Knowledge beyond colour lines

Towards repurposing
knowledge generation in
South African Higher Education

EDITORS

Monwabisi K. Ralarala

Lorraine S. Hassan

Rajani Naidoo

EXPLORING LECTURERS' ENGAGEMENT WITH THE INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMMES AT A UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Najwa Norodien-Fataar

Introduction

The literature on academic development in higher education institutions has primarily focused on the academic support programmes and structures that assist students from diverse demographic, cultural, intellectual and linguistic backgrounds (Norodien-Fataar, 2016; Pather, Norodien-Fataar, Cupido & Mkonto, 2017). What is missing in the research is how the lecturers utilise institutional structures to transform their teaching and learning practices in higher education institutions to ensure that students have access to knowledge. Dhunpath and Vithal (2012) question universities' responsiveness to their diverse students' educational needs and the lack of transformation in staffing, academic programmes, curricula, and institutional cultures. Vorster and Quinn (2017) point out that universities have not engaged adequately with the systemic constraints reproduced by current university structures and cultures. The calls for more appropriate structures and material resources in higher education institutions to support academic staff and greater institutional efficiency have been critical concerns in academic development debates (Badat, 2010; Quinn, 2012). Simultaneously, the need for lecturers to focus on social justice issues by addressing students' access to knowledge through curriculum and pedagogy has been highlighted (Quinn, 2020). Behari-Leak (2017) suggests that academic staff development debates often focus on lecturers' agency but fail to focus on the structures, cultures, and systems within the university that impact academic staff practices. While a focus on lecturer agency is crucial to debates on academic staff development, this chapter instead discusses the interaction between lecturer agency, the social structures and institutional programmes that academics encounter within higher education institutions.

This chapter illustrates the agential capacity of lecturers and the crucial role of 'lecturer capital' in accessing support to transform teaching and learning practices in higher education institutions. Based on my research findings, I discuss the influence of external

forces such as the industry's demands in positioning lecturers at the university of technology. At the same time, I show the difficulty and tension lecturers' experience concerning their need to conduct research and the demands of teaching at the university. The chapter shows the lecturers' active engagement with the university's Teaching and Learning Unit and the Educational Technologies Unit to change and adapt their teaching practices. Lecturers' utilise information communication technologies such as YouTube, video clips, Blackboard, social media tools and peer learning and support to augment their teaching and learning practices. The chapter shows that academic staff development and training in higher education institutions need to focus on supporting lecturers with socio-cultural issues, multilingual support and research development. On the other hand, it illustrates lecturers' limited engagement with the university's managerial and institutional structures to systemically transform their teaching and learning practices.

Bourdieu's field approach as a conceptual framework

This study's theoretical framework is Bourdieu's (1990, 1996) field approach, applied to the higher education context in this chapter's research. Maton (2005:688) suggests that "Bourdieu's framework enables the irreducible social structure of higher education to be seen as an object of study in its own right". Using Bourdieu's concept of field, the chapter attempts to understand the selected lecturers' responsiveness to the higher education 'field', mainly how they access and work with their curricula and the institutional programmes. The chapter applies Bourdieu's understanding of 'field' in terms of social spaces, rather than geographical or territorial ones (Lingard, 2013:9). Understanding higher education as a field allows us to "translate practical problems into empirical observations" (Thomson, 2014:79).

'Field' refers to the social space as comprising institutions, situations, power and people's practices. Locating my study within the university's notion as a 'field' focuses attention on the 'social-educational' spaces of the university's educational support platform. These spaces are the courses that the selected lecturers teach, the institutional programmes, the teaching and learning support services, and related university policies and practices associated with these university life dimensions.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) compare the field to a game guided by the rules and field positions specific to their context. Bourdieu (1990) suggests that people use various strategies to maintain or improve their position in the field, just as in a game. The analogy of the field and the field positions of players are useful in a study that seeks to understand how lecturers position themselves in the university and navigate its institutional structures. Bourdieu suggests that different fields and states exist; and that each field contains "historically constituted areas of activity with their specific institutions and their own laws

of functioning" (Bourdieu, 1990:87). Thomson (2014:67) describes the nature of fields as "shaped differently according to the game that is played on them. They have their own rules, histories, star players, legends and lore". Jenkins (2002:53) points out that "the field is the crucial mediating context wherein external factors – changing circumstances – are brought to bear upon individual practice and institutions". Bourdieu (1996:217) suggests that each field has two principles: an external or heteronomous hierarchisation principle; and an internal or autonomous principle in the specific field.

