

Demystifying research methods: everyday experiences as socio-cultural co(n)texts for effective research methods in teaching and learning in institutions of higher learning in Africa**Felix Banda**Linguistics Department, University of the
Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa

fbanda@uwc.ac.za

Dennis BandaLanguage and Social Sciences Education
Department, Lusaka, University of Zambia

dennisnk@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of the paper is to demonstrate how everyday knowledge can be incorporated into the classroom practices of institutions of higher learning to inform inclusive outcomes for linguistically and culturally diverse students. Using a metaphor of a marketer's everyday interrogation of market conditions, a postgraduate guide to proposal writing and the funds of knowledge socio-cultural framework, we illustrate how forms of everyday and school knowledge can be used concurrently in the construction of socially responsive dialogic pedagogy. We argue for scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) in the South in which knowledge and theory generation is not a preserve of English only, but more so, of the complex interactions between English and the multiplicity of languages that students bring to the classroom. We conclude that SOTL in the South needs to be founded on the transfiguration of everyday knowledge and formal academic knowledge to facilitate the production of new and more powerful knowledge in multicultural postcolonial society. This would allow for inclusive pedagogy that caters for diversity in classrooms, and activity-based teaching and learning, networking students' experiential, community/home and formal academic knowledge in the construction of new and powerful knowledge.

1. Introduction

An overt binary distinction is often made between everyday knowledge and school or academic knowledge. Even where everyday knowledge is acknowledged, it is often constructed as less powerful than academic knowledge. For instance Young (2008, 2013) describes academic knowledge as authoritative, systematic, objective, organised, rational and reflexive, and everyday knowledge as unstructured, innate, imprecise, unsystematic, naïve, subjective and personalised. Although Young (2008) recognises that experience cannot be divorced from production of new knowledge, he does not believe it has the intellectual capacity required for social mobility of young people beyond localised spaces (Catling & Martin 2011). Recent conceptualisation of literacy practices recognises the significance of everyday literacy practices in the enhancement and acquisition of more powerful literacies (New London Group 2000; Heath, Prinsloo & Baynham 2013). It is also recognised that although school knowledge is generally important for socioeconomic mobility, it is not always the case that its outcomes are relevant in all cases (Onyango-Ouma 2006; Serpell 1993). Using ethnographic data, Onyango-Ouma (2006) found that the kind of school knowledge provided in the curricula in the rural Western Kenya did not help students increase their knowledge of their life-worlds and the kinds of skills they needed in everyday life. Onyango-Ouma (2006) cites other studies such as Wolcott (1967), Keddie (1971) and Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1992) to illustrate how school knowledge can be inadequate to the needs of the students and communities or can alienate students from their communities' aspirations and problems. Most postcolonial nation-states still use the curricula as handed down from the colonial era. There is a clear hierarchy and power relationship between school knowledge based on English-only instruction and teaching material, and everyday knowledge embedded in African languages. Going to school in this context entails divorcing oneself from one's everyday life and knowledge, while the acquired school knowledge is irrelevant to the practices of the students and the communities from which they come.

In this paper, we take a socio-cultural perspective (Vygotsky 1978) to contend that everyday knowledge should not be seen to be in opposition to school-based (academic) knowledge; but that it contributes to the funds of knowledge in the students' repertoire (Maitra 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez 1988). In the process, we illustrate how SOTL in the South can be the harbinger of dialogic pedagogy involving both everyday knowledge and formalised academic knowledge in the construction of new and more powerful knowledge.

2. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The idea of SOTL has been traced to Boyer's (1990) publication in which he suggested the need for "a broader definition of the work of faculty members to include the scholarships of discovery, integration, application, and teaching" (Kern, Mettetal, Dixson & Morgan 2015:2). This means that scholarship has to be localised and connected to the students' communities and their everyday practices to be relevant. SOTL has since grown in use in the USA, Britain and Australia and Latin America. There are movements for SOTL in the South, and focusing on Africa, as will be illustrated later. The notion of SOTL has been defined and approached differently in the literature. For instance, McKinney (2004) notes that the Carnegie Foundation conceptualises it as relating to teaching or learning problem-posing, problem-studying through systematic disciplinary epistemologies, the application of results to practice, the dissemination of results, self-reflection and peer review. This is more a description of characteristics involving a number of elements than a specified definition. The

lack of specific definition could be due to the limitations of SOTL, which is that it is situated and context-based and draws from a range of disciplines, some of which have their own methodologies and theoretical orientations (Franzese & Felten 2017). Some of the important ingredients in the conceptualisation are the focusing on the teaching or learning problem, systematic methodology in solution-finding, making findings public, and self-reflection. Indeed, McKinney (2004) notes the difference between Carnegie Foundation's definition of SOTL and that of the Illinois State University where she teaches, in which SOTL has been conceptualised as systematic reflection or study on teaching and learning that is made public. This definition captures the elements found in the Carnegie Foundation conceptualisation but in a more precise manner.

The Center for Engaged Learning (2013) provides the conceptualisation of SOTL in the form of characteristics as involving:

- asking whether what went into the curriculum design meets with outcome (evidence);
- reflection and focusing on student learning;
- faculties and academics bringing their knowledge to the classroom;
- systematic research on teaching and learning;
- enquiry-based practices involving evidence, continually asking questions and finding answers;
- going public with the findings of teaching and learning research;
- a focus on who is doing the research, rather than methods;
- a diversity of people involved in doing the research, which increases the impact of the work;
- a design of methodology that relates to the expertise of researchers;
- perspectives on teaching and learning, a set of practices, a product of enquiry and the necessity for social impact.

