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**1 INTRODUCTION: FRAMING THE GLOBAL**

Development research is increasingly structured around a set of global challenges which academics are asked to address through equitable international collaborations. This shift to global, challenge-led research could acknowledge the unevenness of development and better share responsibility for it (Mawdsley, 2017). However, the same shift can also reinvigorate the old assumption that the global North offers the necessary technical expertise to address the problems of the global South. In the UK, the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) is intended to “support cutting-edge research that addresses the challenges faced by developing countries” and funds such collaborations. The GCRF was designed to bring the ‘strengths of the UK’ to global development challenges and produce ‘excellent research’ (Newman et al, 2019, p. 22). At its inception, the GCRF’s six goals were to: 1) Seek to investigate a specific problem or seek a specific outcome which will have an impact on a developing country or countries; 2) Provide evidence as to why this is a problem for the developing country or countries; 3) Address the issue identified effectively and efficiently; 4) Use the strengths of the UK to address the issue, working in collaboration with others as appropriate; 5) Demonstrate that the research is of an internationally excellent standard; and 6) Identify appropriate pathways to impact to ensure that the developing country benefits from the research.[[1]](#endnote-1) When these goals are not completely in alignment, little guidance is offered on how to prioritise them. Thus, the GCRF potentially places attaining research excellence in tension with delivering effective collaboration and research impact.

The new GCRF funding stream has rapidly produced a race for research partnerships (Noxolo 2017b, 343) where minority world academics, some entirely new to work in developing-country contexts, seek out majority world collaborators. The longer-term impacts of this transformation are only now emerging. GCRF may be both generating effective collaborations and enhancing pre-existing unevenness through poorly considered or unbalanced efforts that effectively reinscribe colonial forms of research relations (Noxolo, 2017a). The balance of outcomes remains uncertain, but the consensus amongst observers is that global research is not only a matter of demonstrating global scope or scale. Global research should also incorporate considerations of inclusivity, equitable collaboration, career development and impact into its framing as a global project (Newman et al, 2019; Noxolo, 2017a). GCRF thus merits close critical analysis to determine what the global of global research means, in practice.

Here, I provide an overview of the publicly-available information on geography-related GCRF projects from the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)’s Gateway. While the Gateway offers limited insight, the emerging literature and commentary on GCRF and GCRF projects both reveal important gaps in data on project design and outcomes. We lack assessment of the impacts of GCRF on collaborative relationships and Early Career Researcher (ECR) careers, as well as a discursive analysis of the GCRF calls and associated documentation as they have shaped project design and team composition. Nonetheless, analysis of GCRF’s impacts will be crucial to UK geographers, international colleagues and research partners, past and present, to understand how development research agendas are being reshaped and to anticipate, and possibly mitigate, effects from the shift to global research.

**2 THE GCRF**

The UK government launched the GCRF in November of 2015 as ‘Tackling global challenges in the national interest’ (HM Government, 2015). With £1.5 billion spent over five years, GCRF has focussed on ambitious, challenge-led disciplinary and interdisciplinary research. GCRF is part of the UK’s commitment to spend 0.7% of Gross National Income on Official Development Assistance (ODA), directing aid through academic research on GCRF Challenge Areas.[[2]](#endnote-2) These are: 1) Affordable, reliable and sustainable energy; 2) Clean air, water and sanitation; 3) Inclusive and equitable quality education; 4) Reduce conflict and promote peace, justice and humanitarian action; 5) Reduce poverty and inequality, including gender inequalities; 6) Resilience and action on short-erm environmental shocks and long-term environmental change; 7) Secure and resilient food systems supported by sustainable marine resources and agriculture; 8) Sustainable cities and communities; 9) Sustainable health and well-being; 10) Sustainable livelihoods supported by strong foundations for inclusive growth and innovation and 11) Understand and respond effectively to forced displacement and multiple refugee crises.

GCRF funds development research outside the (former) Department for International Development (DfID, now FCDO – the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office). Manji and Mandler (2019) argue that GCRF attempted to make the UK’s ODA (Official Development Assistance) more transparent while delivering both value for money and ongoing partnerships between UK academics and scholars in the global South. GCRF was also intended to benefit UK universities when other government research funding streams were in decline and to help to address growing public scepticism over foreign aid (Heinrich et al 2015). This is a lot to ask of one funding stream.

