



Southern African Rurality in Higher Education

Practices, transitions and negotiations to new figured worlds: Southern African rural students in higher education

Sue Timmis
University of Bristol
sue.timmis@bristol.ac.uk

September 2018

SARiHE WORKING PAPER No.2

Citation: Timmis, S. (2018) 2: *Practices, transitions and negotiations to new figured worlds: Southern African rural students in higher education*. Working Paper for the SARiHE project. sarihe.org.za/publications

This work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council, UK [grant number ES/P002072/1] and the National Research Foundation, South Africa.



Practices, transitions and negotiations to new figured worlds: Southern African rural students in higher education

Sue Timmis

Introduction

This paper aims to set out some of the key theoretical concepts that frame the investigations that the SARiHE project is undertaking and to make sense of lived experiences of students at the heart of the study. It is not exhaustive and will develop over time as the project unfolds. At the time of writing (August 2018), this paper is focused on the frameworks that underpinned the research questions and the initial proposal and follows on from Working Paper No 1 (Leibowitz, 2017) that expanded on our understanding of rurality.

The research aims to address how students from rural areas in Southern Africa negotiate the transition to higher education foregrounding the social and cultural capital they bring and how they are shaped by their home, school and community by asking the following research questions:

1. How can the complexities of rurality be conceptualised in relation to higher education?
2. What are the dimensions of rurality as experienced by students transitioning from home to university in the global south?
3. How and in what ways do students negotiate the transitions from rural home, school and community and how does this influence their trajectories through higher education in Southern Africa?
 - a. What are the challenges for students from rural areas facing higher education curricula, which remain imbued with colonialism?
 - b. What are the practices that shape approaches to learning of students from rural areas in universities in Southern Africa?
 - c. How and in what ways do digital technologies, social media and mobile communications influence rural students' higher education trajectories?

4. How and in what forms might inclusive and living curricula be developed that build on the experiences of all students, including those from rural contexts in Southern Africa?

Decoloniality and modernity

Modernity according to Giddens (1998, 94) is shorthand for modern society, or industrial civilization and denotes a society characterised by living in the future rather than the past. There has long been a strong relationship between modernity and coloniality and Mignolo (2011) refers to coloniality as the darker side of western modernity. Mignolo (2009, 176) sees knowledge production in the modern/colonial world as ‘at once knowledge in which the very concept of ‘modernity’ rests and the judge and warrantor of legitimate and sustainable knowledge.’ Modernity is also linked to technocracy - ‘a system of governance in which technically trained experts rule by virtue of their specialized knowledge and position in dominant political and economic institutions’ (Fischer, 1990, 17). Technocracy privileges technical training and specialised knowledges over social meanings derived from experience or cultural practices (Danforth, 2016). Such rationalistic forms of specialised knowledges are often portrayed as neutral or apolitical. Yet, as Williams points out ‘technical knowledge and innovation have the capacity to change institutions and therefore to impact upon human capacities and attributes’ (Williamson, 2018, 219). As such, technocracy can also be argued to form part of modernity/colonial power apparatus and hegemonic dominance within higher education institutions.

South Africa is marked by a long history of marginalisation and exclusion based on race, land dispossession and a domination of imperialist economic power through seizures of mineral wealth (Oyedemi, 2018). Since the onset of democracy in 1994 in South Africa, decolonisation has been a process underway to remove the apparatus of apartheid and redress its history of marginalisation. Yet scholars are increasingly critiquing the utility of the term ‘decolonisation’ acknowledging that this suggests an overly neat and orderly process - as Mbembe suggests:

‘The harder I tried to make sense of the idea of ‘decolonization’ that has become the rallying cry for those trying to undo the racist legacies of the past, the more I kept asking myself to what extent we might be fighting a complexly mutating entity with concepts inherited from an entirely different age and epoch. Is today’s Beast the same as yesterday’s or are we confronting an entirely different apparatus, an entirely different rationality – both of which require us to produce radically new concepts?’ (Mbembe, 2016, 32)

For Oyedemi (2018, 2) whilst decolonisation has been underway in South Africa, colonial power has never gone away. 'Coloniality occurs in the previously colonized spaces and in spaces not historically colonized but have been subdued by allure of Eurocentrism. For about 500 years, coloniality as a parallel phenomenon with European modernity continues to shape global structure of economic and cultural relations of power.'

