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# Abstract

This research focuses on conceptions of teaching held by certain lecturers at Zion Hill Campus (ZHC), Moriah University (MU). I explore lecturers’ understanding of teaching in the context of their actions, intentions and beliefs using *Basic* *Interpretive Qualitative Design* (BIQD). BIQD is a qualitative research paradigm that seeks to promote relationships individuals create in their world, visualising that world from their perspective (Merriam, 2009; Sandelowski, 2010, 2000), including the structure, analysing data gathered aligned to its revelation (Graham, 2002). I also explore lecturers’ dimensions of variation of practice related to: (1) The role of the lecturer; (2) The role of the student; (3) Information and communications technology (ICT) integration and (4) Assessment. To contextualise local higher education (HE) teaching, I utilise the *pedagogical constructs model* (Fanghanel, 2007) to explore lecturers’ positionality on filters they identified. These impact their institutional practice and include: (a) The Research–Teaching Nexus; (b) Reward and Recognition; (c) ICT Integration; and (d) Student Assessment.

The research findings suggests that ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching are located in the lower–order, teacher–oriented exclusive quadrant of the conceptions model (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994) with their highest current conception of teaching occupying a location between the lower–order conceptions and higher–order conceptions. More particularly, the findings suggest lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching in four categories: (a) Delivering Information: (b) Delivering Structured Knowledge; (c) Delivering the Lecturer’s Conception of the Subject Matter; and (d) Facilitating good Student–Teacher Relations/Apprenticeship (Kember, 1997).

A requirement exists for MU institutional recognition and rewarding of teaching, placing it on equal status as research, including opportunities for recognition of early–career lecturers’ excellent teaching and for faculty/departmental support for teaching/learning research. In departments, an environment that fosters collaboration among academic staff as ‘communities of learning and practice’ is also required.
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# Chapter 1: What Prompted This Study?

## 

## *1.1. Introduction*

This Chapter is organised into three sections; the first traces my development as a teacher explaining my professional development journey through Trinidad and Tobago’s education sector to becoming an educator focusing on teaching and learning. The second section establishes my epistemological, ontological and axiological positions as a researcher in education, and reveals my teaching philosophy, a critical component of the underlying principles governing my actions as an educator. The third section outlines the purpose of the study. It builds on the ideas of sections one and two, and lays the foundation for the purpose of this study which is: *an exploration into the current conceptions of teaching held by certain lecturers at Moriah University, Zion Hill Campus* (MUZHC). I begin this journey with my brief autobiography in the following section.

## *1.2. My Brief Autobiography*

My autobiography, though brief, illuminates my experiences as a teacher in our education system. I locate my professional practice as an educator by providing a short discourse of my career as a primary school teacher, secondary school teacher, lecturer and finally as an educator. In doing so I reveal pathways that ultimately led me to undertake this study related to some Zion Hill Campus lecturers’ conceptions of teaching.

### 1.2.1. Primary school teacher

As a teacher in Trinidad and Tobago’s education system for most of three decades in different permutations and organisations, my fundamental conception of teaching/learning at the primary level revolved around student success in the Common Entrance (CE) examination (now called SEA). To local education administrators, student success in examinations were critical to our school’s reputation and achievement (Astin, 2012). Pedagogy utilised was essentially instructional, teacher–centric and teacher–focused (Barr and Tagg, 1995). The students’ role was to prepare adequately to pass the high–stake examination.

Traditional local education arrangements privileged a conception of teaching and general praxis which placed emphasis on ‘bright’ children, using a classical academic curriculum, not aligned to students’ learning requirements (King, 1995; Campbell, 1997). Educational practice was accordingly, implicated in the destruction of the ‘psyche’ of the majority of our non–academic students. Students gained societal recognition by academic performance, not holistic human development. Traditional schooling remained a major stumbling block to post–independent socio-economic development where education expansion was conceived as finding ‘places’ for students in secondary schools (Baksh, 1986), but not the accompanying innovative pedagogy, aligned to a revived curriculum (Gardner, 1993/1983; Alleyne, 1995).

Traditional ‘*elitist*’ education implementation, organised and undertaken by the ‘church’ initially, in the colonial period, and subsequently adopted by post–colonial administrations, was partly responsible for creating a hierarchical society of distinct social classes consisting of an educated local elite (foreign and local), and the working class (Lavia, 2012; Williams, 1964). Traditional social class arrangements, a function of education, focusing principally on ‘bright’ children and promulgating excellent examination results, persisted into our present era (Astin, 2012; Biggs, 2012). In my view, the psychological tensions, as well as social, economic, cultural and political frictions among the various groups in our society, the root of our societal issues, is premised on the (mis)education of our students (Deosaran, 2016).

### 1.2.2. Secondary School Teacher

My primary school teaching experience was used a vehicle to expand my professionalism as a secondary school teacher dealing with students from the ‘challenged’ areas of our country. As the education system packed them into the secondary school’s ‘assembly line’ my job was to make secondary education a priority to students who were functioning as adults, taking care of households, doing the duties of husband/wife but who transformed themselves into their student roles during the day. They were men and women by night, but students by day. Our education system continues to ostracise the majority of our students from lower socio–economic areas (Emdin, 2017).

Traditionalist secondary and primary schools in particular, have maintained an inherited advantage through religion and the ‘concordat’[[1]](#footnote-1), an agreement between church and state which guaranteed church control of denominational prestige schools (Williams, 1964). Such schools have continued to dominate our education system in terms of student examination performance. These schools have traditionally provided the majority of the students entering HE. Such secondary schools receive the majority of scholarships offered by the government based on the CSEC results. Government schools, therefore, whether primary or secondary, are generally not the first choice for parents when choosing a school to send their children.

### 1.2.3. Lecturer/Educator

For two and a half years I pursued advance training in computing technology in the United Kingdom (UK). Living in a developed country, the UK allowed me to gain deeper insights into our institutions from historical, socio–political, cultural, and economic perspectives. This experience demonstrated to me, unequivocally, the historical deficits of our leaders and validating elites regarding education (Best, 2004). (Eric Williams the country’s first Prime Minister did however, demonstrate a commitment to expanding education to include all citizens). They are concerned, principally, with their inherited socio–historical, economic and political dominance in the society (Heron, 2003; Campbell, 1997).

My HE international teaching/learning experience allowed me to experience a society, which, in spite of its traditional racial prejudices, provided an enabling environment for international students to succeed. The international classroom experience was more democratic and far less taciturn than those in Trinidad and Tobago. In my university classrooms, many students ‘spoke up and spoke out’. Although there existed variability in lecturers’ ‘teaching skills’, I experienced high levels of ‘approachability’, a significant factor in students’ conceptions of learning and assessment (Sander *et al*., 2000). The students were free to give dissenting views.

A major outcome of my foreign HE experience was the recognition of the transformative teaching/learning environment existing in British HE which, in spite of its ‘commercialisation’ and ‘massification’ (Knight, 2003, 2002; Naidoo, 2007, 2003), provided a stimulating research sector that included research into teaching/learning. The British HE environment was thought–provoking and dynamic. It was not without problems (funding and governance issues for instance) but it was far more student–friendly and research–focused, and was aligned with my own developing conceptions of teaching as a critical area of research.

As an educational researcher focusing on teaching and learning, I argue that deeper analysis and synthesis of teaching/learning in postcolonial, post–independent Caribbean society is critical. This is fundamental if our education practitioners are to interrogate traditional local teaching practices, and their impact on students (Deosaran, 2016; Bristol, 2012). I submit that our education administrators, and HE lecturers lack meta–cognitive and socio–cultural awareness of teaching. Traditional practice negatively impacted their roles and functions as change agents in our society (Bristol, 2012; Freire, 2000, 1972) since teaching/learning is not conceptualised in local contexts (Lavia, 2013, 2012). Teaching pedagogy utilised mimicked that of traditional universities (Rodriguez, 2008).

Our HE institutions continue to pursue traditionalist, foreign–dominated approaches to educating generally (Best, 2004; Nettleford, 2003, 1997; Sankatsing, 2001, 1998). My local and international university experiences crystallised my opinion regarding our teachers’ perception of teaching/learning, and the deficits in their praxis. Such experiences germinated my desire to focus on teachers’ ‘conceptions of teaching’ as an area of research. The opportunity to realise my goal of pursuing further educational research came in 2009. I entered a Master in Higher Education (MHEd) Tertiary Level Teaching and Learning programme to advance my knowledge. A significant element of a teacher’s practice as well as his/her conception of teaching is a teaching philosophy and educational research theorists who impacted his/her practice.

In the following section I discuss educational theories and theorists who influenced my practice.

## *1.3. Education Research Theories and Theorists: How They Influenced My Practice*

### 1.3.1. Behaviourism

My teaching has been influenced by objectivism aligned to the education theories of behaviourism. As a teacher college student, I studied Pavlov (1927) who outlined classical conditioning and Piaget (1976, 1972) and suggested four–stages of cognitive development from sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete and post–operational, including his schemas of assimilation, accommodation and equilibration. Beyond college, these theorists influenced my practice in curriculum execution, testing, as well as skills and drills in relation to my naïve perception of

my role as a teacher. As a primary school teacher functioning in an elitist educational system, control and hence ‘power’, was critical to my practice, including my students’ learning. It was in this context that my primary school practice was linked to behaviourism, and associated theorists, particularly operant conditioning (Skinner, 1996, 1968). Behaviourism was, and continues to be a populist conception of teaching/learning utilised by local educational administrators, parents and other stakeholders as a major driver of local education policy, student learning, examination performance, and associated measurable outcomes and policy prescriptions.

### 1.3.2. Cognitivism

Continued growth and maturing in my career as a teacher allowed for expansion of my knowledge–base in teaching/learning. As I transitioned into the secondary sector (in our system of education primary teachers generally move into the higher sectors–secondary and tertiary after graduating with their degrees), I was influenced by the cognitivists Kohler (1959) and Bruner (1996, 1961) and in particular, Bloom taxonomies in relation to learning objectives. Bloom identified three significant domains of learning: cognitive (thinking); affective (feeling) and psycho-motor, (doing) (Bloom *et al.,* 1956). The original taxonomy of Bloom *et al.* was slightly modified by Anderson and Krathwohl who added ‘creating’ new knowledge to the original hierarchy (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001).

Bandura’s (2006, 1982, 1977) observational learning, a sub–set of his cognitive social theory which asserted the criticality of self–efficacy and self–regulation as major elements affecting students learning and achievement, also impacted my thinking as a secondary teacher. Bruner’s (1961) self–discovery approach to learning, placing students at the centre of their learning, created tensions in my practice in a system dominated by teacher–centric praxis. I began to formulate ideas about teaching/learning which were not consistent with traditional teaching, since I recognised that our education system seemed unable to cater for underperforming students, and did not provide outlets for students’ creativity.

Cognitivism targets the thinking domain. But more fundamentally, as applied to teaching/learning, cognitivism targets understanding, conceptualisation, analysis, and synthesis aligned to secondary school teaching. University teaching/learning in particular require creative thinking, decision–making, generalisation, problem–solving and evaluation. My practice as a secondary school teacher was underpinned by tensions, trying to make sense of an effective conception of teaching in an environment where senior teachers and education administrators were slow to recognise the viability of alternative forms of student learning. Our education system functioned as a clearing house for ‘bright’ textual students, paying minimal attention to non–textual students. Traditional practice seemed to be aligned to Skinner’s (1996, 1938) operant conditioning related to teaching instruction and reinforcement.

### 1.3.3. Constructivism

As I transitioned out of the secondary sector, into HE, I began to reorient my practice (with tremendous difficulty) from an exclusive teacher–focused/content–oriented approach to a student–focused/learning oriented approach (Kember, 1997). Simultaneously, I began to focus on constructivism (Gordon, 2009; Richardson, 1997). Bruner’s (1961) self–discovery method to learning influenced my practice as a HE teacher in a system dominated by teacher–centric practice. I was also influenced by the theories of Knowles (1973, 1970) around Andragogy, focusing on the teaching of adults; Toffler (1983, 1970) de–synchronisation and the constructivist Vygotsky’s (1986) social constructivism based on the ideas of reality, knowledge and learning. In spite of White’s (1998) criticisms (focusing on Gardner’s criteria for an intelligence, issues with his ‘prerequisites’ and the various extensions of Multiple Intelligence theory since 1983); Gardner’s (1993/1983) Multiple Intelligence theory also motivated my teaching given its focus on students’ learning capacities.

The fundamental feature of traditionalist behaviourist theories and elements related to cognitive theories of learning were their deterministic nature, aligned to rule–based, predictable state of the teaching/learning environment (Bates, 2015). Constructivists recognised knowledge as essentially subjective, and constructed, aligned to our perceptions; knowledge is, therefore, constructed, rather than gained via memorization, or through transmission from teachers to students. Constructivism focuses on free will, consciousness and social context of learning (Rogers, 1969).

### 1.3.4. Critical Pedagogy

Freire’s critical pedagogy theory, aligned with education of the masses helped transform my positionality from a teacher implementing curriculum in an ‘*elitist*’ educational environment, to one with a deeper understanding of my role and function as a local HE practitioner (Freire, 2000, 1998, 1994, 1973). I recognised my professional self as existing in a postcolonial, post–independent society dominated by ideas of class, race and colour biases. Until my reading of his works, I had no idea of justice, social change and critical knowledge in an educational context. I also did not consider the concept of teaching and learning as human experiences. I now embrace the idea that education should be humanistic (my teaching philosophy discussed below). I reflected on teaching in colonial and post–colonial contexts, simultaneously questioning my roles and functions as a HE teacher. I also analysed the deeper meaning of teaching, and my social responsibility as a HE teacher in a post–independent society (Bristol, 2012; Lavia, 2013, 2012; Nettleford, 1997). I did not articulate my ideas in the context of teacher’ conceptions, but they were germinating a deeper concern about teaching, and the HE teacher’s role in education, beyond preparing students for examination success.

As I matured as a teacher professionally, I began to formulate ideas about the requirement for more local research into teaching and learning. My entry into HE crystallised my desire to focus on teachers’ conceptions of teaching. Practitioners in HE assumed, in my view, that teaching was aligned to lecturing, given their perception of teaching as a concept unworthy of serious investigation/analysis. Thus, a combination of the educational theorists I encountered, my teaching experience, and my development professionally provided the impetus for this project.

Any serious teaching practitioner ought to recognise the requirement for a teaching philosophy or be influenced (by mentors) of the critically of such a requirement; a belief system that guides his/her practice. I argue that an enhanced philosophy of teaching is critical to student–centric classroom practice (Brook, 2002), and higher–order conceptions of teaching (to be explored in Chapter 6). I shall therefore, focus on the following principles as enunciated in the following section.

## *1.4. My Enhanced Teaching Philosophy: A Humanistic Teaching/Learning Approach*

### 1.4.1. Introduction

My enhanced teaching philosophy, draws and builds on a previous iteration of my teaching philosophy, and includes the following principles: (1) Education should be meaningful and alive; (2) Education should be personal as well as political; (3) Education should be fresh and integrative; (4) Education should be worldly and holistic; (5) Education should be active and dialectical; (6) Education should be dialogic and relational;(7) Education should be empowering; and (8) Education should be provocative and enjoyable. I shall expand on these principles in the following sections bellow.

### 

### 1.4.2. Education should be meaningful and alive

To be meaningful and significant in the classroom I strive to be engaging and alive—meaning that my content must be appropriate and relevant. It should be contextualised to the demands of my local teaching/learning environment while allowing for the recognition of the world view, wherever appropriate. My teaching should be sensitive to the varied needs of my students, and should allow for maximum participation of all, regardless of the class size. It ought to cater for the range of opinions and interpretations which may occur in any session while, simultaneously, ensuring the rigour of analysis and synthesis, both oral and written that is demanded by any tertiary level institution in which I teach. Technology—both traditional and modern, should play an integral part in this teaching/learning process. I should strive at all times to give ‘voice’ to my students’ opinions and ideas, enabling them to challenge those opinions and ideas which are ‘unacceptable’.

### 

### 1.4.3. Education should be personal as well as political

The juxtaposing of theory and practice with analysis and interpretation of values, ideologies, concepts, and ideas must be the essence of my teaching. There should be a commitment to excellence, at all times. I strive be true to myself and my students. I ought to make a difference, and so inspire my students to strive to make a difference to the institution, to their community, and to the country. My hidden curriculum—tone, body language, attitude and general deportment is at all times positive. I recognise that the hidden curriculum is a broad topic which can be analysed from the societal, institutional, departmental, and individual perspectives. However, I choose to focus on the hidden curriculum in the context of my ‘positionality’ as a teacher in the classroom. It is the least I can do for my students. By encouraging social interaction, the expressing of opinions and debates on issues in the modules I teach; my goal is to provide avenues for my students to ‘grow’ intellectually, and politically. They shall be encouraged to speak up and speak out with respect. They shall be guided to listen more; for it is by listening that we understand, and can therefore predict, and comprehend.

### 1.4.4. Education should be fresh and integrative

The new focus for me is to dynamise the learning experience by encouraging a range of perspectives on issues presented. Whether the module is technology–based or the humanities, the principal approach to teaching/learning in my classes is always to accommodate new and different interpretations, or analyses with appropriate integration. Social technologies which promote communication, both real–time and asynchronous, will always be a medium used to enhance discourse, and offer opinions. Multitasking and parallel thinking will be encouraged, as well as the use of social media. Cooperative learning, as well as group and individual assignments, and assessment, shall be undertaken. Whatever the subject matter the approach to understanding content should be based on the various contexts, whether social, economic, political, cultural, religious, environmental, and sociological. There shall be no ‘one way’ or ‘my way’, but rather unique and varying ways to deliver and explore content. In doing so, I am cognisant of the dynamic nature of knowledge, even as technology and science continue to enhance our collect knowledge–base. Knowledge acquisition, therefore, requires negotiation between my students and me. More importantly, the participatory approach to teaching/learning would always be emphasised by me as teacher since I, as well, learn from my students.

**1.4.5. Education should be worldly and holistic**

As I teach, I aim to bring that multiplicity of lifelong experiences and ideas to my students. I have had a background which is rooted in respect for all religions, all ethnicities, and all cultural practices, even those with which I am not in agreement. More significantly, I have been mandated by all those who influenced my growth to respect women. My experiences living working and studying in the developed world, as well as Trinidad and Tobago, have shaped and refined my life–outlook, and have allowed me to recognise the value of discipline, tolerance and compassion. As part of my mandate of teaching, I aim to influence my students to seek to improve the world they meet. They should strive to develop a ‘social conscience’, and be critical thinkers, recognising that through their individual and collective efforts they can [try] to make the world a better place. It is the least that they can do as they strive in this world, and it is our duty to help them.

### 1.4.6. Education should be active and dialectical

The learning process requires the active participation of both me and my students in and out of the classroom. Learning should not be a singular activity with me playing the ‘sage on the stage’. Critical thinking is to be fostered at all times as we try to interpret educational content in the context of our world. There is always a blend between the theory and the practice, buttressed by the use of technology, especially the social technologies which enhance communication and dialogue, among all in a class or any social setting, beyond the classroom. My students’ experiences are as valid as mine, and therefore, would be used in the classroom. They should learn from me; I should learn from them.

The academic relationship/s between lecturer and student is symbiotic. Teaching without resultant behaviour change yields nothing, neither for the lecturer nor the students. Thought without action is unsustainable, and for me learning should always involve analysis, synthesis, adaptation, reorientation and evaluation; the net result at all times is adding something new, something different and something refreshing. This is the purpose of dialectic thinking and this is the purpose of my interaction with my students. They should, by their actions, questions and thinking, allow me the think and conceive of ideas and ‘answers’ in ways that I did not think of, and conceive of, before.

**1.4.7. Education should be dialogic and relational**

I aim to encourage my students to look way beyond the textbook for knowledge, and to use the vast array of resources available for obtaining information. In this regard, every source is important; the newspaper, the blog, the novel, the e–book, the on–line journal, the article, the podcast, the video-cast, the power point presentation, the interview with the wise sage and the information from peer reviewed journals. These are some of the 21st century reservoirs of information, and it is all right for my students to refer to these sources. What is critical and significant, is how these are used, and when they are used, and for what purpose. The internet is fundamental to the obtaining of worldviews and to viewing the world vicariously. It brings a new kind of reality and relationally to the learning. I aim to use the social communicative technologies as a mechanism for enhancing and improving dialogue among students of the courses I teach.

### 1.4.8. Education should be provocative and enjoyable

Ultimately, my students should enjoy their education. In this regard, I aim to make my classroom one of fun. A classroom should be a safe place to express oneself and not be penalized for it. It should embrace diversity, differences of religion, race, sexual orientation and lifestyle, and simultaneously be disciplined, tolerant, and productive. It must embrace collective responsibility as well as individual responsibility. I shall encourage my students to think not only of solutions, but also of more questions. They must bring different perspectives, ideas and information. They must view the world from different levels of analysis and seek to change it for the better. This is their ultimate responsibility, and I am just a mere guide in the process.

A humanistic approach to teaching, buttressed by a philosophy that encompasses the above eight elements, and focuses on students’ conceptual development, is critical to the evolution of higher–order conceptions of teaching, a major theme of this study (Biggs, 2012; Brook, 2002; Kember, 1997). I seek to interrogate and understand Zion Hill Campus (ZHC) lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, given my claim that our education system continues to emphasise student examination performance, as well as teacher–centric practice.

A direct link exists between my current philosophy of teaching and my approach to this study. I believe that traditional, teacher–centric approaches to HE teaching/learning are linked to the colonial/postcolonial template of ‘elitist’ education (to be explored in chapter 2)—the education of a ‘selected few’ to serve local socio–economic institutions (Campbell, 1997). Aligned to such university training was a system of beliefs (Varnava Marouchou, 2011) linked to the traditional instructional paradigm of teaching (Barr and Tagg, 1995) that achieved the desired result in the traditionalist ‘*elitist*’ educational environment. The current ‘*mass’* education environment requires a different teaching/learning paradigm, focusing on students’ conceptual development (Biggs, 2012; Haggis, 2006). However, such transformation of praxis requires a reorientation of lecturers’ traditional conception of teaching.

In a theoretical context, such transformation necessitates interrogating the postcolonial/post–independent HE environment, and traditionalist teaching/learning practices to gauge whether they were in alignment with current student needs (Bristol, 2012). More significantly, lecturers’ conception of teaching demands amelioration to align with the current globalised, ‘*mass*’ education environment (Naidoo, 2007, 2003). Integral to ameliorating HE teaching, is interrogating lecturers’ conception of teaching, their roles and functions, assessment, and the local contexts which impact lecturers’ practice to glean insights or understanding (Lavia, 2013; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al.,* 1994). This is the intent of the current study.

# *1.5. Research Design*

The research design for this project is *basic interpretive qualitative* *design* (BIQD) (Wellington, 2015; Merriam, 2009, 2002) located in a decolonising methodological context (Smith, 2013/1999). I am interrogating certain local lecturers’ conception of teaching, and variation of practice from a postcolonial, post–independent Caribbean perspective. To analyse teaching theory and practice, I explored the Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009; Griffiths, 2004; Boyer, 1990). Regarding data collection, I utilised semi–structured interviews since I was interested in lecturers’ understanding of their teaching reality (Merriam, 2002) and implemented the Seven–Step Method (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991) to data analysis. The paradigm influencing this study is Interpretivsm (Wellington, 2015; Merriam, 2009, 2002). To explore local contexts in which lecturers operate, I utilised the pedagogical constructs model (Fanghanel, 2007) as a secondary method of analysis. This model was utilised to identify lecturers’ variation in teaching practice. My intention is to elucidate more on these approaches in the forthcoming chapters

The research design for this study encompasses seven phases which can be identified from the diagram below:

**Figure 1: The research design identifying the six phases of the research**
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Phase one focused on an analysis/discussion of my brief autobiography, educational theorists impacting my practice, my teaching philosophy, and ‘positionality’ in the context of the research. These themes provide the foundation to the research questions; phase two focused on an analysis/discussion of colonial/postcolonial education, postmodernist theories underpinning its implementation, as well as the impact of globalisation on higher education (HE); phase three involved a literature review of the teachers’ beliefs and teacher conceptions literature, including elucidation of the concepts of globalisation, power, and postcolonialism and the SoTL. Phase four represents the paradigm underpinning this research—Interpretivism, *basic interpretive qualitative design* (Sandelowski, 2010; Merriam, 2009, 2002) and the *pedagogical constructs model* (Fanghanel, 2007). Phase five presented the findings of the research; phase six focused on the implications of my findings and phase seven elucidated upon recommendations and conclusions.

## *1.6. Contextual Information and Information about Participants*

My study, conducted at the MUZHC, over a two–year period from July 2014 to December, 2016 involved a sample of six participants functioning in different disciplines and faculties. They were the respondents to my original invitation to 30 potential participants to participate in this exploratory study, who had successfully completed the certificate in university teaching and learning (CUTL) programme at the ZHC (the nuances of this sample are explored in Chapter 4).

In the following section I explain the research aims.

## *1.7. What is the Research to Achieve, for Whom and for What Purpose?*

This study provided interpretive evidence, augmented by socio–cultural methods (Merriam, 2009; Fanghanel, 2007) to glean insights and understanding of some MUZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching. Understandings about teaching conceptions can promote departmental and institutional dialogue regarding teaching and learning in our current mass HE environment. Lecturers dialoguing among themselves may lead to consensus about teaching/learning in HE institutional settings (Akerlind, 2008; Astin, 1996) and to reflection upon the value of teaching in a predominately research HE environment (Fincher and Work, 2006). More particularly, encouraging dialogue can also lead to a re–evaluation of local lecturers’ current position on teaching. Finally, an environment of dialogue about teaching/learning may also assist local lecturers to enhance their institutional position on teaching. Such dialogue can assist lecturers in aligning teaching to a similar level as research/publication (Gibbs, 2005). In such circumstances, institutional facilitation, recognition, and rewarding of teaching in like manner as research and publication, may be more easily facilitated (Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996).

These ideas formed the basis of my investigation. I argue that teaching and learning conceptions are activated in educational, socio–economic and historical contexts (Fanghanel, 2007). At an individual level, they are based on epistemological, ontological and axiological principles, and philosophical thought which govern implementation (to be explored in Chapter 2). The above ideas also assisted me in deriving the research questions related to this study of ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, given their participation in the SoTL training. Finally, the results of the study provided evidence that may help deepen MUZHC administration understanding of lecturers’ current positionality on teaching and research.

## *1.8. Research Questions*

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the current conceptions of teaching held by some lecturers at MUZHC?
2. How has training in HE teaching and learning impacted the practice of some lecturers at MUZHC?
3. What do some MUZUC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment?
4. What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?

I argue that such questions are legitimate and are appropriate for a doctor of education (Ed D) thesis. They are aligned to the broader notions of teaching and learning in a postcolonial, globalised context. As I indicated above, current teaching/learning practice in our country is essentially teacher–centric and content–oriented. In the present globalised *mass* education context however, a prerequisite exists for alignment of pedagogy to meet the requirements of the heterogeneous student cohorts who now enter HE lecture halls. These ideas will be further explored in Chapter 2.

## *1.9. My Epistemological, Ontological, and Axiological Stance vis-à-vis the Research*

### 1.9.1. Epistemological stance

Epistemology, the study of knowledge and justified belief, a function of truth, is also concerned with a priori knowledge—knowledge automatically known separate from experience, and a posteriori knowledge—knowledge gained from experience. In terms of updating and informing theory and practice educational philosophers have concentrated on traditional interpretation of epistemology including concepts like ‘knowledge, teaching, learning, thinking, understanding, belief, justification, theory, the disciplines, rationality and others’ (Lankshear *et al*., 2000, p. 17). Such inquiries, in addition to focussing how students can become autonomous knowers, also explored ‘teaching and learning, belief and opinion, knowledge and belief, data and information’ (Lankshear *et al*., 2000, p. 17). Thus, I construct knowledge and meaning. I also consider relational epistemology, ‘systems of knowledge built on relationships’ (Wilson, 2008, p. 74) where knowledge is shared, not only with my interpersonal relationships or participants, but with all and where I am answerable to all my relations as I do my research (Wilson, 2008, p. 56).

### 1.9.2. Ontological stance

My ontological stance is that reality is about perceptions; it is not fixed and is governed by the meanings we attach to our observations. As a teacher, I also focus on relational ontology where my reality is connected with other human beings, including the non–living. Thus ‘I am we; I am because we are and since we are, therefore I am’ or ‘a person is because of others’ Mbiti (1970, p. 141). My reality, therefore, also involves relationships.

### 1.9.3. Axiological stance

My axiological stance suggests personal, political, religious and moral beliefs impact the aesthetics and ethics of any situation. My research, therefore, cannot be value–free (Boyd, 2000). This idea is supported by Lather (1991) who suggests:

Facts are not given but constructed by the questions we ask of events. All researchers construct their objects of inquiry out of the materials their culture provides and values play a central role in this linguistically, ideologically and historically embedded project we call science (p.105).

Thus, a value–free ideology in research, especially educational research is unsustainable because values implicitly and explicitly impact the research process. I am inextricably linked to my research in teaching and learning because of my desire to achieve positive action from my research, and to ‘eliminate the difference’ between myself and those I seek to research (McLure, 2003 as cited in Watson 2005, para. 49).

As a pragmatic teacher/researcher, I focus on dialogue and reasoning, changing my perspective/s based on evidence or on changes in my belief system/s (Turner, 2012). My approach to this study was, therefore, located in my epistemological, ontological and axiological conceptions. I utilised a pragmatic approach, governed by qualitative methodology including a reality that is relationally based, and where I bring my values to the research process. I consequently, focused on evidence–based practice using a second–order data collection approach. I believe that our national schooling/instructional framework needs to be dismantled, and the educational hypotheses, authority interactions including historical control which underpin it ought to be uncovered, evaluated, as well as modified (Myers, 1996).

These ideas will be expanded in Chapters 4 and 5.

## *1.10. Structure of the Thesis*

The thesis consists of seven chapters, specifically:

* Chapter 1: What Prompted This Study?

* Chapter 2: Traditional Higher Education: Philosophical Underpinnings, Modes of Practice and Implications for Teaching Conceptions.
* Chapter 3: Literature Review
* Chapter 4: Methodology
* Chapter 5: Presentation of Findings
* Chapter 6: Implications and Discussion of Findings: ZHC Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching
* Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter 2 sets the foundation for the study. In Chapter 2, I begin with an analysis of traditional Euro–centric education and philosophical theory supporting colonial/postcolonial education implementation. Postmodernist theories and local HE development are explored, including alignment with underdevelopment themes aligned to elitist education. I analyse the impact of globalisation on HE. I then conclude the chapter.

Chapter 3 presents a literature review. I begin by defining and theorising globalisation, power and postcolonialism. I then focus on analysing briefly, teachers’ beliefs. The scholarship *for* teaching vs the scholarship *of* teaching are explored before examining the literature on teachers’ conceptions of teaching and the SoTL. I target major themes related to teaching and learning including scholarship, teaching and staff development, conceptual issues, pedagogical research, professional knowledge, and reward and recognition before concluding the Chapter.

Chapter 4 explains the methodological processes utilised in my research. I

emphasise the criticality of worldviews as they relate to unearthing a Caribbean perspective to this research. I then focus on the research paradigm (BIQD), the rationale for choosing the methods, the research perspective, the research setting and participants, data collection involving the use of semi–structured interviews, data analysis and the analysis process. These constitute the major methods uitilised to yield ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching. Included in my methods, is a consideration of ethics. In this context, I focused on informed consent, harm and risks, honesty and thrust, privacy, confidentiality and anonymity, and voluntary participation. I also discussed validity and reliability, in the context of trustworthiness, credibility and dependability. I then conclude the Chapter.

In Chapter 5, I elucidate upon my findings, exploring the subsidiary questions related to this study. I then explore the variation in teaching dimensions of ZHC lecturers relating to actual practice. Next, I analyse local filters influencing lecturers’ practice, focusing on those excavated from my analysis of the data. Finally, I conclude the Chapter.

Chapter 6 focuses on the implications of my findings. I isolate each research question and analyse its effects current practice. I then explore ZHC lecturers’ teacher–focused/content–oriented practice, targeting the historical influences impacting lecturers’ pedagogy. I discuss the influence of Euro–centric educational contexts, aligned to colonial/postcolonial educational practice and implications in our current globalised, mass education environment. I then conclude the Chapter.

In Chapter 7, the final chapter, I recapitulate ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching and institutional contexts governing their practice. I then identify five recommendations emanating from my analysis. I discuss the significance of this research, the conceptual issues and theories elucidated, and also explore reflections, processes and outcomes, delimitations and limitations of this research, and implications for further research. I then conclude the Chapter.

In chapter 2, I analyse theories underpinning traditional education, postmodernist education, and the impact of globalisation on 21st century HE.

# Chapter 2: Traditional Higher Education: Philosophical Underpinnings, Modes of Practice and Implications for Teaching Conceptions

## *2.1. Introduction*

I contended in Chapter 1 that the principal objective of local education was student examination performance, utilising teacher–centric/content–oriented pedagogy (Astin, 2012; Kember, 1997), not aligned to student conceptual development. Our education system epitomised authoritarian teaching, based on ‘power’, residing in the teacher who implemented the curriculum, utilising the instructional paradigm (Luke, 2005; Barr and Tagg, 1995). Traditional teaching/learning implementation was *‘elitist’*, focusing on upper–class academically inclined students, simultaneously ostracising the majority of non–textual, visual, and kinesthetic learners (Baksh, 1986; Williams, 1964).

In this Chapter, an examination of Euro–centric education practice underpinned by our unique colonial/postcolonial history and socio–economic development shall be undertaken (Kellner, 2003; King, 1995; Williams, 1964). I shall also analyse postmodernist theories and globalisation including the modern approach to HE (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2002), in the context of [re]shaping the purpose of local HE teaching/learning, including lecturers’ conception of teaching. Such themes have had a corresponding influence on local lecturers’ practice, and in significant ways, have persuaded me to investigate ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching. These themes are represented in the diagram below:

**Figure 2:**

***Themes Impacting Local Higher Education Lecturers’ Conceptions of Teaching and Learning***
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**Figure 2:** Significant Themes Impacting Local Higher Education Lecturers’ Conceptions of Teaching and Learning.

I begin this analysis by suggesting that local lecturers’ conception of practice were governed by Euro–centric educational philosophy which underpinned historical colonial/postcolonial educational implementation (Heron, 2003; Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). At the root of ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching were historical educational practices and beliefs which, in part, influenced their positionality, their identity, self–efficacy and hence, professional practice (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001; Bandura, 1997, 1982).

I provide a brief overview of traditional Euro–centric education in the following section.

## *2. 2.Traditional Euro–Centric Education*

One of the peculiarities of traditional Euro–centric education was its perpetuation of Lockean assumption/s which presupposed a clean mind of the individual at birth, in a confusing world where concepts and casual relations were deduced from associations of stimuli (Emery, 1974). These overarching assumptions positioned the teacher as pivotal to teaching/learning [the traditional conception of teaching], who determined what was to be learnt (Kellner, 2003). In this world–view the teacher controls student success [the teacher’s role and responsibility]. Only the teacher’s stimuli were significant; there was no self–concept here, ‘as is the ability to remember that which is not understood and repeated rehearsal’ (Emery, 1974, p. 2).

These ideas, aligned with traditional Euro–centric educational practice, were implicated in the establishment of theories underpinning traditional education implementation (Chapfika, 2008; Kellner, 2003; Milliken, 2004). More particularly, such practices were aligned to teacher–centric, content–oriented instruction, and a conception of the teacher as the central figure in students’ learning (Kellner, 2003; Barr and Tagg, 1995). Such notions were also associated with educating only the *elite* class in the Caribbean/local plantation society (Campbell, 1997; King, 1995; Williams, 1964) and represented the foundation upon which HE was implemented in our country. I extend this analysis of traditional education, focusing on colonial/postcolonial education in the section below.

### 2.2.1. Colonial/Postcolonial Education

Education generally, and more particularly HE, reflects power relations in society which in essence reproduces the cultural hegemony of the majority (Abu–Rabia–Queder, 2008). The British plantation economy that was the Caribbean exhibited a hierarchical white–dominated, socio–economic, political, and cultural structure, aligned to a European/British socio–economic and cultural complex (Best, 1968). The plantation system abhorred an educated slave (King, 1995). The black majority population was, therefore, dominated by the ‘straight jacket’ of slavery (James, 1963/1938). Education—the ability to read and write was dangerous for the slave. Such individuals were considered a bad, an unwanted influence on the society, an instigator of estate protest, and inimical to plantation profits (King, 1995).

Traditional British colonial education, buttressed by European traditions and implemented with the implicit approval of the imperial authority via the Colonial Office, ostracised the majority black population. It was implemented initially, by the Roman Catholics locally, and subsequently, the Anglicans and other religions (Williams, 1964). This system of informal education was the vehicle used to achieve the objective of the ‘civilization’ of the non–white population (Lavia, 2013). The strategic intention involved ‘fitting them [the slaves] for labour’ (King, 1995) during the colonial period and consequently, this historical policy prescription and education implementation have been responsible for the ambivalent, exclusionary and elitist postcolonial approach to local education (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964).

Formal colonial/postcolonial HE also promulgated a Euro–centric philosophy, including a British epistemology, ontology and axiology, especially in the pre–independent period (before 1962). Thus, a British hegemony in knowledge, values, religion, culture and economics, targeting the elite and middle class, was established in local society (Heron, 2003). It simultaneously divorced the African inhabitants, the majority of the population, from their language, cultural practices, and religion (Heron, 2003; Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). The teacher was simultaneously carrying out the colonial/postcolonial mandate, concurrently demonstrating through his/her practice, a foreign identity and system of beliefs (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001). Traditional classroom practice yielded a conception of teaching aligned to the peculiar historical *elitist* environment, and transitioned as normative educational practice in our post independent period (Campbell, 1997).

In my opinion, the systemic influences of post–colonial education, in terms of *elitist* implementation, teacher–centric pedagogy, and examination focus, continue to hamper the current HE system (Jules, 2008). The concordant (mentioned in Chapter 1) remains in existence. Traditional academic students (Biggs, 2012) attending prestige denominational secondary schools were more likely to have positive post–secondary experiences and opportunities (Baksh, 1986). However, tensions exist in our HE sector principally as a consequence of the entry of non–traditional students (Biggs, 2012; Haggis, 2006), especially after the 1995 World Trade Organisation (WTO) agreement, which made education a tradable service (Naidoo, 2007, 2003). Such students require non–traditional approaches to teaching (Biggs, 2012).

Having undergone transformation over the last five decades, the fundamental principles of British HE remain intact in our system today (Bristol, 2012; Campbell, 1997; Alleyne, 1995). Teaching pedagogy is essentially teacher–centric, focusing on academic knowledge and outstanding examination performance (Alleyne, 1995). At the socio–historical and cultural levels, our education system personifies an authority structure, an ethos of dependence and patronage (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). It deprived the majority of the black working class population of dignity, security, and self–respect (Beckford, 1972). More significantly, as a function of a plantation economy (Best, 1968), local education implementation impeded the black population’s material, social, and spiritual advance (Beckford, 1972). The education system promulgated a foreign–dominated conception of education, including teaching practice, producing educated, certified individuals without a sense of the criticality of their history, and local contexts in solving our socio–economic, cultural and political issues (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Nettleford, 2003, 1997; Williams, 1964).

A nexus exists between colonial/postcolonial education implementation and the evolution of values, beliefs and attitudes, aligned to the ‘plantation’ influence which Beckford describes as ‘generally inimical to [human and social] development’ (Beckford, 1972, p. 206–207). Yet in a postcolonial, independent[[2]](#footnote-2) Trinidad and Tobago society, education was the ‘key’ to social mobility of the masses (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). What, therefore, is the link between British/European philosophy, educational theory and education implementation locally, in the context of teachers’ conceptions of teaching?

Three major categories of educational theories, linked to traditional educational implementation provide approaches to educational policy and implementation analysis in the context of teachers’ conception of practice. These are: (1) the Classical Theories based on the concept of modernity, (2) Critical Theories, and (3) Postmodernist Theories (Milliken, 2004). These theories provide the foundation to understanding the socio–political and cultural milieu in which education, as well as classroom practice was implemented. They also provide a link to the evolution of teachers’ beliefs and identity, and hence conception of teaching (to be explored in Chapter 3). However, my focus of attention for this research are the Postmodernist Theories (as depicted in the figure above) as they are linked to a greater degree, to the implementation, development, and expansion of local HE. The Classical and Critical Theories fall outside the ambit of analysis aligned to this research. I discuss postmodernist theories in the following section.

