**Understanding the student experience through the lens of academic staff development practice and research**

Sherran Clarence

**Introduction**

The term academic development is used in a few ways in South Africa and usually encompasses both staff and student development. When focused on lecturers, it is usually termed academic staff development. Most universities have centres for teaching and learning, such as the Fundani Centre for Teaching and Learning at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology, and CHERTL (Centre for Higher Education, Research, Teaching and Learning) at Rhodes University. These are staffed by researchers and practitioners who work with both staff and students to improve teaching and learning, such that formal access to higher education translates into success for greater numbers of students (see Scott 2009). The Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) defines academic development thus:

> A field of research and practice that aims to enhance quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning in higher education, and to enable institutions and the higher education sector to meet key educational goals, particularly in relation to *equity of access and outcomes*. (HEQC 2007: 74, cited in Scott 2009: 22, emphasis added)

The emphasis on 'equity of … outcomes' is particularly important in considering how academic staff development in particular understands its role in relation to students. Success - a positive outcome - in higher education, read most commonly in the attainment of a qualification that enables the graduate to work, and develop a career, is a key aspect of a path to the private goods of education: work, income, ability to support one's family, and a desirable lifestyle. But, success for greater numbers of especially black students in South Africa (CHE 2013; Scott 2009) is also central to advancing higher education as a public good.

Formal access to higher education is largely, although not completely, assured for many more black students now than it ever has been in the past. In practice, this is difficult to achieve for many students, for reasons of finance, preparedness linked to

prior education and home literacy background, and family support (CHE 2013). But, in principle, anyone who meets the entrance requirements and can pay the fees can come to university, regardless of race, class or gender. In terms, though, of what Wally Morrow called 'epistemological access' (2009)- access to the means of acquiring, critiquing and creating knowledge - both access and success are still notably skewed in favour of white students, and students with a more 'congruent' home and school literacy background (CHE 2013; McKenna 2004). This means, in practice, that participation and graduation rates of especially poorer black students remain worryingly low, almost 30 years into democracy (CHE 2013; Dietrich, Moja & Pazich 2014). A significant implication, in terms of seeing higher education as a public good, is that fewer qualified back graduates are entering the professions than should be, and that fewer black graduates are contributing in meaningful, formal ways to innovation, practice and development within their chosen fields. The overall effect of skewed success rates means that higher education, as both a public and a private good, continues to be constrained.

What can academic development do about this? Focusing specifically on academic staff development, this chapter will draw on the literature published in and about South African academic development between 2007 and 2017. Through a critical review of the available literature, the chapter will argue that significant strides have been made in the field towards developing a more robust, latterly theorised approach to improving teaching and learning. Yet, in spite of these developments, persistent deficit conceptions of the sector, and both lecturers and students, continue to constrain the transformative and emancipatory potential of the field, particularly in relation to constructing higher education as a pathway to both public and private goods.

The chapter begins with an overview of the history of academic development in South Africa, before moving on to consider current foci and trends in the literature.

**A brief history of academic development work in South Africa**
Academic development work in South Africa has its origins in the 1980s, when relatively low numbers of black students began enrolling in historically white universities. These students, coming from poorer socioeconomic and poorly resourced school backgrounds, struggled to meet the academic demands of these universities, created for a traditionally homogenous, middle class, white student body (Scott 2009). These students were thus labeled as 'unprepared' for higher education. Academic support programmes were created ostensibly to give them more of what white students had had access to in their prior schooling, so that they could progress in their studies. However, academic development practitioners in these universities began to realise that these 'add on' programmes were patronising, and limited in their reach and outcomes. What was needed, rather, was wider or broader teaching and learning development, focused on staff development as well as on student development (Boughey 2014; Scott 2009).

From these beginnings, academic development, or AD, work in higher education has focused on four different areas of influence: student development (particularly in foundational and extended curriculum programmes); staff development; curriculum development; and institutional development (HEQC 2007, cited in Scott 2009: 22). This chapter focuses on research that is concerned primarily with staff and curriculum development work, but it should not be seen as completely separate from student and institutional development work, as these areas of focus are necessarily intertwined.

