-Ecclesia-Drukkery.
- Cilliers, S. P. (1984). *The origins of sociology in South Africa*. Paper presented at the Association for Sociology in South Africa, Johannesburg, 2–5 July 1984.
- Coetzee, J. M. (1991). The mind of apartheid: Geoffrey Cronjé (1907–). *Social Dynamics*, 17(1), 1–35.
- Connell, R. (2015). Setting sail: The making of sociology in Australia, 1955–75. *Journal of Sociology*, 51(2), 354–369.
- Cresswell, C.F. (1992). Research in an established South African university. *Transformation*, 18, 52–57.
- Fremantle, H. E. S. (1903). The sociology of Comte with special reference to the political conditions of young countries'. *South African Journal of Science*, 1, 462–479.
- Groenewald, C. J. (1989). Die rol van die Sociologie in die Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing: Die verded. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 20(2), 67–79.
- Groenewald, C. J. (1991). The context of the development of sociology in South Africa: A response to Visser and van Staden. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 46–49.
- Hare, A. P., & Savage, M. (1979). Sociology of South Africa. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 5, 329–350.
- Harley, K. (2012). Sociology's objects, objectivity and objectives: Successes and failures in establishing the discipline in America, England and Australia before 1945. *Journal of Sociology*, 48(4), 410–426.
- Institute for Contemporary History. (1978). *A bibliography of the South African sociology*. Potchefstroom: Institute for Contemporary History, University of Orange Free State.
- Jubber, K. (1983). Sociology and its social context: The case of the rise of Marxist sociology in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 9(2), 50–63.
- Jubber, K. (2007). Sociology in South Africa: A brief historical review of research and publishing. *International Sociology*, 22(5), 527–546.
- Masson, P. (2012). French sociology and the state. *Current Sociology*, 60(5), 719–729.
- Miguel, J. u. s. M. d., & Moyer, M. G. (1979). Trend report: Sociology in Spain. *Current Sociology*, 27(1), 5–138.
- Miller, R. B. (1993). Science and society in the early career of H.F. Verwoerd. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 19(4), 1–17.
- Mukherjee, R. (1977). Trends in Indian sociology. *Current Sociology*, 25(3), 1–147.

- Osipov, G. V., & Rutkevich, M. N. (1978). Trend report: Sociology in the USSR, 1965–1975. *Current Sociology*, 26(2), 1–82.
- Sorokin, P. (2016). ‘Global sociology’ in different disciplinary practices: Current conditions, problems and perspectives. *Current Sociology*, 64(1), 41–59.
- Welsh, D. (1981). Social research in a divided society: The case of South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 27–44). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Yazawa, S. (2014). Internationalization of Japanese sociology. *International Sociology*, 29(4), 271–282.

## In Apartheid Times, 1948–1993

**Abstract** Apartheid segregates South African society along racial lines. Sociology is not free from this division. Some use the discipline to serve the interests of the state while others refuse to be any part of it. Different sociologies co-exist under apartheid. Two opposing professional organizations opened their own channels of publication. Sociology at universities is firmly established in independent departments. As a teaching discipline it gains ground in the country and develops through parallel streams. Universities are differentially resourced and the better resourced are the white Afrikaans universities. Sociology is dominated by whites. Conducting research under apartheid poses great challenges. Scholars are arrested, imprisoned or killed for opposing apartheid. Not only sociologists but also other social scientists contribute to the production of sociological knowledge in South Africa.

**Keywords** Apartheid • Sociology • Universities • Sociological research • South Africa

### AN OVERVIEW

Apartheid made South Africa a racially divided nation. The division was evident in inequalities in all realms of life between people of different racial backgrounds. The apartheid policies enunciated by the National Party,

which first won the general election in 1948, were designed for separate and segregated social and economic development on the basis of race.<sup>1</sup> Apartheid policies served to protect and advance the interests of whites more so than any other race. Whites formed only a minority of the population. During this period, sociology produced both supporters and antagonists to the apartheid regime and its policies.

Some pioneering sociologists were in the frontline, rationalizing and providing a scientific explanation for the apartheid ideology. The most notable were Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd (the first professor of sociology and social work in 1932 at Stellenbosch University),<sup>2</sup> Jan De Wet Keyter (professor of sociology at the University of the Orange Free State) and Geoffrey Cronjé<sup>3</sup> (the first professor of sociology at the University of Pretoria). Nic J. Rhoodie, a professor of sociology at the University of Pretoria, was another strong exponent of apartheid. All of them had studied at South African universities before they went abroad for further higher education. Located in an elongated, triangular, and geographical configuration (Cape Town, Orange Free State and Pretoria), these sociologists deliberately used sociology as the scientific basis to bolster apartheid theory and policies. The negative impact on sociology, particularly the sociology Verwoerd employed, was to last for a long period in the history of sociology in the country. This stigma on the discipline has not as yet been completely erased.

Sociologists depended on the state, and the state wanted them for its own plans and purposes. The discipline thus earned the dubious label of being the servant of the state which used it for their covert programme of social engineering. The issue of dependency and independence of the discipline thus became a matter of serious concern. South African sociology was not alone. French sociology also went through a similar stage in the late 1950s. It was closely tied to the state and this relationship was a central issue for its autonomy and dependence (Masson 2012).

Not only sociologists but also other academics in universities were divided in their views on the apartheid policies of the regime. While the Afrikaans language universities in the country were the intellectual bastions of apartheid, the English language universities were in the opposing camp (Hugo 1977). Not every Afrikaans scholar was supportive of the repressive regime. There were Afrikaans sociologists like Frederik van Zyl Slabbert and Hendrik W. van der Merwe who opposed apartheid ideology and consistently worked against it.<sup>4</sup>

As in most other domains of life, apartheid made for divisions in education along racial lines. In 1959 the Extension of University Education Act was passed. Under this Act, separate universities were to be established for major ethnic groups and also for the coloured population.<sup>5</sup> A few fell under the category of black universities, formed after the enactment of the Extension of University Education Act, 1959. Some positive effects on the development of sociology were to be realized due to these changes. All these newly formed universities<sup>6</sup> for different ethnic groups and the coloured population resulted in the establishment of departments of sociology. This led to an increase in the number of sociology students and positions in sociology (Jubber 2007). On the other hand, a survey showed that the percentage of advanced degrees in sociology to the total degrees awarded by the universities did not actually increase during the period 1956–1970 (Venter 1973) (Fig. 3.1).

The Extension of University Education Act of 1959 prevented black students from attending universities such as the University of Cape Town and the University of Witwatersrand. Instead, the Act recommended the establishment of separate university colleges for Africans. These institutions (HBUs [historically black universities]) lagged behind white universities (HWUs [historically white universities]) in several respects. The quality of education imparted and the facilities and resources available were distinctively different for the HBUs and HWUs. The segregated university system moved ahead in clearly separatist orientations in regard to teaching sociology and conducting research. They differed in methodological preferences, theoretical orientations and even in their research (Alexander et al. 2006). The Afrikaans language universities were oriented to structural-functional theories and quantitative methods while the English language universities were largely influenced by liberal, neo-Marxist and phenomenological approaches and critical methods (Hare and Savage 1979; Taylor 1989; Uys 2006). Sociologists affiliated to both of these types of universities researched mostly in the areas of criminology, demography, migration and development (Adam 1981).

As we have seen in Chap. 2, sociology in the early years in South Africa was part of other allied disciplines and did not gain the status of an independent discipline until the early 1960s. When they assumed the status of independent departments, a growth in the number of trained sociologists and in the production of sociological knowledge was manifest (Hare and Savage 1979). By the 1960s, sociology departments in many universities became detached from other joint departments such





Fig. 3.1 Map of South Africa

as social work, and formed independent sociology departments (Ally et al. 2003). Eventually they became full-fledged departments equipped to produce PhDs. As Hare and Savage (1979) record, this growth resulted in an increase in the number of clients for sociology. The enrolment of students in sociology was soon to increase (Webster 2004). In 1965, the first PhD in sociology was produced at the University of Natal (Ally et al. 2003).

The courses in sociology introduced in the English language universities since the 1970s were also instrumental in attracting more students to sociology. Sociology dealt with the topics of labour, class struggle, organizations and social change, and produced a good number of graduates in sociology (Buhlungu 2009). Teaching sociology during this period had to rely on textbooks produced in the West, and the course outlines were similar to those elsewhere in the world (Hare and Savage 1979). Sociology in black universities, however, had a late birth. Until 1962, sociology was not offered in black universities, which changed when the University of Fort Hare introduced sociology in its course offerings (Ally et al. 2003). African universities preferred themes of problems of developing societies, demography, the sociology of development and political sociology (Hare and Savage 1979).

Under apartheid, the division between the Afrikaans language and English language universities was sharp. The gap continued to widen up until the late 1980s. This was obvious in the syllabi of sociology taught at universities. Research methodology had a high priority in some universities while theory was de-emphasized (Savage 1981). Theory courses in black universities (most of them were taught by graduates from Afrikaans universities) were structural-functional (Savage 1981). There were courses in applied sociology focusing on social problems such as poverty, housing, migration and others (Savage 1981). For the sociologists in English language universities, teaching and research were concerned with social welfare and political problems related to the racially rooted policies and programmes of the government (Ally et al. 2003).

The differences between the various types of universities were obvious in matters of student-staff ratio, qualifications of the staff employed, research output, research publications, research funding, conference attendance and many other aspects that determined the quality of education (*South African Sociological Review* 1994). The consequences were reflected in the sociological research of the sociologists based at these. Research at black universities was inconsequential under the apartheid administration of education. White universities were advantaged in many ways. They had a small student-teacher ratio, liberal funding from the state, close relations with industry and better infrastructure (Pityana 1992). Up until 1968, there were only 11 black postgraduates in sociology in the country, of whom only 2 had been awarded by local institutions (Anonymous 1981). In 1977 there were only 2 black graduates in

sociology among the 83 masters and PhD dissertations submitted to black universities (Anonymous 1981).<sup>7</sup>

South African sociology in its early years was influenced by different strands of Western and American sociology<sup>8</sup> (Cilliers 1984; Miller 1993; Savage 1981; Taylor 1989). Divisions existed on the basis of the methodologies staff followed and preferred.<sup>9</sup> Some of them, who led the departments of sociology in the country, had received training in the USA.<sup>10</sup> The influence of the Carnegie study through its American sociologists was also considerable.

While in his short stint in sociology, Verwoerd promoted the American version of sociology, using its empirical tradition and its usefulness in applied functions and in social welfare (Ally et al. 2003). Following this, Parsonian structural-functionalism came to South Africa in the 1950s. It was introduced by one of Talcott Parsons' students, S.P. Cilliers, who was a professor at Stellenbosch University (Groenewald 1991).<sup>11</sup> South African sociology was also influenced by the West-European and Anglo-Saxon traditions (van Eeden 1984).

Sociology in South Africa developed unevenly, depending on the sociologists who gave directions to its journey. The leadership of the sociologists at English language universities came from John Gray, who held a professorship in sociology at the University of Witwatersrand (Ally et al. 2003). He built and shaped sociology at the English language universities into a discipline for an objective and scientific approach to contemporary social problems, which was based on the tradition of British liberalism (Gray 1937, cited in Ally et al. 2003: 77–78). A major feat for sociology was achieved when the first social survey of Cape Town by E. Batson<sup>12</sup> was launched. This survey, which employed scientific procedures, enhanced the position of sociology by showing that it could provide the necessary tools to identify areas that need social welfare (Ally et al. 2003).

The mainstream sociology was centred at the Afrikaans universities (Taylor 1989). In the decade between 1950 and 1960, the majority of sociology graduates came out through the Afrikaans universities. They accounted for 69% of the sociology graduates in the country (Pollak 1968, cited in Ally et al. 2003: 87). In the early apartheid period of the 1950s, sociology courses contained the topics of poverty, social pathology, demography and race relations (Jubber 1983). Theorists also found their place in the sociology curriculum. Theorists were included in several sociology courses at different levels. Conspicuous by their absence were Marx and Marxian theorists (Jubber 1983). This character of sociology

was to change later. In 1980, sociology students were taught Marxism and allied theories (Jubber 1983). Close to the 1980s, but still under the apartheid regime and amidst ongoing struggles, sociology made some noticeable progress. Theoretical sociology, particularly related to Talcott Parsons, advanced. Some branches of sociology, such as urban sociology and political sociology, employed sophisticated methods of surveys and data analysis that received the attention of the international community (Rex 1981; Waters 2015).

Theoretical development in the discipline of sociology was to be seen from as early as the 1960s. Similarly, positivist theory made its impact on the discipline. Sociology branched out in different theoretical directions. This again depended on the sociologists and the institutions (Afrikaans, English or black universities) where they worked. The transforming social context under the political pressure of apartheid and the growing and organized opposition among academics were also relevant in this regard. While some sociologists at their specific institutional locations nurtured structural-functionalism others at other institutions were attracted to Marxism. Some universities took the bold step of teaching Marxism to sociology students from a different perspective (Savage 1981).

Marxist influence on the social sciences in Europe was an intellectual undertaking, rather than a reaction or response to the profession or academic enterprises (Deflem 2013). Marxist sociology in South African universities began to emerge in the 1970s, first at the English language universities and then at the black universities. Marxism was destined to attract more scholars thereafter. The existing divide between Afrikaans and English language universities further accentuated the emergence of Marxist sociology in the country. The grounds were fertile for the rise and local development of Marxist sociology, due to the social context in the country and on the continent. It was a time when opposition to apartheid and struggles against it was reaching a peak. It coincided with the collapse of colonialism in many parts of Africa. Concomitantly, it came with the radicalization of sociology in the international arena (Deflem 2013). This was the time, in the 1970s, that South Africa also saw the emergence of the Black Consciousness movement,<sup>13</sup> the uprisings of 1976, school boycotts of the 1980s, and the rise of militant trade unionism (Cross 1986; Jubber 1983; Webster 1985, 1997). These were influential factors for sociology and affected the way sociologists viewed society, which was important from the perspective of the development of the discipline.

By the 1980s there was a substantial number of sociologists who followed the same path (Jubber 1983) of Marxian analysis of societal issues. The birth and genesis of Marxist sociology were not free from challenges, not only within the community of sociologists but also from other societal forces. Some, influenced by neo-Marxist ideas about society and Marxian analysis to understand South African society, opposed the structural-functionalists. The decline of functionalism in British sociology, the inability of liberalist approaches to adequately study the problems of change in South Africa, the concurrent rise of Marxist thought in European and American universities, the structural changes in the South African economy and the labour movement jointly contributed to the new chapter in South African sociology (Webster 1991, cited in Groenewald 1991: 48).

South African sociology thus developed, if not advanced, through different streams that often existed in parallel to each other. It began with a theoretical framework to explain social problems at the beginning of the twentieth century, and then to structural-functionalism and to Marxism (Groenewald 1991). Although this was not uniformly the international trend in sociology, it was the case elsewhere—the rise of this strand of sociology. In Finland, for instance, there was a widespread interest in the Marxist-Leninist philosophy and its application in social research during the same period (Antikainen 2008). Canadian sociology in the 1970s, despite opposition from within, began to accommodate Marxian sociologists (Brym 2014). Soviet sociology based on the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin covered historical materialism, partial sociological theories (middle-range theories) and research carried out to provide empirical findings (Osipov and Rutkevich 1978). Appointments were made in Ireland to teach Marxist sociology in 1970 (Fanning and Hess 2015).

As in sociological research, the courses in sociology avoided contentious issues (Savage 1981). To qualify this view, Savage (1981) provides some evidence: no year-long course in race and ethnic studies in sociology was offered by any university; the emphasis on industrial sociology was to train students to become the servants of power and to gain insights into managerial problems of industrial organizations<sup>14</sup>; no detailed empirical analysis of the South African political system was used in political sociology; and apparent avoidance of important topics of sociological significance such as income and wealth distribution, trade unions, labour organizations and corporate ownership. Similar tendencies were observed in other disciplines namely, psychology, English, history and in law (Savage 1981).

## SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Conducting research in apartheid South Africa posed its own challenges, some of which were hard to overcome in trying conditions. Racial polarization cast its visible shadow on research. An authoritarian and racialized political system and a divided society were enough to create an inhospitable environment for social scientists to carry out studies with the freedom and scientific objectivity they required (Savage 1981). It was not easy to study the black population or to get access to them as respondents as they were geographically isolated and separated. People often suspected the intentions behind research and refused to participate in studies. State controls were in place for research in black areas by white social scientists. They had to seek permission from the state to conduct research in black areas, and many of them were denied permission (Moodie 1994; Welsh 1981). The apartheid rulers made it hard for social scientists to conduct research. Researchers were under the watchful eyes of the police and state informants. Social scientists were harassed and arrested and data was seized from researchers who were either detained or removed from the research sites (Rex 1981).

Under the Suppression of Communism Act, the publishers of research could be arrested or imprisoned for publishing material that furthered the ideas of communism (Rex 1981). The Unlawful Organizations Act of 1960 disallowed studies of historical, political or social research into banned organizations (Welsh 1981). A banned researcher could not do research as he/she was prevented from approaching and having social interactions with informants (Rex 1981). Academics were arrested, imprisoned, assassinated or exiled for their stance against apartheid.<sup>15</sup> They were prosecuted for publishing their research findings that the state found unpalatable (Welsh 1981). State police kept a vigilant eye on foreign scholars who were doing research in the country. The lack of trust and disintegration between races also made primary data collection difficult.

The research situation for sociologists in the country during apartheid has to be viewed from different angles. As Rex (1981) lists, there were several obstacles to the conducting of research under a politically oppressive regime. They are the concept of social science research that exists in the researcher's milieu, the way the research problem was conceived and formulated, the conditions attached to resources for research including access to data and informants, the possibility of publishing the results, and influencing political change with the research findings (Rex 1981).

The political and financial climate for social science research was not very good in the early years of apartheid. Funding was not easy. A conference held at the headquarters of the University of Natal in 1954 raised this issue of the negative approach of the government towards social science research (Welsh 1981). While the natural and physical sciences garnered most of the available funding from the state and other sources, the social sciences were left with a paltry sum. In 1971, only 1% of the total funds for research and development was allocated to the social sciences (Welsh 1981). Although this figure is not representative for all the years during the apartheid era, it shows how the natural and social sciences were treated differently and received disproportionate shares of the funds. The disparity in the allocation of resources to HBUs and HWUs also had its effects on the sociological research conducted by sociologists in these institutions. Sociologists at the Afrikaans language universities had a strong relationship with the apartheid government (Taylor 1989) which helped improve their research portfolio.

South African sociology during apartheid had characteristic features. According to van Rensburg (1989), there was extensive diversity in theoretical and methodological orientations at that time, a great diversity in specialization in areas of sociology existed, and sociology was widely used for its application and serviceableness. The usefulness of sociology to improve the living conditions of the population has been recorded since its early years of existence in the country. Scholars called for the involvement of sociologists through their scientific research (Bekker 1990; Kock 1989). They played an important role as opinion leaders in several spheres of social life (Oosthuizen 1989). At conferences, this specialization and branching of sociology were apparent. The annual congress of the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa (ASSA) had a variety of themes and papers, ranging from class analysis to the sociology of education to the sociology of media, that were all the products of research.<sup>16</sup>

Some classification of sociology, according to the knowledge produced in the country, is available. At the Afrikaans language universities, sociology was more of a professional and policy kind and at the English language universities it was critical and public sociology (Burawoy 2004). Empirical sociology also flourished at some universities. During the 1950s and 1960s, a group of scholars at the University of Natal in Durban were able to produce substantial empirical knowledge (Waters 2015). Empirical research was thriving at the international level around this time. In France, through its teaching and research institutes such as the Institut

des Sciences Sociales du Travail (ISST), empirical research was supported and this popularized survey methods (Masson 2012). Accessing substantial funds, French sociology contributed to the development of quantitative methods in sociology (Masson 2012).

There were not many initiatives emanating from sociologists to conduct research in the areas of their choice. South African sociologists were not intensive or rigorous researchers. They were more preoccupied with teaching than research. The teaching load of sociologists at many universities in the country was heavy (K. Oosthuizen 1991b). This might have prevented them from doing thorough empirical and theoretical research.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the research output of sociologists was limited (Taylor 1989).<sup>17</sup> One reason for this, Taylor (1989) thinks, was due to the exodus of liberal and radical sociologists in the apartheid period. Reportedly, during 1974–1977, most of the research outputs of sociologists in the country appeared in South African periodicals and in the government reports, and these were produced by Afrikaans universities (Hare and Savage 1979). In the WoS data, which is analysed later in this chapter, only 14% of the publications (of the total for 1970–1990) were in sociology or related areas during 1970–1975.

Writing in 1968, Pollak (cited in Hare and Savage 1979: 345) observed that the contributions of sociologists in the country in sociological research have been very fundamental. Such research was mainly in the areas of social surveys, demography, family, religion, social policy and administration (Pollak 1968, cited in Hare and Savage 1979: 345). Later in 1975, Rex pointed out that most of the sociological research at the time dealt with specific groups of the population, specific problems and policy-related research. A bibliographic compilation (referred to in Chap. 2) of the research produced by South African social scientists until 1975 showed that the majority of the research was in the areas of race and ethnic relations, social problems and industrial sociology (Hare and Savage 1979). A different trend was obvious in the WoS data, which is presented later in this chapter.

The second Carnegie study concentrated on poverty and development in Southern Africa, which was discussed at a conference held at the University of Cape Town in 1984 (*Social Dynamics* 1984).<sup>18</sup> This again stimulated research in poverty-related issues. Apart from those who taught at universities, there were sociologists based at the South African Council for Educational Social Research, the predecessor of Human Sciences



Research Council (HSRC) until 1968, conducting research into socially relevant matters (Cross 1986).<sup>19</sup>

The HSRC in its initial years was commissioned to undertake research in educational and social fields, and more. It functioned under the Ministry of National Education, which cared only about white education, and operated within the government policy framework (Welsh 1981). Several Afrikaner sociologists became affiliated to the HSRC at this time. The HSRC was dominated by Afrikaners, and no black academics served on its committees while black universities were not represented (Ally et al. 2003; Moodie 1994; Savage 1981; *South African Sociological Review* 1990; Taylor 1989; Welsh 1981). There were questions about the quality of the research conducted by the HSRC, some being very pedestrian in nature (Lever 1981), and about its biased positions on social issues. It was characterized by deep conservatism and commitment to apartheid (Savage 1981), and preferential treatment was given to projects that did not impinge on controversial areas (Webster 1981).<sup>20</sup> Funding from the HSRC to universities was not unreserved and remained limited (Whisson 1981).

Sociological research was also produced at the National Council for Social Research (NCSR), which was the new incarnation of the National Bureau of Educational and Social Research (NBESR). At NCSR, the sizable chunk of the research was on community studies that covered children, delinquency, alcoholism, labour and divorce (Ally et al. 2003). The Institute of Race Relations, Suid-Afrikaanse Bond vir Rassestudies, Rasseverhoudingsbond van Afrikaners, Suid-Afrikaanse Buro vir Rasseaangeleenthede (SABR), NBESR,<sup>21</sup> the Council for Research in the Social Sciences (CRSS), the National Council of Social Research (South African Institute of Race Relations [SAIRR]), and the Institute for Social and Economic Research (at Rhodes University) were involved either in implementing research projects or supporting research. The South African Plan for Research in the Human Sciences (SAPRHS) directed research as prioritized by the committee composed of mostly government representatives and nominees. Of these, the CRSS needs special mention as it inspired sociologists to go beyond teaching and wanted universities to conduct research (Ally et al. 2003). The research at the CRSS were both practical and theoretical, ranging from themes of social change, children, family, race relations and social pathology (Ally et al. 2003).

Human's (1984) analysis of the sociological research carried out during 1969–1983 by the HSRC presented the characteristic features of

research under apartheid. Based on a sample of research projects (current and completed) in the area of human sciences at HSRC, masters and PhD theses, and that of other research centres, Human (1984) provides insightful views on sociological research. The findings of his analysis can be summarized as:

Three quarters of the studies were empirical, including both descriptive and explanatory studies. Survey research method was the major form of the method used in the empirical studies. The studies in general lacked theory and historical sense. In research that pertained to social groups, the majority referred to the official race groups, namely whites, followed by urban blacks, coloureds and all race groups. Sociologists mostly researched the symptoms of social life rather than causes. The topics of research covered (in the order of the count of studies) were deviance, industrial sociology, labour, sociology of the family, health, religion, family planning, leisure, housing, demography, race relations, political sociology, education, stratification, industrial relations and others. There were only a few studies that dealt with issues such as poverty, state policy and economic sociology. On the other hand, sociologists for their research favoured issues such as alcoholism, drugs and prostitution. South African sociologists conducted studies on a wide variety of topics, which paints a very fragmented and varied picture of the nature of sociological research. These findings have resemblances with the data gathered from sociology journals and WoS, presented later in this chapter.

Some branches of sociology advanced more progressively than others. Labour studies, which developed a strong presence in the country ever since it started in the 1970s, was one that was significant during apartheid. The growth of labour studies was triggered by the historical 1973 strikes of African workers in Durban for wage increases (Buhlungu 2009; Sitas 2014; Webster 1981).<sup>22</sup> The knowledge produced in this area has been very significant in South Africa. There was a proliferation of writings on labour between 1970 and 1990 (Buhlungu 2009), with conferences organized and lecture series on industrialization and human relations being conducted.<sup>23</sup> Teaching courses in industrial sociology began at universities.<sup>24</sup> Research centres and units, independent or affiliated to universities, also engaged in conducting studies into industry and labour.<sup>25</sup> Publications including the *South African Labour Bulletin*, and the *Bulletin of Labour Law* came into being, which carried topics of labour, trade union, industrial relations, strikes and boycotts, managerial aspects, employment and

many others (Webster 1981). *The Durban Strikes 1973* was another notable publication of the period.

The research foci of sociologists based in white Afrikaans and English language universities varied significantly. The research publications of those in Afrikaans language universities mostly dealt with family and religious studies and were supportive and prescriptive of government policies (Hare and Savage 1979). As will be seen later in the scientometric analysis, the topics of the family, population and religion formed a substantial share of publications in prominent journals of this time. Sociologists in English language universities dealt with issues of race and labour which were deeply critical of existing governmental policies (Hare and Savage 1979).

Human's (1984) analysis for the period of 1969–1984 showed that research priorities were different for universities and for the HSRC. The HSRC and Afrikaans language universities were akin to each other in their selection of areas for research (Human 1984). Both Afrikaans and English language universities, in comparison to the HSRC, were more interested in industrial sociology and labour studies for reasons of marketability (Human 1984). In his analysis he found that research in industrial sociology dominated as the single largest area in Afrikaans language universities. English language universities worked more in the area of the labour market than in industrial sociology. Sociologists at Afrikaans language universities also researched on labour markets, but not to the same extent as they did in industrial sociology. A small percentage of studies in labour markets also originated from the HSRC. At the HSRC, about one-fifth of the projects conducted for the period of analysis were on topics related to deviance. In order of popularity, the number of projects at HSRC were family sociology, quality of life studies, housing, leisure and demography. The over-emphasis of studies of deviance by the HSRC social scientists, according to Human (1984), might be that they were not very aware of the other societal problems and racial prejudice.

Universities continued to produce most of the social research in the country, relative to the HSRC, the National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR)<sup>26</sup> or other research institutes (Savage 1981). The NIPR specialized mostly in research on industrial psychology and had the competency to undertake such research (Savage 1981). It was involved in studies such as selection, training, job evaluation, productivity, attitudes towards work and utilization of labour, and conducted research on behalf of several government departments and other organizations (Webster 1981). Other agencies involved in social research were the South African

Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), the Africa Institute and research units attached to universities (Savage 1981). The Institute for Black Research led by Fatima Meer at the University of Natal, Durban, was another which had a precarious existence working under the severe conditions of apartheid (Anonymous 1981).

During this time, quantitative research did not find much favour with social scientists that provided an ambience for its development. The methodological choices of South African sociologists during the 1980s, as shown in the analysis of the *South African Journal of Sociology* (SAJS) publications by J.S. Oosthuizen (1991a), were overwhelmingly quantitative. Despite the preferred choice of conducting quantitative research there were questions about the skills and knowledge of sociologists to undertake and present quantitative research in a scientifically acceptable manner. J.S. Oosthuizen's (1991a) comments on the analysis of the publications in SAJS bring this weakness to the fore. Those sociologists who presented their quantitative research in the journal in many cases opted for basic descriptive statistics to analyse the data they collected. There were only 5% among them who demonstrated the skill to employ advanced statistical procedures. In a large number of publications the basic assumptions of statistical tests were not even followed (J.S. Oosthuizen 1991a; van Staden and Visser 1991). This raises issues of the strengths and weaknesses of the sociologists of the time to carry out methodologically strong research.

