We are an international learned society concerned to advance understanding of higher education through the insights, perspectives and knowledge offered by systematic research.

We bring researchers together through our conferences, network events and web-based seminars to share, discuss and develop their research.

We provide opportunities for the publication of research through our own book series and our journals Studies in Higher Education, Higher Education Quarterly and Higher Education Abstracts.

We aim to build capacity and support newer researchers by providing research awards and specialist development conferences and workshops.
The Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) is an independent and financially self-supporting international learned Society. It is concerned to advance understanding of higher education, especially through the insights, perspectives and knowledge offered by systematic research and scholarship.

The Society's primary role is to improve the quality of higher education through facilitating knowledge exchange, discourse and publication of research. SRHE members are worldwide and drawn from across all the disciplines.

The Society has a wide set of aims and objectives. Amongst its many activities the Society:

- funds and supports a large number of special interest networks for researchers and practitioners working in higher education from every discipline. These networks are open to all.
- runs the largest annual UK-based higher education research conference and parallel conference for postgraduate and newer researchers. This is attended by researchers from over 35 countries and showcases current research across every aspect of higher education.
- runs an established series of Professional Development Workshops for new and emerging researchers.
- offers a series of annual research awards which are funded entirely by the Society to support new research into higher education.

SRHE Networks

The Society welcomes the involvement of all researchers in higher education in our range of networks. SRHE Networks are led by higher education academics active in the relevant research area. Each network provides a range of opportunities for discussion of current research issues from seminars to web based discussions and email forums. As appropriate, research topics explored within the networks can also lead to a range of publication options with the Society’s Journals and the SRHE Book Series.

SRHE network events are open to all and membership of any Network or participation in any network activity is not restricted to current members of the Society.

Visit the SRHE website at www.srhe.ac.uk or contact the Society on srhe@srhe.ac.uk to view the calendar of forthcoming events and join the mailing list of any of the networks.

Access and Widening Participation

Convenors: Professor Penny Jane Burke, University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia; Professor Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University; Dr Kate Cunliffe, Thames, Birmingham City University

Academic Practice

Convenors: Dr Geoffrey Hinchliffe, University of East Anglia; Professor Helen Wallington, Oxford Brookes University

Digital University

Convenors: Dr Lesley Gourley, UCL Institute of Education, University of London; Dr Kelly Dale, King's College, London; Dr Libra Bhattacharya, Lancaster University

Employability, Enterprise and Work-based Learning

Convenors: Professor Helen Hyson, Aston University; Professor Richard Blackwell, Southampton Solent University, Dr Heike Beineke, University of Warwick

Higher Education Policy

Convenors: Professor Carol Leathwood, London Metropolitan University; Dr Tim Kim, University of East London; Dr Karen Smith, University of Hertfordshire

International Research and Researchers

Convenors: Professor Linda Evans, University of Leeds; Emily Henderson, University of Warwick

Newer Researchers Network

Convenors: Dr Mark Kember, Anglia Ruskin University; Dr Saranne Weiler, London South Bank University; Dr Richard Jones, Buckinghamshire New University

Post Compulsory Education

Convenors: Professor Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham; Professor Kevin Orr, University of Huddersfield

Postgraduate Issues Network

Convenors: Professor Pam Denicolo, University of Reading; Dr Martin Gough, University of Liverpool; Dr Richard Race, University of Roehampton; Dr Julie Reeves, University of Southampton

Student Experience Network

Convenors: Dr Camille Kandiko-Hawson, King's College, London

South West Regional Network

Convenors: Dr Lisa Lucas, University of Bristol; Professor Rajani Naidoo, University of Bath
Exploring freedom and control in global higher education

SRHE Annual Research Conference
7-9 December 2016
Celtic Manor, Newport, South Wales, UK

Conference Programme & Book of Abstracts
New titles for 2016

- Freedom to Learn by Bruce Macfarlane
- Student Politics and Protest edited by Rachel Brooks
- Theorising Learning to Teach in Higher Education edited by Brenda Leibowitz, Vivienne Bozalek and Peter Kahn
- Religion and Higher Education in Europe and North America edited by Kristin Aune and Jacqueline Stevenson
- Access to Higher Education edited by Anna Mountford-Zimdars and Neil Harrison
- Changing Pedagogical Spaces in Higher Education by Penny Jane Burke, Gill Crozier and Lauren Ila Mlaszok

Find out more: www.routledge.com/series/SRHE

Interested in discussing a book idea for this series? Visit the Routledge stand to speak to the editors about your proposal.
CONTENTS

2 Welcome Letter – Helen Perkins, Director SRHE

3 Conference programme at a glance
   Wednesday 7th December 2016
   Thursday 8th December 2016
   Friday 9th December 2016

6 Keynote Speakers
   The European University’s ‘living autonomy’ and the shifting dynamics of its inner life
   Professor Åse Goritzka
   Sausages, evidence and policy making: The role for universities
   Professor Jonathan Grant

8 Research Directions Discussion Groups

11 Book of Abstracts

113 Posters

108 Author Index

115 SRHE Conferences 2017 and 2018

116 Acknowledgements
Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of the Society for Research into Higher Education, and all the individuals who have contributed to the development of the 2016 SRHE Annual Research Conference, I extend a very warm welcome to you all and hope that you will experience a lively and stimulating conference and enjoy your time at the Celtic Manor.

This year we are again at full capacity with our delegate numbers. This is both exciting and challenging. It will be a busy programme with a very full timetable but we have worked hard to ensure that everything will run with our customary smoothness. In particular we have worked on providing a very clear Conference programme and Timetable in order that delegates can search out and find their way to all the events, activities and academic presentations on offer.

The Conference theme this year is: Exploring freedom and control in global higher education

The growth of higher education globally highlights, in new ways, tensions between freedom and control that have always been present in higher education. As national systems expand in countries with widely differing political and social norms, the role of the university is always in contention. Governments that seek to make universities more productive may prefer a route of tight control or to trust market forces. Each has implications for institutional and individual autonomy. Communication technologies offer new ways of connecting globally. However, as knowledge flows more freely, the traditional role of the university in generating and sharing knowledge is threatened. At the same time the influence exerted on policy appears weakened. How should universities respond?

Our keynote speakers aim to address different aspects of some of these questions.

Professor Asa Gornitzka, from the Department of Political Science, University of Oslo will focus on life within the university in her address The European University’s ‘living autonomy’ and the shifting dynamics of its inner life. Professor Jonathan Grant will take an outward-facing perspective in his Keynote Sausages, evidence and policy making: The role for universities, tackling directly the thorny issue for higher education – and higher education research most especially – of how to impact on policy.

At the core of the SRHE Conference is the forum that provides for the presentation of papers relating to research into higher education across the widest spectrum of topics. This year we have 260 plus papers being presented across 12 different research domains in a variety of different formats: individual presentations, group discussions, 9 symposia and poster sessions.

The Conference aims throughout to be highly participative and our Research Directions Discussion Groups are a key part of the sharing and networking elements of conference. This year we are offering Discussion Groups in six of our research domains; Access and widening participation; Digital University; Higher Education Policy; International perspectives and contexts; Postgraduate Issues and Student Experience. These research groups convene at the end of the first day to give delegates the chance to meet with colleagues with shared research interests at the beginning of the conference, support the renewal of current networks and help establish new ones. The Discussion Groups are developed and facilitated by the SRHE Network Convenors. They will feature some opening focused presentations leading into open forum discussions. Full details of each of these Group Discussions are contained in this Conference programme.

The Society’s annual conferences are truly international, bringing together delegates and contributors from around the world. For those of you who have not previously attended an SRHE Conference, we encourage everyone involved to do all they can to make you feel welcome and included in all aspects of the conference. I do hope that this will come across to all delegates. The conference programme provides plenty of opportunity to exchange knowledge and ideas with colleagues working on similar topics and, equally important, to enjoy some congenial downtime. I hope you will take full advantage of all these opportunities and be enthused to be part of the SRHE community, and join us here again at Celtic Manor in 2017.

Helen Perkins, Director SRHE
## Conference Programme at a Glance

**Wednesday 7 December 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00 - 10.30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Hotel Entrance Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 - 11.00</td>
<td>Conference Welcome</td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Perkins, SRHE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td><strong>Keynote address:</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The European University’s ‘living autonomy’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the shifting dynamics of its inner life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Åse Gornitzka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Political Science,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oslo, Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 12.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: A1-A12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45 – 13.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: B1-B12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 – 14.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 – 14.15</td>
<td><strong>Poster Session 1</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45 – 14.00</td>
<td><strong>Book Launch A:</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Harrison introduces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountford-Zimdars &amp; Harrison: Access to HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.15 – 14.45</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: C1-C12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 15.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: D1-D12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45 – 16.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: E1-E12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15 – 17.00</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee Break</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15 – 16.30</td>
<td><strong>Book Launch B1:</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Brooks introduces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Politics and Protest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 – 16.45</td>
<td><strong>Book Launch B2:</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Macfarlane introduces Freedom to Learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 – 17.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sessions: F1-F12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.45 – 18.30</td>
<td><strong>Research Directions Discussion Groups</strong></td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 – 19.15</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
<td>Merlin's Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Lobby area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.15 - 21.30</td>
<td>Informal Dinner for Delegates</td>
<td>Resort Restaurants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At SRHE events we use coloured lanyards for our delegate badges to help participants pick out specific individuals they may wish to ask for help or to speak with particularly.

The lanyards for this event are colour coded as follows:

- **Black**
  All SRHE executive team and helpers. Do please seek any assistance required from these individuals.

- **Yellow**
  Speakers at the event

- **Red**
  Trustees and Members of the SRHE Governing Council

- **Green**
  SRHE Network convenors

- **Blue**
  All event delegates

May we remind you please to wear your event badge throughout the day and at all evening events. Your conference badge helps the Resort staff identify delegates, and will be of assistance to you.
# Conference Programme at a Glance

Thursday 8 December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 09.30</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: G1-G12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: J1-J12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.30</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee Break</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10 – 11.30</td>
<td><strong>Journal Launch C:</strong> Policy Reviews in Higher Education introduced by the editors</td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: K1-K12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12.15 – 13.00 | **Keynote address:** Sausages, evidence and policy making: The role for universities
               | Professor Jonathan Grant
               | Director, The Policy Institute,
               | King's College London | Caernarfon Suite  |
| 13.00 – 14.00 | Lunch                                                   | Caernarfon Foyer  |
| 13.30 – 14.00 | Poster Session 2                                        | Caernarfon Foyer  |
| 13.30 – 14.00 | **SRHE Annual General Meeting**                         | Caernarfon Suite  |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | Paper Presentations: Sessions: L1 – L12                | Breakout Rooms    |
| 15.15 – 15.45 | Tea / Coffee Break                                      | Caernarfon Foyer  |
| 15.30 – 15.45 | **Book Launch D:** Jacqueline Stevenson
               | introduces Aune & Stevenson: Religion in HE in Europe & America | Caernarfon Suite  |
| 16.30 – 17.00 | Paper Presentations: Sessions: P1-P12                  | Breakout Rooms    |
| 17.15 – 17.45 | Paper Presentations: Sessions: Q1 – Q12                | Breakout Rooms    |
| 19.00 – 20.00 | **Drinks Reception (open to all delegates)**
               | Sponsored by Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group          | Caernarfon Foyer  |
| 20.00 – 22.30 | **Conference Gala Dinner**                             | Caernarfon Suite  |
| 22.30 – 00.30 | **Disco (open to all delegates)**                      | Caernarfon Suite  |

At SRHE events we use coloured lanyards for our delegate badges to help participants pick out specific individuals they may wish to ask for help or to speak with particularly.

