

**Accelerated development programmes for
Black academics: Interrupting or reproducing
social and cultural dominance?**

MASIXOLE BOOI

G14B6090

Supervised by Professor Louise Vincent

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the
degree of Master of Art in Political and International Studies**

November 2015

ABSTRACT

A wide body of research literature on transformation of higher education institutions in South Africa has focused on institutional reform and restructuring, change in employment legislation and policies, transforming institutional culture(s) and student and staff demographics (Portnoi, 2009:373; Viljoen and Rothmann, 2002:3; Badat, 2007; 2010; Cloete, Muller, Makgoba and Ekong, 1997; Nieman, 2010). The literature on transformation of higher education institutions shows that the underrepresentation, recruiting and retaining of blacks and women in senior posts is still the major challenge faced by the project of transforming higher education, particularly in Historically White Institutions (HWIs). Universities have introduced a variety of ‘accelerated development’ programmes to meet this challenge and accelerate the entry into academia of black academics. The present study draws on Pierre Bourdieu’s notions of cultural capital, field and social capital to interpret the lived experiences of participants in the Accelerated Development Programme (ADP) of one HWI. In particular the study is interested in how, in the participants’ experience, they, as members of the programme, have or have not been able to contribute to the transformation of the culture(s) of the institution. The study critically examines the assumption that the institutional practices, values and norms can be changed only by socialising ‘new’ lecturers into an already existing dominant culture rather than seeing the need to socialise existing lecturers into a new culture informed by a democratic ethos.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Background and Context.....	1
1.2. Rationale	4
1.3. Theoretical framing: Social and Cultural Reproduction.....	7
1.4. Structure.....	8
Chapter 1: Introduction	8
Chapter 2: Background and context.....	8
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	8
Chapter 4: Cultural capital.....	9
Chapter 5: The rules of the field	9
Chapter 6: Social Capital	9
Chapter 7: Conclusion	9
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework.....	10
2.1. Cultural Capital	11
2.2. Field	12
2.3. Habitus	14
2.4. Social capital	15
Chapter 3: Research Methods.....	18
3.1. Participants.....	19
3.2. Interviews	22
3.3. Ethical considerations.....	22
3.4. Data analysis	23
3.5. Categories and Themes.....	24
Chapter 4: Cultural capital and Habitus	26
4.1. Cultural reproduction and embodied capital.....	28
4.2. Habitus	35
4.3. Conclusion.....	46
Chapter 5: The rules of the field.....	47
5.1. Institutionalised cultural capital	54
5.2. Conclusion.....	62
Chapter 6: Social Capital	64
6.2. Personified Representation.....	64
6.2. Conclusion.....	76

Chapter 7: Conclusion	77
References	81
Appendix A: Email to the participants.....	94
Appendix B: Informed consent form.....	95
Appendix C: Nodes.....	96

List of tables

Table 1: University academic staff by race and gender (2010)

Table 2: University academic staff by race and gender (2013)

Table 3: Participant Demographics

Table 4: Categories and Themes

List of Abbreviations

ADP	Accelerated Development Programmes
CHE	Council on Higher Education
CHERTL	Centre for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning
HESA	Higher Education of South Africa
HWI	Historically White Institutions
WASA	Women's Academic Solidarity Association

Acknowledgements

My humble gratitude for the completion of this work is firstly due to the one and only, the Almighty, my Creator. To Professor Louise Vincent, my supervisor, I would like to express my deep gratitude for your tireless and uncompromising supervision and guidance.

My source of strength for the completion of this work, I would like to thank my family, my mother Cwaita Mgwana and my father Sonwabo Mgwana, my sisters Ntombekhaya, Xolelwa, Asiyolise and my brothers, Mzoxolo and Thabo thank you for your patience and encouragement, Ndiyabulela ngoku ndinyamezela.

To Yolanda Nyenzane, deep gratitude for your unconditional support and confidence in me along the way, thank you. To Sandiso Bazana, a friend and a brother, enkosi Mkhuluwa for your robust conversations and guidance.

Finally, I would like to thank the institutional culture research team for their resolute intellectual and emotional support. To all my participants, deep appreciation and gratitude for sacrificing your valuable time to share your lived experiences with me.

I would like to thank the Ada & Bertie Levenstein Bursary for funding my studies. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily attributed to the Ada & Bertie Levenstein Bursary.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Background and Context

Research on transformation of South African Higher education institutions post-1994 has focused on institutional reform and restructuring, change in employment legislation and policies, transforming institutional culture(s) and changing student and staff profiles (Portnoi, 2009:373; Viljoen and Rothmann, 2002:3; Badat, 2007; 2010; Cloete, Muller, Makgoba and Ekong, 1997; Nieman, 2010). Although there has been institutional reform in South African higher education institutions and changes in employment policies, the literature on transformation of higher education institutions notes that the underrepresentation of blacks and women post-1994 is still the major challenge faced by the project of transforming higher education (Higher Education South Africa, 2011:2; Mazibuko, 2006:106; Mabokela, 2003:133; Mngomezulu and Ndlovu, 2013:112; Council on Higher Education, 2009:74; Sebola and Khabo, 2010:207-213; Govinder, Zondo and Mokgoba, 2013). Higher Education institutions in South African, in short, are facing a challenge with recruiting and retaining black academics and other senior staff (see Quinn and Vorster, *Mail & Guardian*, October 5, 2012; HESA, 2011; Hlengwa, 2015; Altbach, 2009; DeLong, 2004; Cloete and Galant, 2005; Africa Grant Makers Affinity Group, 2008; Tettey, 2009; Badat, 2008; 2010; Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2010; Dube and Ngulube, 2013; Geber, 2009; McGregor, 2008; Portnoi, 2009).

Between 2003 and 2009 nationally, the representation of Africans¹ in the academic staff of all 25 South African public universities increased from 21.3% to 28%, similarly for Coloureds a slight increase from 4.5% to 5.2% was seen, while for Indians the percentage increased from 7.9% to 8.4%. The percentage of White academic staff in the same period declined from 61, 6% to 57, 7% (HESA, 2011:3; Mngomezulu and Ndlovu, 2013:112). The Staffing South Africa's Universities Framework (SSAUF) that is implemented by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) is aimed at transforming the size, capacity and composition of the academic staff of South African universities as its primary objective (DHET, 2015).

¹ Racial terms in the thesis are used not as biological categories but rather as socially constructed identities

The SSAUF is shaped by the Proposal for a National Programme to Develop the Next Generation of Academics for South African Higher Education (HESA, 2011).

At Rhodes University, training and retaining the next generation of academics is addressed through two Accelerated Development Programmes, one funded by the Mellon Foundation and the other by the Kresge Foundation. The university received \$1 000 000 from the Mellon Foundation in 2001 and a further \$600 000 in 2008 for this purpose. The Mellon Programme has been running for 14 years and to date 23 lecturers have been selected to participate in the Programme. Of the 23, 13 lecturers have been appointed to permanent positions at Rhodes University. In April 2009 the university was awarded a grant of \$900,000 from the Kresge Foundation for the Faculty ADP, a project which would run for the period 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2012. This grant enabled the appointment of eight lecturers on three year contracts. In 2010 two appointments were made and in 2011 a further three lecturers were appointed, with the remaining further three lecturers recruited in 2012.

Between 2001 and 2014, there have been 44 ADP posts, 5 (11%) of the appointments have been international members of staff (black foreign academics); 18 (41%) of these staff are currently permanently employed while 15 (34%) individuals are currently on the ADP lined up against permanent posts; seven (16%) individuals who were in the programme left the university; four (9%) individuals also left the university since there were no posts available to them after the completion of the ADP (Rhodes University Growing the Next Generation of Academics, 2015). The stated aim of these programmes is to respond to the post-apartheid context of South African higher education in which it has become imperative to ensure that a new generation of scholars is developed and to ensure that this new generation is increasingly reflective of the demographics of South Africa (Rhodes University Kresge Foundation Faculty ADP, 2010; Centre for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning, 2014).

Thus the Kresge and Mellon ADPs exist at Rhodes University as a mechanism for giving effect to the University's strategic intent of enhancing the diversity of staff by accelerating the academic careers of individuals from designated groups, and facilitating their entry into academic life at Rhodes University. These programmes also provide black and women South Africans the opportunity to acquire, within a carefully structured and developmental mentoring system of three-year duration, the teaching experience, research skills and teaching qualifications that are essential to their ability to function as scholars, researchers and intellectuals (Rhodes University Kresge Foundation Faculty ADP, 2010:1; Rhodes University

Mellon Foundation ADP: Employment Procedures and Regulations, 2008). The Mellon and Kresge programmes at Rhodes University notwithstanding, academic staff demographics at Rhodes University remain a challenge for the University.

Year	Race	Male	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior lecturer	Lecturer	Junior lecturer
2009	Africans		4	5	4	15	2
	Indians		2	1	2	3	0
	Coloured		1	0	1	1	0
	Whites		52	33	39	46	3
2009	Race	Female	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer	Lecturer	Junior Lecturer
	Africans		2	0	3	8	1
	Indians		0	2	0	3	1
	Coloured		0	2	1	2	1
	Whites		12	5	35	44	6

Rhodes University permanent academic staff by race and gender 2009 (Rhodes University Digest of Statistics 2010)

Year	Race	Males	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior Lecturers	Lecturer	Junior Lecturer
2013	Africans		2	6	7	13	1
	Indians		1	0	3	6	0
	Coloured		0	1	2	7	0
	Whites		39	38	42	32	0
2013	Race	Females	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer	Lecturer	Junior Lecturer
	Africans		1	0	5	10	1
	Indians		0	1	2	8	0
	Coloured		1	3	2	3	1
	Whites		11	10	51	33	1

Rhodes University permanent academic staff by race and gender 2013 (Rhodes University Digest of Statistics 2014)

Noting these staff demographics and the slow pace in the transformation of Rhodes University in terms of equity, Jeanne van der Merwe (*City Press*, August 3, 2014) points out that, “Rhodes University has the highest percentage of white professors (94.3%), followed by the University of the Free State (92.6%) and the University of Pretoria (86%)”. This reflects the challenge for the ADP at Rhodes University established in 2001, when after a decade the Rhodes University professoriate is still predominantly white.

Given that South Africa’s academic labour market is ageing, the country’s university system can only be sustained if the imperative of investing in the next generation of academics succeeds (Unisa Foundation, 2013). As Quinn and Vorster (*Mail & Guardian*, October 5, 2012) point out, “most senior academic positions in historically white universities are now held by ageing white males who are due to retire within the next decade or so. It is thus an imperative for the academy to attract and retain particularly young blacks and women”. At present however, with white and male students in the ranks of post graduate classes continuing to be unrepresentative of the country’s population demographics (constituting 52% of Master’s graduates in 2005 HESA, 2011:7), it clear that changing the demographics of academic staff remains a challenge going into the future.

1.2. Rationale

The existing research literature on developing and retaining black and women academics in South African higher education identifies the major obstacles as including: alienating and exclusive institutional cultures especially in historically white institutions (HWIs); remuneration of academics and the lack of adequate funding for postgraduate students (Badat, 2010; Canham, 2013; HESA, 2011; Visser and Heyns, 2007). Very little research work has been done on the contribution of programmes that are aimed at training and retaining the next generation of academics to the transformation of institutional cultures. Most of the research work has focused on the underrepresentation of blacks and women and the need to retain blacks and women in order to change the racial composition of academic staff (see Mapasela and Hay, 2006; Mabokela, 2003).

Mabokela (2000:111) argues that it is important to examine the institutional culture of HWIs in order to clearly understand what it is that makes these institutions a homely space for white academics but alienating and exclusive in the experience of many black academics. The creation of institutional cultures that are conducive and welcoming so that black and women

academics feel a sense of belonging is of central importance. Accepting racial equity as a basis for training and retaining the next generation of academics, institutional cultures and practices which affect how black academics are treated need to be transformed. Existing evidence notes that there is still some distance to be travelled before this goal is attained and that at HWIs the challenge of institutional cultures that are experienced as unwelcoming and inhospitable by black academics is particularly acute. Magoqwana (in Women's Academic Solidarity Association 2013:332) for example has observed of Rhodes University that: "Rhodes is struggling to retain black and women academics because of the fact that we are still being made to feel 'like the other'. The university needs start building a unified academic community culture in a far more pro-active way".

Niemann (2010:105) describes institutional culture as "shared values and beliefs as well as the more tangible ways of what binds the group of people together such as the physical environment, shared symbols, artefacts, organisation stories, role model, practices, rituals and ceremonies". The project of training and retaining the next generation cannot be separated from the need to transform institutional cultures perceived as exclusive and white by many black academics and scholars. For example, HESA (2011:8) observes that:

The struggle of historically white institutions to attract and retain black and women academics can also, in part be attributed to alienating institutional cultures. Black academics tend to find themselves marginalised by the 'whiteness' of institutional environments and cultures and the hegemony in the centre of administrative and academics power (committees, disciplines and faculties) of white academics and administrators.

Institutional cultures have to do with the day to day experiences of those who inhabit an institution, incorporating interpersonal relations and shared working environments. Mapasela and Hay (2006:711) observe that "institutional culture is often explained as feeling at home or in place ... and it is often expressed by referring to feelings of alienation and exclusion ... because of not fitting in or identifying with ... the story that [the institution] tells about itself". Many black and women academics at HWIs like Rhodes University find the institutional cultures of these universities alienating and exclusive. As Vorster (2014:21) points out:

Lingering racist and sexist conduct, privileges associated with social class, the overwhelming predominance of white and male academics and administrators, the concomitant under-representation of black and women academics and role-models, and insufficient respect for and appreciation of diversity and difference all combine to

reproduce institutional cultures that are too often experienced by black, women and working class and rural poor students as discomforting, alienation, disempowering.

The CHE (2007:97) for example, notes that, the institutional cultures of the HWIs in South Africa are “experienced by black staff and students as the overwhelming whiteness of academic culture. Whiteness here refers to the ensemble of cultural and subjective factors that together constitute the unspoken dominance in higher education of Western, European or Anglo-Saxon values and attitudes as these are reproduced and inflected in South Africa”. Thus the institutional culture of a university like Rhodes University cannot be divorced from the history of racism that was deeply entrenched in every aspect of these institutions. These institutional cultures of ‘whiteness’ continue, in the present, to reproduce past values informed by racism, sexism and gender stereotypes which are institutionalised in day to day interaction rather than an overtly alienating culture. Transformation of institutional cultures is aimed at changing these orientations and interrupting the process of reproducing such old norms, values and attitudes which are experienced as discriminating, excluding, and alienating by black academics.

As Thompson and Luthans (1990, in Nieman 2010:104) remind us, “institutional culture once established is difficult to change because changing a culture involves learning new behaviours and patterns of interaction”. However, transforming institutional cultures is a necessary condition for the success of ADPs to ensure that black and women academics trained by these programmes are retained which is unlikely if their experience of the institutional culture is discomforting and alienating. This question is of central importance to the concern of the present thesis which asks whether the academics recruited into a HWI through ADPs are able to play a role in interrupting and transforming the dominant institutional culture of the University. Since the university is a social setting, the production of shared values, norms and identified goals that comes to constitute the ‘culture’ of the institution, are social activities, rooted in continuous everyday activities that sustain the culture in its present form. By the same token, transforming institutional culture will involve shared efforts to inculcate different practices, values and norms at the level of day-to-day interactions and practices. Tierney² (1988:3) described an organisation’s ‘culture’ as encompassing ‘what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it’ and concerning ‘decisions, actions and communication both on an instrumental and a symbolic level’. While

² Please note the term organisational culture and institutional culture in the study are used interchangeably

the demographic composition of ‘who is involved in doing it’ changes as a result of ADPs, ‘what is done and how is done’ is shaped by historical and cultural realities deeply instilled within an organisation.

Even though there have been legislation and policies implemented to deal with racism and gender discrimination in HWIs like Rhodes University, racialised and classed behavioural patterns, attitudes, norms and values which have been learned from the past are still apparent in the present. If the very programmes aimed at attracting black and women academics are stigmatized and lecturers appointed through these programmes viewed as deficient (see Quinn and Vorster, *Mail & Guardian*, October 5, 2012), then there is little likelihood of their success. In some academics’ experience, stigmatisation remains a challenge. Magoqwana for example (in WASA, 2013:332) refers to:

The kind of language used around the Kresge and Mellon academic development programmes needs to be challenged because when you are introduced as the new Kresge lecturer rather than simply as the new lecturer, there is a tendency for it to be interpreted as an affirmative action appointment. It makes you feel as if you are not part of the mainstream academia and that the University is doing you a favour.

According to Tierney (1988:4) an analysis of the organizational culture of a college or university occurs as if the institution were an interconnected web that cannot be understood unless one looks not only at the structure and natural laws of that web but also at the actor’s interpretations of the web itself. Organizational culture is the study of particular webs of significance within an organizational setting. Considering the above, one can assert that the starting point for one to study institutional culture is to firstly grasp the institutional policies and legislative framework and then to critically analyse how members of an institution give meaning to those policies and how closely they identify themselves with those implemented institutional policies.

1.3. Theoretical framing: Social and Cultural Reproduction

Pierre Bourdieu (1977:57) in his theory of social and cultural reproduction, views the education system as the institutional tool for the “conservation of a culture inherited from the past” (Bourdieu, 1977:57). Furthermore, Bourdieu (1977:56) suggests the intergenerational reproduction of such inherited cultural norms and values within the education system. Bourdieu (1986) explains social and cultural reproduction through proposing the interaction between different forms of capital: economic, cultural and social capital, and argues that

education institutions play a crucial role in reproducing class inequalities and conserving old inherited cultural and institutional ways of being. Bourdieu (1992) employs the notions of ‘habitus’ and ‘field’ to describe the reproduction of upper- and middle-class embodied cultural dispositions and the contestation for power amongst agents possessing different forms of capital (see also DiMaggio, 1982; Lareau and Weininger, 2003; Messner, 2000; Swartz, 2002; Naidoo, 2004; Crossley 2003).

As pointed out above, black academics in HWIs like Rhodes University experience the existing institutional cultures at these institutions as alienating and excluding. This is also captured by Mabokela (2000: 106) arguing that, “black academics are entirely responsible for adaptation and survival with little transformation of the institutional atmosphere”. Black academics are expected to assimilate and sustain already existing institutional cultural ways of being (see also Dugmore, 2015). The present study employs Bourdieu’s theoretical framework of social and cultural reproduction to critically examine the contribution of the ADPs at Rhodes University to the transformation of institutional cultures at the institution. The study asks whether participants in ADPs are in any way able to interrupt and/or transform these existing dominant institutional cultures or whether those who are the products of such programmes reproduce inherited dominant institutional cultures despite inhabiting somatically different bodies.

1.4. Structure

Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview, context and background of the study, rationale, method and theoretical framing of the study.

Chapter 2: Background and context

This chapter provides a review of existing research literature on under-representation of blacks and women in HWIs and Rhodes University. The chapter also reviews the literature on transformation of institutional cultures in these institutions and describes the theoretical approach of the study with respect to social and cultural reproduction.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter provides a description of the research process followed and includes reference to the paradigm of the study, the data collection process, specifically, in-depth open ended interviews, the process of data analysis employing the NVivo software programme for

qualitative data analysis and theoretically directed content analysis. The chapter describes how the theoretical framework employed shaped the data analysis.

Chapter 4: Cultural capital

Academic inbreeding refers to a recruitment process whereby a university mostly retains its own graduates to work as academics. Bourdieu's concepts of embodied cultural capital and habitus are employed as a lens through which to examine academic inbreeding in relation to cultural reproduction at Rhodes University.

Chapter 5: The rules of the field

Bourdieu's concepts of 'field', habitus and institutionalised capital are employed to analyse how unequal power relations and inherited cultural dispositions among academics in the university shape the process of maintaining and reproducing existing (inherited) institutional practices and cultures

Chapter 6: Social Capital

Bourdieu understands social capital as networks of connections and social relationships. In the university these can play the role of sustaining inequities and reproducing dominant institutional cultures and practices.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

The study analyses the role of black academics recruited through the ADP in interrupting and transforming or reproducing the institutional cultures at Rhodes University. Bourdieu's theory of social and cultural reproduction provides a lens through which to analyse their agency in transforming or reproducing the existing institutional social and cultural ways of being and doing things. The study argues that employing mostly those that graduate from a university, and who mostly come from more privileged class backgrounds contributes to the reproduction of the existing institutional cultures and (white middle class) identity of the institution. While there are examples of how some of the participants do interrupt some elements of the dominant institutional cultures, racialised and classed structural power relations and deeply embedded existing ways of doing things remain intact.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Marxist approaches (see for example Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Althusser, 1971) to education have long proposed that education be seen as a site for the ideological reproduction of the interests of the dominant classes. These approaches see education institutions as instruments for the reproduction of social inequalities. A wide literature in the field of social reproduction of inequalities has focused on how the ideology and interests of socially dominant classes are reproduced in and through education systems (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1973; 1984; 1986; 1998; Hlengwa, 2014; Macris, 2002; Nash, 1990; Huber, 1990; Gaddis, 2012; Demaine, 2003; Hoadley, 2006; Kennedy & Power, 2011; Dumais, 2002; Kingston, 2001; Susen & Turner, 2011). But, as Kvasny (2006) points out, social reproduction theories leave unanswered the central question of how relationships of inequality and domination are reproduced in educational settings of various kinds. Analysis of these relations calls for elucidation of the processes by which unequal relations of power are reproduced through forms of knowledge, cultural production and acquisition that may on their surface appear neutral (Morrow and Torres, 1995:46). Central to the idea of social reproduction is the question of the interplay between structure and agency in the reproduction of inequality. Scholars in the sociology of education have pointed to the specific mechanisms that result not just in the acquisition of an education qualification but also of ‘appropriate’ attitudes and values (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977:209; Demaine, 2003:126).