## *2.3. Postmodernist Theories*

*Postmodernism* as a concept has been subjected to numerous debates during the 1980’s and 1990’s among theorists (Selden, *et al*., 2016). For many researchers, *postmodernism* is a continuation and expansion of prevailing attitudes and practices located in the *modernist* era. To others, the concept reflects a radical break, a dislocation from traditionalist *modernism* (Rubtsov, 2011; Giddens, 1990). Yet, for other theorists postmodernism represents a filter for reviewing modern art, literature and culture, including text and authors using a lens of *postmodernism* (Lyotard, 1986). As a culturally influential model, *postmodernism* concedes the coexistence of other contradictory personas existing concurrently within its domain (Samuels, 2015). *Postmodernism* is also aligned to the concept of social realities as dynamic developing and redeveloping notions in response to environmental stimuli (McQuail, 2010; Littlejohn and Foss, 2005).

An analysis of *postmodernist* discourseis complex and impracticable to accurately delineate and it is, perhaps, necessary to seek to clarify general concepts or ideas pertaining to the concept. Thus, according to Rzayeva Oktay, we may have a discourse about *postmodernism* in the context of an intellectual phenomenon; we may also discuss a condition which is *postmodern.*  *Postmodernist* philosophy provides a theoretical basis or foundation for *postmodernism* and ultimately, *postmodernism* represents a theoretical and ideological amplification of *postmodernity* (Rzayeva Oktay, 2016). Postmodernism, therefore, communicates a philosophical idea which suggests that *postmodern* and *postmodernity* are social. It also indicates that *postmodernisation* is a social, as well as economic indicator of a concept [*Postmodernism*] that is interdisciplinary and complex in character (Rzayeva Oktay, 2016).

Giddens (1990), broadening the discourse declares whereas *postmodernity* illustrates the state of existence or form, or is associated with institutions and modifications in social conditions, *postmodernism* articulates political, aesthetic, literary, and social philosophy. As a Lyotardian explanation, *postmodernism* becomes an issue of expression of thought, firstly, in realms such as literature, philosophy, art and policy (Lyotard, 1986). Thus, a significant concept of *postmodernism* is the ‘*discourse*’. As a Foucauldian interpretation, the ‘*discourse’* represents, ‘first of all, the certain establishment causing a mode of existence of objects’ (Foucault, 2002, p. 285). In a Trinidad and Tobago context, this represents an intellectual establishment of *elites* whose role it is to manage the society and its institutions, especially HE, providing the intellectual rigour to what Campbell called the ‘increasing minority’—the few who entered HE classes (Campbell, 1997). In a HE context, the *‘discourse’* is similar to theoretical models established for analysing educational policy and implementation at both the institutional and classroom levels.

I argue that postmodernist theories provide an analytical base for investigating local HE practices, especially teachers’ traditional conceptions of practice. I have alluded to the implications of British education implementation, inherited by the local colonial authorities as it relates to the setting up of the Caribbean university (to be discussed below). This is critical to understanding how some lecturers at MUZHC function, in terms of teaching and learning, as well as their conceptions of teaching. *Postmodernist theories*, though contested in the literature, offer more enlightening methods of analysis and synthesis of HE in our present context (Kellner, 2003). They emphasise the significance of difference, marginality, heterogeneity, and multiculturalism in colonised Western dominated societies (Kellner, 2003; Best and Kellner, 1991). Such theories point to the breadth of experiences of marginalised groups and suppressed voices in the modern postcolonialist tradition (Smith**,** 2013/1999; Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1988; Said, 1978).

There exists an inevitable link between postmodernism and globalisation, especially in the context of the ‘massification’ of HE (Longsworth, 2009; Naidoo, 2007; Kuhn, 1970; Hargreaves, 1994). The issues relating to the transformation of educational practice in terms of constructivism, transmission instruction, and teaching/learning transformation (as identified in the figure above) would be analysed as part of the impact of globalisation on HE in the sections below

Finally, I argue that from a theoretical perspective, the power of *postmodernism* its power of inclusion, recognising diversity, giving voice to the marginalised, and in the Trinidad and Tobago context, placing value on working class individuals (Lavia, 2013; Bristol, 2012; Smith, 2013/1999; Scott, 2006). In a teaching/learning environment, it allows for an assessment of teachers’ beliefs and conceptions of teaching in our present context (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001). More fundamentally, *postmodernist* theory embraces those traditionally excluded main stream HE, for example, black people and other groups lacking social power (Kellner, 2003), and from a local perspective, aligns with the questions related to my investigation into ZHC lecturers’ practice identified in Chapter 1.

In the context of HE postcolonialism, and more particularly postcolonial theory, provide significant themes of underdevelopment and conceptions of practice. In the following section a brief examination is undertaken of the HE themes of underdevelopment, and conceptions of practice in the context of postcolonial theory.

### 2.3.1. Higher education and underdevelopment: Conceptions of practice

Postcolonial theory provides critical lens and themes that allow for HE analysis to ascertain its influence on stakeholders’ conceptions of teaching, for example, lecturers’ conceptions of practice, their positionality and self–efficacy as teaching practitioners (Bandura, 1997, 1982; Kember, 1997).

As Ben–David argues, HE development, generally, aligns with the idea that ‘effectiveness of a HE system is closely related to the social, economic and political contexts within which they develop’ (Ben–David, 1977, p. 13). Implicated in Ben–David’s assertion in a Trinidad and Tobago context, are themes of colonial underdevelopment which have influenced local HE practice in particular (Best, 2004, 1968; Nettleford, 2003, 1997; Williams, 1964).

Thus, research on Western HE as practiced in colonised States such as Trinidad and Tobago, reflects major underdevelopment themes which include racial undertones (Smith, 2013/1999). The ‘Westerners’ view is always superior to the Orientals’ (Spivak, 1988; Said, 1978). The written word or text gave cognisance to perspectives of the coloniser, not the colonised (Scott, 2006), who had no ‘voice’ (Smith, 2013/1999; Viruru, 2005). These ideas have had negative consequences on local HE development and practice (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Best, 2004; Nettleford, 2003, 1997).

Thus, local lecturers’ conception of teaching and research are aligned to foreign practice (Best, 2004; Sankatsingh, 1988). Some local lecturers, functioning from a conception of ‘*eliteness*’ in HE practice have traditionally adopted foreign values and cultural habits, not aligned to the local environment in which they functioned (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Heron, 2003; Sankatsingh, 1988). The tensions occuring in local HE may be located in the mismatch between the demands of *mass* education, and traditional teaching/learning practice associated with *elite* education conceptions of practice and traditional research (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008; Nettleford, 2003, 1997).

Postcolonial theory, aligned local HE implementation is, therefore, a significant socio–cultural and economic tool used for colonial/postcolonial domination, in the context of globalised practice, including the birthing of local elites, and development of conceptions of teaching and research, aligned to foreign institutional practice (Lavia, 2013; Bristol, 2012; Best, 2004). The development of non–Western models of HE research is, therefore, fundamental to the continued articulation of non–Western epistemology and ontology (Smith, 2013/1999; Sankatsing, 2001) critical to analysis of ZHC lecturers’ perception of teaching/learning, and their role and functions in our current *mass* HE environment. Significant also, is the evolution of a Caribbean ‘voice’ of ideas which places non–Western/Caribbean intellectual thought centre–stage (Nettleford, 2003, 1997; Best, 2004, 1997, 1968; Sankatsing, 1988; Beckford, 1978, 1974, 1972). What, therefore, were the circumstances which influenced the development of HE in the region, and locally? In the following section a brief analysis is undertaken.

## *2.4. Higher Educational Development in Trinidad and Tobago*

### 2.4.1. Higher Education: Britain’s departing gift

In Trinidad and Tobago, tertiary education was conceived as part of a Caribbean imperative by the colonial power Great Britain, not the local critical elite (Asquith, 1943). Official thinking suggested educating locals would not best serve the colonial/local interest in keeping with modernist conceptions of education (King, 1995). The colonial power, however, recognised the criticality of developing a cadre of local professionals and administrators to maintain its postcolonial socio–economic, political, and cultural supremacy in Trinidad and Tobago (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). The impact of the World Wars and subsequent depletion of foreign professional and administrative personnel in the islands, hastened the implementation of HE by the Colonial Office which is reflected by the Asquith Report (1945):

In this stage preparatory to self-government, universities have an important part to play; indeed, they must be said to be indispensable. To them we must look for the production of men and women with the standards of public service and capacity for leadership which self rule required (p. 10).

Tertiary education in Caribbean was, therefore, based on foreign *elite* education implementation, aligned to modernist philosophy and was a fundamental strategy adopted by Britain (Sankatsingh, 1988; Williams, 1964). It had very little to do with increasing human resource capacity for development, or training to help solve the socio–economic issues plaguing the region (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). Britain decided that a HE institution was a fundamental requirement for developing a Caribbean *elite* to administrate local, public, and private institutions in the region, while simultaneously maintaining its socio–economic interests (Williams, 1964). This a class of individuals, schooled in the (proposed) regional HE institution, qualified to occupy public service and private sector institutions to replace returning British officials from the region, particularly after the World Wars (Asquith, 1945).

The British exit strategy on HE involved presenting a 1948 ‘gift’ of a regional university (Williams, 1964). By 1962, the local university campus was created. Thus began the *elitist* approach to Trinidad and Tobago’s HE. Only the brightest and the best academic students would be afforded the opportunity to participate. The local university epitomised the traditional British university system, focusing on traditional pedagogy in teaching/learning and research (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Williams, 1964). The mode of instruction was manifested in the lecture, and in a broader HE context, ‘the lecture’ defined traditional university education, focusing on transferring knowledge from professor—subject–matter expert to students (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008). It was thus linked to a conventional transmission mode of teaching/learning instruction, aligned to the cultural mystique and behaviour codes of the long–established conservative university, developed and matured over centuries of existence (Rodriguez, 2008).

### 2.4.2. Local Contexts and Response

Locally, HE lecturers are a highly educated, influential, *elite* group (Campbell, 1997). They are recognised as the symbol of academic authority and subject discipline experts, whose role is to transmit discipline knowledge to fill students’ ‘heads’ with information (Lammers and Murphy, 2002; Van Dijk *et al*., 2001; Campbell, 1997). In a teaching/learning context, this transmission mode of instruction, defined as, ‘that form of teaching which is primarily didactic, using one way transmission of knowledge from the expert teacher to the dependent student learner’ (Brockbank and McGill, 1998, p. 52), dominates HE classroom instruction. But the teaching/learning demands of 21st century *‘mass’* HE system have created anxiety within the local HE sector, and in a broader globalised context, have disrupted traditional instructional classroom practice (Day, 1998; Barr and Tagg, 1995; Hargreaves, 1994).

A wide array of research exists detailing the impact of globalisation on HE worldwide (Georgantzas *et al*., 2010; Acker, 2004; Jensen, 2003; Sen, 2002; Guillen, 2001; Giddens, 1999). At the heart of tensions occurring in local HE were various responses by stakeholders (governments, HE institutions and lecturers) to globalisation impacts upon the sector (Jules, 2011, 2008; Didou Aupetit and Jokivirta, 2007; Roberts, 2009; Thomas and Soares, 2009). Also included in the responses are the reengineering of local lecturers’ practice, re-assessment of their roles and responsibilities, including lecturers’ conception of teaching. Critical to individual professional growth and development in the globalised, dynamic environment, is the requirement for development of teaching/learning scholarship, and an assessment of local contexts in which HE lecturers function. These issues represent pertinent aspects of my research. In the following section, I turn my attention to an analysis of globalisation and its impact on traditional education practice.

## *2.5. Globalisation: Impact on Higher Education*

While positivist epistemology underpinned the functioning of *elitist* traditional education implementation, the world–wide paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1970) augmented by globalisation enabled challenges to traditional modes of thought, and caused the established tenets which governed Western society to be questioned (Milliken, 2004). As Hargreaves (1994) argues, ‘at the heart of the transition is the globalisation of economic activity, political relations, information, communications, and technology’. ‘This transition has major implications for the profession of teaching’ (p. 48). HE, including the traditional concept of teaching as a profession continues to undergo continuous transformation, both in terms of practice and expectation. Change has become a metaphor influencing every aspect of teaching in a globalised context (Hargreaves, 1994).

As Milliken suggested, transitioning societies rooted in traditional conceptions of positivism to societies of modernisation required fundamental societal transformation (Milliken, 2004). Crises interrupting developments in the economy, the society, including technology and intellectual thought, were precipitated by the disintegration of traditional ways of thinking and living (Best and Kellner, 1991). The 1970s and 1980s were the decades of radical socio–economic, cultural, and technological revolutions, heralding ideas of globalisation, and with them, fundamental transformation of HE teaching, and the concept of the teacher/lecturer (Milliken, 2004).

Like Milliken, Toffler also focused on the metaphor of ‘change’ within globalised society. He indicated that the unyielding, constant, unrelenting and dynamic change in postmodernist, globalised society suggested that change remains the singular constant (Toffler, 1983, 1970). Extending the argument about change, Fullan, like Kuhn described change as a ‘quantum leap’ aligned to extreme turmoil and constant social reengineering of society (Fullan, 1993; Kuhn, 1970). Continuous change/reform/transformation remains a major aspect of the HE educational sector during the last four decades, prompting Grace to suggest that professionalism and management culture of HE of the 1950s and 1960s have been replaced by one of centralised control and measurement (Grace, 1994).

Ozga, in describing the new approach to institutional governance asserted that governments intention of managing professional workers involved methods to *‘deprofessionalise’* and *‘reprofessionalise’* teachers [and teaching] to align with long–term governmental objectives (Ozga, 1992). Milliken, arguing in a similar vein, indicated that the dilemma created by the ‘new’ management style of government control created tension for teachers who were required to adjust their pedagogical beliefs to align to this new market culture in HE (Naidoo, 2007; Milliken, 2004). Harris, furthering the debate also indicated that such reforms were conceived as one element of a *‘deprofessionalisation’* process (Harris, 1993). Lawn and Ozga concurred with Milliken and Harris regarding this ‘change’ by arguing that it was not intended to improve professionalism of teaching staff, but was a mechanism utilised by the State to control teachers (Lawn and Ozga, 1986). Lyotard, like Day and Milliken suggested that such change was conceived as part of a larger conceptualisation of scientific knowledge as a ‘metanarrative’, ‘metadiscourse’ or grand narrative privileging science as a valid mode of understanding over all erstwhile modes of knowledge (Milliken, 2004; Day, 1998; Lyotard, 1984). A new conception has emerged which implies that the university is an institution for producing the human resources required to make the economy more competitive, in highly aggressive international globalised marketplace (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1993; Schultz, 1961).

Trinidad and Tobago’s HE system did not escape these cataclysmic transformations occurring in the world–wide HE sector. The tensions occurring in local HE is a consequence of the perpetuation of traditional modes of thought and classroom practice perpetuated by lecturers in a challenging 21st century, globalised, HE environment (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). In Trinidad and Tobago, HE lecturers perceive themselves as an *‘elite class’*, holding on to the traditional mystique of the traditional university (Rodriguez, 2008; Campbell, 1997) in an era of ‘*mass’,* ‘*commercialised*’ education (Knight, 2003, 2002).

Local universities are considered as research institutions, not research/teaching institutions (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). Such notions of self, as lecturer and/or researcher, are exacerbated by traditional criteria for promotion (Clegg, 2008). Lecturers are expected to teach, but the criteria for promotion includes research and publication, together with public service to the community, not excellent teaching (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Fincher and Work, 2006). This is the ‘calamity of purpose’ that confronts local HE lecturers and continues to impact their conception of teaching as they negotiate the current dynamic HE environment (O’Brien, 2008; Land, 2004). New conceptual schemas are required to articulate local HE philosophy, purposes and practices, including lecturers’ roles within it, at this present globalised/ education conjuncture (Jules, 2011, 2008; Bush, 2006; Milliken, 2004).

In a Trinidad and Tobago context, the ideas expressed above are representative of the complexity existing in the local HE environment (Barnett, 2004, 2000, 1999; Campbell, 1997). Lecturers’ agency, beliefs, self–efficacy, and positionality, as well as their conceptions of teaching are essentially traditionalist and *elitist* (Lavia, 2013; Bristol, 2012; Gee, 2001, Bandura, 1997). However, they are functioning in a postmodernist, *mass* HE environment (Naidoo, 2007). Traditional notions of existence and practice, underpinning my study of ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching are linked to the research questions (identified in Chapter 1). The present HE environment creates a dilemma for HE lecturers, challenging their autonomy and professionalism, their roles and functions, as well as their conceptions of teaching (Didou Aupetit and Jokivirta, 2007; Knight, 2003). In the following section, I expand this discourse in the context of autonomy and professionalism as a critical aspect of lecturers’ conceptions of teaching.

### 2.5.1. Autonomy and Professionalism: Impact on lecturers’ concept of teaching

A significant feature of globalised HE environments, is the shift from traditional *elite* education to *mass* education, with the resultant structural and systemic transformations (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2002). These characteristics have permanently interrupted lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, as well as their positionality, roles and functions within the academic environment (Bandura, 1982, 1977). Two significant paradigm shifts in HE education have transformed its purpose, and functions, and hence its conceptualisation. The first is ‘commercialisation’ and ‘massification’ (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2002). HE commercialisation is represented by the international socio–cultural, economic, technological, accreditation and marketing strategies that underpin institutional functions, demonstrated by their competing for both national and international students (Giddens, 1991, 1990).

The second is the shift in the functions of research and knowledge production (Lyotard, 1984). As Lyotard (1984) suggested, ‘Knowledge is and will be produced in order to be sold; it is and will be consumed in order to be valorised in a new production; in both cases, the goal is exchange’ (p. 4). This view is also supported by Milliken who indicated that such knowledge functions ‘have been transformed by the leading sciences and technologies of telematics, cybernetics, informatics, and the expansion of computer languages’ (Milliken, 2004, p. 14). Such trends suggest that *modernity* as an epistemological concept governing the university’s function has failed to fulfil HE objectives, as well as assurances of spearheading the process towards postmodernity (Harvey, 1991; Lyotard, 1984).

Uncertainty now epitomises the HE environment in which the university functions adding to its supercomplexity (Lea and Callaghan, 2008; Barnett, 2000, 1999), and significantly transformed the original emphasis of the university—research to include teaching and learning (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). The university’s current existence is linked to fulfilling the requirements of government and industry (Readings, 1996). It is in this context that the *raison d'être* of the universityhas come into question, especially the issue of the politics of research, as well as teaching (Derrida, 1983). The university’s survival is linked to its response to the external forces impacting it in the context of its traditional pedagogy, research output, sources of and for funding, its management, and professionalism (Milliken, 2004; Derrida, 1983).

The literature points to a managerialist approach to university administration which is described as the private–sector ‘solution’ to the public–sector ‘problem’ (Milliken, 2004). Uhr describes the managerialism approach as ‘the pursuit of results–oriented systems of government management through streamlined processes of decision–making, designed to allow greater autonomy, but also greater responsibility for the field or programme manager’ (Uhr, 1990, p. 22). Partnerships pervade every aspect of the university’s existence which is noted as a worldwide phenomenon (Lawton, 1992). It is not surprising, therefore, that a number of theorists have suggested that given the current climate of complexity and uncertainty, the traditional autonomous function of the university may be declining, or be coming to an end (Barnett, 2000, 1999; Beloff, 1990).

Managerialist approaches to university administration and lecturer control are collectively impacting lecturers’ conception of their profession (McEwen, 1999). What is at stake is the very essence of the profession as originally conceived and implemented (Pratt, 1994). The ‘disconnect’ between teaching and management, as well as erosion of lecturers’ traditional autonomy and presumed ‘*proletarianisation’* of the profession of teaching is a cause of concern (McEwen, 1999). Collectively, these forms of interventions are intensifying the profession’s atomisation, while simultaneously causing lecturer burnout (Milliken, 2004). These issues impact lecturers’ conception of their profession and of teaching/learning, including their roles and functions (questions in my research) in an increasingly complex environment (Barnett, 2000, 1999). Thus, Milliken argues that globalisation as a conceptual schema, manifested in approaches underpinning governmental/public institutional university management continues to corrode the foundation of HE teaching professionalism and traditional autonomy (Milliken, 2004).

In addition to globalisation as a form of neo–colonial practice, the historical context of HE development in Trinidad and Tobago [discussed above] rooted in external conceptualisation and implementation by British colonial authorities, and perpetuated by local authorities in the postcolonial/post–independence period, have impacted lecturers’ conceptions of HE teaching [represented in the figure above as the history that surrounds and impacts local lecturers’ conceptions of teaching]. It is also implicated in their current classroom practice, the local contexts in which they function, as well as lecturers’ reaction to the SoTL. These ideas provide a platform for analysis of ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching, the major theme of the present study.

## *2.6. Conclusion*

In this Chapter, I have analysed critical concepts underpinning HE implementation including Euro–centric philosophical theory supporting colonial and postcolonial education in Trinidad and Tobago, and the impact of such policy prescriptions (Keller, 2003; Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964; Bolgar, 1963). I argued that HE development in Trinidad and Tobago was aligned to *elitist* implementation which sustained lecturers’ conceptions of practice, as well as traditional approaches to teaching/learning. I have focused on a broad–based analysis of postmodernism (Selden, *et al*., 2016; Foucault, 2002; Lyotard, 1986, 1984), and colonial/postcolonial educational practice, and on globalisation as it relates to HE (Milliken, 2004; Kuhn, 1970; Hargreaves, 1994). By so doing, I have presented a broad–based framework of analysis that allows for my investigation into some ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching. The chapter therefore, sets the foundation to the rest of the thesis; the link between traditional beliefs, practice and historical HE implementation which govern current conceptions of teaching held by certain ZHC lecturers.

I argued that traditional conceptions of teaching, aligned to conventional university practices may not satisfy requirements of the dynamic, supercomplex mass education system in which ZHC lecturers function (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008; Barnett, 2000, 1999). These contexts give validity to my investigation of certain ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching through the use of BIQD (Merriam, 2009, 2002).

In Chapter 3, I undertake a review of the literature related to teachers’ identity, beliefs and practice as well as conceptions of teaching, and the major themes associated with SoTL. I shall explore traditional and newer research frameworks related to teacher conceptions including the variations of practice. I shall also investigate the influence of the concepts of globalisation, power, and postcolonialism upon local HE.

# Chapter 3: Literature Review

## *3.1. Introduction*

Building on the themes presented in Chapter 2 including postmodernism, postmodernist theory, colonial/postcolonial education implementation, and globalisation impact on HE; in this chapter I focus on a literature review. I shall review teacher beliefs, identity and professional practice, as well as the SoTL. With respect to the SoTL, I shall investigate the literature on teaching and staff development (Poole, 2010; Kreber, 2002), conceptual issues (Clegg, 2008; Jenkins and Healey, 2005), pedagogical research (Lucas *et al*., 2007; Healey, 2000), professional knowledge (Macfarlane, 2004; Gibbs, 2002), and reward and recognition (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Gibbs, 2005, 2002). These SoTL themes are a subset of research informed teaching (RIT), the fourth element in Griffiths’ typology of teaching (Griffiths, 2004) and significant to lecturers’ professional practice.

In Chapter 2, I discussed the impact of globalisation on HE, focusing on the metaphor of ‘change’. In Chapter 3, I shall expand the analysis theorising the concepts of globalisation, power, and postcolonialism, including their impact on local HE. My research is embedded in these three concepts.

## *3.2. Globalisation: Issues in the Concept of Globalisation*

### 3.2.1. What is Globalisation?

Acker, like Guillen, argues that globalisation remains a contested topic and significant area of research in HE (Guillen, 2001; Acker, 2004). Giddens further suggests that globalisation research focuses on political transformations, transnational corporation growth and cultural effects (Giddens, 2000). Castells, writing from a sociological perspective identifies the effects of globalisation as the formation of a [new] society with 4 major dimensions; the deployment of information technology; globalisation, underpinned by technological, organisational and institutional capacity (Held, 1999); a dominant culture of interactive electronic hypertext, and the demise of the nation–state. These are replaced by networks of shared sovereignty formed by national governments, supranational institutions, conational institutions—European Union, NATO, regional governments and NGOs involved in negotiated decision–making (Castells, 2000, p. 693–694).

Interestingly, Acker (2004), researching from a feminist standpoint postulates a gender–neutral focus on the globalisation discourse. Acker (2004) also highlights influential male theorists in the social sciences, for example, Sen, Beck, Giddens, and others, arguing about the meaning of term globalisation, the processes, and the likely outcomes (Sen, 2002; Beck, 2000; Hardt and Negri, 2000; Giddens, 1999; Bauman, 1998; Wallerstein, 1974). Freeman also identifies the implicit ‘masculinisation’ of these macro–structural models’ (Freeman, 2001). Smith (1987) has commented that these mainstream theories of society’s construction focus on the masculine standpoint, impeding adequate globalisation analysis. Like Smith, Elson and Mies have asserted that these traditionalist analyses pay little attention to women, unpaid caring, households, and the informal economy that sustains human life (Elson, 1994; Mies, 1986).

Held and others have focused on global interconnectedness in the literature (Georgantzas *et al*., 2010; Held *et al*., 2003). In this context, Block argues the literature on globalisation also pursue a number of [social] features including Jensen’s cultural perspective: spatial connection—the linking of social relations and connections; homogenisation—unison in consumption patterns around the world—McDonaldisation, and Mcworld—a single global culture (Block, 2004; Jensen, 2003). The transformative effect of globalisation on major socio–economic, cultural, and technological existence of the majority of the world’s population also impacted local HE implementation as argued in chapter 2.

### 3.2.2. Globalisation: A Caribbean Perspective

From a Caribbean perspective, researchers Girvan, like Pantin and others, assert that globalisation continuously occurred over the past 500 years (Pantin, 2001; Girvan, 1999). They maintain that as a philosophical concept, globalisation, and its mantra of neo–liberalism, is conceptualised on a defective intellectual base (Pantin, 2001; Shaikh, 2001; Benn and Hall, 2000). They suggest that locally, the polity exists as a regulator of public conscientiousness, justice, and upholding of the common good. However, no such supranational entity exists, or is vested with authority for implementing integrity by participating countries in the global economic system (Giddens, 2018).

What occurs instead on the global stage is unfair, unequal competition (Pantin, 2001; Shaikh, 2001; Benn and Hall, 2000) where developed countries are endorsed over developing countries. Klak further states that the policy affiliate of globalisation, neo–liberalism, is associated with an obdurate disposition facilitating the boldness of developed countries that they can even limit supremacy and authority of international organisations (e.g. America withholding funds from the United Nations agencies) (Klak, 1998).

Castells and Benn also declare that although similarities exist between traditional colonial expansion and the imperialist globalised development phase, present globalisation contains a qualitative element that foreshadows widespread technological advancement, and targets economic progress not previously contemplated (Benn and Hall, 2000; Castells, 2000). Benn and Hall further advances the North–South divide concept, describing power asymmetries which exist within globalisation (Benn and Hall, 2000), where the south’s (the developing nations generally) position as a united force in global economic interactions has constantly eroded since the world trade organisation (WTO) agreement, especially the 1995 Uruguay Round which transformed HE in a tradable service (Benn and Hall, 2000). GIobalisation thus continues to impact the world, where developed countries continue to maintain traditional power positions, exercising their historical hegemony. Caribbean countries remain on the periphery of socio–economic, political and cultural development, maintaining an essentially traditionalist elitist HE system that is not aligned to current human resource development requirements (Torres–Saillant, 2005; Best, 2004).

## *3.3. Power*

The concept ‘power’, is premised on vagueness, indeterminateness and generality; consequently, power is not amenable to identification or measurement (Partridge, 1963). However, the notion of power is significant in social science research and in teaching/learning. Like Partridge, Dahl asserts that social scientists have found difficulty in providing a rigorous definition which can assist in systematic inquiry of power (Dahl, 1957).

Fairclough, for example, writing from a socialist perspective, and utilising the rubric of the ‘discourse’, introduces the concept of power or power relations rooted in language (Fairclough, 2001). He categorises power through ideology, or through the ideological working of language. Fairclough, in furthering the theoretical ideas of Bourdieu (1977), Foucault (1972), and Habermas (1984), operationalised the concept of power focusing on two aspects—power in discourse, and power behind discourse (Fairclough, 2001). Power relations are exercised in face–to–face discourse, or in cross–cultural discourse, and in the hidden power of the discourse of institutions e.g. education and mass media. The goal is always social reproduction or maintenance of the status quo. Fairclough suggests that power is enacted through social struggle. It is dynamic, as it can be won or lost through social struggles. Consciousness is, therefore, critical towards any form of emancipation (Fairclough, 2001; Martin, 1998).

Research by Diefenbach and others provide a strong focus on the informal aspect of power, including the contested matter of legitimacy (Diefenbach *et al*., 2009; Clegg *et al*., 2006, p. 290–319). Hüther and Krücken suggest this shift in focus is aligned to developments of a general theory of power (Hüther and Krücken, 2013). Lukes, as well as Foucault, focus on newer studies regarding power, targeting forms of domination which are essentially hidden, implied, and engraved in humans and their social relations (Lukes, 2005; Foucault, 2002, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984). Although conceptions of power may be at variance from one another, the significance of these new studies, however, is they reveal a general postulation that power is habitually assumed, without official and overt decision–making procedures.

Bourdieu, for example, portrays French society in the context of the exercise of power via everyday rituals such as taste (Bourdieu, 1984). On the other hand, Foucault’s concept of power which has been profoundly modified over time concludes with the suggestion that current mechanisms of biopolitics have transformed the implementation of power into the self–disciplination of subjects (Foucault, 1997, 1982). In such a context, the direct exercise of power in society becomes much less significant in practice, as well as research.

### 3.3.1. Power: University Environments

University environments exhibit individual and collective actors, and consequently, Hüther and Krücken identify three types of sources of power aligned to formal university settings which Luhmann distinguishes as *organisational power* and *personnel power* (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Luhmann, 1980). These are the principal types of power exerted by [university] organisations (Luhmann, 1980). Mintzberg identified a third source of power especially in universities—*resource power* (Mintzberg, 1983).

Hüther and Krücken have contended such sources of formal power, exercised by superordinates in universities settings are linked to subordinates’ desire to advance a career, remain a member of the institution or increase resources by subordinates and departments (Hüther and Krücken, 2013). Given the transformation and restructuring at universities world–wide, it remains increasingly difficult for university leaders/management to exercise the above mentioned sources of formal power (Hüther and Krücken, 2013). Reay, Hinings, and other researchers also highlight a collective *counter power* existing in universities that is managed and sustained involving shared values, positions and benefits among experts/academics (Reay and Hinings, 2009; Waring and Currie, 2009; Mintzberg, 1983).

Academic communities, occupied by university lecturers, also promote institutionalised *counter power* (Reay and Hinings, 2009) which Weber suggested present spaces/forums that restrict hierarchy and power (Weber, 1976). Depending on the location, the structure and strength of *counter power* may differ. This is a function of whether the power–base is formal or informal. The *counter power* in the USA, for example, may be strong, but it is essentially informal (Hüther and Krücken, 2013). In Britain, it is both strong and formal given the national HE institutions existing. They provide accreditation, research and training, among other services to the sector [e.g. The Higher Education Academy]. In our local environment there exists no counter power–base because of the HE sector’s small size (two local universities; one regional).

### 3.3.2. Power Relations

Teacher power relations can be conceptualised from three perspectives: (1) traditional power dynamics operating institutionally, departmentally and individually; (2)power ascapacity—*potentia* versus power as domination—*potestas* (Lukes, 2005); and (3) from the context of *teaching and learning regimes* (TLRs)[[3]](#footnote-3) applied to teacher development programmes concerned with improving HE teaching/learning. I shall focus on concepts (1) and (3).

With respect to (1), conceptions of power arise from notions of formal/informal relationships among various university groupings, for example, lecturers, departments, administration and students. Lecturers [traditionally] exert superior power relations upon students, whether such power is derived and executed because of subject expertise, including assessment, and knowledge production from research and publication (Trowler and Cooper, 2002).

### 3.3.3. Power Relations: Teaching Learning Regimes

With respect to (3) TLR’s, power is exerted by lecturers wherever incongruence exists between lecturers’ identity, tacit assumptions and academic practice, and goals of professional development programmes (Trowler and Cooper, 2002). Power relations are also embedded in lecturers’ departmental culture, and in the teaching and learning context, (Trowler and Cooper, 2002; Gee, 2001). Given the impact of social interactions in HE departments and classroom sessions, power flows between lecturers and their colleagues. Students are generally tacitly regulated, and are not enabled to challenge lecturers. When lecturers enter teacher development programmes environments, however, power tensions may develop (Trowler and Cooper, 2002). Professional development programmes may present new or different environments for academics. They are consequently, unable to exercise such power as they normally do over curriculum and teaching/learning practices. In such programmes, lecturers are the object of activity, not the subject (Trowler and Cooper, 2002). They are likely to feel uncomfortable given the new rules, approaches and academic labour to which they are exposed (Fanghanel, 2007). This may lead to disempowerment as their identity [may be] threatened (Wareham, 2002, pp. 94–95). Thus, transitioning power relations from one TLR to another may be challenging for some lecturers (Trowler and Cooper, 2002).

As an education researcher, I argue that the complexity of teaching in managed, problematized environments, and institutional structures containing diverse student cohorts, challenge traditional notions of power held by *elitist* lecturers in terms of identity, beliefs and professional practice (Österholm, 2010; Fanghanel, 2007; Thompson, 1992). Power in this context is exercised and enacted through interactions between individuals (lecturers and students in classroom sessions, groups (lecturers as faculty) or institution (the university) in the current ‘massified’ and ‘commercialised’ HE sector (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Naidoo, 2007; Knight, 2003; Marland, 1998, 1995).

At ZHC, traditional power structures reign supreme, as in the context explored by Bristol’s Plantation Pedagogy (Bristol, 2012) which illuminates the inadequacies of neo–liberal and global rationalisations relating the teachers’ practice. I submit that power, in all its manifestations, is at the core of traditional practices, more so, in local HE with its *elitist* underpinnings referred to in Chapter 2 (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). In this context, I subscribe to Myers’ view that from a national perspective, the teaching/instructional framework aligned to HE requires dismantling, and the educational hypotheses, authority interactions, including historical control which underpin it ought to be exposed, reappraised, and modified (Myers, 1996).

## *3.4. Postcolonialism*

Postcolonialism as a concept presents a range of definitions and usage. It is appropriate to provide an elucidation of the concept in order to glean an epistemology of usage and definitions as they relate to Caribbean socio–economic, political, cultural, and education experience. Childs and Williams quoting Farrell (1994) defined postcolonialism as ‘a period of the dismantling of colonial structures between 1950 and 1960 which culminated in African and Caribbean colonies gaining independence from Britain from 1947 (India) and beyond 1960’s’ (Childs and Williams, 1997, p. 73-75). Selmon (1991) however, defined Postcolonialism from cultural perspective in the context of locating a specifically anti–or post–colonial discursive purchase in culture, which began ‘when the colonial power inscribed itself onto the body and space of its ‘Others’, continued as an occulted tradition into the modern theatre of neo–colonialist international relations’ (Selmon, 1991, p. 3). Spivak, for example, distinguished post–colonialism which she found totally bogus, from postcoloniality, which defined neo–colonialism as the domination of former colonies by the colonial power (Spivak, 1991).

From an academic/intellectual perspective, Dirlik, averred ‘post–colonialism began when third world intellectuals arrived at First World academe’ (Dirlik, 1994, p. 329). In this vein Child and Williams asserted, postcolonial intellectuals were pivotal to theorising, providing intellectual rigor, inspiration and groundings by their writings and activism—both textual and revolutionary, to the study of postcolonialism (Child and Williams, 1997). The revolutionary pedagogy of postcolonial theorists provided a broad–based, non–western intellectual platform from which to analyse postcolonialism and its impacts on colonised societies (Spivak, 2003, 1988; Freire, 2000/1972; Bhabha, 1994; Fanon, 1986/1952, 1965/1961; Said, 1978; CLR James, 1963/1938).

### 3.4.1. Postcolonialism: Higher Education Traditions and Caribbean Intellectual Responses

From a HE theoretical context, the theme ‘ambivalence’ emerged as a critical factor, driving the strategic implementation of postcolonial education by the *elites* in the ex-colonies. The writings of Bhabha, Smith, and Viruru focusing on the concept of ‘ambivalence’ were revealed in notions of ‘unhomely’ (Bhabha, 1994 p. 9) and ‘disconnection’ (Smith, 2013/1999, p. 5) as indicated by (Viruru, 2005). As Chang denoted, the local *elite* merely replaced the metropolis bourgeoisie who, in a shrinking of policy space and policy autonomy, were unable or unwilling to validate anything ‘local’, including HE intellectual output (Chang, 2006). Spivak, like Rivera further elucidated the ambivalence by western universities in legitimising indigenous knowledge, or indigenous intellectuals whose output revealed discourses in concepts of identity, authentic local knowledge and tensions surrounding the center—the imperial country or the periphery—the colony (Rivera, 2006; Spivak, 1990).

In the context of the region and locally, Torres–Saillant has commented that such policy implementation negated the autonomous and extensive body of ‘Caribbean’ knowledge, not transparently expressed in Western history, even when Caribbean intellectuals may have influenced Western thinkers (Torres–Saillant, 2005). Torres–Saillant further suggested that an examination of traditionalist HE approaches of postcolonial/post–independent institutional Social Sciences, revealed two issues: (1) it placed the Caribbean on the periphery in the context of the production of autonomous and independent knowledge; and (2), it did not allow for the production of a counter interpretation of Caribbean cultural and artistic phenomena (Torres–Saillant, 2005). He further argued that although the Caribbean possessed a body of knowledge, traditional Caribbean intellectuals were ‘hard–pressed’ to produce a ‘Caribbean–centric’ narrative; many chose instead, to follow the trends of North American and European (British) academia, ignoring the original history of independent and rebellious knowledge (Torres–Saillant, 2005). Similar positions were adopted by Smith and Spivak with respect to the ‘indigenous academic’ approach and ambivalence in western universities regarding the legitimacy of indigenous knowledge, and with the indigenous intellectuals’ role in the academy (Smith, 2013; Spivak, 1990)

But more significant, were attempts by Caribbean intellectuals to recalibrate normative Euro–centric discourses perpetuated by traditional academics, and replace these with Caribbean–centric analyses where the region was located at the centre, rather than at the periphery of the discourse (Thomas, 1974; Girvan, 1973; Best and Levitt, 1969; Best, 1968; James, 1963/1938). Postcolonialism, analysed from a Caribbean intellectual perspective, allowed for the reinterpretation from non–western, non–European perspectives, action/s of the coloniser on the colonised (Girvan, 2012; Best, 2004, 1997, 1968). Postcolonial education was a significant aspect of such discourses.

I now turn the critical features related to teacher conceptions of teaching in the following sections. There is tangible evidence from the literature that historical, socio–economic and cultural environments in which lecturers function impact their *identity* and epistemological *beliefs* and hence professional practice (Turner, 2012; Marland, 1995). I seek to explore this nexus between beliefs, practice and conceptions in the following section.

## *3.5. Teachers’ Beliefs and Conception of Teaching*

##### Teacher identity and personal beliefs are critical to professional practice. In the context of the Personal Interpretive Network (PIN) (Kelchternmans, 2009, 1993) rooted in social constructionism, two segments can be considered—professional self–understanding— the representation of the lecturer as a HE teacher, and subjective educational theory— the personal knowledge and beliefs about teaching (Vanassche and Kelchtermans, 2014). These present the link between teacher beliefs, and identity, signifying the ‘starting blocks’ for investigating belief construction. Kelchtermans suggests that self–understanding may be considered as inseparable from the fundamental notion of being a teacher (Kelchtermans, 2009b, 1993). However, self–understanding is also influenced by, and developing in the unique contexts of discursive, institutional and affinity perceptions of identity (Kelchtermans, 1993). The foregoing ideas establish the idea of the intersection of the teacher, self–developed socially as an individual, and his/her exclusive environment (Kelchtermans, 1993). Given that Kelchtermans’ research is embedded in social construction, the model acknowledges the expression of variations of a person’s ‘selves’ in diverse environments, simultaneously remaining a rational ‘self’ (Kelchtermans, 2013). Kelchtermans’ framework, therefore, acts as an exploration tool for investigating the multi–faceted question of teacher identity, as well as beliefs (Kelchtermans, 2009a, 1993).

