The ‘Academic Precariat’: postdoctoral fellows in South African higher education

Abstract

Postdoctoral research fellows, commonly referred to as ‘postdocs’, are a relatively new type of knowledge workers in the South African higher education landscape. It is estimated that in 2020 there were 2,867 ‘postdocs’ in the South African public universities. This figure is based on an annual survey. There is no systematic and comprehensive data on the number of ‘postdocs’ or, for that matter, on their terms and duration of employment, their demographic profiles, their contribution to the system, or the challenges they face in their precarious position as neither students nor staff. Much of what is known about ‘postdocs’ is based on anecdotal information. This paper provides a summary of what is known about ‘postdocs’ in South Africa and draws attention to gaps in the understanding of this category of knowledge workers. It concludes with a set of recommendations for more informed and equitable institutionalisation of postdoctoral fellows in South African higher education system.
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Introduction

In a previous issue of Briefly Speaking the age structure of academic staff in public universities in South Africa was placed under the spotlight. The focus was on senior academics, and the matter of contention was whether the country’s universities were facing challenges related to an ageing professoriate. In this issue, the focus shifts to the other end of the age spectrum. Attention is paid to a particular group of relatively new and younger academics. They are neither students nor staff; typically, they are employed based on fixed-term contracts. All have doctoral degrees compared with the 48% of permanent academic staff who held the apex qualification in 2019 (Bunting et al. 2021; Khuluvhe et al. 2021). They hail from South Africa, the rest of the continent and from further abroad. They teach, train, co-supervise, collaborate, and, most valued of all, they conduct research and they publish. They are the post-doctoral fellows, or ‘postdocs’ for short – a distinct category within the academic workforce at most, if not all, South Africa’s public universities.

Surprisingly, relatively little is known about the ‘postdocs’ in South Africa. The popular and academic literature has most often focused on the experiences of South Africa’s ‘postdocs’ at single
universities (see for example Drennan & Morris 2021; Hammet 2012; Kerr 2020a, 2020b; Mothapo 2021; Simmonds & Bitzer 2018; Vranas & Hendry 2013). Very little data is available at the national or system level. Systems have not been set up (or adapted) to collect the kind of information needed to provide a comprehensive account of the functions, numbers, contributions, challenges and career pathways of ‘postdocs’. The problem is not unique to South Africa. In a recent policy paper on academic research careers, the OECD (2021: 43) identifies the need for more evidence on “what is really happening with doctorate holders, particularly with the postdoctoral cohort … countries often do not have a good understanding of the number of postdoctoral researchers, their working conditions, and their career trajectories”.

This issue of Briefly Speaking sets out what is known about the ‘postdocs’ in South Africa and, in doing so, hopes to identify important gaps in the understanding of the unique place of the ‘postdocs’ in the country’s higher education system. It does so by posing a series of questions, each of which speaks to a particular aspect of the ‘postdocs’ as a relatively new addition to the academic workforce.

**Who or what is a ‘postdoc’?**

There is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes a ‘postdoc’. According to the Frascati Manual (cited in OECD 2015) a “postdoctoral researcher concerns the first grade into which a newly qualified doctoral graduate would normally be recruited, for a fixed-term without the prospect of extension, either with an employment contract or a stipend”. ‘Postdocs’ are therefore distinct from those who hold permanent academic posts such as researchers or assistant professors, or posts with a fixed-term but with the prospect of permanent or continuous employment (for example tenure-track) (OECD 2021: 14).

At the institutional level, Stellenbosch University (2017: 2) defines its ‘postdocs’ as “PhD graduates who are establishing their academic research careers by primarily conducting research but can also undertake other academic activities such as lecturing and co-supervision of students, under the supervision of a host at the University. The host of a postdoctoral fellow is an academic staff member in a relevant academic department, centre or institute at Stellenbosch University, who acts as supervisor and mentor to the ‘postdoc’”.