The lanyards for this event are colour coded as follows:

- **Black**
  - All SRHE executive team and helpers. Do please seek any assistance required from these individuals.

- **Yellow**
  - Speakers at the event

- **Red**
  - Trustees and Members of the SRHE Governing Council

- **Green**
  - SRHE Network convenors

- **Blue**
  - All event delegates

May we remind you please to wear your event badge throughout the day and at all evening events. Your conference badge helps the Resort staff identify delegates, and will be of assistance to you.
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME AT A GLANCE

Friday 9 December 2016

09.30–10.00  Paper Presentations: Sessions: R1-R12  Breakout Rooms
10.15–10.45  Paper Presentations: Sessions: S1-S12  Breakout Rooms
10.45–11.15  Tea / Coffee Break  Caernarfon Foyer
10.45–11.15  Poster Session 3  Caernarfon Foyer
11.00–11.15  Book Launch E: Penny Jane Burke introduces Burke et al Changing Pedagogical Spaces in HE  Caernarfon Suite
11.15–11.45  Paper Presentations: Sessions: T1-T12  Breakout Rooms
12.00-12.30  Paper Presentations: Sessions: U1-U12  Breakout Rooms
Professor Rosemary Deem
Vice Principal (Education),
Royal Holloway, University of London

13.15–14.15  Lunch and Depart  Caernarfon Foyer

EXHIBITORS AND PROMOTIONAL EVENTS AT CONFERENCE

Exhibition stands are open throughout conference in the Caernarfon Foyer.
Exhibitors this year are:
Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group
Institute of Education Press
Bloomsbury Publishing
John Hopkins University Press
Emerald Publishing
Higher Education Quarterly

PUBLICATION EVENTS DURING CONFERENCE

There will be a series of publications events during conference which will take place in the Caernarfon Suite. Please see the schedule above.

At SRHE events we use coloured lanyards for our delegate badges to help participants pick out specific individuals they may wish to ask for help or to speak with particularly.
The lanyards for this event are colour coded as follows:

Black
All SRHE executive team and helpers. Do please seek any assistance required from these individuals

Yellow
Speakers at the event

Red
Trustees and Members of the SRHE Governing Council

Green
SRHE Network convenors

Blue
All event delegates

May we remind you please to wear your event badge throughout the day and at all evening events. Your conference badge helps the Resort staff identify delegates, and will be of assistance to you.
KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

Wednesday 11.00-11.45

The European University’s ‘living autonomy’ and the shifting dynamics of its inner life

Professor Åse Gornitzka
Department of Political Science, University of Oslo, Norway

Session Chair: Professor Penny Jane Burke, Director Centre of Excellence for Equity in Higher Education, University of Newcastle, NSW Australia

European universities are positioned in rapidly changing national, regional and global contexts, which are strongly affected by knowledge economy visions. These visions incorporate a core role for universities as prime knowledge institutions. It implies walking the tightrope between several, purportedly conflicting, concerns and interests. It also implies managing universities’ performative, professional and moral reputation among multiple audiences (Christensen and Gornitzka 2016).

Universities are expected to maintain if not strengthen their academic excellence, but also to produce knowledge of relevance to society at large; to deliver graduates that are able to learn and (further) develop their competences and skills in professional practices; and to strengthen their global competitiveness. This is a tall order for universities, navigating between multiple visions of what they should be and what they should accomplish (Maassen and Olsen 2007).

Central to the policy debate has been the notion of ‘institutional autonomy’ as a key element in the framework conditions for European universities for handling internal and external expectations more effectively. The general call for ‘more autonomy’ has been a mantra among policy makers and stakeholders, a call that reverberates a central discussion all over Europe about university autonomy as part of governance reforms of higher education and as part of general public sector reforms (Christensen, Gornitzka and Maassen 2014). Core assumptions underlying these university reforms were first that autonomous universities will more effectively accommodate the needs of various stakeholders in the ‘knowledge marketplace’; and second that strategic organisational actorhood of more autonomous universities will lead to ‘healthy’ systemic integration and diversity.

Research on how these reforms have impacted university autonomy has mainly been focused on changes in the formal governance relationship between state authorities and universities (e.g. Enders et al. 2013). However, studies on changes in the formal governance relationship cannot explain important aspects of the nature of intra-university change. In order to understand intra-university change dynamics we have to examine the ‘living autonomy’ of universities, i.e. the ways in which the changes in the formal governance relationship between state authorities and universities are perceived, interpreted, translated, operationalised and used inside each university (Fumasoli, Gornitzka and Maassen 2014).

Drawing on a recent study of European ‘flagship universities’ this presentation takes the following question as its point of departure:

How are changes in institutional autonomy interpreted and used at different levels within universities, and what are the implications for how universities organise their ‘inner life’ as well as for how academic practices are controlled?

Biographical Note

Åse Gornitzka is a political scientist and holds a doctoral degree from the Faculty of Public Administration, University of Twente, the Netherlands. She has previously been senior researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education (NIFU) and at the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) at the University of Twente.

Her main fields of academic interests are in the transformation and sustainability of the European political order in the area of education and research policy, the dynamics of European level governance sites, the role of expertise in EU policy making and the domestic impact of the EU’s soft modes of governance.

Link: http://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/people/aca/aasego/
Thursday 12.15-13.00

Sausages, evidence and policy making: The role for universities

Professor Jonathan Grant
Director, The Policy Institute, King’s College London

Session Chair: Professor Helen Higson, Provost and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Aston University, UK

“Law and sausages”, as Otto von Bismarck famously did not say, “are two things you do not want to see being made”. Much the same might be said of policymaking. Like sausage- and law-making, it is messy, iterative, and little understood. And for those of us who champion the use of evidence in policymaking, this messiness is a real challenge.

Indeed, as we see it, part of the appeal of evidence is that it “lides up” some of the messiness that pervades the policymaking process. To apply the words of David Sackett, one of the pioneers of evidence-based medicine, to a slightly different context: good policymaking should be about “the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of current best evidence”.

The growing acknowledgment of – and advocacy for – the use of evidence in policymaking is a good thing. But it is balanced by a certain cynicism. During the EU Referendum campaign, Michael Gove famously said “People in this country have had enough of experts” - perhaps reflecting a preference for ideology over the inconvenience of evidence. This fatalistic view that “nothing works” is dangerous and needs to be challenged. Those of us who champion the use of evidence in policymaking need to up our game.

We need to understand and acknowledge that ‘evidence’ is just one ingredient in the policymaking process: habit, resources, values, ‘marketability’ and politics all, for example, legitimately impinge on that way policy is made. From this perspective, one role that evidence can and does play is to help reduce the uncertainty – the messiness – inherent to policy and decision-making. But it is not the only role that evidence can play.

Translating thoughtful research (or evidence) into actionable policy is a tough challenge that requires innovative and creative thinking. Research findings compete with other diverse inputs for viability on the policymaker’s radar and different agendas, timeframes and communication styles also create obstacles. A systematic review of the use of evidence by policymakers suggests continuing needs for academic research that is timely, relevant and of good quality. We need to explore new ways of engaging with policymakers: developing communities of practice, employing the concept of ‘nudging’ from behavioural economics, and, most importantly, creating a ‘marketplace’ for evidence that includes both supply and demand-side incentives.

The introduction of impact case studies as part of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) has begun to put some of those incentives in place. It is interesting to note that the word “policy” was mentioned at least once in 3,208 case studies and the two largest impact topics identified through text mining techniques were ‘informing government policy’ (n=1233, 20% of case studies) and ‘Parliamentary scrutiny’ (n=983, 17% of case studies).

But as researchers and those interested in the application of research to societal benefit we must ensure that evidence-based policy making is itself open to being researched. to make sure we understand the effectiveness of knowledge exchange, translation and mobilisation activities – all areas that receive significant amounts of public money in their right but with limited evidence and understanding about what actually works.

Biographical Note
Jonathan Grant is Director of the Policy Institute, Professor of Public Policy, and Assistant Principal for Strategy at King’s College London. The aim of the Policy Institute is to improve evidence-informed policy and practice by facilitating mutual engagement between academic, business and policy communities around current and future policy needs in the UK and globally.

Jonathan’s main research interests are in biomedical and health R&D policy, research impact assessment and the use of research and evidence in policy and decision making. He has significant international experience providing analytical support on the formulation and implementation of R&D strategies in, for example, the UK, Greece, Norway, Qatar, Oman, Australia, Canada and the USA.
RESEARCH DIRECTIONS DISCUSSION GROUPS

Breakout Rooms | Wednesday 17.45-18.30

Conference delegates are warmly invited to participate in these Research Domain discussion groups, which will feature short presentations and open forum discussion on current research issues and projects within selected research domain strands running throughout the conference.

These discussion groups are a valuable opportunity for delegates with mutual research interests to come together, hear about some of the latest research and share perspectives and ideas.

These discussion groups are convened and facilitated by our SRHE Network Convenors. They provide an excellent networking opportunity at the start of the Conference and will offer plenty of opportunity for participant contributions. In addition to focussing on some current key topics these discussion groups also help identify research areas the Society can potentially support and develop through our programme of seminars and through our various research award schemes.

Delegates are free to participate in any discussion group of their choice but our expectation is that most will choose the domain in which their own work is represented in order to share perspectives and contribute ideas on research directions in their area of expertise and knowledge.

Access and Widening Participation | Beaumaris 1 | Wednesday 17.45-18.30

‘Using Theory to Inform Praxis’

Featuring presentations from: Professor Sue Webb, Monash University, Australia. Annette Hayton, University of Bath, UK
Facilitated by: Professor Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK. Convenor AWP Network.
Professor Penny Jane Burke, University of Newcastle, NSW Australia. Convenor AWP Network.
Dr Kate Thomas, Birmingham City University, UK. Convenor AWP Network

As conveners of the Access and Widening participation network we would argue that widening participation praxis is needed, drawing together ‘critical theories of inequalities in higher education, practice-based perspectives and lived and embodied educational and pedagogic experiences’ (Burke, 2012, p. 35). This session will offer a discussion forum to consider how theory might inform a praxis-based framework for widening participation. Professor Sue Webb and Annette Hayton will set the context by considering how Bourdieusian theory has been used in widening participation research, and by exploring how concepts from his wider ‘toolbox’ can aid investigations of the enduring relationship between social class background and inequalities in higher education. The session will explore how working with theory for praxis might influence policy development and tackle the issues faced by those from under-represented social class backgrounds.