The question of the institutional cultures of South African higher education institutions has been much debated in the literature on South African higher education transformation. Scholars in the field of the transformation of higher education, particularly those focusing on former white universities, have been concerned with “un-transformed institutional cultures,” and how past values, institutional practices and orientations within these institutions reproduce themselves on a daily basis (Nieman, 2010:105; Mapasela and Hay, 2006:711; Jansen, 2014; CHE, 2007:97). The reproduction of alienating and excluding institutional cultures, in turn, has been implicated in serving to perpetuate the underrepresentation of blacks and women in these institutions notwithstanding efforts to recruit a new demographic of academic staff through ADPs which exist in a variety of forms at different universities (see for example Govinder, Zondo and Mokgoba, 2013). The present study will draw on the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s theorising of social reproduction to critically investigate

the reproduction of social relations inherited from the past and embedded in existing institutional cultures at one formerly white South African university: Rhodes University.

Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction centrally invokes the concepts of cultural capital, social capital, field and habitus in order to support his central claim that "the education system transmits the culture of the dominant class" and maintains their values in order to reproduce social class inequalities (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu examined how different forms of capital are interrelated and depend on one another to reproduce class inequalities, rather than operating in isolation. In particular, he proposed the interaction of three sources of capital: economic, social and cultural, and argued that "it is in fact impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form" (1986:46).

2.1. Cultural Capital

Bourdieu (1986) described three different forms of cultural capital, firstly, embodied cultural capital, which consists of dispositions of the mind and body. Secondly, objectified cultural capital, for example cultural goods such as books and thirdly, institutionalised cultural capital such as educational qualifications. As Dumais (2002:46) pointed out, the three forms of cultural capital are mutually interrelated: one cannot attain institutionalized cultural capital without firstly having 'embodied cultural capital' and embodied cultural capital in turn provides the basis upon which one can obtain objectified cultural capital. Embodied cultural capital often precedes education certificates or qualifications and the acquisition of cultural goods being "accumulated in a lifelong process of socialization" and often taking place largely unconsciously (Kraaykamp and Eijck, 2010:210). Moreover, cultural capital as a social process of gaining knowledge about different things such as reading, writing, articulation and other artistic enactment, enable agents or individuals to attain other forms of qualification and to come to occupy privileged position within these fields.

Bourdieu's interest was in how the culture, values, standards and political attitudes of the dominant classes are transmitted through the education system and in turn have an impact on academic outcomes and serve the purpose of social reproduction (Lamont and Lareau, 1988). The impact of cultural capital on the school success of working class students has been

studied in a variety of contexts (DiMaggio, 1982; Nash, 1990; Dumais, 2002, Hoadley, 2006, Macris, 2002). Scholars have also employed the concept of cultural capital to interrogate the “school-university relationship” particularly with regard to the entry of working-class students from public schools into prestigious universities (see for example Zimdars et al, 2009; Kennedy & Power 2011).

2.2. Field

Bourdieu (1998) conceived of social space as a ‘field’ of forces or struggles between agents who possess varying forms and degrees of social and cultural capital with which to negotiate the field’s ‘rules of the game’ which are not explicitly codified. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:17) explain in *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*:

Each field prescribes its particular values and possesses its regulative principles. These principles delimit a socially structured space in which agents struggle, depending on the position they occupy in that space, either to change or to preserve its boundaries and form.

The field is thus a social space where unequal agents are in a constant power struggle. Its “regulative principles” or rules of the game privilege those agents who consciously and/or unconsciously understand or have imbibed these “regulative principles” because they have been socialised in a cultural setting that consists in, and functions according to, those same regulative principles. As Messner (2000:460) suggests then, different institutions of higher education can be regarded as fields. Embodied cultural capital obtained through long processes of socialisation plays a central role in enabling agents to grasp the regulative principles that govern a field. The rules of the game become second nature to those who have internalised them through the process of socialisation in the family and in school, which consequently makes it easier for those agents with embodied cultural capital to attain institutionalised cultural capital such as school or academic qualifications and competitive positions in academic settings (see Kraaykamp et al 2010:210; Nash, 1990). While education is commonly perceived as a class leveller, enabling upward mobility, this is possible only for a selected few who are able, or willing, to mimic the dominant culture with its implied rules of the game, and be assimilated within that hegemonic culture (Ndletyana, 2014:11).

Employing Bourdieu's conception of the field it can be argued that any social space is a contested space and a centre for power struggles among agents. A relevant analogy is that of a soccer match that has different rules of the game compared to say, a cricket match, and if the players (agents) have ambitions to win at both games they would have to firstly familiarise themselves with the rules of each game. If players operate outside the rules of the game they are penalised (social sanctions) by the referee. In the social field this translates into the ways that those socialised into middle- to upper-class ways of being possess an inherent knowledge of the rules of the game that prevail at privileged higher education institutions and are therefore able to act in accordance with the norms and expectations that the institution has of them. For those who do not possess these dispositions and habits, negotiating the field successfully is more difficult (see Bourdieu, 1992; Swartz, 2002:625-656).

Messner (2000:460) argues that:

When women professors and/or professors of color enter the field, they do not immediately or obviously display all of the signs of authority that are "necessary" for a smooth and unquestioned reproduction of the unspoken assumptions underlying academic hierarchy. In fact, they may directly by virtue of their presence and sometimes through the style and content of their courses challenge these unspoken assumptions. By contrast, white male professors are likely beginning from a position of assumed and automatically accepted authority and respect.

Each field prescribes its own particular regulative principles based on its particular values. Thus for instance, an historically white elite South African university will have a particular dominant institutional culture constituted from an intersection of raced, classed and gendered norms (among others). To the extent that this configuration of 'rules' of the field persist and are reproduced in the present, inequalities and forms of exclusion and inclusion are reproduced. Bourdieu, (1997:165) argued that,

One can equally well say that agents take advantage of the possibilities offered by a field to express and satisfy their drives and their desires, in some cases their neurosis, or that the fields use the agents' drives by forcing them to subject or sublimate themselves in order to adapt to their structures and to the ends that are immanent within them.

In this formulation Bourdieu thus shows how agency can be shaped and limited by the structuring principles of a field and the particularities of the opportunities that the field provides. While some agents are in a position to use the field's possibilities to realise their own drives, others must 'adapt' and 'sublimate themselves'. The field thus channels and

silences their different forms of agency and allows for the reproduction of the dominant cultures within the field while suppressing ways of being that do not reflect that dominance.

2.3. Habitus

In Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction 'habitus' plays a central role in understanding the process of the "intergenerational transmission of cultural capital" and the reproduction of human practices and relations (Kraaykamp, Eijck, 2010). For Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:16) "habitus consists of a set of historical relations deposited within individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception, appreciation, and action". In Bourdieu's scheme of thought, "field and habitus exist in dynamic relation to each other" (Messner, 2000:459). Cultural capital becomes embodied in an individual through the process of socialisation. Part of this process has to do with making agents familiar with the rules of the game that predominate in institutions of power and privilege. Each field prescribes its own rules that shape the disposition of the agents that occupy it. These are determined and enabled by historical relations and transmitted through family settings to institutions of learning which shape the individual's world view. For Bourdieu (1992: 127), habitus and field are related in two ways: "On one side, it is a relation of conditioning the field structures the habitus, which is the product of the embodiment of the immanent necessity of a field. On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction". Even though the field shapes habitus, Bourdieu argues that, "habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world" creating a culture, values and social relations that serve the interests of dominant agents in that specific field (Bourdieu, 1992: 127).

In *Pascalian Meditations*, Bourdieu (1997:138) explains that "social agents are endowed with habitus, inscribed in their bodies by past experiences". This embodied cultural knowledge structures a pattern of behaviour. Cultural capital attained through primary socialisation influences how the individual socially interacts, behaves, view things and influences human relations. As Swartz (2006:63) further posits, "these same internalised dispositions, however, also predispose their holders to generate new forms of actions that reflect the original socialisation experiences". Agents will have dispositions that reflect their socially constructed make-up based on their original socialised lived realities and these will in turn shape their

practice within the fields that they later enter. Even if agents adopt new forms of action in a field their past socialised experiences continue to structure their perceptions. For example, a student culturally socialised into a family of lawyers might be expected to themselves become a lawyer. That student can “generate new forms of action” and be say, an engineer instead. However, their “original socialisation experience” shapes their belief in the importance of having a degree. As Swartz (2006:63) argues, “habitus generates perceptions, expectations, and practices that correspond to the structuring properties of earlier socialisation”. Habitus, incorporating for example accent, posture, and mannerisms, can be regarded as socially conditioned ways of being that are internalised subconsciously. Such bodily dispositions are raced, gendered and classed and therefore play a significant role in the reproduction of exclusion and inclusion. For example it is not difficult to imagine that someone speaking at a formerly white English speaking elite university in a middle class English accent will be more readily accepted as a bearer of valuable and valued knowledge than someone speaking in broken or heavily accented English. Having acquired culturally exalted habitus eases passage into middle-class fields such an elite university and its rules of the game while at the same time reproducing the cultures of dominant social groups as the most desirable.

2.4. Social capital

Bourdieu held the view that not only one form of capital but rather different forms of capital reproduce social class inequalities. Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as a strong “network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance”. Noting the institutional access and privilege generated by the cultural capital that a person has, social capital is no different in ensuring “institutionalised relationships” to enable agents an easy entrance into a particular field which rewards them with mutual social gains. Social capital did not get much attention in Bourdieu’s theory of social reproduction compared to his treatment of cultural capital, field and habitus. But scholars like James Coleman and Robert Putman have theorised the notion of social capital extensively. According to Putman (1996: 34) social capital refers to “features of social life networks, norms and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives”. Agents in a

particular field who wish to maximise their advantage will need to establish networks and relationships to help them realise their ambitions and objectives within that field.

While cultural capital and social capital are discrete forms of capital, it can be posited that those who possess cultural capital are likely to be entering the field with already established networks and relationships that will assist them to achieve their objectives. Of course everyone has networks and relationships but the point is that the well-connected have access to networks of the powerful and advantaged from which they are able to make capital withdrawals that benefit their progress and positioning within the field of play. Bourdieu (1986:51) writes that these relationships:

... may exist only in the practical state, in material and/or symbolic exchanges which help to maintain them. They may also be socially instituted and guaranteed by the application of a common name (the name of a family, a class, or a tribe or of a school, a party, etc.).

These relationships established by families through class, which in turn leads to particular school or university attendance, are intergenerationally transmitted, forming sustainable social capital for different generations within the same social class. Members of privileged families attend the same schools and share social exchanges through sports and other leisure activities such as the arts. A child coming from one of these families has, by the time they are in university, access to established durable networks which can provide benefits such as job opportunities because their class position makes them more likely to be 'trusted'. Gambetta (cited in Ostrom and Ahn (2003:6) defines trust as "a particular level of the subjective probability with which an agent assesses that another agent or group of agents will perform a particular action" such as for example a particular employment position. People in networks of privilege have a basis upon which to trust one another due their mutual familiarity and prior exposure to one another. Thus members of the network are likely to be preferred hiring choices. In contrast, to form social relations and networks with people outside that class can be seen as a social risk because these people are regarded as unfamiliar strangers regardless of their institutionalised cultural capital achievements and accreditations. Even when such outsiders are given access to the network for instance by being hired, they are expected to fit into an already existing classed social space in order for them to be trusted and therefore to flourish in their new position.

In the following chapters, these central concepts of capital, field, and habitus are employed to understand how the participants might be understood to be reproducing or transforming dominant institutional cultures at Rhodes University.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

This study focuses on academics that enter Rhodes University through the university's ADPs whose goal is to change the staff demographics of the institution (see Rhodes University Kresge Foundation Faculty ADP, 2010; CHERTL, 2014). The study is aimed at understanding the lived experiences of the participants in the ADPs and how, in the participants' experience, they, as members of the programmes, have or have not been able to contribute to the transformation of the culture of the institution.

The study used qualitative research methods to understand the lived experiences of the participants in the ADPs at Rhodes University. The focus of qualitative research is to explore individual experiences and to understand how individuals interpret and view the world (Given, 2008). Qualitative research can be employed to investigate different social phenomena within their context and the individuals located in these contexts (Berg, 2001: 6-7). As Berg (2001:6-7) points out, qualitative researchers "are most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles, and so forth". Qualitative researchers are, moreover, concerned with understanding the different social, economic and cultural aspects that shape the experiences of individuals located within a particular society or context (Neuman, 2006). More than this, interpretive social research is interested in understanding not only actions and experiences but also the meanings, and intentions that people associate with their lived experiences in relation to others within a particular context (Given, 2008: 458; Neuman, 2006).

The overall aim of this study is to critically investigate how participants in Rhodes University's ADPs experience the day-to-day practices and taken for granted values and norms that form part of the existing institutional culture at Rhodes University. The study aimed at examining the experiences of the participants in the ADP in order to come to an understanding of:

- Whether members of the programme see themselves as having been able to contribute to the transformation of the existing institutional culture of Rhodes University.

- In the light of these experiences, whether it can be concluded that ADPs can be said to be interrupting or fulfilling the social reproduction function that Bourdieu and others have identified as central to education systems.
- Whether the participants experienced being expected to adopt existing values, norms and practices in order to successfully negotiate their entry into the university field.
- Or whether the participants' experience was one of acquiring the agency to interrupt the social reproduction of inequalities in the institution; to challenge and resist the hegemonic culture and its resulting social practices.

3.1. Participants

The study focuses on the participants in the ADPs at Rhodes University. Eighteen academics participated in the study, thirteen of whom were women. All are black lecturers who entered the university academic workforce through one of the university's ADPs.

Six of the participants have a first degree and work experience from universities other than Rhodes University while the remaining twelve are graduates of Rhodes University who do not have work experience from a different university. Some of those who participated are now no longer part of the ADP, having gained permanent positions in their respective departments. Others are still part of the ADP.

Table detailing the demographics of the participants who took part in the study

Qualification	Pseudonym	'Race'	Gender	Academic Rank
PhD	Maryna	Black ³	Female	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Brian	Black	Male	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Thandile	Black	Female	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Kathrin	Black	Female	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Mandla	Black	Male	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Vuyolwethu	Black	Female	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Lizole	Black	Male	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Mlungisi	Black	Male	Senior Lecturer
PhD	Xolani	Black	Male	Senior Lecturer
Masters	Tebogo	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Sibahle	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Luyanda	Black	Male	Lecturer
Masters	Athini	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Simpiwe	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Lesego	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Sinazo	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Brenda	Black	Female	Lecturer
Masters	Zonwabele	Black	Female	Lecturer

³ Includes Coloured and Indian

3.2. Interviews

The study employed in-depth open ended interviews with eighteen lecturers who have participated in Rhodes University's ADPs. Turner (2010:756) argues that open-ended interviews allow "the participants to contribute as much detailed information as they desire and also allows the researcher to ask probing questions as a means of follow-up". This procedure enabled me to understand more about the lived experiences of the participants in the university's ADPs. As Given (2008:422) points out, in in-depth interviews participants are encouraged to talk in a detailed way about the topic under investigation rather than being guided by the researcher's use of predetermined questions. The duration of most interviews conducted was fifty minutes to an hour. Participants were contacted via emails that outlined the purpose of the study in detail (see Appendix A). The time and place for the conducted interviews were decided by participants.

3.3. Ethical considerations

The study followed the ethical procedures stipulated by the university ethics committee. All participants were informed that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time (see Appendix B). The participants were also informed that they were free to refrain from responding to any questions that they did not feel comfortable answering. Participants were assured that their anonymity would be respected and measures were taken to ensure confidentiality. The advice of Nieman (2006:413) was followed in this respect, in that confidentiality was taken to mean not only "keeping information confidential from others" but also disguising participants' identities. In this light the names of participants, genders, departments and the like were changed to preserve anonymity without sacrificing the meaning of the data.

The number of interviews conducted was determined by the principle of saturation. Mason (2010) argues that there is a point of diminishing return to a qualitative sample: as the study goes on more data does not necessarily lead to more information or new insights. Therefore, data collection continues until such time as no new themes or insights are emerging. On the other hand, scholars such as Bowen (2008:140) point out that, the need for data saturation

entails bringing “new participants continually into the study until the data set is complete, as indicated by data replication or redundancy”. Theoretical saturation happens when all critical differences in data have been identified and “incorporated into the emerging theory” (Guest, Bunce and Jonson, 2006:2004). The study reached theoretical saturation after sixteen interviews. In order to test this impression a further two interviews were conducted after the point of saturation had been reached and the process then ended as no new significant insights were emergent.

3.4. Data analysis

In qualitative research, Neuman (2006: 459) explains, “researchers look for patterns or relationships” in the data. All interviews were transcribed verbatim. The transcripts along with documentation on the university’s ADPs was analysed using the method of a theoretically directed qualitative content analysis. Qualitative content analysis is one among numerous qualitative data analysis methods used to analyse textual data. In qualitative content analysis, the focus is on the content and contextual meaning of the text (Hsien and Shannon 2005:127-128). Researchers using qualitative content analysis view documents and textual data within a broader social and cultural context in order to draw from the data social meanings (Given, 2008:323).

Coding of the transcribed interview data was conducted using the NVivo software programme for qualitative data analysis. Using my theoretical framework as a starting point for analysis, the procedure was one of deductive category application in order to identify emerging themes which could be regarded as confirming, disconfirming or extending the extant theoretical framework.

Data analysis proceeded according to the following steps: precoding, initial coding, looking for themes in the data, naming the themes that emerged from the data. Attribute coding of each interview transcript enabled me to record the personal background and characteristics of each participant; this process had to do with recording descriptive information about the participants (Saldana, 2009: 55). I then created 63 nodes from each of these transcribed interviews to see what themes were emerging in relation to my theory (See Appendix C).

In the second cycle of coding I re-analysed the data in order to reduce and further make sense of the data (Saldana, 2009: 149). The codes were further reduced and categorised into fewer codes based on the similarities and commonalities between them. Saldana (2009: 149) explains that the main objective of second cycle coding “is to develop a sense of categorical, thematic, conceptual, and theoretical organization from your array of first cycle codes”. In this process, in a theoretically directed content analysis, the researcher has the theoretical framework of the study in mind which informs the process of distilling overarching themes. The analysis chapters are consequently a discussion of what emerged from the data in relation to Bourdieu’s key concepts of habitus, field, social, institutional and cultural capital. Viewed through the lens of these theoretical constructs the experiences of the participants are analysed with regard to the question of how they have or have not and in what ways they have or have not seen themselves either reproducing or interrupting the dominant institutional culture of Rhodes University.

3.5. Categories and Themes

The process of re-analysing the codes into dominant categories and themes is presented in different theoretical constructs which are discussed in detail in each chapter.

Cultural capital & Habitus	Field	Social capital
Growing our own timber	Rhodes way of doing things	Durable networks of connection
Sense of belonging	Burden of transformation	Academic Representation
Safe bets	Decision making	I was known as a tutor
Felt like an outsider	Stigma attached to ADP	Most people knew me in the department
Institutional resistance to change	Adjust, manage and cope	Relationship with the HOD
Fitting in	Self-restraint	
Better fit	Anti-transformation culture	
Resistance to curriculum change		
Proving myself		

Power struggle		
Assimilation		

Chapter 4: Cultural capital and Habitus

I argue that many of those appointed as part of this programme [Programme for Accelerated Development] are ‘safe bets’ in the sense that, while they are members of designated groups, blacks and women, they are culturally similar to the majority of those already at Rhodes University...A ‘safe bet’ is an individual from a designated group who helps the university to improve its equity statistics..... a ‘safe bet’ fits with relative ease into the prevailing institutional culture and hence is unlikely to challenge prevailing exclusionary culture...I am a ‘safe bet’, I am a black woman, so my presence at Rhodes has helped to improve the equity profile of the university, the aim of the [ADP] but I worry that, given my middle class status and privileged educational background, I was brought up in a home dominated by white, middle-class ways of being, my presence does not challenge the status quo (Hlengwa, 2015:148-149).

Horta (2013:488) described academic inbreeding as a “recruitment practice where universities hire their own doctoral students after graduation, who subsequently remain at the institution to work for their entire careers”. Other scholars such as Godechot and Louvet (2010) have argued that, “Academic inbreeding is therefore a selection process based on personal relationships rather than the standardised evaluation of applications or the thorough analysis of individual skills”. Some scholars have noted the impact of academic inbreeding on research outputs and scientific productivity, arguing that inbred academics have less research outputs compared with non-inbred academics (see Hargens and Farr, 1973; Horta, 2013; Horta, Veloso & Grediaga, 2003:415). Other research suggests to the contrary that inbred academics are more likely to produce more research outputs compare with non-inbred academics (see Yudkevich, Altbach and Rumbley, 2015:197-198; Morichika & Shibayama, 2015).

Morichika & Shibayama (2015:147) point out that, the literature on academic inbreeding has focused more on the negative rather than the positive impact for scientific productivity. Scholars such as McGree (1960:484) argued that, “much less attention has been paid to the reason for inbreeding in a university faculty than to its effects upon the individual and institutions”. In South African HEIs post 1994, academic inbreeding, termed ‘growing your own timber’ has been a strategy for some universities to retain young academics in order to address the problem of an aging professoriate and under-representation of blacks and women particularly in the upper ranks of academia (see Jansen, 2014; Yudkevich, Altbach and Rumbley, 2015:274). However, even though the motivations for grow-your-own-timber

programmes are transformative, there is a need for a critical analysis of the effects of academic inbreeding on institutional cultures and practices.

In the South African higher education literature there have to date been two studies on academic inbreeding (see Fouche and Louw, 2001; Yudkevich, Altbach and Rumbley, 2015). Badat (cited in Yudkevich, Altbach and Rumbley, 2015:194) argues that there are two types of academic inbreeding. Firstly, there are pure inbreeds: lecturers or researchers that have only worked and conducted research in the university they graduated from and never conducted research or worked in different universities or organisations. Secondly, there are mobile-inbreds: lecturers or researchers that have worked and conducted research elsewhere and later rejoin their alma mater. Horta (2013) explains the idea of the mobile-inbred further, arguing that, “research universities in the United States sometimes sponsor a practice whereby academics finish their degree at one university, go and work for a few years in another university, and if they demonstrate themselves capable, they are hired back by the university where they graduated in the first place”.