Thus, decolonisation denotes a political term, signalling the removal, either through negotiation (for example, in South Africa, Lesotho, Botswana) or by force (for example in Zimbabwe, Mozambique) of the former colonisers, with very little to no material, psychological, emotional, or intellectual benefit to the citizens of ex-colonies. *Decoloniality*, on the other hand, denotes dealing decisively with colonial vestiges in knowledge generation traditions and knowledge itself, psychological enslavement and a sense of unworthiness engineered for many centuries over the colonised through colonial institutions such as schools and universities (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2014).

Mgqwashu (2016) reminds us that despite the ending of colonialism, Africa's education systems were not revised to draw from local philosophies of education and knowledge generation or to restore pride and confidence in local traditional lifestyles, identities and knowledge systems. Rather their aim was to expand colonial education by making this widely available to indigenous communities (Mgqwashu, 2016). Mgqwashu argues that this form of postcolonial globalism is only likely to be useful to those living in cities and the value base of such an education has far less relevance for rurality, rural lifestyles or contexts. He further asserts, drawing on Sadar (1999) that it is not the West (or Global North's) economic or technological power that is most important in asserting dominance but it is the power to define – values, systems, what it is to be human.

Mgqwashu therefore suggests that academics in Africa across all fields need to take back the power to redefine the purpose for which students are educated. Oyedemi (2018) further argues that decolonisation should be about polycentrism and innovation, not about harking back to the past and staying there:

Decolonization is about de-hegemonizing the imperium of Eurocentrism for a tapestry of intercultural connections grounded in African realities. Also, decolonization is about innovations. To decolonize, there is a need to intensify current efforts in scientific, economic, cultural and technological innovations toward knowledge that will shape a future prosperous Africa. (Oyedemi, 2018, 15)

These ideas are developed further at the end of this working paper in relation to the curriculum more specifically in the section **Towards curricular justice**.

Space, place and rurality

In a study of rurality and the lived experiences of students coming from rural backgrounds and transitions to higher education, it is important to clarify our understandings of space and place and their contribution to understanding the transitions from rural contexts to universities and trajectories through the higher education landscape.

Massey (1992, 70) argues that the social and the spatial are inseparable and ‘space and the spatial are implicated in the production of history - and thus, potentially, in politics’. In South Africa, space is a deeply political and historical issue due to the displacement effects and continuing legacy of apartheid, which Gordon (2015) refers to as ‘geography of race’. Massey argues that space and time are inextricably linked and mutually constitutive, so that space is always dynamic and under construction (Massey, 1995). This is very similar to arguments made by the Russian author Bakhtin (See Bakhtin, Emerson and Holquist, 1981) writing about literary narratives in the 1920s who outlines how *chronotopes* or time:space configurations move the action from one scene to another. This idea has subsequently been adopted in educational research by Lemke (2000) who rejects the traditional view of spatiality – as ‘static slices of the social’ and flat views of human interactions that travel only to very local interactions, where immediate human scales of activity are most visible (Lemke, 2000, 274) and who, like Massey, argues that time and space are mutually constituting and through this, can act as resources for learning where space becomes *place* over time when it takes on personal meaning for us (Lemke, 2004).

Fenwick and colleagues (2011), taking a cultural geographies and sociomaterial approach adopt a slightly different perspective on the value of the concepts of place and space in researching learning contexts, referring to place as having a more static, sedimented or settled meaning, whereas they see space as a tool for asking questions such as ‘how [spaces] are constituted in ways that enable or inhibit learning, create inequities or exclusions, open or limit possibilities for new practices and knowledge; and how space is represented in the artefacts we use in educational practices, such as maps and pictures’ (Fenwick, Edwards and Sawchuck, 2011, 129).