GCRF projects typically feature large academic teams spread across multiple countries and disciplines (Callard and Fitzgerald, 2015; Datta, 2018), incorporating government, industry and civil society partners. GCRF’s calls for proposals create inclusions and exclusions that shape the scope and scale of such research activities. Some calls have specified projects in three or more countries while others have focussed on regions, though without guidance defining ‘region’ itself. A proportion of GCRF calls have nonetheless accepted single-country projects fitting within the call’s overarching theme. Thus, though global research may be supra-national in import and/or multi-national in scope, in practice GCRF’s global is often assembled within one nation or by adding together selected nation-states.

ODA compliance defines GCRF-eligible research. Each GCRF project must, as its primary objective, promote the welfare and economic development of people in ‘developing countries’, defined by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) through its Development Assistance Committee (DAC) List of ODA recipients (OECD, 2019). The list of aid-eligible countries is what most evidently frames GCRF’s ‘global’.[[3]](#endnote-3) If a country has ‘graduated’ from the DAC List, it is ineligible for GCRF-funded projects, despite inequalities or ethnic exclusions within that country.

GCRF funds interdisciplinary research. UKRI initially published an interactive GCRF map[[4]](#endnote-4) listing funded projects by country and funding council.[[5]](#endnote-5) Here, the ‘home’ discipline for each project’s Principal Investigator (PI) was not reported. While there is no overwhelming evidence that previous academic research on development was mono-disciplinary (pace Conway and Waage, 2010), GCRF encourages research design that blurs disciplinary boundaries. GCRF thus frames the global as a space where disciplines no longer set the benchmark for the research excellence it seeks. This framing then runs counter to established UK disciplinary norms for research excellence. The most prominent example is the UK’s Research Excellence Framework (REF) assessment exercise, for which a new structure of interdisciplinary advisors has now been appointed.[[6]](#endnote-6) This contradiction between interdisciplinarity and (disciplinary) ‘excellence’ is thus constitutive, shaping not only GCRF’s impacts and outcomes but the ways global research is structured and conducted by UK academics.

**2.1 Funded projects**

Initially, UKRI published GCRF awards data separately, then, after April 2018, included awards data in the UKRI Gateway.[[7]](#endnote-7) The Gateway reports on 95250 projects, searchable by investigators’ ORCID ID, Project Abstract, Project Reference and Project Title, as well as Classification. Each project carries up to four or five classifications, including ‘GCRF’. On the Gateway database, 2153 funded projects had a classification of ‘GCRF’.[[8]](#endnote-8) Of 2153 GCRF projects, 196 also carried a Classification falling under the broad umbrella of geography.[[9]](#endnote-9) I reviewed the Gateway Project Summaries for each of these 196 GCRF grants. By triangulating the PI’s name and academic affiliation with their current public web profile, I identified those projects where the Principal Investigator’s home department or school title included Geography and/or their web-published academic biography showed a higher degree in Geography.[[10]](#endnote-10) There were 50 projects awarded in this sub-set, with awards made to 48 individuals named as PIs who had Geography affiliations or degrees, as shown in Figure 1 – Distribution of GCRF funding by research council 2015 – 2019, PI a geographer.

The largest number of successful projects led by geographers investigated the GCRF challenge area(s) within a single country. Somewhat fewer projects were awarded to regional networks and only a few projects were awarded for research designed to explore the challenge theme(s) in three or more countries.[[11]](#endnote-11) Thus, where Geographers are successful in securing GCRF funding, it appears they deliver excellent global research predominantly at the single-country or regional scale.

It is unclear if geographers are resisting multi-country ‘global’ research design, or unsuccessful in bidding for it. While this distribution of awards appears to broadly reflect the relative distribution of GCRF funds across the UKRI’c component councils, more analysis against the archive of Calls for Proposals is needed to evaluate comparative success rates. What is evident is that geographers have not been dissuaded from trying to grasp how the global emerges from local and national particularities that require deep contextual knowledges. The diversity in size, scope and composition of funded projects indicates that, just as there is no one object of global study, there is no single unit of analysis that is appropriate for investigating the articulation between studies framed at one scale and another (Amelina et al., 2012, in Kahn, 2014, 7).