Seekings (2001) locates three reasons for the slow pace of development of quantitative methodological approaches in South Africa. One, the apartheid regime was not bothered to produce information about the majority of the population, but rather mostly about the whites. Two, due to the political differences among academics, the amount of quantitative research produced was limited and ignored. It related to the divide between Afrikaans and English language universities. The former had state-funded research which the latter did not have due to their opposition to apartheid. There was not enough quantitative data produced by the state as a background resource for social scientists to work on. Three, the hostility expressed towards quantitative research which related to the political perspectives of the academics involved and the preference for qualitative research (Seekings, 2001). This situation began to change as the country approached the end of the apartheid era, and thereafter. A number of large-scale surveys were conducted that provided the data for academics to analyse and related the findings to their own areas of interest.<sup>27</sup> The need and demand for quantitative data continued to soar, for

political and policy-making reasons, thus providing a pool of survey data for further studies. These surveys were mostly on income, expenditure, race, employment, political behaviour and crime. Despite the potential for quantitative research and the availability of the quantitative data collected from various agencies, the change in the methodological preferences of sociologists was slow.

Apartheid as a political system had a malign effect on the social research conducted back then (Rex 1981). But Rex is quick to add that this was not a unique case. Part of the reason and part of the truth for the failure in social science research in the country was not only due to governmental interference and oppression but also due to the lack of energy on the part of sociologists (Rex 1981).<sup>28</sup> A good number of researchers shied away from contentious areas of interest in their respective disciplines (Welsh 1981) and avoided researching them. They were restricted by the prevailing social norms, values and perceptions of the social structure that blinded them to those questions that were relevant and important (Savage 1981). Sociologists were among this group of researchers who avoided problematic research topics. Topics related to racism were a case in point. Academics from sociology substantially avoided the study of race relations during this period (Pollak 1968, cited in Welsh 1981: 40). The analysis which follows of the publications in some prominent journals also substantiates this. Only 3% of publications dealt with the issue of race (Table 3.2).

As previously noted, sociologists under apartheid experienced restricted freedom in their research undertakings. In several ways the academic freedom of sociologists was curtailed—censorship, restricted freedom of association and expression, limited access to geographical areas and participants in the homelands and black urban areas, seizure of research notes by police and harassment (Hare and Savage 1979; Savage 1981; Welsh 1981; Taylor 1989). Many published works were banned at this time (Hare and Savage 1979). This included books, journals, reports and other material that are of value to sociologists for their research.<sup>29</sup> Many instances occurred of police confiscating valuable research notes, transcribed interviews and other related material from social scientists. The imposed censorship of the apartheid regime prevented scholars from being in touch with international developments in the field and intellectual engagement (Hare and Savage 1979; Moodie 1994). This naturally disadvantaged academics, particularly social scientists, from conducting research to gain recent knowledge in their respective fields of interest. Some research units benefitted from secret funding from the state, which

in the view of Savage (1981) subverted free and independent sociological research in the country.<sup>30</sup>

Sociology in the apartheid years suffered in terms of its ability to transform the society, developing its own theoretical constructs to understand the social realities, and lost its independence from the state and businesses (Human 1984). While the quantity of research conducted by sociologists during apartheid was remarkable, there were concerns about the nature and focus of the research. The sociological knowledge produced during the apartheid era was, according to Human (1984), fragmented, atheoretical and ideological. Very little was fundamental in nature, and did not make a substantial contribution to the field of race relations (Pollak 1968, cited in Savage 1981: 49). Critical sociological research in the country remained limited and there were not many sociologists who could do this type of research (Taylor 1989).

During the 1980s, sociologists reinvigorated their interest in a number of topical issues. Those issues were wide-ranging: labour studies, culture, gender, race, class and health (Webster 1997). As the analysis of the publications in the journal of *SAJS* shows, a good share of the publications was either reviews of or comments on theories of Western sociologists (J.S. Oosthuizen 1991a). This led Oosthuizen to observe that South African sociologists did not do much to develop some unique sociological theories and that was a major drawback of their research. Most of the theoretical papers of South African sociologists were either interpretations or evaluations of the theories of other sociologists (J.S. Oosthuizen 1991a). The data from the journals and WoS confirms this.

The authenticity of research produced under the control and monitoring of the state was questionable in many cases. It was also known for the lack of in-depth analysis of social issues, particularly those which affected black communities (Zegeye and Motsemme 2004). Knowledge that is produced disregarding its scientific rigour, objectivity, procedures and that is influenced by external factors cannot be considered valuable. Its usefulness to build further knowledge is minimal, if not immaterial.

The segregation of universities on the basis of race and language hampered the academic exchange between sociologists at these universities (Olzak 1990). Sociologists in South Africa formed different professional organizations (on the basis of race) and produced their own separate journals to publish sociological research. Different sociologies existed in apartheid times. There were two professional associations, founded on the basis of racial division and with restricted membership for sociologists to be

involved in their professional activities. The first professional association to be formed in the country was the Suid Afrikaanse Sociologie Vereniging (SASOV), that is, the South African Sociological Association (SASA) in 1968.<sup>31</sup> The membership of this organization was restricted to whites. The race clause was finally dropped in 1977 after several unsuccessful attempts. The efforts to form this association came from three prominent sociologists—E. Batson (University of Cape Town), O.J.M. Wagner (University of Witwatersrand) and S.P. Cilliers (University of Stellenbosch) (Ally et al. 2003). Ironically they had to quit the organization as it was moving towards whites-only membership. The members of SASA were sociologists from Afrikaans language universities. Three years later, in 1971, the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa (ASSA), a non-racial association, was formed at a meeting held in Mozambique.<sup>32</sup> Both these organizations—ASSA and SASA—co-existed with a combined membership of 70 members (Lever 1981). They had two main functions at the time of formation. One, to organize conferences for sociologists to meet and present their papers. Two, the publication of a journal. Although the *South African Journal of Sociology* was not SASA's official journal, the association worked closely with its production, which was financed by the Department of National Education, responsible for white education in the country (Hare and Savage 1979). With the opening of ASSA it attracted a diverse membership. This was obvious at ASSA's first conference in Mozambique (Lourenco Marques, now Maputo). Although the participants were mostly from South Africa, the congress was a significant achievement for sociology. At this congress it was decided to form a new association for all qualified sociologists without any prejudice over any discriminating parameters. The early congresses of ASSA were also represented by participants from neighbouring African countries such as Malawi, Angola and Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) (Lever 1981).

The differences between the two associations continued unabated and even worsened until the early 1990s. They were called 'academic' sociologists and 'ideological' sociologists to differentiate their allegiance to SASA and ASSA and their affiliation to Afrikaans and English language universities respectively (van der Merwe 1983). They followed divergent professional, ideological and political directions (Jubber 2007). They organized separate congresses, published different journals and used different languages. Later in 1993 both SASOV and ASSA merged to form the South African Sociological Association (SASA).<sup>33</sup>

It is argued that the status of sociology prior to the period of 1994 was one of progress and since then it has declined (Alexander et al. 2006). This has to be examined in the light of the evidence.

The growth of the discipline had made its mark on the sociological knowledge it produced. Between the 1960s and the 1980s there was a perceptible growth in the discipline in the country. During this period the number of sociology departments, the number of students who enrolled to do sociology at various levels, and the number of sociologists at universities and research centres increased (Jubber 2007). As Jubber (2007) notes, this offered the discipline opportunities to expand its teaching and research, taking up topical areas of interest. Despite the division of sociologists on the basis of the type of universities (Afrikaans or English) to which they belonged, the discipline expanded. The expansion of sociology as a discipline in the 1960s, as Ally et al. (2003) report, also caused its institutionalization and professionalization. Professionalization of sociology was also active in the minds of sociologists, which spilled over to conferences in the apartheid period.<sup>34</sup> Papers were carried in the *South African Journal of Sociology* that focused on the components of the professionalization of sociology in the country. This set the discipline on a firmer grounding to take off. There were some main sociological areas of research that flourished during this time: race and ethnic relations, labour studies, the sociology of work, and political issues (Jubber 2007; Webster 1999).

In one of the calculations relating to sociology lecturers at one South African university, Hare and Savage (1979) report that there were 16 of the 106 who obtained their highest degrees from countries other than South Africa. This is about 15% of the total sociology staff in 1975, who studied mostly in the UK. South African sociologists in the 1980s had little contact with the international community of sociologists (K. Oosthuizen 1991b). While these were the potential seeds for the internationalization of the discipline, there were hindering events that prevented the discipline from such opportunities. One major event that obscured South African sociology from the limelight of the international scene was the academic boycott instituted by the international community. This boycott affected not only sociology but other disciplines and, more seriously, the science disciplines.<sup>35</sup> During the heightened period of apartheid, South African sociology was weakened by poor participation in international debates (Alexander et al. 2006). The academic isolation from the international community of sociologists distanced South African sociologists from current developments, negatively affecting sociological research in the country (Olzak 1990). This



was despite the distinctive features of South African society that possessed a wealth of social data.

Sociologists were keen to be in touch with their international colleagues. This was evident in several ways. The *South African Journal of Sociology*, ever since its first issue, has shown interests in this linkage. The first issue of the journal stated that it intends to continue and sustain contacts with other social scientists living outside South Africa (*South African Journal of Sociology* 1970).

In the following section, an analysis of sociological publications from selected sociological journals is carried out.

### RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

Under apartheid, the works of sociologists, among other social scientists, came out in the form of reports, books and journal articles. There were a few outlets in which sociologists published their research. The *South African Journal of Sociology* (*Die Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Sosiologie*), a trilingual (Afrikaans, Dutch and English) journal for sociology was launched in November 1970. This was the official journal of the sociological association, SASA, which was founded in 1968. It was the first journal for sociologists and was to serve as a medium of communication for local sociologists. It published original sociological research and review articles that portrayed developments and new perspectives in the discipline but without any preference for a particular methodological orientation (J.S. Oosthuizen 1991a). The opening issue carried eight papers from authors within the country and abroad. Some of them dealt with sociology, theory and methodology while others were on social issues. The subsequent issues for the year had papers on urbanization, migration, nationalism cutting across race, people and state, racial attitudes, migration, labour, modernization, poverty and professionalization of sociology.

The journal *Social Dynamics*, published since 1975 and considered part of ASSA, was another outlet for sociologists to publish their research. *Social Dynamics* was published by the Faculty of Social Science at the University of Cape Town. It was meant to be a journal for papers from all social science disciplines including sociology, and from authors in Southern Africa. It published papers on topics ranging from conflict to ethnic issues and industrialization. The *South African Sociological Review*, the official journal of ASSA, brought out its first volume in October 1988. The journal, as announced in its first editorial, was intended to rectify the problem of

much of the work of the sociological community being removed from the academic and public realms (*South African Sociological Review* 1988). The journal was designed to promote new and innovative propositions in all areas of the discipline, focusing on South African social problems. The early issues of the journal had papers on gender issues, black employees, sociology, trade unions, housing and urbanization. Although both associations (SASA and ASSA) were merged to form a single association of the South African Sociological Association, both journals, namely, *SATS/SAJS* and the *South African Sociological Review* continued in publication until 1995 (Jubber 2007).

*Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, published since 1985, was not a sociology journal but sociologists found it acceptable to submit their research pieces to it. The journal aimed at providing a forum for debate on both South African society and the surrounding region. *Humanitas*, started in 1971, also published papers by sociologists in the country. A number of papers of sociological importance also appeared in the journal, *Development Southern Africa*, which began publication in 1984. All these journals have been used here for the scientometric analysis. Note that there were some other journals in which sociologists could publish their research.<sup>36</sup>

After cleaning and processing there were 596 publications (from the *South African Journal of Sociology*, *Social Dynamics*, *South African Sociological Review*, *Transformation*, *Humanitas*, and *Development Southern Africa*) finally available for the analysis of sociological research, from 1970 to 1993. In order to track the trends these publications were grouped under four equal periods of six years each. Only research papers were included in the analysis. The papers were either written by sociologists or by others whose work contributed to sociological research. The preliminary features of these publications are presented in Table 3.1.

Up until 1975 there were not many publications by sociologists or social scientists whose work was related to sociological topics. There were only 18% of publications during 1970–1975, which increased incrementally in the subsequent years. By the end of apartheid the count of publications had increased by 33%, which is an 83% increase over the first period of 1970–1975. A large number (two-thirds) of sociological publications considered for analysis were carried in the *South African Journal of Sociology*. *Social Dynamics* had the second highest number of publications.

On average, 1.19 authors per publication were involved in these journals. Over the four periods of analysis this figure did not vary significantly,

**Table 3.1** Publications in selected journals, 1970–1993

<i>Features</i>	1970–1975		1976–1981		1982–1987		1988–1993		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%
Number of publications	109	18.3	127	21.3	164	27.5	196	32.9	596	100
<i>Publications in journals</i>										
<i>South African Journal of Sociology</i>	67	61.5	75	59.1	96	58.5	120	61.2	358	60.1
<i>South African Sociological Review</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	11.2	22	3.7
<i>Development Southern Africa</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	15.9	21	10.7	47	7.9
<i>Social Dynamics</i>	9	8.3	31	24.4	41	25.0	20	10.2	101	16.9
<i>Transformation</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	13	6.6	14	2.3
<i>Humanitas</i>	33	30.3	21	16.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	54	9.1
<i>Mean</i>		<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Number of authors (ANOVA: $F=1.359$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.254$ )	1.17	0.40	1.13	0.40	1.23	0.56	1.20	0.47	1.19	0.47
<i>Race of authors</i>										
Number of all white authors (ANOVA: $F=1.489$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.217$ )	1.13	0.45	1.08	0.43	1.15	0.58	1.04	0.59	1.09	0.53
Number of all African authors (ANOVA: $F=5.215$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.001$ )	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.13	0.04	0.19	0.10	0.36	0.05	0.24

Number of all Indian authors (ANOVA: $F=1.388$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.246$ )	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.15	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.31	0.05	0.23
<i>Sector of affiliation of authors</i>										
Number of university sector (ANOVA: $F=0.888$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.447$ )	0.94	0.59	0.88	0.59	0.90	0.68	0.98	0.65	0.93	0.63
Number of research institutes (ANOVA: $F=0.406$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.749$ )	0.10	0.38	0.12	0.37	0.14	0.38	0.15	0.40	0.13	0.38
Number of other sector (ANOVA: $F=1.314$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.269$ )	0.11	0.31	0.05	0.21	0.09	0.31	0.06	0.26	0.08	0.28
<i>Length of publications</i>										
Page length of publications (ANOVA: $F=1.122$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.340$ )	11.5	5.90	12.52	5.30	11.36	6.02	12.32	8.01	11.95	6.60

as shown in the ANOVA test. A small increase in the number of authors per publication was found during 1982–1987. The race of all authors for every publication was combined and counted for each racial group. The average figures were 1.09 white, 0.05 African and 0.05 Indian authors. While white authors maintained their dominant share for all these years, there were significant changes for African authors during the periods of analysis. From the average value of zero it had increased gradually to 0.1 authors by 1993 for African authors. For Indian authors the mean hovered around 0.05, without any significant changes between the years of analysis.

Prominently, two types of organizations to which the authors of the publications were affiliated were universities and research institutes. Most of the authors came from universities, followed by research institutes and other sectors. A few belonged to government and industry as well, which were grouped under other sectors. No specific trends were obvious across the years. The material published in these journals during the entire period was equivalent to 7024 printed pages of varying sizes (as the sizes of the journals were not the same). The mean size of the publication was about 12 pages. The length of the publications is usually determined by the policy of the journal although this does not seem to have been the case. The range of publications was between 2 and 50. No characteristic change over the period was seen in the statistical test.

The research areas of the publications in these journals were gathered into manageable groups for analysis (Table 3.2). Some areas were more conspicuous than others by number. About 17% of the publications dealt with topics of sociology, social sciences and methodological issues. Close to this were publications that investigated issues of labour, industry, migration and occupation. There was great interest in the family, marriage, population, children and youth. These were the three other major areas of research during this period. Other areas of study included apartheid, development, urban problems, community studies, race, religion, crime, attitudes and social problems. Most of the publications (71%) dealt with South African topics, issues and problems.

The institutional affiliation of authors (referring to the first author) showed that the highest number of publications (13%) originated at the HSRC and other research institutes. About 11% of the publications was produced by scholars at the University of Cape Town. Other major institutions were the Universities of Natal, Rand Afrikaans University, South Africa, Pretoria, Witwatersrand, Stellenbosch and Durban-Westville,

**Table 3.2** Research areas of publications in selected journals, 1970–1993

<i>Research areas</i>	<i>1970–1975</i>		<i>1976–1981</i>		<i>1982–1987</i>		<i>1988–1993</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	10	9.2	27	21.3	36	22.0	29	14.9	102	17.1
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	28	25.7	16	12.6	21	12.8	30	15.4	95	16.0
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	15	13.8	9	7.1	19	11.6	35	17.9	78	13.1
State, apartheid and democracy	2	1.8	7	5.5	7	4.3	15	7.7	31	5.2
Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	11	10.1	6	4.7	4	2.4	7	3.6	28	4.7
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	5	4.6	13	10.2	2	1.2	4	2.1	24	4.0
Race	4	3.7	6	4.7	8	4.9	2	1.0	20	3.4
Religion and culture	2	1.8	3	2.4	8	4.9	5	2.6	18	3.0
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	0	0.0	2	1.6	4	2.4	11	5.6	17	2.9
Crime and violence	2	1.8	2	1.6	3	1.8	9	4.6	16	2.7
Attitude	2	1.8	3	2.4	2	1.2	8	4.1	15	2.5
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, etc.)	3	2.8	3	2.4	5	3.0	3	1.5	14	2.4
Health and medical sociology	0	0.0	2	1.6	6	3.7	5	2.6	13	2.2
Poverty and unemployment	1	0.9	3	2.4	9	5.5	0	0.0	13	2.2
Others (globalization, technology, sports, etc.)	24	22.0	25	19.7	30	18.3	32	16.4	111	18.7
South African research topic	78	73.6	83	66.9	104	65.8	150	77.3	415	71.3

which produced 5–6% of the publications. A considerable number of publications (8%) were by scholars from overseas universities and institutions. This percentage was higher than that of many other South African institutions. Scholars from the universities of Vista, Zululand, Free State, Port Elizabeth, Western Cape and Rhodes produced 1–2% each.

The count of institutions for all authors reveals further details (Table 3.3). As in the case of the first author of the publications, the HSRC and research institutes led other institutions in the country in producing the maximum number of publications. They scored a mean value of 0.13 for all years. Between the groups of years, the contribution was stable with no statistical difference evident. In the order of production were the universities of Cape Town, Free State, South Africa, Pretoria, Witwatersrand, Natal, Rand Afrikaans, Durban-Westville and Stellenbosch. A few HBUs (Bophuthatswana, Transkei, Vista, Venda and Zululand) jointly produced publications worth the mean value of 0.03. Foreign institutions, as found earlier, were important contributors to sociological knowledge, but not specifically on South African topics. The mean score for overseas scholars was 0.06 for South African topics as against 0.17 for other topics.

From institutions we turn to departments to see where these scholars came from. There were 40% of publications that were produced by scholars in the departments of sociology at different institutions in the country and abroad. This was when only the first author was taken into account. For the second author the percentage was slightly higher at 44% for sociology departments. Although it cannot be concluded that they were all pure sociologists by training, there were many who had different disciplinary backgrounds. This was not known in the given data. The majority (60%) was from departments other than sociology. During 1970–1975, 52% of the publications were produced by scholars in sociology departments, which gradually decreased to 43% by the end of apartheid. At one point, that is, during 1976–1981, the percentage of publications touched an all-time low of 31%. Further, the combined measure for all authors indicated that sociology authors were behind other non-sociology scholars in knowledge production (0.29 and 0.43 respectively). At the same time, but not seen in the count for the first author of publications, the figure was increasing for sociology departments (from 0.17 during 1970–1975 to 0.45 during 1988–1993). Research institutes had a major share as well (Table 3.3).

**Table 3.3** Institutional and departmental count (mean) of all authors in the selected journals, 1970–1993

<i>Institutional/ departmental count</i>	1970–1975		1976–1981		1982–1987		1988–1993		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
<i>Institution</i>										
HSRC and other research institutions (ANOVA: $F=0.802$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.493$ )	0.09	0.15	0.12	0.35	0.16	0.41	0.15	0.40	0.13	0.39
University of Cape Town (ANOVA: $F=3.195$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.023$ )	0.09	0.29	0.09	0.32	0.18	0.42	0.08	0.28	0.11	0.34
University of Free State (ANOVA: $F=1.112$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.344$ )	0.04	0.19	0.09	0.29	0.10	0.34	0.08	0.35	0.08	0.31
University of South Africa (ANOVA: $F=0.725$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.537$ )	0.10	0.33	0.05	0.25	0.07	0.31	0.06	0.27	0.07	0.29
University of Pretoria (ANOVA: $F=1.596$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.189$ )	0.12	0.40	0.06	0.24	0.05	0.22	0.06	0.26	0.07	0.28
University of Witwatersrand (ANOVA: $F=2.292$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.077$ )	0.07	0.30	0.06	0.24	0.03	0.17	0.10	0.32	0.07	0.27
University of Natal (ANOVA: $F=0.563$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.640$ )	0.08	0.28	0.09	0.28	0.07	0.27	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.26
Rand Afrikaans University (ANOVA: $F=1.445$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.229$ )	0.08	0.31	0.08	0.27	0.04	0.19	0.10	0.39	0.07	0.30
University of Durban-Westville (ANOVA: $F=5.178$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.002$ )	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.09	0.33	0.10	0.37	0.06	0.27
Stellenbosch University (ANOVA: $F=1.874$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.133$ )	0.07	0.30	0.03	0.18	0.04	0.19	0.08	0.29	0.06	0.24

*(continued)*



**Table 3.3** (continued)

<i>Institutional/ departmental count</i>	<i>1970–1975</i>		<i>1976–1981</i>		<i>1982–1987</i>		<i>1988–1993</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Bophuthatswana, Transkei, Vista, Venda and Zululand universities (ANOVA: $F=4.006$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.008$ )	0.02	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.16	0.08	0.35	0.03	0.22
Potchefstroom University of CHE (ANOVA: $F=1.929$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.124$ )	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.20	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.13
All institutions (ANOVA: $F=3.913$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.009$ )	1.07	0.42	1.00	0.33	1.08	0.43	1.16	0.48	1.09	0.43
Foreign institutions (ANOVA: $F=1.185$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.314$ )	0.09	0.37	0.13	0.36	0.07	0.28	0.07	0.26	0.09	0.31
<i>Department</i>										
Sociology department for all authors (ANOVA: $F=13.407$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.17	0.44	0.12	0.39	0.34	0.54	0.45	0.60	0.29	0.53
Other departments for all authors (ANOVA: $F=21.782$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.17	0.46	0.24	0.50	0.62	0.65	0.55	0.59	0.43	0.60
All departments for all authors (ANOVA: $F=68.300$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.33	0.60	0.36	0.59	0.96	0.54	1.01	0.46	0.73	0.62
Research units for all authors (ANOVA: $F=2.989$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.031$ )	0.12	0.40	0.14	0.37	0.26	0.52	0.22	0.43	0.19	0.44

Institutions had preferences for certain research areas. This dimension of research was found for some major institutions (Table 3.4). Research in the area of health and medical sociology was undertaken more seriously at the HSRC and other research institutes and at the University of Cape Town. To a certain extent, such studies were important for UNISA and

**Table 3.4** Research areas across major institutions in publications in selected journals, 1970–1993

Research areas	N	HSRC & others		U of Cape Town		U of Natal		Rand Afrikaans U		UNISA		U of Pretoria		Foreign		All	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Health medical sociology	13	0.15	0.38	0.15	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.28	0.08	0.28	0.00	0.00	1.38	0.65
Attitude	15	0.33	0.62	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.26	1.33	0.49
Poverty, unemployment	13	0.00	0.00	0.31	0.48	0.31	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.38	1.23	0.60
Gender, sexuality, women's studies	15	0.13	0.35	0.12	0.33	0.06	0.24	0.27	0.80	0.20	0.41	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.26	1.20	0.56
Community studies, informal settlement, township, community development	24	0.54	0.72	0.13	0.34	0.17	0.48	0.04	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.17	0.38
Crime, violence	15	0.27	0.46	0.07	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.26	0.20	0.41	0.07	0.26	1.13	0.35
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children, youth	78	0.31	0.59	0.03	0.16	0.06	0.25	0.12	0.36	0.05	0.22	0.03	0.16	0.00	0.00	1.08	0.48
Others (globalization, technology, sports, etc.)	107	0.06	0.23	0.12	0.36	0.06	0.23	0.08	0.31	0.07	0.28	0.12	0.38	0.11	0.37	1.08	0.39
Sociology, social sciences, methodology	99	0.06	0.24	0.07	0.26	0.06	0.24	0.06	0.24	0.07	0.30	0.06	0.24	0.13	0.36	1.07	0.29

(continued)

Table 3.4 (continued)

Research areas	N	HSRC & others		U of Cape Town		U of Natal		Rand Afrikaans U		UNISA		U of Pretoria		Foreign		All	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide)	14	0.21	0.43	0.14	0.36	0.07	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.27	0.36	0.63	0.00	0.00	1.07	0.30
Religion, culture	17	0.06	0.24	0.06	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.53	0.06	0.24	0.12	0.33	1.06	0.24
Labour, industrial relations, migration, occupation	89	0.09	0.29	0.17	0.41	0.11	0.31	0.07	0.29	0.11	0.38	0.06	0.28	0.04	0.21	1.04	0.54
Development, urbanization, planning, industrialization	28	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.42	0.04	0.19	0.04	0.19	0.07	0.38	1.04	0.43
State, apartheid, democracy	26	0.12	0.33	0.19	0.40	0.08	0.27	0.04	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.20	0.27	0.45	1.00	0.40
Race	20	0.10	0.31	0.25	0.55	0.05	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.55	1.00	0.46

the University of Pretoria as well. Studies on attitudes found more favour with the HSRC and research institutes than at any other institutions. Poverty and unemployment studies were concentrated at two institutions, the University of Cape Town and the University of Natal. Foreign institutions also showed their interest in this area of research. Issues of gender and women attracted the attention of the Rand Afrikaans University and UNISA rather than at any other institution.

Studies in the area of communities and townships were carried out largely at the HSRC and similar research institutes. Crime and related areas were of interest to scholars at the HSRC and research institutes and at the University of Pretoria. The University of Cape Town led other institutions in labour studies. The University of Natal and UNISA were close behind the University of Cape Town. UNISA produced more research in religion and culture than any other institutions. Apart from gender and women studies, the Rand Afrikaans University specialized in one more area, namely, urban issues, development and industrialization. Race was a sociological concern for scholars based at the University of Cape Town and the University of Natal. Foreign institutions were also interested in racial studies like that of the state and apartheid. Two institutions (the University of Pretoria and the HSRC) produced a large number of studies that pertained to a variety of social problems.

The focus of research areas showed that sociology departments, more so than other departments, conducted more research in the area of health and medical sociology (mean values of 0.69 and 0.46 respectively). One other area in which sociology departments had an edge over other departments was sociology, social sciences and methodology (0.43 against 0.25). A higher percentage of labour studies belonged to departments other than to sociology (0.41 and 0.33). Similarly, the areas such as family and population, development and urbanization, state and apartheid, community studies, race, crime and violence, gender, social problems, and poverty and employment were largely the contributions of scholars working at non-sociology departments. The prominent non-sociology departments were psychology, economics and geography, which had a share of 0.05, 0.03 and 0.03 respectively.

There were different methodological approaches pursued by sociologists. Such approaches were characteristics of the research areas as well. In the order of numbers, three major approaches can be identified: theoretical papers (55%), papers that used qualitative data (24%), and papers based on primary or secondary quantitative data (20%). A negligible per-

centage was of mixed methodology. In the research areas, a large number of labour studies were qualitative (42%) and theoretical (36%) rather than quantitative. There were some publications (22%) that relied on quantitative information for the study of labour. About 90% of the publications that dealt with issues of sociology, social sciences and methodology were theoretical. Studies on attitudes were largely quantitative (80%), and the same held for social problems (64%). Most of the studies on the family, fertility and population were either theoretical (45%) or quantitative (30%). A quarter of the research conducted in the area of gender and women were quantitative while crime studies fell largely under qualitative methodologies (44%).