Though both the education and social science literature contain an array of terms relating to *belief*, a gap exists in succinctly demarking *belief* as a theoretical concept (Pajares, 1992; Calderhead and Robson, 1991; Nespor, 1985; Abelson, 1979). For example, Pajares, (1992) notes ‘it will not be possible for researchers to come to grips with teachers' beliefs, … without first deciding what they wish belief to mean, and how this meaning will differ from that of similar constructs’ (p. 308). Österholm, like other researchers indicate that *beliefs* as a concept is flawed at the most basic level, since it is not easily open to systematic investigation (even though their studies utilised a non***–***constructivist paradigm ) (Österholm, 2010; Tillema, 2000; Richardson, 1996). Kagan has also asserted that teaching as a field of expertise, ‘is characterised by an almost total absence of truths’ (Kagan, 1992a, p. 73). Thus ideas classified as beliefs go against systematic investigation or methodical reasoning.

Thompson identifies a link between a lecturer’s behaviour and his/her instructional practice suggesting an alignment to epistemological beliefs, whether consciously or unconsciously (Thompson, 1984). Richardson *et al*., (1991) on the other hand, utilised Harvey's (1986) definition of a belief system as a ‘set of conceptual representations which signify to its holder a reality or given state of affairs of sufficient validity, truth and/or trustworthiness to warrant reliance upon it as a guide to personal thought and action’ (p. 660). Such notions influence professional practice, as well as conceptions or ideas about teaching (Marland, 1998, 1995).

Teachers therefore, cultivate models of behaviour typical of their instructional practice and identity (Kelchtermans, 1993), which may be manifestations of consciously held ideas, philosophies, and inclinations that act as 'driving forces' in determining the teacher's actions (Thompson, 1984). In other instances, the driving force may be insentient held *beliefs* or perceptions that may have developed from the teacher's experience/s (Kagan, 1992b; Thompson, 1984). Expanding the research of Lortie and Pintrich on *belief*, Pajares suggests that investigating *belief*s also requires delimiting knowledge which may assist in evaluating these concepts individually (Pajares, 1992; Pintrich, 1990; Lortie, 1975).

Verloop *et al*. (2001) however, identify the difficulty in establishing a concise definition of *belief* when they assert, ‘in the mind of the teacher, components of knowledge, *beliefs*, conceptions, and intuitions are inextricably intertwined’ (p. 446). Marra, like other researchers therefore, suggest, the criticality of investigating either concepts separately, since the impact of knowledge on beliefs, or whether they both represent the same entity is contested (Marra, 2005; Guskey and Borko, 2002; McAlpine and Weston, 2000). I hold the view that both concepts, though significant to understanding lecturers’ practice, ought to be investigated separately. Beliefs, like identity consequently forms a critical foundation of conceptions, and it could be argued that lecturers are unlikely to develop conceptions of teaching without some alignment to a belief/identity system (Kelchtermans, 2013; Richardson *et al*., 1991).

The principal focus of my study targets ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, a function of their belief system (O’Connor, 2008) as well as their perceived professional identity as lecturers (Kelchtermans, 2009a, 1993). This is the gap the investigation is attempting to fill—the deficiency of research related to local HE lecturers’ conceptions of teaching.

The current literature focuses principally on lecturers’ conception of teaching aligned to the developed world experience. Very few studies exist identifying lecturers whose colonial/postcolonial environment impacts their identity and/or belief system, and hence their conception of teaching. It is in this context that I investigated ZHC lectures’ conception of teaching given the historical colonial/postcolonial experience of local HE development [mentioned in Chapter 2].

There exists a body of literature specific to teachers’ conceptions of teaching which I shall explore in the following sections.

## *3.6. Teachers’ Conception of Teaching*

Although conceptions of teaching represents a major concept articulated in the literature, there is difficulty in defining precisely what it is (Kreber and Cranton, 2000). Pratt is one of the few research theorists who have provided a definition of conceptions.

Pratt and Associatates (1998) state:

… conceptions refer to specific meanings attached to phenomena which then mediate our response to situations involving those phenomena. We form conceptions of virtually every aspect of our perceived world, and in so doing, use those abstract representations to delimit something from, and relate it to, other aspects of our world. In effect, we view the world through the lenses of our conceptions, interpreting and acting in accordance with our understanding of the world (p. 204).

Given that conceptions of teaching is a significant question within HE research, a substantial degree of consensus exists regarding the two major teaching orientations—a student–centred approach versus a teacher–centred approach (González, 2011; Kember, 1997; Trigwell *et al.*, 1994), including variations within these prime orientations (Martin *et al*., 2002; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999; Marton, 1994a; Prosser *et al*., 1994; Pratt, 1992; Ramsden, 1992; Dall’Alba, 1991).

Marton has suggested that such research captures ‘conceptions by analysing subject–object relation’ (Marton, 1994a, p. 30) in the context of how lecturer orientation towards teaching is described. Research outputs in teacher conceptions also highlight a number of orientations to teaching by analysing how they differ from each other (Akerlind, 2004). Kember suggested that such studies publicised consensus around conceptions relating to the teacher–centric strategies, progressing towards the student–centric approaches and student learning (Kember, 1997). In addition Kember, like Prosser revealed that investigations of the 1990s showed that teaching was conceived along a continuum as transmitting information, leading to development of students’ conceptual awareness (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994).

Newer research, particularly those investigations of the 2000s extended the focus of investigations into conceptions of teaching by introducing different facets of teaching not previously explored. Such research output on teacher conceptions: (1) extended empirical evidence associated with teacher–focused/student–focused frameworks utilised in conceptions of teaching analysis; (2) exposed the variations of dimension of teachers practice while simultaneously improving knowledge of the range of such variations; and (3) supported conceptualisation of teachers’ perceptions of teaching as hierarchical. The results associated with such investigations show superior–order perceptions subsuming lower–order perceptions but not vice versa (González, 2011; Ginns *et al*., 2008; Carnell, 2007; Law *et al.,* 2007; Lindblom–Ylanne *et al*., 2006; Ashwin, 2006; Akerlind, 2004, 2003). Akerlind also pointed to differences in such studies relating to teachers conceptions as permanent concepts, or related reactions, situated in particular circumstances (Akerlind, 2003, p. 375–377). Studies revealed conceptions as autonomous and constant or related and relational (González, 2011). I focus on the newer studies undertaken in the 2000s in the following section.

### 3.6.1. Newer studies: Dimensions of Variation

Beyond Akerlind’s review of investigations associated with teachers’ conceptions (Akerlind, 2003), newer studies have expanded the range of insights into conceptions of teaching, especially those studies undertaken after 2005. In this context, Akerlind challenged Kember’s assertion that additional investigative studies in relation to teacher conceptions were not necessary (González, 2011; Akerlind, 2004; Kember, 1997). Akerlind’s (2004) study proposed four new dimensions of variation’ of being a teacher namely: ‘(1) the role of students; (2) benefit for students; (3) benefit for the teacher and (4) breadth of benefit’ (pp. 370–371). Kember’s (1997) study focused only on the first variation—the role of students. Akerlind (2004) asserted that investigative research into teaching conceptions ought to be encouraged, recognising the gap between what we know, and what is still to be known about the different aspects of teaching.

It is in this context that newer studies on various features of teaching conceptions are welcomed, for example, Ashwin’s study of academics’ account of tutorials (Ashwin, 2006). Academics accounts varied from ‘tutorials as a place where tutors help students to develop an understanding of concepts’ to ‘tutorials as a place where new positions on the topic are developed and refined’ (Ashwin, 2006, p. 11). This study revealed a continuum of conceptions from, addressing significant quantities of content to student development of individual perspectives regarding the subject matter. The results from this study reflected a concentration on subject matter or learner scholarship.

In terms of superior teaching, Parpala and Lindblom–Ylanne’s (2007) study identified six elements: ‘practice, context, teachers’ role, students’ role, atmosphere, and physical environment’ (p. 360). These research findings further highlighted different components of teaching articulated (Akerlind, 2004). Carnell’s study, utilising eight participants averred that students’ learning was the principal focus of effective teaching (Carnell, 2007). The distinguishing features of this study relating to effective teaching, as described by informants were: ‘learning is transparent; dialogue enables learning; and a community of learners generate knowledge’ (Carnell, 2007, p. 30). Carnell’s research showed a fundamental shift in relation to previous studies. The perception of effective teaching as described in Carnell’s context was the move from ‘constructivist to co–constructivist knowledge development’ between teachers and students (p. 30). Their roles were now aligned to shared responsibility in teaching/learning episodes.

Law’s research involving Hong Kong teacher educators identified themes which were aligned to those emanating from perceptions of good teaching originating from Western conceptualisations (Law *et al*., 2007). However, there were features of excellent teaching in Hong Kong often limited in the western research/practice such as theory–based instruction, enthusiasm and expert dedication (Gonzalez, 2011). With respect to the biosciences, Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne study reported that informants’ responses were represented as a system highlighting diverse facets of learner–focused perceptions (Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2010). But more significantly, this study reported a disparity between instructors and learners’ perceptions of teaching/learning. Teachers ought to be aware of their students’ conceptions of learning since this factor has serious implications for their teaching. Together, these studies offer additional knowledge about different components of teaching, especially that revealed by student–focused conceptions.

In my research context, given my claims in Chapters 1 and 2 regarding traditional education implementation, HE teaching remains essentially teacher–focused and content–oriented (Kember, 1997). Lecturers’ current practice is weighted in favour of the traditional instructional paradigm (Barr and Tagg, 1995), given the current institutional arrangements. Teaching/learning continues to be problematised in non–systemic contexts, where students’ roles are aligned to *surface learning,* rather than *deep learning* (Marton and Säljö, 1976). As would be gleaned in Chapter 5, many ZHC lecturers are yet to conceptualise a student–centric perspective about teaching/learning as the current literature is demonstrating.

### 3.6.2. The teacher–focused/student–focused framework

The common themes as identified by Akerlind’s original research are also discerned in the later studies (Akerlind, 2003). Two significant areas emerged in relation to the range of research identified above. Findings based on the teacher–focused/content–oriented structures were associated with teacher–focused conceptions (González, 2011). In particular, student–focused conceptions remained a significant finding in most newer studies (Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2010; Carnell, 2007; Law *et al.,* 2007). Other investigations targeted teacher educators (Law *et al*., 2007) and biosciences (Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2010), which were exclusive discipline domains. Such studies differed somewhat from traditional investigations where multidisciplinary samples were used.

Research findings reported by other researchers identified teaching conceptions as a hierarchy, where conceptions were categorised as teacher–focused, transitioning onto student–focused conceptions. Ashwin, like Akerlind pointed out such findings aligned with variation in teaching experiences as opposed to a singular focus on one element of teaching (Ashwin, 2006; Akerlind, 2004). These studies extended our knowledge–base of teaching by exposing recent components of teaching variation (Akerlind, 2004), to discovering teaching perceptions from tutorial environments (Ashwin, 2006).

### 3.6.3. Independent/stable or relational/related conceptions

Akerlind’s classification of research identified differences in conceptions of teaching as independent/stable, or relational/related (Akerlind, 2003). Independent/stable conceptions are associated with traditional approaches to analysis. Conceptions are unique, unchanging and are related to a hierarchical set of beliefs about teaching. On the other hand, conceptions of teaching that are relational/related align to newer approaches to analysis. Such conceptions were conceived of as an inclusive hierarchy ‘of increasing breadth of *awareness* of different aspects of [teaching] being investigated’ (Akerlind, 2003, p. 378). As such, these conceptions were more sophisticated and inclusive. Ashwin, like Akerlind, suggested the more recent studies conceived teaching conceptions as a hierarchy where higher–order, more complex conceptions subsume lower–order, less complex conceptions (Ashwin, 2006; Akerlind, 2004).

### 3.6.4. Similarities and differences: Teachers’ conceptions of teaching

### 

### Kember, like Prosser underscored the general consensus on the veracity of conceptions of teaching aligned to teacher–focused and student–focused dimensions of teaching (Kember, 1997, Prosser *et al*., 1994). However, Akerlind’s analysis identifying similarities and differences related to teachers’ conceptions of teaching, represented an update to Kember’s comprehensive analysis teacher conception studies (Akerlind, 2003). These investigations into teacher conceptions of teaching provided an expanded knowledge–base by: (1) reporting new findings related to teaching dimensions which further clarify elements of teaching; (2) extending and elucidating on student–centric teaching conceptions; (3) empirically supporting frameworks used in teacher–focused/student–oriented analysis of teaching conceptions; and (4) signifying differentiation in research results linked to teacher conceptions (González, 2011, p. 67). There is a scarcity of studies regarding teacher conceptions emanating from the Caribbean, which is a gap I identified in the literature.

I proceed to the third aspect of the literature review related to the SoTL which is linked to my second research question: *How has training in HE teaching and learning impacted* the practice of some lecturers at MUZHC? Critical to understanding of the SoTL are concepts of ‘*the scholarship for teaching’* and ‘*the scholarship of teaching’*. These two scholarships form an integral part of lecturers’ conception of teaching, and are implicated in how lecturers perceive their practice. I shall, therefore, elucidate these two concepts before reviewing of the SoTL literature.

## *3.7. Scholarship for Teaching vs. the Scholarship of Teaching*

For the purpose of clarity and deeper understanding, I have isolated the scholarships of ‘teaching’ and ‘learning’ to explore evolutionary development of these concepts as I understand them. Healey (2000 citing Kreber, 1999) suggested the ‘notion of teaching–scholarship remains an elusive, yet, intriguing concept’ (p. 323). It is critical to differentiate between ‘the scholarship of teaching’ and ‘the scholarship for teaching’—being knowledgeable and current in your subject specialisation which you teach (Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), 2000, para. 169–170).

As Hutchings and Schulman indicated, implicated in the scholarship of teaching are activities related to functioning as an exceptional instructor or academic (Hutchings and Schulman, 1999); expressing familiarity with the current research in one’s area of interest, and with the latest ideas related to teaching the subject (Healey, 2000). Expanding on Hutching and Schulman’s ideas, Healey asserted that the scholarship of teaching also includes evaluating and reflecting on (your) praxis, as well as student learning (Healey, 2000). In addition to sharing the attributes of excellence and scholarly teaching, the scholarship of teaching also includes sharing and publishing instruction/scholarship knowledge in (your) field of study (Hutchings and Schulman, 1999). It also involves researching issues relating to student learning within a discipline (Healey, 2000). These ideas point to a ‘scholarship hierarchy’ in the evolution of the teaching concept (Healey *et al*., 2000, a, b). ‘Teaching’ as a concept now includes the critical aspect of learning, and is referred in the literature as the ‘scholarship of teaching and learning’ (Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000; Elton, 1992; Boyer, 1990).

In aligning the SoTL and professional enquiry or scholarship with teaching and learning, Griffiths’ topology provides an effective option for analysis. Griffiths identifies four dimensions of teaching. He suggests that teaching can be (1) Research–led; (2) Research–oriented; (3) Research–based and (4) Research–informed (p. 722). The literature focuses principally on the fourth dimension of Griffiths’ topology, research–informed teaching (RIT) Griffiths (2004). A nexus exists between RIT and university teaching. RIT enhances the synergies between teaching and research with a focus on the student’s learning and the scholarship of teaching. Jenkins and Healey have underscored the idea that RIT enhances a deep interest in one’s teaching, underpinned by research, describing this as *pedagogic research*—enquiring and reflecting on teaching/learning (Jenkins and Healey, 2005).

Poole sees these approaches as HE professionals attempting to comprehend their practice (Poole, 2010). Kreber, like Healey and Elton has suggested that such practices now includes systematic inquiry, and seeks to describe ways in which academics improve their practice (Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000; Elton, 1992; Boyer, 1990). Cousin and others indicated this is achieved by literature investigation and active research (Cousin, 2009; Norton, 2009; Biggs, 1996). Thus, my interest in RIT relates to research into teaching, as well as student learning.

I review the major ideas underpinning the SoTL next.

## *3.8. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*

The SoTL has been the subject of critical discourse by a number of HE theorists (Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000; Elton, 1992; Boyer, 1990) and uncertainty (O’Brien, 2008). Secret, however, points to the lack of consensus regarding the meaning of SoTL (Secret *et al*.*,* 2012). Mc Kinney suggests two reasons: the conflicting ideas related to concepts of ‘scholarly’ and ‘scholarship’, and dispute/s relating to the overlap or relationship between the SoTL and evaluation of student achievement during a course (McKinney, 2006, 2004). Boyer’s seminal research on the four scholarships of teaching has been a major source of discourse/debate, providing the basis for further analysis and critique within the SoTL community (Boyer, 1990). Kreber and Cranton in establishing ambiguity regarding the meaning of SoTL proposed another typology which categorised three distinctive, but similarly significant domains of teaching scholarship: instructional, pedagogical, and curricular knowledge (Kreber and Cranton, 2000). The concept of SoTL in the literature is, therefore, contested with a number of frameworks put forward by different theorists. What was noted, however, was the element of research that seeks to deepen understanding of practice in the context of scholarship (Secret *et. al*.*,* 2012; O’Brien, 2008; Kreber, 2002; Kreber and Cranton, 2000; Healey, 2000; Elton, 1992; Boyer, 1990).

In this context there is legitimacy to my research question 2: *How has training in HE teaching and learning impacted* the practice of some lecturers at MUZHC? I seek to understand, based on research evidence, whether HE professional training has impacted ZHC lecturers’ practice.

With respect to research question 3: *What do some MUZUC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment?* I aim to explore lecturers’ perceptions of their roles and functions, and how these perceptions have impacted their positionality, agency and self–efficacy as lecturers (Bandura, 2006, 1982). In my view, local lecturers’ conception of teaching, as well as their current practice is underpinned by the ‘elitist’ historical implementation of our HE system (discussed in Chapter 2), and practices associated with traditional elite university education (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Campbell, 1997; King, 1995; Williams, 1964). Current practice may not be aligned to HE teaching/learning in the globalised mass–education environment discussed in Chapter Two (Biggs, 2012; Milliken, 2004) and as would be gleaned in Chapter 6.

Shulman, in attempting to align the SoTL with elements of traditional discipline scholarship, asserted that knowledge relating to teaching and learning be judged as scholarship if it demonstrates these three characteristics: ‘It should be *public*, susceptible to *critical review and evaluation*, and accessible for *exchange and use* by other members of one's scholarly community’ (Shulman, 1998, p. 5). McKinney on the other hand, suggested that traditional discipline specific scholarship of Boyer’s schema provides an entry point for analysis of the SoTL (McKinney, 2006). McKinney further indicated that SoTL should be considered as significant as disciplinary specific research. Secret *et al.* combines McKinney’s slant to the SoTL with characteristics by identified by Shulman to yield a working definition of SoTL—‘the systematic, literature–based study of processes and outcomes involved in teaching and learning intended for peer–reviewed publication and dissemination’ (Secret *et al*., 2012, p. 2; McKinney, 2004; Shulman, 1998).

Excellence in teaching in this context suggests an expert approach involving reflective, scholarly, evidence–based perspectives to teaching which help students learn (Hearley, 2005; Jenkins and Healey, 2005; Griffiths, 2004; Kreber and Cranton, 2000; Martin, 1999; Elton, 1992). In line with this process of professional growth is teaching and staff development which I discuss next.

**3.8.1. SoTL: Teaching and staff development**

Two major intercontinental approaches to the SoTL, related to the scholarship of teaching and professional staff development are promulgated by theorists. Kreber (2002) identifies such international differences by suggesting that in Britain and Australia, ‘the scholarship of teaching is conceived of as ‘… a campus activity…, whilst in the USA the scholarship of teaching has been conceived of as both a campus activity and as an activity or a career path…’ (pp. 163–164).

Jenkins and Healey identified RIT as one perspective of ‘scholarship of teaching’ which has been extensively explored (Jenkins and Healey, 2005). Poole has identified two perspectives, RIT described as teaching that deliberately depends on methodical investigation into the teaching and learning practice itself, and staff development as a consequence of their engagement with RIT (Poole, 2010). However, Jenkins and Healey (2005) cite (Bradford, 2003) who describes RIT as pedagogic research—enquiring and reflecting on teaching which Poole also described as pedagogic research (Poole, 2010).

Although RIT is aligned to systemic inquiry, it is contested in the literature (Griffiths, 2004). Cousin, like Norton, has identified issues as centred on the nature and criticality of systematic inquiry surrounding HE academics’ practice (Cousin, 2009; Norton, 2009). Yet Lucas, Kreber, and Healey point to some form of consensus among the SoTL movement theorists relating to a ‘paradigm’ of teaching and learning, critical elements of which involved the scholarship of teaching and professional staff development (Lucas *et al*., 2007; Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000).

At the ZHC, emphasis targeted staff development since 2006, based on its 2007–2012 strategic development plan, and institutional collaboration (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011). Teaching and learning was described as the University’s primary pillar and alluded to key graduate outcomes and learning–centred teaching strategies (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011). This approach was sustained in both the 2012–2017 and 2017–2022 strategic plans. In the following section, I review conceptual issues regarding the SoTL.

**3.8.2. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Conceptual issues**

Lucas, Kreber, Healey and Elton have all critiqued the SoTL concept itself (Lucas *et al*., 2007; Kreber, 2003, 2002; Healey, 2003, 2000; Elton, 1992; Boyer, 1990). O’Brien has also pointed to the uncertainty of the SoTL concept among academic colleagues (O’Brien, 2008). Neumann (1994), for example, identified varied approaches to the research–teaching nexus as a function of academic life which aligns to how academics develop their professional knowledge (Clegg, 2008; Land, 2004). Poole described this as ‘academic identity’ (Poole, 2010) which determines methodologies used in disciplinary research, including academics’ stance on teaching and learning (Clegg, 2008; Fanghanel, 2007; Land, 2004).

These different perspectives regarding the concept of the SoTL and teaching/learning have led other researchers to identify the complexity of 21st century academic life. Barnett highlights the ‘supercomplex’ university and comments that, [it] ‘is one in turmoil where the basic assumptions as to one’s self–identity as researcher, scholar and teacher are kept perpetually in the air’ (Barnett,1999, p. 172).

### 3.8.3. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Pedagogical research

While Lucas *et al.* (2007) contend that any advancement in knowledge about teaching and learning requires a ‘discipline’ approach, Kreber and Healey focus on scholarship (Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000). Kreber further suggests that ‘discipline’ research be undertaken by HE lecturers themselves, rather than by specialist educational researchers (Kreber, 2002, pp. 160–161), a view also upheld by Martin and Boyer (Martin *et al.,* 1998; Boyer, 1990). Trigwell disagrees with this position, focusing on the act of teaching itself, rather than research about teaching. He suggests that research/enquiry/assessment of an individual’s teaching or teaching context is a critical element of the scholarship of teaching (Trigwell, 2003). If learning and the position of teaching require enhancement, then research is to be applied to the activity, teaching, not research, on teaching (Knight *et al*., 2006).

Trigwell is focusing on the dynamic act of teaching, rather than peripheral notions about teaching research (Trigwell, 2003). This is in alignment with the ‘discipline’ focus of scholarship adopted by academics involved in the SoTL movement (Lucas, *et al*., 2007; Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000). Norton on the other hand, emphasises synergy between ‘disciplinarity’ within the SoTL and pedagogic action research, and identifies the epistemology of action research as insider research, where the researcher is ‘inside’ the research frame (Norton, 2009). In this context, Cousin asserts that discipline specialists expose their own subjectivities to articulating and interpreting research issues (Cousin, 2009).

I turn my attention to professional knowledge, another critical element in SoTL.

### 3.8.4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Professional knowledge

Cousin, like Norton and other researchers indicate that, perhaps, the best way of conceptualising professional inquiry into teaching and learning is to recognise the deeper and more extensive approach required to implement pedagogic research regarding teaching (Cousin, 2009; Norton, 2009; Clegg, 2008; Fanghanel, 2007; Land, 2004; Kreber and Cranton, 2000; Neumann, 1994). In legitimising teaching as an area worthy of research, Boyer made the observation that:

The time has come to move beyond the tired old teaching versus research debate and give the familiar and honorable term scholarship a broader and more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work (Boyer, 1990, p. 16).

Macfarlane (2004) and Gibbs (2002) also point to the inevitable link between the scholarship of teaching and professional knowledge. It includes process of how academics develop their professional knowledge (Cousin, 2009; Norton, 2009; Jenkins and Healey, 2005; Griffiths, 2004; Healey *et al*., 2000 a, b). Clegg (2008), like Land (2004), asserted that the teaching–research nexus also connects intellectuals’ procedure to disciplinary research and determines their positionality on learning and teaching. The teaching/research nexus remains a significant aspect governing academic identity, and is implicated in the development of professional knowledge (Sharpe, 2004).

The lecture is, traditionally, the mechanism by which the HE lecturer transmits his/her (professional) knowledge and is recognised by what intellectual capacity he/she brings to the subject area (Macfarlane, 2004; Gibbs, 2002). Another substantial aspect of HE lecturers’ activities is the development of the next generation of professionals. Pearson and Brew (2002), like Knight and Trowler (2001) see this as an essential aspect of professionalism, for instance, research guidance. Conceptual tensions dominate debates relating to the research–teaching nexus as theorists pontificate on an academic’s professional knowledge (Macfarlane, 2004; Gibbs, 2002, 1995). Jenkins in particular, highlights that HE academics’ primary allegiance is, principally, towards to their subject area or profession (Jenkins, 1996). Poole (2010) however, points out that critical discourse relating to professional knowledge focuses on [teaching] relationship with research and scholarship. In this context, Boyer’s four scholarships [mentioned above] are significant. Elton also recognises the SoTL as a significant category worthy of recognition and resources (Elton, 1992).

The SoTL in this context requires more intensive activities than simply engagement in pedagogic research (Martin *et al*., 1998). Elton (1992) suggests scholarly teaching involves similar types of reflection procedure academics use in their instruction, which they utilise in scholarship; these practices help to professionalise teaching and contribute to HE academics’ professional knowledge.

I review reward and recognition as a fundamental factor in the recognition of high–quality teaching as part of the SoTL below.

### 3.8.5. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Reward and recognition

Gibbs, like Ramsden and Martin, indicate it is extremely critical to recognise good teaching (Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996) and affirm that no substitutes exist, but the promotion of excellent teachers. He also suggests that universities are required to alert staff by the institutional action they take in effectively recognising high–quality teaching (Gibbs, 2005, 1995).

However, Fincher and Work (2006) indicate that traditional approaches to university scholarship, tenureship, and promotion, have been based on research and publication, a function of the traditional ‘research university’ (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). Maphosa and Kalenga (2012) indicate the traditional university has been a transmitter of specialised knowledge, utilising the faculty system to impart knowledge in different independent disciplines. Faculties have also been competitive, and may be considered as more important than others, impacting funding, [promotion] and status (Vick, 2004). Martin *et al*. (1998) also claim, included in this traditional HE environment are academics who compete for recognition and prestige.

However, Tapscott and Williams (2010) observe that university tenure/contract is better facilitated, not only for research, but also excellence in teaching and learning. This idea is in alignment with researchers in the SoTL movement who emphasise the significance of rewarding high–quality teaching and learning in HE (Gibbs, 2005, 2002; Ramsden and Martin, 1996; Ramsden, 1995; Ramsden *et al*., 1995). Terpstra and Honoree (2009) also agree that reward and recognition constitutes the HE institution’s established practice of promoting academics attitude towards teaching/learning. But Walker *et al*. (2008) and McKinney (2006) point out while increasing acceptability of the SoTL occurs within HE, it is not fully recognised as equivalent to traditional research.

For example, Shapiro indicates that SoTL activities are deemed ‘add-ons’ and may therefore, not be considered as core faculty activities (Shapiro, 2006, p. 42). In addition, Gurung *et al*. (2008) has maintained that departmental policies [may] encourage SoTL activities in HE institutions; however, institutional policies may exclude such [SoTL] encouragement. Additionally, conventional reward structures in HE institutions include teaching, research and service, but not evenly (Skelton, 2005). Walker *et al*. (2008) therefore, suggest that high–quality teaching is in fact expected, but not privileged, and hence not (generally) rewarded.

Fanghanel (2007) has categorised the contending demands and filters [influences] acting to influence academics’ positionality on teaching and learning, including the institution’s reward and promotion structure. According to Fanghanel (2007), these influences operate at three levels within universities: (1) Macro: the institutional or external factors, example the research–teaching nexus within U.K.’s HE; (2) Meso: the departmental (or equivalent) and the discipline, and (3) Micro: internal factors affecting the individual lecturer (p. 7). Poole (2010) suggests at the micro level academic identity seems to play a critical function as to how decisions relating to professional development are made, including a rational for continuing professional development (CPD) choices [in the context of contracts, rewards/awards and promotion].

However, a general international trend in HE now exists, which places teaching as a significant component of the HE institution’s strategic mandate (Gibbs and Coffey, 2004). Lecturers are required to improve their praxis, given the contexts in which HE functions— an internationalised, ‘commercialized’, ‘massified’, and technology mediated environment, diverse student cohorts, and using managerialist approaches to governance (Knight, 2013; Naidoo, 2003 ; Milliken, 2004). Poole and other researchers therefore, indicate, given that a significant goal is improving academic practice through systematic and scholarly engagement with SoTL (Poole, 2010; Palmer and Collins, 2006), reward and recognition of high quality teaching then becomes a significant approach of perpetuating teaching, as well as lifting its status (Gibbs, 2005, 2002; Healey, 2003; Ramsden and Martin, 1996).

## *3.9. Conclusion*

This literature review, together with the ideas elucidated in Chapters 1 and 2 form the foundation upon which the study is premised. The colonial/postcolonial development of local elitist HE, aligned to postmodernism and postcolonialism, buttressed by Euro–centric philosophy and policy implementation provided the basis for elite education implementation. Such implantation ostracized the majority of the local population from achieving HE. Implicit in this traditional arrangement were issues of lecturers’ power, identity and beliefs, influencing professional practice, aligned to teacher–focused/content–oriented pedagogy (Kelchtermans, 2013, 2009a, 1993; Aceros, 2012; Turner, 2012; Gergen, 2009).

Globalisation transformed HE and lecturers’ position with the HE space, challenging their self–concept and professionalism, including the very essence of their professional practice and existence (Barnett, 2005, 1999). A significant by–product of globalisation were the critical discourses related to the SoTL, a significant concept aligned to ‘the scholarship for teaching’ and ‘the scholarship of teaching’, and pivotal to lecturers’ conception of teaching, and how they perceived their professional practice (Fanghanel, 2007; Gibbs, 2005, 2002; Healey, 2003; Ramsden and Martin, 1996). Teaching and staff development, pedagogical research, professional knowledge, and reward and recognition emerged as significant themes and critical areas of SoTL research (Poole, 2010).

In the context of SoTL, the research literature has demonstrated a significant number of studies elucidating upon teachers’ conceptions of teaching (González, 2011; Poole, 2010; Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Clegg, 2008; Ashwin, 2006; Akerlind, 2003), but there exists a gap in studies illuminating conceptions of teaching held by HE lecturers in the Caribbean. This is the gap this study is intended to fill. I contend that local lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, as well as identity and beliefs are dominated by the inherited Euro–centric/British HE implementation template underpinned by this country’s colonial/postcolonial socio–economic development, governed by an elitist HE system (Bristol, 2012; Best, 2004).

In Chapter 4, I shall focus in detail on the methodology used in my research to unearth ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching.

# Chapter 4: Methodology

## *4.1. Introduction*

In this Chapter, I undertake an interpretive, small scale, locally contextualized and interview base study of a sample of ZHC lecturers in order to understand their current conceptions of teaching. Over the past four decades, significant intellectual debates have questioned the veracity and dominance of western–based research (Smith, 2013; Bishop, 2005; Menzies, 2001). Postcolonial indigenous scholars have pointed to the inadequacy of traditional methodologies in addressing peculiar requirements and aspirations of indigenous people (Smith, 2013; Chillisa, 2011; Carjuzaa and Fenimore–Smith, 2010). They assert that social science‘needs emancipation from hearing only the voices of Western Europe, emancipation from generations of silence, and emancipation from seeing the world in one color’ (Guba and Lincoln, 2005, p. 212).I note the comment of Scheurich (1997) when he indicates:

Our current range of research epistemologies—positivism to postmodernisms,poststructuralisms—arise out of the social history and culture of the dominant race . . . these epistemologies reflect and reinforce that social history and that social group and this has negative results for the people of color in general and scholars of color in particular (p. 141).

This research is attempting to fill this perceived gap. Like Best and Sankatsing, I take the position that using a combination of western and non–western centric methodologies and methods (if appropriate) will enable me to accomplish this research (Best, 2004, 1997; Sankatsing, 2001), by ‘using methodical processes to add to the body of knowledge (in local HE) by discovery of non–trivial facts and insights’ (Howard and Sharpe, 1983, p. 6) including consideration of ethics[[4]](#footnote-4), in this qualitative interpretive study.

To ameliorate the concern of DePass and others that [many] Caribbean scholars ignore the original history of independent and rebellious knowledge of the region (DePass, 2012; Best, 1997; Brodber, 1997; Nettleford, 1997) I choose to produce a ‘Caribbean–centric’ narrative/analysis which centred the Caribbean, where I examined ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching from the ‘*inside’* (Best, 2004) not at the periphery (Torres–Saillant, 2005). What follows, therefore, is an interpretation from the inside; I locate my research as a faculty development specialist, focusing on teaching/learning at the institution.

In this Chapter, I discuss the methodology—methods and procedures utilised for investigating ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching (Merriam, 2009). The *BIQD* method is described, including the research design and rationale, research perspective, and setting. Also discussed are issues related to gaining access to participants, how I arrived at my sample, data collection and analysis. Finally, I explain my use of semi–structured interviews, consideration of ethics, including trustworthiness and validity. In the following section, I discuss my research design.

## *4.2. Research Design*

My approach to this study was underpinned by *BIQD*, identified by Merriam, as well as Sandelowski, who further clarified this paradigm (Merriam, 2009; Sandelowski, 2010, 2000). *BIQD* promotes the relationships individuals create in their world, visualising that world from their perspective, including the structure, analysing the data gathered, aligned to its revelation. Using qualitative procedures or methods in this context allow participants to ‘interpret their experiences, … and...attribute meaning to their experiences’ (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). This is critical to personal experiences, the relational world view (Graham, 2002) including a sense of communalism, respectful individualism (Hart, 2010; Weaver, 2001, 1997) and [Re]–presenting local values and knowledge in [educational] research. Researchers involved in *BIQD* research are predisposed to utilise qualitative theories, rather than any assignment to a specific qualitative theory (Sandelowiski, 2010), freely portraying the impact of concurrent hypothesis ‘instead of inappropriately naming or implementing these other methods’ (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 339).

Creswell, in discussing the nexus between qualitative research and interpretive designs in the natural world asserted that the qualitative researcher’s activities are not finished, if they have not revealed individual meanings, including meanings in the context of practice or experience which exposes his/her constructionist inclination (Creswell, 2007). An argument further advanced by Shank who identifies those researchers utilising qualitative methods as ‘discoverers and reconcilers of meaning where no meaning has been clearly understood before’ (Shank, 2002, p. 7). The methodology also aligns with the epistemological framework associated with our history and emanating from the cultures and sagas of all our transported peoples (Best, 2004; Sankatsing, 2001, 1998). In this context qualitative research operates as a resource–base to knowledge acquisition and increased understanding of any phenomena or topic for both researcher and participant (Merriam, 2009).

A generic interpretive paradigm (Percy *et al.,* 2015) like *BIQD*, targets ‘what the experience was *about’* (Percy *et al.,* 2015, p. 77); in other words what exactly occurred focusing on the actual experience. In essence, where the researcher is focused more on the external world, (the questions of interest, the specific ideas, the actual personal experiences, and the participants reflections), an interpretive qualitative method is more appropriate (Rots, *et al*., 2012; Merriam, 2009; Shank, 2002). The qualitative researcher’s task, therefore, according to Merriam (2002), involves exposing ‘what those interpretations are at a particular point in time and in a particular context’ (p. 4).

My research is, therefore, not aligned to sociological viewpoints related to HE lecturers’ teaching positions; ethnography is, consequently, not required (Merriam, 2002). Nor is my aim to produce or advance theory, as in grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). More fundamentally, my research does not concentrate on exploring the core understandings of teaching related to phenomenological research (Creswell *et al*., 2007; Groenewald, 2004). It is to understand the conception/s of teaching held by certain ZCH lecturers, and whether training in SoTL has impacted their teaching, and perceptions of their roles and functions in a globalised postcolonial, elitist HE environment, including local contexts influencing their teaching. The study therefore, aligns with the essential requirements of a *BIQD* as demonstrated by Merriam and Sandelowiski (Sandelowiski, 2010; Merriam, 2009, 2002).

### 4.2.1. Research Perspective

This study treated with perceptions, opinions and understandings of ZHC lecturers. I am conducting a ‘small scale, contextualised, localised [interview based] study’ (Wallace, 2000) directed at unearthing and understanding lecturers’ conceptions of teaching (Akerlind, 2012, 2008; McKenzie, 2007; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). This qualitative theoretical perspective stresses an interpretive view where reality is inherent in the perceptions of individuals (Akerlind, 2008; Kember and Gow, 1994). The research is located in a colonial/postcolonial context, aligning with the historical development of local HE (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964), utilising BIQD research which is described as ‘naturalistic’. The research is carried out where events are naturally occurring as participants engage in ‘natural’ behaviour (Wellington, 2015; Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

As a faculty development specialist, I have a vested interest in lecturers’ conceptions of teaching and the SoTL. For me, both qualitative methods as well as quantitative methods are significant to any research project (Wellington, 2015); there is no dichotomy, only relevance, based on the research context and rationale for the project (Cohen *et al*., 2013). My assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of investigating ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching suggests the most appropriate methodology to adopt is qualitative—BIQD (Uduma, and Sylva, 2015; Walsham, 1995). I have developed, over the years strong views regarding local teaching and learning in HE. As a form of bracketing, I have placed my perceptions and other writings including memos on notes as I reflected and engaged with the data; these actions were attempts to maintain the rigour of my research (Cutcliffe, 2003).

### 4.2.2. Research Setting and Participants

Utilising guidelines underpinning interpretive research, I selected a sample with some variations, given nuances of the local HE environment. Merriam, for example, suggests that there ought to be adequate participants to respond to the research questions (Merriam, 2009, 2000). I was required to include in my sample, participants who had the experiences that I was interested in, since I was dealing with experiences of phenomena (Marton and Booth, 1997, p. 129). The intention was to interview sufficient individuals to attain a saturation point or *informational redundancy* (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

In addition, I was also investigating variation in experience of teaching (Akerlind, 2012; Bowden, 2000). I had to incorporate individuals who had taught for a minimum of two years, and who completed the CULT programme. Qualitative research focuses on the unique environment, and does not allow for generalisation involving the broader populace. In this context, I focused on purposive techniques which target *information-rich* cases or participants. In defining these, Patton suggests that they are ‘those (cases) from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research’ (Patton, 1990, p. 169). Merriam asserts that purposive sampling can be deemed as accomplished where further or fresh information is not generated from additional dialogues (Merriam, 2009).

