

Editorial

With the first issue for 2019, we enter our 7th volume of *Critical Studies in Higher Education*. The articles, and reviews, included in this issue tackle pertinent issues across higher education, ranging from developing new academic lecturers, to creating more inclusive educational spaces for students from diverse socioeconomic and linguistic backgrounds, and addressing different aspects of decolonising higher education. These papers provide for stimulating reading, and we hope that they will spark and continue important debates and conversations in your own contexts.

In the opening paper, entitled “How are institutions developing the next generation of university teachers?”, Amanda Hlengwa contributes important insights for the broad field of Academic Staff Development in South African Higher Education. The idea of building the next generation of university teachers has received structural support *inter alia* through the New Generation of Academics Programme (nGAP) and Hlengwa has chosen in this paper to focus in particular on the structural and institutional development of teaching as one component of this academic career. The study investigates how the nGAP was implemented at four universities by focussing on the induction experiences of early-career academics, and incorporates representation from each of the three university types in the South African Higher Education differentiated system: two comprehensive universities, a university of technology and a research-intensive university. Specific attention is paid to the complex institutional cultures across these three institutional types as the paper reports on how three dominant discursive constructions of teaching, emerging from induction programmes in the four institutions, may contribute to shaping a new generation of university teachers. The findings show that nGAP lecturers’ induction into teaching is framed by these three discourses and the paper concludes with recommendations on how universities can better support nGAP appointees to become effective teachers, as well as how the marginalisation of teaching within the nGAP can be addressed.

Following on from this paper, Natashia Muna, Taahira Goolam Hoosen, Karis Moxley and Ermien van Pletzen, in “Establishing a Health Sciences writing centre in the changing landscape of South African Higher”, reflect on the five years of planning, establishment and evolution of a writing centre in the Health Sciences faculty of a South African university. The writers treat the “Writing Lab” as a case study and draw on the theoretical framework of the New Literacies Studies, the academic literacies approach and the scholarship developed around writing centres in South Africa. They use monitoring and evaluation data to analyse the progress of the Writing Lab and argue that the conceptualisation of the writing centre was at the outset underpinned by the academic socialisation model but that, facilitated by the

Primary Health Care philosophy of the Health Sciences faculty, it has shifted over the period to encompass a more transformative ideology. They illustrate this shift by showing how, in some areas, such as the Writing Lab's practice of mediating between postgraduate students and their supervisors and its use of multilingual academic literacy practices, the Writing lab has begun to participate in new forms of knowledge building which may contribute to creation of decolonised spaces and shifts in institutional culture.

In their paper, "Post-qualitative design research: Negotiating serendipity and risking the colonised self", Karolien Perold-Bull and Elmarie Costandius provide an interesting take on the potential for using post-qualitative research in the field of design at a university in the context of transformation in South African higher education. Post-qualitative research is different from humanist research, which focuses on codes, themes and meanings, in that it allows for creativity in the research process and pays more attention to how things work rather than what they mean. As they note, post-qualitative research troubles the easy sense-making of humanist qualitative methodologies. The 'new' that Perold-Bull and Costandius offer to the literature on post-qualitative methodologies in higher education is their concept of serendipity in an increasingly controlled research environment, which they argue, can facilitate attunement and considered response to such moments as they emerge. Their paper gives a detailed account of the unfolding research process, using many illustrations to demonstrate how they did it. The article gives the reader a good understanding into how a post-qualitative approach may actively work towards the discovery of unexpected and transformative insights, practices, and things – by which they mean serendipity. This is also achieved through the elimination of the binaries of research and teaching which merge to allow for opportunities to arise for creativity, attunement and serendipity.

Utilising innovative methodology in the 4th paper of the issue, "Recognising poor black youth from rural communities in South Africa as epistemic contributors", Mikateko Mathebula argues that in South Africa, students who are poor, black and come from rural communities with poorly resourced schools are vulnerable to being victims of epistemic injustice. The paper explains that this is largely because they are usually seen as knowers who have low (English) language proficiency and deficits in academic literacy, and thus the knowledge they already have is poorly appreciated in university contexts. In an attempt to provide a nuanced characterisation of youth from rural areas, the author reflects on one student's life-history interviews and his photo-story that form part of data collected since 2017 for *Miratho*, a project on achieved higher education learning outcomes for low-income university students. The paper uses a capabilities approach as an interpretive framework for the qualitative data and theorises that students' linguistic capital and narrative capital are epistemic materials that can be mobilised into the 'capability for epistemic contribution', conceptualised by Miranda Fricker. Mathebula thus makes a case for higher education researchers

and educators to recognise poor black youth from rural communities as both givers and takers of knowledge or 'epistemic contributors'. It argues that doing so constitutes an ethical response to the structural inequalities that limit equitable university access and participation for youth in this demographic.

Closing the 'Articles' section is Arie Rip's paper "Recapturing the status of indigenous knowledge and its relation to western science". The paper was originally written as part of an NRF-funded project in their then-programme on indigenous knowledge systems (the project also involved Johann Mouton and George Subotsky). Though drafted some time ago now, the main argument - that the sociology of knowledge has important insights to offer as we consider higher education and the inclusion and exclusion of different kinds of knowledge and knowers - remains important. Additionally, the paper contributes to the curriculum knowledge debate, especially now that students' claims about decolonising the curriculum (for example, #ScienceMustFall) have been heard, and are being tentatively addressed by teaching staff, and teaching and learning experts. Rip argues that calls for decolonising the curriculum often begin from a perception of being 'othered' and that this may lead to 'counter-othering' which is not a productive approach, in his view. Rather, drawing on cases of lay and indigenous knowledge in health, agriculture and education, he suggests a more productive 'trading zone' approach to bringing together Western scientific and indigenous knowledge.

The issue closes with three reviews of excellent new books in higher education studies.

The Editors

Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning