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Abstract

This study, which is part of a National Research Foundation project on Social Inclusion in Higher Education (HE), focuses on the exercise of agency among new academics, conducive to the social inclusion of students. Transitioning from varied entry points into higher education, new academics face numerous challenges as they embed themselves in disciplinary and institutional contexts. Given the complexity and contested nature of the current higher education landscape, new academics are especially vulnerable.

Using Roy Bhaskar’s critical realism as meta-theoretical framing and Margaret Archer’s social realist theory, with its methodological focus on analytical dualism and morphogenesis, this study offers a social realist account of how new academics engage with enabling and constraining conditions at institutional, faculty, departmental and classroom levels. Through an analysis of six individual narratives of mediation, this study explicates and exemplifies the range of agential choices exercised by new academics to mediate their contested spaces. A nuanced social and critical account of the material, ideational and agential conditions in HE shows that the courses of action taken by these new academics are driven through their concerns, commitments and projects in higher education. Yet, despite the university’s espousal of embracing change, the current induction and transition of new academics is inadequate to the task of transformation in higher education. Systemic conditions in HE, conducive to critical agency and social justice, are not enabling.

Bhaskar’s Seven Scalar Being, used as an analytical frame and heuristic, guides the cross-case analysis of the six narratives across seven levels of ontology. The findings highlight that, despite difficult contextual influences, the positive exercise of agency is a marked feature of new participants in HE in this study. This has immediate implications for ways in which professional and academic development, and disciplinary and departmental programmes, could create and sustain conducive conditions for the professionalisation of new academics through more sensitised practices.

Using alternative research methods such as photovoice to generate its data, this doctoral study proposes that new research methodologies, located in the third space, are needed now more than ever in HE sociological research, to recognise the researcher and the research participants as independent, autonomous and causally efficacious beings. To this end, this study includes a Chapter Zero, which captures the narrative of the doctoral scholar as researcher, who, shaped and influenced by established doctoral practices and traditions in the field, exercises her own doctoral agency in particular ways.
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Chapter Zero complements the theoretical and methodological frames drawn on in this study, namely critical and social realism. Both are ultimately concerned with truth, reality and the sense that 'being' is not the same as 'knowing' (Bhaskar in Archer 1998). Things do not happen by chance or without a reason (Danermark et al. 2002). This means that our accounts of reality may be different to the way things actually are or how the world is or can be (Archer 2004).

"The traditional scientific model seems to give an oversimplified picture of how learning happens and what knowledge is, since it presents learning as a more or a less linear, impersonal and individualistic process resulting in knowledge which may be detached from the personal, cultural and historical context of the researcher" (Hanrahan, Cooper and Burroughs-Lange 1999).
Chapter Zero

Prelude

Humbled before the traditions of doctoral education with its established practices, the doctoral scholar submits and commits to a deep engagement with knowledge in a quest for answers to a key research question. Most self-help manuals on the doctoral journey claim that the scholar’s greatest contribution is to the body of knowledge, but I argue that this is a vital by-product of an even greater accomplishment. The doctoral scholar in the doctoral process comes head to head with her own traditions, practices and ways of seeing the world, which alter and transform her thinking, feeling, and being in ways that are irreducible to the outcomes achieved in the thesis.

In paying homage to this process of coming into being as a doctoral candidate, I would like to preface this doctoral thesis with a pre-introductory chapter titled ‘Chapter Zero’, appropriately named to invoke the notion that ‘nothing is what it seems’. At the same time I want to revoke the notion that ‘nothing comes from nothing’, as I believe that there is always something to be developed, shaped and nurtured into something greater, even from nothing.

Contained in this Chapter Zero is a record of my motivation for embarking on this doctoral study; the rationale for the study; and acknowledgements to my data participants, my supervisors, the community of doctoral scholars at Rhodes University and my family and friends, who have all contributed in both tangible and invisible ways to lead me to this milestone in my life. To ignore them in this birthing process is to deny vital components of my own Self.

I have regrettably not infused the entire thesis with the approach taken in this Chapter Zero, and you will find that Chapter One through to Chapter Seven follow conventional regimes, except for the inclusion of pictures, drawings, images and photographs which dot the pages. Nonetheless, I invoke your ability as reader to read between the parallels of nothing and something in this chapter and the rest of the thesis. In doing so, I invite you to be an active reader of this thesis, to engage with it beyond the words, claims and the evidence provided, to see its potential. The ‘spiritual’ meaning of zero deals with pure potentiality and I believe there is great value in scholars taking on the PhD study with the vision of its potentiality; not just for the award of the degree or the bestowing of the title, but for its potential to change how we and others see the world and how we engage with one another and with knowledge.
Chapter Zero thus is presented in an experiential and experimental mode, to see what possibilities there are for pushing the doctoral envelope, even if just a little.

**The significance of Zero**

The number ‘Zero’ is significant to my thesis in a myriad of ways. The concept Zero as a number, and not merely a symbol or an empty space for separation, is attributed to India, where, by the 9th century A.D., practical calculations were carried out using zero, which was treated like any other number, even in the case of division. Visually, the number Zero is symbolic of the seed, womb or egg from which pure potential emerges, representing a beginning. Pythagoras viewed the sign of the Zero as the birthing place of all other values, where that which precedes must be the birth giver of all that follows. Zero thus represents the Tao – the container of the eternal and the birth-giver to the concept One. As doctoral scholars we are often reminded that the thesis is only the beginning of yet a longer journey where greater things are bound to happen.

The image of a circle resembling the Zero is symbolic of eternity, evolution, infinity, birth and death cycles, but more importantly, time. The doctoral thesis, while time bound by its genesis and culmination, is timeless as well, and defies cycles of birth and death to render it ‘eternal’, whether on the shelves of libraries or in the heart of its creator.

The Zero in all its nothingness is full of energy. Focus upon the zero is encouraged when we wish to be present in the moment, when we meditate or chant the full-bodied ‘ohm’ sound which reminds us of the Zero as a primordial chord. Zero is representative of the essence of reality: it is everything and nothing at the same time. In its essence, the energy of Zero can take on the characteristics that make it feminine or masculine in its impact. The Mayans used the cosmic spiral to represent the numeral zero and the massiveness of mystery in the universe, and the Zero is the feminine divine in all its mysterious energy. As a doctoral scholar, I have found the traditional thesis to be quite ‘masculine’ in its constitution and composition, driven by the need to be ‘black or white’, with limited grey areas or creative expression through the use of colour and shape, for example. There is little room for speculation, hearsay, ‘gut feel’, intuition, mystery, or infinite wisdom borne by bearers of research through their deep experiences of life.

The quantitative/qualitative research divide represents this dichotomy arising from fundamentally different views of the world and embodying alternative understandings of how knowledge is created (Haberman 2009). The dissemination of research findings is confined
to conventional paper forms of publishing, and research excellence is measured and audited through such forms, be it in monographs or academic journals (Carrigan 2013). There is little space for emerging researchers with alternative research methodologies to illustrate their findings in creative, unique and ‘mysterious’ ways that are considered legitimate scholarly research.

Chapter Zero represents the fertile and neutral ground for doctoral scholars and researchers, like me, who work across cultural divides in the Western tradition, where one’s sense of Self is constantly in tension with the Other, struggling to find creative expression. Asian writer, Mika Yoshimoto (2008), disrupts the Western, colonial, objective, logical, explicit, and unemotional academic style. Deliberately she uses the Japanese *ki-shou-ten-ketsu* (begin, develop, change, conclude) writing style as a performative technique in her texts to show her reader/audience that her thinking is deeply rooted in her cultural traditions. ‘My way of thinking is circular, so I cannot simply follow a traditional, linear Western academic style, while I am being displaced from my own culture as I experience transnational living’ (Yoshimoto 2008). Similarly, Suresh Canagarajah, writing about multilingual Tamil writers in America, points out that writing not just constitutive, it is also performative as ‘we write to achieve specific interests, represent our preferred values and identities, and fulfil diverse needs’ (Canagarajah 2006: 600).

Doing a doctoral study is an experience in learning and the traditional scientific and social science model seems to give an over-simplified picture of how learning happens and what knowledge is. It presents learning as a more or a less linear and impersonal process resulting in knowledge which may be detached from the personal, cultural and historical context of the researcher (Hanrahan et al. 1999). The nature of ‘scholarship’ as we have come to accept it in doctoral conventions, even when we are fully aware that theory is value laden, needs to be more accommodating, receptive and representative of scholars not of Western tradition. It needs to expand its boundaries beyond the conventional and traditional; a process which begs the question, whose conventions and whose traditions?

As a canon, its written code contributes to a more specific cultural code that may not be in the realm of the scholar’s cultural repertoire and styles of writing, which are neither fixed nor innocent, and ‘reflect the historically shifting domination of specific schools or paradigms’ (Richardson 1994: 476). It is sometimes worth breaking the ‘sacrosanct rules of scholarly writing in order to display these practices’ (Blair, Brown & Baxter 1994: 384) and to critique
the normative way that writing in the social as well as natural sciences functions, as if neutral and absent of ideology (Richardson 1994).

For some writers, the limitations and boundaries of the printed page offer little space for exits and entrances that are characteristic of creative writers in the discipline. Haberman (2009) describes her journey through her doctoral writing as ‘spilling over’ the conventional page, and beyond the literal and figurative margins: she wrote notes to herself in the blank spaces of articles; she wrote letters to others about the writing of her thesis; she wrote down comments from others as they passed in and out of the room, or her thoughts; she wrote images and reflections of her thoughts, her process, her heart. Eventually those elements took shape as conversations interspersed in the body of the text and thus the text is structured in a way that allows for interventions, conversations, and departures. It is a way of making and doing – performing – the fundamental questions and explorations of the scholarly and embodied work of writing.

Texts that invoke the combined influences and cultural shifts toward personal narratives used in social justice research, and that have succeeded in challenging assumptions and practices regarding writing within academia (Richardson 1994), have done so using alternative methods such as narratives, autobiography, auto-ethnography, or photo-elicitation. I have used some of these research methods in this thesis to generate deep and rich accounts of participants’ challenges. My co-supervisor Dr Cecilia Jacobs had also used similar methods in her work to show, rather than only tell, by enacting what they described and evoking what they named (Phelan 1998: 13). But these examples are too few and far between to be able to put a dent in a tradition that is held firmly in place by its guardians. In the current global and international climate, and especially in this digital age, we might need innovative conventions and new traditions for the doctoral study – ones that are evocative, provocative, representative and reflexive.

**Knowing the doctoral scholar: motivation for the study**

For most of my life I have experienced myself as both an outsider and an insider, located on the periphery of my ‘tribe’. This awareness of Difference from early on forced me into an ongoing dialogue with my Self about existential and humanistic questions around my ontology and my purpose in this world. My identity as a teacher and academic has been shaped in no small part by the master narratives of race, class and gender. In a country like South Africa, riddled with these dichotomies, I was exposed at an early age to
the discourse of liberation and oppression as binary opposites. My teaching engagements with students and lecturers have been imbued with the sense that the pedagogical intersects with the political and the personal in the classroom (Giroux 1994), and like many teacher-activists of that era, I believe that awakening our socio-cultural consciousness is as important as the teaching of disciplinary content areas. I believed strongly then, as I do now, that higher education classrooms, in all their diversity, with students and lecturers of different race, class, gender, ethnicity and language, are sites of and for ongoing struggle.

For a long time I faced a crisis of identity, purpose and meaning as an academic in higher education. Where were we going? What was the point of it all? What would be the outcome? I felt that the higher education academic project had sold out the transformation goals of 1994 in the onslaught of the neo-liberal agenda, with academics choosing accredited journals as the battlefield instead of ‘fighting the good fight’.

In my experience, important research in teaching and learning was not making a significant difference at the chalk face, and research outputs had not succeeded on the ground in transforming the physical or discursive spaces that had historically been dominated and controlled by the intellectual elite. What were we doing wrong? What were we not seeing? Were we looking through the wrong lenses?

In an attempt to offset my own existential crisis, I started looking at the possibility of doing a doctorate but, like many others, I was looking for something meaningful: something that would make a difference. I must also admit that I partly succumbed to the pressure to enter the doctoral marathon, to join the sprint towards a professional career and put myself in the ‘market’ for a better academic position in higher education (HE). I had observed that those around me were ‘getting ahead’, using the currency of certification to climb all sorts of ladders. I was also aware that, if one wanted to make a difference in academia, one needed to learn to play by and/or master the rules of the game. Even though no one really cared about the dishevelled activist cheering from the side, I wanted to retain the integrity of the process, so my challenge was to learn how to channel my ideas and beliefs into an academic project that would have greater reach and contribute meaningfully through wider dissemination.
I slowly began to see that the new ‘struggle’ was one of knowledge and for knowledge and the various ways in which our lives intersect with knowledge at the crossroads of class, gender, race, ability, ethnicity, and language, especially in this country. The delusion that the ‘struggle’ in HE was over was dangerous and provocative at the same time. There was so much that HE could still do for students today, to extend and transform the racial, sexist, ethnic and class debates into tangible realms of reality. Higher education could provide the ‘safe’ intellectual, cognitive and emotional space and platform where young adults could exercise their socio-political muscle within an informed understanding of national imperatives and global aims. Higher education had a responsibility to facilitate this expression and to deepen this holistic perspective. And I could still play a part in this.

**Being the doctoral scholar**

My positionality as doctoral scholar and researcher is thus set against this backdrop. As scholars we are not *tabula rasa*, but come into our studies with a wealth of experiences, conditioning, and positions, which strongly shape who we are and who we become. Especially in the social sciences, this sense of *being* is crucial to how researchers shape their studies to raise criticality and awareness of social issues for society’s transformation.

At the beginning of 2011, when I was accepted to be part of the Social Inclusion Doctoral Project at Rhodes University, funded through a grant from the National Research Foundation (NRF), I had found the perfect medium through which to channel my efforts. This doctoral project, located in the Centre for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning (CHERTL) in the Faculty of Education, arose out of commissioned research for the Council on Higher Education undertaken by Professor Chrissie Boughey, later joined by Professor Sioux McKenna. Concerns raised by this research included the extent to which students from diverse backgrounds had equitable access to the powerful knowledge offered by a university education (Boughey 2009a; Boughey and McKenna 2011a, 2011b). The relationship between knowledge and social inclusion in higher education, coupled with a concern about the lack of larger-scale studies in education research in South Africa.

---

**The Rhodes/NRF Social Inclusion Project:**

*The promise of higher education often remains unrealised and instead universities frequently continue to be a powerful mechanism of social exclusion and injustice, through their own internal thinking, structures, cultures and practices and through their external relations with wider society* (Rhodes website, 2011).
Africa (NRF 2009), led Boughey to submit an application for funding to the NRF to support a number of doctoral scholars to investigate the issue of epistemological access to different kinds of knowledge across different institutions. I was fortunately one of them.

To ensure that the intensive research of the project was able to attain systemic relevance, multiple studies were undertaken across different disciplinary homes and within differentiated institutional types, but the methodology for these studies was the same, so that broader conclusions could be reached. The key research question for all the scholars in the team was:

**How do disciplinary knowledge and knower structures and their associated practices serve to include or exclude students?**

Drawing on the same broad ontological and theoretical frames, the design of each study and its specific research questions, study site, focus and substantive theories would be individually developed by each scholar, but the broad framework and central concern would be shared. The idea of co-creating and co-producing this knowledge in a shared, supportive and scaffolded environment rather than as an individualistic and solitary learning activity was attractive to me. This ‘team doctorate’, unusual in the humanities in South Africa, brought together a team of eleven doctoral candidates and researchers from seven universities to investigate ways in which disciplinary structures and their associated practices served to include or exclude students in higher education in South Africa. My specific study does not focus on the knowledge and knower structures aspect of the project research question, but explores ‘the associated practices’ of lecturers in HE and their mediation of their social contexts. This team doctorate, with its collaborative pedagogy, had a special charge for me as it drew on socio-cultural theories of inclusion and sharing.

That this project would be ‘contributing to equity, intellectual, cultural, social, economic and political development, democracy, and social justice’ and ‘forging social cohesion among the disadvantaged and the marginalised’, with ‘a respect for social class, difference and diversity in HE’, resonated with me at a deep level. The noble intentions of the project, coupled with a strong social justice component in a climate of tenuous educational legitimacy in South Africa, spoke to my personal objectives of reading for a doctorate that was meaningful, purposeful, valuable, critical and transformational.
Doing: stepping into the doctoral space as doctoral scholar

My supervisor, Professor Chrissie Boughey, made me aware that stepping into the doctoral space was the most difficult hurdle to overcome. I was aware of stepping into the doctoral space as a woman and a multicultural being whose global and local identity were not synonymous with the univocality required of me as doctoral scholar. Stepping into the space made me aware that, apart from the head space that is called on, heart and body spaces are also invoked when one responds to, assimilates and tackles the emotional and affective aspects of the study. For me, a study on inclusion and exclusion starts with witnessing in our own lives the various forms of inclusion and exclusion that we have been subjected to, and that we have subjected others to. I was especially interested in the extent to which new lecturers, arising from the ashes of the old exclusivist South Africa, could navigate through the messiness of their academic lives to make a meaningful difference and contribution through education.

I was aware of the writer and researcher sitting within me and sometimes beside me, watching, recording, and responding to information that my analytical brain was digesting. My skills as researcher involved not only the critical skills that I had acquired as an academic in the field, but invoked my own ontology as a ‘raced, gendered, languaged and classed’ individual, which did not make it easy for me to become invisible and silent ‘to let the facts speak for themselves’. For me, this doctoral experience was a real, lived, and embodied one.

Doctoral or doctored?

Embarking on a doctoral study means that one has to also step into an academic space of ‘doctoral natives’ and scholars who have gone before. My status as ‘immigrant’ is dependent on my demonstration of the ability to navigate and chart a course in an already established terrain. I was also conscious that the doctoral process had tremendous powers to shape me in different ways, but I did not want the doctoral process with its traditions and conventions to ‘doctor’ me into submission and leave me feeling like an impostor.

With this in mind, my next quest was to find a research methodology and framework that would allow me the freedom to create and be created, and to raise issues that were central to me as scholar and researcher, but at the same time to respond to the doctoral team and project concerns regarding social inclusion. I was not convinced that the conventional modes of inquiry usually associated with research in the humanities, namely interviews,
observations, document analysis and discussions, would contribute in vibrant and dynamic ways. Traditionally the data 'out there' becomes the property of the researcher and becomes 'in here', rendering the voices and identities of the contributors silenced after their role has been fulfilled (Denzin 2001). I did not want to engage with participants in this way and I wanted to generate data that reflected a mutually beneficial relationship between 'subject' and 'agent'. I wanted to do it all, in a variety of ways, to capture the essence of a lived reality, but soon came to the realisation and greatest challenge of all: I could not do it all and even if I could, how would I do so in a non-egotistical way, without navel gazing or indulging in a personal and idiosyncratic celebration of Self? Above all, I needed this doctoral study to read and speak and count as credible academic research and scholarship.

Locating the doctoral scholar in an emerging paradigm

A third emerging paradigm, to accompany the qualitative and quantitative, known as the third space (Denzin 2001), provided the framework for me to conceptualise the possibility of this perspective. As an alternative way of understanding research and its purpose, I was interested in locating my research in this hybrid space, enacting and embodying methods that looked critically at implicit ideology in taken-for-granted assumptions of the traditional paradigm. The traditional doctorate, according to Berridge (2008), is embedded in the problem-solving approach rather than in creative production research. This traditional process, however, is far from the rational, deliberate and clinical process that it appears to be, especially if it is a highly creative project, and involves false starts, readjustments, redefinition, and uncertainty, inter alia (Scrivener 2000). So into the third space (Bhabha 1996) I leapt, heart first and mind in tow in a seemingly effortless dance to marry the rational and the esoteric.

Understanding the doctoral scholar: rationale for the study

My interest in this specific doctoral study was born out of my involvement in 2011 as the convenor and facilitator of an academic staff development initiative known as the Teaching Development Programme (TDP) for new academics at a South African university of technology. My vantage point as TDP facilitator offered me profound insight into the challenges of new academics as they struggled to immerse and embed themselves in the educational ethos of the institution while they negotiated their identity and agency in their contextual settings. The participants on the staff development programme were faced with many complexities of context and practice at an institutional, faculty and departmental level. Their ‘fresh eyes’ as new academics allowed me a renewed look at where we are, how we
got here and where we are going. While new lecturers are the unit of analysis in this study, the ramifications and implications considered in this study apply to staff development in general and are applicable to a wide range of academics facing similar challenges.

**The doctoral scholar as researcher and researched**

Ideological clarity was important to me when I started with the doctoral project. In the early days, my study was driven by a distinct focus on ‘identity’ and I believed that the identities of new academics in my study had a direct causal link with what they did in their classrooms, that is, through their teaching practices. But, as I engaged with the theory and prepared for the readings, seminars and discussions during the doctoral research weeks at Rhodes University, I started to notice how the parallel process of the large doctoral project and my specific study had slowly but surely begun to shift my own sense of identity as an academic, doctoral scholar and human being. As one’s knowledge shifts, so too does one’s identity. Embodied learning (Dall'Alba and Barnacle 2007) is where shifts began to happen for me, not just as cognitive engagements with knowledge but as real, visceral and actual shifts in thinking, feeling, behaviour and discourse.

I soon observed that I had started to move away from a focus on who I was (Identity) to what I could do (Agency). Changes in identity are linked to the concept of agency (Archer 2000), and more and more I found that I was initiating, leading and lending support in important ways to the group, especially since I was highly vested in the success of the Social Inclusion Project, and my efforts were directed at making sure that this would happen. It is “through the activities of agents who hold ideas and who act within social contexts on and within social structures that social change may be effected” (Archer, 1995).

In my professional life, I began moving into a space that opened up collaborations with other strategic agents across the university to effect changes in more meaningful ways. I feel that the entire process of being involved in the doctoral programme and the Social Inclusion Doctoral Project had a profound effect on the depth of the reflexive deliberations and the agential choices that I now make, which include notions of community, common purpose, transformation and social change.
The doctoral scholar as team player

The Rhodes/CHERTL doctoral programme that served as the mother ship for the launch of the project, headed by a dynamic and powerful social actor in Prof. Sioux McKenna, allowed us to build a community of scholars across the country, and across various institutions and disciplines. We attended three research seminar weeks per year in which specific discussions, themes and streams were designed to tap into and provide support for the wide range of scholars on the project. We were extremely fortunate to have had seminars with our key theorists, namely Roy Bhaskar, Margaret Archer and Karl Maton, among others. Meeting them in this way provided a non-threatening way of coming face to face (literally) with the theoretical tools that we are employing. The online space set up for the project on the virtual learning environment at Rhodes University provided a platform for online discussions and resource sharing. This was an invaluable support to me, especially when trying to balance the challenges of being a remote, distant, off-campus scholar. Technology served in a very real sense to reduce the impact of long-distance learning, while the very supportive and responsive person who facilitated engagement on the site did an excellent job in keeping us all connected and maintaining project coherence and developmental support.

The doctoral scholar as student

The doctoral journey cannot be undertaken without a guide and the role of the supervisor is crucial to the direction, detours, and new paths that the scholar takes. The relationship with this guide is principally one of mutual trust and respect. ‘If you do not positively want to carry out this work, if you do not look forward to the whole process of an extended research project, if you and your supervisors do not manage to involve you in a sort of love affair with what you are doing and the kinds of motivation, single mindedness and determination that often goes with love affairs, then you are less likely to succeed’ (Delamont et al. 1997). I have been extremely fortunate to have had two ‘guides’ with whom I have formed an alliance.
which has provided me with the safe space to discuss, debate, share, extend and shape the research project and doctoral journey in meaningful ways.

As a mature student, even in this late stage of study, my cultural understanding of the ‘teacher’ as guru (which is a Sanskrit word for ‘teacher’ or ‘master’) is invoked. The Guru Gita (verse 17) aptly describes the guru as a 'dispeller of darkness' (from gu, ‘darkness’ and ru, ‘that which dispels’). A guru is uniquely qualified to lead the seeker on his or her inward journey and is someone to be revered and respected, who provides guidance, advice and counsel without minimising the efforts, thoughts and growth of the student in any way. The guru–disciple relationship in the spiritual sense is the highest expression of friendship, for it is based on unconditional love and wisdom. It is the loftiest and most sacred of all relationships and one who shares this relationship is on the way to wisdom and freedom.

My experience as scholar has been shaped in no small way by my two gurus, Prof. Chrissie Boughey and Dr Cecilia Jacobs, with whom I have felt a maternal and sisterly bond. As experts and authorities in the HE field, they have given good counsel, and have been able to hold me and contain me even when the road was rocky and I could not find my way. To Chrissie and Cecilia: I could not have done this without you. You have been superb and have exceeded all expectations. Thank you for believing in me, and for all the support, calmness, tenacity, and encouragement that was necessary to make me understand I could do this. I am forever indebted and long may our relationship last.

Through such a positive supervision experience, I am in awe of what potential there is for other novices like me to be mentored and supported in such meaningful ways by similar supervisors who have had just the right balance between guiding, steering, and leading, without compromising the scholar, and who have provided the conducive conditions and influences for the exercise of agency of the doctoral scholar.

To bungee jump off an academic cliff with the head only is to miss out on the extraordinary exhilaration of the embodied experience that is the defining moment.
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- My akka, Thilla, who stepped in as mum and dad and has been a pillar of strength and guidance – your living legacy reminds me where I come from and where I am going.
- My brother Suren and his family, who have been a strong anchor in my life even from across the miles – thank you for your encouragement and belief in my ability to complete this project.
- My fellow doctoral scholars at Rhodes, Sioux and CHERTL, who have been an invaluable community of practice over these years and a huge source of strength and camaraderie. Thank you to my group of social inclusion scholars, especially Genevieve, for your friendship and support through this journey. Thank you Langutani for your calm and grace as we approached the finish line together.
- All my friends, colleagues (past and new) and family who understood that I had to fly under the radar in the last six months but supported me nonetheless with kind words of encouragement, enormous faith, and wonderful patience and humour.

Finally, to my dear family, who have stood by me and put up with my moody days – thank you for your infinite love and wisdom. To my son Yuri, thank you for our discussions and your daily question, ‘How much have you achieved today, mum?’ when part of you was really asking (and understandably so) ‘When are you going to be finished?’ To my daughter Shae, whose remark helped me to put things in perspective when it all got unwieldy at times: ‘So a PhD is like a very big comprehension test; you have to read quite a lot and answer some very difficult questions!’ To my darling husband, Michael, thank you for being the wind beneath my wings. You have been there for me in such a profound way that I could not have done this without you. I am extremely touched and moved by your generosity and your love. I dedicate this thesis to you. Truly, madly, deeply!
Chapter One: Background and Context

1.1 Background to the study

In the new democracy, the post-apartheid South African government has achieved much in terms of transforming higher education institutions into more socially-responsive and critically-engaged systems, and deepening and broadening South Africa as a nation (CHE 2010). Restructuring initiatives can be traced to the extensive report of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) (1996), which informed the Green Paper on Higher Education and eventually the White Paper on Higher Education (DoE 1997) and the National Plan for Higher Education (DoE 2001). Three key areas were identified as crucial to transformation: participation, responsiveness, and governance. With massification of higher education came increased diversity in the student body, apparent in economic status, and language, cultural, and educational background. The granting of access to more poor and black students into universities and technikons1 (or technical colleges) meant that different programmes, qualifications, curricula, entry and exit points, and institutional changes in functions and structures, and more funding, were needed.

While the change has been largely in the policy framework arena, interpretation and implementation of these policies have proved to be a slow, arduous and ambiguous process (Reddy 2006), attracting intense debate, as ‘impressive gains sit alongside old patterns, reproducing themselves both within the higher education sector and in the relations between this sector and society’ (Ibid. 2006:2). Even though the NCHE report was lauded as progressive and conciliatory (Moja and Hayward 2000), the actual capacity of national policy and structures to usher reform into South African higher education is related to the nature of the 1994 political transition, the effect of the macro-economic policies on state and civil society relations, and processes internal to universities and the higher education sector itself (Badat 1998).

This juxtaposition of policy and practice may be attributed to the post-1994 policy changes for higher education, which split a university’s focus. On the one hand there is the expectation that universities contribute towards economic and socio-political transformation by becoming viable ‘corporate enterprises’, producing graduates to help steer South Africa

1 The name Technikon, a unique South African invention, was around for twenty-five years (1979–2004), referred to as Technical Colleges specialising in vocational training. Technikon graduates were not recognised by professional associations and the public service.
into a competitive global economy. At the same time, however, universities are expected to serve the public good and produce critical citizens for a vibrant democratic society. These two foci are not implicitly contradictory, yet in a country with deep class, race and gender divisions, they could well pull in opposite directions (Reddy 2006). Despite the creation of a new educational landscape, the principles and goals of a transformed HE system are in tension with the competing discourses of globalisation, empowerment, economic needs, and democracy, which coexist in an uncomfortable tension (Ibid. 2006).

While the goal of increased participation in HE holds promise, some argue that massification has not in fact happened in South Africa as the actual participation rate of rural and poorer students has steadily decreased over the years, despite access (Reddy 2006), and participation remains highly skewed (Scott et al. 2007; Cooper and Subotzky 2001). Although physical access to the university opened up participation options, epistemological access (Morrow 2009) to the goods of the university still eluded many black students who were not performing well or successfully completing their university studies. Access to HE does not necessarily equate to success (Scott 2009), as students without the cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986) experienced tertiary education as an overwhelming challenge. In current times, this epistemological access (Morrow 2009) is still limited for those from certain social class backgrounds and the reality is that, for many young students, the university is not an empowering environment, and those already advantaged and primed for success by virtue of their ‘habitus’ (Bourdieu 1986) are positioned to succeed. Most traditional institutions continue to mirror the cultural values of the middle class, often espousing their ways of speaking, seeing the world and doing things. In many cases the culture, structures and ethos of universities prevent many students from ‘cracking the code’ (Ballard and Clanchy, 1988), leaving students ‘paralyzed or confused’ (Canagarajah 2002), and making access to knowledge and success problematic and burdensome. As a result, black working class students experience ‘epistemological exclusion’ (Appadurai 1996), which prevents them from appropriating their own prior knowledge and skills in the often alien and elite institutions of learning. Thus the perpetuation of the status quo continues as dominant ideology is reproduced.

Performance in South African higher education is marked by high levels of failure and dropout (CHE 2013a), for example:

- Only about one in four students in contact institutions (that is, excluding Unisa, South Africa’s one distance-learning university) graduate in the designated time (for example, three years for a three-year degree).
• Only 35% of the total intake, and 48% of contact students, graduate within five years.
• When allowance is made for students taking longer than five years to graduate or returning to the system after dropping out, it is estimated that some 55% of the intake will never graduate.
• Access, success and completion rates continue to be racially skewed, with white completion rates being on average 50% higher than African rates.
• The net result of the disparities in access and success is that under 5% of African and coloured youth are succeeding in any form of higher education.

The reality facing HE is that, despite impressive legislation and noble intentions, the high student dropout rates (Scott et al. 2007) signal that HE may be inadvertently promoting social exclusion and social injustice instead. While equity of access has enabled physical access to sites of learning for students, the issue of ‘equity of outcomes’ (Scott, 2009) of students who cannot get through still prejudices black social and economic advancement, which in turn poses a threat to national stability. HE is in a ‘crisis’, not only of identity and purpose, but also of integrity. Poor student performance is an indication that, while many positive changes have occurred, the system has not fulfilled its promises, most notably with respect to teaching and learning. The new cohort studies (Scott et al. 2007) indicate that the broad performance patterns, such as those outlined above, show little significant change from those that emerged from the earlier studies (CHE 2013a: 16):

The conclusions are that the output of higher education is not meeting the country’s needs, that the system has low internal efficiency in utilising human and material resources (and consequently does not provide a sound basis for growth), and that the scale of the failure and dropout occurring within a small and selected student body points to substantial systemic problems that require systemic responses. It can be said that, in relation to its educational role, higher education in South Africa is a ‘low-participation, high-attrition system’ (Fisher and Scott, 2011, p. 1) that has not yet come to terms with its developing-country environment.

It is a crisis from which HE must rise, if it is to retain credibility and respect as a social pillar and key producer of knowledge. But why has the transformation of HE been so slow and stilted despite enablement through government plans and policy changes? Why has HE not been able to bridge the divide between past, traditional practice and current reform? Deeper analysis suggests that the more complex changes of the social and cultural ethos at universities has not been in tandem with the structural changes, and the problem of inclusion and exclusion of students and lecturers from the universities’ cultural and social practices...
still needs to be addressed in situ. As Enslin and Pendlebury (2004) caution, socially
excluded groups remain on the margins of deliberation, silenced or ignored by dominant
terms of discourse and privileged styles of action and expression.

The social inclusion of students (and staff) has been high on the transformation agenda of
cast the Bill of Rights (Republic of South Africa 1996, 1998, 2000) as its moral framework,
while the policy framework for education reflects a substantial commitment to social justice
and social inclusion both in and through education (Department of Education 1997). When
one invokes the construct ‘social inclusion’, the converse, ‘social exclusion’, is also evoked,
which in turn begs the questions, from what and by whom? More recently, the focus on
social inclusion is captured in the Draft Policy Framework for Social Inclusion in the Post-
School Education and Training System (Republic of South Africa 2014), and draws attention
to the need for institutions to address issues such as race, class, disability, gender, HIV and
Aids, age, demographics and citizenship, among others. The main intention of the
framework, according to the Minister of Higher Education, is to ensure that educational
institutions recognise and promote integration, a culture of human rights, and unity in
diversity, as well as human dignity, and thus eradicate all forms of discrimination (Nzimande
2014). While the framework is a constraint, in that it does not allow for more specific detail
such as situational analyses, planning for the future, etc., it provides enough depth and
creates good understandings about what social inclusion is.

My sense is that this is an excellent document that higher education and other
institutions should embrace. It will mean different things for different institutions
depending on what their specific contexts represent. At the same time they are all
confronted with a South Africa that is fairly exclusionary in its practices given our recent
history (two decades). It general it offers many possibilities to bring to the centre those
that are marginalized and alienated (Naicker 2014).

In the South African context, the academic development movement of the 1990s drew
attention to the need for social inclusion of previously disadvantaged students, who
experienced problems in accessing historically white universities under apartheid. Academic
developers working on the periphery of mainstream departments at universities brought
student challenges into sharp focus and continued to raise questions about social inclusion
by spearheading the focus on student learning, which had begun in the 1980s at the height
of the apartheid rule. The ‘weakness’, however, was that their efforts were directed at ‘fixing
the students’ to make them acculturate into the university. By the late 1990s, more theorising
led to the view that structural changes were needed on the part of universities to ‘accommodate’ new and different students (Boughey 2007a; 2012a), not the other way around. This changed the focus to a consideration of what constituted ‘under-preparedness’ for higher education in South Africa. While the deficit discourse located the problem with students and what they lacked, the discourse of under-preparedness for HE extended the debate to what ‘being prepared’ meant and what was needed to achieve the required level. But both discourses were based on some aspect of deficiency, discursively constructing the student as a ‘decontextualised learner’ (Boughey and McKenna 2011a; 2011b) who did not succeed in higher education because of some internal shortcoming (e.g. cognitive or motivational), or some external weakness linked to the student (e.g. cultural or familial background), which the university could ‘fix’. What this discourse masked was the reality that the systemic issues, which influence educational approaches, choices and outcomes, remained unchallenged yet reproduced the status quo. Despite a show of good faith at some institutions, expressed through changed signage, new language policies, transformation initiatives and the like, deeper levels of systemic disadvantage remained intact.

To combat the superficial changes which were unconvincing, further initiatives led to a focus on curriculum development, staff development work and professional development programmes which Boughey (2007b) calls ‘second generation’ academic development (AD) work. In the curriculum development arena, several moves were afoot, especially at the universities of technology, regarding the recurriculation of programmes to align with the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) requirements. Especially after the introduction of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) in 2004, the entry and exit points necessitated the introduction of new curricula and programmes, to achieve the curriculum goals of ‘demonstrable outcomes’ in student learning. This focus sharpened the central role of AD at universities, and soon many institutions established centres of higher education development to respond to these needs from more structured, visible and recognised platforms.

This structural innovation became the precursor to staff development work, identified as a further vehicle to drive and sustain change. In the area of staff development, structural changes included professional development programmes for lecturers, the emergence of postgraduate diplomas in higher education teaching to support the strengthening of AD practitioners and their work in order to keep abreast of the changes in cultural terms, and the field of Higher Education Studies to enable more rigorous theorising of practice. New ways of conceptualising teaching and learning were discursively being embraced, and culturally it
was becoming clear that mainstream educators also had a responsibility to ensure that, through effective teaching and learning practices, students had the ‘knowledge, values, skills, creativity and critical thinking required to build democracy, development, equity, cultural pride, and social justice’ (DoE 2000:2). Through the foundational and critical work of AD, the Department of Education recognised the active role that all educators needed to play in dismantling oppression (Francis and Le Roux 2011) and in preparing students for participation in an anti-oppressive society (Adams et al. 2007). The need for a socially just society, whose public political arrangements provide a basic level of capability among society’s citizens (Nussbaum 1997), was an imperative, and university teachers were being targeted as the ones to champion this cause.

With a renewed focus on teachers and their role in responding to the HE crisis, recent efforts by government, on the advice of the CHE, are being redirected at the classroom, by turning attention to higher education teaching. Through the vehicle of the Teaching Development Grant (TDG), which was earmarked funding to improve teaching in the hope of making the system more efficient, recent efforts by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) suggest that teaching is seen as the catalyst, and that HE teachers, through their improved practice, hold the answer to the complex challenges such as inclusion, exclusion, and student success. Shifting the focus from other areas such as curriculum reform, institutional restructuring, and programme reconfiguration to the HE classroom and the teacher means that there is sufficient faith that the considerable TDG funding and grants are going to deliver on their promise.

On closer analysis, it becomes apparent that the discourse of ‘fixing the student’ has been extended to include ‘fixing the higher education teacher’, based on the assumption that teaching has a cause and effect relationship with learning. In other words, the tacit understanding is that if ‘good’ teaching is secured, then learning will be automatically improved, and students will be successful in obtaining their university degrees and completing their tertiary studies. However, the notion of what ‘good teaching’ is, or what the ‘good teacher’ looks like, especially in the South African setting, is a highly contextualised one, and must be seen in relation to other pillars and segments at the university and in the field as a whole. One of the main shortcomings of HE in addressing these questions is in locating the ‘solution’ at the micro level of interaction and interface (in the classroom), while the problem of inclusion and exclusion, and its concomitant challenges, is at a macro level, tied to historic imbalances in universities’ social practices and cultural expression (in the institution and the field at large). In other words, equity as a macro-level goal has been
reduced to a focus on pedagogic practices at a micro level of interaction (Clegg 2009); bringing into question the efficacy and longevity of the Department’s teaching development plan. The solution does not lie in transforming the teaching and learning practices in the classroom while the supporting structural and cultural contexts at a systemic level are left unchanged.

Responsibility, which belongs to every stratum in the university configuration, cannot be placed mainly on educators and their practices, who are discursively constructed as ‘saviours’ of a distraught and problem-ridden system. In assessing why cultural and social changes in HE have lagged behind, the onus should not be placed on the teacher solely, and rigorous analysis must interrogate the question of the extent to which the university teacher can in fact ‘save’ the situation. Is it not a responsibility and necessary burden that must be borne by everyone, alike? It is a responsibility that new academics entering HE have to shoulder and, despite being newcomers to a system that predates them, they are tasked with righting the wrongs, through their practice.

1.2 Context of the study

It is against the national historical and socio-political background discussed above that this doctoral study is set. With increased attention on professional development programmes to provide the bridging device between HE transformational goals and student success in the classroom, academic staff development work finds itself in the spotlight. New academics in particular, entering HE from a variety of entry points, are tasked with the responsibility of achieving some of the goals set out in the HE policy documents, even though they are new to the field and have very little understanding of the historical tensions and schisms that have beset HE in the last 20 years.

In crossing the threshold from discipline expert to educator (Behari-Leak and Williams 2011), new academics entering HE have to undergo a huge shift in identity to function as effective HE practitioners. New lecturers, entering with creative talent, technological savvy and global identities which are framed by discourses situated outside the academy but with a limited understanding of HE challenges within, have to make critical decisions and choices that sometimes have a negative effect on the inclusion of students in their classrooms. Professional development programmes, focused on new academics’ induction, such as the one cited in this study, namely, the Teaching Development Programme (TDP), are in part examples of HE’s attempt to address its challenges by providing instructional guidance on teaching related topics such as student-centred teaching, understanding deep approaches to
learning, and linguistic and cultural diversity, while incorporating social transformation goals in educational practices.

Given the complexity of the higher educational landscape that shapes new academics’ induction, notwithstanding the enormous challenges they have to embrace as they embed themselves in their disciplinary and institutional contexts, one would assume that educators would do the bare minimum as it is easier to accept pressures and comply with situations than to challenge them (Connors 2012). As the convenor of the TDP at the UoT, it was surprising for me to find that six new academics in the 2011 cohort did not comply, or buckle under the pressure of heavy workloads and departmental commitments. Compared with the majority of participants, who were satisfied but relieved that the programme was over, these six educators demonstrated resilience, perseverance and a commitment to their concerns in education, which became obvious and concrete for them on the TDP course. Through their critical reflections in their teaching and assessment portfolios, and the fresh perspectives brought to bear on their department-based TDP projects, these lecturers acknowledged that huge shifts had occurred in their physical, social and discursive academic environments. For these academics, the disjuncture between departmental practices and the teaching development programme practices, identified as an insurmountable obstacle for most, translated into enabling conditions for the exercise of their voluntary efforts that constituted their primary agency (Archer 2000). It is through observing how agents use their personal powers, which derive from their sense of self and are prior and primitive to their sociality to act within social and cultural contexts, that we understand how shifts and social change occur (Ibid. 2000: 7).

Using Archer’s (1995; 1996; 2000; 2003) social realist theory, framed by Bhaskar’s (1979) critical realism with its depth ontology, this study explores the interplay between structure and culture in the exercise of agency of six new academics at a UoT, on a specific professional development programme for teaching in HE. Using critical realism as a meta theory, my interest is in excavating to the level of underlying causal mechanisms that give rise to new academics’ agential choices, to see how structural and cultural contexts shape new academic agency (beyond observable practices and experiences). It is here that explanatory critiques of critical realism encourage the researcher to look beyond practice to expose the false beliefs by which oppression and injustice are disguised and perpetrated (Bhaskar 1998: 389).

In developing a deeper understanding of the generative mechanisms that enable change, we
can hopefully create similar conditions to make a meaningful transformation in HE through one of many pathways: the new academic experience. To participate as equals and full partners in social interaction through participatory parity (Fraser 2004), and for true emancipation or transformation to take place, the mechanisms generating the problems must be removed or blocked (Sayer 2000: 160). This in turn has implications for the ability of education as a social movement to be a mechanism for social change.

This study shows how new academics’ pursuit of specific projects, driven by their individual concerns, and their use of personal powers such as intentionality and reflexivity engage with the constraints and enablements derived from their social and cultural contexts. Through an analysis of their reflexive deliberations (Archer 1995), this project interrogates the structural and cultural mechanisms that shape the exercise of agency by the participants, conducive to the social inclusion of students.

If social justice is what is needed, which according to Griffiths (2003) is a dynamic state of affairs where we hold a concern for individuals as well as the broader issues of race, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, religion, ethnicity, nationality, social class, and other divisive differences in society, then we need agents and social actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as a sense of responsibility towards others, their society and the broader world in which we live (Adams et al. 2007). In other words, what is needed in the South African context is a ‘critical agency’, where one’s voluntary and purposeful actions as an educator respond to the wider historical, social and political context in the service of educating students to be thoughtful, active citizens (Giroux 1988: 122). Critical agents (Francis and Le Roux 2011) are transformative intellectuals, who combine scholarly reflection and practice to critically examine the world and its processes, including the political and educational institutions that maintain social inequalities, and subsequently transform it (Giroux and McLaren 1996; Ladson-Billings 1995). To reach this ideological clarity, we need to stand outside of our histories and examine our epistemological and ontological assumptions (Bartolomé 2004; Haggis 2008).

Framed by the focus and concerns of the Rhodes University PhD Social Inclusion Project discussed in Chapter Zero, this study is also an exploration into new academics’ agency conducive to the social inclusion of students. Using Archer’s (2000) model for the mediation through agency, I explored the extent to which new academics’ agency (primary or corporate) embraces an understanding of the concept of critical agency and social justice in South Africa, in relation to HE’s needs. In choosing a university of technology as an
institutionally-differentiated research site, I also explored how teaching and learning practices are contextually and discursively constructed in staff development units compared with the pedagogic practices within disciplines at HE institutions such as UoTs.

1.3 Goals of the research

This study is located in the broad field of higher education and within the sub-field of academic staff development. It is concerned with the induction of new lecturers into the higher education system and analyses the processes lecturers engage with to make sense of the structural and cultural contexts they confront. The agential choices used by new academics to mediate situated challenges of teaching and learning practice raise important issues and concerns for staff development and professional development initiatives in the sector as a whole.

Using Archer’s (2000) social realist theory, and framed by Bhaskar’s (1979) critical realism, the overarching research goal of this study was to use an explanatory framework to offer insights on how social change occurs in HE in relation to teaching and learning. As mentioned already, this was done by analysing the way six new academics mediated their contexts and concerns to exercise agency in relation to the structural and cultural conditions at a South African university of technology. The study also offers an account of the generative mechanisms undergirding the contested spaces that the new academics had to navigate, though not always with success, as they tried to embed themselves in the institutional structure and culture. In looking at how the new academics developed their projects into successful practices, we get a glimpse into the conditions of possibility for critical agency, to see whether new academics draw on the discourses of social justice and social inclusion within and outside of HE when they formulate and develop their projects, or whether their agency is shaped by more personal ambitions related to discourses focused on individual interests in climbing the ‘corporate’ ladder. The overarching research goal was to ascertain whether these contingencies serve to include or exclude students in HE.

New academics’ ontological and epistemological orientation to their teaching in their disciplines is key to understanding who they are, what they do and what they know, and how these aspects impacted on their sense of agency. In keeping with the meta-theory framing this project, I looked at the structural and cultural enablements and constraints that impacted on academics’ agency, but ultimately the research concern centred on whether these factors transformed educative practices or reproduced them. This in turn speaks to and has
implications for the ability of higher education as a social movement to be a mechanism for social change.

1.3.1 Research questions

In seeking meaningful explanations for the complexities facing HE, this study undertook a social realist analysis of the exercise of agency of new lecturers in the broad domains of structure, culture and agency, which are distinct but permeable domains, intertwined with each other in ongoing interplay (Archer 2000). In keeping with the broad goals above, the main research question was:

**What conditions enable or constrain the exercise of agency of new academics in higher education, conducive to the social inclusion of students?**

By analysing the reflexive deliberations and the internal conversations of new academics, this study attempted to account for the concrete courses of action taken by them, which are driven through their concerns in relation to education but linked to their sense of self-worth in their teaching contexts and performative competence in terms of their expertise (Archer 2007a). Agents’ internal conversations, which according to Archer (2007a and 2007b) mediate social structures and human action, are textured by three questions. Archer’s questions (Archer 2000) form the basis for this study’s sub-questions:

1. Why do people act at all? What motivates them and what are they (fallibly) trying to achieve by endorsing given courses of action?
2. How do social properties influence the courses of action that people adopt?
3. What exactly do people do?

In explaining why new lecturers ‘act so rather than otherwise’, this study analyses the enabling and constraining conditions for the exercise of agency among new lecturers. It is hoped that the outcomes of the research will contribute to an understanding of the conducive conditions HE needs to consider if we hope to deliver on the promise of a transformed education system for a transformed society at large.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

Chapter Zero presents the narrative of the doctoral scholar, who in the process of undertaking the doctoral project is shaped and influenced by established practices and traditions in the field. It captures an agential account of how this journey was mediated.
Chapter One provides the background and context to the study, framed by historical and socio-political events and experiences in higher education in South Africa that influence the unfolding of the research and the insights reached.

Chapter Two presents the meta-theoretical framework used in the study, namely, social and critical realism, and provides an explication of the key concepts that are used to establish the ontological, epistemological and methodological positions of this study. Margaret Archer's social realism (1995; 1996; 1998; 2000; 2003; 2007a and 2007b) is discussed in relation to the study, namely, the exercise of agency among new academics in HE, and includes a description of Archer's (1995) methodological framework of analytical dualism and morphogenesis, which analyses the changes in structure, culture and agency as distinct strata of reality, over time.

Chapter Three presents and problematises the methodology used in this study, and includes an intensive case study design and innovative methods such as participatory learning and action activities, including photovoice. I explicate the ontological, epistemological, methodological and axiological concerns that relate to the research alignment and coherence of the component parts. I assert that new research methodologies that acknowledge research subjects as independent, autonomous and causally efficacious beings, and who are intrinsic to the data generated and gathered, are much needed in HE sociological research.

Chapter Four captures the macro context (both international and national) in HE post-1994, which acts as a structural and cultural conditioning influence on the social and socio-cultural interaction in this study. This is the conditioning phase (or T1) of the morphogenetic cycle. Structural conditioning is explained first, in order to identify the key mechanisms that influence experiences and practices of new academics, while cultural conditioning (the ideas, beliefs, ideologies, theories, and concepts which are expressed through discourses) is presented in the second half of the chapter.

Chapter Five presents the narratives of mediation of the participants in this study who mediate the structural and cultural conditions through the exercise of their personal emergent powers and properties (PEPs), which are activated and triggered in particular ways. This is the interaction phase (or T2 – T3) of the morphogenetic cycle. New academics’ socio-cultural interaction with structural and cultural systemic features of the HE system illuminates the enablements and constraints that they confront as they enter and progress
through the institution. In exploring the levels of agency exercised, the emergence of corporate agents and social actors is discussed to give a full account of the capabilities of primary agents in this context.

Chapter Six undertakes a cross-case analysis of all the six narratives of mediation to render a more abstracted account of the features that characterise new academics’ agency in the context of the study. This is the elaboration phase (or T4) of the morphogenetic cycle. Bhaskars’ Seven Scalar Being (2010) is used as an analytical frame and heuristic to guide the discussion and analysis at seven levels of ontology.

Chapter Seven is the concluding chapter of the thesis. In this chapter, I summarise the main ‘take home’ points of the research findings and suggest ways that professional development and higher education in general can reconceptualise their role and influence in responding to the macro goals of transformation identified in the White Paper 3 of 1997 (DoE, 1997) through staff development programmes.
CHAPTER TWO
Chapter Two: Meta-theoretical Framing

2.1 Introduction

As already indicated, the genesis of the intellectual inquiry for this study was born out of my staff development interaction with a group of academics, newly appointed and transitioning from industry to academia. On the surface it appeared that these new academics had entered at the same level of ‘newness’, in that they had not taught in higher education before and were not familiar with the university as an educational and organisational institution. They joined the university’s compulsory professional development induction programme, of which I was convenor. Despite the myriad challenges faced by these incumbents at various levels of the university, by the end of the programme, a group of new lecturers showed remarkable creativity and resilience in identifying meaningful teaching projects to extend and embed themselves in the academic landscape. How these lecturers made sense of their purpose as incumbents, and their choices and actions, are at the heart of my study. I am also interested in the assumptions adopted by professional and staff development courses in HE in relation to their structural and cultural contexts, pertaining to their limitations and opportunities in creating conducive conditions for the exercise of agency by academics, both new and established.

As an academic staff developer in HE, working with academics is a sociological act for me. To effectively understand and interpret social phenomena that arise in the social context of the university, we need effective social theories to provide useful frameworks for empirical research in the social sciences, especially where South African HE finds itself at this particular juncture (see Chapter One). Since the transformation of HE in 1994, there have been many educational and academic development interventions to support student learning and success, given the massification and widened access nationally and globally (see Chapter Four), which introduced diversity in classrooms, unparalleled in the former system. However, these interventions have not succeeded in achieving the desired goals of social justice, social inclusion, and transformation (Department of Education 1997), raising the question of efficacy and suitability of the theoretical lenses used in HE to ‘investigate’ social phenomena.

Traditionally, empirical research in higher education has focused on what can be observed by using a descriptive lens to try to understand what students and lecturers do in the classroom and what lecturers and students say about their experiences, but such research is
undertaken at the expense of how things really are at a deeper level (Luckett 2009). Such a focus restricts theorising of the world to that which we can see and experience, rather than seeking to identify underlying causal mechanisms (Wheelahan 2007). By privileging epistemology (what we know) over ontology (what exists), researchers make judgments that are one dimensional, without accounting for why people choose to act the way they do, or for the unobservable, invisible and silent aspects (Luckett 2009) that condition and influence social contexts.

Many scholars have recognised that a social theory has to be useful and usable: it is not an end in itself. In this study, the ways that the theory interprets the influence of and interaction between social components (structure and culture) and draws distinctions between different ways of reacting and responding (agency) to social life are crucial to the responsiveness of the HE sector in dealing with the dilemma facing students and academics in the classroom. Notwithstanding, such an approach would entail both an attitude of involvement in the social life of the university and an attitude of detachment from it (Harrington 2005) so that we are capable of shaping our future while being confronted by the impersonal constraints of the context (Archer 1995: xii). Structure and agency have thus been at the centre of a longstanding debate in contemporary sociology as sociologists unpack the problem of how to link the social system with individual agents (the macro–micro link) in a way that frees us from the ‘vexatious’ conundrum (Archer 1995), namely, that we humans form society through our activities (agency), but that we ourselves are also shaped by it (structure) (Ibid.).

While theorising is not meant only for experts and ought to be the organic extension of social debates in which every ordinary person has a say and capacity to contribute (Harrington 2005), the important difference between theory (social theory in this case) and common sense is that social theory seeks to systematise and clarify debates about problems of social life through well-defined concepts and techniques of analysis (Maton 2008). Such theories offer a rich explanation of data in particular contexts, which is crucial to the effective design and analysis of the research problem (Archer 2000). Theories are judged by the extent to which they accord with what we know, are materially possible as far as we know, and are productive in helping to understand and practise in the world (Sayer 2000).

In this doctoral study, I have drawn on the meta-theoretical frameworks of Critical Realism and Social Realism to guide the theoretical rigour of the thesis by making the ontological positioning explicit, thus setting a process in place for examining how truth and existence (reality) are understood and worked with. If one-dimensional accounts based on the principle
of ‘what you see is what you get’ continue to be reproduced, then HE is in need of theoretical reasoning that can provide explanatory accounts, aimed at the underlying generative mechanisms that cause systems and people to reproduce and be reproduced by the inherent inequality and imbalance in the sector. As Clegg (2005: 153) points out:

If we want to theorise about change in education we need a theory that can account for the selves who make choices as academic workers and students, how we engage in constant internal and social debate about the conditions of practice, and how we should act to resist, restructure and preserve aspects of the complex system called higher education.

Meta-theory is the highest level conceptual device used in social science research and provides the philosophical basis that acts as an ‘underlabourer’ for the theory (Archer 1995: 148). It is the fundamental set of ideas about how phenomena of interest in a field should be thought about and researched (Bates 2005). According to Ritzer (2001), meta-theorising describes, prescribes and gives direction to what is acceptable and unacceptable as a theory, and provides an ontological arrangement of constructs and a set of meta-theoretical assumptions or propositions. This study is guided by critical realist ontology and a social realist theory, each of which has developed its internal language extremely well through interrelated concepts and a shared ontological and epistemological orientation, namely Realism, which in turn guides both methodologically.

Realism is the belief that there is a world that exists independently of our knowledge of it (Sayer 2000: 2): ‘an external world, independent of, and often defying our desires of it and attempts to understand and change it’ (Benton and Craib 2001: 120). Empirical studies adopting a realist worldview or paradigm investigate the cause of actions, which, according to Sayer (2000: 17), has to be understood: ‘it cannot be measured or counted, and there is always an interpretive or hermeneutic element in social science’. Humans as structured beings bring about this meaning through inherent reasons, beliefs and intentions (Carter and New 2004). Unlike positivists, realists maintain that the layers and nuances that characterise human experience cannot be studied in terms of universal laws of prediction which are ‘grounded in an atomistic understanding of the social world and based on the search for constant conjunctions of events, rather than relational causal relationships (Wheelahan 2007).

For realists, these causal relations are between emergent properties and powers that can be explained by learning the mechanism that produces them. In HE, this entails a process of
interaction between the parts (policies, values, people), and the way they are organised to enable other events and entities to be activated. At the heart of realist ontology, there is an understanding that the world is seen through our subjectivity but independent of our knowledge of it (Ibid.). This understanding foregrounds the importance of seeking underlying causes for events and social phenomena:

The world after all has a regulatory effect on what we make of it and what it makes of us just like gravity influenced us long before we conceptualized it (Archer 2006: 266).

As indicated earlier, the ontological orientation of this study is Realism, which, when applied to this study, understands the social world at the university as constituting social events enacted by human agents (new lecturers in this case), in causally-efficacious relations with one another and the social structure. These enactments, driven by causal processes (Elder-Vass 2010), are concerned with seeking to explain the causal interactions that produce social events (Bhaskar 1998).

At a meta-theoretical level, Critical Realism provides an explicit ontological and epistemological positioning for my study as it uses ‘powers of abstraction’ to isolate and differentiate between underlying structures whose existence is not visible from the surface of social life (Callinicos 2004) and to show that these structures can act as real and generative mechanisms (Bhaskar 1979). I have drawn on Roy Bhaskar’s (1979; 1998) Critical Realism (CR) to reach a nuanced understanding about what these underlying structures are by posing questions about the existence of agency, why things are the way they are, why they exist, and whether they can be changed (Danermark, Ekström, Jakobsen and Karlsson 2002). Aspects of CR in service of this study will be discussed shortly.

I have used Margaret Archer’s (1995; 1996; 2000; 2003; 2007a; 2007b) Social Realism (SR) to offer a stratified and differentiated view of social reality at the university, and to foreground the new academic in this study as an active human agent. I have also used SR to explore the ways in which emergent powers and properties in the structural and cultural domains (Archer 1995), in the context of the university, have conditioned human agency, and how these conditions are actively mediated by new lecturers through their human intentionality and reflexivity. A full exposition of SR follows in 2.3 below.

In presenting Archer’s framework, I will foreground her Theory of Agency as this is a central concern in this study, but in relation to how agents mediate their contexts, namely their classrooms, their departments, and their faculties at the university. Agency can be theorised
as an empirical construct and phenomenon where the researcher is concerned with what it means, how it is possible, and when it happens (Emirbayer and Mische 1998; Biesta and Tedder 2006).

For agency theorists, the distinction between behaviour, action and agency raises differences in discursive understandings of ‘agency’ as the capacity for human action (Arendt 1958). In more recent times, agency, understood as a social structure (Alexander 1992), raises questions about actors, agents, intentional acts and habitual behaviours. While behaviour is doing something without intention, volition or reflexivity, and action is seen as doing something with intention, volition or reflexivity, agency is seen as a more complex issue to do with the capacities to act (Jisc 2013). The concern is that, by just looking at a moment in time, the sociologist might see only habitual behaviour, but if the sociologist looks at what people do in a broader scope, then the established habit can look more intentional (Ibid.). At the very least, this raises serious methodological and conceptual difficulties. Critics of Archer’s version of agency contend that in the exploration of agency as a phenomenon, the structure–agency debate may not be the only way (or most effective way) to pose and address questions about agency (Biesta and Tedder 2006). Agency must also include a notion of the ‘unconscious’, which, according to Akram (2013), is an aspect clearly neglected in Archer’s work.

While these criticisms of Archer are thought provoking (see also 2.3.7), my understanding of Archer’s ‘agency’ as a social explanatory theory is used to account for human action, agential choices and causal relations of new academics in this study, which were analysed over time. I agree that the exploration of agency in its own right has been neglected in terms of how it can be theorised as an active response and link to the structural and cultural complexities of our time (Archer 2000; Clegg 2005; Kahn 2009). In this study, my focus is on the explanation of the conditions that enable and constrain agency against the backdrop of challenges facing HE today (outlined in Chapter One). To this end, I have used the empirical data from this study to theorise and account for agential change in Higher Education.

In the current era of HE in the context of transformation in this country, I am interested to see how new academics are able to exercise agency when their lives and their students’ lives are/have been conditioned by relations of class, gender, race and other socially-structured dimensions of privilege and disadvantage. Such explanation will enrich academic and educational development work in the sector by uncovering the various mechanisms, unseen and intangible, to establish rich accounts of what lies beneath the surface and why people
(academics and students) do what they do. With this insight, we will be better placed to conceptualise interventions that are not only rigorously theorised but with implications for practical application.

Critical realism as a meta-theoretical philosophy and social realism as a theory of change are ‘explicit’ theories, but Luckett (2009) cautions that, because social realism operates at such a high level of abstraction, it is sometimes difficult to apply it directly to data sets: this carries the danger that the theory over-determines the data. I have found SR to be a ‘useful’ theory nevertheless, as it affords explanatory power to illuminate the key elements and issues that need to be considered. Both these clearly-articulated theories have two advantages over covert theorising: their propositions are internally consistent and open to public scrutiny, and they are open to straightforward refutation (Archer 1980). To judge what is important, and to understand what is possible to change, how to change it, and with what effects and for whom (Maton 2008), involves developing not just an internal language of description (Bernstein 2000), where concepts relate strongly to each other and combine to tell a convincing story, but an external one too, to do more than just describe: to explain.

While critical realism and social realism have both helped me to identify the theoretical basis and theoretical vision for the research problem in this study, social realism in particular provided a ‘user-friendly’ methodological toolkit for analysing and understanding the data through its Morphogenetic Model (M/M) (Archer 1995: 135) (see 2.3.5 below). In this study, the theoretical paradigm, the chosen theory, the research methods, and the explanations reached are all in the service of the study’s research question, forming the ‘golden thread’ of the study. Alignment is important between meta-theory, which, according to Sibeon, is concerned with ‘matters of a more general kind relating to ontology, epistemology and methodology’ and substantive theory, which consists of ‘propositions that are intended to furnish information about the social world (Sibeon 2004: 12). I have drawn on professional and staff development literature in HE to provide substantive support for my analysis in this study. I shall now explain the central tenets of critical realism to establish their purpose and function as an underlabourer for social realist theory as used in this study.

2.2 Critical Realism

Critical Realism (CR) as a philosophy of reality has ‘its main focus on ontology, not epistemology’ (Sayer 2000: 78). It acts as an ‘underlabourer’ to social research (Bhaskar 1975) to diagnose and resolve problems at their roots by providing a realist framework for complementary social theories such as social realism (Sayer 2000). Critical Realism
underlabours by ‘clearing away the rubble’ and paving the way for social realism’s engagement in empirical research as a practical social theory (Ibid.). ‘Underlabouring’ is important for social theory as it makes explicit the ontology that ‘acts as both gatekeeper and bouncer for methodology’ (Archer 1995: 2). The methodology and ontology work in reciprocal ways because ‘what we think social reality is cannot be a separate matter from what we find it to be’ (Archer 1995: 23).

In looking at the world, critical realists make three commitments: ontological realism, judgmental rationality, and epistemological relativism (Bhaskar 1979). Ontological Realism asserts that reality exists independent of us and irrespective of what we think or know about it. Our knowledge of the world is not the same thing as the world itself: they are not co-terminus; therefore we cannot reduce reality to knowledge about reality (Ibid.). Judgmental Rationality maintains that, if we have different understandings of some part of reality, we can make rational judgments about which understanding is better; however, all perspectives are not equal. Our understanding of the world is also dependent on our conceptual and discursive tools at a particular time which we use to choose ‘some accounts over others’ (Sayer 2000). Epistemological Relativism means that our judgments are socially and historically situated (Sayer 2000; Bhaskar 1979). In other words, our perspectives are greatly influenced by our social environment. Our ‘judgmental rationality’, together with ‘epistemic relativism’, means that our accounts of reality may be different from the way things actually are or how the world is or can be (Archer 2004).

CR is thus premised on the existence of a dual reality: the real world (Ontological Realism) and our knowledge of that reality (Epistemological Relativism) (Bhaskar 1979). Our knowledge of the social world does not exhaust all there is to know, even though agents’ conceptions are not external to the facts described but make up part of the reality of those facts (Outhwaite 1998). Archer reminds us that our knowledge is always theory laden (though not theory determined), and therefore it is fallible and value laden (Sayer 2000; Archer, Collier and Porpora 2004). Our knowledge will always be fallible because knowledge of the natural and social worlds is not identical to those worlds, as these worlds exist independently of us (Bhaskar 1998: 142).

To conflate reality with what we can say or think about it is a one-dimensional view that would constitute an ‘epistemic fallacy’ (Bhaskar 1979). ‘Being’ is not the same as ‘knowing’ (Bhaskar 1998) as things do not happen by chance or without a reason (Danermark et al. 2002). Knowledge according to Bhaskar (1979) is two-fold: the intransitive dimension, which
is not dependent on our conceptions for its existence (Sayer 1992), and the transitive dimension, which constitutes our theories and is produced as a result of human agency (Ibid.).

From a critical realist perspective, reality is stratified, emergent and irreducible. It is stratified ontologically into chemical, biological, psychological and social dimensions that produce new mechanisms through emergent powers which are irreducible and non-conflationary (Bhaskar 1998). The social world has emergent properties which cannot be reduced to a sum of its parts. The fact that the social world conceived like this can be separated for analysis provides the possibility of increased explanatory power to account for interplay and to see which domain exerts relative influence on whom, when and why (Archer 1995). Given the increased diversity of ideas, differentiation between people, and heterogeneity in modern society, this nuanced account of change or stability, that can analyse the interplay between properties and powers, should not be underestimated.

CR uses depth ontology to account for reality, which comprises three strata: the Empirical (mediated observations by our senses and experiences), the Actual (where transitive events are manifested as a result of causal powers and social interaction), and the Real (the deepest intransitive layer capable of causal powers and properties generated when mediated by human agents) (Bhaskar 1979). The focus on the level of the Real is what is distinctive about CR (Benton and Craib 2001). In this study, the stratified and differentiated reality of CR enables a focus on the underlying structures and mechanisms that cause new academics to comply with, challenge, and/or change the material structures of the institution or the ideational culture of the establishment through their agential powers individually (actors) or in groups (agents).

The work of CR can be likened to an archaeological dig. Rather than restricting our theorising to that which we can see and experience (Wheelahan 2007), CR excavates to find the underlying causal mechanisms of experiences and events by identifying the generative mechanisms that produce them in an open system, where mechanisms operate in a complex interaction with other mechanisms either in cooperation or resistance (Danermark et al. 2002: 199). The concern with causal mechanisms is what sets CR apart from positivism, which sees the empirical as the only possible explanation for the existence of objects and phenomena (Collier 1994; Sayer 2000). To assume that new academics in this study are no more than the sum total of their performative competence constitutes epistemic
as well as ontic fallacies (Danermark et al. 2002), denying the richness and depth involved in the complex construction of what it means to be an educator in HE today.

For critical realists, all events are caused by multiple interacting causal powers (Bhaskar 1979), some of which include the powers of individual persons and the powers that we attribute to social structures (Archer 1995). Unlike positivism, causal laws express tendencies, that is, the likelihood of certain things occurring, given certain sorts of conditions (Bhaskar 1989: 1–21), but they are not recipes or formulae for predictable outcomes. Concrete experience and data are indicators of something deeper at work; something that causes the evidence to surface (Sayer 2000), so that one can identify transcendentally what the conditions must be like for the phenomena to exist (Danermark et al. 2002).

Social structures are dependent on pre-existing structures, which operate below the surface (Crinson 2007), and the relations into which people enter, pre-exist the individuals who enter them (Collier 1994). Societies are ‘open’ and dynamic systems rather than ‘closed’, in which causality, expressed as ‘mechanisms’, refers to the tendential causal structures which may or may not trigger events in the domain of the Actual, and which may or may not be observed in the Empirical domain (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011). A ‘mechanism’ makes things happen and is what makes a system what it is, such as metabolism in cells, research in laboratories, work in factories, and litigation in courts (Ibid.). In HE, state funding and the discourse on transformation, for example, act as mechanisms located at a deep level of reality but which influence what is experienced and enacted on the surface.

To understand any social phenomenon fully means to contextualise it in terms of the operation of hidden generative or causal social mechanisms, which interact with other objects, including social agents, and result in non-predictable but potentially explicable outcomes (Crinson 2007). These generative structures of objects and people are not deterministic but enable or constrain events and actions (Sayer 1992; Archer 1995). The outcome of mechanisms is contextual and dependent on other mechanisms (Pawson and Tilley 1997) while the power of mechanisms is tendential, that is, it may or may not trigger the same outcomes for every structure, depending on context.

2.2.1 The ‘critical’ in Critical Realism

According to Benton and Craib (2001: 120), the ‘critical’ in critical realism points to the desire of social realists to change systems that are counterproductive into an emancipated and liberated society. The ‘critical’ element in the critical realist project and in its concern for
social justice is what makes critical realism transformational (Collier 1994) in that, through its explanatory critique, it can reveal the effects of underlying structures and mechanisms in the world. Applied to higher education systems as mind-independent realities possessing deep and complex causal relations (Shipway 2005), a stratified reality of the university makes it possible to penetrate the layers of institutionalisation to reveal how wider structures and mechanisms in society filter into and embed themselves in education. In this way, ‘criticality’ leads to uncovering deep and hidden mechanisms.

CR acknowledges education as being situated in an open system (Shipway 2005), hence the production of knowledge is a social practice where the conditions and social relations of production influence its content (Sayer 1992). In this way, CR validates the causal efficacy of new academics’ accounts of experiences and events in this study. Our educational systems, which are struggling to meet the challenges of diversity, are in need of change, and scope for criticality exists through CR to ascertain how things can be changed, if they need to be (Kahn 2009). According to Shipway (2004: 3–17), we need to:

... interpret adequately; probe experience; liberate knowledge from deeper structures, processes and events; reveal those structures that produce and reproduce powerful interests that prevent people from realising their potential; expose knowledge or ideology that sustains such interests; and reflect and act on alternative structures, processes and knowledge which allow a greater degree of self-determination and democracy.

This sounds like a tall order, but the relevance of a critical social theory which is forward thinking and all-encompassing, is much needed in the context of South African HE, where the remnants of past structural and cultural conditioning continue to exert considerable influence on the ability of social agents and actors to respond in ways that initiate and promote transformation at deeper levels of social organisation (Danermark et al. 2002). The understanding of the ‘critical’ aspect in CR opens up the space for me as researcher to look critically at new academics in this study and at their conceptions of social structures, which exist whether or not they are conceptualised (Kahn 2009). This provides a responsive rather than a reactive account of change in HE.

I shall now introduce and discuss aspects of social realism that serve my study. These conceptual tools enabled a nuanced understanding and explication of Archer’s theory of agency, especially in the application of these concepts to the analysis of the data (see Chapter Five).
2.3 Margaret Archer’s social realism: the parts and the people

2.3.1 Social realist ontology

The ‘vexatious fact of society’, namely that we humans form society through our activities (agency), but that we ourselves are also shaped by it (structure) (Archer 2000), has kept Structure and Agency in a conceptual vice in the contemporary sociological fray for too long (Archer 1995; 2000). The solution to this problem, according to Archer, lies in the link between the social system and individual agents. In sociology, there has been a tendency to sink or conflate the ‘parts’ (systems) and the ‘people’ (agency), that is, to see them as indistinguishable entities that cannot be separated (Archer 1995). Based on Lockwood’s social and systems integration (1964), the ‘parts’ refer to the social structures or cultural systems, while the ‘people’ refer to agents who operate in the social world (Archer, 1995); however, the fallacy of conflation withholds autonomy or independence from both the parts and the people.

Archer identifies three types of conflational theorising in terms of structure and agency: upwards, downwards and central. Archer (1995) is opposed to all forms of conflation for not acknowledging personal emergent powers (PEPs) between humans as individuals and humans in society, the result of which closes off direct interplay with society and decreases our explanatory power to account for change or stability. Social determinism is where the individual is oversocialised, as society determines subjects and agents are reduced to bearers of its properties. This is known as ‘downwards conflation’, which is guilty of social hydraulics, that is, of pushes and pulls between structure and agency. This is also ‘Society’s Being’, in which the effects of socialisation impress themselves upon people, who are seen as malleable ‘indeterminate material’ (Archer 1995). Agential voluntarism is guilty of ‘upwards conflation’, where the individual is undersocialised and determines society, displaying a high degree of voluntary effects on society. This is also ‘Modernity’s Man’, in which the single property of rationality is held to make both human beings and also their society. Both ‘Modernity’s Man’ and ‘Society’s Being’ are reductionist theories as they conflate and reduce structure to agency, or vice versa, and as they promote voluntarism and determinism respectively, they are based on epiphenomenalism, where one aspect is dominant and the other weak.

In ‘central conflation’, where ‘elision’ occurs in the middle, structure and agency are seen as mutually constitutive and their influences upon one another cannot be unravelled because they are inseparable and intertwined, with no interplay (Archer 1995). Giddens’ structuration
theory (1984) elides structure and agency and maintains that structural properties are only real when instantiated by actors or human agents. As such, they do not possess autonomous powers and properties, but the concept of 'modalities' is advanced to account for their interconnection (Giddens 1984).

Both Bourdieu’s (1986) and Giddens’ (1984) respective approaches to human practices preclude one from disengaging the properties and powers of the practitioner from the properties and powers of the environment in which practices are conducted. Again, this prevents analysis of their interplay (Archer 1995). Instead, there are amalgams of practices, which oscillate between voluntarism and determinism, without our being able to specify the conditions under which agents have greater degrees of freedom or, conversely, work under a considerable stringency of constraints (Archer 2007a). Archer’s non-conflationary theorising is crucial for this study as it acknowledges new academics’ PEPs in the mediation of structure and culture at the university. The understanding of new academics as separate and autonomous entities to the environment of the university is crucial to the explanatory power of this study, hence the non-conflationary approach advanced by Archer is appreciated and upheld.

Social realism thus perseveres in linking the parts and the people by trying to be more precise about the properties and powers of human beings, and how these emerge through our relations with the world, which cannot be narrowly construed as ‘society’, let alone as ‘language’, ‘discourse’ and ‘conversation’ (Archer 1995). The inadequacy of both conflationist and elisionist theorising to provide a valid link between structure and agency is tantamount to their denial of ‘emergence’, which is central to realist theorising (Ibid.).

### 2.3.1.1 Emergence

Critical Realism and its three pillars, ontological stratification and depth, epistemological relativism, and judgemental rationality, are based on emergence. The concept of emergence refers to something new that comes about as a result of the interaction of two or more things (Archer 1995; Sayer 2000). In denying emergence, ontological realism, stratification, irreducible properties and powers, interplay and efficacious causal power are also denied (Archer 1995). Elder-Vass (2004) adopts a compositional definition of ‘emergence’ where higher-level entities always emerge from collections of lower-level entities but the whole is more than the sum of its parts. Bhaskar himself defines emergence as ‘the relationship between two terms such that one diachronically, or perhaps synchronically, arises out of the other, but is capable of re-acting back on the first and is in any event causally and
taxonomically irreducible to it, as society is to nature or mind to matter’ (Bhaskar 1994: 73). As Archer avers, ‘emergent properties are relational: they are not contained in the elements themselves, but could not exist apart from them’ (Archer 1982: 475).

Emergence is about interdependence: just as water remains constituted by the hydrogen and oxygen atoms from which it emerges, and has properties different from its constitutive elements (Archer 2000).

Archer criticises reductionist theorists for not including ‘emergence’ as a central tenet in sociological theorising, for not to acknowledge a stratified model of social reality and humanity is to deny the ontological status of each domain: structure, culture and agency. This also denies each domain’s structural, cultural and agential emergent properties, which share internal and necessary relationships (Archer 1996) and are activated and emergent through interaction in society (Ibid.: 48). Archer (2000) argues that the emergence of human properties and powers is what makes us social beings and contributes to the relational characteristics of being human to the way the world is, how the world is constituted, and the necessity of mutual interaction. Archer thus responds to the structure/agency debate by providing a link in the form of a causal mechanism: human and personal emergent powers and properties. By linking and not sinking their differences, social realism tries to account for personal human powers and for the way in which people (agency) interact with the parts (structural and cultural systems) of society to either reproduce or transform it.

This is particularly relevant to my study, as the reconciliation of subjectivity and objectivity offers a more effective way of thinking about the personal powers of new academics in their socio-cultural contexts, contrary to a reductive approach to academic practice (Kahn 2009). To recognise the personal emergent properties of new academics as agents, as they face up to the corresponding emergent properties of the contexts they confront, is to acknowledge that there is not a linear relationship between what new academics as teachers do in their classrooms (although this is important) and the outcomes for student learning in classrooms. When teachers and students come together in a pedagogic relationship, the ‘outcomes’ cannot be predicted, since contextual powers and properties are activated and triggered, and influence what people do in different or similar situations. To understand the independent and autonomous powers and properties in this way is to see the various components of the HE system as fons et origo of emergent socio-cultural structures, not as epiphenomena of social forces (Archer 1995). Various aspects of HE at a systemic level contribute to the frustrations or advancement of the academic project, so the full responsibility should not be that of academics alone:
The importance of distinguishing, in the most categorical way, between human action and social structure will now be apparent. For the properties possessed by social forms may be very different from those possessed by the individuals upon whose activity they depend . . . I want to distinguish sharply then between the genesis of human actions, lying in the reasons, intentions and plans of human beings, on the one hand; and the structures governing the reproduction and transformation of social activities, on the other (Archer 1995: 62).

Archer (1996) argues that, like structure and agency, culture and agency have also been conflated, to the extent that one cannot distinguish between people and their meanings. In conflating culture and agency, the distinct properties and powers of each are denied, eradicating the interplay between the parts and the people. The result is that the source of internal cultural dynamics that could account for change is occluded, and the locus of change becomes located externally, in cultural contact, clash or conquest (Ibid.).

2.3.1.2 Analytical dualism

Archer’s response to conflationary thinking is through the principle of analytical dualism, which is based on the premise that structure, culture and agency are ontologically distinct and temporally distinguishable (1995). As a result of this ontological approach, the methodological approach in social realism is to keep various entia distinct for analytical purposes (Archer 1995). Methodological realism is thus committed to mechanisms and interplay, and approaches structure and culture through analytical dualism in order to be able to explore the linkages between these separate strata with their own autonomous, irreducible, emergent properties, avoiding any form of conflation (be it upwards, downwards or central) in social theorising (Archer 1995: 159).

Archer (1995) reminds us that, in reality, the three domains of structure, culture, and agency are not separated, since society as an open system cannot interfere, halt or suspend the flow of unpredictable events. Structure, culture, and agency can be separated for analytical purposes, though, to acknowledge their irreducible and autonomous emergent properties. It must be emphasised that this dualism is analytical rather than philosophical, as a theoretical necessity for unravelling and explaining the processes involved in the structuring of society and the specific forms of restructuring that take place over time (Archer 1995: 157).

By not eliding or conflating the parts and the people, but by considering their variable combinations, the principle of analytical dualism distinguishes the emergentists, whose insistence on the temporal distinguishing of structure, culture, and agency enables us to
account for a historicity of emergence (Archer 1996: 66). The strength of analytical dualism is that it affords greater explanatory power by foregrounding the temporal aspect with pre- and post-phases that can be studied to analyse changes over time and to explain how these domains influence each other temporally (Danermark et al. 2002). This sequential method facilitates a more precise analysis in ‘slow motion’ of the data under exploration (Vandenberghe 2005). The ultimate benefit of analytical dualism is that it is not a static method of differentiation but a tool for examining the dynamics through which the 'parts' and the 'people' shape and re-shape one another through their reciprocal interaction over time (Archer 1995). In this study, the temporal aspect of new academics transitioning into higher education is salient to their mediation of contexts, and time itself is an influence, as newcomers want to ‘bed down’ as quickly as they can. Analytical dualism allowed me as researcher to identify specific phases in the transitioning process, to enable me to do an informed analysis of temporal and spatial aspects of their agency.

Archer’s theoretical point of departure for developing analytical dualism is Lockwood’s (1964) distinction between systemic and social integration. The systemic relations between parts of the social structure need to be distinguished from the relations between social groups or actors. Complex social and cultural systems derive from pre-existent institutional structures, which are internally related, and known as systems integration (Archer 1995: 188), which refers to the orderly or conflictual relations between the parts of any social system. The causal relations which exist among people at the social and socio-cultural interaction level, are known as social integration and refer to the orderly or conflictual relations between actors (Willmott 2002). Lockwood’s seminal contribution to social theorising strengthens the explanatory power of analytical dualism.

2.3.1.3 Systems and social integration

Lockwood (1964) shows that social change is attributed to variable combinations between the component elements of social systems and their interaction with people. Social systems are seen as specific configurations of their component structures, where the emergent features of the former derive from the relations between the latter. Relations may be internal and necessary, or external and contingent (Archer 1995: 189). Lockwood was unable to argue ontologically how systemic properties of social systems affect causal relations among people and resorted to describing his theory as a useful heuristic (Archer 1995). It is nonetheless important to examine when and how stasis or change happens, which is made possible in part by the level of incompatibility or complementarity between structures, which indicates their well-integrated or mal-integrated states.
High systems integration means there is a high degree of complementarity between structures, while low integration denotes the opposite. Whether high or low, integrated systems present agents with conditioning influences, which they confront in new contexts and which predispose them to certain courses of actions. At the level of social interaction, people engage with one another on the basis of relations that show reciprocity between actors, and between groups and collectivities (Archer 1995). A lot of conflict would denote a low social integration, while congruence between ideational groups would show the opposite.

The level of conjunction between system and social integration depends on how they co-vary: when they are highly integrated, morphostasis is ensured, whereas the mal-integration of the two at the same moment paves the way for a change of systems or agents, that is, morphogenesis. The principle of analytical dualism is central to Archer’s morphogenetic argument, which will be discussed shortly, but first it is necessary to explain features of structure, culture and agency at a systemic level, as these domains are responsible for the structural emergent properties (SEPs) and cultural emergent properties (CEPs) that are activated when agents mediate these systems through their own personal emergent properties (PEPs).

### 2.3.2 Social realist epistemology: structure, culture and agency

As indicated earlier, from a CR perspective the social world is stratified, differentiated, and intransitive. ‘What the world is and how we think about the world can affect what we know about it; and how we can shape or change it’ (Case 2013). Using Critical Realism as an underlabourer for her social realist theory, Archer puts the spotlight on the level of the Real by sub-dividing it into the domains of structure, culture, and agency, which in turn enables the researcher to analyse and account for change through a study of interplay and emergence. Separating these domains means that causal relations between mechanisms in HE and events and experiences of new academics as agents can be distinctly identified to see which domain exerts more influence on new academics’ agency and why. I shall now turn to each of these domains to discuss their main features.

#### 2.3.2.1 The domain of structure

Archer defines Structure as relating to material systems, resources, and social institutions, which include social class, gender, race, marriage, education, social practices, and social positions and roles (Archer 1995: 95). In HE, structures may include the institution,
departments, policy, professional bodies, and committees. Structures exist on different strata of reality, each with its own emergent properties. These are *sui generis* properties and powers that provide enablements and constraints (Carter and New 2004) on agents’ projects. Social structures can be identified because of their irreducible character and are independent of the people who influenced their origin. They possess powers and properties that are distinguishable and independent of the agents who draw on them in their interaction.

One of their powers is that they exert a causal influence on people irrespective of people’s understanding of them (Archer 1995: 252). What people say about structures is subjective, but structures have a life of their own, and the way social reality has come to be is not synonymous with how we take it to be (Ibid.: 209). In other words, the situations structured by past actions ‘exist and act independently of the knowledge of which they are the objects’. It is by asking transcendental questions that one can come to know what the structural relations are. They thus exert an autonomous influence (not deterministically so) over agents and create enabling or constraining conditions for choices that agents make for their courses of action. Persons confront structural (and cultural) properties as motivating or discouraging influences (Archer 2000). When they come up against such structures, people choose how to respond in what they do, but they make their choices from a structurally- and culturally-generated range of options, which they do not choose (Ibid.).

An example of this in this study is the merged institution of the university of technology that provides a context predating the new academics appointed after 2004. The effects of the university merger (see Chapter Four) may not be fully understood by new academics entering the institution, yet they have a structural conditioning influence on how these academics understand practices and discourses at the university. The university as a Structure thus predates agential interaction and is anterior to it.

Attached to Structures are ‘institutions’, which are regularised practices, structured by rules and resources (Archer 1995). Rules and resources have a material existence and not a virtual one since, by definition, material things exist in time and space. This is true also for human resources, since human beings are embodied and cannot be virtual (Sewell 1992: 109). Where rules are concerned, they have an actual existence as in law, the Constitution, liturgy or contracts; are anchored in time and space; and exist (as penalties, entitlements, rights and obligations) independent of their invocation (Archer 1995: 108). Resources can be accumulated, where people have more of one than others, and can be increased. Structures have a relatively enduring character but are not constant or stagnant for all time. Structures
are changed or modified through the actions of agents and become the conditioning context in which new agents find themselves. Structural conditioning is continuous, and activity dependent on the emergentist outcomes of the interaction of its components.

### 2.3.2.2 The domain of culture

Culture comprises the ‘corpus of existing intelligibilia . . . all things capable of being grasped, deciphered, understood or known by someone’ (Archer 1996: 104). It refers to ideational constructs such as beliefs, values, attitudes and ideologies housed in society’s propositional register, which have the dispositional capacity of being understood by someone. Archer (1996) divides culture into the cultural system (CS, or the parts) and socio-cultural system (S-C, or the people), which are logically and sociologically distinct. The cultural system is an emergent entity and is a sub-set of items or propositions through which people (individually and collectively) seek to alter or reinforce the social arrangements they encounter for the realisation of their own interests (Archer 2000). It is this prime power that enables agents to maintain or modify the world (Carter and New 2004), and in this way culture becomes the link between structure and agency, as people and their ideas are what interact with systems and their agents (Archer 1995: 77).

The myth of cultural integration (Archer 1996: 2), propagated by many early anthropologists, is dependent upon a community of shared meanings as the archetypical picture of the place of culture in society (Archer 1996). It is a myth because in reality there is no universal conjunction between cultural components, as there is no utopian cultural integration (Ibid.). Archer contends instead that culture in itself has ‘parts’ and the ‘people’: a logical consistency among components of ideas, beliefs, doctrines and theories (the parts) and the causal consensus between groups of cultural agents (the people). The CS cannot be reified, and exploring how parts of the culture map on to people helps us to see influences of CS on S-C. Conditioning influences can have varied responses; hence culture cannot be thought of as universal or integrated (Archer 1996: 21).

In this study, for example, the ideas held about professional development and staff development in new academics’ disciplinary departments can be contradictory or complementary to the way new academics themselves see professional development initiatives. These logical relations between components are the cultural emergent properties (CEPs) that impinge on S-C level, influencing actions at this conditioning phase (or T1) of the morphogenetic cycle (discussed below). The causal effects on people holding these ideas, as well as on groups such as new academics, staff developers and departmental
members, result in a level of integration among them, but the way in which these contradictory and complementary relations between the 'parts' map on to the conflictual relations between 'people' helps to generate conditions for change or stasis (Ibid.).

The analysis of Culture is the same as that of Structure. As with social structures, components of the cultural system predate agential interaction, that is, they are anterior to context and the product of past activities of agents; they are autonomous and relatively enduring. The CS has an objective existence and is equivalent to the propositional register of society but distinct from the meanings held by agents at any given time. Similar to social structures, the components of the cultural system are emergent from S-C interaction and have properties of their own. In Popper’s World Three\(^2\), culture is the product of the human mind and constitutes objective knowledge, independent of people’s power and influence, and regardless of being recognised, exploited or concealed (Archer 1996).

It is knowledge because it retains the dispositional character to be understood, though it persists unrecognised, sustaining potential powers (of contradiction and complementarity with other cultural items) which remain unexercised (Archer 1995: 144).

There are additional aspects of culture which include non-propositional items like myths, mysteries, hermeneutics, ideology, tastes, prejudices, affinities and animosities, which are also interpreted by people (Archer 1996). Based on their high variation and subjectivity, these exist outside logic. For social analysis, only ‘propositions’ are used (from which truth claims are possible) and it is at the level of logic that ideas constrain or enable the actions of agents (Wilmott 2002). The CS provides the context for theories, beliefs and ideas developed anterior to S-C interaction and which influence it. In the cultural system, there are logical relations between items, characterised by logical consistency or inconsistency, leading to stability or change.

Logical consistency is the degree of internal compatibility between the parts. Logical relations do obtain and, while causal relations are contingent, they may pertain. When these relations are internal and necessary, they constitute CEPs and have conditioning influences that shape people. The CS exerts these constraints by introducing new problems or new possibilities to theories held by people and between ideas and physical environment. These

---

\(^2\) World 1 is the physical universe. It consists of the actual truth and reality that we try to represent, such as energy, physics, and chemistry. World 2 is the world of our subjective personal perceptions, experiences, and cognition. It is what we think about the world as we try to map, represent, and anticipate or hypothesis in order to maintain our existence in an every changing place. While knowledge may be created and produced by World 2 activities, its artifacts are stored in World 3.
constraints exist as contradictions in the cultural system (Archer 1996). In this study, there are innumerable items that exist in the cultural register of HE in the form of discourses that shape the actions and experiences of new academics whether they (CEPs) are actively drawn on through discourses or whether they remain dormant, waiting to be triggered.

‘Discourses’ in the realist framework are seen as components of the CS that have a dialectical relationship with reality (Sibeon 2004). They do not determine reality and agents are not seen as products of discourse (as in the post-modernist view) nor do they diminish the role of the agent. Discourses exist in the CS but are irreducible to it or the social context in which it is embedded. From a realist view, discourses are causally efficacious and have their own powers and properties. In Chapter Four (See 4.3: T1 of the M/M cycle), the established and emergent discourses in HE (both internationally and nationally) are discussed to gauge their level of causality, that is, their powers and properties to influence how ideas are taken up by these new agents in their mediation of their contextual settings at the university.

Socio-cultural interaction concerns relationships between cultural agents and constitutes causal relations that are contingent and reliant upon agential instigation. The realist’s interest is in how people add new items to the cultural register to displace older understandings. Further, the effects of holding certain theories and beliefs that make truth claims about possibility are important considerations in explaining causality (Archer 1996). Contradictions and compatibilities exist as CEPs of the S-C interaction, and causal consensus is the degree of social uniformity produced by the ideational influence of one group of people on another. People interact with each other through manipulation, mystification, legitimation, persuasion and argumentation, and these mechanisms are linked to power and influence (Archer, 1996). The same approach may be used in relation to culture and agency to ensure that properties of the cultural system are not conflated with characteristics of socio-cultural interaction.

2.3.2.3 The domain of agency

Archer is at great pains as a sociologist to instate human beings as powerful agents in their own lives as well as in society. Her approach recognises emergent powers of persons and their roles in contributing to the change and stability of structural and cultural systems. Archer (2000) distinguishes between ‘active agents’, as people who can exercise some governance in their own lives, and ‘passive agents’, to whom things merely happen. It is the very notion that people make sense of their worlds and prioritise their concerns, then
mobilise as a collective for change, that confirms that people are capable of imposing their identities and will on others. This makes them active beings, not passive recipients.

We are always agents of something. Active agents thus seek to develop and define their ultimate concerns (those internal aspects that they care about most) into elaborated projects which are then translated into a set of established practices (Archer 2000). Agents act on the basis of their concerns, projects or practices in the three orders of reality: the practical, natural, and social. This ontological endowment means that it is people who make history (Ibid.).

Among the *sui generis* properties of people relevant to agency are self-consciousness, reflexivity, intentionality, cognition, and emotionality (Archer 2000). As reflexive beings capable of highly sophisticated symbolic communication, human beings as agents are able to formulate projects, develop plans, have ambitions, and pursue interests. When we recognise the *sui generis* powers and properties of agency, it becomes difficult to see people as passive puppets, cultural dopes or discursive effects (Carter and New 2004). This is at the heart of Archer’s theory of agency, which she conceptualises as an explanatory tool for action, rather than as an empirical construct, to account for those people who seek to replace society’s rules.

Archer’s social realism thus presents us with a stratified agent whose personal powers and properties (PEPs) emerge at different levels. This is far from a one-dimensional or flat view of a person. Using analytical dualism, Archer is able to distinguish between four strata, namely the self, the person, the social agent and the social actor (Archer 2000). The emergence of our social identity as agents and actors has its origins in selfhood and personhood (human selfhood). As emergent strata, agents exercise PEPs in articulating shared interests, organising for collective action, generating social movements, and exercising corporate influence in decision making. The things they can do qua human beings, qua agents and qua actors will be different in different settings, involving different powers, different interests, and different reasons (Ibid.). This aspect is borne out in this study as new academics choose different actions in a relatively similar setting, that is, the university.

### 2.3.2.3.1 Sense of self

A continuous sense of self or self-consciousness begins prior to and is primitive to our sociality. Self-consciousness derives from our embodied practices in the world and involves
practical work, where each one of us has to discover the distinctions between self and other, then between subject and object, before finally arriving at the distinction between the self and other people. Only when these distinctions have been learned through embodied practice can they be expressed in language.

Embodied practice is the source of a sense of self and our embodied memories give us the sense of our own continuity (Archer 2000). This is highly compatible with Lockwood’s (1964) conception of the self, where the continuous sense that we are one and the same being over time hinges upon the body and our memories. Neurobiology gives further evidence of our durable powers of recognition, our lasting and distinctive eidetic memory (which selects and deselects when faced with a challenge or constraint), and the indelibility of our procedural memory of performatve skills (Archer 2007a). Thus a continuous sense of self, which is unique to each individual, anchors his or her strict (unique and not general) self-identity. This self-identity, which is the possession of a continuous sense of self, is universal for each human being (Archer 2000) and emerges early in life through practice, rather than innately or discursively, and is the source of reflexive self-consciousness which lasts throughout life. Practice is enduring and pivotal to the knowledge which we gain, and to possess this power also implies that we are reflexive beings, for to know oneself to be the same being over time means that one can think about it (Archer 2000).

Archer thus advances a transcendental argument for the necessity to the existence of society of an acknowledgement of a ‘sense of self’. For society to be what it is, that is, a playground where people make the world and are made by it, there must be human beings who have a deep sense of an autonomous self that is continuous, irrespective of sociality.

2.3.2.3.2 Primacy of practice

In the establishment of our self-consciousness, Archer (2000) defends the primacy of practice over language, discourse or conversation in the natural world, where homo sapiens and animals alike learn about their environment, their bodies, space, and time through actual experiences and practices in the real world. This gives rise to embodied or tacit knowledge, which includes the knowledge, concepts, ideas and experiences that we have internalised (Polanyi 1983; Wheelahan 2007). This awareness of Self in relation to Other is accompanied by our ability for intentional causal action. Primacy of practice is further defended by Archer: she cites Piaget’s empirical work with children, who acquire reasoned knowledge non-discursively and pre-linguistically through play as they develop through different sensory motor skills stages. This evidence complements the realist stance that language is learned
through reference to reality, and gains meaning through relation to it. Archer’s conception of agency is developed against linguistic accounts of agency, and is intended to locate the agent as a real and material presence in the world (Archer 2000).

2.3.2.3.3 Three orders of reality and their respective forms of knowledge

Being embedded in the world as a whole requires that we sustain relations with all three orders of reality which embrace our trinity of inescapable human concerns (Archer 2000). As human beings, we necessarily live out our lives in the natural, practical and social orders, and this is the link from the stratum of human beings to the stratum of personal identity at maturity. Any form of knowledge emanates through the interplay between properties and powers of the subject and properties and powers of the object, that is, between our human powers (PEPs) and the powers of reality in the natural, practical and social orders. These include embodied knowledge (nature), practical knowledge (the skills we can acquire in practice), or discursive knowledge (the propositional elaborations we can make in the Cultural System) (Archer 1995; 2000).

Practical knowledge, which is performative and procedural, and acquired through apprenticeship (Archer 2000), is engendered by constraints and enablements, embedded in an instrumental concern (does it work?), while discursive knowledge both challenges and extends this concern by an exposition of the causal powers involved (this is how it really works in principle) (Archer 1995: 78). ‘Our social relations in the world are mediated through propositional culture and give rise to discursive knowledge’ (Wheelahan 2007: 12).

The three kinds of knowledge that emerge are distinct but interconnected. The way in which they affect the agent is by shaping the context of situation through the physical powers of the natural order, the material affordances and constraints of material culture, and the logical constraining powers of the Cultural System. All three impinge upon subjects by providing constraints or enablements in relation to the subjects’ projects. While they are interconnected, the interpenetration between the three interconnected domains of reality, according to Wheelahan (2007), is underestimated by Archer, as well as the way knowledge in one is a precondition for knowledge in the other. In this study, it was evident that impingements in the practical order (where performative competence is lodged) were most profound, with ramifications for new academics in the other two orders.

2.3.2.3.4 The emergence of personal identity

Personal identity depends on a mature ability to take a reflective overview of all three orders
of reality in which we are ineluctably engaged, in order to decide where our predominant concerns lie. It is the distinctive patterning and prioritising of these concerns which gives people their personal identity, but the precise balance we strike and what feature as our ultimate concerns are what give us our strict identity as particular persons (Archer 2000).

The process of patterning and prioritising our concerns is conducted through an internal dialogue or inner conversation (see below), enabling us to distinguish salient concerns (ultimate concerns) from less important or subordinate ones. This involves sifting through the constellation of commitments to explore and work out which ones we can live with (Archer 2000). The acquisition of a personal identity is therefore an active, reflective process, undertaken by an active agent and, when attained, can be considered an achievement. It is not attained by all but for those who do, the emergent *modus vivendi* is what defines the uniqueness of each personal identity.

### 2.3.2.3.5 Emotional commentary

Personal identity is also a matter of what we care about in the world. It refers to our emotional commitments and our ultimate concerns, all of which help to sustain the internal conversation within agents. Emotional development is part of this interaction, as emotions carry the importance of situations to us and offer ‘commentaries on our concerns’ (Archer 2000). As a result, emotionality is our reflexive response to the world. Our emotions, however, are fallible (Collier 1994), because the beliefs that generate those emotions may be based on incomplete knowledge of the material and social environment. This is because agents have differentiated knowledgeability based on their different roles and positions and as such cannot have discursive penetration of unknown courses of action. Therefore they can have distorted, defective and deficient knowledge (Wheelahan 2007).

Three distinct concerns arise from each of the three orders of reality in conjunction with emotions: physical wellbeing (in the natural order), performative competence (in the practical order), and self-worth (in the social order). Emotional commentary in the natural order, where we are concerned with our physical wellbeing, stems from our ability to anticipate outcomes based on our embodied experiences of reality. Emotions like fear, anger, disgust and relief are emergent from these. Our performative achievement in the practical order is reflected emotionally through frustration and boredom as well as through joy and satisfaction. This commentary signals the success or failure of our performance, in relation to feedback from the environment. In the social order, we receive feedback such as shame, or acceptance from other social beings. The most important concern in the social order is
self-worth, which is vested in certain projects (career or family). It is because we are invested in these projects (and not just as role incumbents) that we are emotionally affected by them and by society's normative evaluation of us (Archer 2000).

Each person receives all three kinds of commentaries on his or her concerns, and has to work out a modus vivendi by prioritising one of his or her inescapable and ineluctable concerns, which becomes the ultimate concern. Our personal identity is thus emergent, when we prioritise one of our concerns at the expense of accommodating others, and is worked out by an active and reflexive agent. The process of reflection or interior conversation entails a rigorous cognitive and affective process in which we test our ongoing commitments against our emotional commentary. We do this by reflecting, evaluating, and prioritising our emotions. This internal dialogue takes places between the present 'I', the future 'you', and the past 'me' (see 2.3.4.3.7 below) in the formation of personal identity.

Our reactions to relevant events are emotionally transmuted by our ultimate concerns. When we are faced with future and ongoing concerns, we evaluate them both retrospectively and prospectively in relation to our ultimate concerns. We exercise personal properties and powers (PEPs) to shape our lives around what we care most about, but these are not done in contexts of our choosing since, as primary agents, we are embedded involuntarily as human beings in the three orders of reality.

2.3.2.3.6 Concept of self

Social theorising, according to Archer (2000: 108), has conflated the sense of self with the concept of self and has led to a denial of the reality of the self. To defend this argument, Archer draws on the 1989 seminal work of Mauss to argue that a crucial distinction is needed between sense of self and concept of self, where the former is universal and the latter is historically and socially constructed (Archer 2000). Once a universal sense of self is acquired, the formation of personal identity sets in as a quest for authenticity (Vandenberghe 2005), and this is in contrast with Archer's notion of an evolving concept of self, which is social.

2.3.2.3.7 The emergence of social identity

In Archer's stratified model of agency from human selfhood to social agent to social actor, we see the concurrent emergence of personal and social identity. Social identity is the ability to express what we care about in our social roles. It comes from adopting a role and personifying it in a particular manner. Our social selves as stratified beings emerge at the
interface between structure and agency and through a relational development between SEPs/CEPs and PEPs. The emergence of agents and actors occurs between these two sets of properties. The human powers (PEPs), upon which structural and cultural powers impact, are self and personal identity, which derives from relations in the three orders. While social identity is defined in social terms (between people), both personal and social identity are intertwined in their emergence.

Everyone has a personal identity (PI), but not everyone has a social identity (SI), that is, a role in which they can invest enough of themselves. There is thus a dialectic relationship between personal and social identity (Archer 2000). As a result, SI is assigned a role (big or small) within PI and the person actively decides how much priority to give to or how much of themselves to put into the role. In the process SI becomes defined, but as a sub-set of PI, making the acquisition of SI a process of progressive individuation underpinned by iterations (Archer 2000):

- ‘I’ = self-conscious, introspective human being through primacy of practice and continuous sense of self; reflects on involuntary placement; happens during childhood.
- ‘Me’ = self as object; involuntarily placed in society’s distribution as primary agent; conditioned; part of pre-grouped collectivity.
- ‘We’ = collective, interactive action as corporate agents to bring about transformation.
- ‘You’ = positions that are occupied, accepted and personified as actors with strict social identity.

The process starts with the involuntary placement of humans as primary agents, that is, members of collectivities who share the same life chances. This means that the ‘I’ (subject of self-consciousness) discovers the ‘Me’ (object of society) who is involuntarily resourced. However, socio-cultural configurations have their own emergent properties and powers, and morphogenetic scenarios enable collective action. This encourages a movement from the ‘Me’ towards the ‘We’, which together seeks strategically to transform such structures. Corporate Agency transforms itself in pursuing social transformation. Then the ‘You’ emerges as social actor to take his or her rightful place as personified social agent.

The different strata are all part of an individual’s personal morphogenesis. Throughout life, through autonomous personal powers, agents monitor and evaluate their options choice in the light of the different strata to replicate or transform their choices. Agents are capable of
intense personal scrutiny. The human being (‘I’) can simultaneously be involuntarily placed within a stratified society (‘Me’), capable of working collectively to reshape that society (‘We’) and find themselves role(s) within it (‘You’), which they can embody and personify in a way which is satisfying and sustainable to them (Carrigan 2013). In this study, the new academics undergo personal morphogenesis through their mediation of their contexts, and there is a causal relationship between who they are (personal and social identity) and what they do (agential choices) at the university.

**Primary Agents**

Primary agents (always in the plural) are collectivities of people who share the same life chances and occupy different positions (involuntary or voluntary placement, or through birth), with which they accrue certain powers (Archer 2000: 177). They are shaped by the emergent properties of their natal contexts, which are not of their choosing or making. As primary agents, they are inarticulate in structural and cultural modelling and systemic organisation, as they neither express interest in nor organise for their pursuit. As a result, they appear to be passive people to whom things happen and who merely respond to events. They lack collective organisation and objectives, and it appears as if they exercise no agential power in society because their effects are uncoordinated and unarticulated. In this study, the new academics enter HE and the university as primary agents, involuntarily placed.

Primary agents have a vested interest in acquiring the powers of collective action, which is an emergent property of agency (a PEP), to redress the subordinate position in which they find themselves and to improve upon the inferior life chances assigned to them there (Archer 2000). Contrary to how they ‘appear’, primary agents (new academics) in this study reacted and responded to their contexts and were able to generate powerful effects in their settings through their organised and articulated objectives.

