CULTURAL IMPACT ON TEACHER-EDUCATORS’ USE OF TECHNOLOGIES IN THEIR PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES: A STUDY IN THE MALDIVES

Aminath Shafiya Adam
The University of Waikato

Abstract

A substantial body of literature discusses the complexity of integrating technology into teachers’ pedagogical practices. However, the literature provides limited understanding about the impact of teachers’ culture on their use of technologies. I argue that technological and pedagogical practices of teachers cannot be fully understood without considering the social and cultural norms of their specific cultures. This paper aims to explain the impact of Maldivian culture on teacher-educators’ technological and pedagogical practices.

My research used an ethnographic methodology linked with Bourdieu’s (1977) habitus as a lens. The data were gathered from eleven teacher-educators who work in a Maldivian university context. The process of ethnography took place during two visits to the research site. In the first visit, I spent six weeks “hanging out” with the participants, interviewed them individually, and observed six participants’ classroom teaching. In the second visit, I spent five weeks hanging out and organised focus groups with ten participants. Accordingly, follow-up interviews were carried out with five participants to clarify the main understanding of teacher educators’ habitus. The finding was generated through various strategies adhering to grounded theory.

Key findings demonstrated that teacher-educators’ technological and pedagogical habitus was influenced by the cultural practice related to their learning norms and some aspects of their institutional context. The study revealed that teacher-educators adopted specific technologies available in their workplace relying on benefits gained for their pedagogical purposes. However, these pedagogical purposes were much influenced by the social cultural norms of the Maldives. As a result, the participants formed technological (PowerPoint-assisted) and pedagogical (content-oriented) habitus. This study offers valuable insights for understanding the impact of culture and habitus on teachers’ practices and their use of technologies both in schools and university contexts.

Introduction

Pedagogy involves learning to teach. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) consider that teacher conceptualisation of pedagogical practice occurs when they actually practise teaching and treat their classrooms as sites. In these sites, teachers apply the knowledge and theory to see how they work and accordingly, pedagogical practical knowledge develops. However, Loughran (2010) asserts that teacher conceptualisation of pedagogy depends on the practicality of the learnt pedagogical knowledge in their context of practice. This means that the ways teacher-educators teach in the Maldives may have been conceptualised through their experiences of teaching in their context of practice. It could also mean that some of what they learned may not necessarily be applied in their pedagogical practice. Many researchers argue that conceptualising technology integrated pedagogical practice is a complex process. According to Koehler and Mishra (2008) technology introduces additional variables to the learning and teaching context which demands teachers’ change of their practice, which eventually adds complexity to their pedagogical approach. Koehler, Mishra, and Yahya (2007) suggest that this complexity arises due to teachers’ lack of understanding the relationships between content, pedagogy and technology and within the context in which they function. Burchardt (2013) considers constructivism as the best suited pedagogical approach for implementing technology. According to Burchardt (2013) and Pritchard (2007), using technologies enhance student interaction and

1 “Hanging out” is a term used to describe ethnographers’ field experiences and their involvement with the participants during the field work (Bloor & Wood, 2006).
engagement and enables them to take control of their learning process. In such learning environments, learners are considered to be partners in the learning process, in that they become “autonomous thinkers … [where they] internalise and reshape, or transform new information” (Brooks & Brooks, 1999, pp. 13-15). This understanding suggests that the interaction is the main element of constructivist learning when using technologies.

However, researchers found that a constructivist pedagogical practice is not observed in teachers’ practices. Ertmer (2005) found that teachers often explain their pedagogy with technology as enabling students’ higher order thinking; yet, their day-to-day activities remain on using computers for drill and practice. Judson (2006) argues that even though teachers say that they apply “student centered teaching” and “constructivist tenets”, their actual practices provide a different picture (p. 592). Perkins (2012) reported that teachers’ use of technologies was married with the traditional teaching methods that were established prior to the advent of technologies. Lim and Oakley (2013) confirm that the advent of technologies does not guarantee the appropriate pedagogical practice.

Although these researchers draw attention to teachers’ ineffective use of technologies in their classrooms, they only provide limited analysis of how these teachers’ pedagogical practices were influenced by their culture. The above researchers focused on understanding teachers’ fluency and efficiency of using technologies, rather than understanding the reasons behind their lack of pedagogical adaptation. The literature thus suggests a gap in understanding the influence of teachers’ own culture and background on their integration of new technologies into their pedagogies. This point is pivotal in my research because of the strong connection between teachers’ conceptualised pedagogical practice and their culture.