Each field of cultural production is subject to these two principles of hierarchisation, and its degree of relative autonomy is revealed by the extent to which the external principle of hierarchisation is subordinated to the internal principle of hierarchisation.

This chapter uses the field analysis method to analyse lecturers' engagement with the university's institutional structures and programmes. Hilgers and Mangez (2015) indicate that field analysis has three stages:

The first stage consists of locating the position of the field in question in the overall social space and in relation to other fields, in order to evaluate its degree of relative autonomy with respect to the external interests and to neighbouring fields (in particular the field of power, the economic sphere and the political sphere (2015:19).

The second stage is to "describe the activity that constitutes the specificity of the domain in question (2015:20).

The aim is to grasp the particularity of the field, its specific capital, its specific rules and the symbolic order of its specific productions". The third stage consists of "objectifying the structures of the relative positions, the main actors who work in distribution, production and consumption" (2015:21).

Based on this analysis method, the relations between the various elements in the university field are identified. Bourdieu suggests that social reality is relational, so the relationships among the elements and not the elements themselves must be at the heart of the analysis.

Another theoretical element that this chapter focusses on is Bourdieu's notion of 'capital', a key part of 'field'. The capital-field relation is vital in understanding how lecturers respond to institutional programmes to augment their teaching practices. Bourdieu (1990) argues that individuals are always in the process of producing capital in the field. He suggests that the production of different amounts and quality of capital in the field is dependent on individuals in the field. According to Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), capital functions as power over a field, and the more capital an agent can access, the more power he or she will be able to exert in the game.

This chapter focuses on lecturers and their interactions with institutional structures at the university of technology. Field theory and Bourdieu's notion of 'capital' provide an appropriate focus for a method of analysis to discuss the relations between lecturers and

the university's institutional programmes. Bourdieu's analytical tools of field and capital make it possible to understand and explain institutional reproduction phenomena while also giving a central place to change and movement within this field (Boyer, 2003). The theory of field and its relation to capital illuminates the 'network of relations' that confront lecturers concerning what they establish or how they adjust their teaching practices. The analytical tools of field and capital allow me to discuss how lecturers can produce practices and dispositions to access and engage the university as a 'field'. Furthermore, it will allow me to explore how lecturers can introduce changes to their teaching practices via the university's institutional structures and programmes.

Research design and methodology

This chapter describes a qualitative study that focused on lecturers' engagement with institutional programmes at a university of technology. A case study approach (Yin, 2018) was applied to capture the types of institutional programmes that academics access at the university of technology to strengthen their teaching. Lecturers in the Faculty of Business Management who sought regular academic support were invited via email to participate in the study. Of the eleven participants, six lecturers were purposively selected, and semi-structured interviews were conducted with them to gain an in-depth understanding of the types of:

- institutional programmes they access;
- the activities they undertook to gain access to the programmes; and
- the steps and processes they initiated to ensure student success.

The sample population comprised six lecturers from the Faculty of Business Management Sciences who sought academic development support, such as tutor training and academic literacy programmes for their students. These lecturers provided 'information-rich' data that enabled me to gain an in-depth understanding of how they navigated the institutional academic structures to improve students' learning (Patton, 2015).

I used ATLAS.ti (2020) to code and identify the patterns and themes in the data. I analysed the data using an inductive approach and generated concepts and explanations from the data collected (Patton, 2015). I followed a process of analytical induction, which involved correlating the data with Bourdieu's theoretical framework of 'field'; and after that, I developed the themes.¹

My role as a head of department in the Student Learning Development Unit in the Teaching and Learning Centre was significant as it positioned me as an academic located outside the

¹ See Bourdieu, 1990.

faculty. The lecturers were aware of my status; they volunteered to be part of the study and were assured of confidentiality.

This chapter discusses the lecturers' active engagement with their institutional structures to augment their curriculum offerings and their lecturing practices based on the study's findings. Of specific interest here is their use of information communication technologies such as YouTube video clips, social media tools, tutorial support and Blackboard, a virtual learning platform that the university use for blended and online learning opportunities. The chapter explores lecturers' teaching and learning practices and the type of support they access, such as teaching and learning structures, educational technology units, and other institutional structures to augment their teaching practices.