In their characterisation of SOTL, Kern *et al.* (2015) provide a framework for how to distinguish the teaching process, and the research informing that process. Their aim was to provide a model to help universities locate SOTL in the institutions' teaching and learning missions. Kern *et al.*'s (2015) model is founded on two dimensions: systematic/informal and private/public, which form four quadrants. These are practice of teaching, which includes course development, curriculum design and teaching portfolios; sharing about teaching, which includes published curriculum, blog teaching and shared of teaching portfolios; scholarly teaching which includes attending teaching conferences, literature-based teaching and the use of classroom assessment techniques and scholarship of teaching and learning which includes published empirical research, literature review and published case studies. It is evident that the model contains the features highlighted in the literature above.

Hood (2017) demonstrates how institutional outcomes can be enhanced if infused with students' aspirational outcomes of their learning. Inputting students' voices in articulating institutional outcomes relates to some of SOTL's characteristics, such as involving students in the enquiry, including their learning problems in the curriculum and involving them in them in the process of resolving the problem. Re-aligning students' expressed outcomes to be part of the institutional outcomes makes students feel that they have contributed "to their own learning to the same extent as faculty and courses (Hood 2017:6). Failure to match students' aspirations and institutional

outcomes could instigate student apathy or opposition to learning, leading to some dropping out (Willis 1993; Serpell 1993; Onyango-Ouma 2006).

Acknowledging diversity in SOTL as an intellectual work, Felten (2013) has proposed five shared principles as frameworks to measure the efficacy of, and to define, individual SOTL inquiries. As the international community of SOTL grows, so does the likelihood of inconsistency and incoherence of the concept of SOTL across the world, as well as the difficulty in appraising the quality of SOTL investigations (Felten 2013). The principles are “(1) inquiry into student learning, (2) grounded in context, (3) methodologically sound, (4) conducted in partnership with students, and (5) appropriately public” (Felten 2013:121). Given the multilingual and multicultural contexts of Africa, for example, SOTL in the South will need to put diversity at its core to remain relevant to the majority of students.

Based on Felten’s (2013) principles, Franzese and Felten (2017) propose that the SOTL framework can be used as a device to evaluate the efficacy of contemplative pedagogies in teaching and learning. They argue that the principles can be a useful guide for faculty to “incorporate new pedagogical approaches into their teaching and to conduct classroom-level practical inquiry into learning and development linked to contemplative pedagogies”, and for individuals seeking a reflective guide for their planning, conducting and acting on the results of the SOTL enquiries (Franzese & Felten 2017:2). Franzese and Felten (2017) note a number of limitations of SOTL, which includes that it is context-based making it difficult to replicate the findings; it is multidisciplinary and hence draws from many fields, some of which may have their own specialised methodologies and theoretical frameworks, and that it focuses on isolated pieces of learning and not on the learning experience in its entirety.

We should like to note that these limitations are focused on the internal workings of SOTL, not on those resulting from teacher and student idiosyncrasies or cultural backgrounds. It also seems the case that the characteristics, faculty and classroom designs and implementation heuristics of the SOTL strategies, as outlined above, have a Western and monocultural orientation. This explains the increased interest in SOTL in the South and using epistemologies from the South. There have been a number of conferences and workshops on SOTL in Latin America and South Africa. For instance, the SOTL in the South Conference was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, on 24-26 July 2017. The *SOTL in the South* journal was inaugurated on 25 July 2017, during the conference. The third Annual International Conference on SOTL is to be held in Bloemfontein, South Africa, from 25-26 October 2017. There is therefore interest in SOTL and, increasingly, the need to conceptualise it from the perspective of the South. This paper can be seen as a contribution to this ideal as it shows how SOTL can tap into everyday knowledge of Africans for outcomes relating to scientific enquiry in outlining research proposals and research protocols.

3. Everyday knowledge, school knowledge and funds of knowledge

Indigenous knowledge and everyday knowledge can be said to be related. Indigenous knowledge has been defined differently in the literature, but a common thread that runs through it is that it is transmitted from one generation to another in a specified family and/or community (Banda 2008; Banda & Banda 2016). Indigenous knowledge transmission can be said to be largely

intergenerational. Everyday knowledge can be said to be non-formal knowledge derived from everyday practices and life (Onyango-Ouma 2006; Catling & Martin 2011; Hood 2017). Everyday knowledge can thus draw from indigenous knowledge and from translocated knowledge from the different social networks and communities to which the student belongs. It is for this reason that we have opted to use the socio-cultural funds of knowledge as theoretical framework rather than indigenous knowledge, as the former is premised on wide range of sources of knowledge across social networks, communities and generations. We elaborate on this below.

It seems the case that most knowledge in institutions of higher learning is drawn from formal schooling structures, and in the case of most of Africa, such knowledge is transmitted through English language. Everyday knowledge is that which is acquired outside formal structures outside school knowledge. Since, in Africa and the Global South generally, students spend most of their life outside the school using languages that are not used in the formal structures, this means most of the knowledge at their disposal lies in their everyday experiences. Studies have shown the benefits of integrating students' everyday experiences in learning (Upadhyay 2005; Barton & Tan 2008; Onyango-Ouma 2006). These everyday experiences could constitute the funds of knowledge for teaching and learning, as the classroom is transformed into a third place in which everyday knowledge and school knowledge are transfigured for teaching and learning (Bhabha 1995; Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez & Chiu, 1999). Instead of being the site for competing forms of knowledge, the classroom as the third space becomes the arena for the production of cultural capital for effective and inclusive teaching and learning in the multilingual and multicultural contexts of the South.