The Digital University | Caerphilly | Wednesday 17.45-18.30

“Presence and distance: digital shifts and the campus experience”

Featuring presentation from: Professor Sian Bayne, University of Edinburgh, UK
Facilitated by: Dr Lesley Gourlay, UCL Institute of Education, London, UK. Convenor DU Network.
Dr Ibrar Bhatt, Lancaster University UK. Convenor DU Network

This discussion session will consider how campus-based, part-time, online, and distance students experience ‘the university’ in the context of the shift of Higher Education teaching online. The session will be initiated by our guest discussant, Professor Sian Bayne, who will outline from her own research how the space of ‘a university’ is experienced symbolically and materially by students who may never physically attend that campus. Through discussion and the perspectives of the group, the session will explore the new and complex relationships students of all types face with their campuses.
Postgraduate Issues Network  |  Chepstow  |  Wednesday 17.45-18.30

“Freedom, Anguish and Quality in Doctoral Education”

Featuring presentations from: Dr Annette Fillery-Travis, Middlesex University, London, UK. Dr Soren Bengtsen, Aarhus University, Denmark. Dr Kay Guccione, University of Sheffield, UK.
Facilitated by: Dr Martin Gough, University of Liverpool, UK. Convenor Postgraduate Issues Network

In this open discussion session, invited speakers will pose questions through very brief summaries of their research to set the scene. Martin Gough will explain why anguish in this context is not of freedom (Fromm 1942) as such, neither is it constituted by fear of knowledge (Williams 2016), and in itself it is a well-being problem (cf. Hargreaves et al. 2016) neither on the utilitarian / medicalised deficit model nor on the Aristotelian epistemic model. He will be followed by speakers on how their research presented at this conference informs conceptions of pedagogical quality at doctoral level: Annette Fillery-Travis will offer a pan-European perspective on freedom in relation to stakeholder needs; Soren Bengtsen will outline the relative implications of the ‘torn’ vs ‘ecological’ curriculum, and also on the role of friendship in the supervisory relationship; Kay Guccione will underline the importance of trust within the supervisory relationship.

Trust, or other conditions of interpersonal relations, would be a further key facet of the pedagogy of the research environment (Devos et al. 2015). But is this trust about expectations of systems working, including agents being competent, or is it something else?

As well as the touching on the UK Teaching Excellence Framework, we may also muse on implications of that other current main policy, and also anguish-inducing, issue, Brexit, for the Second and Third Bologna Cycles.

Higher Education Policy  |  Conwy 1  |  Wednesday 17.45-18.30

“Brexit and its implications for higher education policy and research”

Featuring presentations from: Dr Susan Harris-Huemmer, German University of Administrative Sciences. Dr Marie-Pierre Moreau, University of Roehampton, UK

Facilitated by: Professor Carole Leathwood, London Metropolitan University, UK. Convenor HEP Network. Dr Terri Kim, University of East London, UK. Convenor HEP Network. Dr Karen Smith, University of Hertfordshire, UK. Convenor HEP Network

This research directions discussion forum provides an opportunity for delegates to discuss the potential implications of Brexit for higher education. The debate will be stimulated by two short, focused inputs from academics bringing different perspectives to the Brexit agenda: Dr Susan Harris-Huemmer, a British academic living and working in Germany, and Dr Marie-Pierre Moreau, a French academic living and working in the UK.

The presentations will be followed by small group discussions to give everyone the opportunity to share their thoughts and experiences in relation to Brexit and higher education. The session will conclude with a pulling together of key concerns and avenues for future research.

Student Experience Network  |  Conwy 2  |  Wednesday 17.45-18.30

“Measuring the Student Experience: Excellence, Enhancement and Accountability”

Featuring presentations from: Dr Bart Rientes, Open University, UK. Dr Heike Behie, University of Warwick, UK. Dr Fabio Arico, University of East Anglia, UK

Facilitated by: Dr Camille Kandiko Howson, King’s College, London. Convenor Student Experience Network

Three researchers will provide some thought starters on various approaches to measuring the student experience (Bart Rientes, Heike Behie, and Fabio Arico). The seminar will then open up a discussion on research on the student experience and learning, what is missing, sharing international practice and providing networking for future projects.
International Research and Researchers | Denbigh 1 | Wednesday 17.45-18.30

“The politics and practice of international research collaboration”

Featuring presentations from: Dr Vassiliki Papatsiba, University of Sheffield, UK. Dr Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela, Universidad de Chile. Dr Talita Calitz, University of the Free State, South Africa

Facilitated by: Dr Emily Henderson, University of Warwick. Convenor International Research and Researchers Network

The International Research and Researchers (IRR) Discussion Group is organised around a central ‘provocation’ about the current politics and practices of international research collaboration. During the session, Dr Vassiliki Papatsiba (University of Sheffield) and Dr Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela (Universidad de Chile) will respond to this ‘provocation’ in the form of two short, informal presentations in which they draw on their own experiences of researching collaboration and engaging in collaborative research projects. There will then be ample opportunity to discuss the different issues and ideas raised. Anyone is welcome to attend, and we particularly welcome researchers who are involved in collaborative projects to share their ideas, concerns and practices.

The provocation

International research collaboration is increasingly an externally imposed phenomenon. Research has always functioned around communities, cooperation and the mutual generation of ideas, many of these international in some way. However, in the current moment of the global internationalisation of the higher education sector, national governments, research funders and research-active higher education institutions are under substantial pressure to collaborate with international partners. This pressure is filtering down to individual researchers, who find that the funding they are bidding for includes eligibility requirements for particular types of partnerships, including the number of countries to be included in the bid, the range of countries (e.g. ODA, i.e. in receipt of development aid; EU members), and the type of partner (‘external’, e.g. civil society organisation or company; academic). Perhaps there are some benefits to these requirements, such as including countries or regions which do not receive sufficient international attention, or fostering collaboration across borders which are politically and linguistically challenging to traverse. But conversely demand-led requirements to collaborate can produce particular behaviours, such as turning research interests towards ‘where the money is’ and making choices about research partners based on tenuous links or contacts. These behaviours can only be exacerbated by funding calls that demand lightning-speed responses, and increasing competition for reduced funds.

The risks of a demand-led and externally-imposed collaboration practice are several. Genuine mutual research partnerships are notoriously difficult to establish and maintain – working together across different sets of ideas, languages, structural conditions and research climates, not to mention historical and actual histories of colonialism and conflict, takes time and effort. At times, partnerships fail. In the current collaborative climate, time is of the essence, as is value-for-money – and partnerships cannot be allowed to fail. The ‘provocation’ that we put forth for discussion in this session focuses in on the tensions between the (ethical) politics of research collaboration, and the collaboration practices that respond to and/or resist the effects of the acceleration, intensification and hyper-management of international research collaboration.
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A1

Beaumaris 1 | Session A1 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

The rationalisation of education (0052)

Geoffrey Hinchliffe, University of East Anglia, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Gilles Deleuze’s concept of a ‘society of control’ suggests a ubiquity of domination that goes well beyond the ‘disciplinary society’ explored by Michel Foucault. But Deleuze’s nightmare was first entertained in a modern context by Max Weber who spoke of the ‘iron cage’ that man had constructed for himself through a process of rationalisation (i.e. broadly speaking, instrumental reason). It is easy to see how this process has now spread into higher education. Yet Alistair Macintyre offers a different vision of what higher education could be through the concept of a practice with its own ‘internal goods’. I suggest that we can can conceive subject disciplines in terms of practices that may – possibly - be able to resist the depredations of rationalisation. In my presentation I will go into more detail as to how this might be achieved.

A2

Beaumaris 1 | Session A2 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Three’s a crowd – Does including an employer in the learning relationship affect learner freedom (0187)

Stephanie Meyer, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The traditional learning relationship exists between two parties: the learner and the learning institution. Work-based learning is unique in that it brings a third actor, the learner’s employer, into the relationship. This study will examine the ways in which introducing an employer (third actor) affects learners’ engagement with their education, focusing on their perceptions of freedom, control, agency, value, ownership, and choice within their studies. The study draws from several areas of Higher Education Research – learner engagement theory and its applications to programme design, the nature of the learning relationship between HEIs and mature students, and the relatively new field of work-based learning at HE level – and will utilise student voices from both work-based learning and more traditional HE studies to make progress in designing and implementing work-based learning in ways that are effective and engaging, meeting the needs of students as well as HEIs and employers.

A3

Beaumaris 2 | Session A3 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Research conditions, and nothing else matters? – International researcher’s rationales for choosing host institutions (0168)

Antje Wegner, German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Germany

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The ability to attract skilled researchers in an international competition is an important issue for science policy and comes along with a growing interest to quantify stocks and flows of cross-border researcher mobility and identify mobility drivers. Researcher surveys consistently highlight research conditions, expertise of research personnel and reputational factors as relevant criteria for favouring specific host institutions or countries. However, systematic insights into researchers’ mobility decisions and interrelations between personal and academic reasons, as well as opportunity structures such as job or scholarships offers are limited.

Based on survey data about foreign-educated post-doctoral researchers at German Higher Education Institutions and qualitative interviews, I analyse researchers’ rationales for choosing specific destinations.
By applying a triangulation approach, I (1) identify five distinct motivational profiles, (2) characterise them with regard to their basic orientation and (3) show how they relate to researchers’ perceived career perspectives, previous mobility, and their private living situation.

A4
Caldicot | Session A4 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Study transparency through meta-communication (0141)

Hanne Thingholm, Aarhus University, Center for Teaching Development and Digital Media, Denmark

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper refers to findings from the survey Navigating in Higher Education. The survey tries to gain insight into the relation of teaching and learning and it reveals a ‘foggy’ dimension or discrepancies in the relation of teaching and learning. Based on the survey the concept of study transparency is developed. What I call study transparency is the clarification of this ‘foggy’ dimension, which is regarded as means as well as a goal for teachers and students together. To create study transparency meta-communication or dialog concerning not just what to study but how to study becomes essential. Student-life and the students’ ways of navigating in higher education are strongly affected by their life-world in general and are therefore described as complex, chaotic and vulnerable, an important aspect in relation to the concept of study transparency.

A5
Caerphilly | Session A5 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Predicting Higher Education MOOCs Engagement-Level Odds; A Stochastic Approach (0098)

Saman Zehra Rizvi, Sayeed Ghani, Institute of Business Administration, Pakistan

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) is comparatively a new occurrence in the realm of computer mediated or collaborative learning. Learners’ retention and certification in MOOCs has always been a subject of interest to course developers and providers. This study attempts to predict learners’ retention and certification odds. In this study we used a subset of data from first two years of MOOCs launched by MITx and HarvardX. Under the assumption that future participation in elearning is dependent upon learners’ present learning experience, we proposed a Markov Model for the process with a consideration of fraction of course chapters accessed by registered learners. We categorized the learners based on fraction of chapters accessed and used Chapman–Kolmogorov equation for prediction of learners’ transition from one learning state to another learning state. The study also tries to guesstimate retention rate expected in upcoming semesters based on the trend observed in previous semesters.

A6
Cardiff | Session A6 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Supporting transition to HE: stratifications and strategies in the post 16 sector (0258)

Clare Gartland, Christine Smith, University Campus Suffolk, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper is concerned with the experiences of young people from differently positioned post-16 UK colleges, in an area of low HE participation and high levels of multiple deprivation. The FE and 6th form sectors serve high proportions of young people from disadvantaged areas, yet there is little comparative research exploring how experiences of different institutions and vocational routes prior to entering university impact on progression to and engagement with HE.

It draws from a small-scale, qualitative research project exploring the experience of BTEC students studying at level 3, in FE and 6th form college contexts. In this paper, we discuss the affects of different colleges and vocational routes on students’ identities as HE learners and the importance of institutional habitus in students’ developing HE identities. We consider the challenges presented by an increasingly marketised system and the important role HEIs can play in supporting the progression of young people.
A7

Chepstow I Session A7 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Living with the world rankings: How ‘aspirational’ universities negotiate status anxiety within increasingly competitive environments (0049)

William Locke. UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

This paper draws on the findings of an international research study that endeavors to answer the question: How do universities rankings challenge and affect institutions of higher education in different countries? This is one of the first international comparative studies of the influence of rankings within universities, as distinct from on HE systems and global policy discourses. It explores the ways in which key university personnel negotiate the use of such rankings for internal and external strategic purpose, attempting to avoid their distorting effects while recognising their increasing influence in orchestrating global and domestic reputation. The core of the paper is the UK case study of the University of Reading, but it draws on the other ten national case studies to test a conceptual framework devised to examine the processes of internalisation and institutionalisation of rankings logic within universities and the intensification of these as the rankings industry expands.