This is how agents become active participants in society’s decision making, and if they do they can hope to re-design the social array of roles, such that the positions available to them are ones in which they willingly invest themselves and become the kinds of ‘social selves’ with whom they can voluntarily identify. Collective action is possible through aggregation, where primary agents exercise ‘demographic power’ or ‘demographic agency’ (Carter and New 2004; Luckett 2009) by virtue of their numbers or other categories. In this way, they inhabit the contexts shaped by corporate agency but reconstitute them by forming themselves into new social movements to eventually become new corporate agents. This scope is open to new academics too, who enter as primary agents, but soon reconstitute
themselves as corporate agents. This is called ‘double morphogenesis’, during which Agency, in its attempt to sustain or transform the social system, is inexorably drawn into sustaining or transforming the categories of Corporate and Primary Agents themselves, and ends up elaborating itself (Archer 2000).

**Corporate Agents**

Corporate agents are self-conscious interest groups. These include vested interest groups and promotive interest groups, and their typical powers are capacities for articulating shared interests, organising for collective action, generating social movements and exercising corporate influence in decision-making (Archer 2000). Various promotive interest groups may work together or against one another in order to promote their own interests or to undermine the interests of another group to gain ascendancy. They are aware of what they want, can articulate it to themselves and others, have organised in order to get it, and can engage in concerted action to re-shape or retain the structural or cultural feature in question. They are thus powerful where systemic stability and change are concerned, and they shape the context for all actors (Archer 2000).

Corporate agents act together and interact with other agents strategically and actively to bring about social outcomes. In HE, corporate agency sprouts in various areas of work, in relation to academic as well as social concerns at the university, as academics garner support for causes that extend beyond classroom practice. Corporate agency has two tasks: the pursuit of its self-declared goals, as defined in a prior social context, and its continued pursuit of goals in a current environment, modified by the responses of primary agents to the context which they confront. Some of the new academics in this study who started off as primary agents showed early signs of strengthening their collective action to exercise their powers to re-group themselves into corporate agents. Structural and cultural conditions at the university can either support or impede primary agents in assuming the powers of collective action. Not all members of the group were able to ascend to this level of strategic action, but those who did were able to acquire additional resources (both structurally and culturally) to increase their bargaining power and negotiating strength in their departments and faculties at the university. Some of these corporate agents shaped their personal morphogenesis to the extent that, even as nascent academics, they were fast becoming moulded for the social actor roles that they could and would take up.

**Social Actor**

The next emergent stratum concerns the social actor who emerges through a ‘triple
morphogenesis’, that is, from human being → agent → actor. Agency strongly conditions the involuntary placement of social agents and affects the social actors that some of us voluntarily become. It does not determine the particular social actor an individual chooses to become, but it strongly conditions who comes to occupy different social roles. Put differently, agency is a springboard (Archer 2000: 284) to positions in the extant role array, and the interests that agents possess serve to make the choice of role positions reasonable. Agents make the positions available and assist certain categories of people to have access to them, based on their life chances. This is how they acquire the social identity as social actor, which is part of ‘our destiny’ as human social beings (Archer 2000).

Social Roles
Social actors are defined as role incumbents who choose to identify with a particular role and personify it, rather than just animate it. These actors use their own capacity and ability to develop their roles further and to overcome possible constraints attached to the role via structural mechanisms. Conversely, actors’ properties and powers may be hindered and stymied by constraining conditions that leave the role unchanged for future incumbents. All in all, this acknowledges actors as a source of role change, capable of innovative reinterpretation, and able to exercise reflexivity and creativity. For an actor to move beyond the routine acts of role fulfilment and reproduction, he or she needs to use personal ingenuity to exploit the degrees of freedom in respect of roles she occupies (Carrigan 2013).

Roles themselves have emergent properties which cannot be reduced to the characteristics of their occupants and are thus independent of their holders. Roles are at the structural level and have emergent properties (SEPs) while incumbents are at the social level with their own emergent properties (PEPs). Roles are durable over time and pre-exist their bearers, so that a role pre-structured by previous agential action now conditions the circumstances in which new agents find themselves.

However, social roles also have causal powers through the capacities, liabilities and powers inherent in them. By modifying or replicating the roles themselves, social change or reproduction is enabled. Once again it is the person who strikes the balance within his or her social and other concerns. Social actors can only do this by prioritising their ultimate concerns, which will determine how much of themselves is invested in their social identities, and therefore what they will bring to living them out (Archer 2000).

Role-taking could conceivably be a thin hermeneutic tale told from within a ‘form of life’,
People change with the experience they acquire in living out the role, therefore the final consolidation of personal identity and social identity is dialectically related (Archer 2000). As the moments of their interplay are disentangled, it becomes clearer that social identity is a sub-set of a much broader personal identity. Social actors exist in the singular and meet the strict criteria for possessing unique identity, but the social agent and the social actor are not different people. Their distinction is only temporal and analytical (Archer 2000). The agent is the father of the actor, who as a role incumbent cannot be understood without reference to Agency (Ibid.). Yet it is important to separate what the agent does, in response to constraints and enablements he or she faces, from what the actor does in his or her particular roles. Unlike Agency, which is universal to members of society, not everyone can succeed in becoming an Actor, that is, in finding a role(s) in which they feel they can invest themselves, such that the accompanying social identity is expressive of whom they are as persons in society.

2.3.3 Reflexive deliberation

Reflexivity is the mediation of the influence of structural factors from the social and cultural context on the actions of agents (Archer 2003). Archer (2003) defines reflexivity as an internal conversation which consists of the dialogues that people engage in inwardly and through which they define and clarify their beliefs, attitudes and goals; evaluate social circumstances; and define projects based on their main concerns (Caetano 2014). As an emergent personal property, reflexivity mediates between structure and agency by activating the causal powers of structures and allowing individuals to project their actions, based on the articulation between personal concerns and the conditions that make it possible to accomplish them (Ibid. 2014).

This is what makes for ‘active agents’, or people who can exercise some governance in their own lives, as opposed to ‘passive agents’, to whom things simply happen. The subjective powers of reflexivity mediate the role that objective structural or cultural powers play in influencing social action, making reflexivity indispensable to explaining social outcomes (Archer 2003). According to Archer, reflexivity is about matters that are social – it is not just thinking about mundane everyday issues to which there are no practical solutions:
‘Reflexivity’ is the regular exercise of the mental ability, shared by all normal people, to consider themselves in relation to their (social) contexts and vice versa (Archer 2007a: 4).

Intentionality on the part of agents is thus neither ‘static, uniform nor passive’ (Archer 2003: 134). Social constraints and enablements can work on people because human beings are able to think, reflect, deliberate and decide. Through their PEPs, agents have the ability to form projects, but through reflexive deliberation they can also anticipate projects, circumvent them, and strategically choose gains over losses; this ability comes with degrees of freedom for each individual. So while constraints and enablements derive from SEPs and CEPs, they are activated by agents who conceive of and pursue projects that can be constrained and enabled (Archer 1996). There is thus the existence of properties and the exercise of their causal powers by agents who have choices. Hence these properties are tendential, that is, they have potential and ability to be influential until activated.

The ability to ‘act back’ on conditioning instates the agent as an active body, who strategically adopts ‘stances’ to society to regulate the relations between person and society. Taking a stance (discussed further in Chapter Six) proves the existence of an active agent who can deliberate purposefully about social contexts, with the capacity to conceive of concerns, projects, and practices. What holds this sequence in traction is the agents’ reflexive dialogue about their unique configuration of concerns that gives them a modus vivendi; it is in this nexus between their contexts and concerns that agency is exercised (Archer 1995: 343).

. . . it is the quintessential reflective ability of human beings to fight back against their conditioning (not nullifying it for if nothing else it dictates language and topic), giving them the capacity to respond with originality to their present context (Archer 1996: xxvi).

Reflexive deliberations make the interface between contexts and agential projects explicit. As stated, it is not personal properties that interact directly with structural or cultural properties, but subjects’ powers, as expressed through the pursuit of their projects, that activate the powers of social forms. The reflexive deliberation over a life course is guided by generic questions posed and answered, which can be distilled into two main reflexive foci: ‘what do I want?’ and ‘how do I go about getting it?’

How individuals answer these questions involves a dialectical interplay between their ‘concerns’ (as they reflexively define them) and their ‘contexts’ (as they reflexively respond
to them) (Archer 2007), derived through an internal conversation. To explain agents’ actions, one has to understand agents’ intentions, arrived at through external ‘inspection and inner dialogue’. Archer’s ten mental activities involved in inner dialogue, namely, to plan, rehearse, mull over, decide, re-live, prioritise, imagine, clarify, imagine conversations, and budget (2003: 161; 2007b: 91), are interspersed among three main phases of the life-long internal conversation. This temporal aspect of inner dialogue comprises three phases: discernment, deliberation and dedication, which are discussed briefly below.

**Discernment**

This is fundamentally about the subject’s assembling reflective, retrospective and prospective considerations about the desiderata to which he or she is drawn, through an inner dialogue that compares and contrasts them (Archer 2000). It is an inconclusive moment of review but it begins to clarify our relationship to our reigning concerns because, as ‘strong evaluators’, we cannot be lacking in concerns. It clarifies our predominant satisfactions and dissatisfactions with our current way of life.

**Deliberation**

This is concerned with exploring the implications of endorsing a particular cluster of concerns, from those pre-selected as desirable, to the subject during the first moment. This is performed by disengaging the demands, merits and likely consequences of that constellation of concerns were the subject to embrace them. Deliberation produces a very provisional ranking of the concerns with which a subject feels that he or she should and can live. Often this phase of the process entails visually projecting the modus vivendi that would be involved, while listening to the emotional commentary that is provoked and evoked when imagining that particular way of life.

**Dedication**

This represents the culminating moment of experimentation between thought and feeling that has occupied the preceding phases. The subject has to decide not only whether a particular modus vivendi is worth living, but also whether or not he or she is capable of living such a life. Within internal conversation, dedication is a phase of inner dialogical struggle, because the completion of the dialogue has to achieve both prioritisation of and alignment with the concerns endorsed, but also resignation to those relinquished.

**2.3.3.1 Archer’s modes of reflexivity**

Reflexivity has also been analysed in its multiple dimensions in Archer’s later work (2003;
2007; 2012a) where she proposes an ‘operationalization of the concept of reflexivity in view of its empirical implementation’ (Caetano 2014: 1). Based on empirical analysis of biographical interviews with a cohort of 20 people from very heterogeneous social backgrounds in the United Kingdom, Archer (2000; 2003) identified a typology of four modes of reflexivity: communicative, autonomous, meta- and fractured reflexives. Through these four modes, which capture agents’ reflexive proclivities, we learn about agents’ origins, orientation and outcomes. According to Archer (2000), and in a nutshell, the Communicative Reflexive Mode fosters social integration through collectivism, contextual continuity, and morphostasis, with no systemic development of structure and culture. The Autonomous Reflexive Mode intensifies systemic development at the cost of reducing social integration through a focus on individualism and instrumental rationality. The Meta-Reflexive Mode has the tendency to subvert the social and the systemic, in the search for an ideal society that is well intentioned and with good values that uphold cultural ideals, encouraging a morphogenesis of societal values to usher in alternatives to repression. The last mode, which is the Fractured Reflexive Mode, is counter-productive to social change as agents here are disconnected from social life and are ineffectual in their actions and import.

While Archer’s sociological analysis using the four modes of reflexivity offers pioneering and substantial insight into the theory of reflexivity, I have refrained from categorising my participants into modes of reflexivity as this has little explanatory power for the explicit research goals and objectives in this study. I fully recognise that the strength of Archer’s reflexive typology lies in its ‘diagnostic’ value in terms of the relationship between reflexivity and social mobility, but in this study I am not exploring the social mobility of new academics in the institution. I am interested in the propensity of new academics’ reflexive deliberations to talk back to conditions for agency at the university. Further, while Archer’s typology was used to develop a theory of social change and mobility, it is not easily applicable to or generalisable in the South African context, which itself is in a process of change and transition. The modes of reflexivity, based on a UK cohort, do not consider social origins, socialisation and differentiated contexts to be relevant in explaining reflexivity (Caetano 2014), which are critical in the South African context.

Also, within the internal conversation framework, and while Archer takes into account the possibility of changes in the dominant modes of reflexivity of a given actor, her empirical device does not enable her to validate these trajectories (Caetano 2014). This is corroborated in another study in the field of Information Systems, where De Vaujany (2008) found that agents and actors did not fit easily into a single category: ‘depending on the kind
of technology they were discussing (e-mail systems, groupware, specific intranet tools, etc.),
many interviewees evinced several kinds of internal conversations (see the internal auditor).
The same person could thus be communicative in his/her interaction with email, autonomous
with the groupware technology, and meta-reflexive with the Web’ (Ibid.: 68). Even in a ‘soft’
reading of the data in my study, I could tell that my research participants straddled many
modes, depending on the situation they were in and what they were being called on to do.
New academics’ internal dialogues in this study, made explicit through externalised
processes such as the photo voice stories, reflect both social origins and socialisation at the
university. Categorising these reflections into different modes would not offer significantly
greater explanatory power than the current analysis does, because the focus of this study is
not on social mobility, as in Archer’s case.

2.3.4 The mediation of structure and culture through human agency

Margaret Archer, in her social realist theory (1995; 2000), offers a fully theorised account of
what it means to be human and how this is linked to agency. ‘Agency’ points to the capacity
of people to act on their social worlds in a voluntary way, based on their personal and
psychological constitutions. The double-loop of people acting on themselves while being
acted on is salutary to the existence and acknowledgement of the human agent as having
independent powers and properties. This is unlike ‘Modernity’s Man’ and ‘Society’s Being’
discussed earlier, which Archer (2000) critiques, not only because these are under-
stratified and impoverished models of agency which result in under- or over-socialised
human beings, but also because they are both ‘thin’ accounts of human agency (Clegg
2005) with little explanatory power.

Agents, whom Archer always refers to in the plural sense, are people who operate in specific
contexts that are structurally and culturally nuanced. The individual shapes his or her identity
by prioritising concerns, and exercises agency in a social context with an acquired self-
understanding and a broader social understanding of the relationship between the self and
the broader context (Wheelahan 2007). Archer’s model of morphogenesis is predicated upon
active agents, where morphogenesis formulates how we both shape society and are also
shaped by it, through examining the interplay of the distinctive sets of emergent causal
powers (Archer 1995: 308). The extent to which agents can effect change depends on their
ability to negotiate the enablements and constraints that structural and cultural contexts
afford them (Archer 2000). The way that they do this is through their powers of critical
reflection upon their social contexts and of creatively redesigning their social environments,
their institutional or ideational configurations, or both. How it is possible for human beings to
become agentially effective in these ways, namely in evaluating their social contexts, creatively envisaging alternatives, and collaborating with others to bring about their transformation, is at the heart of Archer’s argument on agency. It is also the focal point of the analysis of narratives of mediation (see Chapter Five) in this study.

The use of the terms ‘human’ and ‘agent’ are used quite specifically but not interchangeably because Archer’s agent, while emergent, is not reducible to the human being. Being human has everything to do with our embeddedness in the world and our relations with the world. Being an agent has everything to do with the social context and involves the causal powers proper to agency itself, which enable people to reflect upon their social context and act reflexively towards it, either individually or collectively. Being an agent is not possible outside the context of social forms, their relations, and people who inhabit social contexts. Without these, there is no drawing on anything in the person that is agential. Only by virtue of powers as agents can human beings be active shapers of their socio-cultural contexts, rather than passive recipients. These are the personal powers necessary for giving an account of how we contribute to shaping society and are dependent upon the realisation of universal human powers, such as self-consciousness and a concept of self. From the self, the agent emerges to take its social place in society, never forgetting the human being who gave rise to it, and persists in shaping its course in the world. From the agent grows the social actor. The human being is thus both logically and ontologically prior to the social being, whose subsequent properties and powers need to build upon human ones (Archer 2000: 190). In summation then: an appreciation of how ‘agency’ relates to being human in a non-conflationary exchange is crucial to understanding Archer’s theory of agency (Archer 2000).

In this study, the structural and cultural conditions at the university are mediated through the exercise of new academics’ agency through a nuanced and complex unfolding of different sets of emergent powers and properties. When new academics confronted their contexts replete with conditioning influences, various properties were triggered or activated. These emergent properties had a bearing on choices and actions, and the actual implementation of agents’ reflexive decisions in turn had a bearing on the structural and cultural contexts such as classrooms, departments and faculties. As independent and autonomous sets of powers, these actions, their discursive constructions and their implications could not be ‘diagnosed’ or predicted in advance, in the open system of the university. Rather, new academics’ narratives of mediation (See Chapter Five) offer rich accounts of the interplay between these various powers and properties. How new academics exercise agency reveals much about their PEPs, but also illuminates the underlying and systemic conditions that influence events.
and experiences at the Empirical and Actual levels in the HE system. Professional development programmes, especially for new academics, would benefit from adopting similar critical perspectives, so that staff development interventions are more reflexively and more responsively designed to address specific concerns in HE (see Chapter Seven).

2.3.4.1 Emergent properties

Society is made up of structural, cultural and agential emergent properties that share internal and necessary relations (Archer 1995), which cannot be reduced to interpersonal relationships or people. Emergent properties can be external and contingent, that is, the two can exist on their own for they are existentially independent but contingent. Emergent properties are not aggregations because they can and do modify the powers of people.

A structural emergent property (SEP) depends upon material resources, both physical and human. These include systems, institutions and roles that are dependent on material resources and their distributions. SEPs such as distributions, roles, institutional structures, and social systems in material terms are the outcomes of previous social interaction, and these necessary and internal relations confront the agents of the next cycle and are relatively enduring.

Cultural emergent properties (CEPs) comprise ideas, beliefs and ideologies implicit in discourses. CEPs develop as ideas, beliefs, values, and rules, and become part of the cultural landscape, while agential emergent properties (PEPs) come about as people interact in different contexts that require them to exercise different sets of powers as part of new groups or where individuals’ interactions are challenged within the natural, practical or social realms of reality (Archer 1996). Emergent powers are exercised in the interplay between structure, culture and agency, and by examining this interplay one can probe if culture is more significant than structure (or vice versa), to account for how their causal power is mediated through agency (Vandenberghe 2005).

SEPs and CEPs, emergent from the structural and cultural contexts in which agents are located, influence agential choices and action. Results of past actions through anterior agential action on structure and culture constitute ‘first-order emergent properties’ (Archer 1995); ‘results of these results’ also condition action and are known as second-order emergent properties; while third-order emergent properties refer to relations between structure and culture. Agents’ choices of action (which are different for different people) depend on and are conditioned by a combination of all three influences. In other words, all
three sets of emergent properties are mediated through human agency (Ibid.: 225, 228, 325). In this study, the SEPs and CEPs activated and triggered by agents’ PEPs in the context of the university exert influences of enablement and constraint on new academics and their choices. Such is the nature of conditioning in the domain of structure and culture.

2.3.4.2 Conditioning

The term ‘conditioning’ is a transitive verb, that is, to condition needs something to be conditioned. All structural influences (i.e. the generative powers of SEPs and CEPs) shape the situations in which agents find themselves, but these are mediated by people themselves. There are thus two sets of powers: powers of social forms to impinge upon agents and the power of agents when they respond. Conditioning is not and cannot be a unilateral activity accentuating how situations are moulded for us (Archer 2007a). The full mediatory process ‘is a single story of the interplay between objectivity and subjectivity but in a way that recognizes the PEPs of human agents; the most powerful one being reflexive deliberation’ (Archer 2007a: 342). Conditioning is also not eternal or fatalistic, as agents do not have to be ‘dispositionally reconciled to their experiential lot’ (Archer 1995).

The generative powers of SEPs and CEPs shape the contexts in which people find themselves and condition different courses of action for those differently placed by supplying different reasons for deliberation. Agents mediate the tendential powers inherent in material and ideational structure by considering a variety of options, but the link between structure and agency is via social conditioning, in the form of constraints and enablements. From a CR perspective, this link is anti-conflationary and non-discursive.

Although structures are activity dependent, they are irreducible to current practices as agents can choose to respond to conditioning in a variety of ways (Archer 1995). They do not necessarily become victims of their circumstances. While circumstances that confront each new generation are not of their making, they do affect what contemporary agents can make of them (structural and cultural elaboration) and how they reconstitute themselves in the process (agential elaboration). Agents can and do mediate the objective influences which condition their action patterns by using the strategic directional guidance that conditioning provides (Archer 1995). However, conditioning can go undetected and be unacknowledged. At any given time, structures are the results of human interaction, and may be unintended, unwanted and unacknowledged (Archer 1995). Exercising PEPs does not depend on agents knowing or understanding the generative mechanisms that cause the
structuring of situations, therefore agential subjectivity can be entwined in the conditioning even without agents’ awareness (Archer 2007).

2.3.4.3 Constraints and enablements

SEPs and CEPs as features of contexts have situational powers that restrict or enable agents’ projects. It is only their specific relationship to the particular projects of particular agents in particular positions that allows us to call their conditional influence a ‘constraint’ or an ‘enablement’. These are relational terms and influence the level of congruence or incongruence between the ‘parts’ and the ‘people’. Thus the same context can give rise to situations which some agents find enabling and others constraining. Change occurs when there is congruence between structural and cultural systems and agents, and stability persists when there is incongruence.

In virtue of the relationship of compatibility or incompatibility between the ‘projects’ (any goal countenanced by a social agent) of people and the generative powers of the ‘parts’, which constitute their environment, the latter exerts a conditional influence upon the former (Archer 1995; 2000). In other words, structural properties (SEPs and CEPs), as features of the situations in which people find themselves, can only foster or frustrate ‘projects’. Moreover, it is only their specific relationship to the particular projects of particular agents in particular positions, which allows us to call their conditional influence a ‘constraint’ or an ‘enablement’. The HE context, with its SEPs and CEPs, serves as conditional influences on the choices that new academics in this study make, given their involuntary placement as primary agents (discussed below).

2.3.4.4 The mediation of structure

Interplay at the level of the Real involves the confluence of emergent properties, although in reality the structural and cultural systems and socio-cultural life are independent but mutually influential and overlap and intertwine. In applying analytical dualism, they are separated for the purpose of analysis, and through this their interplay and mediatory processes can be explored. The effects of the ‘parts’ are mediated and the ‘people’ are the mediatory agents. For Bhaskar (1979), the mediating system should be that ‘of positions (places, functions, rules, duties, rights) occupied (filled, assumed, enacted etc.) by individuals, and of the practices (activities) in which, in virtue of their occupancy of these positions (and vice versa), they engage’, but Archer (1996) asserts that this should not be restricted to occupied roles and their influence. The conditional influence of the parts cannot determine agency, but is
subject to the reflective deliberation of agents who use their PEPs, such as self-monitoring and self-consciousness, to weigh up their concerns. Agents also have intentionality (caused by reasons), which is their personal capacity to entertain projects (goals) and to design strategies to accomplish them. Agential relations themselves exert emergent powers on agents by modifying or exerting causal powers (Archer 1995). I shall now turn to aspects of the mediatory process in the domain of Structure.

2.3.4.4.1 Involuntarism

Agents are all subject to involuntaristic placement through their natal contexts: in other words, they are born into life chances that are not of their making. These life chances are defined by prior distributions of material resources and form part of the conditioning influence through material structures. Situations are defined (not determined) for agents and shape agents’ choices and ideas. They are continuous (all the time) and pervasive (they persist). In this study, the social contexts that new academics find themselves in (or are placed in, such as departments) embody the social forms discussed above. If changes are made to our material resources, this is the result of agential action such as confrontation. The significance is not our inability to change our situations, but altering them is an uneasy choice of challenges and opportunities that carries costs. Agents cannot escape this situational conditioning, but they have to weigh up whether they wish to retain the situational bonuses to accomplish their goals, or overcome the situational problems which provide them with no incentive to continue holding on. In this study, some new academics were able to overcome challenges in their contexts but others, with less incentive to do so, had fewer options based on the opportunity costs involved (see 2.3.10.3 below).

2.3.4.4.2 Vested interests

Vested interests are the means by which structural (and cultural) properties exert a conditional influence on action. An interest is characterised as ‘vested’ if it is built into a social position by the relationship of that position to other positions in the system; if positions change, then so do interests. Actors are motivated to act in their interests, to reproduce advantages or to change disadvantages, especially if they experience their contexts as favourable and rewarding, predisposing them to different courses of action and life courses. Vested interests thus have causal powers. Involuntaristic placement affords different sections of society different vested interests, and the features are both systematic and enduring and are attached to all socially-structured positions (Archer 1995: 203). With vested interests, new academics in this study as active agents decided what their interests were, and why and how they would invest in them. Although many confronted similar conditioning
contexts at the university, different agents made different choices given similar courses of action.

2.3.4.3 Opportunity costs

Structural influences condition action through the opportunity costs associated with different choices. When agents perceive their contexts as frustrating, they choose actions that are designed to eliminate the negative effects but costs are involved in doing so, and agents ‘pay the price’ (Archer 1995: 205) by worsening their situation or perpetuating their under privilege. The costs attached to frustrating or rewarding situations condition (without determining) the interpretations and responses by agents, which in turn exert influences in significant ways. In this study, the conditional influences exerted by opportunity costs shaped new academics’ choices to give up their vested interests when their contextual situations became less rewarding for them.

2.3.4.4 Degrees of freedom

Opportunity costs attached to promoting vested interests by protecting advantages or removing disadvantages depend upon discretionary judgements of agents. The objective distribution of costs and benefits conditions both interpretation and action through the reflexive ability of agents. In choosing a course of action, agents are able to exercise degrees of interpretative freedom about their preferred choices and they use their reflexive ability as agents to do so. These freedoms are curtailed if the constraints of context discourage the promotion or the defence of interests. In any given situation, agents ‘weigh up’ the odds using the degrees of freedom that pertain to the specific course of action. Both material (structural) reasons and normative (cultural) reasons can encourage or discourage certain judgements about action (Archer 1995: 209). In this study, new academics as primary agents and incumbents at the university had fewer degrees of freedom than the more resourced actors in departments, making their mediation of their contexts, in some cases, more challenging.

2.3.4.5 Directional guidance

The direction that agents choose for their actions is guided by distinctive configurations which predispose them towards specific courses of action for the promotion of their interests. ‘Directional’ guidance is created by the relations within and between the various SEPs and CEPs, while ‘strategic’ guidance works by supplying good reasons for particular courses of action in the form of the premiums and penalties associated with following them or ignoring
them, in relation to agents’ vested interests (Archer 1995: 207). Both SEPs and CEPs are relational properties which help to shape situations for agents by creating configurations of ‘situational logics’, which predispose agents towards specific courses of action for the promotion of their interests, thus offering processes of directional guidance. Strategic action is thus conditioned structurally by creating situations of necessary complementarities (stasis), necessary incompatibilities, contingent incompatibilities, and contingent compatibilities.

Whether SEPs and CEPs are congruent or not accounts for their third-order emergent property, that is, the relationship of congruity or incongruity between SEPs and CEPs themselves. These are the ‘results of the results of the results’ of social interaction, which constitute the final conditioning influence upon social interaction, ultimately responsible for conditioning whether the subsequent trajectory is morphogenetic or morphostatic (Archer 1995: 218)

2.3.4.5 The mediation of culture

Interplay occurs where logical relations of the cultural system (CS) intertwine with the causal relations of socio-cultural interaction (S-C). Archer’s approach is to explore how ‘contradictory or complementary relations between the “parts” of the CS map onto the orderly or conflictual relationships between the “people” at the S-C level’. This is what influences whether the outcome is cultural stability or change (Archer 1995: xxi). Holding ideas that are either complementary or contradictory places its holders in action contexts of different situational logics (discussed further). Understanding the situational logics deepens our understanding of the influence of cultural system (CS) properties on the agents who uphold them. As society is an open system, different logics can prevail, and all agents are not involved in all of them while some are involved in several. How agents ally with others in strategic groupings influences institutional reproduction or transformation. A plurality of vested interests in institutional relations entails different types of situational logic that have a direct effect upon the strategy that agents employ. At the outset, these two factors strongly condition who will be involved, how they will proceed strategically, and what resources they have at their disposal, all of which are decisive for institutional morphostasis and morphogenesis.
2.3.5 Situational logics

Institutional configurations of different social formations create situational logics that condition the context at T1, in which agents find themselves and influence their choice of actions. The relationships between SEPs and CEPs may be compatible and complementary (showing high systems integration and propensity for reproduction/morphostasis) or contradictory or incompatible (showing low systems integration and the potential for transformation or morphogenesis). The variations of situational logics may be necessarily or contingently related, constituting relationships that agents are confronted with and which provides strategic guidance for their action (Archer 1995: 216) by predisposing them to serve their interests by defensive, concessionary, competitive, or opportunist modes of interaction with other groups (Ibid.: 217). The situational logic carried through becomes the generative mechanism for change or stability and is a conditioning link between structure and agency.

In this study, Archer’s work on the complementarities and contradictions are used in Chapter Four to analyse the macro-context at the UoT in the context of institutional reconfiguration through the merger between two former technikons. Archer (1995) acknowledges that, while contradictory or complementary relations constitute the underlying mechanisms which create problem-ridden or problem-free situations for agents in social interaction, the types of strategic action provided by situational logics typically apply to large sections of the population, as opposed to individual agents (Kotta, Case and Luckett 2014: 516). As such, situational logics were useful in the present study to analyse how the merger at the UoT conditioned new academics’ socio-cultural interaction in general (see Chapter Four) rather than in their micro and meso contexts of the classroom and disciplinary departments (see Chapter Five) in the actual research.

Archer discusses complementarities and contradictions in each of the domains: structure, culture and agency. The table below (Archer 1995: 303) is provided as a nodal point for a summary of the situational logics shaping structural and cultural morphogenesis at both the systemic and social-interaction levels.
2.3.6 Social realist methodology: the morphogenetic model

Archer’s seminal contribution to the structure–agency debate is the morphogenetic model (M/M), a contribution to practical social theory, which provides a ‘user-friendly’ methodological toolkit for analysis (Archer 1995: 147). The term ‘morphogenesis’, coined by Walter Buckley and derived from his systems theory (Archer 1995), is defined as ‘those processes which tend to elaborate or change a system’s given form, structure or state. In contrast, morphostasis refers to processes which tend to ensure that the system remains unchanged (Archer 1995: 75). The principles of emergence and analytical dualism, which recognise structure, culture and agency as analytically and ontologically separate and distinct, and which possess independent causal powers in the form of emergent properties with relative autonomy, form the basis of the Morphogenesis/Morphostasis (M/M) model (Archer 1995).

As a theory of social change, M/M is neither atemporal nor ahistorical. The central argument in Archer’s morphogenetic approach is that structure and agency can only be linked by analysis of their interplay over time (Danermark et al. 2002). The temporal aspect is thus very important for Archer for examining a problem within a specific period (Archer 1995). Archer (1995) not only attaches importance to the passage of time, but also acknowledges the historicity of the process. As Bhaskar (1979: 49) avers, ‘theory need not be static, but can depict, in abstract fashion, flows, cycles and movements . . . tendentially applicable to concrete historical situations’.

---

Table 1: Cultural and Structural Morphogenesis/Morphostasis at the Systemic Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contradictions</th>
<th>Complementarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>Elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncretism</td>
<td>Systematization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unification</td>
<td>Cleavage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>Polarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>Complementarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Opportunism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematization</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Sectionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Diversification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The morphogenetic task is to account for how the powers of the 'parts' (involuntaristically but non-deterministically) condition the projects of 'people' over time to account for stability or change. Social structures that are activity dependent and autonomous and possess causal powers continue to exert their effects upon agents and actors and their activities, but how they carry over and how they exert their effects is what the M/M approach attempts to theorise. Archer (1995) is at pains to highlight that it is individuals who reproduce as well as change society, and they do so by virtue of conscious and intentional action, even though the results are often unplanned and with unintended consequences (Danermark et al. 2002).

‘Human agents do not create structure; they reproduce or transform it’ (Archer 1995: 148), and in Archer’s terms morphogenesis is always a transformation of morphostasis. The M/M approach thus conceptualises the conditional effects of structure upon action in terms of the former’s supplying reasons for different courses of action to those who are differently positioned. In my study, the M/M focus is on the interplay between structural and cultural conditioning contexts at a UoT; on how new lecturers, as agents, evade, strategise, disrupt or choose not to engage with the opportunities and frustrations that inhere; and on how this in turn leads to morphogenesis or morphostasis in the three domains: structure, culture, and agency. What emerges from socio-cultural interaction cannot be predicted, but the indeterminacy can be attributed to a stratified view of the subject, whose different properties and powers (PEPs) in an open system produce different kinds of agency.

Archer’s M/M approach is congruent with Bhaskar’s Transformational Model of Social Action (TMSA) on many counts, and the crucial similarity between TMSA and M/M (Archer 1995: 148) is that both identify three distinct temporal phases, which in reality overlap and intertwine with one another: a 'before' (pre-existing social forms), a 'during' (the process of transformation itself) and an ‘after’ (the transformed, since social structures are only relatively enduring), with the last phase becoming the start of a new cycle.

For the purposes of analysis, Archer uses analytical dualism to separate these phases in order to identify which processes are more influential on whom and why. In this study, analytical dualism allows for richer analytical ability and greater explanatory power in understanding how new academics mediate their contexts over time. The M/M is thus upheld and implemented to analyse properly the cyclical emergence, reproduction and transformation of structural and cultural systems at the university in relation to new academics and their agential choices. Archer’s (1995) morphogenetic cycles consist of three chronological frames, namely, conditioning, interaction and elaboration phases.
T1: Conditioning

The first phase (T1) is a period of systemic conditioning where $T = \text{time}$. In this phase, agents find themselves in contexts not of their making and over which they have no control. Systemic features of the structural and cultural contexts have already been shaped by SEPs and CEPs generated by an anterior cycle, where a social or cultural structure lays down conditions in the form of constraints and enablements for the actions of agents. These structures predate agential interactions, intentions and concerns, but condition and shape the circumstances agents involuntarily find themselves in, predisposing (not determining) that they take up certain courses of action.

T2–3: Social interaction

The second phase (T2–T3) is a period of social interaction where, in response to the conditioning influences, people choose certain actions over others, in an open system. Society is ‘peopled, and being peopled can always be re-shaped through human innovativeness’ (Archer 1995: 166). In this phase, human agency is exercised through mediation. Here social agents have influence over their social conditions based on reasons for retaining benefits or overcoming obstacles. These are further influenced by agents’ vested interests, bargaining power, and objective premiums and penalties for supporting or repudiating vested interests and material conditions (Archer 1995). There are also unintended consequences of interaction (context dependent) so the outcomes of this phase cannot be predicted. In this phase, primary agents interact with corporate agents to create the third level of agency, that is, social actors, who occupy social roles in ways that change their identities and the social roles themselves.

T4: Elaboration

The last phase (T4) is a period of systemic elaboration where the outcomes of the interaction
between agents and contexts result in the structure in question being reproduced or transformed, that is, the system is elaborated (Danermark et al. 2002). The outcome of these interactions in turn shapes the structures that future agents encounter and, T4 becomes the conditioning context (T1) for the next morphogenetic cycle (Archer 1995). Using a series of continuous cycles, which are interlinked with similar anterior and posterior cycles, Archer can account for genesis or stasis of social relations within the domains of structure, culture and agency respectively, as shown below.

**Archer's morphogenetic cycles of structure, culture and agency**
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**Figure 2: The morphogenesis of structure**

The practical application of morphogenetic/static analysis to the structures which constitute the social system entails four basic propositions:

i. There are internal and necessary relations within and between social structures (SS).

ii. Causal influences are exerted by social structure(s) (SS) on social interaction (SI).

iii. There are causal relationships between groups and individuals at the level of social interaction (SI).

iv. Social interaction (SI) elaborates upon the composition of social structure(s) (SS) by modifying current internal and necessary structural relationships and introducing new ones where morphogenesis is concerned, and reproduces the same ones when morphostasis applies.
Application of morphogenetic/static analysis to the cultural register which constitutes the social system also entails four basic propositions:

i. There are internal and necessary relations within the cultural system (CS).
ii. Causal influences are exerted by CS on socio-cultural interaction (S-C I).
iii. There are causal relationships between groups and individuals at the level of S-C I.
iv. Socio-cultural interaction elaborates upon the composition of the CS by modifying current internal and necessary structural relationships or reproducing them.

Archer describes the morphogenesis of the cultural system in terms of the disjunction between the relations of contradiction and complementarity between the ‘parts’ of the system on the one hand, and the relations of cooperation and conflict between ‘people’ on the other. When the contradictions between the ideas of the cultural system mesh with the social conflicts of the life-world, morphogenesis ensues; in the opposite case, morphostasis is more likely (Archer 1995).

The morphogenesis of agency occurs at many levels. Agency, which leads to structural and cultural elaboration, is itself elaborated in the process and is systematically transformed. In
the same process by which people bring about social transformation, they are themselves changed as people. This process is called a 'double morphogenesis'. As discussed, in a 'triple morphogenesis' the particular social identities of individual social actors are transformed in relation to the role array available at that time.

The link between Phase I (T1) and Phase II (T2 and T3) exerts its conditional influence in the distribution of vested interests and works by confronting agents with different situational logics for their attainment (Archer 1995: 311). The connective mechanism between Phase II (T2 and T3) and Phase III (T4) works through 'exchange transactions' and power relations, which are both responsible for social elaboration. Transformation or reproduction originates in the second phase of the morphogenetic cycle via socio-cultural interaction.

In using resources to transact exchanges to attain goals, the initial bargaining positions of the groups are important, and the differential availability of different resources to various agents constitutes their bargaining power. The position of the vested interest groups and the availability of the resources are crucial to distribution of resources and bargaining power (Archer 1995). The interaction of groups with low or high access to resources is constrained or supported in the following ways (Archer 1995: 312):

1. Agents with low access to all resources will be in the weakest bargaining position.
2. Agents with differential access to all resources will be in a stronger bargaining position.
3. Agents with high access to all resources will be in the best bargaining position.

It follows that those with high access to resources can bring about major changes, while those with least access are limited in their ability to modify arrangements. The negotiating strengths of resource holders are a result of the result of prior interaction (second order), and are an important relational aspect as well. In this study, it was important to consider how new academics as agents stood in relation to one another, and how corporate agents got on with one another to pull together to attain joint or mutually-compatible goals. Negotiating strength arises in exchange situations when power influences interaction. The effect of (first order) bargaining power is to define who can bring various of resources to bear in the struggle to promote vested interests when confronted by (second order) constraints or enablements arising from SEPs and CEPs (Archer 1995: 302).
2.3.7 The significance of critical and social realism for this study

Margaret Archer's social realist theory (1995; 2000; 2003) provides the theoretical framework for understanding the development and exercise of human agency among new academics in this study. Social reality is activity dependent: it needs human action for change, stability or continuation. This is particularly relevant to my study as it reinstates human beings as creators of their own destiny and not epiphenomena of each other. ‘Structure and culture do not constitute two moments of the same process; rather they refer to radically different things' (Archer 2000). Sayer (2000) argues that our understanding of the world is also context dependent. New academics entering the particular social and cultural context of the university conceive of the world differently; how they choose to act in and on the world is understandably different as well.

Given that HE is becoming an increasingly contested terrain (see Chapter One), more attention should be given to how academics (new and established) respond to HE contexts and how they negotiate their agency (Delanty 2008), whether to thrive or to merely survive as academics (Mathieson 2011). In this study, new academics entering the field inhabit HE social and cultural contexts not of their creation (Archer 2000), yet they actively engage to pursue courses of action that they do create. Using a range of personal emergent powers, they respond to their social and cultural contexts (see Chapter Five) in unique ways. Whatever their courses of action, there is a particular understanding of educational practice, whether as a socio-cultural (Lave and Wenger 1991), or socio-political conceptualisation at their institutions (Åkerlind 2003; Trowler and Wareham 2007). This situatedness has a profound influence (non-deterministically) on new lecturers' ability to act, reflect, change or reproduce existing practices that serve their interests, and the interests of HE broadly.

Archer's social realism enables a rich account of the practices and choices of these new academics as their agency unfolds in real time, rather than through some static or detached perspective that avoids recourse to human subjectivity (Kahn 2009). This increases the scope for newcomers to shape and change HE in ways that are innovative, relevant and emancipatory for the sector as a whole. This also advances the vision that HE and academic staff development programmes should play an important and effective role, not only in how new academics are inducted into HE, but also in how they may be sustainably encouraged to continue engaging with teaching and learning practice, and other aspects of being an academic in HE today. Professional development programmes are in a position to offer a positive conditioning influence on the continued development of new academics as they shape their power and properties as corporate agents, enabling their strategic
morphogenesis and involvement in resource re-distribution at strategic levels of the university, to shape social change in HE and beyond.

2.3.8 Criticisms of Archer’s theory of agency

There have been many criticisms of Archer’s work but this does not imply a wholesale rejection of her theory. Archer’s critics enable a robust interrogation of her theory of agency, and as such strengthen the existing explanatory power of social realist conceptual tools. For purposes of this discussion, I will focus attention mainly on those criticisms that have a direct bearing on my study. Limitations of space and time prevent me from engaging fully with some of the broader critiques of Archer in the literature.

As discussed already, criticism is lodged mainly against Archer’s theory of reflexivity and her typology of reflexive modes. While her focus on reflexivity is vital to the advancement of reflexivity as an imperative (Archer 2012a; Carrigan 2013), the emphasis on the internal dialogue in the different modes of reflexivity is not the only means of mediating structure to agency (Caetano 2014). Archer acknowledges this possibility mainly in terms of the communicative reflexive, but what became evident with the group of new lecturers in this study, regardless of their predominant mode of reflexivity, was the need to communicate with the group when reflecting on their choices and decisions. This does not make them ‘communicative reflexives’ in the strict sense of Archer’s typology, but highlights the interactional nature of reflexivity itself and the human need to share thoughts and views with others. The external conversations people have with one another in specific social contexts are also important in the explanation of human actions.

According to Caetano (2014), limitations in Archer’s approach also include the weak role ascribed to social origins and to socialisation; the non-acknowledgement of the internalisation of exteriority processes and of other social mechanisms mediating structure and agency; and the strong emphasis on contextual discontinuity and incongruence in the analysis of social change. For Caetano, the process of externalising is more than an extension of internal dialogues: it is a different form of reflexivity and mediation with its own specificities, which contribute equally to the definition and negotiation of personal concerns and projects (Caetano 2014: 8). Building on this argument, Benton (2007) criticises Archer for her emphasis on ‘inner’ instead of ‘outer’ conversations. What seems to be unclear for Benton is why inner conversation is so crucial to Archer’s argument for the irreducibility of personal to social identity. He suggests that Archer has used the inner conversation to save individual agency and identity from undifferentiated social conformity, but he questions why a
differentiated personal identity is more likely to arise from inner rather than outer conversations. I think his critique is relevant to the development of Archer’s theory of agency in relational terms: why does it matter whether we arrive at a modus vivendi between our different emotional dispositions and commitments by way of an inner conversation with ourselves, or by way of an outer conversation with friends, members of the family or other acquaintances? Benton asserts that self-clarification can arise as a result of external dialogues no less than through introspection (Benton, 2007).

The real danger is that interpersonal relations may become overshadowed if the ‘internal conversation is privileged at the expense of the external conversation’ or, if there is ‘primacy to the primary agency of persons over the collective action of groups’ (Archer 2007: 44). Of course, Archer herself acknowledges and refutes these assertions and points to the ‘reflexive imperative’ (2012a) as the motivation for keeping internal and external conversations in traction.

Another criticism, advanced by Akram (2013), asserts that Archer’s concept of agency, developed from a CR perspective, is over-reliant on her theory of reflexivity. Archer describes reflexivity as ‘ . . . one of our most distinctive human properties and powers (2000: 2), but such a claim can over-inflate agency and undermine the effect of social structure. When this happens, according to Akram (2013), an overemphasis on reflexivity and intentionality could be interpreted as a return to an individualist approach. Ashwin (2008) cautions that agency is in itself situationally contingent. I think this is relevant in developing countries such as South Africa. As I found in this study, an overemphasis on agency does tend to be salutary to individual and group efforts to mediate difficult and challenging contexts. While this positive account of agency valorises human intentionality and action, it tends to downplay structural and cultural influences that could eclipse accountability. The default reasoning is that if a few (new) academics, as in this study, can rise above their conditions, based on their commitments, concerns and projects, then others can as well. This may well have the tendency to deflect responsibility away from the very structural mechanisms and systems that create the challenging conditions in which academics work.

According to Ashwin (2008: 152), debates around structure and agency continue to raise a series of significant questions, such as: how much are individuals free to decide on their own actions and how much are they constrained by the social settings in which they operate? Are explanations of educational phenomena to be found at the micro level of the individual or at
the macro societal level? To what extent are educational institutions stable entities, or to what extent can they be changed by the actions of individuals?

While these questions are critical in themselves, for purposes of this discussion, I think a formidable counter-balance and response is to be found in the meta-theoretical framing of this study. The CR focus on depth ontology complements Archer’s theory of agency well, and plays a role in uncovering structures and mechanisms (that may not be emancipatory) at the level of the Real. In analysing the interplay between structure, culture and agency, one is forced to hold the ‘parts’ up to the ‘people’ and vice versa, to try and avoid the conflationary tendencies wrought in historical structure–agency debates.

Other critics identify Archer’s lack of emphasis on the temporal dimension in her theory of reflexivity as a severe limitation. Emirbayer and Mische (1998) propose three phases or elements to the internal conversation, which foreground the temporal dimension of reflexivity, consistent with conceptualisations of human agency and temporal orientation. According to the authors (Ibid.), actors shape responses to their environment through iterational, projective and practical-evaluative elements. Firstly, the ‘iterational’ element is linked to past action and practice, where agents locate their reflections in terms of habit or routines. The ‘projective’ element is concerned with the future, and ways of creating new patterns of thoughts and actions. Lastly, the ‘practical-evaluative’ element is located in the present, where agents make choices based on demands and challenges placed on them in their present contexts. Building on this, other authors, such as De Vaujany (2008), link Emirbayer and Mische’s (1998) temporal dimension in reflexivity with the stratified model of agency (see also 2.3.2.3.7). The iterational element of agency

... is tightly linked to the ‘me’ modality of internal conversation, i.e. the image of myself worked out through past actions and their effects (such as routines). The ‘practical evaluative’ element would relate more to the ‘I’ modality and to its judgmental and interpretive powers. In contrast, the ‘projective’ element would be more bound with the ‘you’ modality of internal conversations, a vision of the world as a scope of possibilities (De Vaujany 2008: 7).

In terms of this study, Archer’s morphogenetic argument, which is her seminal contribution to the structure–agency debate, is operationalised through analytical dualism and non-conflationary theorising (Danermark et al. 2002). Archer’s morphogenetic cycles, especially the morphogenesis of agency, provide a solid temporal framing for reflexivity and agency. This offers a suitable response to the aforementioned criticisms regarding the lack of
temporality in reflexivity. Archer introduces the notion of temporality in her morphogenetic argument, as a factor in distinguishing interaction between structure and culture, which are analytically and ontologically separate, with independent causal powers. On the subject of morphogenesis, Vandenberghhe (2005) criticises Archer for foregrounding the morphogenesis of individual agency over that of collective action. He claims that we ‘need to talk to others, with others, about others and about society’ (2005: 6) for a more inclusive and democratic society.

Akram (2013) reminds us that while agency is about intentionality and choice, it is also exercised through unconscious patterns of thought and action. For example, when lecturers internalise and interiorise constraints to the extent that it becomes counter-productive to realising their bigger projects and goals, we are concerned with how they choose their paths, how they are implicated in their reproduction and how they are coerced into different roles through socialisation at the university. Drawing on Hymes, Ashwin (2008) brings into focus the ‘cognitive unconscious’ which signals that structural and agentic factors can influence agents in ways of which they are unaware. This means that an individual’s biography, the institutional setting, the historical moment, and wider socio-political factors can work in ways that are outside the awareness of academics and students. This urges us to question the unconscious and invisible ways in which structure and agency influence agency.

Using gender discrimination as a referent and example of this ‘invisibility’, we see that an activity may be perpetuated not only by those who explicitly act against women’s interests, but also by women and men themselves who are unaware of how, unconsciously or through habit, they reinforce and reproduce constraining structures (Akram 2013). When examining agency and actions, one must not ignore the reasons people state for why they act, or undermine the value of their reflexive deliberations or of external constraints in society. Most importantly, one must also consider the role of the unconscious in the way that structure affects agency and how agents may be complicit in this (Ibid.).

Notwithstanding, Archer’s theory of agency holds immense explanatory promise and power in a study like this, to account for why new academics exercise agency in the way they do. Archer’s emphasis on the internal conversation, made external through relational mechanisms such as the professional development programme reported on here, opens up new ways of exploring the mediation of structure and culture to agency, which is the central tenet in social realist theory and a central concern of this study.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

... it is to the artistic to which we must turn, not as a rejection of the scientific, but because with both we can achieve binocular vision. Looking through one eye never did provide much depth of field (Eisner 1981: 9).

3.1 Introduction

This doctoral study endeavours to understand the processes and mechanisms that influence the exercise of agency among new lecturers at a UoT. Understanding ‘methodology’ as an umbrella term, this chapter elucidates why the research was undertaken, how the research problem was defined, the range of data that was generated and gathered, the methods that were chosen, and the analytical strategies and frames that were used. The study is explanatory in nature in that it seeks to explain and account for the conditions enabling or constraining agency among new academics in HE.

This methodology chapter thus captures the research architecture and framework of the study and weaves together the ‘golden thread’ of the conceptual argument to show how the theory, data and analysis align to guide the logical and sequential design of the research methods. The methodological approach also complements the theoretical and meta-theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter Two, and affirms the critical realist ontological stance adopted in this study. It ensures that internal coherence and internal logic are maintained, to demonstrate the rigour and integrity of the theoretical frameworks employed. My aim in this chapter is thus to make explicit the relationship between the object, purpose and methods of the research and to provide a context for understanding how the theory and data link.

3.2 Locating the study

As social beings, our worldviews include our beliefs about how knowledge is produced, the nature of reality, and the enactment through practice. In other words, researchers adopt paradigmatic stances, which include a basic belief system that guides their investigation (Guba and Lincoln 1994: 105). Presently, the world of social science research operates within several paradigms (Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Mertens 2010), with subsets of views such as positivism, critical realism, interpretivism, and critical theory, instantiated through many paradigm shifts (Kuhn 1962). Pledging allegiance to specific paradigms (Kuhn 1962:
177) can sometimes lead to becoming locked into or ‘trapped’ into a specific way of looking at reality or truth. To avoid entrapment, progressive researchers suggest a conceptualising of paradigms on a continuum, where proliferation (Lather 1991) rather than rigidity is entertained, enabling the researcher to select frames that best suit the research purposes. Methodological choices depend on what one is trying to do rather than a commitment to a particular paradigm, and different modes of research allow us to understand different phenomena that may require the use of different methodologies (Deetz 1996). No matter the paradigmatic framework, researchers make choices about what and how to research (Mertens 2010), but they should also be cognisant of the philosophical beliefs that underlie their choices.

In this study, the philosophical or paradigmatic assumptions of realism are upheld (see Chapter Two), namely that knowledge and understanding of the real world is independent of the world that exists. The realist orientation to research shows a collection of logically held together assumptions, concepts, and propositions, that orientates investigative thinking about the nature of reality (Bogdan and Biklen 1982: 30) and is achieved by (fallibly) naming and describing the generative mechanisms that operate within it, which lead to the events that may be observed (Danermark et al. 2002). Identifying unobservable mechanisms is a great challenge within a critical realism framework (Crinson 2007). While Sayer (1992; 2000) and Danermark et al. (2002) have contributed significantly to the development of CR methodology, there is a lack of explicit methodology on data analysis for generative mechanisms (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011). Bhaskar (1998) suggests that one starts with theoretical description to retroduction of possible causes, and elimination of alternatives to identify the generative mechanisms or causal structure at work.

This study is part of a commissioned National Research Foundation (NRF) inquiry into the social inclusion of students in HE (see Chapter Zero). As such, it is an applied educational research study, concerned with explanation rather than testing theory or developing generalisations. The central concern of this study is how a group of new academics, after a semester-long professional development programme (the Teaching Development Programme or TDP) in HE teaching, identify their concerns and projects in education and how they exercise agency in mediating conditions to translate their concerns in teaching and learning into projects in their context at the UoT. A further aim of this research is to contribute to educational development within the field of higher education using relevant and critical sociological theories (Ashwin 2008; Trowler 2005). The data generated in this study, and produced through a collaborative and participatory process, was achieved through the
use of innovative research methods such as photovoice and other participatory learning and action methods to make explicit the tacit and often taken for granted assumptions regarding new academic practice. It further suggests that the repertoire of research relationships and processes practised in HE today needs to be extended.

3.3 Research question

Drawing on Social Realism as a meta-theoretical framework (Archer 1995; 1996; 2000; 2003), the focus of this research study is located at the level of the Real in the domain of Agency. It involves looking at how individuals fallibly understand, exercise and reflect on their voluntary efforts (agency), given the opportunities and constraints (through structural and cultural systems) that the context of a UoT provides. It explores the varying levels of agency exercised by new academics as they try to make sense of their teaching and learning contexts, analysed in specific ways that relate to:

- Voluntary efforts of involuntarily placed primary agents
- Efforts to translate concerns into projects and practices through reflexive deliberation
- Mediation of enabling and constraining conditions.

In keeping with the broad goals above, the main research question is:

**What conditions enable or constrain the exercise of agency among new academics in higher education, conducive to the social inclusion of students?**

By analysing the reflexive deliberations and the internal conversations of new academics, this study accounts for the concrete courses of mediation taken by them, which are driven through their concerns in relation to education but linked to their sense of self-worth and performative achievement in their teaching contexts (Archer 2007a). As mentioned already, I am interested particularly in whether new academics draw on the discourses of social justice and social inclusion within and outside of HE when they formulate and develop their projects, or do new academics, shaped by more personal ambitions related to individual aspirations in climbing the ‘corporate’ ladder, draw on discourses related to the production of workers for a global economy? The overarching research goal is to ascertain whether these contingencies serve to include or exclude students in HE. The research design is thus concerned with agential framing within a social justice context and agenda in South African higher education.
3.3.1 Research sub-questions

Agents’ internal conversations, which mediate social structures and human action, are textured by three questions (Archer 2007a). These questions form the basis for this study’s sub-questions. In the examples below, I discuss how each of Archer’s sub-questions (Ibid.) relates to my study:

**Why do people act at all? What motivates them and what are they (fallibly) trying to achieve by endorsing given courses of action?**

My study entails an examination of the beliefs, values and attitudes held by new academics that relate to their ultimate, personal concerns and drive the ways in which they conceptualise and formulate their teaching and learning practices in their specific contexts.

**How do social properties influence the courses of action that people adopt?**

This involves an interrogation of how the objective structural domain at the UoT, through its departments, faculties, policies, and committees, constrains or enables agency, as well as how the cultural powers, embedded in the ideational system of discourses prevalent at the UoT and HE, and which shape agency, are reflexively mediated by new academics in their teaching practices.

**What exactly do people do?**

This entails an exploration of the different projects that new academics embark on in their socio-academic contexts and how the differences in their processes of reflexivity enable or constrain different levels of human action. The examination of the interplay between structure and culture in situational contexts should capture and account for the nature of the projects, how they relate to concerns, and how they link with the idea of inclusive practices.

3.4 Research orientation

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), four sets of philosophical beliefs guide the choices regarding the research process: ontology (reality), epistemology (knowledge), methodology (inquiry) and axiology (ethics). These four sets of beliefs will be described and presented now in relation to the conceptual and methodological concerns of this study.

3.4.1 Ontology

Using a critical realist ontological positioning (see Chapter Two), this study is guided by ‘depth realism’ (Bhaskar 1975), which is the philosophical belief that the nature of reality is
stratified, differentiated and layered. As discussed in Chapter Two, a central tenet of the critical realist ontology is the division of reality into different domains with specific properties. In CR, the research aim is to observe and analyse the domains of the Empirical and the Actual to discover the non-observable structures and mechanisms, independent of the events they generate (Outhwaite 1983). At the domain of the Empirical we can make observations of ‘experiences’ and of the phenomena we study. These experiences constitute parts of the ‘events’, which we can identify at the domain of the Actual, which in turn is the outcome of ‘mechanisms’ at the domain of the Real (Jeppesen 2005).

This critical realist research study acknowledges that, because the intransitive world is real and independent of our knowledge of it, we come to know the world, however fallibly and corrigibly, by examining people and their experiences of the world at a transitive level. By analysing the interplay of the structural, cultural and agential domains at the level of the Real, we come to understand the social world by delving deeper into the underlying levels of reality beneath experience and events. We also come to know the causal mechanisms at work in the domains of structure, culture and agency, which generate the lived experiences and occurrences as we know them. In alignment with this ontological position, the design of this study is necessarily aimed at reaching to underlying layers of new academics’ realities to see how events and experiences at the university emerge from the generative mechanisms derived from structural, cultural and agential dimensions or domains in that setting, that either keep things the way they are or account for change. Acknowledging the fallibility and corrigibility of participants’ knowledge of their worlds, the research design of this study incorporates different and varied sources of data to strengthen the accounts of reality. The critical realist emphasis on the importance of multiple measures across multiple sources is an attempt to achieve reliability of the findings (Crinson 2007).

3.4.2 Epistemology

Epistemology is intimately related to ontology and methodology. Where ontology involves the philosophy of reality, epistemology addresses how we come to know that reality, while methodology identifies the particular practices used to attain knowledge of it. The term ‘epistemology’, which comes from the Greek ἐπιστήμη (epistêmê), is the philosophy of knowledge or beliefs about how one might discover knowledge about the world, what constitutes valid knowledge, and how we can obtain it (Bhaskar 1998). It is important for the researcher to examine the key epistemological assumptions in the study as well as the types of relationship between the researcher and participants (Mertens 2010) and who produces the knowledge.
Epistemologically, the aim of Critical Realism is to explain the relationship between experiences, events and mechanisms, and often this relationship is represented in discourses. This perspective emphasises questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’ a particular phenomenon came into being, but the focus is on the explanation of the constitution of empirical phenomena and not on predictions. To do this, critical realists employ different forms of reasoning, such as inductive, deductive, abductive, retroductive and even retrodictive strategies (discussed further in this chapter) to analyse the various domains of reality and to generate knowledge about the relationship between experiences, events and mechanisms (Danermark et al. 2002: 123–172).

Sayer (1992) rejects the notion of scientific objectivity as a naïve belief that facts can ‘speak for themselves’ and only need to be collected as data, this applying as much to qualitative as to quantitative research methods (1992: 45). Theory does not order or structure given observations or data, but rather it ‘negotiates their conceptualisation’ (ibid.: 84). According to the naturalist or constructivist view, knowledge is established through the meanings attached to the phenomena being studied, researchers interact with the subjects of study to obtain data, inquiry changes both researcher and subject, and knowledge is context and time dependent (Coll and Chapman 2000).

Alternatives to traditional qualitative research are gaining ground as a ‘third paradigm’, where knowledge is co-produced in an interactive exchange and the research culture invites participants to contribute to the research project by being involved in various stages of the research (Denzin 2004). It relies on participants to offer beliefs, ideas, and knowledge about a particular phenomenon through a process of active construction and generation of data. This is contrary to the dominant mode of thinking that sees data as being collected, which by inference implies that pre-packaged knowledge lies in wait for harnessing.

### 3.4.3 Methodology: stepping into the ‘third space’

The orientation of this research study is influenced by the notion that there are alternative ways of understanding research and its purpose (Alvesson 2003). A new way of working with research participants and research data signals the move away from externally-imposed denial and detachment of the subject who is doing the research from the object of study, to a reclaiming of the role and involvement of the self, particularly where the self is personally involved (Denzin 2004). This third space provides the framework for understanding research as a ‘hybrid space’ where the researcher and the researched share integrity of process in a mutually beneficial exchange (Denzin 2004). By enacting and embodying the data, that is,
being intimately involved in the research process with participants, the researcher takes a critical stance on the implicit ideology in taken-for-granted assumptions of the traditional paradigm, and asks serious questions about how knowledge is constructed, by whom and for what purpose (Ibid.). Trowler’s (2005) and Ashwin’s (2008) critiques that HE research is too tacit support the need for such interrogations.

Ontologically, the participants and researcher in this study were conceptualised as living, thinking, feeling and performing beings, each with his or her own powers and properties (PEPs) whose multidimensional and dialogic nature called for direct engagement in the research process. To understand the ways participants think, act and feel in relation to their observations and experiences at the levels of the Empirical and Actual, I chose research methods that focus on meaning being created, not discovered (Brew 2002). This enabled a spontaneous, honest and open elicitation of responses, and opportunities to maximise communicative expression and group sharing. Affective filters were thoughtfully managed so that the atmosphere of each data session was conducive to sharing in an authentic way. Within this new framework, data is understood as ideas laden with hidden meanings and research is interpreted as a journey of discovering or uncovering these underlying meanings, possibly leading to transformation (Ibid.).

In exploring these ‘new’ ways of doing research, I have become acutely aware of the need to put both researcher and researched on as equal a footing as possible. Close personal contact with participants was crucial for engaging in real conversations and for empathic understanding. Treating participants as ‘equals’ allowed them to express personal feelings and present a more ‘realistic’ picture than could have been uncovered using traditional interview methods (Fontana and Frey 1994: 371). This was significant to me, as I have had a working relationship with the participants over three years and this knowledge could not be bracketed off but needed to be incorporated as ‘insider’ knowledge. In fact, my insider position was a considerable advantage to the approaches I used and the methods that I identified for this study.

Third space research is also taken to refer to critical research that aims at understanding, uncovering, illuminating, and transforming how aims, dilemmas, tensions and hopes are related to social divisions and power differentials (Denzin and Lincoln 2000). Harvey (1990) defines critical social research as research underpinned by a critical–dialectical perspective which attempts to dig beneath the surface of social structures. This is contrasted with positivistic concerns to discover ‘factors’ of phenomena or to build grand theoretical edifices
to make phenomenological attempts to interpret the meanings and symbolic processes (Harvey 1990:1).

I will now look at the Third Space of research in terms of some of the theoretical and conceptual tools drawn on in the literature that suggest alternative ways of working in this space. As Velazquez (1998) asserts, this form of transformative research empowers the researcher and participants with the knowledge to change power relationships, and research is done so that it can change us and others (Waghid 2000) and the communities we are striving to serve.

3.4.3.1 Narrative methodology

The narrative turn in qualitative research signals a renewal of the narrative as a unit of analysis and a research method, but of importance to this study is the recognition that, as human agents, we tell our lives in stories (not in tables, pie charts and matrices); at the same time we are shaped by the stories we tell (Sandelowski 1991). In addition to the structure–agency debate highlighted in Chapter Two, the ‘narrative’ is used as a research method in this study to make a convincing argument for agency by neither privileging nor denying it, but through participants’ stories. As an extension of educational research, narratives contribute to ways of empowering academics to theorise about their own professional practice as they try to improve the quality of their own and others’ learning (Dhunpath 2000).

There are many forms of narrative inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly 2000; Czarniawska 1998) premised on the notion that we are all ‘storied’ in ways similar to how we are ‘classed’, ‘languaged’, ‘raced’ and ‘gendered’. We are immersed in narrative (Polkinghorne 1988), through our cultural belief patterns, rituals, myths, or even urban legends, as stories are central to almost every conversation (Labov 1997). Experiences, which are life histories of people, consisting not only of facts, but also values, emotions and memories (Clandinin and Connelly (2000: 415) are brought by individuals into educational situations by virtue of their own temperaments, histories, and purposes. Different individuals interact with a given configuration of education in different ways and with different outcomes (Dhunpath 2000). The term ‘narradigm’ coined by Dhunpath (2000) connotes the pervasive quality of the narrative in our lives, which can help us to reconceptualise our studies of teaching and curriculum in fundamentally different ways. Yet the narrative remains an ‘elusive, contested and indeterminate concept’ (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2000: 64–68) in HE. Advocates for this method have called for the interview and research report (loosely referred to as ‘anti-
narrative’) to be rescued from efforts to ‘scientize’ them and to reclaim them as occasions for storytelling (Denzin 2001; Witherell and Noddings 1991).

Narrative inquiry also uses field texts, such as stories, autobiography, journals, field notes, letters, conversations, interviews, family stories, photos (and other artefacts), and life experience as the units of analysis to research and understand the way people create meaning in their lives as narratives. In this study, the river of life and photovoice story are attempts to create a narrative ‘device’ (Czarniawska 1998) to allow for the telling of specific stories in response to specific research questions. These are ‘small stories’ (Georgakopoulou 2003) in comparison with the tradition of big stories or the ‘grand narratives’ (Lyotard 1984), yet they are deep stories of individual challenge and mediation of new academics, echoing their interaction with sites of engagement and conflict at the university against the grand narratives shaping HE currently. From a critical realist and social realist perspective, the challenge for the researcher is to look deeper than the story itself to the meta-narrative, to get to the underlying causes for the experiences (Empirical Level) and events (Actual Level) depicted by narrators in real time.

3.4.3.1.1 Story circles

The story circle method, through which the personal and professional narratives of new academics in this study were shared, is part of the narrative process modelled on a similar method used extensively in digital storytelling workshop processes (Lambert 2006). My involvement as facilitator and participant on a number of digital storytelling workshops and projects as a staff developer informed my understanding of this process as a research method. The purpose of the story circle is for participants not only to share their own stories, but also to provide feedback to others in the group, encouraging participants to reflect on their own subjective positioning in the narrative process. While the participants in this story did not explicitly use storyline elements (Lambert 2006) to structure their stories, as they used photos for this purpose, they were tacitly drawing on their own conventions of storytelling and story writing, which became evident in the chronological sequencing of the photovoice stories (discussed later), that captured new academics’ journeys of individual and collective challenge and strategic action as incumbents in HE. The story-telling experience that took place in the data generation phase of this study involved mini-processes such as listening, witnessing and group dynamics that all led to the full experience of sharing in a space of trust with peers and colleagues.
3.4.3.1.2 Listening and witnessing

Key to telling stories is the act of listening, which involves listening to others, and oneself, and listening to what emerges from the collective (Scharmer 2007). Effective listening requires the creation of open space in which others can contribute to the whole. Storytelling as a professional development activity in this study enabled personal voice to emerge, beckoning the listeners to pay attention to the voices of colleagues as they told their stories. After active listening, participants provided collaborative feedback to one another, as the value of peer review is intrinsic and implied in the story-telling process (Ibid.).

3.4.3.1.3 Spectating versus witnessing

‘Spectating’ a story signifies the privilege of allowing oneself to inhabit a position of distance and separation, to remain in the anonymous crowd and abdicate any possible responsibility, while witnessing is a process in which we do not have the luxury of seeing a static truth or fixed certainty (Boler 1999). Witnessing a story is a dynamic process (Feldman 1992: 5), and as witnesses we undertake our collective responsibilities to ask the critical question: what are the forces that bring about this crisis? Witnessing the power of shared stories validates the voice of the individual storyteller (Lambert 2006). Through collective witnessing, stories are understood in relation to others, and in relation to personal and cultural histories and material conditions (Boler 1999).

3.4.3.1.4 Group dynamics

There are obvious dynamics in the assembly of any group, group members being independent and autonomous beings in an open system, but, in this study, a number of aspects militated against negative dynamics among the group members. The six lecturers had already ‘bonded’ as part of the 2011 TDP cohort, where they were all new to HE, seeking support and guidance in their teaching practices. They experienced the university and institution as a new entity and their sharing of specific challenges was a source of cohesion rather than division. Interactions at an interpersonal level seemed to be focused on the research task at hand, which involved ‘reliving’ some of the emotional, cognitive, and practical highlights they had experienced as a group on the TDP. Where needed, my role as facilitator was invoked to mediate the group dynamics and bring everyone into the fold through probing questions and confirmatory statements. The strength of the story-telling process was due in large part to how well this group had cohered on the TDP, and the extent to which they played down possible negative dynamics in favour of ‘getting on with it’.
3.4.3.2 Narrative as reflexive deliberation

Narrative is a powerful tool in the transfer or sharing of knowledge (stored in stories), bound to cognitive issues of memory, constructed memory, and perceived memory (Bruner 1991), where the focus is on the interpretations of events related in the narratives by the individual telling the story. Internal conversation or reflexive practice (Archer 2000) is a key feature of the narrative method used in this study, providing insight into how agents (new academics in this study) mediated their contexts through embodied and emotional reflection. The story circle was modelled in a safe environment of mutual respect and trust, in which participants were empowered to share personal anecdotes (Lambert 2006). Through their reflexive deliberation in the group (Archer 2003), the narrative served in helping individuals make sense of their lives, particularly through shaping random and chaotic events into a coherent story that made the events easier to handle by giving them meaning (Bruner 1991).

3.4.4 Axiology

Axiologically, the study consciously considered aspects of ethics, values and trustworthiness discussed below. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, critical realists do not take a conventional scientific approach in believing that research can be free of values to be valid. Neutrality and objectivity are striven for, but the ontological status of the ‘researcher and the researched’ is evidence enough that independent powers and properties possessed by entia in an open system cannot be free of theory or values. Some groups are more knowledgeable about certain things than other groups, owing to their positions in society and their involuntary placement. In other words, the critical realist is critical of our ability to know reality with certainty, but also believes that all observations are theory laden and that scientists are inherently biased by their cultural experiences, world views, and so on. ‘Objectivity’ is not seen as a characteristic that resides in an individual (the scientist, for example), who is responsible for putting aside his or her biases and beliefs to see the world as it ‘really’ is, but is enacted as a social phenomenon (Denzin and Lincoln 2005).

Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that rigour, which is generally taken for granted with quantitative methods, has to be attended to differently in qualitative research. They term this ‘trustworthiness’, which refers to the degree to which a reader can have confidence in the integrity, value and worthwhileness of a qualitative study. There are various strategies employed in this study to make the research more transparent and thus more rigorous.
An ‘audit trail’ was kept from start to finish, complete with documents, artefacts and reflections; this comprises a meticulous record of the process of the study so that others can recapture steps and reach the same conclusions, and includes not only the raw data but also evidence of how the data was reduced, analysed, and synthesised, as well as process notes that reflect the ongoing inner thoughts, hunches, and reactions of the researcher.

Post-positivism rejects the relativist idea of the incommensurability of different perspectives, that is, the idea that we can never understand each other because we come from different experiences and cultures (Rudestam 2007). On the contrary, the combination of multiple methods and perspectives in a single study adds rigour, breadth and depth to any investigation (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). Multiple fallible perspectives enhanced by the use of more than one approach to data gathering were thus advanced, and I solicited data from various sources as a means of cross-checking and to make the data ‘trustworthy’ and ‘worthwhile’. The different sources included participants, different methods, and evidence of previously conducted research studies in HE.

By definition, ‘validity’ is ensured by a chain of evidence (Yin 2003) to strengthen relations between data and explanations offered. The realist schema used in the analytical framework (above) in this study provides a chain of evidence to make transparent and explicit all the steps followed in the analysis process. The validity concerns in this study around the data generation and analysis have been addressed through the linking of the data, findings and research question. As I am professionally and academically embedded in staff development work with academics, to support them with their teaching practices through professional development programmes, induction processes, departmental socialisation, and institutional initiatives, I do not see myself as an ‘objective and neutral observer’. This does not mean that this study is compromised in any way because of it; in fact the forms of rigour discussed above are implemented and upheld to counter-balance this. In any case, given each researcher’s individual and unique perceptions and interpretations of phenomena, research is essentially biased to begin with, so there is no point in trying to ‘establish validity’ in any external or objective sense (Trochim 2002).

As a qualitative researcher working within a critical realist framework, and in declaring my positionality upfront by locating myself in the study (see Chapter Zero), I admit that I have a vested interest in this research study offering possibilities for change in HE. I feel encouraged to record my own biases, feelings, and thoughts and to state them explicitly in the thesis (Creswell 2007). The extent to which these ‘researcher confessions’ have
influenced the analysis of data and findings is subordinate, in a critical realist study, to a view of truth and reality that are anyway approximations and not confirmations of 'the truth'. I therefore concur with Creswell (Ibid.) that, in the eclectic process of qualitative data analysis, there is no 'right way' of conducting it. In addition, the critical realist ontological positioning of this study is in itself a philosophical ‘triangulation’ of data in a sense, as it asserts the fallibility and corrigibility of knowledge through judgemental relativism (Bhaskar 1998).

In complying with the ethical aspects of this research, I obtained informed consent from the participants in this study through an information briefing session and a consent form (see Appendix A), outlining the nature of this study, its value and my position as researcher. The consent form indicated the scope of new academics’ participation, which was clarified as voluntary, anonymous, confidential and not binding. Participants were assured that pseudonyms would be used to ensure anonymity as far as possible. I also obtained consent from the Centre for Higher Education Development at the UoT to use the materials generated in the 2011 TDP in so far as they contributed to this study. In addition, I obtained permission from the UoT through their Research Ethics Review Board to interview the six new academics in this study, after which I communicated with the heads of department in the respective faculties to inform them of this study.

3.5 The research design

Research design is often thought of as a logistical problem rather than a logical one (Yin 1989: 29). The function of a research design is to ensure that the evidence obtained enables one to answer the research question as unambiguously as possible. In social research, the logistical issues of sampling, methods of data collection (e.g. questionnaire, observation, document analysis), and the design of questions are all subsidiary to the question of what evidence needs to be gathered. Design, which is also often confused with methods and approaches, does not imply any particular method of data gathering, which can be qualitative or quantitative (Yin 1993: 32). The critical realist ontological position and its depth realism have implications and consequences for the methodology and methods adopted in this study. Instead of generalisations located at the level of the Empirical and the Actual, CR methodology entails abstract research, aimed at theoretical description of mechanisms at the level of the Real.

3.5.1 Qualitative, applied research

This study may be categorised as qualitative, applied education research. It is ‘qualitative'
because it is rich in contextual and cultural information and seeks to understand the research problem from the perspectives of new academics at the UoT by valuing their opinions, beliefs, values and social contexts through vivid textual descriptions. Like human beings, qualitative methods enable flexibility and spontaneity, and allow for open-ended questions to allow participants to answer as naturally and freely as possible, without having to choose from among fixed responses (Fraenkel and Wallen 2006). The affordances of the qualitative approach are thus in keeping with the critical realist notion that the world is an open system (Sayer 1992) where people cannot be controlled or contrived. Moreover, intensive research (discussed below) mainly applies qualitative methods and analysis (Ibid.). Qualitative methods allow for a less formal relationship between researcher and participant, and responses are more generative and real (Fraenkel and Wallen 2006). The researcher is engaged in close listening and reading of the situation, and is aware of the need to probe further to deepen and enrich the responses.

It is ‘applied’ research because it is concerned with finding an answer to a real problem, for example, in higher education, where the question of social inclusion of students is crucial to transformation of the sector and society (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000). Applied research does not focus on the development of theory or generalisations and it is not gathering knowledge for knowledge’s sake (Ibid.).

Sayer (1992) distinguishes between ‘intensive’ and ‘extensive’ research designs that are used to link the abstract or theoretical and the empirical or concrete in Critical Realist terms. The ‘intensive research design’ is used to obtain in-depth knowledge of specific phenomena by focusing mainly on groups whose members may be either similar or different but which actually relate to one another structurally or causally. Intensive research is similar to case study research, but with the express goal of uncovering deep mechanisms:

Both from an understanding-oriented and an action-oriented perspective, it is often more important to clarify the deeper causes behind a given problem and its consequences, than to describe the symptoms of the problem and how frequently they occur (Flyvbjerg: 2001).

3.5.2 Case study research

A case study design is thus an appropriate choice for this intensive qualitative study, as the research addresses explanatory questions (Yin 2003) such as the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the research. In a typical critical realist research design, case studies and unstructured or semi-
structured in-depth interviews are acceptable and appropriate within the paradigm (Danermark et al. 2002). A study of a ‘case’ would be especially effective to observe the interplay between layers (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011). This is in alignment with a critical realist framework that focuses on causality, with a structural and substantial focus on relations and connections (Sayer 1992: 243). Answering the ‘why’ questions involves developing causal explanations, and these cases are thus appropriately referred to as ‘causal case studies (Yin 2003).

The site for this case study is a university of technology, chosen for its unique vocational orientation in HE and its perceived purpose as a differentiated institution (see Chapter Four). Case-study research rests on what one identifies as a case, which can be defined as a person, a classroom, a programme, an organisation or an institution, a problem, or a body of evidence (Rule and John 2011). The case has to be a case of something (Danermark et al. 2002): it is a specific example of something that belongs to a larger category of instances. The HE institution as a site provides a case for an ‘empirical enquiry to investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly defined’ (Yin 2003). The site also provides an orientation to the way the UoT is conceptualised as new academics are inducted into HE, and the conceptualisations of teaching taken up by them as they mediate structural and cultural conditions at the university. This explicates the understanding of what the UoT mission and purpose are in relation to the HE transformation goals.

Within an intensive research approach, a case-study research design is also suitable to study specific, identifiable individual agents in their causal contexts to see their powers and properties activated in their mode of connection to others (Sayer 1992). The professional development programme (the TDP) at the UoT that new lecturers are obliged to attend is an ideal location within this site as it provides a collaborative, participatory, and bounded space, with a shared collective consciousness among new academics in the process of acquiring a secondary discourse (Gee 1990). With the assumption that knowledge and practice are inseparable, and that the structures of social objects are constituted through a set of internal relations, the case offers the possibility of exploring the intersubjective meanings of social practices (Sayer 1992). Textual material derived from narratives and discourses within a realist methodological framework opens up the possibility to understand the dynamics of the social relationships that act to reproduce or bring about a transformation of such social practices (Crinson 2001).
The unit of analysis is thus the ‘new academic’, six of whom were chosen to explore their interaction and their level of agential response with the professional development programme, their departments, and the university. Critical and social realist research practices derive purchase from a concern with what agents actually do, what produces a change, and what counts as causal explanations for that which generates an event or produces an object (Sayer 1992). Embedded in different departments and faculties across the institution, the ‘sample’ is rich in its academic and cultural diversity, shaped by lecturers’ specific domains (Gee 1992). Given the complexity of participants’ contexts, I was able to look at ‘agency’ in a rich and textured way. The individual specificity within a common collaboration enables a thick description of the data (Geertz 1994) to heighten the transferability (Lincoln and Guba 1985) rather than the generalisability of the data. While Yin argues that generalisation is possible on the basis of a case study, critical realists, including Sayer, reject the notion that uniquely causal mechanisms which are highly context specific can or even need to be generalised (Jeppesen 2005).

To increase transferability, this case study employs methods such as interactive interviews, photo elicitation and other forms of qualitative analysis to explore, describe and explain the conditions of possibility for agency as new academics mediate the structural and cultural conditions at the UoT. The variety of research methods acts as multiple sources, and is useful in case study design to ‘triangulate’ the evidence and to make the data as robust as possible (Rule and John 2011).

Case study research allows one to undertake an in-depth analysis (Flyvbjerg 2001; Yin 2003) by focusing not only on the complex relations within the case but also on the wider context and how this affects the case. To change the world in an organised way, researchers are naturally interested in causal relationships (Trochim 2002) where the causes (in this case, the TDP and the institution) tell us about the outcomes of interest (in this case, the exercise of agency of new academics).

Intensive research focuses mainly on members who may be either similar or different but who actually relate to one another structurally or causally (Sayer 1992). In this study, I engaged six of the twenty new academics who participated in the TDP in 2011, each of whom is embedded in a specific teaching context but has a connection to the others as a result of the TDP. The study thus considers each new lecturer as a single case to be analysed separately, then as part of a cross-case analysis (see Chapter Six), to discover what participants know and how they act in relation to others and the institution (Rule and
John 2011). A cross-case analysis allowed for a comparison that was confirmatory yet contrasting and diverse (Yin 2003) in terms of agential mediation of contextual conditions.

Units of analysis are directly related to the question of sampling. In a causal study we usually compare the effects of our cause of interest (the exercise of agency) relative to other conditions (the institution). The units or people for case selection were based on the extent to which each provided exemplary instances of the phenomenon being studied (Rule and John 2011), in this case, of agency. The case study screening (Yin 2003) was based on reviewing the TDP teaching and learning portfolios of evidence submitted by the cohort for summative assessment in 2011, as well as my observation of and interaction with these new academics on the programme. The TDP portfolios were crucial in that they documented a personal reflective essay in which candidates had to identify key concerns as projects that they would like to undertake further, post the TDP. It is through their reflexive deliberations in these essays that it became clear to me that the six lecturers in this study demonstrated perseverance, resilience and a commitment to their concerns and projects (Archer 2000) in education, which had surfaced and become concrete for them on the TDP course.

In addition to their teaching portfolio reflections, the perspectives brought to bear on their department-based teaching projects showed that these lecturers were cognisant of the huge shifts that had occurred in their physical, social and discursive academic environments. These mini-projects were presented at the TDP 2011 Milestone Event where participants, using mini-presentations in Pecha Kucha3 format, shared with others their vision and insights for further development as higher education teachers. The sampling was thus done purposively, based on participants’ unique concerns, projects, and practices. The six new academics selected for this case not only met the screening criteria, such as willingness to participate in a study on agency, but also carried the potential of contributing significantly to this study by virtue of the richness of the contexts and challenges that they confronted.

For these six new academics, the disjunction between departmental practices and the teaching development programme practices (Fanghanel and Trowler 2008), identified as an insurmountable obstacle for most, translated into enabling conditions for the exercise of their voluntary efforts as primary agents (Archer 2000). It is this exercise of agency, identified at the end of the TDP, in all its iterations, and negotiated and exercised in relation to the

---

3 PechaKucha or Pecha Kucha (Japanese: ペチャクチャ, IPA: [pecha kyucha], [1] chit-chat) is a presentation style in which 20 slides are shown for 20 seconds each (6 minutes and 40 seconds in total). The format keeps presentations concise and fast-paced.
structural and cultural constraints and enablements at the UoT post the TDP, that I explored in this study.

3.6 The research methods and modalities

The research methods chosen for this study are aligned with a critical and social realist exploration into new academics’ agency. The data-gathering processes are designed with the aim of maximising free communication related to one’s sense of belonging and one’s place in the academic world. In order to access participants’ perspectives, values and beliefs in as authentic a way as possible, this study sought alternatives to the traditional interview method used in qualitative research. Despite its reputation as a reliable method, critics identify certain problems with interviews that question the validity of the information collected (Alvesson 2003). As texts, interviews are both socially structuring and socially structured, creating a particular kind of social encounter with conventions of propriety, privacy and disclosure, and by particular distributions of material and cognitive resources (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2004). There is limited capacity for the researcher to accurately and sufficiently reflect participants’ reality, as one is dealing with the subjective world of the interviewee (beliefs, attitudes and traits) (Silverman 1993). Interviewees are influenced by the interview context, as well as the available cultural scripts about how one should normally express oneself on particular topics (Alvesson 2003).

Given that an interview is a context-dependent, social situation and interviewees comply with norms of social talk and interaction, respondents’ expectations of what the researcher wants to hear, and social norms for how one expresses oneself, influence the depth and breadth of what is said (Silverman 1993). Script-following, the social dynamics of the interview situation and impression management are critical factors influencing how interviewees select and edit the way they share their feelings, thoughts and ideas in accordance with accepted social practices, making it difficult to separate the distortions from the authentic experiences of the interviewee (Alvesson 2003).

While the three most common qualitative methods, namely participant observation, in-depth interviews, and focus groups, may be seen as standard methods, with each method particularly suited to obtaining a specific type of data, the ‘research modalities’ used in this study may be seen as less standard and slightly more alternative in the sense that they urge both researcher and participants to go beyond their zones of comfort, to be critical and creative. By ‘research modalities’, I refer to the particular way that the research was conducted. The ‘interview’, for example, in this study takes the form of an informal progress
check with participants, while the participant observation modality involves the researcher in actually facilitating workshops for participants. These modalities are not arbitrary or random, but have been purposefully chosen with specific aims to serve the overall alignment between ontology, epistemology, methodology and axiology of the overall study. The methods and modalities favour a hands-on approach where participants are directly involved in generating the data to be analysed by the researcher. The ambience and tenor of each data generation session was thoughtfully created to dispel the traditional notions about research as a clinical and formal event. In doing so, it hoped to enable and support a research environment of trust and integrity. By opening up ways of thinking that disrupt common-sense assumptions and views that have become naturalised, research methodology, such as the performative one used here, invokes and evokes the potential for critical insights and transformed perspectives in both researcher and the ‘researched’. If one is working with a critical framework, then the research methods, not just the analysis of data, should be ‘critical’ too.

In summary then, this study uses an in-depth case study designed to delve into the reflexive deliberations of six new lecturers and their mediation of their structural and cultural systemic conditions in their contexts. Each agent is independent and autonomous, capable of powers and properties of their own and each case is analysed as a unique and in-depth narrative of mediation in Chapter Five. A cross-case analysis (see Chapter Six) is undertaken to look across the six cases for convergence and divergence to add to the breadth of relevance of the data (Maxwell 1996) and to make a contribution to staff development practices in HE as a whole.

3.7 The generation of data

I refer to the process of gathering information for my study as data ‘generation’ and not data ‘collection’ to consciously subvert the notion that, akin to a laboratory scientist, I would collect samples (pockets of information) for analysis. I had been contemplating for some time the disposition and qualities needed in and of the researcher as well as the participants that would make the generation and gathering of the data a natural, organic process. Given the nature of my topic and thesis, it was important that human beings were being instated (Archer 2000) even in the data-generation process, so that their views, reflections and perspectives were captured authentically. ‘Data Generation’ in this study presupposes agency and I was conscious that my participants needed to be seen as living, thinking, feeling, believing human beings who could respond richly (or otherwise) to stimuli provided in an environment that was conducive to and supportive of the level of contextual depth required.
I envisaged the data-generation phase with the participants as mutually beneficial in terms of providing them with a space to share their experiences, frustrations, challenges, and opportunities of being new academics at the various levels of organisational structure at the UoT. This was a chance for them, post the TDP, to reconnect with ‘similars and familiairs’, and to assess where they were and how they were going to proceed. It provided me with a rich pool of perspectives and insights from which I could draw my analysis. The data-generation phase was thus organised into three professional development workshop sessions which I facilitated. As my methodological reasoning argues, the reflexive deliberation in each session enabled them as social agents to become aware of how certain aspects at the university affected the whole and vice versa. In Archerian speak, I could see, as researcher, how the ‘parts and the people rubbed against each other’ in the interplay between structure and culture, and agency, where one was mediated by the other, and vice versa.

As a result of the strong professional relationship that I had developed with participants on the TDP, I had come to know them in their academic, professional and personal capacity. In letting the data speak for itself, I allowed individual voices to reverberate loudly through this study, minimising any danger of researcher bias emergent from my insider positionality in this study. At the beginning of 2012, I left the institution to take up employment at another university in the region. This meant that I had no direct and official contact with participants after 2011, and the change in job moved me from an insider to outsider position, freeing me to approach the group wearing a slightly different hat in this doctoral study. This phase of reconnecting with participants to look back at and decide on their future participation in the study is what I call the ‘circumspective phase’, which redefined our relationship in less intense and historical ways. It also meant that I was able to put some distance between us so that I could look a little more objectively at them (if such a thing is indeed possible) as ‘ordinary’ participants in a HE project for academics.

### 3.7.1 The data generation plan and phases

Employing the depth ontology perspectives of the critical realists, I used the data generated at the Empirical Level (from the reflective pieces and portfolios) and events at the Actual Level (such as the TDP workshops) to uncover the underlying structures at the institutional level in the domains of structure, culture and agency, to understand how agents mediated their placement and positioning ‘to act so rather than otherwise’ (Archer 1995). Using their reflexive deliberations (Archer 2000) in the various data generation sessions, I wanted to
account for the choices they made either to extend positions of newly attained privilege or to abandon their projects in education in pursuit of ultimate concerns based elsewhere.

Using Archer’s morphogenetic cycle and framework (1995; 1996; 2000) as the methodological toolkit (see 2.3.6) and upholding the importance of chronological historicity and analytical dualism, I structured the research study using Archer’s three morphogenetic stages, that is, conditioning (T1), social and socio-cultural interaction (T2–3), and elaboration (T4). In the first stage, called T1, SEPs (in structural distribution of costs and benefits) and CEPs (in the pool of ideas and discourses) exist, providing structural and cultural conditioning which shapes the situations that people involuntarily find themselves in and that influence them (non-deterministically) to take certain courses of action. In the second stage, human actors with their own concerns and projects located in particular roles and positions in institutions interact at T2–3 to activate the PEPs of human agency. The outcomes of social interaction involve structural and cultural change or reproduction at T4, which is the last stage in the M/M cycle.

Following Luckett (2012), the three stages of the morphogenetic cycle are used in conjunction with the different phases of data generations in this study. The periodisation of the data and MM cycles are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Generation Plan</th>
<th>Morphogenesis / Morphostasis Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1 (2011 - 2013)</strong></td>
<td>Structural/cultural conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New academics entry into HE; joined the TDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2 – T3 (early 2013 – late 2013)</strong></td>
<td>Social/ socio-cultural interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumspective Phase: individual and group meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective Phase: looking back on TDP journey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspective phase: photovoice project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Phase: construction of individual narratives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T4 (2014)</strong></td>
<td>Structural/cultural/agential elaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross case analysis and conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This periodisation is carried through in the actual presentation of Chapters Four, Five and Six in the thesis. Chapter Four sets out the cycle of structural and cultural conditioning for new academics in this study when they joined the university. This includes their involvement in the TDP in 2011. The HE context, both internationally and nationally, as well as the institutional context of the UoT, is presented as the structural and cultural systemic
conditions that these agents have to mediate. This is the T1 of the MM cycle and is presented in and as Chapter Four.

The T2–3 phase captures the social and socio-cultural interaction among agents, which for the purposes of this study starts with the TDP in 2011 and picks up again with the first briefing meeting with participants in April 2013. This meeting covered an explication of the goals of the study, and the methods of research and levels of participation required by participants. This was also when I sought informed and signed consent from participants. This meeting forms part of the pre-data generation phase and, because it involves participants contemplating their involvement based on my input, it is named the ‘circumspective phase’ (see Table 3 below and 3.7.1.1).

Table 3: Data-Gathering Phase: Circumspective Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Individual and Group Information Meeting</td>
<td>PhD Research Information Modus Operandi Informed Consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social and socio-interaction phase extends until the culmination in the photovoice project in October 2013. This is the T2–3 phase of the M/M cycle. It is presented as Chapter Five in this thesis and includes the narratives of mediation of the six participants.

The elaboration phase is established and presented in Chapter Six, where a cross-case analysis, using Bhaskar’s (2010) Seven Scalar Being (see Chapter Six), is undertaken to identify moments of genesis or stability. It is also used to draw cross-cutting conclusions about the exercise of agency of these new lecturers. This is the T4 phase of the M/M cycle.

The actual data generation plan for this study was subdivided into three phases: the retrospective phase, the introspective phase, and the prospective phase. The ‘retrospective phase’ involved the process of recalling and reflecting on participants’ experiences of the TDP as a formal induction to HE teaching and learning. These experiences at the Empirical Level (which took place in 2011) were shaped in no small part by the formal events in the intra-curricular duration of the TDP; by the non-formal contact sessions after the TDP, while lecturers worked on their portfolio completion; by a milestone event in the form of a seminar-based ‘conference’ for participants; and by the teaching and assessment portfolios submitted as the summative portion of the course. The TDP itself had generated a host of documents and artefacts that I, as researcher, surveyed as part of this phase; in addition I reflected on
the actual sessions that I and others had facilitated, and recalled my experiences through field notes as participant observer in the TDP and its various tasks and assignments. The retrospective phase of the data-generation plan in 2013 was designed to stimulate participants' recall of the experiences of 2011 (see memory room below) to provide them with a base line as it were for the launch of the data generation for the present study, and to provide impetus for evaluative reflections on social and socio-cultural interaction on their academic journeys, post the TDP.

The ‘introspective phase’ of the data-generation phase refers to two experiences and events at the levels of the Empirical and the Actual: the progress check with each lecturer mid-study, and the construction of photovoice narratives at the end of the data-generation project. It is introspective in that it encouraged lecturers to reflect-in-action (Schön 1983) in their life course of being new academics, and to look at the constraints and enablements they had to mediate. As they participated in the photovoice project (discussed later), which was part of the introspective phase, they were prompted to (consciously or not) discern, design and deliberate (Archer 2000) on how they were mediating and negotiating the conditions (systemic at the level of the Real) that they were confronted with, through the exercise of their agency.

The ‘prospective phase’ of the data generation refers to the last session, where participants brought together their chosen photographs to construct individual narratives as external expressions of their internal conversations. While externalising internal deliberations has its own constraints and limitations, resulting in not quite a precise match between internal and external deliberations (Archer 2000), the photovoice narratives (discussed below) served as a fairly accurate proxy for what new academics in this study had contemplated as agential choices amidst their contextual constraints. As this was the culmination of the research process with the participants as a group, this session also invoked a range of prospective or forward-thinking options, understood as ‘intentionality and motivation’ (Archer 2000), for their continuing journeys in HE.
Table 4: Data-Generation Phase: Retrospective Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Recall</td>
<td>Memory Room</td>
<td>To stimulate recall of TDP and their first year as new academics; highlights and lowlights of this phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory Walk</td>
<td>To activate individual episodic and semantic memory; group sharing of memory; collective consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA Drawings</td>
<td>River of Life</td>
<td>To capture academic life course with milestones, shifts, critical incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Tree</td>
<td></td>
<td>To identify key issues with reference to teaching, learning, academic life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>To ascertain participants’ assessment of their preparedness to know, be and do as HE teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>River of Life Stories</td>
<td>To give each participant dedicated time and space to share his/her narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Group Share</td>
<td>To debrief; to get a sense of how critical issues were being processed by the group; used to get participants’ views on merger and its effects; to gauge impact of research methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Data-Generation Phase: Introspective Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>Photo capture</td>
<td>Participants immersed in the field (university) capturing photos as part of daily life course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Progress Checks</td>
<td>To do a progress check; to see if photos were being taken; that reflexive processes were in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.1.1 The circumspective phase: data gathering

3.7.1.1.1 Participant observation

My involvement and interaction with this group of new academics was premised on my role as convenor and facilitator of the TDP in 2011. My particular approach to the TDP curriculum was based on co-creation, so I was a facilitator and a ‘participant’ in the professional development programme. Participant observation is appropriate for gathering data on naturally-occurring behaviours in their usual contexts. As TDP convenor, I observed the new lecturers through a series of workshops and interactions over a year, making me partial to the academics that I had come to know in the professional setting of the university. I had of necessity observed lecturers in their classrooms and in one-on-one meetings in a consultative role around their portfolio submissions. When six of the TDP participants had agreed to be part of this doctoral study, strong strands of our historical relationship transferred to the new context. We were the same people wearing different hats. Through the life span of the doctoral study, I engaged with lecturers through emails, face-to-face contact and informal group meetings to discuss their photographs and drawings. My position as participant observer–researcher in this study was crucial to participants’ sense of community, as I was performing a similar mediatory role for the group as I had done on the TDP. My observation notes and field notes therefore became important memo devices (Maxwell 1996) that acted as triggers for my recall of the views, perspectives, thoughts and emotions that participants had shared outside the data-generation sessions of the study.

3.7.1.1.2 Survey of documentation

The sets of documents derived for this study were compiled from primary sources
(documents produced by participants in data-generation sessions) as well as secondary sources gathered prior to data analysis (TDP portfolios, related HE policy documents, UoT mission and vision, UoT website, institutional reports and other related policy documents). These were surveyed to generate an overall sense of context and were analysed to obtain a specific grasp of critical issues. Documents were compiled to assist in the design of specific modalities such as the memory room (discussed below), and to provide participants with guidelines, briefs and summaries. The TDP portfolios were especially significant as they had been assessed by me in 2011 in my capacity as programme convenor; now they were being surveyed by me as researcher. In terms of the doctoral study, I was now interested in participants' reflective pieces for their discourse and content, rather than for style or convention. The document survey, which included HE policy and framework documents, provided substantive evidence for establishing a ‘baseline’ for the T1 phase for this study, that is, the structural and cultural conditions for the exercise of agency.

3.7.1.1.3 Focus groups

Focus group discussions were used in the various data-generation phases to give the group a chance to reflect on issues and challenges that they (on the surface anyway) commonly faced. Besides offering me insight into their views as a group, the focus group made it more accessible for members to share a common language by listening to others’ verbalised experiences, which stimulated their own memories in the group. This is known as ‘chaining’ or ‘cascading’, where responses ‘tumble’ out of preceding views (Lindlof and Taylor 2002: 182). In this study, ‘disclosure’ by new academics as ‘similars and familiars’ in a safe setting was relatively easier as their views were validated or contested by peers, leading to the rich and textured data needed for the study. In a way, the group offered a way of checking on the ‘accuracy’ of the shared data. Certain disadvantages of sharing in a focus group were evident in the way particular members ‘dominated’ the discussion, especially when conventions such as turn taking were interpreted differently based on cultural conditioning. It was a little difficult for me at times as facilitator to steer the discussion, as the double-edged sword had to be wielded between free and regulated speech, which was experienced by some group members as a slight constraint. In the interest of the study, my role as facilitator ensured that equal chances were afforded to all to obtain a wider range of perspectives, which meant curtailing the input by some, especially where this was repetitive and time consuming.

3.7.1.2 The retrospective phase: data generation

This phase of the data-generation plan included a subset of data gathered through the
employment of specific qualitative research methods: the memory room (sources included documents and video clips); the river of life exercise (source included participants’ drawings and commentaries); a problem tree (drawn and discussed by participants); a free-writing piece (written by participants); and a focus-group session or group share. These constituted the first session of data generation with the research participants. All the methods used were chosen with specific purposes and specific aims in service of the broader aims of the methodological conceptualisation in answering the study’s research questions. These methods are discussed below.

### 3.7.1.2.1 The memory room

Slough (2001) credits Benjamin Bloom with the first description of ‘stimulated recall’ in 1953, which he described as a method for retrieving memories. Stimulated recall as a research method invites participants to recall their concurrent thinking during an event when prompted by a video sequence or some other form of visual recall (Fox-Turnbull 2001). The concept of the ‘memory room’, which is part of a stimulated recall strategy, was introduced to me by my co-supervisor, Dr. Cecilia Jacobs, who had used it in her doctoral study to stimulate participants’ recall of their project experiences and provide an environment for in-depth reflections (Jacobs 2014). The memory rooms in the Jacobs’ study (2014) were used as a methodological space to physically house all project participants for a collaborative free-writing exercise and, in the second instance, as a space within which to conduct the individual narrative interviews.

Cognitive psychology experiments have typically studied individuals’ learning and remembering in isolation; however, in many real-world settings, memory is a social process (Barber, Rajaram and Fox 2012). Memory retrieval is a reconstructive rather than reproductive process, facilitating the formation of collective memories (Hurst 2010). The memory room in this study provided the impetus for the collaborative memory recall of the TDP experience as a group; at the same time it acted as a container for individual stimulated memory recall in individual tasks in the data session. Since the TDP participants had not worked together prior to this session, the memory room was conceptualised as ‘a pedagogy of reinvention’, which is the ‘process of going back over something in different ways and with new perspectives, and of studying one’s own experience with insight and awareness of the present for the purpose of acting on the future’ (Mitchell and Weber 1999: 8). This memory work goes ‘beyond nostalgia’ to speak to the turning of practices of working with memory into what might be described as ‘future oriented remembering (Mitchell and Reid-Walsh 2002: 54) for growth and change. Compared with individual recall, during collaborative recall
individuals are re-exposed to items they had forgotten, but that a group member recalled; and collaborative retrieval, which allows for error pruning, is where an individual makes a memory error and the group members provide corrective feedback (Barber et al. 2012). For my study, the memory room provided the visual, textural and emotional stimuli needed for the participants’ stimulated recall of the TDP at the level of experience and events. The venue used was one that participants were familiar with, as it had been used for TDP workshops in 2011. Similar to the Jacobs’ study (2014), this venue was ‘an important part of the data collection process as the space itself was charged with memories for the participants’.

Since chronology is important in the morphogenetic cycle and in the recall of events and experiences, the memory room was thoughtfully and carefully recreated with memorabilia from different stages of the TDP, grouped around tables at different points in the room, and creating a circular walkway or pathway from start to finish. The added significance of the pathway recreated a sense of the ‘journey’ that had been traversed by TDP participants, both metaphorically and literally on the day.

Even though it was a constructed space, the memory room created a rich tapestry of images that participants could immediately recall and relate to through the uses of memorabilia, photos and artefacts from the documentation survey process, and the walls of the venue were lined with posters, books, programmes, brochures, excerpts from portfolios and reflective essays, and a live streaming of photographic images of the TDP 2011 experience.

3.7.1.2.2 The memory walk

When participants entered the memory room, they were invited to partake of a finger lunch, during which they reconnected and revitalised old links with one another and with me. I noticed that some participants had drifted to various tables to read and engage with the varied and colourful artefacts in the memory room. At an appropriate time during the lunch, I invited all of them to start the ‘memory walk’ with me, through the room, which they did with food and drink in hand. The group was fairly relaxed and the energy in the room was palpable. We started the group walk by looking at a collage of photographs of the very first TDP sessions in 2011. When sufficient memories, together with participants’ emotional commentaries had been surfaced, we walked to the next table, where participants were reminded of the symbolic artefacts used in the TDP sessions such as ‘muddy cards’, manual voting cards, a match box, and so on. Participants recollected how those items had been introduced in the TDP sessions and how they had been used for teaching and learning. We
continued on the walk, arriving full circle when all the stations had been visited. When the memory-walk process started, participants were at first somewhat subdued and quiet, taking in the pictures and other stimuli. After prompts and probes from me, they soon started volunteering information and sharing memories of their struggles and triumphs since they had started at the university. Some recalled their motivation for first joining the TDP:

I came because I couldn't talk loudly in class, I had to do totally different things to teach and when I first came there I thought, you know, I need information now so that I can teach in a different way and I immediately realised when we started with the check-ins and all those things, that this is the most creative teaching space I’ve ever, ever been in and I’ll just have to open up, you know. Go with the flow. And I’ve done that I think and I really enjoyed it, up until the last minute [TDP participant].

Some reflected on the reflective practitioner model of the TDP and how it had enabled a deep engagement with their own practice:

I also think the reflection in the course helped us to learn how to reflect because sometimes you reflect, but as you say . . . you don’t go deep enough; you don’t take any further steps and then you lose it, achieving the reflection, you know. It helped us to use it and to say I reflect, but I’m also going to do that and that to help it. I think it taught me a lot about what to do with my reflection [TDP participant].

I started using reflection with my students, because I think that sometimes they do a project and then there’s no time for anything, they just move on to the next project. And they don’t understand what they should have learnt through the previous project. So I now at the end of almost all my projects have a little bit of reflection worked into it [sic] so that they can reflect back on what they have learnt and how they would do it differently next time and so on [TDP participant].

I think that it definitely also makes you think on your feet. Like sometimes reflecting in action, you realise you have to attend to this now and you have to solve this kind of miscommunication now. And also, I try . . . when I think about it after I have the session with students, then I try and immediately in the next session with them rectify it, so it doesn’t . . . you know, they don’t carry the same mistakes or whatever. But we also had a reflection session on Friday with the students, where we reflected on the year thus far and just that going into the next semester, the students are where we see them and where we need them to be and we’re aware of where the students need us to be. So we’re now able to alter our lecture prep and things to suit them accordingly for the second semester [TDP participant].
3.7.1.2.3 Alternative reflective practice: finger painting

The finger-painting activity was introduced to the TDP as an alternative way of reflecting on what it means to ‘know, be and do’ as HE practitioners (see Chapter Four for discussion), and to open up emotional spaces in the classroom (again see Chapter Four for discussion), not often encouraged in HE (Barnett 2005; Dall'Alba and Barnacle 2007). Participants remembered with fondness the ‘finger painting’ session in the TDP, where they were asked to explore their reflective ability using non-verbal methods and to exercise their creativity in ways not confined to the discursive limitations of words. Drawings create the space for creative representation of important phenomena in academic study (Rule and John 2011), as they provide access to unconscious views and beliefs that are not easily put into words (Mitchell and Weber 1999). The finger-painting activity done at the end of the TDP course was a precursor to the river of life drawings in the data-generation sessions in this study. Drawings are useful for gauging the role emotions play in the teaching context, allowing participants to present a view of their context (their institution or disciplinary departments) and to tap into perspectives that are not always surfaced through language (Rule and John 2011). Based on its reception on the TDP, I was confident that the drawing method would be suitable for this group of participants.