The student experience of higher education is primarily one of learning: attending lectures and tutorials, writing assignments, working with peers, reading, and so on. These experiences are varied, of course, but it is worth noting the amount of literature devoted, in South Africa and globally, to improving teaching and learning such that students have less alienating, difficult, and trying experiences of higher education (see Quinn 2012b, McKenna 2004, 2012; Jacobs 2007). This, in my view, is the primary value of academic staff development: to contribute to the student experience by working in constructive, theoretically sound ways with lecturers, such that teaching and learning is significantly improved. Improvement, influenced by the literature explored in the following sections, can be understood here as enabling teaching and learning to be more inclusive, thoughtful, socially and environmentally aware, and cognisant of diversity and difference. It also encompasses creating curricula and assessment structures that are fit for purpose, and can enable the greatest number of students to achieve meaningful success.

This chapter now moves to explore what we know about academic development in South Africa, from the perspective of published research primarily focused on staff and curriculum development. It seeks to connect to this research the question of how students experience teaching, learning and assessment in South African universities. While staff development is directly focused on building the relevant educational knowledge, skills, and confidence of lecturers and tutors, it is always concerned with doing all of this to enhance 'equity of access and outcomes' (Scott 2009: 22). However, there are different understandings in the field of academic development, and higher education more broadly, about what constitutes 'equity' in terms of access and outcomes, what paths would lead us to greater equity, and how to enable students to achieve the best possible educational outcomes. Thus, this chapter also adds a layer of critique to the literature on staff development, to explore to what extent the ideological or theoretical underpinnings could influence outcomes or experiences of learning for students.

**Reframing the student experience through the lens of AD**
Students are the core 'stakeholders' in any higher education system. Without students we would not be working in universities; we would be working in research institutes. Thus, teaching, learning and assessment aimed at enhancing or enabling success for the greatest number of students is - or should be - higher education's core goal. Research, innovation, policy development and so on should all contribute towards

achieving this goal. Yet, as several researchers have pointed out over the years, in South Africa and elsewhere, teaching and its allied practice-oriented activities are often under-valued and under-rewarded compared to research (Ndebele & Maphosa 2014; Scott 2009). In many university contexts, academic development work struggles consistently with an ongoing tension between focusing on practical, teaching-and-learning-oriented development work, *or* research and scholarly work. Following this logic to one possible conclusion, should teaching remain systemically under-valued, students who come to university to learn, grow and graduate with the capacity to advance the public good, as well as their own private goods, are shortchanged. Their experience of learning will be compromised. Students, in particular, have highlighted this in recent protests across universities in South Africa. Among many demands made, a relevant one here is demands for more equitable, open, and socially just teaching and learning environments.

Currently, then, higher education in South Africa is on the verge of change, although the forms this will take are as yet unclear. Calls for curriculum renewal and changes to staffing and teaching approaches, primarily from students under the broad coalition of the #FeesMustFall movement, implicate issues of race, class, gender, systemic (under)privilege and systemic (in)equity of both access and success. Parts of the academic development field have been grappling for some time with these questions, and these protests have reinvigorated this space and opened it up to new debates, and consideration (see Luckett 2016; Quinn 2012a, 2012b; Shay 2016; Vorster & Quinn 2017). Since the 1980s, and especially since the end of apartheid in 1994, South African universities have been widening formal access especially to previously excluded students, primarily black students. Yet, success is still skewed in favour of those students who are better prepared academically and financially for study at tertiary level (CHE 2013; Scott 2009; Scott, Yeld & Hendry 2007). Many students who are less able to achieve this seemingly elusive academic success can see that *systemic* inequalities, privileges and structures, such as the curriculum, need to be addressed for that success to be realistically in reach of academically and financially underprepared students (Cooper 2015).

There are aspects of university structure, culture and practices that influence how students and lecturers are positioned relative to one another. These structures and cultural elements also influence how academic development work is understood, practiced, resourced and supported. The sector is currently comprised of a mix of 26 traditional, comprehensive and technology-oriented universities, located in both rural and urban areas, and with markedly diverse staff and student bodies. It stands to reason, then, that there is a wide range of structural, cultural and practice-oriented contexts. Academic development work, thus, needs to be understood as a differentiated body of practices; there is one definition of academic development, according to the HEQC, but there are many different ways of realising the espoused goals mentioned in the Introduction.

The following sections unpack the key discourses and issues affecting academic development work, and attempt to tease out some of the more important differences and divergences in AD praxis and research.