According to Van Benthem et al. (2020) the postdoctoral position was originally created as a short training period for doctoral graduates on the path to becoming university professors. And according to Lin and Chiu (2016), the ‘postdoc’ “is a special transitional position for those with a doctoral degree and is usually regarded as an investment to accumulate the additional human and social capital needed to facilitate future job
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searches or to add to an academic reserve army of unemployed PhDs”.

In the USA, a ‘postdoc’ position is seen as an expected component of an academic career (Wei et al. 2012). Doing a ‘postdoc’ has also become more prevalent across all science domains and is no longer only typical in domains such as the natural sciences, and specifically the biological sciences.

In South Africa, public universities introduced the postdoctoral fellowship positions as far back as the 1980, and, by 1999, there were an estimated 300 ‘postdocs’, mainly at the universities of Cape Town, Pretoria, Stellenbosch, Witwatersrand and Rhodes (Vranas & Hendry 2013). It was in the early 2000s that ‘postdocs’ became more common, driven, in part, by national priorities geared towards developing the nation’s knowledge capital (Holley et al. 2018).

While the average age of ‘postdocs’ is unknown, it is likely to be in the range of 30 to 45 years, based on the available data on the average age at which holders of doctorate degrees graduate, and depending on the scientific field. Schutte et al. (2013) in a survey of 88 ‘postdocs’, found that the average age of ‘postdocs’ was 34 years, ranging from a minimum of 26 to a maximum of 51 years. Holley et al. (2018) observe that ‘postdocs’ are usually young scientists2 who are within five years of obtaining their doctoral degree, often under the age of 45. But as Simmonds and Blitzer (2018: 277) point out: “the envisaged age of a ‘postdoc’ continues to be contested for various reasons [...] Preferring ‘postdocs’ below the age of 45 needs to be viewed against the South African backdrop where, on average, doctoral candidates are between 33 (natural and agricultural sciences) and 41 (social sciences and humanities) years of age when first enrolling for a doctoral degree and can take five years completing their degrees.”

The duration of a position of ‘postdoc’ typically ranges from 6 months to 3 years (Holley et al. 2018; Simmonds & Blitzer 2018). Schutte et al. (2013) found that 82% of 60 South African ‘postdocs’ held positions lasting up to two years. A more recent study based on a much larger sample size, found that the bulk (68%) of ‘postdocs’ were contracted for a period of between two and four years (Mouton et al. 2021).

What do ‘postdocs’ do?

In the South African context, ‘postdocs’ teach in undergraduate programmes or courses, co-supervise postgraduate candidates, and conduct research and publish (Holley et al. 2018; Simmonds & Blitzer 2018). It is their research and publishing activities that are highly prized by universities because ‘postdocs’ improve universities’ knowledge production capacities and outputs (postgraduate supervision and publications) which, in turn, attract income via the

---

2 ‘Scientist’ is used in its broadest sense to include all areas of knowledge enquiry, including the Arts and Humanities.
DHET policy of recognising research outputs from universities by means of providing subsidy funding. In other words, producing postgraduates and accredited publications attract guaranteed government subsidy-income for universities. In South Africa, outside of the five ‘research universities’ the other twenty-one public universities struggle to consistently produce high levels of recognised research outputs in some fields, and therefore having ‘postdocs’ whose contract often include a requirement to ‘conduct research and publish in recognised journals’ assists them to address their apparent weaknesses in this regard. South African ‘postdocs’ spend on average 92% of their time performing research, compared with 55% in the case of doctoral students and 24% in the case of academic staff in the university system (CeSTII 2014, 2019 & 2021).

According to Cloete et al. (2015), some university departments require ‘postdocs’ to produce a paper for each year spent as a ‘postdoc’, while others expect ‘postdocs’ to produce four journal articles per year and to assist with PhD supervision. An analysis of selected institutional ‘postdoc’ policies confirms that this is the case at one of the four universities analysed (see Table 1), while it is assumed that the requirement for a minimum number publications is set out in the memoranda of understanding between ‘postdoc’ and host in the case of other universities.