My sample consisted of participants of different ‘subject discipline’, ‘academic position’, ‘years of teaching experience’, gender and ‘teaching level’ (González, 2011), in order to obtain some notion of equilibrium, and a range of (teaching) experiences. However, there were peculiarities; the sample consisted of six (6) participants although Trigwell (2000a) suggests a sample size ranging between 15 and 20. There were two reasons for this; first, ZHC lecturers had difficulty in participating in research studies of this type. They perceived their role as researcher, not the object of the research. Second, thirty invitations were sent to lecturers (participants who completed the CUTL programme at the ZHC) to participate in this study. Only eight replies were received. Of this eight, one lecturer opted out since she had left the institution to take up another job offer. Another lecturer forgot to keep the first interview appointment because of his busy schedule. He has not responded to my emails to reschedule and so I have come to the conclusion that he has also opted out. The sample presented the following characteristics. See Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Showing the Characteristics of the Sample Used in the Research**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Academic position** | **Years of teaching experience** | **Teaching Level** |
| Male Lecturer 1 | Senior lecturer | 15 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |
| Male Lecturer 2 | Lecturer | 7 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |
| Female Lecturer 3 | Lecturer | 3 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |
| Female Lecturer 4 | Lecturer | 9 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |
| Female Lecturer 5 | Lecturer | 10 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |
| Female Lecturer 6 | Lecturer | 7 | Undergraduate/Postgraduate |

These six individuals, therefore, represented my sample in this study. They all had participated in the ZHC CUTL, and had been tutored by me in two of the modules.

Given that the research was conducted in a HE environment and I knew the participants, ethical issues including power positions could arise. For example, participants may volunteer in the hope of receiving something in return (Corbin and Morse, 2003); or to receive imminent reciprocation (Smith, 1992) or as a consequence of needing to articulate concerns about HE teaching/learning (Clarke, 2006). In attempting to obtain optimal data I, as researcher, was required to view the researcher/participant relationship as a collaboration facilitating the joint construction of meaning (Garton and Copland, 2010) relinquishing any notions of researcher power position over those been researched. The valuable information provided by the interviews ought to be balanced by the difficulties which can occur where colleagues or peers are involved. To mitigate against such issues, I relied on my reflexivity by acknowledging, as well as creating an awareness of how my values and assumptions can impact data collection and analysis/interpretation (Spencer *et al*., 2003). This was necessary to ensure rigour in the research (Etherington, 2007) while simultaneously focusing on ethical practice (Smythe and Murray, 2010). See section 4.5 below.

Lecturers were each contacted by email; those who responded agreed to participate in the study. I then arranged with each, a date and time for conducting an interview (see schedule in Appendix 2). When I visited a participant for the interview, I provided each with a model information sheet and two consent forms (see Appendix 6 and Appendix 7). I retained for my record, a signed copy of each participant’s consent form which signalled their voluntary agreement to participate in the study.

Given the small sample in my study, I utilised the concept of *maximum variation* sampling, a strategy aligned to purposive techniques to assist me in achieving my objective of gathering information. Lincoln and Guba asserted that *maximum variation* sampling is a significant method aligned to basic or naturalistic research that enables a researcher to unearth a range of perspectives regarding the research topic (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This approach revealed commonalities of understandings within a sample. Patton indicated that any commonality of findings occurring from a minimal sample containing informants with a wide range of backgrounds is of considerable value (Patton, 1990, p. 172). This occurs because of repetition of such commonality, although deviation exists amongst participants (Patton, 1990).

My sample had representation from five of the six faculties of the university at the time of the interviews (a seventh faculty now exists). It also contained a mixture of male and female participants (2 males and 4 females) representing a range of teaching years and different discipline backgrounds. I contend that my sample represented a diverse set with wide representation amongst the participants, notwithstanding the nuances identified above. As Patton (1990) indicates:

The validity, meaningfulness, and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with sample size (p.185).

Patton suggested that, ‘there are no rules for sample size’ (Patton, 1990, p.184). He also asserted a nexus existed among sample size, answering of the research questions, usefulness of answers and ‘what can be done with the available time and resources’ (p.184). Patton further indicated identification of the smallest possible flexible sample size which ought to be in alignment with information saturation (Patton, 1990; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). I observed Patton’s edict that we do not over–generalize from purposeful samples, but rather focus on fully maximising the benefits which will help to mitigate concerns regarding small sample size (Patton, 1990).

I discuss my approach to gathering data in the following section

### 4.2.3. Data Collection: Semi–Structured Interview

The researcher functions as the principal agent utilised for data collection (Merriam, 2002). Among data collection methods to choose from are in–depth interview, document review, participant, and direct observation (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p.78). Sandelowski suggests the interview function relates to determining ‘the who, what, and where of events or experiences, or their basic nature or shape’ (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 338); a view espoused by Creswell and others in terms of investigating human experiences (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002; Merriam, 1998). Patton further suggests the interview is significant, as ‘we cannot observe everything... how people have organised the world and the meanings they attach.... We have to ask people about those things’ (Patton, 2002, p. 341). I choose the *semi–structured interview* as my major data collection device to step into the environment of the ZHC lecturer.

My role, conducting each interview was to enable each interviewee to reveal his/her understanding, utilising, ‘their terminology and judgments. . . . to capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences’ (Patton, 2002, p. 348). As such, *semi–structured interviews* enabled me to collect similar types of data held by all participants, as well as peculiar conceptions held by individual participants (Creswell *et al*., 2007; Merriam, 2002; Patton, 2002; Sandelowski, 2000). I did produce a list of questions or topics protocol (Patton, 2002) (see Appendix 1). Interviews took on a conversation style, and initially focused on participants original conceptions of teaching, that is, before they were exposed to the ZHC CUTL programme.

The intent of this approach was to allow the participants, the latitude to express their innermost thoughts and ideas concerning the topic/s uninterrupted by the interviewer. They were able to express themselves, providing deeper and significant ideas rather than responding the closed–end questions using the binary yes/no. Opened–questions enabled a deeper thought process enabling the provision of valid information and new qualitative insights. This interview approach allows for lengthier responses to questions and hence better data for analysis.

I asked questions to elicit responses, unearthing participants’ awareness and reflections on their conceptions of teaching—the principal focus of the study (Prosser, 2000; Marton and Booth, 1997, p. 130). Questions were asked to allow interviewees to expand on their own experiences and reflections of local HE teaching pertaining to their individual classroom practice. I further explored the phenomenon of teaching by utilising the *pedagogical constructs model* (Fanghanel, 2007). I probed lecturers’ conception/s of teaching from individual, departmental, and institutional contexts (Fanghanel, 2007). I asked lecturers to comment on their perceptions of their roles and functions in a local globalised HE environment; the impact of their discipline and departments on students’ education, and how they approached teaching episodes. I also solicited lecturers’ views on the aims of local HE education and their impact as university educators upon our society. My prime purpose was to derive local contexts and excavate how local HE lecturers were conceptualising teaching in our local HE environment. Having obtained the signed consent form from each participant and utilising this interview design approach, explaining the option to voluntarily withdraw, I employed the following prompt to start each interview: *What was your conception of teaching before doing the CUTL course?*

### 4.2.4. Data Recording

Conducting interviews requires a mechanism for recording and storing of such data. Patton (2002) asserts ‘a good tape recorder is indispensable’ (p. 380). However, digital recordings have showed up weaknesses of the traditional tape recorder, especially in storing and retrieval of data. Digital recordings have the advantage of better quality, simpler storage and retrieval, using the time stamp on individual recordings for obtaining specific words or passages (Evers, 2011).

Using a digital recorder, I recorded each participant having obtained their permission to do so. I then transferred each recorded file unto my computer. I also typed written comments, observations, summaries and other reflective ideas I made during each interview. Away from the interview site, I wrote a reflective note so as record a more complete narrative about each interview including my observation of informants’ body language and other non–verbal communication (Smith *et al*., 2009). These actions were attempts to align my activities with Hunt’s idea by been ‘attentive to individual cases while seeking to identity inductively what was common among the experiences of the participants’ (Hunt, 2009, p. 1287). All files pertaining to interviews residing on my computer were password–protected and hidden.

## *4.3. Working with the Data*

Creswell identifies data collection, analysis, organisation, as well as preparation, including reduction as fundamental processes the researcher implements in qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). These processes are iterative (Merrian, 2002). Analysis therefore, according to Bogdan and Biklen goes beyond manipulating the data. It involves ‘organising it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesising it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others’ (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982, p. 145). Marshall and Rossman (1995) on the other hand, describe data analysis as the ‘process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data’ (p. 111). The uniqueness of individual studies in qualitative research, including the approach to analysis to unearth meaning is also distinctive (Miles and Huberman, 1994). I utlised the *‘seven–steps’ method* of analysis (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991) specific to teachers conceptions of teaching research for deriving categories, themes and patterns, and for testing emerging conceptions of teaching held by local lecturers against the reported research in this area.

### 4.3.1. Data Analysis

Reed (2006) in commenting on Marton’s (1986, p. 43) description regarding the process of unearthing categories of description suggests, that not much detail is supplied regarding how (lecturers) ‘utterances are brought together into categories on the basis of their similarities’ and how ‘categories are differentiated from one another in terms of their differences’ (p. 9). He comments that few researchers dedicate time to expose explicitly, their process (of analysis) since it does not constitute a ‘structured series of steps’ that are straightforwardly depicted (p. 9). What follows is my own interpretation and actions related to the data analysis of ZHC lecturers’ categories of description based on data assembled from interviews and guided by the *‘seven–step’ framework* (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991). The process is initiated with data organisation.

### 4.3.2. Data Organisation

In keeping with processes of interpretive research, I utilised Hunt’s idea that ‘line-by-line coding is eschewed in favor of asking broad questions (of the data) such as “What is going on here?” and, “What am I learning about this?’’’ (Hunt, 2009, p. 1286). This approach focuses on initial interpretation of data before moving unto more detailed analysis. I implemented Powers’ technique of partial transcriptions which enabled me to isolate sections of each interview not applicable to my study (Powers, 2005). For example, personal comments about colleagues, religion and matters not germane to my objective.

I therefore isolated significant themes—those related to teaching/learning from insignificant ideas of a personal nature, not related to lecturers’ conceptions of teaching. The audio file associated with each interview was uniquely identified by a number. Personal details including names, position, departments and the university were deleted. The number allocated to each transcription file matched that on the consent form signed by each participant prior to commencement of each interview. For the reporting process, I allocated a pseudonym to each transcript and no one else was aware of the allocation.

Having transcribed the interviews as recorded on the digital recorder, I proceeded to analyse the data, focusing on basic interpretive analysis (Hunt, 2009; Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002; Sandelowski, 2000). I initiated the analysis process by reading each transcript. This allowed me to glean a preliminary understanding of the responses in general. At this juncture I was involved in stage one process of analysis. I then proceeded to read each transcript in greater detail, targeting any thematic similarities and/or differences as stated in the text (Akerlind, 2012). Whenever I encountered any teacher–centric, or student–centric theme, I made notes, using colour codes I developed to delineate the paragraph or snippet. I also highlighted descriptive segments (Bowden and Green, 2005; Bowden and Walsh, 2000), placing them into tables.

In attempting to better understand the context of each interviewee’s conception of teaching which was beginning to emerge, I made a summary of each interview. However, unlike the member checking procedure to confirm accuracy as identified by Lincoln and Guba, I was unable to send my summaries to the participants since they all afforded me only one interview, principally because of their busy schedules (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). I continued iteration of the data reduction process which produces themes, categories as well as patterns related to lecturers’ conceptions of teaching and perception of their roles and functions as HE teachers in our local context. Marshall and Rossman (1995) identified this process as ‘most difficult, complex, creative and fun’ (p. 114).

Miles and Huberman (1994), in commenting on this process of data reduction, suggest that it helps the researcher in formulating conclusions, in addition to making data organisation more manageable. Included in this process is identification of themes or conceptions participants share as they aligned to their narratives. Miles and Huberman, as well as Marshall and Rossman pinpoint Patton’s research in the context of birthing categories from participants’ narratives (Marshall and Rossman, 1995; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1990). In this context, Merriam (2009) suggests that qualitative research places significant emphasis on data. In describing the inductive approach to initiating data analysis to birth categories, including data patterns, Patton indicates that such data can be classified as indigenous—emerging from participants, and are very significant, as they are created by them, and analyst categories—topics utilised by participants, but unearthed by the researcher’s examination (Patton, 1990, p. 394).

The process of developing categories enhances identification of relationships and themes, especially creating of indigenous categories which helped my data reduction process. Although software can be utilised in this process, I manually transcribed the interview data to evolve codes (Merriam, 2002) or categories (Marshall and Rossman, 1995) simultaneously checking my records/comments related to each interview. These actions were critical to identification of indigenous categories of conceptions of teaching held by HE lecturers, and classifying data units as a mechanism for data reduction into convenient and expressive units, which allowed for identification of similarity and contrast (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 56). To extrapolate indigenous categories and aligned them into analyst classified themes, I focused on Corbin and Strauss’ constant analysis approach (Corbin and Strauss, 1990).

## *4.4. The Process*

### 4.4.1. Step 1: Familiarisation

Having transcribed the six transcripts verbatim as recorded on a digital recorder, I assembled the sample for familiarisation (Evers, 2011). Familiarisation involves reading and re–reading transcripts to get acquainted with ideas contained therein. This was no simple task, since I was unable to unearth any categories of description in my initial readings. I continued reading individual transcripts trying to glean from textual representation, meanings attached to the narratives (Merrian, 2002). Beyond the 10th iteration of reading each transcript, a new perspective of teacher conception appeared (Akerlind, 2012; Bowden, 1994). To clarify my understanding of each transcript, I again listened to recordings of each narrative and read the transcript associated with that narrative (Akerlind, 2012; Merrian, 2002). These actions allowed me to get a foundation understanding of responses in general, and represented the first stage of transcript analysis.

### 4.4.2. Step 2: Condensation

Although in Step 1 I treated the data as a collective, the process of condensation in Step 2 involved an approach which entailed dissecting each transcribed interview, identifying meaning units or fragments for further analysis (Stenfors–Hayes *et al*., 2013; Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Marton, 1986). Whenever I encountered any teacher–centric or student–centric themes, I placed the text into designated tables. I also underscored descriptive paragraphs (Bowden and Green, 2005; Bowden and Walsh, 2000) also placing them into tables.

I found use of colour codes useful as I grappled with demarcating each reflective experience of teaching from each transcript. Here, I isolated each fragment (Marton, 1994a, 1986), and cut out excerpts to form what Marton identifies as a stack or ‘a pool of meanings’ (Marton, 1994b, p. 4428). It consists of a decontextualised compilation of excerpts generated from the sample of interviews. It is interesting to note that (Trigwell, 2000a) admits that to simultaneously hold ideas from 20 interviews in their heads is indeed, a difficult task for researchers (p. 66). As I read each interview, I isolated the meaning units of experience (Marton, 1986) expressed in each interview conversation using different colours. This process was used vertically (individual interviews) and longitudinally (across the sample) (Fanghanel, 2007). See Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Showing ‘Units of Meaning’ Excavated from Interview 1**

|  |
| --- |
| I am using a little bit more of the technology… I think it make much better delivery. Students are now engaged prior to class and I put a lot of YouTube videos and also in particular, making use of the storyboard in terms of developing the course. I have found that in most instances that we just going by the course outline Sometimes it can feel as though it is not as cohesive in terms of delivery based on the topic. (01) |
| But I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course in particular I was able to see where there were some gaps and was able to make the course more cohesive in a way that essentially tells a good story in terms of the material been sequential not only for me but for the students as well and the students function a lot more easier in that I gave them the storyboard as well. (01) |
| My position is that I have to give a final and I have to grade them because for me a student’s grade is a reflection of my success in terms of a delivery mechanism and if they are not doing well at that point; I reflect on what I am not doing well and try to get ideas or solutions or what can be done differently, for them. (01) |

Key:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Initial category** |
|  | Imparting Information |
|  | Transmitting structured knowledge |
|  | Student-teacher relationship |

Table 2 identifies three pools of meaning extracted and coded from interview one. The first item represents an initial category of imparting information; the second, transmitting structured knowledge, and third, student–teacher relationship. The process here is tentative, as it is iterative, involving re–reading of transcripts to verify the fragment represented in the first instance, an initial theme and later, a conception (Marshall and Rossman, 1995). Having exhausted the process of identifying units of meanings, I was now in a position to examine the stack for further analysis to begin the process of identification of categories; the third step, comparison.

### 4.4.3. Step 3: Comparison

I began the long and laborious process of extracting from the pool of meanings fragments that were similar, as well as different; placing these into different tables. Simultaneously, I attempted to identify common themes running through the narratives, trying to structure logical relationships within each developing category and between developing categories (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Trigwell (2000a, p. 65) has commented on the demanding nature of this process. The significance of this step cannot be underestimated. It is data driven; the researcher is required to immerse himself/herself in the process, maintaining concentration on meaning units while unearthing themes, structures, as well as logical relationships emerging (Reed, 2006).

Each quote has two contexts: ‘the interview from which it was unearthed and the pool of meanings to which it belongs’ (Marton, 1986, p. 43). As I read transcripts, ideas of transmitting information, transmitting structured knowledge and transmitting lecturers’ concepts to students began to emerge as initial conceptions of teaching among ZHC lecturers. Simultaneously, themes of ‘delivering’ (basic) information and delivering (structured) knowledge and transmitting teachers’ concepts began to emerge as fundamental conceptions of lecturers’ teaching/learning activities. As I continued this process of analysis of quotes, I seamlessly merged into the process of grouping. See Table 3 below:

**Table 3: Showing Initial Conceptions of Teaching of Zion Hill Lecturers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Zion Hill Lecturers’ Initial Conceptions of Teaching** | | | | |
| **Teacher**–**focused/content**–**oriented**  **Lower**–**order conceptions** | | | | **Student**–**focused/learning**-**oriented**  **Higher**–**order conceptions** |
| Transmitting basic Information | Transmitting structured knowledge | Transmitting lecturer’s concepts | Student–teacher relationship | No higher–order conceptions identified |
| Category A | Category B | Category C | Category D |  |

### 4.4.4. Step 4: Grouping

Source: Adapted from Kember, 1997, p. 264.

w

As defined by Stenfors–Hayes *et al*. (2013) grouping involves assigning of similar conceptions of teaching as expressed in quotes to the same category. The process is iterative, and involves detailed reading and interpretation of meaning units (Creswell, 2007). The second category to emerge was ‘delivering structured content’. Throughout the transcripts, beliefs about teaching and the subject as a subset of topics from the curriculum emerged as a critical conception of lecturers’ teaching. As I interpreted the excavated data, emergence of the two other categories came to the fore: ‘teaching as delivering lecturers’ conceptions of the subject’, and the highest category, ‘articulating “good” student–lecturer relationship/apprenticeship’.

These categories formed the initial themes. However, in my mind these categories were transient; I was required to confirm them (Larsson and Holmstrom, 2007). It also became clear to me that ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching were not totally in alignment with previous studies in this area (Parpala and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2007; Samuelowicz and Bain, 2001; Kember and Kwan, 2000; Prosser *et al*., 1994). The analysis unearthed very little perceived articulation by ZHC lecturers of student–focused/learning–oriented conceptions. Thus, the iteration of teacher conceptions forming the initial categories, though tentative, featured conceptions of teaching aligned with the teacher–focused/content–oriented perceptions of teaching (Gonzales, 2011; Kember, 1997). See Table 4 below:

**Table 4: Initial ‘Categories’ of ZHC lecturers’**

**Conceptions of Teaching with Meaning Units**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Zion Hill lecturers’** **conceptions of teaching** | | | | |
| **Teacher**–**focused/content**–**oriented** | | | **Transition to Student**–**focused/learning**– **oriented conceptions** | |
| **Delivering Information** | **Delivering structured knowledge** | **Delivering lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area** | **Student**–**teacher interaction/apprenticeship** |  |
| My take on teaching and learning would be anything to gather knowledge. That is what it was before; whatever I knew I wanted to share, yeh; that was before CUTL. | Following that-the course, a few things happen. I restructured the course outline [ meaning the engineering course that he teaches], much of it as possible | I want them to understand a 100% of what they learn rather than 10% of a bigger slice or syllabus, you know. What they need to know. Do you know what you need to know, all right. | OK, in terms of my conceptions like how I see things, to me I think that teaching is not just about… I am always giving; I am also receiving. So that actually, you know, I appreciated it (meaning conceptions of teaching/learning) after CUTL. I actually saw it in the classroom. |  |

Key:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Category** |
|  | Delivering information |
|  | Delivering structured knowledge |
|  | Delivering lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
|  | Student–teacher interaction/apprenticeship |

Table 4 contains initial transient categories of ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching. The first fragment taken from Interview 3 aligns with the conception of *transmitting subject information*, the lowest conception of teaching (Gonzalez, 2011; Prosser *et al*., 1994). The second fragment originating from Interview 2 aligns with the conception of *transmitting structured knowledge* (Kember, 1997). The third fragment originating from Interview 2 aligns with the conception of *delivering lecturer’s conception of the subject*–*area*. The fourth fragment originating from Interview 6, aligns with the highest conception of teaching articulated by ZHC lecturers, *facilitating student*–*teacher interaction*. To achieve confirmation of these initial categories of description, I was required to describe the critical meaning expressed in each category unearthed so far. This is described as articulating (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991) and is the process undertaken in Step 5, Articulating.

### 4.4.5. Step 5: Articulating

Marton (1986) describes the process of articulating as ‘tedious, time–consuming, labor–intensive, and interactive’ (p. 43). I focused on similarities of ideas relating to each category I developed in an interactive way, interpreting core notions related to each of the initial (four) categories. I also narrowed quotes associated with each category until I derived succinct ways of describing ZHC lecturers’ understandings of the phenomenon of teaching (Marton, 1981).

I captured similarities and differences of emerging themes (Miles and Huberman, 1994), annotating them, using a colour code system capturing explicatory paragraphs in the relevant table. The process I followed was iterative to derive meaningful and stabilised ‘categories’ (Hunt, 2009; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The initial ‘theme represented in each category, a uniqueness regarding the phenomenon (distinctiveness); each was hierarchically related–lower categories were subsumed in higher–order categories (structurally inclusive relations) and there were few categories represented the variation in (teaching) experiences (parsimony) (Marton and Booth, 1997). This represents the first iteration of categories (Kember, 1997). See Table 5 below:

**Table 5**: **Initial Categories Representing Zion Hill Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teacher**–**focus/content**–**oriented Conceptions**  **Providing good lecture delivery** | | | | **Current highest level conception** |
| **Category** | **Category A** | **Category B** | **Category C** | **Category D** |
| **Delivering information** | **Delivering structured knowledge** | **Delivering lecturer’s concepts /understanding** | **Student**–**lecturer relation/ apprenticeship** |
| **Role**  **of lecturer** | Lecture delivery  Sage on the stage | Lecture delivery  Transmitter of discipline knowledge | Lecture delivery  Transmitter of lecturer concepts of discipline | Lecture delivery but with two-way communication  Subject apprenticeship  Preparing students for examinations |

Table 5 identifies the four categories of ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching as currently held. The theme of *‘delivering’ knowledge/information* cuts across all but the highest conception, student–lecturer relations/apprenticeship. Lecturers’ focus remains principally on delivery and/or transmission of knowledge which also includes delivery of their concepts of the discipline, Category C. Category D, the highest current conception of teaching held by lecturers, in addition to emphasising good student–teacher relations, also targets subject apprenticeship and preparing students for examinations.

Source: Adapted from Gonzales (2011) and Kember (1997)

In the following section I discuss labelling, the unique description of each category.

### 4.4.6. Step 6: Labelling

Labelling represents description of the focal meaning of a category (Stenfors–Hayes *et al*., 2013). Lecturers’ understanding of the phenomenon of teaching was iterated into four categories as identified in Table 5 above. I interpreted the meaning of these four categories from lecturers’ perspectives, differentiating each one from the other, focusing on similarities and differences (Gonzalez, 2011). The iterative processes of comparison, grouping, articulating and labelling (Stenfors–Hayes *et al*., 2013) were essential to excavating the four parsimonious themes representing ZHC lecturers’ initial categories of teaching conceptions. (See 5.9 below). In chapter 5, I shall explore the final step—*contrast*, step 7 which is the report (Marshall and Rossman, 1995) concerning the outcome of this research.

## 4.5. *Ethical Considerations*

### 4.5.1. Informed Consent

As part of my methodological approach to this study, I paid particular attention to ethics, a fundamental requirement of modern research (De Vos *et al.,* 2005; Creswell, 2003). In this regard, as an institutional prerequisite for embarking on the research, I submitted a proposal, including the methodology and procedures associated with this research to Sheffield University. I subsequently got approval to proceed on the study after the proposal was reviewed by the Sheffield University’s Ethics Committee. Given my interpretive approach to this study, and the fact that I interacted deeply with participants as I entered their private spaces, and exposed their values, identity and practices (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2003; Silverman, 2000); I was required to institute *informed consent* (Milesand Huberman, 1994) in writing in the format indicated in appendix (7)*.*

I delivered an *information sheet* to each participant which described in detail, the goals of the study, including the consequences of their involvement (Creswell, 2003) as indicated in appendix (6). I also discussed my approach to the study in face–to–face interactions with participants prior to each interview, and obtained their agreement to be interviewed by ensuring that each participant voluntarily signed the *consent form* (Howe and Moses, 1999). I informed each participant of their right to withdraw from the study at any time, without any questions asked, and without any consequences to themselves. These actions were in keeping with Wassenaar’s first principle of *autonomy and respect* for the dignity of all participants (Wassenaar, 2006).

### 4.5.2. Harm and Risk

My emphasis was always on protecting the participants, and ensuring that there were no negative fallouts from their participation in the research. These actions were representative of the second principle of Wassenaar—Nonmaleficence, ‘do no harm’ (Wassenaar, 2006). I therefore, reassured each participant that no harm or risk would accrue onto them as a result of their participation in my study (Wassenaar, 2006; Trochim, 2000). The data from interviews were personal, and to mitigate against risks in talking about the subject matter, I implemented procedures to prevent participants’ identification based on their interviews. Pseudonyms (numbers) were used to identify each participant reducing the possibility of individual recognition.

Each interview was tagged only with the number associated with that participant. No names or departments were used. All paper documents and files relating to the study were locked away when not in use by me. I personally kept keys to the filing cabinet in which they were stored, so as to prevent unauthorised access. These steps were in keeping with Wassenaar and Trochim’s principle that no physical or psychological harm should accrue to participants as a consequence of their involvement in the study (Wassenaar, 2006; Trochim, 2000).

### 4.5.3. Honesty and trust

Linked to Beneficence—‘do good’, the third principle is *honesty and trust.* This principle represented critical concepts implemented during this research (Wassenaar, 2006). I ensured that I adhered to standards associated with trustworthiness of data I delivered from the interviews, and explain as lucidly as possible, the steps I undertook in data analysis to derive the findings related to ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching. I also described in detail, the nuances related to this particular ‘one man’ study. These steps are described in the sections below.

### 4.5.4. Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity

These concepts are aligned to *Justice,* the final principle of Wassenaar’s ethics framework (Wassenaar, 2006). Linked to the other three concepts in this framework, Justice implied fair and equitable treatment of every participant in all stages of my research implementation. I ensured that confidentiality and anonymity of each participant was maintained. This was achieved by eliminating all distinguishing features relating to the institution (the institution’s name and other symbols were deleted from documents and electronic files).

I also ensured that participants’ names and departments were not used as a means of identification. I have indicated to participants that information generated from the analysis is to be used strictly for educational purposes in relation to improving teaching and learning at our institution. Most critically, I indicated to participants that any information related to this study to be shared would not include their names, nor in any way identify themselves or the institution. In this regard, I share Wassenaar’s view that *Justice* aligned to research is, indeed, a complex philosophical principle, which requires that researchers regard and handle research participants in a fair and equitable manner throughout the research process (Wassenaar, 2006).

I note the problem of preserving anonymity of research participants in small state settings (Louisy, 1993). As Powney and Watts (1987) indicate regarding large scale and small-scale educational research:

the profession is relatively small and it is difficult, even in largescale

surveys, to disguise the identity of unique schools, colleges or

even distinctive styles of educational management. Therefore it is

possible that even individuals can be tracked down. Concealing the

identity of informants becomes still more problematic in small-scale

educational research (p. 184).

Given the highly personalised nature of small states and the fact that people know each other in a multitude of settings (Bray, 1991a, 1991b); anonymity could be problematic. However, in this research this was not the case since participants were from different faculties. I note also that anonymity and confidentially are aligned to researchers’ obligation to participants (Louisy, 1993). I am aware, however, that the boundaries in the research setting may become blurred when the research project is published and/or disseminated (Louisy, 1993).

### 4.5.5. Voluntary participation

In Chapter 4, I indicated the difficulty I experienced with respect to colleagues’ participation in this study. Firstly, ZHC lecturers’ perception of themselves as researchers (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009; Norton, 2009), a function of their beliefs, identity and a professional practice (Aceros, 2012; Turner, 2012) located in the ideal of elitism and secondly, lecturers’ perception of teaching as a secondary activity contributed to their unwillingness to be interviewed. Many seemed unable (or unwilling) to submit themselves to deep and reflective conversations about their practice, especially to an interview by a researcher who was not ‘doctored’, and hence, not occupying similar social status. Additionally, male professors were transparently, more reluctant than females to participate. Colleagues’ decision to participate; I submit, had more to do with helping me as a tutor involved in research, since I helped them in their modules of the CUTL programme and my finding out information about them. It was also a demonstration of their power position as lecturers and the power relations existing in HE institution (see p.58). A revelation of their attitude was gleaned from the fact that everyone in the sample offered only one interview, although I asked for at least two more. They all politely declined citing their busy schedules.

I argue that the researcher–participant relationship in this research project was based upon ‘power’ (Hüther and Krücken, 2013) aligned to lecturers’ TLR (Trowler and Cooper, 2002) where they exercised *personnel power* (Luhmann, 1980) to help a tutor–researcher in the ZHC setting. Lecturers therefore, perceived themselves as functioning in a non–threatening environment in terms of my research, and exercised their right to answer questions, and explore themes, giving their views on the teaching/learning issues as they saw fit.

In spite of my careful attitude, aligned to the requirements of ethical research standards enunciated above, I was compelled to ensure that participants understood that this research was to be used for academic purpose solely. I also made sure that each participant understood that his/her participation was completely voluntary. Any participant was free to withdraw without consequences. By these various actions, I endeavoured to maintain a high ethical standard towards my study and by so doing, demonstrated my obligation to respect each participant (Creswell, 2003), aligned my values and culture with the environment of the participants (Silverman, 2000), and remained focused on the ethical issues throughout the research process (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

## *4.6. Validity and Reliability: Trustworthiness and Credibility*

### 4.6.1. Validity

Stenfors–Hayes and others including Akerlind have suggested that critical to any methodology employed in research are issues of validity and reliability (Akerlind, 2012; Stenfors–Hayes *et al*., 2013). Akerlind further indicated that although aligned to positivist ideology and objectivist research practice, qualitative researchers like their counterparts involved in traditional quantitative research are required to focus on validity and reliability (Akerlind, 2012). Akerlind further intimated that traditional research practice focused on the study of objective reality, whereas qualitative research is aligned to the investigation of inter–subjective ‘reality’ (Akerlind, 2012) utilising (generally) an interview–based approach (Akerlind, 2005; Kvale, 1996; Guba, 1981). Interpretive research therefore, is able to draw on the common assumptions aligned to qualitative conventions, as well as differences, dictating its unique array of practices (Akerlind, 2012).

Validity is defined as the degree to which my research is investigating what I set out to investigate (lecturers’ conception of teaching), or the extent to which my research results manifest the phenomenon (teaching) being investigated (Akerlind, 2012, p. 123). Uljens asserts that validity in [my] research context represents the degree to which research data correspond to lecturers’ understanding of the phenomenon (teaching) (Uljens, 1996), and is exhibited via the research processes I use (Ashworth and Lucas, 2000; Francis, 1996; Bowden, 1994).

Marton and Booth, like Kvale and others point out that communicative and pragmatic validity are the two reliability checks available to me. Communicative validity involves my ability to argue persuasively, my unique interpretation of the research data given the multiplicity of legitimate interpretations which can occur (Marton and Booth, 1997; Kvale, 1996; Sandberg, 1996). Akerlind identifies research seminars, peer–reviewed journals and conference presentations as environments for defending my research methods and interpretation (Akerlind, 2012).

The other available validity check accessible to me is pragmatic validity. Kvale, like Sandberg assert this is the degree to which my research results are recognised as valuable (Kvale, 1996; Sandberg, 1994). Uljens also identifies the degree to which the research results are significant to the HE teaching community (Uljens, 1996). Kvale underscores the purpose of the research is to provide useful knowledge/understanding, enabling lecturers to execute efficient (teaching) performance (Kvale, 1996). Thus, while Entwistle and other researchers claim that [my] research outcomes are evaluated according to how they stimulate lecturers to engage in more effective approaches to teaching (Entwistle, 1997; Marton and Booth, 1997; Marton, 1996). I hold the view that my research offer insights into ZHC lecturers’ current notions about teaching/learning,

Akerlind (2005) commenting on pragmatic validity suggested research outcomes can be adjudicated according to the insights they give to more efficient modes of functioning in the world. She quotes Entwistle in this regard and suggests some researchers argue this function of any research approach is critical ‘for researchers in HE, however the test is generally not its [methodological] purity, but its value in producing useful insights into (local) teaching and learning’ (Entwistle, 1997, p. 129).

### 4.6.2. Reliability

Kvale, like Guba points out the primary focus is employing appropriate methods/measures to ensure that, in the context of data interpretations, data is consistent with requisite quality (Kvale, 1996; Guba, 1981). There are significant issues however, related to the use of reliability checks in this study. First, such checks involve the use of several researchers, not appropriate for a ‘one man team’. Second, there is no consensus regarding the use of reliability checks in the research community. For example, Bowden and others favour dialogic reliability checks (Bowden, 1996, 1994; Prosser *et al*., 1994).

Other researchers like Marton suggest that coder reliability checks are significant as a reliability check in qualitative research (Marton, 1996). Sandberg however, has argued against coder reliability checks stating that it is inappropriate (Sandberg, 1996). Sandberg contends in a research environment which exhibits a lack of consensus regarding reliability checks, the qualitative researcher is able to resort to documenting and detailing his/her procedure, including the researcher’s critical attitude and attempts to control his/her biases in the context of the research outcomes (Sandberg, 1996). These approaches allow for the credibility and trustworthiness that are critical for any defence of my research and I shall explore these concepts in the following section.

### 4.6.3. Credibility

Given the qualitative nature of my study, I had an obligation to maintain trustworthiness and credibility (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). There was the requirement to assess the correspondence between the categories and the distinct modes of understanding of the phenomenon (teaching) by the participants in the study. To maintain trustworthiness, I was required to ensure that there was a relationship between the categories I derived and the data. Lincoln and Guba suggest that in order to establish trustworthiness in qualitative research, a focus on credibility, dependability, and confirmability is critical (Lincoln and Guba, 1985)

Credibility involves the researcher reporting precisely the research context and in this vein answering accurately, major questions associated with the study (Merriam, 1998). To achieve these research objectives, Lincoln and Guba suggest that Peer Debriefing, Triangulation, Persistent Observation, Member–checking and Negative Case Analysis can be utilised (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

In the present study credibility was achieved by the use of the quotations to concretise the relationship between the data and the category (Gonzalez, 2011; Sjostrom and Dahlgren, 2002). As Reed like Marton suggests, each category is described using the *second order approach*—the narratives or reflections expressed by the participants (Reed, 2006; Marton, 1981). Thus, in keeping with the ideas of Giacomini and Cook, the categories and descriptions were expressed through the ‘eyes’ of the participants, utilising their descriptions in the form of quotations (Giacomini and Cook, 2000). In their research Patton, as well as Marshall and Rossman make mention of Lincoln and Guba’s research in this area.

Since I was a ‘one–man’ team, I was unable to use peer debriefing and presentations for testing preliminary findings (Brinkmann, 2012; Guba, 1981), nor could I have used investigator triangulation (Giacomini and Cook, 2000) to obtain ‘negotiated consensus’ (Wahlstrom *et al*., 1997) or member checking to increase trustworthiness. Given the time constraints in terms of completing the study, the general negative attitude of local lecturers towards teaching and learning research, and my inability to convince colleagues of the significance of teaching and learning scholarship as a critical area of study; I was unable to garner the required support in this research exercise. I was, therefore, unable to use peer debriefing as Brinkmann suggested to highlight and bring to the fore, my own biases given my experience in HE as a teacher educator with strong opinions about teaching and learning (Brinkmann, 2012). Nevertheless, I persisted in a variation of member checking where I tried to represent participants’ voices as accurately as possible (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 314). This was achieved by asking for clarification during the interview, and utilising the notes I made during each interview during post interview analysis, for example, during the transcription process.

To ensure credibility of the research I relied on my self–awareness of my role as a researcher; taking great care as Sin and Sandberg admonish, to recognise how my interpretations (reflexivity and researcher interpretative awareness) impact the research process (Sin, 2010; Sandberg, 1997).

In this vein, I described in detail the steps I took in the analysis process; including how I arrived at my sample, the variations encountered, the approach to interviewing, the iterations undertaken in arriving at the categories and ‘themes’. All these activities helped to increase the trustworthiness and credibility of my research (Akerlind, 2012; Sandberg, 1997; Kvale, 1996). They were also an extension of the ethical considerations regarding this research mentioned above. The intent here was, as Akerlind and Uljens suggested, to allow for defence of my categories, to suggest usefulness, and to ensure meaningfulness of conceptions of teaching held by certain local HE lecturers derived by my study to the reader or audience (Akerlind, 2012; Uljens, 1996).

### 4.6.4. Dependability

In spite of the issues mentioned above, I ensured dependability in this research by establishing a data trail to trace the development of the study. The purpose is to ensure that my research findings were aligned to the data coming from the interview transcripts (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Creswell, like Miller also identify the requirement for audit tracking, as well as the use of journals to map the research processes, collection of data and data analysis methods in the project documentation or report (Creswell and Miller, 2000, p.128). The figure below indicates the research design to my audience. This represents my approach to data collection, data analysis, and the production of the research report in keeping with the requirements of basic interpretive qualitative research design (Wellington, 2015; Merriam, 2009, 2002).

**Figure 4: Showing My Approach to Data Collection and Data Analysis**
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## 4.7. *Methodological Review*

Using *BIQD* methods for investigating social phenomena, including human experiences (Sandelowski, 2010; Merriam, 2009, 2002);I undertook data collection, utilising semi–structured interviews to obtain data sets relating to ZHC lecturers’ sample. Then utilised the *seven–step method* (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991), including the *pedagogical constructs model* (PCM) (Fanghanel, 2007) which identified local contexts in which ZHC lecturers function, revealing variations in ZHC lecturers’ professional practice. These processes yielded initial categories for ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching. Since teaching conceptions were not static, I may further refine them by applying the analysis loop as shown in the second half of the diagram. See figure below.

**Figure 5: The methodological processes undertaken in this research**
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## *4.8. Conclusion*

The present study focused on unearthing the current conceptions of teaching held by certain ZHC lecturers. Its primary methodology centred on the *BIQD paradigm* (Mirriam, 2009, 2002), utilising *semi–structured interview* for data collection. Participants’ narratives were digitally recorded, manually transcribed and reduced. The data collection process included use of the ‘*Seven Step’* method (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991) as a strategy, aligned to unearthing teachers’ conceptions during data analysis. Data analysis resulted in the reduction of data for intense analysis, and the eventual unearthing of themes as well as categories, aligned to ZHC lecturers’ current conception/s of teaching. Critical to the methodology in this research was a focus on validity and reliability including credibility, and dependability, including the issue of power relations between the researcher and the participants, significant elements in maintaining trustworthiness in this study. In Chapter 5, I shall focus on the findings.

# Chapter 5: Presentation of Findings

# *5.1. Introduction*

My intent in this study was to unearth and understand the current conceptions of teaching held by certain lecturers at the ZHC campus. In Chapter 4, I outlined the methodology I utilised to undertake the investigation. In this Chapter, I present the findings.

In response to the first research question: *What were the current conceptions of teaching held by certain ZHC lecturers?*  The table below presents one general model representing conceptions of teaching held by HE lecturers (Kember, 1997). In alignment with ideas of Akerlind, Kember, and others, lecturers’ conceptions of teaching can be conceived as transitioning from lower–order, teacher–focused/content–oriented conceptions to higher–order, student–focused/learning–oriented conceptions (Akerlind, 2012, 2008; Marton and Booth, 1997; Kember, 1997).