Some studies have discussed how Islamic culture may influence pedagogical approaches. Talbani (1996) further argues that the learning and teaching in many Muslim communities rely on “listening, memorization, and regurgitation” (p.70). He further affirms that the teacher is seen as an active “transmitter of knowledge, while the student is passive” (p. 70). Abdou (2012) indicates that teaching is strongly influenced by the rote learning and memorisation pedagogies of Islamic culture. She also highlights that although teacher graduates who enter the teaching profession having learned standard theories (active, cooperative, and constructivist views of learning); they do not necessarily apply them in their teaching. These views suggest that Muslim communities may have an embodied notion of pedagogy which is influenced by the rote learning of knowledge delivered by experts.

The literature also addresses how people’s backgrounds influence their pedagogical practices. For example, researchers across various cultural contexts highlight the notion of embodiment in terms of people’s habits and routines in pedagogical practices (Cheng, Cheng, & Tang, 2010; Kukari, 2004; Wong, 2005). Lortie (1975) argues that the teacher socialisation process is closely associated with the initialising of teachers’ own learning experiences and the models they observed when they were learners. Kukari (2004) examines Papua New Guinea’s indigenous culture and its influence on student teachers’ preconceptions of pedagogy. His investigation has drawn some useful conclusions on how individuals’ early learning can be part of what they understand about pedagogy. The findings demonstrate that people may have pre-conceived ideas about teaching which later influence their pedagogical practices.

In addition, some researchers argue that individuals’ pedagogical practice is influenced by the context of practice. Barton and Berchini (2013) view a context as a place which is “multidimensional, where each individual’s action is associated with its history, culture, geography, and politics” (p. 22). This means that when teaching is done in specific contexts, the nature of the students, the history of the context, and shared religious values could be considered as part of their pedagogical practice. Discussing the meaning of “Ako” (reciprocal learning) Bishop (2003) states that “the teacher does not have to be the fountain of all knowledge, but rather a partner in the ‘conversation’ of learning” (p. 226). In this description, Bishop demands that teachers consider the cultural aspects of Maori learners in the learning and teaching process. These researchers suggest that the context where teachers practise may influence their shaping of specific pedagogical practice. This paper aims to explain the
impact of Maldivian culture on teacher-educators’ technological and pedagogical practices.

The next section thus describes the Maldivian context to shed light on the possible cultural influences on teacher-educators’ formed pedagogical practices.

**Research Context: The Maldives**

The Maldives is a small country which consists of a 1196 chain of coral islands in the South Asian Region, as in Figure 1. Islam has been practised in the Maldives since the middle of the 12th century (Faiz, 2007). Since Islam is the only religion practised by Maldivians, its religious principles and practices have been deeply embedded in Maldivian traditions over centuries.

Latheef and Gupta (2007) claim that the education system of the Maldives is influenced by three streams: “informal training, which children receive from the family and island community; Islamic religious instruction, provided through private tutoring and individualised teaching; and Western-style schooling which emerged in 1960 with the introduction of English-medium schools” (Smerdon et al., 2000, p. 116). Although their argument was not completely related to pedagogical practices in the Maldivian education system, the first two streams, informal training and Islamic religious instructions, appeared to inherently affect the Maldivian pedagogical practices. Yasir (2004) describes both of these streams as the foundation of Maldivian children’s early education which normally starts from Edhuruge (a home-based tutoring). This Edhuruge system is part of the traditional schooling in the Maldives, and makes a major contribution to children’s early education from the age of two years (Duch, 2005). In this cultural practice of learning recitation of the Qur’an, children are simply taught to read Arabic scripts to learn to recite the Quran (Duch, 2005) without understanding the meaning. These researchers drew attention to the rote learning pedagogical trend followed in this Edhuruge system.

![Figure 1. The map of the Maldives, Sources: http://www.tsunami.org/lowe.html](http://www.tsunami.org/lowe.html)

The effect of the traditional teaching in the Maldives appears to be embodied in the pedagogical practices established over centuries. Many researchers argue that the rote learning being implemented in teaching of subjects such as Economics (Nazeer, 2006), Environmental studies (Shareef, 2010), and English language (Mohamed, 2006) in Maldivian classrooms. The review of the findings summarised
above are likely to be true for all the teacher-educators in my research. Since they are Muslim Maldivians and had grown up in the Maldives, their pedagogical practice was probably influenced by the local cultural practice. Therefore, a focus on habitus can help explain why the participants used technologies the way they did. The next section explains the methodological approach I adopted to investigate their practices through the lens of habitus.