In this study, we are focusing, not only on spaces and artefacts within institutional domains, we are also focusing analytic attention on rural spaces and the artefacts,

practices and different knowledges that have shaped the histories of the students coming to university from rural contexts. Furthermore, we are focusing on transitions and trajectories, movements towards and through places and across time and therefore we need to pay attention to how the spatial and temporal configurations encountered open up or limit the possibilities for students from rural contexts and in what ways they reinforce or augment inequalities or offer creative alternatives and avenues. Furthermore, Roberts and Green also argue that ‘using the language of place helps shift the focus of social justice considerations toward subjectivities and particularities’ (Roberts and Green, 2013, 766), and therefore towards lived experience, and the constructed nature of rurality and topographies. All of these perspectives are important in articulating a clearer focus on the role of time and space in lived experiences across contexts.

However, in seeking to conceptualize rurality, as argued in our first working paper (Leibowitz, 2017), it is important to understand that it is multifaceted - demographic, geographic, cultural and contextual (Roberts and Green, 2013). There are problems with essentialising and homogenising rurality (Roberts and Green, 2013), of constructing oversimplified binaries between urban and rural and seeing rural as urban’s ‘other’ (Cuervo, 2016, 18). There are also dangers on the one hand of romanticising rural life and experiences (Balfour, de Lange and Khau, 2012) and on the other of seeing rurality through the discourses of traditionalism, disadvantage and even backwardness (Roberts and Green, 2013). Rural contexts are diverse and perpetually in a state of flux, their different and evolving features need to be recognised. There exists a continuum of contexts of sparse population, small towns and large towns, and contexts of privilege and lack of access to resources may even exist side by side (Moreland, Chamberlain and Artaraz, 2003). Furthermore, rurality is both all-enveloping, but it is at the same time permeable, intersecting with other aspects of human existence that occur in other locations, be these cultural, institutional or physical. Rural life is also not static but changing and evolving over time so it is important to pay attention to how things change and why.

Leibowitz (2017) states that whilst we cannot offer a precise definition of rurality because of its complexity, we can investigate its meanings for people where such meanings are multidimensional; encompassing space, history, power, culture, material resources and identities (see working paper 1 – Leibowitz, 2017 for a more detailed discussion). In addition, the concepts of transition and trajectories underpin our research questions, so that we are focusing on movements through and between different contexts, which will be discussed below in the section on **Transitions, trajectories and changing identities across figured worlds.**

Socio-cultural, mediated practices

A focus on space and topographies contributes to a broader understanding of the material, and of embodiment as central parts of the sociocultural tradition that recognises that human actions and behaviours are mediated and shaped by social, cultural, historical and material means (Wertsch, 1991; Daniels, 2015). This mediational perspective offers scope for the examination of the role of the material within practices: the technological, the bodily and affective, and time and space constituted as part of the social, cultural and historical context. Context can be an overused and poorly understood concept and has often been interpreted as ‘that which surrounds’ (Cole, 1996). A sociocultural perspective on learning however argues that context is neither static, nor reducible to the surrounding environment. It is produced dynamically through our practices and mediated by material, social and historical relations (Van Oers, 1998).

The concept of practice (and practices) comes originally, according to Schatzki (2005), from anthropology but has been taken up very strongly in sociology and sociocultural and situated learning traditions. In sociology, both Giddens (1979) and Bourdieu (1977) have put forward the concept of practice underpinned by the dialectic relations between structure and human agency. Giddens (1979) argues that focusing on practices as a unit of analysis overcomes the dualisms of individual and society whilst Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of *habitus* can be argued to be both the product of material and historical conditions and embody the principles for generating and structuring practices. “The habitus is the universalizing mediation which causes an individual agent’s practices, without either explicit reason or signifying intent, to be none the less ‘sensible’ and ‘reasonable’ ” (ibid, 79).