**Table 6: A multiple**–**level Categorisation Model of Lecturers’ Conceptions of Teaching**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lecturers’ conceptions of teaching** | | | | |
|  | |  |  | |
| **Teacher-focused/content**  **Oriented** | | Student–teacher interaction/apprenticeship | **Student-focused/learning oriented** | |
| Imparting Information | Transmitting  structured knowledge | Facilitating understanding | Conceptual change/intellectual development |
| **Lower**-**order conceptions** | | **Transition point** | **Higher**-**order conceptions** | |

Source: Kember (1997, p. 264)

Table (6) above, demonstrates a transition from lower*–*order (left quadrant) to higher*–*order (right quadrant) in alignment with studies of teachers’ conceptions of teaching. To transition from *teacher–focused/content–oriented* conceptions to *student–focused/learning–oriented* conceptions of teaching, lecturers derive a temporary *student–teacher interactive* conception (transition point) of teaching as they move onto *student–focused* conceptions of teaching (González, 2011; Kember, 1997). Kember and others also suggested that *teacher–focused/student–focused* orientations, may be perceived as occurring along a continuum (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994**;** Samuelowicz and Bain, 1992). Lecturers traverse, generally, from *teacher–focused* conceptions, less complex and inferior, to *student–focused* conceptions, more complex and superior (Akerlind, 2003).

However, my sample of ZHC lecturers’ currently held conceptions of teaching were not aligned with the normal trajectory of teachers’ conceptions identified in the literature. Based on their narratives and my analysis, current conceptions of teaching held by ZHC lecturers were aligned significantly, to *teacher–focused/content–oriented* orientations of Kember’s (1997) model. See Table (7) below:

**Table 7: Showing ZHC Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ZHC lecturers current conceptions of teaching** | | | |
| **Teacher-focused/content-oriented** | | | |
| Delivering Information | Delivering structured knowledge | Delivering lecturer’s conceptions of subject | Student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| **Category A** | **Category B** | **Category C** | **Category D** |
| Lower-order, simple, exclusive conceptions | | | Unstable transitionary conception |

Source: Adapted from (Kember, 1997, p. 264)

## *5.2. MUZHC Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching: Detailed Analysis of Findings*

My research revealed commonalties and differences with respect to ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching. ZHC lecturers perceived teaching as a hierarchy, but with a focus on ‘*delivery’* of information. Lecturers’ narratives revealed three categories of description of conceptions of teaching aligned to the theme of ‘delivery’:

* + Category A: Delivering a ‘good’ lecture to students;
  + Category B: Delivering structured discipline content/knowledge to students;
  + Category C: Delivering lecturer’s conceptions of the subject area; and
  + Category D: Preserving and perpetuating ‘good’ lecturer/student relationships.

I present below a detailed analysis of ZHC lecturers’ categories of descriptions. A numeric code was used to identify the participant giving illustrative descriptions of conceptions of teaching, and to indicate that such narratives came from different transcripts, while simultaneously ensuring that all participants remain anonymous. Where specific parts or words in transcripts were omitted, square brackets [ ] have been used. The intention was to focus only on what was critical to the analysis pertaining to each category. To capture intonation, hesitations or pauses from each interviewee during the interview, ellipses (…) were used to denote the essence of each interviewee’s non–verbal expression.

### 5.2.1. Category A: Teaching as delivering a ‘good’ lecture to students

Aligned to a transmission and acquisition approach, Category (A) conceived teaching as delivering a ‘good’ lecture (Fisher, 2005; Kember, 1997). Pedagogy utilised was teacher–focused/content–oriented, without consideration of students’ prior experience or motivation. Information transmission was the lecturers’ focus, not learning theory (McAuliffe *et al*., 2009; Kember and Glow, 1994). This conception of teaching was power–driven, and non–democratic with a one–channel communication pathway from lecturer to student, premised on knowledge transmission, not student transformation (Cox, 2003; Cox and Richlin, 1993). Category (A) epitomised teaching/learning practice in traditional ‘*elite*’ education identified in Chapter 2. Descriptive quotations which demonstrated Category (A) were as follows:

My take on teaching and learning, […] anything to gather knowledge. That is what it was before; whatever I knew, I wanted to share, yeah […] that was before CUTL. [Participant 03]

I thought that it [teaching] was simply a matter of presenting information […] basically just throwing students to the wolves. That was my honest conception [of teaching]. [Participant 05]

The central theme emanating from these narratives was ‘lecturing’ (Campbell, 1997). In Category (A), participants’ conception of teaching was conceptualized as presenting information to students, the unproblematised notion of teaching (Fanghanel, 2007). The lecturer organised curriculum content, decided what was to be learnt, and how content was presented (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Emery, 1974). Before CUTL, lecturer (03) conceptualised teaching as knowledge gathering and sharing. Lecturer (05) conceptualised teaching as presenting information (lecturing), but unlike colleague lecturer (03), provided no guidance to students. They were expected to master discipline content (throwing them to the wolves—Participant 05).

[Teaching]… at the undergraduate level; there is some level of lecturing. In the first and second year there is lecturing […] in the third year especially in the final semester, there is more facilitating […]. We are now training you for graduate school so that it is important to make that transition now. [Participant 01]

Unlike participants (03) and (05) above, participant (01) distinguished between undergraduate and post–graduate teaching, implying the significance of ‘lecturing’ at undergraduate level, and lecturer facilitation during the final semester of year three. This participant’s perception of teaching revolved around the subject specialist imparting information and transmitting expert knowledge (Rodriguez, 2008; Samuelowicz and Bain, 1992). Lecturing was the predominant pedagogy utilised in keeping with traditional ‘*elite*’ HE practice. Category (A) conception of teaching was evident across the sample set as a major conception.

Next, I analyse Category (B) delivering structured knowledge.

### 5.2.2. Category B: Teaching as delivering structured discipline content/knowledge to students

Linked to Category (A), Category (B) concentrated on delivery of structured subject knowledge. Such foundational knowledge was required by anyone studying the discipline (González, 2011). Descriptive quotations illustrating delivering discipline content/knowledge were as follows:

…but I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course, in particular, […] ...and was able to make the course more cohesive in a way that essentially tells a good story, […] …in terms of the material been sequential; not only for me, but for the students as well. [Participant 01]

Following that [meaning his participation in the CUTL course] […] I restructured the course outline [meaning the course that the lecturer teaches]; much of it as possible. [Participant 02]

Category (B) conception of teaching was aligned to delivery of syllabus/text concepts beyond basic discipline information (Prosser *et al.,* 1994). Concentration was on participants’ understanding of the discipline (González, 2011; Prosser *et al*., 1994) but more critically, course structure. Participant (01) for example, restructured course content to derive a sequence which told a story, while lecturer (02) restructured course content, both focusing on better course delivery (Barr and Tagg, 1995).

In our local context, two features were prominent in course delivery by lecturers: (1) The use of Moodle, the learning management system (LMS); and (2) blended learning delivery. A lecturer may use Moodle to place learning materials—YouTube videos, power point presentations, web links or other reading materials for students to access remotely, as the following illustrative description by participant (02) clarified:

…I am trying to get the most [meaning the course content] into myelearning […] [meaning the LMS] […] you could have the video clips […] …embed it in the myelearning webpage. [Participant 02]

A participant may also redesign his/her course content for blended delivery mode, given his/her knowledge acquired on the CUTL programme as participant (01) described:

…I think it makes much better delivery […] students are now engaged prior to class, and I put a lot of YouTube videos [on the LMS], […] making use of the storyboard in terms of developing the course [for blended learning]. [Participant 01]

The approach to course delivery was still, essentially, teacher–focused. As participant (01) averred, use of the LMS facilitated better course delivery and allowed for pre–class engagement with course content. Teaching focus targeted course content where foundation concepts were transmitted to students (González, 2011).

### 5.2.3. Category C: Teaching as delivering lecturers’ conceptions

Category (C) subsumes Categories (A) (delivering information) and (B) (delivering structured content). A participant with a conception of teaching aligned to Category (C) may discuss with students, his/her research in the discipline, while simultaneously persuading them to undertakeresearch as post–graduate students (Pearson and Brew, 2002). Participants seek to develop future generation/s of discipline specialists via, for example, research supervision (Pearson and Brew, 2002; Knight and Trowler, 2001). This conception of teaching also resonated with all participants in the sample.

Descriptive narratives which demonstrated or drove participants’ conception of teaching as ‘delivering lecturer concepts of the discipline’ were as follows:

I don’t give them [students] […] …I give them the minimum amount they need to read […] …I try to make sure that they understand that amount. [Participant 02]

You think that this is the university […] …you deal with adoption and you [the lecturer] come with your knowledge […] you could engage them with it and then carry on. [Participant 04]

Participant (02), unlike (04) focused on a minimalist instructional approach, standardizing discipline or content/concepts which he/she thinks learners need to acquire without consideration of individual differences or students’ prior experiences (Roberts *et al*., 2011). Lecturer concentration during teaching sessions encompassed teacher–focused/content–oriented strategies (Prosser and Trigwell, 1998; Kember, 1997). Participant (02) focused on learning outcome/s, not the learning process (Barr and Tagg, 1995).

Participant (04), unlike colleague (02) alluded to student adoption of the university environment [as different from the secondary school environment] and conceptualised teaching as engaging students with knowledge, assuming the position of subject expert. This description may point to a higher–order conception of teaching, however, it was aligned to participant (02)’s instructional approach (Roberts *et al*., 2011). Participant (04) focused exclusively on the lecturer’s conception of the discipline. Both lecturers’ conceptions of teaching were, essentially, teacher–centric (Kember and Glow, 1994). Category (C) in my study aligned with Category (B) in Prosser’s *et al.* (1994) model: *teaching as transmitting the teacher’s knowledge* and with category (B) in González’s (2011) model: *teaching as transmitting lecturer’s understanding*.

In the following section, I analyse the final category of ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching, Category (D).

### 5.2.4. Category D: Preserving and perpetuating ‘good’ lecturer/student relationships

A participant with a conception of teaching aligned to category (D), maintaining ‘good’ student–teacher relationships (Biggs and Tang, 2011; Kember, 1997), also subsumed (Category A), (Category B) and (Category C) in practice. Described as a transitional phase, a participant in Category (D) conceptualised teaching as focusing on the discipline, and providing an enabling physical environment for subject comprehension (Fox, 1983). This Category, however, remained a contested concept in the literature (Samuelowicz and Bain, 2001, 1992).

Below were participants’ narratives which aligned with Category (D) in my study:

I see myself as teaching my students, but I also learn from them. I help them and they help me [...]. I was a mature student myself; so I naturally have, you know […] empathy for mature students and design what I am doing to make sure that I include them. [Participant 06]

Participant (06), utilising the notion of ‘good’ student–teacher interaction/apprenticeship (Prosser and Trigwell, 1997; Trigwell and Prosser, 1996), conceptualised teaching as a multiple–channel communication activity between lecturer and students (Bates *et al*., 2011; Fox, 1983), and exploited previous experience as a mature student to afford a context for enhancing teaching/learning sessions (Barr and Tagg, 1995). The mature student has, in many instances, unique needs beyond the traditional academic student (Biggs, 1999), and also brings work/life experiences into the classroom setting, enabling a shift to more facilitative teaching/learning (Biggs, 2012, 1999).

That has been a challenge. […] I have an ice breaker, which was an interactive icebreaker. […] ...they saw that this lecturer was fun. […] I tell them you can call me doc or doctor x if you not comfortable calling me (Malcolm), my first name [not his name]. I see no disrespect in that. [Participant 01]

Unlike participant (06), participant (01) utilised ‘*interactive icebreakers’* as a mechanism for fostering good student–lecturer relations in classroom sessions (Kember, 1997). A shift from traditional lecturer domination (discussed in Chapter 3) to recognition of the student’s role in teaching/learning occurs (Trigwell *et al*., 1999; Kember, 1997). Participant (01)’s approach to achieve this outcome involved persuading students to address the lecturer informally—by first name, or simply saying ‘doc’, which many students found extremely difficult, given the high esteem in which ‘doctor’ lecturers are held in our HE system. Both participants were utilising the simple theories (the travelling and/or shaping theories) of the personal teaching model (Fox, 1983) as they move towards implementing more developed theories of student–focused/learning–oriented conceptions of teaching (González, 2011; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994).

I still believe that I am trying to create the best (students) possible. I am trying to create an elite group of people who can be leaders and that can be turned to for answers […] [Participant 05]

Participant (05), unlike colleagues (06) and (01), grounded a conception of HE teaching that produced [future] ‘leaders in the discipline’ (Pearson and Brew, 2002; Knight and Trowler, 2001); but more significantly, focused on ‘creating’ an *elite* class of academics in the discipline (Haggis, 2006; Campbell, 1997; King, 1995). At post–graduate level, this lecturer may undertake research supervision as a critical pathway to developing the next generation of discipline specialists (Pearson and Brew, 2002; Knight and Trowler, 2001). Participant (05)’s conception of teaching was aligned with recent research which suggested that the discipline, and pedagogy utilised in lectures were connected (Lindblom–Ylanne *et al*., 2006).

Category (D) in my study aligned with the mid–point category between the teacher–focused/content–oriented and student–focused/learning–oriented conceptions of teaching (Kember, 1997). Samuelowicz and Bain (2001), like Prosser *et al*. (1994) query the mid–point category, insisting that conceptions of teaching were either teacher–centred or student–centred. Thus, it was expected that in the future, as ZHC lecturers developed their practice, and became aware of higher–order conceptions of teaching, they [may] transition to teacher–focused/learning–oriented conceptions of teaching (Akerlind, 2008).

In the following section, I analyse the first variation of dimension of ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching, the role of the lecturer. This analysis responds to research questions (2): *What do some MUZUC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment?* and (3) *What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?*

## *5.3. Variation in Dimension of ZHC Lecturers’ Teaching Conception*

### 5.3.1. Role of the lecturer

Unlike Kember (1997) and Prosser *et al*. (1994) whose variation in teachers’ conceptions of teaching suggested an extended role for the lecturer encompassing content provider, transmitter of structured knowledge to that of facilitator, and change agent; the focus of ZHC lecturers’ role was premised on delivery of subject content, and on transmitting structured subject knowledge organised as teaching sessions. This role involved pre–planning for better lecture delivery as in the following descriptions:

What I do is that sometimes, [...] about two weeks into the semester, I ask the students to tell me if this method [meaning this lecture delivery method] is working […]. I elicit from them what they would like to see change […] I make those changes right away. [Participant 01]

Soliciting views from students regarding lecture delivery underlined the significance this participant attached to teacher–student interaction in teaching sessions (Kember, 1997). In this role, changes to teaching methods were activated seeking to improve lecturer’s content delivery, not necessarily facilitating student engagement or understanding of material (Prosser and Trigwell, 2017). The major function was, seemingly, on teacher–focused/content–oriented practice; the less complex teacher conceptions of teaching (Gonzalez, 2011; Akerlind, 2003; Kember, 1997).

To my mind what is the best I could deliver to the students? […] within the constraints that I have, as well as been an academic [...]. I mean the constraints that I have as an academic. [Participant 02]

Participant (02), unlike colleague (01) demonstrated a teaching function aligned to ‘*delivery*’ of content, category (A) but balanced this approach by highlighting the constraints of the role as an academic. This may suggest a preference for the research function and allegiance to the discipline (Jenkins, 1996), rather than the teaching role as part of the teaching/research nexus (Fanghanel, 2007).

I analyse the second dimension of variation, *the role of students*.

### 5.3.2. Role of the student

Whereas the first dimension of variation, ‘*the role of the lecturer’* was critical to the process of teaching; in the second dimension, ‘*the role of the student’* was essentially passive, as a receiver of knowledge (Trigwell *et al*., 1994). The lecturer was ‘*the sage on the stage’* (King, 1993), and effectively mediated the teaching/learning process. The student received discipline information, typical of traditional HE practice (Rodriguez, 2008; Biggs, 1987). Participant (01) clarified the local student’s role in the teaching/learning by suggesting:

We have all of these techniques [meaning constructivist methods] that we teach in the classroom; that is ok there [meaning the USA and Europe], but not here, because of that socialisation [meaning how local students are socialised]. They, the students don’t go against the lecturer because you can’t do that, because then the lecturer says, listen! […] [Participant 01]

Implicit in this variation narrative is power (Hüther and Krücken, 2013) exhibited by lecturers in the traditional university (Rodriguez, 2008). Students’ designated role was to accept, unequivocally, the lecturer’s knowledge, without question (Fisher, 2005; Fox, 1983). Linked to the modernist theories and Lockean assumption/s underpinning classical education discussed in Chapter 2, the lecturer was central to the learning process (Emery, 1974). It was in this context that participant (01) highlighted the tradition of the student ‘*not going against the lecturer’* as a socio–historical feature of local HE which, in a real sense, negatively impacts student higher–order conceptual development (Prosser and Trigwell, 2017; Kember, 1997).

I don’t ask my students to do any reading out of the classroom. [Participant 02]

Participant (02), like colleague (01) conceptualised a teacher–centric practice, but unlike (01), participant (02) determined subject content, excluding completely, student input. This variation of teaching was indicative of traditionalist teacher–focused/content–oriented lecturing, reflecting the less–complex, lower–order conception of teaching (Akerlind, 2003; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Students depended exclusively on the lecturer. Knowledge construction and collaboration by students was not transparently encouraged (Carnell, 2007; Hargreaves, 2000; Martin and Balla, 1991).

I still value the old way […] I still value what I consider the old way [the traditional lecture]. I can see the direction. I can see value to the old [way of teaching]. [Participant 05]

In conceptualising the ‘lecture’ as a primary pedagogy, participant (05), like colleagues (01) and (02), expressed a conception of teaching aligning with the traditional function of HE—transmission of knowledge (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). A student’s role in this model, focused on rote learning, memorisation and regurgitation (Biggs, 2012). Fisher (2005) described this transmission model [the lecture] as important and was, therefore, not totally irrelevant. General consensus however, is, the lecture has many weaknesses (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; King and Kitchener, 1994). Significantly, it deprives students of active participation in knowledge production, collaboration and interaction (Hutchings, 1997; King and Kitchener, 1994; Murray, 1991). In our present HE context, the lecture ought to be combined with other delivery mechanisms in teaching sessions to foster engagement and collaboration (Breslow *et al*., 2004).

### 5.3.3. Use of ICT

As a consequence of their participation in ZHC’s CUTL programme, utilising ICT formed a critical variation of ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching/learning, (Laurillard, 2006). Lecturers’ illustrative descriptions included utilising Myelearning, the LMS (Laurillard, 2006) for YouTube videos, course notes and assessments, (González, 2009; Ellis *et al*., 2006; McConnell and Zhao, 2006). Such implementation of ICT integration focused principally on enhancing lecture delivery, providing structured course content, and asynchronous student communication—email, discussion–forums and limited use of online assessment. The following illustrative descriptions demonstrated lecturers’ understanding of ICT integration in teaching/learning:

I think it makes much better delivery. Students are now engaged prior to class and I put a lot of YouTube videos […] …and making use of the storyboard in terms of developing the course. […]. Sometimes it can feel as though it is not as cohesive in terms of delivery, based on the topic. [Participant 01]

Emphasising the notion of better delivery of course content and cohesiveness in terms of course structure, participant (01) affirmed utilising the LMS enhanced student engagement prior to teaching sessions. Lecturers were yet to exploit the higher level advantages of blended/on–line learning. Current ICT integration mechanisms involved lower–level usage, including placement of YouTube videos and urls. ICT integration as conceptualised and utilised in ZHC contexts, offered limited student interaction and communication. This variation of teaching practice emphasised the lecturer, and subject content, but not student development (Biggs, 2012; Marton and Booth, 1997).

The moment you put something online and you ask them [the students] to engage in it; no […], they prefer to come to classroom and occupy a seat. At least they are there as the person [lecturer] is speaking and then that’s [the online content] there […]; so much so for discipline in learning […]. [Participant 04]

Participant (04), unlike (01) telegraphed tensions existing between conception of ICT integration and students’ perception of teaching/learning. The participant described a perceived lack of engagement with online content prior to attending lectures. This was viewed as a lack of discipline by students. Students, on the other hand, continued to demonstrate a preference for seat–based education (McAuliffe *et al*., 2008). They preferred to attend to lectures. The non–alignment of lecturers’ conception of teaching and students’ conception of learning (Prosser *et al*., 1994) were implicated in this variation narrative by participant (04). Participant (01), however, suggested that utilizing the LMS secured more student engagement prior to attending lectures. These narratives pointed to a lack of consensus among ZHC lecturers on the impact of ICT integration on student learning.

It cannot be that […] Ok […], so now you say to me that I could put my students online, it makes it easier; it doesn’t […] and for the workload […]; it adds to what you have to do, and so something needs to be adjusted. [Participant 05]

Unlike colleagues (01) and (04), participant (05) conceptualised the impact of ICT integration from the perspective of academic labour (Fanghanel, 2007); alluding to additional workload it presented for lecturers. Such a conception points to lack of institutional and departmental support in the use of the LMS (Shapiro, 2006; Gibbs, 2005, 2002). However, participant (05)’s conception of teaching exposes deeper conceptual issues regarding pedagogy which may be discipline–specific (Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2010). This participant did indicate a preference for the traditional lecture as a principal pedagogy for the discipline (Fisher, 2005).

Unlike participant (05) and (04), participant (01) displayed a positive attitude towards ICT integration. Institutional capacity building in ICT, deployment of ICT infrastructure, and ICT training for academic staff were critical issues which impeded or advanced integration of ICT in HE (Mishra and Koehler, 2006). The ambivalence towards ICT integration identified by ZHC lecturers’ narratives also negatively impacted systemic change, lecturer recognition and lecturer comfort (Mckenzie, 2003). ZHC lecturers’ variation of conception of teaching, even in the context of ICT integration,epitomised a teacher–centric/content–oriented paradigm of practice (Prosser and Trigwell, 1999; Prosser *et al.*, 1994).

In the following section I focus on the final variation of conception.

### 5.3.4. Student assessment

In terms of assessment, ZHC lecturers’ practice focused on ‘high stakes’ summative examinations, emphasising student performance and student grades (Astin, 2012). Current practice did not accentuate the process of teaching—transitioning course outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessments to align with learning objectives. These measures encouraged individual student growth and conceptual development (Astin, 2012; Biggs, 2012). Traditionalist teacher–centric approaches to assessment, focusing on student performance compromised student conceptual development (Astin, 2012, 1996, 1985), while emphasising surface–learning, rather than deep–learning (Marton and Säljö, 1976). Traditional lecturing, exacerbated by the large student cohorts lecturers encountered at undergraduate level, limited the range of assessments available to lecturers (Owen, 2016; Entwistle, 2000; Trigwell *et al*., 1999). Participant (04)’s illustrative description expressed this dilemma:

…and huge for me is a 100 students. […] …for some people it is 400 students and up. But huge in our department is anywhere between 70 and 120 […] …in one class I have 100 students [… ] ...in another class […]70 plus students. [Participant 04]

Think of the assignments [… ] think of those kinds of things […] you are bound by time […] think of classroom management. As much as I want to engage everyone […] I want everybody to get the material and use it as a good base to carry on […] that doesn’t always happen. [Participant 04]

Participant (04)’s narrative illustrates that lecturers reverted to the ‘default’ style of lecturing when facing large student numbers (Biggs, 2012, 2011; Fisher, 2005). However, no impediment exists which prevented the ‘lecture’ from transforming into an interactive session (Biggs, 2012; Frederick, 1986). Traditional examination, however, remained the major mechanism for ZHC students’ assessment (Astin, 2012). Given institutional arrangements which currently emphasised traditional assessment formats; lecturer exposure to professional development training in teaching/learning is critical (Poole, 2010; Macfarlane, 2004) to advance the use of alternative forms of student assessment (Astin, 2012).

I want to spend half an hour with each weak [student] […] …to figure out the root cause of why their performance is low, over the semester. Those who perform well […] I don’t need to worry about those […] I am focusing on those that don’t do well. [Participant 02]

Participant (02), like (01) was genuinely interested in students’ performance. Students ‘doing well’ in examinations was aligned with the traditional conception of assessment—performing with distinction, the reputational excellence as described by Astin (1985). Students’ conceptual development was not featured (González, 2011; Prosser and Trigwell, 1998; Prosser *et al*., 1994). In this variation of practice, ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching was inevitably aligned with students’ academic ability. The participant consequently, prioritised class time to help only those underperforming students.

I was a bit skeptical at first, because I am pro–exam and I think that I am best at exams because of how I was taught […] the traditional way of teaching here […]. So I would say I was a bit concern, concerned about whether I would excel in the programme. Because I am someone […] I need to excel. I am self–motivated. So for me, I was, like […] no exams! I was a bit concerned […] I was worried. [Participant 03]

Participant (03)’s illustrative narrative demonstrated, unequivocally, the significant role many ZHC lecturers attach to traditional assessment. Even from the context of ZHC, CUTL programme, certain lecturers mistakenly believed that traditional examinations ought to be the primary assessment method. Assessment, therefore, resonated at the institutional, department, and the individual level (Fanghanel, 2007) and some lecturers expressed deep reservations about the efficacy of a ‘course–work’ driven professional development programme.

They failed to comprehend that student learning can be assessed in non–traditional ways. More significantly, in a professional development learning environment where authentic learning is occurring, demonstration of such learning is more appropriate than traditional examination performance (Martin *et al*., 1998). Teaching/learning at ZHC was, consequently, ‘plagued’ with traditional assessment (Astin, 2012, 1985) which participant (03) interpreted as extremely critical to lecturer identity and self–efficacy (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001; Bandura, 1982, 1977). This participant’s variation of practice, linked to traditional assessment, permeates the local HE sector (Trowler and Cooper, 2002).

In Chapter 2, I identified major themes impacting lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, governed by our unique historical conditions of colonialism/postcolonialism that impacted local lecturers’ institutional practice. In keeping with my research design, I have utilised Fanghanel’s socio–cultural framework which identified filters impacting lecturers’ institutional practice (Merriam, 2009, 2002; Fanghanel, 2007). I now focus on the final research question: *What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?*

## 

## *5.4. Filters Impacting ZHC Lecturers’ Institutional Practice*

Several themes emerged, appearing horizontally—occurring across the sample set and vertically—as they relate to each individual sample, regarding ZHC lecturers’ local institutional practice (Fanghanel, 2007; Trigwell *et al*., 2005). These themes, akin to filters, impacted local lecturers’ teaching at three institutional levels and are identified in Fanghanel’s *pedagogical constructs model* (Fanghanel, 2007). The model provides a graphic representation of the filters regulating ZHC lecturers’ institutional practice (p.129).

Fanghanel’s (2007) model identifies seven filters through which the context of lecturers’ practice may be analysed. Institutionally, these filters function at three levels of practice with some amount of overlap. Fanghanel (2007) suggesting that:

At the macro level four filters operate—the institution, external factors, academic labour and the research–teaching nexus; at the meso level two filters operate—department (or equivalent) including the subject discipline and at the micro or individual level one filter operates—pedagogical beliefs (p. 7).

I have adapted the model to align with those filters (contexts) of teaching identified by ZHC lecturers in my study. At the macro level participants identified three filters, the *research–teaching nexus,* *academic labour* (associated with reward and promotion), and the *institution* (associated with technology integration). At meso level, participants identified two filters, *the department* and their *subject discipline*, and at the micro level participants identified one filter, *pedagogical beliefs* (associated with teaching and assessment). ZHC lecturers did not transparently identify *external factors* as a filter or context which influenced their practice, although this filter is significant from the perspectives of HE historical development and post*–*1995 HE expansion (Longsworth, 2009; Jules, 2008; Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). See figure 6 bellow:

**Figure 6: Filters Conditioning ZHC Lecturers’ Pedagogical Constructs**

****

Source: Fanghanel, J. (2007) Investigating university lecturers’ pedagogical constructs in the working context. *The Higher Education Academy*.

### 

### 5.4.1. Teaching/Research Nexus

Across the transcripts, participants emphasised research as their major institutional function, maintaining that limited institutional policy directions exist for placing teaching as a ‘track’ for promotion (Fanghanel, 2007). Lecturers, consequently, focused on research, as major criteria for career path development at ZHC (Clegg, 2008; Land, 2004; Jenkins, 1996). What follows is an elucidation of participants’ conceptions relating to the teaching/research nexus based on illustrative descriptions excavated from the transcripts:

I think that the criterion for promotion is research and publication. I think that that is not settled. […] I think it lends to better delivery, better understanding from which the student can then benefit. [Participant 01]

Participant (01) recognised the importance of research and publication for promotion but also highlighted the benefits from engaging in research (Poole, 2010). Given the institutional emphasis placed upon enhancing teaching and learning through the CUTL programme (Richlin and Cox, 2004; Boyer, 1990), the participant suggested the teaching/research nexus at ZHC required clarification. Research, however, remained a significant aspect of the participant’s institutional function (Cousin, 2009; Norton, 2009) as it was linked to promotion (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009).

129

One of the reasons why I didn’t do some of what they [meaning facilitators on the CUTL course] suggested because of time concerns [… ] …because there are other responsibilities in the job […] for example, research. [Participant 02]

Participant (02), like participant (01) identified individual challenges of HE teaching (Kreber, 2002), both claiming that teaching responsibilities negatively impacted research time (Lucas *et al*., 2007). Consequently, participant (02) was unable to implement teaching strategies identified in the CUTL programme. Like participant (01), participant (02) implied that research had a higher priority than teaching at the ZHC, and consequently, more academic time was dedicated towards research. Participant (02) made no link between teaching and research, as did participant (01) who suggested that research can inform one’s teaching. Both participants implied that promotion was based on research and publication, not teaching (Fincher and Work, 2006).

I think in our domain, in general, university research is located somewhere between teaching and research. So where do you strike the balance? Something suffered meaning teaching prior to CUTL. I think I have a better idea now. [Participant 04]

Participant (04) identified the institutional recognition of research, as well as teaching, as critical elements of professional practice in ZHC HE environment (Tapscott and Williams, 2010), but questioned the importance MU attached to teaching, given the significant emphasis placed on research and publication for promotion. The participant professed that institutionally, prior to CUTL one, teaching, suffered since lecturers focused generally, on their research (McKinney, 2006).

Participant 06 expressed the current sentiment of many ZHC lecturers, regarding their perception of MU, ZHC administrative/academic officials’ current attitude towards teaching, the CUTL programme, including the teaching–research nexus.

…That is the reality and they [meaning the institution] don’t care [about teaching]. What they [meaning the institution] reward is research, and that is what they promote […]. It’s not about teaching. [Participant 06]

The participant then made the following comment regarding the CUTL programme.

Certainly, CUTL has helped me improved my interfacing with all my students. We tend to dwell on the exams […]. But during the semester we should do more to support student learning. I say this as I remember my days as a mature student in classrooms. [Participant 06]

Participants focused on research and publication given perceived links to promotion. Teaching consequently, played a subservient role (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009). The teaching–research nexus as a consequence, remained a powerful filter through which ZHC lecturers conceptualised their institutional practice (Fanghanel, 2007; Macfarlane, 2004; Gibbs, 2002). Given that MU, according to its strategic plans spanning 2007 to 2017 periods, recognised teaching as critical to improving students’ experience in teaching/learning; it was incumbent upon the institution to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, as it did for research (Tapscott and Williams, 2010).

In the following section, I analyse the filter, rewards and promotion.

### 5.4.2. Rewards and promotion

Across the sample set, all participants articulated that MUZHC Teaching Awards formed the most recognised system of rewards for teaching at the institution (Gibbs, 2005, 2002). Yet, as a filter aligned with Academic Labour (Fanghanel, 2007), the awards were not recognised as meritocratic, as the following illustrative descriptions demonstrated (Secret *et al*., 2012).

I have thought about it, yes […] but I have to say that I have never been keen on submitting a portfolio […] I think that that’s not for me [meaning the institution’s teaching awards]. [Participant 04]

Participant (04) expressed ambivalence regarding submission of a portfolio for the teaching awards programme. This is of major significance. Teaching excellence was a major goal of MU’s mandate (Strategic Plan 2007–2012). The 2012–2017 Strategic Plan identified as a strategic objective: ‘Enhance learning effectiveness by providing students with a more diverse, flexible and multidisciplinary teaching/learning experience’ (p. 58). Yet, as currently implemented, the teaching awards programme demonstrated the propensity that experienced lecturers (in terms of number of years of teaching) were more likely to be selected (Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996). Thus, vacillation persisted among younger ZHC lecturers towards the teaching awards programme (Gurung *et al*., 2008; Walker *et al*., 2008).

Honestly, I think it’s important to recognise those who have worked on this particular area, teaching. […] I think that is the only thing in the university right now that officially recognises someone who works in, you know […], in the teaching and learning stream. I am not saying the other part. [Participant 05]

Participant (05), like participant (04) expressed mixed emotions in describing the experience of the teaching awards. However, the participant, refused to discuss what was described as ‘the other part’. My interpretation of this statement suggested that participant (05) did not wish to discuss ‘the negatives’ about the awards. In keeping with the ethics principles underlying this study; I did not probe, further, pessimistic ideas related to the teaching awards programme.

… No, I won’t. I believe that an award for teaching and learning should come from the department and they ought to be part of that. I should not be submitting or nominating myself or someone else; if I have not sat in their classroom for an entire semester. […] I think that part of that award should be inclusive of the students’ survey. [Participant 01]

Participant (01), unlike colleagues stressed the criticality of department involvement in awarding teaching excellence (Fanghanel, 2007), but like participants (04) and (05) also highlighted serious issues regarding the teaching awards programme. The participant introduced the idea of student evaluations, indicating that the first cycle of investigation regarding evidence of excellent teaching should come from the students one teaches in department, before submission to the institution for consideration of an award. The participant posed the question: ‘How can one be nominated for an award in teaching by a colleague or colleagues who have not sat in your class and observed your teaching’? Participant (01) suggested that some lecturers non–involvement in the programme was principally because of the perception of presumed bias.

### 5.4.3. ICT integration

ICT integration was analysed extensively as a variation of dimension of ZHC lecturers’ practice (pp.123–125); it was also a filter impacting lecturers’ practice (Fanghanel, 2007). ICT integration in teaching/learning was recognised institutionally as a significant feature of 21st century teaching/learning, but barriers exist (Kistow, 2011). Based on participants’ narratives, there appeared to be a lack of consensus by ZHC lecturers of its efficacy in HE teaching, including technical and reliability issues. Concerns relating to increased lecturer workload (participant, 05, p. 124), and lack of student engagement with online material on the LMS because students prefer seat–based education (participant 04, p. 124). These perceptions were negatively impacting ICT integration institutionally at ZHC (Gaffar *et al*., 2011).

Other participants displayed a positive attitude toward ICT integration. For example, participants cited better course delivery (participant, 01, p. 123). Institutionally, the integration of ICT in teaching/learning continues at MU (Siemens and Weller, 2011; Anderson, 2009). However, resistance, based on individual lecturer’s attitude towards technology integration remains (Gaffar *et al*., 2011). Students, on the other hand, expect lecturers to implement some form of blended/on-line learning as part of their teaching/learning sessions (Bates, 2015).

### 

### 5.4.3. Assessment

Previously analysed as a dimension of variation in lecturers’ practice (5.3.4. above); assessment also featured as an institutional filter impacting ZHC lecturers’ practice (Astin, 2012; Fanghanel, 2007). Assessment was recognised as critical to student academic performance, certification and represented a major aspect of MU resource and reputational excellence strategy (Astin, 2012, 1985). Consequently, examination results featured as marketing strategy in the highly competitive, ‘local’, internationalised HE environment. As a function of their institutional practice, lecturers’ current conception of assessment was primarily focused on obtaining excellent student performance (Astin, 2012, 1985). However, assessment at ZHC was traditional, individualistic, and competition–based (Maphosa, and Kalenga, 2012; Astin, 1985). Undergraduate excellent examination performance was rewarded with full post–graduate scholarships.

Current student assessment focus was inadequate, with a tendency to demonstrate current knowledge, not student conceptual development (Boud and Falchikov, 2007; Gibbs and Simpson, 2005). Lecturers in my sample continued to demonstrate a positive attitude towards the long–established traditional HE assessment (Maphosa, and Kalenga, 2012). This is not surprising since, institutionally, MU teaching function involves, principally, transmitting specialised knowledge (Rodriguez, 2008). While attempts continue at improving student assessment, principally as a consequence of lecturers involvement in the CUTL programme; current focus targeted preparing students for examinations (Participant 01, p 123 ); and helping to improve the performance of underperforming students (Participant 02, p.126).

## *5.5. Post–CUTL Support*

Given the link between CUTL, and teaching portfolio development for ZHC teaching awards; participants recognised the requirement for more post–CUTL support, particularly with respect to peer observation. They recognised the criticality of collaboration as a means of fostering excellent teaching.

I don’t think we have enough supporting mechanism after CUTL […]. One of the things is that peer observation process. The fact is, we want post–CUTL support. […]. Maybe encourage us or find some ways to get us to continuing doing good teaching [Participant 02].

CUTL wasn’t anything that I chose to do […]. It was something I resisted […] and didn’t want to do, but I felt well, ok […]. No one came into my classroom to enquire how I was doing […] so I continued to use the old teaching methods. [Participant 05]

Participant (02) like (05) highlighted a serious institutional deficiency in terms of the monitoring of lecturers’ post–CUTL practice. Both participants identified the institutional requirement for post–CUTL support, pointing for department/faculty involvement in teaching/learning. This is in alignment with the literature on institutional support for lecturers (Lucas *et al*., 2007; Kreber, 2002; Healey, 2000). If excellent teaching was to be promulgated, it ought to be supported, as well as rewarded (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). There existed no better substitute (Ramsden and Martin, 1996; Ramsden *et al*., 1995; Gibbs, 1995). ZHC lecturers highlighted the requirement for continuous teaching support, especially by the faculty/department.

## *5.6. Teaching/Learning Research: Departmental Support*

Linked to departmental support of teaching was department/faculty support of HE teaching/learning research. ZHC lecturers’ exposure to CUTL activated their desire for institutional support for HE teaching/learning research. Teaching research required more faculty support for elevation of its status, similar to that of traditional discipline research (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009) as participant (04) observed.

I think they are viewed differently […]. But teaching requires faculty support especially if we are to value it as important in our institution. CUTL is about teaching/learning […] what kind of support do we get for teaching research after […] from our faculty? [Participant 04]

That is the reality and they [the administration] don’t care […]. It is because of how the [university] structure is. […] It’s not about teaching. […] They don’t support teaching research […] Teaching research has to be promoted by the department or faculty. [Participant 06]

Participants (04) and (06) elucidated upon ZHC lecturers’ perception of current lack of institutional support for teaching research. As was discussed on Chapter 3, promotion and tenureship in traditional universities like MU were linked to discipline research and publication (Fincher and Work, 2006). ZHC lecturers, however, were alluding for institutional support for high–quality research on HE teaching/learning (Gibbs, 2005, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996). Such a call was indicative of a ‘broadening of teaching awareness’ and the criticality of teaching research in HE, as a consequence of their CUTL experience (Biggs, 2012).

## *5.7. Communities of Learning and Practice*

Aligned to both the department and discipline filters of the pedagogical constructs model (Fanghanel, 2007), ‘communities of practice’ were slowly beginning to evolve at MU. Two snippets from participants’ narratives provided evidence of the beginning of teaching and research collaborations among colleagues. ‘Communities of practice’ ought also to be encouraged by the department/faculty to provide the enabling environment for sustained research in the SoTL at ZHC (Healey, 2000; Hutchings and Schulman, 1999). Participants (02) and (01) articulated collaboration efforts among colleagues.

I have seen the overall trends you know. […] The less time to prepare is more time to strategize about trends about why some students do badly and some do well. [...] It is one of the research projects I am trying to following up upon […]. That is one of the projects on which I am collaborating with another colleague. [Participant, 02]

What happened is that there were three of us who went through the programame together. We have been through a lot… […]. I would say that we meet at least once per week […]. I co–authored a couple papers. Because we were in the classroom together, we would share research ideas. [Participant, 01]

Given the overwhelming institutional recognition of research and publication as critical elements governing ZHC lecturers’ career path and tenure (Fincher and Work, 2006), collaboration among colleagues was an insignificant feature in lecturers’ professional development at MU. This was principally as a consequence of the traditional competitive approach to faculty status and funding (Vick, 2004), as well as academics competing for recognition and prestige (Martin *et al*., 1998) alluded to in Chapter 3. As more lecturers participate and graduate from the CUTL programme, it is expected that more participants will engage in SoTL research.