Globally, ‘postdocs’ have become an institutionalised feature of the university landscape. As McConnell et al. (2018: 1) write: “The postdoctoral community is an essential component of the academic and scientific workforce.”

How many ‘postdocs’ are there in South Africa?

The only known publicly accessible source of data on ‘postdocs’ in South Africa is the annual R&D Survey. The data include headcounts, disaggregated by gender and nationality for selected years, and full-time equivalents as a percentage of headcounts. The data are reported in the various main and statistical reports produced by the Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators (CeSTII) at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC).

According to the R&D Survey, there were 357 ‘postdocs’ at South African universities in 2004. By 2020, this number had increased to 2 867 ‘postdocs’ (see Figure 1). Using data for 2019, this equates to one ‘postdoc’ for every seven permanent academic staff, and an average of 110 ‘postdocs’ per public university, although ‘postdocs’ are unlikely to be distributed evenly across the 26 public universities. Stellenbosch University alone, for example, ‘registered’ 323 ‘postdocs’ in 2022.
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3 According to a presentation made by DHET in 2014, the Higher Education Management Information System (HEMIS) consists of four modules: students; staff; space; and ‘postdocs’. However, the ‘postdoc’ data table is not publicly available on the DHET website.
The data show that the proportion of ‘postdocs’ who are South African citizens declined from 46% in 2012 to 39% in 2017 (CeSTII 2002-2020). In other words, South African nationals have traditionally only made up approximately half of the ‘postdocs’ in the country, and the proportion of non-South African ‘postdocs’ has been increasing since 2012. There has also been a general decrease in the proportion of male ‘postdocs’ from 63% in 2004 to 58% in 2019 (CeSTII 2002-2020).

How do the number of ‘postdocs’ in South Africa compare with what is known about the number of ‘postdocs’ elsewhere? According to Duncan (cited in Woolston 2020d: 183), United Kingdom (UK) Research and Innovation, the leading funder of research in the United Kingdom, supports roughly 40 000 ‘postdocs’ in UK universities. Approximately 690 000 ‘postdocs’ were enrolled in the United States of America between 1985 and 2011, compared with approximately 105 000 ‘postdocs’ in China during the same period (Kang 2013 as cited in Ahmed et al. 2015).

What does policy say about ‘postdocs’?

According to McConnell et al. (2018:1) a “lack of data about [the postdoctoral] community has made it difficult to develop policies to address concerns about salaries, working conditions, diversity and career development, and to evaluate the impact of existing policies”.

Nevertheless, policies and policy statements directly related to ‘postdocs’ appear in several national policy documents. In fact, the need to increase levels of postdoctoral research in South Africa is widely recognised. For example, the National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) (DoE 2001) asserts that there is a competitive edge to be derived from intensive postdoctoral training. As such, South Africa needs to improve on the quality and output of its ‘postdocs’ to support national research, assist with equity goals and ensure that universities and the nation at large can meet global challenges (Vranas & Hendry 2013). While not making any direct reference to ‘postdocs’, the 2002 National Research and Development Strategy (Republic of South Africa 2002) identified the need for a new generation of scientists to respond to the challenge of an ageing productive scientific population. This had led to calls for “Strategic interventions are needed to reverse these trends in order to ensure correct positioning of the country for competing in the global research and innovation arena” (NRF 2021: 3).

The Education White Paper 3 (DHET 1997: 33) under the heading ‘Research’ drew attention to the
importance of increased access of female students to postdoctoral positions as a means of increasing the pool of researchers and improving the demographic representation of staff in higher education. More recently, the 2013 White Paper for Post-School Education and Training (DHET 2013: 35) refers to “postdoctoral fellows” as being an important component of building the research capacity of the country’s universities.