A8

Conwy 1 I Session A8 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Black and Minority Ethnic leaders: support networks and strategies for success in higher education (0018)

Kalwant Bhopal. University of Southampton, UK, Hazel Brown. University of Winchester, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper will explore the experiences of Black and minority ethnic (BME) leaders in HEIs (higher education institutions). BME will be defined as individuals who identify as Black, Asian, Chinese or from mixed heritage backgrounds. The paper will draw on a small scale study funded by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education project to examine participants’ career experiences to explore strategies for success into leadership roles. The research is based on a questionnaire survey of 127 respondents and in-depth interviews with 15 BME academics in leadership roles. By drawing on theories of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), our findings suggest that greater change is needed in HEIs for BME academics to reach senior leadership roles. Policy implications from the study suggest the need for the development of supportive structures for those from BME backgrounds as they progress into leadership roles, such as formal mentoring and the introduction of BME networks.

GROUP DISCUSSION A9

A9.1

Conwy 2 I Group Discussion A9 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Learning Gain and Confidence Gain as Metrics for Pedagogical Effectiveness: an empirical assessment within an active learning large-classroom environment (0297)

Fabio Riccardo Arico, University of East Anglia, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper details the most recent results and outputs of a research project aimed at investigating the concept of ‘learning gain’ as a measure of pedagogical effectiveness. In the first part of the paper we describe the principles of an already well-established teaching approach that combines pedagogies such as self-assessment and Peer-Instruction to facilitate the creation of an active learning environment for a large-class undergraduate module in Economics. In the second part of the paper we conceptualise our definitions of learning gain, and we describe how these definitions can be operationalised to develop an evidence-based evaluation of our teaching approach. We argue that a comprehensive appraisal of teaching should assess learning gain in relation to the enhancement of student self-assessment and self-efficacy skills, and we investigate the interplay of these metrics to assess pedagogical effectiveness.
A9.2  Conwy 2  |  Group Discussion A9  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Measuring learning gain (0333)

Camille Kandiko Howson, King's College London, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Learning Gain – the attempt to measure the different ways in which students benefit from their learning experience – is now a core part of the Government’s plans for higher education. A focus on student outcomes is signalled in the new Higher Education White Paper and learning gain is a key strand of inquiry in the Teaching Excellence Framework consultation. New approaches to quantifying learning gain and new metrics are being developed through 13 HEFCE-funded pilot projects across England. Challenges to measuring learning gain, particularly disciplinary difference, are explored. The theoretical underpinnings of the metrics analysed include behavioural, cognitive and affective approaches, as well as progress and outcome measures. Policy implications are discussed, including the use of metrics to drive enhancement, rank excellence and ensure quality and standards.

A10  Denbigh 1  |  Session A10  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

When Choices Become Chances: Extending Boudon’s Positional Theory to Understand University Choices in Contemporary China (0005)

Ye Liu, Bath Spa University, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Boudon’s positional theory is of particular relevance to understanding social inequality during the expansion of higher education in the era of globalization. This paper extends Boudon’s theoretical standpoints to make sense of university choices in contemporary China in relation to social characteristics. The paper will use both quantitative and qualitative methods applied at different levels. The questionnaire survey, involving 2,425 undergraduates, investigates the effects of social origins on different choices. The 15 focus group interviews investigate the strategies that student employ to navigate in their transition to higher education. The findings suggest that geographical inequality is the main stratifier in distributing educational opportunities across China, and that students from less well-off families are not bound by their social and geographical disadvantages. Instead, they are bold in imagining transitions beyond their cultural identity and strategic in making choices in the fields that would enhance their life opportunities.

A12  Raglan  |  Session A12  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Institutional Employability Development Opportunities and Undergraduates’ Enhanced Employability (0022)

Oluymo Pitam, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The purpose of this study is to empirically establish the extent of the relationship between employability development opportunities (EDOs) offered by universities and undergraduates’ employability. Data were collected from 600 final-year university students with the use of an adapted questionnaire on undergraduates’ perceptions of their engagement with EDOs. Results indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between EDOs and undergraduates’ enhanced employability. Also, the study established the relative contribution of each of these EDOs, which is a major contribution to the limited existing body of knowledge on employability. Real-world activities make the highest contribution. Extracurricular activities were found to have no significant relationship with undergraduates’ employability. Universities are expected to evaluate themselves to identify gaps in provision and areas for future action. To gain competitive advantage for graduate jobs, undergraduates should make conscious efforts to look for ways of getting engaged with the EDOs within and outside the school.
B1  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Session B1  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**Negotiating boundaries and borders: transformative pedagogies on a PGCertHE. (0088)**

Rachel Higdon, De Montfort University, UK. Pam Thompson, De Montfort University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

What should we learn on our PGCertHEs? Professional pedagogies are continuously attempting to forge connections between the key ideas and effective practice (Schulman, 2005). A survey of position statements written by new academic staff at the start of a PGCertHE in a post 1992 university, revealed both the diversity of their backgrounds and their disparate expectations of the course. A widespread view was that the programme would be a catch-all primer in teaching and administration. As full-time staff, they hoped the experience would be neither troublesome nor too challenging. A survey of reflective statements written by the same lecturers at the end of the course, revealed a widespread view that the course had been ‘transformative’ and interdisciplinary learning ‘inspirational’. This paper discusses ways in which a PGCertHE programme negotiates boundaries and borders between disciplines as the basis for developing creative and inclusive pedagogies and enhanced academic practice.

B2  Beaumaris 1  |  Session B2  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15


Karen MacFarlane, Yvonne Wayne, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

In 2014-15 the Scottish Government announced in its Programme for Government its intention to take measures to ensure that every child, regardless of socioeconomic background, has an equal chance of participating in higher education. This paper addresses the work and evaluation of an innovative transition programme which sought to embed a culture of the university experience in school pupils by delivering Scottish Advanced Highers in a university environment. This initiative is explored within the context of the publication of the final report of the Commission on Widening Access which has proposed a systemic approach to widening participation in Scotland. Moreover, the report has made a number of recommendations to support the achievement of the key target that by 2030 20% of entrants to higher education must come from the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland.

B3  Beaumaris 2  |  Session B3  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**What makes an excellent lecturer? Academics’ perspectives on the discourse of ‘teaching excellence’ in higher education (0199)**

Margaret Wood, York St John University, UK. Feng Su, Liverpool Hope University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

In the context of the forthcoming Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), we examine academics’ perspectives on the discourse of ‘teaching excellence’ based on an empirical study with 20 participants from post-1992 universities. The paper reports the findings on academics’ general view on the term and concept of ‘teaching excellence’; examples of ‘teaching excellence’; the distinction between ‘good’, ‘good enough’ and ‘excellent teaching’; and the measurability of ‘teaching excellence’. Drawing on the research findings, we argue for a more expansive and considered conceptualization of ‘teaching excellence’. In developing this more expansive view, we assert the importance of a cosmopolitan outlook on teaching excellence.

B4  Caldicot  |  Session B4  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**Student experiences of lecturer research in different higher education settings (0142)**

Cathy Schofield, Truro College, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The teaching-research nexus has been an important focus for researchers for decades, assuming research to be essential for quality HE teaching. What has not been considered to a lesser degree are what student's
perceptions are of the research activity of their lecturers and what are the experiences of those who undertake HE courses at institutions that are not generally research-active. This study examined HE students’ awareness, experiences and perceptions of their lecturers’ research-activity through focus groups of university and further education college HE students. The findings indicate that institutional research-activity does not necessarily dictate the levels of awareness. Not all students who experienced research welcomed its intrusion on their studies and not all students believe it is essential for their lecturers to be research-active as long as they are aware of the current standing of their discipline.

**B5**

**Caerphilly | Session B5 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

**Freeing or controlling pedagogies? A rhizomatic view of theory underpinning teaching with technology (0116)**

Louise Drumm, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

This paper will present findings from a qualitative doctoral research project which asked the question “what role does theory play in university teaching with digital technologies?”. The research used rhizome theory to view lecturers and their use of digital technologies in order to explore untheorised attitudes and practices. Findings indicate a number of theories in play, including folk pedagogies, theories of utility and technology, and a limited use of educational theory. This paper will address whether technology has become a site of control or freedom for university teaching and learning. Recommendations for further research in this area will be made as well as a discussion of implications for those teaching and supporting teaching in higher education.

**B6**

**Cardiff | Session B6 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

**Understanding unequal pathways towards higher education in a developing context: focusing on access and learning (0307)**

Sonia Ilie, Pauline Rose, University of Cambridge, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Recent global trends in higher education (HE) access suggest rapid growth but enduring inequalities, which may be traced back to earlier levels of school access and learning. This paper explores the relationship between childhood conditions and young people’s subsequent learning, aiming to understand what enables children to progress through educational systems, and into HE. We analyse data from the Young Lives longitudinal study, revealing wide variability in HE access between the four country-cohorts, and also relationships between childhood learning and HE access. Our preliminary results indicate that learning in early-adolescence is correlated to HE access over and above childhood learning in Anhola Pradesh, while late-adolescence appears to be the critical transition for the Ethiopia, Peru and Vietnam cohorts. We discuss implications of these and other findings for policy initiatives aimed at narrowing global HE access inequalities, and also for data requirements from a perspective of monitoring progress towards this goal.

**B7**

**Chepstow | Session B7 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

**Paths to the Canadian Deanship: A Study of Canadian Universities’ Appointment Announcements (0071)**

Eric Lavigne, University of Toronto, Canada

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

Who are the Canadian deans? Where are they from? And how often are they reappointed? This paper presents the results of a content analysis of Canadian deans’ appointment announcements. By focusing on gender, race, previous roles, movement across positions, institutions, provinces, and countries, this study tells us who the Canadian deans are and where they are from. It finds that Canadian deans come from outside the institution as often as inside, and that the paths to the deanship are many and run parallel, though the great majority of them involve a rise through the academic ranks. Of particular interest, it finds that women, while showing equal representations among newly hired deans, are underrepresented among reappointed deans. Implications for research and policy are explored.
GROUP DISCUSSION B8

B8.1 Conwy 1 | Group Discussion B8 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15

Freedom and control: the implications of student demand-driven university funding in Australia for student choice: a case study of Australian social professions. (0118)

Trudi Cooper, Edith Cowan University, Australia

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

In Australia, the Bradley Report recommended the centrally planned funding model be replaced by a student demand-driven funding model, whereby the funding provided to universities followed student course preferences, and caps on the numbers of subsidised places available to domestic students were removed. A rationale for this change was that universities would become more responsive to student demand and student choice would increase. A case study of availability of niche social professions shows that these initial expectations were simplistic. The case study illustrates that offerings of specialist degrees in social professions have declined, and this has reduced the choice available to students. This presentation discusses how different aspects of policy, including both demand-driven funding and institutional response to policy have contributed to the decline in students’ choice, even whilst the rhetoric pronounces that the policy will increase choice. The conclusion outlines some possible responses to this.