Schatzki takes a slightly different perspective (Schatzki, 2005, 11) drawing on Heidegger and Wittgenstein to argue that *practices* are ‘embodied, materially mediated arrays of human activity centrally organised around shared practical understanding’. The emphasis on embodiment and material mediation are important in highlighting that practices are not just actions but are culturally mediated in different material and bodily ways. From a situated learning perspective, Lave & Wenger (2005) argue that a theory of social practice ‘emphasizes the relational interdependency of agent and world, activity, meaning, cognition, learning and knowing’ (Lave and Wenger, 2005, 151). Their attention is on participation and for them, the concepts of practice and practices show how meaning is produced and understood within a community including through the ‘shared repertoire’ of community members which forms part of the practice of that community, including the artefacts, discourses, routines and actions that people share (Wenger, 1998). Lave & Wenger (2005) link practice more specifically to learning as “the historical

production, transformation and change in persons” where understanding and experience are in constant interaction. Holland & Lave (2009, 5) go further in proposing that “social practice theory emphasizes the historical production of persons in practice, and pays particular attention to differences among participants, and to the ongoing struggles that develop across activities around those differences”. The importance of seeing practice in relation to history produced in persons is, we argue, particularly important in a study of rurality set principally in South Africa, where as highlighted above, the continuing legacy of apartheid is particularly felt in rural communities.

Taking all these slightly differing interpretations into account, we argue that the notion of *practices* provides a central unit of analysis as a means to interrogate the historical, cultural, relational, material and embodied shared (and also diverse or conflicting) understandings of learning, knowing and identities within and across contexts and communities.

Transitions, trajectories and changing identities across figured worlds

The SARiHE research is investigating transitions to higher education and trajectories through higher education and how students negotiate transitions from rural contexts into and through higher education. Moving from one context to another and negotiating transitions is always a matter of changes in the self, of becoming and therefore changing identities and subjectivities. Ecclestone, Biesta and Hughes (2010) focus on transition as a means of ‘identity making’ through changing understanding of self, in relation to individuals and social structures. *Trajectory* implies a path or journey through a particular lifeworld and tends to be more longitudinal but is also often associated with becoming and changing identities (e.g. Barnett, 1996). The idea of transitions between different worlds and trajectories through life worlds and the relationship these have with identity making and agency has been well theorized by Dorothy Holland and colleagues in ‘Identity and agency in cultural worlds’ (1998) through the theoretical construct of ‘figured worlds’. This theory balances previous perspectives on identity, which Adams suggests have been either overly structure-centric or overly agentic (Adams, 2006). This hybrid interpretation of identity, drawing on constructs from Bourdieu, Vygotsky and Bakhtin incorporates reflexivity and agency, whilst nonetheless acknowledging the societal structuring and positioning that shape our future selves.

A *figured world* can be understood as ‘a socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others’ (Holland et al., 1998, 52). Figured worlds are therefore social encounters in which the positions of those taking part matter, they are socially organised and located at particular times and places. They are also cultural worlds. A rural community, a learning environment or a university can be considered as figured worlds. Through our encounters with different figured worlds over time, we gain new or changing identities ‘through continued participation in the positions defined by the social organisation of those worlds’ activity’ (Holland et al., 1998, 41). Therefore, identities are not fixed. Rather, how we act when encountering new figured worlds gives rise to and shapes our identities. Instead of seeing identity in essentialist terms, we consider identity dynamically as the ‘self in practice’ (ibid, 31). According to Holland and colleagues, two forms of interacting identities shape the self in practice. Figurative identities concern ‘*the stories, acts and characters that make the world a cultural world*’ (ibid, 12), whereas positional identities concern ‘*day-to-day and on the ground relations of power, deference and entitlement, social affiliation and distance – with the social-interactive, social-relational structures of the lived world*’ (ibid, 127). The interplay of these identities enable us to move beyond the social positioning and structures that reproduce inequalities and develop a new or reformed identity within a community, principally through the improvisational acts. For Holland et al improvisations are the mechanisms for employing our agency through actions designed to resist or overcome the cultural and historical constraints that powerful structures and positions embody (ibid). This conception of improvisation can also be defined as the interplay between agency and habitus.