Participants used the finger painting as a memory device to recall their individual and unique struggles in mediating structural and cultural contexts, which were actually generic to the group, even if for different reasons:
I think it was used to support the concept of stepping out of your box and looking at yourself, so your painting kind of reflects you . . . you kind of reflect on your teaching practice . . . how do we evaluate ourselves . . . [TDP participant].

To me it was almost scary how really true it was or how people could read everything from a picture that I thought was just a finger painting. Gee, how’s that possible? It really touched me [TDP participant].

3.7.1.2.4 TDP Milestone Event 2011

Participants also remembered with pride their involvement in a seminar based ‘mini-conference’ at the end of their TDP year, appropriately named the ‘milestone event’, to mark the end of the programme and their first year as new lecturers on the programme. Participants’ Heads of Department (HoDs) and colleagues were invited, and at the event, participants received certificates for successful completion of the TDP from their HoDs and CHED staff. What started as a daunting prospect at the beginning of the TDP had now become a sense of accomplishment for new academics in this study. Their involvement in the milestone event also marked the first move of this group towards corporate agency (Archer 2000).

What was amazing was the mini paper as a Pecha Kucha presentation for the audience . . . it perhaps was the start of the other aspect of your being a higher educator. Classroom practice is one thing but the mini-conference and research into teaching . . . that also needs to be taken on, which not everyone is comfortable with in their first years [TDP participant].

More significantly for this study, the milestone event also marked the identification of specific projects that lecturers had named as their ‘burning issues’ in education or, in Archerian terms, their ultimate concerns (Archer 1995; 2000) in higher education. This formed an important baseline for this study and for the trajectory of development of their educational concerns into fully-fledged projects in HE. What the milestone event highlighted for participants was the need for the scholarship of teaching to be embraced and enhanced to support theorised practice.

All in all, the memory walk and memory room established for me that the participants in this study had experienced the TDP (and not necessarily the institution) as a positive and overwhelming structural and cultural enablement and support. Many of the artefacts in the memory room had triggered positive recollections of time well spent on the professional
development programme in a community of peers. Reflecting on what had happened post the TDP in their journey as new academics was the next step in the data-generation session (discussed below), to see more specifically how their involuntary placement in the institutional context as primary agents had influenced their choices and actions. To frame the methods that I had chosen to achieve my specific research aims, I shall first discuss the overarching Participatory Learning and Action approach that I adopted in this phase.

3.7.1.2.5 Participatory Learning and Action/Participatory Action Research

Participatory Action Research (PAR) and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) are approaches for learning about and engaging with communities. They consist of a toolkit of participatory and visual methods that become natural interviewing techniques, intended to facilitate a process of collective analysis and learning (Thomas 2014). PLA tools combine the sharing of insights with analysis and, as such, provide a catalyst for the community members themselves to act on what is uncovered. PLA techniques, according to Chambers (2006), enable people to share, enhance and analyse their knowledge of life and to plan, act, monitor, evaluate and reflect. PLA techniques refocus attention on criticality and positionality by allowing participants to understand causal relations both experientially and conceptually (Bozalek and Biersteker 2010). They have been especially useful techniques to allow people to confront difference and privilege, thus giving people the chance to be both insiders and outsiders in the interactions and understanding of ‘otherness’ across the divides (Bozalek 2011). By utilising visual methods and analytical tools, PLA enables all community members to participate, regardless of their age, ethnicity or literacy capabilities.

Transported from the local world of globalised communities, PLA techniques have been used in HE with students and educators alike, and have been shown to make a substantial contribution to reflective processes, especially in contexts such as South Africa that have been scarred by social boundaries such as race, class, ability, language, sexuality, ethnicity and gender, among others (Bozalek and Biersteker 2010). PLA techniques involve the use of open-ended, flexible, visual learning methods which include visioning, mapping, mood lines, one-way and two-way matrices, impact diagrams, problem and objective trees, community maps, body maps, and rivers of life, among others (Pretty, Guijt, Scoones and Thompson 1995). In HE, PLA techniques have been used in a collaborative project with students (Bozalek 2011) and on a short course on Community, Self and Difference for educators (CHEC 2013). In both studies, the value of PLA research techniques is highlighted, showing how the interaction between students across cultural groups was facilitated through drawings, and ‘it is doubtful whether students would have engaged in
such deep encounters revealing their experiences without the community maps’ (Bozalek 2011).

The usefulness of PLA is substantial in staff development work as well, as inclusive participatory parity is achieved in discussions and debates. I was involved as a participant and facilitator in the course for academics, (Citizenship, Social Inclusion and Difference), run by the same team of facilitators and convened by Cape Higher Education Consortium (CHEC). It was a very engaging short course on which I was exposed not only to PLA techniques, but also to different theoretical lenses, such as the ‘Pedagogy of Discomfort’ (Boler and Zembylas 2003), to frame the HE experience in South Africa. The strengths of PLA include alternative methods for expressing strong and uncomfortable views, which often leads to new insights; stimuli for discussion which are non-threatening and ‘playful’ techniques; and promotion of social learning and emotional learning, as well as the opportunities to challenge and deepen knowledge (Bozalek 2011; Chambers 2006).

In this research study, specific PLA techniques, such as the river of life, problem trees and free writing, were employed in the retrospective phase of the data generation, in order to enable a creative and collaborative process for new academics to reflect on their challenges from the time of entry to HE to the period in this research study, including the time spent on the TDP. This was done by allowing research participants to draw and then narrate accounts of how they understood their contexts as enabling or constraining environments, as novice educators and practitioners in higher education in South Africa today. These methods are discussed briefly below.

### 3.7.1.2.5.1 The River of Life (RoL)

From my own experience of using the River of Life (RoL) exercise as a participant and facilitator, and from similar accounts of practitioners using it in their participatory work in HE, the River of Life is seen as an effective group facilitation technique using visual narratives to help people tell stories of the past, present and future. In this study, the participants were asked to draw Rivers of Life to show the milestones and/or challenges in their journey as educators, highlighting critical incidents that led to significant shifts in their perspectives and teaching practice. By imagining their academic projects as a river, participants used the landscape, water, rocks, rough waters, and tributaries in their drawings to symbolise the major events and milestones in their academic lives and to capture their challenges and successes over time, indicating where progress had been made and revealing patterns that proved useful for realistic future planning. By focusing on drawing rather than
text, the River of Life was a useful, interactive method for engaging people in this group across language barriers (Rule and John 2011), which was a constraint for one of the participants.

The RoL drawing session was a highly emotive one for the group. Some participants used their rivers (see Chapter Five) to share stories of the complex and nuanced challenges that they had experienced as individuals and as educators – this brought the research group close to tears – while others shared stories of elation, success and accomplishment in navigating their way strategically over hurdles. For yet others, the rivers showed pictures of being overwhelmed at the prospect of juggling and managing the multifarious tasks bestowed on them without departmental or other support. All in all, the RoL brought the group to a common meeting point again, in terms of the involuntary distribution of structural resources among them as primary agents, as well as the cultural stock of ideas and concepts (Archer 1996) they could draw on to make sense of the contexts and their obligations to their students and themselves. The River of Life drawings of each lecturer, as well as the data generated through this exercise, form a substantial part of the data analysis in Chapter Five.

3.7.1.2.5.2 Problem tree

The second PLA technique employed in the retrospective phase was the ‘problem tree’ (also known as the Objective Tree). The problem tree is based on a simple framework of identifying causes (roots), problems (trunk) and effects (branches and leaves) to surface the stressful challenges bubbling just underneath. After the group had drawn their individual problem trees, they shared their ideas and problems with one another, with some participants offering ‘solutions’, anecdotes and advice as responses. While it was made clear to all participants that the data session was not a therapeutic space, as neither I (nor anyone else there) was qualified to offer therapeutic advice, many participants responded with advice. Since the group had bonded already and had worked together in the TDP for a year, intergroup dynamics were managed very well. The overall camaraderie was strong and group morale was very high; even after being cautioned to share only what they felt comfortable to share, participants offered personal and emotional stories, textured with strong emotion and affect (see Chapter Four), to which group members
responded in equally emotional tones and overtures. This was not at all surprising for me, as the sub-text enacted here was a spill over from the way I had worked with the group on the TDP in 2011 and their participation on the programme.

3.7.1.2.5.3 Free writing

The last exercise completing the full suite of data-generation methods in the retrospective phase was the free-writing exercise. As researcher, my objective with this exercise was to ascertain participants’ level of forward thinking and action in relation to both the river of life exercise, which mapped out from where they had come, and the problem tree exercise, which identified what they saw as current and insurmountable challenges. Free writing was thus used as a tool for discovery rather than recollection. In writing non-stop for a set period of time (15 minutes), participants were tasked to synthesise the session’s key points and to critically reflect on their ability to carve a pathway ahead, given the challenges or opportunities at the university. Used as a discovery tool, the free-writing exercise was an attempt to foreshadow possible agential options and to endow participants with an overall sense of forward looking and forward thinking, and a sense of hope and action. The free-writing pieces are drawn on in Chapter Five, where social and socio-cultural interaction takes place in the T2–3 stage of the morphostatic/morphogenetic cycle.

The end of the first data-generation session with participants established a baseline for the study, as participants had surfaced ideas, thoughts, memories and emotions to recollect the strides they had made on the TDP and beyond. They were also aware of the challenges they still faced. With my staff development hat on, I had fulfilled my commitment in offering them a dialogic space for collaborative discussion and reflection on their development and growth, similar to the supportive role that I had played in the TDP. With my researcher’s hat on, I had provided the stimuli and prompts for them to generate a rich pool of data that I needed for the study. As a further ‘training’ option crucial to the next phase of data generation, participants were given a crash course in photography by a videographer. In a hands-on photo workshop, they were introduced to basic shooting, editing, and framing techniques. It was emphasised and made clear to all that photographic skill was not a measure; I was interested in their creative expression through the use of visual images to reflect on their
points of tension and opportunity as new academics. This basic photography training was essential for the second phase of data generation, which employed photovoice as a research method, discussed below.

### 3.7.1.3 The introspective phase: Photovoice for data gathering

Photovoice (PV), which was developed by Caroline Wang (1999) to enhance critical dialogue, is part of the Participatory Action Research approach (see above) which uses visual methods such as specific photographic techniques to promote critical reflection and engagement through individual and group discussions of photos (Wang 1999). The term ‘photovoice’, coined by Wang and Burris (1997), describes a process of constructing narratives based on photos taken by participants themselves, to explore issues of concern and challenge through a facilitator-guided group discussion. Related terms such as photo elicitation, photo novella, and auto-photography are used to describe this participatory action research (PAR) method. PV as a research method recognises that people can best represent their own realities (Wang and Burris 1997), and places the camera in the hands of participants for a period of time to capture responses to research prompts provided by the researcher.

Basic camera training is provided, after which participants take photos that are developed and talked about in a workshop setting. Participants are interviewed about their photographs, allowing respondents to choose what they see as significant to the area of study, guided by the researcher’s non-directive instructions. It is the participants as experts, who reflect on what they see as most important information and who enter into critical dialogue among themselves or with researchers, which enhances the researcher’s understanding, as well as that of the participants (Wang and Burris 1997). Photo elicitation thus inspires collaborative action from two or more people to discuss the meaning of photographs in an attempt to elucidate something together, making it an ideal model for social science research (Harper 2002).

Acting as an alternative to the traditional interview, PV serves to complement the narratives constructed by lecturers in response to the prompt/research questions posed to them. Photovoice provides the space for unanticipated data (Rule and John 2011) in informal and
non-threatening settings and stretches the boundaries of what is considered ‘authentic’ research. The adoption of PV in this study raises awareness of the dichotomy between the researcher and researched, the generation of data as knowledge and understanding, and the self-reflective and interpretive nature of qualitative social science methods (Creswell 2003). A key strength is that ‘photovoice shifts power in the research process from the researcher to the researched’ (Nelson and Christensen 2009), and thus encourages people to find and develop their critical voices. Photographs help to tap into unconscious and unquestioned domains (Rule and John 2011) of experience, beliefs, values and attitudes, which enhance researchers' and participants’ understanding through dialogue (Wang and Burris 1997).

3.7.1.3.1 Photovoice in this study

As an alternative to the traditional methods used for generating data through reflexivity, I used PV as a reflexive medium to elicit the rich and meaningful stories, perceptions and beliefs that new lecturers shared about their sense of self, their teaching practices and their agential choices. These reflections were undertaken as a collaborative effort and the group-enabled engagement, was facilitated by me in a safe space. The notion that the quality of an internal conversation can be refined, sharpened and strengthened through articulating it with a trusted significant other, who gives considered feedback (Luckett and Luckett 2009), suggests that making the internal dialogue external through group sharing may deepen the levels of critical reflection and the nature of agential choices that become apparent. Harrison (2002: 857) argues that visual imagery can give strong insight into ‘wider cultural perceptions, categories, and metaphors, and provide us with views of how things are or should be’. This study, which analyses six new academics’ narratives to see how they exercise agency in relation to structural and cultural constraints and enablements in higher education today, also assesses the affordances of PV to see how PV enabled them to generate rich reflexive accounts of their experiences (See Chapter Seven: Reflections on Research Methodologies) through an innovative modality for researching aspects of HE practice.

At the end of the first data-generation session, each participant left with a camera and a photovoice task which was based on a set of specific questions: What challenges and/or opportunities do you face as a new academic in the context of the UoT? What organisational or institutional features are problematic or supportive? Which cultural ideas or attitudes are limiting or liberating? Although the photovoice method was a key data-generation tool in this doctoral study, in many ways it also served as a stand-alone professional development
project that participants used to increase the repertoire of innovative teaching and learning pedagogies with their students.

As researcher, I wanted participants to use their cameras and photographs to capture the structural and cultural constraints and enablements that they had to mediate. ‘Looking back on oneself’ is key to Archer’s (2000) internal conversation which agents employ to mediate contextual challenges. PV was thus used as an exploratory method with lecturers in HE to experiment with alternative forms of reflexive deliberations through which they could make external a process of deep internal reflection in response to their concerns and projects. In Chapter Five, I draw substantially on participants’ PV stories, captured in the six narratives of mediation.

3.7.1.3.2 Progress checks

Mid-way through the introspective phase, I met with each participant individually, to offer support and to check on progress. In an email invitation to participants, I specifically requested that they did not show me their photographs as I did not want to influence their choice of photographs, since the photo story was part of their unique reflexive deliberations.

In each of my meetings, I was amazed that all participants used the meeting again as an outlet to vent their frustrations about their contexts. For some participants, the process of taking photos had accentuated the gaps and voids in their academic lives; for others it served as reinforcement of decisions taken and actions followed. It was clear that they needed a space and forum to share, and, in the absence of the TDP, they had few other fora in which to share their frustrations and challenges. All it took from me was a simple prompt, which elicited impassioned vignettes as they told me of the extent of the challenges that faced them as new academics in their departments, faculties and classrooms. What stood out for me was that these exchanges were done ‘in parenthesis’. By this I mean participants seemed to be speaking under their breath, even though we were alone and away from possible departmental intrusions. This alerted me to the fact that in their departments they felt somewhat unsafe; personal challenges had to be handled and managed on their own, bracketed off from mainstream departmental concerns.

This reminded of the side bar in court, where lawyers request a private meeting with the judge to clarify issues that the entire courtroom cannot be privy to. It is in the safety of the side bar that lawyers clarify their misunderstanding and misgivings. Similarly, the side bar interviews or progress checks with the participants allowed for a slightly more intimate
sharing with me of issues that had surfaced in group sessions and that had now spilled over. My ‘side-bar interviews’ with participants also revealed that while there was a wealth of insights, perspectives and suggestions that these new academics could share, they did not have a sympathetic ear in their departments, and they yearned for a space where they could offload their emotional burdens. The space I offered them proved to be optimal for gathering data on individuals’ personal histories, perspectives, and experiences at the UoT, but quite fragile and moving too, as once again sensitive topics were being raised. My observation notes were used in the analysis in Chapter Five as I drew on these side-bar exchanges to nuance the narratives of each agent in the social interaction phase.

3.7.1.4 The prospective phase: data generation

This next phase of the data generation was my last meeting with the participants. Each person emailed me a selection of 10 photographs, which I printed in colour and in different sizes prior to the session. The first part of the session involved a PV workshop, guided by the SHOWeD framework (Wallerstein 1987), which provided a set of questions for the construction of the photo story.

I adapted the SHOWeD framework for my own research purposes and presented the questions below to participants, which they used to construct narratives on each of their selected photos, and then across all photos:

```
What do you See here?
What’s really Happening here?
How does this relate to Our/ Your academic/professional life?
Why does this problem/strength exist?
How have you Experienced it?
What are you Doing/ have you Done about it?
```

Although all of them used the SHOWED framework in the construction of their photo stories, many explained that when they stood in front of the group they felt inspired to tell the story in an original way. Participants were given information on assemblage options such as collage, montage or free style, and the second part of the session was spent with each participant at a separate work station, cutting up photos and pasting onto A1 size paper, much like a story board. The actual photo stories were uniquely personal and individualised in content, in arrangement, in the use of devices such as metaphor, and in explication. The energy in the
room was charged and emotional. It was clear that, for these new academics, it was a special time of standing in their own light, ready to be listened to by a captive audience.

Each photo story began with participants talking through their collection of photos, uninterrupted by the group or researcher. Some stories made explicit reference to photos in sequential order in the case of montage assemblage; others followed an intuitive patchwork of vignettes inspired by the most poignant photo, through to the rest. At the end of each PV story, the space was opened up to group questions, feedback and probes. In most instances, participants (unwittingly) raised issues, concerns and comments that extended the scope of possibilities for the research project and its concerns. In many cases, the researcher was a silent observer, intervening only when necessary to reframe questions and to probe further. The photo story and its structure performed the job of 'interview schedule'; the key themes of each story became talking points for further explication by the storyteller.

Each of the stories was video and audio recorded (with participants' permission) and transcribed verbatim for analysis purposes, as was done with sources in the retrospective and introspective phases. The actual photo compilations were photographed and used in Chapter Five (see Chapter Five Cover). Participants’ narratives and commentary complemented each other very well, giving credence to the dual aspects of 'photo' and 'voice' in the PV methodology, which made for very rich, nuanced and complex data. The video recordings captured the emotive aspects of the individual story telling as well as the energy involved in the group sharing of stories, intricately connected to what these new academics considered critical in their experiences as primary agents at the UoT.

3.8 Data handling

Different strategies may be used to sort the data before analysis actually takes place. As I was faced with a large volume of data from a multiple range of sources, the first task was to ‘handle’ or manage the data effectively so that there was order in and organisation of the different components. I used the temporal aspect (discussed already) as an organising principle, given that the data-generation phase took place over five months and in different time sequences. I also used each unit of analysis, that is, the individual lecturer, as a way to separate and collate the relevant data items into a composite portrait for each lecturer.
3.9 Data analysis

3.9.1 Analytical framework: narrative bricolage

Bricolage is the French term for ‘tinkering’, referring to the process of construction or creation of a work from a diverse range of things such as theoretical traditions and multiple frameworks and methodologies (Kincheloe 2005). This is linked to the concept of ‘methodological bricolage’ (Denzin and Lincoln 2000) and its related notion of ‘blurred genres’, which is a fitting way to describe the methodological pluralism (Danermark et al. 2002) evident in this study. ‘Bricolage’ also refers to the holding together of a variety of methods and modalities adopted in this research study, without compromising the ontological, epistemological, methodological and axiological (Denzin 2004) dimensions of the research frame upon which the design of this research study is premised.

In this study, I used the concept of a ‘narrative bricolage’ to bring together data items from all the data sessions, and threaded together the multiple units of data generated through the different research methods used. Narrative summaries or vignettes are useful to counter the fragmenting and decontextualising of the data that can happen when coding begins (Miller 2012). Each bricolage included participants’ visual drawings, free-writing pieces, rivers of life commentaries and photovoice stories and collages. It also included the progress check interviews (side-bar interviews) with individual lecturers, as well as the focus-group discussions at the end of each data session. Each piece of data was narrated by me as the researcher–bricoleur to create narrative summaries of each story, which served as ‘holding texts’ for the detailed contextual analysis. In terms of Archer’s morphogenetic frames (1995), the narrative bricolages helped me to incorporate the chronological and temporal aspects of the data to see how participants’ reflections had changed or stayed the same over the course of the five months.

3.9.2 Data analysis approach

In keeping with the ontological depth of the critical realist philosophy outlined earlier, the approach to data analysis in this study was guided by the need to move from empirical data of concrete phenomena, captured in participants’ narratives and other sources, to the underlying generative mechanisms through abstracted re-description (Crinson 2007). The analytical strategies used were varied, and were selected on the basis of how they allowed me to work with data to answer the research questions of the study with integrity and rigour. Data analysis involved using an explanatory framework in keeping with a critical realist and social realist ontology (discussed below). As part of the initial phase of theorising, Archer’s
Morphogenetic Model (M/M), with its morphogenetic cycles, was used to understand the interrelationship between structural conditioning, social interaction, and patterns of structural elaboration (morphogenesis or morphostasis), as it unfolded in the lives of six new academics in the specific temporal and spatial orientation of the UoT. Throughout, analytical dualism (Archer 1995) was upheld to ensure that the structuring aspect (the UoT and HE as structured and structuring entities and institutions, and other structural systems) was not conflated either with the ideational aspects (beliefs held that enabled or constrained new academics’ agency), or with the agents and the actors in the agential domain.

3.9.2.1 Realist schema for analysis

The next step was to organise each narrative bricolage using a schema concomitant with realist analysis. I had to decide on an analytical process that would make the ‘trail’ from the data to analytical conclusions transparent (Crinson 2001), in order to show the iterative process of how I had drawn on data from participants, literature and discourses and to ensure the reliability of process and the strengthening of validity through the use of multiple sources.

I found that the proposed realist schema for the analysis of qualitative data by Crinson (2007) was very useful for this purpose. In addition, the steps involved in search of mechanisms for conducting a critical realist data analysis (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011) threw light on the frequently-neglected process of identifying the generative mechanisms crucial to a critical realist analysis. I shall now discuss this schema and explain how (and why) I adapted it for my study. While the table suggests a linear track from transcription to analysis, the actual movement in the schematic description by Crinson (2001) clarifies and confirms the cyclical nature of analysing qualitative data in general, and proposes a five-step process, moving from the rows ‘transcription’ to ‘retroduction’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim transcription</td>
<td>Indexing</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Theorisation</td>
<td>Retroduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: A Realist Analytical Schema for the Generation of Qualitative Data

Each of the above categories will now be discussed in relation to the analytical framework used in this study.
3.9.2.1.1 Verbatim transcriptions

These were taken from participants’ contributions in the memory room and memory walk, river-of-life stories, problem-tree explanations, free-writing pieces, and photovoice stories. The first unit of data from the memory room was transcribed professionally, but the transcriber found it difficult to decipher the various accents and dialects of the participants. I transcribed the rest of the data myself and found that being immersed in it was the first step in a ‘soft eye’ coding (Maton 2001), which involved a very intuitive and organic conceptual categorisation of participants’ contributions.

3.9.2.1.2 Indexing or coding

Indexing is a description of clusters of observations made by researcher or participants (Sayer 1992). Typical clusters in this study included new academics’ experiences on induction programmes such as the TDP, their departmental interaction, their interaction with students in lectures and with colleagues, and so on. This involved non-exclusive coding of discursive material and included all contributions by participants. Following the CR and SR analytical framework, this coding was located at the level of the Real in the domain of structure, culture, and/or agency. According to Saldaña (2013), coding is not a precise science but an interpretive act: when we reflect on a passage of data to decipher its core meaning, we are decoding; when we determine its appropriate code and label it, we are encoding.

The process of creating codes was guided by the data (inductively) and from an a priori theoretical understanding of the phenomenon under study. These codes included professional definitions found in literature reviews; local, common sense constructs; theoretical orientations; and personal experiences (Maxwell 1996). Strauss and Corbin (1990: 41–47) refer to this as ‘theoretical sensitivity’, which was also influenced by the ontological, epistemological, axiological and methodological concerns of the study (Creswell 2003).

Using a social realist methodology, I resisted the impulse to discover categories or themes; a process which according to Saldaña (2013) is an outcome of coding and analytic reflection. Instead, I looked at the data with ‘theoretical sensitivity’ for structural, cultural and agential components derived from the theoretical framework and research question in this study. Ideas, concepts and actions were coded to fit these domains. During this process, a set of emergent codes became apparent, and pointed to new levels of meaning and relationships that were different from the pre-set codes. Creswell (2007: 153) notes that a code can
emerge from data that is surprising, unusual, or conceptually interesting: this act of discovery is what grounded theorists call ‘open coding’ (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Initial coding was done using line-by-line coding, with ‘speed and spontaneity’ (Charmaz 2006: 42–57), which facilitated a ‘close reading’ of the text, listening carefully to what the person said, without yet thinking theoretically or abstractly about the text. This was to get a sense of the key ideas that made some ‘inchoate sense’ (Bogdan and Biklen 1982: 165).

Focused coding was then done (Charmaz 2006: 57–60) by reading several times through the lists of initial codes in order to identify codes that spoke specifically to structure, culture and agency. It was helpful to create a storyline to keep in mind the objective of the research, and I continually returned to the goals of the study: the conditions that enable or constrain the exercise of agency among new academics. Richards and Morse (2007: 157) assert that it is through coding that we transcend from the diversity of data to the sorts of things represented by the data at more abstract conceptual and theoretical levels. Notes or memos (Maxwell 1996) explaining the key codes were used to capture the ideas that emerged; these were vital to the analytic process as they suggested new interpretations, as well as new connections with other data.

3.9.2.1.3 Interpretation

This is where an abstraction of conceptual categories was done (Miller 2012), analytically induced through an interpretative understanding of indexed data. The social meanings and concepts that essentially represented the perspective of social agents (through interpretation) were emphasised through the interpretation of the analyst. Abstracted concepts represented the first stage in the retroduction (discussed below) of a concrete conceptualisation in this analytical schema, rather than an end-stage in the process of data analysis. The problem, however, from a depth realist perspective, in leaving the analysis at this level, which is rooted in the actual discourses and practical logic of the participants, is to merely examine the domain of the Actual, instead of getting to the hidden dynamics at the level of the Real.

3.9.2.1.4 Theorisation

To gain deep knowledge and understanding of the underlying causal mechanisms at the level of the Real, critical realists engage in inferencing techniques or reasoning strategies (Danermark et al. 2002) such as abduction, retroduction and retrodiction (Outhwaite 1983). These strategies of theoretical reasoning are recognised as key epistemological processes by critical realists who explain events by ‘postulating (and identifying) mechanisms which are
capable of producing them’ (Sayer 1992: 107). Abduction is on the one hand logical (and thereby reasonable and scientific), and on the other hand extends into the realm of profound insight (and therefore generates new knowledge) (Sayer 1992).

In using abductive reasoning in the analysis, I was able to interpret the case in ways that transcended the actual events by identifying the relevant theory and comparing and integrating where possible (Danermark et al. 2002) in order to understand the events in more depth and to reframe the case. Abduction involves abstracting the case by exploring different theoretical perspectives and explanations because, as mentioned already, ‘a case is a case of something’ (Danermark et al. 2002). Again, the problem with leaving the analysis at this theoretical-deductive level is that it is in essence a generalised conceptualisation of a complex social phenomenon (Crinson 2001), but as a conceptual category it needs to offer a structural context for the particular discourses analysed (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011). Both the interpretation and theorisation columns/categories in Table 7 above reflect what Sayer (1992) describes as ‘an ordering framework’ used as a ‘nominalist solution’ to concept formation. The analysis has to proceed to the next level, where generative mechanisms are identified.

3.9.2.1.5 Retroduction

In using retroduction, counter-factual questions are used, inter alia:

- What does the existence of this object presuppose?
- What must the world be like for this to be possible? (Danermark et al. 2002).

This process should not be confused with retrodiction, which is about applying theory to the data to account for it. Retroductive reasoning identifies the necessary rather than contingent causal relationships or mechanisms which are the condition for the generation of the social phenomena (Sayer 1992), and produces a set of generative mechanisms which can account for and contextualise the discourses of the specific social agents investigated (Bygstad and Munkvold 2011). Certainly, in the case of the discourses of new academics, it was necessary to be sensitive to developments within the ideological environment influential in their practices.

When new mechanisms are found, we can identify others by analysing how context (other and existing mechanisms) influences the triggering of this mechanism (Sayer 1992). This involves looking at the interplay between social objects and other objects, such as in the domains of structure, culture and agency, to produce observable outcomes (Bygstad and
Munkvold 2011). In social realist terms, this interplay can account for social change by validating explanatory power through a key mechanism or through the causal structure that best explains the events observed (Sayer 1992). Using abduction and retroduction as inferencing techniques allowed me to gain insight into what the world must be like at the UoT for the six new academics in their exercise of agency, unfolding over time.

3.9.2.2 Framework for causal analysis

As discussed in Chapter Two, the central goal of the study’s research question is addressed through the use of Archer’s Three-Stage Model of Mediation (2000). Archer argues (2003: 135) that the effects of structural and cultural factors are mediated to the agency of the individual through three main stages, depicted in Table 8 below. This trajectory is driven though the inner conversation or reflexive deliberation on one’s concerns in relation to society (Archer 2007a: 3). Archer’s Three-Stage Model (2000) foregrounds practice as pivotal to the agential choices of new academics, and through which they establish a modus vivendi in relation to their teaching. How they negotiate their agency is exercised over time and through experience (Kahn 2009). These three stages are depicted in the table below to illustrate how they relate to this study’s research sub-questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description of Stage</th>
<th>Research sub-question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Structural and cultural properties objectively shape the situations that agents confront involuntarily, and inter alia possess generative powers of constraint and enablement in relation to subjects’ projects.</td>
<td>How do social properties influence courses of action? This involves the agential mediation of structural and cultural properties by new academics in this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subjects’ own constellations of concerns, as subjectively defined in relation to the three orders of natural reality: nature, practice and the social.</td>
<td>Why do people act at all and what are they fallibly trying to prove? This involves the identification of projects adopted by new academics in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Courses of action are produced through the reflexive deliberations of subjects who subjectively determine their practical projects in relation to their objective circumstances.</td>
<td>What exactly do people do? This involves the endorsement of different courses of action by new academics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each stage above corresponds to each of the three sub-questions pertaining to this study. However, in using the three-stage model to address the central question of the study, I swopped Stages 1 and 2 as it made more sense to me to first establish and identify what
new academics’ projects in education were (Archer’s Stage 2), before considering how they mediated their contexts in pursuit of the projects (Archer’s Stage 1), rather than the other way around. Stage 3 remained unchanged. Each of the stages above, with their corresponding sub-questions, was then sub-divided into conceptual categories, which emerged from the literature and the data through an initial ‘soft-eye’ coding (Maton 2001). These included conception of project, pursuit of project and realisation of project. The three stages with their conceptual categories are represented in the table below. This completes the causal analysis framework used in the data analysis and writing up of the narratives of each new academic in this study.

Table 9: Adaptation of Archer’s Three-Stage Model for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description of Stage</th>
<th>Research sub-question and explication</th>
<th>Conceptual Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subjects’ own constellations of concerns, as subjectively defined in relation to the three orders of natural reality: nature, practice and the social.</td>
<td>Why do people act at all and what are they fallibly trying to prove? This involves the identification of projects adopted by new academics in higher education</td>
<td>Conception of project Sense of self and concept of self; identification of concerns; emotional commentary; adoption of projects; personal emergent properties; discernment, deliberation and dedication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structural and cultural properties objectively shape the situations that agents confront involuntarily, and inter alia possess generative powers of constraint and enablement in relation to subjects’ projects. This stage looks at the mediation of structural and cultural properties by new academics in this study.</td>
<td>How do social properties influence courses of action? This involves the agential mediation of structural and cultural properties by new academics in this study</td>
<td>Pursuit of project Impingement on project: congruence or incongruence between properties (SEPs and CEPs) and project. Advancement of project: exercise of PEPs; reflexive deliberation Impingement and advancement aspects to be analysed at macro, meso and micro levels at the UoT, namely, institutional, departmental and classroom levels, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Courses of action are produced through the reflexive deliberations of subjects who subjectively determine their practical projects in relation to their objective circumstances.</td>
<td>What exactly do people do? This involves the endorsement of different courses of action by new academics</td>
<td>Realisation of project Agential responses through reflexivity: adaption, adjustment, abandonment, enlargement, anticipation, evasion, compliance, strategic manipulation, subversion, resistance, circumvention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each conceptual category was then developed for ease of data analysis, discussion and presentation. These conceptual categories were used in each of the individual cases to develop a coherent and cohesive analytical thread for the cross-case analysis in Chapter Six, namely the Elaboration stage (T4) of the M/M cycle. The conceptual categories are discussed below.

3.9.2.2.1 Conception of project

This involves the identification of cares and concerns in education and establishes the agent’s project through an analysis of the ‘sense of self and concept of self’. Identification of concerns and adoption of projects occurred during the TDP, and these are analysed here against the emotional commentary and personal emergent properties that guided the discernment, deliberation, and dedication processes.

3.9.2.2.2 Pursuit of project

In pursuing a project, agents necessarily deal with social conditioning. This entails two sets of causal powers, and how those belonging to structure and culture impinge, while those belonging to agents influence them to act in particular ways. There is impingement on it (objective) and responses to it (subjective), but people do not respond in uniform ways to similarly structured situations in an open system. Besides the external contingencies, the causal power to reflect and decide what to do is unique to individual and human subjectivity, and subjects similarly situated can debate, both internally and externally, about appropriate courses of action, and come to different conclusions. The six lecturers in this study are confronted with similar impingements from the structural and cultural systemic conditions, yet each has his or her own agential responses, which in turn acknowledges the part reflexivity plays in ‘enabling subjects to design and determine their responses to the structured circumstances in which they find themselves, in the light of what they personally care about most’ (Archer 2007b: 11). Impingement means that there is a level of constraint on one’s project, but the actual degree of enablement and constraint is dependent on the level of congruence or incongruence between the property and the project (Archer 2007a: 13). Both the SEPs and CEPs, activated and emergent from the interaction between structure, culture and agency, serve to impinge (or advance) new lecturers’ projects, which they have to deliberate on reflexively, by their own description.

3.9.2.2.3 Realisation of project

In working towards realising their projects, agents summon their PEPs to ensure that their
cares and concerns are materialised and brought to fruition through their efforts. In mediating contextual concerns, however, many agents’ projects are renounced or abandoned owing to overwhelming constraints exerted by structural and cultural systemic features. For those agents who are able to invoke just the right balance of personal powers to circumvent contextual concerns, projects are realised as ‘practices’ that become well established and add to the professional and social identity of agent as actor.

3.9.2.3 Representation of participants in the analysis

The burden of representation is fairly heavy in narrative analysis presentation, as the research participants were active generators of information, knowledge and perspectives in this study. The danger in narrative research processes is the quoting of individuals out of context or linking statements to create meanings never intended (Roed 2012). In selecting quotations that best support an argument, the ‘authority of experience’ is afforded to some individuals at the expense of others. Even in my analysis I inadvertently ‘silenced some participants while giving voice to others’ (Roed 2012). While my responsibility was to ensure that participants were quoted sufficiently as needed, not all were quoted in equal measure. When an individual was given more space, this was based on how succinctly and effectively he or she was articulating something that others may have raised as well (Roed 2012). I will now turn to the final analytical strategy contributing to the explanatory framework in this study, namely, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which was used to transcend the experiences and events generated by the data and to delve into the underlying causes of the phenomena (Bhaskar 1989).

3.9.3 Critical discourse analysis

According to Bhaskar (1998: 238), the critical realist starting point is the analysis of how meanings are constructed in social practice. To complement the analytical framework discussed above, I therefore used CDA as an analysing strategy to see how new academics constructed meaning by drawing (tacitly or explicitly) on a range of discourses in HE to legitimise, repudiate, enhance, enable, challenge, and even resist the material and ideational systems embedded in their academic reality. Given the critical and social realist ontological and epistemological stances adopted in this study, CDA was a natural choice as a data-analysing strategy because it is compatible with both of these, and because most of the data generated and gathered in this study constitutes textual representations of a semiotic kind. However, this study is less concerned with linguistic, textual or micro features of the
discourses (Jacobs 2014) and more interested in their discursive ability as mechanisms to enable or constrain (Fairclough 2003) the exercise of agency among new academics in HE. The term ‘discourse’ is understood and drawn upon in different ways by discourse analysts, but critical discourse analysis as a ‘clump’ or set of ideas at the level of the Real that has causal powers to affect social practice (Fairclough 2000; Gee 1992; Kress 1985) is significant for this study. According to Boughey (2012b), the text is experienced at the Empirical Level; it emerges at the level of the Actual, and it is a structuring mechanism at the level of the Real through SEPs (such as language, and class), CEPs (in discursive ideas and beliefs) and PEPs (in the way agents draw on them). Discourses as sets of ideas which ‘clump’ together in language or other sign systems may be stable, central or marginal, or not (Ibid.) in an open and intransitive system.

In using CDA in the analysis, I took care to uphold the realist characteristics and features of agents, the process, and the texts as independent and autonomous entities. In recent work, Fairclough (2003; 2010), moving towards a critical realist perspective on CDA derived from Bhaskar (1998), asserts that social events are constituted through the intersection of two causal powers – social practices and social agents. The overriding objective in using CDA is to give precise accounts of social change by looking at the ways and extent to which social events are produced through discourse (Fairclough 2005). Research in CDA is thus related to the practical problems of social life, with the objective of an ‘explanatory critique’ (Bhaskar 1998), based on the discoveries of social practices and from searching out methods for their solution (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999).

In examining how new academics mediate their structural and cultural contexts through discourses, it was important to instate them as active agents. Social agents actively work these ‘resources’ to create texts out of them, rather than simply instantiating them (Papa 2008). They ‘texture’ the texts through the use of devices such as hedging and modalising, manifested in the causal powers of new academics in this study, because it involved them as agents with causal powers drawing upon social structures (including language) and practices (including orders of discourse) in producing texts (Fairclough et al. 2004).

The most influential approach in CDA comes from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which analyses the relationship between language and its social functions (Halliday 1994). The importance of the text in relation to its context (Ibid.) is what distinguishes discourse analysts from critical discourse analysts (Fairclough et al. 2004). The ‘critical’ aspect of CDA is concerned with the truthfulness of texts, their production, and their interpretation, while a
‘genre’ perspective of discourse analysis (Bazerman 1997) relies on understanding texts as they are used for socially-recognised purposes. I found that the discourses drawn on by new academics in this study are closely interrelated with the context of HE, in which they are embedded.

It is equally important to see discourses not just as being activated by agents but capable of structuring mechanisms themselves. Discourses are seen as generative mechanisms of the various dimensions of social life, including physical, chemical, biological, economic, social, psychological and linguistic chemistry, possessing distinct structures, with effect in the events and experiences of agents (Fairclough et al. 2004). In this study, I was particularly interested in how dominant and marginalised discourses in HE contributed to the emergence of sub-discourses at the socio-interaction level (see Chapter Four). According to Kincheloe, Steinberg and Gresson (1996: 30), ‘discourses as tacit rules regulate what can and cannot be said, who can speak, and who must listen, whose educational perspectives are scientific and whose are unlearned and unimportant – in short it [sic] defines what is thinkable’. The data in this study, emanating from multiple sources and generated through multiple modalities and methods, provided a rich canvas for CDA, given its adherence to critical realist terms and its commitment to analysing texts as part of broader contextual realities. This was crucial in this study, where textual meaning was interrelated but not determined by the context of the university and HE in general. There was recognition of new academics’ ability to ‘work’ textual resources, often unknowingly, in ways that shaped their choices, placing them in an active role and in a dialectical relationship with discourses.

The discourse aspect of a social order is called an ‘order of discourse’, which is the way in which a range of genres, discourses and styles are networked (Kress 1989). An order of discourse usually encompasses a range of sub-discourses. In the example of the ‘quality discourse’, these would include discourses of performativity, accountability, and marketisation, and so on (Quinn 2006). The orders of discourse represent the totality of the discursive practices of a social domain and how they are articulated together (Fairclough 2005: 53). Orders of discourse can be envisaged as existing at three levels of realisation: situational, institutional, and societal (MacDonald and O'Regan 2009). In Chapter Four, orders of discourse, together with their sub- and associated discourses at different levels of realisation, are identified and discussed, as they pertain to the structuring mechanisms in this study.

The different sub-sets of data were analysed using orders of discourse, by drawing on
substantive and meta-theoretical knowledge as well as the realist schema for data analysis discussed above (Table 7). Moving from a ‘soft eye’ gaze, informed by an implicit knowledge of the field through my immersion in it as academic staff developer, I used critical discourse analysis to lean on my trained ‘academic’ gaze (Maton 2001) in the HE field to enhance the analytical process (discussed already) of coding, interpreting, critiquing, exemplifying, abstracting, and retroducing, against the backdrop of discourses and HE substantive literature. I used CDA explicitly to maintain the tension between text and context, driven by critical realist disposition to get to underlying causal effects of discourses in order to explain how new academics, as primary agents, mediate the structural and cultural conditions that they confront. Aware that these accounts were fallible because of their many interpretations in an open system, I used CDA cautiously so that it did not over-determine the narrative construction of either the river-of-life story or the photovoice story enacted and embodied by the new academics as active agents. I remained committed to letting the data speak for itself as much as it could (Maton 2001). The actual presentation of the analysis of the social and socio-cultural interaction at T2–3 in Chapter Five is based on the adaptations I made in the adoption of the critical realist schema used in this chapter.

3.10 Limitations of the study

While the research question of this study focuses on conditions that enable or constrain the exercise of agency of new academics, conducive to the social inclusion of students, it is beyond the substantive scope of the study to cover the wide range of considerations that apply to inclusion and exclusion, which extend beyond the agency of new academics. There are many systemic structures and mechanisms at the university and in HE itself that pertain directly to inclusion/exclusion. My study is concerned with the conditions that new academics draw on when they make choices to act, and how these conditions shape different kinds of agency. The findings of the study are thus to be read against the frame of social inclusion to the extent that it gives an understanding of the nature of the agency being exercised (as discussed in Chapter One and Chapter Four). While the objective situation in which new academics find themselves constrains and/or enables the development of their practice, it is not simply a case of their agency being influenced by social and cultural contexts in determined ways. Their concerns also give shape to their agency, as do the reflexive deliberations in which they engage (Archer 2003). By looking at how new academics exercise agency in relation to socio-cultural factors, we get a glimpse not only into the constraints they face, but also into the capacity they demonstrate to negotiate challenges in their contexts. This, together with the macro challenges identified for HE itself, enable a
consideration of the conditions that can be created in HE for enabling agency that is critical and conducive to transformative student learning through social inclusion.
Chapter Four: Systemic Conditions at T1 of the Morphogenetic Cycle

4.1 Introduction

As discussed already in the research design in Chapter Three (see 3.5), this chapter describes and analyses the conditions at T1, which is the first stage of the morphogenetic (M/M) cycle in this study. This phase is concerned with structural and cultural conditioning at the macro (international), meso (national) and micro (institutional) levels of the HE system. In this study, distinguishing between the ‘parts’ (structural and cultural systemic conditions in HE) and the ‘people’ (mediation and interaction of new academics as agents) is crucial to the critical and social realist analysis undertaken here. According to Archer (1996: xxi), ‘we need to specify, first, which systemic relations impinge upon agency and how they do so; and, second, which social relations affect how agents respond to and react back on the Cultural System and Structural System’.

For the purposes of analysis, I present the social structural (SS) conditions first, to sketch the HE landscape and context at a systemic level, but it should be remembered that this phase of conditioning at T1 has been arrived at through active mediation by social agents in previous M/M cycles of elaboration. In upholding Archer’s insistence on analytical dualism (1995), structure is divided into the structural system (SS) and socio-interaction (SI), both of which are logically and sociologically distinct for analysis. The policies, legalities, and governance of HE, for example, embraced in South Africa post 1994, are the results of previous deeply-engaging democratic processes (Lange 2014) at the level of social and socio-cultural interaction. Next, the cultural system is described and analysed to show how, in interacting with structures, agents necessarily and meaningfully draw on the cultural conspectus, which conditions (not determines) their choices and actions. Again, in upholding analytical dualism (Archer 1995), culture is divided into the cultural system (CS) and socio-cultural interaction (S-C), both of which are logically and sociologically distinct for analysis (Archer 1996). Similar to social structure, the CS is the product of historical socio-cultural interaction and elaboration; in drawing on cultural components through discourses, agents invariably engage with structures. Such is the nature of interplay between the domains of structure, culture and agency at the level of the Real (Archer 1995).
4.2 Structural conditioning at T1

4.2.1 Structural conditions at the international and national levels

The structural conditions at T1 are a strong conditioning influence on new academics’ exercise of agency in this study. The structural morphogenesis in HE initiated by socio-cultural action in the early years of democracy, marking the transformation to a non-racial, non-sexist, democratic society, has serious implications for how university teachers are constructed, and how they and others perceive their roles and responsibilities. The resilience and robustness of a fledgling democracy like South Africa lie partly in the strength of its social pillars, HE being a significant pillar in shaping and enabling not only entry points to tertiary study, but also exit points into the field of work and then back into society. I now look briefly at the structural changes that affect discursive understanding of the purpose of university education and the part that academics (new and established) have to play in the new dispensation.

Policy work and policy innovation were the vehicles through which the philosophical vision for an integrated HE system was made manifest, and work in this area was extensive, culminating in the publication of a White Paper (3) in 1997 titled, ‘A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education’. This report was acclaimed both domestically and internationally as a landmark in HE policy formulation (OECD 2008), as it opened a space for policy debate, negotiation, consultation with stakeholders, consensus building and the inclusion of dissenting views (Badat 2004; Bundy 2006; CHE 2004). Structural reforms (including government’s steering instruments such as policies, funding frameworks, and the establishment of professional bodies to consult, govern, advise and monitor HE) were instantiated to redress the inequities of the past and to begin the process of nation building (CHE 2004; DoE 2008b). In HE, the structural transformation of the historical and social legacy of differentiated education (CHE 2010) brought about new institutional configurations (CHE 2004). The Higher Education Act No. 101 of 1997 provided the legal framework and foundation for the governance structure for universities. The vision of a reconfigured higher education system was guided by the principles of equity and redress, democracy, development, quality, effectiveness and efficiency, academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and public accountability (DoE 1997). These notable reforms served and continue to serve as structuring mechanisms for the aims, strategic goals and vision for democratic change and redress of the past imbalances in HE (DoE 2001).

Widening participation and increasing success rates of previously disadvantaged students
through the HE system was thus high on the agenda (CHE 2010; HESA 2011; Scott, Yeld, and Hendry, 2007) to ensure that students could contribute effectively to the growth and development not only of themselves as critical citizens, but also of the economy as a whole (DOE 2008b).

At the same time that the structural morphogenesis was in progress, disjunctions between policy reform and the values and attitudes attached to the purpose of HE signalled that the tensions in this contested terrain needed to be resolved. Reaching consensus on the purpose of HE in South Africa has always been a complex matter (CHE 2013a); post 1994, South African HE was faced with a strategic decision either to prioritise a social obligation to service the public good (Singh 2001) and to promote critical citizenry (Nussbaum 1997; Badat 2009), or, given South Africa’s economic history, to address the economy first, through knowledge production for the market (Habib 2013; Ball 2012). The knowledge production argument was bolstered by the discursive understanding that the aim of tertiary education is ‘to open access to the labour market and to provide an opportunity to break away from the reproduction of poverty and disadvantage’ (Mdepa and Tshiwula 2012: 29). To resolve this disjunction, the HE sector chose to do both, but the conjunction deepened rather than tamed the concomitant tension between the instrumentalist view of producing intellectual workers and graduates for a knowledge economy (Boughey 2008), and the view driven by a social justice agenda of developing full human capacity to function effectively in society (Badat 2009; Nussbaum 2007). This dual purpose was set to influence the simultaneous achievement of the goals in HE in both negative and advantageous ways.

This phase of policy reforms was bolstered by the National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) in 2001 (DoE 2001), which gave momentum to a restructuring plan to eradicate the inherited inequities, ineffectiveness, and inefficiency of a costly and duplicitous apartheid system (OECD 2008). This plan strongly advocated a process of institutional mergers, reducing the number of higher education institutions from 36 to 23, and creating new institutional types (DoE 2001). This reconfiguration process differentiated between three kinds of universities: traditional, comprehensive, and universities of technology (DoE 2008a), reflected in redrafted institutional mission statements of universities based on their unique contextual nuances and focal points (CHE 2013a).

Soon after this, the Department of Education (DoE) and the Council on Higher Education

---

4 The Department of Higher Education and Training is one of the departments of the South African government which oversees universities and other post-secondary education in South Africa. It was created in 2009 after the election of President Jacob Zuma, when the former Department of Education was divided. Similarly, the
(CHE), which had a policy advisory mandate, were established. CHE also has executive responsibility for accreditation, quality assurance and quality promotion through a permanent subcommittee, known as the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), as well as for the monitoring and evaluation of the achievement of policy goals and objectives, including annual reporting on the state of higher education in South Africa, and promoting students’ access to higher education (CHE 2007). The National Qualifications Framework (NQF)\textsuperscript{5}, a single national quality assurance system, comprising programme accreditation and reaccreditation, institutional audits and development and promotion of quality in higher education, was further instated.

The stage was set (structurally anyway) for the unfolding of a new HE system, with its component parts, to bring to fruition the transformation goals envisaged by the new government, but as structural reforms were implemented, necessary contradictions emerged, presenting a situational logic that agents and the system had to respond to in discursive terms. The new structurally-reconfigured universities were entities in their own right, having emerged from a deep political and economic system and process (Lange 2014), and capable of exerting their own influences on the sector, as they did. Universities are the emergent product of the political and socio-economic systems in which they are embedded (Habib 2013). Whatever the argument, it was evident that the HE sector could not escape the super complexity (Barnett 2000) of its embedded reality.

By mid-2000, the reconfiguration of HE and the outcome of the mergers, presented a paradoxical problem: structurally HE needed to be unified but culturally and socially it needed to diversify in order to uphold the uniqueness of entities merging for the first time in the country’s history. This complexity was also reflected in state policy documents on HE that foregrounded the importance of levelling the playing fields in education through a commitment to equity (Boughey 2007b).

Compounding the tension in HE, the effects of the economic crises and economic trends at an international level were experienced in local contexts. Parallel to the South African political and economic development, global economies were locked to a large extent into each other’s fate in an open market, thus the integration of the South African economy within the global economy had dire consequences for HE in South Africa (Habib 2013). Here again,

\textsuperscript{5} The revised HEQF in 2013, in line with the previous HEQF, provides the basis for integrating all higher education qualifications into the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) – see CHE’s Discussion Document on the HEQF Review, 2010
by splitting its priorities and focus, South Africa faced two ways: on the one hand it embodied a Third World economic reality but, as a new democracy, it embraced First World aspirations and ambitions influenced by the neo-liberal economic agenda in advanced industrial societies during the 1980s (CHE 2013b).

The change from an ‘elite higher education system’ to a ‘mass higher education system’ was made possible by structural enablements such as policies on widened access, increased participation, and diversified education, but this change was juxtaposed with a corporatisation (Chomsky 2011) and marketisation (Bertelsen 1998) based on HE’s location in a macro-economic transformation agenda (Habib 2013). The adoption of the macro-economic policy, Growth, Employment And Redistribution (GEAR) – A Macroeconomic Strategy, has further affected universities by making them more like business organisations (CHE 2010). The growing impact of globalisation and global trends on higher education put pressure on students to think of themselves as consumers, investing only in their own personal human capital with a view to reaping high financial rewards (Holmwood 2011). When we value our students only for what they achieve, they become resources in an instrumental sense (Noddings 1992). The notion that university education is seen as something purchased at a high price for private benefit leads to the commodification of knowledge and the marketisation of higher education provision (Bundy 2006; Walker 2002). The discourse of equity in HE was now being counterbalanced by a new discourse on efficiency (Boughey 2007b), which meant that the HE transformation goals were shifted further afield (Bozalek and Boughey 2012).

The changes in HE had ushered in a large proportion of ‘new’ students who were ‘underprepared’ for a university that had been historically designed and conceptualised for an elite few who, in possession of the economic and cultural capital, were in familiar territory in the disciplinary contexts of the academy and could reproduce their privileged positions of wealth and superiority, inherited from their parents. Students from increasingly diverse social, cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds were introduced to an education system that they could not negotiate. The unification of academic life on a structural level was now being enacted differentially in the socio-cultural realm through individual biographies of ill-prepared students confronting new situations without reference points with which they were familiar. This contextual discontinuity (Archer 2012a) highlighted that universities needed to change too, to become more accessible through their knowledge production and engagement.
A study of the cohort of students entering South African universities in 2000 highlights not only the skewed participation rates of the different racial groups, but also the reality that black South Africans have less chance of succeeding compared with their white counterparts (Scott et al. 2007). From a gender-equity perspective, female students enrolled in larger numbers in the field of humanities, particularly in teacher education programmes, but remained seriously underrepresented in programmes in science, engineering and technology, and in business, commerce, and management (Badat 2004; Cloete 2002; Cooper and Subotzky 2001). Cooper and Subotzky’s (2001) *Skewed Revolution* shows how the former ‘technikons’ (a uniquely South African institutional designation) moved quickly to recruit working-class black students who were looking for ‘work-ready’ qualifications. The affective and institutional cultural factors, and the teaching and learning processes taking place in HEIs, had a major influence on student performance (OECD 2008: 344).

It can be seen that the gains derived from nearly two decades of policy work are not distributed equally since black South Africans simply are not completing their studies at the same rate or in the same time as their white peers. This has led to the proclamation of a ‘crisis’ in teaching and learning in popular discourses related to higher education (Boughey 2013:1).

This ‘crisis’ in education meant that, although students had physical access, they did not have epistemological access (Morrow 1992) to the ways the university engaged with knowledge. Students also did not have access to the elevated discourses (Boughey 2002) of the academic language of the university, which was a gatekeeper to that knowledge (Ibid.; Jacobs 2007; Leibowitz, Adendorff, Daniels, Loots, Nakasa, Ngxabazi, Van der Merwe and Van Deventer 2005; McKenna 2004). If universities were to contribute to a more equitable South African society,

. . . then access and success must be improved for black (and particularly black working class) students who, by virtue of their previous experiences, have not been inducted into dominant ways of constructing knowledge (Boughey 2008: 2).

The huge schism between student access and student success, manifest in the attrition rates, undergraduate success, and graduation figures (Scott et al. 2007), showed that improvement in equity of access and outcomes, especially for black students, was critical. Lecturers too were ill equipped to confront and embrace the diverse and heterogeneous classrooms and students they now confronted. Stark disjunctions were evident in the differing expectations of students’ roles and the role of the lecturer, widening the gap
between the skills and experiences that both parties were drawing on in the academic space. Significant demands were now made on the teaching role of academics (HESA 2011), for the massification of HE presented a new focus on the explicit ‘teaching’ of academic literacy skills to disadvantaged students (Quinn and Vorster 2012). Thus, while many strides were advanced structurally to shape the academic identity formation of universities and, by many accounts, there have been positive changes and developments in HE since the beginning of democracy (CHE 2013b), participation and engagement on a social and cultural level were still minimal and nowhere near intended numbers, especially among black and coloured students (Scott et al. 2007).

Various reasons have been advanced to explain these patterns, such as underpreparedness for university study, inadequate funding for students, a non-supportive socio-economic environment, and so on (DHET 2013). State advisors were quick to point out that policy is not the only driver of change in this context, yet criticism was levelled at the DoE for reneging on its policies and promises (CHE 2004: 37) when the redress funding (Steyn and De Villiers 2007) geared towards the attainment of these goals did not materialise. Several institutions faced serious threats to their sustainability, further aggravated by ‘governance crises’ (CHE 2004: 27). Those students entering HE through revised university access policies and financial aid schemes, such as the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS), were not completing their studies, and drop-out, failure and completion rates did not reflect the grand ideals of strategic transformation outlined in previous structural policies and documents (Scott et al. 2007). This was a serious indictment on what the system had done (or not done) in terms of efficient use of the country’s resources to realise the transformation goals (CHE 2004).

The significant investments made through material resources and the creation of a new educational landscape post 1994 still left HE a highly contested terrain. The lack of fit between education policy and education practice could be described as ‘nothing more than a struggle for the achievement of a broad political symbolism to mark the shift from apartheid to post apartheid society’ (Jansen 2001: 272). There was little displacement of past structures (Wolpe1991), and little success in terms of de-colonising, de-racialising, and de-gendering inherited intellectual spaces (Badat 2007). Institutions remained bastions of past tradition and discrimination (CHE 2010). This highlighted the need, as a matter of urgency, for the transformation of HE to be mediated by concerns for social justice (Lange 2006: 40; Singh 2006: 66) and the social inclusion of students (CHE 2013a).
This impasse had to be circumvented and the one area targeted for this was teaching and learning, and, by implication, also the university teacher. In fact, the lack of adequate professional development of university teachers was cited as one of the serious contributing factors to the inability to effect change in the system (Fiske and Ladd 2004). A key challenge was to ensure that academic staff development (ASD) practitioners, as well as new and established academics, possessed the teaching and learning capabilities that were essential to produce high-quality graduates and enhance equity of opportunity and outcomes for students (HESA 2011).

Professional development was now seen as vital in its perceived potential to address the shortcomings of a fractured HE system. In the next section, I problematise the discursive constructions of the university teacher as ‘saviour’ of an ailing system and key to solving the crisis in education (Boughey 2011), but here I will analyse the structural features relating to the (limited) improvement in the arena of university teaching per se to meet the transformation goals of 1997 (CHE 2004).

The plan to professionalise the HE academic and teaching staff was bolstered structurally through government’s outlay of huge monetary amounts in the form of teaching development grants (discussed below) for the professional development of academics. Teaching development took on greater salience as a more formal approach to staff development in HE, with an explicit focus on lecturers and their teaching ability, teaching resources, and professional skills, as well as on managing the academic core functions of teaching, research, and community engagement. These functions required support and specialist pedagogic expertise from staff developers and other stakeholders (HESA 2011).

The conjunction between structural and cultural morphogenesis meant that structural changes by the DHET and CHE led to ideational expansion, in that teaching was now considered important, even at research-intensive universities. A cultural morphogenesis triggered the shift in emphasis from student learning, which characterised the work of academic development movements of the 80s and 90s (Volbrecht and Boughey 2004), to staff development. Structurally, HE, of necessity, had contributed via funding and policy to a renewed focus on developing university lecturers as professional teachers, with targeted efforts aimed at opening up and uplifting the status of teaching in the university (MoHET 2012). The age-old tradition of Research holding the key to academic prestige and rewards was slowly being eroded by a focus on teaching.
However, locating teaching and the teacher as central to student success within the current academic context, given the socio-cultural challenges discussed above, meant that the systemic level of HE was being overlooked regarding its conditioning, influences and mechanisms in the domains of structure, culture and agency (Boughey 2013). It also meant that academic staff developers needed to take on a more significant role in mediating contextual challenges (CHE 2010) by working more closely with disciplinary experts in collaborative projects, in order to bridge the gap between general academic practices and specific disciplinary practices needed in specific knowledge areas (Jacobs, 2006). This led to a more nuanced way of working with academics (Boughey 2005), in keeping with calls from the government and related bodies to develop curricula and teaching methodologies that were more responsive to the needs of learners (CHE 2010).

Efforts to improve the calibre of academics in HE included a number of formal qualifications offered to university teachers, such as the new postgraduate qualifications in HE teaching and learning (Rhodes University, University of the Western Cape, Stellenbosch University, University of Cape Town, among others) which are an indication that efforts to promote a scholarly approach to teaching development (Bamber 2002) are being strengthened. Even though formal certification is essential, concerns have been noted about the dangers of credentialism in the drive towards the accredited professionalisation of higher education teachers (Winberg and Garraway 2014b). With this structural support of teaching excellence awards, teaching development grants, institutional audits on teaching, and a proliferation of scholarly publications on teaching (Boyer 1990), in national and international contexts, teaching has also grown discursively in recognition and status.

The structural enablements for teaching and professional development have important implications for this study, in the hope that new academics, as they are recruited and professionally developed in HE, will avert the crisis in education by teaching in effective ways. Most significant of the efforts to bolster teaching is the recent Teaching Development Grant (TDG), which has an explicit focus on the development of university teachers and their teaching practices. The White Paper on Post-School Education and Training and the National Development Plan (Essop 2013) emphasise this urgency because, despite a range of interventions, ‘including support through the fiscus for expanding extended degree programmes and teaching development grants, the challenge of poor throughputs from higher education remained’. When this grant was introduced in 2004, ‘considerable agency was therefore allowed to institutions and institutional leaders to decide how money, symbolically intended for teaching development, should be used’ (Boughey 2013: 4). This
freedom involved identifying the ‘killer’ courses or ‘at risk’ courses within university programmes, (failed by large proportions of students), and submitting proposals for interventions to remedy their deficiencies.

In the second cycle of funding, it was imperative for the state ‘to seek to more intentionally steer the use of the grant to support and strengthen teaching at universities’ (2008a: 12). With the emphasis explicitly on teaching (for transformation), resources were now being deployed into developing the teaching capacity and expertise of university lecturers. The change in focus from student learning to lecturer enhancement was a significant shift in understanding how to respond to the ‘crisis’ in education in more nuanced ways. The second cycle of the TDG was thus flanked by the simultaneous release of two steering and guiding documents: the White Paper on Post-School Education and Training (DHET 2013) and the National Development Plan (National Planning Commission 2011), known as Vision for 2030. There was a strong suggestion that proposed programmes, projects and/or activities by universities should focus on the development of teachers, teaching, and teaching resources in order to contribute to the achievement of improved learner success rates, throughput rates and graduate attributes that were personally, professionally and socially valuable (MoHET 2012).

The establishment of the Quality Enhancement Project (QEP) by CHE is a further indication of the seriousness with which teaching was now being regarded by the state and its advisors, but also shows an apparent cultural morphogenesis in the use of the term ‘enhancement’ instead of ‘audits’ in the emergent teaching and learning discourse. Following the Scottish model (CHE 2014), ‘enhancement’ in HE suggests the promotion of a scholarship of teaching and learning, enhancing the status and importance of teaching at universities and enabling the development of a sustainable pipeline of new academics. This understanding and approach were operationalised by the DHET in an initiative known as the Next Generation of Academics Project (nGap). The ‘Next Generation’, in contrast with a ‘new generation’, refers to individuals who are currently not academics but on a trajectory towards a career in academia (HESA 2011).

The intentionality and rationale behind the new TDG policy and its intended use seemed to be better conceptualised, with a more sustainable vision in the second round, but, on closer critical reflection, it could be that tipping the scales too much in favour of teaching development might be short sighted (Leibowitz 2015). If the purpose of the grant is based on the lecturer/teacher as ‘the central figure upon which improved teaching and so improved
learning outcomes rests (DHET 2011: 2), questions need to be asked about the extent to which the lecturer/teacher can be this person, given the historical legacy of poor infrastructure at some universities, namely, dysfunctional admissions processes, poor quality resources for teaching and learning, huge classes, lack of capacity of academic staff developers, and so on (Boughey 2013). In critical and social realist terms, this construction involves privileging the agency of the individual at the expense of structure and culture in order to account for the emergence of improved outcomes (Ibid.).

ASD, which is foregrounded by the TDG, is enacted differently at different institutions depending on availability of material resources, capacity of people, and the cultural response to ASD work in general (Leibowitz, Ndebele and Winberg 2014). Given the complexity of issues in HE discussed earlier, many ASD centres and agents face both financial and socio-cultural challenges, and are limited in their ability to develop stances in positioning themselves as critical agents of change. This is severely compounded by contingent pressures from a fast-evolving AD/ED movement internationally, resulting in inertia at some universities (Boughey 2013).

The structural evolution of ASD over the decades reflects the contextual and advocacy challenges of this work in the university. A range of generational influences on ASD (Leibowitz et al. 2014a) in international contexts (see T1 Cultural) provided conditioning influences (both enabling and constraining) on ASD practice in South Africa. In sum, the socio-political history of the country, as well as the transformation goals identified in the White Paper (3) of 1997, offers strategic and directional guidance to the conceptualisation, theorising, practices and implementation of ASD as a formalised programme in this country. The emergence of ASD as a real structure in its own right, able to exert its own powers and properties, is a result of deep structuring mechanisms at the level of the Real that account not only for its identity and agency, but also for what it is able to do, and not do, in pursuance of the goals of the sector. The structural and cultural conditions, namely, the enabling and constraining influences in HE internationally and nationally, and at institutions specifically, have moulded the shape and form of ASD as we see it today, embodied and enacted by real agents, who mediate, resist and transform it in continuous cycles of change.

The background and context provided above explicate and exemplify the structural and cultural conditioning at T1 of Archer’s morphogenetic cycle and set the scene for the social and socio-cultural interaction in this study (see Chapter Five). As has been shown, the current HE field, both nationally and internationally, poses huge challenges for all academics, and more so for new academics transitioning into academia. New lecturers
coming to HE inherit the structural and cultural contexts of previous agents and actors which influence how they mediate the contextual challenges they confront (Archer 2000). New lecturers in South Africa face a bigger challenge in that they have to engage in professional development activities to frame their teaching as individuals, but they also have to understand the socio-political climate in HE and the sector’s role in redressing the inequities of the past, with the concomitant need to be contributors to a global and local knowledge economy. It is against a backdrop of constitutional and social imperatives that South African universities need to recruit, produce and retain the next generation of academics (HESA 2011), which should be constituted mainly of black and female South Africans who also possess the intellectual and academic capabilities related to teaching and learning, and to research and community engagement, that are a necessary condition for transforming and developing South Africa’s universities (Badat 2009). From an ASD perspective, this also means that novice academics need to be inducted into the academy in much more structured and deliberate ways than in the past (Quinn and Vorster 2012).

The question of how new lecturers are inducted into HE and what HE and staff/professional development programmes are doing (or can do) to support these lecturers holistically forms the research thread in this study. My interest is to locate both these concerns in a situated context of HE practice, emergent from deep social and historical processes nationally and internationally, in order to gain insights into how contexts, with their structuring mechanisms, influence the choices made and practices adopted by new academics in the South African HE system. The overarching question, given the contextual complexities presented in this chapter, is whether we are doing enough as a sector to be truly effective, critical, responsive, and accountable in terms of the goals of transformation that HE is striving to achieve.

4.2.2 Structural conditions at institutional level

4.2.2.1 Introduction

The aim of this section is to show how structural and cultural influences (Archer 1995) in the context of the UoT have conditioned (via their emergent properties) the human agency of new lecturers by enabling and/or constraining them. According to Archer, human beings are inescapably born into a social context not of their making, and confront social and cultural structures in their daily lives (Archer 2007a). My research question, which focuses on the conditions that enable or constrain the exercise of agency among new academics at the UoT, is aimed at exploring these conditional contexts to see which aspects feature more strongly than others in accounting for how new lecturers exercise agency.
4.2.2.2 The university of technology (UoT)

The UoT as a differentiated higher education institution is of significance to this doctoral study as it provides a further layer of conditioning for the new academics who are located in this particular institutional context. In the early 2000s, the government, under the leadership of Minister of Education, Kader Asmal, led a process of differentiation through the creation of three institutional types (Lange 2012) and the restructuring of institutions into merged institutions. This has been discussed in an earlier section; suffice it to add here that the objective of the differentiation process was to decide on the orientation that universities would adopt in relation to teaching, learning, and research. The conceptualisation of differentiation underpinning the mergers hinged on an understanding that differentiation was a means of reassessing a problem and not an end in itself (Lange 2012). As such, differentiation was conceptualised contextually to consider the size of the population, current and envisaged higher-education participation, the difficulties of the schooling system, the availability of human and financial resources, and the socio-economic reality of the different provinces to offer a nuanced response (Ibid.).

Related to the size and shape of HE providers (CHE 2000), ‘fitness for purpose’ (Harvey and Green 1993) was a key aspirational goal for the development of quality at merged institutions, as well as the development of a common but unique identity shaped around the differentiated provisions of teaching, learning, research, and social responsiveness in keeping with institutional mission and vision statements. UoTs have a strong corporate orientation and industry linkages, with a substantial focus on service to industry and community as their knowledge production is based on applied research and technology innovation in career-focused education in niche areas such as Science, Engineering and Technology (SET).

While the concept of a technical university is not new, and exists in various technical institutions around the world, the ‘technikon’ legacy which underpins UoTs is a uniquely South African concept, in existence from 1979–2004. However, it is neither well recognised nor understood internationally, making qualifications difficult to align (CHE 2010; du Pré 2010). The technikon was discursively considered inferior to universities and the quality of graduates produced was regarded as substandard to universities (du Pré 2010). For a long time, technikons struggled to shrug off the negative associations with the discourse of ‘glorified high schools’ (Jansen 2002). This discourse invokes the notion of rule-governed and rule-administered tertiary education provision, in stark contrast to the autonomy,
collegiality and academic freedom hard fought for and viciously defended at traditional universities.

The technikons’ commitment to industry training continued in the UoTs, which offered ‘work ready’ qualifications to meet the needs of poor black students, who, having been denied access to HE, enrol at UoTs as a means of getting better employment and improving material conditions for themselves. This has profound implications for teaching and learning as these very students come with particular orientations to learning and so-called learning ‘problems’ (Boughey 2012a). Cooper and Subotzky’s Skewed Revolution (2001), discussed earlier, shows how participation numbers at technikons and UoTs increased significantly from 1990 onwards. The UoT seemed to play a specific role in widening access and increasing participation of students, in keeping with the transformation goals of 1994 but, in this role, the necessary challenges of teaching diverse students with differing learning capacities were exposed. Two structural innovations were designed to boost this: the establishment of a unit focused on work-integrated learning (WIL), to offer a training-on-the-job component for students at the UoT today, and the granting of degree-awarding status to technikons in 1993. This was recognition of the contribution this sector had made to the creation of a critical mass of graduates educated specifically for the world of work.

4.2.2.3 Mergers

As discussed, from the government-led restructuring of the higher education system, and following the reconfiguration in 2005 of higher education providers from 36 to 23, UoTs emerged as differentiated universities with particular goals and purposes aligned to the needs of industry in a knowledge economy. However, merger policy was seldom implemented in merger practice and, according to Jansen (2002), there were twin logics underpinning the mergers: the logic of resolving the apartheid legacy in higher education, and the logic of incorporating the higher education system within the context of a competitive, globalised economy. In understanding these political imperatives of transition, one can begin to comprehend the nature and intensity of the contestation surrounding the merger process and its outcomes in South Africa.

4.2.2.4 The UoT in this study

In this study, the university of technology was the result of a merger between two technikons, historically divided along racial lines in the old dispensation. The UoT is predominantly urban-based and is a contact, and to some extent, residential university. The
majority of its students are drawn from the Western and Eastern Cape and it operates across a number of campuses. It is currently organised into six faculties and its programme and qualification mix (PQM) focuses predominantly on offering National Diplomas and Bachelor of Technology degrees, a few national certificates, and a limited number of master’s and doctoral degrees.

Unlike other mergers which occurred between universities and technikons, this UoT combined two technikons, and this highlighted the causal link between its conditioning as a technikon and its ability to transition from technikon to university, without the dispositions, traditions and capacity available to support the transition to university (Boughey 2011). The structural morphogenesis created by the merger was not matched by a parallel change in the cultural stasis in each technikon, making the disjunction between the two greater, and the harmonisation between the two entities more difficult to realise. This has a conditioning influence on new academics entering this UoT, creating a situational logic that they have to mediate at the social and socio-cultural interaction level.

4.2.2.5 Situational Logics at the UoT as a result of the merger

Phase 1
New lecturers entering the UoT are confronted with an institutional context that predates them. When the two previous technikons (historically one white and one black) were amalgamated (through structural morphogenesis) to form a new higher education institution, a situation of necessary contradictions (Archer 1996) prevailed between different parts of the structural and cultural systems at the UoT, which constituted problem-ridden situations. The structural relations between the two former technikons were necessary and internal, as they both formed part of the new HE landscape as a merged social structure and therefore needed each other to exist. On the level of the cultural system, the effects of the merger meant that each technikon had to give up something or lose something in the act of uniting with the other. This meant that despite the physical union of their component parts, the unique histories, values, and beliefs which they brought with them and which prevailed (cultural morphostasis) had to be negotiated. This put a strain on ideational relations, making them contradictory and not mutually reinforcing, which manifested as a threat to the endurance of their former separate identities as HE tertiary providers. When this is the case, according to Archer (1995), the situational logic invoked is one of correction and both parties need to adapt, leading to structural containment and cultural syncretism. As one lecturer in this study commented,
I think what makes it way more difficult as new lecturer is the merger . . . remember you know . . . it’s been 5 years now . . . plus minus and it’s still . . . not a merger . . . and you know that I had to teach (on different campuses) so thank goodness all of us teach on this campus now and it makes it much easier but people still talk about . . . (belonging to the different technikons) (TDP participant).

At the structural system level, strategic action was called for by agents who had to weigh up options so that differences and disparities were minimised and contained. Containment, which can be both authoritarian and sectional (Archer 1995), is a strategy to prevent differences from becoming visible.

We had to have a change management workshop to deal with [the] merger because people still say ‘these (technikon) people’ . . . ‘those (technikon) people’! (TDP participant)

At the social interaction level, new academics as agents worked to make the situation more compatible, and the disjunction between structural and cultural systems suggested a logic of compromise. At the cultural systems level, the sinking of differences between ideas and attitudes, which Archer refers to as syncretism, was mutually beneficial to minimise differences at the ideational level and to foster cultural cohesion. Socio-cultural interaction was thus focused on unifying the disparate entities, while agents (both corporate and primary) worked to influence this positively by the cautious balancing of losses and gains (Archer 1995: 224). It often happens in this situation that while one group is devoted to promotion of their vested interests, the other works to contain the dissent so that the situation is made more compatible.

That was before we arrived . . . and after they merged, we were sort of thrown into the mix . . . and expected to cope (TDP Participant).

At the end of the formal period of merger, which lasted five years, the new merged university was structurally more equipped to cope with transformation goals, but the emergent ideational context still bore the brunt of the two racially segregated campuses as well as the technikon legacy of compliance with authority (Boughey 2010). Thus a weak disjunction developed between the structural system, that changed significantly (structural morphogenesis) owing to HE transformation, institutional differentiation and merger policies, and the cultural system, that remained slightly impervious to societal and institutional transformation (cultural morphostasis).
While, on the face of it, the UoT appeared to have transformed in size and shape, culturally it remained fractured and disparate as a result of the cultural morphostasis. Although the homogeneity of the past structural system had been replaced by a diversity of race, class, language, and ethnicity (structural morphogenesis) at the chalk face, its cultural counterparts lagged behind. The merger accentuated issues arising from different discourses associated with diversity and transformation, and a further disjunction developed between the values, ideas and beliefs of the merged institution and the goals of transformation in HE. Changes suggested in the DoE White Paper 3 (1997) for the transformation of higher education were better handled structurally than culturally at this UoT.

As classrooms were now being dominated by students of greater diversity and differing academic capabilities, attention was drawn to the need for more quality teaching to meet the academic literacy and pedagogic needs of students. Problems of race, class, language support, and ethnicity created an extra burden in the classroom and impinged on all levels of the university. Unfortunately, the new university was culturally too polarised and diversified to address these issues head on, so it ushered in a suite of staff development courses for teaching and assessment to perform this function, not just to induct new staff, but to even out discrepancies between the past and present. As a result of the contradictions, lecturers who had been employed by virtue of their industry experience were now being coerced to adopt a teaching identity as well. This also opened up spaces for agents (old and new) to interpret the situation on the ground idiosyncratically, depending on orientation, expertise, roles and rank, bargaining power, vested interest, etc. To respond to the high rate of structural morphogenesis, agents reluctant to change returned to cultural morphostasis, creating further disjuncture between the structural and cultural systems.

**Phase 2**

The UoT then entered a situational logic of contingent complementarities. The new university, which is dependent on funding based on high throughput rates, is in a contingent relationship with the DHET and other professional bodies (engineering, accounting, nursing) that exert considerable external pressure on the UoT for the professionalising of qualifications and curricula. These relations are contingent as external influences are capable of being exercised in an open system, resulting in ‘projected identities’ of faculties and departments. In this period of greater state intervention than before, particularly in the areas of planning, funding and quality assurance, relations are also complementary, as both parties need each other. However, in such a contingency, it is difficult to develop corporate agency when primary agents are struggling to find their feet, with undue pressures of work
overload, timetabling issues, etc. This leaves the door open for powerful social actors (older and from previous technikons) to step in to bring about change based on promotion of their vested interests.

A situational logic of opportunism prevailed and, to handle discrepancies and unevenness, strong actors stepped into management positions to specialise their efforts. As a result, the top became more managerialist towards lecturers, with more administrative requests, form filling and bureaucracy; less academic freedom and autonomy; and more compliance with systems and structures. These constraints are borne by the new academics in this study (see Chapter Five). Performance management was used to keep people in line and dissenters were sectionalised. Simultaneous demands were placed on educators for research outputs and teaching, but teaching overload constrains research growth and development. Thus practice and discourse are further polarised. New academics’ agential choices, given these situational logics, were a combination of strategic actions which were in addition to the enabling and constraining contextual conditions that they had to mediate as newcomers (discussed in Chapter Five).

4.2.2.6 Mission and Vision

The UoT’s vision to be at the heart of technology education and innovation in Africa contains two important conceptual elements that reflect its understanding of its identity as a university of technology: (1) its career-oriented programmes, and (2) its focus on research, with the specific purpose of supporting development at the regional, national and international levels (HEQC 2011). The extent to which a university is understood to be ‘of quality’ is related to the mechanisms and procedures that are in place to ensure that the purpose is achievable and achieved (Boughey 2011). Within this understanding, teaching and learning need to be informed by the purpose a university has identified for itself. In turn, teaching and learning then drive the purpose through the way they are conceptualised and organised (Ibid.).

4.2.2.7 Students

Based on the National Benchmark Test (NBT) to identify the entry-level competencies of students, the UoT has a large number of disadvantaged or underprepared students with one of the lowest success rates for African students among the universities in the Western Cape (HEQC 2011), and provision is made through extended programmes, tutors, academic and numerical literacy programmes, and academic mentoring in residences to support student learning. This poses a fundamental challenge for student success in the area of teaching and learning. The responsibility for the academic development of students, lies with the
Although participation is voluntary, students do not make optimal use of available services such as academic development, disability assistance or poverty relief, in order to avoid the perception of stigma attached to them (HEQC 2011). Notwithstanding, in an audit summary of the UoT, the HEQC (2011) noted that students were not always satisfied with the preparedness or professional training of new lecturers to teach and facilitate student learning competently. This is significant for this study, as it relates to the nature of induction programmes and the support of new lecturers in their teaching capacity. Further, and specifically in regard to the transformation of student life, the HEQC (2011) stated that some students reported feelings of mistrust, anger, insecurity and vulnerability in relation to both administrative and academic service provision in some departments.

4.2.2.8 Institutional Culture

The absence of an integrated conceptualisation of the relationship between the student curricular experience and the socio-cultural environment of campus life offered at the UoT is a challenge, and a Transformation and Diversity Office has been created in the Vice-Chancellor’s portfolio to take care of these issues. While the Transformation Charter and the Transformation Strategy (Winberg and Garraway 2014b), inspired by ministerial task teams to address transformation in HE, provide a framework at the UoT for a systematic approach to transformation, there is still a need for a deeper engagement with the charter to create an inclusive institutional culture, within which critical challenges relating to curriculum transformation, student governance, the student experience, residences and staff demographics can be addressed (HEQC 2011). The university has adopted a unitary management structure since the merger, with all management decisions being taken by the Vice-Chancellor and the executive management team.

4.2.2.9 Teaching and Learning Policy

Many structural enablements ensure that teaching and learning at the UoT is governed and guided by a rigorous framework. The Teaching and Learning Policy requires all teaching staff to attain a basic level of teaching and learning competence in work-integrated teaching and learning. The Teaching and Learning Plan highlights the need for staff development in the field of innovative teaching and learning, particularly in educational technology. A further structural support is the requirement that all new staff members who are not in possession of a basic teaching qualification enrol for the Teaching Development Programme, which is offered by CHED. The faculties are structurally supported by teaching and learning
committees, which include CHED representatives, while the institution has a Teaching and Learning Committee reporting to Senate, in which the faculty teaching and learning reports and other pertinent issues are discussed.

Structurally, the UoT is currently configured as six faculties, each comprising a number of departments and research entities: Applied Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Health and Wellness Sciences, and Informatics and Design. The social actors in each faculty comprise deans, assistant deans and HoDs with line management functions, as well as heads of programmes who report to HoDs. A substantial enablement comes through four portfolio coordinators per faculty – Teaching and Learning, Language, Information Technology, and Research – who draw on their roles in the structures to enact and implement policies, through discourses in the cultural conspectus at the UoT.

4.2.2.10 Teaching and Learning Strategy

A teaching and learning strategy is an operational structural plan, intended to prioritise and enhance key areas in teaching and learning in alignment with the institutional vision, mission and values, and other institutional policies and strategic objectives. The UoT aspires to be an excellent provider of career-focused education, producing graduates who are ready to enter the world of work and able to apply knowledge to new situations (HEQC 2011). The curriculum and the institution's pedagogical approach are informed by the philosophies that underpin co-operative education, WIL, experiential learning and service learning. Conceptualisation, implementation and monitoring of these elements at faculty and departmental level (HEQC 2011) draw on discursive constructions of teaching and learning in the way they are differentially enacted across the campuses.

Two additional structural enablements are (1) the Academic Planning Framework (APF), which sets key quality imperatives identified as serving the 'skills needs of the region and of the country' and being 'the leading UoT in South Africa . . . rooted in the Western Cape', as well as emphasising a focus on the development and teaching of applied knowledge (HEQC 2011), and (2) the Teaching and Learning Plan, which focuses on the systemic implementation, monitoring and evaluation of teaching and learning and on the appropriate resourcing of these activities. The implementation of the Teaching and Learning Plan gives expression to institutional practices, such as the development of curricula commensurate with higher education across all departments. The appointment of Curriculum Officers, who meet regularly to unpack and implement the plan at departmental level, is a significant resource to support the Plan (HEQC 2011). This will be discussed further in Chapter Five.
4.2.2.11 Academic Development

CHED as a structural enablement performs a pivotal role in engagement with teaching and learning at the UoT. CHED has a wide scope of services, including teaching (offering a Higher Diploma: Higher Education and Training), student learning, staff development (Teaching Development Programme), curriculum development, extended programmes, education technology, recognition of prior learning (RPL), research in teaching and learning, and the writing centre. Provision of these services across all campuses remains a serious challenge for this unit and in order to cope, CHED encouraged the development of parallel faculty structures by devolving some of the work to faculties or working with Student Affairs and residences. CHED staff working in the faculties draw on discourses promoted by the Centre, which creates a situational logic of necessary complementarity for faculties and academic development support in jointly mediating the challenges of student learning and success. The need for more capacity to work with curriculum development has been approached innovatively through the appointment of curriculum officers within the faculties. Teaching and Learning Coordinators are also considered to provide a valuable link between the Academic Planning Committee and the faculty executive.

4.2.2.12 Educational Development

With regard to academic staff development, the appointment of experts acknowledged by industry, is crucial in the UoT’s employment process (CHE 2010), but this has cascading repercussions for the ‘trainability’ and professionalisation of these experts from a teaching and learning perspective (see T1 Cultural). The focus of the academic work is on the preparation of a new generation of knowledge workers for the knowledge economy, focusing on work ethics, multicultural teams, and so on (Ibid.). One possible mechanism for this perception is a related discourse, that is, the ‘production’ of industry-compliant graduates who are able to function in society and to contribute to the expansion of the economy by using their acquired knowledge and skills to produce new knowledge. The discourse of graduate attributes for industry is thus perceived as a salient thrust for academics in the classroom, and it may also be argued that professional development programmes need to embrace this vision and training for staff so that teaching and learning is guided by these foci.

The ‘graduate attributes’ discourse is a contested one, especially in under-developed countries that adopt the model of generating wealth by justifying knowledge production as a mere epistemological exercise (Sandoval, de Carmona and Inciarte 2011). It is not
challenged in the main at the UoT that knowledge production for a knowledge economy is not the only purpose and value of a university education. According to Boughey and McKenna’s Institutional Audit Report (2011), the ‘culture of compliance’ evident at many UoT’s could mean that policies and frameworks, which are complex and attempt to manage and regulate all aspects of academic life, are ‘obeyed’ rather than resisted, compared with their traditional university counterparts. ‘Obedience’ is tightly managed through a layered hierarchical structure from HoD through to Vice-Chancellor, and the discourse of obedience is drawn on in sometimes uncritical ways, which has a conditioning influence on how teaching is understood and implemented at the UoT, especially for and by new academics in this study.

4.2.2.13 Discursive constructions of teaching and learning

Given the call for corporatisation and marketisation of HE, and the imperative at UoTs to retain strong links with business and the corporate sector, it is easy for teaching at the UoT and elsewhere to be conceptualised as a craft (Lupton 2013). A craft is usually associated with conformity, utility and preconception of outcome, while art is usually associated with uniqueness, improvisation, expression and communication of meaning. In developing one’s signature pedagogy (Shulman 2005), it is perhaps important to maintain a gaze of teaching as an art form through originality, imagination, creativity and innovation (Lupton 2013). The suite of teaching and learning policies at the UoT, including the policies on Teaching and Learning in Career-Oriented Higher Education, Assessment in Career-Oriented Higher Education, e-Learning, Experiential and Service Learning, and Student Academic Development, discursively understand ‘good teaching’ to mean teaching that is career-focused, innovative, appropriate to the discipline and responsive to work-place needs (Winberg and Garraway, 2014).

CHED thus discursively constructs good teaching as a constructivist engagement with learning, encompassing syllabus and lesson planning, methodologies that promote active and engaged learning in large and small groups, methods that affirm student diversity (e.g., provision of multilingual support), educational technology, responsiveness to workplace needs, principles of assessment and design of formative and summative assessment tasks, student feedback on teaching, using peer review, and critical reflection. The basic level of good teaching is approached through a ‘constructive alignment’ frame (Biggs 1996) that makes explicit the alignment between curriculum, teaching, learning, and assessment. At more advanced levels, such as the Higher Diploma in Higher Education and Training and the Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education (Teaching and Learning), good teaching is
understood to include theorising teaching and learning and reflecting against theoretical frameworks, as well as scholarly teaching (e.g., evidence-based teaching) and teaching scholarship (e.g., conducting educational research) (Winberg and Garraway 2014b).

A situational logic of necessary contradictions exists between institutional discourses and academic development discourses promoted by CHED. Senior managers at the UoT construct good teaching in terms of satisfactory throughput and pass rates: improvement in teaching correlates with success and throughput rates. Academic developers construct good teaching as complex and multidimensional, constantly changing, responsive to students’ needs, and focused on their holistic development. Good teaching is associated with innovation, and meeting students’ learning needs, inspiring them, challenging them, and making a meaningful difference to their lives (Jacobs 2006). Socio-cultural cleavage at the level of interaction would mean that, although both entities have a common desire to improve student learning, there is a significant pluralism in conceptions, which constrains efforts to move the UoT forward in its strategic goals. This is evident in the HEQC audit report (2011), which highlights that the university experiences difficulties in implementing its teaching and learning strategies, as they are too broad and too ambitious and there is a perceived lack commitment from different levels of the institution. Consistent and proactive relationships with industry need to be solidified to allow programmes to be current and to provide placements for work-integrated learning (WIL) in the relevant programmes. Wider buy in, participation, commitment and accountability should be encouraged so that, at all levels of the institution, everyone understands the institutional priorities and integrates these as part of their teaching and other activities (Winberg and Garraway 2014b).

As part of a national process of auditing institutions for quality assurance purposes (Boughey 2009b; Boughey 2010; Boughey and McKenna 2011a; Boughey and McKenna 2011b), Boughey (2011) found that little attention had been given to the way institutional type could impact on teaching and learning. When quality is understood as undefined ‘excellence’, teaching and learning tend to be understood as autonomous of the context, resulting in a proliferation of ‘generalised’ theory and research rather than work which explores both phenomena in context (Ibid.: 2). With specific focus on the UoT, Boughey found that the way teaching and learning were conceptualised was too broad and generalised and ‘could have applied to any university rather than to universities of technology in particular and no attempt appeared to have been made to identify understandings which could inform the development of the high level skills the universities aimed to produce’ (Ibid.: 3). At the root of this claim is the idea that context is critical to teaching and learning. What the case study report fails to
consider explicitly is the honing of teaching and learning practice to align with teaching in the professions, which arguably is a 'signature pedagogy' for the UoT.

The conceptualisation of teaching at the UoT is matched by policies and reward structures attached to teaching at the institution, boosted and bolstered by enablements such as teaching awards, formal teaching programmes, informal courses, and ad hominem promotions. Notwithstanding, senior management staff, according to the institutional audit report (Winberg and Garraway 2014b), felt that teaching had to compete with research, which was a primary focus in the disciplines and important for the UoT’s credibility. The curriculum officer project was a further example of a capacity-building forum for teaching, and institutional processes, such as subject reviews, created opportunities for staff to reflect on their teaching, adding to elevating the status of teaching at the UoT.

4.2.2.14 Work-integrated learning (WIL)

Work-integrated learning, also known as experiential learning and previously known as cooperative education, is a strategy of applied learning which involves a structured educational programme that combines productive relevant work experience with academic study and ‘professional reflection’. Students are required to undergo a period of on-the-job training as part of their degree studies. This period of work placement varies from a few weeks undertaken throughout the period of study, to six months, and a year in some programmes in the final year of study. The principal advantage is that students gain experience in a professional field during their formal studies and begin working life with knowledge of the marketplace, organisational structures and employers’ expectations. Students are provided with practical and creative scope, and potential for advancement and personal growth in their chosen field (CHE 2010).

The Work-Integrated Learning Research Unit (WILRU), based at the UoT, describes WIL as an educational approach that aligns academic and workplace practices for the mutual benefit of students and workplaces (Engel-Hills, Garraway, Jacobs, Volbrecht and Winberg 2010). WIL is based on the principle that learning should be demonstrated to be appropriate for a qualification and should be assessed wherever it takes place or is provided. This difference, however, between work and academic vocational knowledge is a stumbling block to implementing WIL, but, drawing on activity theorists like Engeström (2001) where focus is on practice in a material and social world, integrated knowledge can be achieved. The theoretical components of WIL curricula need to take into account the dual nature of career-focused education, that is, the curriculum needs to meet the demands of both the discipline
and professional practice (Barnett 2006). In work-integrated theoretical learning, the acquisition of discipline-based content knowledge should include active forms of learning such as group learning, demonstrations, tutorials, practicals and formal lectures, as well as approaches such as problem-based learning, project-based learning and workplace learning. The WILRU group suggests that credit-bearing WIL programmes and modules should comply with the standard quality assurance processes within the university, and assessment should simulate workplace models where these are appropriate, for example, technical reports might replace academic essays where appropriate (Winberg 2007).

An example of a WIL model developed by Morkel (2011) and implemented in the second-year programme of the ND: Architectural Technology, is a simulated ‘design studio’, which is at the centre of learning (and teaching) in architecture (discussed in Chapter Five). It is in this physical space at the UoT where problem-based learning happens through interaction, collaboration and conversation. This innovative model, that aims to provide similar collaborative learning, successfully integrates the academic project with Workplace Learning (WPL) and Service Learning (SL) and ensures an enhanced learning experience for students, but, at the same time, it is an overwhelming constraint for new lecturers who have to embrace these structural and cultural features.

4.2.15 Professional development of new academics

The Teaching Development Programme (TDP) is offered to newly-appointed academic staff, and the Higher Diploma in Higher Education and Training (replaced in 2014 by the Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education (Teaching and Learning) to more established academics. The TDP is a compulsory but non-formal certificate programme intended for new lecturers in their first three years of employment at a university, to develop their practice in higher education teaching, learning and assessment. As such, it is a means of acculturation into the academy and it provides a sense of institutional membership. The TDP is offered in two modules that are roughly equivalent to one term of study each. It includes a practical component in which the candidate works with a mentor. All new lecturers are invited to attend the TDP during their first year of permanent employment or contract. Candidates who enrol for the TDP are expected to build a basic teaching and learning portfolio and a basic assessment portfolio.

As convenor of the TDP in 2011, I was in an opportune position to gather information on a variety of teaching-related topics through discussions, informal tasks and assignments from a group of about 20 new lecturers on the programme. It became evident that lecturers’
conceptualisation of teaching depended on a variety of factors, ranging from epistemological characteristics of the discipline to socio-cultural influences such as personal beliefs, values and past experiences. To compound matters, the conceptualisation of teaching and learning on programmes such as the TDP is often at odds with actual practice at the UoT, where the one is directed at holistic education and the other at instrumental–rational acquisition of workplace skills. In addition, lack of departmental support, work overload, large classes, administrative tasks, lack of research time and strong disciplinary boundaries contribute to lecturers’ inability to transfer the practices introduced on the professional programmes to their contexts of practice in their departments (Fanghanel 2007).

How new lecturers conceptualised their teaching and learning practice on the TDP ranged from teacher-centred to student-centred approaches. The theoretical underpinning of the TDP was based mainly on a psychology-based approach to teaching and learning (See T1 Cultural). This discourse tends to focus on cognitive processes, intentions and beliefs, and on strategies to enable or enact them (Malcolm and Zukas 2001), which has been the dominant model for teaching and learning at many HEIs. At the UoT, the context of practice for lecturers is framed largely by a professional idea that shapes the quality of teaching and learning at the micro level of classroom. Those departments that favour a more socio-cultural approach to their teaching, where students are seen to be learning and thriving in a social-academic setting of groups and communities of colleagues, are more cognisant of community-based factors and social aspects of teaching and learning. In these cases, Lave and Wenger’s approach to learning, through legitimate participation into communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991), is used to understand the way individuals and groups experience learning and practice in this context.

4.2.2.16 Losses and gains

However noble the intentions of the programme to create a supportive and collaborative environment to explore teaching and learning in HE, the TDP does not offer the lens for lecturers to engage with disciplinary practices in their departments, nor with the affective issues in a diverse HE classroom, synonymous with a social learning theory model in which embodied subjects are prime. The generic one-size-fits-all approach of the TDP thus reduces the ability for teaching and learning to be conceptualised as transformative, emergent and grounded in lived contexts that are peopled, languaged, gendered, raced and classed. This disjunction between departmental practices and development programme practices is an insurmountable obstacle for some new academics, while for others (albeit a small number) the structural conditions provide the conditions for the exercise of agency.
Academics who see it as opportunity attempt to repackage the knowledge content of their disciplines into suitable teaching modes, but this repackaging or recontextualisation of knowledge (Bernstein 2000) hinges on their understanding of their disciplines (construction and positioning), as well as their conceptualisations of teaching (previously held or influenced by the programme). Lecturers on the TDP who managed to find the links between the pedagogy and the disciplinary field were able to better facilitate a learning process where students felt more included in the knowledge-construction process. But, for many, the disjunction was a source of stress and despair, as new lecturers struggled to find their own means of incorporating what they were exposed to on the programme with how things were done in their departments. In other words, educational development practices and disciplinary knowledge practices presented contradictions in departmental contexts, where contestation over the ways things are done is great (Becher and Trowler 2001).

I will now turn to the cultural conditioning at the UoT, to analyse and discuss how discourses in the cultural conspectus condition the agency of new academics in this study.

4.3 Cultural conditioning at T1

4.3.1 Introduction

As an emergent entity, the Cultural System at any moment has properties of its own (Archer 1996). Having emerged qua product, it has an objective existence, with autonomous relations amongst its components (theories, beliefs, values, arguments, or the propositional formulations of them), independent of anyone’s claim to know, to believe, to assert or to assent to them. The CS contains constraints, embodies new possibilities, and introduces new problems through the relationships between the emergent entities themselves (the clash of theories); between these and the physical environment (mastery and ruin); and between these and human actors.

In this section of the chapter, I examine how cultural systems condition HE internationally and nationally, circa the uptake of a neo-liberal agenda in HE, to take count of the socio-cultural balances or imbalances affecting academic staff development practices in service of new academics. If culture comprises the ‘corpus of existing intelligibilia . . . all things capable of being grasped, deciphered, understood or known by someone (Archer 1996: 104), the HE cultural system encompasses ideational constructs in the form of beliefs, values, attitudes, concepts, theories and ideologies (Archer 1995) concerning education and about teaching and learning in its broadest and most detailed sense.
Ideas, and ideational connections (including category mistakes, logical contradictions etc.), are part of everything, and everything is real. To deny the reality of a part of everything (of anything), such as ideas (or say persons, or consciousness, or agency, or values—or mind, or body) extrudes or detotalises it or them from the world, that is the rest of the world of which they are in principle causally explicable and causally efficacious parts (Bhaskar 1997: 139).

When ideas are ‘detotalised’, the result is an implicit dualistic or split ontology. In the social sciences, in addition to ideas, the cultural conspectus contains ideological aspects as well. There are values and beliefs (Bhaskar 1989), which are generated by society and necessary for the functioning of that society. By drawing on these beliefs, agents make choices about their lives, and act to protect, perpetuate or resist the structuring mechanisms which underlie their world of experience and practice (Collier 1994). These beliefs, ideas and values, which are components of the CS, are housed in the cultural register as ‘discourses’, with the dispositional capacity of being understood and drawn on to influence choices and actions. Discourses are also ideological, so agents are influenced by what is deemed possible to value or not value. From a realist perspective, the HE cultural system, as an entity, is relatively enduring, independent, autonomous, irreducible and capable of exerting powers and properties of its own (Bhaskar 1979). Ontologically, it exists independently of its users but is causally efficacious in generating (not determining) specific mechanisms that influence agents’ knowledge of policies, roles, institutions and choices, which are both fallible and corrigible. It represents the ‘parts’ of the structure – agency engagement.

The established and emergent discourses, situated in the cultural domain, are triggered and activated as a result of interactions between the components of the cultural system and agents. This represents the ‘people’ at the socio-cultural interaction level. The central concern of this chapter is the interplay between the parts and the people; in other words, how the cultural conditioning that the HE context exerts and the emergent discourses pertaining to new academics influence the exercise of new academic agency. This chapter thus focuses on what these generative discourses are, how they are understood, how new academics come to know them, and how they influence the choices that new academics in this study make. In Chapter Five, using a critical realist perspective, I shall show how the generative mechanisms identified in this chapter, enacted by the CS through discourses at the level of the Real (Archer 1996; Bhaskar 1997; Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2004), shape social mediation by and interaction among new academics as agents in this study.
4.3.2 Generative discourses at the level of the Real

As discussed in Chapter Three, discourses at the level of the Real have a causal relationship with reality, with the generative power to influence reality and constrain reality at the same time (Archer 1996). Discourses are understood in this study as . . . systematically organized sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution. Beyond that, they define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say (and by extension what it is possible to do or not to do) with respect to the area of concern of that institution, whether marginally or centrally (Kress 1989: 7).

This conceptualisation of ‘discourse’ is compatible with critical realist philosophy, which considers both text and context (Fairclough et al. 2002). The way words (text) are associated with the values and norms of a particular way of thinking about the world and of interacting with knowledge (Gee 1990) allows us to analyse the social stances of discourses and how they act to condition what is said and what can be said about social practices (Fairclough 2000). From a critical realist perspective, uncovering the functions of ideas that ‘clump together’ to act as generative or structuring mechanisms for events and experiences that emerge (Bhaskar 1979; Fairclough et al. 2002; Sayer 2000) is a critical act. The most pervasive effect of discourses is when they build alliances and support for specific social projects to establish them as normalised truths (Clarke and Newman 1997), and to determine the boundaries of what can be thought or said and by whom (Land 2004). Walker (2002) maintains that the university is an important location where discourses collide, and where they are distorted or articulated. Discourses prevalent in HE are drawn on and used by new academics to mediate their contexts, but they can be ‘used’ equally well by actors to condition contexts for other agents (Archer 2000).

As discussed in Chapter Three, the way in which a range of genres, discourses and styles are networked and articulated together (Fairclough 2005; Kress 1989) is called an ‘order of discourse’, which comprises sub-discourses. The order of discourse represents the ‘totality of the discursive practices of a social domain’ and can be envisaged as existing at three levels of realisation: situational (relating to immediate social contexts); institutional (relating to the knowledge domains of a society: medical, judicial, educational, scientific, religious, familial, political, etc.); and societal (relating to the overall configuration of situational and institutional domains together) (Fairclough 2005: 53). At the third level, the institutional orders of discourse together constitute a ‘social formation’ or society (MacDonald and
In this chapter, the orders of discourse pertinent to the HE context are grouped around cognate areas of academic staff development activities for new academics.

These orders of discourse can either prop each other up (complementary discourses) or be in conflict (contradictory discourses), depending on their function (Fairclough 2005). Complementary/complicit discourses encourage morphostasis and reproduce the status quo, even if limitations and possible negative effects are evident, while contradictory/competing discourses strive to gain ground by defeating or establishing superiority over others (Land 2004), and bring about morphogenesis in the cultural conspectus.

Discourse, according to Archer (1996), is a CEP with enabling and constraining powers, with real power to impinge on or advance social practice and social institutions. However, as Archer warns, any analysis of discourses does not begin with a complete description of the Cultural System, that is, with a full itemisation of its contradictions and complementarities. It starts instead with ‘the ideas which at any given time have holders’ (Archer 1996: xxi), for only if an item is held by someone, can its logical relationships with other items have any effect on agency. The ideas held by agents/people, or holders, articulated and expressed in the form of discourses, may be either complementary or contradictory, both being vital elements as mechanisms to account for cultural stability and change (Archer 1996). As discussed in Chapter Two, contradictions mould problem-ridden situations for actors, which they must first confront, and from this confrontation work out their actions, non-deterministically. By contrast, complementarities mould problem-free situations for agents who can explore their ideational environments without danger or difficulty, and from this build up an elaborate conspectus, the elements of which are mutually consistent and reinforcing (Ibid.: xxii).

Discourses may also be enabling and/or constraining, depending on the degree to which they are dominant, powerful, latent, and invisible, and on who is invoking them and for what purpose. Discourses in this study are referred to as ‘emergent’ or ‘established’, according to modes or orientations of their use, to show how these discourses, at the level of the Real, condition thought, ideas and beliefs at the level of the Empirical and enable or constrain practices at the level of the Actual.

### 4.3.3 Clearing definitional ground

As my study is focused on new academics, and based on the literature in this area,
terminology referring to new staff entering HE in an academic role, appointed as ‘lecturers’ or ‘researchers’, needs some explication. The term ‘new academics’ is distinguished from ‘new lecturers’, depending on institutional configuration and type (see T1 structural conditions for institutional types). Although the role incumbent takes on a wide range of academic tasks, teaching is a huge responsibility in current times. Where institutions focus predominantly on the teaching function, new academics are referred to as ‘lecturers’. At research-intensive universities, new academics are called ‘academics’. At yet others, new academics are called ‘teachers’, ‘educators’, or ‘teacher—educators’. Depending on its usage in context, the term ‘lecturer’ is used synonymously with ‘educator’, ‘teacher educator’, or ‘practitioner’. The role is nonetheless ‘academic’ as opposed to being ‘administrative’, although being an academic in contemporary HE means that administration is part and parcel of the daily grind. These terms are used interchangeably, even when the subtleties in difference of meaning are crucial to the aspects being foregrounded, and in relation to who is doing the foregrounding. Being called an ‘academic’ also brings into focus one’s acquired academic qualifications and research trajectories, while the term ‘lecturer’ refers to the teaching function in the HE classroom. The term ‘educator’ refers to academic tasks that go beyond skills and knowledge engagement to social objectives, whereas ‘practitioner’ draws attention to the professional craft of practice in the classroom, for example, the architects’ teaching studio (Winberg 2008).

In international contexts, new academics are referred to as ‘early career academics’ (mainly Australia), ‘new academic appointees’ (UK), and ‘new faculty’ (USA). I use the term ‘new academics’ in this chapter to capture the full range of capacities, dispositions and expectations of newcomers in university settings, and to discuss the structural and cultural features that condition and shape agency of this group. In the next chapter, I lean specifically on the term ‘new lecturer’, commonly used by participants in the data and at the UoT, to frame ways in which the academic as teacher is conceptualised in this setting.