This chapter employs Bourdieu’s theoretical constructs of embodied cultural capital and habitus to critically examine the impact of academic inbreeding on cultural reproduction at Rhodes University. Bourdieu’s theory of social and cultural reproduction argues that the ideology, interests and cultural ways of being of socially dominant classes are reproduced in and through education institutions (see Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Bourdieu, 1977; Nash, 1990). Bourdieu (1977:57) further argues that, “the education system reproduces all the more perfectly the structure of the distribution of cultural capital among classes, in that the culture which it transmits is closer to the dominant culture and the mode of inculcation to which it has recourse is less removed from the mode of inculcation practiced by the family”. Bourdieu’s view on cultural reproduction locates upper- and middle-class families and the education system as primary institutions for the transmission and replication of dominant cultures.

This chapter reflects on how retaining mostly black lecturers coming from the middle-class at Rhodes University contributes to reproducing the dominant white-middle-class culture of the institution regardless of the racial characteristics of these lecturers.

4.1. Cultural reproduction and embodied capital

Bourdieu (1986) divided cultural capital into three interrelated forms. Firstly, embodied cultural capital, for example an agent's habitus, accent or dialect. Secondly objectified cultural capital which might include for example books, music, art and other material possessions. And thirdly, institutionalised cultural capital, such as qualifications, degrees and diplomas. Moore (2004:446) argues that cultural capital for Bourdieu is an "attempt to expand the category of capital to something more than just the economic and to identify culture as a form of that more general category". Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital thus transcends the one-sided view that interprets capital only as an economic category. Bourdieu's forms of cultural capital illustrate how capital produces and reproduces a particular culture that assumes a dominant position in an education system which also shapes objective relations among agents. Prieur, Rosenlund and Larsen (2008:46) point out that "while class analyses formerly portrayed society as a one-dimensional hierarchy, Bourdieu painted a more complex picture of what he termed the social space, wherein economic and non-economic assets (cultural capital) work together or against one another in the formation of social groups". Prieur et al (2008) capture the inseparable link between capital, culture and social reproduction of class inequalities and the importance of cultural capital as non-economic asset that is central to social exclusion and inclusion in education institutions.

Badat (cited in Yudkevich, et al 2015:194) argues that, "academic inbreeding, rather than being a policy of employment or the result of institutional policy or informed and conscious choice, is the outcome of certain institutional conditions and a matter of dispersed individuals' choice and informal practice". Considering the history of racialisation of higher education institutions in South Africa, academic inbreeding based on individual discretion, existing social networks and dispositions, and personal relationships rather than institutional policy can reproduce racialised, classed, gendered assumptions within a particular university or department. For example, recruiting mostly lecturers coming from middle-class backgrounds can be seen as an informal institutional approach which has the effect of preserving and reproducing social relations and practices informed by a white-middle-class dominant culture at Rhodes University while at the same time being able to be seen as transforming the demographic composition of academic staff. As one product of this system of in-breeding, Amanda Hlengwa (2015) has pointed out, appointing 'safe bets' -- mostly

those that are culturally similar to the dominant white-middle-class culture -- contributes to cultural reproduction rather than disrupting the normalised white-middle-class culture and practices.

Kathrin's experience as a working class student at Rhodes University and now a lecturer, points to an alienating and exclusive middle-class culture where working class students, particularly those coming from working class township schools, feel a sense of not belonging.

So I would not exchange that experience of being a working-class student for anything, because that is what helps me even today. You know if that particular (working class) student I was back then, feels the same thing that I have experienced then, it means there is something we are not doing right, not only am I talking about the matric stuff but I am talking about within the university, whereby you feel you don't belong and you feel like an outcast. Rhodes is a very nice environment for students who are familiar with a certain culture because we know that Rhodes University is a westernized, liberal and very middle-class kind of university. But now when you have been trained from that particular background for a while even if you are a black person, for instance, if you have been to [a private school] and you have been cultured in that way and you get here and you'd be like I do not know why are these people (working class) complaining because we are all the same. Then you do not understand the person who is coming from [a township] high school, a person who has never seen a computer or touched a computer before, who does not even know how to do research and you'd be like ohh my god these are so basic. So the university favours middle class students one way or the other that is why we need transformation. That is why we need transformation in terms of teaching staff members for those working class students. That is why I am always saying that people who are against transformation they don't know that they are actually killing the students and the working class students cannot mirror themselves and this is our duty what we are here for to create a mirror for the students to say actually I can see myself in Siyanda, I can see myself in Simphiwe you know so that students can feel like they are at home (Kathrin).

Those coming from elite schools who are familiar with the middle-class culture, view the daily practices at the university as something normal because they have been socialised in a similar culture through their early family and school socialisation. Hence, it is foreign to them to grasp why working class students complain about how exclusive and alienating the university culture is. Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital locates the culture of middle-class families as one and the same as the dominant cultural practices in the education system (see also Lareau, 1987; Ndletyana, 2014; Jaeger, 2011; Werfhorst, 2009). Bourdieu (1977:494) noted that:

By doing away with giving explicitly to everyone what it implicitly demands of everyone, the education system demands of everyone alike that they have what it does not give. This consists mainly of linguistic and cultural competence and that relationship of familiarity with culture which can only be produced by family upbringing when it transmits the dominant culture.

According to Bourdieu's analysis of the reproduction of class inequalities in and through the education system, the cultural capital of those coming from the upper- and middle-class perpetuates itself while those coming from the working class such as Kathrin are expected to familiarise themselves with the dominant culture of the education system. Safe bets, as pointed out by Hlengwa, possess embodied cultural dispositions similar to those of the dominant groups, which make them safe options who safeguard rather than threaten cultural reproduction.

Brian's embodied cultural capital, which takes the form of certain linguistic and cultural competencies, result from his prior education and socialisation which lead to him experiencing no alienation in the university environment.

My experience at Rhodes...I did not feel alienated, my schooling prepared me for Rhodes environment, my schooling mirrored the practices of Rhodes and I did not have culture shock, I did not have any of that. But what also is important is that within my department, the way in which I was received, the way in which I was treated and still I am treated has never made me to question whether this is a place for me or not. Those are not my questions of whether do I belong or I do not belong. It is only recently I thought of it, if I belong then other people feel like it is an alienating space, their department and the whole university, and what is it about me and my department that allows for me not to feel that? And I think first part of it is the environment because I come from a particular type of family which has a set of values about education and practices that are not alien to what is expected here. I went to private and Model C schools (Brian).

Brian suggests that attending private and Model C schools⁴ enabled him to familiarise himself with the cultural dispositions that are dominant in the university environment. Brian identifies in his personal narrative the two centres of transmission of embodied cultural

⁴ Mthatyana (2014) 'Former Model C schools are schools that were reserved for white learners in South Africans under apartheid but which began, in a limited way, to offer places to black learners in the dying days of apartheid'

capital, the family-school relationship, and the school-university relationship, as the primary social institutions that work to reproduce class inequalities.

My junior schools have been a biggest contributor to my education success ... The practices in schools mirrored the kind of values in my home. My father is a lecturer and my grandfather was a lecturer. So those things that are done at home and encouraged at home are the things that are not contradictory to things that happen in a school environment. I will give you an example: I go home for holiday and I am allowed to play for a month but that last week of the holidays it is my whole orientation, I have to go back to school, I have to go back to reading and I have to practice so that I don't have to spend two weeks at home but I know nothing and you go back to speaking English. So I did all these things so that when I go back to school it is not difficult. When we went to my grandfather's house he would ask when is the last time I picked up a book and it didn't matter what book it is, so there were books in the house (Brian).

Bourdieu (cited in Eggleston, 1974:32) argues that, "in fact, each family transmits to its children, indirectly rather than directly a certain cultural capital and a certain ethos. The latter is a system of implicit and deeply interiorized values which, among other things, helps to define attitudes towards the cultural capital and education institutions". In this proposition, Bourdieu views the family as the primary structure for children to acquire and internalise values and attitudes that are not different from those required by educational institutions. Brian comes from a middle-class family and was raised by parents who are both lecturers. As a result of his middle-class upbringing and prior socialisation, he has no sense of not belonging because the practices and values he encounters at university are not foreign to him. Embodied cultural capital is often not seen as holding the same value as economic capital, it is 'unrecognised' (Bourdieu, 1986). As Bourdieu (1986:2) argues, "the social conditions of its transmission and acquisition are more disguised than those of economic capital". Nevertheless, as Brian's experiences illustrate, it holds great power to determine who is and is not denied belonging in particular social institutions.

Bourdieu (cited in Eggleston, 1974:33) further points out that, "the attitudes of the members of the various social classes, both parents and children, and in particular their attitudes towards school, the culture of the school and the type of future the various types of studies lead to, are largely an expression of the system of explicit or implied values which they have as a result of belonging to a given social class". The culture of reading that Brian refers to is an example of how middle class families inculcate and transmit cultural capital to their children. As the education system demands that everyone demonstrate the linguistic and

cultural competence of the middle-class, this cultural requirement is expected of those that enter academia. Thus, ‘inbreeding’, the recruitment of only those who have already been inducted into the ways of the institution, reproduces the already existing white-middle class dominant institutional culture. This is noted by Mlungisi:

Because often what I see which is starting to disturb me is that from all the people I have mentioned four of them all studied at Rhodes, and I studied here...one person was from UCT and I am quite disturbed if this is how Rhodes is going to transform by only employing people who have studied at Rhodes and it is too comfortable in a way. We know how things work here and there is something very dangerous about that and I hope that departments do not fall into that trap. And I know someone who is being pressured from Commerce to take a lecturer post that is going to be available soon because of the same thing: that he is going to fit in because he knows how things go. I think there is a good part in growing our own timber but I think we must not take it too far. There are posts available in this department and I do hope that we get people that come from outside the department: young scholars that do not have a history with Rhodes University; then you can really see how things are (Mlungisi).

Growing your own timber is an institutional strategy that has been employed by different universities to retain their own (black) graduates as a way of responding to the challenge of the under-representation of blacks and women in South African academia. Mlungisi outlines the shortcomings of this approach arguing that, ‘it is too comfortable’ as it is aimed at retaining mostly those who are familiar with existing institutional settings and cultures and already know how things are done and will therefore be less likely to disrupt existing practices, values and expectations. Sara (2007:158) points out that most often institutions employ ‘orientation devices’ to sustain and reproduce existing institutional settings and cultural habits to make members of the institution feel ‘at home’. Such orientation strategies could be interpreted as attempts to inculcate a “form of comfort, to be at home in the world, the word comfort suggests well-being and satisfaction and to be at ease with one’s environment”. Employing academics who do not know how things are done at Rhodes, who did not graduate from Rhodes or any university with a similar institutional culture, is risky because such people are harder to make comfortable and at home with an institutional culture that they experience as alienating and unfamiliar.

But I have realised in many departments they will say they cannot find the black candidate, when a candidate do come often it is said they are too young, why will they choose to stay in Grahamstown. So they pick someone who is safe and someone who fits in to the department. One department here was talking about who will be a better

fit. Sometimes what is needed is someone who is not a fit just to shake those departments. So that has been the tension for me and the annoyance (Mlungisi).

This is similarly captured by one of Mabokela's (2000:108) participants in her study on diversification of South African universities focusing on the University of Cape Town and Stellenbosch University:

What you basically do with the programme is to identify promising African or Coloured students and employ them at very junior levels, which is an opportunity. The problem is that there is another philosophy on the line, that we want to train our own Blacks. We don't want them to come in from outside and lower our standard. We won't make a great effort you know, to try and attract somebody at the professorial level, for instance. We won't go out of our way to do that.

Sara (2007:158) argues that, "to recruit can suggest both to renew and to restore. Organisations tend to recruit in their own image, the hey you, is not just addressed to anybody, some bodies more than others are recruited, those that can inherit the character of the organisation, by returning its image with a reflection that reflects back that image, what we could call a good likeness". Retaining its own graduates through the ADP, the university recreates its own likeness, thus sustaining and reproducing its own (white, middle class) image. Badat (cited in Yudkevich, et al 2015:197-198) has noted the adverse effect of academic inbreeding at the individual level, stating that:

The inbred academic will likely have been supervised by an academic in the department which he or she is already in. He or she could also have been a member of a research program in the academic department and undertaken tutoring and teaching. On the one hand, there is the advantage that the inbred academic would be entering a familiar environment, be able to maintain momentum in teaching and research and possibly become more rapidly productive in research and publishing than an outside candidate. On the other hand, there can be power relations that work to the detriment of the inbred academic, he or she could become a clone of senior academics, locked into their research concerns, paradigms, orthodoxies, methodologies, methods and techniques and stifled in pursuing his or her own research issues and approaches.

Internal graduates are perceived as the most competent and the best 'fit', implying that their ability to fit in is what makes them desirable appointments. Because they are familiar with how things are done, their familiarity is seen as a resource that will enable them to be productive. However, even the most inbred academic encounters unequal power relation as Lizole relates:

To me it still feels that I need to prove myself, that is the experience that I am feeling, I need to prove that I am worthy lecturing, I need to prove that I am part of the knowledgeable community of the elite. I don't know, but to me it is just a constant need to either prove myself or to prove to the Mellon programme that I am worthy to be in this position not because of my blackness or my femaleness but because of my competences (Lizole).

Bourdieu (1992:99) argues that, "at each moment, it is the state of the relations of force between players that defines the structure of the field". Here, Bourdieu draws the relation between the capital that agents hold and the field, suggesting that the capital of each lecturer informs their relations, orientation and practices within the field. As Jawitz (2009:603) asserts, "how new academics experience the effects of the field they enter is shaped by the capital that they bring". Lizole's transition from being a student to a lecturer in the same department suggests how difficult it is for him as an example of 'home grown timber' to disrupt the internalised unequal power relations between him and his former lecturers, now his colleagues.

That was a major transition for me because all the staff members who taught me undergraduate, honours and whatever are now my colleagues to me it feels a little bit strange but my colleagues thought it was ok. It was more of a power struggle in my mind in terms of how do I approach these colleagues that I called Dr and Professor and now they are expecting me to call them by their names. It was a quite big transition for me but I don't think it was for them. The interaction to me felt like these are my superiors you know, coming in with an honours degree having to study for my masters and these people in my mind were the knowledgeable (Lizole).

According to Bourdieu (1983:312-313) academia is a field of struggle among agents occupying different positions "tending to transform or conserve this field of forces". Furthermore, Bourdieu suggests that, the objective relations between agents' positions shapes the strategies agents employ "in their struggles to defend or improve their positions". Naidoo (2004:459) points out that, "agents and institutions individually or collectively implement strategies in order to improve or defend their positions in relation to other occupants". The internalised unequal power dynamics between dominant agents (senior academics) and their former students, that have joined the department as academics through the ADP can influence the agency of the former students to disrupt the already existing departmental settings, practices and cultures.

On the other hand, dominant agents can employ strategies to sustain and reproduce their dominance and a culture of the 'right' way of doing things, their own research agenda, methods and theoretical lens, making the inbred academics their 'clones' or 'safe bets'. These

unequal power relations can in turn become ways of resisting change in curriculum, teaching, research and a cultural way of doing things within the university. This is also noted by Lesego:

For me it could be a different experience compared to others because for me I was a student here for years and now I am a staff member. So that transition on its own has had a bearing on my voice to influence transformation, the fact that you were a student in the department for years can be used against you, do you get it, so there is that paternalistic attitude if I can put it in that way. I am not saying that people are anti-transformation but it is that sense of paternalism that they treat you like you are still a student, you will grow to learn and you will get used to it. Maybe your background as a student can be used against you in that sense, so it is the paternalistic attitude that kinda hinders you from being a full member who participates on equal scale as anyone else. It can be different from other people who have just joined the accelerated programme. There was a transition not only for me but also for the department as well they needed to understand that I am no longer a student but a staff member, so that on its own can influence your voice (Lesego).

Jawitz (2009:603) suggests that older agents of the field often resist any form of changes to the field that might disrupt their monopoly on the capital they hold and power relations between them and new agents entering the field. The paternalistic treatment that Lesego speaks about can be seen as an orientation strategy that older academics use to condition their former students to perceive themselves as forever students in order for older academics to sustain their hegemonic position of being forever senior academics. Bourdieu (1992:98) uses an analogy of a game, to demonstrate this effect noting that, “players can play to increase or to conserve their capital”. For older academics sustaining their capital means to reproduce the lecturer and student relations that already existed for them and which allow them to continue to be in powerful positions that serve their interests rather than the interests of overhauling unequal relations in the institution.

4.2. Habitus

Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past (Marx, 1852).

Marx here explains how the agency and dispositions of agents is shaped by an already existing set of conditions and this also describes how cultural reproduction is made possible by inherited structural positions that structure power relations amongst agents and their

practices within a particular field. Rhodes University can be thought of as an inherited white-middle-class field including for lecturers that have entered it through the ADP. Bourdieu's theory of practice, habitus, which locates the practice of agents within a social context and argues that it is socially constituted, is useful to explain the practice of academic inbreeds that contributes to cultural reproduction. Drawing on the relation between habitus and field and how the interaction between the two make up the habitus of agents and shape their practice Bourdieu (1992:127) demonstrates the impact of habitus by pointing out that:

When habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a fish in water, it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted...Habitus being the social embodied, it is at home in the field it inhabits, it perceives it immediately as endowed with meaning and interest.

Those who encounter Rhodes University as a familiar field because they embody white-middle-class habitus as a result of their early socialisation process, can consciously and unconsciously face difficulties with seeing it as foreign and alienating and hence being able to put themselves in a position of wanting to disrupt its reproduction. They are the fish who do not feel the weight of the water, but rather, take it for granted, which influences, as Tebogo comments, every aspect of their practice.

The examples you bring into your class room are influenced by your social class, so we cannot say that class does not count, class and race count at Rhodes (Lesego).

As Bourdieu (1992:129) puts it, "every time it is confronted with objective conditions identical with or similar to those of which it is the product, habitus is perfectly adapted to the field without any conscious search for purposive adaptation".

There are so many black faces but they are very white in their thinking and in the way they were socialised. There are also students who think Rhodes is now transformed, there is emerging a big proportion of middle-class students who are here at Rhodes there are just black in the faces but not the way they do things in a sense (Mandla).

Even when lecturers coming from working-class backgrounds are retained, their lack of, or unfamiliarity with, the cultural dispositions of the middle classes that happens to be seen as a naturalised norm and a dominant culture in the institution, makes them feel a sense of alienation. Even though our focus here is not on student experiences, Vuyolwethu illustrates how the family school-relationship links agents' habitus, practice and way of viewing dominant white-middle-class culture.

I noticed that my students that I was teaching, when I first did some tutoring, I found more black students in the department but still it was classed, the black students who

didn't have Model C accents they were very quiet and they were very alienated in that space, it took a lot to draw them out and get them to speak. The black students who were wealthy and who went to private schools -- they fitted. There was nothing alienating about the experience [for them] but I am sure there were some things alienating but in the context having enough power in that context, it was the working class kids who tended to not speak, who tended to be very alienated (Vuyolwethu).

In the same way, working class students retained as lecturers, in many instances, feel alienated in an institutional environment in which white-middle-class culture is regarded as the norm. Yet it is these very individuals who are more likely to be agents of transformation, disrupting the dominant cultures that exclude them because they are able to see the dominance rather than simply experiencing it as normal life. Their exclusion enables them to see the need for the dominant culture to be disrupted and transformed in order to become inclusive since it is they who 'feel the weight of the water'. In other words, their habitus shapes their practice, not to fit into already existing cultures that excludes and belittles their ways of being but to change those cultures. On the other hand, they do not necessarily possess the power to do so.

Sara (2007:157) suggests that, "what makes bodies different is how they inhabit the space, the space is not a container for the body rather bodies are submerged such that they become the space they inhabit in taking up space". Rhodes University as a field is inhabited by agents from different race groups and social classes and their practice within this space differs according to their socialisation and familiarity with the rules of this field and the cultural setting that already exists. The unequal power relations amongst agents and their habitus within the space are central to their inclination and ability to either transform or reproduce the dispositions of the field.

For me, sometimes it feels like the people who are within the Accelerated Development Programme are people who are from the middle-class background who accept the Rhodes norm, people who are easy to gel with the Rhodes culture. Do you get it? Sometimes this is how I felt. As I have said firstly, for me because I have been here for a while it helps to pick up those things and be able to talk a different language with different people. So for me it is not challenging to be with people who are from their privatised lifestyles within the programme because ultimately our experiences as lecturers would become the same because of race, because mostly those people who are there are black lecturers. Do you get it? So our racial identities will surpass the class identities you know (Lizole).

Lizole's experiences illustrate the intersection between class and race, arguing that in the context of a dominant white- middle-class culture, race still transcends class. For this reason, scholars such as Mohoto (cited in Dugmore, 2015) have argued that, it is not just about

‘having more black students and academics but rather transforming the environment beyond the current hegemonic, white-middle-classness, which continues to permeate the university environment and replicate itself in different skin colours in both the students and academic staff’.

When apartheid just ended black people sent their children to private schools and so the student body in private schools diversified quickly and you had a lot of black students in classrooms. But what you never had was principals and teachers who were black, you might have a black teacher teaching Zulu in Johannesburg but they would not be black teachers teaching maths, French for example right? If you think why that is and the message it is sending you is that the authority is white and the people who are learners are black, you can be learners as black but you cannot be an authority figure and also in order to keep the system working it has to be white and that is what is happening at Rhodes. Rhodes student body might be diversified -- I don't know what it is now 50 % black students but the authority of Rhodes even though the Vice Chancellor is a black man, the normative authority of Rhodes is white, most of those, the majority of lecturers and professors here are white. I sit on these equity committees and the figures are seriously ridiculous, it's completely ridiculous numbers, and male and female staff so it's completely ridiculous, the message this is sending is that this system is white and you are a black person; we (whites) are teaching you to adapt to that system and you have to adapt and if you can do it well and you have the right accent you become like us, white culturally (Maryna).