“Improvisations are the sort of impromptu actions that occur when our past, brought to the present as habitus, meets with a particular combination of circumstances and conditions for which we have no set response. Such improvisations are the openings by which change comes about from generation to generation.” (1998, 17-18)

Employing the concepts of figured worlds, positional and figurative identities and improvisational acts enables us to explore the influences of rural, cultural worlds upon the new worlds of higher education including different practices, funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López and Tejada, 1999), discourses and expectations encountered and the adaptations students make in relation to access, participation and studying at university. Further to this, Norton (2010) in relation to language practices developed (inspired by Bourdieu) the concept of ‘investment’ in order to understand learners’ actions and agency towards different funds of knowledge (in her case this was in relation to language learning). For Norton, this

“signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language and their often ambivalent desire to learn and practice it. If learners ‘invest’ in the target language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital.” (Norton, 2010, 353)

This notion of *investment* can also help to avoid a deficit positioning by focusing on how students *invest* in the funds of knowledge in rural communities. For example the ways in which students invest in indigenous knowledges, languages and local practices and how these shape their identities and influence their cultural capital, whilst also acknowledging the positionings of students within rural backgrounds and how such positionings are embraced, resisted or adapted through new or reformed identities and improvisations. Similarly, it will also be important in analysing how students from rural backgrounds experience higher education and invest in the practices that shape their encounters with the university world, its knowledge domains, pedagogies, spaces, technologies, systems and structures.

Funds of knowledge, indigenous knowledge systems and living curricula

One of the key aspects of this study is to understand the role of different funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992; Gutierrez et al., 1999) that students invest in including informal and local knowledges, for example youth culture, church cultures and more traditional, historical knowledge practices, often called indigenous knowledges. There are many competing definitions of indigenous knowledges, the following is from Parent, a Canadian author:

“encompass the technological, social, economic, philosophical, spiritual, educational, legal and governmental elements of particular Indigenous cultures throughout the world. As Indigenous Knowledges are context-specific and interwoven within a given community’s lived experience, they are dynamic and ever-changing to reflect environmental and social adaptations. Indigenous Knowledges are therefore not a singular body of knowledge but are multi-dimensional and pluralistic in that they contain many layers of being, knowing, and modes of expression.” (Parent, 2014, 59)

This suggests that indigenous knowledges are dynamic and multi-layered and deeply connected to lived experience, history and community values.

Kaya and Seleti (2014) from South Africa have challenged the western understanding of knowledge or knowledges in order to show that a more Africa-centric interpretation of knowledge does not separate theory and practice as western understandings of knowledge tend to. Furthermore Nkondo (2012) suggests that western perceptions of African indigenous knowledge as mere repetition of practices without any underpinning theory, demonstrates continuing western cultural and intellectual arrogance. Such perceptions also privilege theory as always needing to be present.

Kaya and Seleti further argue that indigenous ways of knowing need to be understood as collective, cultural and intellectual:

“Indigenous institutions of knowledge production, conservation and sharing such as initiation schools, indigenous games, agricultural systems, dances and songs, storytelling, proverbs, etcetera, still remain pillars of indigenous African ways of knowing. The wealth of knowledge that still exists among the elders and other knowledge holders in African local communities demonstrates the vibrant intellectualism to which African researchers and intellectuals should turn.” (Kaya and Seleti, 2014, 33)

We want to examine how different funds of knowledge including indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing might contribute to transitions to and trajectories through higher education for rural students. We are also exploring the role of dominant forms of knowledge found in universities in potentially excluding students from rural backgrounds. Rethinking material and cultural resources within associational and recognitional forms of social justice necessitates a focus on indigenous knowledge systems and alternative curricula (Chilisa, 2012; Mertens, Cram and Chilisa, 2013) how teaching and learning should respond to the needs and resources of differently positioned students (Trahar, 2011; Trahar, 2015). There is a need to ascertain the knowledge practices – artefacts, discourses, routines and actions that students from rural areas bring to university, and how these may be acknowledged and used as a bridge to scaffold the students towards their acquisition of dominant knowledge forms, and to challenge the reliance on dominant knowledge forms to the exclusion of all other knowledge systems.