4.3.4 Established and emergent discourses

Academic staff development (ASD) practices across the spectrum, textured by different conceptualisations of teaching and learning, have a direct bearing on the induction and support of new academics in HE. What university professional development programmes identify as their primary goals and foci affects the curriculum choices, course content and ideological stances around which these programmes are constructed. The full extent of the induction programme, for example, both in material and ideational terms, becomes a conditioning influence on the way new academics perceive of and conceptualise teaching in
HE. This has a knock-on influence (not determination) on lecturer–student practices in the classroom, which are shaped by these cultural emergent properties.

Established discourses in academic staff development, around issues of equity, quality, knowledge, teaching and learning, accountability, technology, entrepreneurship, and so on, have been well documented and analysed (Boughey 2013; Leibowitz 2014; Quinn 2006). I shall draw on these discourses in the discussion that unfolds, but the discourses central to this chapter pertain to new academics in the university, as they transition into HE. If new academics are exposed to an uncritical theorisation of teaching in a particular context, then their exercise of ‘critical agency’ in relation to the transformation goals in HE may be compromised as this might not be the kind of agency that HE is seeking, given its current ‘crisis’. The concern as to what is held to be ‘good practice’ in the service of transformation in HE and the country, and how this practice is supported by all pillars of the university, is salient to the discussion of discourses that now unfolds.

Emergent discourses relevant to teaching as a developmental act of grooming the full human being for critical citizenship are activated as CEPs in the structural and cultural conditions instated by the neo-liberal agenda in HE. These emergent discourses offer a counter-perspective on how knowledge, learners, and teachers engage with the systemic features in HE. These discourses, at the level of the Real, offer resistance to the wholesale reproduction of morphostatic discourses, already quite influential in HE. Those agents (and new academics) who draw on these emergent discourses exercise significant agency in using them to respond to their contexts, and in doing so shift the focus from knowing to being (Barnett 2005). These morphogenetic shifts have resulted in many ‘discursive turns’ that the social sciences and humanities have undergone: the linguistic turn, the cultural turn, and the social turn, but the turn to ontology and affect indicates an important shift for ASD practices in the service of new academics transitioning into HE in South Africa, which will be discussed as a sub-order of the Contextualised Induction discourse below.

4.4 New academics transitioning into HE

‘Transitioning’, as the term suggests, is a process and not one that can be achieved via once-off workshops (Hurst 2010). Joining a new university should thus be viewed as a ‘critical point’ for new academics, since it is an important process for new lecturers to learn the value system of the organisation, as well as for employers, to shape the attitudes and behaviour of the people they employ (Scheckle 2014). Transitioning is an important temporal
moment, which Archer, in her M/M approach, is at pains to emphasise the need to account for changes over time (1995).

The need to attract and retain a new generation of academics or the next generation of academics has already been emphasised as an enabling discourse for new lecturers in HE (HESA 2011). This call has been echoed in local as well as international contexts, for example in the Dearing Report (NCIHE 1997; Gosling and Hannan 2007), with the UK and Australian governments, for example, keen to ‘attract, prepare, place, develop and retain quality teachers (White, Bloomfield and Le Cornu 2010: 182). New lecturers are considered a critical target group in South Africa, based on the evidence that nearly half of the professoriate are due to retire in less than a decade (HESA 2011). The importance of recruiting and retaining quality teachers is crucial to avoid an untenable situation where a large exodus of academics from the boom years of the 60s and 70s (Trowler and Knight 2000) will leave the academy bereft.

Besides the need to increase numbers, there is an imperative for the next generation of academics to contribute to the re-orientation of universities in accordance with their social purposes, and to meet new constitutional, economic and social needs and development challenges (HESA 2011; Waghid 2002). This means that novice academics need to be inducted into the academy in much more structured and deliberate ways than in the past (Quinn and Vorster 2012).

Professional development for new lecturers has become an established feature of higher education, nationally and internationally, over the past decade (Gosling 2007; Fanghanel and Trowler 2007), and the successful completion of such programmes has become an accepted standard and is often a requirement of probation (Sales 2014; Stefani 2004). The rationale is that new lecturers will become effective educators, armed with pedagogical knowledge about teaching, learning and assessment, quality frameworks, the student experience and integration of research, scholarship, and professional activities with teaching and learning (Fanghanel and Trowler 2008; HEA 2006; Ramsden 2003).

Programmes used to induct new lecturers into the HE sector are viewed in different ways based on their different purposes. From an operational and human resources (HR) perspective, induction is viewed in terms of drivers such as ‘productivity, participation and quality’ (White et al. 2010: 181), not in terms of the teaching function of the academic role. There is the assumption that anyone with a good grounding in content knowledge can teach
(Gravett and Petersen 2002). While most staff appointed to academic positions have already completed a research degree, and thus already have training and experience in the methodology of their research, there is ironically very little parallel provision for specific preparation for their teaching role, even though teaching takes up a lot of head space and physical energy. Further assumptions that formal training programmes on their own will make better university teachers (Gibbs and Coffey 2000) or that academics can rely on the prior experience of being taught might be inadequate for HE teaching, as the current content or subject matter still needs to be recontextualised and translated into a pedagogy for learning in a specific context.

The term ‘induction’ conjures up notions of lecturers being streamlined into a duct or pipe, under considerable pressure, to be churned out at the other end in altered shapes and sizes. However, given the complexities highlighted in the previous chapters, it is clear that new academic induction cannot be a mere churning out or transmission of information about the many systems and operations at the university. Neither can it be an acculturation process, that is, from the novice on the periphery to the expert positioned at the centre of the community (Lave and Wenger 1991). Novice academics have a great deal to contribute, especially because of their positionality on the periphery, and they may be experts already in many areas that can benefit the institution, if they are enabled to bring their experiences to bear on HE practice.

The concept of ‘newness’ is thus both an enabler and a constraint in the way new academics are perceived and perceive themselves, as they invoke their ‘tacit knowledge’ (Polanyi 1983) of what being an academic means. New academic staff are discursively constructed as moving from professional expert to novice teacher (Cangelosi, Crocker and Sorrell 2009; Jansen 2010), in a liminal space where they are caught ‘between a rock and a hard place’ (Hellströhm 2004). New academics are perceived and engaged with as experts and novices at the same time (Tierney 2003). They are both vulnerable and robust, and knowledgeable in their respective fields but, in being new to HE, they experience difficulty in making the contextual and conceptual shifts into their classrooms, where they have to make critical decisions that sometimes have a negative impact on the social inclusion of students.

Therefore, new university teachers more than others need to do ‘identity work’ by ‘making and re-making their identities’ in order to establish themselves in their new environment and culture (Trowler and Knight 2000: 34). However, this identity work involves a process of socialisation (Becher and Trowler 2001; Clegg 2008; Henkel 2000; Trowler and Knight 2000)
into the profession of teaching and the practices and expectations of this role (Boyd 2010; Field 2012). A complex, dynamic set of demands on the new academic, related to identity formation, emerges in the initial period of becoming a teacher, when the professional typically retains an identity as a professional in a new context, for example, as an architect or physiotherapist (Boyd 2010).

Many new academics experience a perceived loss of status when they join a university where they are no longer regarded as an expert among other experts (Boyd 2010). This clash of professional and academic worlds can lead the newly appointed academic to feel all the insecurities that come with being a novice, which is particularly hard for those used to being experts in their own right (Sales 2014). Janhonen and Sarja (2005), however, challenge the ‘expert to novice’ discourse, suggesting that there is a complementary relationship between previous practitioner and the new teacher identity, theorised as moving from first-order (practice setting) to second-order practitioner (within a higher education setting) (Murray and Male 2005). The downfall, however, in trying to engage with the university as a structural entity, is that new academics identify strong social and cultural factors that affect their sense of agency (Kahn 2009). Most individuals redefine their identity, for example, as ‘architect teacher’, in which they integrate their identity as a professional with their new career identity as an academic. New academics, who are unable to redefine themselves as having a new identity, may experience discomfort in their new roles, and may choose not to continue in academia but return to professional practice (McArthur-Rouse 2008). This adds to the ‘revolving door’ syndrome (Cross and Johnson 2008), where new academics leave as soon as they arrive, due to inhospitable conditions in HE.

To obviate this, many professional development induction programmes provide a physical and conceptual space through their teaching and learning curricula (Kandlbinder and Peseta 2011; Knight 2002; Ramsden 2003; Scheckle 2014), which supports the transition. Kandlbinder and Peseta (2011), drawing on a research survey on higher education teaching and learning across Australia, New Zealand and the UK, identified five concepts that hold ‘key’ status in professional development courses for most academics, new and established: reflective practice, constructive alignment, student approaches to learning, scholarship of teaching, and assessment-driven learning. In the South African context, programmes also include topics on diversity, interpersonal skills, literacy practices, classroom management, innovation, and technology. Albeit in lesser or greater depth and detail, these frameworks are similar to the course content of induction programmes in South Africa, surveyed on university websites.
What is less obvious is how these programmes are enacted and for what purpose. To what extent are the above cognate areas problematised to respond to unique university contexts? This dialogic engagement with the material and with literature is what influences the understanding of practice that new academics take with them when they are ‘released’ from programmes into the university. It also shapes the extent to which new academics feel they can exercise their agency in their departments and faculties, based on what they have encountered in the induction programme, but this is often with a great deal of difficulty as knowledge gained in professional developmental spaces is not easily transferable to departmental specificity (Fanghanel 2007; Kahn 2009; Mathieson 2011). The other problem is that much of the teaching and learning content is ‘mangled’ (Haggis 2003) or ‘lost in translation’, literally and figuratively in the South Africa context, in the way that it is ‘taught’ on professional development programmes, as well as in the way the content is appropriated and interpreted for practice by individual lecturers.

Being in the classroom is a value-laden task because new teachers with their own unique sense of self, ultimate concerns and projects are facilitators of students’ engagement with knowledge and their engagement with the academic world. This is not an intuitive process for academics, new or established, and without serious guidance and critical thinking about how knowledge is structured and engaged with, old values are also unwittingly reproduced. These attitudes are evident, for example, in the handing down of curricula and syllabi by heads of some departments to new lecturers without a feed forward on the re-contextualising mechanisms needed for specific department or university settings. Nor are strategies on how to re-interpret (Gamble 2006) specialised knowledge for undergraduate purposes shared. These constraining attitudes restrict the ability of new academics to exercise agency in being innovative in facilitating effective curriculum change and learning for their students. A lack of focus on knowledge and its structures (Bernstein 2000) means that academics have a limited view of the change that students as knowers (Maton 2008) should undergo in subject areas, that is, from a simplistic view of knowledge and learning towards a more relational view where they become aware of the sophisticated relations and connections between different bodies of knowledge (Ramsden 2003).

The range of discourses discussed below, relating to the induction of new academics and their transitioning to HE, are interconnected and intertwined with discourses embedded in ASD, and departmental and disciplinary framing of teaching and learning. These discourses have a causal link with how new academics take up professional development programmes, and the extent to which they commit to a process of self-adjustment in relation to the rest of
the university. These discourses will now be discussed as two main orders of discourses, namely decontextualised induction and contextualised induction, with their related sub-discourses, which are evident in the ways they are enacted and practised in HE. They are efficaciously evaluated on the strength of their influence, which is in turn conditioned by both structural and cultural features relative and relevant to the challenges confronted by new academics. As Real mechanisms, they have the power to enable or constrain new academic practice; the ripple effect thereof is the impact on student learning and the broader transformational goals for HE.

New lecturers are thus faced with simultaneous challenges of content, context and practice at an institutional, faculty and departmental level which are salient in this study, as the new academics draw on some, if not all, of these discourses to varying degrees in the deliberation, discernment and design of their agential choices (Archer 2000) with regard to teaching and learning. In realist terms, discourses are not deterministic, but they do have considerable ability to shape and influence agents’ choices. Agential choice and freedom are always there, whether new academics choose to resist or comply with dominant ways of thinking in the sector and at their institutions. Irrespective, these discourses have a ‘ghostly presence’ (Clegg 2009) in the lives of new academics, because they have emerged from very real and lived experiences of agents who predate the cultural (and structural) contexts in which current new academics find themselves.

After sketching the established discourses of induction of each order of discourse invoked in HE today (some enabling for new academic development while others constraining), I move on to a discussion of specific discourses that emerge from the various SEPs and CEPs in the socialisation processes of new academics as incumbents. These discourses, as third-order emergents (Archer 1996), are the result of the result of the conditioning influences of the afore-mentioned discourses and structural contexts, and have real emergent properties and powers to shape how new academics think of themselves, how they define their projects, and how they exercise their agency.

4.5 New academic transitioning and induction: Orders of discourse

Discourses related to the transitioning and induction of new academics in HE give rise to a host of discursive styles and genres adopted by academic staff development (ASD) units, departments and the institution. These discourses comprise the ‘orders of discourse’ (Fairclough 2005; Kress 1989) relevant to this study. Decontextualised Induction and Contextualised Induction have been identified here as orders of discourse associated with
university induction practices, ranging from organisational initiatives, such as HR induction and ASD programmes, to more localised departmental induction (where it exists).

Each order of discourse, with its related discourses known as sub-discourses, is located at different levels of realisation, namely situational, institutional, and societal (Fairclough 2005). These will be kept analytically distinct, although in reality there is much slippage and overlap between discursive constructions of teaching and learning in different contexts at the university. The situational level is understood here as new academics’ immediate social context or the micro level of the classroom; the institutional level relates to HE as a knowledge domain of society; and the broader societal level relates to the overall configuration of situational and institutional domains together (Ibid.; MacDonald and O’Reagan 2009). The following table illustrates the configuration of discourses used to establish the cultural conditions at T1 of this study:

Table 10: Configuration of Discourses Used to Establish the Cultural Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of discourse 1: Decontextualised Induction</th>
<th>Emergent discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atomised</td>
<td>Heavy duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologised</td>
<td>Approaches to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptions of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational socialisation</td>
<td>Silent and invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From deficit to learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompetence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quick starters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myth of meritocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One size does not fit all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of discourse 2: Contextualised Induction</th>
<th>Emergent discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Discomforting difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ontological turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The affective turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affect as emotional labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotionology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social practice</td>
<td>Myth of communities of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sink or swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Mushfaking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cultural fit: square peg in round hole?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student centred</td>
<td>Accenting Accent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1 Decontextualised Induction

The ‘decontextualised educator’ discourse as a conditional influence in new academics’ understanding constructs the role of university teachers as non-specific but loosely differentiated (Gerzina and Foster 2013), and is predicated on recognised teaching activities such as lecturing. Skelton (2012) differentiates between three types of university teachers: ‘specialists in teaching’ who see their educational role as encompassing a broader professional responsibility than simply lecturing or taking tutorials; ‘blended’ professionals, who regard both teaching and research as contributing to learning and see learning as the primary activity of a university; and researchers, for whom teaching is often an activity secondary to research.

Generic professional development practices based on these approaches to teaching and learning fail to meet the needs of academic staff in their specific contexts (Quinn 2012). In this sense, induction is decontextualised and removed from actual contexts of practice. Agential choices influenced by their ideological positioning are not accounted for because the process of teaching and learning is seen as ‘occurring in something of a bubble, dissociated from its special, social, political and economic context’ (Fanghanel and Trowler 2007: 9).

Also, given the centralised location of professional development programmes, few inroads are made into departments and faculties where many new lecturers struggle to carve an identity for themselves (Henkel 2005; Kreber 2009b). Some of their disciplinary homes, where new academics are inducted (albeit less formally) into actual ways of practising in their disciplines (Becher 1989; Becher and Trowler 2001), resemble alien spaces where their outsider status is pronounced. When teaching and learning are located outside the reality and context of practice (Ashwin and McLean 2004), it reduces teaching to a ‘technology of behaviour’ (Malcolm and Zukas 2001: 35), implying that teaching behaviours can be predicted and controlled, and perceived as an individualised and practical exercise that is performative (Skelton 2005). Lecturers’ experiences of teaching remain an intellectualised expression of a restricted, highly situated, specific experience, which tends to understate context (Fanghanel 2007).

In this study, new academics experienced huge difficulties as they straddled the dual roles of discipline expert and educators, and the shift in identity in crossing the threshold from discipline expert to educator was significant. Many of them struggled to incorporate what they were exposed to on such programmes (espoused theories) with their actual practice
(theories in use) (Argyris and Schön 1974) in their departments. The notion of ‘fitness for purpose’ in relation to teaching and learning is still a relevant and crucial one if we conceive teaching as something that can be ‘customised’ for different purposes (Boughey 2011), not as a generic one-size-fits-all model that does not take into account student learning needs. Given the complexity of the higher educational landscape that shapes new academics’ induction, notwithstanding the enormous challenges they embrace as they embed themselves in their disciplinary and institutional contexts, one could understand if ‘decontextualised’ educators exercised very little agency in relation to their contexts and concerns.

4.5.1.1 Atomised Model of induction

The atomised model of induction (Lowman and Mathie 1993; Lueddeke 2003) refers to programmes that deliver neatly packaged modules which ‘stand alone’ or are aggregated as part of an induction ‘curriculum’. The curriculum is sub-divided into ‘topical’ modules, loosely strung together as a somewhat coherent offering to lecturers who attend either once-off training, or scheduled weekly slots for a limited period, with a developer to ‘learn the ropes’. The skills base of this model, however, is not easily transferable outside the realm of professional development practice, and connecting the dots between theory and practice is an abstract exercise (Trowler and Knight 2002). Workshops are developed on the deficit model with the assumption that new academics have shortcomings, but by attending workshops they will raise their level of competence (Rowland 2002).

The generative mechanism underlying the atomised model is the ‘autonomous model’ of the student, better conceptualised in current times as the ‘decontextualised’ learner (Boughey and McKenna 2011a). This constructs students as ‘autonomous’ of the wide range of social and cultural contexts into which they were born and raised. Constructing students using the ‘discourse of the decontextualised learner’ promotes a problematic understanding that all education is socially, culturally and linguistically neutral (Boughey 2009b; 2010; Boughey and McKenna 2011a; Boughey and McKenna 2011b). The student is seen as someone who should be able to confront tertiary challenges, despite personal, social, economic, and other hurdles that constrain his or her ability. However, given our apartheid history, with race and class still impinging, the majority of black students, who come from impoverished and under-resourced schools, are not autonomously predisposed to do this as they do not possess the cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986) required by universities to succeed.

This ‘problem’ is framed by many in HE in a deficit discourse (Quinn 2012), locating the
problem in students themselves or in poor schooling (McKenna 2004), and the approach is to ‘fix’ students’ problems irrespective of their socio-cultural locations. This approach has been long critiqued within the South African academic development movement (Boughey 2012a). Underprivilege in South Africa has been used as a proxy for race, but students from a wide spectrum of racial and economic groups experience varying degrees of under-preparedness when they struggle to acclimatise to university life (Kapp and Bangeni 2011). This is most pronounced in their first year, when their inability to navigate the often difficult pathways to academic achievement is stark. Students are actually not ‘decontextualised’ when they enter HE; in fact they are intimately bound to and by their natal contexts, which they have to mediate with support from the university.

In Archer’s terms, parents (from students’ natal contexts) no longer have the cultural capital needed in this age of modernity to pass on to their children. The digital age and information explosion (Castells 1990) have surpassed the traditional cultural transmission between primary and secondary discourses (Archer 2012b; Gee 1990). Parental culture is thus less of a cultural good in the university’s cultural register; rather it is an internal good that families value and enjoy (Archer 2012b). The discontinuity or incongruity between students’ background and foreground (i.e. future contexts such as work places where they need to succeed) is exacerbated by universities, which are built on and set on preserving old-style cultural capital, making the university an even more alienating place for new students, whose variety and difference is neither valued nor acknowledged.

This ‘decontextualised learner’ discourse is echoed and presupposed in the discourse of the ‘decontextualised university teacher’, where it is assumed that new lecturers joining HE have an in-built toolkit for easily mediating the wide range of social and cultural university contexts in which they are positioned. However, students from diverse economic, cultural and social backgrounds who display increasingly diverse levels of skills and competence (Fanghanel 2007) now populate the new HE classroom, and new lecturers do not always feel equipped to respond to the issues of diversity and difference raised by their multilingual and multicultural students. The challenge of teaching large classes of 200 or more, which may include mature students as well as ‘digital natives’, as well as responding to institutional demands regarding transformation, leaves many new academics feeling out of their depth. In addition to dealing with their own displacement in a new setting, new academics have to interact with students and their displacement.

Given the challenge, it is quite possible that new academics (and established ones) draw on
the discourse of the ‘decontextualised learner and teacher’ to get students through the system, rather than getting to the system by resisting this discursive construction. This is evident in the array of teaching enhancement and development opportunities in HE today, still largely focused on the individual rather than the underlying structuring and generative mechanisms at the systemic level in HE. This leaves the ‘cultural institutions that gave rise to the problem in the first place largely untouched’ (Guest 2001: 5). More holistic theories of change are needed to enhance teaching and learning practices and the student experience in more critical ways.

4.5.1.1 Emergent discourses

As new academics transition into teaching, they suffer from a kind of ‘myopia’ (Grossman, Thompson and Valencia 2001), since they focus primarily on their competences as teachers and on managing the most immediate demands of the classroom. For some time they fix their sights on the closest action contexts and they struggle at this time to develop a repertoire of professional behaviour related to being a teacher, teaching in a way that is suitable for students to learn (Reali, Tancredit and Mizukami 2010).

However, being a discipline expert does not mean that one is automatically a good teacher (Kreber 2009b; Ramsden 2003), and often new teachers (as in this study), entering academia from professional practice, experience challenges in transferring knowledge of teaching learnt in the practice context to their new role (Trowler and Knight 2000). Teaching in a university context is a specialised activity and requires expert pedagogic knowledge and, to do this well, new university teachers need to develop pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman 1987). New academics therefore need to be supported as they transition into the classroom.

Heavy Duty

Workload constitutes a particular constraint on the exercise of agency in relation to adopting practices promoted on professional development programmes (Fanghanel 2007). In this study, teaching is clearly the task that absorbed most of new academics' time, as they worked long hours, well beyond a 40-hour working week. The range of their teaching activities included giving lectures, tutorials and postgraduate seminars (Ibid.; Adams and Rytmeister 2001).

Besides teaching, new academic staff members have competing responsibilities which leave them with very little, if any, time to work on extra demands such as undertaking professional
development courses (Laurillard 2002). There are expectations of involvement in research, community engagement, leadership and participation, and university administration. The new academic has to balance these various perspectives regarding their roles, often with little or no guidance from others. This diverse range of abilities ‘demanded’ of academics in the current HE context is partly due to funding cuts to HE that make it necessary for academics to be involved in far more aspects than their own area of expertise.

At some universities, promotion requirements call on academics to meet criteria in five areas: Teaching and Learning, Research, Community Engagement, Leadership, Administration and Management, and Professional Involvement, making it difficult for new academics, as well as established academics, to exercise sufficient agency to transcend their involuntary placement as primary agents and opt for more strategic positions as corporate agents, and even social actors, through the promotions channel. Academics report work constraints (such as lack of time, overload and general undervaluing of teaching when compared with research) as barriers to the adoption of new teaching practices (Conceição 2006) or to attending to the increased pressure to update the curriculum and teaching materials (Sheard and Carbone 2008). A recent national project on the contextual influences on the uptake of professional development opportunities in HE in the Western Cape recognises increased and diverse workloads as a major contributor to lack of uptake of professional development (Leibowitz et al. 2014a). The heavy workload of new academics (in this study at the UoT) is a constraint in university settings where local cultures, practices, languages and ways of working are complex and which new educator–teachers need time to come to understand (Trowler and Knight 2000).

4.5.1.2 Psychologised Models of induction

4.5.1.2.1 Approaches to learning

A dominant yet complicit model of ASD practices for new academics is an orientation to student learning that assumes an ‘approaches to learning’ perspective (Haggis 2008). Here traditional academic induction views learners through a psychologised lens (Entwistle, Skinner, Entwistle and Orr 2000; Goodyear and Hativa 2002; Mathieson 2011), with a focus on individual cognitive processes and individual intentions and beliefs (Marton and Säljö 1976; Ramsden 2003; Entwistle 2005). Such approaches have been criticised for being ahistorical and asocial (Fanghanel 2007; Haggis 2008), as they encourage the notion of ‘disembodied’ learners and teachers (similar to the decontextualised learner and teacher discourse above) and tend to underplay the importance of identities and power relations in teaching and learning interactions in context (Ashwin 2008; Ashwin and McLean 2004).
4.5.1.2.2 Conceptions of teaching

The field of teaching and learning in higher education has been dominated by a considerable amount of attention to deep and surface learning approaches, conceptions of learning, conceptions of teaching, and teacher thinking, beliefs and knowledge (Biggs 1999; Coffield 1999). The ‘conceptions of teaching’ approach (Åkerlind 2003; Prosser and Trigwell 1999), and the teachers’ beliefs on teaching variety (Entwistle et al. 2000; Kember 1997), provide substantive research to establish a degree of consensus around conceptions of teaching, spread on a continuum between transmissive and facilitative conceptions, and the related teacher-centred versus student-centred approaches (Prosser and Trigwell 1999). Much of this comes out of phenomenographic research which has focused and restricted attention to individual cognition, seeing the individual, and their conceptions, approaches and practices, as largely independent of their context, or at least paying only limited attention to the interaction between ‘figure and ground’ (Trowler 2005).

While alternative views have been advanced to point out that the strength of the ‘approaches to learning’ paradigm lies in its advocacy of student agency (Marshall and Case 2005), a learning-focused approach to teaching tends to focus on strategies to enact specific kinds of learning (Malcolm and Zukas 2001). Staff development programmes ‘teach’ the principles of constructive alignment (Biggs 1996), the application of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Krathwohl 2002), and the identification of learning gaps (Gibbs 1988), among others. Other models mentioned above focus on conceptions and intentions of teachers (Prosser and Trigwell 1999) in their individual capacity.

The pitfalls of adopting such approaches are that, while useful, such a trained gaze on the individual teacher and student, impacts negatively on agency and practice, particularly at the departmental level, where much of an academic’s allegiance lies, and where scope for contestation and power is great (Becher and Trowler 2001). HE needs a more contextualised induction process to combat the significant challenges universities face in initiating new staff members into their environments because of the huge differences in socio-political, cultural, educational and linguistic backgrounds and experience (Scheckle 2014; Trowler and Knight 2000) at institutional, departmental and individual levels. The clarion call thus gets louder for more contextualised, localised and discipline- or department-specific induction processes (Mathieson 2011; Staniforth and Harland 2006; Trowler and Knight 2000) because, in academic staff development terms, induction into HE needs to do far more than improve individual lecturers’ discrete skills (Bitzer and Kapp 1998; Brew and Boud 1995). Traditional induction, based on a corporate, structural–functional perspective,
denies new academics an opportunity to exercise agency and neglects the values, background and individuality the newcomer brings to the organisation (Van Maanen and Schein 1979). When prior experiences are recognised, they are invoked only insofar as they explain the relation between ‘intentions’ and ‘strategies’ (Prosser and Trigwell 1999: 94), and this is limiting to the full potential of academic repertoire that can be maximised.

4.5.1.3 Induction as organisational socialisation

The term ‘organisational socialisation’ (Trowler and Knight 1999) is used to describe induction processes of new academics carried out in conjunction with professional development units. These programmes are slightly more sensitive to incumbents’ challenges than the atomised or psychologised models. ‘Socialisation’ suggests a picture of a more thoughtful and better-designed initiative to ‘facilitate the entry of new recruits to an organization and to equip them to operate effectively within it’ (Trowler and Knight 1999: 178). However, this level of induction is focused on organisational aspects of the university, which vary and are different in different institutions. It is understood as a process through which an individual becomes part of a group, community or organisation (Austin 2002) by being informed about how the organisation functions. Some have defined organisational socialisation as the ‘lifelong process whereby an individual becomes a participating member of a group of professionals, whose norms and culture the individual internalizes’ (Bogler and Kremer-Hayon 1999).

Organisational socialisation, quite simply, is conceived as the process by which someone is transformed from being an outsider to an insider (Sabin 2004) through general participation in meetings, committees, conferences, and so on. As a form of decontextualised induction, organisational socialisation is still removed from new academics’ context of practice in their departments and classrooms. The mode of induction used, which is more tacit than explicit regarding teaching and learning, is autonomous of the reality that new academics confront in different institutional settings.

4.5.1.3.1 Emergent discourses

Silent and invisible

According to Bezuidenhout (2013), many new academics spend their first years being inconspicuous or ‘staying out of harm’s way’. Apart from their classrooms, where they are in charge, other academic and cultural spaces are new to them and difficult to navigate:
Everyone works behind a closed door in my department. The signs on the various doors become familiar but the faces inside remain a mystery. After two months, there is a departmental celebration. I stand quietly by myself, waiting to be introduced, and feeling very self-conscious. I make no effort to socialise with anyone. When I realise that no introduction or word of welcome is going to happen, I leave for the safety of my office. I close the door carefully behind me and find comfort in the loneliness (Bezuidenhout 2013: 26).

A real concern is that new academics will become effectively ‘invisible’ because they do not feel that they have an institutional identity, or any expertise outside of their research and teaching that they can contribute to the wider university community (Staniforth and Harland 2006). The relentless competition between teaching and research also constrains newcomers’ ability to evolve a coherent identity within their domains of competence (Fanghanel and Trowler 2007). Their lack of a strong academic identity and voice compromises their ability to present themselves as confident and knowledgeable in departmental regimes. Bezuidenhout (2013) claims that many new academics report having felt invisible and silent for the first five years at their university, when what they ‘craved above all’ was interpersonal contact, support and guidance from other subject specialists in their subject (Bezuidenhout 2013: 28). By the time new academics are ready to join others, they have already been acculturated into dominant discourses that neutralise their initial efforts to innovate and change the cultural spaces in which they are embedded (Ibid.). The academy therefore needs to take seriously its exclusionary practices, which will pervade and persist, until ‘universities adopt innovative strategies for training all academics, black and white’ (Mangcu 2014).

From deficit to learned incompetence

The emergent discourse of ‘learned incompetence’ is where some new academics label (and are labelled by) their lack of practical experience (phronesis) or theoretical grounding (episteme) in teaching as individual deficits. Many express strong feelings of incompetence and inadequacy in their classrooms, relying mainly on how they had been taught or on how teaching had been framed for them by others (Kahn 2009). Induction programmes that employ a ‘train and monitor’ model for new lecturers strongly reinforce this deficit discourse by often focusing on what incumbents do not know rather than working with their rich and diverse expertise (Fanghanel and Trowler 2007). Deficit can easily be translated, understood and learned as ‘incompetence’ by new academics who have no recourse to support, mentoring or feedback systems (Ibid.). The term ‘learned incompetence’ is used in psychology to talk about how humans learn helplessness (Young and Allin 1986) because people around them suggest they are incompetent or allow them to be. In assuming that
people cannot do things based on their gender, for example, people lower expectations about what they can do. It is through these assumptions, consciously or not, that people learn to be incompetent.

**Quick starters**

On the other end of the spectrum is the discourse of new academics who are ‘quick starters’ (Boice 1992). These academics lecture in a ‘facts-and-principles’ style, but in a comfortable fashion that allows time for student involvement, active learning, and a learner-centred focus (Ibid.). Quick starters are associated with ‘success’ and are understood to combine satisfaction, productivity and collegiality, conferring a holistic understanding of success in academia. Successful new academics, according to the literature, are proactive in seeking support, help, advice and guidance (Warhurst 2008); they do not wait for the institution or their colleagues to provide support. They demonstrate resilience in the face of setbacks, rejections or obstacles (Bazeley 2003) rather than acting defensively or simply not taking risks. At the same time, they are knowledgeable and remain up-to-date on important new developments in their disciplines (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey and Staples 2006). While the notion of the quick starter and successful academic is acknowledged, Boice’s 1992 research determined that only five to ten percent of new academics in general are natural quick starters. Therefore as an enabling discourse it is useful, but it is not an accurate reflection of the usual range of experience of new academics in HE today.

**The myth of meritocracy**

Although quick starters are few and far between, even in their small numbers they set a standard for meritocracy. The sub-text here is that if a few individuals can do it through hard work, motivation and dedication, then the case should be the same for all (Boler and Zembylas 2003). As Grant (2006: 186) asserts, ‘Anyone can float upwards on a rising tide, but you need to be aware of obstacles and risks that may impede or halt your progress’. New academics are not a homogeneous group and they do not face obstacles and risks in the same way; neither do they mediate them with similar formulaic responses. Widening participation in HE, which is equally about widening the base of different people employed as lecturers, (who come from different educational backgrounds, professional and working communities, and bring with them different understandings and experiences of research, teaching, academic citizenship and service) means that the discourse of meritocracy is a false understanding of the constraints that the majority of new academics face and the opportunities available to them to overcome these.
**One size does not fit all**

New academic induction, although a long process until maturation, is not a linear trajectory of fitting into departmental ways of being and doing. It is about self-fulfilment (Archer 2008), enjoyment (Lucas and Murry 2002), autonomy (Archer 2008; Warhurst 2008), security (Bazeley 2003) and balance. One-size-fits-all socialisation programmes do not support new academics in balancing their own aspirations with the expectations of their institutions, communities and students (Sutherland, Wilson and Williams 2013). New educators in HE have their own distinctive development needs in teaching and research. At the same time, they have to become engaged in academic communication structures, committees, quality assurance processes and curriculum development to meet new agendas (Marrisse 2010). Personal factors play a significant role in the individual's stance in relation to the development process; each person will have his or her own style, and the way that the individual strives to achieve meaning in the learning process is an important consideration in the management of the staff development process (Marrisse 2010).

### 4.5.2 Contextualised Induction

This is the second order of discourse on induction and is ‘supported’ by sub-discourses relating to processes that take contextual settings and their challenges into account. An example of a contextualised induction initiative takes place through departmental induction, which, although crucial, is seldom carried out, and often treated with a ‘hands-off approach’ (Staniforth and Harland 2006), being deferred to human resources or staff development units. Academic socialisation at departmental level should ideally be tailored to the individual, in a community with a focus on the department rather than the university (Staniforth and Harland 2006). Departments within faculties must realise that their context and setting strongly influence the development of staff in their care (Ibid.). Examples of contextualised induction processes are evident on medical campuses, which are usually both physically and epistemologically removed from the main campus of the university, providing as it were a different contextual space for students and lecturers alike. At some universities, more localised and specific induction programmes, that often mirror the university professional development programme, are used to acclimatise new academics to specific ways in which the faculty or department runs.

To enrich the contextualised induction process, experienced and more senior members need to exert their influence wisely by being informed about the induction programmes on offer and by being committed to affording new staff members the opportunity to participate to the full in their new community of practice (Ibid.). The hierarchical structures evident in
departments serve as constraints in this regard, and give rise to discourses that border on ‘power’, based on job rank and titles, evident in this study. Bensimon, Ward and Sanders (2000) suggest that the head of department (see Chapter Five), who operates from a position of power in terms of workload distribution, can also play a huge role in social adjustment of inductees by providing resource support, mentoring and evaluation. For example, senior staff members are sometimes intimidating to new staff in that they are hard to refuse if they make requests (Staniforth and Harland 2006). The department manager’s capacity and willingness to analyse cultural contexts (Knight and Trowler 2000) could be used to mediate issues of power relations and clarify hierarchical differences to make establishing relationships less problematic for new lecturers.

There needs to be a negotiated and dialogic space between deans, directors, managers, heads of departments, existing lecturers, and the newly appointed staff members to discuss how they constitute the space and the types of academic pressure they feel (Scheckle 2014). Heads of departments (HoDs) tend to see their role as ‘implementing systems’, whereas inductees are concerned with how they fit into the institution, and how they can become both productive and ‘stayers’ (Staniforth and Harland: 2006, 194). Gibbs and Coffey (2004), working in the UK, suggest that where induction is not taken seriously in departments, educational developers could act as counterweights to departmental cultures (Knight 2000), and the opportunity for joining forces with professional development teams could be very effective. Certainly the value of departmental induction should be promoted as part of university-wide structured programmes so that professional development of new academics is seen as a departmental as well as a central responsibility (Martin and Ramsden 1994). Teaching and administrative loads should be reduced for less experienced staff in their first year of teaching to enable them to undertake appropriate professional development.

4.5.2.1 The Holistic Model of Induction

Running counter to the atomised teaching model is the sub-discourse of the holistic model of induction which ‘views academic preparation and development holistically’ (Brew and Boud 1995: 8). Blackmore and Blackwell (2006: 375) assert that in conceptualising academic work, there should be an explicit concern with teaching, research, knowledge transfer and civic engagement, leadership, management and administration, and with their interrelationships. The critically reflexive model of teaching practice is useful here (Brookefield 1995; Moon 1999; Schön 1983) but a reflexive practice approach is more critical, involving a teacher looking back on practice with a forward-looking intention in a way
that necessarily engages structure, culture and agency (Archer 2000). In attempting to make the shift from being practitioners to becoming effective HE teachers, it is a further imperative in the holistic model for new academics to understand who their students are. This is critical if they are to effectively help students gain epistemological access (Morrow 1992) by developing in students ways of being, acting and knowing (Gee 2001) that enable them to succeed at university.

Induction processes that strive for a more holistic engagement with the relevant aspects of academic work, in an integrated and thoughtful manner and design, aim to embed the core values, beliefs and attitudes that are considered central to the university's core function. In such induction programmes, the facilitator is the kingpin, making explicit the various aspects that need integration, and providing a network of support through the university’s many units and structures to new academics for their continued and ongoing interaction in their early years. While the holistic model of induction is contextualised, it is not explicitly aligned with the socio-cultural practices of a particular department or disciplinary unit, but rather is focused on bringing together a host of academic responsibilities to create the sense that 'the whole is in fact bigger than the sum of its parts'.

4.5.2.1.1 Emergent discourses

Discomforting Difference

When new academics enter HE, they are sometimes faced with situations that are discomforting, such as not being welcomed by the department, not being introduced to staff members, or not being noticed or seen by anybody. These are pronounced on entry as incumbents encounter the familiar in unfamiliar ways. Those inside the culture of power rarely notice it, while those excluded are often acutely sensitive to how they and others are being marginalised (Kivel 2004). New academics may be immediately challenged to move out of their ‘comfort zones’, defined by Boler and Zembylas (2003: 112) as the ‘cultural and emotional terrains occupied less out of choice than through hegemony’. Comfort zones are by and large such because they remain unexamined cultural spaces and pass as common sense, but there is little common sense in an HE system that embodies dominant cultural values and assumptions which are experienced by new academics as alienating, isolating and marginalising (Mangcu 2014; Soudien 2012).

Difference has provided the conceptual framework for a number of theorists in education working towards redressing unfair distributions of contexts for teaching and learning that are typically delineated on the structural basis of race, class, gender, ethnicity, and so on.
(Giroux 1994; Spivak 1993). Anti-racist pedagogies have accentuated Difference as a marker of voice and identity (Bhabha 1996; hooks 1994), while conceptualisations of Difference framed by a social justice agenda have been re-discoursed in current times in liberal institutions under the banner ‘social inclusion’ (Leibowitz, Bozalek, Rohleder, Carolissen and Swartz 2010). New academics have to deal with Difference on many levels, the most significant of which is their relational interaction with students, peers and colleagues. In HE, despite vision and intentions of recognising individuality, a homogeneous student population is ironically the target (Boler and Zembylas 2003), and one that is defined by ‘excellence’ according to standardised levels of progress and achievement (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). Such are the conditioning influences of the corporate and managerialist culture that pervades HE today.

Professional development programmes for new academics rarely address Difference in explicit ways but couch it discursively as transformation or cultural diversity. Workshops on intercultural competence are included, but these once-off workshops address those issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation that are most visible, without an understanding of how class limits people’s ability to participate because they have not been able to participate previously, because they do not speak the language (or the academic discourse) of the institution, or because they are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with the cultural values and styles of the academy (Kivel 2004). Professional development programmes draw on cultural myths such as the ‘celebration of diversity’ (or the ‘unity in diversity’) model, the ‘we-are-all-the-same’ model and the ‘biological–born this way’ model (Boler and Zembylas 2003) to offset the deeply embedded values and assumptions that academics face within their teaching, and with students and colleagues. The emotional neutralising that these models encourage ranges from denial to tolerance, and prevents Difference from being addressed or engaged with in theorised ways (Ibid.).

Markers of difference are experienced by new academics in very tangible ways, as both dominant and marginalised forms of a cultural understanding of Difference are evident in classrooms, staff rooms, meetings and other socio-academic spaces. While these markers may be construed as structural components in an Archerian framework, they are drawn on here in their discursive power and ability to condition the experiences of new lecturers in the cultural domain of HE. In South Africa, the academic workforce has also widened in participation, and the notion of the traditional academic as the learned, male, white, bearded professor type is fast being eroded at traditional, conservative and liberal universities. Lecturers today come in different shapes, ‘colours’ and ‘accents’ and defy out-dated
stereotypes. This is enabling on the one hand, in that it opens up spaces for black academics to take their place on the academic stage; it is also a constraining discourse because new, young, black and female academics (to present an extreme case of a different lecturer profile) are being judged and measured against old stereotypes and criteria before they are given a chance to share their expertise, as is the case with one of the participants in this study. The burden of proof is much greater compared with that of their counterparts, when new lecturers ‘of colour’ are judged by students and staff alike as ‘not cut from the academic cloth’. The generative mechanisms here derive from evaluations of what academic wisdom is, but which are now being contested based on how new lecturers disrupt traditional constructions of the academe.

The Ontological Turn
Trends in the contemporary HE context, nationally and internationally, inadvertently support the complicit role HE plays in instrumentalising, professionalising, vocationalising, corporatising, and ultimately technologising education (Heidegger 1954 in Dall’Alba 2009). As discussed, the principles underlying these practices are epistemologically driven, focusing on attributes of knowledge in a decontextualised way, with little concern for the contextualised knower (Maton 2008). Admittedly, there is a fast-growing body of work by social realists who, ‘by bringing knowledge back in’ (Maton and Muller 2007), are equally concerned about the knower and the knower code, critically analysing the way knowledge and its practices are legitimated by the institution (Maton 2001). However, this reconceptualisation of knowledge and knower in discursive terms is only starting to make inroads into the overwhelmingly conservative focus in HE that conflates knowledge with learning, treating it as unproblematic (Ramsden 2003; Walker 2002). As a corollary to social realist conceptions of knowledge, the embodiment of knowledge and knowing as lived practice has also received renewed attention (Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007), constructed as ‘the turn to ontology’.

The ‘ontological turn’ is a much-needed CEP for the conceptualisation of the new academic as an autonomous, independent and causally efficacious being. Being and becoming are ontological concerns, and the challenges of teaching in a ‘supercomplex’ world warrant a turn to ontology (Barnett 2005: 795), which entails a shift from knowing the world to being-in-the-world as a conceptualisation of university teaching (ibid.). New academics in particular, on entry into HE, are initiated into a process of becoming an academic, but becoming is in a relationship of necessary complementarity with being a new academic. The ontological turn is premised on Heidegger’s notion of ‘being’, which is useful for foregrounding ontology in
teaching and learning rather than the traditional focus on epistemology and the use of knowledge and skills (Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007). How we understand the world (Knowing) is interconnected with Being, making ontology and epistemology inseparable (Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007).

The concept of being-in-the-world is highly appropriate to the experiences of new academics as they to come to know themselves as teachers, through their actual practices, as well as in their reflexivity and interpretation of their practices. In HE today, ‘being’ an academic is an ever changing and shifting process, so that ‘becoming’ a new academic is neither smooth nor straightforward. It can encompass periods of exclusion and inauthenticity (Archer 2008), or it can be confusing as a result of a lack of clarity in job descriptions and task specificity. It can be overwhelming, as academics have a strong sense of duty towards their students (Calvert, Lewis and Spindler 2011) but have to display a high level of commitment to many other aspects. Becoming a new higher education teacher can be highly stressful as the fear of performing poorly at teaching makes new members exceedingly cautious (Sorcinelli 1994), causing them to face their new employment contexts in emotionally-laboured ways because everything is so new. This performative concern translates into emotional commentary in the practical order of reality where self-confidence is lodged (Archer 2000).

The ontological challenge to new academics therefore is for them to assert their sense of being, which Archer (2000) refers to as a sense and concept of self (see Chapter Two), representative of who they are, in their own right as autonomous, independent agents capable of exerting their own power on the institution (and non-apologetically so) as they transition into HE. In being responsive to this challenge, professional development programmes need to re-orient their focus by assisting new academics to integrate knowing, acting and being by engaging with epistemology in the service of ontology. Transitioning programmes for new academics should not only address specific bodies of content knowledge and sets of skills that teachers might need, but also develop appropriate ways of strengthening the process of Being and Becoming to enhance teacher effectiveness so that student learning is enhanced (Dall'Alba and Barnacle 2007). In doing so, emphasis is placed on the process of learning, becoming and changing; not on knowledge in and of itself (Ibid.).

The Affective Turn
The ‘affective turn’, identified by Clough (2002) in the humanities and social sciences, is underpinned by the old but still pervasive Cartesian dualism and dichotomy between reason and emotion (Clegg 2009), which is bolstered by a traditional conceptualisation that emotion
is the binary opposite of reason. ‘Universities have repeatedly “valorised Western rationalisation, autonomy and control, with emotion rejected as subjective and irrational’ (Zembylas 2012: 2).

In populist discourses, the notion of emotion, feeling and affect are used synonymously, referring to the inner psychological states of being (Mulcahy 2004). Woods’ (2010) distinction between feeling, affect and emotion is useful in considering whether emotions as feelings are bodily responses to external events (the Cartesian position) or whether emotions as ‘affect’ involve judgements and evaluation (the Aristotelian position) (Roed 2012). According to Woods (2010), feelings are sensory responses to the environment (feeling cold, feeling tired), and are usually regarded as neutral. In academic discourse, the term ‘emotion’ is used to refer to ‘an interpretive experience of how one feels, as this experience is embedded in a particular cultural context and its social codes’ (Zembylas 2007a: 443). The conceptualisation of emotions has been well documented (see, for example, Ahmed 2004; Beard et al. 2007; Boler 1999; Bozalek 2011; Trowler and Knight 2000; Leibowitz et al. 2010; Zembylas 2007a).

Ahmed (2004) argues that emotions are not things or internal mental states, but are relational. ‘It is through emotions, or how we respond to objects and others, that surfaces or boundaries are made: the “I” and the “we” are shaped by, and even take the shape of, contact with others’. This ‘sociality of emotion’ regards emotions as social and cultural practices rather than psychological states (Ahmed 2004; Mulcahy 2004). Within this conceptualisation, emphasis shifts to what emotions do rather than what they are (Ahmed 2004). Where emotion has been ‘entertained’ in HE practices, it does so in the service of the education of the rational, autonomous student (Ahmed 2004; Boler 1999) who must exhibit certain emotional skills and behaviours, such as ‘emotional intelligence’ to advocate emotional self-restraint in the name of progressive, civilising and neo-liberal agendas (Boler 1999; Zembylas, 2003).

In this doctoral study, new academics connect to their projects through their emotions and the emotional commentary elicited through their reflexive deliberation (Archer 2000). This plays a significant role in how they exercise agency. Negative emotions are aroused when constraints are faced and the opposite is true in the face of opportunities. Besides offering commentary on concerns (Archer 2000), emotions relate to new academics’ wellbeing in the three orders (see Chapter Two) to shape internal conversations more deeply. New academics embody affect in a relational sense rather than as individual and private (Mulcahy
2004). Their cognitive engagement with knowledge, curricula, and pedagogy has a relational connection with affect, that is, with what they are doing, thinking and experiencing. With every action and experience, there is parallel emotional commentary, first registered by the body as embodied responses, and then reflected on as part of social interaction. For ASD, the implications are vast and staff development programmes need to consider how affect may be acknowledged, worked with and used as reflexive material to support new academics as they transition into HE.

**Affect as Emotional Labour**

Some discourses construct the process of becoming an academic as involving ‘emotional labour’. Morris and Feldman (1996) conceptualise ‘emotional labour’ as occurring when what a person feels in reality (authentic feeling) is incompatible with what is required by an organisation. Academic employment contracts assume that academics will conduct themselves with professionalism, but managing emotions is left up to the individual (Ibid.). The marketisation discourse in HE shapes how emotional labour is viewed in the academy. In current practice, being ‘nice’ to students tends to be more important than being ‘professional’; such discourses are ‘driving “student-focused” emotional labour’ (Ogbonna and Harris 2004: 1192). Leathwood and Hey (2009) claim that this emotional labour discourse is being used to micro-manage students in relation to graduate employability and widening participation. When students are perceived or perceive themselves as customers, learning is expected to be entertaining or students will complain or go somewhere else. The ‘art’ (Roed 2012) of teaching in current HE thus involves not just the skill of disciplinary content being facilitated in effective ways, but the skill of managing students’ emotions so that there is little room for criticism and negative feedback. Keeping students (or clients) ‘happy’ tends to be skilfully steered alongside the actual learning process, and new academics, who are new to this, struggle to find the right balance between the two. This aspect of emotional labour in HE is the emergent result of generative mechanisms of a corporatised and marketised HE system, battling to keep itself in business, where the quality of services a university can provide through teaching, for example, is compared with and evaluated in terms of its value for money (Roed 2012).

**Emotionology**

The attitudes or standards that a society, or a definable group within a society, maintains towards basic emotions and their appropriate expression, and ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct (Stearns and Stearns 1985: 813), are referred to as ‘emotionology’. The traditional way that emotions are handled in the university
and at institutional level is by ‘managing’ them so that the organisation benefits from them (Roed 2012). This means that staff must be managed in a supportive manner to project an image of vitality, progress, innovation and enthusiasm (ibid.). ‘Emotionology’ is thus a contested notion in ‘corporate’ HE and begs the questions (Clegg 2009): ‘Why is the idea of emotion so problematic in the micro-politics of academic life and how and why does the discursive erasure of emotions appear to be such a feature of the academy?’

The emotionology of students

Established discourses that do not favour the linking of emotions in relational terms to learning, critique the relevance of the emotional help and support provided by universities to assist students with their learning. Emotional care-giving is viewed by critics as contributing to a ‘diminished self’ (Ecclestone 2007), leading to a ‘therapy culture’, criticised for making higher education institutions softer places where academics and students deviate from ‘denial of self in the pursuit of knowledge’ (Ecclestone and Hayes 2009: 104). At the other end of the spectrum, ‘emotional intelligence’ (Goleman 1995) and soft skills like communication and empathy are being recognised as a ‘currency’ in the market economy of higher education (Hatcher 2008), as these are images more compatible with the independent, autonomous, rational graduate (Roed 2012) needed for the knowledge economy and society. But studies show that in the transition to university, emotion plays a huge role in shaping students’ experiences of the university. The extent to which emotional commentary shapes young people’s framing of their concerns of ‘being a student’ and ‘becoming a professional’, relates to aspects of the university’s material and cultural environment. This has a causal relationship with students’ emotional responses, which consequently are implicated in the perpetuation of class-based differential life chances (Ibid.).

The emotionology of new academics

Similarly, a wide range of emotions is experienced by new academics, who, unsure of what is acceptable or permissible in their actions in departmental and other cultures (Staniforth and Harland 2006), experience a fair amount of emotional upheaval. Exacerbated by the organisation’s lack of appreciation of the delicate problems that exist for the newcomer in the early years of the career (Trowler and Knight 1999), the induction period is described by new academics as stressful and marked by avoidance and distress (Boice 1992). The sense of confusion, loneliness and isolation (Siler and Kleiner 2001) that new academics feel is evident in discursive constructions such as ‘lost’, ‘exiled’, ‘at the bottom of the tree’, ‘in the dark’, ‘in this glass bowl’, ‘on the moon’ and ‘at sea’, and ‘need a guidebook’ (Gourlay 2011).
New lecturers who experience HE as emotionally challenging, position themselves as outsiders and unsure amateurs, which is viewed as a deficit by the rest of the community and themselves (Ibid.). This transition from first-order practitioner into second-order educator–practitioner has been described as a ‘culture shock’ (Sales 2014) by many. Often these ‘narratives of despair’ (Fanghanel 2012: 21) frustrate new academics’ ability to exercise agency to operate autonomously and shape expectations in ways that serve their own agendas and meet their personal values.

Academics experience emotions as constraints when the ‘corporateness’ of their workspaces increasingly values what is visible and can be measured (Fanghanel 2012: 24). As the workload for academics increases (more students, more teaching, more administration, less time for research), academics have to increasingly demonstrate their impact in auditable form (Hey 2011: 209). An area of ‘auditable’ practice that has significant emotional consequence for academics is student evaluations of lecturer performance and courses (Boughey 2000). Students, through their evaluations, exercise great ability to make or break a lecturer’s self-esteem, and, through this practice, the academic is unwittingly being re-designed into a ‘corporate character’ (Hatcher 2008) who must deliver on demand and must be committed to the efficiency and instrumentality (Boughey 2000) demanded of the system.

There is an inherent danger, however, in creating and supporting a discourse where new academics in HE are seen only as vulnerable and in need of emotional support. This discourse reproduces inequalities already inherent in the education system in relation to newcomers (Leathwood and Hey 2009: 436). The way new academics engage emotionally is not all negative, and it is worth considering how a positive account of emotions and second-order emotionality might relate to the particular commitments of academics (Clegg 2009). Some describe their transition as a necessary ‘rite of passage’ which they must embrace in the assimilation of a new working identity (Sales, 2014). In this study, emotions as CEPs provide rich commentaries on new academics’ projects by conveying to them possibilities for the exercise of agency in relation to their bigger social and contextual concerns in education.

4.5.2.2 Induction as social practice

From a realist perspective, the whole and the parts are independent and causally efficacious as autonomous entities. A social practice model of induction, which is based on social theory, comes closer to this position in that it is an ‘accommodative process which takes
place when new entrants to an organization engage with aspects of the cultural configurations they find there’ (Trowler and Knight 1999). Here structure, culture and agency are recognised in both their independent domains as well as in their interplay. A social theory of learning argues that learning is located in dialogue as well as in the heads of individuals, and it shifts the focus from a concentration on individual cognitive processes to the social arrangements and relationships which shape, for instance, positive and negative learner identities, which may differ over time and from place to place (Coffield 1999: 493; Trowler 2005a). This type of induction also includes an academic’s socialisation into a department and the university, ‘created by the discourses and practices of the community in which one works’ (Knight and Trowler 1999: 23). Here professional learning is mediated through an active dialogue between the new academics and the social system that they find themselves in.

The concept of teaching and learning regimes (TLRs), developed and elaborated by Trowler and Cooper (2002), is helpful in developing insights in relation to the dimensions of cultures and subjectivities in universities which relate both to teaching and learning and to change processes. TLRs shed light on social processes that need to be understood as operating simultaneously and holistically rather than individually or in a disaggregated way (Fanghanel 2007; Trowler 2005; Wareham 2002). Socio-cultural induction, through sensitive professional development programmes, communities of practice or collegial support, enables new academics to become familiar with the culture and practice of their new environment (Boyd and Harris 2010), to gain confidence in their practices, and contribute to a theorisation and understanding of the role of socialisation processes as crucial to the successful induction of new teaching staff (Trowler and Knight 2000). This might ensure a more sustainable work force than a temporary and casual one.

4.5.2.2.1 Emergent discourses

The myth of Communities of Practice

Much has been written about the value of communities of practice (CoPs) in new academic induction and the advantages of a learning process that occurs during debate, dialogue, networking, guidance, support, critical reflection and mentoring, which Lave and Wenger classify as ‘legitimate peripheral participation and situated learning’ (Lave and Wenger 1991: 29). Other writers caution that actual academic practice in higher education is usually textual and tends to take place in private, with development and observation of the ‘unpacking’ process not always amenable to new academics (Gourlay 2011; Tennant 1997). This sense of opacity around academic practice and scholarship pertains to all newcomers, as
experiences in an academic context are often individually voiced, unique, highly specialised and context specific. Even if the processes by which they are produced were observable, they could not be enacted by the novice in a direct and straightforward manner, without support. A ‘community’ should not be assumed to pre-exist in an academic department in a way that will allow ‘novices’ with limited experience of advanced scholarship to learn new practices from more experienced colleagues in a relatively organic manner (Gourlay 2011). Established academics tend to remain isolated from colleagues in other disciplines, are defensive of their turf, and lack connections, interest, involvement, rewards, and recognition (Senge 1990).

Playing the game
In an article which draws on Bourdieu’s social practice theory, Jawitz (2009) describes disciplinary departments as ‘fields’ in which members each carry an individual *habitus*, ‘which is all at once a “craft”, a collection of techniques, references, a set of beliefs’ (Bourdieu 1993: 72–73), formed out of ‘past experiences and socialisation processes’ (Jawitz 2009: 602). Jawitz argues that the academic’s individual *habitus* must eventually align with, subsume, or be assimilated by the field’s collective *habitus* or the community (or department’s) shared repertoire and ways of doing things (Archer 2008). This lining up of *habitus* or conditioning from an Archerian perspective is not an intuitive or organic process; it is the result of reflexive deliberation of agents as they mediate the contexts they find themselves in. When new academics come up against constraints presented by departmental cultures, ‘playing the game’ can be counterproductive to their exercise of agency in the service of their identity formation, development of their voice and the morphogenesis of their practices based on their unique concerns and projects in education.

Sink or swim
In the UK, a study of twelve higher education institutions found that most new staff said they were left to their own devices, to sink or swim (Rust 1991). Using water-related metaphors to describe how newly-appointed academics come to terms with a change in role and identity (Sales 2014), Anderson (2009) refers to staff as ‘splashing in the shallows’, ‘drowning’ and occasionally ‘treading water’ when they first enter academia. New academics themselves describe their experiences as being ‘thrown in at the deep end’ to ‘sink or swim’. Those who had positive experiences were in a minority, and any assistance received was ad hoc and unstructured. Findings in an Australian study in a large research university (De Rome and Boud 1984) were similar: new staff felt under considerable pressure, had large teaching loads with inadequate assistance, and experienced a conflict between teaching and
research responsibilities. A more recent Australian study indicated that only just over a quarter of a sample of 94 new academics experienced any kind of mentoring with regard to their teaching (Marshall et al. 1999).

‘Mushfaking’
The ‘Mushfake Discourse’ (Gee 1990) refers to a strategy adopted in literacy practices as part of the process of acquiring a secondary Discourse, which is making do with something less when the real thing is not available (Gee 1990: 13). In other words, it is a case of ‘faking it till you make it’. When new academics are faced with similar challenges in the process of ‘mushfaking’, there is constant threat of ‘being found out’. This is experienced as inauthenticity (Gourlay 2011) as there is a lack of legitimacy in relation to being an academic. Participation in academic discourses as either a participant or even an arbiter is seen as an important marker of academic identity and legitimacy, but also a troubled and ambiguous area of academic practice where new academics lack confidence and a sense of legitimacy about this aspect of their roles (Archer 2008). This is likely to stem from the fact that some new academics do not have higher degrees in higher education or the experience of advanced scholarly work (Archer 2008), and buckle under the pressure towards performativity (Ball 2003).

The cultural fit: square peg in round hole?
Every institution of higher education has a culture of power and each department, division, school, programme, and office within it has its own subculture of power (Kivel 2004). It is through these sub-cultures that new academics experience the strange and unfamiliar when departmental spaces become awkward in their racial and gender staff distributions, in their linguistic exclusion, or in their cultural values and assumptions:

If you are a woman and you have ever walked into a men's meeting, or a person of color and have walked into a white organization, or a child who walked into the principal's office, or a Jew or Muslim who entered a Christian space, then you know what it is like to walk into a culture of power that is not your own. You may feel insecure, unsafe, disrespected, unseen or marginalized. You know you have to tread carefully (Kivel 2004: 1).

When new academics are not part of the cultural fit (Jansen 2014) at institutions, they have to work extra hard to be accepted because fitting in, feeling comfortable, and feeling accepted are important to them as they transition in HE. Some new academics express feelings of ‘not belonging’ while many others experience emotions of ‘feeling other-ed’ or
‘less than’. The ‘cultural fit’ discourse is seen as a debilitating discourse for the project of HE transformation as it highlights aspects of informal institutional climate that are not being transformed. Other static features which have exclusionary effects are the traditions, symbols and customs of daily interaction, which point to ‘the way in which we do things’, revealing the underlying assumptions and beliefs that underpin the mainstream culture (Ministry of Education 2008: 35).

At the same time, the ‘cultural fit’ discourse can act as an enabler if it motivates agents to exercise their agency to mediate such obstructions, as I found in this study. As Barnett (2005: 795) argues, ‘awkward spaces’ are needed ‘to and for students in order to enable them to deal with the “strangeness” they inevitably encounter in an uncertain and unpredictable world’. New academics too need to be socialised into ‘the strange and the awkward’ in HE, but from theorised and affirming vantage points so that they can confront taken-for-granted perspectives and develop new ways of engaging with HE. An example of this in recent developments, is a group calling themselves ‘black academics for transformation’ at a world-class, liberal university in the Western Cape, who have started mobilising support for the academic forum to address the marginalisation of black academics in the promotion process of the professoriate (Mangcu 2014). These corporate agents have met with the vice-chancellor and various selection committees to raise the issue of bias in the selection process, which, conditioned by the university’s fear of ‘dropping standards’, has not shown progress in transforming historical white institutions in the new dispensation in South Africa.

### 4.5.2.3 Student-centred induction

In attempting to make the shift from practitioners to effective HE teachers, it is a further prerogative for new academics to understand who their students are if they are to effectively help students gain epistemological access (Morrow 1992), in ways that develop students’ ways of being, acting and knowing (Gee 2001) that enable them to succeed at university. A growing number of scholars have argued for a form of education that puts students rather than teachers at the centre of educational activity (Engeström 2001; Vygotsky 1978; Wheelahan 2007). The term ‘student-centred learning’ articulated by the psychologist Carl Rogers (1951) in the 50s, is currently interpreted as synonymous with ‘active learning’ and ‘participatory learning’. Unlike the transmission model, the student-centred model stresses the importance of encouraging students to undertake higher-order thinking about what they learn, by providing structured learning activities that require substantial engagement in decision making and critical thinking (Ramsden 2003). Both models problematise the
teaching and learning strategies used in learning and development, and the need to find a fine balance between what the teacher does and what the student does to achieve the learning goals (Biggs 1996; Ramsden 1999).

To make the complex knowledge, from both the curriculum and practice domains, accessible to students in a manner that relates to their abilities to understand, requires expert guidance. This means that teachers must not only be able to use a range of instructional strategies and techniques, but also know when and how to use them. The challenge of constructively aligning the aims of learning with the way learning is assessed is challenging for new academics with little or no teaching experience. Induction programmes and staff developers could play a more supportive role here by engaging in a type of ‘elastic practice’ (Carew, Lefoe, Bell and Armour 2008), where multiple theoretical bases are melded to support an adaptive, responsive, and more aligned approach to teaching and student-centred learning, by tailoring specific approaches from the full professional development ‘toolkit’ of techniques, experiences, ideas, values, and theories that are currently in circulation.

4.5.2.3.1 Emergent discourse

Accenting Accent

‘Accent’ is an emotive topic in this country as it is often used as a proxy for incompetence and ignorance. Where students cannot signal ‘race’ as the underlying reasons for their dissatisfaction with a lecturer, they target other markers of difference such as ‘accents’ and ‘qualifications’ as signs of inadequacy or failure of the new academic to live up to academic norms. The dominant discourse which constructs students as clients (who are always right, and have to be kept happy) is drawn on by students to inadvertently target the lecturer. This is a huge constraint on new lecturers, trying to establish themselves as knowledgeable others in the classroom, but who are being tested on so many fronts in an HE space that appears to be more threatening than supportive.

The discourse of accents is complex and raises a host of sensitive issues that can be quite damaging if not ‘handled’ well. From a new academic perspective, ‘accents’ are sometimes self-identified (or as a result of student evaluations) by mainly black lecturers (both national and foreign). In my current experience as the convenor of a programme for new academics, lecturers’ accents are highlighted repeatedly as sticking points in classroom practice. A certain type of accent is accepted as a marker of traditional, mainstream university teaching. New lecturers, especially at traditional universities, are expected to reproduce the norm (read as English-speaking, Received Pronunciation) rather than introduce Difference and
variety (read as ‘deviations’ from the norm). Student descriptions of a ‘deviating accent’ are equated with professional incompetence, which leads to the surfacing of issues of self-worth and self-esteem. New academics are reluctant to trade their personal expression for the ‘standardised model’ that students demand because accent is also an expression of group identity and personal pride, especially when accent and race are conflated, as they are in this country given its cultural and historical past. Where accent is seen as a mediator of communicative ability, students ‘assess’ accents on their mechanics, that is, whether they can actually understand what is being communicated, and the extent to which the accent is debilitating to student learning. Many new lecturers feel that the approach to ‘correct’ accents should not involve imposing a ‘remedy’ such as ‘accent training’ or ‘voice clinics’ (which are value laden, contested and contentious for lecturers), but should invite lecturers to explore ways in which the issue can be unpacked and addressed in their classrooms in the interest of teaching and learning.

4.6 Conclusion

Criticisms of traditional induction processes reveal that institutions of higher learning do not necessarily ensure that new staff, transitioning into HE understand the mission, vision, goals, values, expectations and demands of the university in particular, or higher education transformational goals in the sector, or calls for innovation in teaching and learning (Hassan 2013) in the classroom. Given the challenges confronting new staff, many of the national university induction programmes that I surveyed, do not include an explicit focus on induction into the HE field as a sector, which is located at the societal level of realisation (Macdonald and O’Reagan 2009) or the macro level of national significance. If the gap in understanding HE against its national goals in a new democracy widens, it is likely that the broad societal goals attached to the university’s mission and purpose may be overshadowed by more localised and narrower conceptualisations of the academic role of the lecturer. The institution does not always take positive steps to provide an enabling environment to ease the adjustment process of new staff, not only into their institutions, but also into the national landscape. Neither does it guard against models that pay lip service to induction through attendance at a series of uncoordinated events during which new academics are hurriedly introduced to the general work environment, rather than being offered experiences that inspire and prepare them for the challenges ahead (Anijaobi-Idem and Archibong 2012). This is further influenced by the use of a train and release/train and monitor model of induction, where engagement with new academics is short-lived and unsupported. This lack of sensitising new academics to their societal commitments through HE, is a severe constraint on the exercise of new academics’ agency at all levels of realisation and, in light
of the transformational goals of 1994, it perpetuates the false dichotomy between academic and social concerns.

Socialisation programmes and induction models that do not take into account the ideologies at work in HE teaching (Bartolomé 2004), deny new academics the opportunity to conceptualise and approach teaching and learning by positioning themselves in relation to their teaching and learning context. Ideological filters or ‘pedagogical constructs’ (Fanghanel, 2009), which affect academics’ conceptions and enactments as discipline experts, could be better tempered by considering the broader social goals in HE. These include responding to the plight of the majority of students struggling to succeed in HE, rather than focusing on the individual teacher and his or her concerns, which may be deleterious to the achievement of the more socially-encompassing goals that HE has embraced.

Four ideological positions in relation to higher education were identified by Trowler (1998) and Fanghanel (2009), namely a ‘traditionalist’, ‘vocationalist’, ‘progressive’ or ‘emancipatory’ position, and a ‘social constructionist’ or ‘critical’ position in which HE is seen as a vehicle for transforming society. Ideological positions which affect how lecturers teach in their disciplines could be better engaged with on socialisation programmes. Here critical questions could be raised about alternative models of teaching and learning (Trowler 2005a) so that new academics as active agents, can mediate the pedagogical stances they confront to adopt informed and well theorised understandings of what HE as a social project is trying to achieve. In other words, such an approach would enable and ensure an active engagement of agency with structure and culture at a more systemic level.
Chapter Five: Social and Social-Interaction at T2–3 of the Morphogenetic Cycle: Narratives of Meditation

In the previous chapter, I provided a detailed description and discussion of the structural and cultural conditioning contexts internationally, nationally and at an institutional level, shaping the exercise of agency among new academics. This marked the T1 phase of Archer’s morphogenetic cycle. In keeping with the goals of this study, I have established that the conditions which texture the situational contexts that new academics confront are both problem ridden and problem free (Archer 1995), presenting new academics with particular constraints and enablements for the realisation of their own projects in education.

This chapter analyses the projects that new academics adopted and discusses how they responded to the contextual influences by engaging their personal powers and properties through reflexive processes. This is the T2–3 phase of the M/M cycle, which captures the social and social-interaction of agents. Through the interaction of two causal powers, namely those of structure (SS and CS), and their agency (SI and SC-I), new academics as agents mediate the emergent structural and cultural properties that enable or constrain their projects.

Pseudonyms have been used to protect the anonymity of the participants.
5.1 Narrative of mediation: Mira

This vignette focuses on Mira, whose narrative captures the involuntary placement she confronts when she joins the Department of Architectural Technology at the UoT. With special intentionality and determination (PEPs) to realise her project in education and to successfully mediate the structural and cultural conditions she finds, Mira’s story is one of successfully advancing her concerns into a meaningful project. Calling on her own powers and properties, she works out what she wants and how to go about getting it, within the enablements and constraints in the context of the institution (macro), her department (meso) and her classroom (micro) that she has to circumvent.

Mira’s photovoice collage (above) uses an ‘architectural theme’ using principles such as line, texture, shape and angles to represent the challenges that she has faced as a new academic in the Department of Architectural Technology at the UoT.
5.1.1 Conception of the project

5.1.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Mira is a professional architect who joined the UoT in 2011 as a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Informatics and Design. She teaches ‘Applied Design’ and established the ‘Contemporary Design Philosophy’ course in the Department of Architectural Technology for the final-year BTech programme, which she coordinates. Mira grew up in KwaZulu-Natal and studied at the University of KZN, completing a master’s degree in South African commemorative architecture in 2009:

I am an architect, greatly moved by the world of design. I love architecture. I am passionate about it – making me extremely dedicated to what I do. This interest began subconsciously at a very young age, and developed over childhood through my enjoyment of drawing, building models, and constructing little things. Following an introduction to the discipline in matric, my enthralment with architecture continued to grow (TDP reflective essay 2011).

After her studies, Mira began practising at a large leading architectural firm in Durban:

Upon completing my studies, I quickly became acquainted with the reality of the architectural industry by working with a large successful practice. The position as project architect allowed me to develop my niche as a design architect, whilst also managing drawing documentation, contract administration and on-site construction demands (TDP reflective essay 2011).

While establishing her career in corporate practice, Mira completed a postgraduate research degree, which focused on memory and architecture. Mira is fully embedded in the discourse and lifestyle of architecture and has embodied its practice in a visceral sense (Dall’Alba 2005; Barnett 2000):

Being, knowing, doing – aspects that are embedded in architecture. When one enters into the discipline one chooses a lifestyle – to live and breathe architecture/to be informed by the discipline in whatever choices one makes/to experience the world and life through this multi-faceted culture (TDP reflective essay 2011).

However, after working in industry for six years, Mira felt that she had reached her ceiling. This milestone also meant that, up until this exit point, she had acquired a wide range of
skills and experiences as an architect and professional in her field, and was thus well endowed as an agent when she accepted a lecturing post in Cape Town.

I am in the higher education profession because my move from practice to education is an attempt to bridge the gap between the two disciplines, and to contribute my experience and knowledge to the education and development of students in preparation for the reality of the workplace (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mira’s conception of a project in education is linked to her need to contribute to the development of students, but when she accepted the senior lecturer post that the UoT offered her, she had no idea what it entailed:

I had no idea what it was . . . I just came. I arrived at UOT and thank goodness for TDP, because now I was at this point where I was in this kind of broader discipline, but in another discipline as well (River of Life 2013).

Apart from a well-established personal identity at a relatively young age, Mira had also developed a strong concept of self (Archer 2000) that placed her in a strong evaluator role in her own professional life as she transitioned into HE. Although she was initially concerned that her age would be constraint on her being taken seriously by students, it was not a debilitating concern and did not override her goals:

Subconsciously, I was initially concerned about my age and how the students would perceive my teaching abilities and me (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Even though she was young, she had acquired a fair amount of cultural capital in her field, which contributed to her positive sense of self and self esteem. One’s continuous sense of self is a self-consciousness that is prior to our sociality; it is unique to each individual and anchors his/her strict self-identity, and is universal for each human being (Archer 2000). Mira’s personal identity provided a solid basis from which her social or professional identity could grow further and mature, based on her professional experience and her configurations of concerns in HE (Archer 2003).

5.1.1.2 Identification of concerns

While Mira was still in industry, she had interacted with students from tertiary institutions who job-shadowed at her firm. Through this interaction, and based on her own insights when she
was a student herself, Mira came into HE with already well-established cares and concerns in education that she wanted to shape further:

Whilst in practice, we received many students out of tertiary institutions, which made me realise just how ill prepared students generally are for industry. I knew I wanted to make a further and more meaningful contribution to the development of students, which would entail putting my skills to use in higher education. Talking about and sharing views and notions on architecture is extremely stimulating for me. That is why I enjoy engaging with the students (TDP reflective essay 2011).

With noble intentions of adding value to education by joining its ranks, Mira was keen to transfer her knowledge gained in practice. However, like other academics transitioning from industry into higher education, the reality of the challenges of teaching in the HE context was a huge constraint, which quickly blurred the virtuous intentions that had motivated her transition in the first place:

With no training or formal qualification in education, my contract stipulated that I attend the compulsory Teaching Development Programme (TDP). From just my first lesson at the TDP, I soon realised that my first thoughts on teaching were naïve. Before I started teaching, I assumed that my teaching approach would be based on my experiential perspectives as a practitioner. I envisaged myself to be empathetic with the students, whilst instilling the workings of the architectural discipline into the students (TDP reflective essay 2011).

The TDP as a structural enablement provided Mira with a cultural space in which she was able not only to solidify her concerns in relation to teaching and student learning, but also to dedicate her energy to prioritising which concerns mattered to her the most and which she was able to commit to (Archer 2000). Despite her challenges in teaching, Mira knew that, in following her ‘desiderata’ (Archer 2003) to establish a modus vivendi in education, she had to reflect on her concerns and begin the process of prioritisation so that she could develop a project that would engage her. She therefore turned her attention to her students and her impassioned belief that students had to understand what it meant to embody and embrace architecture as a discipline in the way she had:

Architecture is the integration of art and technology, theory and practice. In the workplace, it involves interdisciplinary understanding such as the intersection of engineering, urban design and landscaping, and in education it goes beyond the domains of institutional learning. Rather, architecture is learnt through engaging: by
understanding socio-political aspects, interacting with community, attending conferences, mingling at dinner parties and coffee shops, etc. Various aspects such as books, fashion, movies, nature, science fiction, music, food and industrial design inspire architecture. The disciple is talking, reading, writing, and drawing; all executed in a particular way, specific to the domain. All these elements contribute to architectural Discourse: the being of the discipline, embracing that being, and making individual identity part of that architectural collective (TDP reflective essay 2011).

The ontological endowment bestowed on her students via an architectural disciplinary identity meant that students, as independent and autonomous beings, were engaged as agents themselves as they exercised their causal powers and properties in service of the educational project of completing their studies. Mira’s concerns were embroiled with the perception that students needed to be part of an architectural Discourse community (Gee 1990; Jacobs 2007), which paved the way for her commitment to the establishment of a project in education. Like students in creative disciplines transitioning into tertiary education, who undergo a dual transition when they commence tertiary study, taking on a student identity but also assuming their professional identity as a creative practitioner (Kinniburgh 2014), new academics like Mira undergo a similar shift (Norton, Aiyegbayo, Harrington, Elander and Reddy 2010). There is a clear causal relationship between taking up new ways of operating as a teacher on the one hand, and changing one’s personal and professional identity (see Chapter Four for discussion) on the other (Trowler and Cooper 2002).

5.1.1.3 Emotional commentary on concerns

When I met Mira on the first day of the TDP, she came across as a very reserved and shy individual. Her demeanour suggested that she was out of her comfort zone, being stretched somewhat to find her place among a group of professional ‘experts’ who were all being neutralised by being cast as ‘novices’ again on the TDP. While different university teachers are open to giving up particular identities when they join educational development programmes to reposition as novices (Trowler and Cooper 2002), this is not always easy for new academics like Mira with strong professional identities. Where an individual’s identity is relatively fixed, this involves a rejection of a repositioning as novice or learner in a new social context or within a new teaching and learning regime (Ibid.). This clash of identities acts as a conditioning influence, generated as a threat to the process of transitioning from practitioner to HE classroom. This repositioning is cause for great emotional stress, as one’s new placement conveys a new set of meanings that must be negotiated in the three orders of reality. The most significant for academics like Mira is the practical order, where her
performative competence is lodged (Archer 2000). As she is already an accomplished researcher, scholar, practitioner and consultant, her impoverished resources as a university teacher mean that she is as yet unable to ‘master’ the novel contextual influences in HE, which she experiences as a ‘culture shock’:

My life was falling apart and my personal life . . . and there were lots of kind of little stumbling blocks in terms of dealing with students, dealing with a new city, dealing with teaching and a whole lot of just . . . away from family, away from relationships, all of that. (River of Life 2013).

Mira’s emotional concerns have more to do with her performative competence than with social and normative evaluation of her self-worth and ability, although the latter is necessarily affected by the former. Her performative achievement in the practical order signals feedback from the environment, which causes her frustration, despair and fear, depicted in her river of life drawing and narrative as ‘rocky’ and ‘turbulent’:

And things got really quite turbulent, because in the first year . . . I was thrown into subjects at first-year and fourth-year level that I really didn't enjoy, but because I came out of a practice I was kind of put into the box of what I should be teaching (River of Life 2013).

The emotional commentary on her concerns carries the importance of her project to her, giving further shape to Mira’s actions and choices, and influencing her to enlarge or abandon projects based on how well she can mediate their contextual influences. ‘We are who we are because of what we care about: in delineating our ultimate concerns and accommodating our subordinate ones, we define ourselves (Archer 2000: 10). The establishment of a successful social practice is thus dependent upon the ‘adaptive ingenuity of reflexive subjects’, who must deal with the causal powers of social properties in a non-deterministic way ‘in the conception, the pursuit and the realisation of their projects’ (Ibid.).

Primacy accorded to practice in her core discipline enabled Mira to embody architecture to such a finite degree that the associated knowledge, concepts, ideas and experiences were deeply internalised at a tacit level (Polanyi 1983). Our knowledge in the practical order ‘derives from our ability to enhance and extend our embodied knowledge, by using artefacts to develop knowledge further, through interaction with material culture’ (Archer 2000: 166). This was not matched, however, by Mira’s newly found identity as HE teacher. As practice is pivotal to the knowledge we gain from society (Archer 2000), Mira had to find ways to
embody teaching in the same way, and with the relatively similar intensity that she ‘lives and breathes’ architecture.

5.1.1.4 Adoption of a project

Archer refers to agents in the plural as a ‘collectivity of similarly placed individuals’, but, as discussed in Chapter Two, primary agents are entities in their own right. Agents are emergent, autonomous and irreducible to the human being (Archer 2000), but can only be called ‘agents’ once they are agents of something, that is, their projects. Archer defines a project as ‘any goal countenanced by a social agent, from the satisfaction of biologically grounded needs to the Utopian reconstruction of society’ (2000: 198). In other words, it is any action intentionally engaged with by a human being. Without the structural and cultural emergent properties that enable and constrain agents’ projects, agents have little to be agential about, that is, they do not have to expand, circumvent or renounce anything (Archer 2003). Mira is acutely aware of her strong professional identity as architect but equally aware of the need to develop her nascent academic identity as a university teacher. This is her goal, which becomes her quest for authenticity as a lecturer and as a social agent. This concept of self, which is historically and socially constructed (Archer 2000), is attached to being social, that is, an agent who takes his or her social place in society and persists in shaping his or her course in the world.

To be able to exercise agency, Mira must first identify and prioritise concerns, then conceive of and adopt a project to which she can commit and through which she can activate causal powers to ‘act so rather than otherwise’ in relation to the social context (Archer 2000). In her Milestone Project for the TDP, Mira identified the following as the focus for her engagement: ‘From boardroom to blackboard: the shift from practice to teaching’. The identification of a project has its origins in the agent’s ultimate cares and concerns, which in turn are born out of the agent’s sense of self and concept of self that gives him or her personal identity by virtue of how he or she prioritises these concerns in his or her life course (Archer 2003). In Mira’s case, her cares and concerns at this point in her academic career derive from her commitment to realising her goals in education, namely to make the shift from practice to education as effectively and effortlessly as possible. By the end of the TDP in 2011, Mira was ready to embark on her project to further deepen and strengthen it through her choices of activities and events that promulgate her development as a HE practitioner in the classroom.

It was clear that Mira, as primary agent involuntarily placed in a context not of her choosing,
was a well-resourced agent. She was privileged with a wealth of relevant past experiences through her background, her ability to follow her interests and passion, her educational trajectory, and her professional networks. She possessed the social and cultural capital rewarded at the university; she was qualified, was experienced in industry, had engaged in disciplinary research, and had maintained an ongoing professional development profile through postgraduate courses. Even though she was new to HE, Mira was able to transfer the key skills acquired in architectural practice to her new context in HE. Through a careful process of selection and de-selection, Mira used her reflexive ability to discern, deliberate and dedicate herself to a project (Archer 2000). Having been embedded in the social reality of her discipline through her work in the industry, which had its own causal properties and powers, Mira was able to strategically ‘reflect upon her social context and act reflexively towards it’ (Archer 2000: 12) by using her own properties and powers honed during her time as practitioner in the field.

We see the exercise of these PEPs (her agency) as Mira dedicates herself to the challenge of integrating architecture into education, so that she can bring her disciplinary ways of knowing and being (Barnett 2000; Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007) and professional discourse to bear not only on what it means to be and become a lecturer, but also on what it means for students to be employable graduates worthy of the disciplinary identity as an architect:

This is what we have to impart to our students. Regardless of students’ backgrounds and make up, they have to participate in the commonality of the culture and lifestyle of architecture . . . My teaching objectives are to link practice and academia in the education and training of students and to encourage students’ understanding of the relevance of integrating the subjects they are studying in the context of practice (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Given her strong professional identity, Mira has struggled to embrace the understanding that, in as much as students need to be inducted into architecture, they are first and foremost students, especially in their first year, navigating the university context in ways that are meaningful to them, not just epistemologically but ontologically as well. As 19-year-olds, who have not reached strict and mature identity (Archer 2000), students need to ‘breathe’ in both worlds: academic and professional. Mira’s main challenge as an educator is thus to find ways to enable students to do this and to smooth out the peculiarities of pedagogical frameworks in her discipline, which require tailored support mechanisms to ensure student success (Kinniburgh 2014). This is often a neglected aspect in HE teaching, which is
focused primarily on knowledge acquisition rather than knowledge engagement (Maton 2001).

5.1.1.5 Personal emergent properties

Through her participation in the TDP, and in the early adoption of a project born out of her concerns in education, Mira’s personal emergent powers and properties were activated and exercised in her social and socio-cultural interactions in her context. How agents conceive of and pursue courses of action in social and cultural contexts is dependent on their use of their PEPs such as intentionality, motivation, deliberation, and command of a language, among others (Archer 2000; Kahn 2009).

For Mira, the sui generis properties and powers that emerge as a consequence of her embodied interactions as an architect in the world of education (Archer 2003) include her fundamental capacities for consciousness and reflexivity, which shape her sense of selfhood and concept of self as agent (Plumb 2008). Archer (2003) identifies this capacity as the ‘internal conversation’ (discussed in Chapter Two), which is the point of contact between our internal powers of reflexivity and the powers possessed by the external world. Mira’s understanding and exercise of reflective practice in the TDP strengthens her ability for reflexive dialogue, which she uses to ascertain the worth of her project to decide if she can commit to it by active ‘discernment, deliberation and dedication’ to it (Archer 2000):

My early interactions with reflection, through mandatory engagement via the TDP, made me realise that I did actually reflect a lot subconsciously in both my personal capacity, as well as that of architectural practitioner. But being made actively aware of the uses of reflection in teaching and learning encouraged me to challenge some of my preconceptions and notions in this regard; it forced me to think about what I was doing in the classroom, as well as how and why I was doing it; and it made me recognise and identify the connection between developed teaching and learning theories in relation to the outcomes for students (TDP reflective essay 2011).

As Archer avers, the internal conversation becomes an important means through which human beings can sustain or transform their natural and social contexts (Archer 2003). By honing her reflexive skills in her personal and professional capacity, Mira was able to apply them to her teaching practice in an academic context, making use of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action (Schön 1983) to assist her in gaining some control over the teaching strategies that worked and those that needed her attention in relation to student learning:
Despite my initial reservations towards reflection, due to my unfamiliarity with it in teaching and learning, the TDP encouraged me to pursue reflective practice. The TDP reflective piece allowed me to systematically unclutter my mental mess. It was essential in organising my thoughts and posing a relevant question, thereby allowing me to form a rational plan of action to seek the appropriate answers in order to forge ahead. As the basis of my development as an educator, reflection now underpins my approach to teaching in order to address what is taught and how it is taught (curriculum and pedagogy) (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Her reflexive deliberation also signals to Mira the importance of making a success of her new venture in education. Mira had made the transition from practice because working in industry had become meaningless for her:

I think . . . I think the meaningful stuff needed to happen . . . because that really made me see the real again – after three years and it was real in a meaningful place, in terms of the community and not lining a developer's pocket or some rich . . . , some piece of property somewhere (River of Life 2013).

Mira thus has a vested interest in doing well as a university teacher. She was an accomplished architect who had enjoyed professional life but had chosen on the basis of her ultimate concerns as a social agent to move into higher education. Agents with vested interests are predisposed, with PEPs of determination and motivation (Archer 2003), to imbue their projects with the sufficient amount of emotional and cognitive drive to realise their projects. Determined to succeed, by crossing the threshold from practitioner to educator, and even with little departmental support for her project, Mira armed herself by reading widely in the field of educational development to prepare for the topics under discussion in the TDP.

Even though well endowed as professional expert, Mira was in clear need of pedagogic support, yet she did not solicit this explicitly or overtly from me, or others, in the TDP community. Here again we see the tension between learner and expert and the reluctance to reposition completely as novice (Trowler and Cooper 2002). Mira would try out innovative ideas in class and then report on them for feedback from the group and me. She was able to push through constraints of fear and despair to exercise her agency in service of her project, thus displaying the determination required of new academics who want to forge ahead and establish themselves as formidable newcomers in a specialised setting such as HE. Mira, with her range of powers and properties as an agent, was in good stead to overcome and circumvent the constraints she confronted. Again, contrary to the discourse of the novice
teacher as ‘inexperienced’, Mira makes a compelling case for the focused, determined, passionate and driven new academic, in the service of a more enhanced and inclusive teaching and learning practice for herself and her students. These are her unique PEPs, activated through her reflexively engaging with her context in the adoption of her project, born out of her unique cares and concerns (Archer 2003):

I guess you can make a decision to mull over the horrible stuff or you just move on . . . and I just learnt in our department you’ve just got to pick yourself up and go. If no one else is coming with you that’s too bad! You’ve just got to do it for yourself at the end of the day unfortunately, otherwise you will just wither . . . you actually have to find out and do it . . . and I think that’s what frustrates me when I see some people in our department who just sit there and feel sorry for themselves . . . and how come everyone else is going and doing stuff and we are not . . . well we spend a lot of time looking for things to do and keep busy (Photovoice 2013).

Mira clearly displays a range of formidable PEPs, which no doubt serve her well as she further engages as an agent with the enablements and constraints that she confronts when she engages with her project in her department, classroom and institution, to which I now turn.

5.1.2 Pursuit of the project

After adopting her project, Mira pursues how she is going to go about promoting her concerns through its design and unfolding. At the same time as we deliberate the relative balance between our varied concerns, we must also confront and negotiate the different ways the world impinges upon us (Plumb 2008). The final results of this engagement (Archer 2003) characterise our unique modus vivendi (Ibid.: 149). In doing so, Mira exercises her causal powers as an agent to put her project into action by necessarily engaging with the context she is embedded in, summarily activating the structural and cultural properties pertaining to that context. We shall now see how she pursues her project in the institution, her department and her classroom.

5.1.2.1 Impingement on the project

5.1.2.1.1 Institutional constraints

Mira was employed at the UoT in a senior lecturing position. This means that the university valued the resources that she had acquired thus far (such as a master’s degree), and
viewed Mira as being more accomplished than others at the subordinate levels, probably because of her industry experience and research projects. In terms of the university’s hierarchy and gradation of academic levels, Mira is two levels above the rank of junior lecturer, but, being new to the promotions system and hierarchical, structural organisation of the UoT, Mira herself is not sure on what basis she was appointed in a senior lecturership role as she is young, inexperienced in academia, and has had no teaching experience.

I responded to an ad for lecturer/senior lecturer at the [UoT] and I got the senior lecturer post, I had no idea what it was, what the senior lecturer post was . . . I just came. (River of Life 2013)

Rank and position, which seem to be very important structural influences at the UoT, work in discursive ways as conditioning influences on her. Mira is supposedly in a position to command how seriously she is taken by others, based on her senior rank, and she can in a sense dictate how she would like to be treated, compared with her peers on the TDP who are at the ‘mercy’ of their departments because they are not as well resourced as agents. Nevertheless she has very little choice in terms of the subjects that are ‘shoved’ onto her. She alone cannot decide and stipulate in which niche areas she would like to teach, and, as a new lecturer, she has no support from her department to establish this voice:

I was thrown into subjects at first-year and fourth-year level that I really didn't enjoy, but because I came out of a practice I was kind of put into the box of what I should be teaching. Meanwhile I came into education and academia because I was interested in theory and design, but then I was shoved into like a construction course, which . . . so it was really not nice (River of Life 2013).

As an agent involuntarily placed, the structural distribution of resources allocated to Mira as senior lecturer is mainly in monetary reward at this stage, as she has little discursive power to use her position to command any redistribution of resources in her favour (Archer 2003). Nonetheless, the accrued benefits of being a senior lecturer, although not exploited by Mira, are discursive ways of bolstering and boosting her professional and academic worth, even though, in her performative competence as a novice teacher, she is on the same level as others, especially in the TDP group. This is a causal link to her exercise of agency; she is in a ‘privileged’ position in terms of social capital but must work harder to establish herself in the classroom to become less reliant on social evaluation of her ability by management, peers and students, and more especially her own evaluation of her ability in performative terms.
Administrative Nightmares

Mira is severely constrained by the lack of proper administrative functionality at the UoT. In her river of life and photovoice stories, she was quite enraged by the red tape or bureaucratic channels that served as obstacles to her project and progress.

And then of course it’s admin things and admin has been a recurring theme but lots of red tape. We are encouraged to research and to do certain things but how do you get funding? And if you get funding it will be at that moment you’re just going to get onto the plane, fingers crossed that you get let into the conference; that registration was actually paid for . . . you know it’s this angst . . . eternal angst and that’s painful. That’s just admin and I think the support here is just terrible” (Photovoice 2013).

For new academics especially, lack of administrative support is sometimes the last straw on the camel’s back. It can mean the make or break in participation in projects, innovative interventions and collaborative work, causing people to abandon their interests. If everything is such a struggle to complete, too much energy is expended in areas, which could be better used on actual conceptual and disciplinary activities that are crucial. To express her frustration, and using the architectural metaphor in her photovoice (see collage at 5.1), Mira is at pains to explain the concept of a V-joint, which symbolically represents her dismay at the weak administrative support that she experiences:

Just looking at architecture as a theme in these photos here . . . when we construct and plaster and paint a wall between columns and brick work we leave a V-joint . . . so that when the building actually moves there are no cracks but cracks eventually occur and on an unanticipated point. And that’s how we are when we are structuring ourselves as teachers and researchers. With the admin part of it, you can take all the precautions, make all the decisions, be so structured but something’s bound to go wrong . . . and it’s probably beyond your control . . . or HR’s (Photovoice 2013).

5.1.2.1.2 Departmental constraints

When Mira joined the Architectural Technology Department, she was allocated subjects and classes to teach. As discussed, she had no choice in the allocation and had to accept the distribution of resources in this setting:

Placed at the ‘bookends’ of the Architectural Technology programme, I teach ‘Construction and Detailing 1’ (Alternative Construction and Framed Construction modules) to first-year students, as well as teach and coordinate ‘Construction and
Detailing ‘4’, and facilitate ‘Applied Design 4’ to the BTech students. Hence, I was and still am conscious of the significance of my teaching and learning practices for students entering and exiting the degree (Photovoice 2013).

Ironically, her position as senior lecturer did not carry any weight so Mira had no choice but to accept the dispensation. To compound matters, Mira was allocated subjects to teach that she did not have an interest in, nor did she enjoy, making the transition to the classroom even more traumatic. With little support from her department, Mira found herself in the throes of juggling the expectations and responsibility of two different levels of classes: first year and fourth year.

I was challenged by teaching in different environments: a large group of first-year students and a small group of BTech students. Let alone differentiating between all of the students; I had no knowledge of how to identify their learning styles or how to adapt my teaching methods to suit (River of Life 2013).

Given first-year students’ challenges on entering tertiary education and fourth-year students’ level of complexity and conceptual challenge in completion of their studies, Mira’s workload was overwhelming. Both levels are in themselves difficult years for the established academic, but much more so for a new academic transitioning from industry into the HE classroom. The generative mechanism at work here is the ideational embrace by many HoDs and managers that, if you ‘learned the content’ as a student, you should be able to teach it; however, most educators in HE are not taught how to teach and find themselves teaching by accident. People assume that if someone is good in a particular field they will also be good at teaching it, but knowing the subject matter is very different from knowing how to teach it.

The UoT discursively constructs teaching as a non-specialised field or arbitrary and random craft that anyone can do (Trowler and Cooper 2002; Mathieson 2011; Norton et al. 2010), irrespective of specialisation or interest. Whether the university considers teaching in HE a specialised activity, or even a core activity, is debatable, based on the mixed signals regarding its commitment to teaching (espoused theories) versus actual practice (theories in use) (Argyris and Schön 1974). This is common to many universities that allude to teaching being a ‘core activity’ and commit to it in their mission statements and teaching and learning policies (Kotta, Case and Luckett 2014) but do not follow through when it comes to enacting these policies.
Heavy duties

Mira is involved in a host of activities in her department that she feels compelled to engage in, but this involvement cuts right across her focus on her project as well as her preparation for the new role as teacher that she has committed to and embraced:

My initial enthusiasm for teaching was curbed by the reality of the teaching experience and its associations – faculty and departmental responsibilities; undertaking scholarly research papers for journal publication and conference proceedings; lecturing and facilitation; lecture and project preparation; course co-ordination; marking – it was overwhelming to say the least, and time management was incomprehensible. And preceding the start of 2013 . . . I had lots of things that my finger was in – in terms of possible furthering my studies, I was in different design workshops, I was asked to be a member of a practice and as a partner in a practice whilst teaching and so all of these things came and I was trying to juggle them (Photovoice 2013).

In addition to curricular activities and obligations to an already heavy workload, Mira, being new to teaching, spends a great deal of time on lesson preparation and design:

Ja, workload is another thing – it doesn’t stop . . . you go home and you carry on reading till 11 or 12 or 1 o’ clock – that’s when you are preparing your lectures . . . you’ve just got to carry on (chuckle) (Photovoice 2013).

In responding to a question about how workload is decided at the UoT, the group responded in ways that showed no clear understanding of this process but clearly expressed the repercussions of being allocated sizeable teaching loads that comprised at least 20 teaching periods per week. Some thought that workloads were calculated using a formula called ‘Full Time Equivalents’ (FTEs), which is a funding unit allocated to lecturers, determined by the DHET but calculated by senior university management. Mira herself was confused about the workload distribution worked in her faculty and department:

I am not so sure . . . in my faculty they are saying you still have to accomplish the formula . . . that is what we are busy with now – the workload – you have to calculate according to the ratios . . . . There are different systems in departments, which is even weirder. In the university there is no standard policy and every department is kind of chiselling this thing and making it their own. So we have ‘above the line and below the line’. That baffled me for 2 years . . . I think I only got it this year . . . and for me that’s stuff like research, marketing, library committee – all these extra things that you have to do in
order to keep the department going . . . um . . . they count that and that factors into it at some level . . . I don't know how (Photovoice 2013).

Mira is consumed by her participation as a fully-fledged member of her department, despite her newness and her inexperience in HE. As an agent, she is constantly weighing up the opportunity costs to herself and the price that she has to pay for pursuing her vested interests in this fashion. Mira's reflexive dialogue is her most vital PEP, which provides the armour and impetus for her continued engagement at this level:

All I do is work and I keep thinking that this is exactly the lifestyle I didn't want. I didn't leave the comfort of my last job and home for this. While it is still early days, how can I change this? (TDP reflective essay 2011).

**Research integration**

Research was an integral part of Mira's professional identity. Being thrown into the domain of teaching as the main focus of her activities as a new lecturer meant that her research involvement had to be minimised to allow her to engage fully with her core project in education. Nonetheless she musters her PEPs to ensure that she stays abreast of this pillar of her academic identity by attending and presenting papers in discipline-related conferences that constitute her disciplinary community:

In terms of research that's something I was interested in from the time I was studying and also why I came into academia as opposed to staying in practice . . . so I have been presenting at conferences . . . I think 3 weeks ago I was at the KZNIA conference in Natal. It was really cool because again it took me back to where I started and [I] met all my old lecturers; some of my old classmates . . . it was something to actually stand up in front of this audience and present this paper to people that taught me and then to be acknowledged after that . . . it was really cool . . . but it just made me think about where I've come from and where I'm going which is this (points to photograph of the flower) (Photovoice 2013).

As part of her response to the problem tree exercise (see below), Mira identified key challenges around the research–teaching nexus (Kreber 2009a) as her current complexity:
Mine is about integrating research and teaching. Because often it can’t be that you’ve researched something completely different from what you’re teaching, because then there’s no time to get the research done. Next is to establish a more definitive syllabus. Often we just like go on and I find like I’m teaching a new subject this year and there’s nothing to work on. I just carry on, on my own (Problem Tree 2013).

Mira mediates her need to continue with research by dovetailing it with her teaching activities. For a new lecturer, this engagement with the scholarship of teaching (Boyer 1990) is a means of positioning herself as social agent through accruement of further resources, specific to her project. As Mira strategically selects and de-selects through her summoning of PEPs, her agential choices are in alignment with her overall commitment and concerns. She presents a research paper at the Design, Development and Research conference on the topic: ‘Transfer of Design Know-How from Practice to Education: Reflections of a Nascent “Practitioner-Teacher”’. This proves to be a very viable endeavour for her goal of making the shift from practitioner to educator. The abstract for the paper shows Mira’s perspectives and choices as she mediates the research/teaching integration, as well as her own integration into HE:

Given the position of the author now as teacher, this paper reflects on ‘practitioner-teachers’ entering higher education, by investigating the transfer of design know-how by practitioners through teaching (DDR Conference Proceedings, 2012 in TDP reflective essay 2011).

Beleaguered Colleagues
Compared to her first year, when she joined the TDP, Mira made great strides to gently assert herself as a full agent in her department by virtue of her contributions to its workings and through her own agency in innovating and bringing about changes through her teaching:

I noticed that the previous lecture notes and presentations were quite dry. I find myself completely unstimulated by them – just imagine what the first years make of it? So, I have taken on the challenge of preparing new PowerPoint presentations that are lively and colourful, which allow students to relate to them easier. This is not an easy task. I have found myself swimming (almost drowning) in an ocean of books in both my office and at home (TDP reflective essay 2011)

The Mira I reconnected with in 2013 for this doctoral research study was a much more self-
confident and self-assured lecturer, still committed to her cause and dedicated to her project. Her interaction with her colleagues, which she saw as an enablement, was crucial to her growth in her new departmental community:

I now believe that I am on the correct route to achieving the objectives I have set out for my teaching practice, taking into account the observations from my peers and students. Supportive and guiding discussions with peers with whom I lecture, really assist with developing my teaching practices further (River of Life 2013).

Teaching at the UoT, however, presented challenges in working with some people in the department. This is an enabling and positive conditioning influence for the emergence of Mira's nascent corporate identity and the way she relates to colleagues and members of her community:

I think it's quite frustrating in the department and in the institution when you get people who are just going through the motions and you can see that being here is a thorn in their side. I just think after coming from practice, you realise what a privileged position this is to be in where you can actually make such meaningful change and you also have . . . you are given a lot of opportunities to grow which sometimes don't happen in practice. So that just frustrates me when people are just in their silos wanting to do their own thing and even though you try and almost manufacture situations for interaction to happen and kind of group work to happen for staff, some just don't bother . . . don't respond to email . . . don't arrive at meetings set up – don't, don't, don't! At the end of the day you still send them the invite but don't expect them to be there (PhotoVoice 2013).

Having depended largely on the TDP, her own resources, and PEPs as a new lecturer, to infuse the skills acquired in her professional training and practice into her teaching practice, Mira is constrained by the lack of a departmental figure or mentor to provide guidance and to oversee her teaching activities. Post the TDP, she had no education development community to confer with:

So amidst the chaos of teaching, I always feel that I am here for 3 years now and I prepare lectures and I always start off in this like eternal kind of jumble of stuff because there's no set syllabus; there's no person to go to say 'okay what am I supposed to do?' You just kind of decide this is what the students need to know; this is kind of how I am doing it and so I'm going to read really broadly and distil something out of that and hopefully something works at the end of it. So generally it's a whole bunch of random spots and stuff that I am just reading frantically and then trying to put it together and
fortunately thus far it’s kind of been harmonious and it’s a lecture that I can present with confidence and discuss after and take questions and so on . . . All of this craziness must at least contribute to something (Photovoice 2013).

About midway through the data-generation phase, I met with Mira to check how her photovoice project was progressing. She was still negatively affected by the ongoing challenges with unanticipated consequences over which she had little control:

No matter how organised and structured you can be in your intentions and your approach to work in your discipline, there’s always something chaotic that’s going to strike . . . and you have to just always have to keep your guard up and be prepared . . . and although it can’t be anticipated, you can’t just let it knock the air off you. I had that experience in August/September when we had this horrible external examination and critique and it just threw me . . . and again that was the point of discomfort where suddenly you got to actually just think about it and then take action . . . but don’t let it throw you completely . . . you still have to know who you are at your core (Progress check interview 2013).

Despite this setback, Mira seemed very confident at this juncture about her presence in the classroom, and was pleased with her new appointment as coordinator of one of the courses, despite having to deal with a certain apathy that she observed in colleagues that constrained her efforts as co-ordinator:

I still need more cooperation from colleagues. Especially with coordination, I’m trying to establish certain things and you have meetings and they don’t attend or they don’t respond to emails, so it’s very difficult to put forward ideas and carry through things that you can’t . . . that can’t happen without other people’s support (Progress check interview 2013).

As her corporate identity continues to flourish, Mira engages with the SEPs and CEPs activated through her interaction at this level, but at this stage Mira is well positioned to achieve her goals in terms of her personal project in education. She has indeed made the shift from practitioner to educator as evident in the changed Discourse, even though not fully developed yet, that she now embraces regarding her practice:

My teaching methods include an understanding of reflection as an important part of teaching and learning in architectural design . . . I use interactive enquiry-based learning as the practical application of theoretical knowledge in order to stimulate deep learning
[sic]; academic literacy to address the diversity of students and languages that need to be accommodated within a class; student-centred learning that focuses on me the teacher as a facilitator rather than an ‘instructor’ . . . ; Discourse to engage the students in the being of the architectural discipline; and technology-enhanced teaching to use social networking and electronic media to engage student learning (Photovoice 2013).

5.1.2.1.3 Classroom constraints

Students entering the architecture classroom begin to adopt their professional identities from their very first encounter with the subject. Mira, as a facilitator, is aware of the importance of being a good role model for students to model their practices on:

Apart from being influenced by ‘architectural identity’, my style and approach to teaching is influenced by my personality and ethical beliefs and values. I believe in mutual respect between the students and myself. However, I reinforce my position as teacher through my practical aptitude and teaching abilities (Photovoice 2013).