The six academic staff members who participated in the study were lecturers in the Faculty of Business Management Sciences at the university of technology. They taught first- and second-year students from diverse demographic, cultural, intellectual and linguistic backgrounds.

TABLE 12.1 A brief profile of the lecturers.

Lecturer	Teaching subject	Level of teaching	Highest qualifications	Duration of lectureship
Lecturer A	Internal Auditing	First-year	Chartered Accountant	7 years
Lecturer B	Marketing	Extended Curriculum Programme (ECP)	BTech in Marketing	7 years
Lecturer C	Human Resource Management	First-year	Master's in Industrial Relations	3 years
Lecturer D	Economics 1	Second-year	Master's in Commerce	16 years
Lecturer E	Consumer Behaviour	First-year students	Master's in Marketing	9 years
Lecturer F	End-User Computing	First-year students	DTech in Electrical Engineering	3 years

Lecturers' positioning in the context of the university of technology

In this section of the chapter, I focus on the first stage of the field analysis

which consists of locating the position of the field in question in the overall social space and in relation to other fields in order to evaluate its degree of relative autonomy with respect to the external interests and to neighbouring fields (in particular the field of power, the economic sphere and the political sphere) (Hilgers & Mangez, 2015:19).

The university of technology where this study was conducted offers diploma and degree courses based on a work-integrated learning platform (Garraway & Winberg, 2019), attracting students from previously disadvantaged educational backgrounds; offering programmes with a strong undergraduate, vocational focus and a suite of postgraduate qualifications in selected vocational areas. The university of technology consists of six faculties and institutional structures and programmes, such as the Teaching and Learning Unit, the Technologies Unit, the HIV/Aids Unit and the Student Development and Counselling Centres. These institutional structures are a central part of the university designed to support students and staff and bolster student learning. Lecturers access these support structures to strengthen their teaching and learning practices. How lecturers are positioned within the field of the university of technology and their relations with industry are vital in understanding how they engage with the university's institutional programmes. (Their position in the university of technology will be the focus of the next section.)

According to Naidoo (2004), Bourdieu's theoretical framework emphasised the university's high degree of autonomy. Maton (2005), following Bourdieu, distinguishes between positional and relational autonomy as essential conceptual categories to explain the degree of autonomy in the higher education field. 'Positional autonomy' refers to the extent to which lecturers in the higher education context look inwards towards their positions as autonomous academic professionals to develop their research and academic identities. In contrast, relational autonomy, according to Maton (2006:699), refers to

relations between the principles of relation (or ways of working, practices, aims, measures of achievement, etc.) within a context or field and those emanating from other contexts. In the case of higher education, if the ways of working or markers of achievement within higher education are drawn from other fields (such as economic gain), this indicates weaker relational autonomy.

Maton (2005) further suggests that current policy and practices within higher education institutions are aimed at encouraging lecturers to link external forces to current practices in these institutions; academics are practising their profession based on weaker relational autonomy – academic practices and identity are strongly impacted by factors external to the university.

These external factors played a substantial role in influencing the selected lecturers' teaching strategies primarily as a result of the formative relationship between vocational functioning in industry and their teaching courses. The lecturer in the marketing department commented that

[So], we have a good relationship with industry, and we know our role. Our role is to train our students. Okay, over the years it has been training students for the industry; in the Marketing Department, we have a good relationship with industry.

The meetings with professional bodies are a vital feature of their teaching and take place regularly. Lecturer C referred to the economy demanding graduates with specific skills and that the university plays a significant role in providing education and skills to educate students for the working world. This lecturer suggested that the university provides opportunities for 'empowerment' and explains that "because students come here with a certain level of knowledge and when they leave here, they leave more enlightened and perhaps more equipped and ready to enter the workforce".

Lecturer A, the internal auditing lecturer, regards the university as a "Technicon who provides technical and practical skills as well as theoretical knowledge". She was explicit about the need for students to articulate themselves as internal auditors, and they needed to use words properly when writing and presenting. She felt that the university "should cultivate the skills so that it builds confidence and competence".