To deepen my analysis, I reviewed the Project Summaries for each of these 50 projects, examining team composition, named project partners, and narrative summaries. The information held on the Gateway is highly uneven, a likely artefact of changing requirements over several years of the scheme’s operation, so the outcome was inconclusive. I was often unable to reconcile data in the Project Summary with the PI’s current web profile or project website, where one had been built. Project Summaries and Classifications do suggest GCRF is drawing a much broader cohort of people into doing ‘development geography’, broadly conceived, possibly by collaborating with Geographers (146 of 196 awards). These colleagues could be Geographers in the global South who are Co-Is. Or they might be UK colleagues who are ‘geographers beyond geography’ and thus chose a Classification that does not necessarily match their degree(s) or academic appointment(s). GCRF Co-Is may be similarly questioning the global significance of single country studies, the comparative methodology shaping projects combining countries across multiple and disparate regions, and the selection criteria for case studies within their overarching GCRF design. They, too, should be engaged in a discussion of the shape of the global in global development research and the social and ethical aspects of research design and collaborative relationships. However, the publicly-available data do not offer much insight into collaborative ethics. Questions of global research design and the delivery of inclusive, impactful, equitable and career-building projects across global partnerships thus requires urgent work.

**3 Transforming research ecologies**

GCRF’s impact extends well beyond what is funded. The ‘scramble for the South’ (Noxolo 2017b) has not necessarily challenged the “lopsided” geographies of knowledge production (Walker and Frimpong Boamah, 2017). GCRF has appeared during a period of rapid change in UK Higher Education where the sector has been shifting from a more inclusive research culture supported by Quality-Related (QR) funds to a focus on ‘research excellence’ as acknowledged by competitive grant awards. GCRF emphasises large networks and big hubs which coordinate and fund research agendas with relatively little support made available to sole investigators or ECRs for their own independent projects. Unsurprisingly, then, the emerging literature on GCRF highlights concerns over collaborative relations and career-stage equity.

It is not clear how effective this new research ecology is in supporting junior researchers or small teams to secure funding to establish expertise, expand the networks initiated, then build successively bigger projects (Thompson, 2020). Accessibility by career stage has been addressed, in part, with GCRF Fellowships, but these are few and far between. Project Summaries suggest ECRs are most often involved as Co-Is or Postdoctoral Research Assistants on GCRF projects. Some GCRF projects may rely on nationals from DAC List countries or their wider regions employed by UK universities in these roles. While it is possible that a sensitive project design can offer ECRs career-building resources and some security of employment, concerns over impact delivery could also entangle UK-based scholars with origins in the global South or capacities to work there in complex ethical issues around partnerships, impact and dissemination strategies. GCRF may set ECRs’ career aspirations against their ethical obligations to attempt to decolonize the space of research partnership or to deliver public engagement benefits. That Co-Is and PDRAs are typically more junior academics with family and care responsibilities can make the international travel and flexible working hours required by GCRF an additional burden.

Comparatively little GCRF funding has been available for smaller-scale work by sole researchers or small teams (Nolte, 2019). Some GCRF funds have instead been made available to support these activities through University-managed awards systems, complementing the Newton Fund’s ‘pump-priming’ funding. The number of scholars who have successfully developed internally-funded bids into larger GCRF projects is unknown. Themes and scale of initiatives sought varies widely between GCRF calls and university internal priority areas. Thus, it can be difficult for scholars, well-networked and even successful in securing internal University pilot funds, to develop the larger bids GCRF seeks. Lacking a clear bid development pathway can make equitable collaboration with international colleagues difficult. This has been seen in previous rounds of challenge-led funding that have tended to produce uneven partnerships with colleagues in the global South. Noxolo (2017, 344) argues that GCRF produces the “same old colonial processes”. Kraftl et al (2018) suggest GCRF may nonetheless offer openings for decolonial work. For example, GCRF could potentially enable minority world geographers to support majority world colleagues to publish in venues which redress the balance of authorship, decolonizing academic knowledge. The push for impact, large-scale complex projects, widespread metricisation and the intensification of research management for ‘excellence’, however, could mute the potential Kraftl et al (2018) identifies.