Research methodology

This study² adopted an ethnographic methodology to investigate the use of technologies in the pedagogical practice of teacher-educators in the Maldives. The ethnographic methodology was organised by three characteristics that I sought to understand. Firstly, I aimed to understand the cultural influences on their shaping of pedagogical practices. Wolcott (1987) argues that ethnographic research describes cultural entities in individuals’ actions and practices. Secondly, I sought to understand the natural milieu of the teacher-educators’ existing pedagogical practices. According to Hammersley and Atkinson (1995), ethnography emphasises a ground understanding of the real world of participants. Charmaz (2006) defines ethnography as understanding about a “particular group” (teacher-educators) which thus entails sustained participation and observation in “their milieu” (workplace), “community” (professional interaction with other colleagues), or “social world” (professional social world) (Charmaz, 2006, p. 21). Thirdly, since my research involved understanding teacher-educators’ existing pedagogical practices, I required an approach that would allow me to immerse myself in the research site. Reeves, Kuper, and Hodges (2008) argue that ethnographers’ engagement and involvement with the natural setting is necessary in order to provide “thick descriptions” about individuals’ social context (Geertz, 1973, p. 10). My ethnographic methodology was linked with the notion of habitus, as explained in the following section.

Bourdieu’s Notion of Habitus

Bourdieu’s notion of habitus sheds light on how individuals’ practice may be influenced by their own cultural practices and backgrounds within the context of this research. According to Bourdieu, habitus is: “a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 72). He argues here that habitus is the dispositions of individuals that come from schooling, social, cultural aspects, and occupations. Further, Bourdieu (1977) stresses that individuals generate habitus unconsciously, which reinforces the formation of certain behaviours. With this idea, he asserts that habitus is predisposed in individuals. Explaining this view, Bourdieu (1977) states “agents are possessed by their habitus more than they possess it” (p. 18). Thus, it does not depend on conscious attention to predetermined “roles,” “rules,” or “models” (p.17). These views explain how an individual’s early background can become the matrix of later everyday activities in any profession. Hence, it will shape roles they execute, rules they pursue, and models they follow.

However, Bourdieu (1990) believes individuals are actors in the “field”, hence the action of an individual cannot be understood in isolation from the “field” in which the action becomes meaningful (Joas & Knöbl, 2011). This view is useful for understanding teacher-educators’ agency in doing things differently or going along with what is already established in the professional context (workplace culture). Bourdieu (1990) argues that education is a field where positioning and repositioning take place over and around capital. He uses the forms of capital to explain habitus and its socialisation process. Therefore, the capital can be understood as forces or resources that make individuals take different directions. What this could mean to my participants’ practice is that their views about different technologies available at their workplace may enable them to change their positional views about the technology as it had been previously understood. Emirbayer & Johnson (2008) confirm that habitus is generated through everyday activities in an institution, is to some extent formed through
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interaction and therefore is able to shapes the future practice. In the Maldivian teacher-educators’ practices, this view may help to understand the notion of agency, because in this research, most participants became teacher-educators before technologies were readily available in their workplace. This also means that when technologies became available, teacher-educators are likely to try and seek the relevance of these tools to their teaching.

More of Bourdieu’s concepts related to people’s habitus, such as capital (social, cultural, and economic), the autonomy of agent, and the logic of practice will be discussed with the findings later. Using habitus as a lens, I designed my ethnographic research as follows.

Research process

My research was designed through an ethnographic methodology. I gathered data from eleven teacher-educators who volunteered from a teacher education institution where I had previously worked in the Maldives. Therefore, I had the same professional and cultural background as the participants which positioned me as an insider researcher. This position enabled me to closely observe and clarify various issues related to the teacher-educators’ practices. In order to manage any emerged difficulties related to my insider status, I kept a field journal to reflect my own thinking. This helped me to separate my researcher-self from my participants’ data. In addition, the diagramming strategy, as outlined by Buckley and Waring (2013) helps a researcher to become reflexive and transparent in the research process. The diagramming approach allowed me to visualise my participants’ data and accordingly helped me to separate my experience from theirs. In order to gather data, I visited the research site twice: one at the beginning of 2012 and again in 2013 as shown in Figure 2.