B8.2 Conwy 1 | Group Discussion B8 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15

Are University Degrees Value for Money? Business School Students’ Earnings Expectations (0266)

Martina Benesova, John Anchor, University of Huddersfield, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper reports on the findings of a study comparing the earnings expectations of first year and final year students in business studies in two countries – England and the Czech Republic - between 2011 and 2014. Students’ expectations were investigated under two scenarios – immediately after graduation and 10 years later. No change in expectations was observed following the trebling of tuition fees in England in 2012. Several personal characteristics (including gender, age, ethnicity and socio-economic background) explain some of the variance in earnings expectations, although the results were more significant for the Czech sample. We also found that students in England who undertook a sandwich work placement and those who expected to obtain first class honours degrees had higher salary expectations. On the other hand, planned postgraduate studies and casual work experience did not have an effect on students’ expectations in England.

GROUP DISCUSSION B9

B9.1 Conwy 2 | Group Discussion B9 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15

‘I want something better for my children’. A study of the ‘experimental capital’ of First generation mature students in HE (0050)

Julia Hope, University of Kent, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper presents the transition experiences of mature first generation students at an English Higher Education Institution. The study captures how these students moved into and took up their place at university and engaged in study. It focuses on how this mature (aged over 25) cohort drew on their life-journey and work experiences. Explored is how attending university impacted the students and their families. Suggested is that these students brought to HE, a variety of capitals especially what has been termed by Yoss, (2006) as ‘experiential capital’. Though examination of the origins of these capitals this paper proposes that HEIs need focus on the range of capitals that mature students bring to university and how these are not deficit but are a source of resilience.
B9.2  Conwy 2  |  Group Discussion B9  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

Transforming lives on the foundation degree and beyond: exploring the complexities of post-graduate professional and career decisions. (0083)

Helen Bovill, Neil Harrison, University of the West of England, UK. Vicki Bennett, Hilary Smith, Bath Spa University, UK; Liz McKenzie, Plymouth University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper will report findings from data collected across three teaching-focused universities in the southwest of England where FD programmes in ‘educational support’ or similar have been delivered. Alumni students have provided their perspectives on their post-graduate professional and career decisions. The majority of participants are working-class mature female learners who may have experienced a fractured relationship to education prior to university study.

The paper draws upon data from the three universities and from two phases of the research: questionnaires and preliminary findings from semi-structured interviews. A potential theoretical framework will be explored to help understand why students on similar programmes experience different professional and career progression upon graduation. Particularly, various forms of reflexive responses will be considered to understand social mobility processes associated to: economic gain; to the pursuit of social ideals; and to the pursuit of social bonds, alongside a potentially fractured mobility process associated with heightened anxiety.

B10  Denbigh 1  |  Session B10  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

Constructing the Higher Education Student in Europe (0014)

Rachel Brooks, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

There are currently over 35 million students within Europe and yet, to date, we have no clear understanding of the extent to which understandings of ‘the student’ are shared. Thus, a central aim of this paper is to investigate how the contemporary higher education student is conceptualised and the extent to which this differs both within nation-states and across them. This is significant in terms of assumptions that are made about common understandings of ‘the student’ across Europe – underpinning, for example, initiatives to increase cross-border educational mobility and the wider development of a European Higher Education Area. It is also significant in relation to exploring the extent to which understandings are shared within a single nation and, particularly, the degree to which there is congruence between the ways in which students are conceptualised within policy texts and by policymakers, and the understandings of other key social actors.

B11  Denbigh 2  |  Session B11  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

Defining student engagement in practice: individual understandings and motivations (0036)

Abbi Flint, Luke Millard, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This presentation explores qualitative research into staff perceptions of student engagement in practice, at a UK post-1992 university. Student engagement is a high profile issue in both pedagogic and political debate. However, despite increased discourse on this topic, little attention has been paid to the way it is conceptualised at the individual level, and how that may influence practice and engagement with institutional student engagement initiatives. This research used concept-map mediated interviews with teaching academics to gain a nuanced understanding of how student engagement is understood and practiced. During the presentation the authors will share key findings, compare individual understandings with models from the literature, and explore links between the different ways of understanding student engagement and individual pedagogic and professional decision making processes.
B12  
Raglan | Session B12 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15  
**Developing Employability Skills: A Dragons’ Den for Music Students (0033)**  
Carola Boehm. Manchester Metropolitan University, UK  
Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

This case study presents insights into the development and running of a 30 credit (15 ECTS) unit/module that focuses on employability using a Dragon’s Den model. A focus of this presentation is on the reconceptualization of the concept ‘employability’, which underpins the design of this unit. Intending to provide students with skills and knowledges necessary towards planning for and managing vocational, professional and academic aims and outcomes towards future employability, it allows students to critically analyse their own aspirations and develop strategies towards becoming successful professionals within the creative and cultural industries. The unit is a core mandatory unit for all Single Honours Music students, including Popular Music, Music and Creative Music Production. This case study looks at the design, student feedback and the impact it has had to students.

C1  
Beaumaris Lounge | Session C1 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45  
**Freedom and control in teaching decisions within global higher education (0131)**  
Karin Crawford, Lincoln University, UK, Angela Brew, Macquarie University, Australia. David Boud, Deakin University, Australia. Lisa Lucas, Bristol University, UK.  
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper draws attention to the paradoxes of planning and designing teaching where there is an espoused strategic intent that is not manifest in the daily practices of university teachers. It explores how teachers balance the freedom they have within the controls that strategic conditions place on them.

Semi-structured interviews with 27 mid-career academics in England and Australia provide evidence of contradictions between stated strategy and ambitions of institutions and how teaching allocation, planning and delivery is experienced by those who undertake it. This paper argues that this lack of overt alignment between strategic intent and teaching practice, can cause problems for academics. The argument is developed through three areas where teaching decisions are made: individual teacher level; departmental, programme or school level; and strategic, institutional level. As English institutions grapple with the implications of the TEF, this paper provides a timely analysis of teaching decision-making.

**SYMPOSIUM C2**

Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15  
**Thinking critically about time in higher education: equity, conflict and contradictions**  
Discussant: J Case, University of Cape Town, South Africa  
Chair: J Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

**Symposium overview**

Until recently there has been little critical work on temporality in higher education yet an understanding of differing temporalities is arguably essential to understanding how higher education policy is formed, institutional ways of functioning, which students are able to access and succeed in higher education, and the life worlds of both staff and students.

This symposium, comprising academics from the UK, Australia and Finland, sets out to bring together empirical and theoretical work on temporality to illustrate how valuable this can be. The first paper introduces some key theoretical ideas including the multi-dimensionality of time, and critiques a view of the future as empty. The next three papers argue that temporal approaches are critical for theorising equity in HE; paper two examines how experiences of time, as well as dominant discourses about ‘time management’, significantly impact on the experiences, participation and academic achievement of students in higher education; paper three considers adult learners’ imagined futures and possible selves, by presenting narrative interviews with refugees, ex-
offenders, and care leavers, all of who have complex pasts and protracted trajectories into and through HE, and paper four introduces the spatial to the theorisation of the temporal, whilst also suggesting that sociological thinking is necessary in using concept of the ‘possible self’ to avoid individualising discourses of deficit. The final paper considers the increasing temporal complexity of academic work and, in drawing attention to temporal conflicts, aims to promote a better understanding of what it is to be an academic at the accelerated academy. Overall the symposium argues the case for taking time seriously.

**C2.1**
Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
---
**Temporal realities in higher education: different conceptualisations of the future (0061)**
---
*Sue Clegg, Leeds Beckett University, UK*
---
*Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)*
---

The paper will argue that dominant conceptualisations of temporality in higher education are flawed and based on an imaginary projection of time in the ‘present future’ as empty and open. The neo-liberal policy discourses of employability and social mobility depend on seeing futures as equally open for everyone ignoring the structuring realities of inequality which exist into the future as well as the past. Drawing on the work of Margaret Archer the paper suggests that the rationality of autonomous reflexivity which postulates action based on a calculable future has become less reliable with the intensification of change at the cultural and structural level resulting in greater unpredictability at the personal level. I will argue, however, contra Archer that meta-reflexivity as the dominant mode under conditions of accelerated morphogenesis will benefit students who have more economic resources and cultural capital with which to navigate and negotiate in conditions of uncertainty.

**C2.2**
Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
---
**The temporal orientations of adult learners: past, present and future possible selves (0062)**
---
*Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK*
---
*Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)*
---

The temporal orientation of UK policy on access to and success in higher education is towards the future. It assumes a reflective student, usually young, able to imagine both an undergraduate and then a postgraduate ‘possible self’, and who can plan and implement requisite strategies to attain it. Underlying such policies, however, is the assumption that all students are oriented towards the future, that they can imagine what this future might look like and that progression in to the future is linear. This paper problematizes such assumptions by presenting narrative interviews with adult learners, including refugees, ex-offenders, and care leavers, all of who have complex pasts and protracted trajectories into and through HE, to describe their different temporalities, how they think about their futures, the strategies they are adopting, or not, in order to attain their imagined futures, as well as the reflexive work involved in working to ‘stay put’.

**C2.3**
Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
---
**It’s About Time: working towards better understandings of unequal temporal resources and the impact of time for students in higher education (0073)**
---
*Penny Jane Burke, Anna Bennett, Georgina Ramsay, University of Newcastle, Australia, Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK, Sue Clegg, Leeds Beckett University, UK*
---
*Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)*
---

Higher education experiences are increasingly intensified by competing imperatives of study, work, and personal commitments. However, despite significant change, the assumption persists that time is a neutral and linear framework in which all students are equally positioned. This paper will examine how experiences of ‘time’, as well as dominant discourses about ‘time management’, significantly impact on the experiences, participation and academic achievement of students in higher education, often exacerbating inequalities. The paper will draw on qualitative data from a comparative research project, including in-depth interviews with and time journals produced by students from undergraduate Nursing, Law and Engineering programs at one Australian and one English regional university. The research reveals how temporalities shape inequalities
in higher educational participation, as pedagogical and institutional structures and practices of time are entangled in, and often reinforce, unequal social relations.

**C2.4**  
Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

*Thinking about the future: Potential sociologies of Higher Educations students’ possible selves (0074)*

Holly Henderson, University of Birmingham, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This conceptual paper argues for the importance of complex and non-linear understandings of student futures that take into account structural educational inequalities. The paper begins by establishing the role of imagined futures and embedded pasts in present Higher Education student experiences, using the discourse of employability as an example. It then introduces the possible selves concept (Markus and Nurius, 1986) as an initial way of interrogating naturalised understandings of student temporalities. The paper suggests that sociological thinking is necessary to using the possible selves concept in a way that avoids individualising discourses of deficit. I offer two potential theorisations, using Butler’s (1997) writing on performative subjectivities to explore narrative constructions of future selves, and Massey’s (2012) power geometries to highlight the importance of the spatial in understanding the temporal. Overall, the paper highlights the value of re-thinking the temporal conditions of Higher Education that we might otherwise take for granted.

**C2.5**  
Beaumaris 1 | Group Discussion C2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

*Navigating temporal dilemmas in academic work (0075)*

Olli-Helena Ylijoki, University of Tampere, Finland

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Based on the theory of social acceleration, the paper argues that the timeframe, timing, tempo and temporality of academic work are changing, leading to the strengthening of externally imposed, fast, fragmented and short-term time, which is called scheduled time. The paper investigates what temporal conflicts the dominance of scheduled time creates, and how academics navigate these conflicts in their daily work. Grounded in focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with Finnish academics in social sciences, four distinct time perspectives are discerned: body time, timeless time, career time and family time. Each of these involves specific conflicts with scheduled time, which produce paradoxes and unintended effects. By casting light on increasing temporal complexity of academic work, the paper aims to promote a better understanding of what it is to be an academic at the accelerated academy.