As it is their chosen field, and not a second choice after not being accepted into other fields of study, architectural students are highly motivated to engage with the discipline (Dall’Alba and Sandberg 2006). The tailoring of learning to real-world design processes and an understanding of practice-based performance provide students with an early induction into the discipline of architecture (Kinniburgh 2014). Mira’s role in this process at this early stage is to be the Discourse facilitator (Gee 1990):

Architectural Discourse plays an important role in this, as I strive to engage the students in activities that reflect the being of the discipline. Hence, the outcomes are specific to the behaviour of architects and architectural technologists in the workplace in relation to what they do, how they do it, and why. The teaching and learning and assessment activities synthesise these concepts that require students to apply their knowledge in order to learn-by-doing, thereby encouraging active learning by using Constructive Alignment to link learning and assessment in order to facilitate deep learning (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Students are designing architecture from day one, not just learning about it. By first learning the skills to do it in a learning-by-doing framework, they develop their identities as architects (Kinniburgh 2014). Throughout their education and careers, students’ design processes and outputs develop in sophistication, but the role required of them never undergoes a shift from student to professional: they develop a conflation of both from the outset of university studies (Ibid.).
The design studio is the hearth of architectural education and it is the fulcrum around which all other curriculum areas revolve. ‘Tacit rules and habits of the studio guide how meaning is made and how design is practiced [sic] in studio-based learning’ (Brandt, Cennamo, Douglas, Vernon, McGrath and Reimer 2013). The disciplinary and professional identity acquisition occurs primarily here within the first year of an architectural education (Kinniburgh 2014). It is also where students can learn the norms, practices, and tools used in the larger professional community of practice, yet studio practice must also respect and take into account the academic community of which students and staff are a part (Brandt et al. 2013):

My teaching methods also consider the differences of student maturity and comprehension at undergraduate and postgraduate levels because I teach three courses over both first and final year (BTech) levels. My style and approach to teaching BTech students differs to that of first-year students to accommodate for the differences in maturity and comprehension. Although I am approachable, I am an authoritative figure with the junior students to instil discipline in them. However, I am more relaxed with the senior students as they are more mature and we feel comfortable to engage with each other (Photovoice 2013).

In tutorial groups, the design problem is interrogated and the individual student responses are discussed and developed against a set of criteria and a brief. The range of approaches, design methods employed, and theoretical bases for exploration are diverse, preparing students for the dynamic and changing nature of architectural practice (Cuff 1991):

Similarly, I strive to create a setting that encourages and appropriately supports students engaging in specific activities. Thus, my approach to teaching theory subjects (such as ‘Construction and Detailing’) in a classroom differs to teaching design subjects (‘Applied Design’) in the studio. This is because I recognise the requirements of theory and design subjects, taught and facilitated in the classroom and studio respectively. Just as the classroom environment is relatively structured and by contrast the studio is casual, so too are my styles and rapport adapted to suit each setting. However, my approach to teaching in both environments integrates reading, writing and drawing; stimulates active learning and interactive teaching; encourages social collaboration; respects diversity; and engages architectural Discourse (Photovoice 2013).

A core pedagogic device within the studio is the discipline-specific ritual: the design review, design jury or ‘crit’ (as it is variously known) is unique to creative fields, such as design, art, and architecture (Webster 2008; Vowles 2000). ‘The crit is a sophisticated social event that
is traditionally an assessment of representation (the individual student's presentation of his or her project) and a reproduction of the social relations of the architectural profession' (Vowles 2000: 259). The final summative assessment of the design jury and critique, as the predominant mode of studio assessment around the world, is a daunting event for students (Kinniburgh 2014). Mira circumvents this by adopting a teaching approach that takes cognisance of student learning styles based on how they perceive, respond to and interact with the teaching and learning environment.

By taking a flexible yet holistic approach within the context of the architectural discipline, my integrated approach incorporates learning styles that are kinaesthetic, where I use activities to encourage the involvement of students to encourage learning-by-doing; social individual, by setting individual assignments and projects; social group to stimulate the sharing of ideas through group activities; expressive oral via verbal presentations; and expressive written through graphic and written text (TDP reflective essay 2011).

The architecture ‘crit’ is about identity work, but, being part of the academic Discourse of architecture, it is a Discourse where emotion is generally marginalised; yet students experience the critique as a judgement about their value as designers (Webster 2006). This internalisation of the critique is amplified by the fact that students typically work very long hours in the build up to their reviews, and come to the review exhausted and emotionally invested in the work they are presenting. A number of studies point to the importance of comprehending the connection between assessment and identity in this context (Melles 2007; Orr 2007). Showing a more than adequate understanding of identity being rooted in the discipline (Becher and Trowler 2001; Henkel 2000), Mira’s intentionality with regard to teaching is cognisant of this link:

My teaching objectives are to link practice and academia in the education and training of students; to encourage students’ understanding of the relevance of integrating the subjects they are studying in the context of practice; to ensure there is balance between theory and technique in the students’ education; to maintain a humanistic outlook to empathetically prepare the students practically, within the context of the discipline, for the reality of the profession; to expose and acculturate students into the workings of the architectural discipline; and to use identity in terms of discourse and architectural agency to frame my teaching (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Identity work is not limited to the student currently occupying the presenter position; ‘peer critique by fellow students is also an opportunity for students to “display” their identity as knowledgeable architects’ (Melles 2007:162). The student-centred nature of the reflection is
critical in the construction of the individual architectural identity. Webster (2006) notes that many students adopt tactics more aligned with surface, shallow approaches to learning, to ensure a favourable jury review and/or mark. In this way, tactics ‘required for reflective learning (creativity, risk taking, openness and self-criticism) can be effectively undermined’ (Webster 2006: 19). Mira’s understanding of the need for inclusive education, with a view to embracing multiple talents, abilities and challenges among her students, mediates this problem, which is responded to and accommodated in her social inclusion approach (discussed below) and her choice of teaching activities:

We acknowledge their diversity by embracing it and allowing equal playing fields in the studio and classroom – commonality in presentation of their work so as to not advantage privileged students or disadvantage financially challenged students; to aid in verbal communication by guiding their demeanour and stance when justifying their choices; to expose all to a broad spectrum of learning by screening movies that may have been inaccessible to them; by investing time in those students who may struggle with language to ensure that their drawings communicate that which they may not be able to; by working on community upliftment projects to expose the students to the context that we live in and work in; to keep students up to date with current research and trends in the discipline via guest lecturers/architects who they may not otherwise be able to interact with (TDP reflective essay 2011).

5.1.2.2 Advancement of the project

In joining the TDP as an eager newcomer, and to solicit support and guidance in her new career, Mira was acutely aware of the need for professional development to shape her identity as a teacher and academic. Although a professional in her own right, she needed access to specific pedagogic practices to improve her presence in the classroom. The TDP thus serves as a structural enablement for new academics like Mira, in the absence of any other support from their departments, HoDs, colleagues, and the broader community. She is reliant on this intervention although it is divorced from her disciplinary context, which constrains her ability to exercise agency with regard to her disciplinary teaching (Kahn 2009; Mathieson 2011).

Lack of departmental support acts as a discursive mechanism that constructs professional development such as the TDP as a means for newcomers to get ‘trained into shape, and to slot back in’. Instead of enabling a process of becoming a disciplinary practitioner in the classroom, generic programmes like the TDP deny the ontological status of HE teachers to come into full functionality as independent and autonomous agents, and as disciplinary
pedagogues. Notwithstanding, the TDP serves an important link in Mira’s transitioning into HE on many levels:

The TDP has been instrumental in my transition into and preparation for teaching in higher education. The TDP facilitator has helped me to change my mindset about my preconceptions on teaching; to understand and utilise the concept of reflection in order to make sense of my thoughts and actions . . . . The TDP group has helped me to exchange my thoughts, challenges and fears with them, thereby making my transition from practice to higher education easier to cope with. The group has helped me to try new things in the company of people outside of my discipline, thereby affording me new and different outlooks on a variety of topics and issues. It is through the Teacher Development Programme, that I am able to recognise my possible potential as a teacher (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mira accredits her deepened reflective ability to the practices on the TDP, which holds her in good stead for the reflective practice that is a ‘signature pedagogy’ (Shulman 2005) in architecture, as well as in her role as co-ordinator:

Later, my additional readings on reflection in the context of my architectural discipline drew to my attention that reflection actually forms a large part of designing in architecture – not only in practice, but in teaching and learning too. Thus, the teaching and learning processes of design entail reflection-in-action, where design teachers and students ‘think on our feet’ whilst performing our tasks; as well reflection-on-action, which enables us to consider what we have done after performing the task. Reflection is therefore necessary for enquiry-based active learning, by allowing deliberate pauses to improve teaching and learning as well as to encourage deep learning (TDP reflective essay 2011).

By attending the TDP, Mira could practise critical reflection by being open to exploring new teaching and learning concepts and practices, step outside her comfort zone to learn and accept various methods of teaching and learning, identify conceptual and theoretical underpinnings in her current teaching, and consciously apply them in her future teaching:

I constantly identify areas of my teaching that require improvement, as well as to develop and make positive contributions to learning. Thus, by using ‘Kolb’s Learning Cycle’, which includes concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualisation (AC), and active experimentation (AE), students in both my ‘Construction and Detailing’ and ‘Applied Design’ courses are encouraged to engage and be involved in new experiences; to reflect on the experiences via different perspectives and feedback; to form, reform, and process ideas with theories and feedback; and
enlarge their understanding to make decisions, problem solve and test implications respectively (TDP reflective essay 2011).

**Social Inclusion**
As a new lecturer, Mira’s awareness of, interest in and commitment to the social inclusion of students runs counter to discourses that construct new lecturers as ‘myopic’ (see Chapter Four), with an over-indulged interest in their own skilling up:

So social inclusion in terms of the community and the different resources we have – lecturers and administration but also our classes and the students sitting in our class. Where are they from and what are their perspectives . . . and experiences? Then the broader comm. [community] outside . . . the actual people we serve in our discipline – it all comes down to the discipline in terms of us as educators, performing our purpose within the discipline (Photovoice 2013).

Mira is able to place her discipline and subject within the broader vision for a transformed society in South Africa, and is aware of her contribution in this regard as educator:

Social inclusion is a major thing in architecture. We have this obligation to society; it’s what we do; they are our core. I think the practice I was in even though I did learn from it and I loved it because it was stimulating and engaging . . . I was actually missing the meaning of what I was supposed to be contributing . . . where we do kind of community projects. This year I finished a project in the BTech where we went into informal settlements looking at water as negative . . . flooding of the shack and that . . . So we will be doing projects like that which is so gratifying . . . but there is so much more that can be done and we do so little but people are so grateful for it . . . (Photovoice 2013).

As a primary agent on entry and a corporate agent in the making, Mira is a likely candidate for assuming the role of social actor, as she is structurally and culturally endowed by virtue of her agential choices and changes, and ready to step into the role of establishing her project into practice by imbuing it with unique personification of the position (Archer 2000; 2003).

**5.1.3 Realisation of the project**

**5.1.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context**
In engaging with the enablements and constraints of the contexts she confronts, Mira mediates the conditioning influences as a strong evaluator, not giving in to pressures placed
on her – cognitively, emotionally and socially:

I think here I was in denial, because I kind of . . . I really missed all of the corporate stuff and then I was like oh my gosh, what have I got myself into. And then in here I was juggling all of that and I was starting to think about . . . it was about juggling the hats, but then I realised that I am here and part of being in the architectural discipline is also an academic part of it and I am a researcher in the field. So why I just said no to the practice offer and I said I want to concentrate on my students, I want to grow their curriculum for the year. So I think I'm more comfortable with the fact of being in education and being in academics, with the notion of researching. But it doesn't mean that I'm not this . . . I'm still that. I think I didn't want to leave this ever behind, because it is still part of my identity. It's actually frightening. So ja, I'm just embracing this whole academic thing more (Photovoice 2013).

Her project in education, namely to shift from practitioner to educator, is realised through her considerable efforts as agent, despite the challenges she faced:

When my life crashed, I headed over the waterfall (referring to her river of life drawing). But I think waterfalls are funny, because they're quite scary at that point, but then they give you something really beautiful to watch and then you kind of land and it starts something new that's quite calm and starts moving on from there. So here I just started making some decisions in my life. I started teaching the subjects I want to teach, I did not teach first years anymore, I'm concentrating on my BTechs, I'm a subject coordinator, year coordinator. Ideas of doctorate . . . it's not that I'm registering for a doctorate, but I'm researching around it, so it's all at my own pace. My slave mentality of work is no more, so I'm actually being able to be quite disciplined about when I work, and when I have time for myself (Photovoice 2013).

Her teaching practice reached a high level of engagement with deep approaches to teaching and learning through her interaction with her students. Her actions in the classroom especially are not random or ad hoc; in contrast they display a high degree of thoughtful, detailed and considered reflection, supported by sound educational perspectives, which work as structuring and discursive mechanisms for her motivation and agential choices at all levels of her practice.
I think being a coordinator of a year is important, because you can actually make the decisions and, you know, tell people which way to go. And also I just have a good relationship with my students I think. I was able to take this stuff that I learnt in TDP, although in my . . . in the first year I was able to do fun stuff like this, with the BTechs you can't. But the whole reflection in action; on action I think that’s really important, the social inclusion . . . so ja, I’m having fun. So I’m like . . . I’m going that way now. A new route, but calmer [laughing] (Photovoice 2013).

For someone so steeped in her professional identity and so embedded in the Discourse of architecture, Mira was keenly focused on instilling in students the need to think, act, and breathe as architects, at the expense of their coming into their own as students and human beings. Through her engagement with her project and with feedback from significant others in her community, Mira realised that holistic education and not just the needs of the professions should be nurtured. In this sense, she confesses that:

I have relaxed a lot, I have more understanding, and I am not so hard. I believed initially in ‘neat drawers of practice’ (referring to photo in PV collection); precise and accurate but now I see it as a collective experience. In my studio now with my BTechs, I allow them to do more, say more, etc. I understand my role as educator, but still keep professional aspects in my teaching. The TDP helped to orientate me to pedagogy. In my first 2 years, I had to do what I was told with little space to innovate and I felt trapped. But soon I took control and introduced innovations that gave me more freedom. I introduced more integrated ways of assessing students in studio and passed this on to my HoD, who suggested it should be used by the department (Photovoice 2013).

As a full social agent engaging actively with the powers and properties in her context, Mira has indeed crossed the threshold from practitioner to educator, with more ability and resources now as a convenor (and corporate agent) to bring changes to her teaching and the curriculum to make both more relevant. At the same time, she is mindful of her social responsibility as educator and to society and is committed to exposing students to real-world architectural challenges in the townships, where community projects need assistance in human, economic and cognitive resources that the university possesses in the form of public goods. She is in a position to take on the role of social actor to further deepen and enhance her contribution to HE:
This last photo is really a strange flower but it’s really cute. It is always about pruning and nurturing and never really getting comfortable; once you think it’s going to bloom it just suddenly dies on you and you have to start putting it outside and trimming the leaves and bringing inside and watering but not too often but make sure the soil is damp and just keep nurturing it and sooner or later it starts to bloom again. So that’s where I am: you can’t get comfortable, you just have to keep nipping and trimming and pruning and allowing the buds and the blooms to come and they eventually die off and you must not get comfortable and check again and make another move . . . (Photovoice 2013).
5.2 Narrative of mediation: Kira

This vignette focuses on Kira, whose narrative captures her story of mediation when she joined the Department of Civil Engineering at the UoT. As a ‘foreigner’ to the South African HE system, Kira confronts her involuntary placement with a special intentionality and determination (PEPs) to realise her project in education and to successfully mediate the structural and cultural conditions she finds. As an agent, she calls on her own powers and properties to work out what she wants and how to go about getting it, within the enablements and constraints in the context of the institution (macro), her department (meso) and her classroom (micro) that she has to circumvent.

We can look different, but our sight should be addressed to a communal objective; we can speak different languages, but we can debate the same issues; our background and circumstances may have influenced who we are, but we are responsible for who we become! You are the rainbow, you are South Africa, and you can make a difference. You can let those bridges stand! (TDP Milestone Project 2011).
5.2.1 Conception of the project

5.2.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Kira is a qualified structural engineer from Cuba whose professional training and industry experience in the field for 20 years were among the skills and expertise for which she was employed at the UoT. She relocated to South Africa with her husband in 2005 and her daughter was born a few years later as a South African citizen or ‘CubAfrican’ as her parents preferred to think of it (Interview with parents in a local newspaper, 2013). Soon after that, Kira accepted an appointment at the UoT which she saw ‘as a professional opportunity because I enjoy the idea of teaching and shaping young engineering minds’ (TDP reflective essay, 2011). Kira wanted to be a higher education teacher because she was doing it ‘for the right reasons (River of Life, 2013) and this passion defined her concerns and cares as educator and teacher and, more importantly, her modus vivendi as a lecturer (Archer 1995).

Despite her professional engineering credentials, Kira was new to the HE academy. It was the first time that she was teaching in HE and in a different cultural setting. She started off at the UoT as a part-time junior lecturer, initially tasked with teaching a four-year engineering construction and design class and first-year National Diploma students in the Department of Civil Engineering and Surveying. She was then offered a two-year contract appointment, after which she was made a permanent member of staff. Having had no formal training, especially at higher education level, she was new to university teaching, which she described as ‘extremely challenging’ (River of Life, 2013), as she was not prepared for the pedagogical demands of the tertiary classroom. She faced huge adjustment challenges because her fourth-year class had not been structured as a formal lecture before. As the incumbent, she had to create a new structure and flow for this subject but with very little to base it on. This represents Kira’s first opportunity to exercise agency in relation to her teaching, albeit without any support.

Someone taking on a lecturing role without prior training is expected to use a wide range of teaching practices as well as a theorised selection of those practices (Kahn 2009). Kira signed up to do the TDP in 2011 in order to seek professional guidance and support with her teaching and to strengthen her classroom presence and practice. Her challenges speak to the cultural conditioning of the university in relation to teaching (Boughey 2012b; Leibowitz 2014). To put someone in a classroom without training, even before they attend programmes such as the TDP, illuminates that the university does not exactly consider teaching in HE as specialised activity, although alluded to as a ‘core activity’ in mission statements and
teaching and learning policies (Kotta et al. 2014).

5.2.1.2 Identification of concerns

Through a process of inner reflexive deliberation, articulated in her TDP reflective essay, Kira externalises her inner dialogue, using the TDP task as a structural enablement to reflect on her concerns and define them further. This is part of her emergent academic identity, which is shaped by the identification of what she cares most about (projects) and how to go about getting what she wants (choices) (Archer 2000: 13).

Among her strengths, Kira identified her understanding of students’ behaviour; her ability to be adaptable and creative, and to accept criticism; her interest in research for teaching; her interest in improving her teaching skills; and her overwhelming affinity for the act of teaching. Among her challenges, she identified her language ability, her preparation before class, her project output, and her academic literacy practices for her students. In terms of her developmental work, she credited the TDP with deepening her abilities to reflect effectively on her teaching and problem-solving skills. She saw the need to expand her content lectures with additional learning activities, and to make use of digital resources such as Blackboard and Twitter as part of her teaching repertoire, as well as to improve her teamwork ability. Reflecting on her teaching philosophy, Kira adopts a student-focused approach and believes that her objective is to prepare students effectively ‘to become professionals in the engineering world’. Her tasks as a teacher, she explained, are to provide students with adequate technical knowledge to master the subject by understanding the role of the engineer, the engineering world, and the subject. She measures her success in the aforementioned tasks by her students’ results, their feedback and their sense of motivation, as well as her moderator’s report of her assessment.

Personal identity is a matter of what we care about in the world (Archer 2000). We can see from Kira’s collection of cares and concerns in education (above) that, having reached ‘maturity’ through the establishment of a sense of self that is a well articulated ‘I’, as well as a concept of self that is an embodied ‘me’ (Archer 2000), Kira displays a strong personal identity emergent from her prioritisation of concerns. Having worked as a structural civil engineer in Cuba and then in South Africa, Kira had also achieved professional identity (as part of her social identity) as a female engineer, developing concerns and projects in the engineering discipline and specialisation in her own right and by her own description. Through her reflexive deliberations, as well as in the river of life and photovoice narratives generated in the data sessions, we see that in her life course to date, she has engaged with
deep processes as an individual to configure her commitments in education in this particular way, which establishes her uniqueness and identity as an educator today. While academic identity is shaped mainly in disciplinary departments (Becher and Trowler 2001; Henkel 2005), new lecturers coming in to HE, especially from industry, already have a well-developed disciplinary identity based on their experience as professionals in the real world (Mathieson 2011).

As a professional engineer now in academia, Kira used the opportunity of the TDP Milestone Project to emphasise her professional concern that ‘local engineering firms of undeveloped countries were at a disadvantage, being condemned to become sub-consultants and providers of cheap local professional resources, thus losing their local identity in the face of the booming engineering corporate culture’. She describes this as ‘the gap between First and Third World economies where fierce battles take place to control the market’. According to Kira, developing countries in the BRICS economic block (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) were responding to the challenge of bridging the gap by using globalisation strategies to overcome the barriers, which included using technology in a connected world where social networking was the catalyst for accelerated development. ‘South Africans will need to use all their ingenuity and local flavour to continue to be a reference point in Africa and worldwide as part of the BRICS group (TDP Milestone Project, 2011).

Kira’s articulation of her concerns in this way, and through the broader social focus that she highlights, we see the emergence of her nascent corporate agency. Archer (2000) describes the typical powers of corporate agents as capacities for articulating shared interests, organising for collective action, generating social movements and exercising corporate influence in decision making.

It’s necessary to create in our students an awareness of the existing engineering community locally and abroad, their social responsibility as professionals, the latest technology development, environmental impact of the discipline, and world trend and tendencies (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

Although not yet fully developed, Kira’s sense of corporate agency is articulated through her interest in developing career paths for students in civil engineering in South Africa by drawing attention to the need on a wider social level for actors and agents to engage with these notions. These are concerns which transcend immediate functional concerns that primary agents are focused on. By implication, Kira invites her audience to consider how the UoT is positioned to do this, who their students are, and where they could be in terms of
specialisation, market control and cutting-edge technology in the future. Clearly Kira’s concerns in education reflect a social dimension, encouraging others to think broadly about education and its purpose.

5.2.1.3 Emotional commentary on concerns

When I met her on the first day of the TDP, Kira came across as a very emotional and somewhat distraught individual, and was struggling as a new academic, both personally and professionally. Kira explained that she felt inadequate and incompetent, even though in her professional life as an engineer, she was confident and self-assured. Here she is drawing on the ‘expert to novice’ discourse, which minimises her self-confidence in this setting. Kira tried very hard not to let the tears flow when she described her challenges to the group: ‘It was really challenging. It was crazy’ (River of Life, 2013). Despite her efforts, Kira could not help but show how vulnerable and fragile she was in terms of coping in her class. The emotional commentary on her concerns (Archer 2000) showed how deeply she was affected by ‘not being prepared to teach’, and she echoed the sentiments and insecurity that many others in the group had also experienced.

This dimension of her academic identity showed how her concept of self (Archer 1995) had been shaped and framed by the circumstances she confronted, compounded by novel contextual influences that were a ‘culture shock’ for her as a ‘foreigner’. In many spaces she felt alienated because of her language and cultural status, and the discourse of ‘discomforting Difference’ was a source of her anguish. Her struggle to obtain a national passport and birth certificate for her daughter for five years was traumatic for both parents, and the ordeal of her daughter’s being ‘stateless’ emphasised her own sense of alienation when she joined the university.

Kira’s narrative was dotted with emotionally charged phrases such as ‘challenging, crazy, chaotic, too much . . . ”, which she coined to describe her many observations and experiences of being a new academic. At a ‘feeling level’ (Woods 2010) (see Chapter Four), she seemed quite fragile in her story telling and the emotional transfer of sadness to other lecturers was palpable. From an emotional perspective (Ibid.), Kira was dealing with a host of emotive triggers and responses as she told her river of life and photovoice stories, as if the very act of telling her story provided the impetus to relive some of the negative episodes that had happened with the group. This bears out the assertion that emotions are not internal mental states, but relational processes (Ahmed 2004).
A story circle of trusted peers, whom she had worked with for over a year on the TDP provided a safe space for Kira, allowing her to be herself and to feel what she needed to feel. Here the emphasis shifted to what emotions do rather than what they are (Ahmed 2004). This was very moving for me as observer as I felt both empathic and ‘responsible’ for her, given that she was a foreigner and new academic in this country. At the level of ‘affect’ (Woods 2010) we could see that Kira’s emotions were charged with the social and cultural significance of the contexts she described; at some times her attitude seemed strained, while at others she showed understanding of what had caused her to experience events as she did. This ‘sociality of emotion’ emphasises that emotions are relational social and cultural practices rather than psychological states (Ahmed 2004; Mulcahy 2004).

It is through emotions, or how we respond to objects and others, that surfaces or boundaries are made: the ‘I’ and the ‘we’ are shaped by, and even take the shape of, contact with others (Ahmed 2004: 10).

Much of Kira’s emotional commentary has to do with her challenges in the practical order of reality (Archer 2000), where her performative competence as lecturer is evaluated by students. These episodes are highly charged as they are directly related to her perceived success or failure as a lecturer in relation to feedback from her environment. This has reciprocal effects on the other two orders, especially the social, where society makes normative evaluations of us (Archer 2000). Again, her emotional commentary shows her frustration with the ripple effect on her self-esteem in terms of evaluation (by colleagues, peers and management) of her performative achievement in the exercise of skilled expertise.

5.2.1.4 Adoption of a project

Only once she has identified her concerns, and has prioritised what she cares most about in education, can Kira elaborate her concerns into a project. We form projects to advance or protect our ultimate concerns (Ibid.), and the development of ‘projects’, countenanced by human beings (Archer 2000), is what accelerates the individual from social being into social agent.

While Kira acknowledged the advancement made in South Africa, and the recognition by the South African Institution of Civil Engineering (SAICE) in its favourable evaluation of South African infrastructure through the FIFA World Cup™ project in 2010, she observed many gaps in how students were being prepared for an engineering future. The impediments students faced in higher education were great, and Engineering was not addressing these
concerns. These ‘gaps’ included ‘the social precedence [by which she means their economic and social status] in the students’ profile, which impacted their performance in their learning practice; language ability, which was a barrier to the detriment of students’ level of comprehension and problem-solving skills, affecting the projection of personality and confidence; differences between lecturers’ level [class and race] and student background, which made gaps difficult to overcome; gender gaps in how men and women perform and are treated as engineers; and the way disability impacted on students’ opportunities’. Kira’s pressing concern was in the UoT’s role in this context (TDP Milestone Project, 2011).

Searching through a constellation of commitments to crystallise the ones she could develop further, Kira was able to articulate quite passionately ‘those internal aspects that she cared about the most’ (Archer 2000) in education. In engaging with her project in the manner that she did, with clear goals and objectives, Kira was able to give shape to her emergent academic identity and her modus vivendi as lecturer. Her teaching project was titled, ‘Bridging the Gaps! A Pilot Project for First-Year National Diploma Civil Engineering’ (TDP Milestone, 2011), which explored innovative ways of teaching and learning that promoted student engagement (Strydom, Kuh and Mentz 2010). She was clear that she wanted to ‘bridge the pedagogic gap’ by teaching in ways that engaged all students (including previously disadvantaged students), and that gave all students a global vision of engineering by:

. . . bringing in from my industry experience to try to enhance the students’ knowledge and to bring them together from different cultures in South Africa; to try to bridge the gap (Photovoice 2013).

As it is impossible to provide students with all the relevant knowledge and information they need to underpin their technical knowledge in the time constraints of a lecture or practical sessions, Kira proposed:

. . . the use of social networking to engage students right from 1st year; motivating their interest in research; allowing them to practise their academic literacy skills; and to create in our students an awareness of the existing engineering community locally and abroad; their social responsibility as professionals; the latest technology developments and environmental impact of the discipline; and world trends and tendencies. All our students are connected; they are Tweeting, Googling, WhatsApping and Facebooking from early morning to late evening (TDP Milestone Project 2011).
She chose a group of 20 to 30 women, representative of the different communities, to pilot her project because, as a female engineer herself, she felt that ‘gender discrimination disadvantaged many female students from taking up engineering as a career’ (TDP reflective essay, 2011). As part of the project, ‘students would be encouraged to tweet and re-tweet from the train, taxi or buses about real engineering problems faced by the country, quality of lecturing, interest in the subject, students’ concerns, students’ behaviour, engineering news, etc. This method would be used to supplement formal lectures with additional academic reading, research, report writing, case solving, and interacting to exchange information and knowledge with the rest of the class’ (TDP Milestone Project, 2011).

I would like to add the use of technology in teaching and learning to complete the full suite of the Professional Civil Engineering Diploma (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Through the integration of Facebook, Twitter and blogs, implemented as supplementary material or for creative use, Kira clarified that students would be enabled to become more engaged in learning through constructing knowledge, rather than passively receiving it. Kira’s ‘Bridging the Gaps’ project was intended to build a bridge of communication between perceived gaps and real opportunities in higher education. Kira’s project demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the South African transformation challenges, despite her being relatively new to the country. She has a keen focus on the importance of the social inclusion of students and how technology might be used to bridge the class and social gaps between them so that, through sound educational practices, they can be well-prepared graduates. Kira’s identification with and adoption of this project exceeds common sense expectations of a new academic, and defies discursive constructions of new lecturers as unskilled and inexperienced. Kira’s wealth of experience through a well-defined concept of self is what she brings to her project, and what illuminates her personal powers and properties as agent to realise her goals.

5.2.1.5 Personal emergent properties

Through her participation in the TDP, and in the early adoption of a project born out of her concerns in education, Kira’s personal emergent powers and properties were activated and exercised in her social and socio-cultural interactions on the TDP. Social theory, according to Archer (2000), typically downplays how agents use their PEPs to conceive of and pursue courses of action in social and cultural contexts. Such PEPs include intentionality, motivation, deliberation, and command of a language, among others (Kahn 2009).
Despite her challenges, Kira tried very hard to communicate and share her thoughts and feelings with others. Kira’s interaction with me as convener and facilitator of the TDP led me to see her as an intuitive, intelligent, deep, and caring individual. As a ‘foreigner’, she brought new insight and perspective to discussions on the HE classroom that were common sense for many others who had themselves come through the education system, but who were so immersed in it that their social practices had become naturalised and taken for granted. Her ‘fresh eye’ gaze illuminated gaps in teaching and learning practices, signalling to others, aspects that needed urgent attention and review. She observed that it was ‘probably because I am from a different country; I could see it but for others maybe it’s a normal issue’ (River of Life, 2013).

Her somewhat negative personal experience as a new academic in a foreign culture and locale drew attention to the ability (or lack thereof) of HE as an entity to enact social inclusion in relation to new academics, as well as the students it embraces in the new dispensation in South Africa. As a new academic, Kira needed a great deal of support from me and from others. Her general disposition in the early days was emotional and intense, yet passionate. As discussed, emotions carry the importance of a situation to us and are commentaries on our concerns (Archer 2000). She had innovative ideas to introduce to her students but experienced fear as a severe constraint on her ability to act on these innovations without assistance. She was also aware of being judged by younger and more technological savvy members of the TDP group so she clung closely to ‘similars and familiares’ from her own discipline. She displayed her determination by often staying after class or emailing me to seek advice on specific aspects of the course work. Certainly there was a great need on her part to find ways to respond to her own challenges as an ‘inexperienced’ new academic, by using the challenges she faced to ‘grow professionally’ and to ‘change the storms into opportunities’ as she put it. Despite the social and cultural aspects that she found jarring in her new context, Kira used her personal powers and properties such as intentionality, perseverance and determination to address her challenges. By immersing herself in the programme, she demonstrated her exercise of agency in relation to structural and cultural constraints in this setting.

As a new academic, it is noteworthy that Kira, despite her own challenges as newcomer and ‘foreigner’, is able to activate and marshall her PEPs towards bringing a wealth of ideas, clear goals and intentions to her academic project; intentions that have much to do with the social inclusion of students as per the transformation goals in HE. Contrary to the discourse of the novice teacher as ‘inexperienced’ or ‘myopic’, Kira’s example makes a compelling
case for the nurturing of raw, creative talent and educational commitment in new academics, in the service of a more enhanced and inclusive teaching and learning practice, and experience for all. These are her PEPs, activated through her reflexively engaging with her context in the adoption of her project, born out of her unique cares and concerns.

Kira then pursues how she is going to go about promoting her concerns through the design and unfolding of her project. In doing so, she again calls on her personal emergent power of reflexivity to ascertain the worth of her project in order to decide if she can commit to it. Once Kira has ‘discerned, deliberated and dedicated’ herself to a project (Archer 2000), she exercises her causal powers as a human being to put her project into action by necessarily engaging with the context she is embedded in, summarily activating the structural and cultural properties pertaining to that context.

5.2.2 Pursuit of the project

The moment Kira, as a primary agent, embarks on pursuing her project, she encounters the structural and cultural properties of the context she is embedded in, which are activated as powers (SEP(s) and CEPS) that serve to enable or constrain her actions to varying degrees. In addition to the day-to-day tasks of preparing lessons, marking, assessing, and holding the pedagogic space for her students, Kira as a primary agent is driven by her need to protect her concerns and to realise her project. In the pedagogic selections she makes for group work, for example, she is aware that ‘bridging the gap’ for students is crucial to her perceived role in her student-focused classroom, and as she had defined it for the purposes of her project. In engaging with this fully, however, she faces serious challenges or constraints that impinge on her ability to develop her vision fully.

5.2.2.1 Impingement on the project

New lecturers entering the UoT are always confronted with an institutional structural and cultural context that predates them as this is a necessary condition for the involuntary placement of agents (Archer 2000). The context that Kira confronts on entering the UoT as an institution, the Engineering Faculty, the Civil Engineering and Surveying Department, and her classes presents at each level, specific logical relations (Archer 1996) that she encounters and, as an agent, must mediate.
5.2.2.1.1 Institutional constraints

When Kira moved to South Africa from Cuba, she experienced a high level of ‘contextual discontinuity’ (Archer 2012a) between her home country and her new residence, because everything was different and new. Growing up in a socialist country meant that Kira was accustomed to an economic and political way of life that was completely different from South Africa. She had chosen to give up her comfortable location to enter a very different structural and cultural space. She was unfamiliar with the ‘obvious class but tacit race stratification’ that she observed, remnants of an apartheid past and a capitalist present/future in South Africa. She was also part of a rare group in South Africa of female structural civil engineers working in a ‘male dominated field’. Politically, socially and culturally, Kira was not quite prepared for the context that she confronted.

Kira was also new to the reconfigured HE sector, and the UoT she joined had been newly formed as a result of an institutional merger in 2005 between two former technikons (see Chapter Four). The merger presented problem-ridden contexts (Archer 1995), especially for new academics, by virtue of how relations between the conflicting SEPs and CEPs had been ‘stacked’ in these contexts that they found. As HE classrooms globally and locally opened up to accommodate a greater diversity of students as a result of massification and open access, the UoT as a merged entity was also dominated by students of greater diversity and differing academic capabilities who all needed to be ‘trained for employment’.

Being new to the institution, notwithstanding that she had chosen to come here and had agreed to take up employment, the context that Kira found was not of her choosing (Archer 2000), and the nuances of the merger changes in cultural terms (first-order emergents) occluded her discursive penetration as she is not South African and does not fully understand the historical impetus for such changes. Then there were also the ‘results of the results’ or second-order emergents (Ibid.) that Kira encountered and must mediate to thrive as an academic.

In many ways, the context that Kira confronts is problem ridden because of the merger and the many emergent structural and cultural incompatibilities at the various levels of social and socio-cultural interaction on the different campuses. For Kira and her peers, teaching on different campuses meant that they had to deal with different discursive notions of ‘good teaching’ as practised by the former technikons. At the structural systemic level, strategic action is called for by agents to weigh up options so that differences and disparities are minimised and contained. Agents faced with this logic opt for containment of difference,
which can be both authoritarian and sectional (Archer 1995), but used as a strategy to prevent differences from becoming visible. For Kira, attention was immediately drawn to the need for more quality teaching to meet the academic literacy and learning challenges of students on the different campuses. Differences in race, class, language support, ethnicity and academic literacy created an extra challenge for lecturers in the classroom and impinged on all levels of the university, creating problem-ridden contexts not just for new but established academics as well:

It hit me from the beginning of my lecturing practice at the UoT – the uneven level of development of the students in the diverse groups on the different campuses. Right from the beginning, lecturers are able to assess which students are condemned to failure and those with [the] biggest opportunities to be successful. But what do we do about it? (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

At the social interaction level, agents work to make the situation more compatible, and the disjunction between structural and cultural systems invokes a logic of compromise. At the cultural systems level, the sinking of differences between ideas and attitudes, which Archer refers to as syncretism (1996), is mutually beneficial to minimise differences at an ideational level and to foster cultural cohesion. In the wake of the new challenges activated by the merger, the departmental infrastructure and its limitations, as experienced by Kira, are ill equipped to respond effectively to these glaring problems:

When I came to the department I found out we have . . . we have the intention to try to enhance the students and to bring them together from different cultures and to try to bridge the gap; and we are working towards it but we have a lot of restrictions that the job creates . . . when you come with all this theory knowledge and science and engineering concepts . . . when students are not even ready for the simple mathematics, we need to think again . . . I think it’s a challenge” (River of Life 2013).

While, on the face of it, the UoT appeared to have transformed in size and shape, culturally it remained fractured and disparate as a result of the cultural morphostasis. Although the homogeneity of the past structural system had been replaced by a diversity of race, class, language, and ethnicity (structural morphogenesis) at the chalk face, its cultural counterparts, as observed by Kira, lagged behind and served as constraint on her discursive understanding of the context:

When I came here, it was challenging . . . colour . . . people see colour everywhere and culture everywhere. It was too much. People look at you and they see your colour before
seeing your face. That for me is too much . . . . Probably because I am from a different
country, I could see it but for others maybe it’s a normal issue . . . (River of Life 2013).

For someone whose interest is in bridging the gap between students in the engineering
world, Kira was faced not only with the disjunction between the values, ideas and beliefs of
the merged institution but also with the constraining contradictions between transformation
goals as professed by HE in the new South African democracy and the reality that she
observed and experienced at the socio-cultural level of interaction in her classroom and in
the staffroom:

As a Cuban, born in a communist system, where we value a person for her aptitude,
beliefs and behaviour, I was not use[d] to judgement related to external looks or

group/culture classifications. To face a class with this huge ‘baggage’ of race, gender,
and economic discrimination was a challenge for me (River of Life 2013).

The structural and cultural juxtaposition evident here created a conditioning context for Kira,
one that she was determined to circumvent (discussed later). Kira was experiencing at the
social- and socio-cultural interaction level the accentuated and different discursive practices
associated with diversity and transformation as structural imports, suggesting that, while HE
had been enabled structurally by policy work on transformation (discussed in Chapter Four),
there was a cultural lag in terms of prevalent conservative attitudes and beliefs among
people of diverse groups at the UoT in transforming into a cohesive unit. Induction
programmes, such as the one reported on in this study (TDP), are thus not just aimed at
inducting new staff into the HE landscape in general, but also have the burden of attempting
to smooth out the imbalances caused by disjunctions such as the UoT merger through a
centralised model of induction.

**Teaching and Learning**

Kira recognises that HE teaching is a specialised activity and not a random act. One would
imagine that teaching and learning as it is constructed at the UoT would be even more
specialised than other institutions, given its industry focus and professional qualifications.
This specialisation is not lived out, however, as the theories used at the UoT are the ‘same
old’ everywhere (Boughey 2010). In its defence, this UoT is slightly different as a result of
the Work-Integrated Learning Research Unit (WILRU) (see Chapter Four). The lack of
teaching as a specialisation acts as a ‘filter’ (Fanghanel 2007), which makes it difficult for
new lecturers to change their pedagogical beliefs or to put new insights into practice (Norton
et al. 2010). This leads to a compromise among new university lecturers between their
intentions and their actions. There is also the assumption that formal training programmes will make better university teachers (Norton et al. 2010), and many of the recent teaching enhancement initiatives, such as the TDGs by the DHET (Ministry of Higher Education and Training 2012), are predicated on this assumption. These assumptions, however, eclipse the sites of tension and conflict that academics must mediate in their own contexts and by their own description, and are often not explicitly addressed by formal professional development programmes.

I realised that I was not ready and they [my department] didn’t make a proper induction programme. You should be ready to teach; they cannot put you in front of class if you don’t really know what you are going to do (Photovoice 2013).

Kira sees the need for academics like her to be formally ‘trained’ as HE teachers because teaching is not something that can be framed solely on how one was taught before (Kahn 2009). One of the reasons why induction into teaching and learning is not taken seriously by many institutions (Trowler and Cooper 2002) is because teaching is seen as a common sense practice that anyone can do. As cultural mechanisms, these discourses are powerful in labelling lecturers as ‘decontextualised’ and boxing students into separate academic ‘camps’ in the university in ways that are further disempowering and detrimental to their acquisition of the epistemological access (Morrow, 1992) needed for their success.

Far from boxing students in, Kira believes that engineering students have to be taught to think ‘out of the box’.

I think today to bridge the gap students have to really think out of the box. Being an engineer means to be ingenious, to be clever, to know how to solve problems, so most of the time you have to try to do something different and to think out of the box (Photovoice 2013).

For Kira, teaching seems to be closely linked to student success; one is trained so that students can benefit from better-informed practice. This notion is closely linked to the recent teaching development activities launched by the DHET to address the slow transformation of student success rates in HE discussed in Chapter Four. Kira acknowledges that her ‘gaps’ in teaching must be bridged so that students are prepared well for their engineering careers.

**Quality**
The measure of quality of programmes at the UoT is achieved not just through academic
authorities such as the CHE and the HEQC; the UoT’s link with professional bodies means that accountability is to external sources that regulate and control quality, such as the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA). While these bodies have an advisory function in terms of input into curricula and programmes, their decisions are discursively constructed by lecturers at the UoT in absolute terms. Kira, for example, is frustrated about the lack of supposed quality in curriculum depth and breadth of one of the engineering programmes, which ECSA, as external contingent regulator, did not sanction:

They threw out one of our courses; ECSA didn’t allow one of our main courses to be accepted . . . how do you say . . . they withdraw . . . and then it’s a challenge in itself, because I’m a structural engineer, even when I’m teaching there I feel a little bit frustrated about that. But I think if we are able to prepare better the subject, we can again recover that registration. And [this] gives us an opportunity (Photovoice 2013).

Kira, as a new academic, draws on the established discourse of excellence and quality in her awareness of the need for developing and designing the engineering curriculum so that the subject’s curriculum components meet quality assurance requirements and standards. These are the professional resources that she brings to her new job: her trained ‘gaze’ (Maton 2001), based on her real-world industry experience. Withdrawal of a course by ECSA discursively translates into the course not being good enough, which is a further constraint for her as she must use her own professional barometer to work out the actual level she should be teaching at. Despite her professional experience, as a new academic, ‘pitching’ her teaching at the right level is not that easy to work out or do.

Making these judgement calls also requires a ‘cultivated gaze’ (Maton 2001), acquired by being immersed in the field. In the absence of departmental guidance, as well as the inability of the TDP to be the preparatory training ground for this level of disciplinary detail, given its one-size-fits-all orientation, new academics like Kira have to ‘sink or swim’ in an effort to keep ahead of the game. The costs to her personal project in education, that is, of bridging the gap for students, are experienced as an additional burden for Kira, because a disciplinary gap exists between what the subject should be and what it actually is (from a content and curriculum perspective). It is a situation that she, as a new academic, must try to mediate.

**Assessment practices as specialised expertise**
Assessment practices in HE are not for the faint hearted. New academics who have never taught before have no solid basis or sense of how to set exam papers, prepare different
aspects of assessment, ensure validity and reliability of the instrument, and so on. Like HE teaching, assessment cannot be an assumed skills-set by virtue of the experience of having undertaken assessments as student or scholar before. While the TDP addresses assessment to some degree, Kira experiences the lack of explicit attention to assessment practices in her department as a constraint on her ability to perform her duties as HE teacher without specific training in this regard. She recognises that HE teaching is not same as high school or any other form of instruction that she is used to. In places like Cuba, universities are much more controlled by the state and academics have ‘state status’ (catedrático), that is, they are public employees. This is different from other contexts, such as South Africa, where universities are largely autonomous and academic freedom is cherished. When a university is a public entity, control of assessment is through state examinations. Kira is thus confronting both cultural and structural differences here, as the complexity of holding a teaching space for a diverse class of about 300 students in one sitting and preparing assessments for them is an overwhelming challenge for her, as it is even for experienced and established academic teachers.

In my country we don’t prepare the assessment ourselves. Here I have to do it. You don’t know if you fail the student . . . what is the level? How deep you can go with the question? If I only knew how to do assessment . . . the way we learnt on the TDP is that you can have the final assessment, as well as what do you call it . . . the formative assessment? Without this knowledge you sort of do what you’re thinking, but it’s not always the right way to do it. It was a lot. And I think you cannot let anyone teach at a higher education level in such a condition (Photovoice 2013).

Teaching and research
The workload and time constraints at the UoT further influence and affect new academics’ agency with regard to research. The concomitant pressure for the average academic to teach as well as to produce research outputs is an overwhelming challenge; more so for the new academic who has pressure to fulfil both these contractual obligations with equally satisfactory results. Many new academics at the institution identify researching in their own disciplines as a way of extending their disciplinary expertise in their teaching to keep up with current trends in their fields. Kira, for example, sees research as core to her teaching purpose and function at the university, but the lack of available and dedicated time to do it affects her ability to develop this capacity further:

I think the root of my teaching is researching and to have a deeper knowledge than what I have. And at the end of the day I think my problem is I want to increase my knowledge
for research and to further my studies but I don't find the support
to do that or the time (Problem Tree 2013).

In the structural domain, the social system at the UoT dictates
that, to reach full academic status for promotion, the teaching, the
research and the community engagement duties of an academic
have to be complied with in almost equal proportion. There is a
growing realisation that teaching requires the same deliberate nurturing that the
development of research capacity has always enjoyed in some institutions (Quinn and
Vorster 2012).

As discussed already, there are no affordances in the academic's teaching timetable to be
able to service the research requirement. Work overload and other commitments make it
close to impossible for new academics to write journal articles, present papers at
conferences, or undertake other academic co-curricular projects. This disjunction leads to
ideational disgruntlement, where groups needing to challenge and change the structural re-
distribution of time resources lead from the cultural wing to penetrate the material structures
at social structure level (Kotta et al. 2014). With the structure intact, ‘material groups hold
dominance and render the primary agents (lecturers) impotent to effect change and their
subjugation by the structural system prevents them from fulfilling their obligations and
realizing their full potential as academics’ (Ibid.). While the structural constraints at the UoT
remain strong, there is little room for Kira to exercise agency in the nexus between teaching
and research.

5.2.2.1.2 Departmental constraints

The disciplinary department acts as a crucial filter on the formation of teaching practices
(Fanghanel 2007) that offer the space for a range of opportunities as well as conflicts that
affect new academics' agency. When Kira joined her department as a primary agent, the
social and cultural properties in this departmental setting seem stacked against her, offering
significant tension in terms of her agential options. She was allocated classes by the HoD
which she had no choice in selecting. She was not given any guidance regarding how those
classes had to be arranged and organised. She had a heavy workload and stringent
deadlines. In the academy, she is a newcomer, with no teaching experience, or research
and publication track stacked in her favour. Her bargaining power and negotiating strength
as an agent are reduced.
The institutional academic hierarchy, which serves as a structural mechanism for acquiring more academic capital, is a cultural constraint for Kira. The term ‘junior’ in HE discursively refers to academics who start off at the bottom of the ladder, with little experience to exert gravitas in their academic, professional or personal capacity. The issue of her ‘juniority’ is a conditioning influence for Kira; one that she is frustrated by but also one that she tries to circumvent:

I came from my country with almost 20 years’ experience and have to start as a junior, it’s tough (Photovoice 2013).

The actual structural ranking system at the university activates CEPs to discursively construct those at junior level as inexperienced, new, and not yet knowledgeable. However, those in a junior position may be chronologically older than those at senior lecturer level and infinitely more knowledgeable. Ironically, some new academics who have not been in academia before, start off at the senior level, based on other accrued benefits and material resources that the UoT rewards, such as qualifications (TDP reflective essay 2011). In Kira’s understanding, her positioning as a primary social agent, which is based on the material and cultural resources that she brings into her new context, including about 20 years’ experience in industry as a structural engineer, and her experience in the international arena, which makes her perhaps more worldly in the ambit of engineering as a profession, should hold her in good stead. On the contrary, her conditioning and positioning invoke a situational logic of contingent complementarity (Archer 1996) in the dialectic between personal and social identity: the subjective ‘I’ who values the many years of rich experience gained through practice in practical and social orders has to now reflect on a ‘junior’ ‘Me’ who is graded according to academic achievement at the university. This causes a negation of ontological endowment in favour of epistemological capital as the university does not recognise the real experience (in this case Kira’s 20 years’ experience in engineering) that human agents bring to their roles as lecturers. The further constraint exerted by the mechanism of hierarchy is that it is used to decide who gets the extant role array from the pool of social agents moving into social actor role (see Chapter Two).

Each context and position has material and ideational distributions that influence the positions, and the agents who hold those positions, with advantages or disadvantages which they work to maintain or modify (Archer 1995: 204). In time, agents come to accrue certain benefits attached to their positioning through movement up the hierarchy via ad hominem promotions, awards, and the like. As primary agents acquire more ‘capital’, they endow their roles with weightier achievements, which then become discursively translated and perceived
as ‘importance’ and ‘status’. Archer (1996) assures us though, that active agents can change their positioning through individual action (PEPs) by responding voluntarily to involuntary placement.

I tried to make that storm to become an opportunity as well, because I want to be sitting somewhere (Photovoice 2013).

Here the SEP activated is a vested interest attached to the lecturer position. Kira has an interest in improving her lot by achieving the capital needed for her to be recognised in a role that she perceives has befitting status. Porpora (1989) argues that actors are motivated to act in their own interests that are a function of social position by either maintaining or changing their contexts based on their positioning.

Then I used that [my junior level] to grow professionally (Photovoice 2013).

The situational logic of opportunism in the face of the contingent complementarity means that some academics view professional growth as a specialisation at the CS level. Kira, like other new academics, recognises that, through sectionalism on her part, she can distinguish herself by growing professionally in HE to make her teaching practice not a random act but a specialised activity. This is also part of her emergent professional identity as she recognises the importance of being an effective teacher, which is part and parcel of being an academic practitioner and disciplinary expert in HE today.

**Work overload and time constraints**

As discussed already, time constraints and work overload are serious impediments to the full growth and development of the agency of new academics. Teaching a 20-hour week with back-to-back lectures and having to travel to remote campuses takes its toll on the preparation and marking time needed by new academics to consolidate and integrate work and to be innovative. The over-emphasis on quantitative output, which is the hallmark of a marketised and corporatised HE globally (see Chapter Four), is not necessarily matched by qualitative input for academics (old and new), by allocating time to do this. This temporal constraint is not conducive to the development of new people coming into the academic system, who are frenetically adjusting to structural and cultural contexts that are incongruent with their own professional realities in the world of work. The consequences are felt by all, most poignantly for agency itself, which is deeply undermined and conditioned by a ‘treadmill’ system that new academics like Kira cannot escape.
My big problem is to be able to integrate what I have learnt and what I have been involved in professionally for 20 years. Because of the time constraints and all the other things I do to survive, I cannot integrate the knowledge. I want to be able to integrate what I know, all this fruit, out of what I've been achieving, so my professional life and teaching today are integrated . . . but I don’t find a way of integrating them in a proper programme for the subject, because I don’t have the time to sit and do it . . . to implement whatever I have been doing . . . (Photovoice 2013).

Kira is frustrated by workload and time limitations, which are constraints on her ability to use her professional expertise as a structural engineer in service of engineering as a discipline and subject. Kira also shows a keen understanding of the need to integrate theory with practice; she sees the value of theory-led teaching, or practice-based teaching as an aspect that is crucial, especially at the UoT where theorised practice is vital for the shaping of the professional graduates going to industry (Gamble 2006; Engel-Hills et al. 2010).

Students should go out as professionals with a full box of tools: soft skills, and hard-core engineering skills. They should see their career as the first engineering project of their life and learn to manage from the day of their first class! (Photovoice 2013)

Administrative tasks attached to teaching and assessment, are equally cumbersome and time consuming; they detract from academic work and burden lecturers with managerial overload. This is extra difficult for a new lecturer, who has to spend a lot of time analysing students’ marks, for example, to decide what the teaching interventions should be. If assessment is seen as a ‘mark-crunching’ exercise rather than a development process for learning (Biggs 1999), then an overemphasis on marks processing is discursively constructed as more important and takes precedence over assessment for learning (Ibid.).

I was never on time with the admin work, I didn’t know when marks had to be submitted and I didn’t know what the timeframe for marking was, it was terrible. It’s a nightmare, it’s crazy (Photovoice 2013).

As mentioned already, the TDP discusses assessment and constructive alignment in broad brush strokes where they are given a light touch; the real challenges of these frameworks are experienced in lecturers’ actual contexts of practice. New lecturers are not introduced to specific procedures and processes used in the department and they are often left to find out for themselves which ways work best. If a department is driven by reporting on student success, it places the onus on the lecturer to ‘produce’ these results, and lecturers, especially new ones, experience this as a conditioning constraint on their ability to interpret
assessments as a social and not just epistemic practice, that is, not as a means to an end. The TDP assessment module, for example, which places great emphasis on developing students through formative processes rather than only summative ones, is sometimes in necessary contradiction with departmental practices in this regard. Assessment regimes and marks reporting involve new academics in numerous routine and mundane tasks, necessary though they are, but departments do not provide the concurrent administrative support for new lecturers. Without mentorship, the gap between generic and departmental practices (Mathieson 2011) severely affects new academics’ agency, as it increases workload and affords less time for new academics to shape their teaching practice by integrating their own professional expertise.

**Social inclusion and exclusion**

Adding to her perceived sense of inadequacy, Kira struggled to speak English, which is not her mother tongue (MT) but is the medium of instruction (MOI) at the university. Owing to the close link between language and identity, ‘languages function as markers of national or ethnic identities’ and assume a form of social capital (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004: 2) As an outsider to the South African context, Kira’s language use is a marker of her Difference and uniqueness (Boler and Zembylas 2003; Gee 1990). Being emotionally vulnerable in a foreign tongue is very challenging and, apart from the obvious distress caused by her new circumstances, Kira was inarticulate as well as unable to comprehend the many idiosyncratic and nuanced layers of meaning in the variety of ‘Englishes’ spoken by the TDP group and in her department. Drawing on the discourse of Difference, she often felt alienated and unsure, as she was not able to ‘crack the code’ of the ‘South Africanisms’ that punctuated and dotted the group dialogues. Kira did not always have the ‘right words’ in English to express her fears and challenges. Language thus acted as a severe constraint on her ability to present herself as ‘professional’.

At an educational institution such as the UoT, the level of academic and technical proficiency in the medium of instruction is crucial to both student success and academics’ discursive command in different disciplinary contexts (Gee 1992). It is also a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986), exchanged as currency for status, confidence and knowledgeability in the classroom. Language, according to Archer (1995), would qualify as a structure in that it is a rule-governed established practice that can exert pressure on its users in terms of accuracy and fluency usage. At a structural level, language and its properties have causal effects when agents (students and lecturers) activate it through their interaction (Archer 1995; Fairclough 2000). When different CEPs and SEPs are activated through language use, as in
Kira’s case, a situational logic of necessary incompatibilities is created: English is necessary to the success of students from undergraduate through to postgraduate study at the UoT. At the same time, there is an incompatibility in how English is used differentially by students and staff in this context and who and what the MOI legitimates through its usage (Maton 2001).

At the UoT, most students are not mother-tongue speakers of English (HEQC 2011). By virtue of the academic support structures in place at the UoT, such as the First-Year Experience and the extended curriculum courses, as well as the numerous services for second-language (L2) speakers, students and lecturers alike seem to experience the academic linguistic space as a problem-ridden teaching and learning environment. To correct this incompatibility, agents at a socio-cultural interaction level in the classroom resort to a syncretism, that is, a sinking of differences. In Kira’s case, it means that students who are not comfortable in using English in the academic setting remain silent in class, finding it difficult to participate in discussions or to even to ask questions (TDP reflective essay, 2011). In Kira’s class, she observes that the discursive gaps in the disciplinary language of engineering are further constraints on students’ ability to succeed:

Lecturing to first-year students in civil engineering usually seems if you were talking in a totally foreign language to them. Sometimes we can be talking the same language and people don’t really know what you are talking about and I think this is what happened in engineering (Photovoice 2013).

New lecturers who speak English as a second language are in constant judgement of themselves (TDP reflective essay 2011), as they have not as yet developed a voice that inserts and asserts their expertise in an academic sense.

At four [sic] year level, it was a challenge technically . . . I was not ready to start teaching in another language at that level . . . . It was really challenging. It was crazy . . . “ (River of Life 2013).

However, like Kira, lecturers cannot remain silent in their classrooms; they have to mediate their differential material and cultural resources in strategic ways (discussed in the next section). It is at this juncture that Kira as the subjective ‘I’ looks at the objective ‘Me’ to take note of her positioning in this context (Archer 2000) (i.e. being given a fourth-year class as an inexperienced new lecturer) as well as her positioning as L2 speaker, to note that SEPs and CEPS act as constraints on her objective chances as an incumbent.
In Kira’s case, the issue of accents is a further constraint, as the way she pronounces words in English is different; her intonation patterns also set her apart as a ‘foreign language speaker’. Drawing on the emergent discourse of ‘accenting accents’ (see Chapter Four), people have prejudices about accents that are powerful, and very easily learned (Cauldwell 2014). Not speaking the dominant variety of English in an academic setting such as the university is discursively associated at the UoT, with a lack of expertise in the subject and of one’s sense of competence as an expert (TDP Milestone, 2011). ‘The appeal of labelling accents “right” and “wrong” is a reality and as teachers, we like to be able to judge our students (and sometimes our colleagues, and newcomers to the profession) on the basis of these “rules” and the implication is that if you deviate from these rules you are somehow to blame’ (Cauldwell 2014: 2).

The relations across structure and culture thus also influence agents’ interaction with each other through language. Language has structural properties on the one hand, but carries cultural and ideational import on the other by virtue of what it enables and constrains when it is being used. So, while there are structural constraints in the MOI being different from one’s MT, there are also gaps in terms of how language is used discursively in disciplinary ways. Kira may not have discursive penetration of how language was used historically to marginalise sections of the population under apartheid, but she notices that students themselves lack a good grasp of and handle on disciplinary concepts in an academic sense. How she mediates this constraint is interesting from her perspective as an ‘outsider’, as she calls herself. This will be discussed in the next section.

Language is also a constraint for Kira outside her classroom, in her social interaction with colleagues:

> Well, in general I almost feel out . . . left out a little bit. From sitting in a room and everybody wants to speak Afrikaans and I just say, ‘What now’? I’m just talking about social inclusion . . . for me it’s a totally new topic. In my country you don’t have that kind of problem (River of Life 2013).

She initially experienced the staff room as a non-inclusive space, albeit less from her ‘inadequacy’ to speak the language than from her colleagues’ failure to welcome and include her. Socially she felt alienated from colleagues in her department on the basis of her language and foreign identity. We see the interplay of structural and cultural properties here (Clegg 2005), where Kira experiences a double loop of alienation. In her interaction with her students, she is not an MT speaker (structure) and therefore is not always sure how effective
she is in teaching in English. With her colleagues, she feels alienated as a result of not being able to speak the language of social communication used in the staff room, namely Afrikaans. She cannot summon her own PEPs to fit in with her department (Becher and Trowler 2001; Knight 2002) and is not able to share in the exchange of ideas, attitudes, and thoughts (culture) with members of her department. Through these structural and cultural mechanisms operating as constraints, Kira cannot find a way in from the periphery to the proverbial centre (Lave and Wenger 1991), as she does not understand the language nor its social conventions and idiosyncrasies to be able to ‘break in’ to the group.

Apart from the use of English as the MOI in the classroom, there are languages of cultural and social convergence (such as Afrikaans and isiXhosa, for example) in staffrooms, corridors and other non-formal settings that Kira as agent has to be aware of and try to mediate. As part of a collectivity of similarly-placed new lecturers in HE, she is a primary agent with similar objective circumstances, but the properties of the context, while similar for some, mean different things to Kira as she is differentially placed and uniquely positioned as a ‘foreigner’.

5.2.2.1.3 Classroom constraints

The physical classroom is an important space for Kira. It is the structural domain where her project takes shape. As a university classroom, it serves as an enablement, designed for the enactment of effective learning and teaching practice. It is also where she mediates the impact of structural and cultural influences (Clegg 2005) at a micro level. However, Kira experiences the physical classrooms she occupies as sites of tension and struggle. The situational logic invokes a necessary contradiction in that, contrary to the UoT’s mission to be at the ‘heart of technology in Africa’ (HEQC 2011), many of the venues Kira teaches in are ill equipped to support innovative, technology-enhanced, student-centred teaching and learning, mainly because of poor infrastructure and inadequate attention to and maintenance of these venues (Photovoice, 2013). The lack of ‘supporting conditions’, as she refers to them, acts as a constraint (by virtue of their absence), not only on her ability to be a good teacher, but also in her pursuit and realisation of her project:

> As a lecturer we every day also struggle because we don’t have all the conditions . . . you don’t come to a class which has a laptop and projector. You have to come to class with your own laptop and your projector. You have to use the staircase or lifts if they are working; otherwise you have to walk two floors down with equipment. When you get to the class most of the time you are not in the mood to start your presentation. Sometime
you are sitting in your office thinking twice to do the presentation with a PowerPoint; or should you just go there and make a speech? (Photovoice 2013).

For someone who has adopted a project that has technology at the heart of it ('Bridging the Gap in the Engineering World'), it is debilitating for Kira not to be ‘supported’ in this way. The fact that the classrooms are not equipped with computers and a projector, or other technological enhancements to assist the teaching of engineering in this context, leads Kira to question what the pedagogical potential is to truly equip Engineering students to be national and global contenders:

Will our civil engineering students be able to be one of the big five today in South Africa, to be able to cope with the technology that is there? If we are teaching in such a condition, I don’t think that they will be ready tomorrow for what they have to do. They go to a company where all the technology is there . . . they won’t be able probably to relate to others in the same way and to use that technology wisely (Photovoice 2013).

In addition to her perceived lack of support from significant others in the department, an ill-equipped classroom is a further frustration and challenge. Apart from not being technologically equipped, her classrooms, instead of ‘opening the doors of learning’ to all, are hemmed-in and physically-bounded spaces because the furniture in the classroom, that is, the tables, desks and chairs, are bolted to the floor.

When I came this semester I found my tables and chairs clamped down to the floor in this situation [refers to picture of student desks in photovoice story]. It really shocked me [very emotional] . . . I couldn’t have my civil engineering students enclosed in that way; I feel enclosed myself (Photovoice 2013).

The negative affect she attaches to the classroom and its arrangement of furniture is expressive of her vested interest in her project, because use of space and physical structure are important aspects for her as a structural engineer, and for her project ‘Bridging the Gaps’. The bolted furniture is an apt metaphor for how constrained Kira feels as a new academic:

I had a picture of two poles of a table that the person fixed at this length from the wall and I had to take it off . . . I even had a student stand over there and I took a picture. You can see the student don’t [sic] fit . . . I won’t fit there at all myself [laughter from all]. That
is the kind of mentality that I think we have to work away and it goes against what we want to establish and want to teach them . . . how to be tomorrow (Photovoice 2013).

This is especially frustrating for Kira because many of her classes are based on group- and team-work, where students come together to solve engineering problems interactively.

If I want to do team work which is part of my subject because I do projects, students have to work together; you have to choose a thing that is diverse because one would enrich the other from different communities; one have more English . . . experience, the other probably have experience from industry because they are students of different nations and different backgrounds. How are you going to do team work? It's a struggle to work in teams – a struggle to be able to share (Photovoice 2013).

She is emotionally moved by the number of burglar bars in the building that are not just on the windows, ‘but everywhere’. She draws attention to the faculty’s awards cabinet to juxtapose the notions of being locked into traditional ways of thinking (in the classroom) with the display of awards and trophies in the cabinet (see photovoice collage, 5.2.), which for Kira does not reflect the real success achieved by and for students:

In this picture, we have a few big awards and recognition. I am wondering if this is nicest way of showing the award . . . they are in the box. And also are all of these awards going to really give us a way of taking the students forward, bridging the gap and getting what they have to get, to be able to compete in the world . . . I don't know if that is the kind of award we are looking for (Photovoice 2013).

The emotional commentary on her concerns is carried through her emotional response as she tells her story, evident from her quivering voice and tear-stained eyes. The story circle witnesses that she is deeply moved by the fact that the classroom is a bounded space, and not one in which she can be free to teach her students in ways that she deems important. Irrespective of whether the building and classroom management facility had good intentions behind chaining the desks and chairs to the floor, these reasons were not communicated to her, and Kira as agent experiences them and confronts them as conditioning constraints on her ability to be an effective lecturer. The lack of freedom to arrange furniture for group work mirrors for her the rigid discursive spaces in education, chaining her as it were to limited ‘ways of knowing, being and doing’ (Barnett 2004) in her classroom. Compared with other spaces, such as the staff room, board room, and meeting rooms, her classroom is where she can potentially exercise her own freedom in her domain, but, being denied this, she
confronts a further conditioning influence for the exercise of her agency (discussed further) with regard to teaching.

5.2.2.2 Advancement of the project:

Professional development as enabler

One of the ways in which the UoT seeks to address the discrepancies discussed above is through its organisational socialisation strategies (Trowler 2005). As a non-accredited but compulsory course, the informal TDP programme tries to compensate for the gap in expertise in those new academics who have never taught before. The TDP is a special type of community of practice that brings together ‘a group of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in an area by interacting on an ongoing basis’ (Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002: 4).

While acknowledging that ‘without teaching qualifications it is difficult to engage in teaching informed by educational research’ (Kotta et al. 2014), new academics are encouraged to familiarise themselves with higher education teaching and learning practices through the TDP. This is done against the backdrop of fast-growing globalised trends dominating universities the world over. This structural and cultural device, which serves as a generative mechanism for the ‘skilling up’ of university teachers, means that new lecturers like Kira, who had been employed at the UoT on the merits of their industry and/or research experience, are now being coerced into adopting a teaching identity as well.

The generic nature of the TDP, and the fact that the new UoT (at the time of this study) still appeared culturally too polarised and diversified as an entity, is a constraint on new academics, regarding their penetration into the discursive practices of specific disciplines and departments across the different campuses. Despite the high rate of structural morphogenesis due to the merger, older agents reluctant to change rely on the cultural morphostasis in the new structure, creating further disjunctions between the structural and cultural systems in the merged university. The TDP, however, in its single-mindedness in presenting the university as a whole and new structure, succeeds at some level in bridging this divide for new academics. The TDP as a staff development initiative was thus a huge structural enablement for Kira as it provided her with the developmental support to shape the framework of her teaching practice. Even though Kira had not taught in HE before, she recognised that HE teaching required specialised knowledge and practice:
Teaching in higher education is not the same [as] giving a workshop or teaching, or doing a sort of workshop for professionals. The TDP was the right frame to learn how to become a better lecturer. With the TDP experience, I am able to sort out the problems a bit (River of Life, 2013).

Through the modules on assessment, teaching design, teaching with technology, and so on, Kira was able to develop her knowledge and practices further. While the TDP adopts an ‘approaches to learning’ frame which has been criticised for its decontextualised understanding of learning (Haggis 2003; Trowler 2005; Mathieson 2011; Kahn 2009) (see Chapter Four), for a structural engineer who had never taught before, the TDP offered Kira a lens into a generic pedagogic framing for the discipline of engineering. It did this not just in its consideration of knowledge and curriculum features, but also in its acknowledgement of the student as knower (Maton 2001), as an important part of a student-centred teaching approach and practice. Kira therefore sees the need to protect the right to be part of this development programme as it is crucial to her understanding of what a good HE lecturer should be doing. We see evidence of this in her consistent attendance and participation in the programme. Despite her rigorous schedule and commitments as lecturer, researcher, and departmental staff member, she contributed fully, by attending nearly all the TDP sessions and completing all the assessment tasks, in order to be able to reap and reproduce the benefits from the TDP for her own project and journey.

In the absence of much-needed support from departmental colleagues, her consistent involvement for the duration of the programme also points to her need to belong to a community. She was able ‘to network with other colleagues; to feel a sense of camaraderie with others in a similar predicament’ (River of Life, 2013). It was also a forum in which she could learn discursively about the values, attitudes and ideas that the university privileged, so that she could strategise accordingly in service of her own project in education. The TDP thus becomes a significant space for new academics not only to be able to share their burdens and woes with ‘similars and familiars’; it is also a catchment area where new academics can ‘re-group, catch their breath and strategise on survival tactics for the next teaching week’ (TDP reflective essay 2011).

**Professional development as constraint**
The TDP, however, like many other staff development interventions, is too generic in nature and too divorced from disciplinary contextual influences (Fanghanel 2007; Mathieson 2011; Trowler and Cooper 2002) to offer Kira realistic strategies and tools for transferring what was learned on the course, to her specific challenges in her classroom and her subject. The TDP is thus a constraint in her crossing the threshold from disciplinary expert to disciplinary practitioner, and in orientating her to what is required in teaching in the different professions. In this sense it does not instate the professional underpinnings of each UoT programme mix, neither does it recognise the ontological status (Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007) of the HE teacher as an autonomous and independent being. In being a generic model of induction, the TDP conflates lecturers' unique challenges with generic disciplinary challenges, irrespective of disciplinary identity (Henkel 2000; Becher 1989). This severely constrains and reduces the agential potential of new academics to respond effectively to conditioning influences (Mathieson 2011; Kahn 2009) at the university.

Kira is also keenly aware that the National Diploma she teaches on, is a professional qualification, and she displays an acute understanding of the need for the development of a professional identity in her students, which should be moulded through appropriate teaching efforts. Kira is therefore aware of the need for teaching programmes to include an additional professional angle to ‘being and becoming’ a teacher at the UoT:

> You are preparing someone to become a professional graduate; you are not just talking about a topic in your profession (Photovoice, 2013).

This speaks to her awareness of the emphasis on graduates and their attributes at the UoT, the development of which the UoT is committed to shaping, based on its industry-facing link to professional careers. Preparing a professional graduate entails specialised knowledge and practice (Gamble 2006; Winberg 2008; Engel-Hills et al. 2010; Wheelahan, 2007) by integrating work and learning (WIL) with a service component, but, to do this well, it needs lecturers who are pedagogically capable and aware. The generic staff development programme, however, does not incorporate or focus on work-integrated learning, although each faculty and department at the UoT has embraced WIL as part of their re-curriculation strategy and improvement plan (HEQC 2011). The teaching regime (Trowler and Cooper 2002) embodied by the TDP might be seen as incompatible with lecturers' experiences in their own departmental settings, again making it difficult for agents to exercise agency in relation to their teaching (Kahn 2009).
5.2.3 Realisation of the project

5.2.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context

The attempted realisation of any project immediately enmeshes agents in the properties and powers of the context both structurally and culturally (SEPs and CEPs) in relation to their own (PEPs) (Archer 2000). In Archer’s terms, these two sets of causal powers are activated based on the nature of the project and how the agent seeks to realise the project. When these are activated, they can enable or constrain projects to varying degrees, but the actual outcome is mediated by inner deliberations about these conditioning influences. The outcomes of reflexive deliberation incite reflexive circumvention if projects are met with serious social constraints, but also with renunciation or resignation to the abandonment of such projects by agents in the social order. In Archer’s terms, these are circumventory or renunciatory actions (2000), which agents use to resist or adapt, based on their personal powers which are influenced by the degrees of freedom, opportunity costs, and vested interest attached to projects (Archer 2000). This is to acknowledge the part reflexivity plays in ‘enabling subjects to design and determine their responses to the structured circumstances in which they find themselves, in the light of what they personally care about most’ (Archer 2007b: 11).

In Kira’s narrative of mediation, I have shown how the causal powers of structural and cultural emergent properties, which are activity dependent in both their origin and enactment, are exercised as constraints and enablements, which work automatically as soon as Kira as agent engages with her project (Ibid.). Human causal powers, on the contrary, work reflexively and mediation is done through reflexive deliberation, and entails what the agent can do about the impact of structural and cultural conditioning influences on their projects. Mediation is thus about agents’ responses to the impact of social forms. ‘Reflexivity, exercised through internal conversation, is advanced as the process which not only mediates the impact of social forms upon us but also determines our responses to them’ (Archer 2000). To mediate between her concerns and the problem-ridden context she confronts, Kira must work out the balance between what she wants and how to go about getting it, always tipping the scales in favour of her realisation of her project. In the context of her classroom, department, faculty and institution, Kira responds to the enablements and constraints impinging on her project as an ‘active agent’, to ‘promote her concerns, to form projects, and to advance or to protect what she cares about most’ (Archer 2007b: 13).

Kira’s response to the context that she describes as alienating, invokes her own PEPs to
provide traction for her concerns attached to her project of ‘bridging the gap’ for students. She tackles the ideational constraints of her lack of cultural capital due to her linguistic differences by putting into action, practices that are counter-factual to the dominant status quo. In this way, she attempts syncretism to correct the inconsistency in cultural domain:

I bend rules, I am a bit rebellious because I want to be sure I am fair and students see it! I started studying students’ behaviour and tendencies to group and act and after a few months I could identify reasons behind the activity and I was better prepared to ‘step in’ and make a difference with my ‘outsider’ background (Photovoice 2013).

What Kira refers to here is the natural tendency of students to converge in groups to avoid the embarrassment of being judged by others perceived as better than they are. By ‘better’, I am drawing discursively here on those with the cultural capital to navigate the academic tasks more easily. Kira’s ability to reflect on her ‘outsider background’, and to use it to help students to work better together, shows not only her reflexive deliberation but also her decision to circumvent the disabling constraints that the structural components of race, class and language have imposed on students, preventing them from discursively transcending their boundaries in the interests of their studies. As an ‘outsider’ who felt alienated herself, she reflexively assesses the import of the debilitating feeling of being alienated, and summons her PEPs to use the very thing that worked against her, as the device to bring students together in cross-cultural groupings.

Kira’s agential choices are activated further by her determination and motivation (PEPs) in relation to the constraining influence of language as MOI. When Kira comes up against the constraint of language, she neutralises the influence of linguistic domination by shifting the emphasis to valuing what the student is contributing via their input rather than whether they are proficient or accurate in their language use. By refocusing on what is shared rather than how it is shared, she is able to reduce the barriers between how students interact in her class.

Language barrier from my side was no longer a problem. I use it to make empathy with those scared of participating for fear of a public mistake. Intentionally I made others in class to read and face my daily challenge ‘language’ and to make others see that it’s more important WHO YOU ARE, WHAT YOU KNOW than WHAT OTHERS THINK OF YOU! (Photovoice 2013).

When Kira activates her personal power of empathy, she does so in relation to students’
experience of being ‘outsiders’ in their own university contexts or ‘academic homes’.

I feel today close to those from other countries – Congo, Angola etc. I feel students recognise that I respect differences and I encourage diversity. Through teamwork, I ‘force’ them to be diverse and is lovely to see how in a team they care about someone that in another context probably will be seen as a threat (Photovoice 2013).

In her teaching and learning practice, Kira has tried to implement what she learned on the TDP to strengthen her own practice in novel ways. Her personal powers of creativity and innovation were invoked when she came up with the idea in her project,

. . . to try to incorporate what I think people don’t normally want to use in class. Most people like the old fashioned way of teaching: ‘no cell phones allowed, don’t clown around . . . just be focused’ [see Kira’s photovoice collage]. I want to see how the students do that – they want to use technology and they do it every way but how we incorporate it in our teaching and learning procedures is important (Photovoice 2013).

In responding to the constraint of the bolted chairs and desks in her classroom, Kira has tried in her own capacity and through her own PEPs to change the way her projects run, offering students more freedom.

And in my projects I normally have to work like this . . . as you can see [refers to photovoice collage] it’s high quality work and to achieve something like that the students have to work hard . . . it’s a short semester . . . it’s no free time for them . . . they have to do it at home. They live in different communities, transport is difficult and communicating via technology is a great way of sharing whatever they are doing . . . and being able to achieve a good result (Photovoice 2013).

Kira’s commitment to her project means that she has a vested interest in strengthening students’ ways of working to achieve better results. She takes advantage of a technology hub in the building, which has a project room attached to it where students have all the resources at their disposal in one place:

When a student works, they [sic] can be able to work with their hands . . . to have all the technology available to do research. They don’t have to go from library to a room to be cutting and pasting and doing things. They should have everything in one place . . . to be able to work nice . . . and that is what we are aiming and hoping to get. At the end of the day I think we get a better result and then we have rainbow nation (Photovoice 2013).
Kira’s outrage at the desks and tables clamped to the floor emphasises her commitment to her own project, that is, to bridge the gap and to get students to think out of the box.

All our classrooms are this way today [refers to picture again]. It was a smart solution for a classroom that was not in order every morning. In a civil engineering department you cannot have such a solution – thinking out of the box? That is my main question and that is my main picture today. Is that what we teach our students? (Photovoice 2013).

By foregrounding the picture of the clamped desk as the central point of her photovoice story, Kira drives home the point that this is not what she wants to be teaching her students. Kira thus exercises her agency to this end by restructuring her group and project work so that students come to her class for short periods, and then separate into groups to work outside class, to attend tutorials and to work on their projects, which they have a week at a time to complete. While this is a further constraint on her ability to complete the programme content, she draws on her PEPs of organisation and planning to ensure that the class has time to work together to finish the ‘syllabus’. In response to the underlying reasons for practices enacted this way in her department, Kira again foregrounds the student as central to the academic project in HE:

It could be the approach in the department . . . maybe people are not sensible [she could mean sensitive] enough to what a student needs? Are we seeing the student as the main client? I don’t see a kind of chance for communication . . . (Photovoice 2013).

Although Kira draws on a neo-liberal discourse of student as client, her intentions appear to be steered towards securing conditions for students as autonomous beings, much the same as she advocates for the development of new academics as teachers (and professional learners). There is a disjunction for Kira between what these student-centred goals are at the UoT and the enactments of these goals, which are done in often ironic and contradictory ways. Her observations and experiences are connected through her reflexive ability as agent, in addition to other PEPs that she summons in relation to her project:

Yes the lift is broken because sometimes students break them but is the solution to say that students not allowed in [the] lift? Only staff and disabled people can use it? What is ‘disabled’? I’m fat so it’s difficult for me to go up to 2nd floor with my laptop. That is why I need the lift sometimes in the morning . . . I need it in the afternoon. What is the kind of relationship that staff have with students? Are students not part of our community then? They are the main client. Why is that they cannot use the lift? Why do we need to tie up the tables? To teach them manners? (Photovoice 2013).
Kira responds to what she sees as a disjunction in communication between staff and students by asserting her PEPs in class in ways that foster collegial and mature relationships with her students through project work, independent work, and tutorial work. By resisting the ranking tradition which is a mechanism in her being discursively constructed as ‘junior’ in her department, Kira addresses the issue with the classroom facility manager, inadvertently transcending the limitations placed on her by her academic ranking as ‘junior’. She exerts her agential power by addressing the issue directly with him:

I must say I spoke to the lift person . . . I told him that I didn’t like the picture on that wall and I say I am not going to use the lift and he says you just use it because it’s right; because they break the lift and I have to struggle to get to the second floor. He is so right in what he says but also so wrong; it depends on the point of view . . . where you [are] sitting and what you want to see. How do they call it? It’s a ranking . . . it’s a ranking thing. I got the rank to make the decision ‘you don’t get into the lift’ . . . which is for everyone in the faculty (Photovoice 2013).

As Kira’s sense of agency developed, I observed a change in her confidence as social agent from the time she started on the TDP, to the first river of life session and then to the photovoice session. In terms of Archer’s morphogenetic cycles, Kira is able, over time, to sift through her constellations of concerns against the constraining conditions of her context in order to re-position her modus vivendi and insert her own sense of purpose and commitment to her teaching project. She does this by continuously reflecting on her project to discern, deliberate and re-dedicate herself (Archer 2000) to what she wants and how she goes about getting it, despite contextual influences:

I focus on my main aim at UOT– I am here to teach my students. How do I find my way? Every student is different and you have to give them different treatment. And to be able to do that, you need to say right from the beginning, how do I do that? But I find a way because I like to teach them . . . I like what I am doing (Photovoice 2013).
5.3 Narratives of mediation: Mari

This vignette focuses on Mari, whose narrative captures her story of mediation when she joins the Department of Food Technology at the UoT. Mari confronts her involuntary placement with a special intentionality and determination (PEPs) to realise her project in education and to successfully mediate the structural and cultural conditions she finds. As an agent, she calls on her own powers and properties to work out what she wants and how to go about getting it, within the enablements and constraints in the context of the institution (macro), her department (meso) and her classroom (micro), that she has to circumvent.

“I am just going to tell my story as it comes from my heart” (Photovoice 2013).

Mari’s photovoice collage is an eclectic mix of photos, but there is a focal point on ‘agriculture’ as this relates to her discipline, food science. Mari especially found the photovoice project to be a creative outlet for her as scientist, and her apt use of metaphor shows the depth of her reflexive deliberation and internal conversation, in all its nuances.
5.3.1 Conception of the project

5.3.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Mari is a food scientist and technologist who joined the UoT as a lecturer in 2007. She grew up in the Free State and studied food science at the University of the Free State.

I was not sure if that was what I was destined to study, but I grew up in a house where studying was as important as brushing your teeth (TDP reflective essay 2011).

After completing a Bachelor of Science degree, she was accepted to do a Master of Science in food science at Stellenbosch University but was still not sure if she was really meant to be a food scientist. In Archer’s terms, she was still deliberating about her ‘ultimate concerns’ in terms of her career choices and her professional identity (Archer 1995). She started work at a fruit export company, which she ‘absolutely hated’, so she resigned after three months to pursue an academic career:

Confused on the one hand but proud on the other I resumed life in academia, thinking I would still go back to the industry. Grabbing the opportunity, I upgraded to a PhD (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In the period that she undertook the doctorate, Mari taught a few small, research-based classes at the university, and attended a few national and international conferences on the strength of her doctoral studies:

I was living the academic life but determined to get out once I graduated (TDP reflective essay 2011).

With PhD in hand, and after two years as a post-doctoral fellow of the Research Microbiology Group, she applied for a lecturer position at the UoT, and with that her career as a food technology lecturer was launched. When Mari joined the UoT she did so as a primary agent, involuntarily placed in a context that predated her, which influenced the distribution of resources in that setting (Archer 2000). Mari had already established a fairly good research record as a result of her work in the research unit, she had published in a few disciplinary journals in her area of specialisation, and she had obtained a PhD. These academic credentials, being the right currency at the university, were stacked in her favour and contributed to her ‘resourcefulness’ (Archer 2000) as a primary agent and as a new lecturer, influencing her bargaining power and negotiating strength in her department, in her
faculty and institution, and among her peers, where she was beginning to develop her concept of self as a social agent (Archer 2000). To complement these resources, Mari had a twin passion, which extended her beyond the confines of the laboratory into the classroom. She loved interacting with others in a classroom environment:

> I think my whole life [primary discourse] prepared me for my secondary discourse . . . life in academia. I like to teach to empower other people (TDP reflective pieces 2011).

Her modus vivendi as lecturer, which was initially shaped by her passion for research as this had been her prior conditioning as a social agent, was further moulded by a growing need to strengthen her teaching purpose. When she joined the UoT, however, she had not received any formal training as a university teacher, so what she knew about teaching had been framed by how she had been taught herself (Khan 2009), as well as the few classes that she had facilitated as a PhD scholar. In her words, her teaching style and perspective were modelled on and a reproduction of her experience as a student at a ‘traditional university’.

> I did not want to do the same thing, you know, as my lecturers did when I was at university and I came from a traditional university, so in essence it’s a little bit different (TDP reflective pieces 2011).

Mari’s continuous sense of self as a person is prior to her sociality (Archer 2000). It is unique to her and anchors her strict self-identity, as it is unique to each individual and universal for each human being (Archer 2000). Mari’s concept of self, however, is historically and socially constructed (Archer 2000) through her involvement at the university and also her home and family, for whom studying was intrinsic to who they were. Academically, Mari had been primed for university long before she got there, in ways that many students in HE today are not, and this evolves in her quest for authenticity for her social identity (Vandenberghe 2005). However, after three years of being at the UoT, her concept of self in HE is ‘under threat’, even with her prior conditioning, as Mari is not on solid ground in the academic domain of teaching in HE, yet it is a domain that persists in shaping her life course in the institution (Archer 2000).

### 5.3.1.2 Identification of concerns

The TDP had not yet been established when Mari started at the UoT, so professional training was not available to her. As she continued through the first three years with no training or support, she discovered a huge gap in her limited pedagogic expertise as a
practitioner in the HE classroom, experiencing what Archer refers to as ‘resourcelessness’ (2000). She had a very finite repertoire (as most new lecturers do) and limited discursive access to relevant teaching styles, approaches and methods for the current classroom. The higher education classroom that she now experienced was infinitely different from the one she had ‘grown up in’. In all its diversity, linguistic variety, academic literacy abilities and differentials, and cultural influences, it was synonymous with the massification of the system and widened access in student participation, Mari was out of her depth.

Conditioned by her experiences as a laboratory researcher, her teaching approach in class had been very ‘scientific’, with little room for creative expression and personable interaction with students. The ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ disciplines identified by Biglan (1973) discursively construct the sciences as ‘hard’ and by association ‘serious’, while the educational and social sciences are ‘soft’ sciences and by implication less intense. Many theorists identify the discourse of the ‘learned professor’ in HE, a construction which is predicated on the construction of the traditional university teacher as ‘scientific, objective, driven by reason’ rather than compassion (Roed 2012; Woods 2010; Zembylas 2012). In critical realism, discourses are understood as generative mechanisms (Fairclough et al. 2004) and, in the case of Mari (who trained as a research scientist), it predisposes her to draw on this discourse to adopt a teaching approach that could be experienced as highly ‘clinical’, believing that such an approach validated and strengthened her credibility as the lead ‘investigator’ in the classroom. In critical and social realist terms, Mari exercised her agency to draw on her social and cultural conditioning, plus structures and mechanisms in the new environment in which she found herself, to effect the emergence of certain forms of teaching- and learning-related events.

Perhaps not too unexpectedly, then, given that she had little or no support from significant others in her department to navigate this challenge, Mari reached a point unusually early in her academic career where she felt that her restricted and bounded teaching practice, which had become a severely constraining influence, had reached a stalemate because she had ‘nothing new and nothing more to offer her students’.

Feeling disconnected from her purpose as a lecturer, she contacted the Academic Staff Development Unit for assistance but presented her problem as one of not being able to physically talk in class. She explained that her ‘voice had dried up’. She was advised by the unit to start using a microphone and it was strongly recommended that she join the TDP for support with teaching strategies. This she did, ‘as a last ditch attempt to salvage something
of a teaching career in HE (TDP reflective essay 2011), but with the self-inflicted proviso that if things did not change, that is, if she did not find a way to make teaching more meaningful for herself, she would ‘move out of HE and probably back into industry’.

A necessary contradiction is at play here. The academic capital for which academics like Mari are employed, namely their research experience, is not necessarily the same as the social capital (Mhlahlo and Chacha-Mhlahlo 2014) needed in HE in the current climate, where facilitating teaching and learning in a multimodal, dynamic, somewhat conflicted and challenging new higher education classroom seems to be the order of the day (Trowler and Cooper 2002; Kreber 2009b; Mathieson 2011). According to Archer (1996), when faced with this situational logic, agents at the social and socio-cultural interaction levels lean towards compromise and unification (Archer 1996), so that the imbalance or contradiction is corrected. What Mari’s structural and cultural conditioning had not prepared her for was ways to respond to the rich diversity and nuanced challenges that were now pronounced both for her as a practice gap and as a gap in ideational terms. Mari’s awareness of the discursive gap in her understanding of teaching as a social science endeavour leads to attempts by many like her to bridge the divide by soliciting alternative ways of teaching practice.

What is also noteworthy is that Mari does not sign up to do the TDP out of compulsion. She is motivated intrinsically by the need to professionalise her practice, which has more to do with accruing resources as an agent, and to build up her academic identity as a teacher, rather than by exogenous pressure (Quinn 2006) as an outcome of compliance with the UoT’s policy.

5.3.1.3 Emotional commentary on concerns

When I met Mari on the first day of the TDP, she came across as a softly-spoken lecturer with a small ‘injured’ voice. As I got to know her in the first few weeks, I started noticing that she was quickly becoming more articulate, and developing a stronger voice in terms of her presence and practice in the classroom. The problem of not being able to talk in her classroom had its roots in a deeper reality that was not obvious to her until, in the company of like-minded peers, she started to rekindle her confidence through the realisation that:

All the lecturers here struggle with something depending on their specific field and discipline . . . I can share my struggles and challenges with them so that I feel less isolated; and I can make new contacts and friends whom I could call at the university.
Mari had a vested interest in doing well at the TDP because the opportunity costs (Archer 2000) attached to her not succeeding were unfavourable, as they meant she would leave the university. She was thus emotionally attached to the outcomes of her involvement in the TDP, watching very closely and reflecting on how input from the programme was enabling her to change her practice:

The Teaching Development Programme really helped me to be a better lecturer as well as a human being. I think more creatively now, have more compassion for the students, do breathing before I go to class to calm myself down and centre myself (TDP reflective pieces 2011).

As a result of SEPs such as vested interests and opportunity costs, activated when she engaged with her concerns and project, the emergent CEPs acted as generative mechanisms to account for her being more ideationally partial to the TDP as an enablement, making her less critical of its shortcomings. While some lecturers attended the TDP out of contractual obligation, and others, compulsion, Mari was there because she had summoned her PEPs to use the TDP to turn her academic life around. She was thus positively influenced by the new teaching methods, discourses, and teaching styles, and the network of like-minded new lecturers who had a wealth of ideas to share with her about how to do things differently.

Mari’s emotional commentary on her concerns in the three orders of reality imports to her the significance of her doing well, performing effectively and being seen to be making a change in her class. Mari had responded very positively to input on the TDP, and in her reflective piece, she explained that being on the TDP had brought about a life-changing shift in her. Her HoD confirmed this in an email describing her as having

. . . metamorphosed into a beautiful butterfly as an HE teacher (private correspondence with HoD).

This normative and social evaluation of her performative competence (Archer 2000) contributes to what defines Mari as a social agent and lecturer, and what gives her the emotional wherewithal to pursue and realise her project in higher education.
5.3.1.4 Adoption of a project

Mari joined the TDP as a slightly more 'experienced' teaching fellow than her peers (some of whom had literally stepped off the airplane into the TDP forum, which begins in the February of every academic year) but she still had no formal training.

As Archer (2000) notes, the bilateral relations between subjects and their objective circumstances instate agents as active beings, creatively making their way through their worlds. For any agent, the interplay between one’s concerns as reflexively defined by them, and their contexts as they reflexively respond to them, is a dialectical one (Ibid.). Mari thus joined the TDP in the hope that she could re-ignite her passion for teaching by 'picking up some tips and techniques' (TDP reflective essay 2011) to do things differently, but, while the TDP is primarily designed to provide new lecturers with basic tools for teaching, it is not atheoretical. With a mild introduction to educational theory, the TDP provides some framing for understanding teaching learning and assessment (Biggs 1999; Krathwohl 2002) and other constructive models, albeit more simplistically than critically. The balance between practical tips and theory is managed through an experiential focus on participants’ classes, which is assessed through a reflective portfolio on experiences during the programme.

While the TDP acted as a structural enablement for developing Mari’s teaching framework, it more pertinently provided her with the shared communal and cultural space that served as a temporary but adequate substitute for a lack of similar support from her department:

Talking [about] and sharing your struggles with others opens up solutions you might not have thought about before (TDP reflective pieces 2011).

This differential make-up of agents as new lecturers is a particular positive feature of the TDP, which draws new academics in from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds to learn in a group or community to enrich the exchange of experiences, ideas, suggestions, thoughts and comments from a mixed disciplinary pool (Rowland 2002). New lecturers are also exposed to alternative and emergent discourses, and are invited to share their responses on contemporary challenges, arrived at via internal conversation or inner dialogue, which is made external (Archer 2003) in the stories that they share with each other.

For lecturers like Mari, whose identity as a teacher is not as highly regarded or recognised as her research and disciplinary expertise, the TDP community provided her with a space in
which to develop a ‘teacherly identity’. She relies on this community to help her make sense of the many concerns she has which need clarification in relation to her objective circumstances, especially in relation to her predominant dissatisfaction with her current practice. As a ‘strong evaluator’ (Archer 2000), though, she is able, through her personal emergent properties of intentionality, motivation and determination, to be a better teacher and to ‘save her teaching career’; define her concerns and cares as an educator; and, more importantly, give shape to her modus vivendi as a lecturer (Archer 1995).

As discussed in Chapter Two, agents identify their concerns through reflexive deliberation by engaging in three key processes: discernment, deliberation and dedication (Archer 2000). Through these phases, Mari engaged in a process of ‘reflective, retrospective and prospective considerations’ (Emirbayer and Mische 1998) about the desiderata to which she was drawn, through an inner dialogue that compares and contrasts them (Archer 2000). In the process, Mari identified ‘teaching development’ itself as an initial project to re-ignite her interest in teaching and learning. Her other concerns, such as her research interests and identity, not worthy of immediate attention and action, were eliminated through negative de-selection (Archer 2000), so that Mari was left with only the concerns that mattered to her the most. She identified the goal of her project as the improvement of her expertise as an HE practitioner in the classroom for the benefit of her students (TDP reflective essay). This was very inspiring for me as convenor of the TDP to see, as Mari did not draw on the discourse of ‘myopia’ to exercise her agency. In contrast, many of her peers through no fault of their own were so concerned with their own survival in the first few years that they could not apply themselves to more expansive social goals in HE. Mari was able to consider the social inclusion of her students as part of her personal challenges; in doing so she commits herself, consciously or not, to the broader transformation commitments in HE students from diverse backgrounds.

5.3.1.5 Personal emergent properties

How individual people respond in the interplay between contexts and concerns is a matter of differential makeup of agents and their PEPs in respect of the projects that they choose to pursue (Archer 2000). The merger of the two former technikons to form the university of technology (see Chapter Four) introduces an interesting institutional configuration at the UoT between its internally-related components which place its holders in a situational logic of opportunism (Archer 1996). While the structural components are in place and have a very well-defined goal and purpose, there is a variety at the socio-cultural level as to how these goals are interpreted. While professional development programmes go a long way to provide
a basis for such interpretation, there are many ideas and options ‘up for grabs’ in the cultural conspectus as to what it means for this UoT to take on the ideational and propositional systemic features of a university; what teaching and learning, research and community engagement mean; what actual autonomy exists at decision-making levels; etc. For the new lecturers in this study, the new merged university is still in the process of establishing its ‘strict academic identity’, one that is open to specialisation and differentiation at a systemic level but which stimulates agents into interaction, promoting either sectionalism or diversification at the socio-cultural level (Archer 2000).

For Mari and others similarly positioned, the logic of opportunism means that she can look at new ideas and prospects that she is introduced to via the TDP and other institutional structures, and enact the ones she would like to invest in to increase her own material and ideational benefits and to give further shape to her concerns and projects. She is aware of the need to ‘specialise’ at an ideational level and this in itself opened her up to further enablements to realise her project in education.

She was soon the only person in her disciplinary department who could straddle two areas of specialisation, namely food technology and educational development (science and social sciences, respectively). This endows her with accrued benefits as an agent as she is more ‘knowledgeable’ than her peers and colleagues in her department in the area of how food technology could be taught differently and effectively to address the learning challenges of diverse students. This is something that many of her colleagues, having been employed much earlier than Mari, were still struggling to address in their own unique ways and by their own description, without much support.

We can see that Mari’s PEPs of determination, perseverance, intentionality and ambition to succeed, activated when she engages with her project, place her in a well-resourced frame for the pursuit and realisation of her project in education (Archer 2000). Contrary to the popular discourse that constructs the new academic as ‘novice’ or ‘between a rock and a hard place’, Mari is very focused on her project and is able to marshal her PEPs well, as a result of her being very clear about her aims: to organise, articulate and optimise them, keeps her committed to their realisation.

5.3.2. Pursuit of the project

New lecturers entering the UoT are always confronted with an institutional structural and cultural context that predates them. This is a necessary condition for the involuntary
placement of agents (Archer 2000). The contexts that Mari confronts on entering the UoT as an institution, food technology as a department, and her classroom, each present specific logical relations (Archer 1996) that she encounters and must mediate as an agent. As an ‘early adopter’ or ‘quick starter’, Mari is able to identify enablements that she uses strategically to advance her project. As these enablements are more prominent for Mari, ‘advancement of project’ will be discussed first, before ‘impingement on project’.

5.3.2.1 Advancement of the project

5.3.2.1.1 Institutional level

In her reflective essay for the TDP portfolio, Mari is very explicit about how much the TDP extended her teaching practice and critical reflection skills. Similar to many other staff development programmes in higher education, and based on the ‘reflective practitioner’ seminal work of Schön (1983), critical reflection is a key component of the TDP for strengthening academics’ ability to reflect on their practice (Barnett 2004; Brookfield 1995; Ramsden 2003):

> I have enjoyed every moment so far, although it was not always easy and definitely out of your comfort zone . . . the TDP really changed my attitude to positive, making me more in tune with students’ needs and you know, just being a good lecturer, just not doing the same thing . . . (TDP reflective essay 2011).

She incorporates many of the teaching strategies discussed on the programme to complement her newly found range of teaching options such as the use of case studies, video clips, animated diagrams, animated graphs, and clickers in her lecture material and teaching slides. She also has experimented with group work by assigning tasks, which students had to present to the class, using a group presentation method.

> We call assignments, *tirogae*, which is the Sotho word for homework. After each *tirogae*, which they either had to prepare before class or during class, when I provided reading material, one of the group members had to present. With my feedback I could see improvement in the way the students answer and present their *tirogae*. I felt proud and I could see the difference I was making . . . but still I had that first assessment in the back of my mind (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Although Mari has a vested interest in innovating her teaching through technology, and in being more current in her department and for her students, she is able to critically reflect that
her initial attempts to use Facebook and Twitter to integrate technology into teaching did not work too well. This reflexive ability shows her discernment and deliberation as emergent PEPs shape her other strengths as a reflexive agent. Apart from the language of technology, the TDP provided Mari with an educational language and discourse to make sense of her practices in the classroom. She was discovering a whole new language with which to understand her specialisation, food technology. Her previous conditioning as research practitioner had served to minimise her interaction with the subject in educational development terms. She was now trying to be a Discourse member (Gee 1990) in an effort to understand the domain of science as a literacy practice (Jacobs 2006):

The presentation that was given to us by Professor Cecilia Jacobs really struck me in more than one way. For me, academic literacy was usually linked to a written piece of work, but she made it clear that various discourses use various types of learning materials/styles. I learned that a technical drawing or mathematical equations are all academic literacy. It all depends on your discourse (TDP reflective essay 2011).

It struck me that in her TDP portfolio especially, Mari had adopted the educational development discourse very easily, which acted as a structuring mechanism for her to shape her practices in teaching and learning; a threshold that other new science lecturers had struggled to cross and had great difficulty with, given their embeddedness in the disciplinary practices of science they had been trained in and for (Boughey 2002). Mari was intent on changing her research–teaching identity, which was shaped largely by her disciplinary context (Becher 1989; Becher and Trowler 2001; Henkel 2000,). After having been exposed to the structural (SEPs) and cultural (CEPs) properties activated via the TDP, she used her PEPs to familiarise herself with the discourse of educational development by reading extensively in the field. She was thus able to draw on relevant ideational and ideological discourses to shape a new identity for herself as a higher education educator and lecturer. Mari was able to blend these two (science and educational development) very effectively, and this places her in a strong position to influence change in her department (Henkel 2000). Here we see the generative power of discourse (Fairclough et al. 2004) at work, in enabling agency at the level of the Real.

Before the TDP, Mari had fallen back on her common sense understanding of teaching practices, repeating patterns that had worked for her in the past but knowing that these approaches were not sustainable. After her experience of the TDP, she was able to change her practice by drawing not only on better-informed methods (Structure), but also on new discourses (Culture) such as a new ontological understanding of students as independent,
autonomous beings in their own right (Barnett 2000). These influences had a direct effect on her agential choices:

Usually I would lock the door of the class to prevent latecomers. Instead I decided to treat them as grownups this year and I told them that mutual respect is very important. I was eager to see what would happen in the following class and to my surprise all of them were on time and eagerly waiting for me. What a feeling! I felt so connected to them from that first class onwards. It was a totally new experience to me, since I usually gave them the ‘I am the lecturer, you are the student and you do as I say’ speech (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Her ‘metamorphosis’ involved a cultural morphogenesis, as Mari re-imagined possibilities for her classroom. She measured her success as lecturer by the responsiveness of her class, through their assessment marks, through interactive debates in class, and by her ability to get silent students to become active respondents, as well as by how well the groups performed at their tasks. Her teaching philosophy was student centred, and teaching objectives now appeared to be very group-focused, to get students to learn as a community through one another and through interaction.

I previously never made use of group work in the class. I was always so focused on getting through the content in time that I never really worried about deep learning [sic] and the various teaching methods to reach different kinds of students. Previously I would have gone through these sections so fast that the poor students could not always grasp the gist of the lecture. Now the action verbs from Bloom’s taxonomy helped me to prepare the students on possible questions in the assessment as well. I could now give them examples in class to make sure that they understand what was expected from them. I realised that students know more than we think (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Although Mari’s understanding of ‘deep approaches to learning’ is erroneously conflated with deep learning (and perhaps ‘deep students’, as cautioned by Haggis (2003)), her understanding offers a glimpse into her significant attempt to exercise agency with regard to her concerns by activating appropriate discursive mechanisms, namely ‘student-centred learning’ and ‘student-focused activities’. By increasing the levels of stimulation and participation among students, she is able to navigate around her own limitations, which previously involved relating to them in a sterile and clinical manner, based on her disciplinary orientations to teaching and to educational development (Clegg 2009).

With students active and contributing in her class, she increases her focus on her concerns
and commitments, which she is now ready to shape into a project in education.

I realised that food technology as a field of study is so wide and that many types of academic literacy and learning materials should be used to encourage deep learning [sic] in students. Different students learn in different ways. They all come from various backgrounds and their primary discourses did not necessarily prepare them for their secondary discourse, such as university. It was during this TDP class that I realised that my primary discourse definitely led me to . . . to teach other people. I made peace with myself . . . . What a revelation! (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In relating to students from a wide range of linguistic and academic abilities, the new HE teacher is called upon to be far more than a mere disseminator of content and knowledge (Barnett 2000; Dall'Alba and Barnacle 2007; Maton 2001). Given the increasing role of state and market (Cranfield and Taylor 2008) as well as the complexities and contested nature of contemporary higher education (Mathieson 2011), a re-focusing of efforts on students and their needs as learners and knowers (Maton 2001) is crucial to developing an HE practice that does more than churn out graduates for the economy (see Chapter Four). In her TDP reflective piece, Mari demonstrated her awareness of this need for an ‘ontological turn’ (Barnett 2000; Dall'Alba and Barnacle 2007), not just for students but for lecturers themselves to instate them as vital evaluators of approaches to teaching that are more suited to address students’ specific realities. She identifies the following as her personal development challenges in this regard:

. . . to be more creative; be more free and ‘me’ in class; show my human side; relate better to my students; not feel intimidated and be less intimidating (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Curriculum Officer (CO) Forum as enabler
At the end of the TDP in 2011, new academics were ‘released’ to the ‘care’ of their departments, except that in many cases there was very little care available, with a dearth of persons with the necessary educational development expertise to be able to ‘advise’ them on aspects of teaching and learning. Many new lecturers who experienced the TDP as a structural and cultural enablement were left bereft when the programme ended, as they had lost an important support structure for their transition into departments and classrooms.

. . . after TDP you’re hanging. Who do I call? Who is my community of practice? There’s no one here. I try so many things but there is no one to talk to. So I felt this void after
TDP and you know you are standing there and you don’t know who to call; to learn more and what now; you’re hanging, where do you go; what do you do? (River of Life 2013).

For Mari, the post-TDP phase was a ‘let-down’ and a significant constraint on the development of her newly acquired skills. She exercised her agency by nominating herself as her departmental representative on the institutional Curriculum Officer Forum (see Chapter Four), which is concerned primarily with the re-curriculation initiative at the UoT as required by the HEQSF as part of the national plan (National Planning Commission 2011), but focuses on teaching and learning as one of its pillars:

. . . I sort of appointed myself as a CO. I wanted to . . . I did this on purpose. I wanted to keep myself there TDP-wise and I thought the CO journey would keep me there, you know? Now I had the CO label, so I had to do CO stuff which I enjoyed (River of Life 2013).

