



















































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































































4. How would you describe the role of the DHET's policy documents in relation to the Student Development and Support work, its model or framework, its component parts, its practice and theory at your institution?
  
5. Describe the macro context within which you work, any challenges brought on by globalisation for the student development and support domain. Perhaps elaborate on the impact of internationalisation, or changes in practices or other influences of globalisation on the student development and support domain at SDS at your institution.

## APPENDIX B: INVITATION TO PARTICIPANTS

# FACULTY OF EDUCATION

University of the Western Cape  
Private Bag X17, Belville, 7535  
South Africa  
Tel: +27 (0) 21 959 2246  
Fax: +27 (0) 21 959 3943  
Website: [www.uwc.ac.za](http://www.uwc.ac.za)  
Email: birgitschreiber@uwc.ac.za



To participant ...

27 October 2010

Dear ...

### **Re: Request to participate in my PhD research**

I would like to kindly request you to volunteer as a participant in my PhD study.

I am a PhD student at the Education Faculty of the University of the Western Cape. I am conducting this research as part of my dissertation. You are selected as a particularly suitable participant for my research due to your experience in this domain and your position within the University of Stellenbosch.

#### **Title of PhD Thesis**

An exploration into the role and function of Student Development and Support Divisions within the changed context of higher education in South Africa, at three Higher Education Institutions in the Western Cape

## **Purpose of Research**

The aim of my research is to explore the role and function of Student Development and Support in three Higher Education Institutions in the Western Cape. More specifically, the research aims to illuminate how Student Development and Support practitioners understand their role and function with regard to the challenges of throughput, retention, and their theoretical consistency and practical impact in contributing to the challenges of higher education.

With this research I aim to contribute to the debate around the roles and functions of Student Development and Support and I hope to contribute to the coherence of a comprehensive model for Student Development and Support services, addressing some of the tension between theory and practice.

## **Methodology**

I am employing Grounded Theory Method which is particularly suitable to my research (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I will interview 6 participants from each institution and I have employed 'maximum variation sampling' and 'theoretical sampling' method to target particular participants. I have identified the potential participants from the group of Deputy Vice Chancellors, Directors of Student Development and Support and Deans of Students.

## **Procedure**

If you agree to be a participant in my research, I will interview you for approximately one hour and record this interview digitally.

You are welcome to review the interview transcripts shortly after the interview and I would like to possibly conduct a second interview to provide an opportunity for you to review the themes if you wish. I would like to incorporate your feedback in my discussion and in this way hope to provide an accurate reflection of the data collected from you as participant.

## **Participation**

I would like to invite you to participate on a free and voluntary basis. You may withdraw your consent to participate at any stage in the process with impunity.

## **Confidentiality**

Any information that is obtained through our interview will be analysed by myself only. In that way I can assure you of confidentiality. I will encode your name into 'participant 1' and in that way will ensure that your identity is not associated with the data extracted from the interview. In this way I can assure you of anonymity.

I will employ the assistance of a peer reviewer who will contribute to the trustworthiness of my content analysis of the interviews. The peer reviewer will review the transcription and hence will not know the identity of the participant, but only the coded name.

I very much appreciate you considering my request.

With appreciation,

**Birgit Schreiber**

UWC  
Cell: 0826637244  
Student No: 2971119



# APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT

## Informed Consent Form

I herewith certify, that I ....., hereby agree to participate as a volunteer in the research as proposed by Birgit Schreiber, supervised by Prof Sandy Lazarus.

The information regarding the aim, purpose, methodology and participation in this research was fully explained to me by Birgit Schreiber and I understand the implications of my participation.

I was given the opportunity to ask questions and I have received information to my satisfaction.

I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this research.

I understand that I am free to not answer specific questions during the interview.

I understand that any data and answers to the research question will remain confidential.

I understand that the results of her research will be made available to me and that the process of extracting themes from the data might also involve me.

I understand that I am free to withdraw as a participant at any time with impunity.

I have received a copy of the information contained herein.

**Signature of Participant:**

**Name of Participant:**

**Address of Participant:**

**Date:**

**Signature of Witness:**

**Name of Witness:**

**Address of Witness:**

**Date:**



UNIVERSITY of the  
WESTERN CAPE



**Researcher Declaration**

I declare that I explained the information contained in this document to my participant,  
.....(name).

Signature:

Date:

**Birgit Schreiber**

**Education Faculty**

**University of the Western Cape**

**Cell: 082 663 7244, birgitdewes@gmail.com**

**4 Kingston Rd**

**Rosebank, 7700,**

**South Africa**



## APPENDIX D: EXTRACT OF CODING 2

### Level 2: Summary of Themes and Frequencies

#### 10 Key Themes

1. Role, function and, scope
2. Theory and practice
3. Framework and ideology
4. Relationship with HEI domain
5. Intra institutional relationships, status and co-operations
6. Alignments and divergences
7. AD
8. DHET
9. Globalisation and internationalisation
10. Other Themes



Key theme (according to Qs)	Subtheme	Participant code	comment	
Role and Function	Scope	Unclear explicit	N1 N1 N2 N3 C2	N1: 'what is their job?', 'mission drift'
	Scope is person/leadership driven	N1 N2 N3 C2		
	SDS beyond their domain (conflation with AD)	N1 N2		N1: 'move beyond into a area that they think is not taken care of' (psych: SDS perception of neglect and compensation for it) mission drift
	Clear	N2		Essence is

					clear to SAACHDE, esp for Counselling and Dev
	Role	Enabler	C3 W1		
		Create conducive environment	N1 N3 C5 C7 W4		
		Care for students, protective, Comfort students	N1 C8		
		Administrative and operational	C2 C7 C8		Fin aid and contracts, eg housing – but shift to infuse this with development (see quote C2)
		Advocate for student needs	C8 C6 W1		
		Watchdog	C8 N3 N2 N4 C5		Alerting exec to issues = feedback, keeping HEI on course re contract with society
		Co-ordinate/structure out of classroom experience	N3 W4		explicit
		Contribute t/w student success	N4 C6 C7 C2 W2 W4 W5		Esp throughput and retention, but not only narrowly defined
		Develop and support from entry to exit	N5 C2 C6 W3 W5		(including enrolment and progression)-key intersection – perhaps not utilised by N5 and C2
		Architect of culture	N7		Beyond res
		Contribute towards nation building	N5 N7 C2 C3 C6 C6 C7 W2 W3 W5 W8	0	N5 quote NB, contribute towards GAs