## *5.8. Significant Findings*

Overall, the research unearthed two significant findings related to ZHC lecturers’ teaching: (1) *Teacher–focused/content–oriented conceptions of teaching as currently held by ZHC lecturers* (Kember, 1997) and (2) *An almost complete absence of a conception of student learning* (Biggs, 2012). Based on the interview data obtained, lecturers viewed themselves as an *elite* group (Participant 05, p.119) dedicated to educating academically bright students (Biggs, 2012). They also aligned their professional practice as researchers who ‘lecture’ (González, 2011). This conception or pedagogical belief drove ZHC lecturers’ current transmission practice in the current *mass*, globalised HE environment (Milliken, 2004; Barr and Tagg, 1995). Modern trends in HE teaching in the 21st century environment emphasised the generative and transformative models (Rodriguez, 2008; Cannon and Newble, 2002).

With respect to (1) *Teacher–focused/content–oriented conceptions of teaching as currently held by ZHC lecturers*; the following snippets from the interviews demonstrated a traditionalist lecturing focus, providing evidence of lecturers’ current notions of teaching.

At the undergraduate level there is some level of lecturing […] In the first and second year there is lecturing […].(Participant 01 p. 114)

My take on teaching… would be anything to gather knowledge. […] That is what it was before CUTL […]. (Participant 03, p.114)

Maphosa and Kalenga and others challenged the traditional *transmission mode* of instruction in HE (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Gonzalez, 2011; Barr and Tagg, 1995). These researchers positioned the *transformative model* of instruction based on constructivism, and aligned to 21st century university teaching/learning as a viable pedagogical alternative (González, 2011; Kim, 2005; Cannon and Newble, 2002). Rooted in Giroux’s critical theory, they view the *transformative mode* of instruction as a 21st century imperative for HE teaching and learning (Giroux, 2004, 2003, 1998).

Maphosa and Kalenga (2012) further identified traditional roles of the University—*teaching and learning, research and community engagement*, as having receded in the present HE environment. They emphasised that greater emphasis was placed on teaching and learning in the context of HE ‘commercialisation’ and ‘massification’ (Naidoo, 2007; Knight, 2003), and heterogeneous student cohorts inhabiting today’s HE classroom (Biggs, 2012). Other researchers asserted that excellence in teaching/learning required critical reflection to ameliorate practice to current HE requirements (Makondo, 2010; Hart *et al.*, 2000; Brockbank and McGill, 1998). The *transformative model* which engaged students in knowledge production, facilitated life–long learning, and facilitated application of generated knowledge in real life situations, is positioned as more appropriate (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Bligh, 2000). The lecturer in this teaching/learning context, functioned as partner or facilitator, rather than as an instructor, undertaking traditional teaching or lecturing (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Carnell, 2007).

With respect to (2) *an almost complete absence of a conception of student learning*; the following snippets from the interviews provide the evidence of ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of the role of students during teaching/learning sessions.

I don’t give them [students] […] …I give them the minimum amount they need to read […] (Participant 02, p. 117)

I still value the old way […] I still value what I consider the old way [the traditional lecture]. (Participant 05, p. 122)

The ‘disconnect’ between ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching and students’ learning was evident from their narratives. ZHC lecturers’ major emphasis in teaching/learning focused on student examination performance, not student conceptual development or transformation (Astin, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008; González, 2011). Lecturers assumed that because they teach, students ought to learn; a taken–for–granted unproblematised notion (Fanghanel, 2007; Akerlind, 2004; Martin and Ramsden, 1992). Mann, as well as Maphosa and Kalenga commented upon the traditional university’s structure, including disciplinary power, academic culture, and the disproportionate emphasis placed on students’ performativity (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Mann, 2001). In a postcolonial, postmodernist, mass education context, these features lead to non–traditional students’ disconnection from learning and HE (Biggs, 2012; Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Terpstra and Honoree, 2009).

ZHC lecturers were yet to implement teaching aligned to deep learning by their students (Biggs, 2012; Marton and Säljö, 1976), since local lecturers conceived of themselves first, as researchers who teach (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Martin *et al*., 2002, 1998). Teaching was relegated to a ‘non–core’ function (Shapiro, 2006). Some ZHC lecturers have not comprehended the meta–cognitive issues related to Caribbean HE teaching/learning in the 21st century, including knowledge production and application, self–reflection, activist identity, subversive teaching, personal mastery and building shared vision, (Biggs, 2012; Bristol, 2012; Mockler, 2005; Sachs, 2003; Nettleford, 1997; Senge, 1990).

In addition to the constructivist approach to teaching/learning, Dall’Alba and Barnacle argue that HE required an ontological turn which demonstrated HE institutions willingness to ‘engage the whole person: what they know, how they act, and who they are’ (Dall’Alba and Barnacle, 2007, p. 689). In elucidating on the idea of ontological engagement, Barnett and Coate further asserted that it required dynamic citizenship, and engagement with the dogmatic disposition of the world (Barnett and Coate, 2005).

Critical to student and lecturer identity (discussed on chapter 3) within a culture of this ontological engagement, was a reassessment the historically positioned non–traditional students as the ‘other’; whether they be mature students (Askham, 2008), ethnic minorities (Johnson *et al*., 2007), and working class women (Christie, *et al.,* 2005). Such individuals have been portrayed as not possessing the required social, cultural and scholastic capital to effortlessly adapt into the academic environment (Lawrence, 2006). Mann also pointed out that even though less challenging, conventional academic students (Biggs, 2012) may also struggle with identity, and existing as an outsider in the environment of academia (Mann, 2001).

As the research findings indicate, ZHC lecturers’ highest current conception of teaching was located at the *transition point* between teacher–focused and student–focused conceptions, it was not unreasonable to assume that: (1) ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching were not static and (2) As their breadth of awareness of teaching/learning expands, lecturers would transition towards student–focused/learning–oriented conceptions of teaching (Biggs, 2012; Akerlind, 2008). In order to expedite this process of transition, MU ought to undertake institutional arrangements to expose ZHC lecturers to more professional development support.

## *5.9. Conclusion*

In relation to research question 1: *what are the current conceptions of teaching held by some ZHC lecturers?*  My findings revealed that ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching were located in the lower quadrant the teacher conceptions framework, the teacher–focused/content–oriented zone (Kember, 1997). As a consequence current conceptions of teaching held by ZHC lecturers do not align with the consensus from the research literature relating to teacher conceptions of teaching (Virtanen and Lindblom–Ylanne, 2010; Carnell, 2007; Law *et al.,* 2007).

Responding to research question 2: *how has training in SoTL impacted the practice of some ZHC lecturers?* My study revealed that CUTL impacted lecturers’ practice by increasing the use of ICT integration in their teaching/learning, enabling better planning (participant 01, p. 115); restructuring of course content (participants 02, p. 115); enabling better delivery and engagement with students (participants 01, p. 123). Participant (05) however, identified traditional lecturing as adequate, since integrating ICT increased workload (p.125) and conceptualised the teaching function as producing elite leaders (p.119).

In response to research question 3: What do some MUZUC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment? My findings revealed that ZHC lecturers conceived of themselves as academics, research academics who teach (Rodriguez, 2008; Macfarlane, 2004). Institutional arrangements for promotion focused on research and publication, not teaching (Walker *et al*., 2008; McKinney, 2006). Participants believed that teaching was not sufficiently rewarded by the institution (Shapiro, 2006). They were as yet to fully embrace the higher–order demands of teaching such as student conceptual development, and changing student conceptions of the discipline (Biggs, 2012; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Current teaching/learning practice centred around preparing student to pass ‘highstakes’ examinations, a reputational focus (Astin, 2012).

Responding to research question 4: *What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?* My findings revealed that ZHC lecturers’ practice was impacted by four filters: the teaching–research nexus; reward and recognition; technology integration; and student assessment (Fanghanel, 2007). These filters werecritical to lecturers’ professional practice, influencing lecturers’ praxis at the institutional, departmental and individual levels of the university (Fanghanel, 2007). Such filters were critical to lecturers’ identity, agency and professional practice (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001; Bandura, 1997; Marland, 1995). However they recognised the requirement for institutional support in encouraging collaboration, teaching research in the SoTL and fostering ‘communities of practice’ amongst colleagues.

In Chapter 6, I focus on the implications of these findings on lecturers’ current conceptions of practice.

# Chapter 6: Implications and Discussion of Findings: Zion Hill Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching

## *6.1. Introduction*

In Chapter 5, I presented findings related to ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching and variation of teaching practice. The findings revealed that lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching did not entirely converge with that of reported outcomes from the literature (Gonzalez, 2011; Ginns *et al*., 2008; Carnell, 2007; Law *et al.,* 2007; Lindblom–Ylanne *et al*., 2006). ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching resided at the contested, unstable ‘mid–point’ conception—*good student/teacher relations* as identified in Kember’s model (Kember, 1997).

In this Chapter, I shall explore the implications of my findings. My main focus in this study was to isolate and understand current conceptions of teaching held by ZHC lecturers, and to derive insights into the local contexts guiding their professional practice in our current mass HE environment. I begin by exploring implications related to question one.

## *6.2. Discussion of Ideas related to Research Question One:*

*What are the current conceptions of teaching held by some lecturers at Moriah University, Zion Hill Campus*?

As was indicated in the previous chapter, delivery of a *‘good’ lecture* emerged as a major theme across all transcripts. ZHC lecturers’ current highest conception of teaching, *preserving and perpetuating ‘good’ student–teacher relationships* was positioned in the contested midpoint of the conceptions model (Kember, 1997) and consequently, does not align with the general consensus emerging from studies of teachers’ conceptions of teaching (Akerlind, 2003; Murray and MacDonald, 1997; Kember, 1997; Van Driel *et al*., 1997; Gow and Kember, 1993; Martin and Ramsden, 1992).

Emerging from current research regarding ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching are issues of colonial/postcolonial HE development, elitism, power and the traditional function of the university as a producer of specialized knowledge, and cultured individuals mentioned in Chapters 2 and 3 (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Rodriguez, 2008; Campbell, 1997). The overwhelming influence of the postcolonial socio*–*economic and HE environment, buttressed by traditionalist epistemological beliefs, as well as a lack of consensus regarding the efficacy of constructivist pedagogy within our HE sector, continue to torment lecturers’ attitude towards teaching/learning at ZHC (Turner, 2012; Bates *et al*., 2011).

Linked to plantation pedagogy (Bristol, 2012) and plantation economic development (Best, 1968; Williams, 1964) that birthed a hierarchical colonialist society, current HE teaching/learning practices continue to risk disenfranchising the majority of our non*–*traditionalstudents (Deosaran, 2016; Biggs, 2012). Teaching/learning at ZHC is, therefore, in alignment with positivist epistemology, where the university functions as a perpetuator of the *status quo,* (Bristol, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008) as knowledge production is dominated by the expert researcher/teacher, and students function as passive receivers of knowledge (Brockbank and McGill, 1998). As indicated in Chapter 2, the domination of Euro*–*centric philosophy (Emery, 1974), aligned to *elitist* practices within the local HE environment targeting traditional academic students (Biggs, 2012) yielded current conceptions of teaching and practice that were located in the lower teacher*–*focused/content*–*oriented quadrant of Kember’s conceptions model (Kember, 1997).

Given the current delivery focus of ZHC lectures’ teaching/learning, they are yet to fully embrace the collaborative, participatory, technology–integrated, and peer knowledge production implementation of teaching as revealed in the current literature with respect to HE teaching/learning (Biggs, 2012, Bates *et al*., 2011; Carnell, 2007). As such, HE conceptions of teaching as currently demonstrated by ZHC lecturers do not totally converged with the established lower–order to higher–order trajectory (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). To the extent that ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions occupied the lower teacher–focused/content–oriented quadrant of the teacher conception model, does not exclude lecturers’ notions of more complex conceptions of teaching (Boston and Smith, 2009; Rittle-Johnson, *et al*., 2001). The literature also identities the criticality of institutional arrangements that focus on research and publishing as well as teaching, but more importantly, that rewards excellent teaching (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009; Kreber, 2003, 2002). This is significant to raising the profile of HE teaching (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Fanghanel, 2007; Ramsden and Martin, 1996)

Current trends in HE teaching emphasise the generative and transformative models (Maphosa, and Kalenga, 2012; Cannon and Newble, 2002). Here, lecturers and students work closely together (Carnell, 2007). Communication is multi–faceted, between lecturer and students, between students and lecturer, as well as among students (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). Students function at generating [their] own information/knowledge, becoming owners of knowledge (Carnell, 2007). Teaching/learning in the 21st century University is better demonstrated as inter–disciplinary and trans–disciplinary; symbiotic relationships are required between and among disciplines (Ford, 2002). This is differs from the concreteness and inflexibility of discipline–based traditional universities (Rodriguez, 2008). In this context Ford (2002) suggested:

If academic disciplines undermine the very possibility of a coherent worldview, distort what they seek to explain because of the fallacy of misplaced concreteness, and are incapable of addressing real world problems, then the university, if it is to be of real service to society, must find some alternative ways of organizing knowledge (p. 51).

As was evident from participants’ narratives, the research/publication criteria remains significant for ZHC’s tenure/promotion, not teaching (I think that the criterion for promotion is research and publication, participant, 01, p, 129). Lecturers are expected to teach but they conceived that currently, teaching is generally not rewarded as research (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009). In spite of current emphasis on teaching/learning as was evident based on the CUTL programme undertaken by MU; the requirement exists for ZHC institutional arrangements that indicate to all stakeholders lecturers, professional, and administrative staff who also teach, that teaching is recognised and equally rewarded as research and publication (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Rodriguez, 2008; Fanghanel, 2007).

## *6.3. Discussion of Ideas related to Research Question Two*

*How has training in HE teaching and learning impacted the practice of some lecturers at Moriah University, Zion Hill Campus*?

### 6.3.1. Teacher–focused/Content–oriented Practice

Despite exposure to professional development programmes which are mandatory for academic staff, ZHC lecturers’ current practice continues to be essentially traditional, aligning with *teacher–centred/content–oriented* pedagogy (Ramsden, 2003; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). This, I hypothesised, was as a consequence of the late entry of the ZHC into professional development programmes associated with SoTL (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011).

But more significantly, socio–political, historical, cultural, economic, and organisational as well as individual factors, govern student–oriented teaching/learning approaches and curricula implementation, including operationalising learning–centred curricula (Stes *et al*., 2007). Growth and expansion of HE institutional *student–focused/learning–oriented* teaching/learning is multifaceted, complex, reflective and iterative (Hubball and Gold, 2007; Hubball and Burt, 2004; Schniedar and Schoenberg, 1999), and present considerable pedagogical and administrative challenges (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011).

ZHC SoTL programmes were initiated in 2006–2008 involving international collaboration with a foreign university (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011). As was evident from participants’ narratives, many issues abound, including resistance by some faculty to HE teaching/learning training, lack of departmental and faculty post–CUTL support of lecturers, and many lecturers’ perception of their main function in HE as researchers.

### 6.3.2. Historical Influences Impacting Lecturers’ Pedagogy and Practice

As was mentioned in Chapter 2, local HE development and implementation, underpinned by Euro–centric education practice were located in a colonial/postcolonial context (Scott, 2006; Campbell, 1997). Local HE, consequently, promulgated traditional *elite* practices (Campbell, 1997). Lecturers’ identity, self–concept and classroom practice, were as a consequence, influenced by Euro–centric, traditionalist, *elitist* modes of thought and practices (Entwistle *et al*., 2001; Gee, 2001; Gioia, 1998; Rogers, 1969). Haggis, like Biggs asserted that modern university classrooms were occupied by ‘mature’, ‘disadvantaged’, ‘non–traditional’ and ‘overseas’ students, who in many instances were working (Biggs, 2012; Haggis, 2006).

Current students have a different outlook regarding HE (Biggs, 2012). These students, unlike traditional academic students, require different types of teaching/learning engagement beyond the traditional lecture (Biggs, 2012). Traditionalist instructional and transmission teaching methodologies alone, will not suffice in today’s HE classrooms (Garbett and Ovens, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008; Barr and Tagg, 1995; Fox, 1983). A requirement exists for ZHC lecturers to utilise more constructivist, transformational, student–focused/learning–oriented pedagogy in classroom sessions (Hart, 2001; Mezirow, 1996, 1994, 1991; Hargreaves, 1994).

Buttressed by theories of human capital development and modernisation, a country’s socio–economic development was based on investment in its human resources (Becker, 1994/1964; Fagerlind and Saha, 1989; Denison, 1979, 1967; Inkeles and Smith, 1974). HE was thus seen as a vehicle for socio/economic transformation of economies and developing human resources, leading to a country’s development (Tewarie, 2009). It is critical for ZHC lecturers to re–examine their current pedagogical approaches. Such a requirement is necessary to determine the extent to which lecturers’ pedagogical beliefs negatively impact teaching aligned to learners involvement in knowledge production and knowledge application (Carnell, 2007). Research–informed teaching (RIT) is a critical asset in achieving the goals of teaching and research, fundamental to the survival and relevance of the 21st university (Griffiths, 2004).

However, the dilemma facing many ZHC lecturers in terms of pedagogic practice, was their emphasis on the traditional *elitist* teaching (lecturing) in a contemporaryHE environment (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Wareham, 2002) as was evident from their narratives. The reality is, in fact, a dynamic local expanded HE environment which is globalised, ‘*massified*,’ and ‘*commercialised’* (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2002), where the university was mandated by the region’s governments, based on the Grand Anse declaration of 1989, to expand HE access in order to meet the socio–economic and human resource requirements for transformation of Caribbean countries economies (Tewarie, 2009).

The present *mass* education context, underpinned by globalisation, has created tensions within the local ZHC environment where teaching continues to be conceptualised as ‘*lecture delivery’* (Category A identified above). This conception, as the research findings indicated, significantly impacted upon ZHC lecturers’ pedagogic/andragogic practice (Rodriguez, 2008; Knowles, 1973). They function as HE teachers covering the discipline, or delivering content where students function as passive receivers of knowledge (Rogers *et al.,* 2006). Transformational lecturers are facilitators, helping learners to understand/acquire content concepts. A requirement exists for creative, innovative and highly adaptable ZHC lecturers who teach for critical reflective thought (Smith, 2011; Brockbank and McGill, 1998). Such pedagogic approaches to HE instruction, however, require resources, planning, curricular restructuring or changes, hard work and creativity (Mockler, 2005).

## *6.4. Discussion of Ideas related to Research Question Three*

*What do some MUZUC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment?*

### 6.4.1. Researchers vs Teachers

ZHC lecturers perceived their roles and functions as researchers who teach, in keeping with the norms of traditional university lecturers (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Lavia, 2013; King, 1995). In this context, lecturers’ principal role involved undertaking research in their area of specialisation. Teaching was conceived as a subsidiary role (Tapscott and Williams, 2010) as indicated by participant (04) (p. 136). However, the significance of transformative learning for the 21st century learner requires fundamental changes to ZHC lecturers’ traditional perception of teaching and necessitates the intervention of the HE institution (Entwistle and Walker, 2002). In this context Rodger *et al*. (2006) indicated that:

With the rate of information growth continuously accelerating, higher education today must place less emphasis on the amount of material memorised and more weight on making connections, thinking through issues and solving problems….We must move beyond the old university model where the primary challenge of learning was to absorb vast array of specific information(p. 3)*.*

The act of teaching as unearthed from my findings, suggested that ZHC teaching was conceived and aligned to traditionalist conceptions of instruction (Kember, 1997). As was mentioned in Chapter 5, ZHC lecturers conceived their most current significant role, in keeping with their current highest conception of teaching, as engendering ‘good’ student/lecturer relations which was seen as a precursor to post–graduate studies (participant, 01, p.118). However, the modern university requires the production of graduates who know how to learn, not simply how to apply know–how, expertise and principles to real–life settings, but also who are very adjustable to variations in society and are also change agents (Bates *et al*., 2011; Rogers *et al.,* 2006; Mockler, 2005).

Mockler (2005), for example, introduced ideas including ‘new professional learning’, and that of the ‘transformative teacher professionalism’ in the context of [governmental] calls for effectiveness, efficiency, ‘bottom line improvements’ measurability and accountability within a narrow framework of standards and expectations. Though highly contested, teacher professionalism is seen as involving a number of stakeholders, both inside and outside the HE learning institution (Hargreaves, 1998, 1984; Goodson and Hargeaves, 1996). Critical to the professionalism debate is the question of power and control (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Luhmann, 1980). The issue of ‘classical professionalism’, a function of government policy and scholarship focuses on technical knowledge and skills within the [teaching] profession, and allow for measuring against real professions’ (Hargreaves, 1996, 1998; Shulman, 1987). Most outstanding in this approach is (Shulman, 1986) ‘content pedagogical knowledge’ which has influenced the development of ‘professional standards’ while attempting to diminish teaching/learning to scientific certainty (Goodson and Hargreaves, 1996, p. 6). However, Sockett (1987) and others have argued that scientific knowledge used as a foundation for [measuring] teaching, rejects the contextual, emotional, reflective and iterative components of well–executed teaching. In other words, it refutes the craft and artistry of teaching (Mocker, 2005).

Implicit in the concept of ZHC lecturers’ teaching function, discussed in Chapter 3 was the notion of power and its impact in university settings, and implications for students in teaching/learning settings (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Reay and Hinings, 2009; Waring and Currie, 2009; Mintzberg, 1983). Generally, ZHC students’ passive role in teaching/learning hampers knowledge critique and development (Schmidt *et al*., 2010; Martin *et al*., 2002; Martin and Ramsden, 1998). But more significant, was the sterile classroom environment created, where utilisation of lower–order cognitive levels of the learning taxonomy (knowledge, comprehension and application) remained in focus (Krathwohl, 2002; Bloom *et al*., 1956), including a *surface learning* approach (Marton and Säljö, 1984, 1976). Given the emphasis placed on lecturing, higher–order cognitive learning skills (analyzing, creating, evaluating) remained under–utilised in teaching/learning (Anderson *et al*., 2001; Bloom *et al*., 1956).

In our present 21st century context however, a transformative model of HE, aligned to critical social theory is required (Giroux, 1988). This model which suggests that [our] society is unequal in different ways mandates what McAllister *et al*. (2006) argues for as a ‘transformative social agenda [which] demands a commitment to review social injustice and change to the status quo’ (p. 1). The role of HE education—teaching/learning, research and community engagement becomes that of empowering students, thereby reducing the inequalities in society—the control and domination which overtly and covertly manifest themselves through teacher–centered pedagogy (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Lukes, 2005). In this context, the lecturers’ role and function as researchers and teachers possess equal status in the HE environment and are equally rewarded and celebrated (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009).

### 6.4.2. Teaching/Learning: Institutional practice

ZHC lecturers’ institutional practice was aligned to what the lecturer did, not what the student did (Biggs, 2012; Fanghanel, 2007). Lecturers were yet to conceive of their roles and functions as helping students’ knowledge construction, or participation in knowledge–building (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Carnell, 2007), or developing and helping to change students’ conception of the subject discipline (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994).

Such teaching/learning practice was not yet transparently encouraged, especially at the undergraduate level (participant 02, p. 130). Institutional practice was directed towards student performance, not developing or re–conceptualising and reinterpreting subject content (Biggs, 2012; Anderson *et al*., 2001; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Consequently, ZHC lecturers’ institutional practices were focused on teacher–focused/content–oriented teaching (González, 2011). Such an approach represented the less–complex teacher conceptions of teaching (González, 2011; Akerlind, 2003; Kember, 1997; Fox, 1983). Significant emphasis was placed on course restructuring/modification and pre–planning for better delivery of lectures (Participant 01, p. 116).

ZHC lecturers’ institutional practice was linked to their pedagogical beliefs located in the traditionalist, elitist, teacher–focus/content–oriented framework of teachers conceptions model, aligned to elitist education (Kelchtermans, 2009b; Kember, 1997). It is evident that ZHC lecturers’ pedagogical beliefs as presently articulated and constructed, based on their narratives, may not suffice in our present globalised, *mass* education context.

The goal of HE investment, with its emphasis on solidifying the modernizing/developing process of the country helps to provide the human capital necessary to carry out the developing process, making a country’s economy more productive and globally competitive (Tewarie, 2009; Schultz, 1961). This idea of modernising is a function of expanding local HE institutions, adopting modern values, adopting modern behavior, modernising the society, and escalating economic development (Fagerlin and Saha, 2016). Institutional practices consisting principally of lecturing including traditional assessment, are too limited a framework to cater for the extended demands place upon ZHC students by the globalised, interconnected, dynamic HE environment (Bates *et al*., 2011; Fincher and Work, 2006). What is required may be a transformative ZHC lecturer premised on a re-engineering of lecturers’ pedagogic beliefs and practice to align with the *mass* HE environment in which they now function (Longsworth, 2009; Naidoo, 2007).

Institutionally, research at ZHC has maintained its pre–eminence over the other two traditional core functions of the university, teaching and learning, and community engagement(Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Readings, 1996; Gibbs, 1995). However, there is a growing tendency in universities of placing teaching on equal status as research (Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996). Current institutional practice at ZHC conceived research in lecturers’ subject discipline as their primary responsibility (Rodriguez, 2008) and consequently, research and publication, not teaching, have been traditionally recognised and rewarded by ZHC (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009). They are criteria for promotion and tenure at MU. Fundamental adjustments are now been made institutionally, to emphasise HE teaching/learning to align to the current complex, inter connected, technology–mediated, globalised postmodernist mass local HE environment (Hubball and Edwards–Henry, 2011; Ford, 2002; Barnett, 2000, 1999). A significant component of this adjustment is improved teaching which caters for the heterogeneous non–traditional student populations entering MU classrooms (Biggs, 2012; Barnett, 2005; Jules, 2008).

Traditional ZHC institutional teaching/learning practice was implicitly supported by participant 5 who indicated that a major function of HE was the creation of an elite group of graduates, leaders to whom the society could turn to for solutions to the regions’ socio-economic problems (p.119). However, one of the unintended consequences of this approach was the pertepuation of the *status quo* (Bristol, 2012) and the maintenance of the conservative norms of the traditional university (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012), as well as behaviour codes instituted over time (Rodriguez, 2008). Consequently, ZHC lecturers have been slow to re-engineer their institutional practices to adapt to the transformative 21st century HE environment that emphasises contructivist teaching/learning practices which focus on knowledge production as well as application (Rogers *et al*., 2006; Barnett, 1999; Hargreaves, 1994). To achieve this objective, local HE is required to be more transformative and teaching/learning more constructivist and collaborative (Cannon and Newble, 2002). As Tapscott and Williams (2010) suggested:

We believe that if the university opens up and embraces collaborative learning and collaborative knowledge production, it has a chance of surviving and even thriving in the networked global economy (p. 18).

The notion of MU as a ‘research university’ and not a ‘teaching/research university’, continue to negatively impact the efficacy of teaching (Healey, 2003, 2000). Institutionally, therefore, ZHC lecturers will continue to conceive of research as superior to teaching, and accordingly, align their individual professional growth and career path development with research output and publication (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996).

### 6.4.3. Assessment Role

Traditional forms of assessment have been embellished by a repertoire of new innovative methods that include self and peer assessment, portfolios/e–portfolios, presentations, and simulations among others; all of these enriching the HE assessment environment (Sambell, *et al*., 1997). A nexus exists between students’ perceptions of assessment and their approach to learning (Struyven *et al*., 2003). Assessment, consequently, resonates within HE contexts as a significant outcome of students’ learning (Marton and Säljö, 1984, 1976; Ramsden, 1997; Entwistle and Entwistle, 1991).

There exists an inevitable link between a student’s thinking regarding studying/learning and assessment. The approach a student exploits to handle assessments, whether formative and summative is as a consequence, a function of his/her conception of learning (Struyven *et al*., 2003). A student also utilizes his/her present experience regarding assessment and/or evaluation as a predictor for tackling future learning (Struyven *et al*., 2003). A strong link consequently, exists between student learning and assessment. Struyven and others suggested that in relation to perceptions of learning, students identified three approaches; Firstly, surface learning, related to the completion of tasks without personal engagement; and secondly, conceptualising learning *tasks* as related to an external obligation aligned to routine, focusing on memorisation and problem solving associated with procedure (Struyven *et al*., 2003).

Limited conceptual understanding was the obvious outcome of such narrow and restricted approaches to learning (Entwistle *et al.*, 2001; Trigwell and Prosser, 1997; Entwistle and Ramsden, 2015/1983). Thirdly, *Deep learning,* which focuses on conceptual understanding, lead to more significant learning outcomes (Entwistle and Ramsden, 2015/1983; Trigwell and Prosser, 1991). The teaching/learning environment created by the lecturer thus alerts the student to respond by utilising the appropriate approach which would yield the associated learning outcome.

Part of the dilemma facing ZHC students is that they quickly recognise the major emphasis placed on high performance in examinations and tests, to the general exclusion of other forms of more innovative assessments mentioned above. Our most brilliant (traditional academic) students (Biggs, 2012) consequently, focus on the ‘strategic or achieving approach to learning’ (Struyven *et al*., 2001, p. 333) aligned to gaining high grades. In this context, very little alignment to the higher–order conceptions of teaching is undertaken in classroom sessions discussed in Chapter 5, as students target ‘well-organised and conscientious study methods and effective time-management’ to pass examinations (Struyven *et al*., 2001, p. 333).

An essential function of ZHC lecturers was, therefore, to prepare students for end–of–semester examinations (Prosser and Trigwell, 1999; Kember and Gow, 1994). In spite of limited attention given to students conceptual development, lecturers were genuinely concerned about student performance in examinations (Astin, 2012; González, 2011; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Lecturers did prioritise their time to help ‘weak’ students (participant, 02, p. 126), a function aligned to student support,as well as the reputational aspect of assessment (Astin, 1985). The predominance of the ‘lecture’ in local HE was well established (Chapter 3), and in the context of assessment, offered limited success to the non–traditional student (Biggs, 2012). ZHC lecturers also identified assessment as one of their critical functions in teaching/learning (Astin, 1985). Success in traditional examinations resonated among the participants (Participant 02, p.126). It was described as critical to their self–concept and teacher identity (Gee, 2001; Bandura, 1977) (participant 03, p.127).

However, based on the evidence emanating from the literature, the 21st century university environment is characterised by exceptional, scientific market–oriented knowledge systems and networked international economy (Duderstadt, 2009). Among the university’s principal roles is the preparation of graduates to perform adequately in the 21st century global economy (Duderstadt, 2009). Assessment is, therefore, a fundamental aspect of teaching/learning (Astin, 2012). In this context, knowledge acquisition for knowledge sake is essentially useless (Rodriguez, 2008). At ZHC, based on the programme objectives of the CUTL Programme, assessments now target the range of modern innovative approaches, the goal of which is to enhance the performance of all students, not only the traditional academic students (Astin, 2012; Biggs, 2012).

Tapscott and Williams (2010) indicated: ‘Research shows that mutual exploration, group problem solving, and collective meaning making produce better learning outcomes and understanding overall’ (p. 20). It may be argued that this is an ideal position. What was clearly demonstrated by my findings with respect to assessment or examinations was that some ZHC lecturers demonstrated a commitment to helping weak students to improve their performance (participant 02, p. 126). Ultimately, it is expected that ZHC lecturers will emphasise collaborative learning and knowledge production in the teaching learning context, as well as assessment (Carnell, 2007).

## *6.5. Discussion of Ideas related to Research Question Four*

*What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?*

In Chapter 2, I underscored four critical factors influencing local HE in general, and ZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice in particular (Figure 2, p. 35). These were the Euro–centric educational context which governed educational policy development and implementation, colonial/postcolonial educational practice which provided the template for *elitist* educational practice, postmodernist theories also related to local HE pedagogical practice, and globalisation, related to HE expansion and transformation, including its ‘massification’ and ‘commercialisation’ (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2003). Here, I expand the analysis to focus on critical contexts which impacted ZHC lecturers’ practice. I believe that our national schooling/instructional framework needs to be dismantled, and the educational hypotheses, authority interactions including historical control which underpin it ought to be uncovered, evaluated, as well as modified (Myers, 1996).

The local contexts which govern our HE system and lecturers’ teaching/learning practice within it are underpinned by elitism. Fanghanel has identified the elements associated with ‘context’, a function of structure, policies and environment in which lecturers function (Fanghanel, 2007). By so doing the peculiar elements influencing ZHC lecturers’ context of practice in HE can be isolated (Fanghanel, 2007). These elements provide a basis for HE lecturers’ perceptions of teaching, as well as their approaches to classroom practice. Fanghanel further articulated that ‘the context of practice rather than psychological and cognitive processes at work in the act of teaching [….],’ ‘provides a useful insight into the realities of teaching, the structures within which lecturers operate, the communities inhabiting those structures, and the degree of agency’ (Fanghanel, 2007, p. 2).

In other words, an understanding of the contexts in which (local) lecturers function is more pertinent than the psychological or cognitive processes underlying the process of teaching (Dunkin, 2002; Entwistle and Walker, 2002, Hativa and Goodyear, 2002). These contexts enable us to glean a deep awareness of lecturers’ teaching, the institutional structures in which lecturers operate, and the professional communities associated with institutional structures. This understanding also includes their agency—lecturers’ positionality and response to those structures in the context of their teaching/learning (Fanghanel, 2007).

Sachs (2003) in extending this discourse identifies the attributes of transformative or ‘activist’ teacher professionalism which includes the following:

‘Inclusive in its membership; working to a public ethical code of practice; collaborative and collegial; activist in its orientation; flexible and progressive; responsive to change; self-regulating; policy-active; enquiry-orientated and knowledge building’ (p.16).

Sachs further suggested:

‘transformative professionalism should not become an orthodoxy which is imposed on the teaching profession…the move for transformative professionalism must come from the membership of the profession and be supported by other interest groups and stakeholders…its singular strength is that it is concerned with mutual engagement around a joint enterprise, namely improving student learning outcomes’ (p.16).

It is instructive that a local vision of teacher professionalism be articulated from within the HE environment to which all lecturers can subscribe; one that offers a range of student learning opportunities rather than a primary focus on testing and grades.

### 6.5.1. Macro Level Contexts

The *research–teaching nexus,* *academic labour,* and *the institution* are the macro level contexts governing ZHC lecturers’ practice (Fanghanel, 2007). Whereas the *research–teaching nexus* positions ZHC lecturers as researchers, rather than HE teachers (Tapscott and Williams, 2010); *academic labour* was associated with lecturers’ functions as HE teachers whose role was to enhance student conceptual development (Kember, 1997), not merely focusing on assessment or student performance (Astin, 1985).

At the institutional level however, traditional HE practice at ZHC located in a postcolonial, postmodernist, and elitist local environment, privileged student success in learning as excellent performance in examinations (Astin, 2012). In such circumstances, student learning was associated with surface approaches to studying, mainly rote learning, memorisation and reproduction, including a lack of reflection and a corresponding preoccupation with task completion (Marton and Säljö, 1976).

Students generally adopted a strategic approach characterised by emphasis on assessment requirement, lecturer expectations, and effective time management in an effort to achieve high grades (Ramsden, 1992; Biggs, 1993; Marton *et al.*, 1997; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). Such traditionalist approaches to institutional learning, where students engaged in perceived [subject] requirements, not encompassing their being and desires in the subject, while locating responsibility for actions and purposes in an ‘external other’ (Mann, 2001) continues to resonate within the local HE sector . Thus, the location of control of student engagement and perceived [subject] demands, and success criteria rest with external others (Mann, 2001). The negative impact of traditional institutional teaching/learning, consequently, involved alienation from the subject area and study itself (Mann, 2001), as well as surface learning; prompting Säljö (1982) to suggest that, ‘one cannot avoid observing the almost perfect way in which a surface orientation meets the criteria of alienation’ (p. 197).

The 21st century HE environment however, demands an institutional arrangement that recognises and facilitates a transformative model of instruction (Cannon and Newble, 2002) where lecturers and students work closely together and where communication is multi–faceted, between lecturer and students (Carnell, 2007). In this context, students function at generating [their] own information/knowledge, becoming owners of knowledge (Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Cannon and Newble, 2002). Such an approach to learning/teaching underpins constructivism where it is argued that humans generate knowledge and meaning as a consequence of communication between their understandings and their thoughts (Kim, 2005), as well as applying created intelligence in real life circumstances (Cannon and Newble, 2002). The lecturer’s role becomes that of partner or facilitator in the learning process.

My research findings indicate that institutionally, ZHC lecturers require a more sophisticated approach to teaching that positions the student at the centre of the teaching/learning process and lecturer migration to the higher–order conceptions of teaching (Biggs, 2012, 1999; Ramsden, 2003; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). This process was occurring, particularly among lecturers who have participated in the MU professional development CUTL programme which focuses on HE teaching/learning. As the results of my study suggested, ZHC lecturers were generally in transition from the lower–order conceptualisation of teaching on their way to embracing inclusive higher–order teaching/learning conceptions (González, 2011; Kember, 1997). But currently, all ZHC lecturers have not yet aligned their practice to the purpose of HE—the development of a critical being—for personal engagement, inclusion and lifelong learning (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Schmidt *et al*., 2010; Kelly *et al*., 2005).

Institutionally, MU positions research on a higher level than teaching (Fincher and Work, 2006) as lecturers derive more personal and institutional recognition from their research/publication efforts (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). Given the continued emphasis placed on the professional development of ZHC lecturers in teaching/learning, it is likely that MU will reward teaching in a similar manner as research in the immediate future. This will raise the profile of teaching intuitionally, placing it on equal status as research and publication (Gibbs, 2002, 1995; Ramsden and Martin, 1996).

### 6.5.2. Meso Level Contexts

At the meso level, the *faculty, department,* and the *subject discipline/s* were critical filters influencing ZHC lecturers’ practice (Krishnan, 2009)*.* The lecture predominated teaching/learning practice where lecturers’ focus remain targeted towards the traditionalist demands of local *elite* education, excellent examination results (Astin, 2012; Fisher, 2005; Campbell, 1997). Participant (01) underscored the importance of the lecture at undergraduate level (p. 114). The findings of my study indicated the overwhelming utilisation of the transmission and acquisition models of instruction, power–driven and teacher–focused/content–oriented (Cox, 2003; Cox and Richlin, 1993).

Buttressed by the colonial/postcolonial template for university teaching/learning inherited from the British, and implemented by MU, ZHC lecturers’ context of practice at the *department* and *subject discipline* levels target the disciplinary approach to knowledge transfer (Sockman and Sharma, 2008; Hart *et al.*, 2000). Seven faculties exist; disciplines have been competitive, and may be considered as more important than others, which impact funding and status (Vick, 2004). Funding also impact lecturers/academics who compete of recognition and prestige (Martin, 1999), a function of research and publication, not teaching (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). This idea was expressed by participants (01, 02, and 04), whose narratives suggested the institutional recognition of research above teaching, as a significant criteria for promotion (pp. 129–130). The notion was further expanded by participant (06) who identified the institutional emphasis placed on research (p.131).

Such approaches to local HE teaching were aligned to the traditional university as a transmitter of specialised knowledge of the faculties, where teaching was inevitably linked to the *faculty, department,* and the *subject discipline/s* (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Krishnan, 2009; Rodriguez, 2008)*.* In this context, MU like other universities, utilise the faculty system and departments as the internal agencies to impart specialised knowledge in different independent disciplines (Sockman and Sharma, 2008).

Transformative learning, a significant theme emanating from the literature regarding 21st century HE teaching techniques at faculty and department levels go beyond the traditional lecture (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Tapscott and Williams, 2010; Rodriguez, 2008). They include activities to stimulate thought and debate, the use of confrontational questioning techniques challenging beliefs and assumptions, and problem solving strategies that help student conceptual development, and eventually change student conceptions of the subject area and the world (Smith, 2011; Rogers *et al*., 2006;Rodriguez, 2008). Such approaches emphasise knowledge acquisition, enable solving of real life problems, not simply knowledge acquisition for knowledge sake. In addition, is the emphasis on critical reflection, targeting students’ experiences (Smith, 2011). Critical reflecting in this context implies integrating new knowledge with original knowledge and pursuing action on insight/s gained, an essential component of adult learning (Brookfield, 1998; Ecclestone, 1996, Senge, 1990).