**C3**  
Beaumaris 2 | Session C3 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

*Now you see me, now you don’t: Gendered regimes of care in academia (0226)*

Marie-Pierre Moreau, University of Roehampton, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Once the preserve of the White, middle-class, male and ‘unencumbered’ scholar; ‘Western’ academia has considerably diversified over the past fifty years (Maher & Terreault, 2007). Yet academic excellence continues to be associated with the ‘bachelor boy’ (Hilton-Smith, 2012) as Cartesian dualisms still permeate academic cultures and are reactualised through gendered discourses of intensive parenting and of the managerial university (Leathwood & Read, 2009).

This paper draws on three separate but related empirical studies about the experiences of student and staff carers in English Higher Education. Using the concepts of ‘space invader’ (Massey, 1996) and of (gendered) ‘care regime’, it attempts to conceptualise the relationship between care(s) and academia, and to provide an insight into the lives of carers, most of which are women, with a focus on their invisibilisation, their marginalisation and the (im)possibility of more inclusive academic spaces.
C4
Caldicot | Session C4 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

"I feel like I've got a finger in the University, whereas everybody else has got their whole body in it": Lone parents’ experiences of Higher Education (0177)

Lucy Spowart, Mel Joyner, Reema Muneer, Plymouth University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The specific needs of students with parental responsibilities have been largely ignored by widening participation agendas, despite research evidence suggesting that this group is increasing in number (Hinton-Smith, 2012; Moreau, 2012). One of the key challenges is that data classifying students as parents is not collected on application or enrolment, and as a consequence this group remains largely invisible. In this paper, we report on a mixed-method study exploring the experiences of single parents in a post-1992 university. Single parents’ motivation for HE study, along with issues relating to transition, study and support are examined through preliminary findings from a focus group and an online questionnaire. We make recommendations about ways in which institutions can support single parents, for instance, through having dedicated spaces for parents on campus, providing timetables in advance and ensuring the needs of student parents are represented by Student Unions.

C5
Caerphilly | Session C5 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

Challenging methods for Literacy research: reflections from a project on academics’ writing (0163)

Ibrar Bhatt, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

Research into the ‘Digital University’ necessitates decidedly digital methodologies. However, much of the recent discussion surrounding digital methods in education, including Higher Education, places more emphasis on qualitative approaches and the affordances of learning analytics (e.g., Sclater et al., 2016). There therefore remains a need to theorise and problematise the use and usability of new and digital methods to augment qualitative and ethnographic approaches to research. I argue that this is particularly pertinent for research on writing activities. In this paper I discuss how my research team approached the study of the writing and knowledge producing work of academics. I reflect upon how we conducted in situ observations of the writing practices of our participants as part of a broader ethnographic and multi-method study. I argue that our theoretical and methodological ideas have the potential to open up new possibilities and opportunities for writing research in the contemporary university environment.

C6
Cardiff | Session C6 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

How fish out of water finally steps into the kitchen: Strategies to foster a sense of belonging at university drawn from a narrative analysis of student stories. (0271)

Neil Cooper, David Nevard, University of East Anglia, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper reports the findings of a project which identifies specific strategies which staff and students may enact to facilitate and nurture belonging at university. Thirty-one second year psychology students were recruited and provided accounts of belonging, following the instruction to: write a story about a single notable personal experience at University which has generated a feeling of belonging. Participants included both students who lived on and off campus, international students and those with backgrounds related to widening participation. Narrative analysis is on-going but has identified targeted strategies derived from student’s experiences. The stories highlight two themes relating to ‘courage’ and ‘confidence’ in facilitating interactions which generate feelings of belonging. The accounts focus on everyday activities which are positioned as both problematic and transformational. Strategies which can foster belongingness relate to empowering students to engineer their own positive relationships, and the timing of interventions by those working with students.
As numbers of international students have increased in the UK, policies have been developed to formalise state responses. While policies have developed and changed over the last twenty years, the theme of quality has been continuous across New Labour and Coalition administrations. This paper presents data from a critical qualitative textual analysis, adopting a discourse theory approach informed by Bacchi’s ‘what is the problem represented to be’ framework. I argue that policies on international students have constructed a marketised concept of quality, premised on the equivalence between student experience/satisfaction and educational quality. International students are seen to enhance quality by their presence as nationally and culturally diverse, to promote reputation by word of mouth and to evaluate quality as consumers. International students are represented as Other, consumers and arbiters of quality. Through critical research of this nature, alternative constructions can be generated in resistance to dominant subject representations.

This talk will focus on international master's students’ experiences of freedom and control within the supervisory relationship during their dissertation journeys. Drawing on a multiple case study of students’ and supervisors’ experiences of master's dissertation supervision (Harwood & Petric, forthcoming), we focus on two contrasting cases of students in two different departments at a UK university. Laura, a humanities student, is working on a dissertation consisting of a film project and an accompanying text, on a topic of her own choice. In contrast, Victoria, a social sciences student, receives an off-the-shelf project from her supervisor, together with research questions and instruments, which she is required to follow. We discuss the two students’ changing experiences of freedom and control throughout their dissertation journeys and the ways in which they intersect with disciplinary and departmental frameworks. We conclude by addressing the implications of the findings for supervision of master’s dissertations.

This paper considers how a study visit to Indian higher education institutions and schools provoked UK university students to perceive the ‘Other’ differently and subsequently reappraise the ‘Self’. Using ethnography, and postcolonial theory, the students’ reflections were analysed to consider their intercultural learning, key to which were critical moments I call the ‘Colonial Signature’.

The Colonial Signature is the signifier of language, symbols, products or other images that are significant to us as a consequence of knowledge, experience and values. The signatures provided a two-way connection for the students between India and ‘home’ and acted as a conduit, or inhibitor, to deepening learning.

Diverse narratives of intercultural learning emerged that highlighted how the experiences that formed the Signatures became opportunities for reflexive reconsiderations of Self and Other. The students were challenged to problematise their worldviews and, where agency emerged, to change aspects of their lives in varied and rich ways.
SYMPOSIUM C11
Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

A cross-institutional perspective on merits and challenges of learning gains for Teaching Excellence Framework

Discussant: B Rintles, The Open University, UK
Chair: C Kandiko-Howson, King’s Learning Institute, King’s College, London

Symposium rationale

In the UK, the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) has increased interest in appropriate and valid measurement approaches of learning gains in Higher Education. Learning gains are defined as growth or change in knowledge, skills, and abilities of learners over time. While the UK government and other organisations like HEFCE expect tremendous opportunities for learning gains to “objectively” measure the value added of higher education across institutions, empirical evidence of the robustness, reliability, and validity of learning gains literature outside the UK is mixed. At SRHE, we will discuss the affordances, lived experiences, and limitations of using different measurements, conceptualisations, and methodologies of learning gains. We aim to set an evidence-based agenda of how HEIs can effectively start to measure and implement notions of learning gains, while at the same time discussing potential limitations and caveats.

In the first paper, Hughes provides a theoretical and critical perspective on the notion of learning gains, in particular by emphasising that measuring private learning gains and public value added might be complex. Using qualitative interview techniques, the LEGACY project aims to explore the variability of definitions of public and private good and how to measure these. In the second paper by Vermut et al., interviews with 30 students at three Russell Group universities indicates substantial disciplinary differences in subject knowledge and skills growth. At the same time, considerable variability in students’ ability to reflect on their learning is found, highlighting potential measurement issues. In the third paper, Behie compares two methodological quantitative approaches to measure learning gains over time: 1) existing UCAS tariff points vs. received class of degree; 2) self-reported Futuretrack surveys. Most of 7500+ students obtained positive learning gains relative to their tariff points, whereas data on self-assessment skills amongst 4800 students indicated limited growth in skills such as written communication and numeracy skills. In the fourth paper, Rogaten et al. presents a three-level linear growth model estimated on 21K+ students at OU that shows module specific factors (e.g., assessment, learning design) significantly influencing the relative learning gains. Finally, Jones et al. provide three studies to measure employability in learning gains, whereby the first study will identify whether knowledge of students’ strengths can enhance their career readiness and self-efficacy, the second assesses the efficacy of an existing measure in student perception of learning gain; and third if and how international experiences enhance employability.

C11.1

Learning Gain for Private or Public Benefit? Reviewing University Responses (0208)

Christina Hughes, University of Warwick, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Learning Gain is currently constructed in much research and national policy as a private good that demonstrates the value added of student investment in their education. Is learning gain, therefore, an area of developing policy interest that can only be drawn on to further support the financialisation of higher education outcomes? This paper takes the current programme of research into learning gain being undertaken by a consortium of Russell Group universities (LEGACY) to explore how those with institutional level responsibilities for learning and teaching consider how learning gain might support both private and public good arguments. The analysis explores the variability of definitions of public and private good as well as how these are, or might be, measured. Using learning gain as a case study, the paper offers some tentative answers as to how the public and private good of university education may be articulated in the present context.
C11.2  Denbigh 2  |  Symposium C11  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

**Multilevel Modelling of Learning Gains: The Impact of Module Particulars on Students’ Learning in Higher Education. (0215)**

**Jekaterina Rogaten**, Bart Riemies, Denise Whitelock, Simon Cross, Allison Littlejohn, The Open University UK. Rhona Sharpe, Ian Scott, Oxford Brooks University, UK; Simon Lygo-Baker, Steven Warburton, Ian Kinchin, University of Surrey, UK

**Research Domain:** Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

In the UK, the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) has increased interest in appropriate and valid measurement approaches of learning gains in Higher Education. Usually learning gains are measured using pre-post testing, but this study examines whether academic performance can be effectively used as proxy to estimate students’ learning progress. Academic performance of 21,192 online learners from two major faculties was retrieved from university database. A three-level growth-curve model was estimated and results showed that 16% to 46% of variance in students’ initial academic performance, and 51% to 77% of variance in their subsequent learning gains was due to them studying at a particular module. In addition, the results illustrate that students who studied in modules with initial high student achievements exhibited lower learning gains than students learning in modules with low initial student achievements. The importance of assessment and learning design for learning gains are outlined.

C11.3  Denbigh 2  |  Symposium C11  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

**Measuring Learning Gain (0221)**

**Heike Behle**, University of Warwick, UK

**Research Domain:** Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper discusses two ways to measure the intellectual development or ‘learning gain’ of undergraduate students in higher education. The first method uses students’ credentials, comparing their UCAS tariff points with their received class of degree. The second method contrasts the self-measured variables of written communication, spoken communication, numeracy skills, computer literacy and self-confidence from the application stage with the same variables measured during their last year in higher education. The paper outlines the advantages and disadvantages of both methods and evaluates their feasible use for the TEF. The paper draws on six variables from Futuretrack data to operationalise the measurement of learning gain: one variable compares students’ credentials; five variables measure the changes in students’ self-assessment of their written communication, spoken communication, numeracy skills, computer literacy and self-confidence. Initial results show that both methods measure different dimensions of learning gain.