		Not to teach and affect the learning	N1 C7		(N1 struggles with boundaries/location within SDS at SUN)
		Contribute towards good image	N6		Seen to comply with disability policy (see window dressing) and to react for psych admissions and crisis – seen to care 24/7
	Function	Support student governance, leadership Support leadership training	N1 N3 C2 C3 W2 N2 N3 W2 W3 W4	0	citizenship
		Manage residences	N1 C2 C7 W4		Referred to as ‘living and learning spaces’ –shift in discourse
		Support student societies	C1		
		Support students with disabilities	N2 W1		
		Manage student fin aid	C1 C7		(100 mil at UCT), administratively, not policy work, C1: located in SDS to ensure students are viewed not as number
		Work with developmental issues	N2 C4 W2		Workshops, etc.
		Provide primary health care	C4		
		Career Development	W8		Improved employability (but see NPHE recommendations)

		Address issues of diversity	N4 N7		(But see Soudien commission recommendations)
		Ensure students are prepared for academics through food/shelter	C1 C7		
		Orientation Programme	N2 C2		
		Academic support	N2 N4 C6 W2 W4		For students and staff at SUN- AD part of the Student Affairs – not as staff affairs, facilitate dev of cognitive skills (N4)
		Development opportunities skills development	N4 W8		
		Not only psych issues – explicitly stated	N2 W3 W2		
	HEIs expectation implied	Gate keeper – readmission	N2		
	HEIs expectation explicit	Contribute to student success Contribute towards Gas	N2 N4 C2 W2 W7		Success defined individually (not only for throughput, and HEI alignment)
	SDS linked to academic success		N5 C2		High level recognition

- Shift: explicit articulation of non-psyche focus t/w strength based and development work
- Shift: t/w out of classroom focus (C2)
- See N1 and N2: not to affect learning – but academic support – support outside of ‘learning’, i.e., not in the classroom, but split off/add on
- N7: Contribute towards overall development of graduates – this not only done in classroom and in curriculum – but also in socio-cultural environment – see shifts in residence by N7
- Fin Aid: Tool to affect size and shape of HEI

- Functions: administrative and developmental, (C2)–find complementary ways to have these components work together–NB quote C2: very NB role of SDS but only PASS and on fringes

Key theme (according to Qs) Practice and Theory	Subtheme	Participant code		comment
SDS has no theoretical ‘home’, not theoretically grounded		N1 N3 N3 N4 C3 C4 C8 C8 C8 W3 W7 W8 N7	0	
Theories/models used	Wellness model	N2		
	Astin	N4 W4		Astin and Tinto = environmental theory cluster
	Tinto	C3 W4		Astin and Tinto = environmental theory cluster
	Involvement theory	W4		Astin and Tinto = environmental theory cluster
	Psychotherapeutic approaches	N2 N2 W2 W5		Cognitive short term Analytical brief term dynamic
	Eco-systemic framework	N6		
	Socio-cultural	N1		Bernstein
	Asset based approach	W2 W3		
	Inclusive social model for disability	N6		
	Learning theory	C6		
	Management theory	W6		
	Developmental theory	W2		
	Psycho educational social model	C6		

		Peer mentoring and peer learning	W8		
		'empowerment model'	C3 C6		
		Student centred model	C3 C8		(C8: 'what ever this means') Explore text for cues on meaning
		'living and learning in residences'	W4		
		'holistically'	N5 (in- and out of classroom) N6 (holistic system) C1 (student as whole) W2 (aim of UWC)		Explore text for cues of meaning of 'holistic'
	Meta comments about theory	Theory not important, practice and service delivery NB	C8 C6 C6 W3 W8		(danger of locking into 'one' theory) (SDS driven by project management)
		Conflation of theory and model (terminology)	N2 C3 C6 W3		See C2 quote on economic discourse (most others, see range of terms above)
		Diversity/proliferation of models acknowledged as useful	C3 C6 W2 W5 W7		
		Explicit 'no deficit' 'no discrimination' stance	C3 C6 W3 W7 W2		But see psychotherapeutic
	Scope	Unclear	N1 W3 C2 C5 C8		Explicit vs implied
		Depending on personality	N1 C8 W2 C8 N6		Person driven scope
	Professionalisation	Lack, range of levels of qualification Challenges re development	N1 N1 N7 N7 W3 W4		

		Broad range	C8 (lovely quote) W3 (v similar quote)		Bring theories from diverse professional backgrounds (grounded within that)
	Discrete compartments	Practice and theory is separate and not articulated	N4 C6 W8 C8 W5 W2		
		Beginning to seek theoretical and practical alignment	C6 W7 C8 N5 C5		

- See theory theme: therapeutic by N2 and W5, wellness by N2 and C4, and Astin by N4 = appropriate lens—increasingly macro as level increases
- See N4 and research indicate out-of-classroom is NB but theories mentioned do not reflect that (only Astin and Tinto)
- Opportunity: range of theories and professions can contribute to rich understanding
- Tension: theory and models not aligned with structure (see C3 comment about rigid structure with claims of responsiveness)
- C8: no framework—leads to confusion about who the right person is to do the job
- needs driven practice without reflection and model remains at low level of assisting/reacting (disabilities) without changing status quo (no systemic or institutional reflection or impact)
- diversity of theories and perspectives reflect complexity of work and context (W5)
- Q re systemic—does the system take responsibility for or adjust to the stud. Is there a systemic shared understanding. These theories probs if held by one office.