In his book *I write what I like* Biko (1977:26) critiques and problematizes the integration of blacks into a white dominant space by pointing out that,

If by integration you understand a breakthrough into white society by blacks, an assimilation and acceptance of blacks into an already established set of norms and code of behaviour set up by and maintained by whites, then YES I am against it. I am against the superior-inferior white-black stratification that makes the white a perpetual teacher and the black a perpetual pupil (and a poor one at that) ...as a result the integration so achieved is a one-way course, with the whites doing all the talking and blacks the listening.

Rhodes University through its white-middle-class dominant cultural setting, values and white authority dictates the rules of the field for black lecturers to assimilate to and who are then expected to reproduce the already existing white-middle-class way of being and doing things. And those with white-middle-class dispositions are seen as the best options for white cultural reproduction. These processes are not necessarily conscious outcomes of deliberately chosen actions by those in positions of power and authority. Bourdieu (1985:724) describes the social space “as a field of forces, as a set of objective power relations that impose themselves on all who enter the field and that are irreducible to the intentions of the individual agents or even to the direct interactions among the agents”. Sara (2007:157) suggests that, “spaces acquire the skin of the bodies that inhabit them. What is important to note here is that it is not

just bodies that are oriented. Spaces also take shape by being oriented around some bodies, more than others”. Because the ranks of academia are occupied by white bodies this shapes the institutional space and orientation. Hence, one can refer to Rhodes as a white-middle-class space because it is dominantly inhabited by white and upper-middle-class agents shaping its cultures in positions of authority. Sara (2013:3) refers to habits as values and cultures that have been ingrained into the body, “becoming part of the body”. This helps to explain the internalised white-middle-class dispositions that characterise the institutional field and that are inherited from cultural habits and past experiences. Furthermore, Sara (2013:4) suggests that, “the process of incorporation is certainly about what is familiar, but it is also a relationship to the familiar. The familiar is that which is at home but also how the body feels at home in the world”. Those with upper-middle-class dispositions inhabit Rhodes as a homely environment and this is shaped by past experiences that allow it to be seen as a familiar environment by some and an entirely foreign one by others.

However, Bourdieu (1992:132) argues that “habitus is not the fate that some people read into it. Being the product of history, it is an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures”. Bourdieu here describes the possibility for habitus to be adjusted (not entirely changed) in a field from that which it is a product of. Bourdieu further shows how habitus can be used in different substructures within the field. Here Simphiwe comments on her ability to literally deploy different voices – a ‘black voice’ and a ‘white voice’ as a strategy to gain positional advantage in a field that in a classed and racialised field:

I would not lie. I felt very intimidated then. Rhodes being white annoys me. It is the students, because the students are very, I would not say disrespectful but very entitled and if you come there and you are not a parent of authority it can be very difficult to deal with Rhodes students. You will end up doing two things and these are two strategies that I used, one is that I speak the English just like you, so do not piss me off you put on that thing that I am quite assimilated in your world of posture. There is another voice that I have which is the black voice, so there is the assimilate voice and there is the black voice. The black voice is when I feel like at this point I am not going to deal with you like as a white student I am going to excludes you in my situation so that I don’t have to deal with you and that is when I start switching languages and not start to give students time in order for me to demonstrate that actually you perform your white entitlement to me don’t make that my space and don’t bring it into my space and do not make that my problem. A lot of the time you are working that assimilated self so if the students for example, students will be like he cannot hear and you are like yeah I give you back the sarcasm and you know you are doing that in a particular mode it is like actually because if you can unpack the way in which

language and sarcasm operate in white culture that is very deeply assimilated with black people like myself who went to these white schools. It is a way of talking, so you use it. Where I think people who did not grow up with that sarcasm would not actually use it because they do not have it, so that white sarcasm became a weapon (Simphiwe).

Bourdieu (1992:133) suggests that there is a ‘relative irreversibility’ of internalised dispositions. Habitus can adapt when it encounters a similar field that it is a product of and where rules of the game are an advantage for that particular agent. Hence, Simphiwe’s ability to ‘work’ the assimilated self that is to say, deploying that self selectively as a tool, is itself a product of her prior (relative) privileges – not everyone has the option to work themselves in this way, to their advantage. For Simphiwe there is power in being able to code switch selectively between two ‘selves’ in order to assert power over students whom she views as entitled. The deployment of his two selves is an instrument of power, a token that she can play in order to elevate his position in the game. she speaks of using her knowledge of the rules of the game in fields such as white sarcasm to gain ascendancy.

Bourdieu uses aging as an example to show how habitus does not entirely change in a similar field that it is a product of but rather adapts, arguing that “the mental and bodily schemata of a person who ages become more and more rigid, less and less responsive to external solicitations” (Bourdieu, 1992:134).

So for me, the high school assimilated me but also in high school we also learned to say no in some situations like actually we want a proper Xhosa teacher, we cannot just have French evening and things like that and we will sing these petty songs to gain our identity. So high school already taught me those kinds of things so when I saw it here at Rhodes so I just knew how to detach myself from the lot of it. So in that sense, I cannot say that as opposed to someone coming from a serious working-class township background who can be like ohh my god. Those of us who were in these environments are able to navigate them better I think because when you have to you can be like I know English better than you and I know all your ways and on top of that please we went to the same schools. So there is a class dimension of your preparedness in fact I could actually manage at Rhodes of course I didn’t like it I won’t lie to you I will phone my parents and say here it is still the same like [at] school. But I could manage because culturally I could speak back; socially I was middle-class. Being black at Rhodes and middle-class then meant that I could just let it slide like this, it does not have to bother me, you know and I will just be here So that was the advantage for me for some who did not like it and might not have my class whatever they might have a greater struggle perhaps in trying to show, it’s either they fit it or do better whereas I was like I don’t care (Simphiwe).

Bourdieu (1992:134) argues that, “primary social experiences have a disproportionate weight”. Habitus is social class embodied capital which is structured, or fixed by its early

class socialisation, making it difficult to change. The school-university similar cultural settings illustrated by Simphiwe which enabled her to navigate entry into university, while being a source of comfort for her, can be seen as serving cultural reproduction since her comfort relies on her cultural familiarity with a white-middle-class dominated cultural environment. Moreover, Bourdieu (1992:135) suggests that, “it is only in the relation to certain structures that habitus produces given discourses or practices”. The agent’s habitus is shaped by the field it inhabits. Habitus generates practices similar to its formation only if it is in a similar field that it is a product of. Hence, Bourdieu (1992:135) suggests that, “we must think of habitus as a sort of spring that needs a trigger and depending upon the stimuli and structure of the field”. The power relations of the field also shape the habitus of agents and their predilection to act in ways that transform or preserve the structure of existing relations. For example, as Zonwabele puts it, black people are reduced to having to have a ‘blackness agenda’ while white people are afforded the privilege of an array of choices and tastes, for instance when it comes to deciding what they wish to research or what issues they wish to take up at the departmental level.

Black people must come so that the place can be transformed but really the people who hold the power and the monopoly over the institutional culture are the white people and it is the white people who need to transform or to actually acknowledge that there are black people who are intelligent and who can be in academia and as long as that don’t happen the university won’t transform.... It is difficult to be here as a black academic because all your research and everything that you ever think about must be about blackness and actually some of us are not interested in making research about black people. Some of us ... I want to research whatever I want to research you know I don’t want to have a transformational agenda; I don’t want to have a blackness agenda. But it becomes very difficult to do that. I think sometimes there is a very violent expectation that all the things must be about black people when there is talk in staff meetings I’m the only person who can talk because I know stuff about black people that white people don’t know and that assumption is problematic because how can I know everything about black people in the same way that the white people don’t know everything about all white people but that is the kind of cross that we have to bear until there is something that says now we’ve got a black lecturer in our department so how are you as a white lecturer dealing with your own transformational agenda in your own teaching, in your own research you know in a way that is reciprocal because I am sitting here being transformative because I am black and my white colleagues can do whatever they want which means they get a lot of research about things that are useful to the institution that maintain the status quo of the institution and by doing that proves that white academics are the best way to go because they get things done while I am sitting here in my office talking to black people (Zonwabele).

According to Messner (2000:460) “the actions of agents within the field cannot be viewed as ‘rational action’ but rather as a socialized subjectivity, an embodied set of dispositions,

strategies that agents have adopted to help them survive within a given field”. For Messner the practice of agents within the field is produced by socially learned orientations and agents are not divorced or isolated from their socialisation but rather they are shaped by it. Hence their action is not random or ‘irrational’ but rather the result of an internalised embodied predisposition. As Zonwabele narrates, her working relations with his white colleagues, the practice of the white lecturers within his department, can be seen as a performance of white habitus as a subjective disposition which narrowly locates and reduces the realisation of the transformation agenda only to the agency of black members of staff, while the counter transformative socially learned orientations and practices deeply held by white lecturers within this department are seen as normal. The violent expectations that Zonwabele as a black lecturer experiences can be interpreted in the light of white habitus as the privilege of not being reduced to whiteness while black people are not afforded the privilege of non-essentialised expectations of how they should be in the world and what they should care about. Furthermore, Zonwabele points out that it is white people’s socially learned perceptions about black people that need to change in order to transform the university rather than transformation resting solely on her presence as a black lecturer who forever assumes a transformative role. This role is foisted upon her, not by choice but by the virtue of being black and this is reinforced by the un-transformative practices of white lecturers who do not see themselves as agents of transformation within the department. Nash (1990:433-434) explains how habitus reproduces particular practices of agents within a field suggesting that, “since habitus is embodied it gains a history and generates its practice for some time even when the objective conditions which gave rise to it have disappeared”. The ‘objective condition that has gave rise’ to racialised dispositions in the South African context was the racialization of higher education pre-1994 and post 1994 the racialization of the education system changed. However, the internalisation of these racialised dispositions in some agents continues even once the formal policies have changed.

Sallaz (2010:300) in his study, *Talking Race, Marketing Culture: The Racial Habitus In and Out of Apartheid*: employs the concept of habitus to critically interrogate the reproduction of racialised embodied dispositions in post 1994 democratic South Africa and refers to these racialised dispositions as “apartheid habitus that perceives the world in terms of a black-white binary”. In Zonwabele’s experience, ‘transformation’ in his department is viewed through the lens of past dispositions that reproduce existing institutional relations and practices, what Zonwabele describes as ‘maintaining the status quo of the institution’. As Nash (1990:434)

puts it, “habitus is structured by the principles of the structure, as a code, and practices are structured by the principle of the habitus”. Even though the education system that gave rise to racialised predispositions has changed, institutions such as Rhodes University continue to be populated by agents whose habitus is structured by these prior principles which are characterised mainly by racialised everyday relations. In a field the daily practice of agents what Sallaz (2013:296) calls ‘everyday practical activities’ is informed by the internalised configurations of agents which require no ‘overall coordination’ to reproduce themselves. The reproduction of internalised predispositions is enabled by unequal power relations amongst agents within the field and the habitus of those who assume positions of power inevitably reproduces itself.

You know, sometimes it’s not racism as much as it’s a way of thinking and a way of being in the world and an assumption that everyone has the liberties you have that is like very bizarre and very strange for me so for instance you will have a conversation about we must get an external examiner and I will because it’s my job to suggest five black examiners and someone will say these people (black people) are not attached to the academic institution, the other person will say you know I don’t think they understand the teaching context. I mean how many black people with PhD’s do you know who have never taught in their life? So in a way there are ways to side step transformation and there are many of those ways and among people that I work with and enjoy, I have no personal problems with any of my colleagues but it is very easy for them to justify why again they are picking a white examiner not the other black one I suggested and it is very easy for them to side step the issue. I have heard things like you know we need to pick someone we trust, who we know can do the job we have used this person for a long time so we just going to use this person again. You know ok like that’s nice but where are you going to get a black person that you trust or you have used before if you’ve never used a black person before? In a way when you suggest a black person and they (white lecturers) say those things you get the sense of oh so you don’t trust my judgment because that’s what you saying because I’m saying I am suggesting this person because I trust them to do the job that you suggesting but when you turn around and pick someone we trust you saying actually you would like to maintain the status quo (Zonwabele).

Central to habitus and fields is what Nash (2010: 458) called “dominant-subordinate relationships” based on the capital that agents possess. Such unequal power relations reinforce the existing make-up that different agents have internalised and the rules of the field are used to legitimate the habitus of agents with greater capital, reproducing the dominant culture and relations. This unequal power dynamic is displayed in how white lecturers in Zonwabele’s department decide on a white external examiner despite her suggestion to choose a black external examiner. The dominant agents (white lecturers) in this department are able to make decisions that reproduce the status quo by continuing to select white external examiners and those who are not white are disqualified on all kinds of grounds for instance

they 'are not attached to academia' or they 'don't understand the teaching context' which results in the field continuing to be inhabited and dominated by bodies that are white and can be 'trusted'. Zonwabele, who herself does not occupy such a body, also feels that her judgement is not trusted because this is the implication of the response from white lecturers that 'we need someone we can trust' and that is not anyone that she has suggested. Zonwabele's attempts to interrupt this business-as-usual set of assumptions about who can be trusted with the job of external examining is itself discredited because it emanates from an (in this space, inherently not-to-be trusted), black body which is by virtue of its blackness, in a position of diminished power to resist or challenge the rules of the field whose ultimate effect is to choose only white external examiners.

Messner (2000:460) points out that, "education and in particular, the college classroom can be thought of as a field, a space of objective relations that is the site of a specific logic. And that logic is grounded in assumptions about professionalism, knowledge, and meritocracy that tend largely to mask the ways that social hierarchy is one of the major structuring processes, and eventual outcomes, of the field". The logic in operation in Zonwabele's department is a microcosm of Rhodes University as a field founded on deeply internalised racial assumptions. The logic of professionalism, knowledge and the meritocracy which has enormous legitimacy because of the specific characteristics of the educational field can then be deployed in order to perpetuate racialised assumptions under the guise of these more legitimate markers that proclaim not race but lack of knowledge for example as the issue. Black external examiners are rejected not because they are black but because they lack merit or cannot be trusted or lack experience or knowledge.

Sometimes I'm so shocked about what I have experienced for instance in this situation just no, what I have realized is that these people don't trust my judgment sometimes. I'm so shocked about the impact of that then its hours later that I think of how I should have responded and by then it's done the decision has been done. And that's how it's going to be and that kind of thing can make you give up and start making you bitter because you start going to staff meeting and be like arg, I'm not going to say anything because these people are going to make their decision anyways or what else can you do? Send emails where you remind people about what they have done in the last staff meeting because now you have realized what happened. I don't know I think the assumption is that because you are black you are going to catch this very quickly and you going to process it in that moment and open your month and say something so clear that everybody is going to go oh gosh we weren't realizing that we were not doing transformation you know. But that's not how it works and it's never going to work like that and until someone says ok guys how are we going to make transformation work here in every decision, you know if we serious about transformation every decision would be ok let's make this decision and before we

make a final decision are we being transformative in making this decision, is this decision in the interest of transformation. And transformation is going to be uncomfortable, it's going to be messy (Zonwabele).

In *Homo Academicus* (1990:95) Bourdieu argues that, "like all forms of loosely institutionalised power which may not be delegated to representatives, strictly academic power can only be accumulated and maintained at the cost of constant and heavy expenditure of time". This power dynamic in the academic field is displayed by Zonwabele in relation to the lack of trust in her judgement on the part of his white colleagues when it comes to appointing black external examiners and as a result the power of his colleagues to decide against her suggestion affects Zonwabele's practice and agency who says, 'I'm not going to say anything because these people are going to make their decision anyways'. Zonwabele as the only black lecturer in the department finds the process of challenging the normalised habitus of dominant agents and the rules of the field they are using to reproduce existing institutional practice an exhausting expenditure of time and effort.

Habitus as an internalised set of values, perceptions and orientations to the different social spaces agents occupy manifests in different practices within a field, as Brian's experience suggests:

The academic environment at Rhodes labels the accelerated academics as some sort of development programme which simply implies that they are just here on equity purposes just because they are black and it's just about affirmative action. And some of my colleagues have been told that remember this is an affirmative action post, as if there is something wrong with that in fact there's nothing wrong with that to be honest with you. I don't give a shit if people say this is an affirmative action program it is and there is a need for it given what is happening in the institution and we should be proud of that but it is then demeaning when someone tries to belittle you, by positioning you and try to silence you by saying you one of the Mellon people then it becomes emotional in that sense (Brian).

Sallaz (2013:302) investigated internalised racial dispositions, pointing out that, "The black/white distinction was also used to discuss divisions within the organization itself. For instance, those departments headed by black managers (human resources, employee training, community relations, etc.) were jokingly referred to as "empowerment" zones". Similarly, Brian describes how lecturers on the university's ADPs are labelled affirmative action appointments. In the same way as 'empowerment' is a positive value that is turned into racialised speech, Brian points out that for the institution to be taking affirmative action to address injustice and inequality ought to be something for the institution and its

staff to be proud of. Instead it is turned into a way of positioning and undermining the black lecturer.

4.3. Conclusion

Academic inbreeding as an informal institutional practice holds the danger of replicating the existing white- middle-class dominant institutional cultures and ways of being and doing things. Moreover, by recruiting mainly those blacks who possess the cultural dispositions that resemble white middle class habitus, a practice which presents itself as a question of ‘best fit’ and safe options, the existing institutional culture is sustained and reproduced. These practices undermine the ability of those who might most be in a position to ‘see’ how the dominant cultures and practices are working in ways that are racialised, classed and excluding, to interrupt and change these practices. The following chapter discusses how racialised and classed power relations within the university as a field enables cultural reproduction of the dominant white-middle-class habitus through the perpetuation of its ‘rules’ for how the game is to be played. The university as a field is inhabited mostly by white and middle-class bodies which structure that space and dictates the objective relations amongst agents as well as limiting the agency of black lecturers recruited through the ADPs to interrupt prevailing institutional cultures.

Chapter 5: The rules of the field

I am never sure how it should work, on one hand I thought I had to come here and learn a different way of doing things and I think that was necessary. On the other hand, I felt sometimes especially at the beginning my experiences from elsewhere were not particular important, I had to learn the ‘Rhodes way’ and a lot of people in the department didn’t want things to change and they didn’t want a new way of doing things and they believed the Rhodes way of doing things was the best. And especially at the beginning quite often I would say what about this and this is how we used to do it at UNISA and it worked and they will say yes but that is not the Rhodes way you know (Sinazo).

A field is explained as a social space with different positions where agents constantly “struggle to maximize their positions” within the field to realise a specific objective (Maton, 2005:689). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) observed that, different social fields (religious field, artistic field and academic field) are an arena for power contestation amongst social agents with conflicting interests in change or reproduction of existing social structures together with specific cultures and practices. Naidoo (2004:458) points out that the field as a social space “is structured in hierarchy in the sense that agents and institutions occupy dominant and subordinate positions” within it. The dominant-subordinate relationships come about as a result of unequal distribution of power and capital which in a field is central to the production and reproduction of dominant cultures and practices. For Naidoo (2004:459) institutions of higher education viewed as a field, rather than evincing total consensus’ can be seen as a ‘product of permanent conflict’. The durable conflicting interests among agents within the field of higher education institutions are a manifestation of differing objectives. While some agents in the field may have the objective of reproducing existing old ways of doing things, what Sinazo calls the ‘Rhodes way of doing things’, others may have the objective of challenging and changing the old way of doing things. Sinazo is told to familiarise herself with the ‘Rhodes way of doing things’, which can be described as a set of rules that operate in the Rhodes field and whose operation is aimed at maintaining and reproducing existing (inherited) institutional practices. The university way of doing things encompasses preserving existing ways of teaching, as well as the content of the curriculum. The Rhodes way of doing things is presented not simply as ‘our way’ or ‘a’ way but as, to use Sinazo’s word, the ‘best’ way. If existing practices can be described as ‘best’ then to suggest changing them is self-evidently counter-productive. A narrative of our way being the best way also serves to delegitimise experiences from elsewhere which are ‘not particularly

important'. Sinazo's experience from another university with a different way of doing things is considered not only different but rather something of less value with little potential to contribute to what is already 'best' at a university with a reputation for academic excellence and high quality teaching.

I came into a department that was little bit divided, there was a very conservative force on the one hand that wanted things to stay the same and there was a group of academics who wanted things to change and I came in with the assumption that I was brought in to help change and I really got the impression that the older established academics didn't want that, so my very presence and experience from elsewhere to them was very annoying I think. So we fought a bit (Sinazo).

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:101) argue that "the field is also a field of struggles aimed at preserving or transforming the configuration of these forces". The institution or a given academic department within the institution, understood as a field, can thus be understood as a social space in which agents interact with some wanting to 'preserve and reproduce' particular values, orientations and institutional practices. The 'Rhodes way of doing things' can be viewed as defining the rules of the field for agents entering that field by agents with the objective of maintaining the existing configuration of rules and relations and a way to resist change. Swartz (2002:655) offers an interpretation of the concept of field as 'structured social situations in which actors compete against one another for valued resources'. The contention for power in a field between those whose objective is to transform existing practices and relations and those whose objective is reproductive those practices and relations happens within structured spaces with an already existing set of rules. Change proposed by a newcomer is treated with contempt and seen as an interruption of established rules. Experiences acquired from a different field (institution) where the rules are different are understood as insignificant and irrelevant to the 'Rhodes way of doing things' which is constructed as the 'best' way of doing things. Sinazo elaborates:

Well, I will give you an example ... our department is teaching intensive ... and when I came here there was a talk about how do we decrease our work as a university but also as a department but without any compromise of the quality of education. And I made the point which I thought was very obvious, [that] no other university in the country [has this many tutorials]. Second year and third year level you would have seminars with your students but you would not have tutorials every week. And I said maybe we should look at these things. There are other ways that universities have operated and this has been a major point of contention: that the Rhodes way is based on the tutorial system and in the country it is the only one. And I said look it does help and it has produced good students but there must be other ways of producing good students, but I immediately stepped on the wrong feet. Because I said we don't need all these tutorials all the time, so it is stuff like that I thought we not helping ourselves

and we not helping our students but it is just an old way of thinking that doesn't gel with the reality of this institution right now (Sinazo).