The methodological orientations of institutions were obvious from the data in Table 3.5. Quantitative methodological approaches were highly preferred by the HSRC and research centres, more so than other single institutions in the country. The mean institutional count against quantitative methodology was the highest (0.25) for the HSRC and other research institutes. The difference between methodologies for the HSRC and research institutes was statistically significant which showed the HSRC's strength in quantitative research. The Rand Afrikaans University had a score of 0.12 for quantitative publications. Qualitative studies were more associated with the University of Cape Town and then with the HSRC and research institutes. The University of Cape Town also produced the highest number of theoretical papers. Methodological preferences or strengths of these selected institutions can also be assessed from this data. For instance, the University of Cape Town was stronger in the production of both qualitative and theoretical publications than those which used quantitative data and methods, the University of Natal had a small edge for quantitative over qualitative and theoretical studies, the Rand Afrikaans University and UNISA were strong in quantitative and theoretical publications, and the University of Pretoria preferred qualitative studies to other methodologies.

Another set of data drawn from the WoS was used to complement this analysis for the same apartheid period. The analysis is based on the publications of South African scholars listed in the WoS database, under its core collection. The sub-dataset of the Social Sciences Citation Index (1956–present) is the appropriate one for the analysis of sociological research. All articles in all languages written by South African scholars for the period of 1966–2015 were used. The records were sorted according to the subject categories. All relevant topics<sup>37</sup> that are related to sociological areas were

**Table 3.5** Methodological orientation and institutions of publications in selected journals, 1970–1993

Methodology	N	HSRC & others <sup>a</sup>		U of Cape Town <sup>b</sup>		U of Natal <sup>c</sup>		Rand Afrikaans U <sup>d</sup>		UNISA <sup>e</sup>		U of Pretoria <sup>f</sup>		Foreign <sup>g</sup>			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
		Quantitative	119	0.25	0.49	0.08	0.32	0.08	0.28	0.12	0.44	0.09	0.35	0.08	0.34	0.04	0.20
Qualitative	141	0.14	0.41	0.16	0.37	0.07	0.28	0.04	0.19	0.06	0.24	0.10	0.32	0.09	0.34		
Theoretical	321	0.10	0.33	0.12	0.33	0.07	0.25	0.08	0.28	0.07	0.29	0.05	0.24	0.11	0.34		
All	581	0.14	0.39	0.12	0.34	0.07	0.26	0.30	0.01	0.07	0.29	0.07	0.28	0.09	0.32		

Notes: ANOVA results: a=( $F=4.054$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.007$ ), b=( $F=1.372$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.250$ ); c=( $F=0.190$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.903$ ); d=( $F=1.512$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.210$ ); e=( $F=0.325$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.807$ ); f=( $F=1.003$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.391$ ); and g=( $F=2.436$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.064$ )

grouped before the analysis. In line with the previous analysis, publications were categorized for the apartheid period.

There were a total of 11,578 publications by South African scholars in the selected topics for the period of 1966–2015. Although the dataset had publications from 1956, there were not any publications by South African scholars until 1965. Since it is not feasible to analyse all these records (as each record has to be entered individually into a software programme) a sample of years was selected. Going backward from 2015, a sample year for every five years (2015, 2010, 2005, 2000, 1995, 1990, 1985, 1980, 1975 and 1970) was chosen. For the apartheid period, publications for the years of 1990, 1985, 1980, 1975 and 1970 were used.

Table 3.6 presents the characteristics of the WoS data in regard to the publications during apartheid. A total of 174 publications fit in with the selection criteria. There were not many publications in the initial years but this changed in the later years. The average number of authors per publication for the entire period was 1.45. As the years progressed, the mean number of authors per publication increased (from 1.2 in 1970 to 1.6 in 1990). In the final years of apartheid South African scholars had become more collaborative than before. The increase in the average number of authors per publication in 1990 was (1.6), more than one-third of the figure for 1970. A significant difference in the ANOVA test was obtained for this variable for all the selected years. These figures are comparable with that of the first dataset on selected journals presented earlier. In the first dataset of the selected journals, the average number of author per publication was 1.19, within range of 1.13–1.23. There were no statistically significant differences among the years selected for analysis. In other words, the publications in WoS journals had more authors per publication than for the publications in the selected journals.

The institutional affiliation of authors of these publications in WoS, as in the case of the previous dataset (of selected journals), was highly in favour of universities. Universities were followed by research institutes, other sectors (government, museum and hospital) and industry. For the university sector, there was an average of 1.22 authors, compared to 0.1 for research institutes and 0.06 for other sectors (Table 3.6).

The average length of the publications in the journals indexed in the WoS database was 14.96 pages. Publications totalled 2603 pages for the whole period of analysis. These publications received total citations of 1206, with an average of 6.93 per publications, ranging between zero and

**Table 3.6** Publications in the Web of Science, 1970–1990

Features	1970		1975		1980		1985		1990		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number of publications	5	2.9	19	10.9	23	13.2	47	27.0	80	46.0	174	100
Mean number of author	1.20	0.45	1.26	0.73	1.22	0.52	1.43	1.25	1.60	0.95	1.45	0.97
(ANOVA: $F=1.074$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.371$ )												
<i>Sector of affiliation</i>												
Number of university sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=4.823$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.001$ )	0.80	0.45	0.79	0.54	1.00	0.60	1.17	0.60	1.45	0.84	1.22	0.75
Number of research institute sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=1.705$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.151$ )	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.43	0.08	0.27	0.10	0.43
Number of other sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=1.032$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.392$ )	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.32	0.13	0.34	0.04	0.20	0.04	0.19	0.06	0.23
Mean number of industry sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=6.657$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.40	0.89	0.05	0.23	0.04	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.19
<i>Length of publications</i>												
Mean page length of publications (ANOVA: $F=1.644$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.165$ )	14.00	8.46	17.63	14.75	11.30	10.48	14.23	7.15	15.86	7.83	14.96	9.11
Mean number of citations (ANOVA: $F=0.627$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.644$ )	4.00	5.79	3.79	7.83	8.61	23.33	5.64	11.10	8.14	13.38	6.93	13.92



112. This is about the half the length of the publications published in the previous dataset of selected journals.

Subject areas of these publications included area studies (44%), education (22%), environmental studies (8%), public, environmental and occupational health (8%), information science (5%) and criminology (3%). There were also publications in the subject areas of communication, demography, ethnic studies, health sciences, women's studies, social sciences and family studies.

### SUMMARY

The above analysis of the two sets of data (specific journals and WoS journals) is indicative of the characteristic features of sociological research produced in South Africa during the apartheid era. The findings from this analysis are supportive to some of the views and arguments found in the literature while some do not fully correspond to those. Both similarities and dissimilarities were apparent in the findings drawn from these two datasets. The publication trends for the period showed that the production of publications, in both datasets, was on a growth path. Towards the end of apartheid there were clear signs of this growth in sociological literature that mainly dealt with South African issues. In one dataset where the racial background of the authors was known, the predominance of one racial group was obvious. Sociology and sociological research were in the hands of white scholars. Also noticeable is that close to the demise of apartheid other racial groups, Africans in particular, came more to the fore and engaged in conducting sociological research although not in substantial numbers. Seen in both datasets was the institutional origin of sociological knowledge in South Africa. Universities were in the forefront of knowledge production. A considerable quantity of sociological knowledge was produced during this period of analysis, with a distinctive character regarding the quantity of publications.

The areas of interest that attracted scholars were rather scattered. However, some focus areas were discernible amidst the variety of topics and issues. In the first dataset the predominant area for research was sociology and methodological debates in the social sciences. Labour and industrial studies came second in the total production of publications in the data drawn from the selected sociology journals. Other areas of interest included the family, fertility, population, children, race, religion, crime, attitudes and social problems. A different categorization was available for

the second dataset of WoS. The most researched areas in the WoS publications were area studies, education, environmental studies and health.

The interest and participation of scholars from abroad in South African sociological issues were very pronounced in the publications analysed here. They have made a significant contribution to the development of sociological knowledge during this period. Although some of their papers were not directly related to South African issues, they were of sociological significance dealing with sociological topics. This has importance in the internationalization of South African sociology, which will be taken up in the subsequent chapters.

Accurate information about the institutions and departments was known for the publications in the first dataset of selected journals. This provided insights into the institutional dimensions in the production of sociological literature. Some institutions preferred some areas, which applied to the methodological approaches they followed. The production of sociologically relevant knowledge in the country was not limited to sociologists alone. There were scholars affiliated to non-sociology departments at universities and at research institutes who contributed significantly to sociological research during this period.

Methodological specializations and preferences were revealed in the analysis, in both datasets. Publications in these datasets were largely qualitative and theoretical. Those attached to research institutes showed their interest more in conducting quantitative research than in doing qualitative research. The view that quantitative research in the country was weak is substantiated in the findings from both the datasets.

In Chap. 4 the position of sociology in the post-apartheid period is discussed.

## NOTES

1. For instance, in 1975 the average per capita income of whites was R182 per month as against R12.50 for blacks (Orkin et al. 1979).
2. Verwoerd did not have any formal training in sociology. Before his appointment as a professor of sociology, Verwoerd was a professor of applied psychology and psychotechnics (he earned a PhD in psychology in 1924 from Stellenbosch University) (Miller 1993). His academic life was short but very active. Later, in 1936 he resigned his position at Stellenbosch (Miller 1993). Verwoerd went on to become the Prime Minister of the apartheid regime in 1958.

3. Cronjé was appointed first as a senior lecturer at the University of Pretoria in 1934 and became a professor there in 1936. He was the first South African to possess a PhD in sociology. He obtained his PhD from the University of Amsterdam (Miller 1993).
4. See Liebenberg (2011) for the contributions of H.W. van der Merwe.
5. The universities of Stellenbosch, Pretoria, Potchefstroom, Rand Afrikaans and Orange Free State were Afrikaans universities. The English universities were Witwatersrand, Cape Town, Natal and Rhodes. The University of North, the University of Zululand, the University of Durban-Westville (for Indians), the University of Western Cape (for coloureds), the University of Fort Hare and the University of Transkei were the black universities.
6. The universities thus formed include the University College of Durban (for Indians), the University College of the North (for Sothos), the University College of Zululand (for Zulus), the University College of the Western Cape (for coloureds), the University of Transkei (for Xhosas), the University of Venda (for Venda) and the University of Bophuthatswana (for Tswana) (Jubber 2007).
7. Sixty-two of them were in education, nine in psychology and three in anthropology. The potential for jobs was high for graduates in education and also for promotion in schools with such additional qualifications (Anonymous 1981). In the same year there were 534 black graduates who were awarded degrees for a population of 17 million blacks (Wilmot 1979, cited in Balintulo 1981: 158).
8. This American influence has been reported in the case of sociologies from other parts of the world. For instance, Chinese sociology was hugely influenced by American sociology and sociologists (Bian and Zhang 2008).
9. Verwoerd turned away Cronjé who was the first academically trained sociologist with a first PhD in sociology in the country, obtained from the Netherlands, as the former preferred people who were trained in American empirical tradition (Cilliers 1984).
10. S.P. Cilliers, a professor of sociology at Stellenbosch University, appointed in 1958, was one among them. He was trained under Talcott Parsons at Harvard and introduced structural-functionalism to South African sociology (Webster 2004). Cilliers played an instrumental role in the formation of the first sociological association, SASOV (or SASA), in South Africa, but quit the organization when it was decided to restrict its membership to whites only (Alexander et al. 2006). Later in 1971 he along with others organized the association, ASSA, which opened its membership to all.
11. This was the time when structural-functionalism reached its peak in American sociology (Burawoy 2004).
12. E. Batson was a professor in the joint department of sociology and administration at the University of Cape Town since 1935 (Ally et al. 2003).

13. It is defined as an attitude of mind and a way of life, as conceived by the South African Students' Organization (SASO), which was the first organization to popularize the philosophy of Black Consciousness (Pityana 1981). This movement refers to the organizations that emerged in the country since 1968 and the rising feeling of black people to search for their dignity and liberation from the forces that suppress them psychologically and physically. It became a political movement in 1976 (Pityana 1981).
14. Industrial sociology between the 1960s and 1980s was more commonly known as managerial sociology as it was being used to facilitate and help management issues (Webster 1981).
15. The list is too long to furnish here. Richard Turner, a lecturer of political science at the University of Natal, was assassinated by the apartheid police on 8 January 1978. David Webster, a social anthropologist, was killed on 1 May 1989. Neil Aggett, another sociologist, lost his life for being against the state (Habib 2008). Harold Wolpe, an influential academic, was in exile with several others. Sociologists like Fatima Meer, Loet Douws-Decker, Charles Simkins, Mary Simons and Jack Simons were among those who had been banned. Rob Morell and Nico Cloete, both lectured at the University of Transkei, were deported. Raymond Suttner was imprisoned for two years (Hindson 1989). Barend van Niekerk, a professor of law, was prosecuted for publishing his research on capital punishment that showed differential justice on the basis of race (Savage 1981). David Russell was imprisoned for three months for refusing to divulge the names of his informants while Toine Eggenhizen was deported after his publication which was critical of Anglo-American mines (Webster 1981). Herbert Vilakazi and Thaele-Rivkin were expelled from the University of Transkei (Jubber 1983). Leo Kuper and many others at the University of Natal left the country due to harassment (Waters 2015).
16. The working groups at the congresses (in 1984, 1985 and 1986, for instance) included apartheid and social research, class analysis, conflict and peace studies, sociology of development, sociology of education, sociology of knowledge, media and culture, sociology of law, sociology of work, sociology of health, sociology of crime and deviance, social theory, teaching sociology, trade unions and industrial relations, labour studies, urban and regional studies, and women's studies.
17. This stance has been criticized while accepting that the potential of the critical sociology has not been realized (Hindson 1989).
18. It attracted more than 400 academics, professionals, researchers and community workers to the 6-day conference and produced more than 300 working papers (*Social Dynamics* 1984).
19. There is some lack of clarity in names. For instance Webster (1981) writes that it is the National Council of Social Research.

20. Black academics were excluded from the HSRC and its projects. The 1977 report of the HSRC showed only one black among its staff, counsellors, committee members and researchers and no black name appeared in the list of its 188 projects (Anonymous 1981).
21. NBSER initiated a number of commissions that investigated social problems of the society (Ally et al. 2003). It also launched the journal, *Journal of Social Research*.
22. It was estimated that 60,000–100,000 black workers participated in this strike that began in February 1973 (Webster 1981).
23. Papers were presented on industrialization and human relations at the annual conference of the South African Institute of Race Relations in 1968, and in the same year a series of papers was published at Rhodes University by James Irving, a professor of industrial sociology (Webster 1981).
24. The University of Witwatersrand started offering an industrial major in 1968; separate courses in industrial sociology were introduced at the University of Potchefstroom, University of Westville-Durban, Rhodes University, the University of Orange Free State and the University of Cape Town (Webster 1981).
25. The Centre of Applied Social Studies (formerly the Institute for Social Research), and a Development Studies Group (at the University of Natal) the Institute of Industrial Education (formed by academics at the University of Natal), the Institute of Labour Studies (at UNISA), the Institute of Industrial Relations (formed by the Anglo-American Corporation), the Centre for Applied Legal Studies (at the University of Witwatersrand), the Institute of Social Development (at the University of Western Cape) and the Institute of Manpower Research (of HSRC) were among them (Webster 1981).
26. The National Bureau for Personnel Research was formed in 1946 which later became the NIPR.
27. The Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development was the first large-scale country-wide survey organized in 1993 by the South African Labour and Development Research Unit. This involved about 8500 households. More surveys were to follow after this (Seekings 2001).
28. He was concurring with the suggestion of Harry Lever (1981) on this issue.
29. The extent of this was evident when an estimated 18,000 books were banned including many sociological classics and writings on Marxism and African nationalism (Savage 1981).
30. At least three research units received secret funding. One of them (the Institute for the Study of Plural Societies) was headed by a sociologist, Nic Rhodie.

31. Jubber (2007) records that the efforts of sociologists to form their own professional association was begun in 1964 when the Joint University Committee for Sociology and Social Work in Southern Africa explored the possibilities for founding a sociological association. Some 18 sociologists met at Stellenbosch University in 1966 and some of whom wanted to have a whites-only association in line with the government policy (Jubber 2007).
32. ASSA was meant to be a regional association of sociologists in Southern Africa, and organized its activities around the objective of bringing regional collaboration of sociologists. Due to the political unrest in the country many of its regional members from other Southern African countries left the organization and it became an association for South African sociologists, called the Association for Sociology in South Africa in 1988 (Hindson 1989).
33. The role of the International Sociological Association (ISA) was important in this merger. ISA did not approve of the collective membership of these two associations that facilitated discussions for a merger (Uys 2006).
34. For instance, at the fifth annual congress of SASA held at Pretoria in January 1973, this issue came up.
35. For a discussion on academic boycott see Nordkvelle (1990).
36. They include *Acta Academia*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, *Journal of Black Studies*, *Indicator*, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, *Industrial Relations Journal of South Africa*, *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe (Journal for the Humanities)*, *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, *South African Labour Bulletin* and *Work in Progress*.
37. The subjects included area studies, criminology, cultural studies, communication, demography, education, environmental sciences, family studies, ethnic studies, health care sciences, health policy, history of social sciences, information science, public, environmental and occupational health, religion, social issues, social sciences, sociology, urban studies and women's studies.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, H. (1981). The vocation of a sociologist in South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 115–127). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Alexander, P., Basson, L., & Makhura, P. (2006). Sociology research in contemporary South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 218–240.
- Ally, S., Mooney, K., & Stewart, P. (2003). The state-sponsored and centralised institutionalisation of an academic discipline: Sociology in South Africa, 1920–1970. *Society in Transition*, 34(1), 70–103.

- Anonymous. (1981). Social research and the black academic in South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 129–140). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Antikainen, A. (2008). Finnish academic publishing in sociology: A critical review. *International Sociology*, 35(5), 649–664.
- Balintulo, M. M. (1981). The black universities in South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 141–159). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Bekker, S. (1990). Sosiologiese navorsing in die derde wereld: probleme, uitdagings en prioriteite. *South African Review of Sociology*, 21(4), 206–208.
- Bian, Y., & Zhang, L. (2008). Sociology in China. *Contexts*, 7(3), 20–25.
- Brym, R. (2014). Our first 50 Years: A note on the University of Toronto's Department of Sociology. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 15(3), 288–292.
- Buhlungu, S. (2009). South Africa: The decline of labor studies and the democratic transition. *Work and Occupations*, 36(2), 145–161.
- Burawoy, M. (2004). Public sociology: South African dilemmas in a global context. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 11–26.
- Cilliers, S. P. (1984). *The origins of sociology in South Africa*. Paper presented at the Association for Sociology in South Africa, Johannesburg, 2–5 July 1984.
- Cross, M. (1986). A historical review of education in South Africa: Towards an assessment. *Comparative Education*, 22(3), 185–200.
- Deflem, M. (2013). The structural transformation of sociology. *Society*, 50(2), 156–166.
- van Eeden, I. J. (1984). The paradigmatic status of contemporary sociology in South Africa. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 15(1), 1–4.
- Fanning, B., & Hess, A. (2015). Sociology in Ireland: Legacies and challenges. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 23(1), 3–21.
- Groenewald, C. J. (1991). The context of the development of sociology in South Africa: A response to Visser and van Staden. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 46–49.
- Habib, A. (2008). Speaking 'truth' to all forms of power: Reflections on the role of the public sociologist in South Africa. *Current Sociology*, 56(3), 389–398.
- Hare, A. P., & Savage, M. (1979). Sociology of South Africa. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 5, 329–350.
- Hindson, D. (1989). Putting the record straight: The association for sociology in South Africa. *South African Sociological Review*, 2(1), 69–73.
- Hugo, P. J. (1977). Academic dissent and apartheid in South Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, 7(3), 243–262.
- Human, P. (1984). *The South African crisis: Sociology and reform*. Johannesburg: ASSA.
- Jubber, K. (1983). Sociology and its social context: The case of the rise of Marxist sociology in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 9(2), 50–63.
- Jubber, K. (2007). Sociology in South Africa: A brief historical review of research and publishing. *International Sociology*, 22(5), 527–546.

- Kock, C. P. d. (1989). Sosiologie in Suid-Afrika: Die toekoms? *South African Review of Sociology*, 20(2), 99–113.
- Lever, H. (1981). Sociology of South Africa: Supplementary comments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7, 249–262.
- Liebenberg, I. (2011). Sociology in practice: H W van der Merwe's contribution to conflict resolution and mediation in South Africa. *Acta Academica*, 43(1), 1–38.
- Masson, P. (2012). French sociology and the state. *Current Sociology*, 60(5), 719–729.
- van der Merwe, H. W. (1983). Ideological and academic polarization: The challenge to sociologists in Southern Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 14(3), 100–106.
- Miller, R. B. (1993). Science and society in the early career of H.F. Verwoerd. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 19(4), 1–17.
- Moodie, G. C. (1994). The state and the liberal universities in South Africa: 1948–1990. *Higher Education*, 27(1), 1–40.
- Nordkvelle, Y. (1990). The academic boycott of South Africa debate: Science and social practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 15(3), 253–275.
- Olzak, S. (1990). Report to the Human Sciences Research Council. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(1), 62–68.
- Oosthuizen, J. S. (1989). Die sosioloog as meningsvormer. *South African Review of Sociology*, 20(4), 209–215.
- Oosthuizen, J. S. (1991a). South African Sociology during the eighties as mirrored in the South African Journal of Sociology. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 2(22), 43–46.
- Oosthuizen, K. (1991b). The state of sociology in South Africa. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(2), 93–99.
- Orkin, F. M., Nicolaysen, L. O., & Price, M. (1979). The future of the urban university in South Africa: Some practical considerations. *Social Dynamics*, 5(1), 26–37.
- Osipov, G. V., & Rutkevich, M. N. (1978). Trend report: Sociology in the USSR, 1965–1975. *Current Sociology*, 26(2), 1–82.
- Pityana, N. (1981). The Black Consciousness movement and social research. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 161–183). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Pityana, S. M. (1992). Research and racial domination in South Africa. *Transformation*, 18, 72–77.
- Rensburg, H. C. J. v. (1989). Sosiologie in Suid-Afrika: Profiel van die huidige. *South African Review of Sociology*, 20(2), 80–98.
- Rex, J. (1981). Introduction. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 11–26). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Savage, M. (1981). Constraints on, and functions of, research in sociology and psychology in contemporary South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 45–65). Paris: The Unesco Press.



- Seekings, J. (2001). The uneven development of quantitative social science in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 27(1), 1–36.
- Sitas, A. (2014). Rethinking Africa's sociological project. *Current Sociology*, 62(4), 457–471.
- Social Dynamics. (1984). Editorial notes. *Social Dynamics*, 10(2), 2.
- South African Journal of Sociology. (1970). Editorial. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 1(1), 1–2.
- South African Sociological Review. (1988). Editors introduction. *South African Sociological Review*, 1(1), ii.
- South African Sociological Review. (1990). Editorial. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(1), 1–2.
- South African Sociological Review. (1994). Editorial. *South African Sociological Review*, 6(2), ii–iii.
- van Staden, F., & Visser, D. (1991). The *South African Journal of Sociology* in the eighties: An analysis of theoretical and empirical contributions. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 2(22), 33–43.
- Taylor, R. (1989). Sociology in South Africa: Tool or critic of apartheid. *South African Sociological Review*, 2(1), 65–74.
- Uys, T. (2006). South African sociology in transition: Continental and global engagement. *Sociological Bulletin*, 55(1), 78–90.
- Venter, D. (1973). Die Vraag na en Aanbod van Sosioloë. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 6, 40–49.
- Waters, G. (2015). Liberalism interruptus: Leo Kuper and the Durban School of oppositional empirical sociology of the 1950s and 1960s. *Transformation*, 88, 43–61.
- Webster, E. (1981). Servants of apartheid? A survey of social research into industry in South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 86–113). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Webster, E. (1985). Competing paradigms: Towards a critical sociology in Southern Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 11(1), 44–48.
- Webster, E. (1997). Democratic transition: South African sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 26(3), 279–282.
- Webster, E. C. (1999). Race, labour process and transition: The sociology of work in South Africa. *Society in Transition*, 30(1), 28–42.
- Webster, E. C. (2004). Sociology in South Africa: Its past, present and future. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 27–41.
- Welsh, D. (1981). Social research in a divided society: The case of South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 27–44). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Whisson, M. (1981). Anthropological research in contemporary South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 67–83). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Zegeye, A., & Motsemme, N. (2004). Editorial: South Africa's past in the present. *Current Sociology*, 52(5), 749–753.

## Sociology in Democratic South Africa, 1994–2015

**Abstract** The transition of South Africa from apartheid to democracy causes changes in the higher education sector. This affects the discipline of sociology as well. In the restructuring process that ensues, sociology departments become interdisciplinary programmes. The two rival professional associations dissolve to form a new entity. Sociology is opened to the international community as apartheid ends. The production of sociological knowledge makes for significant progress and advancement. Some branches of sociology, in comparison to others, develop and grow in democratic South Africa. Both sociologists and non-sociologists engage in the generation of sociological knowledge. Whites and men continue to dominate in sociology. Some institutions lead others in sociological research. The role of scholars affiliated to institutions outside the country is substantial.

**Keywords** South Africa • Democracy • Sociology • Sociological research

An entirely new world of freedom dawned in South Africa in April 1994. The country participated in the first general elections of the new democratic era, leaving the turbulent apartheid past of nearly half a century behind. South African society offered immense possibilities for sociologists to study, teach and research. Undoubtedly, this was the new phase

and face of South African sociology, stepping into the third stage of its life following the colonial and apartheid periods. Changes in many forms, shapes and measures for sociology were imminent.

The unique history and the experiences of the society were capable of presenting new insights, views and perspectives on societal issues. This was not only for South African sociologists but also for other social scientists working outside the country. The insights drawn from South Africa helped sociologists from elsewhere to see their respective societies in a different light. Sociologists from other countries looked up to South Africa to understand issues such as migration and labour supplies (Seidman 1999). From the experience of South Africa they learned new ways of thinking about issues ranging from labour to race (Seidman 1999). The richness of the social conditions, good or bad, outdated or relevant, historical or contemporary, laid out the scope for sociological studies in South Africa. Challenges had to be overcome and corrective measures needed to be put in place. There was a strong perception that the new democracy was left with a stock of knowledge that was deficient, distorted and had been created largely by a minority (Schutte 2007). What were the implications for sociology under the new dispensation?

### WHAT IS NOW? SOCIOLOGY TODAY

Although the democratic era officially began with the first general elections of 27 April 1994, the transition from apartheid to democracy had already begun in the late 1980s. South Africa's higher education landscape was beginning to transform. At the time when the country transitioned to democracy, there were 36 higher education institutions (21 universities and 15 technikons), which were structured along racial and ethnic lines (CHE 2004). A process of mergers was initiated to form new institutions.<sup>1</sup> Today, the higher education sector is now stretched across 26 public higher education institutions<sup>2</sup> and 124 private higher education institutions (as of 25 September 2015, CHE 2015). Enrolment figures grew, and access to higher education improved dramatically. The enrolment of students in the humanities and social sciences, for instance, increased from 215,250 in 2008 to 247,131 in 2013 (CHE 2015). This was an increase of some 15%. Sociology was to benefit from this growth. Most of the 30 sociology departments that existed in the country in 1997 offered varied sociology programmes although some had only small programmes (Crothers 1997). In the same year, the average number of students in sociology programmes

was 1300 with an average staff complement of seven (Crothers 1997). In 2015, most of the sociology programmes in South African universities had students in the range of 300–1400 at the first year undergraduate level. There were some 152 sociology staff teaching and conducting research in South African universities.<sup>3</sup>

Since 1994, the higher education sector in the country had gone through a natural transformation to fit in with the new foci, demands and policies of the new democratic government. As seen in the previous chapters, universities in the colonial and apartheid periods were differentially resourced, resulting in a division into poorly funded historically black universities (HBUs) and well-resourced white universities (HWUs). The first challenge was to level this disparity. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the government began implementing its merger plans to amalgamate differently resourced universities in a bid to correct the inequities in higher education. Restructuring across the country was part of this merger plan which materialized, with some success and some failures. As a consequence, sociology departments in many universities were closed down and reorganized into disciplinary programmes to better suit the market-driven demands (Adésinà 2006; Webster 2008).<sup>4</sup> The programme and qualification mix (PQM) in the new dispensation, as it was called, was meant to determine the appropriate mix for each public higher education institution and programme. This was done on the basis of the existing programme profile, the relevance of the profile to the institution's location and context, regional and national priorities, and its capacity to have new programmes (CHE 2004).