Key theme (according to Qs) Framework and ideology	Subtheme	Participant code		comment
SDS as tool for social transformation	Public good, citizenship, responsibility,	N1 N3 N5 N5 C2 C2 C2 C2 C3 C5 W2 W3 W4 W6 W8	1	Citizen and responsible citizen – explore differences
	Critq: skills focus (SUN HEQC), needs based	N1 N5		
	Graduate attribute	N5 N5 C2 C2 C2 C3 C6 C6 W2 W3 W4	0	



			W6 W7 W8		
	Benefit driven (consumerist)	Get certificate/2 <sup>nd</sup> transcript	N7 C2 C3 C2 W4 W7		Certificate to enhance value of volunteer/skills dev - consumerist
		Employability	C3 C3 W2 C2 C2 W8 W8		CV driven, entrepreneurship focus Explore neo-liberal parallels Goals: employment
		Student centered notions emerge from consumerist – also from participatory learner, empowered	W7		
		Corporate citizen	W6		
	Tokenism		C8 W1 N6 N6		Re disability, but also SDS as window dressing (esp from disability units)
	Agenda	Funding and agenda tensions	C4 C2		Psychs funded externally – public and priv tensions – HEI straddle priv and public agenda
	Need driven		W5		
	Institutional leadership driven		W2		
	Name reflects ideology	Affairs to Development, services to support	W3 C8 W8		
	Operational history	Organic and historical reasons for structure and hence ideology	W4 W8 N6 N5 N4		
	National agenda	HEIs throughput and retention	W5 W8 W6		Alignment NB – with national goals and with institutional goals – direct

					line Nationalistic goals - Explore political implications
--	--	--	--	--	---

- see C2: NB of social good (see his paragraph – but also to put on CV = consumerist – tension)
- See C8: safe spaces = protective, maternal, receptive–not activist role– explore within roles – explore understanding of ‘role’ to the implied ideology
- See C5: spike and wheel model–central and de-centralised tensions– priv and public funding/agenda tensions–‘centre not holding’=neo-lib
- See institutional issues different–reflects different contexts and diff systems (all Ns and all Ws and all Cs)
- For approaches and theories: Com Engagement = differently defined at diff HEIs, eg: com services and pre-professionals as good enough for ‘poor communities’ (W4)
- Eg W3 –emphasis on citizenship but no funding alignment for this (but for entrepreneurship – ‘because students want this’ = consumerist)
- All have keen awareness of nationalistic (?) / the nation’s needs–and SDS ‘s response crucial–intention to respond, but perhaps not co-ordinated
- If DHET gives change in focus–is this enough for SDS to derive its shift in ideology– has this been the case at which HEI
- NB quote from C2 in theme doc

	<b>Key theme (according to Qs)</b> <b>Relationship with HEI status/position/partnerships</b>	<b>Subtheme</b>	<b>Participant code</b>		<b>comment</b>
	Within SDS	no shared understanding of theory	N1 N3 N6 C8		No W
		No shared understanding of goals explicit	N2 N3 C8		Ref to dean and counselling
		Professional and positional power differs	N2 N3 C2		Dean= position, pyschs=prof, tension if reporting lines

				inverted, PASS staff status (C2)
		Some Clusters internally aligned	N2 C4	Acad and counsel support
		Poor internal alignment	N3 C8	
	Institutional	Systemic understanding	N2 W1	See quote: 'system is responsible', see also N2 reporting to com about systemic issues (pocket of excellence)- SDS in observer status W1 requires system
		Committees (advisory), participatory/operational	N2 N3 C2 C3 C8 Note: N5 C2 W3 at exec level	Advisory to DVC SDS (MF- acad DVC) (N3 and N4) Management team to rector Advisory to readmission N2= see quote: puts SDS in NB position, only 'PASS', fin aid, housing, With/for SRC, 'watchdog'- roles?
		Rel with Academic deans	N3	Shared com advisory to DVC
		Conceptually fragmented student experience	N4 N3 N1 N4 N5 N5 C5 W7	
		Fragmented services within SDS and across	N3 N6	
		Shift towards services as development	C1 C2 W7 N7 N5 C8 C5 W8	See C8 and W1 moving away from

					deficit/medical model
	Cohesive/non std experience	Probs with fragmented exp + segmented, call for shared conversations and collaborations	N5 C2 N5 N7 C3 C4 C5 C6 C8 C8 W2 W4 W7 W8 N5 N6 W2 W7	3	
	Disjuncture btw claims, policies and delivery	Claims of diversity – but failure to make flexible provisions	N6 W7 W2		
	Funding	Private partner	N3 C2 C3 C5 W8		Aim for ‘independence’ – no institutional commitment, seeking reach into priv corporate
	poor of institutional commitment	See lack of funding alignment, support, level of reporting	N3 N6 N6 C4 W2 W7 N3		(perceived)(N B quote from N6) Poor institutional com see lag of appmt of psychs (C4) – hence de-centralised at UCT See SUN leadership insti: ‘not even seed funding’ (N3)
	SRC	SDS conduit for students	N3 C3		SUN dean rep SRC to rector
	Coincidental	Historical and organic reasons for structure (not ideology or needs driven)	N5 N6 C7 C1 C2 C5 C7		Ethos and structure not aligned (N6) Fin aid (student service – hence with SDS, not finance) (focus: get service contracts right,

				eg housing, C2)
	Discourse shift in HE	Economic lang and neo-lib	C2 C3 C5 W6	(NB quote from C2)
	Status	Poor (sidelined)	C2 C3 C8 C5 W2 W7	PASS, see also 'next to curriculum'- no access, or committee, leadership training done a/h, sds as window dressing only, positioned to be ineffective see C8, outside of real debate
		Good (influential and decision making)	N2 C3 C8 W8	Advisory, via SRC, C8 moves towards 'transformation cluster'- high level (but see her comment re tokenism), DVC SDS (no add ons),
	Centralised/de-central	De-central probs	C8 C4 C2 C5 C3 C4	No central coord or accountability, aligned with priv funds, fac powerful and central power erased, different models applied depending on funding and champion, central not responsive to diverse needs to fac, so fac de-centralised
	Viewed as		C5 C8 C4	See C5 quote

	ineffectual		W7		about unresponsive/split off/remote, outside of real debate
--	-------------	--	----	--	---

- NB see N2 and N3 re alignment–opposing experiences within one SDS (SUN)
- Which relationships are not there–gaps
- See similarities in institutional commitment and person driven (overlap)
- Status: see C3 positional good, but no real access to time
- NB: explore C4 comment on David Gammon: Deanship on Student Development in Science–how is this understood
- See DVC SDS level and yet no framework in place (HEIs are clearly taking this seriously–yet gaps)