**Research Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>To understand the cultural influence of both social and professional experiences on teacher educators’ pedagogical practice with technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first visit: 2nd Jan to 8th Feb 2012</td>
<td>‘Hanging out’ 6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth interviews (11 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of teaching (6 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background understanding</td>
<td>Preliminary analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capturing an in-depth understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second visit: 2nd Jan- 4th Feb 2013</td>
<td>‘Hanging out’ 5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups (10 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary analysis</td>
<td>Clarifying the main understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generating Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifications: 1st Apr to 30th Apr 2013</td>
<td>Follow-up interviews (5 participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Ethnographic research process*

In the first visit, I interviewed the eleven teacher-educators individually and “hung out” (spent time with them during their work hours) with the participants for about six weeks. The hanging out
experiences and the data from the interviews allowed me to explore the initial background of their pedagogical practice and the technologies they used in teaching. After generating a preliminary analysis, I observed the classroom teaching of six participants who agreed to my observations. These observations enabled me to link teacher-educators’ shared comments in their interviews with their actual practices in the teaching context.

In the second visit, eleven months later, I organised focus group discussions on issues generated from my preliminary findings of the first visit. During these sessions, I explored more about teacher-educators’ embodied pedagogical practice and how it relates to their culture and early learning experiences. During the same visit, I had five weeks of hanging out with participants, which helped me to scrutinise institutional influence on their shaping of specific habitus. Lastly, after analysing the entire data set, I had follow-up interviews with five participants to clear my understanding of teacher-educators’ formed habitus. This research process with its timeline is illustrated in Figure 2.

As illustrated in Figure 2, my data collection and analysis took place together in an iterative manner in accordance with grounded theory analysis. After each data set, I analysed it, shared with the participants, and then clarified and explored more to deepen my understanding. The data analysis process primarily adopted open coding and selective coding (Charmaz, 2006; Dey, 2003) by using NVivo-10. However, other digital tools were used for different aspects of analysis, such as Excel for creating a matrix, Inspiration 8-IE for visualising individual teacher-educators’ journeys, and PowerPoint for diagramming the habitus formation. Furthermore, the habitus lens was iteratively checked in the diagramming to identify the relationship between teacher-educators’ social cultural learning norms, and their later formed practices, and accordingly themes were generated as explained in the findings below.

**Research Findings**

The findings generated specific themes related to the influence of social cultural learning norms and the institutional context on teacher-educators’ formed habitus.

**Influence of social cultural learning norms**

Social cultural learning norms involve teacher-educators’ culture and their own experience of school learning. The findings generated a specific cultural practice related to learning recitation of the *Qur’an* and teacher-educators’ school learning experiences.

**Cultural practice related to learning recitation of the *Qur’an***

The recitation of the *Qur’an* is the very early learning experience that all Maldivian students undergo in their education. In teaching recitation of the *Qur’an*, the emphasis is mostly on the learner becoming fluent in the reading of its manuscript, rather than on teaching for understanding. Thus, the notion of learning which is conceived at a very early age perhaps informs their later learning.

Examples of this teaching approach were given by many participants. In a focus group, ALIA explained:

> In our normal *Qur’an* class, we let students rehearse after the teacher's reading of the part [a part from the manuscript of the *Qur’an*]. We believe that through rehearsing we can make them become fluent and read the *Qur’an* properly. (Focus Group)

Rehearsing to become fluent and learning to recite, rather than to understand could influence the later learning norms. This method of teaching was more closely described in an interview when SHAINA shared her own experience of learning the *Qur’an*:

> My teacher was a very famous Qari [a special name for *Qur’an* teacher] and he taught me recitation of the verses of the *Qur’an* nicely. The primary method he followed in his
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3 Participants’ pseudonyms are written in capital letters to highlight their names in the writing.
teaching was making me rehearse after listening to his reading. His concentration was making me fluent in recitation of the Qur’an. (Follow-up-interview)

Both these comments explain the approach of teaching and learning employed in this tradition. It could be understood to a certain extent that it may influence on learners’ learning habits. This cultural practice is heavily involved in children’s education as early as age two. Since the Qur’an is written in Arabic and Arabic is not the local language of the Maldives, the aim of this practice is making children become fluent in recitation of the Qur’an. Moreover, this learning norm was reinforced by their schooling learning experiences.