The 2018 White Paper on Science, Technology and Innovation (DST 2018) acknowledges the role of ‘postdocs’ in research but focuses to a greater degree on the contribution of ‘postdocs’ in alleviating bottlenecks in postgraduate supervision. The emphasis is clearly more on the mentoring role of ‘postdocs’: “postdoctoral fellows make an invaluable contribution to the research system by mentoring postgraduate students. The number of postdoctoral fellows … has generally increased, but their contribution has not been optimised because their status has not been defined. The DST and DHET will formalise a set of guidelines on how to optimise the contribution of postdoctoral fellows” (DST 2018: 62).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a systematic analysis of all institutional policies specifically related to ‘postdocs’. Table 1 provides key information for four universities, two of which are, according to the DHET classification, traditional universities and two are comprehensive universities. These institutions were selected because they had publicly accessible policies or similar documents available on their websites.

Table 1: Selected information from the ‘postdoc’ policies of four South African universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Cape Town</th>
<th>University of Pretoria*</th>
<th>University of Johannesburg</th>
<th>Nelson Mandela University**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>“A PDRF is not a student, nor an employee, but is an academic and professional trainee, known as a postdoctoral Research Fellow [PDRF].”</td>
<td>“a young researcher (generally up to 40 years of age), with a doctorate, who conducts research at a university in collaboration with a senior research mentor in order to develop his/her research capabilities.”</td>
<td>“as the context indicates”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>Within 5 years of obtaining doctoral degree</td>
<td>Within 5 years of obtaining doctoral degree</td>
<td>Within 5 years of obtaining doctoral degree; under the age of 45 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td>1 year. Maximum: 5 years (no extension)</td>
<td>2 years (no extension)</td>
<td>6 months – 1 year. Renewable to a maximum of 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remuneration</strong></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>R120,000 per annum plus an amount negotiated with the university to a maximum of R200,000 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract type</strong></td>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Grant-holder</td>
<td>postdoctoral Research Fellowship Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MoU
There is not much to draw on in terms on substantive policies related to the ‘postdoc’ at the national and institutional levels. It does, however, seem apparent that recent national policy places emphasis on the transformational and mentoring contribution of ‘postdocs’ to the national research system, while institutional policies (see Kerr 2020a) place greater emphasis on the research contribution of ‘postdocs’ in terms of the production of knowledge and innovation.

**How are ‘postdocs’ funded?**

The National Research Foundation (NRF) funds three types of postdoctoral fellowship: (i) the freestanding postdoctoral fellowships, (ii) the innovation postdoctoral fellowships, and (iii) the scarce skills postdoctoral fellowships. The source of funds for the freestanding and innovation fellowships is the Department of Science and Innovation, while the source of funds for the scarce skills fellowships is the National Skills Fund through the Department of Higher Education and Training (NRF 2021).

The NRF funding framework directs that each university may submit a maximum of 30 applications from candidates who wish to pursue postdoctoral training. Applications are required to be aligned with the following equity targets: 80% South African citizens and permanent residents; 80% Black; and 55% female (NRF 2021: 5). The framework has raised questions about stifling the contribution of international ‘postdocs’, and particularly ‘postdocs’ from the rest of Africa, to South Africa’s science system and the country’s development (Van Schalkwyk et al. 2021). In 2019, 395 of the 799 (or 49%) NRF-funded ‘postdocs’ were South Africans (DST 2019a).

However, non-government funding (such as funding from industry or donor agencies) supports the majority of ‘postdocs’ at South Africa’s research-intensive public universities (Mothapo 2022). In 2001, the NRF funded approximately 40% of the ‘postdocs’ in South Africa (Holley et al., 2019). Prozesky et al. (forthcoming)
report that, from 2013 to 2020 the NRF funded an average of 34% of ‘postdocs’ per annum, while in the most recent year, the NRF funded only 27% (780) of the 2867 postdoctoral fellows in the country.