New methods of HE teaching also involve the use of diary keeping and reflective journals, allowing learners whether as individuals or groups to be more responsible, independent and creative (Tarin and Puyol, 2004). Students are required to transition beyond simplistic descriptions and ultimately, to question existing assumptions, values and perspectives (Cranton, 1996). University teaching in these contexts extends beyond delivery of lecture, delivery of information and the lecturer’s conceptions of the subject, categories of current ZHC lecturers’ teaching conceptions unearthed from my analysis. Such constructivist teaching enhances knowledge reproduction, leading to students ultimately critiquing knowledge (Smith, 2011).

Yet, the traditional university, in continuing to protect its heritage and intellectual mystique including deportment conventions, constructed over epochs (Rodriguez, 2008), is not easily susceptible to change (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012). The dilemma facing ZHC lecturers with respect to teaching/learning (academic labour) is aligned to tradition as well as individual beliefs (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001), including cultural and behaviour codes based on historical *elitist* development and implementation at MU (Rodriguez, 2008; Campbell, 1997). Although the transformative models of instruction require resources, is time consuming, and is premised on curricular redesign, including the use of technology integration; the extreme conservatism displayed by our university may be misplaced in the present globalised, *mass* education context (Kim, 2009; Naidoo, 2007; Duderstadt, 2009). Institutional, as well as faculty/departmental support is necessary to drive the change required to advance teaching/learning at the faculty/departmental levels at MU, ZHC (Terpstra and Honoree, 2009; Gibbs, 2005, 2002).

### 6.5.3. Micro Level Contexts

Academic or *pedagogical beliefs*, aligned to teacher identity and personal beliefs, a function of a teacher’s PIN (Kelchternmans, 2009a, 1993) are fundamental to understanding lecturers’ practice. A lecturer’s belief about teaching, accordingly, governs his/her classroom practice (Turner, 2012; Gee, 2001). As was identified in Chapter 3, teacher identity including teacher beliefs, represent the ‘starting blocks’ for investigating belief formation which in turn in influences a lecturer’s professional practice, including perceptions about teaching, student learning and assessment (Kelchtermans, 1993). Consequently, Kelchtermans, articulated the view that self–understanding and subjective educational theory may be considered as inextricable from the deep–seated notions an individual holds about being a teacher (Kelchtermans, 1993).

Findings from my study suggested that ZHC lecturers’ pedagogical beliefs were aligned to their perceived function as academics who did research (Kelchtermans, 2009b; Martin, 1998 Goodson and Hargreaves, 1996). Their professional practice was implemented as HE teachers who performed an institutional function, teaching and was, accordingly, aligned to lecturing (Hativa and Goodyear, 2002). Lecturing in a ZHC lecturer’s context, therefore, involved delivering information and/or expert knowledge to students; delivering lecturers’ conceptions of the discipline to students; and ultimately, encouraging good student/lecturer relationships; such notions forming the lower–levels conceptions of teaching (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Throughout the sample participants articulated the idea of delivering a lecture to students (Fisher, 2005; Dunkin, 2002).

They excluded in their narratives the higher–order conceptions of teaching gleaned from the literature related to teaching as facilitating learning, teaching as collaborating with students in knowledge production, and teaching as developing and changing students’ conceptions of the discipline (Lindblom–Ylanne *et al*., 2006; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994)

Fanghanel further asserted that pedagogical beliefs are agentic and amenable to ‘ideological positioning’s (Fanghanel, 2007, p. 11). In this context, ZHC lecturers’ beliefs impacted their conceptions of student learning, student intelligence, motivation, the institutions’ student body, curriculum design and implementation, and in significant ways, delineated how lecturers conceptualised, as well as approached their practice (Fanghanel, 2007). For example, Participant (01) spoke to redesigning the course for better delivery (p. 123) while participant (02) spent time focusing on weaker students to ensure better performance (p.126).

Building on Kelchtermans analysis with respect to the concept of identity, Beijaard, like Gee, analysed and explored teacher identity which was located within a teacher’s practice (Beijaard *et al*., 2004; Gee, 2001). Gee proposed four elements of identity: nature, institution, discourse and affinity (Gee, 2001). Beijaard also identified four familiar characteristics aligned to teacher identity,including teacher classroom practice, development of the skill–sets to becoming a teacher, and defining one’s teacher self by one’s teaching practice(Beijaard *et al*., 2004). A significant nexus, therefore, exists between the lecturer’s occupation and identity (Nias, 1989) where the lecturer occupies the epicenter of the profession, focusing on who he/she is, simultaneously deriving a professional identity (Kelchtermans, 2009b; Greene, 1981).

Accordingly, ZHC lecturers conceptualised themselves as an *elite* group within the local HE community, a function of their *institutional identity* from which they derived their power and authority (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Gee, 2001; Campbell, 1997). Emanating from their beliefs, ZHC lectures positioned themselves as knowledge experts, defining themselves by their research, not teaching (Gioia, 1998). Their current teaching function in the context of individual beliefs and identity, as well as professional practice (Kelchtermans, 2013, 2009b; Turner, 2012; Brockbank and McGill, 1998) focused principally on transmission instruction to achieve excellent student performance (Astin, 2012, 1985). However, lecturers continue to increase their breath of awareness of HE teaching/learning given their exposure to MU CUTL professional development programme.

## *6.6. Conclusion*

Given the above discourse related the implications of ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching and practice aligned to their current pedagogical beliefs; it is evident that such professional practice as presently implemented, may not fully suffice in our present mass education context (Deosaran, 2016). The traditionalist, teacher–centric, teacher–focus framework of teaching/learning, aligned to elitist education requires disruption and re–engineering to become more transformative and student–centric (Kim, 2005; Cannon and Newble, 2002; McAllister *et al*., 2006). This vision of lecturer professionalism differs from the instrumentalists discourses by providing [dialogue] spaces and learning opportunities for students, rather than a primary focus on ‘what works’ and on testing impositions from faculty and/or HE institutions. This is the vision that hopefully, all ZHC stakeholders may work towards achieving.

In Chapter 7, l focus on conclusions and recommendations associated with this research.

# Chapter 7: Conclusion and Recommendations

## *7.1. Introduction*

This study focused on interrogating certain ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching. More specifically, the research focused on investigating 4 research questions. Research question 1: *What are the current conceptions of teaching held by some lecturers at MUZHC?* The research findings unearthed four categories of teaching conceptions held by ZHC lecturers. Category A: delivering a ‘good’ lecture to students; Category B: delivering structured discipline content/knowledge to students; Category C: delivering lecturer’s conceptions of the subject area; and Category D: preserving and perpetuating ‘good’ lecturer/student relationships. As indicated in Chapter 5, *preserving and perpetuating ‘good’ student–teacher relationships* was ZHC lecturers’ current highest conception of teaching. This is a contested conception (Samuelowicz and Bain, 1992) that does not aligned with studies emanating from the literature (Akerlind, 2003; Kember, 1997).

In response to research question 2: *How has training in HE teaching and learning impacted the practice of some lecturers at MUZHC?*  The findings indicated that despite professional development programme implementation at MUZHC lecturers’ current practice aligns essentially with *teacher–focused/content–oriented* pedagogy (Kember, 1997). This was representative of the issues identified in Chapter 2 with respect to local HE development and implementation, including Euro–centric education practice, and the colonial/postcolonial contexts dominating local HE (Scott, 2006; Campbell, 1997) underpinned by *elitist* modes of thought and practice (Gee, 2001; Gioia, 1998).

With respect to research question 3: *What do some MUZHC lecturers perceive as their roles and functions in a globalised HE environment?* The research findings suggested that in keeping with norms of the traditional university (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Lavia, 2013; King, 1995), ZHC lecturers perceived their roles and functions in HE as researchers. Teaching was conceived as a subsidiary role (Tapscott and Williams, 2010).

Inresponse to research question 4: *What local contexts influence some MUZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning practice?* The research findings revealed that ZHC lecturers’ institutional practice were impacted by macro level contexts including the *research–teaching nexus,* *academic labour,* and *the institution*; meso level contexts including the *faculty, department,* and the *subject discipline/s,* and *micro level contexts* including *academic* or *pedagogical beliefs* (Fanghanel, 2007) which were aligned to lecturers’ identity and personal beliefs, and lecturers’ PIN (Kelchternmans, 2009a, 1993).

## *7.2. Zion Hill Lecturers’ Current Conceptions of Teaching*

ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching as excavated from the transcripts revealed a related and relational hierarchy that was teacher–focused/content–oriented, progressing from content delivery (lower–order) to ‘good’ student–teacher relations (transition point) (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Of particular interest was the contested Category (D) (Samuelowicz and Bain, 2001; Prosser *et al*., 1994) which occupied a transitionary position between the lower–order, teacher–centric conceptions, and higher–order, student–centric conceptions. Underpinning these conceptions of teaching held by ZHC lecturers was a focus on delivering a ‘good’ lecture, aligned with the concept of the instructional paradigm used in traditional HE (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Fisher, 2005; Barr and Tagg, 1995). This was linked to colonial/postcolonial HE implementation discussed in Chapter 2 (Campbell, 1997; Williams, 1964). Such conceptions of teaching were also aligned to ZHC lecturers’ personal beliefs, pedagogical practice, and teacher identity (Turner, 2012; Kelchternmans, 2009b, 1993; Gee, 2001)

ZHC lecturers’ identity, as well as professional practice(Beijaard *et al*., 2004) was aligned to facilitation of teacher–focused activities, delivering information, providing structured syllabus content, providing lecturers’ knowledge of the subject area, and ultimately seeking good student–teacher relationships; typical lecturers’ functions associated with traditional ‘*elite*’ HE (Rodriguez, 2008; Campbell, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). Data from the transcripts revealed minimal teaching/learning focus on higher–order conceptions of teaching, critical to student conceptual development and student transformation (González, 2011; Cannon and Newble, 2002). ZHC lecturers’ dimension of variations in practice was aligned to 4 functions: (a) the lecturer’s role; (b) the student’s role; (c) use of ICT and (d) student assessment. Implicit in these functions were lecturers’ conceptions of teaching associated with their agency, self–efficacy and positionality (Fanghanel, 2007; Bandura, 1977) which defined their traditional roles and functions as university lecturers (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Rodriguez, 2008)

## *7.3. Recommendations*

Based on analysis of participants’ narratives, the research findings unearthed ZHC lecturers’ preference for: (a) a review of the ZHC CUTL programme and an approach to teaching which transparently imply to staff and other stakeholders that teaching is recognised and rewarded; (b) ongoing monitoring and supporting of teaching staff post–CUTL practice; (c) a re**–**engineering of the teaching awards programme to include opportunities for recognition of early–career lecturers’ teaching; (d) departmental support for research into teaching/learning; and (e) encouragement of academic staff to form ‘communities of practice’.

### 7.3.1. A review of the ZHC CUTL programme which transparently implies to staff and other stakeholders that teaching is recognised and rewarded.

With respect to recommendation (a), participant 06 expressed the current sentiment of many ZHC lecturers, regarding their perception of the institution’s administrative/academic officials’ current attitude towards the CUTL programme.

…That is the reality and they [meaning the institution] don’t care [about teaching]. What they [meaning the institution] reward is research, and that is what they promote […]. It’s not about teaching. [Participant 06]

The participant then made the following comment regarding the CUTL programme.

Certainly, CUTL has helped me improved my interfacing with all my students. We tend to dwell on the exams […]. But during the semester we should do more to support student learning. I say this as I remember my days as a mature student in classrooms. [Participant 06]

Given that MU, according to its strategic plans spanning 2007 to 2017 periods, recognised teaching as critical to improving students’ experience in teaching/learning; it was incumbent upon the institution to demonstrate a commitment to cognitive areas of teaching/learning (Biggs, 2012), as it did for research (Tapscott and Williams, 2010). Institutionally, a revamped and expanded CUTL programme with the appropriate campus–wide recognition and faculty support would telegraph to all MU stakeholders that the SoTL is significant, and is now an active institutional agenda, promulgating the paradigmatic shift from teacher–centred teaching to learner–centred teaching (Dall’Alba and Barnacle, 2007; Cannon and Newble, 2002**;** Kember, 1997).

### 7.3.2. Continuous monitoring and supporting of teaching staff post–CUTL practice

Linked to post­–CUTL support, identified and analysed in Chapter 5, this recommendation constituted the second element of required ZHC institutional engagement for the transformation of the SoTL. Lecturers alluded to the absence of institutional or departmental support for teaching/learning in their narratives. They lamented that after receiving valuable knowledge from the CUTL course they return to their traditional teaching/learning environments, which as participants (2) and (5) suggested, inhibit implementation of new approaches to teaching [the institutional constraints and mechanisms for promotion] (Fanghanel, 2007). There is a requirement for more post–CUTL support, including peer observation, and a department/faculty commitment to enhancing the physical environment for lecturers’ to engage in modern teaching practices. (see snippets on p. 135)

### 7.3.3. Re–engineering of the teaching awards programme to include opportunities for recognition of early–career lecturers’ teaching.

Linked to Rewards and Promotion of Chapter 5, the third recommendation targets ZHC teaching awards as currently existing, and early–career ZHC lecturers. Participants (04, p. 132) and (01, p.133) identified weaknesses within the current processes utilised for the submission of an e–portfolio for the teaching awards programme. Given lecturers’ dissatisfaction with current processes for gaining a teaching award, and the lack of recognition of early–career lecturers’ teaching in the context their e–portfolio development as gleaned from their narratives; early– career ZHC lecturers, in particular, called for a more transparent process for accessing the awards.

Institutionally, the re**–**engineering of the ZHC teaching awards programme ought to include opportunities for recognition of both experienced lecturers, as well as early–career lecturers, critical to raising the visibility of teaching within MU. Essential requirements involve a more inclusive awards system that rewards all categories of lecturers. Updated processes ought to include students’ evaluation of their lecturers’ teaching, and department/faculty involvement in the first round of nomination of potential recipients as suggested by participant (01) (p. 133).

### 7.3.4. Departmental support for research into teaching/learning

Linked to the department filter of Fanghanel’s model, recommendation (d) involved ZHC lecturers making a call for MU to emphasise teaching/learning research. They telegraphed their concern that the institution placed more emphasis on traditional research, making it a significant feature of lecturers’ career path progression (Fincher and Work, 2006). Yet institutionally, ZHC lecturers were mandated to complete the CUTL programme which focused on HE teaching/learning. However, there was little or no departmental/faculty support for research into teaching/learning, a critical aspect of developing the SoTL (Healey, 2003, 2000).

Participants (04) and (06) articulated the view that institutionally, research is held in higher esteem than teaching, and faculties/departments currently provide little or no support to promote teaching research. They were implicitly making a call for the institution to raise the profile of teaching research across faculties in keeping with the tenets of improving the SoTL and making teaching as significant as research at MU. (see snippets on p. 136).

### 7.3.5. Encouragement of staff to form ‘communities of learning and practice’

Recommendation (e) ‘communities of practice’ was also associated with post–CUTL support in the promulgation of the SoTL at MU (Healey, 2003, 2000). Given their CUTL experience, ZHC lecturers recognised the significant value of collaboration in research related to the SoTL (Kreber, 2002). Collaboration in all aspects of teaching/learning was fundamental to their professional growth and development, including the ‘intra’ and ‘inter’ faculty enhancement of ‘communities of practice’ (Mcdonald and Carter–Steel, 2016; Authur, 2016). Institutionally, such communities continue to expand as a result of lecturers’ CUTL experience. Participants (01) and (02) have suggested in their narratives collaboration in research projects. This is an institutional requirement for MU to raise the profile of teaching/learning research (Poole, 2010). Collaborative research was consequently, a critical requirement for sustaining lecturers’ professional development in the SoTL within MU. But more significantly, it was through collaboration that ‘communities of practice’ in faculties/departments would be sustained (Authur, 2016) (see snippets on p.137).

## *7.4. Why is This Research Significant?*

In Chapter 3, I argued that Euro–centric contexts dominated ‘conceptions of teaching’ research (Smith, 2013; Guba and Lincoln, 2005; Scheurich, 1997). My study proffers a Caribbean perspective (Best, 2004; Sankatsingh, 1988). Given the historical context in which the region’s HE was established and perpetuated as discussed in Chapter 2; a dilemma exists between traditional postcolonial/post–independence imperatives of *elite* education, and the realities of a globalised, market–driven *mass* education environment governing current HE expansion (Jules, 2011, 2008; Longsworth, 2009; Milliken, 2004). Implicit in traditional HE, was the extension of postcolonial domination of ideas, religion, power–relations, customs, beliefs and more critically, political and economic institutions (Bristol, 2012; Lavia, 2012; Best, 2004, 1968). Education was the institution authorised to enforce such colonial/postcolonial mandates; the teacher as such, became the agent of continuity, preservation and maintenance of the ‘ideal’ of colonial thinking (Bristol, 2012). A re–orientation of ZHC lecturers’ teaching/learning beliefs, including professional practice was, as a consequence, a major HE institutional imperative (Rodger *et al*., 2006; Kim, 2005).

Conceptions of teaching currently held by the sample of ZHC lecturers confirm the dilemma local HE faces in the context of a globalised, complex, HE environment (Barnett, 2005; 1999; Nettleford, 1997). HE reform and expansion, I would argue, continues to be linked and influenced by our historical plantation society experience (Bristol, 2012; Best, 1968; Beckford, 1971), where its ideology continues to contaminate institutional educational development, as well as individual teaching/learning practices (Jules, 2008; Nettleford, 1997). I would also advocate the research findings validate my contention that local HE teaching was based on traditionalist ‘*elitist*’ modalities of thinking, practice, policy prescriptions and implementation (Nettleford, 1997; Baksh, 1986; Williams, 1964) as indicated in the following snippets.

… I am trying to create a group of elite people who can be leaders and that can be turned to for answers […] [Participant 05]

The major focus targeted student access and performance, but not equity (Campbell, 1997; Barr and Tagg, 1995; Baksh, 1986) as established in Chapter 2.

…and huge for me is a 100 students. […] …for some people it is 400 students and up. [Participant 04]

Thus, I argue that this research was significant, given its findings that suggested ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching were aligned, generally, to the exclusive lower–order conceptions domain (Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994). This may be perceived as a function of socio–historical, Euro–centric epistemology, ontology and axiology perpetuating local practice (Haggis, 2006; Milliken, 2004; Scheurich, 1997). The research findings may provide an impetus for approaches to local HE professional development programmes that focus on meta–cognitive issues surrounding lectures beliefs, identity and conceptions influencing individual practice, not merely teaching skills (Jung, 2014; Turner, 2012; Kelchtermans, 2007; Gee, 2001).

The research, therefore, filled an identified lacuna between historical teaching practices related to the maintenance of traditional socio–cultural, political and economic ‘status quo’ within postcolonial society, and teaching/learning requirements of the globalised, *mass,* HE environment (Fanghanel, 2007; Ashwin, 2006; Haggis, 2006). This study also pointed to the pedagogical requirements for teaching/learning in an expanded 21st century local HE sector, operating in a technology–infused, globalised context (Maphosa and Kalenga, 2012; Bates, *et al*., 2011; Rodriguez, 2008). Access to HE was historically a major stumbling–block for the urban–rural lower–class (Baksh, 1986). Local HE targeted the upper–class and middle–class students, aligned to the goal of the creation of an ‘educated elite’ (Campbell, 1997).

More fundamentally, local HE reform/expansion was inevitably linked to the ‘plantation metaphor’ which limited human resource development potential within the local society (Bristol, 2012; Best, 1968). Post–independence HE implementation, undertaken in the island utilised the traditional structures, policy prescriptions, pedagogy and academic curriculum (Best, 2004; Campbell, 1997). Critical to any understanding of local HE implementation was an acknowledgment the insidious ways our history prevailed though educational beliefs, traditional practices, classroom organisation and assessment, and as my research findings suggest, lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching (Bristol, 2012; Campbell, 1997; Beckford, 1972). Such practices undermined individual/collective ambitions and HE reform as analysed through a filter of ‘postcoloniality’ (Bristol, 2012; Nettleford, 2003, 1997).

At a more conceptual level, the challenge for local HE lecturers is to reoriented traditional perceptions of power/authority and praxis to help subvert colonial/postcolonial/neo–colonial education, while simultaneously fulfilling their legal teaching/researching requirements (hooks, 1994). HE teaching/learning in this context becomes ‘a process of critical and cultural development’ (Bristol, 2012, p. 120) and a ‘political commitment [to higher] education as practice of freedom’ (hooks, 1994, pp. 3–4).

The research implicitly makes a call for action—interrogation of the taken–for–granted notions of teaching/learning (Bristol, 2012). This also includes a re–calibration of teaching and learning strategies to align with the requirements for transformation of the local HE sector to cater for the diverse needs of student cohorts engaged in HE (Biggs, 2012; Jules, 2011, 2008; Nettleford, 2003, 1997). The burden of action is placed on the lecturer, whether individually or as a community of professionals. As Bristol (2012) indicated:

Within a critical professional community [HE] teachers would be better able to identify structures of colonialism, relations of power and the spaces of tension within which they operate. [HE] Teachers could then respond to the practices which determine the reproduction of imperial knowledge with the pedagogical force of teaching as critical cultural consciousness (p. 145).

The significance of this study, therefore, was in providing a platform for ZHC lecturers to interrogate their beliefs and professional practice, and seeking to identify teaching/learning research as legitimate, given the complexity that exists in the local HE environment (Biggs, 2012; Bristol, 2012; Barnett, 2005, 2000; Best, 1997; Nettleford, 1997). A lecturer’s conception of teaching, as argued in Chapters 3 and 4 was a function of his/her identity (Kelchtermans, 2009b; Gee, 2001); beliefs (Thompson, 1984), professional identity (Beijaard *et al*., 2004) which guided his/her approach to teaching. Such conceptions and teaching practice also mediated and influenced students’ learning and performance (Entwistle, 2000). Any effort at alerting a lecturer to reflect upon, and consider the impact of his/her approach to teaching, while simultaneously increasing his/her breadth of awareness of the complexity of teaching/learning, and underlying theories governing approaches to teaching, should enhance that lecturer’s conception of teaching and hence, his/her classroom practice (Wisehart, 2004).

## *7.5. My Research: Conceptual Issues and Theories Elucidated*

In addition to analysing teachers’ conceptions of teaching, this research illuminated other theoretical concepts impinging the approach to local HE implementation and lecturers’ practice: gobalisation, power, and postcolonialism. In Chapters 2 and 3, a succinct elucidation of globalisation from a HE perspective, and the globalisation concept itself were undertaken. I identified major research associated with the concept, providing a range of perspectives including the concept’s contestation (Acker, 2004; Guillen, 2001); political transformations, transnational corporation growth and cultural effects (Giddens, 1999); sociological perspective (Castells, 2000); feminist standpoint, (Acker, 2004); and cultural perspective (Block, 2004; Jensen, 2003). I explored the world–wide paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1970) amplified by globalisation, resulting in unyielding, constant, unrelenting and dynamic change (Toffler, 1983, 1970) together with the reconceptualisation of the university as an institution for producing the human resources (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985; Schultz, 1961), linked to a competitive, aggressive international globalised marketplace.

I also explored the metaphor of ‘change’ as a fundamental concept associated with globalisation which has transformed traditional HE from its elitist moorings into modern mass education, linked to human resource development and socio–economic transformation of societies. I argued that the post–1995 transformation of HE into a tradable service has engendered the ‘commercialisation’ and ‘massification’ of HE (Naidoo, 2007, 2003; Knight, 2003, 2002). I also argued that local lecturers’ agency, beliefs, self–efficacy, and positionality, as well as conceptions of teaching which were essentially located in the traditional, modernist, historical, postcolonial, and elitist HE have been challenged (Lavia, 2013; Bristol, 2012; Gee, 2001, Bandura, 1997). I suggested that the local HE environment is epitomised by notions of uncertainty and supercomplexiety (Barnett, 2000, 1999), all as a consequence of the impact of globalisation (Knight, 2013; Milliken, 2004).

From a Caribbean perspective, I focused on globalisation contestation in the literature, its deleterious effects, both historically, and in our present context (Best, 2004; Girvan, 1999; Nettleford, 1997; Beckford, 1972), mentioning its negative impacts on the region such as evolution the plantation system, slavery, mercantilism, as well as the decimation of the region’s indigenous population and the legacy of disintegration and fragmentation within the region, (Best, 2004, 1968; Giddens, 1999; Williams, 1964).

### 7.5.1Power

I explored the significance of power in the context of social science research and in teaching/learning. In my conceptualization of power, I focused on traditional themes including a general theory of power (Hüther and Krücken, 2013); informal power and legitimate power (Diefenbach *et al*., 2009; Clegg *et al*., 2006); and on the new conceptualisations of power emanating from recent research, including themes such as power as domination, and power governing human and social relations (Lukes, 2005; Foucault, 2002, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984).

In the context of university settings, I explored three frameworks of power including *organisational power* and *personnel power* (Luhmann, 1980), and *resource power* (Mintzberg, 1983). I also explored the theory of *counter power* (Reay and Hinings, 2009; Waring and Currie, 2009; Mintzberg, 1983) which helps sustain the balancing of power between administrations and academics in university environments.

The third concept of power elucidated upon was that of power relations. Two frameworks were explored (1) Traditional power dynamics operating institutionally, departmentally and individually; and (2) power from the context of TLRs. Power, a function lecturers exercise in professional development programmes undertaken by universities impacted their conceptions of themselves, their teaching ideology, their TLRs and was significant to their perception and acceptance of such programmes (Trowler and Cooper, 2002).

### 7.5.2. Postcolonialism

Explored from the context of HE, the major themes emerging regarding postcolonialism were ‘ambivalence’ (Bhabha, 1994) and ‘disconnection’ (Smith, 2013). Ambivalence was explored from the context of the unwillingness by western universities to legitimize indigenous knowledge or indigenous intellectuals resulting in discourses of identity, authentic local knowledge, and tensions surrounding the center—the imperial country or the periphery—the colony (Rivera, 2006; Spivak, 1990). Ambivalence was also explored from the contexts of the unwillingness of local elites to validate anything ‘local’, including HE intellectual output (Chang, 2005), and the national bourgeoisie or validating elite maintaining socio–economic, cultural and political hegemony in the decolonised island (Torres–Saillant, 2005; Best, 2004; Heron, 2003; Fanon, 1965/1961).

Regarding the postcolonial discourse, analysis focused on the perspective of recalibrating traditional Euro–centric output from Caribbean–centric positions, and on output from Caribbean intellectuals, placing the region at the centre, rather than at the periphery of the discourse (Thomas, 1974; Girvan, 1973; Best and Levitt, 1969; James, 1938). The objective was to forge new lines of discourse, interpretations, and production of new forms/methods of solutions to the political, economic, socio–cultural and psychological oppression still threatening the Caribbean (Girvan, 2012; King, 2000; Best, 2004, 1968).

### 7.5.3. Teaching/Learning

I utilised Kember’s (1997) teachers’ conceptions model (Chapter 5) to explore ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching, focusing on the conceptions continuum from lower–order, terminating at higher–order conceptions (student–focused/learning–oriented teaching). The *pedagogical constructs* model (Fanghanel, 2007), was utilised as a mechanism for identifying local contexts governing ZHC lecturers’ teaching. I illuminated upon lecturers’ notions regarding the teaching–research nexus, academic labour, assessment, and ICT integration as critical local perspectives influencing lecturers’ practice.

## 

## *7.6. Reflections, Processes and Outcomes*

In spite of the concerns and uncertainty generated by challenges during the research; I nevertheless, feel positive about my approach to this basic interpretive qualitative study. Reflecting on the processes and outcomes, I believed that I was able to achieve the aims of the project, investigating: (1) the current conceptions of teaching held by ZHC lectures; (2) the impact of professional development training on their practice; (3) lecturers’ perceptions of their roles and functions in a globalised mass education context; and (4) local contexts which govern ZHC lecturers’ practice. With respect to (1), the use of the basic interpretive framework discussed in Chapter 4 allowed me to unearth data from semi–structured interviews with participants (Rots, *et al*., 2012; Merriam, 2009; Shank, 2002), utilising the *seven–step guide* (Dahlgren and Fallsberg, 1991).

These methods assisted me in undertaking the detailed analysis of transcripts from which categories of lecturers’ conceptions emerged. With respect to (2) and (3), lecturers’ narratives allowed me to glean their perceptions of the MUZHC CUTL programme, and their perceptions of roles and functions with respect to teaching in our current HE education environment. To understand (4), local contexts impacting lecturers’ practice, the *pedagogical constructs model* (Fanghanel, 2007) was employed, enabling examination of the institutional, departmental and individual filters influencing ZHC lecturers’ practice, as discussed in Chapter 6.

### 7.6.1. Delimitations

The research project is delimited to the ideas and experiences of local academics at a local campus of a regional university in the Caribbean. The investigation is also delimited by the singular involvement of lecturers teaching both undergraduates and graduate students. Such lecturers participated in the ‘one–year’ certificate course—CUTL offered by the institution. Excluded from this sample were professional teaching staff, graduate teaching assistants and other individuals in supervisory positions interested in teaching or who tutor students.

### 7.6.2. Limitations

This research targeted the conceptions of teaching held by academics after completion of a ‘one–year’ CUTL programme. The study was undertaken in a university in the English speaking Caribbean. Given the limited sample size associated with this research, the results may not be applicable to other categories of lecturers and institutions involved in teaching/learning. Also, given its basic interpretive qualitative design, the research is consequently, not generalizable. The research was also limited by participants who voluntarily replied to an invitation to participate in the study, and agreed to be interview by the researcher.

More significantly, however, were limitations with respect to the sample size. As discussed in Chapter 4, my sample size consisted of 6 informants. A combination of time constraints and unavailability of participants due to their heavy schedules, made it difficult to conduct more than one interview. This did create some anxiety for me. Having read Green (2005), I was comforted, since she indicated that it was not necessary for more than one interview, essentially because the researcher was dealing with the sample set as a whole.

A significant limitation was the fact that I was engaging in this study as a ‘one–man’ team. I did not have the benefit of knowledgeable partners in the processes of the frameworks (Green, 2005). As a ‘one–man’ team, I was could not use peer debriefing and presentations for testing preliminary findings (Guba, 1981). I also could not apply investigator triangulation (Giacomini and Cook, 2000) to obtain ‘negotiated consensus’ (Wahlstrom *et al*., 1997) to increase trustworthiness. I relied on my self–awareness of my role as a researcher to ensure credibility of this research. I took great care, since I recognised that my interpretations (reflexivity and researcher interpretative awareness) impacted the research process (Sin, 2010; Sandberg, 1997). (See Chapter 1: for my positionality regarding this research (p. 31).

## *7.7. Implications for Further Research*

This basic interpretive study is among few taking a qualitative investigative approach into conceptions of teaching held by certain HE lecturers at a Caribbean university. It provides a basis for further research into this area. Teachers’ conception of teaching governs individual practice, and is held as implicit notions governing classroom practice (Akerlind, 2004, 2003; Healey, 2003). As such, further investigations to understand how raising and increasing awareness of the participants’ conception of teaching in this study have impacted their practice. In addition, a longitudinal study involving an expanded sample (including those in this study), would inform the evolution of the social construction of lecturers’ conception of teaching, as well as the development and maturing of such conceptions, and how they influence individual classroom practice on this campus.

Another possibility of research is a comparative study targeting different disciplines across the faculties on this campus and the region, to glean the similarities and differences in conceptions of teaching, and how they impact lecturers’ practice. Further, a significant possibility for further research is in duplicating this investigation in HE vocational/technical institutions where the principal focus is not research, to glean whether qualitative differences exist in lecturers’ conceptions of teaching, or how teaching is demonstrated in such environments. Finally, the conceptions of teaching generated from the study can form the basis of a qualitative/quantitative study administered to an expanded group in the local HE sector, including both traditional and non–traditional HE institutions.

Thus, I would argue that a major impact of this research was unearthing findings that demonstrated a requirement for changes to the CUTL programme undertaken by the ZHC in terms of the institutional discourse around and support for teaching. The findings documented certain ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching was currently located in lower–order domain of the teacher conceptions model (González, 2011; Kember, 1997; Prosser *et al*., 1994) and, therefore, not aligned to research findings emanating from current literature. The research consequently, provided further evidence of the disruptive features of the postcolonial educational implementation discussed in Chapter 2. Such implementation insidiously hampered innovative educational policy formation and transformation, at the national, institutional and individual levels, confirming the historical educational deficits ascribed to Caribbean education in general (Bristol, 2012; Jules, 2011, 2008; Nettleford, 1997).

## *7.8. Conclusion*

The postcolonial context of ‘*elitist*’ HE implementation, focusing principally on ‘academic students’ (Biggs, 2012; Bristol, 2012; Campbell, 1997), utilising transmission pedagogy (Barr and Tagg, 1995); continue to influence certain ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching. Such conceptions cannot align with the 21st century teaching/learning requirements of our dynamic, complex *mass* HE system (Barnett, 2005, 2000, 1999). Increasing access was available, but not equality of opportunity. What was required is equity (Baksh, 1986). In this context, the findings from this research may help to inform, as well as improve local HE teaching practice, signalling the requirement to re–engineer professional development programmes to focus more on the cognitive features of teaching/learning (Biggs, 2012; Akerlind, 2008). As a consequence, I did not engage in esoteric research, but in research that can positively impact the teaching/learning environment at ZHC. I end with this critical observation by Lord James in (Haggis, 2009, p. 377).

Universities today are homes of research into almost every subject  
save one—themselves. There are few fields of social science in  
which painstaking investigation is more necessary and less often  
pursued.Lord James of Rusholme (1965) in (Maton, 2004).

## *7.9. Overall Reflection*

My original approach to this research was located in the idea that the underlying philosophical intent of local HE was ‘to serve’; not to create or to innovate or to emancipate (Nettleford, 2003, 1997); but to mimic, to become a mirror of the colonial, and to disavow any aspect of one’s local history, knowledge, religion and culture (Heron, 2003; Smith, 1999; Fanon, 1986/1952). Perhaps the most critical thought emanating from my observations about local HE teaching/learning was: how do I instigate and help perpetuate critical reflection and reflective discourse amongst colleagues in a HE environment steep in academic tradition (Rodriguez, 2008)?

Traditional teaching and learning, the taken–for–granted notion of passing on knowledge from discipline research experts to students continued to reside in its unproblematised setting in the university where instrumental learning dominated (Fanghanel, 2007). Was there any room for transformational learning? Was it possible in our HE context to instigate intense interaction, instead of unilateral lecture direction; autonomous thinking, learner–centered, participatory, and interactive engagement, instead of rote learning and memorization as the basis for credentialization?

For me, educational research in our context focused on every feature of our education system, but HE teaching and learning. My experience in undertaking this research was, consequently, a ‘lonely walk’ in an environment that was seemingly oblivious to the critically of change—change in thought, change in action, and change in the discourse. Buttressed by the colonial/postcolonial experience of elitist education, and the ‘peripheralisation’ of all aspects of education but academics; our educational institutions were unprepared for globalisation’s profound impact on HE. The current tensions and complexities related to ZHC lecturers’ identity, beliefs, agency, and professional practice are symptomatic of their conceptions of teaching, as well as their attitude towards professional development programmes (Trowler and Cooper, 2002). For these are rooted in our language, a language that refuses to embrace our ideals and ideas, that refuses to embrace our multi–ethnics and give voice to all, and positions non–Eurocentric culture—art, music, poetry, and religion on the periphery (Scott, 2006; Best, 2004).

Linking the ideas of Fairclough’s discourse located in the power of language, and the colonial/postcolonial experience in education (Fairclough, 2001); it is critical for me as an educator and researcher, to recognise and name the neo–colonial interpretations that pervade our space and publicly contest them. This involves radicalised neo–colonial discourse and collaboration to evolve curricula that are more epistemologically sensitive in order combat the traditional racialized, neo–colonial discourse that fail to recognise the complexity of Caribbean history, its oral traditions, including the region’s society and culture (Best, 2004;Sankatsigh, 2001, 1988; Nettleford, 2003, 1997). I have already alluded to the elitist approach to colonialist HE in Chapter 2. To extend this argument, I submit that examinations throughout our education system remain elitist, clinging to concepts of past colonialism that excludes non–European ways of knowing (Hickling–Hudson, 2006). They focus only on traditional academic literacies that are insensitive to folk forms indigenous to our region (Nettleford, 2003, 1997).

Caribbean political, economic and educational systems we encounter, in spite of continuous reform are deeply embedded in European colonialism (Best, 2004; Sankatsingh, 2001). A critical task of the HE lecturer/researcher in my view is to help counter the racist, sexist, and classist poisons associated with our colonial and neo–colonial histories (Willinsky, 1998). The development issues and how they impact education continue to pervade our space. What is missing in these debates are postcolonial issues, and the ways in which they affect the lives of our students and the teachers involved (Hickling–Hudson, 2006, 2004). In a real sense, postcolonialism in an educational context, drives our lecturers’ identity and beliefs, conditions their notions of practice, and is demonstrated in the teacher–focused, content–oriented approaches to teaching (Kelchtermans, 2009b; Beijaard *et al*., 2004; Kember, 1997). Postcolonialism, codified from a Caribbean perspective, also alerts the conscious and critical observer in education to ZHC lecturers’ current conceptions of teaching, the principal theme of this study.

My research is located, consequently, within the broader contexts of globalisation (Longsworth, 2009; Acker, 2004; Held, *et al*., 2003; Sen, 2002; Tikly, 2001; Castells, 2000); power (Hüther and Krücken, 2013; Diefenbach *et al*., 2009; Foucault, 2000; Bourdieu, 1984); and postcolonialism (Chang, 2005; Best, 2004; Bhabha, 1994; Dirlik, 1994; Selmon, 1991; Spivak, 1991). Underlying these ideas is the postcolonial/neo–colonial local environment which fuels the attitude of local societal elites*,* perpetuating their traditional hegemony in socio–economic, cultural and political spheres (Heron, 2003). HE today, is however, massified, allowing the ‘working class’ to enter HE classrooms, simultaneously challenging the traditional exclusive status of elites in HE (Biggs, 2012; Campbell, 1997). The above reflection/discourse is representative of the broader philosophical issues which have guided my approach to this study.
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# Appendix 1 Interview Questions

**Interview Questions**

These questions were asked to set the tone and to allow the interviewees to expand on their own experience and reflections of local HE teaching as it pertains to their individual classroom practice.

1. What were your conceptions of teaching as a HE lecturer before your CUTL experience?
2. How do you approach your classroom teaching?
3. Does the integration of ICT in teaching play a role in your teaching sessions?
4. Do you have the same conceptions of teaching now that you have completed the CUTL course?
5. What impact does your department has on your approach to teaching?
6. Do you see a link between community service and your approach to teaching?
7. Do you think the institution provides you with the kind of support to enhance your teaching?
8. Do you consider the teaching awards programme as important and would you submit a portforlio?
9. What are your perceptions of your roles and functions as an HE lecturer in a globalized local HE environment?
10. How do you approach your students learning during classroom teaching?
11. What do you consider as the impact of your discipline and that of your department on student learning?
12. How do you know that your students have learnt or grasp a concept which you have taught?

**Interview Questions**: These questions were used to instigate conversation about conceptions of teaching during each interview. They were not asked as a list of questions but rather used as part of the conversation during each interview to elicit responses and deeper perceptions on lecturers’ practice.

1. What is your individual position on university teaching?
2. Do you collaborate with your colleagues, for example, when you are both teaching the same course?
3. How you see your roles and functions as a HE lecturer in Trinidad and Tobago’s HE environment?
4. Do you see a link between community service and your approach to teaching?
5. Do you think your institution provides you with the kind of support to enhance your teaching?