Teacher-educators’ school learning experiences

The teacher-educators’ early learning experiences helped me to understand how their social and cultural dispositions related to their propensity to rote learning. The themes include the authoritative acceptance of knowledge, note-taking habits and exam-oriented learning.

In the Maldivian culture, teachers are highly respected. The nature of this respect is reflected in students’ tendency to accept knowledge as given. This means that students’ learning is less likely to involve their own thinking and constructing of knowledge. This unquestioning acceptance of knowledge was shared by ALIA:

When I was a young, I remember respecting them [teachers] … I follow all their instructions without questioning. Even during my class everything that is explained by them, we were expected to learn and memorise. (Follow-up-interview)

For ALIA learning means accepting knowledge as given, thus it should be memorised as it is. Adding more about this learning and acceptance of knowledge, HAULA shared: “We obey our teachers’ instructions.” As seen in these comments, the nature of this acceptance of knowledge perhaps made students form a belief of learning as memorising knowledge. This view of knowledge implies that it is something given by an expert. MEERA said:

Teachers’ instructions whether written or verbal are normally copied as they are because we don’t doubt about the knowledge... We know that they [teachers] are always right. (Interview)

If knowledge is accepted as being given by experts, students are likely to use note-taking to make their learning easy, because this learning process gives so much prominence to memorising content. MEERA explained:

When I was a student in the late nineties…teacher dictates or writes notes on the board. We [her classmates] have to write sometime A4 size four to five sheets … Teachers spend the class time either writing on the board or explaining things. And we students keep sitting, taking notes or listening. (Interview)

It can be seen that observing and participating in such learning experience may lead students to infer that learning/teaching is knowledge transmission. This experience was further reinforced by exam-oriented learning experiences. MEERA said in an interview: “She [teacher] will often highlight the important things that need to be focused in the exam”. Supporting this, NISHA added: “I remember I used to practise on pass papers for preparing the examinations. It is sort of a trend we all follow”.

Influence of the institutional context

Along with the influence of cultural practice and the teacher-educators’ early schooling experiences that led to a rote learning pedagogy, they were also influenced in their workplace by the institutional context. Participants discussed two main effects of this.

Pedagogical context

The pedagogical context involved the logic of practice shaped in the institution because of the exam-oriented system, students’ demands, and content-heavy modules.
The idea of exam-oriented practice was discussed by RAUFA and NISHA:

RAUFA: it [rote learning] is practised because of the exam-oriented system in our education. Most of us think that students’ understanding is assessed through examination. So when we think that way often our concentration is on the content.

NISHA: I completely agree, even when we design modules, we tend to take it that way. We have an assessment policy which demands 50% assessments in the exam conditions. (Focus-group)

These comments were confirmed by other participants, ZEENA and FAIHA said:

FAIHA: … whether we follow rote learning or any other methods. Basically… if they don’t understand they won’t be able to answer in the examination.

ZEENA: Many of us believe if our students score well in the exam they must have learnt really well. (Focus-group)

Apart from this, NISHA added that she always tries to meet her students’ demands by providing handouts so that students can prepare well for their examinations. HAULA further explained:

They [students] always expect teacher to explain... Many students don’t like engaging in activities, they rather prefer listening and taking notes. They like getting the ideas as explained. (Follow-up-interview)

HAULA’s comments regarding her students’ demands perhaps indicate one of the many factors that influenced the shaping of teacher-educators’ content-oriented pedagogical habitus.

Beside teacher-educators concerns related to meeting their students demands, their practice were also influenced by the nature of the heavy-content-modules they teach, as discussed by RAUFA and NISHA:

RAUFA: … It is hard sometime to cover everything if we follow activity-oriented teaching.

NISHA: Sometime these activities do not work … [especially] when teaching really content-heavy modules.

NISHA: I completely agree, even [the] assessment policy [also] demands 50% assessments in the exam conditions.

RAUFA: The way our programmes are designed demands that.