**Terms of employment and remuneration**

New ‘postdocs’ positions are advertised by universities as this is a requirement of the SARS binding class ruling. ‘Postdocs’ generally apply directly to the host of the fellowship. They are retained by their universities as fellows who are recipient of bursaries; they are not registered as students nor are they offered staff contracts, whether on a temporary or permanent basis. The terms of the employment relationship between ‘postdocs’ and their host institutions are set out in contracts or memoranda of understanding entered into between the ‘postdoc’ and their host. As stated earlier, the term ‘host’ is used to refer to the academic mentor or supervisor of ‘postdocs’ at a particular institution, for the duration of their fellowships.

The emoluments paid to ‘postdocs’ are exempt from normal income tax on condition that all the SARS regulations regarding remuneration, as described in the SARS Binding Class Ruling issued in accordance with article 78(2) of the Tax Administration Act (No. 28 of 2011), are fully complied with. As contract ‘staff’, ‘postdocs’ do not receive additional benefits such as a pension or health insurance. Given that the net emoluments of ‘postdocs” are equivalent to their cost-to-employer, the financial status of ‘postdocs’ could be regarded as advantageous for the host institution (Kerr 2020a, 2020b; Simmonds & Bitzer 2018).

The institutional benefits of the ‘postdoc’ become more apparent when ‘postdoc’ positions are externally funded, and when ‘postdocs’ earn publication subsidies for their institutions. The exact quantum of this financial contribution is unknown. But if it is assumed that a ‘postdoc’ publishes two single-authored journals articles per annum, then approximately R240,000 in publication subsidy income would accrue to the institution. Because ‘postdocs’ are often funded by means of external funding, there are no direct costs against the publication income generated by ‘postdocs’, save for relatively low overhead costs.

In a 2020 global survey of more than 7 600 ‘postdocs’, the bulk of respondents (80%) reported gross annual earnings of USD30,000–49,999 (38%) or USD50,000–79,999 (42%) (Woolston 2020b). In current South Africa rand terms, 80% of ‘postdocs’ therefore reported earning roughly between ZAR465,000 and ZAR1,2m per annum. Direct comparisons between remuneration levels in different countries are always difficult because of variations in the cost of living between countries and even between cities. In addition, the Nature survey reports pre-tax income whereas the compensation of ‘postdocs’ in South Africa is exempt from tax. Nevertheless, using the NRF’s approved ‘postdoc’ remuneration for 2022, ‘postdocs’ in South Africa can expect to earn between ZAR200,000 and ZAR265,000 per
annum (NRF 2021). One university has set a minimum for ‘postdoc’ remuneration of ZAR200,000 per annum and this amount is reviewed annually. There is a push at the same university for minimum of ZAR400,000 which will fall under the tax exemption, and any additional remuneration above the minimum amount to be subject to income tax. Four ‘postdocs’ at the same university earn more than ZAR900,000 per annum.

‘Postdocs’ are permitted to provide additional services to their host universities for which they are entitled to be remunerated. Where ‘postdocs’ earn remuneration for services rendered in addition to their ‘postdoctoral research, their services may not exceed 12 hours per month and their additional remuneration is subject to employees’ tax (SARS 2010).

**What are the most common challenges faced by ‘postdocs’?**

Khan and Ginther (2017: 90) aver that “During the past two decades, official bodies have raised concerns about the working conditions, long hours, lack of benefits, and forced geographic mobility faced by ‘postdocs’, as well as the effects of ‘postdoc’ jobs on families” (see also OECD 2021).

Two common challenges for ‘postdocs’ are career instability and status – ‘postdocs’ do not feel that their fellowship is a form of rite of passage into full-time employment (whether in academia or elsewhere) (Holley et al. 2018). Half of the respondents to a global Nature survey of ‘postdoctoral researchers were considering leaving academia (Nature 2020).