Coined by Wolf (1966) to define a variety of knowledge and resources that families deploy to subsist in household and community economies, the term 'funds of knowledge' has been defined as "the historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual help, individual functioning and well-being" (Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001:133). In exploring the interactions of social networks among Mexicans in Mexico and the USA, Velez-Ibanez (1988:38) characterizes funds of knowledge as Mexicans' experiences or practices in:

Information and formulas containing the mathematics, architecture, chemistry, physics, biology, and engineering for the construction and repair of homes, the repair of most mechanical devices including autos, appliances and machines as well as methods for planting and gardening, butchering, cooking, hunting, and of making things in general.

This is the kind of knowledge is analogous to that found in institutions of learning, but hardly acknowledged and used by teachers. Indeed researchers have shown that the funds of knowledge students bring to the school is beneficial to teaching and learning, as classroom practices are drawn and built on the foundations of what the students already know (Maitra 2017; Moll 1992; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001). Onyango-Ouma (2006) describes the situation in the rural community in Western Kenya where students' knowledge of fishing, nurturing and tending cattle, and of business such as running *boda bodas* (bicycle taxis), is not used to frame the school curricula that could benefit from it.

Velez-Ibanez and Greenberg (2009) demonstrate how Mexican families who moved between Mexico and the USA, depending on the economic situation at different times in history, have accumulated funds of knowledge from the social networks that they have encountered and been part of. The different social network systems constitute nodes of different localised funds of knowledge, which can be used, modified or discarded according to the needs of the person in different contexts (Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg 2009). The classroom constitutes a node in the students' social networks, and it can activate funds of knowledge within and outside the classroom settings (Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg 2009).

From the foregoing, it becomes clear that the classroom can be made into a site where the sameness and difference in institutional outcomes and students' own aspirational outcomes, and in everyday and formal school knowledge, are remediated into alternative transformative discourses, and as cumulative funds of knowledge. In this conceptualisation, sameness, conflict and difference are transformed into rich zones of collaboration and learning (cf. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López & Tejada 2009). From a Bakhtinian (1981) perspective, the points of conflict and difference in cultural practices, especially lead to dialogicality, which becomes a mediating tool in inter- or cross-cultural encounters.

Maitra (2017) has suggested that funds of knowledge are not merely a function of household knowledge. They are acquired and are embedded in history and culture. Therefore funds of knowledge are cumulatively created in the experiences of an individual with various social networks in time and space. In this conceptualisation the cumulative everyday knowledge arising from the experiences of students in different nodes of social networks can be analysed diachronically and synchronically. Efforts to connect everyday knowledge, defined as knowledge that has been acquired informally through the experiences and practices outside formal teaching and learning, and school-based knowledge, defined as one acquired through formal curricula in an education environment; relates to efforts in literacy research to find ways of bridging home and school-based literacy practices (New London Group 2000; Perry 2012; Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic 2000; Prinsloo & Breir 1996). One question that comes to mind is why there is a binary characterisation between home and school, when the concept of domain boundaries is increasingly seen as a social construct, and at a time when information and media technology developments have made apparent boundary leakages, and have facilitated constant movement of people and semiotic resources across domains and media (Barton & Hamilton 2000; Heller 2007; Banda & Jimaima 2015). In any case, if we take the contemporary notion of literacy as social practice, then its actualisation is in negotiated meaning. The home- and school-based literacies do not necessarily cancel each other out in interactions; they can be negotiated and one can be used for the benefit of the other. This explains why recent theorising on literacy theories, as Perry (2012) notes, draw on socio-cultural perspectives grounded in Vygotsky's (1978).

Therefore, everyday knowledge and school knowledge do not have to be mutually exclusive or in competition. Following the funds of knowledge framework embedded in Vygotsky's (1978) ideas of scaffolding and zone of proximal development (ZPD), SOTL in the South needs to incorporate and build on localised everyday knowledge for effective learning outcomes through making connections between students' experiential knowledge and the formal curriculum.

In the following sub-sections, we illustrate a SOTL in the South relating to classroom outcomes on teaching and learning research proposal and research methodology. We also illustrate how highlighting the students' everyday knowledge embedded in the funds of knowledge can help bridge home/community and school practices for actualisation of SOTL principles, but from an African heuristic and perspectives.

4. Everyday knowledge and research

Despite literature on funds of knowledge (Maitra 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez 1988) suggesting the benefits of grounding teaching and learning in students' experiences, it is largely the case that current education in Africa is premised on formal aspects of Western (monolingual) education models (cf. Brock-Utne 2009; Banda 2009, 2010, 2017). It is often the case that Africans may have knowledge of phenomena being taught, but are unfamiliar with formulating the examples using formalised English, French, Portuguese and other colonial languages. It is also often the case that teachers do not make connections between what students know and what is being taught so that learning is decontextualised from their lived experiences (Maitra 2017; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg 2009). In the next sections we will use the metaphor of a marketer to demonstrate how ordinary people conduct research as a process and follow procedures without apparently knowing that they are engaging in research. It is hoped that this will show how links between every-day and school knowledge can be highlighted, and also how the dialogicality of the two forms of knowledge can be used to create new and more powerful knowledge, which feeds back in to the students' funds of knowledge framework and envisaged faculty and institutional outcomes.