Roberts and Green highlight a tendency towards ‘spatial blindness’ in academics which assumes similar needs in students from metropolitan and rural areas, that rural students need to become less rural, or are ‘other’ (Roberts and Green, 2013). Our research questions address such issues specifically. They investigate the extent to which students’ existing knowledge and cultural resources are used to scaffold their acquisition of dominant forms of academic capital, or whether they are

excluded. We take a broad view of what is meant by curriculum to include:- disciplinary knowledge, learning and teaching methods, methods of assessments, use of technologies, studying methods and resources. We have adopted the idea of a 'living' curriculum, which according to Bath et al. (2004) is one where 'where regular review and renewal supports alignment between the planned, enacted and experienced curriculum for students and teachers' (2004, 320). We aim to identify how inclusive and living curricula can be developed, building on the experiences of all students, including those from Southern African rural contexts.

Towards curricular justice

Many academics in the Global North and, indeed, in the Global South, are unaware of indigenous knowledge systems, local and non-formal knowledges perhaps because, as Mgqwashu (2016) cautions, grand narratives, including that of "decolonisation" tend to silence "local narratives". As discussed earlier, acknowledging the continuation of colonial thinking and practices is particularly important in South Africa, where the legacy of apartheid and the colonial past are still very much in evidence, including in the educational systems at all levels.

De Sousa Santos (2014) argues that local knowledge systems and epistemologies from the South are subject to 'epistemicide' or the murder of those forms of knowledge that are perceived by the Global North to be subordinate. This silencing of southern knowledges is part of the continuing domination of scientific and western knowledge. Motsa (2017, 30) further suggests that these realities/knowledge systems have been perceived as both irrelevant and primitive and not worthy of inclusion in curricula. De Sousa Santos calls for challenges to the 'monoculture of scientific knowledge and rigor by identifying other knowledges and criteria for rigor and validity' (2014, 188) and a recognition that there is an ecology of knowledges and that all knowledges are to some extent incomplete. He further argues that to embrace other knowledges requires 'intercultural translation' through searching for common concerns and revealing underlying assumptions amongst cultures and developing hybrid forms of understanding (de Sousa Santos, 2014). This is important as many authors are arguing for decolonisation of the curriculum but it is not always clear what is being proposed as alternatives or what mechanisms for change might be useful.

Furthermore, Connell (2017) argues that curriculum change in relation to southern and postcolonial theory is underdeveloped and needs to address the effects of colonization on space, personal and social violence and the marginalization or discrediting of cultural, religious and linguistic traditions. She employs the term

‘curricular justice’ because, rather than reflecting the ‘*culture* of the least advantaged’ (Connell, 2017, 11, original emphasis), it proposes a critique of culture, creating space for dialogue and for reframing learning as conversation. Trahar (2018) shows in her blog on Curricular Justice on our website (see further on <http://sarihe.org.za/curricular-justice-a-socially-just-curriculum/>) how Connell’s critique challenges the accepted understanding of a fixed curriculum by showing that ‘the selection of ‘knowledge’ for a curriculum is ‘not done in heaven by a committee of epistemological angels’ (Connell, 1992, 137). In other words, curricula don’t fall from the sky; they are developed by people in contexts and for particular purposes – often ideological ones.’

This argument for rethinking curricula and the domination of western knowledges in universities, challenges some of the views of academic developers and policy makers in South Africa who often use the term “epistemological access” (Morrow, 2007) to describe how students’ prior knowledge and experience are not recognised, becoming effectively excluded from the curriculum. An emphasis on epistemological access, or lack thereof, has concentrated mainly on a ‘lack’ or under preparedness of the student, rather than the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the curriculum to meet their needs and how students can adapt to or gain access to specialised bodies of knowledge. Whereas, alternative ideas of curricular justice, intercultural translation and an ecology of knowledges to which we subscribe, place the emphasis on the curriculum and dominant scientific western knowledges changing, following the decoloniality argument outlined earlier.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the concepts outlined in this paper are designed to shape the interpretation of the data being co-produced within the SARiHE project. In setting these out, we acknowledge the ‘westernness’ of much of the theoretical framing presented here. We are very much aware of and sensitive to this. We this as part of our questioning and requires us to have an on-going critical reflexivity to all the work we undertake.