	<b>Key theme (according to Qs)</b> <b>Institutional and HEI tensions within and across domain</b>	<b>Subtheme</b>	<b>Participant code</b>		<b>comment</b>
	Relationship with other HEIs	no sharing of resources (skills and knowledge)	N2 N6		Lament, opportunity for change
		Begin of collaboration	N2 N3 N7 W2 W4 W6		
	Relationship with academic sector	No access via timetable Rigid unyielding timetable	C3 C3 C2 C2 C5 C5 C8 W2 W3 W7		(after hours or vac–split off) Also sports only a/h
		Positional challenges	C8 W6 N6 C2 C5 C8 W7		Poor structural pos ('not positioned to do a good job', C8), outside of crucial conversations,
		Segmented only reactive contact	C8 W5		
		Viewed as functional services	C8 C7		C8: SHAWCO outside of SDS

				at UCT–other UCT SDS mostly functional
		Outside of academic core business	C5 C4 C2 C7 C8 N6 N4 N3 N1 C8 W7 W2 W8 N5 C3 W6	4 Lament and implied re-location and beginnings made to link with core and curriculum, ineffectual due to structural outside, split off and add on = ineffectual, a/h, N5: ‘development happens at the moment of learning’
	Structure	messy	C4 N3 N3	Public function funded privately Restructuring confusion
		Not reflecting ethos	C3 N6 W2 W6	Ethos of student centred implies flexibility–but structure at UCT rigid, also N6, W2 Campus not aligned with Mission (staff not delivering on promise – with impunity)
		Accountable to professional bodies	C4	Eg psychs at UCT (protected from institutional agenda, shielded by profession)

- Theme of functional: viewed and self-definition–link to ‘other theme’ of empowerment of SDS and agency is self-determination
- NB see W2 quote in theme doc marked red
- Key: structural location and position outside fac and curr–i.e. central and split off is problematised

Key theme (according to Qs) Alignments and divergences within SDS and within HEI	Subtheme	Participant code	comment
AD and SDS	Tensions	N1	Reporting lines challenges: AD should not report to SDS, is not sharing ideological ground (N1 trapped outside of curr, with rest of SDS)
	Alignments and collaborations possible and valuable	C5 C2 C5 C5 N5 C4 W2 N5	
	Splits	C5 N3	Off campus, centralised, rigid
SDS differences across HEIs	Vision, goals, structures	N2 N5 N7 N3 N6	All N? (difference in essence of HEI – not one structure fits all – see quote by N6)
Scope across		N4 C8	Com Services included? SHA WCO excluded?
Services within SDS	Different emphasis	C3 C8 C5 W1	Focus SRC to the neglect of other services, priorities



KPAs and competencies not articulated		C8	
Range of performance and competences	Challenges	W5 W6 W3	Issues at W – generalised across

- Diffs aligned with diff context and histories–value in diversity (see also above re diverse professions)
- Different emphasis based on vision and funding alignment
- Explore ‘splits’ versus ‘advisory’

Key theme (according to Qs)	Subtheme	Participant code	comment
Academic Support and AD and SDS			
Focus and site of intervention	AD Focus/gaze and site of intervention is/should remain with academics	N1 C5 C5 W7 C7	N1: SDS intrudes on AD space
	AD Focus/gaze and site of intervention is structure of curriculum	C5 C7 C7	C7: SDS not useful in AD space
	Responsibility for support/culture change is with academics – infused in fac	N1 C5 C5 C8 N5 N4 N6 W2 W3 W7	eg ‘disability should be in curriculum’, changes of status quo NB, learning and dev takes place in fac (N5 and N4)
Relationship between SDS and AD	Separation of domains (lack of collaboration)	N1 N1 C5 C5 C5 C7 C7	C7: difference ideologies hence separate, also historical (coincidental?) N1: unable to see good fit
	Collaboration possibilities between SDS and AD	C7 W7 W7 C5 N5 C8 W2 W3 W7 W8	UCT Career located to strengthen curriculum– use for recommendati on as not

				discrete Alignment of acad and couns NB (N5)
		Blurred lines between SDS and AD	N1 C5 W7	Shift towards collaboration – ie: not discrete units N1= problematised, Qs re boundaries and scope def
	Support should be at faculty level—on site not split off		C5 N1 N5 N4 N4 W2	See N4 quote

- Interpret this also with context of HEI and where AD located
- Review Hx of AD

Key theme (according to Qs)	Subtheme	Participant code	comment
<b>DHET</b> Relationship to DHET	Unclear, if any	N1 N6 C3 W7	
Knowledge of any policies	No knowledge	N1 W6 W7	
	Knowledge of	N3 N6 N7 C1 W6 W7	
	Familiar with policies	N6 N7 N5 C2 C3 C8 C4 C6 W3 W4 W1	1 C3: 1997 act re SRC, white paper re student council
	Emphasis	C4 C3 W3	SRC, governance, neglect of other areas
	Idealistic unrealistic	N6 C8 W4	Implementation challenges
Competence of and reliance on dept or policies	No trust	N6 C1 C2 C2 C3 C8 C4	C2: lovely quote
Policies	Gaps	N5 N6 C1 C2 C3 C8 C4 C4 W3 W1	Focus SRC, fin aid,
	unclear	N6 C1 C2 C8	

Absence of dept as guide		N5 N6 C2 C3 C8 C4 W4 W1	
Lack of national frame		N6 C1 C2 C3 C8 W2 W4 W1	fin aid: legal directives and admin guides, no development directive 'we need national frame', explicit
Tumultuous, confused	Confusing messages	N5 N6 C2 C3 C8	
No expectations of dept	Ministers focus on student success is sufficient for SDS to take cues	N5 C6	NB position: if familiar with policy-SDS can derive meaning and interpret within its own context NB quote from N5
Dept communication is clear		N5 C6 W3	Use this cue to reflect and change status quo-rather than to look externally for more directives, exec needs to assist UWC to understand meaning/interpret
Sufficient directives	preserve autonomy sufficient for guidance for SRC, explicit	N5 C1 C3 C6 W3	Interpret minister according to own HEI framework and context, university and SDS driven NB (see theme of agency-SDS needs to

					take agency to drive this response) Meaning derived by uct (own interpretation in fin aid)
	implementation	Policy and resources/context not matched	N6 N7 C8 W2 W4 W4 W4 W8		Lofty, idealistic, vague–beyond implementation
	Expectations of DHET	Set standards, QA, benchmark	N7 C5 W2 W3		(QA beyond professional standards)
		Integrity efficiency responsiveness	C2 W2		
		Extend relationship beyond DVCs	C3		Include SDS
		Monitor implementation / HEIs neglect policy with impunity	C8 W2 W2 W3 W4 W6		W2 and W6: exec is neglectful Refer David Solomon middle mngt implementation crisis-universal or specific HEI
		Only broad framework not prescriptive	N5 C6 W3 W8		See level of respondents (N5 and C6)
	SDS to be more active instead of waiting for directives		W2 N6 C6 C2 W8 W6		

- N5 perceives DHET sufficiently providing guidance–she says: up to us to interpret–N5 at high level, perhaps other respondents are requesting guidance from their own leadership (high level) and not necessarily from the DHET–is this generic to middle management or unique to HEI or SDS?
- Explore cues in text: ‘there is no frame’–is that within HEI and beyond, or immediate leadership request?

- See N5 and C6 directing expectations at the institution—not DHET

	Key theme (according to Qs) <b>Globalisation and Internationalisation</b>	Subtheme	Participant code	Comment
	Unable to respond	Respondent feels un knowledgeable	N1 C1	
	Listing of foreign students	International Chinese	N1 N4 C7	
		African continent	N1 N4	
	Internationalisation	Academic trends to go beyond parochial	N1 N4 C3 C7	Learn Mandarin (N4 and C7 celebrate)
		Affecting character of university and structure (de-centralised due to funding) and focus of support	N2 N6 C3 C8 C4 C4 C5 W4 W5	Shift t/w diversity, corporate principles influencing thinking C4: Funding enables de-centralised = shift away from central thinking C4: rich facs and poor facs (Humanities – gets little SDS support) Acuhoi shaping local housing
	Cash cow syndrome	Revenue	N1 C3 W3	China referred to as cash cow N1 C3: quote NB, explicit push for semester abroad as revenue
		Services specially provided	C3 C4	Space for

					international insurances despite space shortage
	Funding	Private funding required to do SDS work	N3 C3		Q: no univ commitment, but univ requirement (SUN Lead inst)
	'overseas' offering SDS functions	SDS has to resist offerings of money to preserve function alignment to HEI and South Africa	N6 C2 C3		Corporate sponsorship for leadership awards, etc = resulting in individualised achievement – notions of success are changed, not african
	Opportunities through open door	Learn and go to overseas – personal improvement	N4 C3 C7 W1 W2 W4 W6 W6		
	EU and USA > African continent	Preference for EU and US models	N4 N5 C4 W3 W5		Existing o/s models can offer much, not enough engagement with Africa, self reflection required
	USA influences welcome	Assist local functioning ACUHO i	N7 W4 C7 W2 W3 W4 W6		C7 Confucius institute , SDS PhD at UWC
	Influence critical	Ideology influenced	C2 C2 C3 C8 C5		C2 Goals shifted: C2 “Americanised individualised achievement”
	Tension with keeping students locally committed	Keep graduates here explicit	C1 C2 C3 C8 C5 W3		
	Keep it local		C7 C6 C5 C2 N6 W3		
	Tension: funding vs agenda	Paradox dilemma Strategies to protect	C2 C3 C2 C8 C3 C5		

		own agenda		
	Individualised success	CV focus, materialistic	C2 C3 C8 C5 W1 W3 W4 W6	
	Students as clients	Brands on campus Access open (viral or e-)	C3 C5 C4	
	Contract with society	Losing sight, neglect of 'township' student	C5 C3 W3	
	Globalisation as personal development	Theoretical position of diversity (within SA and beyond) working in the virtual	C6 C7 W4	Linking it to personal capacity of diversity, global + local application is linked – locally relevant NB while extracting benefits from global thinking to benefit local realities, the self within a range of contexts, focus on conversation, relativity of reality



- Internationalisation understood to increase number of foreign students (see listing)
- Auhoi= perceived helpful, assist where South African Housing has failed
- NB C2 and C3 quotations: new liberal frame shifts funding and agenda–impact of neo-liberal economic discourse and practices
- See C respondents–Afripolitan focus–but EU contact dominant
- Shift towards de-centralised structure esp pronounced at UCT – funding private and centre not responding to fac needs–hence fac driven agenda
- Shift towards faculty identity rather than generic Graduate Attributes (ie EBE students similar to all EBE students, and COM=Com, regardless of which HEI–see Nico Cloete)

- C5: Fac identity due to separate from core and centre (Fac driven SDS, AD and recruitment and marketing)
- See C responses dominate this theme
- PhD at UWC–US thinking central in the PhD–local R but theory from US (the only theory there is)–no local theory development
- Only implied implications for SDS no direct link explicit

Key theme (according to Qs) Other Themes	Subtheme	Participant code	comment
Internal SDS	Need for agency and empowerment in SDS	N1 C2 C6 N5 N5 C6 W3 W5 W6 W2	'no permission required', identification with poor status by SDS, SDS leadership needs to respond- not be asked to, C6 quote NB, raise its on profile, nationally organise, self def of bush college, self esteem probs,
SDS and other alignment	SDS infused into academic experience	N1 C2 N5 N4 C6 W2 W3 W4	
HEIs	GA as core deliverable	N2 C2 N5 W3 C6 W3 W4	Shift in role of HEI (tension with academe)
Residences	Acuhoi and its role in redefining purpose of residences	N3 N4 C6 W2	
Reflective practitioners	R required – reflection and local theory development	N6 C2 C8 C5 C6 C5 C6 W2 W3 W4 W8	Academic connections are important – enabling academic dev in students, R, crit enquiry, critically



				engage with USA (current) theories, (W3: exec refused and denied access to research funds). HEI considers SDS admin function,
	Academic disciplines	Rigid boundaries	C2 C8 C7 C5 C6 C7 W8	<p>Differs for SDS to affect this space</p> <p>Academic protective over own definitions—prevent SDS from entering spaces (R spaces and fac) C5 quote: ‘soil hands’”</p> <p>(C7: discipline has sanctity—while this notion is upheld—curriculum cannot be changed for AD or SDS inclusion). Structural separation (admin vs acad)</p>
	Crisis in edu and throughput	All must rally, SDS needs to include itself, agency NB	C2 C6 W3	Resentment by 40% directed at privileged—SDS needs to engage this—crucial conversations
	Shortage of resources		C8 W4	
	Positioning challenges		C8	