Lecturer B commented that,

They [industry] ask us for our students; the students are interns and CPUT's role that I've seen at least in the Business faculty, the role is to prepare students for the working world. It is still pretty much the culture in most departments.

He also alludes to a teaching focus on "equipping students to be kind of global citizens and, you know, understanding their responsibility as a citizen and certain graduate attributes that are kind of more general".

Thus, the lecturers indicated that they have sound relations with industry and emphasised training, developing skills and being ready for the workplace as essential to their teaching. The lecturers are positioned to train students for industry and, dependent on the external social forces, such as the economy and industry influencing their teaching approaches, have weaker relational autonomy. In line with Maton's (2006:700) argument, my data show that lecturers' educational discourses stress issues of "income generation, social participation and economic rationalism" when they refer to their teaching and learning practices at the university.

Conducting research and contributing to knowledge in a particular discipline in higher education is vital for lecturer autonomy and reflects a strong positional autonomy. However, the data showed that some lecturers struggled to research their discipline. Lecturer D believed that research was fundamental to her role as a lecturer and emphasised the importance of teaching and research. She commented that "it is about understanding the greater, broader role you have in society and higher education". She explained that she undertook postgraduate property studies to increase her knowledge. She believed that research was crucial to her role as a lecturer and emphasised the importance of teaching, research and community engagement. She commented that,

Section III | Academic staff development and the knowledge question

I still view myself as a teacher because I take teaching seriously, and I enjoy it, and to me, there is nothing nicer than when you have that aha moment in the classroom. I also think there has to be more, you have got to have some kind of links with the community, and I think that that community engagement is important in the discipline that you are in.

Lecturer B, on the other hand, made this comment:

As a teacher, I do engage in reflective practice and action research. I wouldn't, therefore, consider myself a researcher. I struggle to get into research because there are real needs on the ground all the time that I have to deal with.

Another lecturer stressed the dual role of teaching and research at the university of technology and commented that:

[Ideally], it should be both. But practically, the teaching and the admin behind teaching takes up much of your time. It's difficult to do both research and teaching, with the load that you have.

The data showed that the lecturers in the university of technology desired to conduct educational research. However, the teaching loads placed on them as lecturers at a university of technology prevented them from participating actively in research. My data clearly show that the lecturers struggle to balance conducting research and teaching. In the context of staff development and transformation, more institutional support is needed in research development among lecturers.

In this section, I have discussed the lecturers' position and their relations to other fields such as external professional bodies. I also discussed the teaching-research relationship at the university of technology and showed the increasing tension between lecturers' need to conduct research and their teaching and learning demands. I have illustrated that the lecturers are positioned as having weaker relational autonomy due to their dependence on external social forces such as the economy and industry to influence their teaching practices; the lecturers are not positioned as autonomous academics that develop independent research to inform the industry. The professional bodies and industry demands are central to their teaching and learning practices. Lecturers are thus positioned to be on both sides: the higher education academy on the one hand and industry on the other. Barnett (2006:152) suggests that their curriculum "turn its face both ways, from theory to practice in an authentic work environment". This raises critical questions about lecturers' position at a university of technology and the crucial role of research development for lecturers at a university of technology.

While external forces in higher education institutions, such as industry demands and educational discourses, are significant in positioning academic staff, internal forces in higher education institutions propel lecturers to adapt, change, and reimagine their teaching practices. In the next section, I show how, given these "fields of forces" (Hilgers &

Mangez, 2015:77), the selected lecturers went about imagining and adapting their practices for effective teaching and learning within the university's internal field.

Institutional support structures to augment teaching and learning practices

In this section of the chapter, I focus on how the lectures access the institutional programmes, the type of support programmes they engage with and the teaching and learning practices they implement to strengthen their teaching. The data show that the lecturers established relations with the Educational Technologies Unit for Blackboard assistance and the Teaching and Learning Centre for tutorial support to boost their teaching. A significant portion of the data dealt with the importance of relationships between lecturers and individuals operating within support structures. The findings indicated that lecturers established individual connections within the support structures to enhance their teaching and learning practices. The participants identified individual leaders at the university who promoted blended learning, information communication technologies and tutorial support. Through these connections, they were able to strengthen the academic support programmes for students. Thomson (2014:65) suggests that, according to Bourdieu, an essential part of field analysis is:

[To] understand interactions between people or explain an event or social phenomena, it was insufficient to look at what was said and what happened. It became necessary to examine the social spaces in which interactions, transactions and events occurred.