4.1. Marketer as researcher

Following the funds of knowledge framework (Maitra 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez 1988), we can assume that a typical marketer knows basic numbering and accounting relating to how much produce to order, as well as issues relating to quality control, to enable her to generate reasonable profit margins. This makes a marketer knowledgeable, at least, in the basic qualifying and quantifying of objects. Forming a hypothesis on how to access and where to source particular goods means she is capable of embarking in activities akin to those found in formalised education contexts. Although marketers do not call themselves researchers, we want to argue that their activities, which include finding where to get their inputs, calculating how much they need and the cost of transportation that leaves room for profit margins, qualifies them as researchers. The various differently sized measuring instruments (such as tea or table spoons, ladles, cups, tins and buckets) and measuring tapes African marketers use are not random happenstances; they are often consequences of years of experience in what can be called 'qualitative' and 'quantitative' research, which enable them to arrive at the right quantity and price for the product in time and space.

Even if they are not marketers, African students are likely to be familiar with the contexts described here, as either they, or people they know, are marketers, or they have had interactions with them. Students in this case will probably have networked with marketers as part of their everyday experiences, even if they only purchase food or other items sold at markets. They would thus have been part of a social network node in which funds of knowledge is shared. The teacher needs to be

knowledgeable so as to activate such out of classroom funds of knowledge to enhance teaching and learning activities relating to research methodology (Maitra 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez 1988; Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg 2009). Dialoguing everyday knowledge and academic knowledge on research methodology would bring students' lived community experiences into the classroom. This is also one obvious way of realising some of the principles of SOTL, such as ensuring that teaching and learning is grounded in local contexts and focused on students' learning (Hutchins & Huber 2005; Felton 2013; Franzese & Felten 2017).

To further illustrate the importance and how powerful everyday knowledge can be in contextualising classroom practices and igniting interest and involvement of students in their own learning, let us continue with the metaphor of a marketer as a researcher to demystify and teach intricacies involved in the research process. By juxtaposing the 'known' everyday knowledge relating to the marketer as researcher and the academic design of a research plan, we dialogue the two forms of knowledge (everyday and academic knowledge) for transformative teaching and learning. This helps to develop a socially constructed dialogic pedagogy (Catling & Martin 2011) in which the teacher and the learners conceptualise meaningful knowledge together, so that the "learners gradually know what they did not yet know and the educators reknow what they knew before" (Freire 1998:90).

A cursory search on universities' websites will undoubtedly unearth guides to how to write academic proposals and theses. In this paper we use mainly the *Research Proposal Guide: Developing and Submitting a Research Proposal*, a document from the University of the Western Cape (2017), South Africa, designed to help Master's and PhD students develop proposals and to write their theses in a more focused and directed manner. One of the authors uses this guide in teaching postgraduate students the research process and the design features of research proposals. The UWC guide will be supplemented by information from similar documents in other institutions of higher learning, some of which are mentioned below. The Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Stellenbosch University, North-West University, University of Pretoria and University of Johannesburg, to name just a few universities in South Africa, have a similar document. In fact, online searchers show that many universities in Europe, America, Australia and Asia have similar documents. The content and how the different sections are arranged are not always the same. It is important to inform students that research proposals may differ according to the topic being investigated, or the discipline and faculty. However, the documents share some features some of which are summarised in the 12 steps below.

Step 1: Title

Step 2: Background

Step 3: Problem statement

Step 4: Research Aims/Objectives and questions

Step 5: Rationale and motivation

Step 6: The literature review and theoretical framework of the research

Step 7: Research design and methodology

Step 8: Limitations

Step 9: Ethics statement

Step 10: Time-line (optional)

Step 11: Budget (optional)

Step 12: Dissemination of research findings/Expected results

For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetitions, some of the components above are combined during the illustration. In some cases, researchers sometimes merge sections, especially where arguments overlap, so as to avoid repetition.

4.1.1. Everyday knowledge and generating titles

The title gives an idea of what the paper is about. Marketers have ideas about what products they want to source and in what quantities and qualities. They may have a title such as 'Vegetables' and a subtitle such as tomatoes, beans and onions. Similarly, scholars avoid wordy and opaque titles. Titles should be succinct and clear.

4.1.2. Everyday knowledge and background and statement of the problem

The statement of the problem is usually done in a sentence or paragraph. This is because the reader needs to know in a few lines what the research is about and it is important that the researcher indicates this clearly and concisely. Just as the researcher cannot embark on the project without a clearly defined problem, a marketer also needs to be clear about 'problems' relating to why the product needs to be sourced. The background gives additional information relating to the succinctly stated problem. Background information could include the marketer's knowledge and experiences with the product or manufacturer/seller of the product. It could also relate to her experiences regarding the selling of the product (for example, does the product sell well? Will the marketer make a profit? What is the shelf life of the product?). However, the marketer noticing a gap for a particular product just as an academic notices a gap in literature or theory could trigger these. It may also be due to noticing that the products being sold are running low and needed replenishing. This is more like a researcher trying to contribute to theory by doing more research.