Evidence for decolonial scholarship the 50 Geography-led GCRF projects is scant and examples of co-authored work are few. Of note are Antonio Ioris’s (2019) *Geoforum* article co-authored with Benites of the Kaiowa-Guarani and Goettert of the Federal University of Great Dourados, Brazil, and Douglas Quincey et al.’s (2018) article in *WIREs Water* co-authored with Nepalese colleagues, Bishnu Pariyar and Gehendra Gurung, from the Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO), Practical Action. We need to question to what extent publishing in English-language, ‘internationally excellent’ journals (thus meeting GCRF goal 5, above), where the UK-based academic is first author, truly decolonises research practices. Co-Is in the global South may work closely with NGO or government partners who are unlikely to benefit from publication in academic journals. Maintaining impact-delivery relationships could limit their ability to publish in national academic venues or other impact and career-building channels more appropriate to their own career goals.

GCRF projects need to better show how they define and meet the collaborative needs of majority world colleagues. Academics from the global South may find themselves overburdened if project design requires them to deliver the public engagement and impact strategies in-country. They may be handling the logistics of networking with ODA providers in-country, setting up workshops and generating resources, and managing social media feeds while prioritising articles for journals published in their home country and in their national language(s). Delivering impact from Open Access (OA) working papers, blog posts, social media posts and popular press items targeted to development practitioners, local and national policy-makers can give them little scope to simultaneously publish in English-language or global North-based journals. Academics here may not even be interested in or rewarded for second-authoring ‘excellent’ collaborative publications. While, in the UK and elsewhere, there is a widely-held assumption that global journal rankings identify the highest status and most impactful publication (Kraft et al 2018, p. 436), this is not universal. Across the global South, universities are increasingly ‘externalising’ their own metrics (Jazeel, 2017) to take into account these rankings, but the process is uneven. Indeed, this aspect of the emergent global knowledge ecology itself may be unfamiliar to GCRF project partners.

**3 BUILDING BIDS**

GCRF funds made available via UK universities seed global research through competitive internal awards. Support for research networking and collaboration with potential overseas partners is intended to build future GCRF bids. Activating Western privilege (Griffiths, 2017) in relationships with potential partners, the possibilities of GCRF let UK academics dangle pots of money that would transform research at majority world institutions, opening up wider research horizons. Thus, to fully grasp the impacts of GCRF, we would need to consider unsuccessful bids and those which faltered and remained unsubmitted. Funded projects are only the tip of a much larger GCRF iceberg, one on which no data is available. We can, however, suggest what these effects may be, at least tentatively, from experiences in other disciplines and anecdotal reports.

GCRF bid-building and project delivery often depends on overseas colleagues’ mobility and ability to enter the UK. GCRF-funded UK-based networking meetings, workshops, seminars, writing retreats and training events have had international participants’ visas refused by the Home Office. Geographer Elena Fiddian-Qasimyeh (UCL) joined colleagues Alison Phipps (Education, Glasgow) and Insa Nolte (African Studies, Birmingham) to condemn the Home Office approach to GCRF-funded academic visitors in the UK media (Hill, 2019). Being unable to host colleagues from the global South in the UK but nonetheless expecting to be hosted in their home countries undermines the reciprocity and relationship-building on which successful collaborations depend.

GCRF is intended to support established collaborations and build new and emerging ones, but UK academics face institutional pressure to bid often and bid big. Short bid timelines from call to close mean expediency typically sees UK-based expertise driving research design. Increasingly complex requirements to evidence financial commitments from third sector and industry partners mean much work is involved. Vital bid-building activities can often only be undertaken by international collaborators, *gratis* and after hours. While demands placed on would-be academic partners are difficult to quantify, colleagues in the global South complain about urgent requests to sign on as project partner, secure local NGO participation, and agree to a UK-led research design with little input (Nolte, 2019).