A field analysis looks at the relations between people and between elements of the system within the university field. Bourdieu refers to peoples actions in the field as 'strategic calculation of costs and benefits' in relation to the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992:131).

The data further showed the agency of lecturers in their ability to navigate the field of the university and to implement changes to their teaching methods:

So, that's why I like to just figure things out. I find people; the people who are passionate about something, I'll work with them.

Lecturers attended workshops organised by the Educational Technologies Unit and used online tests via the Blackboard platform. The participants stated that they contacted specific people in the Educational Technologies Unit and worked with 'like-minded people' to find support to strengthen their teaching. They made extensive use of information communication technologies to augment their teaching; Lecturer A added five-minute video clips to her Blackboard platform and utilised mobile technology and Google in her classroom to engage with her students. She recognised that her practices were mainly a blended learning approach and sought support from individuals at the Educational Technologies Unit.

Section III | Academic staff development and the knowledge question

The economics lecturer created online videos for students. She commented:

So, for each unit within this semester, we have like seven units, so for one unit we have got seven videos. What we have actually done in the first semester and second semester, we have a self-study unit where the student then watches the videos, which I have explained very well, and then they take the online assessment. So, we are also trying to encourage that self-studying, developing that skill and letting them take responsibility for their own learning as well.

She described the videos: “They don’t see me. They see slides and hear a voice. There are lots of pictures on the slides, and there are graphs and everything like that, but they do not actually see me.” Similarly, the marketing lecturer explained that his students were very familiar with videos and wanted to tap into their knowledge and interest in video as part of a teaching strategy. The lecturer used an added innovative feature to his teaching by using Screencast as a form of teaching:

There is voice and video and images which kind of brings the text to life.

One of my strategies or one of my – based on my research, our current students are very familiar with videos and, you know. So, to kind of take the same text, but just kind of in a different form, all my concepts from the textbook that students need to know have been Screencast in that way, and it is available to the students.

The marketing and economics lecturers used their skills and expertise to create these videos. However, the economic lecturers commented:

I wish we could have more support in terms of videos. I am happy to do them, but again everything is on me, and I have also got to teach. I have also got to do my research, I have also got to – so I think we definitely need more support there. I also feel that our videos should be translated into the three languages in the Western Cape by somebody that is not just a language expert but somebody that knows Economics because the terminology is quite key and perhaps not even change the videos but maybe even subtitles.

The lecturer needed additional support from the Educational Technology Unit in the creation of the videos. She also identified multilingualism as a strategy needing more support from the Language Unit. A lecturer also used videos to explain theoretical concepts such as Skinner’s operant conditioning. Lecturer E commented:

I use lots of videos in my teaching. They are videos that demonstrate the concepts of learning of Pavlov’s theories or it is about Pavlov himself. So I get things from – so for operant conditioning, Skinner and I get something from the Big Bang Theory, so I got a little clip of two or three minutes long, where the actors are using operant conditioning, and then we have actually also theorised from that, so it is kind of a context going there.

Both the marketing and the economic lecturers were able to use their knowledge and skills concerning creating videos to enhance their curriculum. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) refer to this as ‘capital’. They suggest that “capital functions as a form of power in the field

and that the more capital an individual can acquire the more power he or she will be able to exercise in the field". Their actions show the significance of lecturers' capital in accessing support for their teaching.

The marketing lecturer employed the strategy of using blogs in his teaching. He required the students to create their blog, a social media tool that fitted well with marketing as it required all his students to market themselves; he was implementing a strategy through the entire department. He commented:

We are now where all the students will now have blogs. And they will need to blog often about various topics and different lecturers will give them assignments for their blog. Because running a blog is like marketing, because you are creating content; you have a customer base that you have to communicate that content to, you have to keep the relationship with your subscribers. It is a professional blog. It will be in the world, it will be available for everyone to see and they will be working on it for the next four years. It will basically be like an online portfolio, and it will be a place that promotes their professional brand and showcases their work, and it is a space that they can develop.