The CO Forum is for more established representatives of departments to come together to tackle the challenges of re-curriculation, but this forum is also a cultural platform for lecturers to learn, grow, develop and expand their understanding of the HE system as it unfolds at the UoT. COs are nominated to these positions and serve a term of one year and, as representatives, they go back to their departments to disseminate knowledge and tasks, after which they return to the forum bearing the necessary departmental mandates.

This is significant for Mari, who no longer has the supportive link between her developing expertise in teaching and the specialised disciplinary approaches that characterise departmental practices in food technology. Disciplines vary greatly in terms of the way in which knowledge is produced, recognised, and structured, and therefore presented to students (Bernstein 2000; Quinn 2006). There is therefore a danger of presenting teaching as a generic practice, devoid of disciplinary nuances (Rowland 2002), which belies the influence and effects of the ‘ontological and epistemological underpinnings of their disciplines, especially with regard to developing students’ understandings of the concepts, beliefs, values, and theories of their disciplines (Quinn 2006: 302). This ‘weakness’ of the TDP also constrains the agency of new lecturers in bringing disciplinary perspectives to bear on academic practices. Ironically, though, the absence of the mediatory link between the TDP and disciplinary practice provides academics like Mari with scope to exercise agency despite support, in service of their projects, of their own accord and by their own description:

I mean, as a CO, you have to do teaching and learning, to promote teaching and
learning, you have to do curriculum development, you have to do research. There are so many things as a CO (River of Life 2013).

**Corporate agency as Curriculum Officer (CO)**

When Mari joins the CO Forum, it provides the necessary conditions for the emergence of her nascent identity as a corporate agent. Not only did she want to try out the new teaching and learning strategies with her students, but she had also ignited an interest in sharing these insights with her colleagues and peers in her department by introducing a similar teaching development programme (TDP) in her own department, but with a disciplinary food technology specialisation:

> I am very interested in staff development and that’s also one part of being a CO . . . and for me that’s very important; and once re-curriculation is a bit on the back burner, I am going to have to have workshops and stuff about T and L in our department (Photovoice 2013).

The Curriculum Officer (CO) Forum at the UoT is therefore a structural and cultural enablement for Mari’s morphogenesis as an agent. It is imbued with resources and discourses that benefit Mari’s project. Some of the benefits of being a CO include time off teaching (although very little), status benefits, and other attached benefits that increase her social identity and standing among those similarly placed. It is also an ideational link to what she enjoyed and missed on the TDP, namely a community of practice to talk about teaching and learning issues. For Mari, becoming a CO was crucial to the pursuit of her project and the commitment to her goals of enhancing her professional repertoire and understanding of HE teaching (D’Andrea and Gosling 2005) in service of students.

For Mari, becoming a CO heralds her re-grouping from primary agent into corporate agent by virtue of the organisation of the CO Forum as an institutional platform for the public articulation of HE objectives as well as institutional goals. In the process of assuming more responsibility in her department, Mari is herself changed through a double morphogenesis into a new status as a corporate agent working at a higher and more strategic level (Archer 2000). Her corporate agency gives her the cultural platform to discursively engage with teaching issues with like-minded individuals, under the specialised leadership of the CO convenor, to take back to the disciplinary community in her department.

Mari’s vested interest in doing well in her teaching to ensure that her academic job would continue to be meaningful enough to sustain her as educator, as researcher and in material
terms, is met by an equivalent need to prove herself as a CO. Discursively she is constructing herself as a ‘quick starter’ to secure her recently-acquired benefits, but to achieve this Mari has to diversify her uptake of structural enablements by acquiring other resources to grow her expertise, like short courses, online modules and teaching workshops. She also needs the buy-in and support from her colleagues in her department to advance her own goals and to be successful. To do this she draws on the discourse of ‘playing the game’. As a new lecturer, Mari needs to be seen to be playing the game, but Mari, without much effort, is playing it extremely well. The opportunity cost attached to pursuing her project is that, as she acquires more resources (Archer 2000), she differentiates herself from other primary agents in that grouping (sectionalism) by possibly and unwittingly exposing their limitations as primary agents in comparison with her.

New PEPs are activated as she engages in her new role as CO, which, according to Archer (2000), establishes congruence and incongruence that further condition the possibility of alliances between Mari and other agents. In this way her PEPs are under the influence (but not determination) of the conditioning of her strategic interaction as a CA. Where once she had summoned her personal powers such as intentionality and motivation solely for the pursuit and realisation of her project, now she draws on her ability to strategise in a team and make decisions that have a bearing on more people than herself and her students.

These emergent PEPs are distinguished from those of the primary agents in her department and the TDP, whom she had identified with initially but had outgrown as she strengthened her resources as an agent to better articulate her needs. She now exerts a conditioning influence on primary agents in her department, increasing her bargaining power and negotiating strength as a well-resourced departmental member by being an established researcher with a specialisation as a food technologist, a TDP participant and a CO. By exercising her agency in ways that are beneficial not just for herself but her department as well, she is in a position to be the ‘go to’ person for all matters relating to recurruculation, and teaching and learning. This also means that she accrues certain latitudes and benefits as the ‘trade off’. Apart from being the ‘go to’ person, Mari also knows whom to ‘go to’, using these channels in service of her project:

I think I have identified a few people now that I can call and ask for help . . . they are there . . . you must just ask and that’s something I learnt in a hard way I suppose. I think to not ask . . . I am not an egotistical type person . . . I don’t know why . . . but I have learnt to just ask (River of Life 2013).
5.3.2.1.2 Departmental constraints

Mari enjoys a professional, collegial and amiable relationship with her HoD, whom she sees as a huge support and enablement for her project in her departmental context. As a result of this relationship, Mari enjoys a reciprocal relationship of pursuing her own goals but with a vision that benefits the department as a whole:

The relationship with the HoD from TDP time onwards really became very good. We clicked, we could talk about stuff I was open to, more two-way conversations with her, you know, lots of stuff that happens in the department was shared, maybe also because I was now a senior lecturer, I don’t know, but all of these things started to happen and it’s nice; I think personally we have a very open relationship and it’s nice to have (River of Life 2013).

Mari is in a position to use her resources and bargaining power as an agent to justify the courses she wants to attend, such as teaching and learning workshops, conferences and so on. Here we see that relationships between agents, in this case between corporate agent (Mari) and social actor (HoD), derive from PEPs related to professional purpose that work through human agency to shape and influence social identity (Archer 2000). New lecturers especially need academic leadership to enable them to balance the different educator roles in complementary rather than contradictory ways (Quinn 2006).

Mari and her HoD are resource holders of different yet similar vested and promotive interest groups. At all times every vested interest group will have a place on the hierarchical distribution, and the general position of a group is made up of its ‘placing on the hierarchies of wealth, sanctions and expertise’ (Archer 2000). HoDs as social actors in the university’s structural arrangement tend to promote unification in terms of how ideas are taken up by department members, and they try to contain any kind of dissent. Mari as a well-resourced corporate agent is in strategic position to assist both the department and HoD with these tasks. For Mari, the pluralism available in these different resources is the source of her raw bargaining power. This stems from necessary complementarities that exist between corporate agent and social actor in the structural system in this context.

In my life she (her HoD) is an enabler and she is a driver . . . very focused and I have learnt a LOT from her and she is very much for teaching and learning and she enables a lot of stuff that I want to do and need to do as CO (Curriculum Officer). She encourages it so in my life it makes a huge difference (Photovoice 2013).
The effect of (first order) bargaining power identifies who can bring numbers and kinds of resources to bear on projects (Archer 2000). Both resource holders here (HoD and Mari) improve their bargaining positions by virtue of the interaction of their roles, that is, as complementary role players in this context, in the struggle to promote vested interests when confronted by (second order) constraints or enablements arising from SEPs and CEPs in food technology (Ibid.). Mari’s strategic action derives from these relations between structural relations of congruence between HoD and senior lecturer on the one hand, and ideational congruence between disciplinary practices and improving teaching and learning activities in the department on the other. In this discursive terrain, the HoD is reliant on Mari as a social agent to share with colleagues what she has gleaned and gained from participating in forums such as the TDP and the CO Forum.

One enabler is the CO Forum . . . I decided for myself that I wanted to get involved and my HoD was too glad that someone wanted to do the job (River of Life 2013).

According to Archer (2000), negotiating strength arises in exchange situations. High access to resources such as her HoD and the CO Forum means Mari can use them to advance her interest and projects, allowing her to participate in the process of change for herself and her department. Both increased bargaining power and negotiating strength give Mari further directional guidance in terms of which actions to further develop in service of her projects and commitments. She personifies her role in a unique way by bringing to it ‘something other than the normative stuff out of which roles are made’ (Archer 1995: 77). This also means that her status and ability as a corporate agent to organise and mobilise resources effectively for her purposes potentially signals that she is developing capacity to soon occupy the role of social actor at the institution.

**Human resources**

In terms of the structural arrangement at the UoT, the lines of management and academic hierarchy define the roles and positions available to social actors, which are influenced by the extant role array (Archer 2000). Promotion to a senior lectureship is a further extension of Mari’s resources and benefits; this transfers significant value to Mari among her colleagues and peers and improves her standing among other primary agents. Being a senior lecturer imbues Mari with higher academic status by virtue of having achieved well in the three pillars, namely teaching and learning, research, and community engagement. Discursively constructed, in her words, this is the cornerstone of what it means to be a ‘good’ academic and teacher. The emotional commentary in the three orders of reality means that the normative evaluation of Mari in the social domain is positive, where her worth is
recognised and rewarded. In the practical order, this converts to positive performative competence, which transvalues into Mari’s disposition and success as social agent.

‘Apart from how others see us, our own personal judgement on the positioning of the ‘Me’ affects how the self is understood in terms of the ‘You’ that the ‘I’ is becoming’ (Archer 2000: 299). In Mari’s case, this translates into the additional acquisition of new resources as an agent such as remuneration, representation and repute:

Then I was also appointed senior lecturer and TDP really helped with that. Because research-wise it was okay, teaching and learning, now I was excellent as well (River of Life 2013).

Even though Mari was still in the process of developing her practices as a new lecturer and university teacher, her senior lectureship award offers insight into the university’s regard for teaching and learning. There appears to be a growing recognition (as a result of structural morphogenesis in the field) that teaching effort does count, even though not enough effort has been made to recognise that teaching effort alone is insufficient to break the cultural morphostasis around effective holistic practices for student success (Boughey 2010). If teaching is seen as a mere ancillary service to more important foci such as research (Kreber 2009a), it becomes more difficult for more new lecturers as primary agents to ‘climb the ladder’, as it were, as Mari did, to exercise their agency at more strategic levels. More plausible and useful would be a recognition of the wealth and accumulation of a range of resources that agents accrue, mainly in their early years, in the quest to improve their practice, of which teaching is a part.

**Physical resources**

Mari is very proud of the state-of-the-art laboratories and equipment at the food technology plant in her department. These are structural and physical enablements for her own work and project, as well as for the department. The association with ‘world class’ and ‘responsibility to students’ shows Mari’s deep interest in improving the quality of learning of those in her care. In addition to the academic resources that she has accumulated, the acquisition of the plant by her department is also symbolic of the support and quality of work and commitment of her department.

This picture is of our plant . . . it’s world class and the only one in the southern hemisphere related to food tech. It’s a huge responsibility in a way . . . in one way it makes me nervous because we have a huge responsibility to our food industry, to make
use of this and teach students in the best way possible. Here we can do lots of WIL – work-integrated learning – with regard to project-based learning . . . you know, research-based type of projects so we are very fortunate to have this and to me that's a good thing about my department's work (Photovoice 2013).

Her awareness of the importance of WIL (see Chapter Four), especially at an institution such as a UoT, shows her understanding of the strong connection between theory and practice, where the latter is always enacted from a theoretical base (Gamble 2006; Wheelahan 2007). This is crucial to how lecturers induct students into the discipline (Rowland 2002). In the above quotation, we see how Mari is able to link the key components of her work as food technologist educator in the context of the UoT, showing her depth of awareness and commitment to her overall project.

5.3.2.1.3 Classroom constraints

Mari makes a distinction between students based not only on the differential commitment, understanding and involvement in their studies, and on their full-time or part-time status, but also on their industry experience. This is a slight constraint on her ability to implement new teaching strategies in class that may be outside the genre of traditional teaching in the sciences (Rowland 2002):

I use many different teaching methods . . . . Blackboard for discussions, and Respondus for multiple questions, YouTube videos, clips, diagrams, graphs, tables . . . to stimulate the more visual learner in the class. I make use of group work a lot in class. I give them an assignment and they have to present in class. I try various ways to stimulate the students – let them talk in groups in their own language. You as a teacher need to adapt to groups every year (TDP reflective piece 2011).

Mari’s new teaching style and practice challenges ‘traditional’ students who are used to passively receiving information in what Freire (1990) called ‘the banking concept’ in education. Mari’s students resort to disruptive behaviours to register their discontent:

I have to deal with ‘talkers’ in the class and let them understand that they chose to do the BTech. They have a responsibility towards themselves and their classmates (TDP reflective essay 2011).

We can see that pedagogic practices that were used historically to disempower active learning and deep approaches among students are generative mechanisms here in how
students themselves construct learning and their roles as learners. Through traditional practices that have become normalised as the convention, students interiorise their passivity (Bozalek 2011), and judge more innovative teaching methods (and possibly their lecturers too) as superfluous to their conception of ‘real learning’.

In my BTech class I have part-time and full-time students. Some part-time students have worked in the industry a long time so do not attend class at all, while others do if they can. Certain part-time students can be challenging: they think ‘playing games’ in class is a waste of time. I have to make sure that they do not negatively affect the other students (Photovoice 2013).

In trying to be inclusive to the diverse students in her class, Mari finds a way to link the content of her subject to the socio-cultural backgrounds and realities of her students. This socially inclusive way of teaching in HE is much needed, so that students who feel marginalised by the dominant cultural ethos of the university are gently brought into the fold:

Multicultural learning . . . we learn from each other by using the types of food in various cultures and traditions to try to link that to various food-related issues in food technology (River of Life 2013).

Mari takes advantage of the many opportunities at the UoT to further pursue and realise her project and, arming herself with new and innovative teaching methodologies in HE, often very new to her as well, she continues to accrue benefits which add to her specialisation. She turns to technology-enhanced teaching as a way to further differentiate and substantiate her teaching resources as a food technologist, using ICT in education.

I have had the amazing opportunity to join the Google summit, the first one in Africa, at Parklands College. It was amazing; we learnt so much about ICTs and how to use Google and Google apps and the things you could do with teaching and learning. There were so many people there, over 300 over 2 days, and this just opened my eyes. I have in the meantime established that I love teaching and learning, but what aspect, because I have had so many short courses and stuff that I have attended in the last few months that I have made up my mind that I enjoy the ICTS in teaching and learning and I would like to empower myself with these technologies to use them in classroom as well as in staff development. So I think slowly but surely I think that’s where my focus is going to move to . . . (Photovoice 2013).

This is an important move for Mari, as her reflexive deliberation deepens her understanding
and design of her project in education. Where once she had focused on becoming a better HE practitioner for her students through ‘skilling up’ in terms of teaching and learning practices, Mari is now able to articulate specific foci for the general HE project. This demonstrates a high degree of critical reflection and strategic action on her part as an agent. Her PEPs are agentially aligned with her mediation of the structural and cultural configuration at the UoT as she experiences it. She is also able to articulate her interest in ICT in a way that links it to students and to the creation of more conducive learning environments for them. This shows her appreciation at a broader level of concern in HE. The discourse she draws on is a compelling one for new academics as agential beings able to strategically create their own possibilities from a host of contextual influences and enablements to assist their projects and to bring them to fruition and realisation. Referring to the picture of the tractors (see Mari’s photovoice collage), which is relevant to food technology, Mari provides insight into this link:

Students in our class are like the tractors; they are all different . . . you get Massey Ferguson’s and you get John Deere’s and Landini’s and all these different kinds . . . they are all students . . . they are all learning in different ways. That’s why you have to use ICTs for all these different learning styles that students have. You as a lecturer are the only way that can drive that in teaching and learning by how you decide how you want to teach; what you want to teach and how you want to get it across. There are so many things you can do but that will mean you will have to get off your backside and drive the bike; decide where you want to go, what you want to do with teaching, er, so for me this photo speaks about different students, different learning styles, the different ways you have to drive each one of these; the different roads you have to start up, you know each of these old tractors (Photovoice 2013).

Mari shows by her analogous reference to class and equity of students and different brands of tractors that she has a deep understanding of the learning process for students differentially placed. This sophisticated use of metaphor shows her sophisticated reflexive skills and tacit understanding, in teaching and learning terms, of the huge responsibility we have as educators to cater for students’ specific needs in the classroom by the choices we make as educators concerning curriculum, teaching, assessment, and so on:

Formative feedback is very important but not always done with regard to reports written. I give verbal formative feedback on group presentations and link it to the way I would ask questions in an assessment and the way they should answer for good marks (River of Life 2013).
5.3.2.2 Impingement on the project

When Mari engages with and confronts the Curriculum Officer Forum itself, there is a necessary contradiction between her aims in joining the CO Forum (to promote her project and her interests) and what she experiences the purpose of the CO Forum to be:

It did not really [match], because curriculum development and teaching and learning are totally different in the CO space. But in some of the curriculum officer meetings, we still did teaching and learning stuff, so that was the only place I could find where I could still get something out of it with regard to teaching and learning (River of Life, 2013).

She had hoped to engage more with general teaching and learning issues, as she had done on the TDP, but found that it dealt strictly with re-curriculation matters (see discussion on HEQSF’s re-curriculation initiative as part of the national plan by DHET and CHE above), in a more specialised and technicist way. What should have been an integrated engagement with teaching and learning and curriculum development was experienced by Mari as a focused training of departmental representatives to comply with the institutional requirements for the re-curriculation of courses and programmes. Unlike their traditional university counterparts, who display greater degrees of academic freedom and relative autonomy (Boughey 2010; Boughey and McKenna 2011a), UoT academics draw on the discourse of compliance, which is part of the technikon legacy (Boughey 2010). Mari therefore experiences the forum as a slight constraint on her own project, although in broad terms she was ‘still doing the teaching and learning stuff’, compared with doing nothing at all. While her teaching and learning activities are thriving at the departmental level, Mari experiences a fair amount of frustration regarding her research endeavours in her discipline. In her photovoice story, she refers to a picture of a unorganised and decrepit fridge to express her emotional reaction to the hindrance caused by bureaucratic obstructions at the UoT in relation to support for her research:

The UoT as organisation sucks, sorry. With research, there’s just always battles that you have to fight and it seems like you can’t get there, because there’s always these hurdles that you have to get over and it’s really, really frustrating. It’s a frustration in my specific discipline. The systems are such a way that you always have to fight for everything you want to
It might very well have been the tipping point, but Mari’s river of life story documents her journey from inception at the UoT until the time of this study. This included her TDP experience and the CO experience, as well as her senior lectureship award. Up until this point Mari has mediated the contextual constraints in her favour, resulting in the vast array of benefits and resources that she accrues. However, when she is asked to respond to the question of challenges on her journey, she focuses our attention on a need for directional guidance that she faces in choosing to ‘specialise’ in either research or teaching or curriculum practice:

And then I’m in a dilemma personally in my life, I don’t know where I want to be, teaching and learning or science or curriculum development. I’m standing with a leg in each of them, not publishing anything, so I’m lost. I don’t really know at the moment where I fit? Can I fit in all three? I don’t know the answer. The question of how do I do research? . . . In science I know but in the other two I feel lost. And then how to publish? Because this is the end goal at the end of the day here. So I’m standing with my two feet in various sections and can I stand with my two feet in two or three various fields? Is it possible? Yes or no? (Problem Tree 2013).

When there is a choice between roles as the result of differentiation at SI level and diversification at S-C level, agents face the problem of how to maintain integrity by keeping personal and social identities in alignment in a way that neither detracts nor invalidates the commitment one has made to concerns and projects (Archer 2000). Archer avers that authentic alignment can never be a compromise, because compromise is a refusal to prioritise what we care about, which is definitive of who we are. In her struggle to achieve authentic alignment, Mari has to be creative about her commitments. When I met Mari for a progress check interview, she seemed to be wrestling with contextual challenges and tensions. I was fully aware that at the last session she had left with an unanswered
conundrum, which I had suggested the photovoice would help her to resolve, but at the progress checkpoint she seemed very dubious about continuing with her project.

As discussed earlier, reflexive circumvention occurs if projects are met with serious social constraints, but also with renunciation or resignation to the abandonment of such projects by agents in the social order.

I have had support but lots of challenges. Don’t you think the institution also plays a role here? One of my colleague’s contracts is not going to be renewed. She is a hard worker. She says she just does not care anymore. She will do what she needs to . . . the bare minimum. This place makes you mediocre. My thing is, do I move or do I stay? With all these institutional challenges, what do I do? I feel I must leave; study education, an MPhil, and find a way out (Progress check interview 2013).

All aspects of person and social agent have to determine how ‘they’ will be in society and what part society will play in their being:

Then this picture is about our institution [refers to pic]. I have been here for 6 years now and sometimes I have felt like that student there . . . this long dark narrow pathway, alley, a tunnel without really a light there ahead . . . sometimes you feel like that . . . sometimes you feel frustrated . . . you know the way these posters look . . . it doesn’t look good . . . you don’t know if you want to be here for the rest of your life . . . till when you are 50 years? (Photovoice 2013).

Using reflexive dialogue as an important PEP, and stimulated by the photovoice story, Mari deliberates on her situation, showing an acute awareness of the full implications of her involvement at different levels of organisational activity, as well as the price she has to pay in choosing to participate in these endeavours:

I was at the top of the Franschoek pass. I saw all these patches of land and I immediately thought about my role as senior lecturer in food tech; I am CO, I am a teacher, a lecturer, I am a researcher, I have to do BTech workshops, research methodology workshops – there’s so many things nitty gritty sometimes that takes your time away from doing the actual stuff like research and you know what I want to do now is go in depth into teaching and learning. All these nitty gritty things . . . you have all these pieces of land . . . these nitty gritty . . . that you don’t always get to the main things that are important [see Mari’s collage, Photovoice 2013].
For a new lecturer to be involved in the way Mari is, with a full range of activities in the university, is not without its challenges. In forging ahead with her project and actively seeking out ways to promote her interests, Mari has to come to terms with the costs involved in taking up a variety of opportunities (Archer 2000). The immediate cost is the constraints on her time, because it now means that she is stretching herself too thinly to do justice to all her commitments. Given similar time challenges to most new lecturers on the TDP and those in this study, the opportunity cost is also to Mari’s own teaching practice in her classroom:

So the lowlights or the negatives for me . . . because of all of this, is time to keep my lectures interesting. I’m now letting the teaching and learning slip because there’s just no time . . . Learning new skills, I started with a very nice course and then because of health problems I dropped out and it’s not nice, because I don’t like to drop out of stuff. So, so I’m also battling, you know, learning new skills and using it [sic] accordingly in my classes (River of Life 2013).

To mediate this, agents draw on other resources to counter balance the effects felt in one regard (Archer 2000). Through a re-dedication to her project by reflexive dialogue, Mari aptly observes that the very thing that she had started out trying to develop is still the same thing that needs more input, namely her teaching strategies. She has spent a lot of time building up her other resources at the expense of her teaching and her students. Although her full range of teaching methods had increased through her expansion of her professional repertoire, and she has learned a great deal from participating in the CO Forum, she does not have the time to consolidate and integrate what she has learned into her classroom practice. When she comes up against the constraint of time as a structural feature of context, she has to use her reflexivity to work out what is important, liveable and worth pursuing in light of her concerns and project in education. This is where strategic departmental management is required to ensure that young academics have the space and time to develop both their disciplinary research and their teaching expertise (Quinn 2006).

For new lecturers to take on more than the average allocation of duties and voluntary service, such as Mari’s involvement in the university, there need to be more benefits bestowed by the university in exchange so that agents can dedicate their efforts fully to their projects. With Mari’s social role and position comes added responsibility:

So I’m senior lecturer now. I just want to say with senior lecturer there’s a lot of other stuff that comes with that and much of that is admin-wise as well . . . as a CO you have to do teaching and learning, to promote teaching and learning, you have to do curriculum
In terms of interactions with students, Mari is purposive in improving her interaction with her students by developing a more grounded presence as facilitator in the classroom. Given that practice is pivotal (Archer 2000), Mari’s prior conditioning predisposes her to specific and perhaps limited ‘ways of being’ an educator. Having grown up, studied and initially taught in mainly Afrikaans-speaking environments (first-order emergents), the diversity of the integrated UoT, post merger (second-order emergents), presented her with substantial constraints on her socio-academic interaction ability in the classroom. Coupled with a strong research identity as a teacher, shaped by a scientific discipline (Becher 1989; Henkel 2000; Becher and Trowler 2001), it is understandable that Mari’s teaching gap lies in the interpersonal communication between her and her classroom of diverse students. While she uses English for teaching and learning, Afrikaans is her home language, so Mari often resorted to code switching in the TDP group when she struggled to find phrases and expressions in English to articulate her thoughts. If she did the same in her class, and engaged the Afrikaans-speaking students, it is likely that she would have appeared to other students to be ‘favouring’ a specific group of students on cultural and linguistic grounds.

5.3.3 Realisation of the project

5.3.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context

The attempted realisation of any project immediately enmeshes agents in the properties and powers of the context, both structurally and culturally (SEPs and CEPs), in relation to their own (PEPs) (Archer 2000). In Archer’s terms, these two sets of causal powers are activated, based on the nature of the project and how the agent seeks to realise the project. When these are activated, they can enable or constrain projects to varying degrees, but the actual outcome is mediated by inner deliberations about these conditioning influences:

I used this picture [referring to the red bike in collage] to show from where I was and where I’m now at . . . I am the driver. I am the driver of my own academic career and I have to make choices and as you zip with a bike as you sit in traffic on the N1, you need to choose whether you go left or right or straight or whatever and I need to make decisions . . . and you know . . . drive. So that is something . . . where I was and where I am now is a bit different . . . and from the last time I have spoken to you guys (Photovoice 2013).
This reflexive deliberation involves stocktaking of the opportunity costs attached to skilling up or building expertise, and Mari has to weigh these in light of her project:

One of my key burning issues was: I am standing with my foot [refers to pic on agriculture] in food tech (academic life) and I am standing with my foot in teaching and learning. You know both agriculture . . . what do I do? Do I farm with the one? Do I farm with the other? Can I do both? I think I sort of came to the decision or realisation that I can do both . . . but one will maybe you know oversee [sic] the other one in little way . . . I am fine with that now (Photovoice 2013).

Mari also experiences opportunity costs by virtue of her gender. On becoming a new mother, she is temporarily destabilised from her commitments and confronts new conditioning influences on her time and activities, resulting from an external change of circumstances due to the contingencies of life in an open system such as having a baby (Archer 2000).

And oh, and a big thing is I became a mommy as well . . . working at home is not so easy anymore. Updating notes is also becoming a real challenge for me (Photovoice 2013).

As a woman and caregiver to her baby, both time and gender are structural constraints on her project, bringing costs to bear on her ability to extend herself to the same depth and breadth as she had done previously. These nodal points prompt a re-opening of the internal conversation to work out if big corrections are needed, entailing increased costs, which are further reasons why not very many will undertake drastic remedial measures to their situations (Ibid.). In our inner dialogue, we re-visit our commitments, because we change as persons and so do our social identities and roles. This makes reflexivity an imperative (Archer 2012a). It is also why, according to Archer, people heed such opportunity costs that produce the well-known regularities in differential attainment of top positions, according to class, gender and ethnicity (2000). It is also the reason that ‘so few female, Asian home-workers ever find their way to university’ (Archer 2000). Whether Mari chooses to ‘resist, reject and disorientate’ (Archer 2000) through a new phase of discernment, she has to work out how she will mediate these constraints in the interest of her key project and concerns in education.

To mediate the effects of gender as a constraint, Mari attends the leadership academy, the Higher Education Resource Services (HERS-SA), which is dedicated to the advancement and leadership development of women in the higher education sector. HERS-SA provides the impetus for Mari to re-align herself with women in academia, through its advocacy of the
career and leadership development of women employed in the higher education sector, via carefully-crafted programmes:

I managed to attend the HERS academy in Cape Town. If any of you ever have the opportunity, you have to attend. You meet amazing people and it just makes you think a bit differently about your career . . . ja, if any of you ever have the opportunity, you must do that as well. Opportunity . . . it's there . . . just ask if you don't know . . . and many times the answer will be yes; about enabling yourself to do stuff for your department and your institution at the end of the day (Photovoice 2013).

This helps Mari to re-commit to her project and to advance her goals at the university at a level that transcends the boundaries of her laboratory and her classroom. She pursues her project by marshalling all of her personal and social resources to promote her goals and aims with passion and conviction. To mediate the constraints that the use of technology had initially placed on her teaching practice, Mari chose to attend the Google Summit to re-ignite her passion for technology-enhanced teaching. Soon after the summit, she started implementing videos in her classes:

I use a lot of videos in my food microbiology classes. And I have made a video of how I use YouTube videos . . . it's on YouTube. I have interviewed a few people and students about how they experienced the videos in my teaching and I got some very good responses from the students . . . so students feature quite a lot in the food technology part (Photovoice 2013).

Mari commits to her secondary projects even though her CO work, for example, is not directly linked to her project. The outlook for the re-curriculation process that her department has embarked on, as per institutional requirements, is bleak and onerous, but her commitment in this case draws not just on the logos or logical aims and outcomes of this commitment, but also on the pathos, that is, ‘for letting the passions back in to give us the shoving-power to make our commitments’ (Archer 2000: 52).

And now I’m in a position in the department where I’m leading the recurruculation workshops. We all have to recurruculate, so I do group work in workshops . . . . Then keeping staff motivated for recurruculation is also a big job, although I don't have to do it, but I try to (River of Life 2013).

Our commitments represent a new sounding board for the emotions. They both mean that we see things differently and feel them differently (Archer 2000).
This is what I want to do so I have decided stay, drive your bike and do the best you can. And there’s a lot that I can do . . . . In essence I am much more positive. I think I know where I want to go . . . I have clear goals, it might take me 5 years to get there . . . and in 5 years I might not be here . . . I don’t know but I am fine with it . . . but all I know is that you are the driver and you need to make decisions and just go for it. You know, being the first one to sing even if you can’t sing at all (Photovoice 2013).
5.4 Narratives of mediation: Mori

This vignette focuses on Mori, whose narrative captures her story of mediation when she joins the Department of Civil Engineering and Surveying at the UoT. Mori confronts her involuntary placement with a special intentionality and determination (PEPs), but faces great difficulty in realising her project in education as a result of the difficult structural and cultural conditions that she, as newcomer, finds difficult to mediate. As an agent, she calls on her own powers and properties to work out what she wants and how to go about getting it, within the enablements and constraints that she has to circumvent in the context of the institution (macro), her department (meso) and her classroom (micro), but her PEPs are not enough for the sustainability of her project in higher education.

Mori chose a ‘transport theme’ for her photovoice collage, and her pictures depict various modes of transportation such as bicycle, foot, air, bus, and road, in different settings such as urban and rural. This is an apt metaphor to show how Mori’s agency is constrained by the way that the university works, through its many ‘vehicles’ in the various contextual settings that she finds herself.
5.4.1. Conception of the project

5.4.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Mori started lecturing at the UoT in 2008 with no formal training in teaching, having moved straight from being a student in the BTech class to being a junior lecturer. She is from Lesotho, where she is known by her elders as *nkhono miss*, meaning the ‘eldest teacher’, after her grandmother, whose primary school teaching career had been ‘passed on to her’, albeit at a tertiary level. Mori had wished to follow in her grandmother’s footsteps but her family had other plans for her:

My parents, relatives and high school teachers convinced me that I had to do something else other than teaching because I scored good grades in mathematics and science subjects. So I enrolled for a Diploma in Civil Engineering at Lerotholi Polytechnic in Lesotho (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mathematics and science were regarded as scarce skills and subjects in South Africa, especially among black youth, and the promotion of these at secondary-school level was part of a Science Education and Technology (SET) drive by the then Minister of Education to increase the number of black students who qualified with these subjects. Although she studied in Lesotho, her choice of subjects in high school held her in good stead for a career in South Africa, where she was destined to be. Even though science and mathematics were her academic strengths, Mori’s concerns have always been in teaching. When she was 16, she responded to a ‘crisis’ at her church, which showed her first exercise of agency in relation to teaching and learning, given her contextual constraints.

Children were forced to attend Sunday school. The children were forced to study those quotes and repeat them in front of the communion the following Sunday (or they would be whipped). It became a monotonous routine, which children and Sunday school teachers soon lost interest in. As a result it became chaotic and noisy during the church service. The solution to that disorder was to volunteer to be a Sunday school teacher (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In volunteering and taking on the task of teaching in this informal setting, Mori confronted for the first time in this semi-formal context, the complexity of teaching faced by many others in formal educational settings. The challenges that Mori had to overcome as Sunday school teacher included organisation of liturgical material and activities, her teaching and learning philosophy, active engagement of Sunday school learners, take-home assignments,
interpretation, analysis, and so on, which she had to mediate to sustain children’s interest in
the church service.

The challenge was to convince the children that they would enjoy and learn from Sunday
school, without being forced to attend and without punishment. My first approach was to
implement different activities. We started with children’s games, and spiritual songs. I did
not use the booklets, but I asked parents to participate in teaching the children about the
Bible. We would attend the first part of the church service and listen to the Bible study
and preaching. During the second session of the church service we would go to Sunday
school and discuss what was preached during the church service. That way the children
learned to listen, interpret and analyse what was said in church. They read and
understood the religious scripts at home and voluntarily shared their knowledge during
Sunday school session. They would read and act dramatic scenes from the Bible scripts
in front of the congregation, a quality which brought confidence and identity to
themselves. I enjoyed being the leader, teacher, organiser and a sister to those children.
That part of my journey ended when I had to pursue my studies in higher education (TDP
reflective essay 2011).

As insignificant as it might have seemed to her then, Mori’s agency in those early days as a
Sunday school teacher became a prior social conditioning influence that shaped her
personal identity formation in education. Her example of the ‘Sunday school crisis’ becomes
an apt metaphor for what she was to confront in current times in HE: students uninterested
in educational content because learning is routine, passive and mundane; students’ fear of
failure and subsequent implications for employment; and students becoming disruptive as
result of learning that is not interactive or engaging. Mori’s use of teaching strategies at such
an early age shows not only her nuanced understanding of the classroom and the
facilitator’s need to respond effectively, but the ambit of her reflective skills to be able to
assess the situation so well, respond appropriately and be socially aware.

On a much larger and more complex scale, these resources were going to hold her in good
stead for her HE classroom, or so she had hoped. After obtaining her Diploma in Civil
Engineering at Lerotholi Polytechnic in Lesotho, Mori went on to complete a further National
Diploma in Civil Engineering at a South African technikon, and studied further to obtain a
BTech in Civil Engineering (Construction Management) at the UoT. She was soon employed
as a laboratory technician before being appointed as a junior lecturer at the same institution.

Mori’s academic passion was addressed when she took up employment at the UoT, where
she was able to realise her goals for teaching that drew on her strong academic skills in
science and mathematics. These concerns derive from all three orders of reality and are interlinked: in the natural order, there is the notion of living a meaningful life; in the practical order, there is sense of teaching as performative ability; and in the social order, there is the pursuit of teaching students in higher education (Archer 2000). Mori’s personal identity derives from how she prioritises these different concerns in her life, and their distinctive patterning gives her a unique personal identity (Archer 2000).

5.4.1.2 Identification of concerns

As a tutor, she started by facilitating a hydraulics laboratory practical class and tutorials for students. She was, however, encouraged by the convening lecturer/facilitator to work on her confidence because she seemed reserved. Here she received emotional commentary on her concerns in the social order, that is, in terms of her self-esteem (Archer 2000):

The lecturer encouraged students to work in small groups and I would just facilitate the tutorials. The tutoring role was not to solve problems for students but assist them to come with the solutions to their problems. I found it difficult at first because I was really reserved and students challenged my intelligence, but that built my confidence in facilitating in general, and in the subject I was facilitating (TDP reflective essay 2011).

As a laboratory technician, Mori exercised her agency by introducing a learning contract (which was not in place before) to stipulate the content of the laboratory report and what should be included. This was very helpful for students’ compilation of the report:

Before starting any practical I ensured that the students had studied and prepared the theory part of the practical with the lecturer. The students would be divided into groups of four or five members for laboratory practical. I would demonstrate the practical to them and they would do it thereafter. There were in-service training students who assisted in facilitating the practical (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mori was soon appointed as a junior lecturer to teach the following subjects: Transportation Engineering (Semester 3 and Semester 4), Geotechnical Engineering (Semester 3 and Semester 4), Computer Project (Semester 3 and Semester 4), Construction Methods (Semester 2), and Technical Drawing (Semester 1). When she became a lecturer, her social identity as agent was formalised even though she had had no formal training in HE practice. She was a primary agent, involuntarily placed in a situation not of her choosing (Archer 2000). The distribution of resources involuntarily allocated to Mori meant that she had quite a sizeable teaching load; as first-time lecturer and novice teacher, she had five different
subjects to teach, each of which needed her careful organisation and input. Heavy workloads mean that there are many hours of teaching preparation for lectures, practical classes, and laboratories, as well as marking, assessment and administration (Trowler and Cooper 2002). This is especially traumatic for new lecturers who are still finding their way (Kahn 2009).

Through a process of reflexive deliberation and inner dialogue, Mori had to decide through careful selection and de-selection what she wanted to prioritise in order to realise her concerns and develop them into a meaningful project (Archer 2000). At this stage her concerns in education were broad and wide. They ranged from getting students to be more interactive in class to her own goals for strengthening her confidence in class. Her concerns thus needed directional guidance to be shaped into a ‘liveable and doable’ project.

The formulation of a project in itself is shaped by the resources that Mori is endowed with as primary agent, as well as her involuntaristic placement (Archer 2000). She entered the UoT with limited resources (Archer 2000) and her academic and professional trajectory was a linear path from student to lecturer. As she had had no formal training as educator at the time of her appointment and relied heavily on her limited experience as a tutor to first-year students and as laboratory technician to guide her, her need to improve her performative ability as educator was paramount, in order to increase her sense of performative competence. More importantly, though, she was not exactly prepared for the new HE classroom, which was rich in its diversity of students and their academic challenges.

In moving directly from her BTech studies to teaching first-year students, Mori experienced a significant gap in her expertise and practice: she did not have any industry experience in the real world and, apart from her practical studies as an engineering student, she did not have the professional experience of working in the field. In other words, Mori was aware that her stack of resources was low, limited and inaccessible to her as yet. Resources are considered ‘inaccessible’ according to the degree to which socially significant parties do not possess them and cannot make use of them (Archer 2000).

I worked in the lab while I was still a student so I have materials experience and there are other things that I can do with theoretical experience, other than the real experience I need. So I am not sure but I think that’s part of building my confidence I need as well in terms of industrial experience and relating that to academic experience. I think it’s very important for me to have that and relate it to what we have. And when you speak to
students you talk about what's happening outside so you need to be in touch with that (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Among the challenges that she captured in her TDP reflective essay, self-confidence emerged as a significant concern for Mori. Her normative evaluation of her abilities focuses her concerns and highlights her perceived lack of confidence, not just in her social capacity but in her performative capacity, by dint of not having industry and work experience or any teacher training. These constraints have had a significant impact on the shaping of her project, as we shall see further.

I was teaching every detail of the theory, and I used to talk for more than 45 minutes without allocating time for questions or discussions. Within two weeks of lecturing I was already exhausted. One of my colleagues advised me to teach the essential parts of the subject and to avoid spoon-feeding the students. I started attending some of my colleagues’ lectures and realised that I did not necessarily have to talk for the whole period but manage the time wisely (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mori did not feel confident about getting students to be more active or in giving students an opportunity ‘to discuss the content and relate it to what we are doing in a lecture’. Like many new lecturers, afraid of losing control of the class, she did not feel comfortable to stray too far away from the traditional model of teaching that she had been exposed to as a student herself; her past experience being the frame that she was drawing on in her present practice (Kahn 2009; Mathieson 2011).

My method of teaching stayed the same; the difference was that I was talking for a shorter period, and using the other time for tutorials, assignments and quizzes. They performed some of the quizzes on the online Blackboard facility, which I did not manage. I normally encountered students who became busy with their own things and when they were supposed to work they would call me and tell me that they did not know what to do. I used videos to explain processes involved in construction. I gave students questions related to those videos, to answer while watching the videos. Again I did not initiate group work, which would have been beneficial to students who were struggling to understand (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Besides her inability to be more relaxed with her students in her choice of activities for her classes, Mori encountered significant challenges in the way her students ‘judged’ her. Mori was appointed in the role of lecturer and as such has autonomous and causally efficacious power (Archer 1996). At the same time, the role has relative endurance, defined by social
agents who have come before her and have shaped, through their own personifying of the roles, the discursive expectation of what the ‘learned academic’ should be. In the South African context, the stereotype of the ‘learned professor’ is drawn on extensively, especially in traditional university settings, to discursively set the standard for the notion of academic expertise. In the HE dispensation in South Africa, this is a highly charged and powerful discourse, given the historical associations with privilege and lack of privilege of certain sections of the population to education. Currently, black academics at a leading research-intensive university in the Western Cape are contesting the slow transformation processes regarding the appointment of a black professoriate in HE (Mangcu 2014; Sean Muller 2014), arguing that the structural morphogenesis in the promotions race is dictated to by a cultural morphostasis in a liberal education that privileges race over expertise.

As a mechanism, then, Mori’s cultural disposition predisposes her to be judged similarly by her own students, who, drawing on the free-market discourse, feel they are entitled to ‘value-for-money teaching’ by experts that they deem suitable:

Within two weeks of continuous talking, they did not concentrate much on what I was saying which resulted in them considering my lecturers as boring. After introducing other activities, such as assignments, there was a little difference but their perception of the subject stayed . . . they judged me on my physique – specifically my height and also gender. Somehow it became a challenge because it worked against me. Most students thought I was their age, therefore mates. I attended my diploma-level classes with some of them and they wanted to take an advantage of that. I had to work hard to earn respect from them (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Race is a structural constraint, often conflated with incompetence and inexperience in the case of black academics, irrespective of the unequal cultural, social, financial and political trajectories of white and black academics respectively (Kivel 2004; Boler 1999). Mori, as a black female engineering lecturer, by virtue of her positionality, defies many of the cultural norms attached to the teaching of engineering as a discipline, historically constructed as a male-dominated space (Kotta 2012). For a new academic who had not been properly socialised into HE as a field or in terms of its challenges in facilitating a diverse class of students from varying cultural and linguistic backgrounds, the burden of proof was much greater for Mori, compared with her young white male counterparts in the same role.

Mori’s age is a mechanism and structural component that stacks the deck against her even further because, culturally, ‘youth’ is discursively associated with ignorance, lack of
experience and knowledge, especially in South Africa. When Mori was appointed as a junior lecturer, she did so as a graduate of the same department that she began to work in. When Mori started, she was as young as her students, and her relationship with her students was tricky in that she had shared the same space with them as peers and now embodied a different persona in lecturing to them, making it difficult for many of her students to take the leap of faith needed to acknowledge and respect her in her new role as lecturer.

This made it challenging for her to construct herself as an authority or disciplinary expert in ways that many of their other lecturers did and could. To cope with student indifference and lack of respect, Mori responded by adopting an authoritative stance to get them to comply and toe the line:

So I became stricter on attendance, assignments and tutorial submissions (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In the absence of support from her colleagues, or any professional development training, and drawing on the discourse of the new lecturer as ‘novice’, this was the only way she knew to mediate the negative aspects of being young, inexperienced and a novice in this context.

5.4.1.3 Emotional commentary on her concerns

When I met Mori, on the first day of the TDP, she came across as a very positive, warm and friendly individual who showed a quiet confidence in her interactions with other lecturers in the group. Her responses were always well considered and thoughtful; her youthful appearance belied her maturity and insight into some of the teaching challenges that the group faced. What struck me about Mori were her incisive questions to the TDP community. After listening carefully to input from others, she was always able to move the conversation further by her injection of quick and sharp thinking. On being asked to share her reasons for being in HE, Mori ventured that she was there because:

I am passionate about sharing information and with passing knowledge to others . . . I am able to interact with people and I am passionate about teaching (TDP reflective essay 2011).

She was quick to balance this with her personal goals, which were to be more confident and to believe more in herself and her teaching ability. The emotional commentary on her concerns carries the importance of the project to her and steers how she will muster the effort to stay committed to her goals.
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When I met Mori again at the last data session, she seemed like a different person. There was something that seemed ‘switched off’, less optimistic, and with an emotional resolve in place, hard earned and hard fought, which signalled to me the difficulty she had experienced in mediating her contextual influences (discussed further) until then. The emotional commentary Mori received on her concerns in the three orders thus contributed to her commitment to the development of her project and to the further shaping of her social identity (Archer 2000).

As a result of the commentary on her age, race, gender and physique, which pertain to a lack of wellbeing in the natural order (Archer 2000), her sense of success in her performative ability in the practical order of reality was very fragile, which in turn affected her self-worth in the social order in respect of students’ perceptions of her teaching ability. Her students’ judgement of her translated to her a sense of ‘unworthiness’ in the role. Drawing on the discourse of ‘mushfaking’ (Gee 1990) (see Chapter Four), she felt like an impostor in her job. As a primary agent, this commentary means ‘diminished self-worth and incompetence’ as a person, and the normative evaluation, which is crucial to the success of her projects and concerns, in turn affected her engagement with lecturers and students, especially in joint projects. This extended to her capacity and ability to work in a departmental team, which she found very hard to draw on for support.

### 5.4.1.4 Adoption of a project

As a primary agent, involuntarily placed, she shares with many other new lecturers similar challenges of context and positioning but, unique to her own personal identity and nascent social identity (Archer 2000), she has identified a range of specific concerns (discussed above) that she could and needed to develop into a project, towards which she would channel her efforts so that her goals are accomplished. When she confronts her resourcelessness and her decreased capital in these terms (Archer 2000), she has to marshal her efforts (PEPs) to manage her perceived limited repertoire so that she can realise her concerns. Thus, deriving from her concerns, her project in education is identified: to overcome her challenges by ‘engaging differently with different classes’ and her goal is ‘to increase cooperation between students and among different lecturers; to build collegial support among colleagues’, and, in doing so, to build her confidence to be a great educator in HE (TDP reflective essay 2011).

To do this effectively she has to first assess her resourcefulness as primary agent, and decide on how much she is vested in this project and how much she is prepared to invest to
see that it matures. She is aware that opportunity costs obtain if she decides irrationally, and that she will pay the price for making the wrong decisions. She does this through her PEP of reflexivity, through which she mediates the structural and cultural constraints and enablements that she confronts in order to tip the balance between context and concerns in her favour (Archer 2000).

5.4.1.5 Personal emergent properties (PEPs)

Mori’s vested interest in her own project activates a host of PEPs that she uses to mediate the constraints from the structural and cultural properties that come to bear on her project. Her personal powers of perseverance, intentionality and commitment are exercised when she is confronted with the obstructions to the realisation of her goals. Her inner dialogue and reflexivity are the primary media through which she works out these concerns (Archer 2000). Her identification and acknowledgement of her strengths as a lecturer indicate that Mori is cognisant of her personal powers as individual and academic. She knows also that these powers are relevant to her realising her project and imbuing it with the commitment she needs to see it through:

I am a controller, a driver, a facilitator, a friend, a mentor, and I need to take charge. I know a lot and I share a lot of knowledge . . . I need to engage differently with different classes. I am very patient and care about my students’ progress but I need them to be responsible and respect each other and work hard. Cooperation between student, different lecturers and supporting each other as colleagues can make a huge difference (Free writing 2013).

5.4.2. Pursuit of the project

In the context where Mori finds herself, she has to mediate many constraints as a primary agent. Some of these are structural, relating specifically to the activated SEPs such as roles, positioning, and resources when she engages her project, while a great deal of resistance that she meets is associated with the discourses that she knowingly or unknowingly draws on. These discourses are generative mechanisms for many of Mori’s agential choices, some of which are counter-productive and not complementary to her achieving her goals. Both structure and culture as domains in the Real are separated for analysis purposes, but we see evidence of what Archer (1995) means by their ‘inseparability in real life’ in Mori’s narrative. In her context at the UoT, there is structural penetration of culture and cultural penetration of structure; the interplay is heightened and their interconnectedness is solid. For purposes of the analysis that follows, I shall comment on each emergent SEP and CEP
separately in relation to Mori’s PEPs to show how each is causally efficacious and how they together work as generative mechanisms for many of her choices as a primary agent.

5.4.2.1 Impingement on project

5.4.2.1.1 Institutional level

In 2009, when Mori became pregnant, she experienced the structural constraints of gender, with concomitant challenges to her teaching. She had a difficult pregnancy at the beginning and struggled to get to her daily 08:30 lecture:

I wasn’t enjoying myself at all and I wanted to leave (River of Life 2013).

The maternity break had set her back in terms of her concerns and project in education, which she had up until then managed through ‘evasion and avoidance’ (Archer 1995). Mori returned to the UoT in 2010 and resorted to ‘just doing the norm’, in her words. While she might be described as a passive agent, to whom things happened (Archer 2000), Mori was a strong evaluator in her own right, and her reflexive ability as an agent meant that she was fully aware of her challenges, which were influenced by systemic features not of her making or choosing. She had identified the range of challenges to be faced but had not exerted active control on the chain of events as yet. Instead, she had allowed herself to be weighed down by the burden of under-achievement and minimum performance. The immediate effect was evident in her diminished confidence, which was the real casualty. To stay focused and committed to her goals, Mori needed to work extra hard to recover her drive, intentionality and purpose (PEPs not yet activated), as these were intrinsic to her achieving her goal and her project in education.

5.4.2.1.2 Departmental constraints

The classroom was not the only site of tension for Mori. When she joined the UoT, she was part of a group of 12 lecturers (primary agents) whose main aim was ‘to teach our students which is part of our job as lecturers’ (River of Life 2013). But she had no teacher training as such, so she ‘taught as my teacher used to teach’. Although she shared a fair level of collegiality with her colleagues, especially those who were teaching the same subject as she was, there were challenges with relationships, as colleagues also constructed Mori in deficit terms, seeing her as inexperienced and not yet skilled. Staff members surfaced their lack of confidence by drawing on the discourse of learned incompetence (see Chapter Four) where, through others’ assessment of what we can or cannot do, expectations of our performative
worth are raised or lowered accordingly:

Some colleagues actually gave me a helping hand in terms of material, what to use, where to get information . . . I got into a comfort zone and thought I was doing the right thing (River of Life 2013).

Other colleagues, some of whom were structurally more resourced agents with higher qualifications and more experience in the industry than Mori, and therefore equipped with more cultural capital, were ‘helpful’ to her but not always in an empowering way. It is common for new lecturers to ‘inherit’ courses designed by other academics (Quinn 2006), so to make any changes would need serious and experienced understanding of the course as a whole. By withholding control, one colleague, with whom she was teaching the same subject said:

I’ll give you everything, you don’t do anything, you just teach what I say you should teach and I’m the driver here. I’ll drive everything (River of Life 2013).

But the colleague did not always deliver as promised and many times Mori waited for presentations and lecture material that just did not materialise in time for her classes. It was challenging for Mori to face her classes with this level of under-preparedness, which further added to her frustrations as well as to students’ negative impressions of her. Mori felt ill-equipped to tackle this challenge head-on with her colleague because she was constrained by her ‘juniority’, lack of resources and diminished negotiating strength and bargaining power (Archer 2000). In doing ‘what she was told to do by senior colleagues in the department’, Mori continued to be a passive recipient of reproduced ways of being and doing in the university (Barnett 2000), her agency being not only severely curtailed by her own inability to advance her project and concerns, but also severely influenced by the contextual challenges that she confronted.

Staff meetings were an added constraint for Mori. Here rank and hierarchy seemed to play generative roles in influencing whether newer members of staff and junior lecturers like Mori feel that they can participate. According to Mori:

More established and senior colleagues speak with ease and are able to make comments that create a negative impression of the ability of new academics, by implying that the 3rd years are not being taught well (Progress check interview 2013).
Mori is not able to speak at meetings as she feels quite intimidated in the space, therefore she cannot refute any of these claims, even though she has specific responses to them. In her photovoice story, she refers to a bus station (see photovoice collage) to explain her anxiety and frustration at being silenced through the hierarchical organisation of management structure and the extant role distribution among agents and social actors in her department (Archer 2000):

We need to stop for others who are at higher rank – they are not willing to assist so we have to stop to maybe let them pass or do their thing. When we have meetings, for example, there’s so much negativity amongst us. You go a meeting and you come out of a meeting so depressed . . . because anything that is suggested – it depends who it comes from then it gets crushed. So there isn’t any building up in terms of that . . . there isn’t any . . . I don’t see any support for that (Photovoice 2013).

The lack of direct communication among colleagues on matters that are pertinent to quality education is a huge frustration for Mori. She has no forum where she can voice her feelings and perspectives. This is counter-productive to the need for building collegiality in her department.

There isn’t any proper structure to say we have these issues with our students in 3rd year; then how are we going to address those gaps when it comes to the 1st year curriculum? So I found that it doesn’t only affect me as a 1st year and 3rd year lecturer but it also affects our students . . . there is frustration that goes along because if I go to class I start questioning myself; am I doing the right thing if I am told they don’t know 1, 2, 3? . . . . You become de-motivated and sometimes question what you are doing, which makes you have lack of confidence, and that actually affects not only me but the students whose side I am trying to help (River of Life 2013).

New academics especially value having peer feedback on their teaching and a collaborative atmosphere, with regular teaching-related discussions among teams working on courses together, or more general teaching discussions within the department (Adams and Rytmeister 2001). This lack of directional guidance means that Mori has to resolve this on her own with limited resources and has to bear the brunt of being negatively (albeit indirectly) criticised for not doing a good enough job with first years in preparing them for third year:

We have a lot of challenges in the department and I don’t see any teamwork to overcome the challenges . . . our problems are not being solved (Photovoice 2013).
The emotional commentary is directed at her performative achievement in the practical order, which is entangled with her sense of self-worth in the social order. Both these commentaries signal to Mori that she is not achieving her aims in terms of her project and that she is ‘less than’ on many levels:

We need to stop for others who are at a higher rank – they are not willing to assist so we have to stop to maybe let them pass or do their thing (Photovoice 2013).

To circumvent her sense of voicelessness, Mori decides to send an email to colleagues to call a meeting to address the issue of communication between lecturers to clarify expectations in terms of what the course directives should be at each level of student learning, so that lecturers are clear about the cumulative learning for which they are preparing their engineering students. Mori did not send the email, as she felt that she would not be taken seriously, being too ‘junior’ or ‘low down in rank’ to call such a meeting (Progress check interview 2013).

As an agent with a vested interest in her project and a commitment to her concerns in education, Mori exercises her agency by summoning her PEPs such as motivation and perseverance to pursue the matter further. She contacted the coordinator of the programme levels to ask him to send an email appealing for better communication, but was disappointed with the lack of support from him:

Then I decided I won’t even send an email to everybody, I will just go to those with better ranking, because we rank people . . . . So I went to the head of the course and I raised that, but the way it was communicated as well, it wasn’t satisfactory to me; so that is the problem, the meeting hasn’t been called yet to address the gaps and those challenges that I have raised (Progress check interview 2013).

In another study of new academics in their departments, Adams and Rytmeister (2001) found that when one new staff member tried to convene regular meetings for people teaching a large first-year class to work collaboratively, some older members of staff were uncooperative and opposed the idea. One lecturer believed that the aging staff population in her department actually resented the enthusiasm of a new younger academic, seeming threatened by her. Whether this was the exact scenario with Mori is debatable but it was a debilitating move for her, in terms of her dwindling self-confidence and sense of self-worth as lecturer and staff member. Feeling trapped, powerless and voiceless in her personal and academic capacity as staff member, the emotional commentary she registers is a negative
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normative evaluation based on her newness and junior level (Archer 2000). Her sense of self-worth is further diminished as it is not reinforced but undermined through a negative feedback loop in her interactions with colleagues.

I would think, ‘who am I?’ This rank of lecturers with big [sic] academic experience and industrial experience and others older than me . . . I am just a new lecturer who just got into academics . . . I don’t have much industrial experience. So I feel like I am part of this department but I am just support, to lecture and go forward with everyday life (Progress check interview 2013).

Apart from collegial support, professional guidance in the form of mentoring is crucial to navigating one’s way in the academic world as a new lecturer, and is the cornerstone of the collegial support needed to develop one’s confidence and to shape one’s academic identity (Henkel 2000). Unlike in industry, where usually an apprentice model is in place to ensure that a more senior role model is assigned to mentoring incumbents, Mori’s experience in her department is devoid of this support. Post the TDP, where she had the support of facilitators and other colleagues, she has no access to being mentored as a new academic in her own department. The disciplinary context as a site of practice is the very place where, through active mentorship, new lecturers can put into practice the various aspects that they have been introduced to in a theoretical way (Trowler and Cooper 2002; Fanghanel 2007). Even the regulatory process of performance management has been technicist and minimal for Mori as she has not had the experience of sitting down and talking to her HoD to identify an academic career path, professional projects, intentions, aspirations, and so on:

I filled in the performance management forms twice; once when ECSA was coming across and again when ECSA was coming back. I never sat with anybody . . . I just filled in the form myself. In terms of personal growth . . . I feel that I am not growing (River of Life 2013).

Mori also feels that there is little support for new lecturers who are studying, or want to continue with their professional qualifications. Furthering one’s studies for a new lecturer must be borne as an additional load over and above their allotted teaching workload. However, if allocated a heavy teaching load, as in Mori’s case, there is little headspace or energy to dedicate to furthering one’s qualifications, which is a tandem concern for new academics, who feel they need to increase their professional and academic resources so that they are taken seriously at the university.
Mori had identified as one of her key performance areas (KPAs) the intention to complete an MTech in Engineering. She was told that she, as a new lecturer, had to wait for five years to qualify to study, which she did:

> When I did apply and was admitted to a master's programme, I was told that it was not relevant to what I was teaching in that year. As a result I was denied the opportunity of taking up an international opportunity to go to the Netherlands as a master's student in engineering (Photovoice 2013).

This has serious repercussions for how Mori reflexively deliberates about her project in education. For someone new to the field of HE, Mori experiences many obstacles and hindrances to her project. Apart from coming in on the ‘back foot’, she is confronted with a host of challenges that she finds extremely difficult to mediate. In the absence of proper support and guidance from her department, as well as a reciprocal relationship with her students, Mori as agent has to confront the SEPs and CEPs in her conditioning circumstances, using the few resources and powers (PEPs) that she can muster to bring to bear on her project in pursuance of her goals as new lecturer.

### 5.4.2.1.3 Classroom constraints

Mori’s engineering classroom in the merged institutional configuration of the UoT was diverse on many levels: language, race, class, culture, gender and age. This is not unusual in HE today as a result of massification and widened access. What is untenable is that new lecturers, as well as established ones, are not prepared adequately by the institution for the cultural site of tension that the HE classroom can potentially present, given its almost ‘forced’ diversity as a result of induced political changes. The historical challenges facing South African higher education as a whole did not disappear when structural changes paved the way for the new democratic constitution in 1994. Many lecturers, however, were expected to manage the transitions effortlessly and without support, and were assumed to be able to cope with the emotional labour needed to facilitate a complex space between lecturers and their students, as well as among students themselves.

Mori was used to teaching in English, which is the MOI at the UOT. She refers to the groups she taught as the ‘English groups’, meaning that they spoke English in class, but she goes on to clarify that these groups were ‘mostly her colour’, meaning that they were the same race as Mori.
Here we see the conflation of linguistic ability with racial profiling. Historically language and race were used as markers of difference for the racial divide in South Africa. It is also apparent that there is structural penetration of culture (Archer 1996). Language as a structural entity cannot be divorced from its use in the socio-cultural domain, where agents draw on it to surface, for example, their privilege, underprivilege, capital or lack thereof, when they enact it at the socio-cultural level (Ibid.). In her river of life narrative, Mori marks language groups as a challenge for her in her classroom in 2011:

... having to teach all the groups including the Afrikaans groups – the English groups and Afrikaans groups (Photovoice 2013).

Here she is signalling to a more diverse distribution of students in her class now, compared with the composition of students at the historically differentiated campuses prior to the merger. The campus where Mori taught serviced mainly black students while the campus in town serviced white students. This was the historical divide between the two former technikons. With the Afrikaans group, by which she means mainly white students who spoke Afrikaans as home language, she experiences many difficulties:

So with the Afrikaans group, firstly it was my colour that challenged them and then my physical appearance. Also the way I was conducting my lectures, because it was the same old way that my lecturer used to do it when I was still a student. As there are mainly males doing civil engineering, other black female lecturers also have same problem; it was not just a personality clash with me (Progress check interview 2013).

Conflation of race and linguistic orientation results in second-order emergents derived from the merger. Mori is meticulous in pointing out that the response was specifically from the ‘Afrikaans’ groups:

The black males were not a problem but the Afrikaner white males were disruptive and disrespectful. They looked bored and didn’t pay attention or participate. They even asked if I was qualified to teach them (Progress check interview 2013).

Again it is clear that students are drawing on discourses of privilege to measure the perceived standard or quality of their lecturer, whom they as ‘clients’ are being ‘serviced’ by. Contrary to the discourse of the teacher as ‘guru’ or authority, these students are able to voice their misgivings despite the effect on their relationship with the lecturer, who is technically senior to them. To question Mori’s qualifications is not only an indictment on the
university, but is also a slur on young black academics deemed 'not good enough' to teach, despite very impressive academic trajectories in some cases. The cultural disposition of these students reveals a certain confidence and arrogance, both of which are demeaning and humiliating to the self-worth and performative assessment of Mori, but which also transcend an understanding of the conventional role distribution between lecturer and student.

Similar cultural dispositions involving racially-motivated incidents have occurred at different HE institutions across the country. At a university in the Free State, four students made a racist video that captured the nation’s attention in 2008 (City Press 2014). A video of university employees on their knees eating food which had been urinated upon was condemned ‘in the strongest possible terms’ by the university (Mail & Guardian 2008). The video, made by male students at the Reitz Residence, added to an already tense racial situation at the university. At the same university, in another instance, the vice-chancellor was reported as saying that he would send a complaint to the South African Human Rights Commission about a newspaper advertisement looking for ‘non-affirmative action students’ in need of private accommodation near the university. More recent incidents are being investigated by a special commission set up by the vice-chancellor at a university in the Western Cape to look into two alleged incidents where a university student urinated on a black taxi driver outside a club, and a black cleaner was assaulted and verbally abused in a shopping mall (Price 2014).

While the ideals of a democratic and integrated society are being realised in certain spheres of South African society, there are gaping holes through which remnants from a national abusive past still fall. It was clear that Mori did not have her students’ confidence yet, partly because of her inexperience, but her students’ behaviour was indicative of their lack of respect for her and her role as lecturer. While the structuring mechanism may be ‘historical prejudice’ in terms of students’ expectations of the archetypical university lecturer, there is also little support offered by the university to respond to students who feel they can enter into the fray of racialised historic battles. New lecturers entering the HE system are ill-equipped to respond to such occurrences as there is no training as such, and a lack of an institutionally derived set of strategies (not policies) that may be employed. Transformation workshops at universities intended to equip lecturers for dealing with such atrocities are at best exercises in the ‘celebration of diversity’ rhetoric rather than real and meaningful strategies to heal the ‘wounded nation’ as enacted in the university classroom (Zembylas 2003).
Mori, as a young black female lecturer and as a social agent in her own right, has little academic or social capital yet with which to subvert the stock stories and stereotypes that construct her in unfavourable ways. Before she even starts her lecturing, she is constrained by students (and colleagues) questioning her credibility, which compounds her ability to circumvent other pedagogic and curriculum challenges such as course content, teaching strategies, group work, and so on. She is thus faced with an ontological and existential challenge as a lecturer: to establish herself as a worthy academic among her students or to opt out.

Mori is embroiled in a situational logic of constraining (necessary) contradictions where, on the cultural systems level, she draws on the discourse of the autonomous learner, where acquisition of a discrete set of skills is imagined to be the formula for success and is the responsibility of the student (Boughey 2011; Street 2003). This is counter to the academic practices approach (Gee 1990; Street 2003), which sees learners immersed in a learning culture through which they practise how to become proficient in their course of study. Yet on the socio-cultural level, Mori is entangled, like many others similarly placed, in a contradictory belief that it is the lecturer’s role and responsibility to ensure student success. Containment strategies are deployed by agents to reach a compromise between students’ responsibility and lecturer’s roles:

One thing that I’ve learnt is that you have to have set rules and make sure that your students are aware that you’re in charge . . . we’d have the roles at first and they would be knowing what’s working. This year I had to use a bit of a key . . . the class starts at 2 and I give them 15 minutes. After 15 minutes, nobody comes in. So that sets the rules (River of Life 2013).

Mori therefore leans on the structural crutch of her role and authority as lecturer to set the rules for classroom management. She does this as a way of controlling the behaviour of her students so that they are more responsive to and compliant with what she needs to fulfil her role as lecturer effectively. Given her already-established constraints, that is, age, gender, race, and language, using such resources and rules to mediate the situation (Archer 2000) of non-compliant students is not in Mori’s favour. While rules and resources do not exist independently, they may be separated for analytical purposes, and both are drawn on to reinforce the other (Archer 1995). But once rules are set they have a life of their own: ‘they have an actual existence; they are autonomous and they are there to be invoked and have causal influence’ (Archer 1995). The consequence is that students as agents in their own right exercise their ability to mediate what they have been dealt:
And from then they stopped coming. And after that I mentioned in class to their friends, you know what, tell your friends that I miss their faces. And then the following lecture they were there (Photovoice 2013).

What Mori is unwittingly doing is regulating students’ behaviour by instating rules that have a causal influence on what her students can and cannot do in her class. This reinforces a learning culture of compliance and obedience, contrary to the learner focus that she is striving for in her project, and counter-intuitive to what HE is striving for in shaping critical thinkers as future graduates. To deal with her classes, and in the absence of other resources to draw on, Mori continues with punitive measures to control her students' behaviour:

It looks like at the moment you are busy with something else. So according to me I’ve done that section and you’re writing a test on it next week. So, bye-bye. Then I left the class. So the following week I came with a quiz, they thought I was joking, I came with a quiz and I said it contributed to marks. And the marks were there . . . then in the following session I got their attention (Photovoice 2013).

Mori reinforces and reproduces the idea that marks are the ‘carrot’ and the ‘stick’. They can be used to modify the behaviour of students, but also strategically by lecturers to decide who gets ahead and who does not. In the absence of a social identity not yet fully formed, Mori turned to her personal identity as human being to bring to the role those human qualities that she had identified earlier on in her own personal development as important aspects to instil in students and as a lecturer. Thus, as primary agent, she imbibes her performative ability with aspects of her sense of self to give directional guidance to the course that she is charting.

As her project was so intertwined with her students’ success, Mori invariably reflected on her own success by assessing her students’ success. Mori’s understanding of student learning does not grant independence to her students and she believes that she is responsible for their success, irrespective of the myriad social and cultural factors that may be stacked against them:

I had to push them hard to participate in class, push them hard to do the research, but in the end with our formative feedback, I wasn’t happy with what I got, the results that I got, even though I thought that I put in effort (River of Life 2013).

What Mori does not realise is that, at the deep level of generative mechanisms at the level of the Real, lie the structuring mechanisms that she had observed and resisted in her church
experience in Lesotho, where children were whipped if they did not memorise the scripture. As a young and confident member of the congregation then, she stood up and stood out by exercising her agency to mediate the strict learning conventions in place at the church. She was no doubt supported by a loving family and community that promoted her efforts to change old habits and introduce innovative methods, which worked very well in that context. With resources stacked against her at the UoT, however, a very different Mori interacts with bored and disruptive students in her class. Transcendently, it might be argued that in the absence of positive resources to bolster her staying power, Mori falls back on old ways, drawing on powerful generative discourses such as ‘speak when you are spoken to’ to construct an academic identity that will help her to cope with extenuating constraints.

In terms of her performative ability as a higher education practitioner, Mori’s credibility as lecturer was compromised. This highlights the difference between role taking and role making (Archer 2000), in that Mori was unable at this early stage of her career to personify the role with the expertise it needed, and to infuse it with characteristics and qualities to put her personal stamp on it. Given the dearth of pedagogic skills, she focused on content delivery, reproducing subject-specific content in a transmission mode to get through the syllabus, ‘one chapter of the textbook at a time’. By not challenging the merits of what she was reproducing, she reinforces the idea that teaching can be done by anyone, and that it does not need specialised attention. What is also being reproduced here is the status quo and the idea that teaching can be routinised to the extent of producing the decontextualised student, taught by the decontextualised lecturer (Boughey and McKenna 2011b).

5.4.2.2 Advancement of the project

Mori joined the TDP in 2011, which she recalls as an event that changed her journey. She describes it as her most challenging year for many reasons. Mori carried her emotional constraints and academic burdens with her into the TDP, where she gained strength from the community of lecturers and their input to build her confidence and to chart her own course by not merely reproducing her involuntary distribution of resources:

I knew what I was doing after TDP. My students understood what I was saying and from there I had an enjoyable year with the third years. I realised that I have power; I came with my package and I was chosen for a reason (Problem Tree 2013).
5.4.3. Realisation of the project

5.4.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context

In light of the fact that very little goes well for Mori in the classroom and the staff room, which are two significant sites of practice for her, she turns her efforts to one area to which she feels that she can contribute significantly. She uses this avenue to mediate the contextual constraints and influences experienced in other aspects of her work. This marks the potential emergence of Mori’s corporate agency, as she is now in a position to articulate in an organised way the objectives of collective action for change. We also see a morphogenesis of agency in that she is positioned now to increase her resources as agent, and in being a resource holder, she can better bargain and negotiate advancing her ideas in dialogue with other corporate agents, in service of her project.

Through her involvement in the service-learning (SL) component of her teaching load, Mori tries to bring her PEPs to bear on a sub-project in an effort to realise her main project, and to re-commit herself to a modus vivendi in education. Service learning is a component of HE related to community needs (CHE 2006), to extend the purpose and value of HE beyond the classroom into the community, where research and resources are shared as public goods (Singh 2001; Waghid 2002). At former technikons, SL was part of a cooperative endeavour where experiential opportunity was afforded to students as a way to ‘experience’ work-based learning. In the restructuring of HE, universities took on this aspect of learning with a public service aim, hence the term ‘service learning’. Service learning is part of an umbrella pillar in HE, broadly named community engagement (CE), which each institution uniquely articulates, through its mission statement, its interpretation, its response to and prioritising of this aspect (Hlengwa 2013). CE may be attached to teaching and learning, exist as a community service, and be provided by staff and students using their disciplinary expertise (CHE 2006). By engaging with the community outside the university, service learning is a way of integrating applied professional skills and theoretical knowledge to a social problem in the interests of broader public needs (Boyer 1990). By identifying projects in the community and then working with the community to achieve their goals, students at professional institutions, such as the UoT, are exposed to real-world problems and have to come up with solutions pro bono, using human resources and technical engineering expertise (Hlengwa 2013). Mori was elected project leader for the service-learning component in her department. This was a huge incentive to Mori’s sense of confidence and concept of self:

So along my journey I was introduced to service learning and I was chosen as project leader for service learning; it was very exciting for me and I saw it as a stepping stone and part of
growth for myself to look at how we can integrate teaching and learning into the [community] (Photovoice 2013).

Mori’s understanding of SL was that she and her students would be doing something meaningful by applying engineering knowledge to a problem that the community faced, to bring about a change. This meant that lecturers, together with students, would visit the community to work on a joint project for mutual benefit. As soon as she engages with SL, Mori faces a wall of obstacles and frustration based on how SL is conceptualised by both the UoT and the community, and by the lack of organisation and purpose in the SL project:

Taking students out to the community site for project evaluation is dependent on other lecturers’ letting students off so they can attend; this is over and above lectures for the week (Progress check interview 2013).

As project leader, Mori experiences much difficulty in organising this aspect on her own. Even though she gets support from her peers, she feels she does not have specialised assistance such as ‘other expertise from senior lecturers as well’:

So the support I wanted was at the higher level because, for example, at BTech level, they have the whole year to do the project. What I need is to motivate . . . in fact I have sent several topics that can be done within SL and the response I get is ‘NO! It’s either I will come back to you, or I’ll see, or it’s a boring project’ (Photovoice 2013).

In a similar study investigating new academics bedding down in their academic departments, Adams and Rytmeister (2001) found that new lecturers, especially, need guidance in their teaching from senior academics, and the creation of a more collegial atmosphere that would support discussion of the relationship between different core units. They would also value having peer feedback on their teaching and a collaborative atmosphere, with regular teaching-related discussions among teams working on courses together, or more general teaching discussions within the department.

There seemed to be contradictory expectations from the community contingent as well. Mori’s understanding was that her students were going to help the community to do research or practical work, and provide feedback to assist the community project:

What was agreed upon was not met, because service people have their own programme. Instead of getting students involved, a presentation lecture is given, rather than hands-on practical experience. It was workshops and when we went there we said
we were going to clean the river or assist the community to clean the river but when we went there it was workshops and I didn’t find it very valuable for our students because it was a lecture room (Photovoice 2013).

Mori questions the purpose of the SL project if it is done only in a ‘tick box’ way, which, according to her, compromises the integrity of the project as well as the depth and actual meaningful engagement for students:

It will be a tick for me, I have done SL, but what have the students learnt? There is no continuity – after that they go to the next semester and they have forgotten about that project (Progress check interview 2013).

Mori feels that not enough importance is given to SL and that other lecturers do not volunteer to get involved with it because it is perceived as ‘boring’:

What they are concerned about is in-service training – going to industry for a year and coming back and not seeing that working in the community, what we are doing is within our community. I don’t think they realise the importance of communicating with the community in order to implement some things . . . . For us it is all about industry . . . we have to go and construct but where are we constructing? Everything we construct is being used by the community and the people we work with. Our project is about water engineering . . . it’s about wetlands and conservation . . . about construction of low-cost housing and they are using sand bags and other materials, so it is more related to our curriculum (Photovoice 2013).

Although the SL project has the potential to bring Mori into full corporate agency and to play to her strengths, based on her vested interest in pursuing her own concerns and project, the actual infrastructure to support the venture is not well established and offers further frustration and challenge to her concerns about integrating students’ professional applied knowledge using a service learning model (Boyer 1990).

Encouragement of community engagement should be considered and supported among lecturers so that our students can also be motivated to participate in community engagement. There should not be bits and pieces of the syllabus done without official agreement and projects should be properly discussed before implementation. Communication should be in the language that everybody understands. Theory subjects should be supported by going to site, and there should be time allocated for projects (Progress check interview 2013).
The extent to which other social groups can employ resources to exclude agents, their interests, and their issues from processes of transaction is crucial to the agent’s sense of being an effective resource holder who can make a difference and bring about change (Archer 2000). Mori’s efforts in playing a meaningful role as a bridge between students’ professional and real-world knowledge are thwarted. She is not able to fully function in this project because of the opportunity costs attached to her being involved at the expense of her lectures:

The meetings will be during my lecture period and I will be expected to attend; and I wouldn’t attend there because my core business at the moment is teaching; yet SL is part of it but I had to choose between the two. And I ended up not attending meetings in 2 years because they are done at the wrong time for me . . . even though at the beginning of each year I sent my timetable to check when we can plan meetings to suit my timetable and my time. SL expected me to be more into it and if anything comes up I should jump up, not taking into consideration the other workload that I have (Photovoice, 2013).

To obviate and mediate the constraints that impinge on what she set out to achieve, and on her own project, Mori uses the little bargaining position and negotiating strength she has, as an interest group, to seek out an alternative but similar promotive group (Archer 2000) in another department in another faculty. Seeing the SL component as an important part of her development as well as that of her students, Mori shows her strength and growth as a corporate agent when she actively articulates her need to continue her work in SL despite the frustrations experienced in her own department. She clings to this aspect of her professional identity because of the effective links it has with a meaningful educational experience for her students, but also because it is the only domain of experience thus far where she feels that she can contribute as an ‘expert’ in a substantial way to her academic community, and thus to her own modus vivendi:

I’ve joined a service group called Integrated Projects, where different projects in terms of infrastructure are being driven by the Architecture Department. I will be coming in as the Civil Engineering and Building Department specialist to bring input of quantities and of construction because it involves voluntary services to crèches and buildings and so forth. So at the moment it is in the planning stage but when we start it will be an ongoing project so we can link our students to it (Photovoice 2013).
5.4.3.2 Abandoning of the project

In presenting her photovoice story, Mori chose a ‘transport’ metaphor as a theme for her narrative. As a civil engineering lecturer teaching the course Transport Engineering, with subject focus on traffic engineering, it was an apt parallel to her own sense of constant movement to and fro between classroom and staffroom and community, trying to ‘root down’. She used photos of different modes of transport (see collage above) to depict the different cultural and structural systemic features that she is confronted with. Examples included a bus station to show the hierarchical management structure in her department, where juniors have to wait for seniors to pass, a community *spaza* shop to show development needs in the community, and so on (Photovoice 2013).

Her more poignant pictures depicted her sense of disappointment and despair at her own predicament as a new lecturer at the UoT. She used a photo of an accident, which she spoke of as her ‘emergency’, signalling her own feeling of urgency to change her situation and address her challenges. While the group listened to Mori, there was a great feeling of camaraderie among them, evident in their nods, gestures and agreement with the issues she was raising. Her most moving photo was what she called ‘the sho’t left’, explaining that in the face of the constant traffic and pressure at the UoT to continue on the difficult road already carved for her as primary agent, she had decided to take an escape route, or a ‘sho’t left’, off the beaten track and to leave the UoT. This came as huge upset for her peers, who understood fully her reasons for doing this, given her narrative, but who, like me, felt an enormous sense of despair that we could not ‘save her’:

> So all in all, at the moment . . . I am not seeing any progress in what I wanted to achieve (Photovoice 2013).

As already discussed, Mori’s stature as a lecturer was threatened by how she was discursively constructed by students as young, inexperienced, and inadequate; by her colleagues as novice; by her department as a ‘service provider’; and by the SL unit as a ‘stop gap’. These structural and cultural systemic properties are difficult to navigate, as the agent who is embedded and embroiled in the system, has to stand back, evaluate, discern, deliberate and re-dedicate herself to her purpose (Archer 2000). This is done via reflexive deliberation, but if the conditions continue to be stacked negatively and definitively, as they

---

6 A *spaza* shop is an informal convenience shop business in South Africa, usually run from home. These shops grew as a result of sprawling townships that made travel to formal shopping places more difficult or expensive.

7 ‘Sho’t left’ is derived from everyday South African taxi lingo. A commuter wanting a ride to a destination close by will say, ‘Sho’t left, driva – meaning, I want to get off around the next corner.'
seemed to be in Mori’s case, agents mediate by abandoning or renouncing their mission and their projects (Archer 2000), which she did:

And this last picture here shows that I am hiding from my students, and I am not sure if I am this one or that car there but I am within a department and the future for me I don’t think is so attractive for me here at the moment . . . and my feeling is to take probably a shot left and go to the industry and then see how I can come back. That’s all! (Photovoice 2013).
5.5 Narratives of mediation: Maree

This vignette focuses on Maree, whose narrative captures her involuntary placement in the context she confronts when she joins the Department of Interior Design at the UoT. With a special intentionality and determination (PEPs) to succeed and to make the transition into higher education as an academic, she identifies a project in education to successfully mediate the structural and cultural conditions she finds. Maree’s story is one of advancing her concerns by locating the subject in a meaningful project for students. Calling on her own powers and properties, she works out how to mediate the enablements and constraints in the context of the institution (macro), her department (meso) and her classroom (micro).

Maree chose a ‘sea theme’ for her photovoice project. She described her photos as ‘mood’ photos that depict different associations with the sea, which she uses metaphorically to represent her own challenges as she confronts the structural and cultural enablements and constraints at the UoT. The stormy sea shows her navigation through murky and troubled waters in her department: she has bobbed up and down, seeking solace and calmer waters, and often feeling like the windsock, blowing directionless in turbulent conditions.
5.5.1 Conception of the project

5.5.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Maree is a qualified architect who worked as a designer in an architectural practice near Cape Town before she joined the Faculty of Informatics and Design at the UoT in 2009. Still working three days a week at the practice, Maree accepted a part-time lecturer position, on a two-year contract. In 2010 she became a permanent staff member, lecturing to students in the Interior Design Department.

Maree grew up in Bloemfontein and studied architecture at the University of the Free State. After graduating in 2004, she decided to ‘spread my wings and see the world’ (TDP reflective essay 2011). She started working at a family-run architectural practice near Cape Town, where she designed interior spaces for upmarket houses in large estates in the Winelands:

Mostly because I was the only person in the office who was bothered if grey has a pink or a yellow undertone to it, I started getting involved with interior design: doing joinery details, specifying finishes and colours, and helping clients to choose furniture that went with the rest of their new house (TDP reflective essay 2011).

The profession of interior design is not clearly defined and projects undertaken by an interior designer vary widely. Maree soon reached a point where the daily grind at the practice became monotonous and meaningless. Drawing on the need for something more stimulating, Maree felt that she should be contributing in a more significant way to society:

Although I really enjoyed the work I was doing and adored the people I worked with, I always had a feeling that I needed more meaning and that I wanted to make a difference where it counts – not designing large houses for rich people that I did not really fancy, who could just as well have paid someone else to do the work for them (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Based on her design experience in the architectural practice and her qualifications as an architect, Maree accepted a part-time appointment at the UoT as an interior design lecturer. Interior design as a course, which relates to architecture on the one hand and industrial design on the other, aims to develop skills ‘ranging from design in building to furniture design, and could be defined as the creative problem-solving process applied to the practice solution of three-dimensional programmes, primarily within the environment of buildings’ (UoT website 2014).
I started lecturing on a part-time basis in 2009. The Interior Design Department needed a lecturer for a subject called Construction Technology, which is not my favourite, but I took the opportunity to get my foot in the door. Because I enjoyed part-time lecturing so much, but also because of the financial recession in the country, I decided to join the UoT permanently in 2011 (TDP reflective essay 2011).

As a professional course at a vocational university, the interior design course aims to prepare students to be productive and employable on graduation (CHE 2010). Apart from the development of a theoretical basis for the study through a focus on the knowledge of the performance of materials and the possibilities they offer in construction, students have to be well versed in the skills required to communicate their design intentions. The teaching focus is therefore located in the practice of design, where creativity is linked with, and runs parallel to, theory. The lecturer’s teaching challenge is to prepare students to challenge the accepted assumptions about interior design and test new ideas through their design project work, but also to be adequately prepared to present and market their design ideas (UoT website 2014).

Maree struggled initially to find her place amongst others in the department, conflicted by her own professional identity as an architect and the identity she was now being coerced into adopting:

When I arrived, maybe I was (am still) a little like this – I feel like obviously I am like this guy here in front (refers to solitary bird in her photovoice collage) because I am an architect – not an academic – and I am not an interior designer. I arrived at the UoT being something completely different and then I had to fit into firstly the academic box and then secondly the interior design box (Photovoice 2013).

As already discussed, there is a plethora of literature on identity formation in the academy and it is well understood that identities are multiple and in a constant state of flux or fluidity (Clegg 2008). Identity offers points of temporary attachment, which are fluid, dynamic, contradictory, shifting, and contingent (Hall, 1996) and academic identity should be viewed as both “individual and embedded in the communities of primary importance to them” (Henkel 2000: 251).

While her sense of self was well established over her life course to date, Maree’s concept of self in terms of professional architectural training was being significantly stretched (Archer 2003), to accommodate the new demands placed on her as an interior design lecturer but
with a nascent academic identity. Her ‘actual identity’ is at odds with her ‘articulated identity’, the former referring to the actual state of affairs and the latter presenting a state of affairs which, for one reason or another, is expected to be the case (Sfard and Prusak 2005). In a professional capacity, teachers are expected to fulfil certain functions that are framed by terms of employment, and they are contractually bound by this articulated identity, while professionally bound by the nature of the knowledge work that they engage in. Being a young graduate architect herself, and having worked for a short while in practice, Maree is strongly aligned with and embodies the values, attitudes and cultural expression of the professional architect:

Being an architect is who I am; it’s part of who I am; and it’s so much part of who I am (Photovoice story 2013).

The institution plays an important role in the development of the academic identity (Austin 2002; Becher and Trowler 2001; Henkel 2000; Neumann, Parry and Becher 2002), but the discipline is the central context within which ‘academics construct their identities, their values, the knowledge base of their work, their modes of working and their self esteem’ (Henkel 2000: 22). So merged are Maree’s sense of self and concept of self as an architect (Archer 2000) that a fellow TDP participant (from the sciences) commented:

To me I could see, ja, it seems as if there is no difference . . . what you are at home and what you are at work. Is this about who you are or what you are? (Focus group discussion 2013).

To which a fellow architect participant on the TDP replied:

Well it’s all one big blur! (Focus group discussion 2013).

In addition to the discipline, academic identities develop through various practices that are bound by professional expectations and institutional and national policy. This identity work mediates between the competing discourses they are inserted into (Mathieson 2011), and the experience of identity in practice is a way of being in the world (Wenger et al. 2002). On being questioned further about whether these merged identities were reflective of one’s passion or one’s discipline, Maree responded:

We can’t do things that are not in straight lines or something that is not visually beautiful; that’s why I cracked up a little when I had to do this; it’s like it needs to be beautiful; it
needs to be right. It is the way we were introduced into what we do now. When you start out at varsity I thought I was going to have time to drink tea with friends and so on. When you start out in practice it’s like that (for a week or so) and then it’s just that you don’t have any social life except for the people in your studio. At some stage you start doing that as your social life (Photovoice 2013).

This strong disciplinary identity proves to be a formidable site of tension for Maree as an interior design lecturer (as we shall see later) but, based on her involuntary placement in the Interior Design Department, these are also the professional resources she brings to her context. Although in tension with the distribution of resources she finds at the UoT, this is exactly what she as agent has to work out; and to mediate and decipher her modus vivendi as a lecturer. As a design graduate, she knows that interior design is shaped by many other disciplines, each with its own but varied influence. Industrial design, the visual arts, fine arts, behavioural sciences, traditional social sciences, liberal arts and psychology are examples of some of the disciplines that have had an impact on interior design thinking and evolution (Vaikla-Poldma 2003).

I think it’s quite difficult to be an interior designer because it’s something that it is sitting in between different disciplines. You have to understand the architect and architecture but you also need to be a bit of a decorator . . . with the scatter cushions and so on. And then you need to understand graphic design for corporate identities and you need to know about art and fashion . . . what is fashionable? If you do a shop interior, you can’t do something that’s not fashionable or at least you must have something that can change with fashion, or with what is in fashion at moment. So it is important because as a lecturer you are sitting in between different disciplines and you have to be a bit of everything (Photovoice 2013).

In critical realist terms, the discipline of design is a structure at the level of the Real and, in drawing on the various identity components (interplay), design leads to the emergence of a sense of confusion and being overwhelmed for Maree, at the level of the Empirical. Besides having to be ‘a bit of everything’ as academics, lecturers at the UoT face two ways (Mathieson 2011). Firstly they have an obligation to ‘serve’ their students in terms of higher education practices, but at same time they have to prepare their students for industry. Students themselves have to be able to juggle these parallel priorities, tipping the scales in favour of their professional development and employability. For many new lecturers, inducting themselves into the academic space proves difficult, as professional training is often in conflict with academic expectations. For lecturers such as Maree, with strong professional identities, where personal identity and social identity have merged, the struggle
to develop a strong concept of self (Archer 2000) as new academics and lecturers is a conditioning influence on what they choose to focus on. This means that Maree has to weigh up the opportunity costs in giving up some of her architectural identity to develop skills as a strong evaluator in her new professional life as she transitions into HE to take on the role of interior design lecturer. Both academic and professional constructions of the design lecturer at the level of the Real act as structuring discursive mechanisms for the actual balance arrived at and embodied at the level of the Empirical.

To compound her difficulty in pinning down her own professional identity, she is faced with teaching a subject like Interior Design that is still in the process of defining itself as a profession ‘in a global and local climate of hostility and insecurity as it evolves from an art towards a discipline. These insecurities are caused by debates about the nature of what exactly constitutes interior design and about what are its true historical and aesthetic roots’ (Vaikla-Poldma 2003: 15).

### 5.5.1.2 Identification of concerns

Maree has to work out from her ‘constellation of concerns’ which are the most ‘liveable and doable’ for conversion to a project in education so that she can establish her modus vivendi. Torn between her concept of self as architect and her emerging concept as HE lecturer, Maree has to use her reflexive ability to discern what her concerns are (Archer 2003) and to shift from private practice, so that she can transfer to the new academic setting. Culturally these are very different spaces but could be aligned through education, based on Maree’s passion for students and their development. Here we see the primary agent adjusting to contextual positioning and placement by calling on her PEPs of goal directedness and focus in the one area to influence the other. In broad terms, Maree had hoped to translate her knowledge and experience as a graduate and practitioner into the success of her students, ‘to inspire them so that they feel excited about what they are learning and want to learn more’ (TDP reflective essay 2011):

> Paying attention to details such as individual experience and feeling; to drive home the idea that ‘I will’, I hope that my students’ lives will be the most productive and memorable ones yet. With the support and enthusiasm of my students and the feeling of connectedness, I strongly believe I will make them unleash their potential, enjoy their studies and excel. My drive is to ensure that they learn, apply and create. The students I teach should appreciate being happy, responsible and involved in their development to contribute actively and creatively to the betterment of their lives, families and that of South Africa – to make it a better place (TDP reflective essay 2011).
Indeed her concerns are clear, yet they are varied and generalistic at this stage. Maree has not yet worked out specifically what she wants to focus on in ways that bring her dilemma into the equation: who is she as a professional educator now and who does she need to be to realise the goals and vision that she has for her students? As discussed previously, the concept of self is attached to being social, that is, an agent who takes his or her social place in society and persists in shaping its course in the world. To be able to exercise agency, the agent must conceive of and adopt a project through which he or she can activate causal powers and can choose to ‘act so rather than otherwise’ in relation to the social context, but the project has roots in one’s ultimate concerns and cares in the world (Archer 2000).

Maree started to develop this focus further through her experiences on the TDP, which is a structure at the level of the Real, where she had to reflect on her ‘locatedness’ as a designer and ‘situatedness’ as a lecturer. As a subject, there are many considerations that a student has to be able to embrace and defend such as the

... underlying values inherent in the design choices that we must make. As design students, we must learn to ask questions and navigate many points of view about design. As educators, the challenge is to provide enough reflection about these many problems, what they are, how they can be solved, and what dynamics are at play in creating designed environments. Discussions about values imply human experiences, and this is something that is difficult to comprehend as an undergraduate student” (Vaikla-Poldma 2003: 23).

In trying to get to the heart of this dilemma, Maree starts to bring her disciplinary identity and professional experience closer and in clearer alignment with her goals as a lecturer:

Well I suppose I must try to include everyone. One of the biggest issues I face in my classes would be to ‘pitch’ my class/lecture/lesson at the right level. I need to include everyone in class. What I mean is, because you can only design using what you know as your framework or background or basis (your starting point), identity plays a very big part in design (Photovoice 2013).

Maree shows a nuanced understanding of the need for interior designers who seek to integrate aesthetics, context, need and function within and around interior spaces by taking a virtual idea and convert it into a living and active space. Designers ‘use what we learn, what we know and what we have been exposed to as the basis from which to solve complex interior problems’ (Vaikla-Poldma 2003: 32), and Maree shows an understanding of the structuring ability of this discourse and its conceptualisation, at the level of the Real:
Say for instance, a student has to design a kitchen. If this student is from a middle-class background, it might be quite easy, as the student already knows how a kitchen looks/should work. If the student does not come from a home with a kitchen/or has a kitchen that is very different from what we call ‘normal/typical’ in design terms, the student will struggle and need more help. I therefore need to pitch my class to explain to the student who does not have the necessary required background, how to design a kitchen without ‘boring’ the rest of the class. What a challenge! What I found works really well too is to take students on a class outing for them to see and experience an example for themselves. Students can learn from an experience on different levels – whichever suits their needs (Free writing 2013).

Maree as a new lecturer shows great understanding of the diversity of abilities and positioning of students (as primary agents) in her class in relation to her subject. She draws on the discourse of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986) to explain how different students may be predisposed by virtue of their primary discourses (Gee 2001) to being left out or socially excluded. In a subject like Interior Design, which is predicated on taken-for-granted assumptions that students have been privy to and had access to the ‘middle-class’ concepts being taught and communicated, Maree’s need to ‘include everyone in her class’ is well founded and helps to streamline some of her concerns in education, with a view to the social inclusion of her students. In recognising the value and individuality of her students, Maree is obliged to change her teaching approach and perspective to accommodate the unique PEPs of her students in her subject. In her TDP reflective essay (2011), Maree uses the following quotation to show her appreciation of this aspect of uniqueness:

Never burden a student with ‘You could have done that differently’. And certainly not with ‘You should do it such and such a way’. This may show how good a teacher you are, but it's no help to the student. It wasn't your discovery anyway’ (Herman Hertzberger) (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In upholding the uniqueness and creativity of each design student, Maree also has to help her students mediate the ideational constraints that design is influenced by, namely, the dichotomy of function and beauty, which intersect with broad and complex issues transcending aesthetics or function alone (Vaikla- Poldma 2003). In coming together as art and science (Ibid.), design is in a special position to allow each student to let his or her voice be heard, each with its own social and cultural capital (Mhlalahlo and Chacha-Mhlahlo 2014), and for students to make their mark on the field. The Design Indaba, held nationally, which showcases how design, creativity and innovation can positively impact the world, is one such forum where students can shine.
5.5.1.3 Emotional commentary on concerns

When I met Maree on the first day of the TDP, she seemed like ‘a fish out of water’. She was struggling at many levels to make sense of her new role and felt that she did not belong in HE. Her disciplinary training had not prepared her for the challenges of higher education teaching: its diverse student body, its classroom management needs, its demands at every level of institutional organisation that needed her attention and interpretation. She was fragile, to say the least; often very emotional and in tears whenever she had to share her feelings of being misplaced, directionless, and unsupported:

It was chaotic. If I think about it . . . if I think about the start of TDP or actually most of TDP, I can remember that I felt really emotional most of the time, because it was the only time that I had to actually sit and think about anything. And it was . . . ja, it was really chaotic for me actually (Focu group discussion 2013).

It is not surprising that she chose the ‘sea’ as a theme for her photovoice project to illustrate and demonstrate her early years, when being a new lecturer was so daunting and overwhelming that much of her energy was consumed with thinking about ways to escape. Yet escape she did not, even when she faced odds that compelled her to make the choice to leave the university:

I do not believe in what I am teaching. I was ‘forced’ to teach interior decorating but my passion is in design and architecture. My students are not interested in real issues. They are mostly rich, white and privileged. They are into ‘bling’ and other superficial things (Photovoice 2013).

Maree had to learn to navigate through her challenges despite negative feedback through her own reflexive commentary:

Have I grown? NO! I have changed but I feel that I haven’t grown . . . or that growth has been mainly negative. I have had to become harder, more cold and tough to survive in this job (Progress check interview 2013).

5.5.1.4. Adoption of a project

Archer (2000) defines a project as ‘any action intentionally engaged with by a human being’. Maree’s identification of a project has its origins in her cares and concerns about professional identity and the social inclusion of her students. These are in turn born out of Maree’s sense of self (universal) and concept of self (contextual) that give her personal
identity by virtue of how she prioritises these concerns in her life course (Archer 2000; 2003). In discerning, deliberating and dedicating herself to a project, Maree is able to be an active agent, that is, she is an agent of her project. As a primary agent, Maree is an ‘entity’ in her own right, in that she has powers that are emergent, autonomous and irreducible to the human being (Archer 2000). Without the structural and cultural emergent properties that enable and constrain her project, Maree does not have to expand, circumvent or renounce anything (Archer 2003):

I was sitting in our last TDP class of the term, busy with finger painting, when it hit me like a bomb – we’re not creating a safe and uplifting environment for our students to learn; we’re breaking them down, criticising every and anything they do and then we expect them to still become great designers! (TDP reflective essay 2011).

When Maree draws on the discourse of critique, she alludes to more than the disciplinary practice of students presenting their ideas and intentions to a panel of experts, who conduct the ‘crit’. While the studio ‘crit’ is a vital part of the learning that goes on in related fields such as industrial design, urban design, landscape architecture, architecture, and visual arts such as graphic design (Webster 2006; Vowles 2000), its methodology and enactment are aspects that can lead students to feel ‘less than’ and to question their performative competence and self-worth (Webster 2006). ‘As interior designers, not only do we face false perceptions about who we are, but also about what we do. These are frustrations that must be dealt with on a daily basis by critical interior designers and those who educate them’ (Vaikla-Poldma 2003: 24). These are also the very frustrations that Maree must mediate in terms of the cultural constraints on her project, and to which she must find agential responses that help her to move forward as a new lecturer:

Design is a difficult subject to teach: it is such a wide field with so much that you have to know and understand – a way of thinking . . . a way of life. There is no right answer – only ones that answer better to the problem, to which people respond better, not only on a rational level (can it work? is it appropriate?) but subconsciously, subjectively and emotionally (is it beautiful? do I like it? does it make me happy? what is the meaning? (TDP reflective essay 2011).

5.5.1.5. Personal emergent properties (PEPs)

The moment that Maree identifies and adopts a project, her personal emergent properties are activated in relation to the structural and cultural constraints and enablements that she has to confront. She soon discovers that she spends a great deal of time questioning
everything and trying to make sense of her contextual positioning in the department:

There’s also a constant feeling of being uncomfortable . . . it’s not a comfortable situation that I am in – I understand my students and they understand me and everything is comfortable. I am questioning everything the whole time; is it supposed to be like this? How can I do it differently? How can I communicate it to them? (Photovoice 2013).

It is her questioning that allows her reflective thinking to become a reflexive process, as she constantly discerns and deliberates the focal points that she can dedicate herself to. As a reflexive and active agent, she is already mediating her concerns just by exercising her PEPs of vigilance and criticality. Maree recognises through her deliberations that her positioning as an outsider coming in from private practice offers her a bargaining power that her peers may not possess. This adds to her repertoire of resources and marshals her PEPs to serve her vested interests:

I think it . . . maybe it does add; most lecturers there also studied interior design at UOT and did their BTech there as well, and maybe worked for a year or two and came back as lecturers; so they are not questioning anything; they are teaching the same way that they were taught when they were there; so maybe it is a good thing that I am questioning everything . . . (Photovoice 2013).

It is possible that the lecturers Maree refers to are drawing on the discourse, ‘it if ain’t broke, don’t fix it’. Contrary to this discursive construction, the HE reality is that the system is indeed ‘broke’ to an extent, as reflected by the poor student success rates (Scott et al. 2007). Knowing that she has to do something different, her PEPs are activated as emergent mechanisms, working at the level of the Real to respond to the contextual constraints that she faces. These actually hold Maree in good stead for the mediation required to stay in HE and to make a success of realising her project in education:

I must do . . . think, come up with and sort out creativity and passion for what I’m doing at the moment. I think that I’m not so passionate at the moment . . . I realised that at the moment for me it’s a job, I don’t know if I’m so passionate about it, because I don’t know if I should be doing that exactly. And then I should somehow make a plan or come up with a plan, plan my future or plan whatever, so I must . . . where I should be and then I must find meaning in how I
spend my time. The problem with what I think, what I don’t like about what I’m doing is that I probably can’t see the meaning or the . . . yes, the meaning or how I can change other people’s lives or what influence can I have or how can I make life better in some way (Problem Tree Exercise 2013).

Through her PEPs of commitment and integrity to her project’s goals, namely to socially include all her students and to keep learning authentic by conscientising students into new ways of thinking, Maree works towards reconciling her disciplinary identity with her academic identity in order to enable her students to find their own voice and establish their own identity as young professionals for the workforce. Maree exercises her agency through her most important PEP, namely reflexive deliberation, which is at the level of the Real, long before she actually takes any concrete and physical action (Archer 2003) at the level of the Actual.

5.5.2. Pursuit of the project

5.5.2.1 Impingement on the project

Institutional conventions

When Maree started lecturing in the Interior Design Department at the UoT, she had no idea what it would entail. No idea, that is, about the pedagogy of her subject and discipline:

The day before my first day at the UoT, I phoned the HoD and asked him what I should teach the next day. What should I do in the class? And he said, ‘Well, in second year they need to do staircases, so do staircases with them tomorrow.’ And there was no coursework whatsoever . . . and that was how it started . . . it was quite differentiated, like one life and another life. So that’s why I’ve got two rivers (River of Life 2013).

This must be the most daunting challenge for a lecturer. To walk into a class for the first time and not know how or what needs to be done to satisfy the requirements of the job. In which other profession would a person be left to his or her own devices in this way? Not having any basis upon which to frame one’s teaching or any guidance in terms of selection of course material, new lecturers have to ‘shoot from the hip’. This lack of structure acts as a mechanism at the level of the Real in how lecturers draw on discourses constructing teaching from their own prior experience. What lecturers resort to is a ‘talk and chalk’ or a lecture presentation style where content that has not been recontextualised, is ‘delivered’ as a learning experience. The ‘raw’ material, as it were, is presented in all its jargon and dense abstracted form without any repackaging for the classroom. As a result the semantic density (Maton 2008) is high, with little or no semantic gravity, which makes it difficult for students to
find ways to make meaning, and they are left ill equipped to participate and interact in a Discourse that they are desperately trying to break into and acquire (Gee 1990).

With no assistance, new lecturers also resort to reproducing the way they were taught when they were students, irrespective of context, setting, or unique makeup of individual learners. Without the knowledge of how to frame the lecture pedagogically, that is, using a focusing event, everyday examples, and leaving time for group work or feedback, new lecturers spend most of the classroom time in monologue instead of dialogue, focusing instead on ‘swimming’ instead of ‘sinking’ as they mediate their constraints in their classroom:

And that was a little bit of a disaster, so this is a waterfall and there’s some turmoil. And it was crazy. The lecturers that used to be there, the HoD, everyone left the day that I started. So I left my . . . yes . . . my life, organised life for all of that and I wasn’t prepared for it. It was chaotic and then TDP was the only thing that sort of kept me alive at that stage and TDP is the . . . would be the trees on the outside [referring to drawing] (River of Life 2013).

Maree is cognisant that her move into HE offers her more opportunities than private practice could. She looks to extrinsic motivation as a generative mechanism for her commitment to staying in HE:

I know that there is this one light tower standing there (referring to lighthouse in her Photovoice collage) that speaks of opportunities. There is opportunity and I know there are a lot of opportunities at UoT and there is a lot I am able to do because I am now teaching, but it is as if I don’t have the support to actually get there and there’s [sic] so many other things that I have to be busy with; so many administrative things and so on; it seems that I don’t get time to get there . . . I see the white dots [referring to photo again] as sort of being an opportunity but it’s all very blurry. There are things you can do but when do you do them, which ones do you do, and which ones do you focus on? Actually, at this stage, I don’t know (Photovoice 2013).

Maree is also aware of the range of SEPs and CEPs activated and emergent in her context. She is able to identify the points of tension and conceptual conflict, yet has few resources with which she can tackle these head on. Neither does she know how to, as she is not a fully resourced agent yet, and her limited bargaining power means that in a sense she has to ‘accept her lot’ for now, however, on her own terms as she is still an active primary agent.

**Departmental Dichotomies**

As discussed earlier (see Chapter Four), disciplinary orientations to education (Trowler
range from the ‘traditionalist’ or ‘liberal’ view, which pursues ‘learning for its own sake’, to ideological orientations, such as a ‘progressive’ or ‘emancipatory’ position which focuses on personal choice, and personal growth and development of the student. In addition, a ‘social constructionist’ (Trowler 1998) or ‘critical’ (Barnett 2000) position orientates HE as a vehicle for criticality and for transforming society. Also discussed is the constitution of the cognate field of designing interior spaces, which is based on a complex weave of relationships that are built on an understanding of a complex range of factors that influence, and are influenced by, culture, need, function, use, activity, race, history, relationship, aesthetic, form, psychology, and philosophy, and the interrelationships between all of these as processes (Vaikla-Poldma 2003). Space is thus seen as personal, psychological, social or contextual, and may be thought of as structuring mechanisms at the level of the Real that define contexts as either inside, interior space or intangible space in how designers understand it (Ibid.).