As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:40) point out, not all agents in a field struggle on equal terms. Those who dominate in a given field are in a position to make its rules “function to their advantage”. Those who are insiders, operating according to the existing rules are able to appeal to this insider knowledge to their own advantage while at the same time devaluing knowledge and expertise that comes from the outside and thus rendering those who hold this knowledge in a subordinate position. The Rhodes way of doing things is maintained by those who benefit and are advantaged by this way of doing things. These benefits cause power to accrue to them and this power is in turn used to reproduce itself. As Bourdieu (cited in Sage and Silva, 2013:113) argues, the agents who preserve the old existing normalised traditional practice in a field hold “larger amounts of specific capital”, which is structured by the power dynamic of the field. These agents occupy powerful positions in the field and are able to use this power to defend this old way of doing things as a rule of the field. Moreover, agents who are ‘new arrivals possess less capital’ within the field and their presence is treated as disruptive of the old way of doing things which is accepted as the only way of doing things (Sage and Silva, 2013:113).

Capital is thus central to a field, shaping and maintaining specific rules of the field in order to reproduce unequal positions of power and a particular institutional culture and relations among agents. Agents with conflicting interests act to reproduce or disrupt specific institutional settings and cultural norms within the field are in constant contention and the latter defines and shapes structures in the field. But because the rules of the field delegitimise anything outside its structured spaces, the field is shaped by unequal power relations. As Crossley (2003:44) argues, “fields are sites of struggle structured in part through an unequal distribution of the forms of capital pertinent to them”.

The former Vice Chancellor of the University, Saleem Badat, who was the director of the Education Policy Unit at the University of the Western Cape and also served as the Chief Executive Officer of the Council on Higher Education between 1999 and 2006 which advises the Minister of Higher Education & Training on higher education policy matters can be viewed as someone with vast experience and knowledge in higher education. Yet even he, as the University's first black Vice Chancellor, was to come up against the ‘Rhodes way of doing things’, which served to devalue the currency of his existing capital since his experiences had been obtained elsewhere, which is an indication of the capacity of the

existing rules of the game to impinge on the agency of even the most powerful of new entrants. Early in his tenure as Vice Chancellor he was told by a relatively junior member of staff to ‘look, listen and learn how we do things’.

When I first arrived at Rhodes my impression was coloured by the pervasive attitude of ‘it ain’t broken don’t fix it’. I got the distinct message that Rhodes had a particular way of doing things, which had worked for generations, and that I shouldn’t come here and start trying to make radical changes. And I was told, to look, listen and learn how we do things at Rhodes (Badat, 2014)

Badat, similar to Sinazo, as a new agent in the Rhodes field, had to familiarise himself with the ‘Rhodes way of doing things’ and finds his existing capital devalued by existing field occupants. The insistence on an existing way of doing things is a way of reproducing existing social relations and refusing the possibility of the existing rules of the field being interrupted. Rather than trying to make radical changes Badat is instructed to familiarise himself with, and understand, the rules as they are; to look, listen and learn as someone entering a specific field rather than say, to change, challenge or interrupt those rules.

Crossley (2003:59) posits that a field is made up of agents occupying different social, economic and institutional positions possessing different forms of capital or ‘resources’. Thus those occupying positions of power within specific fields have the capacity to direct or re-direct the logic of that field. However, considering the existence of conflicting objectives held by agents in a field, any attempt at re-defining the rules and logic of the field is confronted by the contentious intents of agents with differing objectives. Badat’s experience as a new Vice Chancellor at Rhodes being told about Rhodes’ particular ‘way of doing things’ and how he should learn that particular way of doing things, is all the more remarkable because of his extensive familiarity with, and experience in, higher education as a field. However, his experience outside Rhodes University is rendered irrelevant to the ‘Rhodes way of doing things’ and he must therefore learn the rules of this field. In this way, the attempt is made to reproduce the existing way of doing things and to neutralise or enfeeble a new and powerful entrant into the field who threatens to disrupt the existing rules. However, that is not to say that the attempt to dictate and define the rules and logic of the field according to existing assumptions is simply accepted by new or existing agents in the field. At times there will be resistance by powerful agents who are in a position to influence the rules. As a person of considerable expertise and experience in higher education, Badat saw himself as having agency in the field rather than simply needing to adapt himself to its rules.

I knew I would deal with all this in my own way and in my own time, I'm black, I come from a fairly radical political tradition, I come from the Humanities and Arts, I am an atheist, I attended a government school, I did my PhD at York University, not Oxford University, and my first post at a South African university was at the University of the Western Cape, an historically black university where I was recruited by the late Dr Jakes Gerwel. I say this because there was a definite tendency among white South African universities to see themselves as the Princeton or Oxford of South Africa. This very tendency breeds the 'if it ain't broken don't fix it' mindset, which entrenches old boy ideologies that ostracise newcomers with fresh, diverse, non-racist, non-sexist approaches (Badat, 2014).

Badat is someone who is confident in his position both having 'struggle' credentials and expertise based on prior experience. These items of capital provided him with the resources that he saw himself using in resisting the rules of the field that he entered and that he was told to abide by. Badat positions himself as 'not Princeton or Oxford university' but 'York' and sees this absence as a resource with which to resist reproducing the 'Rhodes way of doing things'. Other resources include his own racial identity which enables him to see the raced dimensions of the existing way of doing things and his experience at a 'historically black university' which means he has not been socialised into the 'Rhodes way of doing things'. These resources enable him to see what needs to be changed and to see that the rules of the field he has entered are specific to that field rather than universally accepted as 'best'.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992:105) suggested that, when studying and examining the field and objective relations within it, one has to "analyse the habitus of agents". They further explain the habitus of different agents as the distinct make-up or characters that the agents have "acquired by internalising" specific value systems and orientation through socialisation. Lawler (2004) explains habitus as "Bourdieu's way of theorising a self which is socially produced". McNay (1999:99) similarly describes habitus as the "incorporation of the social into the corporeal". In other words, habitus is the way in which the social is written onto the body for instance in the form of bodily comportment, habits, gestures and ways of being in the world. Agents internalise past experiences and values into a bodily knowledge that shapes how they view things and their practice and conduct within different fields which is part of how and why agents either reproduce or transform a specific culture and rules of a particular field. Badat describes his habitus as 'York' rather than Oxford and black rather than white which implies that he has habits and ways of doing things that are part of him, written onto him and that this presentation of the self that is him is in some way dissonant with the 'Rhodes way of doing things' and the normalised practices and bodily comportments that characterise the field that is Rhodes.

The conflicting habitus of different agents within Rhodes University as a field is illustrated by how Zonwabele's view of transformation within an academic department differs from that of other agents:

For me as the only black teaching staff member in the department, there is an underlying suggestion that in the staff meetings I must bring up transformation issues right and the one the burden of transformation is on me you know because obviously they are white and they don't know what transformation could possible mean you know and I am the expert on transformation obviously you know. So it's very clear to me at least that there is a feeling of the weight of the transformation and the sort of vigilance about transformation, the kind of the vigilance we all need to build about transformation, about diversity and about those kind of things and they fall mostly on my shoulders. So I'm the one who has to say when we are looking for an external examiner what about these five black people when only white people would be suggested [by white lecturers] if I keep quiet. So in a way I have a weight of transformation sort of forced on me but no one says that. No one says to you ok you the transformation person so every time we do things you need to do transformation things you know, because in a way I would respect that if people [white lecturers] can say look we know we have a blind spot and our blind spot is about transformation so you need to call on us you need to raise up your hand and say actually guys do you see the problem but because no one says that it's a private kind of burden you kind of feel like since no one is talking about the black issue I'm going to put up my hand and talk about the black issue and be that black person who talks about black people issues all the time (Zonwabele).

Bourdieu (1996) argues that, "the field of power is precisely this arena where holders of various kinds of capital compete over which of them will prevail". This contestation can be seen in decision-making within a department where the rules of the field and capital shape and confine new lecturers in decision making. As Athini remarks, while he may be afforded the opportunity to voice his opinions, actually being able to change anything is a different matter.

The experience is quite scary when you are asked to give your opinion because you will never know how your opinion will be received by other people whether that makes it or breaks a decision and I think my experience is I need to stand my ground but still being open to debate issues. But at the beginning it was like just agree with what everyone is saying and get along and we get on with it, but now I think debate is good whether people challenge your opinions is also good and that is my experience in terms of decision making and I don't think I have been in a position to make a decision but at least I have been granted an opportunity to voice out my opinions. Participation is easy but having actually having to do that change, so you are asking me about my participation in decision making and transformation. I think it is easy to participate in discussions and it is difficult to make the changes that have been discussed if that make sense. But in terms of transforming the curriculum I think I had my opportunity to raise my opinions about transformation and changing the curriculum and I don't think I had the power or I haven't taken that power to make

changes within the bigger curriculum if that makes sense. I don't think I have been in a position to make a decision but at least I have been granted an opportunity to voice (Athini).

Similarly, Xolani's experience is one of being present as a somatically different body in the department but with little agency to influence the decisions that are made. The result is that white lecturers continue to make decisions that reproduce the status quo.

If we look at institutional culture there are two parts in my opinion, two parts that we need to look at, we change the representation of the staff but we need to also change how we view and understand knowledge in the context in which we are creating this diversity. Surprisingly we have just changed the textbook for one of our courses in the department and I am showing you now, there was an option between this which is by people in Oxford University... and then we had another book ... a South African book [which looks at] what happens in South African and how we apply this global north knowledge in our context and whether it is applicable in this context. And the decision was made by staff to use this book that was created at Oxford University. Then my question is, we acknowledge and understand we push for transformation but we base our knowledge production on the global North. So there is a discrepancy in my opinion about what we believe and what our principles are and how we are implementing these, our understanding of what transformation is (Xolani).

Bourdieu (1988:79) suggests that, "younger professors ... are defined above all ... negatively, by their lack of institutionalised signs of prestige and by the possession of inferior forms of academic power". The unequal power relations between new black lecturers and senior mostly older white academics makes it difficult for black lecturers as young agents entering the field to influence the direction of decision-making in relation to transformation and curriculum change that could possibly disrupt the university's business-as-usual way of doing things. The limited participation and not having a deciding voice on curriculum change experienced by Athini as a black lecturer can be seen as agents in the field, senior white professors with academic capital, using the rules of the field to reproduce the old way of doing things by. Madlingozi (cited in Visser and Heyns, 2007:29) similarly, reflecting on the experiences of black academics in the Law Faculty, at the University of Pretoria, found that "the invisibility of black academics is made possible by old-boys networks and mentoring patterns that ensure that black academics are forever marginalised and that their impact is merely aesthetic".

5.1. Institutionalised cultural capital

Bourdieu (1986) explained institutionalised cultural capital as attaining qualifications such as a degree or diploma. Institutionalised capital is for Bourdieu one of the three states in which cultural capital can exist, the other two states being the embodied state and the objectified state. The interrelationship between these three forms of cultural capital makes them inseparable. Thus, it is not possible to attain full recognition as a legitimate ‘knower’ in the academic field by possessing one form of cultural capital. Rather, it is necessary to acquire all three in interrelated ways. Naidoo (2004: 458) argues that capital in the institutionalised state as it functions in the field of the university is what “has generally been termed academic capital”. In the university field, Bourdieu (1988:84) argued that, “academic capital is obtained and maintained by holding a position enabling domination of other positions and their holders”.

Central to accumulation of academic capital is not only the experience that each agent has attained though time which has led to them being in a senior or dominant academic position, it is also the agent’s familiarity with the dominant culture’s ways (literary, speech, mannerisms, orientations and ways of being) in the academic field and its institutional tools and strategies of reproducing the existing ways of doing things. Bourdieu (1988:78) pointed out that, in the field of higher education the academic power that professors hold “is founded principally on control of the instrument of reproduction of the professorial body and most of these professors are most often themselves children of teachers in secondary or higher education”. Here, Bourdieu illustrates the reproduction of dominance in higher education institutions and how it contributes to an already existing hegemonic classed culture, and old ways of doing things. Even when lecturers coming from working class families are retained at Rhodes, their alternative way of doing things are seen as subordinate to the dominant Rhodes way of doing things. Their lack of, or unfamiliarity with, the cultural dispositions of those who dominate the field makes them feel a sense of alienation and not belonging.

While ADPs may achieve their purpose in providing black lecturers with institutionalised cultural capital this is not sufficient to ensure their sense of belonging. Instead, these lecturers experience a sense of perpetual self-doubt; the embodied and objectified forms of capital that they do not possess makes it difficult for them to “fit in” and raced, classed and gendered inequalities leave them constantly needing to prove themselves as legitimate holders of

academic capital. The sense of fitting-in and proving oneself in a field with its already established cultural norms and values contributes to the reproduction of existing ways of doing things because agents must either replicate existing cultural practices or, if they choose not to or are unable to, must risk being delegitimised as ‘knowers’ in the academic field. Bourdieu (1986:59) argues that academic qualifications provide their bearer with “a certification of cultural competence” which confers on its holder “a conventional, constant legally guaranteed value with respect to culture”. However, what still remain are dispositions which cannot be ‘conferred’ on agents even if they have attained institutionalised cultural capital.

Unequal power relations among agents within the university field also shape the objective relations and practice of agents and how they view their agency within the field. For instance, racialised unequal power relations between supervisors who most often are white and students who are black and who then join their respective departments via ADPS play a crucial role in sustaining the university’s normative cultures and (unwritten) rules of doing things in old ways. Black lecturers who have been students in their departments find it difficult to challenge their former lecturers, HODs and supervisors, as Lizole and Brenda explained:

The interaction between me and my colleagues felt like these are my superiors you know coming in on the Mellon programme just with an Honours degree having to study for my Masters and these people in my mind were the knowledgeable ones and I was just like this arg shame person let’s help this person out because of her previous disadvantage you know, the blackness the femaleness and the not having, do you get what I am trying to say (Lizole).

One of the challenges is that I have been a student in the department working with my supervisor but now the relationship has changed and we are both members of staff and sometimes I have some fears to perhaps challenge some decisions that are made, I think it is just natural in a sense. I am still growing. I will get in a state where I also feel very much confident. But it is not just that I have not got the support. It is quite difficult. The dynamics have changed but the fact is that I am still working with guys who have seen me grow as a student into a member of staff (Brenda).

Academic qualifications as institutionalised cultural capital do enable their holders to enter university as a field and be academics. But existing senior academics who are the bearers of academic capital control the institutional instruments of reproduction in their different departments. These powerful agents can play an influential role in retaining black academics.

Basically for me without the Accelerated Development Programme I probably would never be an academic. It took two things: Gerald Thomas recognising that there was a potential and Rhodes having the opportunity and it took Gerald to fight for me to have it and that is how I got it. For me my whole academic career was kind of dependent on the accelerated development, the fact that I could do my Masters whilst working and get to meet Gerald, without Gerald to fast track me as a person into, I definitely did not qualify in the sense of qualifying ... I was a junior lecturer but I did not qualify to start. I should have first done a Master's degree then lectured you know. If I did not have mentorship I would definitely have needed to do Masters first but because Gerald was there and the Programme allowed it that is when I become more interested in the academic stream. For me it worked because I was not qualified in my field and have never written an academic article in my life obviously I have done my honours but it does not count and having the room to explore and try and people from ADP -- they called CHERTL now -- they were just encouraging (Thandile).

For some, like Lesego and Thandile, the ADPs are experienced as providing positive opportunities to enter the academic field.

This is a great programme to be honest with you, it is a great tool to nurture young academics because you give them 50% of the salary and 50% of the job, so in a way you are developing as a researcher and a teacher at the same time, it is a privilege for me to be in this programme because you get best of both worlds. I can be able to interact with my students at the same time, I can be a PhD and I can be a lecturer so for me it was nice in that sense (Lesego).

On the other hand, Brian illustrates how stigmatising the entrance of black academics in the university can be interpreted as imposed rules of the field to silence and structure the agency of black academics towards reproducing the existing university way of seeing and doing things.

I had a very bad experience with Human Resource department at Rhodes in terms of my payments in terms of my whole contract and how it was handled that is when I had an issue with the program. The language of development lecturer everywhere you go, even when you are introduced, this is the development lecture and I am like why am I not a lecturer you know. So those are some of the experiences and stigma that comes with it, it gets to be emotionally draining but you know what I have done I have chosen to say that most people here came by some sort of race base program so I don't care, there is a need for the university to acknowledge that black people are needed especially the black academics within the university so I'm not apologetic about being part of the programme (Brian).

The stigma attached to the ADP and its black lecturers is deeply embedded in the racialised gendered dominant institutional culture reducing black and women academics to being less deserving because their entrance into academia is seen as resting on affirmative rather than merit (see Badat, 2008). As Brenda points out:

I am part of the Accelerated Development Programme and obviously I think one thing that affects everyone here is the institutional culture here at Rhodes, I think we have talked about this so many times. I think there is some form of resistance and structural resistance to change, so you kind feel that you are not valued in a sense by some sectors of the academic society here at Rhodes until you can prove that you are worth it and you can do it, in a sense but I am not trying to be specific about certain individuals so but it is some of the things we feel as academics (Brenda).

Bourdieu (1986) argues that, “by conferring institutional recognition on the cultural capital possessed by any given agent, the academic qualification also makes it possible to compare qualification holders and even to exchange them (by substituting one for another in succession)”. In the process of retaining black academics the university does not only recognise academic qualifications attained by agents but also the cultural capital that goes with it. Qualification holders with cultural dispositions similar to the dominant white middle-class culture at Rhodes are seen as ‘best fitting’, which in turn serves to preserve and reproduce the university way of doing things embedded in its racialised and classed assumptions. The institution recognises these agents as holders of cultural competence in relation to the existing way of doings. The institutional resistance to change that Brenda points to is mostly experienced by those who do not find the institutional cultures and ways of being in the university valuing them. They often feel they have to prove to the established dominant cultural agents that they too should lecture and be part of the institution. As Tebogo puts it, the university does not want just any black person but the ‘right black’.

For me, transformation of institutional cultures here at Rhodes should not only be about race, we must not side-line gender and class you know. And changing staff representation through these Mellon and Kresge programmes must not only benefit the so called black middle-class like me, the experience and representation of black working class also matters you know but we both know Rhodes University prefers the right black (Tebogo).

Agents with institutionalised cultural capital but who possess different cultural dispositions that are not similar to the dominant white middle-class dispositions within the university, consequently, experience cultural alienation and self-doubt in decision making arising from their sense of unbelonging which in turn can limit their agency to effect transformative actions and interrupt the dominant practices.

Bourdieu (1988:84) argues that, “the power over the agencies of reproduction of the university body ensures for its holders a statutory authority”. In this case, it is older white senior professors who possess the means of cultural reproduction within the university structure and when these agents ‘train’ new black academics, part of that ‘training’ has to do

with the expectation that they will come to know and accept how 'things are done here'. The racialised unequal power relations of the field enables senior white lecturers as dominant agents to dictate the logic of the field. Bourdieu (1988:85) suggests that, "the extent of the semi-institutionalised power which each agent can exercise in each of the positions of power he holds, his weight so to speak, depends on all the attributes of power which he otherwise holds (this is no doubt what is invoked, in this case as in others, by the use of terms of address such as President or Dean) and on all possibilities of exchange which he can derive from his different positions". Here, Bourdieu shows the impact of different attributes of power held by senior white professors within the university compared to new black lecturers entering the field with less academic and cultural capital and therefore less institutional power. White senior professors who hold academic power also happen to have a dominant voice in decision making at department, faculty and institutional levels because they are familiar with the rules of the field and how things are done and their dispositions reflect this. New black lecturers entering the academic field may, on the other hand, be unfamiliar with the rules of the field and their view on doing things is dominated by their lack of academic capital. The existing forms of capital which they hold place them in differential relationships with power either more, or less, able to interrupt dominance.

Another dimension which limits the agency of ADP lecturers is their need to obtain institutionalised capital (for instance in the form of Masters and PhD qualifications) that will give them greater access to positions of power and influence. But the heavy investment of their time in attaining this institutionalised capital at the same time marginalises their participation in decision making processes within their departments, faculties and the institution as a whole.

I was never really involved in institutional things, especially at the faculty -- those types of meetings and things I did not really get involved because it felt like I am still just that person. So in Faculty it's more of I am just there to hear what is happening, so the experience to me didn't really face me. And I had little understanding of what goes on because I have been reserved and stuck in the department getting my work done (Athini).

One of the things I decided to do was to remain quite invisible you know what I mean? Do my teaching and do my research and not get involved in too many committees and things like that, things that will involve me in the wider institution. And I did that for all the pragmatic reasons and I thought if I can be involved in that stuff I will never finish my work. And the first few years I didn't do any committee work really and I didn't go to many faculty meetings (Lesego).

In a university, involvement at the level of faculty and committee work is critical from the point of view of being in a position to influence the outcome of important decisions. While for Athini and Lesego, not being involved in the 'wider institution' is a conscious choice based on their desire to focus on their work, Luyanda 'kinda shrinks back' from such involvement because she experiences these forums as raced, aged, gendered, etc.

There is an intersection of age, inexperience, blackness and womeness. The first time I would really be just like I didn't know how to present myself in any space so you kinda shrink back (Luyanda).