Furthermore, the demands of GCRF impact partnerships are innovative and unfamiliar, and the bids are reviewed by global panels. Here, the issues around reviewers’ expertise identified for standard grant bids reappear (Jerrim, 2019). Reviewers can fail to engage thoroughly with complex call-based specifications for design. For example, when they mistake network bids for standard projects, they may discount them as lacking an explicit and well-developed project methodology. Reviewers can dismiss the expertise of colleagues from the global South. The UKRI’s Je-S system enables international Co-Is to view reviewers’ comments. Anonymous comments suggesting ‘more expertise in [field] is required’ discourage and humiliate colleagues. Confusion over the role of non-academic partners can compound their experience of alienation. GCRF reviewers may assume academics can do the research design, implementation, and delivery single-handed, with partnerships with NGOs and civil society groups being added extras for impact, rather than fundamental to an engaged and impactful research process. In a recent review of a (failed) project I designed around ongoing work by four NGOs across three countries, one review observed: “It’s good that NGOs are included.” My Co-Is in the global South were disheartened to see their precious NGO partnerships treated like an optional extra. Where colleagues have minimal research time and lack a university scaffolding of support staff, access to infrastructure and travel budgets, NGO partners can be central to research delivery.

Academic research in the global South does not operate through universities alone. It is widely recognised that vital expertise and data on community networks and field sites belongs to third-sector organisations and government agencies (Newman et al, 2019). Academics seeking partners here must demonstrate how their research will enhance ongoing development work, showing how, where, why and crucially, with whom they work. GCRF’s neglect of the expertise and activity in the ODA sector itself means sector leaders dismiss GCRF projects and approaches as often failing to deliver meaningful development impacts (Newman et al., 2019).

Newman et al. (2019) found practitioners think GCRF focusses too much on the individual UK-based academic PI and too little on the wider, practice-based approaches currently deployed in DAC List countries. Practitioners argue a truly ‘global’ research agenda must have a profound and long-term understanding of the interventions already in play, the people involved and the processes that produce change. Long term relationships and career-long commitments (Cupples, 2019) predict global development research’s success. However, because GCRF bids mobilise personal relationships as well as scholarly networks, grounding bids in affective work (Cupples, 2019; Newman et al, 2019), exclusions can arise. Newman et al. (2019) ask “who is included in GCRF bids, and are they the best placed to understand and respond to the development challenges in question, or are they involved because they are relatively easy to reach and well connected?” Under pressure, academics may tend to stick with who they know, privileging their existing networks and colleagues’ previous connections. While prioritising personal connections over professional expertise may benefit project functioning (Datta, 2018), this may also impact research design, inclusivity and expertise in ways that undermine project success and the move to decolonise research. Moreover, the academic infrastructure that previously fostered such personal ties through communities of practice framed by concerns of region and nation - the Area Studies associations – appears to in decline.

**3.1 From Area Studies to global research**

Area Studies has long engaged geographers exploring the deep context features of international research. It offers transdisciplinary conversations with other scholars studying the same country or region. The Royal Geographical Society’s Development Geographies Research Group has historically had a membership that crossed over with the British Academy Learned Societies regional associations: the African Studies Association (UK), the Society for Latin American Studies, British Association for South Asian Studies, the Association of Southeast Asian Studies (UK), and the Society for Caribbean Studies. While Area Studies associations have evident colonial antecedents, they have also been a key space for decolonization and have produced a trenchant critique of GCRF (Nolte, 2019). Geographers seeking to build the personal relationships for potential GCRF collaborations would likely meet far more colleagues from countries on the DAC List at Area Studies meetings (Nolte, 2019) than at the Royal Geographical Society/Institute of British Geographers annual conference (Esson et al., 2017).

Past Chair of the African Studies Association, Insa Nolte (2019) argues that, despite the enduring legacies of colonial power, including the power to represent and to exclude the others being studied, Area Studies associations have been rapidly shifting towards a more equitable footing. Just as Area Studies had begun to decolonize, the British Academy quietly defunded the Learned Societies.[[12]](#endnote-12) Seemingly out of step with contemporary internationalised universities and dominated by scholars from the humanities and social sciences, Area Studies may have appeared a poor fit to the 11 Challenge Areas of GCRF. But the decline of these Learned Societies – most now functioning as charities or supported by paid-access journals threatened by Open Access requirements – has diminished the diversity of interdisciplinary spaces where scholars of regions or nations can gather. Though increasingly driven by the concerns of scholars originating in regions or nations of interest and studying the specificities of the global shaping the daily lives of people living within them (Nolte, 2019), Area Studies has been superseded by the global (Kahn, 2014).