The closure of the sociology departments<sup>5</sup> to organize into school- or programme-based units under the new design of programme and PQM was to meet the democratic project of the higher education sector for interdisciplinarity (Adésinà 2006).<sup>6</sup> The effect of this programme-based education was to be reflected in the way sociology as a discipline functioned in the new democratic period. Partly as a result of this programme-based transformation, disadvantages in both the demographics and in the research outputs of sociologists were evident (Hendricks 2006). Arguably, the PQM model was part of the corporatization and managerialism in line with the global market economy. The White Paper on higher education clearly spells out this new plan as 'a programme-based higher education system, which is planned, governed and funded as a single, coherent national system that will enable many necessary changes to be undertaken' (RSA 1997: 18). Outlined in the White Paper, the National Plan on

Higher Education in 2001 proposed institutional and programme-mixes and restructuring of the institutional landscape of the higher education system. The programme-mix, which had far-reaching implications for disciplines like sociology, was to be determined on the basis of the current programme profile that includes the location of institutions, context and responsiveness to regional and national priorities (RSA 2001). The plan sought to ensure that the graduates of the higher learning institutions in the country are equipped with necessary skills and competencies to succeed in modern society (RSA 2001).

These structural changes exerted their effects on the discipline of sociology. The outcome-based curriculum that was introduced in 2005 and the establishment of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) modified the position of sociology in the country. Sociology, like many other disciplines, lost its status as a department but became a programme to equip students in necessary skills driven by the demands of the market. The programme-based teaching at universities undermined the importance of sociology. Some universities totally abandoned their departments and redeployed academics to fit into the programme delivery (Uys 2006). Sociology had to adjust and adapt to this environment when it entered into its third phase in the democratic era.

On the research front changes were meant to happen. Democratic South Africa was concerned about the research conducted in higher education institutions. As detailed in the White Paper on Education (RSA 1997), the research capacity that exists in the higher education institutions is insufficient and skewed. Concerns were raised with regard to the articulation between the different elements of research and the national needs for social, economic, cultural and intellectual reconstruction (RSA 1997). This was really an opportunity for sociologists.

In 2001 (RSA 2001, 2003) the government, through its Higher Education Act, 1997, introduced block grants for research output,<sup>7</sup> teaching output, teaching input and an institutional factor. As proposed in the National Plan, it emphasized three points that are relevant for research in the country. It states that research resources should be concentrated in institutions which have demonstrated the capacity and potential, greater accountability for the use of research funds, and the ability to enhance research productivity. Grants are determined on the basis of research publications and the production of research masters and PhDs. Under the new National Plan for Higher Education (RSA 2001), a separate component of research based on research outputs (masters, doctorate graduates and

publications) was integrated into the funding formula. Research publications of academics were encouraged through an incentive system which was introduced, first in the HWUs during 1982–1983. Known as SAPSE (South African Post Secondary Education), the funding formula had a component of publication grants based on the number of publications produced by academics in universities in approved peer-reviewed journals.

Prior to the political transition to democracy, changes were beginning to occur in South African sociology. The transitional changes towards democracy were transparent among academia and in their research activities. One major landmark for sociology in the new South Africa was the merger of the two rival sociological associations that previously worked at similar sets of objectives. SASOV and ASSA agreed to dissolve their differences to form a single entity. The South African Sociological Association (SASA) was thus born. This was in 1993, a year before South Africa was officially liberated from apartheid. At the professional level this was a remarkable chapter in the history of South African sociology.

The new association opened the potential for interaction and exchange between the two conflicting streams of sociology in the country. It was expected that these new times for South African sociology would ‘bring together a diversity of philosophical, theoretical, empirical, and political traditions’ to a common professional platform for the richer benefits of sociology in South Africa (James 1993). The merger did not bring a sudden advancement in the position of sociology, but it laid the ground for sociology to develop from a solid footing.

Universities in the country, true to the legacy of the past, remained the epicentre of knowledge production. In 1994, the universities produced 70% of the South African indexed research publications and 80% of them came from five universities<sup>8</sup> (CHE 2004). In terms of the research output of publications (journals, books and conference proceedings) the growth was obvious. The CREST (2014) study revealed that the research output in South Africa has been growing. There has been a sixfold increase in the research capacity of the social science research in the country during 1993–2012 (CREST 2014). In 2008, the total research output units were 8353 which increased to 14,008 units in 2013. In the humanities and social sciences the total research outputs were 34% in 2010 and 33% in 2013. The humanities and social sciences were credited with 38% of the annual research output (ASSAf 2011).

In the first years of the new phase in the research interests of sociologists, to take 1997 as a sample year, ranged from industrial sociology (10%) to

the sociology of development (8%) (Crothers 1997). At the institutional level, heterogeneity occurred in the research emphasis of sociology departments. However, this had been the case in the past. In 1997, the Afrikaans language universities by and large retained their interest in applied topics such as demography and criminology (Crothers 1997). Sociologists at English language universities located their interests in the political issues that were still giving them context, space and material for study.

Some branches of sociology did not develop or grow as much as others. For instance, industrial sociology (which includes labour studies) developed at a much faster pace than other sub-branches. The sociology of religion almost disappeared due to disciplinary prioritization, although it had enjoyed prominence during the apartheid era (Venter 1998). Medical sociology grew substantially in South Africa, as is evident from the analysis of publications in sociology journals. HIV/AIDS attracted sociological investigation at different levels (Alexander 2004; Alexander and Ichharam 2002).

To understand the developments in the discipline in the democratic period, one needs to look at the empirical data. As for sociological research, the preferred route is to analyse the research publications of both South African sociologists and others on topics of South African society or sociology. A preliminary analysis of sociological research for the period 1995–2012, as gleaned from the official journal of SASA, revealed its salient features (Sooryamoorthy 2015). It showed that the research interests of sociologists in the country had been undergoing perceptible changes. They are widely spread and scattered, as seen from the wide array of themes chosen for research. For instance, there are not many who have produced publications in the areas of health, especially HIV/AIDS, or in labour and industrial studies.

The production of sociological knowledge as revealed in the above analysis was concentrated in only five universities in the country (Sooryamoorthy 2015). In addition, another recent analysis of the research publications of sociologists from 1990–2009 sheds light on some relevant aspects of South African sociology in the democratic period. Basson and Prozesky (2015) focussed their analysis around questions of the research methodologies adopted by South African scholars, the collaboration dimensions in the publications and the effects of collaboration (national and international) on the methodology used in their studies. During this period, both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were employed,

more or less equally. A new trend in collaboration was also reported when both local and international collaboration were taken into account. The linkage between the application of quantitative methods and international collaboration was clear (Basson and Prozesky 2015). This has obviously importance for the skills of contemporary South African sociologists.

Becoming a liberated society opened South African sociology to the international community of sociologists. The academic boycott and isolation had come to an end. Closer to the end of apartheid, South African sociologists began to look to the wider world and participated in intellectual engagement through travel, conferences, exchanges, collaborations and participation in international organizations. Organizations such as the Council for the Development of Social Science in Africa (CODESRIA) took part in this process of allowing South African scholars to visit abroad and initiate research programmes with their peers in Africa (Webster 1997).

The objects of the HSRC, which had a dubious past in the apartheid period, were revised and reshaped. The Human Sciences Research Council Act 17/2008 (RSA 2008) provided for the promotion of research in the human sciences with the objective of improving the understanding of social conditions and the process of social change. The National Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIHSS) was established<sup>9</sup> under the Higher Education Act, 1997 in 2013 (RSA 2013) to ‘enhance scholarship, research and ethical practice in the fields of Human and Social Sciences.’ In association with the South African Humanities Deans’ Association (SAHUDA), NIHSS offers PhD scholarships. With the aim of increasing the pool of research graduates in the country in the field of humanities and social sciences, these doctoral fellowships are for South Africans who belonged to the previously disadvantaged groups under the age of 45 years. These fully funded fellowships are in key areas.<sup>10</sup> This has helped sociology as well, although sociology was not on the list of the preferred areas.

The National Research Foundation (NRF), established in 1998 through the National Research Foundation Act, 1998, was to serve the interests of social scientists as well. The objects of the NRF are to support and promote research through funding to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people of the Republic (RSA 1998: 4). Its funding programmes have assisted several sociologists to undertake research in their area of choice.



## PRODUCTION OF SOCIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

A detailed scientometric analysis has been carried out to map the production of knowledge in South African sociology in the democratic period and the findings are presented in this chapter. Two sets of data were used here: the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology* (SARS) from 1995–2015, and the publications in the Web of Science (WoS) database for the period 1995–2015.

The analysis was of the publications drawn from SARS which was previously entitled *Society in Transition* (from 1997 to 2005), and also from the *South African Journal of Sociology* (1975–1996). The analysis of this journal is confined to the 21-year period of 1995–2015, referring to the democratic period. All publications in this period were harvested and converted into relevant variables for scientometric analysis. A total of 359 research papers were finally available. The analysis excluded comments, responses, letters, obituaries, introductions to special issues, debates and discussions. The data has been tabulated across four 5-year periods, except for the last class which, to accommodate the last year of 2015, formed a 6-year class, 1995–1999, 2000–2004, 2005–2009 and 2010–2015. Dividing the data into small classes is useful to identify trends over the years in the democratic period.

Table 4.1 presents the basic features of the publications. There was an average of 17 publications per year, with the highest average recorded for the last period of 2010–2015 (average publications per year: 12 publications during 1995–1999, 19.6 for 2000–2004, 14.4 for 2005–2009, and 21.2 for 2010–2015). These publications were about 16 printed pages in length, which is some 48% higher than the mean size for the publications in the initial years (1995–1999). The difference over the four periods was statistically significant in the ANOVA test. Some of the publications were more than 40 pages in length. Altogether SARS produced 5812 pages of sociological research material from the beginning of its publication. The mean number of authors per publication for the entire period was 1.39, which did not vary significantly between the years.

The variable of the race of authors was counted for each publication and for all authors before it was converted into African, white, Indian and others. The highest mean size (1.03) was found for white authors and the lowest for Indian authors (0.1). The mean sizes of the race of all authors in descending order were white, African, Indian and other races. Between the first two (white and African) the difference (1.03 and 0.21) was close

**Table 4.1** Publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Publications</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Number of publications	62	17.3	98	27.3	72	20.1	127	35.4	359	100
Mean number of authors (ANOVA: $F=0.249$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.862$ )	<i>Mean</i> 1.35 <i>S.D.</i> 0.70	<i>Mean</i> 1.45 <i>S.D.</i> 0.88	<i>Mean</i> 1.39 <i>S.D.</i> 0.87	<i>Mean</i> 1.37 <i>S.D.</i> 0.71	<i>Mean</i> 1.39 <i>S.D.</i> 0.71	<i>Mean</i> 1.39 <i>S.D.</i> 0.78				
<i>Race of authors</i> Mean number of all White authors (ANOVA: $F=2.94$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.033$ )	1.13 0.84	1.19 0.85	1.01 1.00	0.87 0.76	1.03 0.86					
Mean number of all African authors (ANOVA: $F=2.567$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.054$ )	0.19 0.47	0.17 0.59	0.10 0.34	0.31 0.68	0.21 0.57					
Mean number of all Indian authors (ANOVA: $F=2.941$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.033$ )	0.05 0.28	0.05 0.22	0.18 0.42	0.13 0.36	0.10 0.33					
Mean number of other races (ANOVA: $F=2.638$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.049$ )	0.00 0.00	0.03 0.17	0.10 0.29	0.06 0.23	0.05 0.21					

(continued)

**Table 4.1** (continued)

<i>Publications</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender of authors</i>										
Mean number of all male authors (ANOVA: $F=1.176$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.338$ )	0.85	0.72	0.77	0.67	0.64	0.70	0.71	0.76	0.74	0.72
Mean number of all female authors (ANOVA: $F=0.714$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.544$ )	0.48	0.67	0.55	0.72	0.64	0.76	0.61	0.67	0.58	0.70
<i>Sector of affiliation</i>										
Mean number of university sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=1.523$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.208$ )	1.27	0.75	1.33	0.84	1.11	0.90	1.35	0.69	1.28	0.79
Mean number of research institute sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=2.79$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.040$ )	0.03	0.25	0.10	0.58	0.19	0.57	0.02	0.20	0.08	0.43
<i>Length of publications</i>										
Mean page length of publications (ANOVA: $F=31.955$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.000$ )	10.88	3.66	15.32	5.60	18.72	5.83	18.02	5.48	16.19	5.98

to five times, and between African and Indian authors (0.21 and 0.1) the gap was two times. This proportion has been changing over the years as is evident from the significant  $p$ -values of the statistical tests employed. The total mean size for white authors has decreased from 1.19 (2004–2009) to 1.03 in the last six years. For black African authors, it increased from its lowest point of 0.1 (2005–2009) to 0.21 (2005–2010). Indian authors had their high point of 0.18 during 2005–2009, but declined subsequently by 80% during the last six years.

Men dominated the publications in *SARS*. However, over time they lost strength significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ), particularly since 2000–2004. Women authors improved their share of publications from a mean value of 0.48 (1995–1999) to 0.61 during 2010–2015. It was higher still for them during 2005–2009. A higher percentage of the authors was affiliated to universities. The second category composed of research institutes lagged considerably behind universities (1.28 and 0.08 respectively).

The publications in *SARS* showed a wide variety of research areas. The initial count resulted in 74 such research areas, varying from labour and industrial studies to military studies. These areas were further grouped into 17 categories of similar areas. A large majority (89%) of the publications dealt with South African issues. There were three areas that had a share of more than 10% of all publications—labour, sociology and health (Table 4.2). Studies with a gender focus constituted 8%, similar to the same percentage of publications in crime and violence. Two other areas with a significant percentage of the total were the broad areas of family and the state. Studies in the categories of social problems, culture and identity problems had the lowest number of publications.

The publication records across the years exhibit a pattern (Table 4.2). In percentile terms, labour and industry had 16% of the total publications during 1995–1999, which declined to 10% during 2000–2004, and further down to 3% during 2005–2009. This area of study recouped its position in the last six years increasing to 17%. Matters that relate to the discipline of sociology demonstrated a declining interest, from 15% to 6%. An area that produced an increasing number of publications was gender and women's studies, rising from 0% to 17%. The interest in the state, apartheid and democracy lost ground, declining from 10% to 2%.

The institutional breakdown of publications is presented in Table 4.3. The data incorporates merged institutions, as referred to earlier, and under their new names. As far as the first authors were concerned, four institutions contributed to the highest number of publications in the journal:

**Table 4.2** Research areas of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

Research areas	1995–1999		2000–2004		2005–2009		2010–2015		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	10	16.1	10	10.2	2	2.8	21	16.5	43	12.0
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	9	14.5	13	13.3	7	9.7	8	6.3	37	10.3
Health, HIV/AIDS and medical sociology	3	4.8	21	21.4	6	8.3	6	4.7	36	10.0
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	0	0.0	2	2.0	5	6.9	22	17.3	29	8.1
Crime, violence, policing and security	4	6.5	8	8.2	10	13.9	7	5.5	29	8.1
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	5	8.1	3	3.1	4	5.6	11	8.7	23	6.4
State, apartheid and democracy	6	9.7	9	9.2	3	4.2	2	1.6	20	5.6
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	1	1.6	1	1.0	4	5.6	10	7.9	16	4.5
Education, higher education and curriculum	3	4.8	5	5.1	3	4.2	3	2.4	14	3.9
Poverty and unemployment	2	3.2	2	2.0	2	2.8	6	4.7	12	3.3
Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	2	3.2	1	1.0	6	8.3	2	1.6	11	3.1
Civil society, movements and NGOs	3	4.8	1	1.0	5	6.9	1	0.8	10	2.8
Military studies and war studies	2	3.2	4	4.1	2	2.8	2	1.6	10	2.8

*(continued)*

**Table 4.2** (continued)

Race	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	2.8	6	4.7	9	2.5
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, xenophobia, etc.)	0	0	1	1.0	1	1.4	5	3.9	7	1.9
Culture, social structure and African studies	4	6.5	3	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	1.9
Identity and modernity	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.4	1	0.8	3	0.8
Others (globalization, technology, sports, etc.)	8	12.9	12	12.2	9	12.5	14	11.0	43	12.0
South African research topic	51	82.3	74	75.5	50	71.4	112	88.9	287	80.6

The University of Johannesburg (UJ), the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), the University of Witwatersrand (Wits) and Stellenbosch University (SU). They jointly produced nearly half of the total publications in the journal (46%). Authors at research institutes such as the HSRC have also made a contribution. Some of the lowest representation was reported for the universities of Limpopo, Fort Hare, Pretoria, the Western Cape and Free State. While UJ improved its position drastically (7%–21%) between the first and last periods of analysis, UKZN lost its status, after being the top publisher in the journal during 1995–1999. UKZN registered a decreasing trend in production after 1995. Wits and SU had strengthened their respective contributions to the journal over the years. Characteristically, one-fifth of the publications originated from overseas institutions. This was higher than the single contribution of any institution in South Africa for the entire period of analysis.

In order to gain a holistic picture of the institutional share of publications for all authors, a combined variable for the institution of all authors was created (Table 4.4). As per the calculation, the mean of all authors for publications was high for both UKZN and UJ for the full period of 1995–2015. Wits and SU followed these two institutions. In line with the previous finding, UJ had the highest mean value (0.26) for the most recent years (2010–2015). The UKZN score for the same period was just half of that of UJ (0.13), and lower than that of Wits and SU. The

**Table 4.3** Institutional affiliation of the first author of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
University of Johannesburg (UJ)	4	6.8	8	8.2	12	17.4	27	21.3	51	14.4
University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN)	14	23.7	16	16.3	5	7.2	9	7.1	44	12.5
University of Witwatersrand (Wits)	4	6.8	11	11.2	5	7.2	17	13.4	37	10.5
Stellenbosch University (SU)	4	6.8	6	6.1	5	7.2	15	11.8	30	8.5
Rhodes University (RU)	4	6.8	8	8.2	3	4.3	4	3.1	19	5.4
University of Cape Town (UCT)	2	3.4	6	6.1	7	10.1	3	2.4	18	5.1
University of South Africa (UNISA)	2	3.4	2	2.0	1	1.4	13	10.2	18	5.1
University of North-West (UNW)	3	5.1	0	0.0	1	1.4	8	6.3	12	3.4
Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC)	1	1.7	1	1.0	5	7.2	1	0.8	8	2.3
University of Free State (UFS)	2	3.4	3	3.1	1	1.4	2	1.6	8	2.3
University of Western Cape (UWC)	1	1.7	3	3.1	2	2.9	1	0.8	7	2.0
University of Pretoria (UP)	1	1.7	1	1.0	2	2.9	2	1.6	6	1.7
University of Fort Hare (UFH)	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	2	0.6
University of Limpopo (UL)	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	0.8	2	0.6
Foreign university/ institution	14	23.7	21	21.4	17	24.6	20	15.7	72	20.4
Others	3	5.1	11	11.2	2	2.9	3	2.4	19	5.4

ANOVA test results ( $p=0.1$ ) confirmed the declining share of publications for UKZN. The production of sociological knowledge emanating from the University of Cape Town (UCT) also stagnated after 1995. Authors affiliated to foreign universities and institutions remained major producers of sociological literature with a higher mean value than any South African institutions.

**Table 4.4** Institutional count (mean and for selected institutions) of all authors of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
University of KwaZulu-Natal (ANOVA: $F=1.712$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.16$ )	0.32	0.79	0.23	0.66	0.14	0.66	0.13	0.47	0.19	0.63
University of Johannesburg (ANOVA: $F=3.29$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.21$ )	0.06	0.25	0.12	0.44	0.22	0.56	0.26	0.49	0.18	0.46
University of Witwatersrand (ANOVA: $F=1.070$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.36$ )	0.08	0.33	0.14	0.50	0.07	0.26	0.16	0.41	0.12	0.40
Stellenbosch University (ANOVA: $F=1.21$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.31$ )	0.10	0.35	0.07	0.26	0.08	0.33	0.16	0.46	0.11	0.37
University of Cape Town (ANOVA: $F=2.08$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.10$ )	0.03	0.18	0.11	0.55	0.17	0.58	0.03	0.22	0.08	0.42
Rhodes University (ANOVA: $F=0.567$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.64$ )	0.08	0.33	0.08	0.28	0.06	0.29	0.04	0.23	0.06	0.27
Foreign institutions (ANOVA: $F=0.806$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.49$ )	0.27	0.55	0.33	0.72	0.31	0.52	0.21	0.51	0.27	0.58



Clearly, the contributions in *SARS* were not by sociologists alone, which is apparent from the data about the departments<sup>11</sup> of authors (Table 4.5). There were authors from geography, anthropology, politics, education, philosophy, psychology, history, development studies, social work, language, economics and others. Two-thirds of the first authors came from departments other than sociology, which declined to half for the second author. A more accurate figure was obtained when the departments were combined for all authors. The mean value for all authors for sociology was 0.58 as against 0.55 for other departments, showing a slight edge for sociologists. What is significant in this set of data is that the mean value for sociology departments has been decreased from 0.68 (1995–1999)

**Table 4.5** Department of authors of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Department</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>First author</i>										
Sociology	32	61.5	45	54.2	34	56.7	55	47.8	166	53.5
Others	20	38.5	38	45.8	26	43.3	60	52.2	144	66.5
<i>Second author</i>										
Sociology	8	57.1	7	50.0	5	33.3	12	50.0	32	47.8
Others	6	42.9	7	50.0	10	66.7	12	50.0	35	52.2
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Sociology	0.68	0.79	0.55	0.68	0.60	0.76	0.54	0.66	0.58	0.71
department for all authors (ANOVA: $F=0.623$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.6$ )										
Other	0.47	0.82	0.54	0.92	0.54	0.80	0.61	0.79	0.55	0.83
department for all authors (ANOVA: $F=0.401$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.75$ )										
All department for all authors (ANOVA: $F=0.094$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.96$ )	1.15	0.85	1.09	0.86	1.14	0.88	1.14	0.66	1.13	0.80

to 0.54 (2010–2015). The figures increased for departments other than sociology from 0.47 to 0.61 for the same reference periods.

The institutional and departmental production figures, according to research areas, are presented in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. Within South African institutions Wits led in labour and industrial studies, followed by UKZN (Table 4.6). As for the publications on sociology and methodology topics, UJ authors were ahead of others. Two institutions in descending order of publications in the area of health and HIV/AIDS were UKZN and UJ. Military studies were largely from SU. Gender studies were equally important for at least three major institutions (UKZN, UJ and SU). Community studies and education were mostly done by scholars at UKZN rather than any at other institution in the country. Studies of poverty were mainly contributions from UJ and UKZN. UJ also led in the production of publications in the area of civil society organizations and NGOs. UJ and foreign institutions showed a keen interest in researching social problems, more so than other institutions. As to poverty studies only two organizations were significant—UJ and UKZN. Compared to other research areas studies of crime were not as prominent in South African institutions as in foreign institutions. Race studies were concentrated in three institutions, namely, UKZN, SU and at Wits.

As mentioned earlier, contributions to *SARS* came from both sociologists and non-sociologists. Undoubtedly, both of them added value to the development of sociological material through their publications in the journal. The department-wise break-up (Table 4.7) presents the production of publications in the areas by this division of sociologists and others. The department affiliation does not always indicate that the academics are from the same discipline. In several universities, sociology departments have hired academics with other disciplinary backgrounds and qualifications. It is thus more accurate to refer to departments rather than to sociologists or non-sociologists.

The mean difference between sociology and other departments was statistically significant in the *t*-test (1.27; S.D. = 0.59 for sociology and 0.99; S.D. = 0.92 for others;  $p = 0.001$ ). This means sociology produced more publications than other departments. In comparison, sociology departments produced more in the areas of labour studies, sociology, the social sciences and methodology, crime, the state, apartheid and democracy, development, urbanization and planning, civil society and NGOs, and race. On the other hand, other departments led in research and publications in the areas of health, HIV/AIDS, gender and sexuality, community

**Table 4.6** Research areas across major institutions of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology, 1995–2015*

<i>Research area</i>	<i>UKZN</i>		<i>UJ</i>		<i>Wits</i>		<i>SU</i>		<i>UCT</i>		<i>RU</i>		<i>Foreign</i>		<i>All</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	43	0.19	0.45	0.12	0.32	0.26	0.54	0.14	0.47	0.12	0.76	-	-	0.33	0.64	1.42	0.91
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	37	0.16	0.83	0.24	0.64	0.16	0.37	0.14	0.42	0.08	0.28	0.03	0.16	0.08	0.28	1.27	0.77
Health, HIV/AIDS and medical sociology	36	0.39	0.96	0.31	0.67	0.11	0.32	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.17	-	-	0.31	0.79	1.72	1.06
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	29	0.28	0.75	0.28	0.46	0.07	0.26	0.21	0.49	0.03	0.19	-	-	0.14	0.35	1.31	0.66
Crime, violence, policing and security	29	0.17	0.38	0.10	0.31	0.03	0.19	0.03	0.19	0.14	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.63	1.14	0.52
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	23	0.09	0.29	0.39	0.58	0.04	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.85	0.04	0.21	0.30	0.64	1.39	0.89
State, apartheid and democracy	20	0.20	0.52	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.22	0.15	0.49	0.52	0.12	0.30	0.57	0.19	0.40	1.30	0.57
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	16	0.31	0.60	0.13	0.50	0.13	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.50	-	-	0.15	0.49	1.25	0.45
Education, higher education and curriculum	141	0.29	0.61	0.07	0.27	0.07	0.27	0.14	0.36	0.07	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.85	1.64	0.93

Poverty and unemployment	12	0.17	0.39	0.33	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.29	0.17	0.39	1.50	0.52
Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	11	0.09	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.41	0.27	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.47	1.09	0.54
Civil society, movements and NGOs	10	0.10	0.32	0.20	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.32	0.10	0.32	0.10	0.32	0.30	0.68	1.00	0.67
Military studies and war studies	10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.32	0.40	0.52	0.10	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.64	1.10	0.32
Race	9	0.67	1.66	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.44	0.44	0.73	0.00	0.00	–	–	0.11	0.33	1.56	1.33
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, xenophobia, etc.)	7	0.14	0.38	0.43	0.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.54	1.29	0.49
Culture, social structure and African studies	7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.85	1.29	0.49
Identity and modernity	3	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.58	0.33	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00

studies, education, poverty and unemployment, military studies, social problems, culture and African studies, and identity (Table 4.7).

What methodologies or approaches were evident in the publications in the journal? Nearly half of the publications (45%) could be grouped

**Table 4.7** Research areas across departments of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

Research Areas	N	Department					
		Sociology		Others		Total	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	43	0.60	0.66	0.51	0.94	1.12	0.85
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	37	0.84	0.65	0.41	0.96	1.24	0.80
Health, HIV/AIDS and medical sociology	36	0.64	0.76	0.78	1.22	1.42	1.02
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	29	0.34	0.48	0.69	0.89	1.03	0.73
Crime, violence, policing and security	29	0.59	0.73	0.34	0.48	0.93	0.65
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	23	0.52	0.67	0.57	0.59	1.09	0.52
State, apartheid and democracy	20	0.80	0.83	0.30	0.47	1.10	0.72
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	16	0.31	0.60	0.75	0.86	1.06	0.85
Education, higher education and curriculum	41	0.50	0.65	0.93	0.98	1.43	0.94
Poverty and unemployment	12	0.25	0.62	0.75	0.62	1.00	0.74
Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	11	0.73	0.65	0.18	0.41	0.91	0.54
Civil society, movements and NGOs	10	0.70	0.68	0.30	0.68	1.00	0.67
Military studies and war studies	10	0.30	0.48	0.50	0.54	0.80	0.42
Race	9	1.11	1.27	0.44	0.53	1.56	1.33
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, xenophobia, etc.)	7	0.57	0.79	0.71	0.49	1.29	0.49
Culture, social structure and African studies	7	0.29	0.49	0.71	0.76	1.00	0.58
Identity and modernity	3	0.33	0.58	0.67	0.58	1.00	0.00

as publications that used a theoretical approach, followed by empirical studies of a qualitative nature. Purely quantitative methodologies were followed in 44 publications (12%). Mixed methodologies were increasingly evident. A year-wise pattern in this variable showed that theoretical papers have increased (32%–43%), qualitative ones decreased slightly (40%–38%), and quantitative papers decreased considerably (22%–14%) since 1995–1999. Mixed methodologies also shrank in number (5%–2%).

The connection between research areas and methodology was explored, and is presented in Table 4.8. Since some half of the publications were theoretical in nature this dominance was seen across all research areas. Some notable features can be deduced from the data. A considerable number of publications in the areas of education, social problems, and family and marriage have employed quantitative methods (one-third to one-fifth). More than two-thirds of the publications in sociology and methodology, the state, apartheid and democracy, and identity and modernity were theoretical. Studies of social problems also had a substantial number of publications that were the result of quantitative studies. Research on poverty and unemployment also had some publications that employed quantitative methods.