Bourdieu, as Maton (2006:690) point out, "conceptualizes practices in higher education in terms of strategic 'position-takings' that depend for their form on the meeting of an agent's 'habitus' or dispositions with their relational position within the field". The investment in attaining institutionalised capital by new agents can be seen as strategic position taking. Even though in an immediate sense it compromises their involvement in decision making, in the long run it enables them to take up more powerful relational positions within the field. However, limiting one's agency within the field in the short-term in order to maximize access to institutionalised capital in a field such as Rhodes University with its already established values, norms and old cultural ways of doing things does contribute to the perpetuation of cultural reproduction and risks leaving the "Rhodes way of doing things" unscathed. As Maton (2006: 690) points out, "struggles are thus not only over gaining as much capital as possible but also over which form of capital should be the Gold Standard". Institutionalised cultural capital might be seen as the only legitimate capital required to enter university as a field but *what* is regarded as the 'Gold Standard' is a set of cultural practices and raced, classed and gendered dispositions that are valued currency and which allow some agents to bend the rules of the field while remaining rigidly constraining for others. It is primary having a white middle class disposition that qualifies agents as knowers or safe options. For new black lecturers who lack these dispositions, even though they may access and accumulate institutional capital through the various mechanisms that the ADPs provide, this does not in itself confer power to act as agents of change with regard to how the institution works and conceives of itself.

Black lecturers who have internalised the dominant cultural dispositions have a sense of belonging within the university and are able to navigate and even on occasion re-adjust some of rules of the field. But as Maryna comments their room for manoeuvre and assertiveness,

based on their prior familiarity with the rules of the field, is limited and does not extend to ‘structural change’.

As a black person even though I went to white-middle-class schools I still find this white-middle class institutional culture here at Rhodes problematic and it is worse for some of the black colleagues who are not familiar with it. As a black person I don’t entirely accept it but for me it is easy to navigate and a change few things. I don’t mean structural change. When I started teaching in the department the curriculum was too white so I was able to change it. So I can say my cultural upbringing and familiarity with white-middle-class spaces allows me to be assertive and problematize it sometimes. I know a few black people who don’t have that white-middle-class background, who graduated from Rhodes with Masters and PhDs but who don’t want anything to do with the university or to teach here because of this alienating and patronising white-middle-class culture (Maryna).

Maton (2006:696) argues that, according to Bourdieu “higher education is delegated autonomy by the dominant class to the extent that it reproduces and legitimates existing forms of social stratification”. Thus as much as institutions of higher learning may pride themselves on their autonomy, they are autonomous only to reproduce and sustain the existing rules of the field which are informed by, and rooted in, the dominant class interests, cultural norms and values (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). Higher education institutions can be seen as a social space where the upper classes monopolise knowledge production and reproduce it amongst those within their ranks (Bourdieu 1977: 61). Even lecturers like Maryna who have internalised those cultural dispositions that are valued by the dominant culture find the institutional culture problematic. As Luyanda comments, structures may be ‘welcoming or not’. But for Luyanda, this is a matter not of structural inequality built into the system, but dependent on the individuals who happen to be managing this or that structure.

The academic environment is in essence how you perceive it. At an institutional level there are particular structures that guide the manner in which we work, teach, research and invest in community engagement. Those structures, depending on the people who manage them, are either welcoming or not (Luyanda).

Luyanda is not able to see that as Bourdieu (1992: 97) argues, “a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions (domination, subordination). These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions”. The university is thus shaped by objective relations between senior professors and administrators who are mostly white and new black lecturers entering the field. These objective circumstances guide

how things are done in terms of teaching, research and community engagement. Bourdieu (1992: 101) argued that, “the strategies of agents depend on their position in the field, that is, the distribution of the specific capital, and on the perception that they have of the field depending on the point of view they take on the field”. Strategies employed by agents within the university are therefore not down to individual, personal characteristics as Luyanda assumes. They should not be viewed in abstraction from the objective power relations and relationships of domination and subordination that structure the field.

Those who are in positions of power and authority will usually act to reproduce the existing relations which are clearly serving their interests and to maximize their own capital. New lecturers entering the university may attempt to contest the rules of the field and to transform the way the game is played, so that *their* interests are better served, but they will come up against powerful injunctions to fit into an already existing set of social relations that tend to reproduce a way of doing things that serves the interests of those in power. As Athini puts it, the structure imposes a difficult-to-resist imperative to ‘adjust, manage and cope’. Rather than new entrants being able to change the structure, the structure changes them.

As an individual I think I just adjust to these things and if you are experiencing it a lot you tend to adjust, manage and cope with these things, I don’t know whether it has changed or whether I have changed but I hope my approach and understanding in things has changed (Athini).

Bourdieu (1992: 107) points out that, agents are “legitimized to enter the field by their possessing a definite configuration of properties”. Institutional capital from prestigious universities and a familiarity with the dominant dispositions of these institutions form part of what are constructed as the necessary properties for new black lecturers entering the university as a field. In making these properties effectively a condition of entry, or, where they are absent, their development a condition for success, comfort, belonging and thriving, existing cultural practices are replicated. As Morrow and Torres (1995:7-8) argue, in the process of reproduction “fundamental features must be preserved as the basis of the identity of the system”. Even though black lecturers brought in through the ADP slowly deracialise academic representation, the fundamental (white, middle class, and masculinist) identity of the university is retained and replicated. As Grenfell and James (2004: 510) argue, “any field is also bounded and there is that which is included in it and that which is excluded”. Thus the possibility of disrupting the inherent character of the

institution with its specific values, assumptions and culture, is limited. As Luyanda notes, decisions seem to be made elsewhere and it is difficult for individuals to have any impact:

One challenge that I think might face the Kresge development participants is that if the institution does not open up these discussions they will affect us getting down to department level and I think people are in circles, people are not opening up. ... I don't think there are platforms to talk about these issues that we are grappling with.... You will just hear that there is a policy on that and the senate we will approve, I haven't found a space where I could deliberate with colleagues and so forth you know and that is my feeling as an individual but what I can tell you is that there are so many people who feel the same way you know (Luyanda).

The lack of platforms for blacks to narrate their experiences and challenges can be interpreted as a form of silencing, monitoring and managing the black lived experiences and struggles while at the same time sustaining and reproducing the old traditional ways of doing things.

5.2. Conclusion

The unequal racialised and classed power relations in the university as a field is central to the reproduction of old ways of doing things, the Rhodes way of doing things in particular. New academics and academics from elsewhere coming to the university are forever told to mimic and fit in with the already existing cultural ways of doing things that are seen as excellent and therefore not in need of change. Conflicting relations between agents with either the objective to reproduce or to transform existing ways of doing things exist but those who want to transform the existing ways of doing things are in an equal position within this conflict. They are silenced by the power possessed by older, mostly white male academics who have an objective interest in conserving and reproducing the social relations that value their cultural capital. If agents in a field can be thought of as occupying different subordinate and dominant positions, the participants of ADP in their respective departments usually occupy the subordinate positions. They may lack qualifications or resources, they may be too busy trying to gain institutionalised capital to be able to devote time to serve on influential committees and university structures, and their ideas may be devalued or delegitimised because they deviate from the dominant norms. In this way, they tend to be silenced and their

ability to interrupt prevailing institutional cultures is blunted. As an institution, Rhodes University portrays itself as ‘not broken’ and therefore not in need of ‘fixing’ – a narrative which serves to delegitimise the project of transformation and to shore up existing power and privilege which is invested in maintaining existing practices.

Chapter 6: Social Capital

The literature on social capital explains how agents use established in-group networks to reproduce social class inequalities (Bourdieu, 1986; Ihlen, 2004; Portes, 2004). Bourdieu (1986:51) defines social capital as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition”. Bourdieu views social capital as resources utilised to attain mutual benefits amongst agents who are familiar with, and identify with each other. This is achieved and effectively put to use through different collective formations and associations such as common family name, class, tribe, school, social clubs, party (Bourdieu, 1986).

Bourdieu (1986:51) argues that even though social capital cannot be simplified to economic and cultural capital “[i]t is never completely independent of it because the exchanges instituting mutual acknowledgment presuppose the acknowledgment of a minimum of objective homogeneity, and because it exerts a multiplier effect on the capital he possesses in his own right” (Bourdieu 1986). Here, Bourdieu illustrates the relationship between the different forms of capital (economic and cultural capital) with social capital, pointing out that an agent’s social capital can be enhanced by their economic and cultural capital.

Bourdieu (1986:51) argues that relationships of mutual benefit are “socially instituted” through common associations among agents and this has a positive impact on the social capital possessed by an agent, making it durable. Bourdieu (1986:51) further notes that, “the volume of social capital possessed by a given agent” depends on “the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilise”. Bourdieu shows how social capital derives its durable currency from the network of connections each agent has mobilised particularly from socially instituted formations that reinforce and reproduce collective commonality in the way of viewing and doing things. The size of networks of connections each agent holds cannot be separated from their economic and cultural capital. This is where Bourdieu tries to show that the volume of social capital each agent has, particularly in the academic field, is heavily shaped by classed networks of connections, the economic and cultural capital of each agent that enables them to maintain durable networks that increase the value of their currency and the volume of their social capital. Durable networks create strong relationships of familiarity

and trust among agents which can be used as resources with which to position oneself more favourably in the field.

6.1. Personified Representation

For new black lecturers like Sibahle who find themselves in an environment in which white people dominate in positions of power and in which they lack dispositions viewed as desirable given the configuration of forces in the field, it may be difficult to build and access rich seams of social capital. Being able to do so, having a champion, as Sibahle's narrative conveys, can be of critical importance in helping someone to overcome encounters with prejudice.

The person who championed me was Monica Irvine because when I came to Rhodes when I picked up Science, Monica Irvine and I we remembered each other from our first tutorial so Monica will see the students who are eager and love the subject and she will encourage you. She remembers me, so when honours came she said to me you can try to get some honours and do your Masters and it was awesome because now I can prove to my parents why I chose science. I applied but when I applied I got called for the interview for this Mellon thing and around the table is all white men excluding Monica and I think Kate was there -- the dean of research who was another friendly face I looked at. These people kept saying to me, these white men, why should we give this to you? Why don't you just do your Masters full time? Then I said I want to learn something else. Then they [said] will you manage because it is hard to do your Masters and work but I said I need to learn something else. And that also came from the feeling that at Rhodes I have learned very little to be honest with you because it was like whiteness all over again, I already knew the code and already knew its knowledge. Yes, there were moments of learning but I felt that I haven't been stretched. And I said to them I want this, anyway at the end of the day it turned out that they didn't want to give me the job and Monica Irvine told them you must give him the job; I will mentor him, so the only reason they gave me the job was that Monica agreed to mentor me (Sibahle).

Bourdieu (1986:52) noted that, "the existence of a network of connections is not a natural given or even a social given". For Sibahle to be recognised and mentored by Monica he required a prior social relationship between them that was also shaped by the cultural and economic capital possessed by Sibahle. The social relationship was not naturally or socially given but rather socially instituted. Bourdieu (1986:52) further argues that, "the network of relationships is the product of investment strategies, individual or collective, consciously or unconsciously aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term". The durable social relationship between Sibahle and Monica who later became his mentor leads to Monica championing Sibahle's cause on an employment committee dominated by white men who question his ability and motivation.

As Lesser (2000:45) points out, “The acquisition of social capital requires deliberate investment of both economic and cultural resources”. This explains the interplay between economic and cultural capital and its durable impact on one’s network of connections in the academic field. The investment strategies that agents like Sibahle employ to make their network of connections substantial are classed practices that require one to be firstly familiar with the white middle-class way of doing things. This in turn leads to knowing the ‘right people’ like Monica and having one’s abilities and potential recognised by such people with whom one is then able to create a relationship that becomes a valuable resource for being able to achieve one’s objectives in the classed and raced setting of the university.

Similarly, in Brenda’s experience, her transition to academia is facilitated by being recognised as worthy by those in power. Her investment in activities such as tutoring and working as a research assistant pay dividends in that they lead to her being seen as a candidate for an ADP post. This recognition makes the critical difference between whether she leaves or stays.

In 2006 I worked a lot. I was a research assistant in the department. I was very involved with not just the tutoring. I just went above and beyond that year. So I did my honours in geology and I didn’t see myself staying in academia at the time but when I was applying for my Masters I needed funding and I could not continue to study without the funding. Academia was not an option. I just wanted a Master’s degree. I didn’t think I would keep teaching. So what happened is that my HOD spoke to me. At the time I was considering Johannesburg. He wanted me to stick around and he told me about the ADP and asked me if I would be interested in teaching and he had seen all the department tutoring [I had done] since 2006 so they all thought it will be a good idea for me to stay and teach (Brenda).

The investment strategies that agents or group members adopt in a field not only create social relationships but also strengthen and reproduce these social relationships and may result in feelings of “gratitude, respect and friendship” (Bourdieu, 1986: 52). Brenda’s involvement in her department and working hard can be seen as an investment strategy consciously or unconsciously employed which strengthens future social relationships within her department. The results of her investments manifest themselves in her being told to stick around and to consider the ADP while pursuing her Masters. This assistance from the Head of Department comes after Brenda was not sure about her career options and did not know where to find funding for her further studies. But she finds out that her investments have borne fruit when she is approached by the Head of Department to stay on and become part of the ADP. Her access to social capital connections is also shaped by her embodied capital which helped her

to be seen by the HOD as part of the department someone who could ‘fit in’ and becoming part of the teaching staff.

The significance of established social relationships for the facilitation of black lecturers’ entry into the Rhodes field is noted also by ADP participants whose experiences are reported by Hlengwa (2015:152):

I worked at another institution and I did not like it there and I resigned after eight months. I kept in touch with the [Rhodes University] head of department who knew I was interested in working in the department here at Rhodes (First participant).

Similarly, another participant also remarks:

I knew I would come into academia. I was a student here, tutored students like me and the staff in the department knew me (Second participant).

These two ADP participants show the effects of their already established networks of connections which facilitate their early recruitment into departments that feel comfortable with them and in which they feel comfortable. In Hlengwa’s terms, they are seen as ‘safe bets’ whose presence in their respective departments will count towards demographic transformation but will reproduce rather than question the university’s existing ways of doing things and cultural ways of being. Having a degree from the university, having worked as a tutor or research assistant, are all ways in which a person can build trust and recognition from agents who are powerful in the field.

In Thandile’s case, her supervisor facilitated her ability to gain entry into the university and to feel comfortable on arrival.

I think what helped was that before even I got to Rhodes I had discussion with my supervisor, my prospective supervisor. We had communication before I got here and we agreed on the topic I wanted to work on and that made me feel more comfortable and I think to be honest with you I was welcomed in a very good way. I felt very comfortable and during that time there were very few PhD students and I was afforded that respect of a senior post-graduate (Thandile).

Mandla also noted how his relationship with his lecturers helped him to start a PhD. These lecturers also made him aware of the ADP at Rhodes University and their assistance with his PhD proposal facilitated his entry into academia.

After my Masters my lecturers from Wits where I did my Masters pursued me to do my PhD. While I was still trying to settle what to do for my PhD one of my lecturers

told me to contact one of the senior lecturers in our department here at Rhodes to get more information about the Accelerated Programme before applying. Since I was on my PhD proposal stage and I already knew what I wanted to do for my PhD I applied and I got the job (Mandla).

One of the critical resources that social capital networks provide is access to scarce information. As Mandla points out, his entrance into the university was largely shaped by who he knew hence he was able to obtain information about the ADP academic position being advertised at Rhodes. His relationship with his former lecturers from Wits University provides him with access to an information-rich, resourceful network from which he is able to withdraw benefits when it comes to finding out about a post, and being in a position to be seen as the favoured candidate, ultimately landing the job. As Bourdieu (1986:51) explained, 'profits' accrue from membership in a group but membership is not automatic; it is often based on the commonalities amongst agents for instance based on class, family name or prior schooling.

Lesego describes going to a conference and meeting the HOD from his current department at Rhodes University who then encouraged him to apply for a developmental post:

I went into a conference and I met a HoD of this department and he offered and said there is a post available you should apply ... but I kinda liked the half teaching so that I could complete my PhD (Lesego).

The point becomes one of what leads the HOD to identify Lesego as a potential candidate and to informally recruit him in this way. The relationship established is one of mutual benefit, with the HoD recruiting a new black lecturer and thus fulfilling the goal of demographic change and at the same time Lesego also gets the opportunity to gain a lectureship. While both Lesego and the HoD benefit from their relationship, the question is what dispositions are seen as qualifying Lesego in the HoD's mind. The trouble with informal recruitment practices is that those who occupy existing positions of power in a field are influential in determining who does and does not count as a potential candidate for any particular position, as Xolani puts it, who does and does not get 'sent the call'.

I did my honours at University of Pretoria where I also got my undergraduate degree, then after my honours actually I worked a little bit in Pretoria and it was during that year that I was working that I was sent the call for this job and so I took it. I don't think I was deliberately going to become an academic I think I just wanted to do my Masters and this was being offered and I thought that would be nice I enjoy teaching so that's how I got here (Xolani).

While those on the inside of such practices would no doubt describe them as purely merit based and neutral with respect to such features as class, informal recruitment into a network by those who occupy existing positions of power in the context of an overall set of structures permeated by raced, gendered and classed practices inherited from the past, must be viewed with caution.

Lin (2001:3) defines social capital as “investment of resources with expected returns in the marketplace”. McCormick, Fox, Carmichael and Procter (2011:26) note that, the expected return or profits come as a result of “individuals engaged in interactions and networking”. The continuous interaction amongst agents not only creates practical social networks but it also maintains these connections. As Bourdieu (1986:52) maintains, social relationships are “endlessly reproduced in and through the exchange (of gifts, words, women, etc.) which it encourages and which presupposes and produces mutual knowledge and recognition”. The critical point here is the question of mutual recognition which is the basis of powerful network members being able to trust someone enough to bring them into a network and to see them as being fit for a particular position or to be able to carry out a particular task. For Brenda and Mlungisi recognition by their respective HoDs means that they are trusted. But this trust arises from their having been part of the department which means they are familiar with how things are done and therefore are able to appear more competent and ‘suitable’ than an outsider might easily be able to appear. Given that existing membership of the institution is fraught with inequities, it becomes questionable as to whether external candidates who do not embody these valued dispositions that insiders have, and who are not readily ‘trusted’ are able to be treated fairly when it comes to recruitment practices. If external candidates perpetually find it difficult to gain entry into existing networks, and to be seen as trust candidates by powerful agents in those networks, then the likelihood is that such recruitment practices will serve perpetuation of the dominant culture rather than its interruption.

This departmental recognition of postgraduate students that seem to share mutual knowledge and have internalised the department way of doing thing also finds expression in Mlungisi’s experience of how he got into academia:

When I was a student here doing my Honours I was a tutor and I was quite good and I enjoyed it but it never occurred to me explicitly that it was a career option up until before I went do my Masters. It was then that my supervisor who wrote about my performance, he wrote that I think in the future he will be a noted academic in the country and it was the first time I thought about it, you know...if the Head of Department had not decided to take a mentoring role with me from the beginning and

became a mentor for the ADP I think it would have made a huge difference, do you know what I mean? But because the person who ended up being my mentor has been a mentor for me from the beginning (Mlungisi).

Maryna describe a similar experience:

This is the thing about me: I have never been out of the academia, I have always been in the university because I did my undergraduate degree here and I did my post graduate degree here, and towards the end of my Masters I started approaching my supervisors and asking if maybe I could help them in terms of teaching. So I became a teaching assistant for one of my supervisors then, but mostly it was through involvement within the institution and my supervisor just said to me, you know what you could actually stay. He is the one who instilled even the thought of staying because I wanted to go and work for the government or for an NGO and all of that. She was like, no you can actually stay and do your PhD and immediately after that I was done with my Masters she said no we can organize funding of course funding then Rhodes called me back and said they were having these positions am I interested. But it was through mentorship by my supervisors from my post graduate who instilled even the thought of being here (Maryna).

The process that these participants describe having benefitted from are common practices that have the potential to serve social reproduction rather than transformation when the university retains as academic staff only or mainly postgraduate students who have their first degree(s) from the same university. These individuals have access to agents such as supervisors and HoDs who occupy positions of power and who can use this power to select who will and will not be chosen to become part of their networks. Bourdieu (1986:52) suggests that, “each member of the group is thus instituted as a custodian of the limits of the group, because the definition of the criteria of entry is at stake in each new entry, he can modify the group by modifying the limits of legitimate exchange through some form of misalliance”. In this way networks of relationships are used to reproduce the group’s existing cultural way of viewing and doing things, hence retaining those who are already within the group or who are accepted and trusted by those who control access, becomes primary because those who come from different universities and might have a different way of viewing the world and different ways of doing things are seen as not quite ‘fitting’ and are therefore not considered for recruitment.

Luyanda refers to the way in which senior white academics are in a position to play a gatekeeping role, recruiting into academia only those black people whom they ‘approve of’ and who they are ‘friendly’ with in other words if you are in the network of a powerful white academic you benefit.

Another thing that is problematic and slowing the pace of transformation is the resistance to change from some departments, yes the institution has the ADP but we both know that there are still departments here with only one or two black academics the rest is white and there is no radical pressure from the institution for these departments to change their equity. And in order for you as a black postgraduate student doing masters or PhD to be retained here you must know people particular white senior academics and they must firstly approve you as a black person, to me that is very problematic and paternalistic. So in some departments if you are not friendly with these senior white academics then you must forget, so there is this white paternalistic supervision in the process of grooming black academics that makes me uncomfortable (Luyanda).

As Bourdieu (1986:52) points out, networks are policed so that the identity of the network will come to resemble the identity of its most influential members who will recruit into the network only those who are not seen as a risk: “through the introduction of new members into a family, a clan, or a club, the whole definition of the group, its fines, its boundaries, and its identity, is put at stake, exposed to redefinition, alteration, adulteration”. The identity of the university is sustained because postgraduate students are retained as a result of their membership in existing networks. These network members, or ‘insiders’, are recruited because they are seen as safe options, and their safe option characteristics make them more likely to reproduce the existing institutional culture than to interrupt it. Their recruitment does not necessitate having to redefine the rules of the field because they are familiar with how things are done and they are not likely to argue for structural change as they have been socialised into the ‘Rhodes way’.

