



**Ms Rachel Tholakele Khoza, Dr  
Varaidzo Denhere, Dr Tinashe Mutero**

**University of Johannesburg,  
Johannesburg Business School and  
College of Business and Economics**

**JBS**  
JOHANNESBURG  
BUSINESS SCHOOL



# Educators' Experiences of Skills Development in a Funded Technology-Enhanced Learning Initiative



**JBS**  
JOHANNESBURG  
BUSINESS SCHOOL



**Our Future  
Reimagined**



# PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

01

Background & the Pro-Telde Project

02

Theoretical Framework

03

Research Methodology

04

Findings (5 Themes)

05

Discussion

06

Conclusion & Implications

## 01 BACKGROUND

**Funded international project to strengthen Technology-Enhanced Learning (TEL) and digital pedagogy in South African TVET colleges.**

### **CONSORTIUM OF 7 PARTNERS:**

**Europe: Pixel - Associazione Culturale, Universita Degli Studi di Roma la Sapienza, University of Peloponnese**

**South Africa: University of Johannesburg, Vhembe TVET College, Majuba TVET College, and Central Johannesburg TVET College**

### **Pro-TELDE**

**Promotion of Technology-Enhanced Learning and Digital Education in South African University and TVET Colleges**

# What Pro-Telde Set Out to Do

## Train

Build educator capacity

Structured training in digital pedagogy and TEL, equipping lecturers with both technical skill and pedagogical confidence

## Design

Experiential by design

Foregrounded experiential learning, peer collaboration, and contextual resource design — not lecture-style delivery

## ?

An open question

Most TEL evaluation measures competence acquisition quantitatively — little is known about how educators actually experience this process

Research question: How do educators experience skills development in a funded TEL initiative within three South African TVET colleges?

# Three Lenses on Educator Skills Development

## TPACK

Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge

*Mishra & Koehler (2006); via Shulman*

**Educators must balance technology, pedagogy & content — not just acquire tools**

## CLT

Constructivism

*Active, experiential learning*

Knowledge built through interaction, hands-on application, reflective practice

## TEL

Technology-Enhanced Learning Perspectives

*DigCompEdu; Salmon's e-tivities*

Digital tools enable interactive, learner-centred, democratised access

Together they provide a multidimensional lens: cognitive (TPACK), experiential (Constructivism), and contextual (TEL) — the three axes against which findings were coded.

# Interpretive Qualitative Case Study

## PARADIGM

Interpretive qualitative approach, embedded within a broader mixed-methods evaluation

## DESIGN

Case study — three TVET colleges: Majuba, Vhembe, Central Johannesburg (rural to urban range)

## SAMPLING

12 participants, purposively selected — educators directly engaged with Pro-Telde

## COLLECTION

Semi-structured interviews, 30 minutes, conducted online via Microsoft Teams

## ANALYSIS

Braun & Clarke (2006) six-phase thematic analysis — inductive coding + TPACK/Constructivism/TEL deductive lenses

## TRUSTWORTHINESS

Triangulation of perspectives, rich contextual description, peer debriefing · UJ-JBS ethical clearance

# Five Themes, One Analytical Arc – not a flat list

4.1 From Functional to Pedagogical

*Tool use shifts from content delivery to learner-centred design*

4.2 Individual Skill → Institutional Capability

*Personal competence becomes institutional infrastructure (or doesn't)*

4.3 Experiential Design & the Transfer Problem

*What made the learning stick — pedagogical architecture, not content*

4.4 Three Modes of Capability Translation

*Enabling, constraining, and policy-neutral institutional environments*

4.5 Capability Circulation

*Effects extend beyond direct participants into wider networks*

## From Functional to Pedagogical Tool Use

### BEFORE

LMS used as a document repository. Tools possessed but pedagogical purpose absent. Self-rated digital engagement: 2/10.



### AFTER

Padlet for live collaborative introductions. Google Forms as formal assessment. Flippity & Miro redesigning content encounters. YouTube as on-demand access

*“Whatever I recorded it, I uploaded in YouTube and I give the students a link. They're able to use that link, whatever they are, their own time, and they're able to repeat it.”*

**This is not a change of platform — it is a redesign of the temporal logic of teaching. The lesson extends beyond the classroom; control of repetition moves to the learner.**

## Individual Skill → Institutional Capability

### THE STUDIO

One participant's Animaker training led the institution to approve multi-year equipment budgets — microphones, interfaces, monitors, camera — across two budget cycles.