In African Studies, for example, undoing the distinctions of colonizing researcher and colonized research object and/or assistant had been the focus of years of work. Nolte (2019) outlines how the African Studies Association (UK) had initiated a joint publication series, Africa-based workshops, funding for Africa-based scholars to study the impacts of UK institutions and migrants on their home nations and held conferences in Africa. With GCRF, African scholars found they were invited to join bids, but only to generate and collect data that would be analysed by UK-based project leads. Short deadlines offered them little scope for design input and the primary benefit for them was to be co-authoring in ‘high-impact’ international journals. Nolte’s interviewees, senior Africa-based colleagues, directors of their own research institutes or advisors to governments, experienced these requests as demeaning, exploitative and neo-colonial. The effects of GCRF here undermine decolonisation.

**4 CONCLUSIONS: DECOLONISING GLOBAL RESEARCH**

GCRF thus operates as a framing device for the global (Teaiwa, 2014; Kahn, 2014) in several ways. It shapes practices of inclusion or exclusion not only for research themes and objects, highlighting some while obscuring or deprioritising others, but also collaborations and hierarchies. Its framing, as Patricia Noxolo (2017a and b) has argued, activates the legacies of colonial histories and neocolonial policies that have shaped both researchers’ identities and their objects of study (see also Kraftl et al 2018; Nolte, 2019). Like all framing practices shaping scholarly vantage points, the ethics and relationships underpinning GCRF research design cannot be separated from the ‘global’ character of the research itself (Teaiwa, 2014). Thus, if geographers hold on to their concern with the ways global unevenness is perpetuated and reinscribed, there are three lines of inquiry which need urgent attention: 1) assessing the social costs of GCRF failed bids; 2) evaluating the role of third-sector collaborators in framing questions and building impact; and 3) investigating what collective and collaborative post-GCRF-award thinking across single-country outcomes could reveal. We cannot leave framing the ‘global’ of Global Challenges to the GCRF, not only because there is not enough space for decolonial practice in GCRF’s operations (Noxolo 2017b), but because of the power this framing has to exacerbate existing inequalities.

The Gateway data suggest the comparative success of Geographers with single country studies is playing to geographer’s research strengths and existing networks. Geographers recognise, as Sassen (2014, ix) has argued, that the global ‘simultaneously transcends the nation state and partly inhabits national territories and institutions.’ Because Geographers have long conceptualised globalization as far more than intensified international interdependence and the activities of institutions with a global purview, it is unsurprising that their successful GCRF projects tend to see the global as sitting deep inside national spaces. Here, the inner workings of nation states are decoupled from national governments, elites, and institutions, being shaped by processes unbounded by national borders. It follows, then, that knowledge of the global requires specialized expertise in sub-national settings where contextual detail matters profoundly. Geographers know this intimately and will keep global unevenness in focus through further single-country projects. It is through these studies of unevenness that the particularities of global research (Jazeel, 2017; Kahn, 2014) can potentially challenge any thin simplifications of global sameness emerging through challenge-led approaches (Noxolo, 2017b).

Single-country studies offer continuity, but not necessarily the comparative connections and cross-cutting analyses that might support a broader decolonization of research, particularly challenge-led initiatives. Further work to delineate the country and regional foci of the next round of GCRF-funded projects in Geography could well reveal the entrenchment of Area Studies approaches under a different guise. Indeed, the shape of Geography’s global may resonate with that of its old ‘Area’. However, if new scholarship remains discipline-focussed and targeted to REF strategies and thus disjunct from the former BA Learned Societies, accumulated knowledge and collaborations may be lost. If GCRF’s challenge-led approach obscures structural inequalities and thus reinvigorates extractive and exploitative research practices, it is then failing to build on the decolonial work, relationships and networks previously established. This risk of failure, particularly within the much wider field of unfunded projects and less-than visible collaborative relationships, needs to be investigated. Holding the discipline to account on GCRF should encourage a global knowledge ecology that is inclusive and impactful, building equitable relations with colleagues in the majority world while celebrating the more worthy aspects of the discipline’s Area Studies legacy.
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