C11.4  Denbigh 2  |  Symposium C11  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

**Defining learning gain in higher education – exploring the student perspective (0230)**

**Jan Vermunt, Anna Vignoles, Sonia Ilie**, University of Cambridge, UK

**Research Domain:** Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Preliminary defined as the progress students make in developing their abilities, skills, attitudes and competencies, learning gain remains a contested concept in the field of higher education. In this paper we introduce a conceptual framework setting out the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of learning gain and present an empirical analysis of university students’ perspectives on what they expected to learn in higher education. Given the potential emphasis on students’ views as part of the proposed Teaching Excellence Framework, it is important to understand students’ own views and expectations of their learning gain. We report preliminary results from semi-structured interviews with around 30 undergraduate and postgraduate students in three Russell Group universities. We find that students view their learning, in terms of subject knowledge and abilities and skills, as inextricably linked and equally valuable. We discuss the implications of students’ views in relation to the proposed Teaching Excellence Framework.
C11.5 Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Measuring Employability in Learning Gain (0239)

Eluned Jones, University of Birmingham, UK, Nalayini Thambar, University of Nottingham, UK, Adrian Wilson, Heike Behle, University of Warwick, UK. Toni Wright, Newman University, UK.

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

For the majority of students, the most important outcome of higher education is finding employment, as recognised by the government’s White paper (BIS, 2016). Measuring Learning Gain, in this respect, needs to include a way to measure employability defined as the ability to gain, sustain and progress in employment. This paper reports findings based on three different projects dealing with different aspects of students’ increase in employability. The first project will identify if and how the knowledge of students’ strengths can enhance their career readiness and self-efficacy, the second project assesses the efficacy of an existing measure in student perception of learning gain; and a third project identifies if and how international experiences enhance employability. Findings will be used to augment existing measures of teaching excellence.

C12 Raglan | Session C12 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

Higher Fees, Higher Debts: Greater Expectations of Graduate Futures? (0096)

Katy Vigurs, Staffordshire University, UK. Steven Jones, Diane Harris, University of Manchester, UK.

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

This study investigates how the most recent changes to student finance in England have affected the views and approaches of graduating students. Findings suggest that the graduates of 2015 were more worried about their futures than those graduating in 2014. Anxiety was experienced in relation to postgraduate study, the graduate labour market, and how their future finances might be affected by having larger debts. This was compounded by a lack of awareness of how the new loan repayment terms could impact upon their future lives. Many students were making a ‘best guess’ as to the potential impact of the debt repayment on their futures, and this was directly influencing the graduate choices they saw as available to them. Findings suggest that students from widening participation backgrounds may see fewer graduate opportunities and make less well-informed choices about their futures. Thus creating a potential site for further inequity in higher education.

GROUP DISCUSSION D1

D1.1 Beaumaris Lounge | Group Discussion D1 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

An investigation into the dialectic of Academic Teaching Identity: Some preliminary findings (0144)

Agi Ryder, Gillian Lazar, Paul Gibbs, Carole Davis, Middlesex University, UK.

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The development of teaching excellence among lecturers in higher education goes beyond acquiring technical skills; it extends to the formation of lecturers’ identity. This presentation reports on a project which explores the development of this identity in order to improve the co-production of learning between lecturers and their students. This project investigates the development of the academic identity of the participants on the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education. The study takes a phenomenological and temporal auto-biographical approach. Those on the programme are simultaneously students and teachers, which offers a unique insight into this issue. The preliminary findings indicate that the development of an academic identity is perceived as a nuanced and fluid process of construction, which is variable and dependent on context. A theoretical framework is proposed to further our understanding of on the various strands of that influence the development of academic identity.
**D1.2** Beaumaris Lounge | Group Discussion D1 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

**Higher education research as an accidental career: the pathfinder and pathshaper generations (0173)**

Bruce Macfarlane, Damon Burg, University of Southampton, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper reports on the preliminary findings of research into the development of higher education (HE) as a research field. While the core themes of HE research have been identified through quantitative approaches focused on research and publication patterns (e.g., Calma and Davies, 2015; Tight, 2003; Horta and Jung, 2014), there has been little fine-grained, qualitative analysis based on autobiographical accounts. Drawing on an approach developed by Gumport (2002) this study provides an inter-generational analysis to HE studies in the UK through 24 interviews and biographical profiles with ‘pathfinders’, ‘pathshapers’ and ‘pathtakers’. Preliminary findings focus on a smaller sample of pathfinders and pathshapers, who began their academic careers with a range of disciplinary affiliations in the 1960s and 70s. Preliminary themes emerging from analysis include HE research as an ‘accidental’ career path and the continuing importance of the discipline as a means of renewing knowledge creation in HE studies.

**D3** Beaumaris 2 | Session D3 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

**Hidden freedom for lecturers in Higher Education sector margins: finding autonomy and working on ways to keep it (0227)**

Linda McGhie, University of Cumbria, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This qualitative study investigates an aspect of autonomy experienced by Higher Education (HE) lecturers in College Based Higher Education [CBHE], a sector that has grown as part of the Widening Participation [WP] agenda and now accounts for 8-10% of HE in the UK. The dominant Further Education (FE) culture of these settings, known for their performativity and managerial approach, provides a surprising pocket of pedagogical freedom to those teaching HE. The FE managers have sparse knowledge of HE and a lack of time to attend to it, allowing individuals autonomy in their lesson content and teaching style. This autonomy is highly valued and in order to keep it, these lecturers perpetuate the mystery of what they do. This paper explores their experiences with managers and the elements of freedom in their role, offering an insight into how this affects their teaching and consequently the student experience.

**D4** Caldicot | Session D4 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

**Students experience of an interdisciplinary science study programme: negotiations of belonging (0205)**

Lene Møller Madsen, Lars Ulriksen, University of Copenhagen, Department of Science Education, Denmark

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This qualitative study explores how the careers of academic women are constructed and sustained under condition of New Public Management (NPM), in two country contexts namely in Finland and in the UK. While there is an extensive literature exploring the exclusion and inclusion of women from academia, this paper focuses on the careers of academic women. Drawing on 25 semi-structured interviews conducted with academic women working in two business schools and utilizing practice theory this research explores how academic practices, such as teaching and research, have been reconstructed by NPM, and how this reconstruction has effect on the careers of academic women.
D5

Caerphilly | Session D5 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

The Code Spaces of Higher Education (0219)

Sian Bayne, Louise Connelly, Nicola Osborne, University of Edinburgh, UK

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

This paper will report on the early findings of a research project looking at how notions of ‘campus’ are being shifted by code, data and algorithm. Focusing on data from the social media app Yik Yak, the research aims to better understand how – in the algorithmic cultures and computational modes of the contemporary academy – software is shifting the spatialities by which ‘university’ and ‘campus’ are performed. Yik Yak is a geosocial app extensively used across universities in the US and the UK. It allows users located within close proximity to each other to post short, anonymous text or image-based message threads. Drawing on computational and ethnographic data, the research interrogates the app as a manifestation of the encoded campus, with implications for the ways in which we think about the containment and control of campus space, and the ‘sedentarism’ and territorialism driving the activities of the academy.

D6

Cardiff | Session D6 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Bringing the BTEC into the inclusivity agenda (0291)

Lavinia Mitton, Alexander Hersby, University of Kent, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

In this paper we argue that narrowing attainment gaps at degree level necessitates understanding vocational qualifications. Not enough is known of how individual entrants with vocational qualifications may have a cluster of characteristics associated with low academic attainment, which may lead to added disadvantage. This paper focuses on the disparities in students’ confidence in their academic capabilities by qualification and ethnicity. Our evidence base is administrative records and survey data (N=3858) collected from ‘Stonecrest University’, an anonymised English university. Results indicate that in the pursuit of their inclusivity agendas other universities should also monitor the academic attainment of students with vocational qualifications.

D8

Conwy 1 | Session D8 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Decision-logics in the pre-merger phase of an attempted higher education merger (0055)

Mats Persson, Jan Moren, Østfold University College, Norway

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper focuses on the pre-merger phase of an attempted merger between three Norwegian university colleges. A total of 29 interviews constitute the empirical data used in the analysis. Using neo-institutional decision theory two very different perceptions of the pre-merger phase are described and explained. We found that the decision-logic used by those who perceived the pre-merger phase as a process of finding the best way to organize a merged university college was based on action rationality. These were the same who supported the idea of merger in order to become a university. The decision-logic used by those who perceived the pre-merger phase as a way of finding out whether to merge or not was based on decision rationality. These were the same who opposed the idea of merger in order to become a university.

D9

Conwy 2 | Session D9 | Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Empirical evidence on the impact of tuition fees on students’ satisfaction, value, service quality and recommendation (0041)

Suha Omar, De Montfort University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

More than ever before, HEIs are under pressure to compete for students and provide quality educational experiences and value for money as a result of government funding cuts in HE and the increase in student tuition fees. Universities in England can now charge up to £9000 per year for their courses. The present
paper is a first attempt to examine the impact of the increase in tuition fees on students’ evaluations of value, service quality, satisfaction and recommendation. To this end, quantitative research using a sample of 365 students at one UK University was undertaken. The study observed statistically significant differences in evaluations of overall value perceptions and the component of exchange value. The increase in tuition fees did not impact students’ perceptions of service quality and satisfaction. Finally, the paper highlights other important findings and discusses some implications for HEIs.

**Internationalisation of higher education: a north-south dialogue on internationalisation at home (0280)**

Sue Robson, Newcastle University, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Internationalization of Higher Education (IOHE) is a key contemporary debate and a key strategic priority at national and institutional levels in many countries. The transformative trends for IOHE brought about by the economic recession, together with the influence of globalisation and technologization, have created heightened competition and rapid growth in the range and complexity of international initiatives.

Although IOHE is understood and enacted differently in particular disciplines, institutions and cultural contexts, the shift in emphasis towards IOHE as a form of revenue generation, prestige and global rankings is a common concern. A major challenge exists to maintain the positive benefits of internationalization in this competitive environment, to put political and economic rationales in context by highlighting the academic, social and cultural benefits of IOHE. This paper explores the contribution of a UK-Brazil research network on ‘Internationalisation at Home’ (HAI) to the construction of more equitable and values-based approaches to IOHE.

**Super Higher Education: The role of academics in comic books, 1938-2015. (0277)**

Pauline Reynolds, University of Redlands, USA. Sara Durazo-DeMoss, California State University - San Bernardino, USA

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Since the 1930’s comic books have depicted academics and higher education but little work examines their powerful and long-lasting narratives. This qualitative study analyses over 150 comic books featuring academics revealing representations of limited roles and the importance of academics’ work to beloved superheroes. Although portrayals are mainly affirming of scholarly work, the few representations of women and minority academics are shrouded by racist and sexist messaging. As popular culture influences expectations and behavior, these portrayals suggest problematic depictions for an inclusive higher education.

**Developing professional identity in biomedical science: Face-to-face marking of an assignment as a “space of influence” (0233)**

Moira Lewitt, Gary Boyd, University of the West of Scotland, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Learner approaches in biomedical science often focus on acquiring knowledge and concepts. We introduced an assessment approach that encourages students as participants in the community of biomedical scientists. In an Honours level module we offered students the option of being present with the lecturer when their work was marked, and receiving immediate verbal feedback (“face-to-face marking”). The questionnaire used for evaluating the initiative was co-developed with students. Feedback from participating students (n=88, 52%) was overwhelmingly positive, and all recommended the experience to others as worthwhile. In particular, the marking environment provided a social space in which discussions of professional identity could emerge; and students highlighted the potential impact on their professional development. We suggest that this assessment strategy, in addition to evaluating the student’s “doing” according to the norms of the discipline, can be used as a space of influence to encourage the student’s “being” in the discipline.
E4  
Caldicot | Session E4 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**Re-thinking student geographies: Going beyond the immobility dualism in HE research (0217)**

*Kirsty Finn, Lancaster University, UK. Mark Holton, Plymouth University, UK*

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Approximately 25 percent of undergraduate students live at home during term time in the UK. This is a notable shift in patterns of student mobility and contrasts sharply with the traditional ‘boarding school’ model which has its roots in elite participation. Nevertheless, in the English context there remains a strong feeling that residential mobility ought to be privileged over stasis. Semi-permanent residential moves have, thus, become synonymous with ‘mobility’, whilst routinized daily mobilities are mistaken for ‘immobility’.