One more dimension of methodology is contextual. This is the institutional preference, which is shown in Table 4.9. UKZN recorded a higher mean value for quantitative papers. Obviously, as seen earlier, this is largely due to the publications in the areas of education and health and HIV/AIDS. ANOVA results showed significant variation among the types of methodologies for UKZN. Foreign institutions, UJ and SU had a high score for mixed methodology papers. The difference between the types was statistically significant for SU and foreign institutions. The universities where no difference in the use of methodologies was found were UJ, Wits, UCT and RU. No particular methodology is predominant in these universities.

The WoS publications on sociological topics were also analysed to supplement the data from SARS. Publications for the democratic period (sampled for the years 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015) were captured for analysis. There were a total of 2293 publications for this period (Table 4.10). The percentage of growth, from 1995 to 2015, was 5.7–47%. The number of authors per publication also showed an increase during the years of the analysis (from 1.65 to 3.35). This increase was steady and statistically significant. From the count of all authors it was clear that the majority of them were affiliated to universities, followed by research institutes. A

**Table 4.8** Research areas and methodology in publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

Research area	Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed		Theoretical		Others		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	6	14.0	19	44.2	2	4.7	13	30.2	3	7.0	43	100
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	4	10.8	6	16.2	1	2.7	26	70.3	0	0.0	37	100
Health, HIV/AIDS and medical sociology	3	8.3	17	47.2	2	5.6	14	38.9	0	0.0	36	100
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	5	17.2	14	48.3	1	3.4	8	4.9	1	3.4	29	100
Crime, violence, policing and security	2	6.9	14	48.3	0	0.0	13	44.8	0	0.0	29	100
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	5	21.7	12	52.2	0	0.0	6	26.1	0	0	23	100
State, apartheid and democracy	1	5.0	5	25.0	0	0.0	14	70.0	0	0	20	100
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	1	6.3	6	37.5	0	0.0	7	43.8	2	12.5	16	100
Education, higher education and curriculum	4	28.6	4	28.6	0	0.0	6	42.9	0	0.0	14	100
Poverty and unemployment	2	16.7	6	50.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	1	8.3	12	100

*(continued)*

**Table 4.8** (continued)

Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	1	9.1	3	27.3	0	0.0	7	63.6	0	0.0	11	100
Civil society, movements and NGOs	0	0.0	5	50.0	0	0.0	5	50.0	0	0.0	10	100
Military studies and war studies	0	0.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	6	60.0	1	10.0	10	100
Race	0	0.0	5	55.6	0	0.0	4	44.4	0	0.0	9	100
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, xenophobia, etc.)	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	42.9	0	0.0	7	100
Culture, social structure and African studies	1	14.3	3	42.9	0	0.0	3	42.9	0	0.0	7	100
Identity and modernity	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	3	100

few of them came from government, hospitals and from industry. Authors from universities continued to increase after 1995. In 1995 there was an average of 1.26 authors from universities, which by 2015 increased significantly to 2.02. This extent of increase did not occur in research, industry or other sectors. The publications, on average for all years, were 13.8 pages in length, ranging between 2 and 62. This amounts to a total number of 31,682 pages. This variable has not shown any statistically significant increase over the years. The publications received an average citation of 5.31, which varied between 6 and 17 in the selected years. Citation data was not available for SARS publications.

The publications in WoS showed that there were three research areas that constituted the majority of the publications (Table 4.11). Publications in the area of education constituted 23% of the total count, public, environmental and occupational health 21% and area studies 10%. While education and public, environmental and occupational health grew in number after 1995, publications in area studies have decreased considerably, from 24% in 1995 to 5.4% in 2015. Publications in health grew in number, other topics in the social sciences declined while interdisciplin-



**Table 4.9** Methodological orientation and institutions of publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

Methodology	N	UKZN <sup>a</sup>		Wits <sup>c</sup>		SU <sup>d</sup>		UCT <sup>e</sup>		RU <sup>f</sup>		Foreign Institution <sup>g</sup>		All <sup>h</sup>			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Theoretical	162	0.11	0.52	0.16	0.46	0.13	0.34	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.38	0.08	0.32	0.30	0.52	1.22	0.65
Qualitative	138	0.23	0.62	0.17	0.42	0.12	0.46	0.14	0.42	0.12	0.53	0.05	0.25	0.20	0.53	1.38	0.86
Quantitative	44	0.41	0.95	0.20	0.51	0.09	0.42	0.20	0.51	0.02	0.15	0.02	0.15	0.23	0.52	1.61	0.84
Others	8	0.0	0.00	0.50	0.93	0.13	0.35	0.13	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.88	1.13	1.75	0.71
Mixed	7	0.14	0.38	0.29	0.49	0.14	0.38	0.29	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.38	0.57	1.51	1.57	1.13
Total	359	0.19	0.63	0.18	0.46	0.12	0.40	0.11	0.37	0.42	0.22	0.06	0.27	0.58	1.35	1.78	0.78

Notes: ANOVA results: a = ( $F=2.384$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.015$ ), b = ( $F=1.15$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.333$ ); c = ( $F=0.086$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.987$ ); d = ( $F=2.446$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.046$ ); e = ( $F=0.603$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.661$ ); f = ( $F=0.722$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.577$ ); g = ( $F=3.359$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.010$ ); and h = ( $F=1.856$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p=0.015$ )

**Table 4.10** Publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015

Publications	1995		2000		2005		2010		2015		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number of publications	130	5.7	105	4.6	244	10.6	735	32.1	1079	47.1	2293	100.0
Mean number of authors (ANOVA: $F=12.548$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	1.65	1.16	2.35	1.88	2.59	2.18	3.11	3.06	3.35	3.39	3.05	3.05
<i>Sector of affiliation</i>												
Mean number of university sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=23.312$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	1.26	0.90	1.43	0.93	1.59	0.92	1.88	1.05	2.02	1.20	1.86	1.12
Mean number of research institute sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=1.158$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.328$ )	0.17	0.53	0.24	0.64	0.32	0.68	0.27	0.63	0.27	0.67	0.27	0.65
Mean number of other sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=3.172$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.13$ )	0.08	0.31	0.26	0.77	0.13	0.42	0.11	0.36	0.15	0.46	0.13	0.44
Mean number of industry sector of authors (ANOVA: $F=5.102$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.05	0.25	0.06	0.27	0.02	0.17	0.02	0.16	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.14
<i>Length of publications</i>												
Mean page length of publications (ANOVA: $F=1.690$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.150$ )	13.22	7.88	14.01	7.30	14.30	7.23	13.41	5.73	14.04	6.37	13.82	6.42
Mean number of citations (ANOVA: $F=166.970$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	8.68	16.65	17.40	24.03	16.58	19.78	6.61	9.75	0.29	0.85	5.31	12.14

**Table 4.11** Major research areas of publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015

<i>Research areas</i>	<i>1995</i>		<i>2000</i>		<i>2005</i>		<i>2010</i>		<i>2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Education	23	17.7	18	17.1	63	25.8	186	25.3	234	21.7	524	22.9
Public, environmental and occupational health	11	8.5	15	14.3	51	20.9	135	18.4	259	24.0	471	20.5
Area studies	31	23.8	24	22.9	42	17.2	84	11.4	58	5.4	239	10.4
Health	2	1.5	11	10.5	21	8.6	74	10.1	102	9.5	210	9.2
Social sciences, other topics	13	10.0	4	3.8	12	4.9	53	7.2	44	4.1	126	5.5
Environmental sciences	7	5.4	10	9.5	16	6.6	67	9.1	21	1.9	121	5.3
Social sciences, interdisciplinary	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	117	10.8	117	5.1
Criminology	1	0.8	1	1.0	1	0.4	8	1.1	97	9.0	108	4.7
Information science	26	20.0	4	3.8	7	2.9	15	2.0	52	4.8	104	4.5
Social issues	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.4	42	5.7	47	4.4	91	4.0
Family studies	6	4.6	3	2.9	7	2.9	18	2.4	0	0.0	34	1.5
Communication	2	1.5	2	1.9	6	2.5	8	1.1	13	1.2	31	1.4
Cultural studies	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	28	3.8	0	0.0	29	1.3
Demography	2	1.5	1	1.0	7	2.9	3	0.4	12	1.1	25	1.1
Ethnic studies	1	0.8	8	7.6	4	1.6	7	1.0	3	0.3	23	1.0
Sociology	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	3	0.4	15	1.4	19	0.8

ary social sciences grew. Criminology was another area of research that showed a substantial increase in the more recent years. Communication and information science declined from the 1995 level but recouped in 2015, although the percentage of publications was lower than in 1995.

### SUMMARY

The production of scientific knowledge in sociology has reached an all-time high in the last six years. This applies to both the number and size of publications. Note that sociologists alone did not produce the publications in the journal. The racial background of authors favoured whites rather than people of other races. The average number of white authors was far

ahead of other racial groups in the democratic period. The gap between the first two racial groups of authors was very wide. There was not any notable change in the partnership of authors in the production of publications, as the average number of authors did not change significantly during the entire period. The gap in gender became closer in sociological research. A large proportion of the sociological literature originated from universities rather than from any other single sector.

Unsurprisingly the research publications in *SARS* were largely on South African issues, problems, phenomena and debates, adding value to South African sociology. Three prominent research areas can be identified from the analysis—labour, sociology, and health and HIV/AIDS. A pattern of growth and decline within the democratic period was obvious in the analysis. For instance, labour studies first declined and later recovered its position. Gender studies moved ahead with an increasing number of publications. Declining interest was seen in studies on apartheid and state matters, perhaps leaving it to other disciplines.

There are some universities that led in the production of sociological knowledge in the country. In order of the size of their contribution, they were UJ, UKZN, Wits and SU. Half of the sociological research during the democratic phase originated from these four institutions. Scholars from overseas played an equally significant role in the production of knowledge for South African sociology. Sociologists were not alone in this endeavour. There were scholars from geography, anthropology, politics, education, philosophy and other disciplines who took part in the production and publication of research that was highly relevant for the discipline of sociology. Significantly, the works of authors who belonged to departments other than sociology increased over time, even more so than those of scholars from sociology departments. To take some sample areas of research, non-sociology departments in the country published more work on health and HIV/AIDS, gender and sexuality, community studies, education, poverty and unemployment and social problems. Certain connections between the areas of research and institutions were also revealed in this analysis. This aids in identifying the focus areas of scholars located in these institutions.

Methodological dimensions were evident in the analysis. Most of the publications in the analysis had not been the outcomes of empirical research involving qualitative, quantitative or mixed paradigmatic approaches. Only half of them fell under this grouping. The rest were theoretical approaches, either based on the existing literature or providing

some new insights into sociological issues. Quite a number of publications dealt with methodological issues in sociology. Historically, quantitative methodologies were not as popular as qualitative methodologies and this has not changed significantly in the new democratic South Africa, but rather has become more evident. The analysis was helpful in identifying the research areas that usually employ quantitative methodologies and the WoS data also complemented this analysis. It showed a very significant increase in the production of publications. The focus areas of research, and the trends over the years, were also revealed by the WoS data.

Drawing upon these analyses, Chap. 5 considers current sociological research in the country.

## NOTES

1. As part of the process of restructuring and merger, universities and technikons were merged and formed into new institutions. The University of Johannesburg came into being joining the Rand Afrikaans University, Technikon Witwatersrand and Vista University (East Rand and Soweto). The Nelson Mandela University was formed after merging the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth Technikon and the Vista University (Port Elizabeth). The University of South Africa (UNISA) was joined with the Technikon South Africa and the Vista University Distance Education Centre. The Water Sisulu University of Technology of Science was formed after dissolving the University of Transkei, Border Technikon and the Eastern Technikon. The University of Durban-Westville merged with the University of Natal to form the University of KwaZulu-Natal, the University of North and the Medical University of South Africa joined to become the University of Limpopo, and the Potchefstroom University of Christian Higher Education joined with the University of North-West and Vista University (only the staff and students of Sebokeng) to form the North-West University. The Central University of Technology came into being after joining with the Technikon Free State and Vista University (Welkom). The Vaal University of Technology was formed after merging the Vaal Triangle Technikon and the Vista University (infrastructure and facilities of Sebokeng). The Cape Peninsula University of Technology was formed after merging the Cape Technikon and the Peninsula Technikon (Pentech). The Durban University of Technology was formed after it merged with the Mangosuthu Technikon with the infrastructure and facilities of the Umlazi campus of the Zululand University. The Tshwane University of Technology was formed from the union of the Technikon Pretoria, Technikon Northern Gauteng and Technikon North-West.

2. They are the 11 traditional universities (Cape Town, Free State, Fort Hare, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, North-West, Pretoria, Rhodes, Stellenbosch, Western Cape and Witwatersrand), 8 comprehensive universities (Johannesburg, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan, Walter Sisulu, University of South Africa, Venda, Zululand, Sol Plaatje and Mpumalanga), 1 Health Science University (Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences incorporated MEDUNSA) and 6 universities of technology (Cape Peninsula, Central, Durban, Tshwane, Vaal and Mangosuthu).
3. This figure was computed from the department websites of universities on 10 March 2016. Information is missing for two departments of the Walter Sisulu University and Zululand University.
4. This kind of new managerialism was evident in several sociology departments such as the University of Cape Town, the University of Fort Hare and at the University of Western Cape (Oloyede 2006). Resistance to this took place at some departments by leading sociologists like Jacklyn Cock (Webster 2008).
5. For instance, the department of sociology at the University of Port Elizabeth was scrapped when it was converted into a number of different programmes (Hendricks 2006).
6. The programme-based approach is spelt out in the *Education White Paper* (RSA 1997) and in the National Plan for Higher Education (RSA 2001).
7. Research output unit refers to the amount of research produced and calculated for subsidy purposes. This is based on the number of publications and graduate throughput produced in a given year.
8. They were the universities of Cape Town, Natal, Pretoria, Stellenbosch and Witwatersrand (CHE 2004).
9. NIHSS was established on 5 December 2013 as an independent statutory body with the aim of advancing and coordinating scholarship and research in the humanities and social sciences. The institute has its origin in the Humanities Charter that was commissioned by the Department of Higher Education and Training under the minister, Blade Nzimande, a sociologist by training. The Charter was meant to explore the ways and means to save the declining humanities and social sciences in the country. A prominent sociologist, Ari Sitas, was the main architect of this Charter. See Sitas et al. (2011).
10. Preferences are given to disciplines such as visual and performing arts, African languages, history, anthropology, economic, heritage studies, social work, indigenous knowledge systems, and African music and musicology, and does not include sociology.
11. At several universities sociology departments have become sociology programmes. Department is used which includes programme as well.

## REFERENCES

- Adésinà, J. O. (2006). Sociology beyond despair: Recovery of nerve, endogeneity, and epistemic intervention. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 241–259.
- Alexander, P. (2004). The National Research Foundation and priorities for critical research. *Society in Transition*, 35(2), 319–327.
- Alexander, P., & Ichharam, M. (2002). Spitting for science at RAU: Quality in quantitative research on HIV/AIDS. *Society in Transition*, 33(3), 347–362.
- ASSAf (Academy of Science of South Africa). (2011). *Consensus study on the state of the Humanities in South Africa: Status, prospects and strategies*. Pretoria: Academy of Science of South Africa.
- Basson, I., & Prozesky, H. E. (2015). A review of methodological trends in South African sociology, 1990–2009. *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(3), 4–27.
- CHE (The Council for Higher Education). (2004). *South African higher education in the first decade of democracy*. Pretoria: The Council on Higher Education.
- CHE (The Council for Higher Education). (2015). *Vital stats: Public higher education 2013*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education.
- CREST (Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology). (2014). *Mapping social sciences research in South Africa*. Cape Town: The Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology, Stellenbosch University.
- Crothers, C. (1997). South African sociology departments in 1996/7. *Society in Transition*, 28(1–4), 137–140.
- Hendricks, F. (2006). The rise and fall of South African sociology. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 86–97.
- James, W. G. (1993). The founding conference of the South African Sociological Association, University of Witwatersrand, 21–22 January 1993. *South African Sociological Review*, 5(2), 115–117.
- Oloyede, O. (2006). Sociologia cognita: A note on recent concerns in sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 343–355.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1997, August 15). *Education White Paper 3 – A programme for higher education transformation* (Gazette No. 18207). Pretoria: Government of South Africa.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (1998, July 3). *National Research Foundation Act, 1988* (Gazette No. 19017). Pretoria: Government of South Africa.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2001, March 9). *Higher Education Act, 1997. National Plan for Higher Education* (Government Gazette, No. 22138). Pretoria: Republic of South Africa.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2003, December 3). *Higher Education Act, 1997 (101 of 1997)* (Government Gazette. No. 25824). Pretoria: Republic of South Africa.

- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2008). *Government Gazette, Vol. 519, No. 31470, 30 September 2008. Act No. 17 of 2008, Human Sciences Research Council Act, 2008.*
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2013). *Higher Education Act, 1997, Act 101 of 1997. Government Gazette, No. 952, No. 37118, 5 December 2013.*
- Schutte, G. (2007). Looking to the future: Crossing disciplinary borders in South Africa. *International Sociology, 22*(5), 564–567.
- Seidman, G. (1999). Is South Africa different? Sociological comparisons and theoretical contributions from the land of apartheid. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25*, 419–440.
- Sitas, A., Mosoetsa, S., Tame, B., & Lorgat, A. (2011). *Charter for humanities and social sciences*. Pretoria: Department of Higher Education and Training, Republic of South Africa.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2015). Sociological research in South Africa: Post-apartheid trends. *International Sociology, 30*(2), 119–133.
- Uys, T. (2006). South African sociology in transition: Continental and global engagement. *Sociological Bulletin, 55*(1), 78–90.
- Venter, D. (1998). Dissing the sacred canopy: The state of sociology of religion in South Africa. *Society in Transition, 29*(3–4), 143–151.
- Webster, E. (1997). Democratic transition: South African sociology. *Contemporary Sociology, 26*(3), 279–282.
- Webster, E. (2008). Sociologist unbound: A celebration of the work of Jacklyn Cock. *South African Review of Sociology, 39*(2), 175–181.



## Sociological Research: Contemporary Characteristics

**Abstract** A few characteristics are significant in the contemporary sociological scene in South Africa. Methodological orientations and preferences, fragmentation and specialization, collaboration, and internationalization are the major ones. Qualitative methodologies are the preferred approach for sociologists in South Africa. As far as the key research areas are concerned, South African sociology is more fragmented than focused or specialized. Collaboration among sociologists is not as strong as in the natural science disciplines in the country. The association between quantitative methodology and collaboration is obvious in the research publications of South African sociologists. Rather than within sociology departments, collaboration prevails more between sociology and other departments. Internationalization in South African sociology is yet to take deep root, but South African sociologists are active participants in international sociological activities.

**Keywords** Sociological research • Sociology • South Africa • Internationalization • Collaboration

Currently South African sociologists engage in research and produce knowledge more vigorously than ever before. The growing number of publications, mostly in local and occasionally in international journals,

supports the increased production in sociological knowledge. Available publication opportunities for sociologists are now more open than ever before in the new democratic dispensation. South Africa has passed the phase of the 'closed-off' period. The growing interest in South African topics among the editors and publishing houses has accelerated the production of knowledge. Another reason for the increased production of research output is structural. Publications have become an integral part of the performance management system introduced into South African universities during the early years of the decade. The system expects academics to produce research publications in accredited journals at varying levels depending on their rank. The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) has set its benchmark of publications for academics working in universities in the country. Funding from the government to universities is now linked to research output and throughput.

Having seen South African sociology in three clearly discernible phases—the colonial, apartheid and democratic periods—consideration of the contemporary characteristics of sociology is called for. At the minimum there are four important parts that require attention—methodological orientations, fragmentation and specialization, collaboration, and internationalization in South African sociology.

There is no shortage of ideas, issues, problems and opportunities for sociologists in South Africa to undertake research. It offers, as Sitas (2006) says, an exceptional social laboratory. A wide spectrum is visible in the areas in which sociologists conduct research. One could easily group them as more than 100 topics over which the interests of sociologists are scattered and spread. Methodological preferences were evident from these research areas and publications. In order to understand the discipline better, these foci and specializations in South African sociology need to be examined. These reflect the characteristics of sociology in general, that is, fragmentation and specialization.

Collaboration, both domestic and international, has been well recognized as a key factor in the growth of a discipline and knowledge production. This has been proven in the case of several science disciplines in South Africa (Sooryamoorthy 2015b). It is therefore of interest to look at which collaboration patterns exist among sociologists in the country in terms of the preferred areas of research, methodologies, institutional origins and publication outlets.

Internationalization of sociology is important to the growth of the discipline. The ways South African sociologists are collaborating with

international peers, attending and presenting papers at international conferences and other professional meetings, sourcing funds from international agencies, and producing knowledge of an international standard are all part of the process of internationalization. An attempt is also made here to understand this dimension in South African sociology, from the data that can be gleaned from their publications.

### METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

A clear methodological proclivity marks South African sociology. South African sociologists have largely preferred and adopted qualitative methodologies rather than quantitative methodologies. The scientometric analysis presented in the previous chapters shows this very clearly. A considerable number of papers published by sociologists in the country were qualitative or theoretical in nature. A natural consequence of this is reflected in the poor development of quantitative research in South African sociology.

Local sociologists were aware of this drawback in South African sociology and had been quite concerned about the weakness of quantitative and statistical analysis in the nation's sociological research (Botes et al. 1991; Groenewald 1991; van Staden and Visser 1991). A number of explanations have been put forward. The lack of collaboration with experienced researchers, indifference to positivistic methods and the growing followers of humanistic qualitative methods were some of the reasons offered for this backwardness in quantitative research undertakings (K. Oosthuizen 1991). It is also true that there were not enough sociologists well versed in quantitative research methodologies and South Africa did not attract these experienced sociologists (K. Oosthuizen 1991). The number of social scientists, other than economists, engaged in quantitative research was small (Seekings 2001). The situation has not significantly changed in the democratic era.

This lack of interest in quantitative studies has some historical antecedents. Seekings (2001) believes that it was because of the history of antipathy and hostility towards quantitative methodology. The division of Afrikaans and English language universities was instrumental in the backwardness of quantitative research in sociological studies. While sociologists based at Afrikaans language universities opted for quantitative paradigms, their counterparts at English language universities turned to qualitative approaches. This bifurcated attention to methodologies was mainly due to their paradigmatic leanings. Research skills to conduct quantitative

studies were relatively better for sociologists in Afrikaans universities than in English universities and the former were more open to upgrading the research skills of their faculty (Olzak 1990).<sup>1</sup> The difference in approaches to the study of social realities was instrumental in establishing two opposing camps. Apart from these historical reasons, the weakened empirical research in democratic South Africa has also been the effect, at least partly, due to the differences between positivists and Marxist sociologists. The radical left sociologists attacked positivism, quantitative social sciences and functionalism (Jubber 2006). Can this divergent interest to follow specific methodologies (during apartheid and to some extent in the new South Africa) be considered as part of the ‘politics of method’, to borrow the phrase from Savage and Burrows (2007)?

The preference of scholars at the Afrikaans language universities for quantitative studies was evident in the data presented in the previous chapters. In addition to this the cross tabulation of the variables of methodology and universities (Afrikaans and English) of the data for 1970–1993 (for publications in selected journals) revealed the distinguishing methodological features. The analysis showed that 36% of the publications that originated at English universities (Natal, Cape Town, Witwatersrand and Rhodes) were based on qualitative data, while the percentage of publications for Afrikaans universities (Stellenbosch, Pretoria, Potchefstroom, Rand Afrikaans and Orange Free State) was at 21%. In regard to quantitative studies the percentage was only slightly in favour of Afrikaans universities.

As Seekings (2001) observes, while sociology departments across the country taught courses in quantitative methodology at different levels, this has not been translated to the generation of quantitative data through research. On the teaching front, quantitative research and analysis was weakly integrated into the curriculum. There was much room for training and accumulation of skills for quantitative research at universities in the country (Seekings 2001). Similarly, van Staden and Visser (1992) pointed out that South African scholars lacked the knowledge about quantitative research procedures, particularly on sampling and its limitations. This is also clear from the papers that are presented at the annual conferences of the South African Sociological Association (SASA).

The indifference of sociologists in South Africa to quantitative methods has some resonance with the decline of this methodology at the international level (Savage and Burrows 2007). It is also possible that, as van Staden and Visser (1992) observe, South African social scientists were not

very familiar or comfortable with advanced statistical techniques, which is an essential skill required to undertake quantitative studies. This has been emphasized in the analyses of the research publications of sociologists (Basson and Prozesky 2015; van Staden and Visser 1991). But, as Seekings (2001) notes, there was a resurgence of quantitative research in the 1990s in the South African social sciences. This was due to the availability of new sets of data, technological advancement in data management software programmes and the demands from policy-makers (Seekings 2001) in the new democratic South Africa. However, this resurgence is yet to surface in the research publications of South African sociologists in journals like *SARS*.

### FRAGMENTATION AND SPECIALIZATION

Presumably, sociology is the least integrated discipline in the social sciences (Turner 2006). The fragmented nature of sociological research is prominent and is accepted as its feature.

Sociology in South Africa is also fragmented, even within the departments of sociology at universities. It is like an ‘archipelago of poorly connected islands of specialization’, as Craig Calhoun described it (1992 cited in Carroll 2013: 2). Luckett (2009) argues, on the basis of her study, that sociological knowledge in South Africa has been more fragmented over time due to the divide in the social sciences between post-positivist and post-structuralist epistemologies. This has been the trend since apartheid. The fragmented character of sociology gave rise to a collage of topics, issues and sociological problems but it lacked depth and vigour. A close examination of the research and publications of sociologists underlines this nature of sociological research in South Africa.

The scattered areas of interest are also obvious in the research interests and curriculum vitae of sociologists at South African universities. An analysis of this using information from the web pages of sociology departments showed the diverse character of research specializations, varying from biopolitics to witchcraft. To list a few of the prominent research areas that have caught the attention of South African sociologists: labour and industrial studies, health and medical sociology, sexuality, civil society and social movements, disciplinary matters in sociology and methodology, crime and violence, the state and apartheid, development, the family, marriage and children, biopolitics, clinical sociology, human rights, media, social networks, witchcraft and the occult.

Currently sociologists tend, often individually, to do whatever research possible as long as it is publishable. They work and publish in scattered areas of interest. Many are not keen to do intensive and rigorous research in one particular field for an extended period of time. Efforts on the part of sociologists who team up to form groups of researchers in some specialized areas are also missing. Needless to say, any sociology programme in the country is not known for a singular contribution to a field that is its primary focus. The only exception is labour studies. Examining a considerable amount of sociological research, Human (1984) thinks that this kind of fragmenting reality that excludes proper explanation can be due to the weakness of theory in South African sociology.

The analysis in the previous chapters has illustrated the absence of specific research foci of South African sociologists and social scientists. Some of the research areas have continued to receive the attention of scholars while others have lost their significance and importance. Some have grown impressively in the last few years but others have declined to insignificant levels.

Studies on labour, industry and trade unions is one research area that has featured prominently in the previous analyses. Labour studies originated and flourished in South Africa at a particular historical juncture. Industrial sociology has a long tradition and history at universities in the country. No other areas can claim to have gone through a similar phase of growth in the country. This area occupied a pre-eminent position in sociology in the apartheid period. Perhaps the career-oriented nature of industrial sociology was a supportive factor for its growth. It continues to be so in several universities. In some universities, such as the University of KwaZulu-Natal, it is run under a separate programme.

The end of apartheid and the beginning of democracy in South Africa weakened labour studies, once the strongest branch of public sociology (Buhlungu 2009). This was partly because the university-based intellectuals found their role in strengthening the workers through their research and engagement irrelevant. At the same time, the unions were gaining knowledge in areas of their need (Buhlungu 2009). Trade unions that once commissioned academics and researchers to conduct research for them are now able to conduct it for themselves. Members of trade unions now have access to a university education. Externally funded workers' education programmes, offered at some universities are beneficial to them. Trade unions were also forming research groups to undertake studies where research is necessary (Bird 1992) or they associated with other

organizations for research (Valodia 1992). Political organizations also have their own research wings (Ngoasheng 1992).

One other area in South African sociology that is gaining strength is science and technology studies that conduct research and produce masters and PhDs. Studies on race issues continue to attract the attention of sociologists. The views of Murphree (1975) and Stone (1976) on sociological research on race in Southern Africa remain valid even today.<sup>2</sup> Some areas, as Zegeye and Motsemme (2004) note, such as rural issues were ignored in the past. The historically black universities (HBUs) have the potential, for historical reasons, to undertake research in crucial areas such as rural development and health (Reddy 1992).