# Appendix 2 Interview Schedule

**Interview Schedule**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Interview** | **Date** | **Time** | **Participant** |
| 1 | 20/02/2015 | 11:00am | Participant 1 |
| 2 | 23/02/2015 | 3:00pm | Participant 2 |
| 3 | 24/02/2015 | 11:00am | Participant 3 |
| 4 | 24/02/2015 | 2:30pm | Participant 4 |
| 5 | 24/02/2015 | 5:00pm | Participant 5 |
| 6 | 26/02/2015 | 3:15pm | Participant 6 |
|  |  |  |  |

# 

# Appendix 3 Analysis of Interview 1

**Analysis of Transcript 1 (Interview 1)**

**20/12/2015**

**Outcome of analysis of Zion Hill lecturers’ narratives**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teacher conceptions of teaching** | | | | |
| **Teacher focused/content oriented** | |  | **Student focused/learning oriented** | |
| **Imparting Information** | **Transmitting**  **structured knowledge** | **Student–teacher interaction/apprenticeship** | **Facilitating understanding** | **Conceptual change/intellectual development** |
| They have individual personalities and they have collective personalities and I think my responsibility is to be able to adapt to the collective personalities rather than just come in and deliver something.  To let them have two different sections of the same course but you will not find the same delivery in each course.  I sort of gauge the personalities within the first couple classes of the course and tailor the deliver to suit the collective personality of the students in the class. | But I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course in particular  I was able to see where there were some gaps and was able to make the course more cohesive  in a way that essentially tells a good story in terms of the material been sequential not only for me but for the students as well  and the students function a lot more easier in that I gave them the storyboard as well. | They the students don’t go against the lecturer because you can’t do that because then the lecturer says, listen!  That has been a challenge so what I have to is at the beginning of the class; which is an idea I picked up in one of the courses in the program[meaning the CUTL programme] is that I have an ice beaker which was an interactive icebreaker.  I see a really good interaction just from that icebreaker. They have been more engaging. They saw that this lecturer is fun and they are going to have a good time.  I made it very clear to them that if they have questions/issues raise them, ask questions, email them to me and I would get back to you.  I am open and I just let them see the human side. If they ask a question and I don’t know I will tell them that I don’t know but I will research it for you; I will get back to you.  So there is not that wall between lecturer and student that has been build since they went primary school. |  |  |
|  | At the undergraduate level there is some level of lecturing but there is also some level of facilitation.  And the higher you go the less lecturing and a higher degree of facilitation.  In the first and second year there is lecturing with some facilitation- I would say 50/40 but in the third year especially in the final semester, there is more facilitating than lecturing.  We are now training you for graduate school so that it is important to make that transition now. | My position is that I have to give a final and I have to grade them because for me a student’s grade is a reflection of my success in terms of a delivery mechanism and if they are not doing well at that point;  I reflect on what I am not doing well and try to get ideas or solutions or what can be done differently, for them. |  |  |

ZHC lecturers’ conception of teaching reproduced from (Kember, 1997, p. 264).

Key:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Initial category** |
|  | Imparting Information |
|  | Transmitting structured knowledge |
|  | Student-teacher relationship |
|  | Facilitating understanding |
|  | Conceptual change/intellectual development |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Structural** | **Referential** | |  |
|  | **Syllabus/text concepts** | **Teachers’ conceptions** | **Students’ conceptions** |
| **Teacher:** |  | |  |
| Transmitting information | But I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course in particular  I was able to see where there were some gaps and was able to make the course more cohesive  in a way that essentially tells a good story in terms of the material been sequential not only for me but for the students as well  and the students function a lot more easier in that I gave them the storyboard as well. | My position is that I have to give a final and I have to grade them because for me a student’s grade is a reflection of my success in terms of a delivery mechanism and if they are not doing well at that point;  I reflect on what I am not doing well and try to get ideas or solutions or what can be done differently, for them |  |
| Helping students acquire concepts | C | D |  |
| Helping students develop conceptions |  |  | E |
| Helping students change conceptions |  |  | F |

After a number of iterations of reading and identifying ‘pool of meanings’ from each transcript, I listened to the transcript tape and re-read the text eventually placing each pool of meaning into tables [instead of cutting out strips of paper]. I then narrowed the pool of meanings from the original set to four before placing each in appropriate column of the table above. This process involved dealing with each transcript individually and across the sample.

It became clearer to me that ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of teaching were residing in the lower quadrant of the model. The highest current conception of teaching, student-teaching interaction/apprenticeship occupies the transition point between the lower order and higher order conceptions. See table above.

To further confirm the results of the analysis of this transcript I utilized (Prosser et al., 1994) model which identified the structural and referential conceptions of teaching. In the case of participant 01 the focus of conception was related to transmitting information (structural) and focusing on syllabus concepts and teachers conceptions (referential). Currently, there is little focus on student’ conceptions. See diagram below

Zion Hill lecturers conception of teaching (adapted from Prosser et al., 1994) model of teachers conceptions of teaching p. 225)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Initial category** |
|  | Syllabus/text concepts |
|  | Teachers’ conceptions |
|  | Students’ conceptions |

**Key:**

**Variation in dimension: ZHC Context**

In the sections below I adapted Fanghanel (2007) pedagogic constructs model to identify the unique filters which govern ZHC lecturers’ conceptions of practice. I utilized this approach for each transcript. Initially the institutional filters unearthed were: (1) the teaching/research nexus; (2) teaching vs research; (3) the teaching awards; (4) teaching with technology and (5) assessment. See table below:

**Teaching/research nexus**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Filters: Initial category** |
|  | Teaching/research nexus |
|  | Teaching vs research |
|  | UWI/Guardian Life Teaching Awards |
|  | Teaching with technology |
|  | Assessment |

**Key:**

This lecturer recognizes the importance of research and publication of tenure/promotion and highlights the benefits from engaging in research. However the informant suggests that the teaching/research nexus at the ZHC needs to be clarified since the criteria for promotion remains research and publication in spite of the continued emphasis on the scholarship of teaching. But this informant continues to emphasize the idea of better delivery. His conception of teaching is dynamically linked to teacher comfort (Mckenzie, 2003) where he pays particular attention to delivery of content to students. He does not does mention students prior knowledge or students experience or their conceptions of the subject area. He links his teaching to the final examinations which as he says he has to grade. His principal purpose is therefore to ensure that his students are well prepared for the semester finals where he wants to ensure that they do well. This is in keeping with the established norms of HE teaching/learning in Trinidad and Tobago.

I think that the criterion for promotion is research and publication. I think that that is not settled …

You spend a lot more time reflecting on the material that you have read and that makes for a sort of a deeper understanding to deal with urban/rural areas definitions-[his area of research]. I spent quite a lot of time just reading of all types of literature on these things and of course that’s my area of research. As a result of that I got a better understanding of it and I was able to explain the discrepancy with the students in a much clearer way because I understood the area. I think it lends to better delivery, better understanding from which the student can then benefit.

**Teaching vs research**

This lecturer expresses anxiety towards the duality of teaching vs research. He indicates that teaching impacts negatively his time for research which has implications for the quality of his teaching. But he is convinced that the lecturer’s time should be dedicated to research and publication. In keeping with traditional approaches to local HE teaching/learning; teaching is viewed as a secondary activity which may or may not be related to research in the discipline. In spite of the impact he claims that the CUTL programme is providing information and concepts that informs is approach to teaching including the use of the learning management systems (LMS) and other ICT technologies; he remains convinced that good teaching does not provide a pathway for promotion/ tenure, great research does.

But if I have to prepare for classes, that takes away from my time for research. So how much am I prepared to develop the work though research and how much time am I prepared to devout to teaching. So that is where the challenge lie. How do you allocate your time, sufficiently, so that the greater effort is dedicated to your research and publication effort. As a matter of fact you will hear often from a faculty member that you can be the best teacher but that does not guarantee you tenure. You have to be a great researcher.

However he concedes that there is a place for good teaching in local HE and that all lecturers should utilize the opportunity to improve their teaching in spite of the challenges. His unstated idea seems to be that the CUTL progamme is helping to improve lecturer’s teaching skills.

Many for those great teachers did not have their contract renewed because they have not published. Good teaching requires lot of preparation and patience. Lecturing requires a lot of personal time devoted to study and revision. So therein lies the challenge but I think that we all should use the opportunity to improve teaching.

**The Teaching Awards**

This lecturer indicated serious issues regarding the teaching awards programme as is currently constituted by the ZHC. He also suggested that he would not participate in the programme because of presumed bias. He felt that the first cycle of investigation of evidence of good teaching should come from the department before submission to the institution of consideration for an award. He also avers that the students one teaches should be an integral part of the process. He poses the question ‘How can one be nominated for an award in teaching from a colleague or colleagues who have not sat in your class and observed your teaching’?

No I won’t. I believe that an award for teaching and learning should come from the department and they ought to be part of that. I should not be submitting or nominating myself, or someone else, when I have not sat in their classroom for an entire semester. I think that part of that award should be inclusive of the students’ survey.

He suggested that lecturers nominating themselves or been nominated by colleagues without student evaluation followed by peer evaluation and a panel of department heads suggests some form of bias. He suggested that there is need for a formal process which includes endorsements, student evaluation and peer evaluation and a written report which provides a clinical approach to the outcome of the evaluation, including changes to be made in future teaching/learning practice.

Colleagues’ endorsement, Yes, but it should always be based on, and this is again my experience; there should be peer but write a report on the outcomes of the evaluation what changes were made moving forward and what changes you can make based on the issues raised in the evaluation. Doing it is really important. .

**Teaching with technology**

This lecturer expressed the desire to utilize technology as part of his approach to teaching learning. He recognizes the fundamental importance of ICT in 21st century teaching/learning and tries to use it as part of his teaching repertoire.

I am very, very adamant about getting a room with wi-fi, because I think that students ought to see it as an attraction if it’s done properly, then yes if I see that phone in your hand. Nobody else may be looking around to see if it is in your hand; but if I see it in your hand then it better vibrate with a twit; because you may not want to raise your hand and ask a question.

**Assessment**

Ensuring that students perform well in the subject area is high on this lecturer teaching agenda. He recognizes the better performance of students in the subject area when there is more course work.

I know that for instance I have found our students are more successful when there is more course work than finals. … the assessment is that kind of 60% course weight and a semi-final . You have got a 40% final.

# Appendix 4 Meaning Units: Structural, Referential and Themes

Meaning Units: Structural, Referential and Themes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meaning Units** | **Structural**  **(how the explanation is given)** | **Referential**  **(the focus of the teaching)** | **ZHC Lecturers**  **Themes**  **(Conceptions)** |
| Teaching is the thing that I get through for results [Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| They have individual personalities and they have collective personalities and I think my responsibility is to be able to adapt to the collective personalities rather than just come in and deliver something. [Participant 1] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | Transmitting  structured knowledge |
| To let them have two different sections of the same course but you will not find the same delivery in each course. I sort of gauge the personalities within the first couple classes of the course and tailor the delivery to suit the collective personality of the students in the class. [Particpant 1] | Transmitting information | Teacher’s conceptions | Transmitting  structured knowledge |
| But I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course in particular I was able to see where there were some gaps and was able to make the course more cohesive in a way that essentially tells a good story.  [Participant 1] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | Transmitting  structured knowledge |
| At the undergraduate level there is some level of lecturing but there is also some level of facilitation.  [Participant 1] | Transmitting Information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| They the students don’t go against the lecturer because you can’t do that… because then the lecturer says, listen! That has been a challenge so what I have to is at the beginning of the class; which is an idea I picked up in one of the courses in the program[meaning the CUTL programme] is that I have an ice beaker which was an interactive icebreaker  [Participant 1] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | Encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship  (Transition point between lower order and higher order conceptions) |
| My position is that I have to give a final and I have to grade them because for me a student’s grade is a reflection of my success in terms of a delivery mechanism  [Participant 1] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| Following that-the course, a few things happen. I restructured the course outline [ meaning the engineering course that he teaches], much of it as possible  [Participant 2] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Transmitting structured knowledge |
| One [approach] is try to optimize their performance; try to find out why they are not doing well  [Participant 2] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| In terms of the material been sequential not only for me but for the students as well and the students function a lot more easier in that I gave them the storyboard as well  [Participant 1] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting structured knowledge |
|  |  |  |  |
| And the higher you go the less lecturing and a higher degree of facilitation. We are now training you for graduate school so that it is important to make that transition now  [Participant1] | Imparting Information | Syllabus/text concepts | Transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| In the first and second year there is lecturing with some facilitation- I would say 50/40 but in the third year especially in the final semester, there is more facilitating than lecturing.  [Participant 1] | Imparting Information | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| I want them to understand a 100% of what they learn rather than 10% of a bigger slice or syllabus, you know. What they need to know. Do you know what you need to know, all right.  [Participant 1] | Transmitting information | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| If you don’t get the question right in the class, chances are when you go on the job and your boss ask you to do something for him you will do the wrong thing for him.  [Participant 1] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | information delivery |
| I don’t ask my students to do any reading out of the classroom. They have screencasts to work with. I don’t give them-I give them the minimum amount they need to read  [Participant 2]. | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| In this way you know you are training the student not only for exams but for their future.  [Participant 2] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting structured knowledge |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meaning Units** | **Structural**  **(how the lecturers go about their teaching)** | **Referential**  **(the meaning lecturers attach to teaching)** | **St Augustine Lecturers Themes**  **(Conceptions)** |
| My take on teaching and learning would be anything to gather knowledge. That is what it was before; whatever I knew I wanted to share, yeh; that was before CUTL  [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Teacher’s conceptions | Information delivery |
| So for me it was in bringing out, transferring that information to my students.  [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Teacher’s conceptions | Information delivery |
| OK, in terms of my conceptions like how I see things, to me I think that teaching is not just about I am always giving; I am also receiving.  [Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Teacher’s conceptions | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| I try to do different things rather than just a strict power point and calling out notes; I try not to do too much of that.  [Participant 5] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting structured knowledge |
| You know I always want to engage the students. I want to know that they are following, yah.  [Participant 5] | Helping students acquire concepts | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| It was just, simply, I would say my previous experience and following that of my mentors.  [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I think one of the things that we need to start using is new literature  [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I am pro exam and I think that I am best at exams because of how I was taught. The traditional way of teaching here.  [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I find teaching is the thing that confronts you everyday. You have to visit your class, you have to talk, you have to have something to say.  [Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I think even prior to CUTL I wanted my students to be active members of society with the knowledge that we help them to gain the ‘piece of paper’.  [Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| You think that this is the university, you deal with adoption and you come with your knowledge and you could engage them with it and then carry on  [Participant 4] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| Simply said, I think in theory you want your students to be engaged with your material so along that so I try to facilitate that in theory.  [Participant 4] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| I think it has evolved. I think the base of what I was doing , it was still there; I wanted to feel empowered; I want to engage with the material.[Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| I think that having been through CUTL I have now amassed more and a better understanding of how you could do that. [Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| So I think that I am a bit more successful than how it use to be, in terms of my teaching and learning process.[Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| We would get serious opposition if we transition to no exams.[Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| There is a trend of thought that if you give students homework assignments; the quality of the assignment cannot be guaranteed accept you’re in a controlled environment.[Participant 4] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I thought that it was simply a matter of presenting information and basically just throwing students to the wolves. [Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I still value the old way; I still value what I considered the old way (the traditional lecture). I can see the direction. I can see value to the old (way of teaching).[Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| teaching was a matter of presenting information and opportunity and not necessarily about structure and plans you know.[Participant 5] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| In terms of what I see as valuable is that we are there to support the students in any way form or fashion possible. [Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| To a certain extent the old way pitted us against the students and you were almost testing them in form and fashion. [Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| I still believe that I am trying to create the best possible. I am trying to create a group of people who can be leaders and that can be turned to for answers and particularly historians. We are the ones that …[Participant 5] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| I am a fairly young lecturer. I mean I am coming out the exact system that is supposed to create an elite group. I still subscribe to that. [Participant 5]. | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | transmitting lecturer’s conceptions of the subject-area |
| I see myself as teaching my students but I also learn from them. I help them and they help me.[Participant 6] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| Sometimes you take things for granted, you know, but you are dealing with adults and you have to make sure that they understand what you are doing. | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| I am naturally a collaborator. I am not your typical lecturer you know  [Participant 6] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| The concept of the lesson planning is good. Theoretically it is good. When it is practiced it is also good. But the reality is that it is difficult to implement that.[Participant 6] | Helping students acquire concepts | Teacher’s conceptions | encouraging student-teacher interaction/apprenticeship |
| The reality is that most people lecture. I don’t know but that is just been academic as far as I am concern.[Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| … one of the big takeaway for me was the assessment. That was like- that went on over all over. Because that was when I recognized that what we were using as exams, based on assessing people, was madness [Participant 6]. | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| And if you look at the programme you would realize we don’t need the three essays that we think we need.  [Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
| At the undergraduate level all they want is to pass and get the certification, nothing else. This is crazy and I am saying, crazy ! [Participant 6] | Transmitting information | Syllabus/text concepts | Information delivery |
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Key:

I want to elicit from you your conception of teaching and learning prior to doing the course (meaning CUTL)? What has happened since doing the course. How have your conceptions changed and how has that experience in the course literature implicated your practice?

I think I will start by saying that the experience at the Centre (meaning the CETL) the programme had an impact, not so far as in terms of radical changes, but some modifications. I say that because prior this this program, I had gone through a couple other programmes similar in nature, US based programmes. So a lot of what was delivered in the programme in terms of practice, were sort of a refresher for me. It has impacted in that I am using a little bit more of the technology because I wasn’t familiar with the learning management platform and with that training I felt more comfortable now. I am actually doing that now with the expectation that it would go fully online. I think it make much better delivery. Students are now engaged prior to class and I put a lot of YouTube videos and also in particular, making use of the storyboard in terms of developing the course. I have found that in most instances that we just going by the course outline Sometimes it can feel as though it is not as cohesive in terms of delivery based on the topic. But I think taking time to develop that storyboard for this course in particular I was able to see where there were some gaps and was able to make the course more cohesive in a way that essentially tells a good story in terms of the material been sequential not only for me but for the students as well and the students function a lot more easier in that I gave them the storyboard as well. OK

So that they can see exactly when in terms of their assignments, what their activities are and so they know what they can expect when they come to class. Sometimes you can spring and activity on people. Some may not do it well for this activity since they are not mentally prepared for the activity. So that makes it a lot easier though. They know they can use the colour coded system so that they can whether there is an inter-active activity or online activity or group discussions. These are very, very helpful not just for them but for me as well.

I don’t feel that I am a little bit hap-hazard in some instances. I think one of the things that came to bear is that and I think this is jumping ahead a little bit to one of the questions you asked but I think that the material that I have developed is based on the European system, based on their teaching and learning practices. But I think we have to be very careful and what I learn is that I have to take what I learnt in the program and make some modifications and contextualize because our students here are socialized differently. So even though they come into the university their social integration has been quite different to that of North American student. So what may work in a US based system where they are taught from early on to challenge and interact with the lectures, students here have no real understanding that they can raise a question or they can challenge something that the lecturer said. We have all of these techniques that we teach in the classroom that is OK there but not here because of that socialization. They, the students don’t go against the lecturer because you can’t do that because then the lecturer says, listen! That has been a challenge so what I have to, is at the beginning of the class; which is an idea I picked up in one of the courses in the program is that I have an ice breaker which was an interactive icebreaker.

Essentially what I do is to divide them into groups and they are staying in these groups for the rest of the semester. But prior to joining the group, I made them change their seating arrangements because generally students will sit next to their friends. I change seating arrangements without telling them why and I told them that they have to divide themselves into groups and look for the person they were sitting next to but choose somebody they don’t know, somebody whom they have never met before and so the activity as helped to build a structure and so each group had to build a structure. At the end of the excise we had a reflection in terms of what were the traits that emerge from each person in the group. Who was the person that took charge? Who were the people who just went along? Who were the people who were there for moral support; who gave up and all of these little things?

They identified each person in the group and they understand their profile. So that they know that this is the person who would be the natural lead; this is the person who would represent the group. This is the person who will provide moral support etc. So they realize that; and what I have found is that all of that activity including online discussions, debates and assignments help in their interaction. I see a really good interaction just from that icebreaker. They have been more engaging. They saw that this lecturer is fun and they are going to have a good time. I made it very clear to them that if they have questions/issues raise them, ask questions, email them to me and I would get back to you. I am open and I just let them see the human side. If they ask a question and I don’t know I will tell them that I don’t know but I will research it for you; I will get back to you. So there is not that wall between lecturer and student that has been built since they went primary school. So that took some time. I gave them a challenge that they have to get use to calling me by my first name and I am forcing them to do it. I don’t respond to been called sir. I think that the title; I think that creates a barrier in itself If you look at the definition it suggests that I am above you and ‘sir’ usually denotes nobility. So the very use of that word ‘sir’ is a wall in itself. I tell them you can call me doc or doctor C if you not comfortable calling me Michael (not his real name). I see no disrespect in that. They know that I wouldn’t respond if I am called sir. Slowly but surely they are getting there. They see that now they don’t have to call me sir. I have broken that barrier down so that we can interact more now. So now I can use the Wharton techniques but that has to be noted a lot of what is happening is as a result of a lack of research in the area to contextualize those pedagogy and localize it.

Further, I will say that from my perspective I always enter the practice with an open mind. I know that I am there to share. So that I don’t see myself actually as a lecturer; a lecturer lectures at primary and secondary levels. At the undergraduate level there is some level of lecturing but there is also some level of facilitation. And the higher you go the less lecturing and a higher degree of facilitation. In the first and second year there is lecturing with some facilitation- I would say 50/40 but in the third year, especially in the final semester. There is more facilitating than lecturing. We are now training you for graduate school so that it is important to make that transition now. They need to be making the transformation in that at the graduate level there would be more facilitation. I think that is happening and I have been working hard at it.

In terms of your human development with your colleagues, in the literature there is the idea of the conceptions of teaching and learning. Have you a – let me ask the question this way: What has been the impact of the course (meaning the CUTL programme) in perfecting your teaching and learning craft in terms of your own academic particular area? Say, at the departmental level? Do you see yourself communicating more with your colleagues in terms of preparing courses providing outlines etc., etc., for example?

What happened is that there were three (3) of us who went through the programame together. We have been through a lot OK in terms of I find this and it works; you find that and it works and then I find this and it didn’t work like this, it worked with this modification. I would say that we meet at least once per week. We stated at the same time in terms of hiring and so we were like a cohort and we always interact on a regular basis. In terms of the other colleagues working across campus I have communicated with colleagues on the course and what came out of it even more so was that I co-authored a couple papers. Because we were in the classroom together, we would share research ideas but we never really met outside of that classroom setting. So yes we do communicate and I do know that they themselves have made modifications. In terms of people who have completed the programme; I spoke to a few of them as well and there was a comparison of notes as well. So I shared what I did with them and they shared what they did and indicated what didn’t change. So yes we do communicate with them as well but not at a formal level, it is more at an informal level.

I shared my work with them not necessarily with people who were not on the programme. So that’s one of the things that has improved our interaction that came out of the course and we try to put things into practice… it definitely improve our practice.

So that in terms of the conceptions of self and lecturer identity and your conceptions of your students How did the programme impact upon your identity as a lecturer and your conception of your students? I will tell you why I ask this question. Traditionally lecturers and teachers operate from positions of power and see their purpose at this level is to transmit knowledge essentially and the students’ role is to pass the mid-term and the final exam. There is no socialization, no holistic development, no building of the minds in this teaching/learning transaction especially in this localized global environment I want to elicit from you; has there been a movement or conception at the individual level that’s how did that …..

Traditionally the roles to the lecturer and student were based on power positions; he/she was above the students whose role was to learn well and pass the mid-term and final examinations. The lecturer’s principal role was to teach and or research. Not necessarily the holistic development of the student or the development of the mind.

I am not the traditional lecturer. I have never seen myself as the traditional lecturer. I have always seen myself as someone who is going to share some of what I know but more so to learn from the students how they want to received it. What I do is that sometimes and this involves a lot more work is about two weeks into the semester I ask the students to tell me if this method is working for them and then I elicit from them what they would like to see change and I make those changes right away. They are part of the teaching project and I do tell them that. They are not just here for a grade and I am not just there to give them information. I am going to share with you and I see this as a process. Learning is a process and it calls for sharing, I share with them, they share with me and I always tell people that if I were to go to any part of the world and look at the profile of an average student . Students have the same misconceptions in some instances in terms of how they see a lecturer. Is just that a student is a student, they come to pass and get a good grade. That is what they are here for. Is just the interaction, the interpersonal part that is going to change. They kinda focus on the same things. Very seldom do you student who says that I am here because I want to learn. Very seldom do you find at a university a student saying I am doing a degree because I want to learn more about that area are there to learning for learning sake.

If you ask them why they there are here; the main reason is that they need more money. They have individual personalities and they have collective personalities and I think my responsibility is to be able to adapt to the collective personalities rather than just come in and deliver something. To let them have two different sections of the same course but you will not find the same delivery in each course. I sort of gauge the personalities within the first couple classes of the course and tailor the deliver to suit the collective personality of the students in the class.

So how have you changed in your approach to the delivery of the programme?

I would say that I have not really changed much I just like… you know… in talking to a number of lecturers regarding the students who are not doing well; the general thinking is that they [the students] are not doing well because they not reading and they are not working [ applying themselves to the learning tasks]

My position is that I have to give a final and I have to grade them because for me a student’s grade is a reflection of my success in terms of a delivery mechanism and if they are not doing well at that point; I reflect on what I am not doing well and try to get ideas or solutions or what can be done differently, for them. So I always see it as the fault is with me. If I say the fault is with them then there is no need for me to change what I am doing. If they are not doing well, then it is my responsibility to change that; it’s a learning process and I don’t think that it will ever get to the point where I am really a lecturer but I will always see it as a work in progress as a lecturer.

Do you see yourself coming to the realization that there is no difference between what has been traditionally described the teaching /research nexus especially in the context of young lecturers moving towards the research area rather than the teaching area because teaching is generally not recognized a criteria for promotion. Because of the recognition of the validity of teaching as equal to the institution as research ; do you see one as an extension of the other given what the university is doing in regards to the promotion of teaching/learning.

I would say that the place of teaching ……I think that the criterion for promotion is research and publication. I think that that is not settled because you can become a better teacher because of your research; you can use your research because that research gives you a bit more, a better understanding in terms of a deeper understanding [of the research area]. You spend a lot more time reflecting on the material that you have read and that makes for a sort of a deeper understanding to deal with urban/rural areas definitions-[his area of research]. I spent quite a lot of time just reading of all types of literature on these things and of course that’s my area of research. As a result of that I got a better understanding of it and I was able to explain the discrepancy with the students in a much clearer way because I understood the area. I think it lends to better delivery, better understanding from which the student can then benefit.

But it can also be the other way around which is the true purpose of my research [for publication] and because of that focus on my research. But if I have to prepare for classes, that takes away from my time for research. So how much am I prepared to develop the work though research and how much time am I prepared to devout to teaching. So that is where the challenge lies. How do you allocate your time, sufficiently, so that the greater effort is dedicated to your research and publication effort. As a matter of fact you will hear often from a faculty member that you can be the best teacher but that does not guarantee you tenure. You have to be a great researcher.

Many for those great teachers did not have their contract renewed because they have not published. Good teaching requires lot of preparation and patience. Lecturing requires a lot of personal time devoted to study and revision. So therein lies the challenge but I think that we all should use the opportunity to improve teaching. For instance, you can be responsible for large sections of a course you can’t do research on a large section but you may use a smaller section. Because of that you can then do some research work to break the monopoly and publish your results based on that. You can step outside of your research area to break the monotony. You won’t do that too often but you know you can think of something, for example, let me write a paper on my teaching strategy based on my students grades from last year. What I did was to write a paper on this…..

As a sub question to that; do you think… to engage with your colleagues?

Again I am not against traditional teaching I meant that it depends on what you want; the university tries in that they have the research ring where you can place your research; but I think its up to the individual if you really want to share you can have a brown bag session with persons who are in your department or at the departmental level or even across campus. The department head or dean those are things that can be hand out nothing wrong with doing it

And in the context what is your view of the UWI/Guardian Life Teaching Awards? Would you give it any consideration?

No I won’t. I believe that an award for teaching and learning should come from the department and they ought to be part of that. I should not be submitting or nominating myself, or someone else, when I have not sat in their classroom for an entire semester. I think that part of that award should be inclusive of the students’ survey. What they call them the evaluation that are done by the students. I think that is one of the shortcomings of that award. I have been at institutions before where at the end of the semester students do the course evaluation of the lecturers and that report must be included in your application for promotion and is given due consideration. The notion is your student would know if you pass and would give you a good evaluation and if that is the case, let the students’ voice be heard even if it may be biased. Because the lecturers are nominating themselves or their colleagues for this award. So it is bias, you think you are a great teacher and the students don’t know. I don’t think that people get recognition; people always like to be recognized. But if I am saying I am good and my colleagues are saying that I am good and but the students don’t know then somebody is not telling the truth.

Do you think that the award should be augmented to include critical personal or student endorsement?

Colleagues’ endorsement? Yes, but it should always be based on, and this is again my experience; there should be peer evaluation after student evaluation and a panel of department heads. and evaluation not only did you use the peer evaluation but write a report the outcomes of the evaluation what changes were made moving forward and what changes you can make based on the issues raised in the evaluation . Do it is really important. I don’t think we have the peer evaluation or departmental evaluation at our instruction level

Do you see that there is room for an evaluation?

Because one of the things we learned in the class; one of the things we had to do is peer observation. And what was very helpful was that four people came to one of my classes. At the end of that peer evaluation I was able to make a number of changes almost immediately because of what they observed. There were things I did not see and they were brought immediately to my attention. They were sitting at different points. They were observing the students behaviour, they were observing my lecture and so a number of things that I never would have never seen because I am not looking at that every day you know. And even in looking at the video, we were required video-tape ourselves and review the video. I saw things that I would not have noticed. So without that observation how can I make a determination that I am doing a sufficient job , sufficiently good or whether I am improving because if I had an observation last year, and I get observe next year; then I ought to see some changes if I perceiver even though but you have to see some slight changes.

But you know the traditional practice of teaching and learning at this institution, complications of [teaching] practice becomes an identity issue; how do you resolve this? In my own case when I did the course, even with my experience in teaching it took a lot from me to make my practice public.

I think again I may not be the best person to answer that. I think ,what I do; yes they have a level of academic freedom an d yes you have the privilege of determining how you deliver the material. I have no problem with putting myself out there. I am human. I am fallible. If you think that nothing needs to be changed them something is really wrong. Because the technology is evolving t so we ought to be evolving as well. You do like to upgrade your phone. As soon as a new phone comes out you upgrade. As soon as a new device comes out we run to upgrade now. If you see the need to keep upgrading those things, why not see the need to keep upgrading our own pedagogy. Sometimes I do believe that the lack of vision can prevent change in that you can keep trying to evolve and use the different things; I do think so. In talking to a lot of people; I do talk to a few people I would make suggestions. I am very, very adamant about getting a room with wi-fi, because I think that students ought to see it as an attraction if its done properly, then yes if I see that phone in your hand. Nobody else may be looking around to see if it is in your hand; but if I see it in your hand then it better vibrate with a twit; because you may not want to raise your hand and ask a question.

I suggested that in a different setting and I was told that I am not in expressing that sentiment because I have to do something additional by using the technology. a lot a people feel I know that for instance I have found our students are more successful when there is more course work than finals. They are… than the weighting in the … the assessment is that kind of 60% course weight and a semi-final. You have got a 40% final. It means that with the assessment and hence you cannot expect the students to do well but I look at these results and I use these figures not necessarily to do computations, a very small fraction, but in the event and what faction of the material you understand and what fraction I need to review again. So that when they get to the finals they have the confidence. So that you never have to write so many essays in short a space of time I think.

My final question to you is in operating in what obviously is a local global environment as an institution impacting teaching/learning environment in which you have large classes, Governmental controls and a ‘super structure’ involvement that is impacting the university now. The present politicization in light of Government policy like you had mentioned academic freedom.

Academic freedom

OK, I can speak based on a study that I have recently completed, the administrative part of it, where we are looking at the quality of the graduate, the university graduate and what the employers are expecting; and the gap between what they know an d what the employers are looking for here, particularly the University of the West Indies. At first brush I looked at the results, I did some of the analysis and clearly there is a gap between what I am doing and what we are producing, quality-wise.

In that what employers are looking for by way of competencies? Clearly, there needs to be a large scale study done of the labour market needs and then that should inform our working with course outlines, in terms of building competencies. But that is not a short term nor a small scale project-until then we are always ….. I looked at the data and the university student population increased from about 3005 per year to 18,000. During that same time period the faculty increased only by 25%. So you are looking at over 200% or a couple hundred percentage increase in student population. The output is going to be compromised; classes with 300/ 400 students! There is no way…….you can really become a machine, you give a lecture and leave. There is not much you can do by way of adapting to that situation. You have instances where you may have a class and the air condition is not working. Yet still you have to go and give a lecture. The students and everybody know what is taking place but you adapt to it move on. That is not learning. That is what the market could sustain and as a result of the resources available But again I am assuming that these will change, whether in the short term or the not too distance future but right now I really think it’s a mistake as a result of the

Some people are saying its an impediment …..

It really is, it really is

And because of the changing demographics what we have now are mature students and students who are part time

Not only that but we have students who are differently abled but we may have a class in building that doesn’t have an elevator that’s working. So what do we do you know we are having the intake of the student I have a class with 30 students last semester. That rate has not really changed. You have more students accessing the system and you want to be confident in knowing that technical problems as a result of this expansion are been addressed; and I am assuming….. I will do the best I can on the ground but I am assuming that it’s been work on in the ….. ha, I use to call it Taj Mahal but its been worked on at the senior level but you know and again I don’t see myself as an educator [in the traditional sense] and that is a true reflection of myself.

That is a very important statement…..

And I do teach a standard five class on a weekly basis. That is great!

Dr xvb this has been really discerning I really want to thank you. I think you understand why I am using a non-traditional methodology. If I was using a tradition method, we would not have been able to cover the range and depth that we have been able to cover. Again, I need to thank you very much for your help. Now my work has just begun!

End

Pools of Meanings Categories

Having completed a series of readings of the interview I began to isolate ideas from

the transcript from which I would derive ‘pools of meanings’ for further analysis. The colours in the text represent the initial categories I coded

Key:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Colour** | **Initial category** |
|  | Imparting Information |
|  | Transmitting structured knowledge |
|  | Student-teacher relationship |
|  | Facilitating understanding |
|  | Conceptual change/intellectual development |

# 

# Appendix 6 Model Information Sheet

**Model Information Sheet**

# Research Project Title: Higher Education Teaching and Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of Conceptions of Teaching Held by Certain Lecturers at the Moriah University, Zion Hill Campus

*I am inviting your participation in my research project. It is important that you understand the nature of the research project and what is involved. I urge you to read the following information carefully. Inquire of me any area which you don’t understand or about which you need more information. Do take time to decide your wiliness to participate. Thank you*

**What I hope the research will achieve and who and what it is for?**

My aim is that this research helps expand our knowledge of local higher education (HE) lecturers’ practice in teaching and learning. Firstly, the research will benefit HE institutions by exposing local practice in HE teaching and learning. Secondly, it will benefit the HE lecturers by providing understanding about their perceptions/practice in local teaching and thirdly it will help to advance local teaching and learning praxis. I wish to understand lecturers’ perceptions of the “new” role/s they play in teaching/learning, the adequacy of HE teaching and learning training they receive in equipping them to function in the globalised HE environment and explore lecturers’ perceptions of HE globalized business model which emphasizes the commercialization of HE. Finally, I would derive personal satisfaction and fulfilment from contributing to knowledge on local HE teaching and learning.

**The context of the research**

The research will be conducted at the Zion Hill Campus, Moriah University. The research will focus on lecturers teaching practices and their perceptions about their roles in teaching and learning in the context of the HE teaching and learning training they receive from the Centre of Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL).

***You have been selected to participate because your information and/or ideas are critical to the outcome to the research. It is entirely up to you to decide whether or not to participate. If you do decide to take part this information sheet will be given to you to keep. You will be asked to sign a consent form. You may withdraw at any time without out giving a reason.***

Should you agree to participate I will be interviewing you. The information (data) you provide is to be represented as a thesis. The length of time of an interview will vary, given the breadth and depth of data you wish to give. An interview session may last between one and half hours (11/2 hrs) but no more than two hours (2 hrs). I may ask for clarifications and/or additional information. However, I will negotiate with you in advance.

**Will I be recorded, and how will the recorded media be used?**

Yes, but any audio and/or video recording from the interview during this research is to be used only for analysis and for demonstration in conference presentation and lectures. Unless I have your written permission, no other use will be made of them. No access will be allowed to the original recordings.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

There are no tangible benefits for individuals taking part in the research, however, the information you provide will help to advance the local knowledge in HE teaching and learning and the HE sector, allowing for further research into HE teaching and learning from a Caribbean context.

**Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?**

Yes, information obtained from the interviews is to be kept strictly confidential. No participant will be identified in any reports or publications.

**What will happen to the results of the research project?**

The data is to be utilized for my Ed. D thesis primarily but might also be used in later, for example research. Strict confidentially of all participants will be maintained.

**Who will ethically review the project?**

This project will be ethically approved via the Sheffield University School of Education’s ethics review procedure.

If for any reason you wish to ask questions or raise a complaint please contact me at [edp11hgp@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:edp11hgp@sheffield.ac.uk) or henpau@gmail.com or my supervisor Dr. Tim Herrick at T.Herrick@sheffield.ac.uk

Thank you for participating in this research

**Henry Paul**

**Researcher**

# Appendix 7 Participant Consent Form

Participant Consent Form

# Title of Research Project: Higher Education Teaching and Learning: A Qualitative Interpretive Study of Conceptions of Teaching Held by Certain Lecturers at the Moriah University, Zion Hill Campus.

Name of Researcher: **Henry Paul**

**Participant Identification Number for this project: Please initial box**

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet/letter  
   (delete as applicable) dated *[insert date]* explaining the above research project  
   and I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the project.
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw  
   at any time without giving any reason and without there being any negative  
   consequences. In addition, should I not wish to answer any particular  
   question or questions, I am free to decline. *Insert contact number here of  
   lead researcher/member of research team (as appropriate).*
3. I understand that my responses will be kept strictly confidential (only if true).  
   I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my  
   anonymised responses. I understand that my name will not be linked with  
   the research materials, and I will not be identified or identifiable in the  
   report or reports that result from the research.

4. I agree for the data collected from me to be used in future research

5. I agree to take part in the above research project.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Participant Date Signature

(*or legal representative*)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of person taking consent Date Signature

(*if different from lead researcher*)

*To be signed and dated in presence of the participant*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Lead Researcher Date Signature

*To be signed and dated in presence of the participant*

Copies:

*Once this has been signed by all parties the participant should receive a copy of the signed and dated participant consent form, the letter/pre-written script/information sheet and any other written information provided to the participants. A copy of the signed and dated consent form should be placed in the project’s main record (e.g. a site file), which must be kept in a secure location.*

# Appendix 8 Approval Letter



06/11/2014

Henry Paul

School of Education

Dear Henry

**PROJECT TITLE:** EDUR29 Higher education teaching and learning training: How has training in higher education teaching and learning impacted the practice of lecturers at the UWI St Augustine Campus? **APPLICATION:** Reference Number 002047

On behalf of the University ethics reviewers who reviewed your project, I am pleased to inform you that on 31/10/2014 the above-named project was **approved** on ethics grounds, on the basis that you will adhere to the following documentation that you submitted for ethics review:

* University research ethics application form 002047 (dated 22/10/2014).
* Participant information sheet 003146 (22/10/2014)
* Participant consent form 003147 (22/10/2014)

If during the course of the project you need to deviate significantly from the above-approved documentation please inform me since written approval will be required.

Yours sincerely

Jayne Rushton

Ethics Administrator

School of Education

1. The Concordat, a memorandum signed by the Cabinet on December 22, 1960 and published on December 25, 1960 is a two page document with nine clauses which preserves status quo of Denominational schools, Assisted Secondary Schools and other religious stakeholders in the education system. The religious interests fearing that the prospect of independence for Trinidad and Tobago would threaten to end their domination of state subsidised, but ‘totally controlled’ mission schools, pressured the Eric Williams’ government to accept an education concordat which hindered the government’s plans for education /school reform just before the crucial 1961 general elections. Williams fearing that he would loose the general election of 1961 had no alternative but to sign and in doing so preserved the domination of ‘the church’ in our education system. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Trinidad and Tobago gained its independence from Great Britain in 1962. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. TLR ‘is a shorthand term for a constellation of rules, assumptions, practices and relationships related to teaching and learning issues in higher education’ (Trowler and Cooper, 2002, p. 221). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. I applied for and received ethical clearance from Sheffield University Ethics Committee prior to the start of this research. (Appendix 8) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)