*“Everyone is looking at me now like, okay, let's see the blueprint. We're going to build from there.”*

A studio is not a set of skills — it's an enabling environment for continuous production. Not a threshold reached, but a space maintained.

*Individual competence generated institutional investment. That investment created conditions for further competence — without more external training.*

### THE FREEMIUM TRAP

Several November-course platforms ran on freemium models — full features locked behind institutional licensing.

*“You are training, but you're not really training, because you need full access to get all the features of the tool.”*

**Not an individual problem — an institutional policy gap that individual motivation cannot bridge.**

# What Made the Learning Stick

*The training taught THROUGH the methods it was teaching ABOUT — not lecturing about active learning, but doing it.*

## Physical → Digital Bridge

*“They interacted with us first, and then they said, okay, this is how you do this in a computer.”*

Embodied logic before screen-based operation — cited independently by multiple participants as the single most effective technique

## Accountability Structure

*“A sense of accountability was also enforcing us that you need to be accountable to report.”*

Deadlines and peer presentations replicated professional responsibility. Confidence came from having delivered, not from reassurance.

## Retrospective Meaning-Making

*“(Miro, named and explained) gave meaning to an experience she had already had.”*

Training organised prior unexplained exposure (e.g. Mahara) into intelligible knowledge — a less-documented transfer mechanism.

## Three Modes of Institutional Response

### Enabling

*“Already ready for implementing... approving everything that we say we need.”*

Multi-year equipment budgets, sector-wide TEL plan, trained educator as institutional blueprint. Existing computer labs removed the access problem before it arose

### Constraining

*“Because I’m from the rural areas, network coverage or internet connectivity, that is the biggest problem.”*

Load-shedding, connectivity gaps, data costs. Practice continued — but carried entirely by individual resourcefulness, not institutional provision.

### Policy-Neutral

*“Some of us were doing it because we know how to do it.”*

No governing framework. No policy that speaks to online teaching. One educator taught through a month-long hospitalisation, producing 20+ student distinctions — entirely on personal commitment.

## Capability Circulation Beyond Direct Participants

Trained  
Educator

### Peer Gatherings

Post-training sessions reviewing application, helping colleagues, sharing with non-attendees. "The more you spread the information, you learn more."

### Cross-Institutional Networks

Persisted after training — joint podcast production, practical support across Majuba/Vhembe/CJC boundaries.

### Institutional Procedure Redesign

Online placement assessments replaced traditional auditions — using programme-acquired capability to redesign institutional process.

*"When you want to train your colleagues who are at the same level with you, it comes with resistance." — Peer authority is negotiable in ways hierarchical authority isn't. The programme built leadership and patience for this, not just content knowledge.*

# Capability Catalysts, Not Skills Transfers

## 1 Wrong question, right question

Evaluating training by which tools participants can name asks the wrong question. The right question: can they articulate how a tool changes the student-content relationship? This is the TPACK distinction made operational.

## 2 Individual achievement complicates TPACK

The literature frames TPACK integration as individual cognitive achievement. The Majuba studio complicates this: individual competence generated institutional investment, producing infrastructure for continuous reproduction.

## 3 A third readiness category

Existing frameworks treat institutional readiness as binary — supportive or unsupportive. Policy-neutral environments are a third category: neither obstruct nor enable, producing permanently individual capability that cannot scale.

## 4 Impact is relational, not sequential

Capability formation, institutional conditions, and circulation are simultaneous and mutually determining. The same educator is a practitioner in one institution and infrastructure in another.

# Capacity-Building Requires Three Things Together

1

## Experiential learning design

Active before passive, embodied before digital, doing before describing — these are replicable design principles, not facilitator personality.

2

## Institutional alignment

Infrastructure, leadership support, and policy alignment determine whether competence becomes practice — readiness is not binary; policy-neutrality is its own category.

3

## Sustained post-training support

Capability circulates into networks beyond direct participants — but only when institutions don't leave that circulation to chance.

Questions???

**Grazie for your attention!**



**Email: [rkhoza@uj.ac.za](mailto:rkhoza@uj.ac.za),  
[vdenhere@uj.ac.za](mailto:vdenhere@uj.ac.za),  
[tmuteroi@uj.ac.za](mailto:tmuteroi@uj.ac.za)**