Translating this understanding into disciplinary pedagogic practice requires more than the rhetorical processes (Geisler 1994) implicit in how embedded practitioners are in their disciplines. It needs constant and conscious critical evaluation of what is working, for whom, and why. This cannot be left to the intuitive judgement of new lecturers who are overwhelmed by the enormity of the pressure, workload, orientation and transition into not just a studio space, but also a higher education space, which demands highly specialised skills and understanding on the part of the educator.

When Maree joined the Interior Design Department, she was allocated a teaching load (or overload). As a new lecturer with no experience in higher education teaching and little experience, besides her own, in facilitating learning for students, Maree was given a substantial workload, not just in volume, but also in three different focal areas of increasing conceptual depth and complexity. In addition she was given the responsibility of co-ordinating the first-year and second-year programmes:

This year I am responsible for coordinating the first- and second-year programmes, as well as the following subjects: Design 1: 2 x 5 hours and 15-minute sessions per week (of which I take half); Design 2: 2 x 5 hours and 15-minute sessions per week (of which I take half); Construction 2: 1 x 5 hours and 15-minute session per week (I'm responsible for all); Presentation 2: 3 x shorter sessions of about 3 hours each (of which I take 3) (TDP reflective essay 2011).

There is little scaffolding and guidance from the HoD or other senior members, who probably
see teaching as a non-specialist activity that anyone can do. Maree has to try to gather sufficient information on what needs to be done in order to be able to make some strategic choices in relation to how she would go about teaching the content to her students. With most of her time caught up in planning and preparing for these lectures, she has little time to acclimatise to HE and find her feet on her own terms. This not only severely limits her agency to be creative and innovative in her teaching, but also prevents her from questioning the underlying values used to teach design or to reflect upon what design teaching might be.

How Maree exercises her PEPs to recontextualise and re-package the disciplinary material in relation to the structures of interior design as a subject, has a bearing on the values and ‘ways of knowing, the position of the learner and the teacher, and the type of learning used in interior design’ (Vaikla-Poldma 2003: 39). These all have a role to play in how the student experiences design (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). As an interdisciplinary subject itself, design might be said to have ‘vague procedures for knowledge construction which remain tacit and largely dependent on the judgement or intuition of the knower’ (Maton 2001). As a primary agent involuntarily placed in this department, the distribution of resources that Maree faces, in terms of subjects allocated to her to teach, and the added role of coordination that she is confronted with, do not assist her with acquiring this ‘gaze’ (Ibid.) or with gaining command of her situation even a little, in order to be able to increase her sense of motivation and commitment to her project.

According to Trowler (2005), traditional disciplinary differences render practice as normalised and understate the impact of local context (Trowler 2005) and of individuals’ positioning towards the structures that frame their practice (Fanghanel 2009). The socio-cultural perspective, that focuses on context, problematises the deterministic influences of the discipline. Bernstein’s theorisation of knowledge and its structures is used to foreground knowledge as an object in itself (Maton and Muller 2007), which is generative and capable of impacting on disciplines, their communities and academic cultures, which in turn impacts on society, reproducing the inequality therein. Knowledge is not neutral and its ideological underpinnings are often embraced by knowledge workers without criticality. In the same vein, the ideological beliefs of knowledge workers, in this case discipline experts, affect conceptions and the practice of the discipline. When the discipline is taken into contexts of practice, it is imbued with the socio-cultural properties of those enacting the discipline, those receiving it and those evaluating it.

Even though she has had support from the TDP, it is too little and maybe too late, as the
conceptualisation of teaching and learning in programmes such as the TDP is often at odds with actual practice in the department, which is context specific and situation bound (Fanghanel 2007; Mathieson 2011; Trowler and Cooper 2002). Lack of departmental support, work overload, large classes, administrative tasks, lack of research time and strong disciplinary boundaries all contribute to Maree’s inability to transfer the practices introduced on the professional programme to her context of practice in her department (Trowler and Cooper 2002). With a top-heavy generic approach, new academics are inducted into the academy in a non-context specific, ahistorical and asocial way (Haggis 2003), hence they are not given the space to interact with their disciplines in agentic ways (Kahn 2009).

The context of practice for lecturers at the UoT is framed by departmental and institutional culture, which shapes their quality of teaching and learning (Kahn 2009; Mathieson 2011). Moreover, Maree is unsure of how she is faring and proceeding, with little formative feedback on her performative competence from HoDs or colleagues, which places an immeasurable emotional constraint on her as an individual and as a professional:

It's now 2013 and yes, now I'm moving through some rocks again (referring to the drawing on right), I don't really know if it's... what's going to happen or if I should be here or if I should be moving on. I think it's sort of five years now, so it might be time to move on. And yet I think this is where I am today, looking at where I am, looking at where should I be, where should I be going, if this is really what I should be doing and there's another waterfall ahead I think. And that's the side of the mountain again (River of Life 2013).

The emotional commentary on her concerns transvalues the import of her ability and achievement in all three of the orders of reality (Archer 2000). She seeks solace in a colleague who is in the ‘same boat’ (note the reference to the ‘sea theme’ again), whom she attaches to as a departmental ally, who offers respite in terms of social evaluation in social order (Archer 2003):

I wasn’t sure if I was doing the right thing, if I was in the right place maybe, I don’t know, I tried things with the students, some things worked and some things didn’t. Yes. Then 2012, we got two more lecturers, that’s still just part-time lecturers, but at least it wasn’t... I didn’t have to coordinate first and second year anymore, I could now only coordinate second year, which makes life easier. And one of the new lecturers because a very close
friend. So it was as if someone was in the boat with me and the river was a little bit better for a year (River of Life 2013).

Given the complexities of HE, as well as the challenges that new academics face in straddling the dual responsibilities of discipline expert and educator, it is fair to say that new academics like Maree experience a state of fracture. Who they are and where they fit in are burning questions that impress on their reflexive deliberations (Archer 2003):

Some of my other photos are talking about being lonely; the sea that is also, ja . . . confused with not really a lot of support to help me out there. And this one is of a few seagulls but they are all doing their own thing: the one is dipping his head in the water and the other is swimming in another direction and two are chatting and another one is flying away . . . so we are all lecturers and we all look the same but we are all busy with our own thing and we are all focusing on different things at the same time and if we could all at some stage get together and work together I think it would have been easier for me because then it would have felt that there was more support (Photovoice 2013).

Construction of the concept of self is complex with multiple layers, so collegial support from a community of ‘similars and familiars’ (Archer 2000) is an important anchor for new lecturers transitioning into HE. Without this support, especially in the first few (crucial) years, new lecturers flounder, not because they lack the ability to ‘go it alone’ but because it is a reasonable expectation that a field such as education holds these values in high esteem, as education is in itself a sociological act, being what it is through the interaction of social beings. Contemporary HE institutions are not in a position to foster these values, as they have become embroiled in constantly responding to powerful and competing external factors in a global economy. This situational logic of necessary contradictions makes it difficult for new lecturers to develop a stable sense of self as academics (Delanty 2008) and to ‘bed down’ as new practitioners:

I didn’t get any guidance whatsoever. It’s . . . all I got was critique. And it’s still the same. But I’ve sort of just . . . now I just don’t care about the critique anymore. It’s . . . I’m sort of at a ‘whatever’ stage. But it’s quite difficult . . . (River of Life 2013).

In the academic context, disciplinary, departmental, institutional (Becher and Trowler 2001) and national cultures shape new academics’ sense of belonging, not just through epistemological practices but through socio-cultural interactions too. Teaching practice as social practice is shaped by individual and collective identities, social contexts and
communities, which influence teaching identities in relation and response to tasks, assessments, learning activities and related issues (Winberg 2008).

There is so much you have to do; little boxes you have to tick; it doesn’t mean that structures don’t exist but the structures are chaotic. You don’t sit on this date and tick these boxes and then it’s sorted and this is how you have to do. It’s almost as if there is too much for me to do; I am all over the place for me to know what to focus on at what time. If I look at everything, it is mostly that there is so much going on and I don’t know what I should focus on at which stage (Photovoice 2013).

It is with this fractured concept of self as HE teacher that Maree enters her classroom, where she confronts even more constraints to her project and her practice as teacher:

Then talking about the ocean [referring to her photovoice collage, see cover], I see this as talking about moulding and changing not just myself from where I started at the UoT but moulding my students as well. They all come in as individuals but in the end I wonder if we are not trying to make them all into something that is quite similar and fits into a specific box. I try not to do that but it’s quite difficult not to do. The ocean speaks of something we don’t have control over, so it changes us and moulds us or me and the students but we don’t have any control and at some stage you can just decide to let it go and continue with the rest . . . but I think at the moment I am ignoring what I cannot control and trying to focus on everything that I can rather (Photovoice 2013).

Classroom Chaos
The classroom space in the interior design course is the studio space where design subjects are taught as hands-on practical classes. In design, which integrates knowledge from all other subjects, learning is mostly problem based, where students are given a ‘brief’ or problem to which they have to respond (in six weeks) by coming up with a design proposal. The design studio thus becomes a laboratory for problem solving, situated in spatial design, social exchange and negotiation. Problem-based learning is a discursive construction of learning by solving, and while it is a useful strategy for student-centred learning, critics point out (Wheelahan, 2007) that the pitfalls include gaps in students’ knowledge which are left unaddressed, creating a greater disservice to the knowledge-acquisition process of students. In Maree’s case, except for these design briefs, little or no other course material was available or forthcoming.

The design studio is a place where design problems are explored as projects, and where students learn how to think critically while creatively solving human problems in an aesthetic
and functional way. It is also the ‘heart of the education process’ (Vaikla-Poldma 2003), where new ways of thinking should be encouraged. As an environment of learning, the design studio should create new understandings of the human interior environment and, in a research sense, it should hone those questions that situate the user and his needs as fundamental to the research process (Ibid.).

Maree relies on her own experience of learning in a design studio to assist her in working out which teaching strategies to employ in the best interests of her students. However, she struggles again to understand the difference between the identity of her interior design students and her own identity as architect–designer. There exists a logic of contingent complementarities between the professional underpinnings of design on a structural level, which leads to differentiation and diversification, and the actual enactment and embodiment of design as a practice on a socio-cultural level, which gives rise to specialisation and sectionalism in terms of how the subject is interfaced by agents (Archer 1996):

> You might think it's quite similar and yes it is . . . but my students don't look like architects or architecture students; they don't act like architecture students. They wear makeup and high heels and it's something that is completely weird to me. It's a completely different world, where it's more about what things look like than they really are (Photovoice 2013).

For Maree, the discursive construction of design as a subject highlights the conflation between interior design and interior decorating as fields of practice, which means that discursively she is being pulled even further away from her architectural roots and identity. Terms such as ‘decorator’ and ‘designer’ are discursive (and structuring) labels that are often used interchangeably, even though structurally and culturally there is a distinction between the scope of work performed, the level of education achieved, and, often, professional accreditation as an interior designer. In Bernstein’s terms (2000), ‘design’, even though an interdisciplinary grouping of subjects, has a stronger grammar than ‘decorating’:

> I think for me being honest and real about things is quite important, whereas the profession that I am in at the moment is not that way. I am big on authenticity and my students would tell you that I am very passionate about not being a fake. The students we attract in interior design are sort of interested in what you can make it look like . . . I feel quite uncomfortable in the position I am in and it took me quite some time to figure out why I am feeling uncomfortable with it. So maybe the box is not the box for me (Photovoice 2013).
The disciplinary practice of the ‘crit’ is also a site of tension for Maree in the classroom. This ‘legacy’, as she referred to it, is where students would be asked to make or design something, and then be ‘criticised’ on it – usually in front of the entire class.

Overall we weren't really hard on students (I recall disastrous crits from my own education as an architect), but still, the main focus during a crit session would be: ‘What is wrong with this project, what doesn’t work and is it good or bad?’ I suppose there is an argument to be heard for designing something and then defending your point, but I feel that that should be reserved, generally speaking, for professional work, not junior students’ work. We weren’t creating a supportive, uplifting, inspiring and safe environment for students to experiment and learn as much as they possibly could from a project (Photovoice 2013).

Maree shows her deep understanding of the student experience and, through her reflexive deliberation, is able to identify those aspects of the crit session that were detrimental to her overall project of including students in the socio-academic space of the classroom:

Some students did not respond well to this way of teaching. They became scared to try new things – with their main focus to complete a project and getting an OK mark – some became generally demotivated. Students also struggled to make the connection between different subjects. I felt that there had to be a better way of teaching design (Photovoice 2013).

5.5.2.2. Advancement of the project

Through the Teaching Development Programme, Maree was introduced to a number of teaching and learning methodologies and strategies, which allowed her to experiment and/or introduce many new practices to her students. Although the implementation of most of these practices was still in an experimental phase and needed a large amount of streamlining and alignment with her subject, Maree reflects that she had made progress despite the insurmountable challenges that sometimes confronted her at a departmental level:

I think I have come a long way since the beginning of the year. I feel positive that my teaching abilities have improved due to TDP. For me, this document [the TDP reflective portfolio] serves as a personal critical reflection in order to evaluate the different methodologies I have experimented with. I hope to make everything I have learned an integral part of the courses I teach (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Maree’s PEPs such as her commitment, determination and perseverance, and the ability to
sustain herself despite challenging conditions, are what ensure that she becomes a strong evaluator of her positioning and able to introduce the necessary strategies and interventions in order to realise her goals. Her very honest and open reflexive ability means that she is not afraid to tackle her challenges head on, and mediate her constraints to achieve her objectives.

5.5.3. Realisation of the project

In reflecting on her ability to realise her project in education, Maree introduces specific changes to the way that things had been done or that she had been taught as a student herself. In the following extract, Maree refers to a quotation that shows the extent to which she is ruminating and reflexively deliberating her agential choices in her contextual setting:

‘A great designer is not made by way of a brain nearly so much as he is made by a cultivated, enriched heart. It is the love of the thing he does that really qualifies him in the end. And I believe the quality of love is the quality of great intelligence, great perception, deep feeling’ (Frank Lloyd Wright). But how would I go about it? (TDP reflective essay 2011).

5.5.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context

Maree’s specific interventions to her teaching practice and to the learning experience of her students are focused on the following aspects:

. . . the deconstructive way of ‘critting’, where my main focus was on developing an alternative way of ‘critting’ which is more positive and uplifting; student participation and class attendance: with the help of the TDP course I tried to develop lessons to encourage active learning and a better integration of different subjects. I decided to create a better relation between specifically Construction and Design II, by developing a module-system where construction lessons are derived directly from the knowledge needed for the design project (Duh! It seems so obvious now . . .) (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In design, students do not usually write tests or exams. Learning outcomes are usually assessed by considering the quality of the designs students create:

I am planning to schedule the final presentation of the project over a few days, to keep the sessions shorter and make it easier for students to stay focused. They could also be asked to participate in the evaluation process, by allocating marks as per set criteria,
which could then count as a small percentage of each student's marks (Photovoice 2013).

She introduces a number of redesigned and refashioned teaching practices that she is able to call her own, and in this way she builds and adds to her repertoire of resources as agent. Through critical and reflective analysis on her part, Maree is finally able to see the light at the end of a very dark and narrow tunnel:

I think the new format worked very well for the precedent study. I also feel that the written feedback helped to get students involved – even the quiet ones who would normally not really contribute. This forced them to engage critically with design concepts. The ‘mood board’ phase can still improve. For the next project, I’m considering dividing the class into three or four smaller groups of six to eight students for this phase. A specific time slot can then be allocated to each group. With fewer students, we could still have all the benefits of working in a group, but all students could get involved. We might even get time for more in-depth problem solving and brainstorming as a group (Photovoice 2013).

On being asked to comment on the windsock in her photovoice collage, Maree responds:

It’s also about being that lonely windsock – about being blown away. To some extent I see it as an opportunity as well, because a windsock shows direction and I think being a lecturer you are sort of giving or showing the way to students. But the windsock does not have any control over where he [sic] is showing direction. And yes maybe that must/should have been my main picture? I am showing the way but I don’t really know where!! Ja, confusing!! (Photovoice 2013).

There is a marked difference in the way that Maree is now framing her loneliness. There is a more positive spin on her earlier experiences of being isolated and separate. To realise her goals, she draws on her own PEPs such as honesty and steadfastness to steer her way through the minefield of challenges and constraints that she has confronted as a new lecturer and agent:

I think what I try to do in my classes is to try and make things more real and more honest . . . so without getting too technical I steer students away from doing things that are just fashionable and beautiful to maybe look at the technical things of how you put it together and why it’s like this and what it would tell other people. So I try to get a realness and honesty in what I teach them. I don’t know what others would say but that’s the way I go about it . . . that works for me and I won’t be able to teach something I don’t believe in . . . so it’s more of an architectural viewpoint that I try to instil in them as well. Students will
work with architects or on their own . . . and when they work on their own, it can be more to the interior decorating part which is more scatter cushions and soft furnishings and so on . . . [chuckle from all] (Photovoice 2013).

So, in navigating her way through her challenges, Maree tips the scales in favour of her architectural identity as a lecturer, which she shares with her students unapologetically now (compared with when she started). Whether this is detrimental to design students’ concept of the professional self is debatable, but in being explicit about her ideological stance in relation to her discipline and the values she wants to inculcate in her students, she is much clearer and on more solid ground now than before:

But how do we as design lecturers go about creating free-thinking, creative, bold designers? I believe the best we can do is to try to create a space where students can be intrigued, inspired, can dare to experiment and can develop a passion for design (Photovoice 2013).

Students respond to her new positioning as lecturer in a positive light (Photovoice 2013) and see that she is not struggling with the academic/practitioner dualism in quite the same way. In Maree’s embrace of her newfound identity, she is able to be agential in response to contextual constraints and enablements:

They found it easier to understand what was expected and how they could improve their work. They also felt that marks were rewarded in a more objective way. I noticed improvement in the ability of students to critically engage with subject matter. The process of implementing all the new practices I learned over the past few months takes time to apply. Therefore most areas can still do with further attention. I am planning to focus on streamlining the new systems and making them an integral part of the courses I teach (Photovoice 2013).

All of this might not seem as big as developing x-rays or saving the world – it might not even be huge changes I’ve made to my way of teaching – but to me it was an enlightening journey . . . that alternatives to boring lectures do exist. I hope to spend a lot more time, with happy and intrigued students in the design studio (Photovoice 2013).
5.6 Narratives of mediation: Mani

This vignette focuses on Mani, whose narrative captures the involuntaristic placement he confronts when he joins the Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED) at the UoT. Straddling two roles as part-time lecturer in a faculty, as well as writing consultant in CHED, Mani mediates the institutional configuration he finds by using his powers and properties to promote his vested interests. He exercises degrees of freedom that provide strategic guidance for the realisation of his project. All this he does by negotiating his agency within a contrived cultural space in which he is embedded in the context of the institution (macro), his department (meso) and his consulting space (micro).

Mani uses a collection of photos, which are a reflection of his context of practice in a disciplinary department. In his photovoice story, he foregrounds the photograph of the ‘closed door’ to his consulting room (first picture in collage), through which he draws attention to how the academic literacy space is constructed as a bounded and contrived space in the disciplinary department to which he is attached.
5.6.1. Conception of the project

5.6.1.1 Sense of self/concept of self

Mani joined the UoT in 2007/8 as a writing consultant. As part of the Student Learning Unit in the Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED) at the UoT, and as an extension of the academic development support structure at the institution, the Writing Centre was established as an academic support space for students with academic literacy needs. Writing consultants work with students on their academic essays, assignments and other written tasks. Mani is married and their only child, who was born in the coastal town of Limbe in Cameroon, is two years old:

My primary and secondary education was in my maternal hometown in Kumba. I obtained the GCE Ordinary Level and Advanced Level from the Cameroon College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS) Kumba. I then registered in the English Department at the University of Yaounde 1 in Cameroon where I obtained a BA in English Modern Letters in 2004. I proceeded to register for an MA in English in 2005, specialising in the modern English novel. However, I did not complete that programme because Professor Ridge of UWC offered me an opportunity to further my studies in South Africa (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mani then relocated to South Africa, where he completed an honours degree in English at the University of the Western Cape in 2008. In the same year, he accepted a contract position as a writing consultant at the Writing Centre. He felt that he was well suited to this post, given his range of experience as a foreign student himself:

I have a rich background of varied educational experiences in a multicultural context. I did my undergraduate studies at a French-speaking university and postgraduate studies at the University of the Western Cape (South Africa). I am currently completing, online, an MA in Media, Peace and Conflict Resolution at the UN-mandated University for Peace in Costa Rica, where I completed a Certificate in Conflict Studies (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mani may be described as a self-starter or early-adopter; many of his acquired skills and practices have been driven by his need for ongoing continuous development and life-long learning. He has taken advantage of the opportunities available to him to build his academic profile and he prides himself on being able to thrive in a multicultural context. He feels this is a boon to his engagement with his diverse students, as he is able to empathise with them and to support them with their own contextual and academic hurdles:
I feel that my multicultural and multilingual experiences have provided me with commendable potential to assist many of the students I am exposed to, who share similar experiences and problems with studies like me. Issues such as English as a second language, academic writing skills and coping with studies in a ‘foreign’ environment constitute some of the challenges that many students in UOT face and who call on me for assistance daily (TDP reflective essay 2011).

Mani joined the TDP in 2011 as a staff member of the unit that convened the TDP, making the opportunity costs heavier for him to complete the course successfully. This shaped his vested interests in doing well, for, as a contract staff member in a continual process of proving himself so that he might secure employment for the following year, not doing well might have meant that his contract would be in jeopardy. Apart from this interest, Mani was committed to improving his skills as a teacher; the TDP served as a structural means for him to learn about and apply theoretical and methodological frameworks to his pedagogical practice. It was also a cultural space for him to establish networks with an academic community. The accruement of resources not only improved his practice in the class, but also demonstrated his interest and willingness to participate in activities related to teaching and learning:

This is 2011 and this is the TDP period [referring to a pool in the river of life drawing]. I think this is very important in terms of my group here at UOT, because between 2007 and 2011 I was just a writing consultant or learning facilitator, even after I completed my Honours (River of Life 2013).

What Mani intimates here is that the social and normative evaluation of his worth as HE employee constructs him as being less than a fully-fledged academic member, despite his academic qualifications at honours level. Before the TDP, and without the community of lecturers to engage with on issues of teaching and learning, he was seen as ‘just’ a consultant and not as a lecturer, despite the fact that he was lecturing part-time and facilitating workshops for students in academic literacy. The TDP, as a structural and cultural enablement, was thus a way for Mani to build up social capital and resources in a discursive sense, by virtue of his participation in this HE professional development programme.

Mani is a speaker of English as an additional language, which he learned as a foreign language in Cameroon, where English was not as widely spoken as in South Africa, which in contrast is a multilingual environment where English is the lingua franca. As a speaker of other languages, he has benefited from ‘shuttling across discourses’ (Canagarajah 2002) that are not his primary toolkit. Appointed to assist mainly students using English as an
additional language in order to ‘improve’ their academic writing, and based on the strength of his A-levels and his honours qualifications in English literature, Mani was deemed a suitable candidate ‘on paper’ by the university and the higher education unit to be employed as a writing consultant, to advise students on the academic writing conventions they had to master for university. This is indicative of a discourse which draws on the ‘autonomous model of literacy’ (Street 2003), where someone employed with a background in English (literature, for example) is not necessarily prepared to teach writing conventions that university students have to master. Like many others, Mani has had no formal training in teaching, group facilitation or work-shopping skills, yet he is expected to use a diverse range of skills in his work with students; neither has he been trained in any specific writing, tutoring or academic literacy courses.

The teaching as ‘common sense’ discourse is ironically drawn on, even by some educational development units themselves, in order to construct writing consultation and support as non-specialised activities. While academic development (AD) practitioners in the field mostly hail from a variety of disciplinary fields that have little to do with language, much of the specific work that they do when they start off in their AD roles is self-derived, intuitive and common sense practice based on their experiences as academics themselves. The steep learning curve that many AD practitioners undergo early in the job, while on-the-job, is accredited more to their own professional development and learning as practitioners in the field rather than theoretical emergent knowledge from a solid epistemological base in a higher education course or postgraduate diploma. Much of the work in early AD was thus craft based or practice based (Shay 2012), stemming from experiential needs arising from contextual challenges. Much of what Mani has learned and garnered as an academic literacy practitioner has been through his own pursuit of opportunities, such as attending educational workshops and conferences, reading educational development literature, completing HE short courses and skillling-up as an individual:

I have completed some short courses in HE such as the CHEC courses and a UN mandated University for Peace 2011: Foundation Course in Peace and Conflict Studies. I am of the opinion that when colleagues share their practices and their research, they tend to develop their professional proficiencies. This is why I always try to be actively involved in research activities, wherever possible (TDP reflective essay 2011).

In 2011, in the same year that he joined the TDP, he started lecturing as a part-time lecturer in one of the faculties, teaching English Communication to part-time diploma students. Here again, the fact that he was employed in this capacity is indicative of the generative power of
the ‘autonomous model discourse’, which constructs literacy (or in this case Communication) as a set of autonomous, generic ‘skills’ that English specialists can teach.

In this regard, the TDP11 session opens up a most valuable opportunity for me to sharpen and capture such skills aligned to higher education that will better inform the kind of intervention I provide to students during my varied interactions with them . . . to simultaneously weave between my work as a writing consultant and part-time lecturer (TDP reflective essay 2011).

The TDP provides the impetus for a personal morphogenesis in Mani when he joins the programme. The objective ‘me’ reflects on the subjective ‘I’ that is coming into being here in an academic domain, as Mani begins to see himself as more than ‘just’ a consultant:

. . . my journey and growth as a higher education teacher . . . I have developed as a lecturer as a direct result of my experiences during the TDP sessions . . . the TDP11 sessions have enhanced my understanding of my core practice and competence as a teacher within the higher education family, and most especially, how I am able to inculcate innovatively aspects such as technology, integrative learning, reflection and case-based teaching into my teaching experience (TDP reflective essay 2011).

When Mani successfully completed the TDP, he was interested in furthering his studies in education. He wanted to deepen his understanding of educational development to further enhance his positioning as a resource holder (Archer 2003) in the educational development unit for which he worked, so that he would be in a better bargaining position through the relatively greater degrees of freedom (Ibid.) that he would have as a better-qualified lecturer. He had hoped that the TDP would hold him in good stead to qualify for entry into the Higher Diploma in Higher Education and Training (HDHET) course run by his unit, CHED.

First of all, I wanted to do the HDHET, but I wasn’t allowed to do it, because you need to already have a master’s to do it or something like that. I thought that having the TDP with all the experience that they would allow me to do it. So I couldn’t do it and I didn’t want to do a master’s in literature, because that is what I did my honours in – English literature. I wanted something more professional. So I drew this period as dark [referring to his river of life drawing] . . . the sky is a bit dark there and I was still trying to ask myself if I still really wanted to stay here or to move on (River of Life 2013).
Dispirited by this obstacle, Mani considered leaving the university to take up opportunities elsewhere:

So I applied for this UN scholarship to travel out of the country and do a master’s degree in Diplomacy, but I couldn’t make it . . . I just couldn’t make it (River of Life 2013).

At the end of 2012, Mani decided to stay and register for a master’s in education in the Education Faculty at the UoT, which was willing to recognise his prior learning (RPL) on the TDP, and this enabled him to circumvent the restrictions placed on him earlier in his application for the HDHET run by CHED.

5.6.1.2 Identification of concerns

Mani’s concerns and commitments in education are tied directly to his engagement with students. His Milestone Project for the TDP was titled ‘Student Engagement’, where he looked at his role as lecturer in the learning development of his students. As a result of having worked at multiple sites across the UoT, Mani gained experience and insight into how students at the varied sites engaged with their learning, in an academic as well as civic domain. It is noteworthy that in his Milestone presentation, which was also a reflection on the culmination of the TDP course and his participation in it, Mani referred to his professional role as ‘academic literacy lecturer’ (which is a misnomer, given that literacy is acquired, not taught) in the Student Learning Unit. Even though there had been no official ‘upgrade’, as it were, from ‘writing consultant’ to ‘lecturer’ in terms of how the unit positioned him, Mani exercised his PEPs in shifting the way he perceived his role and what he could offer his students and his academic community, based on his newly-acquired cultural and social resources. This demonstrated that he was a stronger resource holder now, especially in terms of his cultural disposition, as a result of his engagement with the TDP, where he had begun to shape his understanding of his identity as lecturer.

When he was assigned to the Tygerberg Campus (which is an extension of the Faculty of Health and Wellness Sciences at the UoT) as ‘resident academic literacy lecturer’, his focus shifted to how he could enhance student engagement at the Writing Centre at Tygerberg. In his Milestone Project presentation, he cited the key factors, such as curriculum design, campus size, student population, cultural diversity and external relationships with industry that would enhance these engagements:

There is a need for an urgent paradigm shift in our understanding of who our students
are and what their major challenges are. There is also the need for greater collaboration between educators, parents and other external stakeholders in understanding and enhancing student engagement (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

Mani shows an understanding of the social domain here, but the dominant discourse at the UoT sees literacy as asocial and positions him inside this, where the SEPs and CEPs act as structuring mechanisms for the exercise of his agency. In identifying his core issues in the Problem Tree exercise, Mani isolates a few key features that he wants to address in the course of his possible project. Each of these cares and concerns is aligned with his positioning as primary agent in HE, and he is aware of the need to tackle these challenges head on if his goals are to be realised:

I'm looking at a couple of issues that I think I need to work on again. I'm looking at motivation. I'm looking at inspiration to do my work. I'm looking at research on my work, research and work. I'm looking at effective use of technology. I really want to improve, keep on improving students' performance. You know, so I think that the answer to all of this is reflected in the tree itself. Maybe the inspiration needs to come from the basics. Maybe I need to have inspiration in the core as I look at all of those issues (Problem Tree 2013).

Mani’s reflexive deliberation produces this range of concerns from which, through careful selection and de-selection, he has to choose and prioritise those that he can translate into a liveable project (Archer 2000), to sustain him in HE.

5.6.1.3 Emotional commentary on concerns

Mani is a highly-committed and dedicated lecturer. Being on contract and having to weigh opportunity costs at every turn, his commitment to his project in education is remarkable. As a convenor of the TDP, I have known him to be steadfast in his commitments, using his own powers and properties to remain positive and focused, even in the light of extenuating constraints on his context of practice. The import of his concerns transvalues the significance of these concerns in the context of student learning and Mani, through sheer dedication and deliberation via reflexive dialogue, is able to identify the things that matter to him the most:
I must immediately and always remember that my first priority as an employee of the UOT is to assist students towards academic success. However, I have always been troubled by the question: what does academic success mean to me and to the student? It may be difficult to answer this question, but I feel that the primary place where academic success begins, and where I am of prime importance – at least from the point of view of a typical modern-day student – is the classroom (Free writing 2011).

As a strong evaluator, Mani is able to use reflexive deliberation as his most important PEP (Archer 2000) to discern the significance of his concerns for his own personal and social morphogenesis:

It is important to constantly reflect on these issues, to measure myself in relation to some of these constructs and to honestly identify my strengths, weaknesses and possible areas of development. To succeed in any or all of these the teacher should and must always transcend the self – to look beyond his [sic]/herself and enter into the students’ frame of reference. I love this job and I always want to do it because of these things I speak of, and because of the challenges it always places before me (TDP reflective essay 2011).

5.6.1.4 Adoption of a project

Mani’s overall cares and concerns, located in student engagement and student learning, were given further directional guidance through the interviews he conducted with many students at the Tygerberg campus. Through this information, Mani could shape these concerns into a doable project that he could commit to over the next few years. Central to student engagement with the subject, among the dental technology students he interviewed, Mani found that course design is crucial to students’ ability to engage with their academic tasks:

The very strong interactive nature of the dental sciences course design is a major factor that enhances the students’ academic engagement. This result is supported by Tinto’s interactionalist theory (Tinto, 1986). Students’ reactions to higher education are another key finding. The intricate relationships between the students, the dental technologists and the dentists serve as a key factor that has developed the current state of student engagement in Tygerberg. This too is supported by the organisational perspective on student engagement (Braxton et al., 1997) (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

Mani saw the Writing Centre at the campus as a vital organ in creating a common intersection for this engagement:
The Writing Centre at Tygerberg serves as a space for interaction, collaboration and dialogue. This space complements the course design and plays a major role in ensuring teaching and learning, even in times of civic unrest. Since our goal is to enhance student learning, we seize every opportunity to do so, yet ensuring that our students meet the qualities enshrined in the university’s vision (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

He thus saw his role at the centre as critical in supporting students to achieve academic success:

This encourages me to think carefully about issues like academic support, social support, the place of a role model, good teaching practice, the use of technology in education, and the place of a self-reflective practitioner/researcher as an ideal educator (TDP Milestone Project 2011).

Mani’s project in education, shaped by his repositioning at the Tygerberg campus, is concerned with student engagement in learning and the role of stakeholders in facilitating this engagement to ensure student success. For a new lecturer, this is not usual, and it shows more than a ‘myopic’ preoccupation with professional concerns, but rather extends the focus to how collegiate relations (as mechanisms) among students, lecturers and support staff can work synergistically towards academic success. In this way, Mani’s project in education dovetails with national goals for a transformed HE system but, while he has intuited the social concerns in HE, he has not consolidated this stance by drawing on appropriate theory to support his perspectives. Further hindrances are contextual constraints in the form of dominant institutional discourses which construct learning as asocial, acultural, and apolitical. While Mani is concerned with student success being promoted through meaningful engagements with knowledge, practice and ‘being in and of the university’ (Boughey 2008), the structural and cultural constraints he confronts have to be mediated by him, by his own description.

5.6.1.5 Personal emergent properties

Mani and I were colleagues in the same educational development unit, but engaging with him as a participant on the TDP gave me a fresh perspective on his breadth of experience and insight as a relatively new lecturer. When I saw him in this space with other TDP participants, I was aware that he was being inspired and stretched by the stimulating energy and ideas of the TDP group, which acted as an enabler for the further exercise of his agency, in virtue of the supportive and innovative space it provided him. He had struck me as a warm, confident and articulate person with well-honed social skills which made him very
engaging. His concern about his students and their challenges was uppermost in his deliberations, and he shared this willingly and honestly with his peers:

It is important to constantly reflect on these issues, to measure myself in relation to some of these constructs and to honestly identify my strengths, weaknesses and possible areas of development. To succeed in any or all of these, the teacher should and must always transcend the self – to look beyond his/herself and enter into the students’ ‘frame of reference’ (TDP reflective essay 2011).

What stood out about Mani for me, as his distinguishing personal power, was his positive, determined and motivated nature, despite all the challenges that he had faced as an employee in a ‘foreign land’. As a routine ‘check-in’ with lecturers at the weekly TDP sessions, I would ask each lecturer to greet one another using traditional greetings as a way of relating to one another across the multicultural range of lecturers in the group. Mani shared a traditional greeting from Cameroon which I thought was quite poetic, given his positioning at the start of the TDP, where he felt quite misplaced in his own academic environment as a writing consultant:

Cameroonianers greet each other with ‘ashi, wilie ei,’ to which the response is ‘na’ah po- uoh’. This has become a basic greeting now, but the actual meaning is that ‘may your day in the seas be good’ and the response means, ‘may I see you on land later’. This is because the indigenes were mainly fishermen and the greeting is a blessing or wish that the man returns from the sea safely . . . (TDP reflective piece 2011)

Indeed Mani has been cast out to sea himself on many occasions and wishes for a safe landing himself, but his perseverance and willingness to improve and succeed as academic literacy lecturer are PEPs that hold him in good stead for the realisation of his project in education.

5.6.2 Pursuit of the project

5.6.2.1 Impingement on the project

Mani’s project in education is impinged on more by cultural impediments than by structural constraints. Academic Development is the universities’ response to changing circumstances in HE (Barrow and Grant 2012), and the field in which Mani works has evolved at the UoT as a result of the many national and international shifts in AD thinking (Boughey 2008; Clegg 2009; Gosling 2009; Barrow and Grant 2012), in relation to how AD work is organised and supported at the university. The academic development focus in South Africa shifted through
political transformation, which changed the demographics of students in HE (Thesen 1997; Boughey 2002; Paxton 1998), who brought with them a range of primary discourses from social and cultural backgrounds that were not always validated at the university. It was then that academic literacy work became salient and a special focus in HE.

At the UoT, which is a vocational institution, academic literacies, derived from Street’s (2003) ideological model of literacy practice, are misappropriated in the South African construction of this discourse, to mean academic skills, derived from Street’s autonomous model. Mani draws on the skills discourse as this is a structuring mechanism in the UoT context, where the demands of a professional working world and a globalised economy serve as generative mechanisms for the urgency to address students’ graduate abilities (and academic literacy as Discourse) in order to respond effectively to professional and business requirements. Even though his conceptualisation is that academic literacy is a socio-cultural practice, as a primary agent, involuntarily placed, he experiences this situational logic as a necessary contradiction at the socio-interaction level. The espoused theories on academic practice as skills at the UoT clash with his theories in action of academic practices as social learning, but Mani does not have the discursive resources as yet to transcend the limitations that this logic possibly presents him with.

This clash of theories is not surprising, as academic development in itself is a varied field and its complexity is surfaced in the various terms attached to this work, which are not conceptually aligned nationally (Gosling 2009). Here we see the generative power of discourses at the level of the Real, as they structure what is understood and enacted at the Empirical and Actual levels. Different universities adopt different foci for their brand of AD work, which is dependent on funding as well as the status of teaching and learning at that institution. The movement itself had undergone many shifts from the apartheid era, where it was associated with activist ideals for a transformed society (Boughey and Niven 2012), to the 90s, where it became a responsive means to address the challenges of diversity that massification and widened access had ushered in. The emancipatory drive was a generative mechanism throughout the 90s (Ibid.), so much of the work was conceived as a social rather than an intellectual project.

Before the institutional mergers took place in 2005, shaped by debates sparked in national and international morphogenetic cycles, both campuses continued with a centralised model of academic development, reporting to a centralised unit but replicated on the two campuses. The language lecturers, however, were relocated to academic departments,
where they had a reporting line directly to the faculties and were in a position in their new disciplinary contexts to form collaborative partnerships with mainstream academic lecturers (Jacobs 2007). After the merger, both campuses disbanded their centralised language departments and the two AD units were consolidated into one centralised Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED).

Lecturers who taught professional communication skills, originally taught as professional skills for the workplace, and for students who were already literate in other ways, were now repackaging ‘Communication’ to include academic literacy as a necessary response to the diverse student body. Language lecturers thus doubled up as academic literacy lecturers in their actual practice, and their role increased as the old communication skills courses were rewritten as academic literacy courses. CHED’s main response to the academic literacy needs of students was through the Writing Centre, while the specialised service and focus on academic development was under the aegis of CHED, which had to respond to the academic literacy needs of all students across the campuses.

It was in this configuration that Mani confronted challenges to his project, for academic literacy embodies ‘norms of behaviour in higher education, the things that each discipline values and the behaviours it does not (McKenna 2004: 279). In being relocated to the Dental Technology Department at the Tygerberg campus, which already had an embedded academic literacy practitioner who taught the credit-bearing Academic Literacy course (which was the old Communication Skills course), Mani was appointed as a writing consultant, within a sea of disciplinary experts. In this context he had to marshal his PEPs to exercise his agency in a less than supportive work context:

The experiences . . . some of them are harrowing and some of them are really, really tedious. I think if I should speak about them, it will take a long, long time and it will put some of you [sic] in tears . . . (Photovoice 2013).

5.6.2.1.1 Institutional conventions

As his story unfolds, and as his narrative illustrates, we see the challenges that Mani confronts and the PEPs he had to employ to mediate the structural and cultural impediments that he faced. Much of what he confronts precedes and predates him as a primary agent but, being involuntarily positioned in this context, he has to summon his PEPs to mediate the challenges in light of his project.
As discussed already, academic development and support at the institutional level falls under the aegis of the Centre for Higher Education Development (HEQC 2011). Based on the belief in the direct causal relationship between literacy and student success, academic development centres nationally, and especially in the post-apartheid era, were strategic units tasked with responding to the huge challenges of a massified higher education system (Boughey and Niven 2012), with its concomitant diverse student body and widened access which made clear the gaps and cracks caused by apartheid schooling (Morrow 1992).

At the UoT, the importance of academic literacies (AcLits) is upheld in the institutional teaching and learning strategic documents and made manifest in the appointment of a teaching and learning coordinator as well as a language coordinator per faculty. It may be argued that professional and not academic literacies are needed at a UoT, but advocates argue that UoT students need both. At the start of their academic journey they need AcLits as they are new to HE but, as they proceed through their academic programmes, they need professional literacies as an endpoint to their trajectories as UoT students (private communication with my supervisors). Some of these strategic coordinators report directly to the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee, while others report to the Institutional Language Committee (a structural feature emanating from a discourse on an approach to the teaching of English as a second language as skills acquisition (Boughey 2002)).

Although coordination happened at faculty level, there was little coordination at a strategic institutional level across these multiple sources of educational experts, leading to discursive clashing at the level of social interaction among agents and actors. The structural changes were not paralleled by a synchronous shift in ideational uptake of academic literacy in cultural terms by all stakeholders. There was thus not a holistic perspective on development across the range of academic work (Åkerlind 2003) at this university. This was evidenced in departments that often contacted CHED directly for assistance, despite the existence of educational specialists located in their own faculties, and conversely teaching and learning and language coordinators’ assistance was solicited instead of that of the educational development unit. Although there was a systematic collaborative partnering between CHED representatives and the faculty teaching and learning coordinators, AD was still seen as a support function of an ‘external’ source and not ‘core business’ of the mainstream lecturers in the disciplines. Notwithstanding, the university has to continue to respond to these challenges in effective ways in order to address student success in light of HE’s transformation goals. Core to student success is student motivation, which is an overall challenge in HE, and, by citing this as his challenge, Mani signals his implicit understanding
At a personal level I can identify 3 key challenges: the 1st challenge is to get the student to be really motivated – by March of any academic year many students are demotivated, they just want to go home and just get lost. And that is a problem. So we really need to look for means to motivate students to want to engage with their academic work (Photovoice story 2013).

Drawing on the discourses of teaching as ‘pastoral care’ and student-centred learning, Mani has a deep commitment to keeping students interested in their learning projects, and in this way he feeds into his own project of deepening student engagement. This aspect of Mani’s work and personal identity highlight the interplay between personal and professional embodiment of work such as AD, which is located in the nexus of one-to-one interaction and group contact. Mani’s PEPs in this regard work strategically and decisively to align his project with his commitments as employee and practitioner in the field.

In order to get students motivated, Mani has to have a certain amount of social and cultural capital to get students to pay attention to him, let alone respond in ways that demonstrate their interest in their learning. Students who are depleted in motivational resources turn to extraneous forms of support to boost their interest and ability to do well in their core projects. For a student not performing well in written tasks, a natural move would be to turn to the academic literacy person to help them improve their writing, with the main purpose of raising their performative competence in the subject. However, the meeting of these two parties is not always a ‘synchronous’ event for, as Mani notes, it is with students themselves that he faces challenges of being accepted and taken seriously as someone who can make a difference in their academic lives:

And that is a personal challenge for me because as a writing consultant the students’ perception of me is not that important compared to the subject lecturer, especially because the subject lecturer gives you marks; the writing consultant supports you . . . an advisor if I can use that word . . . so that is a challenge (Photovoice 2013).

Mani’s use of different job titles to describe his work does show the ongoing tension he faces in positioning himself in relation to students and lecturers. He starts off his river of life and photovoice narratives referring to himself as ‘learning facilitator’ to indicate his positioning in the wider institutional configuration. He then switches to ‘writing consultant’ when he talks about his specific location in the Writing Centre. Then he adopts the title ‘junior lecturer’ to
describe his work in his part-time role as Communication lecturer, and after the TDP he calls himself ‘academic literacy lecturer’. He draws on the titles discursively to show a wide range of roles and responsibilities involved in what he does, but also shows possible sites of cultural tension that he confronts as he moves from one location to the next, where he is trying to negotiate the discursive construction of literacy, language and academic support. Without the support from his own department, the Student Learning Unit, to assist him in navigating this terrain, Mani can only rely on his own PEPs of perseverance, determination and resilience to mediate the SEPs and CEPs activated in the contexts he faces.

Mani worked primarily at the Writing Centre (WC) on the one campus, servicing the needs of drop-in students who accessed the centre for academic literacy support. This model of academic development developed originally on the lines of writing centres in the USA, offering writing support to students completing written assignments and homework tasks to achieve the high standards required of academic essays and reports at university. In South Africa, students with a perceived challenge in this area seek assistance from writing centre consultants, but the ad hoc nature of the visits to writing centres means that long, sustainable relationships with writing support staff are untenable, and many students come to the WC ‘just in time’ before submitting assignments and projects. The infrastructural and administrative support for this is challenging at times for consultants, providing further structural constraints on this tenuous temporal relationship between consultant and drop-in student:

The other challenge is that of administrative support – we struggle to book venues . . . we struggle to book resources to support the students. Even the number of consultants is absolutely a disaster. We have just five consultants for an entire university of more than 38 000 students . . . that is an indication of the resource shortages we are facing (Progress check interview 2013).

Those students who manage to successfully secure appointments meet with consultants in writing centre spaces that are minute cubicles or very small rooms, not very conducive to the interactive engagement between student and consultant. The physical space is a constraining influence on the nature of the AD work undertaken, and the sterile and clinical socio-academic environment is counter-productive to the cultural dimensions of the nurturing interaction between student and consultant. Both dimensions reinforce the construction of the writing centre as the ‘panel beating shop’, where writing problems can be fixed, thereby cementing the understanding of student challenge in deficit terms.
Given the constraints of working in an environment such as the one described above, which has severe restrictions on the degrees of academic freedom attached to the role, Mani was not too perturbed when a need arose for a writing consultant to be based at the Tygerberg campus to look after the needs of students there. Having no disciplinary knowledge in dentistry, but significant experience in working with students on generic writing challenges, Mani faced his involuntary repositioning as agent with eagerness and enthusiasm, open to the random redistribution of resources that he would find in his new setting. Committed to the service of students in general, and with his social skills (PEPs) well established, Mani was up for the challenge, with little directional guidance from his line managers or unit heads in terms of exactly what to do or how to position himself in this space (personal communication).

When he refers to his role at the Tygerberg campus, he uses the term ‘advisor’, which signals his awareness that he is externally positioned to the campus, thus constructing himself as ‘Other’. In fact, in many ways his presence at the campus is hardly acknowledged or validated by the mainstream lecturers, who see his function as superfluous to the core business of dental technology. The generative mechanisms at work here construct academic literacy challenges of students as personal deficits or ‘language problems’ that need to be fixed (see Chapter Four) before the disciplinary expert can begin the ‘main work’ with them (Boughey 2002). Discursively, mainstream lecturers do not see this aspect of student learning as part of their responsibility, and many of them blame poor schooling for the ‘low standards’ of numeracy and academic literacy among first years especially (Boughey 2002; McKenna 2004). Boughey (2007a) challenges the ‘language as problem’ focus by asserting that all students experience challenges in transitioning into tertiary education. AD and mainstream education thus have to consider what it means to be ‘in and of the university’ (Ibid.) to successfully acquire the discourses privileged in HE.

The multiple levels that make up academic literacy are far more complex than simply addressing the technical skills of the student (Van Schalkwyk 2008: 7), so it is not the responsibility of academic literacy lecturers alone. Mainstream lecturers too are vital in developing students’ academic literacy through the discipline (Boughey 2002), until ‘ways of speaking, acting, thinking, feeling and valuing common to that Discourse become natural to them’ (Gee 1990). Literacy practice is an acquisition process (Gee 1990), not something that can be explicitly taught, and literacy practitioners can provide the scaffold for students’ acquisition. As mentioned already, the skills model has been conflated with the practices model (Street 2003) in how it is drawn on in South African HE, as practitioners construct
literacy as ‘knowing about language’ rather than ‘knowing and doing in the language’.

The need to work more closely with discipline experts in collaborative ways was stressed by an important body of work located at the UoT by Jacobs (2007). This work in particular served as a mechanism to shift the dominant cultural conventions, in that it involved ten partnerships of disciplinary experts and literacy lecturers in a joint project to find ways to embed literacy practices more solidly into disciplinary ways of knowing and doing (Jacobs 2007). The practice-based approach advocated by Jacobs stressed the importance of student writers taking up disciplinary positions in a discourse community to position themselves as ideological learners.

Despite the huge strides that work like Jacobs’ was suggesting, faculty-based AD as conceived by the UoT and CHED itself continued to adopt a skills-based model of academic literacy practice (Lea and Street 2006) in its day-to-day practice, where discrete reading and writing skills are practised to improve performance. This model of student learning, the autonomous model (Street 2003), assumes a generic set of transferable skills and strategies that can be taught and applied in specific disciplinary contexts. There was little ‘ontological congruence’ (Staniforth and Harland 2006) between what was perceived as academic development by the policy makers and teaching and learning committees at the UoT, and what was actually practised in academic literacy spaces between student and practitioner. There was also little cognisance of the range of disciplinary knowledges, each with its own epistemological and ontological assumptions, which students were drawing on (Baynham 2010). In my experience, very few academic literacy practitioners in the writing centre drew on situated literacies or social understanding of literacy practices (Lea and Street 2006; Gee 2001) in their explicit work with students. Through his project on student engagement, Mani is aware of the conditioning influences of social context on students’ literacy acquisition.

The understanding of learning as ‘accessing a disciplinary discourse’ (Marshall et al. 1999), similar to Gee’s notion of small discourses and big discourses (2001), should be understood tacitly by many practitioners, who must have some level of awareness that these ontological and epistemological claims shape their practice in generative ways. When academic literacy is conflated with English proficiency, ‘solutions’ to the ‘problem’ result in a linguistic and grammatical treatment only of the perceived language challenges of students (Boughey 2002).

Mani questions his priorities in this regard, despite potential opportunity costs to himself as
primary agent. Being highly committed to his project of student engagement, Mani has had to ask pertinent questions of himself as reflexive agent in relation to the context in which he is embedded:

With a scenario such as this, we have a student who is proactive and who wants support in their [sic] academic work. But is the writing consultant the alpha and omega in terms of providing that support? The answer is NO. For a student to survive in this environment and get that essay to this level, there is a lot of evidence that the student will need a lot of energy from himself as a student but also support in terms of the infrastructure that is provided as reflected by computers and computer labs and most importantly the careful guidance by the subject lecturer in terms of providing the students with the kind of formative feedback that the student will need to complete that assignment (Photovoice 2013).

5.6.2.1.2 Departmental impositions

In being positioned at the Tygerberg campus to offer specialised support to students, Mani’s degrees of freedom and positioning as an agent (Archer 2003) are restricted in that he straddles two departments in his daily practice. He is firstly answerable to the Student Learning Unit in CHED as his first port of call, but he has to report daily ‘for duty’ to the Tygerberg campus where he solely services the Dental Technology Department as language support staff. This dual focus means that Mani is sometimes torn between his commitments to institutional philosophy and strategy in terms of academic development and the discipline-focused needs and perceptions (Clegg 2005; Gosling 2009) of lecturers and students. Lines of accountability (Barrow and Grant 2012) mean that Mani has to please both constituents in his line of work:

The challenge is building a collaborative relationship between the content lecturers. So many times I have been in a situation where I emailed lecturers about what I am picking up in a student’s assignment and what kind of intervention I am assisting the students with; and even a response to say I have noted your email could not be provided. The lecturers completely IGNORE the writing centre and that decision to ignore the WC is a major challenge for a consultant like myself who wants to be sure about what I am doing . . . so it is a personal one but it is also a professional challenge . . . because not so many lecturers are as committed as the gentleman here [refers to picture of lecturer] to be present because this is essentially my session with the students for AL support but for the lecturer to create that time to be there and to support the student in terms of giving the student feedback is very valuable (Photovoice 2013).
Collaborative interest from the other lecturers in the department was lacking, owing not only to possible time constraints and managerial and work overload, but also to a reluctance to take on this type of work. Jacobs (2007) maintains that lecturers are so immersed in their discipline that their knowledge of the literacy practices and discourse features of their discipline is tacit and often taken for granted, and therefore difficult to make explicit to students. But instead of forming collaborative partnerships with academic literacy practitioners to overcome these features, lecturers in the Dental Technology Department, where the demand for academic literacy support is always high, prefer to leave this task to consultants like Mani:

Yes, in departments where we are doing something right, the demand increases. In a department like this one, the demand is constantly high because by the end of each term, the students will make use of the writing centre support for essay assignments to improve their marks (Photovoice 2013).

Without the disciplinary expertise of the content lecturers, Mani’s evaluation is that his feedback to students is limited, as he feels underqualified to comment on the specialised assignment content and Discourse of dentistry. Driven by his own project, though, to deepen student engagement, he recognises that students need the complementary support of their disciplinary lecturers to be able to achieve academic success, and that academic literacy support should be a concerted effort by both disciplinary and language experts (Jacobs 2007).

5.6.2.1.3 Classroom constraints

While the university uses a version of the infused model of academic literacy, where each faculty has a language lecturer dedicated to it, the main site of engagement between Mani and the students he supports is not the conventional classroom or lecture theatre as we know it. Perhaps as a result of the more personalised nature of academic support work, the space that Mani works in is a computer laboratory, discursively constructed as an ‘intimate’ space where students feel safe enough to receive feedback on their performative competence. After all, academic literacy ‘is not something that can be overtly taught in a convenient introductory set of lectures’ (Boughey 2000: 281). Rather, it has to be developed throughout the student’s academic career, through the observation of and interaction with others in the higher education setting (Taylor, Ballard, Beasley, Bock, Clanchy and Nightingale 1998):
The 3rd picture is an example of myself assisting a student and what is happening there is a dialogue but what is not shown in this photo is [sic] the other processes that this student and maybe myself as a support staff lecturer need to provide in terms of assisting the students such that the student’s assignment gets to this level [refers to picture of himself and student in consultation] (Photovoice 2013).

Mani refers to the particular space in which he works as the ‘writing centre office’, as if the word ‘centre’ (next to ‘office’) has lost all explanatory power in defining what happens between practitioner and student in academic literacy support work. The term ‘office’ denotes the generative power of the now managerialist nature of academic work (Mani referred earlier to his students as ‘clients’ and himself as ‘advisor’), reinforcing the generative power of the discourse of neo-liberalism that he is drawing on to explain his construction of student engagement and his role in it.

In the first photo you will see the entrance to the writing centre office. It is a typical entrance where students are expected to make appointments and see the writing consultant, with their assignment. The example is seen in picture 2 (Photovoice 2013).

Mani’s adoption of ‘corporate’ ways of being are structured at the level of the Real through discourses that have become naturalised for him, having worked in this way for a long time at the UoT. Nonetheless, he is quite vigilant and critical of what this space means for students:

However there are underlying issues from this particular photo, which are not very evident. One is that the door is locked. That is a symbolic illustration of the barriers that students face in terms of what they actually need in the writing centre, resulting in them not actually coming to the writing centre in terms of the physical space. The student, if you can look quickly between pictures 2 and 8, the student would want to improve their [sic] writing skills such that at the end of the day the lecturer can give them so many ticks in terms of what is correct. This door is a symbol of the barriers that students have to mediate through in order to get through this space (Photovoice 2013).

The Writing Centres, both on the main and satellite campuses, are configured as computer laboratories, where students are at liberty to work on academic tasks using the electronic platforms and modes. For a student to get to see the writing consultant requires fore-planning as an appointment needs to be scheduled to reserve this timeslot. By the time the student gets to see the consultant, he or she must have worked through editing drafts for mistakes, mainly of a grammatical nature, for which he receives feedback and guidance. The
use of technology means that students can also receive electronic feedback from peers as well as from content lecturers:

In the 4th picture [referring to a picture in his photovoice collage], we see a student’s assignment reflected on the computer monitor. This indicates a process whereby the student first of all takes the responsibility to identify weaknesses in his or her essay and to try to work through it. But this goes beyond that. This also indicates that this student can receive support from other students as well as from lecturers in an electronic medium, which is to say that they would email the draft assignment to a lecturer or the student could invite a classmate to look at his or her own assignment and give that student peer feedback. The first responsibility lies with the student because the WC operates beyond 8–3pm hours – it’s open even in the evening but also there is electronic means to email assignments (Photovoice 2013).

The model of academic literacy used above seems to be located in a skills-based mode, drawing on the autonomous model of literacy practice where the decontextualised learner (Boughey and McKenna 2011a) is thought to possess the necessary skills for acquisition of academic practices devoid of context and social setting. This model is counter to the ideological approach to literacy enhancement (Lea and Street 2006; Street 1984), which supports the positioning of the student in relation to his or her learning in cultural settings (Clark and Ivanič 1997; Street 2003). Academic literacy as social practice offers a strong alternative to the autonomous model of learning that promotes generic transferable skills. This is especially important in a country such as South Africa, where the massification of higher education introduced ‘a wider pool of multicultural and multilingual students who displayed new forms and levels of literacy and discourse and systems of thinking and values that were at times discordant with the accepted norm at the university’ (Free 2008: 12).

5.6.2.2. Advancement of the project

Mani tries to redefine the conventional skills-based approach by drawing in peers and soliciting the assistance of content lecturers to make it more a collaborative effort in inducting students into the discourse community (Gee 2001):

The key idea is to generate the motivation for student, the writing centre staff and for the content lecturer to be willing to assist each other to assist the students with their assignments. So if I look at your student’s essay, for example, and I indicate some issues that I want the student to work on and the student does not show that to you, then there is no communication between yourself and myself. And that lack of communication kills any idea that we may want to develop in order to benefit the situation (Photovoice 2013).
In requiring students to take their edited work with comments back to their lecturers for feedback, we see the emergence of Mani’s nascent corporate agency, as he is able to articulate and motivate for his goals and objectives regarding his project. In his domain of practice, where he confronts the constraints placed on him, we see his emergent personal and social identity emerging through his agential positioning as strong evaluator of his context of practice (Archer 2003):

The 5th picture shows the entire classroom or a portion of that classroom, actively busy, working on a particular assignment. This picture should be closely analysed with the 6th picture because this session is absolutely important in terms of generating the kind of feedback that I am interested in. This is to say that a student who has an assignment with this tick [referring to picture] takes a lot of work. This work has to do with not just the structure of the grammar and sentences but also has to do with the argument or the rhetoric that the student is trying to generate. In academic literacy we say that you can write in very beautiful English but if the sense is not there, you are not handling an issue, then you might not get a right mark (Photovoice 2013).

Mani is also able to articulate the need for this collaboration to be a reflective process, not to focus just on writing ability, but also on teaching and learning as a whole. This shows his cares and concerns for aspects that transcend his immediate ‘jurisdiction’, extending his project to include aspects of engagement that focus on the whole, and not just on the sum of its parts:

It should be done in a synchronous manner. It should be done when a student can identify weaknesses immediately for herself as well as it can be done in a delayed manner so if we do not merge the two in a harmonious manner, then there will be a problem. That is why there should be space even if it is for an essay assignment for students to talk about it. The ability of the students to express themselves orally about what is reflected in their essay on paper helps them to think about their assignment but also helps them to reflect on what they are learning and what they might not have been learning . . . and so it is a teaching experience for everybody concerned: the student, the writing centre and lecturer to get the students to this position (Photovoice 2013).

5.6.3. Realisation of the project

As agents confront their contexts and the activated SEPs and CEPs that emerge, they have to be decisive and deliberate about the strategic actions that they take to realise their projects in education. It is at this stage that a make or break moment is experienced. For agents who have had insurmountable hindrances to their project, it is at this stage that they
gracefully bow out, and renounce or abandon their projects in the light of extenuating circumstances. For agents like Mani, it is here that the channelling of energy and guidance bear fruit against the forces of globalisation, internationalisation, and widening participation.

5.6.3.1 Agential responses: mediating between concerns and context

Mani’s main obstacle to his project, namely deepening students’ engagement in their academic practices, was in getting disciplinary lecturers to support the collaborative model of academic support that he had introduced to the Tygerberg campus.

They want the writing centre to fix students and they don’t want to get involved themselves. TDP helped me with developing actions. I used Prof. Jacobs’s workshops to get lecturers to see that they are part of that process as well (Photovoice 2013).

To mediate this constraint, Mani contacted the language coordinator of the faculty to start a process of dialoguing in order to design workshops to get dentistry lecturers involved with students. His collaboration with the language coordinator again shows the emergence of his corporate agency as he advocates and garners support for his project:

I used a scaffolded methodology to get them involved by getting them to be part of the formative feedback for students (Photovoice 2013).

Mani confessed that many of the challenges with lecturers in the dentistry department were personal challenges that he had to overcome, based on their non-acceptance of his role and status as academic practitioner:

These were mainly in terms of perceptions; they were resistant to collaborate with me. They saw me a consultant there and maybe not good enough to advise them (Progress check interview 2013).

Using his PEPs of perseverance in service of his project, Mani set about changing their perceptions, despite the huge emotional weight that dragged him down, as these were his ‘peers’ whom he had to win over:

I had to get them to see that it was not about me and them but their/our students and their academic competence. It took a lot of struggle on my part at first because they did not care. A lot tied into who I am. Only a few people know me on that campus: the
language coordinator and the HoD of the dentistry department, so I have limited support there (Progress check interview 2013).

Although he had the support of two significant social actors, Mani was left to his own devices (PEPs) in exercising agency to counteract the apathy demonstrated by lecturers. When faced with the lack of interest from content lecturers, who ignored his requests for discussion and feedback on their students’ work, Mani, instead of accepting their apathy, strategically devises an intervention to get the lecturers on board:

I got a lot of resistance from lecturers, for example, when I ask lecturers to check on the content aspect of the assignments, they ignore me. They don’t want to get involved. But I did not attack them; I devised workshops to get them there. I sent an email to the HoD who knows me and has an educational background (unlike the other dentistry lecturers) . . . he knows what I did during the TDP and with the writing centre so he supported the idea (Progress check interview 2013).

Operating as a sole agent and without assistance and intervention from his own department, CHED, Mani single-handedly uses the resources at his disposal to mediate an untenable situation with lecturers. He leans on support from the two social actors who have high bargaining power and negotiating strength (Archer 2003) to give strategic guidance to his own goals and, in so doing, he is able to move beyond the stalemate reached with lecturers. As he gains confidence himself, Mani seizes opportunities to realise his project further:

It took time and sacrifice; it was not instantaneous. I have to seize opportunities. One such example was at the staff meeting where I mentioned it and gave them the academic literacy handbook. It was very simple to understand and when they saw the collaborative examples from departments, they were surprised. I used staff meetings and workshops; I listened in on their lectures; I used the opportunities to gain their confidence and build support for the work (Progress check interview 2013).

It is clear that Mani is the corporate agent at work here. His morphogenesis from personal identity to social identity is matched by changes from primary agent to corporate agent. Through his own determination and commitment, Mani is able to bring his project to full term, advancing efforts to mediate and navigate around the obvious structural and cultural constraints that he faced. He is able to realise not only his own goals, but also broader goals espoused by collaborative researchers advocating for a pedagogy that can bridge the divide between disciplinary and communication specialists so that the explicit teaching of disciplinary literacies could be explored (Jacobs 2010).
Even with students, Mani needed to bring them on board in collaborative synergy. Ironically, though, for someone as committed to the student project as Mani, students themselves were harsh in their evaluation of him and his efforts, drawing on xenophobic and racist discourses, and targeting his accent as a marker of Difference:

Students are very blunt; they say this man can’t speak English. They look at my accent. It is mainly the 1st years who expect an English- or American-sounding lecturer. They do not know the difference between Communication and English. Students have written to the HoD about me; they tell other lecturers that this guy is weird, he cannot speak . . . I deal with it and move on; basically they need me (Photovoice 2013).

As Mani was an outsider to the discipline, he had to work extra hard to make his way from the periphery to the centre (Lave and Wenger 1991). By using his relationship with the HoD and the language coordinator in the faculty, as well as a few supportive students, he was able to break through:

There was resistance to changing writing and improving – for them it was hard work. I managed to work well with BTech students on their articles and assignments. These students then saw the importance of what I do and then they needed me more. I got them to talk to 1st and 2nd year students during workshops I organised so that they could share how they would have benefited if they had taken it seriously from 1st year. By foregrounding them, I was building a community of mentors. We don’t have tutors or mentors but I managed to negotiate with a tutor trainer and got the HoD to agree to do the training in vacation time (Progress check interview 2013).

In mediating the challenges of a diverse HE class, Mani, who prides himself on his multicultural heritage, is well placed to facilitate a cross-cultural learning experience in his class. The diversity in his class represents the diversity that is South Africa. As a foreign lecturer in this local setting, Mani is perhaps more objective in his views on the socio-political history that precedes group interaction in his class. His role therefore in the social inclusion of his students is significant as he works across socio-cultural barriers to bring students together:

It's not just one group targeted at those who need help. There are students from the township as well as Afrikaans-speaking students working together. I use these spaces to get them to work together. Perceptions from homes come in, as this is a very small student population at Tygerberg. In a sense they are forced to work with each other and this helps to break down barriers (Photovoice 2013).
Mani is still driven by his commitment to student engagement, weathering the insults and criticisms well, believing strongly that the need for his services is great and that students will benefit from this if only they embrace his bigger project. This bigger project involves students’ ability to straddle dual contexts of academia and the profession, and ‘learners may often be unmotivated to enhance their literacies, particularly in reading and writing; yet, in the interests of the future growth of the profession, the latter will be required of them as practitioners who conduct research and publish’ (Wright 2012: 1).

There was also resistance from students. They don’t see themselves as people who need to write well. Instructions from lecturers – write well and hand in but students have deficits and capital. Students see dentistry as a practical discipline with very little writing. Only at postgraduate level do they write reports, but some of them come back to academia. They need to see the need to have this competence – the Health Council insists on this as well. When they come to me, I show them how to do it. They need more complex arguments, logical thread, etc. (Progress check interview 2013).

Given all his efforts to deepen student engagement at the Tygerberg campus, Mani is able to appreciate the fruits of his labour. After much perseverance, and as a result of his determination to succeed, Mani forges ahead by breaking down the many walls of resistance by keeping focused on students and their success, even at his own expense at times. His agential actions are directed at the real empowerment of learners. In a study with another group of health science students and lecturers, Wright (2012) found that there was a need for lecturers to implement certain practices that would shape the learners’ identity, not only as clinical practitioners, but also as researchers and writers. In doing this, they will ensure that the learners’ potential is realised and that they have the capacity to make meaningful contributions to the growth of the future profession. As a new lecturer, Mani is doing exactly this, and the way that he draws on his PEPs to do this is commendable and very inspiring to see. If South Africa is to make strides in changing the structural and cultural impingements on the academic and social project to realise the goals of a transformed HE, Mani is the kind of agent with the appropriate social identity that HE needs, committed not just to his own metamorphosis but to that of his students and colleagues as well, and he is someone that HE should nurture and support:

When they know what I can do to help, they change. I deal with their perceptions professionally not personally; the process will show them that the issue is bigger than accents (Photovoice 2013).
In a personal communication with Mani after the data session for this study, he shared with me that the reflexive activities such as the photovoice and river of life had enabled him to reflect on his long-term concerns and commitment, and to develop his dream and goal for a bigger and more expansive ‘project’ in the future:

I have always wanted to teach in a university at home, but I have realised that I need to do more than just be a lecturer. I started thinking about this seriously last year. I hope to make a meaningful contribution to my country’s HE system one day. This is one of the reasons why I diverted from English to Education in terms of my studies. I hope to one day establish a private higher education institution in Cameroon. The reflective journey started during our TDP sessions. The photovoice session was a suitable tool for me to deepen my reflection. I used it with my students last year and the results were very significant. Its transformative appeal inspired me to consider establishing a private university at home. This is because we have very few vocational HE institutions at home, and they are all owned by the government. I think that I am in a suitable position to learn and prepare myself before embarking on such a venture. So, in the midst of all the challenges, I am hopeful and positive (Personal communication 2014).
CHAPTER SIX
Chapter Six: Cross-case Analysis of the Narratives of Mediation at T4 of the Morphogenetic Cycle

6.1 Preface

In undertaking a cross-case analysis of the six narratives of mediation in Chapter Five, I have come full circle in this chapter to revisit the purpose and goals of my research study in critical and social realist terms, and to discover again the structures and mechanisms, as well as the events and observations generated (Outhwaite 1983), in the life course of new academics as these agents mediated their contexts and transition into HE. This chapter is thus focused on moving across the data, to focus on the broader issues that emerged and are of significance to HE at the deeper but hidden levels at the level of the Real, where powerful underlying and generative mechanisms are lodged, either as tendential or operational devices (Danermark et al. 2002; Sayer 1992). As with the other chapters, this complexity is engaged with through a ‘mixture of theoretical reasoning and experimentation’ (Outhwaite 1983: 332), in the context of the social world of the university. The understanding of the reality reached by the analyst is not absolute and is indeed fallible (Archer 1995), as agents and their choices are fallible:

Agents have to diagnose their situation, they have to identify their own interests and they must design projects they deem appropriate to attaining their ends. At all three points they are fallible: they can mis-diagnose their situation, mis-identify their interests, and mis-judge appropriate courses of action (Archer 2003: 9).

Notwithstanding, it is an explanatory account, trying to grapple with the underlying causal tendencies with the same commitment as when this study began, where my research goal was to understand and explain the conditions that enable and/or constrain the exercise of agency among new academics in HE. To this end, I undertook six case studies of individual lecturers, who were the units of analysis, to see how they mediated the contextual influences that impinged on or advanced their projects at the UoT. Guided by the main research question and sub-questions of this study (see Chapter Three), I used a critical realist framework (Crinson 2007) to guide the analytical process and to write up the cases as individual narratives of mediation, each with its own intricacies and nuances. The theoretical reasoning processes of abduction and retroduction enabled me to abstract from the level of specificity of the individual case studies in Chapter Five to a level of transcendental
argument in this chapter, driven by the question: what must the world be like for new academics to exercise agency in this way (Danermark et al. 2002)?

To inform and guide the meta-analysis across the individual narratives in this chapter, I used an organising framework derived from Bhaskar’s Seven Levels (laminar) of Scale or Seven Scalar Being (2010). In their seminal work in the field of disability, Bhaskar and Danermark (2006) used the first ‘laminated system’ to analyse the ontological features in their study in relation to social interaction and reality. This system allowed for a significant depth of analysis as well as a conceptualisation of social interaction in interconnected and relational terms. In my study, the concept of relational agency is crucial to how new academics mediate their contextual conditions, and it is a form of agency that professional development programmes might do well to embrace, given the interrelated nature of the university and HE as a structural and cultural system.

The term ‘laminated system’ was first introduced by Andrew Collier and it refers to ontologically different levels or layers for the exploration of social and natural phenomena. The analogy of a laminar conjures up an image of a flexible but hard structure made up of ontological levels that cannot be separated and cannot be dissolved. Much like the layers of an onion, the laminated system radiates from smallest to largest layer in inseparable and irreducible ways. There are four types of laminated systems in critical realism but I shall be focusing on only one of these, namely the Seven Scalar Being, which allows for analysing and accounting for relationships at different orders of the hierarchical scale, through which critical realists develop the concept of a relational social science (Nunez 2014).

The Seven Scalar Being is understood in conjunction with the Four-Planar Social Being (Bhaskar 2010), which refers to the four dimensions in which any social event must be understood: material transactions with nature; social interactions between humans; social structure proper; and the stratification of the embodied personality. While social life is concept-dependent but not exhausted by its conceptuality, the conceptual features may in turn be developed further

... to include an account of discourse as both constitutive of and conditioned (or causally affected) by, and in turn conditioning (or causally affecting), the extra-discursive aspects of social life as unfolded over the four-planar, seven-scalar social being (Bhaskar 2010: 12).
Each social level, however, according to Bhaskar, cannot only be situated in the dimensions of the four planes, but must also be located in ‘a hierarchy of scale, that is of more macroscopic or overlying and less macroscopic or underlying mechanisms’ (Bhaskar 2010: 14). The distinct levels of ontology, agency and collectivity, with which social explanation in this chapter is concerned, incorporate the seven levels of scale. This is captured graphically in the chapter cover above, and defined in the list below (Bhaskar 2010):

i. The sub-individual or psychological level
ii. The individual or biographical level
iii. The micro-level, studied, for example, by ethnomethodologists and others
iv. The meso-level, at which we are concerned with the relations between capitalist and worker or member of parliament and citizen
v. The macro-level, orientated to the understanding of the functioning of whole societies or their regions
vi. The mega-level of the analysis of whole traditions and civilisations
vii. The planetary (or cosmological) level, concerned with the planet (or cosmos) as a whole.

In employing a ‘laminated analysis’ in this chapter, I explored the significant structures, agencies and their articulation of each level of the Seven Scalar Being using categories and concepts drawn from all seven levels of ontology. As my study involves a social phenomenon, namely the exercise of agency and its mechanisms, the seven levels of scale were appropriate and useful to enable a discussion about contradictions and comparability between two or more structures which are emergent but ontologically different. The Seven Levels of Scale system is used here as a critical heuristic to synthesise the analysis and assimilate it in relation to the study. Again, by keeping the different levels of reality analytically distinct, it allowed me to uphold Archer’s insistence on a non-conflationary analysis. To this end, I have interpreted Bhaskar’s Seven Scalar Being to apply to the meta-analysis in this chapter, and across the individual narratives of mediation of the six participants, as follows:
6.2 Cross-case analysis at T4 of the M/M cycle

The cross-case analysis is the T4 stage of Archer’s (1995) morphogenetic cycle, which is the Elaboration Phase. It is here that the outcomes of the T2–3 social and socio-cultural interaction phase (in relation to the T1 – conditioning phase) of the cycle are seen, which can result in either morphostasis or morphogenesis of the domains of structure, culture and agency. In this study, new academics’ strategic actions and agential mediation contributed to the stasis (reproduction) and genesis (transformation) at T4, and account for the elaboration of the different domains of structure, culture and agency at the level of the Real in the context of the university.

6.2.1 Sub-individual level

At the sub-individual layer of the Seven Scalar Being, the analyst is concerned with the psychological makeup of individuals and how they are constituted at this level of social explanation. Synonymous with this is Archer’s (2003) ‘stratified person’, which has its origins in the consciousness of the Self, and which gives an account of the psychological self as formed through practice in the three orders of reality. As the goals and objectives of this study did not require a detailed exploration of each participant’s narrative at a psychological level per se, my focus at this sub-individual level of ontology was in identifying participants’ ‘sense of self’ (Archer 2000), which answered the question ‘who are you?’ in the context of the university and this study.

At this level of scale, I was able to focus on key aspects that participants, in strict and unique terms (Archer 2000), associated with descriptions of themselves at a personal level, such as their values, attitudes, desires, and beliefs in relation to their practices at the UoT. A ‘sense of self’, in Archer’s (2000) terms, is synonymous with a sense of personal identity, and is expressed not only in ideational and discursive ways, but structurally too, as one’s sense of self is shaped by race, class, gender and other structural markers that differentiate One from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narratives of Mediation</th>
<th>Seven Scalar Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of self</td>
<td>1 Sub-individual level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of self</td>
<td>2 Individual level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom</td>
<td>3 Micro level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the department</td>
<td>4 Meso level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the institution</td>
<td>5 Macro level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE nationally</td>
<td>6 Mega level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and International implications for HE</td>
<td>7 Cosmological Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Other. These markers are also significant points of contact for new academics, who ‘present’ themselves as persons first as they try to establish their professional selves as agents at the university.

Bhaskar’s use of the term ‘sub-individual’ to name this level does not in any way detract from the importance of this layer of ontology for new academics in HE, for, even as a sub-layer, personal identity is a pivotal notion in sociological theorising. It draws a line in the sand between over- and under-socialised theories or models of humanity (Archer 1995; 2000) and provides the basis with which to account for an understanding of agency in the structure–agency debate.

New academics in this study had already developed a mature sense of self, prior to social interaction as agents at the university, and it was through their awareness of their embodied personality traits, characteristics, strengths and weaknesses as individuals that they interacted with one another on the TDP. In trying to capture this sense of self, I honed in on those aspects highlighted by participants in their narratives that conveyed information about their historical and cultural situatedness as human beings, prior to their joining the university. These snapshots sometimes invoked earlier phases in their lives, in some cases going as far back as childhood, where significant events and experiences had imprinted on who they were now becoming as HE lecturers and teachers. New academics’ personal reflective anecdotes often involved family, friends, lecturers, role models and peers, and through these I was able to get a sense of their personal configuration of values, thoughts, ideas and aspirations that had come to shape their lives in unique and special ways, and which impacted on the ‘role takers’ and ‘role makers’ (Archer 2000) they were becoming as lecturers in HE. It is also from this sense of self that new academics interacted with students in their classrooms, albeit in less ‘personal’ ways, and which led others like me to see them as distinct individuals. Through these memory traces, I, as the TDP convenor, had come to know and interact with the participants in relational terms, and to see their dispositions, nature, and characteristics in relation to their evolution as participants, new academics, and novice teachers on the professional development programme.

The sense of self, which is individual and personal, must be acknowledged and validated as a crucial prerequisite for new academics in the development of their emergent academic identity at the university, which in turn is in part also socially emerging as ‘an emergent relational property’ (Archer 2000: 123). According to participants in this study, new academics are not given much attention by most faculties, departments or management
structures at the university. There is little room in departmental spaces for academics to come to know one another as people, except at social gatherings, which are few and far between. Seen as tabula rasa, with nothing substantial to offer, new academics were perceived as stepping into HE as ‘blank slates’, waiting to be shown the ropes by more experienced others, who ironically paid scant attention to who they really were, who they were becoming, and who they could be, as fully developed persons, agents and actors.

I’ll give you everything, you don’t do anything, you just teach what I say you should teach and I’m the driver here. I’ll drive everything . . . okay fine, and unfortunately the person was . . . it was her first year teaching, but she had experience and qualifications in the industry . . . so I said okay then, it’s fine, be the driver, then I’ll just be your mouth (Mori).

We have a lot of challenges in the department and I don’t see any teamwork to overcome the challenges . . . . Support of the department to promote research and encourage personal development can also be appreciated (Mori).

In my experience, I have found little that is ‘blank’ about new lecturers who enter HE, and if we as faculty and staff developers took the time to find out, we would find an oasis of fresh new ideas and perspectives, which, through healthy dialogue and critical debate, could be further developed to provide a rich basis for innovation and change in HE. Getting to know new lecturers in an academic setting is an important aspect that should not be underestimated or glossed over when new academics are socialised into the ranks of the institution. There are many creative ways for faculty and departments to involve new academics in processes that would bring these aspects to the fore. Even though a sense of self is intrinsically connected to the persona of a facilitator of learning, it is ironically not common practice that new academics explicitly reflect on, share or articulate their teaching philosophies and beliefs with colleagues in their departments. As most staff development and HE studies programmes will acknowledge, reflecting on one’s beliefs, philosophy and hidden assumptions (Brookefield 1995), which are cultural influences on one’s teaching practice (however debatable a topic this may be), is a crucial step and an important element in becoming a HE teacher (Rowland 2002). HE literature on teaching philosophies (Rowland 2002) makes a strong case for the interconnectedness of beliefs, practice and interaction. How one was taught contributes in no small part to one’s sense of self and how one understands the learning (and teaching) process (Moon 1999).

As an academic staff developer, one is more likely to get glimpses of this sense of self through the nature of the interactive work that professional development entails, through
which we can see that new academics are *people* first and foremost, not cogs in a machine, although there is a great tendency to see them as a ‘workforce’ with an overemphasis on their instrumental value as disciplinary experts. This is a denial of their life experience to date as people, but their life experience does count in ways that defy the hierarchical ranking and discursive construction of new academics as ‘junior’ to their counterparts (see Kira’s narrative). The more spaces there are for academics as teachers to access and revisit their beliefs, the greater the chance for teaching practice to be an ongoing reflexive process of critical praxis and meaningful action.

On professional development programmes we also get glimpses of their ‘true personalities’ through their use of humour, anecdotes, and memories, as well as their shared experiences of despair or anguish. In this study, it became evident in the photovoice narratives that new academics who used ‘metaphor’ as focal points for their photovoice collages, allowed their personalities to shine through and were able to enrich and deepen their reflective narratives with an additional layer of meaning. Drawing on analogies of the sea (Maree, 5.5), agriculture (Mari, 5.3), transport (Mori, 5.4) and construction (Mira, 5.1), new academics in this study took the opportunity to be creative and expressive through their deep and rich stories of mediation.

Professional development programmes could enable spaces for such expression, as new lecturers meet on almost equal terms with others who have little or no prior experience in HE teaching. They are on similar development journeys with focused goals and with arguably less to fear in terms of normative evaluation of the self by others. While professional and academic staff developers may be privy to this dimension of new academics, very few faculty or departmental staff ever get to see new academics in this way. It is in disciplinary departments that this ontological access needs to be instated, as new academics navigate a difficult terrain from the ‘periphery to the centre’ (Lave and Wenger 1991) in their disciplinary homes.

Although acutely aware of their own historical trajectories as learners, new lecturers in this study found it difficult to bring their creativity and experience to bear on how they shaped their teaching in their classrooms, resulting in more traditional rather than creative forms of pedagogy in the early days, despite the wealth of ideas on how to teach effectively. The introduction of more innovative and non-traditional pedagogies by new academics was more often than not treated with suspicion and frowned upon because they were perceived to be coming from people who knew very little about what was considered appropriate (see Mari’s
narrative, 5.3.2). This difficulty in connecting the dots between their professional practice as experts and their personal creativity, which gives expression to their individuality and uniqueness as agents in the classroom, was experienced by many new academics in this study as a cultural constraint, generated by the disciplinary department’s discursive and tacit construction of the ‘norm’ or the ‘acceptable’ practice (unwritten rules) in that department.

In the absence of departmental members who could provide input on appropriate teaching methodologies and related issues, management was quite happy in some cases to ‘farm out’ this responsibility to professional development units (private communication with interview with Dean of a faculty on interview panel, 2012). According to Norton et al. (2010), there is a widespread assumption that formal training programmes will make better university teachers, but, given the range of constraints influencing academics in departmental and classroom settings, ‘filters’ (Fanghanel 2007) made it very difficult for new academics to change their pedagogical beliefs without input from departments. This was a significant constraint on the exercise of their early agency, which prevented them from putting insights, for example from the TDP, into practice. If professional development programmes, as well as departmental induction programmes (where they exist), are not ontologically and epistemologically conceptualised as enablers to recognise the independent and emergent properties of new academics as teachers, then little or no space is created for them to be reflexive and agential in bringing their sense of self to bear on their academic and professional identities and, more importantly, on their projects in HE. This has a direct bearing on all aspects of HE teaching and learning praxis.

If HE, as Archer puts it, is intent on ‘bringing real people back in, as robust and stratified beings’ (Archer 2000: 306), the sense of self is an important first step in acknowledging the new academic as a human being and then as an active agent, capable of establishing cares and concerns in relation to practical and experiential learning processes in the three orders of reality. Personal identity (sense of self) is crucial to becoming a reflexive social agent because it enables one to avoid being swamped by a social identity (Archer 2003: 19) that might trap academics new to HE into boxed-in constructions of what it means to be an academic practitioner in HE today. Engagement with both their personal (sense of self) and social identity (concept of self) in their professional work is vital to how new academics establish the difference between the Self and impingement by the Other at the university. Without this engagement, new academics are easily persuaded to take up positions that are under theorised or uncritical, leading to extensive reproduction of practices or a morphostasis of culture that does not serve HE well in current times. New academics’
personal identities, expressed as a sense of self or the sub-individual ontology, must find spaces to be strengthened as this ontological validation has causal links with their socially acquired concept of self.

6.2.2 The individual level

While a ‘concept of self’, like the sense of self, is partly psychological in makeup, it is mainly through interaction with structures, social interactions and cultural practices that the ‘concept of self’ is developed and established socially (Archer 2003). I have therefore chosen to link the ‘concept of self’ with the second level of the Seven Scalar Being, namely, the level of the ‘individual’ or biological being. This level of ontology is where human beings, interacting in the world with other physical beings, invest in a social identity. In this study such an identity emerged as a result of new academics’ cares and concerns in education, and through which they were able to adopt a modus vivendi as new lecturers:

Modus vivendi is the concretisation of how agents have determined to live in view of their concerns and in the light of their circumstances. It is the modality through which our subjective reflections about what we most care for intersect with our objective conditions of life, which has the potential to constrain or to enable different courses of action (Archer 2003: 201).

On the level of the individual in the Seven Scalar Being, participants’ ‘concept of self’ answers but is not restricted to the tacit question ‘what do you do?’ One’s ‘concept of self’ has everything to do with being social, and as lecturers move into new roles and new spaces in the university, they necessarily engage with others on the strength of a professional identity, already formed through former industry practice or former educational activities, or in the process of being formed as higher education practitioners.

New academics’ concept of self in this study faced two ways: to the professional identity, as well as to the academic identity, in the cultural settings of the classroom, the department, and the institution. The conflation in response to the ‘who’ and ‘what’ questions revealed that new academics, still in the process of establishing separate identity markers (Boler 1999) as individuals, were comfortable with embodying an ‘interim identity’ as practitioner to allow them to cross the threshold from industry, where disciplinary practices shaped their practice and training, to the classroom. While inter-sectionality is a boon for relational agency, the danger of reducing one to the other is what Archer warns against as she rejects the elision between meanings or ideas with those who hold them (Williams 2012), as culture is not
seamless, coherent, or consistent. The conflation of a sense of self with a concept of self is exactly what Archer (2006) argues against, as ‘the universal’ cannot be equated with the social and the cultural domains:

There has been a persistent tendency in the social sciences to absorb the sense of self into the concept of self and thus to credit what is universal to the cultural balance sheet (Archer 2006: 264).

Archer’s argument for an analytical distinction to be maintained between a sense of self and social variations in concepts of selves rests on the premise that the sense of self is innate, while the concept of self emerges out of existing conceptual frameworks in the cultural system or register (Archer 1995). The negation of either dimension minimises academics’ ability to legitimately contest the hegemony of higher education, which as a system does not readily acknowledge the capacity of classroom-based teachers to create knowledge as ‘living theories’ and not just as propositional knowledge (Whitehead and McNiff 2006). If due emphasis is not given to these ontological dimensions of new academics as causally efficacious beings, it is likely that the professional identity will overshadow the personal identity, rendering null and void the argument advanced here for the recognition of the personal and the professional as important dimensions of new academics as agents. The embrace of both the personal and the professional enables new academics to ‘look at one’s (putative) knowledge from the outside, to suspend belief in order to reflect on what one has been doing’ (Code 1987: 21).

From their career trajectories, it became clear that four of the six new academics in this study, who had already established very strong professional identities (concepts of self) based on their being strong evaluators in their professional capacity, relied heavily on their distinct disciplinary identities in their new academic roles. Mira, Kira, Mari and Maree (see Chapter Five) had entered academia after experience in industry or professional practice and in a sense were quite ‘set in their ways’, even as newcomers to the HE field. Others, like Mari and Mani, who had well-developed educational trajectories as a result of their postgraduate studies, and who had focused on research for several years, presented strong research identities (Mari) that accounted for strong academic concepts of self. But these new academics also ‘struggled’ because their ideational constructs (inherited discursively), of what it meant to be a higher education teacher in an intellectualised sense, conflicted with what was required of them in a real sense in the current HE classroom, with all its challenges. Yet others, who had moved linearly from postgraduate study straight into
lecturing (Mori), with neither industry nor professional practice experience, struggled with a sense of ‘underdeveloped’ identities in both the academic and professional domains.

All six new academics, despite their varied arrival points and their differential resource bases as agents, experienced the greatest level of challenge as they started to establish their modus vivendi through their projects. They needed to embody a ‘hybrid practitioner’ identity, which the TDP enabled them to experiment with because the course called not just on cognitive and intellectual expertise but also on individual and personal accounts through reflective practice and sharing on an interpersonal level. This was a further enabler to strengthen their ability as HE professionals to respond to the educational challenges of their students in their diverse classrooms in more holistic ways, using the ‘the head and the heart’ (Dall’Alba 2005; Whitehead and McNiff 2006) in relation to students' learning challenges and in pursuit of their own modus vivendi. Those academics (Mani and Kira), able to bring more of their personal identity into the academic classroom through their PEPs, were better placed to mediate the micro-challenges faced at this level.

I feel that my multicultural and multilingual experiences . . . have provided me with commendable potential to assist many of the students I am exposed to, who share similar experiences and problems with studies like me (Mani).

The tension arose when they interacted in their disciplinary spaces and in their departments, where colleagues and management, accustomed to more traditional ways of practice, provided few alternative cultural spaces for new academics (Mori, Maree, Mira) to express themselves in their professional work in classrooms and in departmental spaces, especially in the early stages of their nascent identity formation.

We have a lot of challenges in the department and I don’t see any teamwork to overcome the challenges. Instead, our students are getting . . . their problems . . . solved completely, but our problems are not being solved (Mori).

In fact, as new lecturers set about establishing their academic and professional identity at the university, they perceived that they were expected by HoDs and senior colleagues to downplay their individuality, especially at staff meetings and other departmental gatherings, in raising issues and contributing to discussions.

Even with that when we have meetings . . . there’s so much negativity amongst us. You go a meeting, you come out of a meeting so depressed . . . because anything that is
suggested, it depends who it comes from then, it gets crushed. More established colleagues are able to make comments that create negative impressions of new academics, such as what are the students actually doing? (Mori)

Some new academics perceived that they would be ‘laughed at’ and not taken seriously, as their more professional concepts of self, socially formed through disciplinary practices modelled by the department and at the university, were not seen as valid yet. This conflation, according to Archer, leads to the denial of the reality of self (Archer 2000), and illuminates the generative mechanism at play here, which continues to construct the university professional as a one-dimensional and unstratified person:

From this viewpoint, there is only one flat, unstratified, powerful particular, the human person – who is a site or literally a point of view. Beyond that, our selfhood is a grammatical fiction, a product of learning to master the first-person pronoun system, and thus quite simply a theory of the self which is appropriated from society (Archer 2006: 264).

In reflecting on their teaching practices post the TDP, and through their photovoice and river of life narratives, new academics signalled their disappointment with the negative effects of repressing their innate creative and cultural selves. These academics struggled not only with ‘being themselves’ but also with ‘being more relaxed’ with their students in the classroom. In fact, two of them identified these issues as sub-foci for their projects in higher education. The issue of ‘being-ness’ was also evident, for example, when students commented that lecturers were so ‘different’ outside the classroom, often more approachable and friendly compared with their roles in the classroom.

This student comes into my office the one day and we were like having this deep discussion about architecture . . . about it being your life and da da da da . . . and then he actually asks me so like . . . are you married? Do you have a partner? Is architecture your life? (Mira)

Again, the disconnect between who new lecturers are and what they do is partly the responsibility of an academy that has historically favoured reason over emotion, and logic over personal expression (Zembylas 2003), as if the interrelatedness of one with the other can be dichotomized in actual terms.

New lecturers also expressed dissatisfaction with being ‘homogenised’ or ‘homologised’ as they took up their new positions in HE, being expected to fall in line with the rest, with little
mentoring or support from other role players. The act of ‘being human’ in an academic setting was a prominent feature in how new academics related to their students. When work and projects are taxing and overwhelming, students and lecturers refer to work overload as being ‘not humanly possible’, and when lecturers are discriminatory and prejudicial in their interaction with students, these displays are referred to as being ‘inhumane’. New academics in this study referred to the need to ‘be more human’ as the preferred ingredient for forging good relationships and collegiality among students, especially for accomplishment of projects and tasks. The act of being human and humane, and disclosing these aspects of our selves, cannot be blocked off, hidden or erased as one transitions into new roles and settings. Conditioned by an innate need to respond in humane ways, new academics in this study turned to their personal value and belief systems (sense of self) to enable them to be more flexible in their interactions with students, and to become more critical, for example, of idealised stereotypes of race and gender (McNiff 2006).

I lectured different students . . . mostly male dominated and mostly . . . white – that’s when I joined and that group still exists today even though we are more integrated with the other racial groups now (Mori).

I forced them to be diverse and it’s lovely to see how in a team they care about someone that in another context probably will be seen as a threat. I bend rules, I am a bit rebellious because I want to be sure I am fair and students see it! (Kira)

In being able to ‘relax more with students’ and ‘allow their students to be human beings’, new academics drew on a range of personal emergent powers as enduring parts of the Self, that is, who they are, and not just what they do. Both aspects were needed for their inclusionary relations with a diverse student body in the current multicultural HE system. As agents, these PEPs enabled new academics to confront the difficult elements of inclusion and exclusion that they and their students faced on a daily basis.

the analysis shows that this dimension of our professional work needs to be balanced and imbued with a considerable enactment and display of ‘humanity’, especially in the classroom, as it is through this dimension of self that the professional persona of the academic responds to students’ human challenges in the South African context, such as poverty, underprivilege, marginalisation, and alienation. It is the human being in us that responds to human frailty; it is not necessarily the rational being that the academy so reveres that makes the effort to respond humanely to students’ dire needs. The capacity for loving relationships and productive work (Whitehead and McNiff 2006), and the ability to
speak the truth with integrity, enables the reconceptualisation of academic work as directly contributing to social wellbeing and building of human capacity (Sen 1993).

To deny these aspects is to negate a diverse range of perspectives which in essence cannot be ‘neutralised’ if who new academics are, is intrinsic to who they are becoming as HE practitioners (Barnett 2000). The ontological turn (discussed in Chapter Four), advanced as a response to understanding and embracing the new HE (Barnett 2000; Brown 2009; Dall’Alba and Barnacle 2007), applies not only to accessing students’ ontological status but also to lecturers’ as well, so that they do not become ‘cultural dopes’ (Archer 2000) or passive puppets of the HE system. Instead new academics need to be able to instate themselves as autonomous and independent beings, who are the ‘bearers of further emergent properties and powers which are what make them recognisable as persons who respond differently to the world and act within it to change it’ (Archer 2006: 12).

In the six cases in this study, new academics’ concept of self varies greatly based on how well endowed or privileged the agent is on entering HE in terms of qualifications and experience. This became evident in participants’ narratives in Chapter Five, when those lecturers with stronger professional identities (see Mira’s, Kira’s and Mari’s narratives – 5.1; 5.2; 5.3 respectively) were in a slightly better position to assert their identities in their classroom practice and in relationships with colleagues. One’s concept of the professional and academic self is what adds to the resourcefulness that agents are endowed with or need, in order to increase their bargaining power and negotiating strength when they enter the university.

In some disciplines the concept of self was tied to the nature of the discipline, as in the sciences, where the research identity was dominant. In other disciplines, such as architecture, the concept of self was aligned so closely with the sense of self that it was difficult to distinguish where one ended and where the other started. Where the sense of self and concept of self, although distinct, were closely amalgamated in terms of personal and professional identities, there was greater allegiance and loyalty to the participant’s discipline, with less critical reflection on the implications for inducting students not only into the discipline, but into HE in general, which Mira and Mari had come to understand:

I have relaxed a lot; I have more understanding; and I am not so hard. I believed initially in ‘neat drawers of practice’ [referring to photo], precise and accurate but now I see it as a collective experience. In my studio now with my students, I allow them to do more, say
more . . . I understand my role as educator, but still keep professional aspects in my teaching (Mira).

Also, with an overemphasis on graduate moulding, new academics who ‘lived their disciplines’ tended to have more rigid ways of disciplinary induction and empathised less with students who had not quite embraced disciplinary ways of being and doing. Their efforts as discipline experts were geared towards enculturating them into the profession, which sometimes clashed with their need as teachers to see students as students and not as apprentices (see 5.1, Mira’s narrative), a perspective which was counter-productive to the independence and autonomy of students as causally efficacious beings in the first instance.

In yet other examples, concepts of self were entwined with prior practical experience and performative achievement in a field or discipline, which accounted for their strong socially-acquired concept of professional identity, as in the example below:

I make [sic] an informal review of the textbook. I never wrote [it up] . . . and the author came and he took a few notes and he came back with a second [version] which is unclear [sic] than the first . . . it’s frustrating, because I can tell him from A to Z what is wrong in this book, what needs to be improved . . . (Kira).

In these cases, new academics tended to rely on their first-hand anecdotal perspectives, as well as their performative achievement, to work out what was required of them and what counted towards their being ‘good lecturers’ in the field.

Based on the case studies in Chapter Five, the new academics in this study stepped into three main spaces: the professional, the academic, and the practitioner space (in an institutional sense). They had to manage their induction into each of these spaces relative to their own strength in each area. Based on the balance or imbalance of scale, as the case was, new academics in this study identified cares and concerns in education that enabled them (wittingly or unwittingly) to work towards achieving a balance. Through their reflexive deliberation, they weighed up their options, discerned and deliberated, and dedicated themselves to projects they felt would bring about this balance in their process of transitioning. Where professional identities were strong, the move was to strengthen and deepen the academic domain; where the academic identity was strong, the need was to strengthen the teacher identity or HE practitioner domain. To recognise this as part of the conditioning that they enter HE with, is to be sensitive to the appropriate form, breadth, and scope of the induction that new academics need. Generic induction programmes, far removed from the contexts of practice that these new academics are embedded in, mean
that the sustainability and longevity of new practices and insights regarding teaching learning and assessment are compromised and short lived. HE needs to think of induction ‘as a process that goes beyond transmission of information through centralized generic programmes, to take seriously the role of academics in constructing their understanding of themselves in their new environments’ (Mathieson 2011: 244).

If new academics continue to be left to their own devices, devoid of mentorship and post-induction support, it would not be surprising if they resorted to traditional ways of classroom practice in order to survive. New academics as incumbents have to sustain organic, work and social relationships in all three orders in order to survive and thrive (Archer 2006) in the academy, therefore HE cannot be indifferent to the concerns embedded in their relations in these three orders of reality, in terms of who they are and what they do. The uniqueness of each new academic, as embodied in both sense and concept of Self, advances and strengthens the argument that agency is not static. People in similar settings have different emergent properties, based on their composition as stratified humans as individuals, people with roles and positions, and as groups and collectivities who may be more or less ‘powerful’ in decision-making situations, in relation to the contexts that they mediate (Archer 2000).

6.2.3 The micro level (in the classroom)

The case study approach used in this study is ‘intensive’ (Sayer 1992) and consistent with critical realism because the in-depth realist narratives proved to be epistemologically valid, and focused on analysing the structures and the associated mechanisms which gave rise to the observed events (Tsoukas 1989). Through the focus on individual cases, I was able to get ‘much closer to the causal forces than broad empirical research’ (Siggelkow 2007: 23), through the knowledge generated by new academics as knowing subjects, from within their specific social contexts in the university, and communicated through narrativised accounts or cases that tell the story of one's learning (Code 1987).

This in-depth engagement with participants in their contexts of practice unfolds over the next three levels of the Seven Scalar Being, but starts at the micro level of ontology, which locates the novice lecturer in the context of the classroom, where teaching, learning and assessment form the main foci of the teaching – learning interaction between teacher and student. At this level of ontology, the sub-individual and individual levels of the Seven Scalar Being, already analysed above, are invoked as the meta-analysis moves up and across the next levels, and having already emerged as causal links with the SEPs and the CEPs at further levels, the afore-mentioned levels cannot be ignored.
It was at the micro level (in the classroom space) that new academics' cares and concerns were born, emergent from the configuration of constraints and enablements they confronted. For purposes of this study, the micro level was the first organisational level of interaction for new academics, and even though the expression of their cares and concerns, embodied as projects, found their way into departmental and institutional arenas later, depending on the direction that participants wanted them to take. The primary locus of origin for concerns and projects was however at the level of the classroom.

According to Archer (2003), the challenge is not in incumbents having concerns, but partly in identifying which concerns were their ‘ultimate concerns’; or the one concern that was most important to them while subordinate ones could be accommodated to it. Each academic in this study worked out his or her own modus vivendi by prioritising one of the three orders or reality without neglecting the others.

This . . . encourages me to think carefully about issues like academic support, social support, the place of a role model, good teaching practice, the use of technology in education, and the place of a self-reflective practitioner/researcher as an ideal educator. It is important to constantly reflect on these issues, to measure myself in relation to some of these constructs and to honestly identify my strengths, weaknesses and possible areas of development (Mani).

Apart from those people who are said to be ‘adrift’ because they cannot establish a solid personal identity (Archer 2003), all other rational beings have a range of concerns that enables them to get up in the morning, re-set their goals and ‘make their way through their worlds’. This is not to say that there is no challenge or difficulty in doing so, but what it does mean is that as human beings and agents, we have the desire to continually work towards something that improves our lot as agents. Over the duration of the TDP, new academics in this study were able to successfully identify their cares and concerns in education, but concerns are often inescapable (Archer 2000), and new academics had to strike a balance between what they could take on and what they needed to put on hold (see excerpt below). However, the balance they reached and in the particular order achieved, is what defined them as particular persons (Archer 2003) and as new academics.

I don’t know where I want to be, teaching and learning or science or curriculum development. I’m standing with a leg in each of them, not publishing anything, so I’m lost. I don’t really know at the moment where I fit? Can I fit in all three? I don’t know the answer. The question of how do I do research . . . in science I know but the other two I
feel lost (Mari).

The TDP did not determine what they chose as concerns but provided conditioning influences for what new academics could be reflexive about in terms of their goals, and prompted them to ‘check in’ with themselves to see if the driving force behind their concerns was still vital and relevant.

I am the driver of my own academic career and I have to make choices and as you zip with a bike as you sit in traffic on the N1, you need to choose whether you go left or right or straight or whatever and I need to make decisions . . . and you know . . . drive (Mari).

Despite their differential strengths as resourceful or resource-less primary agents (Archer 2003), new academics in this study displayed a wide range of concerns that related directly to the improvement of students and their learning. Even when concerns seem directed at personal goals of individual resource building or collegial relationships, the end point, as articulated by participants themselves, was to contribute to student learning and improvement.

Where participants experienced strengths and weaknesses in their own professional lives, the counter balance became the basis for their configuration of concerns as new academics. For example, where a new lecturer in this study felt alienated or ostracised by students and colleagues, or when they felt not ‘good enough’ as practitioners in the classroom (see Kira’s narrative), bringing students together or forging collegial relations among colleagues became the focal point of the ‘concerns’ that they identified for themselves in education.

When I came to the department I found out we have . . . we have the intention to try to enhance the students and to bring them together from different cultures and to try to bridge the gap, and we are working towards it but we have a lot of restrictions that the job creates . . . (Kira).

In cases where new lecturers felt reasonably strong in their professional identities, they counter balanced this by identifying the shaping of a nascent academic identity as their development goals as lecturers. These concerns were set against and sensitive to broader social challenges as well, which provided and offered appropriate directional guidance in their efforts to make a difference in education through the quality of their teaching, learning and scholarship engagements in the academy. For some new academics, their conditioning prior to entry to HE, influenced their configuration of concerns, where, for example, their
industry experience led them to see certain aspects as more important than others for
graduate success. The teaching beliefs of new academics in this study (already discussed)
were informed and influenced by their prior experiences (Prosser and Trigwell 1999), as
students themselves and through informal teaching tasks that they embarked on before
joining HE.

I grew up in a house where studying was as important as brushing your teeth (Mari).

Whilst in practice, we received many students out of tertiary institutions, which made me
realise just how ill-prepared students generally are for industry. I knew I wanted to make
a further and more meaningful contribution to the development of students, which would
entail putting my skills to use in higher education (Mira).

Their experience on the professional development programme (TDP) was another source or
prior conditioning for pinpointing concerns set against their involuntary positioning as primary
agents at the UoT, and reflecting an amalgamation of commitments that they were
influenced to make.

New academics not from South Africa (Kira, Mori and Mani) saw themselves as ‘outsiders’
who believed they could imbue the South African HE classroom experience with a more
worldly and global perspective. Others, who were born in this country and who had come
through the South African political, social, cultural, and educational systems, used their
classroom presence to advocate for the improvement of student learning as part of the
national social project of transformation. This was despite their own challenges in this arena,
where the cultural dispositions of the students in their classrooms, who judged them on the
basis on their race, class and gender, served as strong conditioning influences on the
choices available to them as agents.