However, the concepts represent a coherent and connected set of ideas to guide our thinking to date, although they are not exhaustive and will need further development.

- Practices** – The historical, cultural, relational, material and embodied shared (and also diverse or conflicting) understandings of learning, knowing and identities within and across contexts and communities;
- The central unit of analysis

The multiple dimensions of rurality – including space, history, power, culture, material resources and identities

- Recognising that we are also investigating this concept and may develop this further;

Figured worlds – including transitions, trajectories, positional and figurative identities and improvisations (as interplay of agency and habitus)

- To explore the influences of rural, cultural worlds upon the new worlds of higher education including different practices, funds of knowledge, discourses and expectations encountered and the adaptations students make in relation to knowledge domains, pedagogies, spaces, technologies, systems and structures.

Investment in different funds of knowledge and indigenous knowledge systems -

- Identifying what funds of knowledge students invest in from their rural communities, histories and cultures, in transitional spaces and when at university

Decoloniality and modernity in higher education

- Recognising that all our analyses are overlaid by an understanding of the continuing challenges of decoloniality, the continuing grip of colonial power, which goes hand in hand with modernity and technocratic university institutions.
- Decolonisation as a redefinition of the purpose of education, polycentric and innovative

Curricular justice, ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation

- To explore curriculum change and new forms of pedagogy and educational practices.

References

- Adams, Matthew. 2006. "Hybridizing Habitus and Reflexivity: Towards an Understanding of Contemporary Identity?" *Sociology* 40 (3): 511–28. doi:10.1177/003803850663672.
- Bakhtin, M M, C Emerson, and M Holquist. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Balfour, R, N de Lange, and M Khau. 2012. "Editorial. Rural Education and Rural Realities: The Politics and Possibilities of Rural Research in Southern Africa." *Perspectives in Education* 30 (1): i–ix.
- Barnett, Ronald. 1996. "Being and Becoming: A Student Trajectory." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 15 (2): 72–84.
- Bath, D, C Smith, S Stein, and R Swann. 2004. "Beyond Mapping and Embedding Graduate Attributes: Bringing Together Quality Assurance and Action Learning to Create a Validated and Living Curriculum." *Higher Education Research & Development* 23 (3): 313–28.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilisa, B. 2012. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Cole, M. 1996. *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 1992. "Citizenship, Social Justice and Curriculum." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 2 (2): 133–46.
- . 2017. "Southern Theory and World Universities." *Higher Education Research and Development* 36 (1): 4–15.
- Cuervo, Hernan. 2016. *Understanding Social Justice in Rural Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Danforth, S. 2016. "Social Justice and Technocracy: Tracing the Narratives of Inclusive Education in the USA." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 37 (4): 582–99.
- Daniels, H. 2015. "Mediation: An Expansion of the Socio-Cultural Gaze." *History of the Human Sciences* 28 (2): 34–50. doi:10.1177/0952695114559994.

- de Sousa Santos, B. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. London: Routledge.
- Ecclestone, K, G Biesta, and M Hughes. 2010. *Transitions and Learning through the Lifecourse*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Fenwick, T, R Edwards, and P Sawchuck. 2011. "Spatiality and Temporality: Understanding Cultural Geography." In *Emerging Approaches to Educational Research: Tracing the Socio-Material*, edited by T Fenwick, Richard Edwards, and P Sawchuck, First. New York: Routledge.
- Fischer, F. 1990. *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*. Thousand Oaks.C.A: Sage.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1979. "Agency, Structure." In *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, 49–95. London: Palgrave,.
- . 1998. *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Gutiérrez, K D, P Baquedano-López, and C Tejada. 1999. "Rethinking Diversity: Hybridity and Hybrid Language Practices in the Third Space." *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 6 (4): 286–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10749039909524733>.
- Holland, D, W Lachicotte, D Skinner, and C Cain. 1998. *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Holland, D, and J Lave. 2009. "Social Practice Theory and the Historical Production of Persons." *Actio: An International Journal of Human Activity Theory*, no. 2: 1–15. <http://kuir.jm.kansai-u.ac.jp/dspace/handle/10112/7582>.
- Kaya, H. O, and Y. N Seleti. 2014. "African Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Relevance of Higher Education in South Africa." *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* 12 (1).
- Lave, J, and E Wenger. 2005. "Practice, Person, Social World." In *An Introduction to Vygotsky (Second Edition)*, edited by H Daniels, 149–56. London: Routledge.
- Leibowitz, Brenda. 2017. "Rurality and Education." 1. Working Paper for the SARiHE Project.
- Lemke, J.L. 2000. "Across the Scales of Time: Artifacts, Activities, and Meanings in Ecosocial Systems." *Mind, Culture & Activity* 7: 273–92.
- . 2004. "Learning across Multiple Places and Their Chronotopes." In *AER*