According to Morrow and Torres (1995:8), in the process of cultural reproduction “some fundamental features must be preserved as the basis of the identity of the system”. This is done through creating classed networks of connection that limit new members who do not possess dispositions approved of by white middle class culture and those who embody it. These dispositions and existing practices have been normalised so that those who do not possess such dispositions are expected to perform their willingness to acquire them and to show a capacity to assimilate and reproduce the existing social relations in order to be approved of by senior white academics. As Brenda comments, this leaves black academics placed in this position with a sense of constantly having to prove themselves.

In terms of being a student and a staff member while I was on the Kresge programme it was difficult because everyone knows what the Kresge programme is about, it is about employing black staff members who are black and women, so all these minority groups in order to transform what the university looks like. I spent a lot of time trying to prove to other academics in my department and the university that I did deserve the

position, I might be a woman but that is not the only reason I got this post that I actually deserve to be here and I was going to contribute something more than just a window dressing for Rhodes (Brenda).

For Brenda to feel she does deserve to be in an academic position and to achieve a sense of belonging she must fit in with existing norms and expectations to be considered a legitimate member of the group. The expectation, as Lin (2001:20) points out, is that “social relations [will] reinforce identity and recognition. Being assured of and recognized for one’s worthiness as an individual and a member of a social group sharing similar interests and resources not only provides emotional support but also public acknowledgement of one’s claim to certain resources”. Bourdieu (1986:53) argues that, “a group as a whole can be represented, in the various meanings of the word, by a subgroup, clearly delimited and perfectly visible to all, known to all, and recognized by all, that of the (nobles), the ‘people who are known,’ the paradigm of whom is the nobility, and who may speak on behalf of the whole group, represent the whole group, and exercise authority in the name of the whole group. The noble is the group personified”. Here, Bourdieu explains how the identity of a few comes to stand for the identity of the group. Those who have been members of the group and socialised into its ways of doing things, and who are also well known by all the other members are seen as suitable and safe options to represent the group. Madlingozi (cited in Visser and Heyns 2007:27) on Magasela’s experience writes that:

If you are black you are never good enough ... You have to fight against the networks that protect interests, position and privilege. The e-mail that is never sent to you, the invites that always miss your office, the meeting that is held in your absence, the mailing list without your name, the suggestions you make in meetings followed by silence as the chair jumps to the next item on the agenda, the ‘inadvertent’ omission of your name, the withholding of information that would advantage your understanding and self-development ... Very quickly, you learn that most of the time you are invisible. And you are secretly blamed for a lack of ambition and determination, for never involving yourself; you are not fit for promotion ... There are informal networks you are not part of. Plans are hatched over red wine at weekends that exclude you. These weekend ‘informal gatherings’ are where career pathing, promotions, ideas and activities are discussed and decided, with the mandatory office Meeting a mere token for the formalisation of the rule of the clique.

These networks of connections that exclude Magasela as a black lecturer are deeply embedded in racialised dispositions that reproduce white academic representation. As Bourdieu pointed out, those that can represent and speak on behalf of the group are those who are seen as members of the group and they form part of these exclusive informal networks that benefit their own members. Magasela lacks access to the informal network where real

decisions are made. He is excluded, silenced or ignored because his ideas seem irrelevant or less important since they fall outside of the existing way of doing things. And the rightful members of the group are white academics and their favoured and chosen postgraduate students that form part of the informal networks that sustain and reproduce the existing institutional cultures. They are considered people who can speak and act on behalf of the group because they have been groomed and developed in informal settings that exclude black lecturers and postgraduate students who do not fit comfortably into the expectations of the dominant group members. In the context of Rhodes University postgraduate students who are well known and familiar with its cultural ways of being and doing things benefit from these networks as they are considered suitable to become the next generation of academics to represent the institution. Maryna comments on how powerful informal networks often exclude those who do not come from privileged backgrounds:

You see the problem with the Mellon programme or the accelerated programme for me, is that, sometimes it depends on who do you have close ties within your department and within the institution -- some sort of informal relationships, you know what I mean? And it is not easy if you do not come from a privileged background to be part of such networks. Yes the programme has made an impact to retain black academics in some departments but you must be a right type of black person to represent Rhodes you know (Maryna).

As Bourdieu (1986) explained, those who represent the group share its fundamental characteristics, its values and normalised cultural ways of viewing and doing things and the group identity is reproduced and personified through them. Maryna describes the exclusive informal networks that exclude those who do not come from privileged families and did not attend private or Model C schools while informal networks of relationship are mostly formed amongst those that are seen as suitable postgraduate students who happen to come from privileged backgrounds and are seen as the right types of black and safe options to be academics that will represent and reproduce rather than challenge the institutional values and its cultures. The way in which the dominant culture works to exclude people like Sibahle often, as she comments, comes down to 'little things'.

Some little things just demonstrate what Rhodes is all about, and I am not that right sort of black person and so that institutional culture is very alienating and I am not that sort of right person for them, I don't want to be (Sibahle).

Bourdieu (1986:53) explains that, agents that represent the group cannot be entirely separated from its institutional settings. Bourdieu uses the example of when Shakespeare refers to Cleopatra as Egypt, which shows how Egypt is personified in Cleopatra as its representative.

Similarly there are those who do, and those who do not, personify what Rhodes University is 'about' as is suggested in the pervasive sense that some of the participants reported, of not being the 'right sort of black person'. Thus these 'right blacks' are not randomly chosen or retained but rather carefully identified based on the dispositions they possess and whether these are similar to the dominant white middle-class institutional cultures. Possession of these dispositions by the 'right sort of blacks' means that they are able to be recognised as legitimate candidates for inclusion in academia. To fail to possess these characteristics and worse, as Sibahle does, to not even want to possess them is to be placed on the margins where it is difficult to have influence, where one is silenced and one's ideas are ignored or devalued.

Those that are part of the institution but have a different disposition compared to the dominant expected ways of being and doing things, those who are not the right types of blacks, are under great pressure to familiarise themselves with the orientations that are expected by the dominant culture and its influential representatives. Lesego describes the way in which expectations of her seemed lowered due to the fact that she was a member of the ADP. She draws the important distinction between learning from others and the kind of learning which involves 'sitting quietly and watching how we do things'.

Like I said it was quite difficult because all staff members at the university know what the Mellon or Kresge programme is about and the kind of impression given is that, these are people that can be possibly be good academic in the future but right now they need handholding and guidance. So as an independent person who is quite sure of what I am capable of and things like that, that was little bit difficult so my mentor will often tell me you are going too fast just slow down a bit and lower your expectations and goals that you want to do in this three years you are just in this development programme there are a lot of expectations from Mellon staff but at the same time they want to make sure we can make it through the three years. So you also quite come in with a quite junior position atleast I did. There are some that come through with PhDs and I think the dynamics are different so it might not just have to do with just being on this accelerated development programme but also what degree do you have and do you know enough about academia, university and teaching to make a legitimate contribution to teaching and so on and so forth. This kinda idea that you still have a lot to learn, so sit quietly and watch how we do it and follow our examples later on, which I don't deal well with that kinda thing. I am willing to learn a lot from other people and I think there is a lot that I can learn but at the same time I think when a new staff member comes in there is an opportunity to see things in a different way because of new eyes and a fresh [perspective] who doesn't have all that baggage of ten years being an academic and disillusionment and all of that (Lesego).

For Bourdieu (1986:53),“Every group has its more or less institutionalized forms of delegation which enable it to concentrate the totality of the social capital, which is the basis of the existence of the group (a family or a nation, of course, but also an association or a party), in the hands of a single agent or a small group of agents and to mandate this plenipotentiary, charged with (*plena potestas agendi et loquendi*) to represent the group, to speak and act in its name and so, with the aid of this collectively owned capital”. What Lesego described as handholding of new junior members of the institution has to do with familiarising and socialising these new entrants into the existing institutional cultures. From the point of view of competence to do a specific job, Lesego wants to do more rather than less than is expected of her. But it is not so much her specific, work-related competencies that need handholding. Rather what is needed is for her to understand not just how to do things but how ‘we’ do things. The handholding by senior white academics described by Lesego is to ensure that new junior academic members of the institution know how to act in the name of the institution as its legitimate representatives. And in that process they should be guided by existing institutional norms of doing things that represent what the group stands for. Academic representation can thus be seen as delegated power of the institution to academics who are regarded as effectively being able to represent the institution’s sense of its own identity and image. It is thus necessary for junior academics like Lesego whose credentials with respect to these features are in doubt, even if their academic credentials are not, to be guided.

Lesego also illustrates how a lack of in-depth understanding about academia is used in a way to ensure that black junior or new academics conform to existing structural academic practices within their respective departments and the institution as a whole. And in the process of becoming academic representatives of the institution, black academics are reminded that they still have to learn a lot, they must position themselves quietly in order to learn to excel in the existing ways of doing things. This is what Lesego is struggling with and resisting as he believes that there is a need for new academics -- blacks in particular -- entering the institution to change the existing way things have been done instead of being integrated into already existing institutional cultural practices underpinned by white middle-class values and interests.

6.2. Conclusion

Bourdieu (1986) viewed social capital as resources used to strengthen social relationships and networks for the benefit of network members. These established social relationships result in strong ties and networks of connection particularly including people who went to the same highly regarded schools or universities, or people who share a family name, a 'race' and/or a social class and its accompanying dispositions. At Rhodes University social capital -- who does and does not have access to privileged social networks and their resources-- is one of the instruments employed to sustain and reproduce old ways of doing things and preserve the institution's identity and academic representation that is founded on racialised and classed assumptions and institutional cultures about who counts as a legitimate 'academic'. These networks work to include and exclude, to determine who can and cannot form part of academic representation. Those who are included and benefit from such networks of connections are mostly those who are seen as being familiar with the dominant cultural ways of being and possess dispositions that do not contradict the existing cultures, values and norms, while those who do not come from backgrounds that have provided them with easy access to such dispositions are excluded. They fail to be incorporated into social networks that could benefit their progress because they are seen to lack the dominant cultural dispositions that are seen as a prerequisite for academic representation. In this way the tendency is for the institution to reproduce itself in its own image that is to say, the image of those who are most influential in its networks and therefore have the power to decide who will be hailed into those networks. Who they do and do not recognise as a potential network member is likely to be shaped by their own values and predispositions. When people in positions of influence in these networks are predominantly white, male and middle class, as is the case with Rhodes University, then the dispositions that are normalised by these networks will be white, masculine and middle class.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

The South African government's transformation agenda for higher education institutions post-1994 is outlined in the White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education of (1997) which points out that, there is a need to rethink and "view anew" all practices, institutions and values that existed in the apartheid system for the democratic era. This vision captures the need for the transformation of institutional cultures, practices and day to day social relations in higher education, particularly HWIs. This study of one such HWI, Rhodes University, finds that some black lecturers experience the institutional cultures and practices at Rhodes University as raced, classed and gendered and therefore alienating and excluding of black academics coming from working class backgrounds. On the other hand, black academics who are familiar with this dominant culture from their early socialisation can use it to navigate and better negotiate the institution. However, even though their cultural dispositions are similar to the dominant white middle class dispositions of the institution, they still experience challenges with trying to effect agency to change the dominant culture(s). Their familiarity with the dominant culture contributes to its reproduction. In writing about the role being played by black lecturers to either transform or reproduce the dominant white-upper-middle-class at Rhodes, the study draws the relationship between under-representation of black academics in the university and the need for transformation of institutional cultures and practices that are informed by racialised and classed assumptions, and argues that the two are intertwined. As Fourie (1999: 277) notes, "transformation of higher education institutions is therefore not only about changes in the composition of staff and students, or changes in governance structures or course content. Essentially, it is about the transformation of the organisational culture and the development and acceptance of new, shared values".

There is an assumption when it comes to the transformation of institutional cultures, that with the arrival of somatically 'different' new entrants into the ranks of academia, the institutional practices, values and norms will be left unchanged and 'new' lecturers will be socialised into an already existing dominant culture. This assumption does not see the need to socialise the old lecturers who have been part of the institutions to the transformation agenda and a new culture informed by a democratic ethos. The role of black academics recruited through the ADPs in the university is central in the process of rethinking and transforming the practices

and institutional cultures informed by race, class and gender that existed under apartheid that are being reproduced post 1994. This allows developing the new, shared cultures and values Fourie refers to. Thus black lecturers recruited through ADPs may contribute to the reproduction of the dominant existing institutional cultures while others play a crucial role in interrupting the existing cultural normative ways of being and social relations.

Employing Bourdieu's theoretical constructs of social and cultural reproduction, field, cultural, institutional and social capital and habitus, the study noted that retaining mostly those that have graduated from the university and do not have any experience of any outside universities ('growing your own timber'), who come from privilege class backgrounds, contributes to the reproduction of the existing institutional dominant cultures and identity. Their internalised cultural dispositions are not that different from the dominant institutional cultures and this leads to them being seen as 'best fit' candidates and safe options who will sustain the institution's existing image and identity.

Black lecturers who do try to interrupt some fundamental features of the old institutional practices and cultures also find it difficult and challenging to interrupt the university structurally racialised and classed power relations and the deeply embedded old culture of doing things. Most these ADP lecturers enter their respective departments as former students of the same departments, junior lecturer and lecturers; few are in more senior positions and most of their former senior lecturers and professors are white. This racialised unequal power relation puts them in a position that does not enable them to play a transformative role and challenge their former lecturers or supervisors. This academic inbreeding complex persists until such a time when they may become themselves senior lecturers who have the power to change existing practices. However, even those who do achieve such positions will not necessarily use their power to interrupt the dominant institutional cultures but will rather 'fit-in'.

The institutional racialised unequal power relations disguised as academic experience and 'excellence' are used as the rules of the field to sustain the Rhodes way of doing things which is seen the best way to do things and attain 'academic excellence'. Scholars such as Swartz (2002:63) argue that, "individual do not simply conform to the external constraints and opportunities given them. They adapt to or resist seize the moment or miss the chance, in characteristic manners". This is illustrated by my participants pointing out that, when they were retained in their respective departments most often the majority of older senior white

academics wanted the old way of doing things in the department to remain the same arguing that ‘if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it’ that is to say, the university’s ways of doing things has worked so there is no need to view anew the way of doing things. This process of institutional resistance to transformation is also shaped by the dominant-subordinate relationships that are forged by these in-bred recruitment practices which place the older white academic in a position of power and cause ADP black lecturers entering the university space to be more likely to sustain the prevailing ways of doing things than to challenge those practices. Some academics adapt to the university way of doing things because it is not foreign or totally different to their earlier school and family socialisation. This habitus enables them a limited sense of belonging. On the other hand, others reject and resist it not only because of their dispositions that are different from those of the dominant culture but also because it is difficult for them negotiate a sense of belonging in an environment experienced as alienating and exclusive.

Bourdieu (1992) describes social space and institutions of higher learning as a field, arguing that higher education institutions are places of contestation and power struggle where different agents have differing objectives of transforming or preserving prevailing power relations. Bourdieu (1992) further explains this process of using the rules of the field to transform or preserve old way of doing things informed by unequal power relations, pointing out that agents that possess greater power are in an advantageous position to dictate how things are done. So the power of senior academics plays a crucial role in reproducing the existing ways of doing things that works against transforming institutional cultures and practices. Mabokela (2000: 105) argues that, “retention is an even more serious problem, and the departure of Black academics cannot be attributed solely to poaching by the private and government sectors. Some academics and administrators have attributed this lack of change to an antagonistic institutional culture and environment, which they argue is not supportive to the professional development and interests of Black academics”. Here, Mabokela describes the lived experience of black academics at HWIs (University of Cape Town and Stellenbosch University) which is not identical but similar to the lived realities of black academics at Rhodes University, where those recruited through ADPs are stigmatised and may experience a sense of alienation resulting in some leaving the institution.

Hlengwa (2015:152) points out that, through ADPs the university tends to employ safe bets, “individuals who possess the cultural capital aligned to the university institutional culture” underpinned by raced and classed values and dispositions. This is made possible by what

Bourdieu termed social capital. Bourdieu (1986) argued that, social capital consists in resources used by individuals who are familiar with one another and aimed at mutual benefit. These individuals might come from same school, town, tribe, race, class and social association, and their familiarity with each other is enforced by the common social ties that they have internalised and are able to perform.

At Rhodes University social capital is acquired for instance by those who went to the same private or Model C schools and who are seen as safe options to safeguard the university's identity and cultural ways of being. Those who are familiar with the dominant culture are seen as safe options to preserve the university's cultural identity so that even if the racial composition changes the cultural ways of being will be sustained and reproduced. This is explained by Bourdieu (1992) employing the concept of habitus, arguing that, habitus produces practices and perceptions that are similar to the structuring properties of earlier socialisation process (see also Swartz, 2002; Nash, 1990). Those black lecturers who are recruited through the university's ADPs are often known very well by senior academics within their respective departments and they have established social relationships with their senior lecturers which helps them to navigate the institution and provides them with inside information about what to do and who to contact in order for them to be recruited into academic posts.

Social capital according to Bourdieu (1986) is also used to create and maintain a particular representation of the group and the representatives can be considered as the group personified. Thus the relationship between cultural capital, habitus, field and social capital is revealed, because those who have similar dispositions to the dominant institutional culture are considered the ones that can 'represent' the institution; the institutional cultural ways of doing things and values are personified through them. Their familiarity with the dominant culture is seen as necessary for them to be considered qualifying candidates. They are more likely to reproduce the existing ways of doing things which are seen as the only or best way to attain the 'excellence' which the university sees as part of its identity. There is institutional resistance to retaining or recruiting black academics who are not the university's own graduates or graduates of other HWIs and this leads to those who are recruited sustaining and replicating the dominant institutional cultures despite the fact that they are black. Retaining black lecturers from outside is seen as potentially risky as it might disrupt the Rhodes way of doing things. Lecturers coming outside would not be familiar with the institution and its own cultural normative ways of being and doing things. They are

considered a threat to a 'perfect' system of academic 'excellence', research and teaching. Growing your own timber using social capital as a network of connections that is racialised and classed enables the institution to reproduce its image and cultural ways of being and doing things.

References

Africa Grant Makers Affinity Group. 2008. 'Developing and retaining the next generation of academics in African universities: Funder's perspectives', Johannesburg, South Africa: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Altbach, P., 2009. 'It's the faculty, stupid', *The times higher education*, viewed 30 July 2014, from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/its-the-faculty-stupid/406313.article>.

Althusser, L., 1971. 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses', in L. Althusser (ed.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*, 127-186, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Alvesson, M. & Sveningsson, S., 2008. *Changing organisational culture: Cultural change work in progress*, New York: Routledge.

Badat, S., 2008. 'Reproducing, transforming the social composition of, and retaining a new generation of academics: The Rhodes university programme of accelerated development', university leaders forum: Developing and retaining the next generation of academics, 24 November, La Palm Royal Beach Hotel Accra, Ghana.

Badat, S., 2014. If isn't broken don't it - Vice-Chancellor Dr Saleem Badat looks back on his eight years at Rhodes, viewed on 23 May 2015, <http://www.ru.ac.za/media/rhodesuniversity/content/ruhome/documents/Rhodos%20-%20Farewell%20Badat.pdf>

Badat, S., 2007. *Higher education transformation in South Africa post 1994: Towards a critical assessment*, Solomon Mahlangu Education Lecture 2007, Centre for Education Policy Development, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Badat, S., 2010. The challenges of transformation in higher education and training institutions in South Africa, Development Bank of Southern Africa, viewed 20 November 2014, from <http://www.dbsa.org/EN/About-Us/Publications/Documents/The%20challenges%20of%20transformation%20in%20higher%20education%20and%20training%20institutions%20in%20South%20Africa%20by%20Saleem%20Badat.pdf>.

Badat, S., 2009, The role of higher education in society: Valuing higher education', HER-SSA academy, university of Cape Town graduate school of business waterfront, Rhodes University, South Africa. Viewed 29 November 2014, from <http://contentpro.seals.ac.za/iii/cpro/DigitalItemPdfViewerPage.external?id=4177791050196079&itemId=1006571&lang=eng&file=%2Fiii%2Fcpro%2Fapp%3Fid%3D4177791050196079%26itemId%3D1006571%26lang%3Deng%26nopassword%3Dtrue%26service%3Dblob%26suite%3Ddef#locale=eng&gridView=true>.

Berg, B. L., 2001. *Qualitative methods for the social sciences*, California State University: Allyn & Bacon Publishers.

Biko, S., 1978. *I write what I like*, Johannesburg: Picador Africa Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D., 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, London: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1985. 'The social space and the genesis of groups', *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 723-744, Springer Publishers.

Bourdieu, P., 1989. 'Social space and symbolic power', *American Sociological Association*, 7(1), 14-25.

Bourdieu, P., 1977. *Pascalian meditations*, California: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*, United States of America: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1986. 'The forms of capital', in J. G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and research for the sociology of education*, New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1977. 'Cultural reproduction and social reproduction', in L. Karabel and A. H Halsey (eds), *Power and Ideology in Education*, Oxford University: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1983. 'The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed', *Poetic*, 12(4), 311- 356.

Bourdieu, P., 1988. *Homo Academicus*. California: Standford University Press

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H., 1976. *Schooling in capitalist America: Education reform and the contradictions of economic life*, New York: Basic Books Inc.

Bowen, G. A., 2008. 'Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: a research note', 8(1) 137–152.

Canham, H (*City press* January 10, 2013) 'Black academics must stake their claim', viewed 21 September 2014, from <http://www.citypress.co.za/columnists/black-academics-must-stake-their-claim/>.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. 2010. Africa: Carnegie grants for next generation academics, viewed 18 October 2014, from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20101212093649309>.

Center for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Learning. 2014. 'Growing the next generation of academics at Rhodes', viewed 20 November 2014, from <https://www.ru.ac.za/communityengagement/chertl/academicstaffdevelopment/growingthnextgenerationofacademics/>.

CHE. 2009. 'Higher education monitor: The state of higher education in South Africa', A report of the CHE advice and monitoring directorate, Higher education monitor no.8, viewed 15 August 2014, from http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/Higher_Education_Monitor_8.pdf.