These ‘judgements’ are set against the backdrop of a series of racially-motivated incidents
that have occurred at various HE institutions across the country, and signal that all is well in
our ‘rainbow nation’. At a university in the Free State, four students made a racist video that
captured the nation’s attention in 2008 (City Press 2014) which was condemned ‘in the
strongest possible terms’ by the university (Mail & Guardian 2008) but the video, made by
male students at the Reitz Residence, added to an already tense racial situation at the
university. At a university in the Western Cape, more recent incidents are being investigated
by a special university commission set up by the vice-chancellor to look into two alleged
incidents where a university student urinated on a black taxi driver, and where a black cleaner was assaulted and verbally abused in a shopping mall by a student.

While the ideals of a democratic and integrated society are being realised in certain spheres of South African society, there are gaping cracks through which remnants from a national abusive past still fall. For new lecturers, students who displayed such behavior, showed their lack of respect for their roles as lecturers, and for them as human beings:

Students are very blunt; they say this man can’t speak English. They look at my accent. It is mainly the 1st years who expect an English or American sounding lecturer . . . students have written to the HoD about me; they tell other lecturers that this guy is weird; he cannot speak . . . I deal with it and move on; basically they need me (Mani).

So with the Afrikaans group, firstly it was the colour that challenged [them] and then my physical appearance and the way I was conducting my lectures. The main issue has been race and gender . . . mainly males doing civil [engineering]. The black males [are] not a problem but Afrikaner males [are] . . . disruptive, disrespectful, look bored . . . don’t pay attention or participate. Other black female lecturers also have [the] same problem – so not just personality clash with me (Mori).

While the structuring mechanism may be ‘historical prejudice’ in students’ expectations of the archetypical university lecturer, there is also little support offered by the university to new lecturers, to support them in responding to students who enter the fray of racialised historic battles. New lecturers entering the HE system are ill equipped to respond to such occurrences as there is no ‘training’ in this regard and a lack of an institutionally-derived set of strategies (not policies) that may be employed.

Conditioned by their own cultural experiences and drawing on discourses applicable to them, new academics’ intentionality (PEP) in relation to their concerns and commitments thus showed a causal link between their own challenges as academics in HE, their prior goal setting lodged in their professional identities, and their commitments to education as a social project. The commentary and feedback from their life course to date, and their vested interests in joining HE, as well as the TDP as a community of practice, served as conditioning influences on this prioritisation process. The generative mechanisms at play here remind us that there is not a zero-sum relationship between agents’ needs and the interventions they devise. These relations may be more causally efficacious and closely linked than we are aware.
Induction and departmental programmes should not underestimate how new academics’ perceived weaknesses act as mechanisms for substantial agential interventions with far-reaching and positive consequences for the institution as a whole. New academics in this study, despite their own challenges, identified the need to do something meaningful and relevant to uplifting of society through improved teaching, and they exercised this agency through careful steering of PEPs, which shaped their projects. The ambitions and goals displayed here are crucial to the cadre of academics that HE needs to attract and retain, if the transformational goals of 1994 are to be realised (HESA 2011). How much better and stronger would this group of academics be if there was a concerted effort across HE structural and cultural systems to support them in ways that encouraged more innovative yet socially-responsive interventions to the dilemma presently faced by HE with regard to student success, and through the exercise of their ‘critical agency’ (see Chapter One).

Once the prioritisation process was complete, new academics adopted projects that reflected their immediate and most pressing concerns as incumbents, and many of these projects centred on pedagogy or the teaching dimension of the academic role. The need to develop the nascent academic identity as a university teacher was made manifest in chosen projects such as: bridging the pedagogic gap; integrating and merging disciplinary ways of knowing and being with teaching; and improvement of expertise as HE practitioners in the classroom for the benefit of students. Some projects also reflected an occupation with concerns that went beyond individual vested interests, such as long-term career improvement, climbing the academic ‘corporate ladder’, or accumulating resources for their own academic development. Given the overwhelmingly corporate nature of HE in current times, which pays scant attention to a holistic higher education (Barnett 2004), and the decreased funding options for HE across the globe (Gosling 2009), as well as the marketisation of education as a commodity (Ball 2012), it is very interesting that the new academics in this study chose ‘projects’ that kept them focused at a micro level on the improvement of teaching and learning in service of their students as core developmental foci.

Other projects which centred more on students’ needs included the use of social networking to engage students; the incorporation of academic literacy practices in teaching; facilitating student engagement across cultural barriers; and strengthening the cooperation between students and lecturer. New academics’ own attitudes to student learning, motivation, curriculum scope, and other pedagogical beliefs played an important role in the way they conceptualised and approached their own projects. The ‘beliefs dimension’ is a highly
agentic one, but one that is influenced in HE by dominant discourses such as employability, widening participation, diversity, instrumentalism, and sometimes negative attitudes towards students and their goals for learning. New academics' projects in this study were directed consciously in most cases to attempting to bridge the gaps between students’ desires and their own expectations and vision as lecturers.

Technology-enhanced learning was an aspect that many new academics on this study used to bridge the cultural gap between them and their students, seeing technology as a universal and common language to compensate for discrepancies in language use and competencies. Their attempts to include technology in the classroom, specifically through the use of video and social media for educational purposes, showed high agentic ability on the part of new academics, as many of them were themselves new to these media as educational pedagogies. All academics except one made use of some form of technology in their classrooms and in their teaching, even though attempts were anecdotal and functional, such as uploading notes and tasks onto the Blackboard Management System. What it did show was that new academics in this study did not shy away from tackling new platforms for teaching, despite their own challenges of being on the whole new to HE.

Market-related ideational conjectures become the generative mechanisms that shape the need to embrace technology-enhanced pedagogies in terms of the current market climate in HE and its employability stakes. This is significant especially at the university of technology where ‘technology’ is not limited to electronic media and devices but includes devising ways (technologies) of responding to specific problems in education through applied and innovative means (CHE 2010). The unexpected benefits of using technology for teaching also encouraged more peer learning and group work outside the classroom, extending the traditional mode of learning to include alternative ways of engaging with knowledge.

It’s a short semester . . . it’s no free time for them . . . they have to do it at home . . . they live in different communities, transport is difficult and communicating via technology is a great way of sharing whatever they are doing . . . and being able to achieve a good result . . . (Kira).

As part of the project, students would be encouraged to tweet and re-tweet from the train, taxi or buses about real engineering problems faced by the country, quality of lecturing, interest for the subject, students’ concerns, students’ behaviour, engineering news, etc. This method would be used to supplement formal lectures . . . (Kira).
Whether or not the methods and strategies were successful in extending learning potential to accommodate student diversity challenges, the inclusion of information technology in their teaching allowed new academics to be highly agentic in selecting material for lessons and in how they responded to otherwise enabling and disabling conditions that they were confronted with in their teaching contexts.

The theme of ‘social transformation’ in an academic space and the social inclusion of students ran strongly through many projects’ foci and included goals and objectives such as ‘teaching in ways that engaged all students, including previously disadvantaged students’; ‘strengthening relationships with students and colleagues’; and ‘increased involvement in service learning to mould students as citizens through a meaningful and holistic education’. These foci, which drew on dominant discourses on transformation, went beyond simple self-interest (Clegg 2013) or a narrow focus on ‘producing graduates for the knowledge economy and demonstrated new academics’ awareness of the need for the creation of nurturing and supportive spaces for student development and success. Concern with the notion of helping students to make meaning on ontological and epistemological levels, with the intended aim of cultivating humanity (Nussbaum 2007) for a more rigorous and engaged citizenship both locally and globally, showed the depth of commitment that these agents, as newcomers to the field, considered meaningful and relevant.

If new academics are entering HE with this commitment to contribute valuably to their own projects and to the bigger social project of transformation, it would bode well if HE recognised that social and cultural factors play a substantial role in influencing new academic agency, and the systemic features should not be underestimated in their power to thwart the noble intentions and goals with which new academics arrive. When SEPs and CEPs bear down on lecturers, making it more and more difficult for them to exercise their agency, and with little support, it might mean that the pressure of academic responsibilities in their early years might cause new academics to abandon their projects and opt for easier, more self-serving options. Compounded by the limited or non-existent supportive teaching environments in their departments to build on what was learned on professional development programmes, the future does not augur well for the sustainability of new lecturers in HE if they are not seen and heard as serious contenders in the field.

6.2.4. The meso level (in the department)

Case study research was particularly useful in this study as it enabled me to focus on the relationship between the person and the setting (Christie, Rowe, Perry and Chamard 2000),
in this case between new lecturers and their departments and classrooms, embedded in the contextual setting of the university. In being able to detach the one from the other, I was able to uphold the social realist methodological requirement of analytical dualism (Archer 1995) in this cross-case analysis, where the relationship between structure, culture and agency in all its complexity is at the centre of analysis but analysed in a non-conflationary and non-reductionist way. At the next level of scale, namely the meso level, the need was to understand ontologically ‘a form of determination in reality, in which several irreducible distinct mechanisms at different and potentially emergent levels are combining to produce a novel result’ (Bhaskar 2010: 12).

The various resolved components of a complex phenomenon must in general be themselves analysed holistically, i.e. as phenomena of holistic causality, and the constitution of events (the components of the complex phenomenon) as a nexus and of structures as a system, for example, as in the levels of a laminated system (Bhaskar 2010: 12).

At the meso level of socio-cultural interaction, we see how the three previous levels of the Seven Scalar Being interact or coalesce in disciplinary departments where new academics are expected to be active departmental team players, as well as to contribute to staff meetings, marks discussions, workshop attendance, and other student-centred activities across the units.

Many new academics in this study found their disciplinary departments to be a substantial conditioning influence on how they perceived their teaching commitments and the conceptualisation of their roles as academics. Their scope for agency was influenced by structural constraints such as time, workload, staff meetings, and departmental administrative duties, as well as cultural impediments such as negative attitudes, and lack of support, acknowledgement and recognition by colleagues and management. Many new academics in this study felt that accounting for their time during ‘office hours’ was a departmental prerequisite, but a huge portion of their work done outside office hours, such as lesson preparation, student consultations, tutorials, student feedback, pastoral care, and weekend work, among others, was unaccounted for or not considered. The increased number of working hours with too many teaching and administrative responsibilities and very little time for research meant that these academics needed to do a huge portion of work outside of work hours, resulting in their working more hours than other colleagues in the department, and impinging on their family and personal lives. This constraint offered little room for new academics’ agential manoeuvres, to innovate and try out new methods in their
own time and at their own pace.

Workload is another thing . . . it doesn’t stop . . . you go home and you carry on reading till 11 or 12 or 1 o’ clock – that’s when you are preparing your lectures . . . it’s not . . . you’ve just got to carry on (Mira).

And oh, and a big thing I became a mommy as well . . . working at home is not so easy anymore. Updating notes is also becoming a real challenge for me (Mari).

At the meso level in particular, new academics confronted constraining SEPs and CEPS activated in relation to work–life balance, research and work overload. Even the quick starters among the new academics in this study, who adopted and practised efficient self- and time-management, were not able to always strike a harmonious balance between their workload and their academic and professional responsibilities.

There is so much you have to do; little boxes you have to tick . . . it’s almost as if there is too much for me to do; all over the place . . . for me to know what to focus on at what time. If I look at everything it is mostly [that] there is so much going on and I don’t know what I should focus on at which stage (Maree).

Most of the new academics in this study found the heavy teaching loads and increased administrative duties to be significant constraints on their time to do research, to prepare well for lectures, and to be innovative, as inter-related departmental activities and obligations kept them ‘on a tight leash’. The generative mechanism at play here, tacit and discursive, and driven by the new corporate disposition of HE in current times, creates the expectation among new academics that the level and intensity of work for success involves very long hours and undivided dedication, much like in the corporate world where business managers work a 16-hour day to keep on top of their responsibilities.

The absence of support to do this, however, meant that the department was often a site for conflict with colleagues who did not support new academics in their endeavours, especially in staff meetings or subject meetings where new academics tried to assert their ‘voice’. Departments such as architecture and dental technology, with strong disciplinary identities, were more intent on new academics fitting in and toeing the line than on fostering a true sense of individuality in community. Other departments, such as civil engineering, were reluctant to reach epistemic consensus about how coursework should be disseminated, while innovative ideas offered by new academics were frowned upon and not given support to flourish, as in Mori’s case. Whether complementary or subversive, these relationships of
alliances or conflicts with other agents triggered new academics’ PEPs in particular ways to mediate the effects of constraining CEPs activated in these contexts. For example, where clear rules for the game were non-existent, new academics oriented their practice towards the performative expectations of whatever system was most conspicuous (Lucas and Murry 2006). Often this was in the area of teaching, where they derived a sense of comfort and control in pedagogical matters (Fanghanel 2007).

One area seriously affected by lack of time, which proved to be a major area of contention for new academics in this study, was the scope and time to do research in areas of their specialisation. Many new academics believed that disciplinary research kept them abreast of their knowledge in their teaching subjects, but many had also developed an interest in researching teaching. The lack of time and energy to do both made them feel that their disciplinary and professional growth had been stunted as a result of over-commitment to teaching and administrative obligations.

And at the end of the day I think my problem is I want to increase my knowledge for research and to further my studies but I don’t find the support to do that or the time (Kira).

For new academics, who need time to be able to focus on developing and creating new lessons, revise aspects of the curricula, and deepen their scholarship in general, lack of time, coupled with little or no support from departmental colleagues, is an overbearing constraint. Epistemological or culturally-bound apprehensions of the discipline in terms of its locus and status (Fanghanel 2007) also provided the impetus for new academics to reflect on their principal disciplines and critically reshape the way they engaged with the subject in the light of diverse student needs (see Mira’s narrative). New approaches to teaching and learning that were dislodged from what colleagues saw as dominant approaches in the rest of the curriculum (Ibid.) were introduced to complement established traditions. These agential moves showed great capacity in new academics, even in limited contexts, to be reflexive in their praxis. Departments would benefit immensely from newcomers’ creative energy if they made the space and time to support new academics’ efforts for the greater good of the department and institution as a whole.

In participants’ departments, teaching and learning, discursively constructed as a means to an end and influenced strongly by the neoliberal discourse of marketisation, employability and quality (Cranfield and Taylor 2008), remained in tension with alternative views about teaching as an ontological development of the strengths of students as holistic and capable graduates (Walker 2005) and citizens (Nussbaum 2007). From this perspective there is little
space and energy afforded to development of cognitive and emotional engagement with knowledge, and many of the less traditional pedagogies and methodologies promoted on the TDP were met with resistance even by students. This was mainly in departments such as food technology, where educational ‘games’ were considered to be superfluous to the core job of learning, which was perceived as a rigorous transfer of facts, knowledge and bodies of information in pursuit of graduate success.

Such perspectives are generative mechanisms for a morphostasis in teaching practices, but more concerning is that, with such reception in departments, new academics are inclined to accept that teaching is a highly individualised, psychologised, practical and performative activity (Skelton 2005: 58–59), with little need for it to be innovative or creative in delivery or impact. Given the diversity of the HE classroom, innovation in teaching is not a ‘nice to have’ any longer but a ‘need to have’ to accommodate the wide range of learning differentials among students.

If traditional conceptions of teaching based on ‘the sage on a stage’ model are perpetuated by departments and the institution as a whole, with only a few places where innovation can take place, teaching will continue to be seen as a cognitive experience that understates context (Fanghanel 2007). New lecturer agency and innovation will be severely curtailed and limited by this cultural constraint. With an overemphasis on intentions and strategies (Prosser and Trigwell 1999: 159), individualised perspectives on teaching which do not embrace socio-cultural interaction strongly suggest that teaching behaviours should be predicted and controlled (Malcolm and Zukas 2001: 35). Such perspectives ignore subjectivities and deny the ontological status of new academics as lecturers who are capable of agential and independent action and choices (Archer 2003).

This becomes a further conditioning influence for new primary agents entering HE, to be entrenched as the status quo. If HE does not see new academics (and all academics in fact) as capable of sufficient agential potential to make their own choices in aligning or resisting dominant ideational frameworks, then the end result of professional development programmes will be simply the churning out of academics incapable of engaging actively with issues of context and other constraints that reproduce traditional ways of practice. The underlying mechanisms will not be challenged and the morphostasis of current cultural cycles will continue. If on the other hand, everything becomes the onus of lecturers, too much emphasis will be vested in ‘fixing’ lecturers, with the aim of ‘fixing’ the problem of student success, without acknowledging that the problem is much wider and deeper than
individual lecturers’ practices. However, if lecturers are supported to exercise their agency in response to structural and cultural hindrances, in innovative and unique ways, we have a greater chance of moving the educational and social project further, and to achieve the transformation goals that HE and society hold dear.

While the SEPs and CEPs of their contexts impinged on new academics’ ability to realise their projects, they also provided the impetus and conditions for significant agential manoeuvres by new academics. Here again there was substantial scope for agency, as new academics used the cultural and sometimes structural limitations to introduce new ideas despite negative attitudes from others, and in spite of limited resources like time and workload. Departments, for example, civil engineering and dental technology, which differed in size and shape, and with regard to their propensity to be inclusive, supportive and collegial to new academics as incumbents, provided the settings within which new academics had to decide, discern and deliberate on how they would respond to their own positioning as involuntarily-placed agents in contexts not of their choosing.

Some new academics (Mari) quickly formed alliances with powerful resource holders to strategically advance their projects; among these social actors and agents were HoDs, managers, senior colleagues and other academics attached to various strategic departmental activities. In the case of two or more new academics in this study, their agential manoeuvres capitalised on perceived tensions among staff by seeking out HoD support for their ideas. Where HoDs were engaged and interested, new academics flourished and were able to extend their projects effectively in their departments. An example of this was Mari’s initiative to recreate the TDP in her departmental context for the benefit of her colleagues. Without her HoD’s support, she would have been limited in her reach to others, but, in collaboration with her HoD, she was able to effectively set up workshops and persuade her colleagues to attend, over and above their line of duty as lecturers.

Despite the impact of divided support in other cases, these new academics rallied support from other key players to bring their projects to fruition, as in Mani’s example. Where buy-in from colleagues was needed, these new agents set the pace by dictating the terms of engagement with other staff members, couching these intentions in amenable terms that kept the focus on the project of student success and improvement, and thereby making it difficult for colleagues to refuse for, if they did, their reluctance and apathy would be seen clearly as lack of interest and even dereliction of duty.
Where there were larger faculties, such as science and engineering, new academics felt the impact of being isolated and estranged, and it was easy to fall prey to the anonymity that comes with being a new staff member, who is neither seen nor heard. Even in these situations, though, it is evident that these very conditions propelled new academics in this study to devote their efforts to the building of collegial relationships and professional networks in and among themselves, for example, Mari and Mira. For many new academics in this study, being uncertain of their belonging and positioning in the large group was a huge source of discomfort, especially when departmental colleagues made little effort to make them feel comfortable in informal spaces such as the staffroom, as in Kira’s example.

Many participants in this study identified lack of mentorship and close allegiance to senior role players who could take them under their wing, as constraints on their ability to fit in, or to feel like they were part of the departmental group (as in Mori’s and Mani’s case). This lack of a sense of direction or steering provided the agential impetus again for them to resolve the problem themselves, even though at the expense of their own sense of wellbeing and comfort. New academics exercised agency in mediating these points of tension and discomfort by forming allegiances and alliances with others outside their units and often across disciplinary groupings at the UoT, as in the case of Mori, who sought out another department entirely with which she aligned, to improve the quality of service learning in her own department.

The conditions that constrained new academics in the exercise of their agency provided the deepening of a meta-reflexive understanding of their role and purpose (Archer 2012a) as academic practitioners in HE today. These conditions triggered agential responses that escalated many of these new academics from the level of primary agency, exercised in relation to their individual projects, to the level of corporate agency (Clegg 2011), exercised in service of HE more broadly. With more new academics activating their own transition from primary to corporate agency in HE, it means that the potential pool for a wider range of academics to fill positions as powerful social actors will be increased significantly and more representatively.

This holds promise for a more transformed HE from the perspective not only of a diverse student body, but also of a diverse group of academics occupying role-making and decision-making positions in the university structure, beyond the level of primary agency which has limitations in its own right. As discussed earlier, the recent public debate and outcry about the lack of staff transformation at universities, evident in very few black academics being promoted to the professoriate, has made it clear that the role array at universities needs to
be overhauled, because the mechanisms that keep old, traditional and conservative promotion practices intact (morphostasis) no longer serve the growing corporate agency burgeoning among academics in response to their own morphogenetic moves to escape their involuntary positioning at primary agency level.

6.2.5. The macro level (in the institution)

In undertaking a number of cases in this study, the primary benefit was that I could make comparisons across the six narratives and draw inferences from the similarities and differences, and their interplay, to develop the theoretical explanatory account for why things are the way they are in the context of the institution or the university. Fully cognisant that the purpose of critical realist research was not to produce a set of prescriptive recommendations based on cause and effect relationships (Christie et al. 2000), the realist research methodology undertaken here was process orientated in search of causal tendencies (Bhaskar 1979), requiring the researcher to achieve a significant level of depth in the description of the subjects and setting and the analysis of the data (Macpherson, Jones and Zhang 2004), as well as significant breadth in exploring the contextual conditions and their interaction with the structuring mechanisms at play at the university. This contributed to the main research objective, which was to describe the situation in sufficient detail and with sufficient sensitivity to explain the underlying causal tensions implicit (Crinson 2007) in how new academics confront their settings.

At the level of the institution or the macro level of the Seven Scalar Being, the central notion of relational agency through a laminated system (Bhaskar, Frank, Hoyer, Naess and Parker 2010: 5), which is predicated on Critical Realist concepts such as the open systemic nature of the world and the phenomenon of emergence (Elder-Vass 2010), comes to the fore. Here the constraints and enablements on new academics’ projects at the levels below this macro level interact to produce, through emergence, a set of outcomes or a new result. According to Bhaskar, there are three defining criteria of emergence: unilateral dependence of the higher level upon the lower level; taxonomic irreducibility of the higher level to the lower level; and the causal irreducibility of the higher level in the explanation of phenomena at the lower level. When the emergence of levels is complemented by the emergence of outcomes, the different mechanisms combine synthetically to produce a qualitatively new result (Bhaskar 2010). At the level of the institution, namely the UoT, new academics confront enablements and constraints of the system as a whole; the SEPs and CEPs evident at the micro level of social interaction converge in the bigger system in ways that sometimes align well but are also dissonant, resulting in divergent relations.
It is at this level that the cultural and structural configurations of the UoT are established and set in motion, through uptake by agents or as a rule of policy through official means. Situational logics are most evident at this macro level, where systems and agential interaction meet: where the parts and the people ‘rub against each other’ in dynamic and dialectic interplay to trigger and activate mechanisms pervasive through the entire system. Context was thus paramount in the analysis of the multiple cases, as I also wanted to see how new lecturers were inducted into the academy at various entry points, such as the professional development programmes, as well as through departmental and institutional socialisation processes in the university context.

The importance of context in social life cannot be exaggerated. In general, we cannot specify the operation of a mechanism in abstraction from its context – how the mechanism acts depends upon its context; so that we need to think of the (mechanism, context) couple as the effective generative dyad in social life, i.e. as that which produces outcomes or tendencies to outcomes in social being (Bhaskar 2010: 12).

At the macro level, the TDP was undoubtedly an enabler to new academics in this study, as it not only provided both structural and cultural affordances for them to realise their projects, but also served as a useful temporal capsule in the early days of their transitioning, when they joined HE. In the data-generation phase of the study, and through the creation of a memory room (see Chapter Three), participants indicated the value and significance that the TDP offered them in their new roles at the university, especially when they started. Through the multiple cases in this study, the temporal aspect, which is consistent with critical realism, and which foregrounds the study of the development of a process over time, enabled a deeper analysis of the periodisation of the observed events and underlying mechanisms, not only for the duration of this study, but post TDP, which was a crucial weaning off period for new academics as they broke ties with the TDP community of practice and moved into their own departments. The passage of time is a ‘crucial advantage in being able to assign causality, a central tenet of the critical realist approach’ (Harrison and Easton 2004: 195), and is in keeping with critical and social realist frameworks which stress the importance of observing and analysing data over time through morphogenetic cycles (Archer 1995). This is discussed later.

The consonance between participants’ needs and the goals of the programme were well aligned and this acted as the container or safe space that they could revisit each week by attending the TDP workshops in a close community. For some new academics, their survival in the early days depended on this contact; for others it served as confirmation that they
were on the right track. In the absence of similar support from their departments, the TDP family was akin to their relatives, with whom they could share joys and sorrows as they navigated their way through the rocky terrain of the university. Thus the socialisation aspects of the TDP allowed for initial acculturation to the university’s ways of being, although not without resistance from new academics when it was needed.

As a professional development course, the TDP offered new academics the theoretical platform to sound out their concerns regarding teaching in the HE classroom and to try out the pedagogical models used on the TDP, such as group and peer learning and problem-based learning, as well as student-centred activities. This provided a basis upon which they built their own disciplinary-focused interventions. Mari introduced games and group ‘check-in’ (see Chapter Three) to bring a more human perspective to the clinical classroom, while Mani used breathing exercises and teasers (see Mani’s narrative) to give the group a focal point for coming together as community. Mira and Maree made extensive use of ‘reflection in-action and on-action’ in their classroom practices, for example in the design ‘crit’ (see Chapter Five).

Educational development courses such as the TDP tend to favour participation over control, employing a constructionist view of learning, together with progressive or ‘social reconstructionist’ (Trowler 1998: 74) educational ideologies. Here the emphasis is on personal development rather than propositional knowledge through student-centred methodologies (Trowler 1998: 70). This developmental aspect was a key feature of the TDP as a community of practice and, despite their expertise as professionals, new academics mediated their need to develop their expertise as teachers within the collaborative framework of the TDP through dialogue and informal reflective practice. However, in the broader scheme of things, the epistemological and ontological stance of the TDP created tension and conflict for new academics who ‘returned’ to departmental homes which were epistemologically different from their stances as new academics.

At this macro level, new academics engaged through the TDP with social actors and role players who facilitated the different sessions and increased the networking opportunities that new academics desperately needed. Despite the lack of alignment of the TDP with specific departmental practices, the course work and summative tasks were located in participants’ contexts of practice and provided the impetus for them to work in their disciplinary homes to unravel their challenges. However, the dissonance between the TDP and departments at the macro level of ontological reality expressed itself in ways that Trowler and Cooper (2002)
describe in their teaching and learning regimes as areas of contestation between new academics as novices and experts at the same time. This ideological dissonance proved to be a constraint in the way that new academics interacted with others, as they were discursively and simultaneously constructed through their participation in the TDP as ‘needy’, but subject specialists at the same time. Mira, for example, had no say in her workload distribution, even though she was a senior lecturer. Mori was ‘handed down’ syllabi and content to teach, even though she was deemed fit to be a lecturer in this subject, and had the level of expertise required for the job. This ‘stigmatisation’ (Fanghanel 2009) creates a discourse of deficit which is a structuring mechanism leading others to think of participants as less intellectually capable than they are. This severely compromises new academics’ bargaining power, even though they may be better qualified than some of their colleagues in disciplinary areas.

The TDP was also a constraint in the sense that it did not offer a bridge or link to departmental or institutional support once the programme had ended. Identified as a limitation and a shortcoming, the lack of post-TDP support was a serious constraint on some agents’ ability to put into practice what they had learned (Kahn 2009; Mathieson 2011). The danger of presenting teaching as a generic practice, devoid of disciplinary nuances (Rowland 2002), belies the influence and effects of the ‘ontological and epistemological underpinnings of their disciplines, especially with regard to developing students’ understandings of the concepts, beliefs, values, and theories of their disciplines’ (Quinn 2006: 302). This weakness of the programme also constrains agency of new lecturers to bring in disciplinary perspectives to bear on academic practices.

Alternatively, a socio-cultural approach to inducting new academics, which explicitly engages in reflecting on the possibilities and limitations of their agency amid a range of structural opportunities and constraints in their departments, and which can empower them to become more critical agents as they develop their identities as academics (Mathieson 2011), is one way of bridging the gap. ‘Educational developers should seek to work with the vast majority of staff to recognize, value and build on staff’s concern for their discipline’ (Jenkins 1996: 15.). The irony, though, is that, in the absence of this mediatory link between the TDP and disciplinary practice, new academics in this study showed considerable scope to exercise agency in service of their projects, of their own accord and by their own description. For Mari, it meant taking the TDP to her department; for Mani it meant changing students’ perceptions of him and his role; for Maree, it meant infusing her teaching with an axiological dimension to change the level of depth that students were working from; for Mira, it meant
changing her disposition to be even more socially inclusive than she had been previously; and for Kira, it was building bridges for students to close epistemological gaps.

This does not and should not negate the importance of and need for professional development programmes to forge links with departmental management, or even key figures and champions who can act as mediatory links to wean new academics off institutional programmes and locate them more solidly in their own units. For this to happen, there needs to be an ongoing conversation between educational development units and disciplinary units so that integration at the micro and meso levels is facilitated and supported. Where teaching and learning coordinators are active and responsive, this process proves to be less burdensome. In the absence of these linking devices, leaving new academics to their own devices with no collegial support is to undo in some cases the hard work and time invested in the development programme in the first place.

The tension between teaching and research was also felt at this macro level of interaction, as there was great compulsion by and pressure from the institution for academics to be producing journal papers to increase the publications count per faculty. Messages received from managers about the importance of research served as constraining influences on those academics whose principal interest was not in research but in teaching. Where new academics’ interests lie arguably affects how they approach their work. Despite the many constraints experienced by new academics in all areas of their academic lives, the research imperative was foisted on them as well, with no reprieve in the early years when they were still ‘finding their feet’ and ‘learning to swim’. In faculties such as the sciences, where considerable interest is in research rather than teaching, new academics felt isolated in their efforts to try out innovative teaching interventions, which were perceived as too ‘practice based’ and not theoretical enough in comparison with research. New lecturers relied heavily on student feedback to gauge if they were on the right track but, while student evaluation is necessary, it may not be what the new academic needs, especially if evaluation is done by students not trained or qualified to evaluate teaching in this developmental way (Boughey 2000).

New academics thus received mixed signals and contradictory messages around teaching development, high teaching loads and unclear promotion information. Without guidance on what to concentrate on, a recurring complaint (Kligyte 2011: 201) is that ‘new academics find university expectations for their performance opaque and ambiguous. In a study by Fanghanel and Trowler (2008), it was found that working conditions for academics are
generally unspoken, while the various systems in place to account for academic labour are inadequate and invisible (MacFarlane 2007), and ultimately that ‘regulation of practice through audits, measurement of performance outputs, and rewards has had limited effect on enhancing practice for all’ (Fanghanel and Trowler 2008: 311). Large classes, which appear to be the norm as result of massification and widened access and participation, are a debilitating constraint on new teachers, who have to mediate this challenge with very little experience and even less cultural stamina as incumbents in a sometimes alien HE space.

Studies show that many early career academics who express a stronger interest in research than in teaching will have to be carefully supported in terms of academic workloads and expectations to ensure some level of loyalty to the institution (Staniforth and Harland 2006). Where loyalty to the discipline is stronger than to the institution, retention of new academics is difficult, given that there is no intrinsic connection between them and institutional management. In a similar study, which asked respondents to identify their peer group, more new academics identified colleagues in the same discipline as their peer group than colleagues at the same academic rank, on the same type of contract or in the same department.

Another constraint that affects institutional loyalty, apparent across all narratives, was new academics’ frustration with administrative support at the UoT. This was especially problematic when funding was sought for research equipment or when participants wanted to attend national and international conferences to increase their exposure to scholarship. New academics in this study cited lack of proper infrastructure and top-heavy bureaucratic constraints as structures that thwarted their efforts and demotivated them in terms of continuing with extra-departmental activities. In these cases new academics exercised strategic relational agency with their limited networks of influence to circumnavigate hindrances to bring their projects to completion.

I think I have identified a few people now that I can call and ask for help . . . they are there . . . I must just ask and that’s something I learnt in a hard way I suppose. I think to not ask I am not an unreasonable person . . . if I don’t know I have learnt to just ask (Mari).

Universities need to be aware of where new academics’ loyalties and affiliations lie, when designing support programmes and considering how best to help them to transition into their institutional workplace. The effects of the institutional merger were still experienced as challenges to the smooth running of practical and logistical operations at the university, but
the greater area of tension lay in discursive construction of ‘us and them’ across the different campuses at the UoT. New academics in this study, who had not experienced the merger and were not privy to the historical imbalances that shaped the cultural landscape at the different campuses, nonetheless confronted the effects as part of their involuntary positioning. Unbeknown to them, and depending on which campus they were based, they unwittingly became part of the divide that cut across staff from the historically white and black campuses.

The institution as a somewhat fractured rather than a merged entity, more culturally than structurally, placed an added burden on new academics, who had a further layer of constraint to negotiate. Compounded by historically-shaped discursive notions of Difference, race, class and gender (as examples of structuring mechanisms) played themselves out at all three levels of laminar, namely the micro, meso and macro. New academics confronted these hindrances, often at a personal level where students or staff commented on their race, language, accent and gender in derogatory and discriminatory terms. Some new academics in this study were negatively affected by this, especially if they had not confronted similar constraints in their native contexts, such as the lecturer from a socialist country. Others used this form of constraint to activate their agency in ways that combatted the effects of divisive and differentiation markers by rising above these elements and not engaging at a personal level with these subversive constraints.

When they know what I can do to help, they change. I deal with their perceptions professionally not personally; the process will show them that the issue is bigger than accents (Mani’s narrative).

Nonetheless, these incidents were registered as negative emotional commentary and exemplify again yet another area in academia that lends itself to affect and emotionology, giving credence to the claim that HE socialisation has as much to do emotional labour as it does with cognitive work (Beard, Clegg and Smith 2007). Denying this is to also deny the ontological status of new academics as human beings first, subject to emotional abuse and capable of emotional navigation, that extends their agency in human terms.

The combination of satisfaction with how the institution runs and loyalty to their departments is a contentious issue when new academics perceive that support is not forthcoming from either avenue. This may create a situational logic of constraining contradictions (Archer 1996), where inclination to stay at the university might be diminished because new academics do not identify with the institution. Even if institutional directives in terms of
policies governing language, transformation, and use of virtual learning and technology-enhanced activities are complied with, studies show that early career academics with strong interests that are not met indicate an intention to leave sooner than others whose interests and work commitments or expectations are more closely aligned (Cross and Johnson 2008). Bolden, Gosling and O’Brien (2014: 9) found in their research in the UK that many people expressed a sense of disengagement from their own institutions and a lack of clarity around organisational boundaries, where a sense of citizenship was expressed more often in relation to one’s academic discipline and/or professional group. But if this disciplinary affiliation is missing, new academics’ loyalties will be placed with people outside the institution, and there will be considerable work to do to help these new academics to settle into the university for prolonged employment (Ibid.; Henkel 2000).

If most of the odds are stacked against them, and all of their energy is channelled into constantly mediating constraints, new academics are not going to ‘stick it out’ and, even if they do, their reasons for doing so would kill any spark of enthusiasm and innovation that inspired them when they entered. Two participants in this study came very close to this breaking point, not because they were incompetent, but because they perceived the department and university as uncaring and inhumane. This does not augur well for HE’s retention of new academics and, as I have shown in Chapter Five, new academics, despite misgivings, are capable of great innovation through their positioning and their agency as newcomers. The PEPs activated by them are much needed in HE today and deserve to be endorsed and supported, not dismissed with indifference.

As an institution that is industry facing, ‘accountability’ to external validating bodies such as the DHET and CHE, as well as professional bodies such as the Health Professions Council of South Africa and various engineering councils, puts pressure on the UoT to be transparent but also of ‘high quality’, in order to live up to its mandate to provide the high calibre of professional graduates that South Africa needs. This is additional pressure for new academics, who are in a sense influenced discursively by these validating bodies in how the UoT conceptualises its relational interaction at a cultural level. Even if new academics wished to resist some of these ‘controlling’ attitudes and dispositions at a cultural level, they are ill equipped as new agents, to contest or resist what has come to be accepted at the institution as acceptable quality assurance practice in relation to industry needs. More often than not, the scales tip in favour of what industry wants and, even though collegial connections do exist between the UoT and industry partners, new academics in this study perceive it as a subtle coercion to align with and keep these stakeholders happy.
The legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger 1991) of new academics in moving from the periphery to the centre entails a high level of mediation by those who are in it for the ‘long haul’. The level of constraint implicit is overwhelming for some, especially in the case of those labelled as ‘junior’ in the ranks of the university. New academics in this study perceived this ranking as a severe obstacle to their full potential to be innovative in inserting new ideas learned on the TDP into their practice, but also as self-demeaning labels that affected their self-esteem.

So I feel like I am part of this department but I am just support staff; to lecture and go forward with everyday life . . . so in all, at the moment . . . I am not seeing any progress in what I wanted to achieve (Mori’s narrative).

Junior lecturers in this study who started out as contract or part-time lecturers in terms of their contractual obligations to the UoT, were not precluded from expectations of them to carry full and heavy workloads and responsibilities, as imposed on full-time and more senior staff members. Innovation is difficult for newcomers in general as they feel that they are going against the tide, but even more so if new lecturers are labelled as ‘junior’, despite their extensive experience as professionals in their fields. Junior lecturers, constructed discursively by departments and institutional units as ‘inexperienced’ and understood as ‘inferior’ by new academics in this study, are left out of consultation and key decision-taking processes conducted by more senior colleagues and management, and therefore remain outside the legitimate central participation in the unit. Co-participation as a pedagogy of community is denied and restricted access becomes the principal hindrance to learning (Billett 2004) as members of the community of practice.

The strata demarcated in the institution between junior, senior, and other levels of hierarchy might serve as structural enablers for those wanting to acquire more resources as agents through promotion opportunities, but the cultural constraints manifest in the discursive understandings of what each ‘title’ entails far outweigh the benefits for new academics. Two participants in this study were appointed as senior lecturers: Mira, when she joined, and Mari, in her first few years at the university. As both had no prior teaching experience as such, it could be assumed that senior lectureship was awarded on the basis of research outputs, qualifications, and industry experience. While both held the same title, the affordances attached to each role were differentially allocated in real and discursive terms. The one lecturer who came in bearing the title had little say in the subjects she taught; the other who had ‘earned’ it through a promotion appeared to be more ably catered for by her department. While both relied on the cultural status afforded them by being higher in rank in
their interactions with colleagues, the disjuncture between what their ‘titles’ enabled and how they were perceived as new academics in their departments was stark, and contradictory to the purpose and function of this role in the first place. This makes a mockery of older established academics who have long sought these roles but have not been awarded them despite long teaching trajectories and long-standing experience in HE. This is also indicative of a disjuncture between promotion and appointment procedures, which itself is conditioned by the need for universities to ‘transform’ demographically, as the recent debate and public discourse on promotion procedures for a black professoriate in traditional universities show.

For Kira, as the foreign national participant in this study, the discrepancy between these false dichotomies was a strong disabling constraint in her ability to assert herself among colleagues and to be taken seriously, as she felt that her experience should have counted for something more than the measurement of her worth as ‘junior’. In more ways than one, she saw herself as ‘senior’, based on her professional capacity and as a result of her many years of experience in the field, compared with other academics who had neither taught nor worked in industry before. For Mori, her ‘juniority’ was accentuated by her lack of industry and academic experience, a feature that students were quick to latch on to and use against her. The various structural and cultural dissonances regarding rank at the UoT do not serve the academic or social project in meaningful ways; certainly for new academics they are further discriminatory devices that serve to repress and oppress their natural affinity to join the ranks as ‘ordinary’ professionals, not as differential agents where some who are more equal than others can use their status in divisive ways.

These cultural and structural dissonances send distorted signals about what the new vision for HE is and what new academics, recruited as agents for change within the institutional context are expected to do. At a departmental and institutional level, cultural morphostasis promotes a very different and disjunctive perspective, based on structural influences such as institutional hierarchies, limited funding, and competing ideologies in the department or disciplinary contexts (Fanghanel and Trowler 2008). This multiplicity and complexity in the laminated system of the university is derived from each irreducible level, context and scale discussed already, and, to my understanding, results in each layer contributing to the emergence and creation of the next layer or level. While they may be kept distinct for analysis, in reality the layers are intertwined and co-created and as systems do not exist as one mechanism, as social reality has to be understood as a coalesced totality (Bhaskar and Danermark 2006).
These different levels necessary for the understanding of the result may be conceived as interacting or coalescing in what I have called a laminated system or totality (Bhaskar 2010: 12).

Such is the realist nature and social reality of the institution as a structural and cultural system, where social reality has to be accounted for and explained in its totality as an interrelated system of levels and layers, all connected yet distinct in powers and properties.

6.2.6. Mega level (HE nationally)

At this level of the Seven Scalar Being, the meta-analysis of the cross-case study extends more widely, to a broader level and field, to show how cultural and structural conditioning in national HE, at a ‘mega’ level of ontology and relational agency, permeate, pervade and act as generative and structuring mechanisms for the social interaction and socio-cultural interaction at each of the subordinate levels. Even at this large scale of hierarchy, HE continues to shape new academics’ lives as agents at the micro level of their classrooms. Through structural changes, such as policy initiatives, as well as discursive mechanisms lodged in its cultural repository, HE as a field continues to influence the agential choices, practices, and dynamic responses of new academics (discussed above) at each of the subordinate levels, in a non-deterministic way.

Filtering down to how lecturers perceived teaching and learning in their classrooms, the generative mechanisms at play at this level have their origin in the context of a neoliberal and marketised HE (Ball 2012), and serve as powerful modulators in the way new academics in this study conceptualised their role, purpose, and value as newcomers to the field. This ideological positioning regarding the value and purpose of a university education, which surfaced as contestation around the university as a public good (Singh 2001), raised discursive issues of concern and tension that channelled the efforts of new lecturers in their classrooms in particular ways, either by enabling them to prepare students for work, to develop them on a personal basis, to equip them with the means of changing the world, or to socialise them into a specific discipline.

It is ‘only because they have employed their personal powers to define projects in society that social constraints and enablements can impinge upon them’ (Archer 2003: 300), and these very same personal powers were used to shape their responses to the conditions that influenced them. New academics in this study exercised their agency by adopting ‘stances’ to their projects and contexts of practice. ‘Stances’ are basic orientations of subjects to
society which work as generative mechanisms at the personal level, with the tendential capacity to regulate relations between the person and society (Archer 2003). Each 'stance' goes above and beyond the manner in which a subject responds to any given constraint or enablement, and represents an overall pattern of response to the totality of structural powers (Ibid.) at play. In this way, the ability to take a 'stance' towards society is in itself a personal accomplishment in that it produces the 'active agent' (ibid.: 342–343). For example, one new academic on the TDP in 2011 (but not in this study) saw his role as educator in nature conservation being linked to the fight to save the planet. He believed that by teaching in effective and meaningful ways, he was making a significant contribution to the longevity of the planet, through the young graduates in his course, who would be employed as game rangers around the country. He did not see nature conservation as an end in itself, but as a vehicle to drive his own ideological views on education and its role.

When agents in this study adopted their projects, they necessarily adopted 'stances' towards the constraints and enablements implicit in their projects as well. The stances adopted by new academics illuminated the generative mechanisms at all levels of scale that underpinned these agential choices so early on in their academic careers. The three fundamental positions adopted, which included 'evasive, subversive and strategic stances' (Archer 2003: 301), had ramifications at all levels, but most evident at the micro level of the individual, the meso level of the department, and the macro level of institutions, systems and societies (Archer 2008). The stances, developed through their internal conversation, afforded new academics as agents, a certain degree of control in and over their own lives (Archer 2003) and offered directional guidance in the light of the social powers that they could unleash upon themselves (Ibid.).

In seeking to transform their own circumstances to realise their concerns and adjust their projects in the light of their new circumstances, agents used their stances, through which they made a commitment to a distinctive course of practical action in their contexts (Archer 2003: 353–354). Four agents, Mira, Mari, Kira and Mani adopted a strategic stance towards constraints and enablements and were able to identify a satisfying and sustainable modus vivendi. These new academics were strategic in the way they worked, allocating time and energy appropriately to tasks, aligning themselves with strong role players, and widening the nature of their involvement with students in their classrooms. The reflexive powers of deliberating upon what had been learned in their contexts and then using this knowledge to anticipate the feasibility of potential courses of action enabled these agents to be active agents with huge transformative potential, capitalising upon relevant enablements and an
equally knowledgeable circumvention of anticipated constraints. These participants therefore successfully transformed from primary agents into corporate agents, organising and working towards bigger projects in their departments and across the institution as a whole. Those who chose to adopt strategic stances also contributed to the advancement of a double morphogenesis, namely of themselves and the social forms at the UoT, enabling agents’ upward mobility at the micro level and social and cultural morphogenesis at the meso and macro levels. This does not, of course, preclude people who are primary agents in one context being corporate agents in another, because these categories are *not fixed but mobile* over time (Archer 1995).

While strategic stances were the dominant mode of response to the impingements on and advancement of projects in this study, one or two new academics (Mori and Maree) in their early projects chose to adopt ‘evasive stances’ due to overwhelming constraints from contextual influences, which contributed to the morphostasis of the social and cultural systems they were embedded in. For Mori, the only logical choice after evaluating her circumstances and reflecting on her concerns and project, was to ‘opt out’ of HE, ‘resource’ herself better, and then to re-enter with the necessary bargaining power and negotiating strength. For Maree, the tension between disciplinary identity in relation to shaping students’ disciplinary and academic needs activated SEPs and CEPs that influenced her to strike a balance between her needs and those of her students.

In addition, new academics like Mira and Kira adopted epistemological stances (Tirri, Husu and Kansanen 1999) to highlight the tension and relational dynamics between professional and moral aspects of their practice. Others like Mari and Mani adopted pedagogical stances to foreground the salience of teaching as opposed to research and other academic responsibilities. However, the way teachers view their disciplines is also affected by their ideological orientations, values and beliefs, and the ideological posture (Bartolomé 2004) adopted by university teachers influences the way they conceptualise and teach their disciplines. The epistemological dimension is thus qualified through the ideological interpretations that teachers carry with them.

When new academics find it impossible to bed down and root themselves through legitimate projects, they may adopt subversive stances that are counterproductive to their own projects and identity formation as social agents, as well as to the social project of transformation as a whole. There were no subversive stances adopted by participants in this study, but if early career academics reach the subversive stance stage, it may be too late to turn the tables.
and HE would have to bear the cost of losing them through neglect and a lack of support and acknowledgement in their initial but crucial years.

Across the six cases in this study, the stances adopted by new academics to mediate their challenges highlight the need to understand the agential potential of agents in context. At all levels of their interaction, that is at micro, meso and macro levels, the extent to which structures actually impinged upon individuals depended on the ‘stances’ (Archer 2003: 342) adopted by new academics in the face of the constraints or enablements activated by their projects (Archer 2008). Notwithstanding the challenges besetting them in their participation in professional development programmes, institutional demands on their academic labour, the emotional labour in managing disciplinary departmental pressure, and their interpretation of HE transformational goals, new academics in this study have shown that they are resilient and irrepressible in many ways, despite the challenge of balancing teaching, research, service, administration and management expectations, and their personal and family life, so early on in their careers. With more than a sense of perseverance or commitment to succeed, new academics are a special group of people, uniquely positioned as involuntarily placed primary agents, with a wide range of PEPs that they were able to summon to mediate their challenges (see Chapter Five).

Adopting a ‘stance’ (although fallible in undertaking) means that agents also direct their own powers (PEPs) towards social powers in a systematic manner, which facilitates the achievement of their ultimate concerns (Archer 2003). The new academics in this study exercised a great deal of critical agency (see Chapter One) in their choices and actions in their disciplinary departments, institutional forums, and in their classrooms, and, in doing so, they showed their propensity to swim, not sink, and to fight, not flee, by suffusing their practices with what they had learned through exposure on the professional development programme, and through their interaction with staff and students, and their engagement in discourses on education. For Kira, this critical agency meant choosing a group of 20 to 30 women, representative of the different communities, to pilot her project, because as a female engineer herself, she felt that ‘gender discrimination disadvantaged many female students from taking up engineering as a career’ (TDP reflective essay 2011).

How new academics exercise agency is useful for HE, especially for staff and professional developers, as well as departmental management, to understand how to create conditions that support this agential process. New lecturers coming in with a limited understanding of HE already think critically about the decisions and choices they make in relation to a number
of contextual influences in HE, but more importantly they should be supported to use their own insights and experiences as new academics to embrace and take on transformational issues such as inclusion and exclusion of students in current HE.

In the light of this, South African HE needs to be circumspect about its foci, limitations and reach when it designs and devises interventions to address the issue of student success or other related challenges. If professional induction programmes are framed as decontextualised models, with a deficit understanding, where the teaching approach is mainly individualised and directed at personal deficits in relation to expectations of the university as a whole, those new academics attending programmes and courses will discursively construct them as ‘less than’ or deficient. Newness should not be equated with ‘deficit’, as agents coming into new contexts have a wealth of agential resources that established academics may have long forgotten about or buried. If the problems of the university are seen to be a result of individual teachers and individual academics’ lack of expertise, which can be easily ‘trained’ into shape, the vicious cycle of pre-, during, and post-models of responding to problems will continue to offer a very limited and narrow outlook on the real underlying and generative mechanism that keep HE turning and churning.

The recent drive to provide funding for teaching development initiatives by the DHET (2013) in the form of teaching development grants in the service of addressing student success challenges, may not be the most strategic way or most theorised intervention to dislodge deep-seated systemic challenges in HE, in relation to induction or socialisation of the next generation of academics, known as nGAP, (Ministry of Higher Education and Training 2012). While noble in intention, the expectation of changing a historically-imbalanced structural and cultural system through individualised interventions that border on decontextualised solutions needs to be revisited, as initiatives that are too localised and too focused on micro contexts cannot succeed in being consequential for the morphogenesis of the structural, cultural and agential systems that we need if we in HE are serious about change.

These attitudes discursively constructed and promoted through the TDG initiative, suggest that if sufficient money, training and interventions are made available to ‘fix’ the deficit teacher, then students and their learning problems will be ‘fixed’ too. The challenges and problems that face academics in their classrooms, departments and the institution go beyond the solutions offered through the formulation of localised and once-off projects. The way teaching and learning are understood discursively at the university in relation to the university as a public good, for example (Singh 2001), is in tension with the production of
graduates for a knowledge economy. The ‘public good’ is defined by Singh (2001) as a set of societal interests that is not reducible to the sum of interests of individuals or groups of individuals, and that demarcates a common space within which the content of moral and political goals like democracy and social justice can be negotiated and collectively pursued.

This emergent understanding of the ‘public good’ recognises individual as well as social goods, but guards against a collapse of one into the other (Ibid.). These underlying cultural mechanisms need to be surfaced and dealt with before a coherent and cohesive ‘solution’ can be embraced. Throwing money at the problems in this instance is not going to make the problems go away. Also, teaching cannot be isolated as the only arena for redress of this type. Systemic mechanisms need an overhaul, especially at the level of culture and structure at the systemic level in South African HE, but this overhaul cannot be initiated if the very systems that prop it up are left unchallenged. Perhaps what is really needed in addition, is the embrace of more liberating and critical theories of change, such as critical and social realism, which foreground the potential of agents as mediators of change in a conditioned context, if we are serious about making a difference to students, their future, and to the future of the country as a whole.

In recognising academics as autonomous and individual beings as teachers, and students as causally efficacious in their own learning endeavours, we come closer to seeing in realist terms that, in adopting a ‘stance’ towards their projects, which in turn activates the internal causal effects upon those upholding it, academics are making an attempt as agents ‘to regulate the personal–societal relationship’ (Archer 2003). Part of that regulation consists in self-monitoring in relation to the SEPs and CEPS through personal powers and properties. Through this conversation, structure and culture as systemic features of the HE system need to be in constant negotiation with academics‘, students‘ and other stakeholders‘ agential responses as shaped by their individual PEPs to offer more varied, wide, sensitive and far-reaching options for morphogenesis of structure, culture and agency and the transformation of HE on the whole.

New academics in this study across all six cases were strongly influenced by concerns in education that were related to student and staff improvement and success, and all of them were significantly shaped by a teacher-oriented professional identity, although many had entered with strong professional identities connected to industry and research trajectories prior to joining HE. New academics forged links through their connections with industry and community by engaging their networks in interventions and specific programmes that served
as multi-modal points of reference for academics, built around an interconnected web of roles and professional identities, but still influenced strongly by concerns that were institutionally embedded.

The case studies provided insights into the interaction of structure, culture and agency in the establishment of professional identities in the context of the UoT, which like many institutions is fast becoming synonymous with contingent regulation, increased accountability, lack of academic freedom, and diminished levels of autonomy as the neoliberal influence in HE becomes more firmly entrenched. The continuous influence of structural and concomitant cultural changes, globally and increasingly at a local level, signals the complexity of challenges that new academics face and the strategies used by these academics to mediate their contexts.

6.2.7 Cosmological level

At this level of the Seven Scalar Being, the meta-analysis across the six case studies and narratives in this study spirals out to the large-scale field of impact and effect in HE. Using the metaphor or analogy of a ‘cosmology’ to indicate the extent of the scope and magnitude of this level, this scale of ontology and agency is understood as the global and international trends in HE, at the level of the planet in Bhaskar’s terms (2010). In everyday terms, ‘cosmology’ is the scientific study of the large-scale properties of the universe as a whole to understand the origin, evolution and ultimate fate of the entire universe. For purposes of the meta-analysis in this chapter, the cosmological level refers to the conditioning influences of SEPs and CEPs on new academics’ exercise of agency in terms of social and socio-cultural interaction at a global and international level in the field of HE.

According to Maton (2008), every field has a cosmology, with some more epistemological in nature (in the sciences) with a focus on knowledge, and others more axiological (in sociology and education) in that they entail a moral perspective. The appeal of theories is related to their comparative explanatory power in the different fields or cosmologies. Those fields which focus on ‘who you are’, through a way of viewing the world, emphasise values and attitudes, and this axiological cosmology becomes the basis of measuring one’s legitimacy as a knower (Maton 2008: 16). In this study, I have foregrounded new academics’ sense of self and concept of self (Archer 2003) to advance the argument and motivation for the promotion of axiological elements of the academic and professional identity. As ‘knowledge workers’ in the field of higher education, the implication of new academics’ adopting such a cosmology is crucial to the nature of the academic labour of teaching (and student learning).
One’s selection and de-selection of concerns, commitments, projects and practices as agents are not haphazard or arbitrary acts. As HE educators,

... choice of concepts, terms, theories, approach, writing style, referencing style, figures, use of quotes, and so on tell others something about what kind of person you are. They show whether your heart is in the right place and so whether you are one of us or one of them (Maton 2008: 25).

According to Maton (2008), a cosmology works by means of the ‘creation of constellations of positions through a process of association whereby ideas, practices and beliefs are grouped together and contrasted to other groups’ (Ibid.: 17). Through the case studies and narratives in Chapter Five and in the cross-case analysis in this chapter, I have sought to highlight the ontological and epistemological constellations in HE to show how ideas, practices and beliefs are positioned to influence the agential choices of new academics in this study. I have taken care to position these in line with the broad transformational goals in HE, and to align individual projects and practices with collective desires and vision for a transformed system for the benefit of all. The HE constellation, while ambitious and noble in intent, is mediated at the chalk face as a series of constraints and hindrances which new academics confront with little or no support. HE constellations involve more than abstract evaluations of ideas, practices and beliefs; they construct the way in which people, and new academics in particular, are viewed as well (Martin, Maton and Matruglio 2010).

From the broad cosmological level, HE as a constellation has significant influence through its structural and cultural systems to condition the actions of new academics at the micro level (in the classroom), even at the level of the individual Self. This range of influence should not be underestimated as a severe conditioning influence on the potential for the morphogenesis of HE as a whole. There is much support in the field for the fact that, in order to move forward, the status quo has to change, as the many traditional and oppressive structures that still exist do so in the guise of liberal and progressive practices which stunt transformation. The burgeoning corporate agency developing among the ranks of primary agents and academics is indication enough that change is imminent and necessary if we are serious about our constellation of concerns for a transformed HE and a transformed society.

This need for an overhaul of repressive mechanisms is not peculiar to South Africa. The constellation of nationalism through a focus of national pride is not as tightly bound to national locales anymore, as a global trend towards international trade relations, investment and business negotiations demands interaction across nations. There are many indications
that, at a cosmological level, global and international tensions in HE warrant an ushering in of axiological commitments as a ‘moral responsibility’ or ‘moral charge’ to resist the onslaught of neoliberalism and the corporatisation of HE (Ball 2012), which to date have dictated the pace and ensured the outcomes only for a privileged few across the board.

In the international arena however, the global constellation of beliefs, practices and ideas in HE faces constriction and disjunction as the situational logic of contingent contradictions magnifies the tension between growth, freedom and independence at a structural level and the concomitant poverty, discrimination, inferiority, and unrest at a socio-cultural level. Perhaps what HE has not developed yet is an appropriate ‘gaze’, which we can use to discern ‘a particular mode of recognising and realising of what counts as authentic’ (Bernstein 2000: 164). This is intrinsic to our educational projects and practices to cope with the implicit dynamics of the ‘supercomplexity’ of global HE and the world (Barnett 2000) as an open system.

Through the perspective on gazes, Bernstein (2000) draws attention to the position of the holder’s ‘gaze’ and drives home the point that ‘truth’ in the social sciences is a matter of a ‘cultivated gaze’ which is tacitly acquired (Martin et al. 2010). As exemplified by Bourdieu and Bernstein, this tacit acquisition is influenced by the privileged middle-class backgrounds for whom traditional and progressive pedagogies were designed (Ibid.). The importance therefore of developing theories of social inclusion to combat the negative imbalance created by the cultural capital that a minority of students possess at the university is crucial to the rewriting of discourses in HE to make explicit these tacit values so they can be critiqued in open and honest educational practice (Ibid.).

Thus the axiological cosmology is much needed in HE today to ensure that the ‘cultivated gaze’ (Maton 2008) is acquired and maintained so that learning the ‘facts’ in education occurs alongside the adoption of the right values (Martin et al. 2010). These tandem goals mirror the synergies discussed already for the integration of emotion and reason, logic and affect, and the many other dualisms that keep HE split down the middle.

Striking the balance between cognition and emotion is a skill that is required at all levels of the Seven Scalar Being; not just as an advancement of intellectual mastery, but also as a basic skill for interaction between and across the main layers of ontology and agency. At this cosmological level, where boundaries between countries and nations are blurred, and where communication via electronic and social networks puts paid to the notion of separatist
identities, HE at an international and global level has to embrace the changes that are affecting the planet. Increasingly complex environmental, economic and political problems continue to cause the planet to deteriorate (Connors 2014) and, in such a climate, knowledge creation has to be sensitive to the needs of the global nation and its habitat, which is increasingly being threatened by global warming and climate change. Economic powers which control natural resources and which act as generative mechanisms for the extreme polarities between rich and poor have to take cognisance of how a dent in one small piece of the Earth has ripple effects on the entire cosmos. An injury to one is indeed an injury to all. For, as a system, the global playground is an energy field, and what affects the strongest has a concomitant effect on the weakest entity in this arena, and vice versa.

Given the global interconnectedness of living entities in the world and cosmos, HE has to think carefully about the knowledge production and creation that have been entrusted to it. Notwithstanding that HE no longer has a monopoly of knowledge production in the current digital age, it is in a delicate and precarious position as knowledge developer. Through its core function, it is also in the enviable and unequivocal position to shape and influence what knowledge is created and how it is engaged with.

This study on the exercise of agency among new academics at a UoT might appear to be a localised and highly contextualised unfolding and unravelling of challenges and narratives of mediation of six random lecturers as they are inducted into the field, but the implications of these narratives are far reaching and widely applicable to a host of similar challenges faced by established academics as well, in contexts that may be similar to or different from the one presented here. This is the unlimited field of impact in an interconnected global world, made explicit through the laminated analysis undertaken here. Even the smallest and least seemingly significant detail that constrains and negatively influences an agent or subject in the ‘force field’ has far-reaching consequences for the structural and cultural features at a systemic level. The actions and attitudes of each and every role player need to be treated with care because the price paid for negatively spiralling ramifications of lack of care are felt at all levels, and in spatial and temporal dimensions too.

Understanding HE as a cosmology at this global level has implications for the social inclusion not only of students, who are our prime concern, but also of lecturers and academics entrusted with this responsibility. Transformation of HE rests in no small part with a transformation of cultural attitudes of the human resources, the agents and actors who, in substantial measure, together with external pressure, control the rate at which HE can and
should be changing. The consequences of exclusion of people from HE, in nation states as well as in the global arena, has led to material and ideational costs in terms of the advancement of humans as sentient beings. With no sense of belonging and few resources that are relevant to making their way through the world in this epoch (such as technology), those who have been alienated, discriminated against, and excluded from HE in general are the real casualties in a war of conflicting interests between material gain and human development.

In a higher education sector which is being reshaped by neo-liberal processes of privatisation and marketisation (Ball 2012), and where education is being packaged as saleable commodities (Cranfield and Taylor 2008), teaching and learning are under pressure, in a global system that advances institutional directives which ignore pedagogical principles (Connors 2014). The problems that have emerged as the current global, national and institutional structures impact upon the pedagogical processes in universities in the higher education sector warrant effort on the part of HE to dig in its heels and not to cower or renege on its promise to provide a conducive environment for the flourishing of human talent.

It is this talent that the world will be relying on to come up with creative solutions to the pandemic of poverty and illness, and climate, global and planetary change, and to design sustainable alternatives for the longevity of the human project, as we know it. As unlikely as it seems, it is at the micro level of social interaction between lecturers and their students, in their classrooms, that such creative solutions are born. It is therefore important that the learning environment, as well as the teaching context, is treated with care and support. Youth need learning environments that are not stifling for them to thrive (Connors 2014); equally new academics need environments in their departments and institutions that are supportive and nurturing of their efforts to be agents of change. Lecturers’ aspirations to develop students’ thinking as motivated, deeply thinking, critical, and engaged is diametrically opposed to imposed managerialist formulae and procedures (Ibid.).

Therefore, the question of what pedagogy and which environment would equip the youth to analyse and act to make changes to the material, social and discursive structures in which we are all currently entrapped (Connors 2014) is a highly pertinent one for the HE sector nationally and internationally. It is also a question with which research efforts and knowledge engagement should be concerned if HE is to retain its vitality and purpose as a critical pillar of a society (under threat). To realise the liberating potential of education and to challenge
the generative mechanism of the marketised image of the student as consumer or client, it is possible to help students to increase their cultural, social and political agency by designing courses and curricula that are dynamic, responsive and responsible. HE needs to turn its attention to these systemic questions in their ontological, epistemological and pedagogical dimensions and to engage academics in debate and dialogue about this large-scale cosmology and its constellation of concerns. Localised and decontextualised interventions and efforts must be balanced against the imperatives at all other levels in the laminated system to produce a new result and to encourage a morphogenesis of existing debilitating structures as well as new ways of thinking and being.

6.3. Elaboration of the system

The use of Archer’s (1995) morphogenetic approach allowed me to capture the interplay between structure, culture and agency to see how they influenced and shaped one another over time, that is, over the duration of this study. How structure, culture and agency ‘emerge, intertwine and redefine one another over time is an overarching concern of researchers (Horrocks 2009: 15). The cross-case analysis in this study was an exercise of emergence in itself, as the process of retrodution allowed many deep and generative mechanisms to be surfaced that made explicit the causal links between cases and their structural and cultural properties. Applied to the HE system and the university, the autonomous and independent powers and properties at each stratum of the structural and cultural life at the university mean that causal powers cannot be underestimated in their role in what is observed at the Empirical and Actual levels. The macroscopic overlying and underlying features have to be included if one wants to get to the level of the Real, where the generative and structuring mechanisms are located, waiting to be triggered (Bhaskar 2010).

Superimposing the morphogenetic frame onto the laminated system brought both spatial and temporal aspects together, in keeping with critical realist and social realist analysis and theorising, to enable an account of social outcomes and change in the domain of the university.

What eventually transpires at the level of events is a combination of the tendential and the contingent; the aim cannot be to furnish a predictive formula but rather an explanatory methodology for the researcher to employ, namely the analytical history of emergence (Archer 1995: 294).

In using the morphogenetic approach, namely the core stages of the emergence–interplay–
outcome posterior and anterior cycles, and by applying the principles of analytical dualism, the methodological distinction between explanatory power and ontological strength of the theoretical framework was upheld. Integration or divergence applies to both the structural and cultural systems, as congruence in the ‘structural domain’ while there is incongruence in the ‘cultural realm’ creates a situation of structural morphostasis while cultures undergo morphogenesis, and vice versa (Horrocks 2009). Similarly, compatibilities ensure systemic reproduction while incompatibilities usher in transformation (Archer 1995).

Central to Archer’s social theory is her concept of agency, which is the focal point of this research study. In acknowledging new academics as people, agency refers to the powers and properties agents have, sui generis, to mediate structural and cultural emergent properties of society. The extent of this mediation is crucial to the morphogentic approach in terms of how it contributes to societal reproduction or transformation (Archer 1995). It became possible to set out the conditions under which change or reproduction was likely to occur in structural and cultural contexts and to produce an analytical history of this without having to resort to a determinist approach (Horrocks 2009).

First-order emergents, such as the distribution of resources, social structures and institutional systems, and roles and positions that new academics confronted, were largely caused by the generative powers of the UoT as an institutional structure with its strata and hierarchical configuration. The UoT in turn was and is shaped by generative powers such as neoliberalism and the market economy, as well as more general changes in cultural and structural systems in HE at a national and international level. As first-order emergents, these influenced the bargaining power and negotiation strength of primary and corporate agents in this study in the first phase of the cycle, namely the T1 stage which, in Archer’s terms, has to do with conditioning, and which present themselves as:

> . . . operational obstructions and practical problems, frustrating these upon whose day-to-day situations they impinge, and confronting them with a series of exigencies which hinder the achievement or satisfaction of their vested institutional interests (Archer 1995).

Second-order emergents in this context arose from the complementarities and incompatibilities brought into being by first-order emergents. These included policies governing new academic conditions of service, induction, responsibilities and other aspects of academic labour at the university. The relationships between and among colleagues, management and students presented situations that propelled new academics as primary agents into modes of interaction as corporate agents in an effort to realise their projects and
establish their modus vivendi as lecturers. Constraints at the university, such as work overload and lack of mentorship or administrative support, created operational hindrances and obstructions, which in turn created practical problems for new academics in this study.

Both the first-order emergents and second-order compatibilities and incompatibilities of structural and cultural systems at the university presented different situational logics which suggested different strategic actions to new academics as agents at T1. This stage also outlined the structural morphogenesis in HE, brought about through a series of policy changes which were unmatched by similar changes in terms of cultural features. This resulted in cultural morphostasis, especially at the UoT (Boughey and McKenna 2011b), where ideas, beliefs and values about teaching, for example, constrained the innovation and creativity of new academics to exercise their agency in relation to their students; however, given these constraints set against the backdrop of situational logics at the UoT, they also provided the platform for agential actions that were strategic and central to how new academics mediated the contexts that they confronted in their socio and socio-cultural interaction at T2–3.

Through the different situational logics, new academics were motivated to pursue any one or combination of four different modes of interaction: defensive, concessionary, competitive and opportunistic (Horrocks 2009). These strategies provided the impetus for the different courses of action that new academics adopted as mediating processes to respond to the push and pull of systemic SEPs and CEPs in their contexts. Where once, relationships were necessary and internal, they became contingent, as new corporate agents aligned more closely with management instead of primary agents. They and sought to maintain alliances with strong resource holders and social actors to realise their own projects and to accumulate further resources in the process. These outcomes of new academics’ strategic actions contributed to the stasis or genesis at T4 that in turn led to the elaboration of the different domains of structure, culture and agency through reproduction or transformation.

By analysing the conditions that enable and constrain the agency of new academics in this study, I was able to theorise about the interplay of structural and cultural morphogenesis/stasis at any given time in the periodisation. According to Archer (1995: 308), this accounts for ‘what actually results under various conditions of conjunction and discontinuity due to what agency does in different circumstances’. The difficulties that agency faces in ‘escaping the conditioning and shaping of previous cycles of morphogenesis, particularly when situational logics and forms of strategic action are
constrained by first- and second-order emergents, are highlighted by the morphogenetic approach’ (Horrocks 2009: 48).

By identifying the SEPs and CEPs relevant to new academics’ contexts, it was possible to point to the possible generative mechanisms that influenced agents’ choices. SEPs are defined as those internal and necessary relationships which entail material resources, whether physical or human, and which generate causal powers proper to these relations. SEPs comprise distributions of resources and roles, institutional structures, and social systems (Archer 1995). Where internal and necessary relations were strong, generative mechanisms were more easily identified (Horrocks 2009). For new academics, SEPs such as departmental procedures and policy, management structures, and institutional directives all exercised conditioning influences on the choices that new academics could and did make. Disciplinary departments were the main source of influence, where new academics’ ideas or their pursuit of projects were conditioned by the internal and necessary relations and already agreed upon rules of engagement between structural entities in this departmental domain. These served as strong causal influences for the morphostasis of the structures, culture and agency in different units.

The cultural system is characterised by logical agreement or disagreement that exists within the system (the degree of logical consensus), while the socio-cultural interaction is marked by ‘the degree of cultural uniformity (the degree of causal consensus) produced by the imposition of ideas by one set of people on another through the whole gamut of familiar techniques’ (Williams 2012: 307). CEPs thus also exercised constraining influences as properties of the cultural system and relations between the components of culture such as ideas, beliefs and values, though independent of the socio-cultural relations between cultural agents (Archer 1995) interplayed.

At the university, CEPs evident in contexts of practice of new academics are triggered by neo-liberal economic theories and beliefs that have increasingly dominated the socio-cultural systems (Horrocks 2009) of HE as a field and influenced how new academics related to their students as ‘clients’ that they had to service. Given that there was an uncritical assimilation of the influences of these systemic CEPs by these newcomers, the neoliberal discourse and its pervasive hold on how current HE conceptualises knowledge, students, graduate attributes and the purpose of the university are overarching and pre-date the new academics in this study as conditioning influences in their involuntary placements in contexts not of their choosing. That new academics were able, in some instances, to resist and challenge these
discourses by advancing their own projects, directed at more holistic teaching and learning practices, is an indication of the extent of their PEPs to respond effectively to what they confront, and necessarily from their own commitment to a fair and holistic education for all. The extent to which these generative mechanisms permeated the cultural systems at institutional and departmental level depended on institutional ‘takers’, who, through their alignment with these generative discourses, strengthened the structuring influences of these powerful mechanisms. This in turn accounted for the slow, even stagnant, change in cultural systems that new academics confronted in their departmental and institutional spaces.

Compared with the emergent properties of structure and culture, more tangible and observable were new academics’ PEPs, or the powers and properties of people manifest in their expressions, consciousness, commitments, affinities and animosities (Horrocks 2009). The PEPs of new academics in this study shaped and modified the capacities of one another as participants, firstly on the TDP, and secondly as research participants in this study. This exemplified the causal links between their powers and the group, as well as between their PEPs of the corporate agents that emerged.

In analysing how situational logics, SEPs, CEPs and PEPs, and generative mechanisms in both structural and cultural domains contribute to elaboration at T4 in this study, context must again be highlighted as a significant feature that affects the temporal and spatial dimensions of the stages and cycles of morphogenesis. While the T1 was easily identified as the entry point, not to the university, but to the TDP, there was a common departure point for the gathering of data in this periodisation. When the data generation for this study commenced, the T2–3 interaction cycles or phases were also clearly demarcated. However, in the nature of being and becoming a university academic, which in itself is a work in progress, it is difficult to stipulate where the interaction ‘stops’ and at what point the elaboration (T4) can be halted and analysed. Owing to the nature of this study, the data phase offers a snapshot of a process that is ever unfolding, therefore any attempts to categorise or demarcate the end cycle leading to genesis or stasis of each of the domains or cycles proved problematic, as from moment to moment new academics are continually in the process of being shaped by SEPs and CEPs, and are also in the process of exercising their own PEPs to mediate the contexts they find. This unrelenting cycle of coming into being defies the periodisation stipulated by Archer in her morphogenetic approach.

Nevertheless, the analysis of cycles of change sharpened the ability for foresight into the conditions needed for the optimal exercise of agency among new academics when they
transition into HE. The problem here is that one cannot say in finite terms when ‘one has arrived’ and is no longer in the process of becoming. Given this feature, namely the indefinite temporal aspect associated with becoming an HE educator and practitioner, the morphogenetic approach helped to make it more tangible by demarcating specific cycles, albeit in the very early phase in the life course of new academics in the academy. The morphogenetic approach enabled a detailed and nuanced analytical account of the history of ‘where, when, who and how’ (Archer 1995) as new academics made their way through their academic worlds.
CHAPTER SEVEN
Chapter Seven: Conclusions

This doctoral research study, which focuses on the conditions that enable and constrain the exercise of agency of new academics in HE, has explicated and exemplified through the narratives of mediation of six new lecturers (see Chapter Five), that agency is conditioned by systemic and contextual features, which are both challenging and enabling for newcomers to HE. This study has also shown that agency is not a construct or phenomenon to be engaged with in isolation. The social realist account provided here reinforces the dialectical nature of agency in relation to structure and culture at the university, and recognises that new academics as independent and causally efficacious beings make choices and take action based on how they experience the ‘push-and-pull’ in their academic contexts. Ultimately, how new academics exercise their agency depends on how they use their own personal emergent powers (PEPs) in relation to contextual features (SEPs and CEPs) at the university.

As mentioned earlier, what it means to be a professional and an academic in HE today poses a huge challenge for the university teacher (new or established) as well as for the student. The contextual discontinuity between an idealised and collegial past and a dynamic and complex present means that HE is a continuous site of tension and struggle, both temporally and spatially, not just for policy makers and social actors, but for the academic practitioner in the classroom, at the interface between his or her concerns and the context. Both increased student numbers and a context where a large proportion of students are under-prepared for university study, place great demands on the teaching role of academics (Boughey 2012b). As numerous studies have shown, there is no easy solution to eradicating this tension (Ibid.), but to effect the changes needed to turn student participation and success rates around in South Africa, we need to validate and acknowledge lecturers and students as agential beings, capable of ‘acting back’ on HE, when they choose certain courses of action over others. By looking at what actions they choose and why, as in the case studies of the six lecturers at the UoT, we can better understand how academics mediate their contexts either by pushing back, resisting, appropriating, sometimes misusing opportunities, or adopting projects and practices that serve themselves, and HE better. Through the narratives of mediation in this study, we glimpsed and gazed at conditions in HE that are not yet conducive to the envisaged transformation, from a predominantly elitist and conservative to a fully democratic, inclusive and engaged system.
Also evident from the data across the six narratives was that, despite their vested interests in joining HE, and their differential resources as primary agents (qualifications, experience, research), participants were influenced differently by similar structures and cultural spaces at the UoT. In this study, where new academics were located in the same context, namely the same department or faculty, responses to challenges were influenced by the way that the context impinged on them, uniquely and differently. When new academics confronted their contexts, they experienced a connection or disconnection with the structural and cultural realities of their classrooms, departments and faculties, which then became a potential or tendential cause for change. Some of the main constraining conditions at the institution highlighted by the study, in relation to how new academics exercise agency, include but are not restricted to:

- Classroom contexts and teaching spaces that are not well supported with infrastructure, technology or learning resources; classrooms that do not create the appropriate cultural spaces needed to support HE literacy practices.

- Departmental contexts that are alienating and unsupportive in both cognitive and affective domains; lack of mentoring systems for new academics; lack of senior management support for efforts by newcomers; staffroom and meetings as silencing spaces; a disjunction between disciplinary conceptualisations of teaching and learning as understood by the UoT’s teaching strategy; and a lack of appropriate support for community engagement projects.

- Institutional structure that is top heavy in terms of bureaucracy, administration, workloads, time constraints, lack of effective and efficient research support, and a cultural disconnect between old and new staff after the merger.

These conditions not only highlight the nature of the constraints that new academics confronted, such as workloads, discriminatory attitudes, and lack of collegial support, but demonstrate their creative capacity and the innovative strategies used to mediate the sometimes very difficult conditions both in structural and ideational forms.

It was at the junction between agency, culture and structure at the university that new academics’ social identity was firmly established (Archer 2003). This social identity was formed and developed through deliberate action in relation to the tensions and advancements of their projects. Those who chose to continue with projects at the meso and macro level, despite the constraints or enablements triggered, exercised a wider range of PEPs in response to the hindrances and obstacles in their way. Those who deferred to
smaller projects (at the micro and meso levels) which were more manageable and doable, and located within the confines of their classroom practice, were able to overcome more personal and immediate concerns in relation to their individual goals.

While academics are capable of exercising a fairly wide range of agential power (as seen in this study), their efforts should not be over-estimated, in relation to the propensity they are perceived to have, to change the entire HE system on their own. Academics, both new and established, are a small but significant part of a bigger whole; each component of the systemic layer exerts its own tendential pressure on the other. To conceptualise the higher education teacher as the saviour of an ailing system is to put the cart before the horse. The academic in the classroom is not able to independently and radically transform the system single-handedly. HE therefore needs to be careful of putting too much responsibility on the shoulders of individual teachers through initiatives such as the teaching development grants (TDG), which presuppose an incommensurable capacity of new and established academics to change the status quo.

HE should also be circumspect about over-investing in interventionist initiatives, such as the nGAP and TDG, which are aimed at the individual teacher, and which do not address the key systemic and generative mechanisms in HE, both inward and outward facing. The assertion of agential difference means that one should not expect one-size-fits-all and generic institutional development programmes, to activate the same emergent responses for all new academics in the same way. Agents’ own configuration of concerns, cares, and commitments means that, as independent and causally efficacious beings, new academics respond in individual ways to complexities they face and problems thrown at them. Staff development initiatives that are highly generic in nature will neither adequately address nor help to shape the agency of new academics entering HE if they do not take into consideration that academics are capable of unique responses which are worthy of considerable attention, support and care.

Teaching cannot be the only catalyst in a context where the structural and cultural features far outweigh, impede or constrain individual and collective efforts, to the extent that some academics contemplate abandoning or renouncing their projects, as demonstrated by some participants in this study. The knowledge generated through this study therefore deepens insights into how HE can provide the appropriate and conducive conditions to enable this agency, but also cautions about the costs involved if new and established academics are not treated with care, and not recognised as valuable contributors and evaluators in their own
right. If newcomers are lost to the system and from the system, the huge investments made in recruiting a new and next generation of academic practitioners, would be in vain.

The challenge for HE therefore is to keep an ever-vigilant eye on how things are changing (or not), for whom, and for what greater purpose; then to apply well theorised and conceptualised responses to mediate these situations. The extent to which educational institutions are stable entities or can be changed by the actions of individuals is questionable (Ashwin 2008); therefore we need a sociologically-informed approach to educational research (Case 2013) in order to be able to effectively analyse and account for this change. I believe that new academics have a huge role to play in this process by virtue of their positionality as newcomers. Who they are, what they bring into HE, and how they exercise their agency in relation to the structural and cultural enablements and constraints that they find in their classrooms, departments and faculties, should not be underestimated.

Given the challenges in HE outlined in Chapter One and Chapter Four, university management and academic staff developers need to consider how new academics develop a modus vivendi in HE and how this influences their modus operandi as they negotiate the enablements and constraints in their contexts of practice, conducive to the social inclusion of students. Academics need to be supported in more explicit ways, not just by staff developers, but also by all levels and strata in the institution. A brief discussion follows now to highlight the ‘sticking points’ that have emerged through the intensive case studies detailed in Chapters Five and Six. These are not exhaustive, but are meant to act as a springboard for further deliberations and proposed studies in this area of educational development work. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the development of theory regarding agency in HE from a social realist perspective, but future research efforts do not have to be restricted to this orientation alone.

7.1 Theories of change

The critical and social realist theories adopted in this study offer viable theories of change without privileging either system and people, or the ideas and beliefs that people draw on. The interplay between the domains of structure, culture and agency has thus formed the organising framework in thinking about discourses and the structural system in this study, as new academics engaged with their projects at the level of the classroom (micro), the department (meso), and the institution (macro). Although not directly related to the context of education, Archer’s social realist theory is especially significant in the South African context where ‘bringing real people back in, as robust and stratified beings’ (Archer 2000: 306) is a
challenge in HE today. The question is whether educators (new and established) are in a better position today to co-create new teaching and learning, curricula, and assessment practices in ways that are more inclusive of students previously disadvantaged by apartheid education. Ongoing debates around structure and agency raise a series of very significant questions: How much are individuals free to decide on their own actions and how much are they constrained by the social settings in which they operate? Are explanations of educational phenomena to be found at the micro level of the individual or at the macro societal level, or both?

The discourses on new academic induction (see Chapter Four) are developed and sustained through the various practices in HE currently. The South African HE scene has introduced an array of teaching enhancement and development opportunities for induction, but they are still largely focused on the individual teacher rather than on changing the underlying structuring and generative mechanisms at the systemic level in HE, through teaching. Even though there is evidence of working collegially and in community with their colleagues, new academics do not always have the cultural tenacity to challenge the disconnected spaces between individual, department and institution. This leaves the ‘cultural institutions that gave rise to the problem in the first place largely untouched’ (Guest 2001: 5). More holistic theories of change, such as the critical and social realist theories used in this study, are needed to challenge the university’s cultural morphostasis, with its disciplines and their associated cultures. This is key to enhancing teaching and learning practices for new academics and their understanding of the ‘student experience’ (Clegg 2005).

7.2 Generative mechanisms

Archer’s view is that the definition of ‘education’ at any place or time is socially determined, socially imposed and socially changed, and

‘unless we come to understand how social groups interacted, which ones were most successful in imposing their definitions, when, where and why, we will never explain the emergence of any given kind of education because both its structure and its contents are shaped by these broad social processes’ (1980: 181).

Trends in the contemporary HE context, nationally and internationally, inadvertently support the complicit role HE plays in instrumentalising, professionalising, vocationalising, corporatising, and ultimately technologising education while powerful generative mechanisms continue to shape both staff and students in particular ways as market
principles become articulated as progressive ideas until they slowly but surely supplant them (Bertelsen 2004).

‘Transformation’ becomes a trojan horse concept, carrying in its belly the whole lexicon of corporate-speak and commoditisation: intellectual capital, strategic planning, mission and goal orientation, customers, benchmarking, best practice, enterprise bargaining, contract employment, and performance rewards. This is our new lingua franca, the ‘vice-chancellor speak’ that drives change and fixes the boundaries of debate (Bertelsen 2004: 3).

The UoT is significant as a research site given its close link with industry. The marketisation, commodification and massification in HE is perhaps more immediately felt at a UoT than at other institutions, and critics of the knowledge economy have exposed its detrimental effect on the social transformation purpose of HE. If, as this research study argues, the impact of the ideological stances of academics, new or otherwise, to their disciplines, students, communities of practices, departments and institutions is to be taken seriously, then the causal and generative mechanisms at play at the university, and in this case the UoT, need to be identified and engage with. In harvesting such insights, we can abductively point to the necessary complementarities and complexities (Archer 2000) that need to be addressed and/or changed so that real transformation of the sector is enabled.

By using the critical realist lens of depth ontology, analyses can be drilled down, retroductively, to the level of the Real, where these structuring mechanisms lie dormant, to uncover their latent power and to critically engage with them to change their power of influence. The systemic features of the HE structural and cultural system, which work at an invisible level (at the level of the Real), cause very real and visible experiences and events that manifest at the levels of the Actual and the Empirical in new academics’ lives. The conditions in HE explored in this study enable and constrain new academics’ exercise of agency at many levels of interaction, analysed in the cross case analysis in Chapter Six. These generative mechanisms (discussed in their various iterations in Chapter Six), are not tangible or obvious in social interaction and socio-cultural interaction per se, but remain tendential, waiting to be triggered by discourses that people draw on or through the structural emergent properties and powers activated as lecturers work in structured university contexts.

The socio-cultural context of the department, classroom and university at large therefore cannot be ignored or minimised in explaining the frustrations and challenges that new
academics face. This study thus contributes to a growing interest in researching the interplay of structure, culture and agency in HE, which is being strengthened and widened, based on the frequency that academics are now drawing on the discursive constructions of agency to advocate for and justify innovative choices and actions at the university.

If we want to theorise about change in education we need a theory that can account for the selves who make choices as academic workers and students, how we engage in constant internal and social debate about the conditions of practice, and how we should act to resist, restructure and preserve aspects of the complex system called higher education . . . . However, it is precisely the significance of selves and their practices that make detailed attention to the mundane ‘worldly’ work of higher education practitioners so important, as it is their willed activity or quiescence that helps us understand how policies and structural changes impact on the practices of higher education on the ground (Clegg 2005).

New academics in this study were very much ‘on the ground’ and were often recipients of structural and cultural remnants of past activity; they had to negotiate these with care and keep an eye on their interests, projects, and concerns, as well as costs to the choices they made and the risks they took. This included choices about teaching, research, community engagement, and various academic responsibilities and obligations they had to manage. As evidenced in this study, new academics were overworked and had little time to adapt the professional development material and suggestions to their own practice. Apart from time, there were also weakly-established links between new academics and their departmental colleagues, especially HoDs and senior staff. Left to their own devices in their early years, they faced huge emotional and practical stresses, which they had to unravel primarily on their own. What they brought into HE as newcomers was not ‘valued’ highly by their peers or management; instead their ‘inexperience’ and ‘juniority’ were pronounced, making it difficult for them to be taken seriously or to find their ‘voice’ at all. The absence of mentors and the dearth of departmental socialisation and induction processes meant that ‘rules’ for progress and success were often unclear and opaque (Gourlay 2011), especially for these new academics.

Induction or transitioning mechanisms for new academics are thus crucial, and academic staff development, as well as other strategic organisational units in the university, can and should do more to create and sustain a more enabling context in which new academics can bed down, in order to contribute to the growth and development of students, scholarship and society. There are many ways to envision and implement this proposal, some of which have
been suggested by inferences made as well as in actual terms throughout the analyses provided in Chapters Five, Six and this chapter.

The journey of induction of the new academic in HE today, instead of being generalised and naturalised as a necessary phase to be undertaken and overcome, could be a shared responsibility among stakeholders across the university, through various fora and platforms to make newcomers feel welcome, supported and acknowledged. Ill-conceived induction and staff development processes send mixed signals to new academics about their possibilities to negotiate and exercise their agency. This is in tension with the dominant discourses that suggest to them that HE is more a constraining than enabling environment because their mediation of their contexts in the classroom, department and institution is fraught with huge difficulty, yet with little support.

If we are to make a meaningful change and put into effect the goals of a transformed HE sector in South Africa, it is important that HE takes seriously who it employs, how they are treated, and what conditions are created for them to make a meaningful contribution through their research, teaching and other engagements. Well conceptualised, theorised, and contextualised professional development programmes for new academics will encourage them to adopt a questioning attitude to the existing educational practices they encounter. To this end, a socio-cultural, holistic induction model is advanced here to encourage higher education teachers to actively shape their existing practices through the exercise of their agency, and not adopt a wait-and-see attitude to their own development and to their classroom practices. However, this agency need not be privileged over other concerns. The interdependence of structure, culture and agency are important relational features that give HE its rich and nuanced character and should be engaged with robustly, across all sectors.

Many staff development programmes, for new academics in particular, are too generic in nature and too focused on an individual trajectory of career development, surfaced in the reflective model of practice adopted by many programmes (Quinn 2006), to be of social and collective consequence. Whether new academics comply with, challenge or resist structural and cultural conditions, it is important for the field of HE and professional/educational development that we understand the nature of induction processes, thus inferring, for the purpose of developing them further, ways in which to transform or create the necessary enabling conditions for more lecturers to exercise agency in (similar or different) critical ways. Staff development programmes and professional development programmes aimed at new academics therefore need to be particularly mindful in their design of the complexity and
challenges facing incumbents in HE; they should not be conceptualised simply as processes of ‘assimilation’ through which new academics acquire the social and cultural capital of the institution. Induction should be seen as a joint enterprise in which the new academic becomes fully involved and engaged in the social practices at all levels of university life.

7.3 Reflections on research methodology

The rich data generated and harnessed through the research methods used in this study, unlike more traditional approaches used in HE research, elucidate and demonstrate how alternative research tools can contribute significantly to expanding the repertoire of methods (Jacobs 2014) used in the higher education research with academics/students in a sociological context. Alternative research methods also enable lecturers to think critically by introducing them to a new medium to create new knowledge. In this study, the research methods allowed participants to experience what it is like to be a researcher and researched at the same time, in an iterative and reciprocal process between agency and reflexivity. The methods used in this study talk back to the social and critical realist theory embraced here to allow for a fuller understanding of the generative power of agency itself, through the internal conversation or inner dialogue made explicit.

Agents considered the efficacy of their responses through their reflexive deliberations, which took the form of participatory learning and action methods including river of life stories, problem trees, free writing and photovoice (PV) narratives. These methods were used innovatively to enable a more nuanced elicitation of perspectives and analysis in response to the research question, by empowering participants to generate honest and open commentary about their concerns and projects in higher education.

At different moments in the data-generation sessions, participants were asked about their specific opinions, beliefs and attitudes to certain aspects of the stories that had surfaced, such as the effects of the merger, the role of their HoDs and senior colleagues, and responses to the photovoice as a reflexive method. These moments arose as natural and organic extensions of both the river of life and photovoice stories, where I as the researcher used questions and pressure points in participants’ stories to engage the whole group in discussion and response. In intensive research, methods are not followed slavishly without considering the context, participants, and the dynamic nature of information flow in a communicative setting. The willingness to adapt preconceived questions and ideas in the course of the ‘interview’, for example, according to what is relevant to the respondent, being prepared to discuss as well as to ‘elicit’ answers, are demonstrations of a realist modus
operandi. According to Sayer (1992), if the researcher’s questions and emphases are disputed by the subject, these should be seen for what the situation reveals about the interviewee and about the researcher’s preconceptions in the first place.

Reflexive practices in this study, embracing different modalities, extended the already well-rehearsed method of dialoguing, conversation or written reflective pieces used in Archer’s (2000) own empirical studies. The PV collages especially, contributed to a deeper understanding of the levels of reflexivity and agency that can be achieved, relative to the experiences of new lecturers’ ability to mediate their contexts. Participants were salutary to PV as an innovative medium for reflection, as it allowed them to reach new insights and meanings:

It allowed me to really reflect and think deeply about not just my academic life or my professional level but my life as whole; socially and spiritually it gave me that opportunity to look deep into what I want to achieve and how I want to achieve it . . . [TDP participant].

For me personally you can think and reflect a lot . . . and it happens in your head . . . but the photos made it tangible; something you can actually see and hold onto and try to make sense of and almost have a dialogue with; as opposed to just in your head like a broken record . . . so for me it was that tangible thing you could see and question [TDP participant].

When I took the photographs . . . I could feel I am [sic] going over to my right brain . . . it’s often when I walk into an art gallery and you ask me a question . . . I won’t be able to answer you . . . I am like struggling and falling over my words . . . so I can feel like I was not thinking about this in words. I was taking photographs . . . and I was feeling it . . . and I think that feeling it is deeper than talking about it. So if we had just had a discussion about this, this is what I think and this is what you think and you haven’t really felt it but if you feel it, you know it . . . mainly why I struggle to talk about it . . . because it is my right brain and I am thinking in concepts rather than in words [TDP participant].

For some participants, the photovoice method evoked the use of symbols and metaphors, which encouraged participants to construct nuanced meaning through an engagement with reflexivity as a relationship between their creative expression and their own preconceptions about their journeys. Visual metaphors contributed to meaning making and a sense of coping with the realities portrayed (Charon 2006):

It also comes in symbols . . . like the chair and table for me, you find a symbol that you
think is talking to you . . . and you can make a full story around a picture. Someone will
look at the picture and get a sense of what you are talking about . . . and that is amazing
. . . you don’t have to make a full speech . . . just one picture can say a lot (Photovoice
2013).

I am glad that we could use metaphoric photos . . . because like for me . . . the motorbike
. . . I actually saw that the day before yesterday . . . when I saw it, I immediately thought
about the photos and that just signified for me that you are in control as far you can [TDP
participant].

The use of metaphors enabled participants to think more abstractly and more conceptually
about the realities they faced. The metaphors allowed for a very personal and emotive
engagement; apt for a study of this nature, where ontological dilemmas are foregrounded as
new lecturers try to make sense of their epistemic realities. This level of reflective
deliberation displayed a conceptual, spatial and verbal sophistication, as images became a
proxy for real issues and feelings that were experienced. Throughout this study, Archer’s
concerns for reflexive deliberation and inner dialogue were thus upheld to enable new
academics to deliberate on their projects, cares, and commitments as well as their beliefs,
values, and attitudes in relation to their being and becoming new practitioners in HE.

7.4 Emotional commentary on concerns

The research methods and the group dynamic established in this community of practice also
allowed lecturers to enrich the data generation with a sensory perception and an
understanding of feeling, values, and beliefs that might not have been easily accessed or
available in traditional formats. Emotionality is a commentary upon our concerns, and our
reflexive response to the world: emotions show how people make (fallible) assessments of
the conditions of possibility in articulating their cares (Archer 2007a). The emotionology of
new academics was underscored in participants’ narratives, as each story unfolded as a rich
description of emotions, feeling and affect, irrespective of story teller or nature of the story
told.

This study suggests that the ontology and emotionology of new academics, as they
transition into HE, should not be treated lightly. New academics in this study were
emotionally engaged from inception but with little recourse or support from more established
colleagues, who drew on the discourse of the rational, logical and academic self. New
academics mediated their emotional challenges on their own, from an emotional and
affective base. This emotionology had direct causal links with not only the pursuit of their
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projects, but also their ability to sustain their interest and dedication to their students. Staff development programmes, as well as departmental programmes, would do well to create enabling conditions for healthy and humane ‘emotional’ interaction so that new academics and established academics have a safe space in their disciplinary contexts and institutional settings to engage with the necessary emotional emergent properties as they arise. Especially at a time when the world seeks more holistic ways of understanding challenges and finding responses to sensitive issues, the value of deliberating openly with trusted others becomes a necessity in the face of adversity.

New academics are ‘affected’ by the emotional disposition of their colleagues as well as faculty and departmental management, who would do well to consider the personal projects and emotional investments that individuals make. To enter into dialogue with incumbents, through which they can assess how future outcomes may be constrained and enabled by lecturers’ social positions, identities, background, and social capital, would be enlightening for management, who should be engaging with these features in a real and honest way. This study has foregrounded participants’ cultural conditioning, class, race, age, gender and other markers of structural conditioning, to show how these properties continue to intersect in ways that shape people’s lives and actions. This is significant in a country such as South Africa as these aspects cannot be glossed over or ignored.

Emotional and intellectual support can be extended through more cascaded assistance, as most new lecturers in this study signalled that mentorship, both academically and socially, was desperately needed, especially in the first years when the challenges of classrooms, departments, faculty and institution are extremely overwhelming and alienating. Collegial support through engaged conversations and sharing of different experiences and perspectives would help lecturers to see that they are not alone. Engagement is crucial and should be encouraged as it enables participants to have a voice (in other words to have a say), and to find ways to contribute meaningfully to the workings of their units. Friendly rapport, dialogue, and discussion help to induct new academics into the ways of knowing and doing in their disciplinary homes, and to invite them to examine taken for granted assumptions and to bring their fresh perspectives to problem solving through intuitive responses to stimulate action.

Engagement goes a long way to encouraging the socio-cultural and holistic approaches to academic staff development work and the building of conducive departmental cultural spaces suggested in this study. Educators are first and foremost human beings, shaped by
their sense of self, which is in turn shaped by contexts to express a concept of self, each with its own identity, ontology and history. New academics bring these personal and social identities to bear on their interactions with students, knowledge and the institution; therefore to recognise them in this sense is to acknowledge that the induction process is not a clinical one, and that time, effort and support are needed by all concerned to make the transition smooth.

7.5 Reflections on the theory

In this doctoral thesis, I have drawn on the meta-theoretical frameworks of Critical Realism and Social Realism to make the realist ontological positioning of the study explicit. This enabled a clear process for understanding how truth and reality are positioned at the university as well as the underlying generative mechanisms that hold systems in traction. The depth ontology of CR enabled an exploration of levels of reality that go beyond the observed. This allowed for a consideration of underlying structures and mechanisms in HE and at the university itself that enable/constrain new academics’ agency. Apart from the emancipatory and critical nature of such an approach, it enabled a practical exploration of the conditions that prevail. By inference, it also pointed to ways to change practice in order to ensure more effective forms of induction to take hold and effect.

Adopting a realist worldview, I was able to access the layers and nuances that characterise human experience at the university in order to seek underlying causes for events and social phenomena. The causal relations between emergent properties and powers (SEPs, CEPs and PEPs) are understood by identifying the mechanism that produced them. Archer’s social realist theory has helped me to systematise and clarify debates about problems of social life at the university through well-defined concepts and techniques of analysis (Maton 2008). There is a strong internal language of description; the coherence between concepts and constructs linked together well and worked effectively towards a common alignment. In the structural and cultural domains (Archer 1995) of the university, human agency is conditioned but actively mediated by new lecturers through their human intentionality and reflexivity. In HE, this entails a process of interaction between the parts (policies, values, people), and the way they are organised to enable other events and entities to be activated. At the heart of realist ontology, there is an understanding that the world is seen through our subjectivity but independent of our knowledge of it (Ibid.).

In using theory to simplify my object of study, I aver that Archer’s social realism has proven
to be useful and usable as a theory of change. Social realist theory allowed me to understand the interaction between and influence of social components (structure and culture) and to draw distinctions between different ways of reacting and responding (agency) to social life. Structure, culture and agency have helped me to unpack the problem of how to link the social system in HE with individual agents in the classroom (the macro-micro link). This was crucial in this study to ascertain the responsiveness of the HE sector in dealing with the dilemma facing students and academics in the classroom.

Archer’s M/M cycle proved to be a useful methodological toolkit as well as a temporal device for analysing and understanding the data over time. Guided by analytical dualism, I was able to investigate the interplay between the parts and the people over time. In this study, the structural and cultural mechanisms, which include social structures and discursive practices respectively, shape and influence the ideas and actions taken up by new academics at the UoT. These influences are considered at various levels of ontology and interaction in this study, advancing the view that agency is in fact interrelated and infused in its conditioning.

Archer’s theory of agency in particular provided a way for instating new academics as causally efficacious beings with their own powers and properties, such as intentionality and reflexivity. Social realism allowed the new academics in this study to be foregrounded as active human agents, fully capable of contributing to structural and cultural elaboration and change. As the data analysis in this study has shown, the morphogenesis of agency invokes a double loop of change, as the very people who effect change are in themselves changed from primary to corporate agents and, sometimes, social actors. As an explanatory theory, SR has offered a rich explanation of data in particular contexts, which was crucial to the analysis of the research problem (Archer 2000) and productive in helping to understand practice in the world (Sayer 2000). This is also a response to the criticism that one of the drawbacks of using Archer’s framework is the dearth of examples of attempts to use the morphogenetic approach in qualitative research, particularly in the field of higher education. The theoretical framework in this study thus allowed for strong empirical data to be generated and analysed in this way, contributing to the growing collection of empirical studies in the field.

As ‘explicit’ theories, both critical realism and social realism do operate at a high level of abstraction but the professional and academic staff development literature in HE provided grounding and substantive support for data analysis in this study. I have found CR and SR to
be ‘useful’ theories, as they afforded explanatory power to consider the conditions that enable and/or constrain agency among new academics.

7.6 The way forward

Despite the apparent constraining factors evident in the HE context at a macro level, the new academics in this study created conditions for themselves to pursue their projects at departmental and institutional levels. This study has thus uncovered how this agency is developed in relation to structural and cultural mechanisms emanating at the level of the Real, and provides insights into how HE can attempt to transform practices to create more enabling conditions for the benefit of all. This shift, initiated in induction and orientation programmes such as the TDP, is often only fully realised in critical depth and breadth much further along the academic journey, if at all. To expedite the process, looking after a new staff member should be the responsibility of everyone in their community. To make this a reality, HE requires a new epistemology of induction and development, predicated on the notion of induction as a collective, social practice (Staniforth and Harland 2006); one that is ontologically rooted in the independence of academics (new and established) as causal beings.

The level of ‘discursive penetration’ (Archer 1996: xxi), or the degree of awareness that established actors and agents have of the ideational contradictions or complementarities influencing the socialisation of new academics in HE, is manifested in discourses that newcomers are embedded in and which they draw on, which in turn draw attention to the nature of the social reality that they confront in HE. This offers us a glimpse into their experiences, and we should use this knowledge not only to problematise the implications of these discourses for the institution as well as for academic staff development practices, but also specifically for the socialisation of new lecturers into the academy. How new lecturers pick up on these discourses can be better theorised so that more effective conditions may be created, not just for recruiting but also for sustaining new academics’ involvement in HE.

The sense of hope, creativity and commitment that new academics embody must be cultivated, and this new generation must be nurtured as necessary conditions for transforming and developing South Africa’s universities (Badat 2010; Jansen 2003). We should not underestimate what the neglect of supporting new academics in the post-induction phase could mean, as such neglect could pose a fundamental challenge for student success. Higher education should provide the ‘safe’ intellectual, cognitive and
emotional space and platform where new academics could develop an informed understanding of national imperatives and global aims.

According to Dall’Alba (2005), teachers in higher education must turn away from an overemphasis on immediate demands to reflexively examine the ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ of university teaching. What is its goal and purpose in relation to students and contemporary society? How can this goal and purpose be achieved in meaningful and responsive ways? Currently, new academics have been identified as a special interest group in HE in South Africa through the nGAP programme, for the growth and development of the next generation of academics needed to populate the system. In imagining what the HE context would be like for new academics and the next generation if they were inducted into HE in more deliberate, explicit, holistic and ‘contextualised’ ways, it becomes clear through this study that greater strides would be made if newcomers are better enabled to contribute in meaningful ways earlier rather than later, and to feel that the concerns and commitments that they come in with are valued and worth sustaining.

Given the fractured history of this country and the pervasive conditioning effects of the past dispensation, the notion of ‘social inclusion’ of students and academics is an important one, especially in HE, as evidenced in this study. The social inclusion of students and academics may be less about what it means but ‘what do we mean by it, or rather what is meant by it, and by whom’ (Levitas 2003: 2)? The question is whether the idea of social inclusion has the potential to be a transformative idea to counteract exclusion and discrimination on the grounds of gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion, and sexuality in HE. This re-iterates the strong link between issues of social participation, and questions of human flourishing (Sen 2001), and makes us consider what kind of society we want to live in, who we are, what we know and where do we go, which demand a form of thinking that is more radical and more holistic than before (Askonas and Stewart 2000). Higher education has a responsibility to facilitate this discussion and to deepen such perspectives, especially for new academics, to enable them to exercise agency in ways that are conducive to the social inclusion of students.
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Appendix A: Doctoral Research Study Consent form

Dear Lecturer,

Kasturi Behari-Leak who is a PhD scholar in the national Social Inclusion in Higher Education project would like to carry out research focussing on new academics who completed the Teaching Development Programme (TDP) at the UoT. This letter is to ask you whether you would be prepared to take part in this NRF research project. Permission has been granted and ethics clearance was approved. In your response, please consider the following:

I, ______________________ hereby agree to participate in research regarding new academics and their agency, which I understand is part of national project on Social Inclusion in Higher Education. I give the researcher named above permission to use the material which was generated during the course of my participation in the TDP and the data that will be collected through my involvement in this study, the details of which are described above. I understand that the researcher is a PhD scholar who intends to use the data collected here in her thesis on Social Inclusion in Higher Education. I also understand that …

- Whether or not to give this permission is a personal decision, and it is entirely voluntary.
- While there is no direct benefit to participating in this research, the results of this research can however be used to improve the new academic experience in higher education, social inclusion of students, and the quality of teaching and learning at university.
- I have the right to withdraw my permission at a later stage – so long as it is prior to any publication which the researchers produce – and the researcher/s then refrain from including my materials in their research.
- The researchers would use material generated through the sessions, focus groups and photo stories for purpose of this study only and not for any other purpose.
- The findings from the research are likely to be published in institutional reports, academic journals, books and book chapters and presented at academic conferences.
- My own identity or that of any other person included in my materials will be protected.
- I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced in any way to do so. I also understand that I can stop participation at any point should I not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect me negatively.
- I have received the contact details of the researcher should I need to speak about any issues pertaining to this research.

My signature below indicates my permission to be part of this study in the various ways explained above.

Name of participant: ____________________________

Signature of participant: ____________________________

Signed at ______________________ (place) on ________________ (date)