NISHA: Our modules are very content oriented. We are supposed to cover [at least] 90% of the module. (Focus group)

These examples denote that because of the heavy content modules, teacher-educators are convinced that the activities do not seem to fit into their teaching. This perhaps may lead them to pursue content-oriented teaching. Examples of their content-teaching habitus were observed in both their classroom teaching and field notes written during my hanging out with them. Some examples can be highlighted, FAIHA said: “When I teach I do emphasise a lot to their understanding but meantime covering the content is one of my aims”. Another example was demonstrated in NISHA’s classroom:

She also asked students to note down when important points are discussed. …, I asked about the main objectives of her explanation of these definitions and terminologies. She responded: “It is important for my students to learn the content explained”. (Classroom-observation)

A third example from SHAINA’s teaching confirmed this content-oriented habitus:

Every time she [SHAINA] finished explaining a definition, she asked questions regarding it...Though students interacted with their teacher or with the student next to them. They mostly discussed the knowledge explained to them. (Classroom-observation)
These examples illustrate the teacher-educators’ formed content-oriented habitus in their teaching.

**Technological context**

Apart from the teacher-educators’ pedagogical context, their selection of specific technologies was influenced by their workplace. Their use of technologies was associated with the available facilities and the quality of support provided. They raised a number of concerns regarding technology infrastructure and technical support.

Teacher-educators often raised concerns related to the Internet facility. ZEENA explained: “I experience difficulties when downloading materials through the Internet”. SHAINA confirmed having the same difficulty: “Our Internet broadband is very slow, it in fact delays the process of uploading and downloading. It is a lot of hassle”. Further, RAUFA described: “It’s slow and time consuming. I always avoid using it during my teaching”. Their concern regarding the Internet was genuine as my field notes of “hanging out” with them complemented this idea. On many occasions, I observed what they meant by “slow” such as in their classroom teaching and some at teacher-educators’ workstations.

Beside the unreliability of the Internet, teacher-educators noted the poor technical support provided by their workplace. DHIMNA said:

> [Once] I had planned to show a video clip and the multimedia didn’t work that day. I wasted my time … it didn’t go as I planned … I sometimes get annoyed… because of the difficulties. If things have been monitored well, would have been easier. (Interview)

Raising the same concern, HAULA complained:

> I think the university administration … does not monitor these things and how things are going on. I have had lots of troubles when teaching with technologies in the classrooms. (Interview)

Some teacher-educators complained that the many facilities available were not properly used because of the technical difficulties. SHAINA talked about some of these:

> We have a variety of tools available for sharing information. Such as GEM, Moodle, IQweb, and Self-service [virtual spaces] I don’t believe that these facilities are utilised well. The reasons…I guess are [because] you always have to tackle with all these things because of the challenges you face... (Interview)

YUSRA confirmed this technical difficulty:

> We are having many difficulties to go with these things [virtual tools]. Sometimes a particular tool may work very well other times it doesn’t. (Interview)

The concerns that teacher-educators had made them select the easy tools that were manageable without having troubles. Their use of PowerPoint was perhaps influenced by the habitus of choosing what works better. An example given by NISHA draws attention to this idea:

> When ICT [PowerPoint] is incorporated it becomes so much easier to deliver the lesson I don’t need to have a lesson plan on a piece of paper. If I put everything in the PPT there is a logical flow, it’s easy for me to get my thoughts together, and plan my lesson as well. (Interview)

Another example of how teacher-educators used PowerPoint can be noticed in the observation-notes written on FAIHA’s teaching:

> She [FAIHA] started with a question on her first slide. She talked for 2-3 minutes. Then she started her explanation. She had many diagrams, pictures, graphs, videos, and tables… in her slides. But mostly related to the content she covered. (Classroom-observation)

These examples show that PowerPoint was the major tool used by teacher-educators. When examining teacher-educators’ teaching with this PowerPoint tool, it could be noticed their pedagogical purpose...
emerged from their own learning experiences or from their cultural learning norms of knowledge centrism. This tool was selected for its convenience in delivering content to their students. Knowledge is still treated as given and transmitted by specific people who own it and then transmit it. The next section synthesise the findings with previously discussed literature and habitus lens.

Discussions and conclusion

The study indicates that the teacher-educators’ pedagogical and technological habitus was influenced by their social cultural learning norms and instructional context of practice. The cultural practice related to learning recitation of the Qur’an has unconsciously influenced their view of learning as receiving knowledge without understanding. Moreover, this rote learning was reinforced by their own learning experiences of accepting knowledge from experts (teachers), memorising content, and note-taking habits in school classrooms as in Figure 3.