2004 Symposium. San Diego, CA. http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jaylemke/papers/aera_2004.htm.

- Massey, D. 1992. "Politics and Space/Time." *New Left Review* 196: 65–84.
- . 1995. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Mertens, D, F Cram, and B Chilisa. 2013. *Indigenous Pathways into Social Research: Press, Voices of a New Generation*. . Walnut Creek: Left Coast.
- Mgqwashu, E. 2016. "Education Can't Be for the 'Public Good' If Universities Ignore Rural Life. The Conversation,." *The Conversation*.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2009. "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom." *Theory, Culture & Society* 26 (7–8): 159–81.
- . 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.
- Moll, L. C., C Amanti, D Neff, and N Gonzalez. 1992. "Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms." *Theory into Practice* 31 (2): 132–41.
- Moreland, N, J Chamberlain, and K Artaraz. 2003. "Rurality and Higher Education: A Conceptual Analysis." In *Higher Education and the Lifecourse. Maidenhead:*, edited by M Slowey and D Watson, 51–66. Maidenhead: OUP/SRHE.
- Morrow, W.E. 2007. *Learning to Teach in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC press.
- Motsa, Z. 2017. "When the Lion Tells the Story: A Response from South Africa." *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36 (1): 28–35.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. 2014. "Global Coloniality and the Challenges of Creating African Futures." *Strategic Review for Southern Africa* 36 (2): 181–202.
- Nkondo, M. 2012. "Indigenous African Knowledge Systems in a Polyepistemic World: The Capabilities Approach and the Translatability of Knowledge Systems." In *Presented at Southern African Regional Colloquium on Indigenous African Knowledge Systems: Methodologies and Epistemologies for Research, Teaching, Learning and Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Howard College Campus: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Norton, B. 2010. "Language and Identity." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, edited by N.H Hornberger and S.L McKay, 349–69. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Oyedemi, Toks. 2018. "(De)Coloniality and South African Academe,," *Critical Studies in Education*. doi:10.1080/17508487.2018.1481123.
- Parent, Amy. 2014. "Bending the Box: Learning from Indigenous Students Transitioning from High School to University: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation." University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0072168>.
- Roberts, P, and B Green. 2013. "Researching Rural Places: On Social Justice and Education." *Qualitative Enquiry*. 19 (10): 765–74.
- Sadar, Z. 1999. *Orientalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Schatzki, T. 2005. "Introduction." In *The Practice Turn to Contemporary Theory*, edited by T Schatzki, K Knorr Cetina, and C von Savigny, Second, 1–14. London: Routledge.
- Trahar, S. 2011. *Developing Cultural Capability in International Higher Education: A Narrative Inquiry*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- . 2015. "Learning and Teaching on Transnational Higher Education Programmes in Hong Kong." *Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences (LATISS) Special Issue Learning and Teaching in Transnational Education* 8 (1).
- Van Oers, Bert. 1998. "From Context to Contextualizing." *Learning and Instruction* 8 (6): 473–88. doi:10.1016/S0959-4752(98)00031-0.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Edited by John Seely Brown. *Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J V. 1991. *Voices of the Mind: A Socio-Cultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williamson, B. 2018. "Silicon Startup Schools: Technocracy, Algorithmic Imaginaries and Venture Philanthropy in Corporate Education Reform." *Critical Studies in Education* 59 (2): 218–36. doi:10.1080/17508487.2016.1186710.