Professional challenges	Range of professional attracted/proliferation , no minimal requirements	C8 N7 C6 C5 W2 W3 W6	SDS needs to professionalise and organise itself, come of age, empower, follow footsteps of AD and T&L, range of profs and level
Counter-culture		C5	Kathy Luckertt: AD challenging academia, now also SDS
Taboos	In loco parentis	C6	
	Low grade staff functioning	W3 W4 W6	Sheltered by EEAct
Middle/senior management malaise /incompetence	Accountability/QA/imp lementation	W2 W6 C8 N6 W3 W4	Unique SDS or HEI or S Africa or Global
Student satisfaction	Issues of needs assessments – middle class and consumerist (edu as fun)	W7	Tension edu fun = compete with satisfaction motivated world yet edu demanding
Historical realities	SUN res culture and hostels	W8	Very real impact of histories – intractable
Employability	See tension with Chapter 4	W8	
consequences	Huge failure rate breeds resentment with HEI/whiteness/authorit y	W8 C2	Long term
Barriers	Assumptions about HEI homogenous (historically and now politically)	W8	But heterogeneous requires flexible provisions

**General:**

- “You can’t have one model fits everyone. We are different. “(N6 and N5)– assertion of ‘apart’ and fear of aggregation, assertion of individual needs re SDS

and independence and autonomy from DHET, why N only? Comb through C and W for cues.

- Q: if history determined structure—but moved beyond previous regime: problem re still using old structure—perhaps explore with current lens (and needs and context) of HE
- W6: social transformation also aimed at corporate transformation, link to funding partnerships—changes is bidirectional—mutually affecting domain
- W8: “on campus we talk about student development. I think we have made great strides”—recognition and affirming
- Shift in discourse: residence=> l&l spaces, affairs=> sds, services=> support
- Shift in discourse re managerial and corporate structures (see W6 quote)
- Shift in discourse: from leadership to participants (N1)
- Academic discipline—not instrumentalist training or vocational training—but pure academia: GA have not place in it (UCT-C7)—tensions between acad and AD/SDS



## APPENDIX E: EXTRACT OF CODING 3

### Theme: Theory and Practice

#### Level 3: Coding key font, colour, underline

---

Because they (SDS) feel the lectures aren't doing it properly. Or they don't care about certain students. So yes, the scope of Student Development is not clearly defined, it depends on the people who drive it what happens.

Because if they do and this is why we aren't happy, because it is a student and academic support and we feel that we are not part of it. So conceptually we don't feel – I like working with Ludolph because he is a very kind man and he does things and never gets in the way and that is it. I love working for him, but conceptually i am not clear how we fit together (BS quote used for AD).

The other part of it is the lack of professional development of people in our field. I think some of the people who work in teaching and learning cannot write. Cannot anything. It is very embarrassing teaching other students how to write. It is the same for Student Affairs, there are also some challenges with professional development, i mean, what really is the professional home of the Student Affairs staff?

theoretically we are from very different places.

Of our own people. I am talking broadly. If you look at the university sector in SA – how many of the people working in the professional support services – are really not well schooled, because often it is people who are not academics for one reason or another. We need to professionalise ourselves. (BS- see in other theme – need to empower)

Our overall model would be the wellness approach. Obviously within that model – that we do not see wellness as the absence of illness or that illness is necessarily the cause of unwellness. So over arching and we did quite a – not – we did quite an extensive religious study about the whole concept of wellness and it is almost a thesis. It needs to be updated. So that is our model. Within that of course we have different perspectives and approaches towards being scientific practitioners towards – the one that was lacking was to take the wellness model which is an approach – not actually a model - as you know and within that go and look a little bit more about development. It is actually that which started my interest in this project as well. So within the package that you also got – there is a document about student development. But then if you look at the psycho therapeutic approach – there is very strong – within our centre – focus on cognitive, but a move also very much to more short term approaches.

Yes, i don't think it is pretty much a theory based thing. It is – it is different programmes.

That question is continually asked. I think i can say i am not sure it is theoretically based and in theory.

Astin and all these people – that if you look at student development in broad terms we've – I think – for many years we have separated it as if the student experiences – the University experience in compartments,

where as we know that the student experiences it in as a whole and that - and we - we find that so in our first year experience and our first year academy research – its abundantly clear that often – the out of class variables impact more on the students eventual success than what's happening in the classroom

BS: (tension- out of classroom but theories do not reflect that –only Astin IEO)

If I say we look at students holistically and when you ask about things like the theory and so on – or the concept for framework – I would regard that as our conceptual framework. Our approach – that we want to take into account the life cycle of a student at the institution, but we also want to look at the student holistically in terms of his student or her student experience at the institution. In the classroom, out of the class socially, sport etc.

Look I believe a student is part of a holistic system. So my eco systemic sort of framework is the theoretical basis from which I work. Students comes from a family, comes from a specific community, specific school – is coming from a specific context here – has his or her specific problems – where they are psychological, physical or sensory or whatever. So already that is my theoretical basis and then I am driven on a practical level by the inclusive model and the social model that sort of become what the ... on support students with disabilities. Also education policies. They speak about access and diversity and redress – when it comes to students with age – in terms of age and gender and race and disability. So, it is already looking at all of that as a basis from which to push forward that agenda on campus

none of them are trained in student affairs theory. I don't think that we are very well underlying in that. I think that is lacking. We are not professionals and that has to do with our training – we lack a theoretical base which could unite all the diverse influences we've had here in SA.