4.1.3. Everyday knowledge and research aims/objectives and questions

The marketer needs to have clear idea about what she is looking for; if she does not she might buy the wrong products or fail to find what she is looking for. For this reason the marketer needs to formulate a number of questions to help define her aims/objectives. The main aim could be to buy more bags of potatoes, for example. She needs to come up with questions about whether there are similar products being sold and how she will be able to sell them at profit. More importantly, the marketer needs to ask herself what products to purchase and why. If the product is already available, the marketer may abandon the whole the project. This is similarly to an academic finding that what she/he wants to research has already been done.

Similarly, academic research questions should be linked to the aims/objectives. They also need to clearly outline what is to be achieved. This could be followed by a section on rationale and motivation. The marketer can think about the conditions that have necessitated the need for purchase of products. In terms of academic research, it might be necessary to motivate why the particular research is required. One reason could be to add new dimensions to existing knowledge or give a different interpretation of scholarship.

4.1.4. Everyday knowledge, literature review and theoretical framework

Having an idea about how others have experienced a particular product or related products is important. The marketer's knowledge of the market situation, the product, and what others have said about these things, provides the theoretical and analytical framing surrounding her decisions, for example, about whether to go ahead to buy the product or go for a different product altogether. The information gained from what the marketer knows and what others have said about the products will be critical in evaluating the products once they are bought and the reasons for loss or profit gained after sales.

Similarly, an academic reviews the literature to be acquainted and to show that she is familiar with the debates on the topic in the field. Just as, for the marketer her knowledge and experiences and those of others is important, the same is true for an academic who has to rely on academic knowledge as expressed in the literature to locate her own study in the field. The collaborative learning occasioned by the juxtaposing of everyday knowledge and academic knowledge as illustrated here can be said to relate to Lave and Wenger's (1991) notion of learning within a community of practices. The notion is important as it acknowledges the significance of social aspects of learning and making connections between school and home, as much as the notion of funds of knowledge (Maitra 2017; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001; Moll 1992; Velez-Ibanez 1988; Velez-Ibanez & Greenberg 2009), and New Literacy Practices (New London Group 2000; Perry 2012; Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic 2000; Prinsloo & Breir 1996).

4.1.5. Everyday knowledge and methodology, limitations and ethics

The research aims/objectives are about *what* the study is about while the methodology is *how* that is to be achieved. Just like in academic methodology, it is important for the marketer to be systematic in coming up with procedures about *how* the product will be sourced. The method selected may depend on the kind of product to be sourced. Similarly, in formal research methodology the topic determines the methods of data collection. However, academics working on the same topic may use different methods just like one marketer may use bucket to carry mangoes, while another one may use a big carton. In terms of finding information to resolve the problem, both the marketer and academic researcher may use primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources for the marketer could include information that is readily available as a result of her experiences while selling the product, or from information gleaned from talking to other marketers and customers. She could also have heard about the shortage on the radio or read about it a newspaper or magazine. These secondary sources are also used by academics. Both marketers and academics are involved in primary information gathering, which means information that has not yet been unearthed. This can be through interviews, observations or conducting an experiment.

The marketer should not buy more than she can manage to store and sell. The other limitation for the marketer relates to budgetary constraints. The marketer should also be conversant with the market conditions. This includes knowledge of where to source the products and whether there is a market for them. Similarly, a researcher, especially a novice, need not be too ambitious in topic selection. Budgetary constraints can also force a researcher to limit the scope of enquiry. For Master's students, they may register for a structured or mini-thesis, or a full thesis. The former is limited in terms of the depth of analysis required and number of pages. It is accompanied by

coursework, which may be tailored to provide the student with theoretical and analytical tools to use in writing the mini-thesis. The full thesis by research requires more depth and sophistication in how the student approaches and executes the thesis. However, regardless of the type of thesis, a researcher, like the marketer, needs to identify possible limitations, and also describe how to minimise their impact on the findings. Some of the limitations may relate to selection bias and information bias.

As for ethics, the marketer needs to be aware of the dangers of selling expired products, counterfeit products or stolen property, just as the academic needs to be aware of plagiarism, or stating things as fact or new knowledge when that is not the case. Both the marketer and an academic need to be aware of the welfare and rights of the consumers and those with whom they interact in the research process or when conducting academic or business transactions.

4.1.6. Timeline and budget

The marketer needs to list activities and times leading to the purchase and reselling of products. The cost to be incurred for each activity needs to be indicated to enable her to determine profit margins. For the plan to work, the marketer needs to have realistic timeframes. Similarly, an academic needs to present a realistic timeframe for the research activities, which should include time for the proposal submission, writing various sections of the thesis, as well as revising and editing the final text. The equipment such as cameras and tape recorders for academics and the cost of transportation for both academics and marketers, need to be listed in the budget. Depending on the cost, or what is written in the budget, some funders may reject the proposal. Similarly, the marketer's budget may determine whether to go ahead with purchasing the product or not.

4.1.7. Everyday knowledge and dissemination of findings/expected results

Some funders and faculties or institutions of higher learning require that the academic or student should include how they intend to disseminate the findings of the research. This is a very critical component of SOTL as was described above (Boyer 1990; Kern, Mettetal, Dixson & Morgan 2015; Felten 2013; Franzese & Felten 2017). An academic may indicate that they will present the results at conferences, publish them in refereed journals or book chapters, for example. The marketer may 'publish' her goods by word of mouth, on radio or TV, and depending on material affordances available to her, she may use the Internet and social media. The idea behind the exercise is for both the marketer and academic to think about and to indicate *what* they will do with the results of their research endeavours. This also compels them to indicate *how* they would make the results available to those that would benefit from them.