Outside of the academy, few know or understand what a ‘postdoc’ is (Mothapo 2021, 2022). The consequences of this lack of knowledge is not trivial. ‘Postdocs’ report how they struggle to access finance to buy property or a car, to provide surety when renting accommodation or when applying for out a cell phone contract or an internet connection. Without employment contracts or payslips, most banks and companies still treat ‘postdocs’ as high-risk students.

Being neither students nor staff, ‘postdocs’ occupy a liminal space. In fact, ‘postdocs’ have been described as being part of the “research precariat” — those who work in positions with little job security, poor compensation and an unclear path to a permanent post (OECD 2021; Woolston 2020b).

**What happens to ‘postdocs’?**

While institutional policies regard the ‘postdoc’ as a temporary position, there is also the expectation that at least some ‘postdocs’ will draw on their experience of academic life and enter academia on a more permanent basis. If this is indeed the case, one would expect to see a steady or increasing number of junior lecturers and lecturers in relation to the number of ‘postdocs’. A less desirable outcome from a career advancement perspective would be an increase in ‘postdocs’ and a declining number of permanent junior staff, suggesting that ‘postdocs’ are part of a growing trend to ‘casualise’ the academic workforce (Kerr...
2020a; Rosella et al. 2018). Figure 2 confirms this latter scenario at the system level.

Source: R&D Surveys (CeSTII 2002-2021); Bunting et al. (2021)

**Figure 2: ‘Postdocs’ and permanent junior academic staff in South African higher education**

According to some observers, an oversupply of ‘postdoctoral scholars relative to available faculty positions has led to calls for better assessment of career outcomes (Silva et al. 2016:1; see also Sauermann & Roach, 2016:663; Gibbs et al. 2015:1). A recent survey of 1 238 ‘postdocs’ (Mouton et al. 2021) showed that 74% of ‘postdocs’ surveyed were employed, 21% still a ‘postdoctoral fellowship, and 4% were not economically active.

Simmonds and Bitzer (2018:285) state that “What remains a trademark of the participants’ experiences are the struggles endured in establishing permanent employment. For five of the participants this had led to them turning the ‘postdoc’ into a career, at the expense of their careers that remain in limbo”. More recent survey data show that 33% of ‘postdocs’ interviewed held more than one consecutive ‘postdoc’ position (Mouton et al. 2021). This supports growing concerns about ‘serial postdocs’, also described as the ‘permadoc phenomenon’ in academia.

### Conclusion

Information is one of the levers government has at its disposal to fulfil its design, implementation and evaluation of higher education and/or science policy. In relation to research careers, this lever entails the collection, analysis and publication of system-level information on researchers and research careers (OECD 2021). This paper has provided a system-level overview of the ‘postdoc’ in South African higher education. It has also made apparent the lack of comprehensive, system-level data required to make informed policy decisions at both the national and institutional levels in support of a productive and content cohort of ‘postdoctoral research fellows. It is therefore recommended that both government and universities improve the systematic collection of comprehensive data (both quantitative and qualitative) to inform future policies and plans related to the employment of ‘postdocs’ in South Africa’ public universities system.

In parallel with improved data gathering and analysis, greater sensitivity and consistency need to be practised in the nomenclature used to refer to ‘postdocs’. This may seem trivial, but it is not without consequence. Referring to ‘postdocs’ as students, for example, not only undervalues their qualifications and contributions, but may place them in weak positions when applying for credit or entering into housing, vehicle or communication-related contracts.

Finally, a national ‘postdoc’ forum is recommended to enable the sharing of
experiences across institutions and as a first step towards developing a more complete understanding of the ‘postdoc’ as a relatively new type of knowledge worker in the South African higher education system. Such a forum should work towards improving the conditions of employment for ‘postdocs’ and provide greater clarity on the expected career pathways of ‘postdocs’ vis-à-vis the university sector, commensurate with the contribution of ‘postdocs’ to the country’s universities.
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