---

*Basically we would like to think of ourselves as the – we don't want to separate ourselves from the academic because we are the enabler. Like in the housing sector we are the home away from home for the students.*

*And we – the development side of it – we pay a lot of amount for that, because we see a student as a whole. Not just an academic machine. We see them way beyond their time here when they are playing a big role in the society and the businesses where they are in making their mark in the world. We want them to have that – they must be distinct. They must separate themselves from the other graduates by the way they deal with issues. By how they conduct themselves in the bigger society. So we pay a lot of investment for leadership and the governance issues.*

*I think Tinto's work has been used and quoted widely.*

– in our discussion certainly we have talked about what is our model. Is there one model? Is there different models? We all come at different points in student development. I have even questioned whether yes we deal with – we have a different emphasis than say what the faculties are doing and say what wellness is doing. So even the name student development – is it an appropriate name for –

We have mixed approaches here even within how we work with student leaders and the issue of agency and promoting this whole thing of agency theory and capabilities and how do you empower – it being an empowering model rather than – we are quite conscious. The one thing we are very conscious about – nothing must be deficit and nothing must be discriminatory.

Yes, so the structure is more administrative rules focussed rather than being student centred. A student development model in my mind – should be more flexible and responsive and if you – it should be all over.

Part of it is who are the people, who is the leadership, who is the management? Are we the right people? Do we need to be better skilled? Do we need to be better – not even skilled? It is not having the theory to understand and grounding. So that you have a broader perspective

No, there is no theoretical frame which hold us. I specifically and I don't think there is really at all a theoretical underpinning to what we do in DSA. I think there is this notion of student centeredness – whatever that means. Like the student comes first – which I think means you can't say to the student – I am having my tea come back 15 minutes later. Literally.

I don't think that there is a real theory or a theoretical framework that anyone could point to and say – you know – we subscribe to whatever theory. I don't even know. I wouldn't even know what example to use. I think – you see – in the end really – it is about student service and not what we think about it, but how we concretely deliver services. We are not meant to reflect on our work, but just react.

(BS connect lack of theory with lack of space for developing theory)

I think though that one of the problems that most institutions – is that there is no concept. There is no perception of who to appoint to make these things work. There is not clear framework that guides our work.

That is right. I think people end up in these jobs by accident. That is my point. If you look at peoples employment history you see the random folk we attract, nurses, teachers, lawyers, psychologists, social workers, accountants, some managers and religious folk and mix in a whole lot of good-doers, and you've got Student Affairs. NBNB

(BS professional variety)

I mean in disability it is quite – it is worse probably than in other fields because what happens at a disability unit really – entirely depends on the insight and knowledge and experience of the person who leads that unit.



(BS person driven)

*Our domain is guided by many theories, but I would venture to say something that I said when I first was appointed and there was a discussion with a few colleagues from academia. I think they were relieved to hear that I don't choose a particular theory. Theoretical approach. Because it means you put on a certain lens and everybody has to adjust to that lens and there should be enough space – as long as you take the key elements of the theory and that is – the key elements—whether it is the psycho educational social theories – whether it is the learning theories of .. or whatever the case might be, but the key things are that students come with their own experiences and how do you articulate their experiences and the university climate to that. It is again shifting away from the kind of – probably before my time – deficit model of you come as an empty vessel. We teach you, we fill you up. I think there is a great consciousness about the individual character of a student. The social character of a student and also I think of late – probably in the last decade – the focus on citizenship and the issue of learning to live in a civic world – that is underpinned by democratic values. Now of course there is not one form of democracy. There are differences. I won't go into those details, but the democratic values are that we look at collective good. We look at co-existence. We look at inclusivity. We look at space for different cultures and different opinions – so long as they are not whatever.*

*In terms of theories talking to each other, I think it is definitely an evolving area. I think much has been done of late and that is looking at students' academic results and looking at the kind of psycho social problems and reasons for student attrition and so there are projects in place that are – I would say one is what Ian is leading. Another one is what Edwina is going to be starting this year.*

*Their work is basically – their projects are prominence by prior research and kind of looking at the need to make sure that students are – they cannot come from the school area and jump straight into university and be left to go. Even with A level or Z levels or whatever the case might be. That they would need different kinds of support – whether that support is about time management. Whether it is about workload. Whether it is about understanding the nature of the academic project and how they align their different academic requirements. Their class room work. Their assignments. Their field work etc. So the theories are – we are not propagating any particular name. but we are taking the values – if there is a – let me say a model that somebody is – a residence system – would favour at this point in time – there are 3 models that they are favouring and they are all to do with actual learning model and which is about things – a student as someone who has their own talents and furthering that. On my self – I think some of my discussions with my colleagues has been about taking – not locking us in into psycho socio models – which is where student affairs evolved from, but rather to look further and look at Back... Gold... [both talking at the same time].... Yes and all of that and to look what I call self authorship in – which is a terminology – which is all it means it is not students writing books, bit it is about them authoring their own voices. So, doing everything to enable them so that they are kind of more confident. Greatly empowered and they can then find their voice to articulate whatever it is they wish to articulate. So one of the things that she speaks of in her theory is that you have got – when you propagate – and it came out of a multi – I think 3 or 4 year research that she had done and she had produced elements of her findings – which I personally find very interesting and I have a last planning workshop.*

*Discussed one of her papers. Said this is not a new way of doing it. This is just something that channels all the different thoughts. That all of it is towards the student's empowerment. The students speaking for their rights. The students being in charge of their own -*

*Well run – let us take a practical low key example like housing. I mean transforming residences from being very peculiar to attach things to where there is learning opportunities and very different cultures – there is a huge achievement. That would definitely enhance the learning of a student and therefore their gradueness. I think that has been a dramatic increase.*

---

My wish list is also one that we have access to a sign language interpreter on the staff. They might not be able to assist everybody, but we should have at least one person on the staff and have the financial ability to go and get in for different sessions. Because that is the one disability that we do not accommodate.

(BS=needs driven practice without reflection and model remains at low level of assisting disabilities without changing status quo).

R I think within academic support – I think developmental theory is probably one of the important theories that I look at, because I find when you are looking at an adolescent coming into university – you cannot ignore it. When you think about what informs your interventions – you need to be aware of developmentally where are they at? I think developmental theory for me is really important, but then I also find that when you look at CBT models – there are almost – I would say that I work – I draw from different theories.