The primary systemic discourse that appears to be implicated in much of the literature is termed the 'deficit discourse' (Smit 2012; Quinn 2012b). One could argue that all students and academics have some kind of 'deficit' in relation to the expectations set for achievement and success; otherwise there would be no real need for staff and student learning and development workshops. However, the deficit discourse as it is operationalised in academic development is politicised, and underpinned by certain ideological assumptions about learning and success. These assumptions tend to construct education as a journey undertaken by an autonomous student, who is primarily responsible for her own success, which must be achieved through motivation, commitments and hard work (Boughey & McKenna 2016; McKenna 2012; Pym & Kapp 2013). This instantiation of the deficit discourse largely neglects, or obstructs, a view of the deeper structures and systems at play in higher education that can enable, and constrain, equitable access and outcomes for students (Boughey 2014; Boughey & McKenna 2017; Smit 2012). These can also further enable and constrain staff engagement, agency and learning (Vorster & Quinn 2012), primarily through locating 'problems' with teaching and student success in individual lecturers or departments, rather than seeing these issues from a whole-system perspective. This deficit approach to teaching and learning development, pinpointing problematic lecturers and departments that need to improve, or update their practices, can be isolating for lecturers and departments. This is counter-productive to improving student learning experiences, as well as lecturers' own teaching and learning experiences.

The deficit perceptions of academic lecturers, students, and the university itself need to be critically and carefully deconstructed. They are not new; Akoojee and Nkomo (2007) show, for example, through a critical review of research into student success, that the problem of students' underpreparedness and poor success rates have been researched and debated since the 1930s in South Africa. A striking difference, though, between the pre- and during-apartheid higher education sector and that of the present, is that the student body now is increasingly diverse, linguistically, culturally, socioeconomically and in terms of their prior education (CHE 2013; Scott 2009). Politically, the problems are different now - specifically, apartheid is over and we are no longer fighting for everyone to have the same rights and opportunities. We all have the same rights and opportunities in principle, but in practice the vast gap between rich and poor, and systemic poverty and inequality is significantly constraining of realisation of these for many South Africans. There is perhaps, then, a more urgent sense that the notion of deficit from a systemic perspective needs to be addressed if we really are to construct and enact higher education as a public or social, as well as private, good, that makes a meaningful contribution on micro and macro levels (Boughey 2007; Singh 2001).

Neoliberal ideologies that cast the system and its standards as unproblematic and the students and staff that cannot fit in as needing support, coaching and a stronger work ethic, arguably underpin deficit discourses that currently hold sway in higher education (Smit 2012, Boughey and McKenna 2016). Internationally, there is a dominance of the meritocracy discourse writ large, connected with more conservative political stances that tend to obscure systemic inequalities and privilege by focusing on a discourse of success being a result of hard work, grit and determination. These are connected with neo-liberal constructions of the university understood in narrower terms as producing workers for the knowledge economy, obsessed thus with measuring skills and knowledge in transparent, standardised ways (see Hargreaves 2002; Sellar & Gale 2011; Shore 2010). Hargreaves (2002) argues that the knowledge economy serves the private good; thus, if universities pursue the current neo-liberal path, it may become increasingly challenging to centre the public good, and legitimate pathways to this within higher education. This has implications for how students are positioned, supported and educated, too.

Boughey and McKenna (2017) point to the powerful ways in which students are constructed in institutional audit documents as 'decontextualised learners' that can be helped to fit in better though teaching and learning interventions outside of mainstream programmes and courses (such as English for Academic Purposes-type courses). Pym and Kapp (2013) and Pym (2006) challenge these instantiations of the deficit discourse though their account of an academic development programme for commerce students at a historically white university. The programme they look at in these papers challenges, as they put it, 'assimilationist, deficit notions of the teaching and learning process' (Pym and Kapp 2013: 272). It does this through asking key questions about:
- what counts as 'success' and why,
- what knowledge counts as legitimate and who determines this,
- and whether and why we are unreflexively expecting black students to shoehorn themselves into a vision of education and success that cannot or will not account for their embodied selves, including their learning needs and approaches (see also Case, Marshall and Linder 2007; Case 2013; Marshall and Case 2010).