He also communicated with his students by referring to YouTube, and he created a Facebook group and a WhatsApp group to stay in contact with them. These innovative strategies show how this lecturer could align his teaching approaches to the marketing industry's demands. In addition, to the educational technology support that some lecturers received, they also accessed institutional support by using tutorial support for their students.

Tutorials as a form of academic support

Lecturer D believed that tutorial support was vital to his course. He organised tutorials on a Friday afternoon when venues were available. He explained:

I have made a tutorial, or more, more than one tutorial for every single concept and every single chapter and every student. So, once they are doing Chapter 2, at the end of the week, there is a tutorial in Chapter 2, which covers – the tutorial focus on the application side of things. So, there is a reader and then specific questions that they need to work through.

Lecturer C, the coordinator for tutorials in her departments, commented that "the challenge with our tutorials is that they are not compulsory, so students, their attendance is always poor". She employed one tutor to assist students academically and commented that, according to her tutor, students prefer individual sessions rather than small group teaching. She provided feedback to the tutor and guided him on how he could support the students.

Lecturer E also depended on tutorials to assist him with his classes. He used tutorials extensively in the first term of the year to assist students with a project. He commented:

Section III | Academic staff development and the knowledge question

I try and get three groups, and then I give feedback for the first part to the three groups from using one group's draft, I get the tutors to come in as well. So in that project – actually a lot of work set on the decision making, a lot of work is trying to induct the students into academic writing.

At the same time, he decided to utilise a teaching assistant to provide academic support to his students. He commented that the teaching assistant “taught a unit on her own. She went into my class, and she taught. So now this was amazing. I sat with her over a period of three/four weeks and getting her to teach, to look at a concept”.

Lecturer A employed one tutor for her classes and made his times available on Blackboard so that students could attend the sessions. She commented:

We have one tutor for all of our students. So, I meet with him on a regular basis. He takes an attendance register because obviously that is the requirement and he gives me quite a lot of feedback in terms of, he will say, “You know, the numbers are really down at the moment.” But he is also very flexible, so he will always say, ‘Okay I know the students are going to come to me because exams the following week’ and actually frees up time, and then he will say to the students to do this.

Lecturer A explained that she believed that the tutors were beneficial to her students in building a ‘student-centric’ culture in her classroom.

Tutorial support and information and communications technology (ICT) support are critical institutional support structures that these lecturers access for their teaching practices. They are key pedagogical strategies used for addressing lecturers’ teaching and learning practices. Drawing on Bourdieu, I suggest that ICT and tutorial support represent the ‘network of relations’ available to lecturers to transform their practices to ensure that students access knowledge. Furthermore, it shows that connecting with individual academics in these centres was central to their teaching practices. The Educational Technologies Unit, the Teaching and Learning Unit and the leaders of these institutional structures formed part of the university field’s relations, and they were crucial in supporting lecturers in their pedagogical practices.

Moreover, the data show that, instead of using the institution’s support structures, some lecturers benefited from using their own ‘capitals’ to augment their teaching practices. Bourdieu suggests that “they are the bearers of capitals and, depending on their trajectory and on the position they occupy in the field by their endowment (volume and structure) of capital”. Lecturers with more capital have a greater ability to navigate the university’s field to improve their teaching practices. This shows the significance of ‘lecturer capital’ for staff development and training within higher education institutions. At the same time, my data highlights the need to strengthen institutional support programmes to ensure that all lecturers acquire the capital to address transformation in higher education institutions.

Lecturers also identified deficiencies in the type of support they needed to improve their teaching and learning approaches. In the next section, I discuss these deficiencies.

Lack of socio-cultural support

A significant aspect of the findings was that one lecturer requested more support than that available in understanding the students he was teaching. He commented:

Yes, I think there's a lot of – I mean, the support structures are there, a lot of lecturers make use of them, and I make use of them the ones that are there. It would be great if there were more, probably support structures for various other things like the social challenges the students are facing, cultural. I am working, from a cultural perspective – there's actually a major lack.

He remarked that he had invited an external guest to assist him with race relation issues in the classroom.