Interest in many other specialized fields was momentary, unstable or disappeared, failing to achieve a substantial position within sociology. Once marginalized for some time, the new research that is emerging from the global South on violence makes it a case for a core issue and a visibly important theme in sociology (Walby 2012). Studies of violence, violence against women and children are receiving the increased attention of sociologists in the country.

Sociological knowledge is produced not only within universities and research institutes. A great deal of work has already been generated and is being generated elsewhere which often did not reach the editing programmes of scholarly journals and book publishing houses. They are mostly works, as Sitas (2014) points out, that are applied in nature, produced at the behest of government or national and international organizations. They are significant contributions to innovations in fieldwork and analysis (Sitas 2014).

There are not many sociologists in the country. This has implications for the development of specialized themes of research with a substantial number of scholars working in specific areas, and for the production of knowledge in such specific fields. Scholars like Webster (2004) have noted this.

New branches of sociology are emerging. Drawing from the works in the past, labour sociologists are aligning to chart new paths for teaching and research in sociology. The sociology of professions,<sup>3</sup> for instance, is poised to make a contribution to the national debate on professionalism and to develop a professional public culture (Bonnin and Ruggunan 2013). The need for a strong professional culture is indispensable for the country in the realms of education, health and other public sectors. These are important concerns for contemporary South African society.

Fragmentation may not always affect the discipline adversely. Indian sociology is highly fragmented without having many negative effects (Patel 2011). In line with the diverse character of Indian society, Indian sociology since the 1960s became more diversified and specialized (Mukherjee 1977). Spanish sociology also had a decade of specialization in the 1970s and as a result some areas flourished (Miguel and Moyer 1979).

Specialization should be viewed in the context of the perspective that there is no mainstream sociological research and the content of the subject is subjected to continuous revision and renewal (Scott 2005). Sociological specialisms, Scott (2005) continues, are formed as responses to the fortunes of other disciplines and the vagaries of social change. Specialization in sociology is triggered by the surrounding social circumstances or changes in the social structure. In Spain, the development of specific areas in sociology coincided with major changes in the social structure (Miguel and Moyer 1979).

Specialization is important and essential in regard to funding. The funding for research sourced from the National Research Foundation (NRF) is linked to one's rating, and scholars are now encouraged to work and specialize in specific and focused areas of interest. As seen in Table 5.1 there are fewer areas in which the NRF rated social scientists (which include sociologists) worked on. This encourages sociologists to concentrate their research on a single area of interest, and not widely dispersed in unrelated areas, as has been the case for many scholars. The advantage of researching deeper into specific problems and areas of interest is not only for career advancement of the scholar but also advantageous for the discipline. Advanced knowledge of particular issues that are relevant locally and nationally has far-reaching positive consequences for the discipline and its stature in the country. On the other hand, scholars also benefit from the focused efforts of work in a particular area, who eventually become an authority in that area. Students who want to do their research masters and PhDs will also be drawn to such areas and approach respective scholars.

Specialization in the subfields of sociology has its benefits, both for the sociologists and for the discipline. Leahey and Reikowsky (2008) list some of these as: it can promote the productivity of scholars and deepen knowledge in the specific area; it can act as a springboard for innovative work; and it can even expand the horizons of research in a more integrative way. A glance at the research committees of the professional associations of sociologists, nationally and internationally, reveals the extent of specialization that the discipline has bifurcated into several areas in the recent past.



**Table 5.1** Specialization of NRF rated scholars, 2015

<i>Specialization</i>	<i>No. of scholars</i>
Education/higher education/educational policy/sociology of/pedagogy/educational change/teacher development/curriculum/	71
Gender studies	26
Health/HIV/public health	22
ICT/communication/media	16
Urban studies	14
Human rights	14
Tourism	10
Development	10
Race/racism	7
Poverty	7
Labour studies/industrial studies	7
Family/marriage/children	7
Local government/housing/livelihoods/sports/diaspora studies	6
Military sociology	5
Emigration	5
Crime/violence	5
Social Movements/civil society	4
Maritime sociology	4
Identity/masculinity	4
Sociology of science	2
Policy	2
Environmental sociology	2

*Source:* Tabulated from NRF (2015)

Specializations in South African sociology emerged as an outcome of reactions to the changing social realities—labour studies, health studies or studies on crime. Sociologists should not be too concerned about specialization or the fragmentation of sociology. Rather they should be concerned with building a strong sociology, perhaps a rainbow sociology. Sociology is fragmenting any way (Leahey and Reikowsky 2008).

## COLLABORATION

Coauthored publication is a proxy to collaborative research. The current coauthorship patterns of sociologists are able to demonstrate the collaborative research dimensions among South African sociologists and social scientists. For this purpose a scientometric analysis of the publication records

from the *South African Review of Sociology* (SARS) and from the Web of Science (WoS) are provided here.

There are two main types of collaboration, domestic and international. Domestic collaboration can be internal institutional or external institutional. In the internal institutional type, all authors belong to the same institution but not necessarily to the same department. The external institutional form refers to association of scholars from two or more different institutions located within the country. International collaboration has at least one scholar from an overseas institution. A publication might have all types of collaboration—internal institutional, external institutional and international—when there are four authors or more (two from the same institution, one from an external institution in the country and one from overseas).

Table 5.2 illustrates the collaborative features of South African scholars from the publications in SARS from 1995 to 2015. The average number of authors per publication is an index of the degree of collaboration. In this case it was 1.39, which indicates that on average less than two scholars participated in the production of a publication. There were no significant differences among the classes of year used in the analysis. Of all the 359 publications in SARS for the period, 28% were jointly produced, involving partners from within the country and/or from overseas. Again, no significant association was found when it was tested using Chi-square. This suggests that the percentage of coauthored publications in the four time periods did not vary much although it declined by about two percentage points after 1995–1999.

Domestic collaboration that brought together colleagues from within the same institution or from other institutions in the country was applicable in the case of three-fourths of all coauthored publications (Table 5.2). Although not statistically significant, it varied from 68% in 2005–2009 to 82% in 1995–1999. It was a loss of five percentage points from the level that existed during 1995–1999. While there were more than three-fourths of the coauthored publications of the internal institutional collaboration type, external institutional collaboration was limited to 15%.

International collaboration was minimal. Only 15% reported having international association. International partners came from the USA, England and Botswana. There were scholars from other countries such as Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Tanzania and Zimbabwe who contributed to SARS. But they were single or multiple authors, not involving any South African partners. Authors were less international than the journal.

**Table 5.2** Collaboration of authors as seen from the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Collaboration</i>	<i>1995–1999</i>		<i>2000–2004</i>		<i>2005–2009</i>		<i>2010–2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Any kind of collaboration, domestic or international	18	29.0	29	29.6	18	25.0	35	27.6	100	27.9
Domestic collaboration	14	82.4	20	69.0	13	68.4	27	77.1	74	74.0
All South African authors (of all collaboration publications)	14	82.4	20	69.0	12	66.7	26	74.3	72	72.7
Internal institutional collaboration	12	70.6	18	62.1	11	57.9	24	68.6	65	65.0
External institutional collaboration	3	17.6	2	6.9	3	15.8	7	20.0	15	15.0
International collaboration	0	0.0	3	10.3	5	27.8	7	20.0	15	15.2
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Mean number of authors (ANOVA: $F=0.249$ , $df=3$ , $p=0.862$ )	1.35	0.70	1.45	0.88	1.39	0.87	1.37	0.71	1.39	0.78

The journal has published a good number of publications authored by those affiliated to overseas institutions. Most of them did not have a South African partner in these publications.

Some research areas, as opposed to others, had more collaboration. They were military studies, crime, violence and policing, sociology and social sciences, and development, urbanization and planning (Table 5.3). The split was equal for studies in health and poverty. As for collaboration at selected institutions, a few were highly collaborative. A high level of collaboration occurred among scholars from overseas (Table 5.4). Other institutions that recorded a higher score on coauthored publications

**Table 5.3** Collaboration and research areas in the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

Research areas	Collaboration		No collaboration		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Labour, industrial relations, migration and occupation	29	67.4	14	32.6	43	100
Sociology, social sciences and methodology	31	83.8	6	16.2	37	100
Health, HIV/AIDS and medical sociology	18	50.0	18	50.0	36	100
Gender, sexuality and women's studies	23	79.3	6	20.7	29	100
Crime, violence, policing and security	25	86.2	4	13.8	29	100
Family, households, marriage, divorce, population, children and youth	17	73.9	6	26.1	23	100
State, apartheid and democracy	15	75.0	5	25.0	20	100
Community studies, informal settlement, township and community development	10	62.5	6	37.5	16	100
Education, higher education and curriculum	8	57.1	6	42.9	14	100
Poverty and unemployment	6	50.0	6	50.0	12	100
Development, urbanization, planning and industrialization	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	100
Civil society, movements and NGOs	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100
Military studies and war studies	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	100
Race	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	100
Social problems (drug, alcoholism, prostitution, suicide, xenophobia, etc.)	5	71.4	2	28.6	7	100
Culture, social structure and African studies	4	57.1	3	42.9	7	100
Identity and modernity	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
Others (globalization, technology, sports, etc.)	34	79.1	9	20.9	43	100

than single-authored publications were the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), the University of Johannesburg (UJ), Stellenbosch University (SU) and the University of Cape Town (UCT) (with significant differences in the *t*-test). UKZN emerged as the institution that promoted collaboration more than any other institution. Department-wise collaboration was in favour of departments other than sociology departments, in which the former reported a higher score. Non-sociology departments produced more coauthored publications.

**Table 5.4** Collaboration in selected institutions and departments as seen in the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Collaboration</i> ( <i>N</i> =100)		<i>No collaboration</i> ( <i>N</i> =259)		<i>All</i> ( <i>N</i> =359)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
<i>Institution</i>						
University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN)***	0.40	1.04	0.11	0.32	0.19	0.63
University of Johannesburg (UJ)***	0.26	0.66	0.15	0.36	0.18	0.46
Stellenbosch University (SU)***	0.18	0.54	0.08	0.27	0.11	0.37
University of Cape Town (UCT)***	0.15	0.70	0.05	0.23	0.08	0.42
University of Witwatersrand (Wits)	0.13	0.54	0.12	0.33	0.12	0.40
Rhodes University (RU)	0.07	0.36	0.06	0.23	0.06	0.27
Foreign university/institution***	0.44	0.87	0.21	0.41	0.27	0.58
All institutions***	2.26	0.98	1.00	0.17	1.35	0.78
<i>Department</i>						
Sociology departments***	0.81	1.04	0.49	0.50	0.58	0.71
Other departments***	0.97	10.28	0.39	0.49	0.55	0.83
All departments***	1.78	1.19	0.88	0.33	1.13	0.80

Note: Independent *t*-test. Significance: \*\*\**p*<0.01

Race is an important variable in South Africa. The most collaborative race was white followed by Africans and Indians (Table 5.5). The mean score for white authors was four times higher than that of the next race, African. In all three races the difference between coauthored and single-authored publications was statistically significant. Note that the majority of authors were white. Male authors reported a higher rate of collaboration than female authors. The higher percentage of collaboration occurred in publications that had a quantitative methodological orientation.

More features of collaboration were unravelled when the correlation between certain variables were tested. The year of publication and white author was negatively related ( $p < 0.05$ ). This supports the previous finding that the average number of authors per publication decreased after 1995–1999. But for Indian authors it was positively related, which means they are becoming more collaborative than before. The relationship between white authors and black authors was significantly negative. Between male and female authors a negative relationship was obvious (Table 5.6).

**Table 5.5** Collaboration and authors in the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Collaboration</i> ( <i>N</i> =100)		<i>No collaboration</i> ( <i>N</i> =259)		<i>All</i> ( <i>N</i> =359)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
<i>Race</i>						
White <sup>a***</sup>	1.77	1.18	0.75	0.43	1.03	0.86
African <sup>a***</sup>	0.45	0.90	0.12	0.33	0.21	0.57
Indian <sup>a***</sup>	0.16	0.44	0.08	0.27	0.10	0.33
Others	0.04	0.20	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.21
<i>Gender</i>						
Male <sup>a***</sup>	1.22	0.94	0.55	0.50	0.74	0.72
Female <sup>a***</sup>	1.00	0.94	0.42	0.49	0.58	0.70
<i>Methodology<sup>b***</sup></i>						
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Quantitative	22	50.0	22	50.0	44	100
Qualitative	44	31.9	94	36.3	138	38.4
Theoretical	26	16.0	136	84.0	162	100

<sup>a</sup>Independent *t*-test. Significance: \*\*\**p* < 0.01

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square test. Significance: \*\*\**p* < 0.01

**Table 5.6** Relationship between year, gender and race in the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

	<i>Year of publication</i>	<i>No. of authors</i>	<i>Black author</i>	<i>White author</i>	<i>Indian author</i>	<i>Male author</i>
Year of publication						
No. of authors	-0.013					
Black author	0.101	0.294	**			
White author	-0.150	** 0.695	** -0.325	**		
Indian author	0.123	** 0.037	-0.087	-0.279	**	
Male author	-0.074	0.482	** 0.172	*** 0.347	** -0.050	
Female author	0.084	0.458	** 0.126	** 0.290	** 0.127	** -0.417

*Note:* Significance \*\**p* < 0.05

The relationship between institutions and departments is presented in Table 5.7. UJ authors have become more collaborative in recent years than in the past. Collaboration at UKZN has been declining since the period of analysis. Institutions such as UKZN, SU and UCT were correlated with all institutions. Authors from these selected institutions had collaborated with authors from most of the other institutions. While significant positive correlation was evident between sociology departments at UJ and Wits, no such correlation existed for UKZN, SU, UCT and Rhodes. UKZN and UCT authors opted for association with non-sociology departments. The negative relationship between sociology and non-sociology departments explains that collaboration largely exists within either the sociology or other departments and not between sociology and other departments.

The data from WoS was also used to investigate the collaboration of South African scholars. The features of collaboration from this dataset are in Table 5.8. More than three quarters of the publications in this dataset were for areas related to sociology and had collaboration types of domestic, international or both. The number steadily increased from 38% in 1995 to 76% in 2015. Chi-square test results agree that collaboration and selected years were significantly associated. Domestic collaboration was applicable to 62% of the publications that had any kind of collaboration. The percentage of domestic collaboration presented a declining pattern from 71% in 1995 to 61% in 2015. Internal institutional collaboration existed in the case of 68% of domestically collaborated publications, which also followed the trends similar to domestic collaboration. While a relatively lower percentage of collaborated publications had external institutional collaboration (39%) of the domestic collaboration, the tendency was one of increase. It grew from 11% in 1995 to 47% in 2015. Half of the collaborated publications had international collaboration as well, which also increased between 1995 and 2015.

Collaboration existed in all research areas, but at varying levels. All publications in the area of the social sciences were collaborated ones. The highest percentages (62–100%) of collaborated publications in the WoS database were found in the research areas of health, public, environmental and occupational health, demography, criminology, sociology, environmental sciences, education, information science, social issues and family studies. Other research areas such as communication, ethnic studies, area studies and cultural studies had collaborations of between 21 and 48%. The lowest collaborated areas were cultural and area studies (21% and 30%).

**Table 5.7** Correlation between year and institutions in the publications in the *South African Review of Sociology*, 1995–2015

<i>Year of publication</i>	<i>All institutions</i>	<i>UJ</i>	<i>UKZN</i>	<i>Wits</i>	<i>Stellenbosch</i>	<i>UCT</i>	<i>Rhodes</i>	<i>Foreign institutions</i>	<i>Sociology departments</i>
Year of publication									
All institutions	0.012								
UJ	0.185 **	0.072							
UKZN	-0.122 *	0.373 **	-0.120 *						
Wits	0.048	0.060	-0.105 *	-0.095					
Stellenbosch	0.066	0.111 *	-0.115 *	-0.091	-0.091				
UCT	-0.043	0.265 **	-0.075	-0.060	-0.039				
Rhodes	-0.060	-0.009	-0.088	-0.069	-0.066	-0.043			
Foreign institutions	-0.046	0.178 **	-0.152 **	-0.129 **	-0.138 **	-0.079	-0.106 *		
Sociology departments	-0.044	0.222 **	0.234 **	0.033	0.091 **	-0.026	0.019	0.010	
Other departments	0.054	0.484 **	-0.115 *	0.382 **	-0.061	0.059	0.185 **	-0.14	-0.476 **

*Note:* Significance \*\*  $p < 0.05$



**Table 5.8** Collaboration of authors as seen in the publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015

<i>Collaboration</i>	1995		2000		2005		2010		2015		<i>All</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%	<i>No.</i>	%
Any kind of collaboration, domestic or international***	49	37.7	58	55.2	149	61.1	485	66.0	822	76.2	1563	68.2
Domestic collaboration***	35	71.4	37	64.8	101	67.8	297	61.2	504	61.4	974	62.3
All South African authors*** (of all collaboration publications)	35	71.4	28	48.3	78	52.3	224	46.2	317	38.6	682	43.6
Internal institutional collaboration***	31	88.6	24	64.9	69	68.3	202	68.0	334	66.3	660	67.8
External institutional collaboration	4	11.4	13	35.1	32	31.7	95	32.0	238	47.2	382	39.2
International collaboration	14	28.6	31	53.4	68	46.6	252	53.1	447	54.4	812	52.4
<i>Mean</i>	1.65	1.16	2.35	1.88	2.59	2.18	3.11	3.06	3.35	3.39	3.05	3.05
<i>S.D.</i>												
Mean number of authors (ANOVA: $F=12.548$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )												

*Note:* Chi-square test results. Significance: \*\*\* $p<0.01$

As for international collaboration, partners came from a number of countries. Two countries, the USA and England, were the major partners of South African scholars. Collaboration with African partners was not very strong. The count of the countries, as shown in Table 5.9, was the highest for US partners. The US partnership has been growing steadily over the years (significant in ANOVA test). The combined count for all African countries was equal to that of one single country, namely England. It increased after 1995. Collaboration with scholars in England also showed an increasing pattern.

In brief, collaboration, as found in the coauthored publications in SARS, was not very prominent. In comparison to science disciplines, collaboration in sociology in South Africa is rather weak. The average number of authors per publication was only 1.39, and the same situation did not change during the different periods of analysis. The most prominent type of collaboration that prevailed in the country was internal institutional. Scholars preferred to work with colleagues in the same department

**Table 5.9** Overseas partners in publications in the Web of Science, 1995–2015

<i>Collaboration</i>	<i>1995</i>		<i>2000</i>		<i>2005</i>		<i>2010</i>		<i>2015</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Mean number of US partners (ANOVA: $F=9.331$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.000$ )	0.07	0.42	0.17	0.61	0.18	0.56	0.22	0.64	0.38	0.97	0.28	0.80
Mean number of African partners (ANOVA: $F=4.645$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.001$ )	0.02	0.18	0.08	0.41	0.07	0.41	0.13	0.49	0.17	0.58	0.13	0.52
Mean number of England partners (ANOVA: $F=2.550$ , $df=4$ , $p=0.037$ )	0.02	0.12	0.11	0.32	0.12	0.38	0.14	0.45	0.14	0.44	0.13	0.42

or institutions, if they collaborated at all. A departmental characteristic has also been revealed. Sociologists do not collaborate as much as non-sociologists and there was no evidence for interdepartmental (between sociology and other) collaboration. Distinguished from science disciplines in South Africa, sociologists preferred to work with colleagues in the same department or institution.

Seekings (2001) noted that the studies that had international collaboration were mostly quantitative ones. A later study by Basson and Prozesky (2015) proved this to be a valid assumption. The same finding was also evident in this analysis. A relationship between the quantitative methodology and collaboration (though not specifically international one) was reported. Race and gender issues were present in collaboration. Negative correlation was found between two different races and gender.

In this context of collaboration and its relevance for the growth and development of the discipline, the issue of division has been noted. Some are concerned about the schism that exists between black and white sociologists in their networking with international peers and academic partners. Black sociologists are making efforts to connect with those in the African continent while their white counterparts are looking for networks in Europe, North America and Australia (Hendricks 2006). A division of this sort will have a deleterious effect on the efforts towards an integrated sociology for South Africa. We have already seen in the analysis of *SARS* publications that there is lack of collaboration between scholars of different races.

Why is collaboration in the WoS data higher than that in the *SARS* publications? A few reasons can be given for this. *SARS* is a national journal, and South African scholars view this as an important medium to publish their research. It is the official journal of the South African Sociological Association. For most of the sociologists in the country, young sociologists in particular, *SARS* is their first option to get their research published. Many of the studies they conduct are at the individual level, and hence they are sole-authored ones. Only one-third of the publications in *SARS* were coauthored. Although the WoS covers national journals, a large majority of the journals are international, and based outside the country. Many of these journals prefer papers based on substantial empirical research. Such intensive research studies often require collaboration. When locals collaborate and produce, mostly with international scholars (as seen in the WoS which has a higher level of international collaboration), they prefer to publish in international journals. Of the total 2293

publications in the WoS, only 349 (15%) were published in journals that were published in South Africa.

### INTERNATIONALIZATION

Internationalization has become the main structural event in sociology (Abbott 2000). The internationalization of sociology occurs through several stages. Publications (journals, monographs, books and papers), the exchange of sociologists, attendance at international conferences, networking, collaborative enterprises (both research and teaching), active participation in the activities of international associations such as the International Sociological Association (ISA) and other national sociological associations are the way towards internationalization. Japanese sociology, for example, proceeded through some of these routes and the process of its internationalization has been intensified (Yazawa 2014).

The need for collaboration of South African scholars with each other and with non-South African scholars has been raised in the sociology community (Alexander 2004). Internationalization of any discipline depends on certain steps that take the discipline from its localized habitat to the international platform. It can be measured from at least two vantage points: the value of the sociological knowledge that is produced for the international sociological literature; and collaboration with international peers that lead to the sharing and learning of new knowledge, skills, methods, techniques, frameworks for the production of new knowledge. The staff complement whose exposure to international sociology also serves as an index to this measure. International collaboration is expected to assist South African scholars to showcase their research at international forums and publish their research in international outlets. The South African science policy encourages international collaboration, and concerted efforts have been successfully made in the natural sciences.

Collaboration with international sociologists can have a positive impact on the growth of the discipline in the country. Firstly, it offers the opportunity to be part of the knowledge production enterprise in sociology, contributing to the local and international development of sociology. Secondly, collaboration facilitates the processes of sharing skills and knowledge. Sharing skills and knowledge will also be beneficial to South African sociology. Thirdly, it opens up new vistas for publications in international outlets and thereby increases productivity. Fourthly but not finally, it enlarges the scope for more visibility of the publications.

Despite the importance of international collaboration for the growth of sociologists and the discipline, it does not seem to appeal to South African sociologists. Historically, as shown in the previous chapters, sociologists were exposed to international collaboration. The analysis of publications in the *SARS* journal between 1995 and 2012 showed that international collaboration was applicable only in 3% of cases (Sooryamoorthy 2015a). The analysis of research publications by Basson and Prozesky (2015) showed that 28% of all publications for the period of 1990–2009 had international collaboration. As for the current data, again about the publications in *SARS* for the period of 1995–2015, there were only 15 publications, which is 4.2% of all publications. This was not the case with WoS publications. A higher degree of international collaboration occurred in WoS publications. For the internationally collaborated publications, the average number of authors was significantly higher (6.11 against 2.77 for publications without international collaboration). The percentage of internationally collaborated publications was also much higher in the WoS data.

One of the promoting conditions for international collaboration is specialization. The relationship between specialization and collaboration has prompted scholars to take that route in the discipline of sociology (Leahey and Reikowsky 2008). As Leahey and Reikowsky (2008) observe, sociologists who are trying to explore new terrains of knowledge are keen on doing so together rather than alone. They also believe that the areas and extent of specialization determines the collaboration strategies they follow.

A serious interest in a subfield encourages academics to work intensely in the area and gain specialized knowledge. As part of working towards enlarging the knowledge base and research in the area, academics will look for international contacts to carry on with their research in the chosen subfield. These contacts might be intended for several things. They are for sharing skills, accessing databases, finding innovative ways of conducting research, and increasing the publication productivity and visibility of their research outputs. These may be challenging if done individually and not collaboratively.

Participation in international sociology is a factor that contributes to the internationalization of the discipline. In recent years, active participation of South African sociologists in international sociology has been observed. Many South African sociologists are members of the ISA and hold (and have held in the past) key executive positions in the organization. Naturally this has widened the knowledge horizons of South African sociologists and

the visibility of South African sociology on the international scene. They also attend international conferences to present their research. Funding assistance, both from the institutions where they are employed and from the NRF, makes their attendance at international conferences possible. The work of South African sociologists appears in international sociology journals such as *International Sociology* and *Current Sociology*. South Africa brought one of the prestigious sociological congresses to the country. In 2006 the ISA organized its 16th world congress of sociologists in Durban, South Africa, the first one to be held in Africa. More than 3000 delegates attended this congress (Waters 2008). In the early years the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa (ASSA) considered internationalization an important activity and responsibility that can assist in the growth and development of sociology in the country. ASSA was keen on the international exchange of scholars and recruiting scholars from other parts of Southern Africa (Hindson 1989). Its annual congresses were held mostly outside South Africa with this purpose in mind.

In Chap. 6 some relevant issues of South African sociology are taken up.

## NOTES

1. There were criticisms against the views of Olzak. See Joubert (1991).
2. Murphree's (1975) formulations for the contemporary study of race are based on the contextual and interdisciplinary to effect change. Stone (1976), on the contrary, examined the basic problems in the sociology of separatism and separatism as an ideology.
3. The field of the sociology of professions arguably is moribund and has been in decline since the 1960s but the literature on this is burgeoning (Adams 2015).

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. (2000). Reflections on the future of sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(2), 296–300.
- Adams, T. L. (2015). Sociology of professions: International divergences and research directions. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(1), 154–165.
- Alexander, P. (2004). The National Research Foundation and priorities for critical research. *Society in Transition*, 35(2), 319–327.
- Basson, I., & Prozesky, H. E. (2015). A review of methodological trends in South African sociology, 1990–2009. *South African Review of Sociology*, 46(3), 4–27.

- Bird, A. (1992). Research from inside mass organisations: COSATU/NUMSA. *Transformation*, 18, 110–114.
- Bonnin, D., & Ruggunan, S. (2013). Towards a South African sociology of professions. *South African Review of Sociology*, 44(2), 1–6.
- Botes, L. J. S., van Rensburg, H. C. J., & Groenewald, D. C. (1991). Reply to van Staden and Visser: Perhaps something more and something else happened in the SAJS of the 1980s. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 50–52.
- Buhlungu, S. (2009). South Africa: The decline of labor studies and the democratic transition. *Work and Occupations*, 36(2), 145–161.
- Carroll, W. K. (2013). Discipline, field, nexus: Re-visioning sociology. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 50(1), 1–26.
- Groenewald, C. J. (1991). The context of the development of sociology in South Africa: A response to Visser and van Staden. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 22(2), 46–49.
- Hendricks, F. (2006). The rise and fall of South African sociology. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 86–97.
- Hindson, D. (1989). Putting the record straight: The association for sociology in South Africa. *South African Sociological Review*, 2(1), 69–73.
- Human, P. (1984). *The South African crisis: Sociology and reform*. Johannesburg: ASSA.
- Joubert, D. (1991). Further comments on Susan Olzak's report to the HSRC. *South African Sociological Review*, 30(2), 91–92.
- Jubber, K. (2006). Reflections on canons, compilations, catalogues and curricula in relation to sociology and sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 321–342.
- Leahy, E., & Reikowsky, R. C. (2008). Research specialization and collaboration patterns in sociology. *Social Studies of Science*, 38(3), 425–440.
- Luckett, K. (2009). The relationship between knowledge structure and curriculum: A case study in sociology. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(4), 441–453.
- Miguel, J. u. s. M. d., & Moyer, M. G. (1979). Trend report: Sociology in Spain. *Current Sociology*, 27(1), 5–138.
- Mukherjee, R. (1977). Trends in Indian sociology. *Current Sociology*, 25(3), 1–147.
- Murphree, M. W. (1975). Sociology and the study of race: Contemporary perspectives for Southern Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 1(2), 111–124.
- Ngoasheng, M. (1992). Policy research inside the African National Congress. *Transformation*, 18, 115–120.
- NRF. (2015). *Evaluation and rating: Facts & figures 2014*. Pretoria: National Research Foundation.
- Olzak, S. (1990). Report to the Human Sciences Research Council. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(1), 62–68.
- Oosthuizen, K. (1991). The state of sociology in South Africa. *South African Sociological Review*, 30(2), 93–99.