Other funders, faculty and institutions of higher learning may ask that the student anticipate the findings under a section often called "expected Results". Based on the problem statement and the aims/objectives in particular, the researcher can list or make notes or a summary of the results expected from the proposed study.

5. Networking everyday and school knowledge: towards SOTL in the South

We have shown, using an example from everyday experience, how everyday knowledge could engender teaching and learning outcomes related to research proposals and processes. Yet such knowledge is often discarded as inconsequential or not amenable to formalised classroom practices. Young's (2008) dismissal of everyday knowledge as irrational, unplanned and lacking reflection, among other things, as elaborated above, is a case in point. Young (2013:105) develops his arguments further by declaring that curriculum theory is in crisis because it has lost its primary object which, according to him, is "what is taught and learned in schools". Wheelahan (2015) links Young's knowledge-based arguments to theoretical knowledge, which she argues needs to be at the centre of vocational education and training (VET). For Wheelahan, VET students are denied theoretical knowledge because the curriculum is focused on applied, experiential, job-focused learning, particularly for students who have failed in other areas of study that require theoretical knowledge. Rather than promote social cohesion and inclusion, VET institutions become sites in which "social inequality is mediated and reproduced because it excludes students from accessing the theoretical knowledge they need to participate in debates and controversies in society and in their occupational field of practice" (Wheelahan 2015:751). There is a danger here that everyday knowledge is equated with applied knowledge only. Using and applying everyday knowledge requires theorising of some sort; otherwise there would no basis for constructing something (new).

In any case, from an African perspective, the choice of school knowledge only means that teaching of research methodology, for example, is seen as the preserve or pursuit of powerful knowledge embedded in English. The danger here is that the English language is not only linked to knowledge; it also comes to be associated with authoritative, systematic, objective, organised, rational and reflexive thinking. African languages are then associated with powerlessness, disorderly and unplanned thought processes, and essentially silencing the voices of African language speakers. On the contrary, in arguing for the power of everyday knowledge, Catling and Martin (2011) review a number of studies which show how learners' experiences of the local and wider world helped them to construct sophisticated ideas in geography classes and the world around them. This also helped them to conceptualise the local and wider world, as well as to reflect and reconceptualise the powerful knowledge they had created (Catling & Martin 2011). In this paper we have shown how everyday knowledge could be used in tandem with school knowledge to teach aspects of the research processes and procedures in a non-threatening and less mystifying way.

Just as experiences and lifestyles are not fixed and static, the model described above can be modified to suit different research problems and topics in pursuit of new knowledge. Thus, we agree with Jackson (2014:136) that knowledge should not be viewed as fixed or a replication of the past, but as "a dynamic within a cultural interface that constantly produces new knowledge and social forms ... albeit through geopolitical power dynamics that have a profound effect on this production". In essence, our example is indicative of how ordinary peoples' socio-cultural interactions can be drawn on to make the research processes and procedures appear less daunting. Further, we argue that demystification of research by using people's everyday experiences and practices within their community of practice (Lave & Wenger 1991) should be encouraged. We are mindful that the global and local dynamics are increasingly becoming inextricably entangled, and so are the different forms of knowledge. Thus, one expects that forms of school-based and everyday knowledge are already

linked, but the linkages need to be activated and highlighted in the process of teaching and learning. Jackson (2014:36) sums up the argument thus:

The purpose of indigenous research should be to give those weaker groups more voice to speak out, not just as subjects of research, but in formulating the purpose and use of such research, and greater agency to affect policies and practices that impact on their lives.

Although Jackson is describing indigenous knowledge, we believe it applies to everyday knowledge as described in this paper.

Therefore, SOTL in the South will not only need to take account of everyday knowledge and home-based literacy practices, it also needs to include them in determining the outcomes of teaching and learning. It also needs to critique the current status quo in which English-based epistemologies and scholarship with English-only theory frame the outcomes of higher and even secondary and primary school education outcomes. In order to account for the multilingualism, multi-ethnic and multicultural diversity in the Global South, there is need to move away from the deficit models on which the Western-dominant SOTLs are framed. The problem with deficit models is that they do not account for diversity but at the same time blame the non-achievement of institutional outcomes on the student, the literacy practices in the homes and communities, and cultural differences (Hogg 2010; Bishop 2001; Gonzalez 1995; Irvine & York 1993; Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez 2001).

SOTL in the Global South has to address multilingual and multicultural practices in teaching and learning as critical components of faculty and institutional outcomes. The points of difference or deviation between everyday knowledge and formal academic knowledge should be used as zone of proximal development (Vygotsky 1978) on which similarities and differences between forms of everyday and school knowledge are used for teaching and learning new things.

Using everyday knowledge not only augments students' school knowledge; it also brings communities' voices into the formal arena of the classroom and the institution of higher learning (Hood 2017). Using students' everyday knowledge as a resource will thus act to enhance community and school literacy collaboration and to propel students' involvement in the learning process. It has been shown in the literature that students' involvement can authenticate their connection to the learning outcomes they desire and seek to acquire while in an institution of higher learning (Hood 2017; Hogg 2011). Instead of everyday knowledge and academic knowledge being seen as contesting forms of knowledge, both are valorised and used concurrently in the social construction of more powerful knowledge. By highlighting the interdependency between everyday and formal curriculum-based knowledge, the argument made in this paper is in line with Vygotsky's and the funds of knowledge socio-cultural approaches in which knowledge is social activity-based (cf. Catling and Martin 2011).