Teaching and learning, assisted with academic development work that is aligned with transformation imperatives, then, needs to act on these questions by opening up spaces for re-imagination and rethinking of the value orientations of curricula and other structures within the university that work to construct success and failure in particular ways.

One way to open up space, in academic development as a field in particular, is to engage with theorised ways of thinking about learning, teaching, student development and higher education.

**Ways of theorising practice, and practicing theory**

An important starting point in choosing any theoretical approach to teaching and learning development is to consider the context in which one is working. Theory acts as a critical 'lens' through which we can 'see' our work, our context, our teaching and so on with perhaps fresh eyes, connecting what we may experience to other contexts that share similarities. In this way, using theory judiciously can lift us out of our own, relatively narrow, contexts and connect us with the work and research done in other contexts, from which we can learn. The South African context is a highly unequal one. University spaces are shared by students particularly, with markedly different levels of prior learning, literacy development, family support, financial independence and preparation for the myriad demands of higher education (Badat 2012; CHE 2013; Scott, Yeld & Hendry 2007). Thus, theory can help those working in academic development to 'see' and critique their local instantiations of this broader context, and deficit discourses.

Currently, there is a move in South African academic development research and practice towards using critical theories that can shine new light on issues of diversity, inequality, and the skewed outcomes of higher education (see CHE 2013; Scott, Yeld & Hendry 2007). Yet, this move is limited, and tends to be happening in universities that have a less overt divide between research and practice in academic development. The authors included in this section also tend to represent primarily well-resourced teaching and learning centres, and universities with well-funded and supportive research offices. Thus, the field itself is significantly skewed in terms of where the knowledge about current academic development work is produced, and notably, the source of critiques of a-theoretical, outdated, and ideologically problematic academic development work.

Particularly, this work draws on the work of Nancy Fraser on participatory parity (Bozalek & Boughey 2012; Leibowitz & Bozalek 2016), Basil Bernstein's work on the pedagogic device and the discourses that underpin it, and education more generally (Shay 2016; Vorster and Quinn 2012), Margaret Archer's social realist account of structure, culture and agency (Case 2013; Leibowitz et al. 2015; Luckett and Luckett 2009; Quinn 2012b); Legitimation Code Theory (Blackie, 2014; Clarence 2016a; Shay 2016; Vorster and Quinn 2015), and Academic Literacies (Clarence 2012; Clarence and McKenna, 2017; Jacobs 2007, 2013). Notable too is the work being done using Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach (Walker 2003; Walker and McLean 2015; Walker and Wilson-Strydom 2016). Responding to Scott's (2009: 22) exhortation for academic development work to focus on improving 'equity of access and outcomes' for students, all of this work has in common is a firm grounding in theorised accounts of learning, teaching and academic development.

Rather than proceeding from an account of students (and lecturers) as autonomous individuals on whom success or failure solely depends, the more recent research that draws on sociological and political theories of society, justice and equity implicates the systems that we are all part of. Autonomous approaches to the study of student learning, and by extension also the lecturers' and tutors' learning, tend to imply that if individuals try hard, don't give up, and apply themselves conscientiously, they will succeed (Boughey & McKenna 2016, 2017). These approaches have been roundly criticised in South African higher education, at the very least by the authors cited in the above paragraph. Primarily, in such an unequal context, shaped by the legacy of apartheid, focusing on individuals over the systemic structuring of inequality is unjust. The social, political and economic systems that we are all a part of shape the 'space of possibles' to paraphrase Maton (2014). Those born into middle class homes, with access to well-resourced schools, libraries, financial networks of support and so on will have an easier time navigating their way through higher education than those born into working class homes, and having access only to poorly resourced schools, and little to no financial back-up (Letseka and Maile 2008; van Zyl 2016). Lecturers who have been these different students will be shaped by those experiences, and also by the opportunities that exist in their universities for further learning and teaching development. Academic development opportunities are also unevenly provided, with better resourced universities having more visible, funded and structured units for academic development that run courses, one-on-one engagements and so on (Scott 2009; Moyo 2018). Hence, any academic development work that focuses on changing the individual over addressing systemic inequalities and challenges will inevitably create a 'band-aid' solution rather than deeper, more meaningful change or improvement.