CHE. 2007. 'Review of higher education in South Africa selected themes', Pretoria: CHE, viewed 13 September 2014, from http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/Review_HE_SA_2007_Complete_0.pdf.

Cloete, N. & Galant, J., 2005. 'Capacity building for the next generation of academics: review report for the Carnegie corporation project, to train and retain the next generation of academics', Cape Town: Centre for Higher Education Transformation.

Cloete, N. Makgoba, M. W. Muller, J. & Ekong, D., 1997. 'Knowledge, identity and curriculum transformation in Africa', Centre for Higher Education Management, Cape Town: Maskew-Miller and Longman.

Crossley, N., 2003. 'From reproduction to transformation: Social movement fields and the radical habitus', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20 (6) 43-68.

DeLong, D.W., 2004. *Lost knowledge: Confronting the threat of an aging workforce*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Demaine, J., 2003. 'Social reproduction and education policy', *International Studies in Sociology of education*, 13(2), 125-140.

Department of higher education and training. 2015. 'Revitalising and transforming the academic profession', viewed 03 October 2015, from <http://www.dhet.gov.za/ssauf/home.html>.

DiMaggio, P., 1982. 'Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation of grades of U.S high school student', *American Sociological Review*, 47(2), 189-201.

Dube, L & Ngulube, P., 2013. 'Pathways for retaining human capital in academic departments of a South African university', *SA Journal of Information Management*; 15(2), 8

Dugmore, H., 2015. 'Rhodes university growing the next generation of academics', viewed 15 September 2015, from <http://www.ru.ac.za/media/rhodesuniversity/content/communications/documents/Growing%20the%20next%20generation%20of%20Academics%20-%20FINAL%20WEB.pdf>.

Dugmore, H., 2015. 'Universities face dire staffing crisis', viewed 25 June 2015, from <https://www.ru.ac.za/teachingandlearning/teachingandlearningnews/universitiesfacedirestaffingcrisis.html>.

Dumais, S., 2002. 'Cultural capital, gender and school success: The role of habitus'. *American Sociological Association*. 75(1), 44-68.

Education white paper 3: 'A programme for the transformation of higher education'. 1997. Pretoria: http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/White_Paper3.pdf.

Eggleston, J., 1974. *Contemporary research in the sociology of education*, London: Harper & Row Publishers.

Fourie, M., 1999. 'Institutional transformation at South African universities: Implications for academic staff', South Africa, university of the Orange Free State: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fouche, J & Louw, D., 2001. 'Academic inbreeding and isolation in South African psychology', *Acta Academica* 33 (3), 151-168, viewed 14 June 2014, from

http://reference.sabinet.co.za/webx/access/electronic_journals/academ/academ_v33_n3_a6.pdf.

Francis, D & Hemson, C., 2010. 'Initiating debate: South African Journal of Higher Education issue on transformation', 875–880, viewed 23 May 2014, from http://reference.sabinet.co.za/webx/access/electronic_journals/high/high_v24_n6_a1.pdf.

Gaddis, M. S., 2012. 'The influence of habitus in the relationship between cultural capital and academics achievement', University of North Carolina: Elsevier Inc Publishers.

Geber, H., 2009. 'Research success and structured support: Managing early career academics in higher education', Paper presented in track 6 at the 31st annual EAIR forum in Vilnius, Lithuania, Centre for Learning, Teaching and Development, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg: viewed 08 September 2014, from <http://eairaww.websites.xs4all.nl/forum/vilnius/pdf/545.pdf>.

Given, L. M., 2008. *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*, Singapore: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Godechot, O. & Louvet, A. 2000. Academic Inbreeding: An evaluation, viewed 13 June 2015, from <http://www.booksandideas.net/Academic-Inbreeding-An-Evaluation.html>.

Govinder, K. S. Zondo, N. P. & Mokgoba, M. W., 2013. 'A new look at demographics transformation for universities in South Africa', *South African Journal Science*, 109 (11-12). University of KwaZulu-Natal, viewed 15 May 2014, from http://www.dhet.gov.za/summit/Docs/2010Docs/Govinder_Article_Equity%20Index.pdf.

Gordon, L., 1984. 'Education, cultural reproduction and social reproduction', *British Journal of Sociology of education*, 5 (2), 105-115.

Grenfell, M. & James, D., 2004. 'Change in the field-changing the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research', University of the West of England: Carfax Taylor & Francis Group Publishers.

Guest, G. Bunce, A. & Johnson, L., 2006. 'How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability', *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82, viewed 12 August 2014, from

<http://api.ning.com/files/bzSRlccncYIHoa9GPd2I1ad0jUj6NIyGREx1RMTzJqjgYoBcPtmAyKny8kWTJW7MhnnIQkEyyo5j9FuEaO8Lr-6LIGYXEoZZ/FM.HowManyInt.pdf>.

Hargens, L. L. & Farr G. M., 1973. 'An examination of recent hypotheses about institutional inbreeding', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1381-1402.

Hearn. J.C., 1996. 'Transforming United States higher education: An organisational perspective', *Innovative Higher Education*, 21(2), 141-154.

Higher Education South Africa. 2011. 'A generation of growth: Proposal for a national programme to develop the next generation of academics for South Africa higher education', Pretoria,

http://hesa2015.websiteinprogress.co.za/sites/hesa2015.websiteinprogress.co.za/files/2011-%20HESA%20Building%20the%20Next%20Generation%20of%20Academics_0.pdf.

Hlengwa, A. 2015., 'Reflections on attracting, developing and retaining the next generation of academics', in Mathews, S and Tabensky, P (eds.) *Being at home: Race, institutional culture and transformation of South African higher education institutions*, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: UKZN Press.

Hoadley, U., 2006. 'The reproduction of social class differences through pedagogy: A model for the investigation of pedagogic variation'. Paper presented at the second meeting of the consortium for research on schooling, university of Cape Town and Human Science Research Council, viewed 18 June 2014, from <http://www.jet.org.za/publications/jet-education-services-conferences/School%20quality%20research%20seminar%202/school-effectiveness-studies-1/Hoadley.pdf>.

Hollingshead, A. B., 1938. 'In-group membership and academic selection', *American Sociological Review*, 3(6), 826-833.

Horta, H., Veloso, F. & Grediaga, R., 2010. 'Navel Gazing: Academic inbreeding and scientific productivity'. *Management Science*, 56(3), 414-429.

Horta, H., 2013. 'Deepening our understanding of academic inbreeding effects on research information exchange and scientific output: New insights for academic based research', *Higher Education*, 65(4), 487-510.

Huber, L., 1990. 'Disciplinary cultures and social reproduction', *European Journal of education*, 25(3), 241-261, Wiley Publishers, viewed 19 August 2014, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1503315?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

Jaeger, M. M., 2011. 'Does cultural capital really affect academics achievement: New evidence from combined sibling and panel data', *American Sociological Association*, .84(4), 281-298.

Jeanne van de Merwe (City Press, 3 August, 2014) 'Where are our black academics?', viewed 29 August 2014, from <http://www.news24.com/Archives/City-Press/Where-are-our-black-academics-20150430>.

Jonathan, Jansen (Mail & Guardian, 8 August, 2014) 'The academy must bridge the gender divide', Viewed 10 September 2014, from <http://mg.co.za/article/2014-08-08-the-academy-must-bridge-the-gender-divide>.

Kennedy, M. & Power, M. J., 2011. 'The smokescreen of meritocracy: Elite education in Ireland and the reproduction of class privilege', *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 8(2)223-248, viewed 20 May 2014, from <http://jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/08-2-08.pdf>.

Kingston, P, W., 2001. 'The unfulfilled promise of cultural capital theory', *Sociology of Education*, 74, 88-99.

Kraaykamp, G. & Eijck, K., 2010. 'The intergenerational reproduction of cultural capital: A threefold perspective', 89(1), 209-231.

Kvasny, L., 2006. 'Social reproduction and its applicability for community informatics', *The Journal of Community of Informatics*, 2(2), viewed 12 May 2014, from <http://ci-journal.net/index.php/ciej/article/view/342/248>.

Lamont, M. & Lareau, A., 1988. 'Cultural capital: Allusions, gaps and glissandos in recent theoretical developments', *Sociological Theory*, 6, 153-168, viewed 13 May 2014, from <http://www.vanneman.umd.edu/socy789b/LamontL88.pdf>.

Lareau, A. & Weininger, E. B., 2003. 'Cultural capital in education research: A critical assessment', *Theory and Society*, 32(5/6), 567-606.

- Lareau, A., 1987. 'Social class difference in family school relationships: The importance of cultural capital', *Sociology of Education*, 60(2),73-85.
- Lawler, S., 2004. 'Rules of engagement: Habitus, power and resistance'. *The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review*, 52(s2), 110–128.
- Lesser, E., 2000. *Knowledge and social capital: Foundations and applications*, Johannesburg: Butterworth Heinemann Publishers.
- Lin, N., 2001. *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mabokela, R. O., 2003. 'Donkeys of the university organisational culture and its impact on South African woman administration', *Higher Education*, 46(2), 129-145.
- Mabokela, R. O., 2000. 'We cannot find qualified blacks: Faculty diversification programmes at South African universities', *Comparative Education*, 36(1), 95-112
- Macris, V., 2002. 'The ideological conditions of social reproduction', *Journal for critical education policy studies*. 9(1), University of Alberta, Canada, viewed 18 May 2014, from <http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/09-1-02.pdf>.
- Madlingozi, T., 2007. 'Confronting and dismantling institutional racism in the Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria' in Visser, H. & Heyns. C., (eds), *Transformation and the Faculty of law, University of Pretoria*, 2-73, Pretoria: University Law Press.
- Mapasela, M. & Hay, D., 2006. 'The effect of change and transformation on academic staff and job satisfaction: A case of a South Africa university', *Higher Education*, 52(4), 711-747.
- Marx, K., 1852. 'The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon', viewed 28 August 2014, from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/subject/hist-mat/18-brum/ch01.htm>.
- Mason, M., 2010. 'Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews', 11(3), 8, viewed 11 August 2014, from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027>.
- Maton, K., 2005. 'A question of autonomy: Bourdieu's field approach and higher education policy', *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6), 687–704.

Mazibuko, F., 2006. 'Women in academic leadership in South Africa: Conventional executives or agents of empowerment'? *Alternation*, 13(1), 106-123, viewed 17 April 2014, from <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/docs/13.1/07%20Maz.pdf>.

Messner, M, A., 2000. 'White guy habitus in the classroom: Challenging the reproduction of privilege', *Men and Masculinities* 2 (4), 457-469.

McNay, L., 1999. 'Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity'. *Theory, Culture & Sociology*, 16(1), 96-117.

McGee, R., 1960. 'The function of institutional inbreeding', 65(5) 483-488, *American Journal of Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, viewed 26 July 2014, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2774077?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

McGregor, K., 2008. 'South Africa: Challenges of equity, ageing and expansion', viewed 16 May 2014, from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20081214092139847>.

Mkhize.N., 2005. 'Am I just a white-washed black woman'? Grahamstown: Routledge Publishers.

Mngomezulu, B. R & Ndlovu, B. B., 2013. 'The state of racial equity at South Africa universities', *Journal of Social Science*, 37(2), 109-115, South Africa, viewed 29 May 2014, from [http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSS/JSS-37-0-000-13-Web/JSS-37-2-000-13-PDF-Abst/JSS-37-2-109-13-1628-Ndkivy-B-B/JSS-37-2-109-13-1628-Ndkivy-B-B-Tx\[2\].pmd.pdf](http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSS/JSS-37-0-000-13-Web/JSS-37-2-000-13-PDF-Abst/JSS-37-2-109-13-1628-Ndkivy-B-B/JSS-37-2-109-13-1628-Ndkivy-B-B-Tx[2].pmd.pdf).

Morichika, N.& Shibayama, S. 2015. 'Impact on inbreeding on scientific productivity: A case study of a Japanese university department', *Research Evaluation*, 24, 146-157.

Morrow, R, A. & Torres, C. A., 1995. *Social theory and education: A critique of theories of social and cultural reproduction*, State University of New York: State University of New York Press.

Mthatyana, A. T. Z, 2014. How are the messages of the official grade ten sexuality education curriculum at a Former Model C girls' high school in South Africa mediated by student sexual cultures, MA thesis, Rhodes University.

Naidoo, R., 2004. 'Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 25.4 (2004): 457-471.

Nash, R., 1990. 'Bourdieu on education and social and cultural reproduction, Massey University, *British Journal of Sociology of education*, Vol. 11(4), 431- 447.

Ndletyana, M., 2014. 'Middle-class in South Africa: Significance, role and impact', Mapungubwe: Institute for Strategic Reflection (MISTRA). Johannesburg, South Africa, viewed June 16 2014, from <http://www.mistra.org.za/Library/ConferencePaper/Documents/Middle%20Class%20in%20South%20Africa-Significance,%20role%20and%20impact.pdf>.

Niemann, R., 2007. 'Transforming an institutional culture: An appreciative inquiry', *Higher Education Studies and Research*, 24(5), 1003–1022.

Nueman, W. L., 2006. *Social Research methods: Qualitative approaches*, New York: Pearson Education Inc., publishing as Allyn and Bacon.

Ostrom, E. & Ahn, T. K., 2003. *Foundations of Social Capital*, Florida State University: Edward Elgar Publishers.

Portnoi, L., 2009. 'Cultivating the next generation of academics in South Africa', *African Education Review*, 6(2), 187-207.

Priour, A. Rosenlund, L. & Larsen J.S., 2008. 'Cultural capital today: A case study from Denmark', 36 (1), 45–71.

Quinn, L & Vorster, J, A., 2012. 'Training new academics is a complex challenge', viewed 20 May 2014, from

<http://www.ru.ac.za/perspective/perspectivearticles/perspectivearchive/name,68985,en.html>

Robus, D. & Macleod, C., 2006. 'White excellence and black failure: The reproduction of racialised higher education in everyday talk', *Journal of Psychology*, 36(3) 436-480.

Roksa, D.& Pother, D., 2011. 'Parenting and academic achievement: Intergenerational transmission of educational advantage', *American Sociological Association*, 84(4), 1-23.

Rhodes University., 2008. 'Mellon foundation programme for accelerated development: employment procedures and regulations'.

Rhodes University., 2014. 'Rhodes university accelerated development programme employment protocol'.

Rhodes University. 2001. 'Employment protocol for academic posts in the Mellon Foundation programme for accelerated development'.

Rhodes University. 2001. 'Kresge foundation faculty Accelerated development Programme'.

Rhodes University. 2010. 'Kresge foundation faculty accelerated development programme'.

Rhodes University. 2011. 'Kresge foundation faculty accelerated development programme'.

Rhodes University. 2012. 'Kresge foundation faculty accelerated development programme'.

Rhodes University. 2013. 'Kresge foundation faculty accelerated development'.

Rhodes University. 2014. 'Rhodes university digest of statistics 2014'. Viewed 14 September 2015, from <https://www.ru.ac.za/datamanagementunit/datarepository/>.

Rhodes University. 2010. 'Rhodes university digest of statistics 2010', Viewed 14 September 2015, from <https://www.ru.ac.za/datamanagementunit/datarepository/>.

Sallaz, J. J., 2010. 'Talking race, marketing culture: The racial habitus in and out of apartheid', University of Arizona: University of California Press.

Saldana, J., 2009. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage.

Sara, A., 2007. 'A phenomenology of whiteness', Goldsmiths College, University of London: Sage..

Sara, A., 2013. 'Institutional habits', viewed 29 June, from <http://feministkilljoys.com/2015/02/02/institutional-habits/>

Sebola, M. S. & Khalo, T., 2010. 'Implementation of employment equity: A case of the universities of Venda and Pretoria'. *Journal of Public Administration*, 45(11).

Sesanti, S. *City Press*, October 31, 2014. 'Black academics must move the centre', viewed 02 November 2014, from <http://www.news24.com/Archives/City-Press/Black-academics-must-move-the-centre-20150429>.

Soler, M., 2001. 'How inbreeding affects productivity in Europe', *Nature International Weekly Journal of Science*, 411(6834), 132-420.

Susen, S. & Turner, B. S., 2011. *The legacy of Pierre Bourdieu: Critical Essays*, New York: Anthem Press.

Swartz, D. L., 2002. 'The sociology of habit: The perspective of Pierre Bourdieu', *The Occupational Therapy journal of Research* 22, Supplement, 61-86, viewed 20 April 2014, from <http://www.bu.edu/av/core/swartz/sociology-of-habit.pdf>.

Tettey, W. J., 2009. 'Deficits in academic staff capacity in Africa and challenges of development and retaining the next generation of academics', University of Calgary: Alberta, Canada, viewed 05 July 2014, from http://www.foundation-partnership.org/pubs/pdf/Tettey_NGA_Indicators_Dec2009.pdf.

Tierney, W. G., 1988. 'Organisational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials', 59(1), 2-21.

Turner, D.W., 2010. 'Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators', *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 754-760.

Tyler, S., 2011. 'Transforming inequality in the classroom: not as easy as it sounds'. University of Wollongong: *Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters*, 1(1), 21-28 <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jseem/vol1/iss1/4/>

Unisa Online, 2013. 'Investing in the next generation', viewed 20 August 2014, From <http://www.unisa.ac.za/Default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&ContentID=26434>.

Viljoen, P. J. & Rothmann, S., 2002. 'Transformation in a tertiary-education institution: A case study', *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, 11(2)2, 2-10.

Women's Academic Solidarity Association. 2013. *In the company of women: 10 Years WASA*, A Publication by Rhodes University, viewed 12 September 2014,

From <https://40e703209bc5bd5a56b6bee8dcbaa93e9f0881a3.googledrive.com/host/0B-LaeMxochkvUW5OZFE5V2FSLU0/WASA%2010%20Years/files/res/downloads/book.pdf>.

Werfhorst, H. G., 2010. 'Cultural capital: strengths, weaknesses and two advancements', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 157–169.

Wyer, J. C. & Conrad, C. F., 1984. 'Institutional inbreeding re-examined', *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(1), 213-225.

Yudkevich, M. Altbach, P.G & Rumbley, L. E., 2015. *Academic Inbreeding and mobility in higher education: Global perspective*, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers.

Yudkevich, M. Altbach, P.G. & Rumbley, L. E., 2015. *Young faculty in the twenty-first century: International perspectives*, Albany, New York United States: State University of New York Press.

Zimdar, A. Sullivan, A. & Heath, A., 2009. 'Elite higher education admissions in the arts and sciences: Is cultural capital the key?' 43(4), 648–666.

APPENDIX A: EMAIL TO THE ADP PARTICIPANTS

Dear participant

My name is Masixole Booi. I am doing my Masters in the department of Political and International Studies, supervised by Professor Louise Vincent. I am researching the experiences of participants in the Programme for Accelerated Development. As a lecturer who has first-hand experience of this programme I would greatly appreciate your participation. This would be in the form of a one hour interview to be held at your earliest convenience.

Please would you let me know whether you are willing to be one of my participants and if so, when we might schedule an interview. If a face-to-face interview is not possible for you, I would be happy to conduct the interview by email. I would like to assure you in advance that the study will adhere to the strictest confidentiality procedures with all data anonymised to protect the identities of the participants. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Humble Regards

Masixole Booi

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I _____ agree to participate in the research project of Masixole Booi on Training and Retaining the Next Generation of Academics: The Programme for Accelerated Development at Rhodes University and Higher Education Institutional Transformation

I understand that:

1. The researcher is a student conducting the research as part of the requirements for a Master's degree at Rhodes University. The researcher may be contacted on 0746341896 (cell phone) or g14b6090@campus.ru.ac.za (email). The research project has been approved by the relevant departmental ethics committee, and is under the supervision of Prof. Louise Vincent in the Politics Department at Rhodes University, who may be contacted on l.vincent@ru.ac.za (email).
2. The researcher is interested in collecting experiences of staff in different departments who entered the academic workforce through the Programme for Accelerated Development Rhodes University.
3. My participation will involve being interviewed at my convenience for duration of about one hour per interview.
4. I may be asked to answer questions of a personal nature, but I can choose not to answer any questions about aspects of my life which I am not willing to disclose.
5. I am invited to voice to the researcher any concerns I have about my participation in the study, or consequences I may experience as a result of my participation, and to have these addressed to my satisfaction.
6. I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, should I have concerns about my participation which I did not originally anticipate.
7. The thesis and publications resulting from this study may contain information about my personal experiences, attitudes and behaviours, but these will be designed in such a way that it will not be possible for me to be identified by the general reader.

Signed on (Date):

Participant: _____

Researcher: _____

APPENDIX C: INDUCTIVE CODING NODES

Name
A need for black scholarship
A need for institutional platform
Academic representation
Active in the department
Adapting to the system
ADP is developmental for people who want to be academics
Adjust, manage and cope
Anti-transformation culture
Alienating institutional cultures
Assimilation
Assimilate self
Being challenged
Black faces
Blacks who are white in their thinking
Black voice and assimilated voices
Burden of transformation agenda on black academics
Class
Confident in teaching
Cultural capital
Departmental support
Dissatisfaction with the post-graduate diploma
Felt like an outsider
Fitting in
Growing our own timber
Institutional culture
Institutional support
Institutional resistance to change
I was known as a tutor
Need to transform curriculum
Middle-class dominance
Mentorship
Most people knew me in the department
Old white lecturers
Power struggle
Problem with white academic supervision
Proving myself
Racism
Remuneration
Resisting change in curriculum
Rhodes way of doing things
Safe bets

Sense of belonging
Self-restrain
Silenced voice
Social networks
Slow pace of transformation
Staff meeting
Stigma attached to ADP
Racialised assumption
Representation
Relationship with the HOD
Remaining quiet and invisible
Right type of black person
Transformation
Violent expectation from black academics
Working-class experiences matters
Whiteness
White power and monopoly over the institutional culture
White-middle-class institutional culture
White authority
White academic representation
White culturally
What happens after ADP