The lack of socio-cultural support for lecturers indicated a need for more rigorous institutional support to those lecturers who teach disadvantaged students. Lecturer D needed more language support to create multilingual videos for her students. Bourdieu refers to changes and new developments in the field as the “external material shifts” (Thomson, 2014:78) that force individuals to change their practices. These lecturers felt compelled to change their teaching approaches based on the diverse students they taught. The lack of support in multilingualism and socio-cultural issues highlight the need for higher education institutions to address multilingualism and student diversity in the curriculum actively. Institutional structures and programmes that emphasise these crucial aspects in higher education institutions will enable lecturers to develop more inclusive teaching and learning practices that are more accessible to students' academic needs.

Structures propelling lecturers to act

In this section, I focus on the structures and programmes within the field of the university that enable lecturers to develop their teaching and learning practices. I focus on the management and institutional structures that impact lecturers' teaching practices. A focus on the university structures allows me to map the various relations within the university's broader field and explore to what extent they are accessible to lecturers and can contribute to transformed teaching and learning practices. The study participants identified several support structures within the university field such as the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), the council and the union, the curriculum officers project and the Research Committee as significant academic support structures for their teaching and learning practices.

Section III | Academic staff development and the knowledge question

The TLC plays a decisive role in dealing with teaching and learning issues in the faculties with individual representatives from each department serving on the TLC, as lecturers explained. Lecturer A commented that a representative in her department attended the meetings of the Teaching and Learning Committee. Lecturer A, however, was not actively involved in contributing to the committee's deliberations. Lecturer D reflected on her involvement in the TLC: "I sat in the Teaching and Learning Committee many years ago when I was still in the Accounting Department. I am not sure that we even have a representative in economics". Lecturer C referred to significant leaders on the TLC and commented: "Normally when I am not clear about stuff, then I ask them", and Lecturer B identified a teaching and learning representative who served on the committee. Lecturer B, however, commented that he had attended several workshops that the TLC coordinator organised. The lecturers valued their participation in the workshops and depended on the TLC leaders to engage with teaching and learning matters.

Lecturer D played a significant role as a member of the council and as a union representative. She explained:

I am sitting on the council at the moment. It is about understanding the greater, broader role you have in society and higher education. I think it's also got to do with – I am also a union rep. I am the Faculty of Business's Union Rep. It is also about making sure that the community within CPUT is functioning correctly, ethically and that the correct control checks are in place. We need to be involved within CPUT; we need to be involved with our own research, we need to be involved in the community, we need to be involved in different structures like council or senate, or you know we need to have a broader understanding of what CPUT's role is in higher education in the different campuses in those areas.

The statements above show the lecturer's involvement in the university's essential structures and that she could, through these structures, address critical ethical issues, such as irregular teaching and learning practices, passing students unduly and adjusting their marks. I suggest that addressing these ethical issues is a core part of transforming teaching and learning practices in higher education institutions.

The curriculum officers play a key role in the rearticulation of new qualifications at the university of technology. Lecturer A was a curriculum officer who assisted with the diploma and the advanced diploma for internal auditing. She attributed her involvement to working with "people that are 'like-minded'" and with whom she could work effectively. Her involvement as curriculum officer was significant as it showed her role in contributing to transformation debates and curriculum knowledge. Lecturer E commented that he was part of the Research Committee because he supervised master's students, so it was more appropriate for him to be actively involved in that committee. At the same time, Lecturer F participated in the information technology cluster where discussions about curriculum took place regularly.

These lecturers participated in a limited capacity in the committees that dealt with strategic teaching and learning issues because they believe that the institutional committees can deal with innovative teaching and learning matters and are important spaces for higher education transformation. The lecturers' engagements with these institutional support structures have the potential to influence and transform pedagogical practices at the university of technology. The data show that the lecturers' engagements with these structures were largely about preserving and managing their university's academic practices. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue that individuals have the choice to act and contribute to change, or they choose to conserve and maintain the status quo. The data show that the lecturers depended on the committee leaders to deal with teaching and learning concerns and challenges. The lecturers did not actively engage in the Teaching and Learning Committee discussions to address transformation in teaching practices.