Academic staff development work is thus moving firmly, albeit unevenly, toward theorised, scholarly 'praxis' (theorised practice). To be relevant to disciplinary academic lecturers, and to claim status and significance within universities, academic staff development work needs to have its own theorised and scholarly positions from which it works, and needs to be able to bring relevant theoretical tools to bear on work within the disciplines (Quinn 2012a; Clarence 2016a). This is necessary to enable academics to reflect anew on aspects of curriculum and teaching with these tools and in collaboration with respected academic developers working as critical peers. Following Quinn (2012a), academic development should be seen as a 'meta-profession', and thus needs to have firm scholarly foundations of its own. All of the authors writing from this understanding of academic development work are skeptical or dismissive of academic staff (or student) development framed as 'skills development' or individualised, ad hoc work. Rather, this work has become increasingly focused on understanding deeper mechanisms and structures that constrain or enable change.

Academic literacies, with its underlying ideological focus on transformation, and equitable access to ways of making meaning and learning the 'rules' of the academic

game, has long been a guiding theoretical approach in South African academic development work. Scott (2009) and Boughey (2014) trace the growth and shifts in the academic development movement in South Africa since the mid-1980s. Their work shows, in particular, how AD units that were created in the 1980s, and that have been framed by a 'activist' stance have focused on moving away from a notion of 'fixing' black students' literacy deficits, to changing the nature of teaching and learning to account for a changing student body and wider social context. This move, as noted earlier in this section, has not yet happened across the sector. The dominance of deficit discourses, and their 'common sense' nature given apartheid's educational legacy that continues to constrain especially black students' educational development, means that not all academic development work is focused in the same direction. There are still instances of 'bolt-on' student writing and 'literacy' courses, skills-development programmes, and one-off workshops for staff focused on practical tips for teaching without deeper underpinning. It is clear that far more work needs to be done in changing understandings of social justice, equity, and criticality in the field of academic development, for both staff and students. There is thus a need for expanding the theory the field draws on in directions offered by social realism, LCT, the Capabilities Approach, and participatory parity. The field will thus benefit from theorising its work, and sharing these theorised understandings and approaches more widely.

Such deeply theorised, scholarly approaches to academic development work are changing both the nature and the status of academic development. Although the field as a whole struggles against marginalisation and precarious funding and tenure (Scott 2009), there are more universities in 2018 with centralised, funded units or centres for teaching and learning than there were ten or twenty years ago. There is also greater recognition of the valuable role that academic development as a scholarly field of practice and research can and should play in professionalising teaching in higher education. Although the field in South Africa is unevenly resourced, and does not work consistently from within theorised, critical understandings of the sector itself, or student access and success, there is evidence to suggest that the field understands its role as one that should create greater equity of outcomes, especially, going forward.

**Conclusion**
The most significant changes in academic development as a field have been enacted by 'activist' academics (Scott 2009), and those who identify themselves as such, including many of the authors cited in this chapter . These academics have long been concerned with the political and social environments surrounding, influencing, and being shaped by higher education. These concerns have in turn influenced the work done in the academic development field, initially with students and then with academic lecturers as well. Thus, we know that academic development does not hold itself up as a neutral space where lecturers can learn value-free 'tips and tricks' to improve their local teaching, or solve individual problems. Rather, through its particular concern with theoretical approaches that are ultimately deeply concerned

with questions of equity, access and justice, academic development locates itself within its local, and wider political, social and institutional context, and works to surface underlying tensions, goals, and knowledges. Through this situated, critical positioning, academic developer activists work to change higher education, to create a more open, critical, socially just culture of teaching and learning.

Yet, this description of academic development as a field does not reflect the South African higher education sector as a whole. The deficit discourses that obscure systemic inequality and privilege are tacitly dominant, and have become so inured that they are both hard to see, and to challenge. Thus, while there is a growing body of theorised research and practice in AD, there is still a notable lack of theorisation of academic development work (Shay 2016, Boughey and Niven 2012). In many universities, especially those with significant numbers of students from poorer socioeconomic and educational backgrounds, there is a perhaps understandable preoccupation with policy standardisation and measurable skills development. This constrains a more critical, theorised, and open approach to academic development, which would challenge dominant, individualised conceptions of students and lecturers as needing to work harder and care more.