In terms of knowledge production, using everyday knowledge would help turn institutions of higher learning into sites of democratic pedagogy (Freire 1972, 1998). Generally, African universities and institutions of higher learning are notoriously monolingual (usually in English), and their libraries have mountains of books written almost entirely in English. The framing of books and other material

used in the classrooms and libraries, and their assumed lenses of interpretation, are often Eurocentric — even where the topic is African culture and languages. Thus, bringing everyday knowledge into the classroom is one way embedding the students' lived experiences and culture into classroom practice, especially if they are allowed to do their discussions in African languages. This would ensure that the students' and local voices are part of the construction of knowledge. We would like to note at this juncture that despite his strong pronouncements on knowledge-based curriculum, Young (2013) concedes that his proposal would require additional and differently trained teachers, and would make additional demands on the preparation of teaching material. More problematically, Young (2013:112) admits that his proposal would “most certainly increase [the] ... proportion of failing pupils and encourage more disaffection and drop out”. In the Global South, with education already short of teachers and teaching material, and governments not funding education adequately, the problems would be worse than Young (2013, 2008) imagines.

Conclusion

Multilingualism and cultural diversity in the Global South demand curricula that are based on a dialogic pedagogy in which formalised academic knowledge and home-based everyday knowledge are concurrently used in the construction of new and more powerful knowledge (Catling & Martin 2011; Alexander 2008). In line with the postcolonial perspective, SOTL in the South needs to guard against scholarship that is premised on the superiority of academic knowledge over everyday knowledge. To be relevant to Africa, for example, SOTL in higher institutions will have to be informed by indigenous, African, everyday types of knowledge of concepts, images, metaphors and modes of critical thinking embedded in African epistemologies. This might include drawing on African indigenous knowledge systems. This entails that, given the colonial legacy, SOTL in institutions of higher learning in Africa will have to deal with the contradictions and tensions created by the English-only monolingual theories dominating research and education, as well as rigidities associated with just using English and theories available in English. This does not necessarily mean that Western epistemologies and theory should be abandoned; it means the Western knowledge systems need to be consumed in dialogue with or from the bases of indigenous African systems. In outlining the principles of practice in SOTL, Felten (2013:122) argues that virtuous practice should be “grounded in both scholarly and local context. Scholarship of any type builds on what is known, using relevant theory, practice-based literature, and prior research to establish a firm foundation for inquiry”. In adapting SOTL to African contexts, it must emanate from African cultural contexts and must be cognizant of the different, often less resourced environment in which African institutions of higher learning are found. Moreover, if SOTL enquiry into learning should be done in partnership with students (Felten 2013; Franzese & Felten 2017), then it should start from what they know as a way to inspire and shape the vision for the desired learning outcomes.

SOTL needs not only to incorporate but also embrace African epistemologies, some of which are oral-based, as well as networks of everyday experiences constituting the funds of knowledge. In African contexts, the disjuncture between school and communities are further apart than what one would expect in Europe and America. The English monopoly in the discourses of education, and English-language-based theory, as well as the culture of knowledge-making in institutions of higher learning in Africa, are often at odds with the students' lived experiences. The social approaches to New Literacy Studies has shown how community-based literacies can be drawn on to enhance the

outcomes of school-based learning, and it has been shown that learning takes place outside the formal structures of the classroom and in languages other than the prescribed colonial language (most often, English) (Banda 2010, 2017). Multilingualism, multiculturalism and diversity need to inform the principles of SOTL in the South, as well as guide the faculty and institutional outcomes.

References

- Alexander, R. 2008. *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th edition). York: Dialogos.
- Banda, D. 2008. *Education for all (EFA) and 'African indigenous knowledge systems' (AIKS). The case of the Chewa people of Zambia*. Herstellung: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Banda, F. 2009. Critical perspectives on language planning and policy in Africa: Accounting for the notion of multilingualism. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 38: 1-11.
- Banda, F. 2010. Defying monolingual education: Alternative bilingual discourse practices in selected coloured schools in Cape Town. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31(3): 221-235.
- Banda, F. 2017. Translanguaging and English-African language mother tongues as linguistic dispensation in teaching and learning in a black township school in Cape Town. *Current Issues in Language Planning*.
- Banda, F & Banda D. 2016. Nyanja/Chewa proverbs as didactics: recontextualising indigenous knowledge for academic writing studies. *Studies in Tribes and Tribals* 14(2): 80-91.
- Banda, F & Jimaima, H. 2015. The semiotic ecology of linguistic landscapes in rural Zambia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 19(5): 643-670.
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*, edited by M Holquist, C. Emerson and M. Holquist (trans.) Austin and London: University of Texas Press.
- Bhabha, HK. 1995. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. 2001. Changing power relations in education: Kaupapa Maori messages for mainstream institutions, in *The professional practice of teaching* (2nd ed.), edited by C McGee & D Fraser Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: 201-219.
- Barton, D & Hamilton, M. 2000. Literacy practices, in *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* edited by D Barton, M Hamilton & R Ivanič. London: Routledge: 7-15.
- Barton, AC & Tan, E. 2009. Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 46(1): 50-73.
- Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brock-Utne, B. 2009. The adoption of the Western paradigm of bilingual teaching: Why does it not fit? in *Multilingualism: an African advantage*, edited by KK Prah & B Brock-Utne. Cape Town: Casas: 18-51.