This means that teacher-educators’ cultural practice of learning to recite the Qur’an and their early classroom experience is largely mirrored on their pedagogical practice regardless of their technology use. According to Bourdieu (1977), individuals generate habitus unconsciously and it influences them to do things in a certain way. Bourdieu (1977) further argues that individuals pursue roles and models unconsciously in their future actions; perhaps this then becomes demonstrated in their teaching. This was clearly seen when examining the teacher-educators’ backgrounds (receiving knowledge without understanding) and the practices that they later formed (concentration on knowledge delivery).

This argument was supported with the findings of many researchers who argue that individuals’ backgrounds may influence their conceptualisation of pedagogy (Kukari, 2004; Wong, 2005). Moreover, the influence of Islamic culture seen in practices such as rote learning and memorising knowledge (Abdou, 2012; Talbani, 1996) could also have influenced teacher-educators’ pedagogies. Consequently, given that possibility, I argue that it is highly likely that teacher-educators’ backgrounds of rote learning experiences were unconsciously embodied in them and later replicated in their pedagogical practices regardless of changes that occurred in their circumstances (Joas & Knöbl, 2011) such as the advent of technologies in their pedagogical practices.

The findings also demonstrate that the teacher-educators pedagogical and technological habitus was influenced by two aspects involved their institutional context. Firstly, the pedagogical context, where teacher-educators’ practice was influenced by the exam-oriented system, content-heavy modules,
their students’ demands for content to be explained, hence their habitus is formed. Secondly, teacher-educators’ PowerPoint-assisted pedagogy was influenced by the technological context of their workplace, due to various issues related to technology infrastructure and technical support, as in Figure 4.

**Figure 4. Influence of institutional context**

Bourdieu (1990) addresses this understanding through his view of how people change their practice in an institution, where positioning and repositioning takes place over and around capital. The technological tools (economic capital) that are available at teacher-educators’ workplace are likely to take on the cultural understanding of these tools as part of their own practice, which will include the conception of pedagogy and what these tools are for. Moreover, the rules or policies that should be adopted in an institution could embody the practices that people are following. This means that when these technologies are provided, teacher-educators are expected to use them. Naidoo (2004) suggests that professionals who work in institutions have a tendency to develop understanding of what it means to practise in an institution. This means that when technology became available at teacher educators’ workplace, they adopt them as part of their everyday teaching. However, their ways of using these tools and the tools they selected were influenced by their everyday experiences as Naidoo suggested.

Examining the practices of teacher-educators’ practices who joined the institution later suggested that their practice may have been modified by observing their colleagues. This example could be applied to teacher-educators such as NISHA, MEERA, and HAULA (who joined later) may followed the logic of practice, including the use of technologies established earlier by senior academics such as FAIHA, SHAINA, RAUFA and ZEENA. Here, the institution becomes a social space where teacher-educators act upon “strategic possibilities” (Bourdieu, 1993) by which Bourdieu refers to the individual’s actions as dynamic and fluid within the given context. This means that “action generally adheres to a practical logic, which is often shaped by routine requirements” (Joas & Knöbl, 2011, p. 12).
In addition, Bourdieu (1985) argues that when individuals struggle with something or within a position they are likely to adopt what works for them in order to make things easier. This idea was clearly seen in the teacher-educators’ adoption of PowerPoint as a main tool for their teaching. They gained benefits from using this tool because of its effectiveness in delivering content. For example, RAUFA, NISHA, FAIHA, and SHAINA, all of them noted the benefits they gained from PowerPoint, which enabled them to explain the content they wanted to deliver. These benefits in this sense could be understood as a force that made the teacher-educators decide to continue with it. On the other hand, if a specific tool does not work as the way it is expected or creates some challenges, it may be eventually avoided. This idea was clearly demonstrated in ZEENA, SHAINA, DHIMNA, HAULA, and YUSRA’s comments. These teacher-educators explained their experience of using virtual spaces (GEM, Moodle, IQWeb, and Self-service) being troublesome and problematic, and consequently they avoided using them.

In conclusion, my findings indicate that teacher-educators’ social cultural learning norms related to learning to recite the Qur’an, their early schooling experiences, and their pedagogical context influenced them to form content-oriented pedagogical habitus. Their technological habitus of using PowerPoint was largely determined by their technology use experiences in their workplace. However, the selection of PowerPoint was also influenced by its suitability to their pedagogical purpose of teaching content. This could perhaps explain the ideas suggested by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), that the field is a "network, or a configuration, of objective relations" (p. 97) in which individuals’ own experiences become the presence of their current practices.
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