There are, Okay, firstly that remember that people that are in Student Development or Student Affairs in South Africa, non of them are trained in that line – we didn't going through, unlike the Americans who specialise and become student, they called Student Affairs. South Africans - we come from Psychology, Social work all sorts of training, teachers and so the founding theories comes from our professions not from the student, it's reading that people like Birgit and the rest of us have done on our own, Birgit is now researching student development, but that is not her training, her training is Psychology. The same with me, my training is social work and so what I can bring into this area is how I understand working with people, in my reading of Student Development – I found some of the theories we did in social psychology because I took psychology up to honours level and it more or less the same theoretical basis, but different emphasis in how – what they pick up – PAG's are there – the concepts of how people understand things, anything to do with theories are young people, because students are assumed to be all young, but you still have to touch on some theories on students who will go work and come back, their life learning – life long learning – from learning kind of theories, you need to settle both, but because we haven't had training in Student Affairs or Student Development – we brought to what we understand – that is a South African Student Development.

my insight into that came about 6 years ago, because of – then I started reading and doing a bit of research myself into all of this. I came across this whole concept the first year experience and then also the living and learning which was relatively entrenched in the US system, in the residence systems already there. When I looked at it I became quite keen about



that, because primarily prior to the 2004 – prior to that – the only real development was probably just what we were doing with your student governance structures in res. You would take them through a little leadership programme and teach them – not teach them, but do some workshops on skills and obviously there was a broader sort of base to cover in the sense of what we were doing. Then when these guys – the students came along with the mentoring programme – that is where we got behind it and put our support into it and then we looked at other opportunities for development – for students on res. Then we came up with the whole S-REP programme.

Well, I think for us it was sort of a reaction from what we were seeing in the literature – like I say from – the literature and also some of my visits abroad to US campus.

There are definite links. If you look at some of the literature – especially like Tinto – no Astin – Astin speaks to this whole sort of involvement theory. He speaks about that involvement theory and there are a number of components he speaks to that and one of them is actually the whole sort of psychological and physiological involvement of that person in his or her community. How he starts to unpack that and then he looks at how the impact of individuals within the community contribute to the well being of the community. Now if that well being creates that environment that is conducive for me – that I can go and sit down and read without you blaring your music or shouting down the corridor – banging doors – then obviously I have a much better chance – if it is not in that environment where people are just totally disrespectful.

(BS theory used to explain our plans and prgms)

analytical perspective

I think the model we use is brief term in therapy, but I think in terms of the way we use theories – I think there is a very strong psycho-dynamic aspect to it.

I think there is almost a minimisation of the extent of the vulnerability of the student population that we deal with. And so when we say we restore function, restore function to what? What was the function to start off with? So for example that is why I think we get so many students come to us when their problems are so severe already and there has been such a lot of fall-out by the time, because there is no sense of self understanding or self monitoring or self awareness. I do feel there is a tension around saying our students are resilient and of course they are resilient.

(BS: healthy tension in range of theory)

I guess it is about having multiple theories and multiple perspective, because it is complex. You cannot have one way – you can't just have a strength based.

management theory

I think it is a sort of new or developing field that people become more and more interested in and you know just as you have had different – very different high education institutions in SA – they have taken very different models of how they do student development – for example the old model is sort of looking at students as – the

psycho pathology of students and psychologising every single problem which to me is not very helpful. I was just having a conversation with James, because he said he is starting a 1<sup>st</sup> year academy so I said what are you going to do? He said we are going to have a test which shows which students – within the 1<sup>st</sup> 6 weeks are failing and then we will refer them to counselling if they have mental problems. The disability unit have their eyes tested.

That is the old model. You are very right. That is the deficit model. So whatever didn't fit into mainstream wants to be counselled.

I do not think that student development services generally – in SA and at UWC has any theoretical grounding. I think it is driven more by project management. By programmes and projects and activities. By past evaluation. By trial and error. By experiential learning as we go on. I do not think there is any theory and even to some extent models that actually forms student development practitioners. That is most of the times a pity. There are some components of it that would. Like for example if you take psychological services – that is – that is the nature of their training. There are some components of it, but the components outside that – my feel is that generally it is not. That is – that maybe a lack but there is also possibly good reasons for that.

I must say that as an example of orientation – it is a particular programme at UWC that while originally in the early starting days – it might have been driven by need and want to request. I think at UWC it is well grounded. That is not by accident. It is by design. So much so that the problem has been written up contextualised and modelled on a peer mentoring model. That is the model that the ... orientation programme has been built. That is by design – not by default or by accident. There are many other orientation programmes driven by need and that is why – the orientation programme particularly is held in high esteem by colleagues elsewhere. If more programmes – government programmes could be – could mirror that - it could make a world of difference in the whole student services delivery.

(BS: sds driven by need and some programmes then by design)

From almost a deprivation model that where we come from. Students are a deficit model. These are the needs. This is what they don't have and what can we do to fill that and we don't do that or rather we are in the process of moving away from it towards an asset based approach where you are saying- yes there may still be deficit, but instead of focussing on the deficits and how we can change that we are looking at – what do they have despite the challenges that they face.

If you are developing someone holistically – I think we have to bear in mind what is the university's goal ultimate.

our image and impact relies on individual people, if they don't champion our cause, then nothing will happen. So we depend on champions, systems are not in place.

Okay – Now – what we do enabling the development we have a philosophy in STS, STS is the Student Development and Support – we have a philosophy that we work with, which is a strength based approach which has a theoretical foundation, you can find it either social record, in Psychology depending on which book you are

looking for – what it say is that you look at people in terms of their health, there is nothing wrong of them – the reason why we use this is because in my thinking – because we deal with students with a history of oppression in our country changes are which I have seen as an academic was that some, not most – some students have this victim mentality that someone owes them something and that you should be getting them whatever it is that you owe them. So my – my directing this division is to say within in a strength basis perspective is that nobody owns you anything, actually there is nothing wrong with you – you healthy – you on your way – what we will do, we will enable – enable an environment of development in a two way street kind of development. You come to the development – we will provide the enablers for you, but we can't provide the enablers and force you to come. You as a student also have got to take responsibility in utilising the environment that enables you to develop.

For me that it is based on my understanding of development of human beings, I don't believe that anybody develops anybody, including the fact that when you teach as an academic you provide the capacity for students to develop – it's what they do with that capacity that develops them.