- Patel, S. (2011). Sociology in India: Trajectories and challenges. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 45(3), 427–435.
- Reddy, J. (1992). Research and the role of the historically-black universities. *Transformation*, 18, 58–63.
- Savage, M., & Burrows, R. (2007). The coming crisis of empirical sociology. *Sociology*, 41(5), 885–899.
- Scott, J. (2005). Sociology and its others: Reflections on disciplinary specialisation and fragmentation. *Sociological Research Online*, 10(1). Retrieved February 12, 2016, from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/11/scott.html>
- Seekings, J. (2001). The uneven development of quantitative social science in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 27(1), 1–36.
- Sitas, A. (2006). The African renaissance challenge and sociological reclamations in the South. *Current Sociology*, 54(3), 357–380.
- Sitas, A. (2014). Rethinking Africa's sociological project. *Current Sociology*, 62(4), 457–471.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2015a). Sociological research in South Africa: Post-apartheid trends. *International Sociology*, 30(2), 119–133.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2015b). *Transforming science in South Africa: Development, collaboration and productivity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Staden, F., & Visser, D. (1991). The *South African Journal of Sociology* in the eighties: An analysis of theoretical and empirical contributions. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 2(22), 33–43.
- van Staden, F., & Visser, D. (1992). Comparison of methodology used in contributions to the South African Journals of education, psychology and sociology. *South African Journal of Science*, 88, 77–77.
- Stone, J. (1976). Black nationalism and apartheid: Two variations on a separate theme. *Social Dynamics*, 2(1), 19–30.
- Turner, J. H. (2006). American Sociology in chaos: Differentiation without integration. *The American Sociologist*, 37(2), 15–29.
- Valodia, I. (1992). Research in service organisations. *Transformation*, 18, 125–129.
- Walby, S. (2012). Violence and society: Introduction to an emerging field of sociology. *Current Sociology*, 61(2), 95–111.
- Waters, G. (2008). The International Sociological Association's 2006 'XVI World Congress of Sociology' and sociology today: A documentary analysis. *Loyola Journal of Social Sciences*, 22(2), 167–183.
- Webster, E. C. (2004). Sociology in South Africa: Its past, present and future. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 27–41.
- Yazawa, S. (2014). Internationalization of Japanese sociology. *International Sociology*, 29(4), 271–282.
- Zegeye, A., & Motsemme, N. (2004). Editorial: South Africa's past in the present. *Current Sociology*, 52(5), 749–753.



## Current and Future Prospects

**Abstract** This chapter takes stock of the position of South African sociology today. It has passed through challenging times in its 100-year history. Apartheid segregated society and sociologists. Sociologists followed paths that run parallel. Africanization has become relevant to South African sociology. Demographic transformation in the discipline has not reached the levels expected. Mobility is more obvious among sociologists in the new democratic South Africa. They leave academia for government and to become consultants. This is to the detriment of the growth of the discipline. However, sociology is destined to grow in South Africa. Student numbers are increasing and new sociological knowledge is appearing not only in national journals but also in international journals. Sociologists are encouraged to conduct research more seriously than ever before.

**Keywords** Sociology • South Africa • Africanization • Sociological research

The previous chapters have provided an account of the history of South African sociology in the colonial and apartheid periods, and of contemporary sociology in the new democratic South Africa. Some of the salient characteristics from the analysis given in these chapters can be recapitulated and placed in perspective.

During the colonial and apartheid times sociological research in the country was constrained by trying political situations (Savage 1981). In the apartheid era (1948–1993), racial segregation was widespread across different realms of life. Higher education was not spared. Apartheid created vast disparities in education and in the production of scientific knowledge. Academics found themselves in opposite camps, one supporting the principles and practices of racial segregation, and the other opposing them. This had far-reaching consequences for the discipline of sociology.

Sociology and sociologists were among those affected by this division in the apartheid society, with segregation triggering divisions within the discipline. The division was characterized by separate groupings for Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking academics at their respective universities. In the foci of research and in the selection of research methodologies, sociologists at Afrikaans language and English language universities varied widely. The division was visible in forming different professional associations of sociologists, organizing separate conferences and opening separate publishing channels. They functioned along racial and language lines, and impacted on the position and stature of the discipline in the country.

The efforts on the part of sociologists lacked integration and made the development and growth of the discipline hard. The racial divide was so prominent that it spilled over to the sociological research undertaken by sociologists in the country. Sociology, perceived from the angles of the knowledge that sociologists produced through research, suffered from the political phases it had lived through. Sociological knowledge generated in the country was fragmented in terms of the divisions in the positivist and post-positivist paradigms. In the apartheid period, sociologists relied on the state for producing what was prescribed to them in order to promote what the regime needed. The resistance to this situation from those in the opposite camp was not loud enough. Their actions did not actually save the discipline from the control of political powers and make it an independent scientific discipline that was allowed to do what was essential and good for sociology. The veracity of knowledge that was produced during this time was not beyond doubt.

There was a dark period, the closed-off period, in the academic history of South Africa. Apartheid isolated South Africa from the rest of the world. The discipline had to find its own ways and means to develop and advance. Academics from overseas refused to associate with their South

African counterparts. This period had negative consequences for the internationalization of the discipline and its research areas. South African sociology suffered.

In both the colonial and apartheid times, one cannot find that sociology was focused in terms of its research agenda and curriculum. It was not just divided but also fragmented. No uniformity was to be found when universities had their own courses and syllabi that varied from each other. The same was true for their research. The foci were hard to see, except in some branches of sociology. Researchers worked in their own areas of interest, or specialization, determined largely by the publication outcomes.

Sociology in the new free environment has to erase its disruptive and destructive legacy of the past and rebuild its own new foundation.

### AFRICANIZING SOCIOLOGY

What kind of knowledge is important, appropriate and necessary for sociologists in the country to produce? It is also important to know for whom the knowledge thus generated is—government, policy-makers, international organizations, labour unions or for academic purposes.

The production of knowledge that is African and that contributes to Africanization has become a debatable matter for sociologists in the country. There have been conscious efforts on the part of sociologists in South Africa, some of whom have moved from other parts of the world, to give an African or South African touch to sociology. Producing local resources and knowledge to understand localized issues and social problems and using local material in classrooms are the chosen means being adopted for this re-dressing of sociology in South Africa (Pattman and Khan 2007). Scholars argue for local resources and scholarship that are to be respected as is that from the West (Adésinà 2006).

Is there a crisis in sociology in South Africa, as Magubane (2000) thinks about African sociology? The view is that the state of African and South African sociology is underdeveloped, and indigenous theory and research are poorly developed (Jubber 2006). Indigenization of sociology in Africa is yet to materialize. There have been attempts but they were either inchoate or unsystematic (Hendricks 2006). Despite the nature of African and South African societies and the potential for the scope for sociological studies, there is not a substantial stock of indigenously produced sociological knowledge (Jubber 2006). Eurocentric approaches and

dependency are major issues in South African sociology (Hendricks 2006; Keskin 2014; Nyoka 2012, 2013). The reliance of South African sociology on borrowed concepts, theories and research is aligned to the paucity of indigenous research, theory and analysis (Jubber 2006).

Africanization of the curriculum requires many things to be desired. Robbe's (2014: 257) argument is that Africanization 'requires interrogating the paradigms of knowledge corroborated with Eurocentric assumptions and developing innovative methods and theories grounded in the experiences of thinking through the African'. This Africanization of sociology is to occur around an African-centred and South African-specific approach. One of the early proponents for the sociology of Africa was van Den Berghe (1984) who called for a more adequate approach from the conventional structural and functional anthropology and sociology to study African societies. He was suggesting a combination of the elements of functionalism and of the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic in the study of African societies that are pluralistic and changing rapidly. Africanization of sociology, as Carroll (2014) maintains, is to be grounded in a worldview that is basically African. This is yet to happen. As Carroll convincingly argues, the articulation of an African-centred sociology has not engaged sociologists, either as a sub-discipline of Africana studies, or as a sub-discipline of traditional sociology (Carroll 2014).

Towards creating an Afro-centric Sociology of Africa, Keskin (2014), recommends scholarly activism and critical sociological research. According to him, the approach of a sociology of Africa rests on critical methodology to address conflicts and the political economy of power relations, and employs historical analysis and empirical data (Keskin 2014). Some argue for a reformed approach from the established teaching of sociology (Suoranta 2008). It is incumbent upon sociologists who have both the interest and commitment to African-centred sociology to develop theories, concepts and models that guide their research to represent the African worldview (Carroll 2014). But, as Akiwowo (1980) cautions, African sociologists have not shown the capacity to formulate new theories or methods to explain African realities. The continent should be used as a reservoir for the generation of sociological theories and develop an African corpus of knowledge for African sociology (Hendricks 2006). South African sociologists can take a lead in this regard, being a strong centre of sociology in Africa.

## DECLINE, RENEWAL OR GROWTH

Sociological research under apartheid was trapped in the shackles of the state. Researchers experienced not only constraints imposed on them through stringent laws but also had to work in a society that did not encourage free and independent research. The chances of researching critical issues were minimal. Social researchers were under stress due to the flexing muscles of the state machinery. Those serious and passionate about social research had to work under severe circumstances that prevented them from revealing scientific facts about the society around them. True findings of research could not be disseminated or published. The authenticity and validity of research were questioned. The value of the knowledge thus produced was considered suspicious. No discipline, and not only sociology, could grow and develop under such trying conditions. This has shaken the foundations of scientific research in the country, as sociology until then was not mature enough. It was still in the early stages of its growth.

When sociology entered the apartheid period it was only 45 years old, and in its prime. For the next 46 years it struggled under apartheid. This would have been the years for the discipline to establish itself. These years of about a half a century in the life of a discipline would suggest that it was flourishing, with a band of researchers and academics in a country that had innumerable social issues and problems available for study. The opportunities to advance in research skills and knowledge were thus lost. The closed-off period further accentuated the process of taking the years back. Detached from international developments and lacking in intellectual engagement, sociology was stuck during this period and for several years to come.

Under apartheid, sociology could not expand its wings for many reasons. The heavy arm of the state, limited information that pertained to all sections of the population, controlled access to new information and data through research, lack of access to recent literature, censorship, threats, prosecution, imprisonment, racial polarization and deep cleavages causing mistrust and non-cooperation, and challenges to conduct independent research were but some of them. Stringent bureaucratic procedures to obtain permits to do studies in areas of the choice of scholars posed obstacles. Sociologists were scared to conduct research on matters that would provoke the state.

Clearly there was an increase in the number of publications in both the colonial and apartheid periods, as is evident in this analysis of the publications in prominent South African journals and that are indexed in the international database of the WoS. The enrolment figures for sociology was not stagnating but rather growing. If these two parameters are taken into account, then definitely sociology in South Africa was on a plateau. This was despite the challenges it had to face during the earlier periods, particularly in the apartheid period. There are other aspects that are also relevant for sociology and its growth in the country—methodological weaknesses, Africanization, fragmentation, specialization, collaboration and internationalization. On all these measures South African sociology has room for improvement.

The demographic transformation of academics has been another major issue (Hugo 1998). Racially, sociologists were mostly white scholars in all three periods of colonialism, apartheid and democracy. White dominance was clearly evident at professional activities such as conferences. In the beginning years of the professional associations there were very few Africans who presented papers at conferences. For instance, the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa's (ASSA) conferences, held during 1971–1975, had only 12% of the papers (15 out of 129) presented by African sociologists (Hare and Savage 1979). Webster (1998) provides some information about the race of sociologists whose work appeared in local sociological journals. The large majority of the publications in these journals for the period belonged to white (85–86%) or male (62–72%) scholars. Of the papers published in the selected journals between 1986 and 1998, 80% was written by whites.<sup>1</sup> The racial divide in the production of knowledge was conspicuous in sociology journals such as the *South African Journal of Sociology*, *Social Dynamics*, *Society in Transition* and the *South African Sociological Review*. Adding to the analysis of the papers published in the journal of *SAJS*, J.S. Oosthuizen (1991a) shares the concern of sociology remaining a single-race-dominated discipline. His view is that the white-dominated nature of sociology in the country will have undesirable consequences such as becoming irrelevant in South Africa for its existence in the country. The scientometric analysis presented in this book concurs with this.

The representation of black academics in general was rather poor in universities and research institutes. Their contributions to social research were therefore not impressive during this time. However, an increase in the number of black academics is now being seen at universities (Oloyede

2006). Transformation in universities and sociology departments had not occurred in the way it was expected to happen in the democratic South Africa. In many universities an acceptable composition and proportion of black staff has not been realized to represent the population. Transformation was to be facilitated and expedited by the merger of universities which began in 2004. But in many instances the process has been sluggish and universities lagged behind in achieving the equity targets.

The figures drawn from the 18 sociology departments at South African universities show that of the total 152 sociologists 53 (35%) are black. This should be compared with the percentage of the black population in the country, which is 80.5% (RSA 2015). The analysis presented from the publications in the previous chapters also showed the poor representation of black academics in the production of sociological literature. This invariably limited their contributions to sociology and sociological research.

A view that is subscribed to by many (Alexander et al. 2006, for instance) is that the conditions for conducting sociological research have deteriorated since the transition of the society into democracy. Sitas (1997) believes that the powers of sociology in the country are on the wane. This waning, according to him, is because of what sociologists in the country do, what they do not do, and also because of what is happening around the sociology in the country. With the collapse of a left hegemony at the international level and with increasing professionalization and institutionalization the prowess of sociologists has waned (Sitas 1997). Added to this were the causes such as professional sociologists turning into consultants, the poaching of talented sociologists by the corporate sector, research agendas not determined through broad dialogue but by policy structures, and fragmentation of social movements (Sitas 1997).

The transition of South Africa to democracy also witnessed some movement and mobility of sociologists. Many of them in the universities, in the given event of new opportunities in the democratic South Africa, were attracted to more lucrative positions in government or turned to consultancies (Alexander et al. 2006; Burawoy 2009a; Hendricks 2006; Sitas 1997). This had its natural implications for the growth and development of sociology in the country. The ensuing position of the discipline in democratic South Africa has made sociologists think that the discipline is on a sliding slope (Hendricks 2006; Sitas 1997). Those who moved to government included some black sociologists (Webster 1997). Losing academics from South African universities to government, consultancy and overseas

have been reported by others (Bekker 1996). The ‘consultancy syndrome’ (Mkandawire 1994) was also spreading in Africa. In the spurt of development projects along with donors and NGOs, and a host of other opportunities for doing sociology has become a very profitable activity in Africa (Chachage 2004). This has brought its own problems for research and the quality of research conducted and produced. This gave rise to new patterns in social science research, collecting selective data for the specific consumption purposes for the funders, and manipulating the data for the purposes for which it was sought and collected (Mkandawire 1994). This is where Cooper’s (2009) fourth-helix model applies.

The loss of key sociologists to government positions or as consultants was not the only reason for this decline of the discipline. The argument of Webster (2004: 35) is that the centre stage has shifted away from social movements with the arrival of democracy and policy-oriented research. In this connection the views of Hendricks (2006) are also important: the discipline has severed its links with civil society, no cutting-edge debates or debates on the problems of the country occur, and the discipline is splintered into unconnected perspectives. Sociology in the democratic period has been forced to move from a reflexive engagement with publics and a critical engagement with the societal goals to a defence against the pressures for deprofessionalization and commodification (Burawoy 2004).

The thesis of the decline of sociology in the democratic period has not been readily accepted, at least by a section of sociologists. Citing prominent works of the time, scholars disagreed with the idea of mediocrity (Webster 1997, for instance). Under the democratic dispensation, both as a discipline and practice, sociology entered a new era. Hopefully this was supposed to be the golden period in the history of sociology in South Africa. South Africa has been freed from the shackles of apartheid that once prevented the natural growth and development of the majority of the population. It had implications for the study of society and sociology. This has to be examined with the support of evidence.

To some, sociology in democratic times has entered into a stage of revival and progress. Mapadimeng (2012) argues that sociology in the democratic era is on its revival and renewal phase. He substantiates it with the evidence that suggests that sociology has responded to the challenges of inequality, that there are stimulating interactions with civil society organizations leading to research enterprises that are beneficial to the community (Desai 2002, for instance), and that the South African Sociological Association (SASA) has provided platforms for debates on topical socio-



logical issues. In his view, sociology in the new democratic era is in its renewal stage rather than in decline. At the same time he concurs that sociologists in the new South Africa have not developed the strand of public sociology and that they have not fully developed and sustained synergies with labour and civic movements in the country.

A balanced view on the rise and fall of sociology has been articulated by Oloyede (2006). Oloyede (2006) holds that the success of a discipline should not be intertwined with the domination of a particular perspective at a particular historical point in time. It is problematic to declare that the discipline is in its ascendancy when a particular perspective is at its peak. Inversely, the discipline is falling when a perspective is on the decline (Oloyede 2006). A discipline needs all its perspectives to be pursued and developed by scholars who hold different views and perspectives. This takes us back to the strengths and weaknesses of South African sociology that can produce sociological research applying different methodological approaches.

The enrolment of students in higher education institutions after 1994 has increased substantially. Additional Further Education and Training colleges (FET), incorporation of colleges of education into universities, the merging of technikons and universities (Jansen and Taylor 2003), widening the base of access to higher education, and student funding at the national level were all accountable for the increased enrolment of students in universities. This was reflected in the number of students registered for sociology courses as well. The 2007 survey of sociology departments in the country by SASA showed that there were 7400 students registered for sociology courses in the country during 2003–2004. By 2007–2008 this had grown to 22,698 undergraduate students and 1364 postgraduates. Staff complement as of 2007–2008 was 170 full-time and 11 part-time academics with a student ratio of 1:143 (Mapadimeng 2009).

Structural constraints and restructuring have affected the position of sociology in an undesirable manner. This has resulted in the devaluation of sociology. Uys (2005) hints at the attempts at devaluing sociology through the process of dissolving sociology into an amorphous social science. As elaborated earlier, the conversion from departments to programmes in the democratic period has not been beneficial to sociology. Does the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary research that is being undertaken in the country really devalue sociology? For some, creative ways of transdisciplinarity can be meaningful for sociology (Sitas 1997). Interdisciplinarity in military studies, for instance, has brought sociologists, political scientists,

public administration academics and social scientists in development studies together from a few universities in South Africa (Ferreira 2012).

### POTENTIAL AND POSSIBILITIES

Challenges to teaching in sociology also emerge from a variety of sources including the structure of higher education (Atkinson 2000; Graaff 2004; Harley and Natalier 2013). The sociology curriculum in its early days in South Africa was determined by the social concerns of that time. It was primarily oriented to social policy and amelioration of social problems and local social issues (Jubber 2006). It was meant to produce social workers rather than sociologists. Teaching sociology courses with more responsive curricula in introductory sociology are expected to better serve the discipline, students and communities (Greenwood 2013). Resources are another issue. In the democratic period, sociology at most of the universities drew students in large numbers, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. This increase, however, has not been accompanied by a corresponding addition of staff to meet the teaching demands and the need for quality education.<sup>2</sup>

Enrolment at the masters and PhD levels is gradually increasing. This is both an opportunity and a possibility for sociologists to work with their students in specific areas of interests that can build knowledge production activities in sociology. How far this has been happening in universities and research centres is debatable. If a sociologist employed in a university supervises on average six postgraduates (which is the norm at many universities) and has an average of two students per year getting through the system, the figures will be substantial for the discipline. About 150 sociologists in the country would be able to produce a substantial stock of knowledge in the area as well. This will assist the discipline in many different ways.

Firstly, improving the throughput rates would attract more new students to sociology, for masters and PhDs, as it will create the impression that students can successfully complete these programmes within a reasonable time. Many universities have no-tuition fees for masters and PhD admissions. Secondly, a group of research students at any point in time is beneficial to sociologists. It gives them an opportunity to concentrate on areas of interest and conduct research with students into various aspects and dimensions of their preferred research topics. Thirdly, such completed student research projects can be converted into publishable peer-reviewed

journal articles, book chapters or even monographs. Universities give full credit to supervisors for such joint publications with students, in terms of the productivity units (PUs) that have already been incorporated into the performance of lecturers at universities. It will therefore be in the best interests of sociologists to keep their research profiles alive and produce PUs.

Fourthly, an outcome of supervised student projects, over a period of years, is the accumulation of knowledge in a particular area of study. This in turn adds to the strengthening of the discipline. In the past this was the case for the sociology of work, labour and trade unions. Since the 1980s this branch of sociology made rapid strides in enlarging its knowledge base and it earned recognition in the international sociological literature.<sup>3</sup> Universities that offered specialist programmes in the sociology of work and labour studies attracted students. The policy implications of this joint student-supervisor research, if they are about the pressing social problems that the country is confronting, will be considerable. Relevant sociological research will encourage the government and policy-makers to make use of the findings for policy-based programmes. The benefits of this will be evident in the form of acceptance and recognition of the contributions of the discipline and sociologists.

Research can serve the discipline in two opposite ways—for growth if it is conducted seriously, or for decline if it is not. Rigorous and long-term research leads to the building of the discipline and knowledge. If this does not occur the discipline slips down on the slope. Dumbled's (2009) critical comment on South African sociology is worth reflecting on. He thinks that South African sociologists, by and large, provided simplistic accounts of social realities, moving away from addressing cardinal questions about society and structural transformations. Sustained research efforts and leadership on the part of senior sociologists are unavoidable. A decline in British sociology was ascribed to the lack of large-scale research for a longer duration that once helped to build the discipline (Turner 2012). Continuous and consistent engagement in research results in the production of new knowledge. It also results in theoretical development and new theoretical understandings of many of the timely topics that fall under the broad umbrella of the discipline. Conceptual development and clarity grounded in African reality are further outcomes of long-term research. This is also crucial for the Africanization of sociology, which was discussed earlier.

A way to encourage research among sociologists in the country, as Olzak (1990) suggests, is to promote joint research projects between research-oriented and academic sociologists. Collaboration then becomes a necessary step. Given the requirements for academics to produce research publications every year and according to their rank, research has become a core activity at universities in the country. This research culture, however, has not permeated to all universities, more specifically to the newly formed universities of technology. Research centred in a few departments in a few research-intensive universities cannot effectively lead to the growth of sociology or sociological research. In sociology departments there are faculty members who are interested in conducting research and in the production of publications. At the same time there are quite a considerable number of them who are struggling to find their feet in research and produce papers. Mentoring young staff and taking them on the path of research should be taken seriously.

Also argued for is a strong PhD culture in the sociology departments (Cooper 2006). Towards this end both the quality of training in PhD and in the number of PhDs produced are important (Cooper 2006). Unfortunately there is no a strong PhD culture in the departments of sociology (Cooper 2006). A study of a sample year in 1996 showed that the doctorates awarded in South African universities comprised only a small portion in relation to other qualifications (Bailey and Cooper 2003).<sup>4</sup> It is true that there has been an increase in the number of doctoral graduates in the democratic period (Mouton 2011). The analysis by Mouton (2015) but shows the reality in the production of PhD graduates in the country.

Not all sociologists who are currently employed in universities in South Africa hold PhDs. Those with this highest qualification constitute only less than 50% as the entry level qualification for a junior academic position is a masters degree. The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) is aiming at 46% of the academic staff to obtain PhD by 2018 (DHET 2015). This has at least two implications for the discipline. One, those without a PhD will be working for their PhD in the next three to five years. This does not allow them to allocate time and resources to conduct any serious research. They also have a teaching load during the period of their PhD unless some external or institutional funding is received for teaching relief. In the experience of many young staff this is a hard time in the early years of their career. Research outcomes, other than that coming out of their PhDs, cannot be expected from them at this point in time of their career. Two, while a staff member is continuing with PhD studies

she/he cannot supervise any PhD students, halting the production of new doctorates in the country. New PhDs are important in the production of new knowledge and sociological research, and to improve the capacity of research strengths in sociology. The situation thus affects sociological research and the production of new knowledge.

Linkages with universities, industry and government have been touted as an option to strengthen research at universities. Following this triple-helix model, Cooper (2009) proposes an advanced formula of a university-industry-government-civil society organizations link, referred to as the fourth-helix model. This model has great significance in the history of South African sociology. Sociology grew up with civil society (Burawoy 2007). The legacy is that scholars at universities in South Africa maintained strong links with civil society organizations in conducting research on them and for them. The sociological community in the country had maintained a close association with social movements in the peak of the apartheid times (Webster 1997). Of late, since 1994, this link seemed to have been loosening. Re-linking these linkages as suggested under the fourth-helix model will open up new opportunities for sociologists to consolidate their research in areas that can be categorized as policy sociology.

Relating the role of sociologists to development, scholars have argued for a research programme for sociologists that critically examines the bases of different development strategies that are being followed in the country (Burawoy 2004). In Burawoy's (2004) view, there is a continued need for sociologists in the new South Africa to develop a professional sociology that can give strength, legitimacy and credibility to a public sociology, and to help evolve a critical sociology that can interrogate assumptions. In the new circumstances, public sociology, as von Holdt (2014) argues, can come to grips with the problems of a transforming society. In the context of South African society, as some scholars have argued, the potential is for a strong public sociology that can be strengthened by other kinds of sociology (Cock 2006). Cock (2006) is a strong proponent of a sociology that collaborates all forms of sociology—professional, critical, policy and public. Perhaps this would be a feasible approach for an integrated sociology for South Africa, rather than a few weak and fragmented ones in which a small number of sociologists are concentrated.

Policy research has been an important stream for social scientists and has been used in the struggle period (Nzimande 1992). The 'disciplinary inertia' (Cock 1994) of sociologists towards policy research limits the sociological contributions to policy research in the country. Due to

the historical legacy of sociology's alignment with the apartheid regime to support its policies, policy research earned a dubious reputation and tainted its image that keeps radical sociologists away from policy research (Cock 1994).

All perspectives in the discipline are important in understanding the complexities of the society (Oloyede 1996). This underlines the space for all diverse perspectives that originate from divergent approaches and methodologies in a varied society like South Africa. Sociology can spread its roots in numerous directions that will ultimately strengthen the purpose and need for a South African sociology.

Methodological catholicity, as Brym (2014) presents it, is based on the view that different methods have their individual but different strengths and limitations, and no unbridgeable chasm divides the discipline along quantitative and qualitative lines. If this view is accepted, the methodological strengths of South African sociologists become real strengths that the discipline requires in the new democratic South Africa. More accommodation and understanding among sociologists, within departments and between departments across the country will assist the discipline.

The research programme for South African sociology in the democratic period needs to be based on the consideration of several things. Conditions have changed for sociologists in the new democratic era. Burawoy (2004) argues for certain directions which sociology in South Africa can take. He calls for a very different sociology in the new times, one that forsakes the singular aim of liberation for the more complex exploration of alternate trajectories (Burawoy 2004). In his scheme for sociology in the new times, collaborative alliances with sociologists is of paramount importance. This is lacking among South African sociologists, as shown in the analysis of the publications in the previous chapters. On the contrary, science disciplines in South Africa flourished and advanced with the collaborative tendencies of South African scientists.

While delivering his address to the first conference of ASSA, Cilliers (1973) stated in unequivocal terms that the advancement of sociology as an academic and scientific discipline depends on the critical evaluation that is done continuously. Such critical evaluations carried out regularly with the focus on the discipline, regardless of theoretical and methodological disagreements that sociologists possess, can serve the discipline. For this purpose, leadership can be taken at the micro-departmental and national levels. The role of the professional association, SASA, is indispensable. It can take the lead through a regular committee that looks into aspects that

affect the discipline and its development and advise the community of sociologists in the country. Is it a defining time for South African sociology? If that is the case, as Hendricks (2006) argues, sociologists in the country should ponder seriously what they can do about addressing critically the challenges the country (and the continent) is facing. The role of a sociologist, as Hendricks (2006) continues, lies in their ability to make life easier and contribute to the solutions of the myriad problems the country faces.

The value of sociologists and sociological research today comes from the ranking, the impact of the research they produce and the visibility of research. Some of the top sociology departments in the world, at the University of Toronto for instance, are recognized for the strength (with more than 55 full-time academics) and the quantity and quality of the research produced (Brym 2014). The value of sociology in any society is variable and depends to a large extent on two things—what is being taught and what sociological knowledge is produced. Teaching sociology and how it is received by the market is of course an indicator that moves the marks on a scale. This goes back to the place where teaching sociology takes place, what curricula are adopted and how they complement local and national needs. This is about the quality of the products, namely, the students who leave the gates of educational institutions holding degrees. Secondly, it is about the type of knowledge sociologists generate through researching topical issues that have immediate applications to the society. The value of sociology, or any scientific discipline, relates to what it is and what it will be.