There is much to be done to change students' and lecturers' experiences of higher education to make them more inclusive, enabling, and resonant with personal goals and ambitions. Currently, there is fierce debate around decolonising the university through critiquing and changing curricula, assessment modes and teaching methodologies that continue to exclude and silence students, and lecturers, whose experiences and prior knowledges are outside of what the university represents as the legitimate ways of thinking, reading, writing and knowing. These debates are in their infancy, and the time is now for academic development as a field to reclaim a firmer 'activist' identity, akin to that held in the 1980s and 1990s, and be a crucial and central part of conversations that focus on reimagining teaching and learning, thereby creating more inclusive and equitable student learning, personal and professional growth, and emancipation.

**References**
Akoojee, S and Nkomo, M (2007) Access and quality in South African higher education: the twin challenges of transformation. *SAJHE* 21(3): 385 - 399
Badat, S (2012) Redressing the colonial/apartheid legacy: Social equity, redress, and higher education admissions in democratic South Africa. In: Hasan, Z & Nussbaum, M (eds) *Equalizing access: Affirmative action in higher education in India, United States, and South Africa*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. pp. 121–150
Blackie, MA (2014) Creating semantic waves: Using Legitimation Code Theory as a tool to aid the teaching of chemistry. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice* 15(4): 462-469

Boughey, C (2007) Educational development in South Africa: From social reproduction to capitalist expansion? *Higher Education Policy* 20(1): 5-18

Boughey, C (2014) The significance of structure, culture and agency in supporting and developing student learning at South African universities. In: Dhunpath, R & Vithal R (eds) *Alternative Access to Higher Education: Underprepared Students or Underprepared Institutions?* Cape Town: Pearson Publishers. pp. 61-88.

Boughey, C and McKenna, S (2016) Academic literacy and the decontextualised learner. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning* 4(2): 1-9

Boughey, C and McKenna, S (2017) Analysing an audit cycle: A critical realist account. *Studies in Higher Education* 42(6): 963-975

Bozalek, V and Boughey, C (2012) (Mis) framing higher education in South Africa. *Social Policy & Administration* 46(6): 688-703

Boughey, C and Niven, P (2012) The emergence of research in the South African academic development movement. *Higher Education Research & Development* 31(5): 641-653

Case, J. (2013) *Researching student learning in higher education: A social realist approach*. London: Routledge

Case , JM, Marshall, D & Linder, CJ (2010) Being a student again: a narrative study of a teacher's experience. *Teaching in Higher Education* 15(4): 423-433

Clarence, S (2012) Making inter-disciplinary spaces for talk about and change in writing and literacy development. *Teaching in Higher Education* 17(2): 127-137

Clarence, S (2016a) Exploring the nature of disciplinary teaching and learning using Legitimation Code Theory Semantics. *Teaching in Higher Education* 21(2): 123-137

Clarence, S and McKenna, S (2017) Developing academic literacies through understanding the nature of disciplinary knowledge. *London Review of Education*, Special Issue on Academic Literacies 15(1): 38-49

Cooper, D (2015) Social justice and South African university student enrolment data by 'race', 1998–2012: From 'skewed revolution'to 'stalled revolution'. *Higher Education Quarterly* 69(3): 237-262

Council of Higher Education (CHE) (2013) *A proposal for undergraduate curriculum reform in South Africa: The case for a flexible curriculum structure*. Pretoria: Council on Higher education.

Dietrich, E, Moja, T and Pazich, LB (2014) Editorial. Struggling with Equity: Access to higher education in the BRICS countries *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning* 16(1): 1-4

Hargreaves, A (2002) Teaching in the Knowledge Society. Technology Colleges Trust Vision 2020—Second International Online Conference. 13-26 October and 24 November - 7 December 2002

Jacobs, C (2007) Mainstreaming academic literacy teaching: Implications for how academic development understands its work in higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 21(7): 870-881

Jacobs, C (2013) Academic literacies and the question of knowledge. *Journal for Language Teaching= Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi= Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig* 47(2): 127-139

Leibowitz, B, Bozalek, V, van Schalkwyk, S and Winberg, C (2015) Institutional context matters: the professional development of academics as teachers in South African higher education. *Higher Education* 69(2): 315-330

Leibowitz, B and Bozalek, V (2016) The scholarship of teaching and learning from a social justice perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education* 21(2): 109-122

Letseka, M and Maile, S (2008) *High university drop-out rates: A threat to South Africa's future*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council