The lecturers rely on their agency and capitals to create innovative teaching practices in the classroom space, such as information communication technologies and tutorial support. They chose not to engage actively in the university's management and institutional structures to institute systemic change. Their limited engagement in these structures raises critical questions about lecturer agency and capital and the role of institutional structures and programmes in facilitating transformed practices in higher education institutions. This means that academic staff development programmes must equip lecturers with the knowledge and skills to engage with the university's institutional structures to transform pedagogical practices.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on institutional structures and programmes which academic staff utilise in support of their teaching. Using Bourdieu's field analysis, I examined lecturers' engagement with institutional structures and university programmes. The focus allowed me to explore how lecturers could navigate the university's structures and programmes to improve their teaching and learning practices. I argued that 'lecturer capital' was crucial in accessing institutional support structures and that there is a need for more staff development and training to strengthen academics' capacities in higher education institutions.

The findings showed that lecturers at the university of technology were positioned to satisfy the needs of professional bodies and the higher education academy. The chapter raised questions about lecturer autonomy and their capacity to research within the university of technology and highlighted the pressure that lecturers experience while navigating between their desire to research within their discipline and the university's teaching demands.

This chapter demonstrated that tutorial programmes and educational technologies are two key institutional structures that the lecturers used to augment their teaching and learning

practices. Crucially, my research identified a lack of institutional support in dealing with socio-cultural issues and multilingualism. These two aspects are central in addressing student access to knowledge, curriculum and decolonising the curriculum in higher education institutions.

The chapter argued that more enabling conditions are needed within the university to cultivate a 'network of relations' between lecturers and the institutional structures. There is a need for more rigorous engagement between institutional support structures and lecturers' practices. Concerted strategies are needed to facilitate the interaction between lecturers and institutional structures and programmes. Strengthening lecturers' engagement with the university's institutional support structures would provide a platform to reimagine teaching practices at the university.

References

- ATLAS.ti. 2020. What is ATLAS.ti? <https://atlasti.com/product/what-is-atlas-ti/>
- Badat, S. 2010. *The challenges of transformation in higher education and training institutions in South Africa*. Midrand: Development Bank of Southern Africa.
- Barnett, M. 2006. Vocational knowledge and vocational pedagogy. In: M. Young & J. Gamble (eds). *Knowledge, curriculum and qualifications for South African further education*. Cape Town: HSRC Press. 143-157.
- Behari-Leak, K. 2017. New academics, new higher education contexts: A critical perspective on professional development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(5):485-500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273215>
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. R. Nice (tr.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1996. *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Boyer, R. 2003. The economic anthropology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Proceedings of the Research in Social Sciences*, 150(5):65-78. <https://doi.org/10.3406/arss.2003.2772>
- Dhunpath, R & Vithal, R. (eds). 2012. *Alternative access to higher education: Underprepared students or underprepared institutions?* Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- Garraway, J. & Winberg, C. 2019. Reimagining futures of universities of technology. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, 7(2SI):38-60. <https://doi.org/10.14426/cristal.v7iSI.194>
- Hilgers, M. & Mangez, E. 2015. Introduction to Bourdieu's theory of social fields. In: M. Hilgers & E. Mangez (eds). *Bourdieu's theory of social fields: Concepts and applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315772493>
- Jenkins, R. 2002. *Pierre Bourdieu*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Lingard, B. 2013. *Politics, policies and pedagogies in education: The selected works of Bob Lingard*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203765708>
- Maton, K. 2005. A question of autonomy: Bourdieu's field approach and higher education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6):687-704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500238861>
- Naidoo, R. 2004. Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4):457-471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569042000236952>

- Norodien-Fataar, N. 2016. Exploring the educational engagement practices of disadvantaged students at a South African university. *Alternation*, 23(1):90-112.
- Pather, S., Norodien-Fataar, N., Cupido, X. & Mkonto, N. 2017. First-year students' experience of access and engagement at a university of technology. *Journal of Education*, 69(69):161-184.
- Patton, M.Q. 2015. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 4th Edition. London: Sage.
- Quinn, L. 2012. Enabling and constraining conditions for academic staff development. In L. Quinn (ed). *Reimagining academic staff development spaces for disruption*. Stellenbosch: AFRICAN SUN MeDIA. 27-50. <https://doi.org/10.18820/9781920338879>
- Thomson, P. 2014. Field. In: M. Grenfell (ed). *Pierre Bourdieu key concepts*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge. 65-80.
- Vorster, J. & Quinn, L. 2017. The "decolonial turn": What does it mean for academic staff development. *Education as Change*, 21(1):31-49. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1947-9417/2017/853>
- Yin, R.K. 2018. *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.