Sociology in Africa has a future, more so for South Africa, given the nature of the social problems the continent and the country has. Sociologists, if they are serious about their role as researchers, have a great deal to contribute to the understanding of the innumerable problems the country confronts. This will be advantageous for the status of the discipline as well. There is a need for a strong sociology that can produce good sociological research (Cock 2006). South Africa is still fertile for the thoughts and studies of sociologists. The sociology of transformation, as Munck (1996) proposes, is one new area where sociologists will have a great deal to contribute.

What kind of sociology is now relevant for the society at this point in time—professional, policy, critical or policy? The choice is theirs. Professional sociology is relevant for South African society. As Burawoy (2009b) believes, professional sociology can advance through empirical studies that are grounded in theoretical frameworks and it involves dis-

seminating and teaching sociology. Policy sociology goes with it when the society is being transformed and relevant knowledge is essential in this transformation. This, as Burawoy (2009b) notes, can introduce new domains for sociological investigation, lead to the development of new methods and techniques, and can be a powerful instrument of power. Critical sociology continues to have its sway in the society, in the context of the dominant labour forces in the country.

Publicizing sociology serves sociology. Contributions to newspapers and magazines on social issues do not harm sociology. In Austria, for instance, newspapers have opened such possibilities for sociologists to write columns (Fleck 2010). Indian sociologists regularly contribute to national daily newspapers in the country, adding to the debates on issues that affect the society. Lead articles on social issues written by sociologists are few and far between in South Africa. Sociology in South Africa can benefit from this in more than one way. Sociologists make themselves active and engage in deliberating on issues of social importance. Such articles in newspapers and magazines attract more readers than do academic books and journals. Society is tacitly informed about the role sociologists are playing in keeping the debates and issues in the public domain. Students who are planning to enter universities become aware of such social issues and of sociologists. It contributes to the standing of sociology in the country.

A core band of sociologists committed to teaching and conducting research in the country could give the right guidance and directions for South African sociology to take in the coming years. They should be spared from managerial and administrative functions so that they can actively engage in teaching and doing relevant research (Webster 2004).

The questions Heribert Adam (1981) raised are still relevant. He asks whether sociology is possible at all in a repressive society. For him the notion of a meaningful sociology precludes the label of professionals who intentionally and uncritically serve power. This was not the case during the apartheid era. Space for the critical approach to social problems and to conduct free academic research was too limited for sociologists in the apartheid period. Adam (1981) puts it thus: 'As soon as a sociologist follows orders, be it from the government or the liberation movement, he loses the capacity to include his sponsor in his critical probe.' Fatima Meer made this same point in unequivocal terms when she delivered the presidential address of the ASSA in 1974: 'South African sociologists are perhaps the furthest removed from reality ... They are stuck with



the apartheid model as the ultimate reality' (cited in Jubber 1983: 58). Sociology develops and grows only when sociologists are free from the externally enforced barricades that affect their thoughts and existence as sociologists. As Murphree (1985) correctly noted, professional sociology can only thrive when sociologists are able to assume an oppositional stance to the status quo and when sociology is perceived as relevant for them and for the society. These views still apply to sociology in the democratic South Africa. It will make for a strong South African sociology.

## NOTES

1. The journals covered by Webster (1998) are the *South African Journal of Sociology* (1988–1996), *Society in Transition* (from 1997 to 1998), *South African Sociological Review* (1988–1995), *African Sociological Review* (1997–1998) and *Transformation* (1986–1998).
2. The sociology department in one of the high-ranking universities in the country; the University of Cape Town, for instance, had an enrolment of 1567 undergraduates in 2006, which has grown to 2117 in 2007 registering an increase of 35%. To cater for these students there were only 12.5 permanent staff against the average of 14 staff that the department had in the 1980s when the student numbers were in the same region (UCT 2007).
3. Connell (2011) noted the case of labour studies in the country that developed a body of knowledge based in the local patterns of social relations and the local struggles from those patterns.
4. Of the total 66,426 degrees awarded at universities in the country in 1996, doctoral degrees amounted to only 1% (699) (Bailey and Cooper 2003).

## REFERENCES

- Adam, H. (1981). The vocation of a sociologist in South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 115–127). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Adésinà, J. O. (2006). Sociology beyond despair: Recovery of nerve, endogeneity, and epistemic intervention. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 241–259.
- Akiwowo, A. A. (1980). Trend report: Sociology in Africa today. *Current Sociology*, 28(2), 3–73.
- Alexander, P., Basson, L., & Makhura, P. (2006). Sociology research in contemporary South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 218–240.
- Atkinson, M. P. (2000). The future of sociology is teaching? A vision of the possible. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(2), 329–332.
- Bailey, T., & Cooper, D. (2003). Profile of doctoral awards in South Africa: A case study of the 1996 university cohort. *Society in Transition*, 34(1), 104–128.

- Bekker, S. (1996). The silence of South African scholars. *Indicator SA*, 13(2), 81–85.
- Berghe, P. L. v. d. (1984). Toward a sociology of Africa. *Social Forces*, 43(1), 11–18.
- Brym, R. (2014). Our first 50 Years: A note on the University of Toronto's Department of Sociology. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 15(3), 288–292.
- Burawoy, M. (2004). Public sociology: South African dilemmas in a global context. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 11–26.
- Burawoy, M. (2007). The future of sociology. *Sociological Bulletin*, 56(3), 339–354.
- Burawoy, M. (2009a). From earth to heaven: South African sociology in the international context. *South African Review of Sociology*, 40(2), 219–224.
- Burawoy, M. (2009b). Disciplinary mosaic: The case of Canadian Sociology. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 34(3), 869–886.
- Carroll, K. K. (2014). An introduction to African-centered sociology: Worldview, epistemology, and social theory. *Current Sociology*, 40(2), 257–270.
- Chachage, C. S. L. (2004). Sociology and the future: Resistance, reconstruction and democracy. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 42–60.
- Cilliers, S. P. (1973). *ASSA sociology Southern Africa*. Paper presented at the ASSA Sociology Southern Africa, Durban.
- Cock, J. (1994). Sociology as if survival mattered. *South African Sociological Review*, 6(2), 14–31.
- Cock, J. (2006). Public sociology and the social crisis. *Society in Transition*, 37(2), 293–307.
- Connell, R. (2011). Sociology for the whole world. *International Sociology*, 26(3), 288–291.
- Cooper, D. (2006). International restructuring of higher education: Comments on implications of global trends, for restructuring of Sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 260–292.
- Cooper, D. (2009). University-civil society (U-CS) research relationships: The importance of a 'fourth helix' alongside the 'triple helix' of University-Industry-Government (U-I-G) relations. *South African Review of Sociology*, 40(2), 153–180.
- Desai, A. (2002). *We are the poors: Community struggles in post-apartheid South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- DHET (Department of Higher Education and Training). (2015). *Strategic plan, 2015/16–2019/20*. Pretoria: Department of Higher Education and Training, Republic of South Africa.
- Dubbeld, B. (2009). Marx, labour and emancipation in South African sociology: A preliminary rethinking. *Social Dynamics*, 35(2), 215–230.
- Ferreira, R. (2012). The interdisciplinarity of military studies: A sociological perspective and South African application. *South African Review of Sociology*, 43(3), 146–162.

- Fleck, C. (2010). Austrian academic publishing in sociology: A critical review. *International Sociology*, 25(5), 625–638.
- Graaff, J. (2004). Progress in teaching Sociology: From cognitive skills to hermeneutics and phronesis. *Society in Transition*, 35(2), 287–301.
- Greenwood, N. A. (2013). Toward publicly responsive sociology curricula: The role of introductory sociology. *Teaching Sociology*, 41(3), 232–241.
- Hare, A. P., & Savage, M. (1979). Sociology of South Africa. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 5, 329–350.
- Harley, K., & Natalier, K. (2013). Teaching sociology: Reflections on the discipline. *Journal of Sociology*, 49(4), 389–396.
- Hendricks, F. (2006). The rise and fall of South African sociology. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 86–97.
- von Holdt, K. (2014). Critical engagement in fields of power: Cycles of sociological activism in post-apartheid South Africa. *Current Sociology*, 62(2), 181–196.
- Hugo, P. (1998). Transformation: The changing context of academia in post-apartheid South Africa. *African Affairs*, 97(386), 5–27.
- Jansen, J., & Taylor, N. (2003). *Educational change in South Africa 1994–2003: Case studies in large-scale education reform*. Geneva: World Bank.
- Jubber, K. (1983). Sociology and its social context: The case of the rise of Marxist sociology in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 9(2), 50–63.
- Jubber, K. (2006). Reflections on canons, compilations, catalogues and curricula in relation to sociology and sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 321–342.
- Keskin, T. (2014). Sociology of Africa: A non-Orientalist approach to African, Africana, and Black studies. *Critical Sociology*, 40(2), 187–202.
- Magubane, B. M. (2000). *African sociology: A critical perspective. The selected essays of Bernard Makhosezwe Magubane*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Mapadimeng, M. S. (2009). *The South African sociology, current challenges and future implications: A review and some empirical evidence from the 2007 national survey of sociology departments*. Paper presented at the ISA Conference of the Council for National Associations, Taipei, Taiwan, 23–25 March. Retrieved March 13, 2013, from [www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/3b\\_Mapadimeng\\_2.pdf](http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/download/3b_Mapadimeng_2.pdf)
- Mapadimeng, M. S. (2012). Sociology and inequalities in post-apartheid South Africa: A critical review. *Current Sociology*, 61(1), 40–56.
- Mkandawire, T. (1994). Social sciences in Africa: Some lessons for South Africa. *South African Sociological Review*, 6(2), 1–13.
- Mouton, J. (2011). The humanities and social sciences in SA: Crisis or cause for concern? *South African Journal of Science*, 107(11/12), 1–4.
- Mouton, J. (2015). The doctorate in SA: Trends, challenges and constraints. Seminar presentation. The University Teaching & Learning Office, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. 18 June 2015.

- Munck, R. (1996). For a sociology of transformation. *Transformation*, 29, 41–52.
- Murphree, M. W. (1985). The science of society across the great divide: Pre- and post-independence sociology in the black states of Southern Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 11(1), 1–6.
- Nyoka, B. (2012). *Sociology curriculum in a South African university: A case study*. Unpublished Masters, University of the Western Cape, South Africa.
- Nyoka, B. (2013). Negation and affirmation: A critique of sociology in South Africa. *African Sociological Review*, 17, 2–24.
- Nzimande, B. (1992). The national educational policy initiative. *Transformation*, 18, 161–163.
- Oloyede, O. (2006). Sociologia cognita: A note on recent concerns in sociology in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology*, 37(2), 343–355.
- Olzak, S. (1990). Report to the Human Sciences Research Council. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(1), 62–68.
- Pattman, R., & Khan, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Undressing Durban*. Durban: Madiba Publishers.
- Robbe, K. (2014). African studies at a crossroads: Producing theory across the disciplines in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 40(2), 255–273.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2015). *Mid year population estimates, 2015*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, The Republic of South Africa.
- Savage, M. (1981). Constraints on, and functions of, research in sociology and psychology in contemporary South Africa. In J. Rex (Ed.), *Apartheid and social research* (pp. 45–65). Paris: The Unesco Press.
- Sitas, A. (1997). The waning of sociology in South Africa. *Society in Transition*, 1(1–4), 12–19.
- South African Sociological Review. (1988). Editors introduction. *South African Sociological Review*, 1(1), ii.
- Suoranta, J. (2008). Teaching sociology: Toward collaborative social relations in educational situations. *Critical Sociology*, 34(5), 709–723.
- Turner, B. S. (2012). Sociology in the USA and beyond: A half-century decline? *Journal of Sociology*, 48(4), 364–379.
- UCT. (2007). *Self-review portfolio*. Cape Town: Department of Sociology, University of Cape Town.
- Uys, T. (2005). Tradition, ambition and imagination: Challenges and choices for post-apartheid sociology. *Society in Transition*, 36(1), 113–120.
- Webster, E. (1997). Democratic transition: South African sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 26(3), 279–282.
- Webster, E. C. (1998). The sociology of transformation and the transformation of sociology in Southern Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 24(2), 117–129.
- Webster, E. C. (2004). Sociology in South Africa: Its past, present and future. *Society in Transition*, 35(1), 27–41.

# INDEX

## A

affiliation, 52, 62  
  of authors, 52  
Africa, 2  
  colonialism, 35  
  sociology in, 2, 11, 143  
Africa Institute, 43  
Africanization, 8, 131, 132, 139  
Agget, Neil, 67  
American Sociological Society, 25  
Anglo-American Corporation, 68  
apartheid, 8, 11, 29–31, 33, 35, 38,  
  77, 130  
  advocates of, 8  
  exponent of, 30  
  proponents of, 8  
  research in, 37, 43, 44  
  social engineering, 8  
  sociology in, 8, 35, 130, 133  
  universities in, 22  
  use of sociology, 30  
Association for Sociology in Southern  
  Africa (ASSA), 7, 38, 46, 48, 66,  
  69, 77, 126, 134, 142

associations, 19, 38, 45, 46, 48, 66,  
  69, 77, 112, 124, 130. *See also*  
  organizations  
  sociology, 25  
Australia, 25, 114, 123  
  sociology in, 10

## B

Batson, Edward, 20, 26, 34, 46, 66  
Black Consciousness movement, 35,  
  67

## C

Carnegie Commission, 19, 20  
Carnegie Corporation, 19, 26  
Carnegie studies, 20, 39  
censorship, 44  
Centre for Applied Legal Studies, 68  
Centre of Applied Social Studies, 68  
China, sociology in, 25  
Cilliers, S.P., 21, 34, 46, 66  
Cloete, Nico, 67

CODESRIA. *See* Council for the Development of Social Science in Africa (CODESRIA)

collaboration, 22, 62, 79, 106, 107, 114, 119, 122–124, 140

areas of, 115

domestic, 114, 119

features, 117, 119

gender, 123

international, 114, 119, 122–125

race in, 117, 123

specialization, 125

types of, 114

colonialism, 25

Comte, Auguste, 25

congress, 26, 46, 67, 69

Council for Research in the Social Sciences (CRSS), 40

Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), 18

Council for the Development of Social Science in Africa (CODESRIA), 79

courses, 16, 33, 41

contents, 17

in sociology, 17, 25, 26, 33, 34, 36

critical sociology, 5, 67, 144

Cronjé, Geoffrey, 8, 11, 20, 21, 30, 66

works of, 21

CRSS. *See* Council for Research in the Social Sciences (CRSS)

CSIR. *See* Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR)

## D

department, 54, 65, 75, 101, 119

sociology, 8, 16, 17, 21, 24, 31, 32, 34, 47, 59, 74, 75, 78, 88, 89, 99, 101, 108, 109, 116, 135, 140, 143, 145

Department of Higher Education and Training, 106, 140

Department of Social Welfare, 21  
Development Studies Group, 68  
Douws-Decker, Loet, 67

## E

Eggenhizen, Toine, 67

England, 20, 114, 122

sociology in, 25

enrolment, 47, 74, 134

of students, 32

Extension of University Education Act, 31

## F

Finland, 6, 36

foundations, 26

fourth-helix model, 141

functionalism, 36

## G

Ghana, 11

graduates, 33, 140

in sociology, 34, 66

Gray, John, 34

## H

higher education, 75, 76

Higher Education Act, 76

historically black universities (HBU), 3, 31, 75, 111

historically white universities (HWU), 3, 31, 75

history, sociology, 3

*Humanitas*, 10

Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), 39–40, 42, 52, 54, 59, 60, 68, 79, 85

The Human Sciences Research Council Act, 79

HWU. *See* historically white universities (HWU)

## I

industrial sociology, 41, 42, 68, 110  
 Institute for Black Research, 43  
 Institute for Social and Economic Research, 40  
 Institute for Social Research, 68  
 Institute of Industrial Education, 68  
 Institute of Industrial Relations, 68  
 Institute of Labour Studies, 68  
 Institute of Manpower Research, 68  
 Institute of Social Development, 68  
 institutionalization, 21, 135  
 internationalization, 65, 106, 124, 131  
   in sociology, 20, 47  
 International Sociological Association (ISA), 69, 124–126  
 Inter-University Committee for Social Science, 26  
 ISA. *See* International Sociological Association (ISA)

## J

Joint University Committee for Sociology and Social Work, 26  
 Joint University Committee for Sociology and Social Work in Southern Africa, 69  
 journals, 9, 18, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 78, 115, 145  
   apartheid, 48  
   sociology, 2, 7

## K

Keyter, Jan De Wet, 30  
 Kuper, Leo, 67

## L

labour studies, 41, 42, 110  
   growth of, 41  
 liberalism, 34

## M

Marxism, 35  
 Meer, Fatima, 43, 67, 144  
 membership, 46, 69  
 merger, 77  
 Merwe, van der, 30  
 methodology, 3, 34, 59, 60, 78, 92, 93, 99, 107, 142  
   Afrikaans universities, 108  
   qualitative, 60  
   quantitative, 43, 60, 107, 108, 117, 123  
 Morell, Rob, 67

## N

National Bureau for Personnel Research, 68  
 National Bureau of Education and Social Science Research (NBESS), 20, 101  
 National Bureau of Educational and Social Research (NBESR), 18, 40  
 National Council for Social Research (NCSR), 40  
 National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR), 18, 42  
 National Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIHSS), 79, 101  
 National Party, 29  
 National Plan, 75, 76, 101  
 National Research Foundation (NRF), 79, 112, 126  
 National Research Foundation Act, 79  
 NBSER, 68

NGOs, 89  
 Niekerk, Barend van, 67  
 Nigeria, sociologists in, 11  
 NIHSS. *See* National Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIHSS)  
 NIPR. *See* National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR)  
 NRF. *See* National Research Foundation (NRF)

**O**

organizations, 45. *See also* associations

**P**

performance management, 106  
 perspectives, 137, 142  
 policy sociology, 5, 144  
 population, 135  
 poverty, 19, 20, 39, 41, 59, 89, 93  
 professional sociology, 5, 141, 143, 145  
 programme and qualification mix (PQM), 75  
 publications, 6, 9, 22, 24, 41–45, 48, 49, 52, 54, 62, 64, 77, 78, 80, 83, 85, 89, 93, 95, 98, 100, 105, 106, 119, 123, 125, 134  
   in apartheid, 62, 64  
   in colonial period, 22, 24  
   features of, 80  
   gender, 83, 117  
   race in, 52, 80, 117, 134  
   sociology, 7, 10, 39  
   UKZN, 85  
   in universities, 108  
 public sociology, 5, 38, 137, 141

**R**

race, 46, 59, 117, 126  
 Rand Afrikaans University, 59, 60

publications, 52  
 research, 7, 8, 21, 37, 39–43, 48, 99, 110, 123, 131, 134, 136, 139, 141  
   at Afrikaans universities, 42  
   in apartheid, 37, 43–45  
   areas of, 18, 24, 31, 39, 42, 47, 52, 56, 59, 60, 64, 83  
   authenticity, 45, 133  
   in black areas, 37  
   colonial period, 20  
   drawback, 45  
   empirical, 38, 41  
   funding, 18, 38, 44  
   groups, 110  
   HBU, 111  
   institute, 40, 54  
   interests, 24, 59, 77, 78, 109, 110  
   methodology, 93, 107  
   nature of, 45  
   output, 39, 75–77, 101, 106  
   priorities, 42  
   productivity, 76  
   qualitative, 43, 65  
   quantitative, 43, 44, 60, 65  
   South Africa, 76  
   specialization, 109  
   state of, 18  
   streams of, 20  
   topics of, 41  
   in universities, 18, 75, 77, 140  
 Rhodes University, 68  
 Rhodie, Nic J, 30  
 Russell, David, 67

**S**

SAAAS. *See* South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS)  
 SAIRR. *See* South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR)  
 SASA. *See* South African Sociological Association (SASA)



- scientometric analysis, 22, 80  
 scientometric methods, 7  
 Second World War, 17, 19, 22  
 Simkins, Charles, 67  
 Simons, Jack Mary, 67  
 Slabbert, van Zyl, 30  
 Social and Economic Planning Council (SEPC), 18  
 Social Dynamics, 10  
 social engineering, 30  
 social issues, 40, 45  
 social problems, 19, 21, 24, 33, 36, 59  
 social research, 42  
   in apartheid, 37, 44  
   institutes, 42  
 social science research, 18, 20, 37, 38  
   in apartheid, 38  
   colonial period, 18  
 sociological research, 17, 18, 20–25, 33, 39, 40, 45, 60, 64, 78, 99, 109, 110, 112, 130, 132, 139, 141, 143  
   in apartheid, 64, 133  
   areas of, 25, 39  
   in colonial period, 25  
   in democratic period, 99  
   race in, 64 (*see also* social science research)  
   sociological research, 3  
   South Africa, 3, 7  
 Sociological Society, 25  
 sociologists, 6, 8, 19–21, 26, 30, 31, 34–36, 38, 39, 41–46, 48, 49, 54, 74, 78, 79, 88, 98, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 123, 130, 132, 135–138, 140, 141, 143, 144  
   at Afrikaans universities, 42  
   in apartheid, 44, 48, 130  
   approaches, 59  
   black, 123  
   in colonial period, 24  
   in colonial times, 19  
   division of, 47  
   freedom of, 44  
   interests of, 45, 106  
   Marxian, 36  
   in South Africa, 17, 45, 47  
   teaching, 39  
   training, 19  
   universities, 130  
   works of, 48  
 sociology, 16, 74, 75, 79, 83, 98, 99, 101, 111, 122, 133, 134, 136, 137  
   in Africa, 2, 11, 132, 143  
   Afrikaans universities, 34  
   American, 10, 21, 66  
   American version, 34  
   in apartheid, 8, 21, 30, 35, 38, 45, 47, 110, 130, 131, 133  
   assessment of, 7  
   in Australia, 10, 26  
   black graduates, 34  
   in black universities, 33  
   branches of, 35, 41, 78, 111, 131, 139  
   British, 10, 36, 139  
   Canadian, 36  
   challenges, 138  
   in China, 25  
   classification of, 5, 38  
   colonial period, 17, 19  
   colonial times, 17, 131  
   concerns of, 25  
   congress, 16  
   courses in, 16, 17, 25, 26, 33, 34, 36  
   crisis, 5, 131  
   curriculum, 17, 34, 76, 138  
   debates in, 4  
   decline, 5, 136  
   in democratic period, 75, 136, 142  
   department 8, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 31, 32, 34, 47, 54, 59, 74, 78, 88, 89, 101, 108, 109, 116, 119, 135, 140, 143, 145

- sociology (*cont.*)
- development of, 35, 135
  - discipline of, 35
  - early years, 34
  - empirical, 38
  - in England, 25
  - enrolment, 32, 134
  - establishment of, 16
  - existence of, 5, 16
  - expansion of, 47
  - features, 2, 3, 22
  - in Finland, 6
  - focus of, 19
  - forms of, 6
  - fragmentation, 109, 112, 113
  - French, 30, 39
  - future of, 1
  - genesis of, 15
  - global, 1
  - graduates, 33, 34
  - growth, 5, 32, 47, 74, 99, 106, 109, 133, 140
  - historical, 3
  - history of, 3, 4, 15, 16, 30, 136
  - independent, 17
  - in India, 25
  - Indian, 6, 112
  - indigenization, 131
  - indigenous, 20
  - industrial, 36
  - influence of, 20, 34, 35, 66
  - interests, 17
  - internationalization, 20, 36, 47, 65, 106, 124
  - Irish, 4
  - in Japan, 25
  - journals, 10
  - kinds of, 5, 6
  - label, 30
  - lecturers, 47
  - mainstream, 34
  - Marxism, 35
  - Marxist, 35, 36
  - nature of, 4
  - patronage, 2
  - perspectives, 137
  - PhD, 32, 140
  - position of, 34, 77
  - post-apartheid, 7
  - professionalization, 47
  - programme, 75
  - publications, 7, 10
  - relevance of, 1
  - research interests, 18, 19
  - size of, 5
  - in South Africa, 2–6, 9, 15, 17, 19, 26, 31, 34, 36, 38, 47, 77, 78, 80, 99, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 131, 132, 136, 139, 141, 144, 145
  - in Soviet Russia, 25
  - in Spain, 10, 26, 112
  - Spanish, 112
  - specialization, 109, 111–113
  - staff, 47, 124
  - standing of, 8
  - state of, 19
  - status of, 31
  - strands of, 8, 34, 36
  - streams of, 77
  - students, 31
  - syllabi, 33
  - teaching, 17, 33, 138
  - topics of, 33, 34
  - in university, 36
  - in US, 25
  - use of, 8, 38
  - value of, 143
  - woes of, 2
  - working groups, 67
  - works of, 18
- South Africa, 73
- apartheid, 6, 11, 37
  - area, 3

- Black Consciousness movement, 35  
 people, 3  
 political system, 36  
 population, 11  
 rainbow nation, 11  
 sociological research, 17  
 sociology, 2–4, 6, 9, 15, 17, 19, 31, 34, 36, 38, 77, 99, 106, 107, 109, 111, 144, 145  
 universities, 8, 17, 74  
 South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS), 16, 18  
 South African Council for Educational Social Research, 39  
 South African Dutch Reformed Church, 19  
 South African Humanities Deans' Association, 79  
 South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), 24, 40, 42–43  
 South African Inter-University Committee for Social Studies, 19  
*South African Journal of Sociology*, 7, 10  
 South African Labour and Development Research Unit, 68  
 South African Post Secondary Education, 77  
 South African Qualifications Authority, 76  
*South African Review of Sociology*, 10  
 South African Sociological Association (SASA), 11, 46, 48, 49, 66, 77, 108, 123, 136, 137, 142  
 membership, 11  
*South African Sociological Review*, 10  
 South African Students' Organization, 67  
 Spain, sociology in, 26  
 specialisms, 112  
 specialization, 38, 59, 65, 109, 112, 125  
 sociology, 111  
 Stellenbosch University (SU), 18, 20, 21, 30, 65, 85, 89, 93, 99, 116, 119  
 structural-functionalism, 34, 35, 66  
 students, enrolment of, 74  
 studies at the University of Natal (UN), 18  
 Suid Afrikaanse Sociologie Vereniging (SASOV), 46, 66, 77  
 Suppression of Communism Act, 37  
 Suttner, Raymond, 67
- T**
- Thaele-Rivkin, 67  
 Thatcher, Margaret, 10  
 theory, 33–35, 45, 132  
 Marxian, 34  
 in sociology, 21  
 transformation, 10, 35, 75, 134, 135  
 Turner, Richard, 67  
 Tutu, Desmond, 11
- U**
- UCT. *See* University of Cape Town (UCT)  
 UJ. *See* University of Johannesburg (UJ)  
 UKZN. *See* University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN)  
 UNISA. *See* University of South Africa (UNISA)  
 universities, 3, 16–18, 22, 24, 25, 31, 35, 42, 46, 47, 66, 76, 78, 93, 95, 99, 106, 111, 135, 138  
 African, 33  
 Afrikaans language, 30, 31, 33–35, 38, 39, 42, 66, 78, 108  
 in apartheid, 22  
 black, 33, 66

- universities (*cont.*)
- differences, 33
  - division, 30, 33, 35, 43, 130
  - English language, 31, 33–35, 38, 42, 66, 78, 108
  - foreign, 86
  - merger, 77
  - publications, 95, 108
  - research, 33, 41, 42, 77
  - segregation of, 45
  - social science research, 18
  - sociologists, 31
  - sociology in, 33
  - in South Africa, 8, 17, 74, 75
  - students, 31
  - teaching, 39
- University of Cape Town (UCT), 17, 18, 26, 31, 48, 56, 60, 66, 86, 93, 116, 119, 145
- publications, 52
- University of Fort Hare, 33
- University of Johannesburg (UJ), 85, 89, 93, 99, 116
- University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), 85, 89, 93, 99, 110, 116, 119
- University of Natal, 32, 38, 43, 59, 60, 67, 68
- publications, 52
- University of Pretoria (UP), 16, 21, 30, 59, 60, 66
- University of South Africa (UNISA), 16, 56, 60
- University of the Orange Free State, 30
- University of Toronto, 143
- University of Transkei, 67
- University of Witwatersrand (Wits), 17, 20, 31, 34, 68, 85, 89, 93, 99
- Unlawful Organizations Act, 37
- V**
- Verwoerd
- background of, 65
  - Hendrik, 8, 21, 30, 66
  - sociological research, 21
  - sociology of, 21, 30, 34
- Vilakazi, Herbert, 67
- W**
- Wagner, O.J.M., 46
- Web of Science (WoS), 7, 9, 19, 39, 41, 45, 60, 62, 65, 80, 93, 95, 100, 114, 119, 123, 125, 134
- problems of, 9
  - publications, 9, 10
- Webster, David, 67
- Wits. *See* University of Witwatersrand (Wits)
- Wolpe, Harold, 67