Luckett, K and Luckett, T (2009) The development of agency in first generation learners in higher education: a social realist analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education* 14(5): 469 - 481

Luckett, K (2016) Curriculum Contestation in a Post-Colonial Context: A View from the South. *Teaching in Higher Education* 21(4): 415-28

Marshall, D and Case, J (2010) Rethinking 'disadvantage' in higher education: a paradigmatic case study using narrative analysis. *Studies in Higher Education* 35(5): 491-504

Maton, K (2014) *Knowledge and knowers: Towards a realist sociology of education*. London: Routledge

McKenna, S (2004) The intersection between academic literacies and student identities: research in higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 18(3): 269-280

McKenna, S (2012) Interrogating the academic project. In: Quinn, L (ed) *Re-imagining academic staff development: spaces for disruption*. Stellenbosch: SunPress. pp. 15-26

Morrow, W (2009). *Bounds of democracy: Epistemological access in higher education.* Cape Town: HSRC Press

Moyo, MT (2018) An Analysis of the Implementation of the Teaching Development Grant in the South African Higher Education Sector. PhD dissertation, Rhodes University.

Ndebele, C and Maphosa, C (2014) Voices of educational developers on the enabling and constraining conditions in the uptake of professional development opportunities by academics at a South African University. *International Journal of Educational Sciences* 7(1): 169-182

Pym, J (2006) The lost, the least and the last: A South African higher education case study exploring the possibility of defying the barriers to learning. In: Bunker, A and Vardi, I (eds) *Research and Development in Higher Education: Critical Visions Thinking, learning and researching in higher education*, Volume 29. http://www.herdsa.org.au/research-and-development-higher-education--vol-29

Pym, J and Kapp, R (2013) Harnessing agency: towards a learning model for undergraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education* 38(2): 272-284 DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.582096

Quinn, L. (2012a) Introduction. In: Quinn, L (ed) *Re-imagining academic staff development: spaces for disruption*. Stellenbosch: SunPress. pp. 1-14.

Quinn, L (2012b) Enabling and constraining conditions for academic staff development. In: Quinn, L (ed) *Re-imagining academic staff development: spaces for disruption.* Stellenbosch: SunPress. pp. 27-50

Scott, I, Yeld, N and Hendry, J (2007) *Higher education monitor: A case for improving teaching and learning in South African higher education*. Pretoria: Council on Higher Education

Scott, I (2009) Academic development in South African Higher Education. In: Bitzer, E (ed) *Higher Education in South Africa: A Scholarly Look Behind the Scenes.* Stellenbosch: SUNPress. pp. 21-49

Sellar, S and Gale, T (2011) Globalisation and student equity in higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 41(1): 1-4

Shay, S (2016) Curricula at the boundaries. *Higher Education* 71(6): 767–779

Shore, C (2010) Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. *Social Anthropology* 18(1): 15-29

Singh, M (2001) Re-Inserting the 'Public Good' into Higher Education Transformation. *Kagisano Higher Education Discussion Series*, Issue 1 http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.470.8247&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=8

Smit, R (2012) Towards a clearer understanding of student disadvantage in higher education: problematising deficit thinking. *Higher Education Research & Development* 31(3): 369–380

van Zyl, A (2016) The contours of inequality: The links between socio-economic status of students and other variables at the University of Johannesburg. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa* 4(1): 1-16

Vorster, JA and Quinn, L (2012) Theorising the pedagogy of a formal programme for university lecturers. In: Quinn, L (ed) *Re-imagining academic staff development: spaces for disruption*. Stellenbosch: SunPress. pp. 51-70

Vorster, JA and Quinn, L (2015) Towards shaping the field: theorising the knowledge in a formal course for academic developers. *Higher Education Research & Development* 34(5): 1031-1044

Vorster, JA and Quinn, L (2017) The 'decolonial turn': what does it mean for academic staff development? *Education as Change* 21(1): 31-49

Walker, M (2003) Framing social justice in education: what does the 'capabilities' approach offer? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 51(2): 168-187

Walker, M and McLean M (2015) Professionals and Public-Good Capabilities. Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning 3(2): 60-82

Walker, M and Wilson-Strydom, M eds (2016) *Socially Just Pedagogies, Capabilities and Quality in Higher Education: Global Perspectives*. The Netherlands: Springer