- Catling, S & Martin, F. 2011. Contesting powerful knowledge: the primary geography curriculum as an articulation between academic and children's (ethno-) geographies. *The Curriculum Journal* 22: 317-335.
- Center for Engaged Learning. 2013. Key characteristics of the scholarship of teaching and learning (September 9). Available: <https://youtu.be/yvDKHHyx7YY>
Accessed 15 September 2016.
- Felten, P. 2013. Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 1(1): 121-125.
- Franzese, AT. and Felten, P. 2017. Reflecting on reflecting: Scholarship of teaching and learning as a tool to evaluate contemplative pedagogies. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 11(1): Article 8. Available: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2017.110108>
Accessed 12 June 2017.
- Freire, P. 1972. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. 1998. *Teachers as cultural workers – Letters to those who dare teach*, translated by D Macedo, D Koike and A Oliveira. Boulder, Co.: Westview Press.
- Gonzalez, N. 1995. Processual approaches to multicultural education. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 3: 234-244.
- Gutiérrez, KD, Baquedano-López, P & Tejada, C. 1999. Rethinking diversity: hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 6(4): 286-303.
- Heller, M. 2007. Bilingualism as ideology and practice, in *Bilingualism: A social approach* edited by M Heller. London: Palgrave Macmillan: 1-22.
- Hogg, L. 2010. Funds of Knowledge: An investigation of coherence within the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27: 666-677.
- Hood, CL. 2017. Bringing students' voices into campus conversations about essential learning outcomes: a survey of students at a mid-sized state university. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 11(2): Article 11.
Available: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2017.110211>
Accessed 24 July 2017.
- Huber, MT & Hutchings, P. 2005. *The advancement of learning: building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Irvine, JJ & York, DE. 1993. Teacher perspectives: why do African American, Hispanic, and Vietnamese children fail? in *Handbook of schooling in urban America*, in SW Rothstein. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 161-173.

- Jackson, T. 2014. Reconstructing the indigenous in African management research: implications for international management studies in a globalized world. *Management International Review* 53(1): 13-38.
- Kern, B, Mettetal, G, Dixson, MD & Morgan, RB. 2015. The role of SoTL in the academy: upon the 25th anniversary of Boyer's scholarship reconsidered. *Journal of the Scholarship for Teaching and Learning* 15(3) June: 1-14.
- Keddie, N. 1971. Classroom Knowledge, in *Knowledge and control: New Directions for the Sociology of education* edited by MFD Young. pp. London: Collier Macmillan: 133-159.
- Lave, J & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maitra, D. 2017. Funds of Knowledge: an Underrated Tool for School Literacy and Student Engagement. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language* 5(1): 94-102.
- McKinney, K. 2004. What is the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), and what can SoTL do for you and you department/school? Unpublished handout. Illinois State University.
- Moll, LC. 1992. Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: some recent trends. *Educational Researcher* 21(2): 20-24.
- Moll, L, Amanti, C, Neff, D & Gonzalez, N. 2001. Funds of knowledge for teaching: using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31(2): 132-141.
- Moll, LC & Greenberg, JB. 1990. Creating zones of possibilities: combining social contexts for instruction in *Vygotsky and education: instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* edited by LC Moll. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 319-348.
- New London Group. 2000. A pedagogy of multiliteracies, in *Multiliteracies* edited by B Cope & M Kalantzis. London: Routledge: 9-37.
- Onyango-Ouma, W. 2006. School knowledge and its relevance to everyday life in rural Western Kenya. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15(3): 393-405.
- Perry, K. 2012. What is Literacy? A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education* 8(1): 50-71.
- Prinsloo, M. & Baynham, M. (eds). 2013. *Literacy Studies*, Volumes I – V. London: Sage.
- Prinsloo, M & Breir, M (eds). 1996. *The social uses of literacy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Serpell, R. 1993. *The Significance of schooling: life-journeys in an African society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, BV. 2003. What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 5(2): 77-91.
- University of the Western Cape. 2017. *Research Proposal Guide: Developing and Submitting a Research Proposal*. Bellville: UWC Postgraduate Office.

- Upadhyay, BR. 2005. Using students' lived experiences in an urban science classroom: an elementary school teachers' thinking. *Science Education* 90(1): 94-110.
- Velez-Ibanez, CG. 1988. Networks of exchange among Mexicans in the U.S. and Mexico: local level mediating responses to national and international transformations. *Urban Anthropology* 17(1): 27-51.
- Velez-Ibanez, CG & Greenberg, JB. 1992. Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S.-Mexican households. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 23(4): 313-335.
- Vygotsky, LS. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*, edited by M Cole, V John-Steiner, S Scribner & E Souberman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K & Gegeo, DW. 1992. Schooling, knowledge and power: social transformation in the Solomon Islands. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 23 (1): 10-25.
- Wheelahan, L. 2015. Not just skills: what a focus on knowledge means for vocational education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 47(6): 750-762.
- Willis, P. 1993. *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Farnborough: Saxon House.
- Wolcott, H. 1967. *A Kwakuitl village and school*. NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Wolf, E. 1966. *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Young, M. 2008. *Bringing knowledge back in: from social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education*. London: Routledge.
- Young, M. 2013. Overcoming the crisis in curriculum theory: a knowledge-based approach. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 45(2): 101-118.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>