Drawing on SRHE-funded research with commuter students at Lancaster University, it is argued here that the dominant dualistic conceptualisation of student mobility practices fails to adequately capture the significance of everyday corporeal movements, such as commuting and diverse engagements with campus, whilst also masking the importance of virtual and digital mobilities for a range of experiences and identities. Theoretical literature from the ‘mobilities turn’ is appraised to imagine new directions for future research.

E5  
Caerphilly | Session E5 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**Intersubjectivity and Teaching: Analysing constraint in online and face-to-face engagement through the cybernetic lens of Ross Ashby (0314)**

*Mark Johnson, David Taylor, Maria Limniou, University of Liverpool, UK*

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

Ross Ashby’s work is little known in education, although his concepts of Double Loop learning, Ultrastability, Requisite Variety and Self-organisation have had a profound effect on educational theory. We focus on his work on Constraint Analysis which, we argue, has application in understanding educational relations, addressing concerns arising from recent critique around sociomateriality, critical realist educational theory, and assessment practices. We provide an overview of these techniques and demonstrate their applicability through case-studies. We argue that Ashby’s cybernetic approach occupies a unique position by opposing analysis of causal mechanisms, and instead articulating a dynamics of constraint. Arguing that “the cyberneticist observes what might have happened but did not” he deployed Shannon’s Information Theory, which he saw as analogous to his own relational theories, developing sophisticated techniques of measurement. In conclusion, we argue that intersubjective relations in education are available for cybernetic analysis, which presents possibilities for new approaches to assessment.

E6  
Cardiff | Session E6 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**Learning and Not Learning from policy and practice: widening participation and organisational learning (0311)**

*Maggie Hutchings, Alex Wardrop, Bournemouth University, UK*

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper examines the positioning of widening participation (WP) within higher education institutions (HEIs). We are interested in how the discourse, policy and practice of WP is learnt or not learnt within different institutions. The methodology uses a two-stage mixed methods appreciative inquiry to elicit current discourses on WP. By exploring WP from the perspective of organisational learning – how institutions gain, retain and share knowledge for access and equity – a complex picture of institutional dynamics, associated with power, freedom and control, emerges. We contend that policy and research on WP occupies a troubling position within higher education (HE) and that by illuminating the nature of organisational learning for WP, we can build more targeted values-led performative strategies for achieving greater access, equity and social capital within institutions and across the sector.
E7
Chepstow | Session E7 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**Appointing for Diversity: Can ‘Old’ Universities Learn From the Experience of the ‘New’?**

(*0218*)

**Sue Shepherd**, University of Kent, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

In an era of transformational change in higher education there has been one constant: the continued predominance of white, male professors in PVC roles. The opening up of an increasing number of PVC posts in the ‘old’ (i.e. pre-1992) universities to external open competition has not had the effect of diversifying the cohort, as might have been expected. On the contrary, it has resulted in a narrowing of the gender and professional profile of successful candidates. So is this same outcome mirrored in the ‘new’ universities, where external advertisement of PVC posts has long been the norm? And, if not, why not?

This presentation will present findings from an SRHE-funded study that maps the PVC population across the two sectors and compares and contrasts their appointment practice. It will identify examples of good practice and make recommendations to support universities in appointing PVCs from the widest possible talent pool.

E8
Conwy 1 | Session E8 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**Freedom and Control in a Gradeless Learning Environment**

(*0044*)

**Kiruthika Ragupathi**, Chris McMorran, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The transition to university brings both freedom and responsibility. Students are empowered to take charge of their learning, while pressured to do well. This paper analyses an alternate form of grading system that gives students the freedom to broaden their learning horizons while reducing the pressure to excel: ‘gradeless learning’. This study contextualises the implementation of gradeless learning at B University and presents findings from three student opinion surveys and follow-up focus groups about the policy. The study shows that respondents overwhelmingly support the policy and understand its strengths, including the freedom to explore unfamiliar subjects and smoothly adapt to university life. However, the study also reveals that in some cases the freedom to choose modules was constrained by institutional barriers, departmental constraints, and cultural context, which combine to limit student freedom and control over their learning choices.

E9
Conwy 2 | Session E9 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15

**The Impact of Curriculum Internationalisation: Perspectives of Academics and Students**

(*0003*)

**Ming Cheng**, University of Wolverhampton, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Increasing enrolment of Chinese students has become a key feature of internationalisation for Western universities, but there is limited study on how curriculum internationalisation affects Chinese students’ learning experiences. Using the typologies of curriculum internationalisation (Edwards et al 2003) as a framework, this paper explores and compares how Scottish and Australian universities integrate international and intercultural elements into their curriculum to support Chinese postgraduate taught students’ study. Interviews, focus groups and a survey are used as the main research methods. Analysis reveals that the practice of curriculum internationalisation in both countries is rather limited and that Chinese students express their desire for more international perspectives in the course content and for more mobility experiences, in order to prepare for their future career. The mismatch between academics and students’ understandings of curriculum internationalisation is highlighted as an arena of power differential and an area for further study.
E10  Denbigh 1 | Session E10 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15
Academics' conceptualisations of their own power and agency in relation to supporting culturally diverse students (0191)

Catriona Cunningham, University of Stirling; Marita Grimwood
Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Internationalising the curriculum in higher education is a process that is both imposed on and enacted by frontline academic staff. Examples abound of the different learning and teaching strategies and tools that have been put into place to enable students and staff to benefit from cultural diversity (Ryan 2011; Leask, Carroll 2015). While we celebrate this refusal in the literature to view culturally diverse student groups within a deficit model, uncovering how individual academics are responding to this linguistically and culturally diverse landscape in practice can be difficult. Using critical (discourse) analysis of one-on-one qualitative interviews in 3 different institutions (our texts), we explore the language with which academics are conceptualising their own power and agency in relation to culturally diverse students; how they are translating this into practice; and what the implications this has for supporting and enhancing learning and teaching in Higher Education.

E12  Raglan | Session E12 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15
The cultural production of master students’ career narratives, study strategies and future selves (0085)

Henriette Tolstrup Holmegaard, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

A range of career- and transition initiatives are presented for higher education students. However moving from being a student to becoming an employee is not only a matter of matching the requirements of the employer, it requires negotiations of the graduates’ identity. Drawing on narrative psychology this study presents the result of a qualitative study at four master study programmes. The aim is to understand how the cultural settings interact with students’ narratives about their career orientation, and to explore how students’ considerations about their future set the scene for their present studies. Five categories of narratives were identified. Some were specifically related to the study programme, while other were found across the data. The narratives not only shaped the students future perspectives, but also their navigation to get there. Applying an identity lens gained insight into the complex interaction of study culture, career narratives and study strategies.

F1  Beaumaris Lounge | Session F1 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30
Tracing of a wasp: Rhizomatic Knowledge in the process of International Academic Mobility (0132)

Ana Luisa Munoz-Garcia, Universidad Andres Bello, Chile
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

In this article, I analyze the impact of academic mobility on the construction of knowledge for Chilean scholars who have studied abroad. I conducted 41 semi-structured interviews with Chilean-born scholars in the social sciences and humanities, who accepted jobs at national research universities in Chile after receiving their doctorates abroad. Findings show that knowledge construction process within the universities is never linear nor unidimensional and it occurs as a rhizomatic process in a multidimensional space. The results of this study challenge the traditional ways to understand academic mobility and it invites to think (and rethink) the ways academic mobility affects how knowledge is being constructed in academia, recognizing that traveling makes scholars think "otherwise" but there is also a process of negotiation that shapes what "thinking otherwise" means after they return to their home country.
Rethinking tensions and freedoms in the higher education environment: Exploring the capabilities and capitals of first-in-family learners (0151)

Sarah O’Shea, University of Wollongong, Australia

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This presentation draws upon Australian research conducted with students who were first in their family to come to university. These studies sought to explore how attending university impacted upon both learners and their families, particularly the ways university attendance was understood and translated within the household. The focus for this presentation is specifically on the ways that learners drew upon existing capitals and capabilities in their transition to university. Applying the theoretical lenses of Yosso (2005) and Sen (1992; 1999) to the analysis of interviews and surveys conducted with learners and family members, this research explores how this group enacted ‘success’ within this environment. Findings inform understandings about the interactions that occur between students’ existing capitals and capabilities and those expected within the university environment. The presentation will also include suggestions about how institutions might seek to both recognise and nurture such resources within the university setting.

Genders at Work: Space and Narrative (0326)

Kate Carruthers Thomas, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper is concerned with providing an analytical understanding of the way decision-making power works in higher level education and research institutes cross-nationally. It draws on documentary and interview data from a purposive sample of twenty-five people involved in power structures in academic organizations in Ireland, Turkey and Italy. Drawing particularly on Lukes’ (2005, 1974) work it looks first at the centralization of power at the level of strategy and resource allocation. It then identifies three kinds of practices that obscure that centralization: ‘talking shops’; loyalty to positional power holders and the absence of alternatives. In contrast to the similarities existing cross-nationally in the centralization of power, there was evidence of some local variation in such practices. Local variation also existed in the perceived legitimacy of power in general, with Irish women being most likely to make visible gendered power in particular.

Commuting, Working, Attending and Performing: The changing route to academic attainment and progression during the first year (0243)

Barry Avery, Daniel Russell, Hilary Wason, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

In recent years there have been significant changes in the profile of students entering university. This research based in a business school at a post-1992 UK university, reports into the characteristics of this new type of student who live at home, commute and work whilst undertaking full-time study. Using questionnaire and performance data we draw associations between various factors that impact on the lives of the students and their chances of progression. We make recommendations regarding changes to pedagogy and practices that would enhance the student experience.

Self-control? Students’ quantified self in the digital university (0334)

Martin Oliver, UCL Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

Discussions of ‘big data’ in Higher Education have focused on what the institution can know about its students, and its ability to act on their behalf. These discussions appear learner-centred, but continue to attribute agency to the institution. An alternative way of framing the use of data is offered by the quantified
self movement. This focuses attention on the user, asking how technology creates new representations of the self, what these mean to them, and how it changes their relationships with others. This paper will draw on this alternative framing to raise questions about the use of students’ data, and about who could and should be expected to know about and to act on learners’ experiences.

**F6**
Cardiff | Session F6 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

*Split Habitus and Othering: first generation students, habitus transformation and higher education (0301)*

*Tina Byrom, Nottingham Trent University, UK*

*Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)*

Widening participation in higher education has been a key policy concern for some time. Despite attempts to increase numbers of students from low socio-economic groups, a consistent and intractable pattern of low participation of particular groups persists. Existing literature highlights that working class young people have to work at being different in order to realise ambitions of going to higher education and that such identity work continues as they navigate their way through what is essentially unfamiliar territory. This paper explores this issue by examining the ways in which critical incidents in the lives of 16 young people from working class backgrounds destabilised their identified primary habitus and resulted in a trajectory interruption and subsequent emerging secondary habitus. Utilising a qualitative approach, findings indicate that much identity work is carried out prior to university entrance, but specific incidents have a large role to play in disrupting pre-determined trajectories.

**F7**
Chepstow | Session F7 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

*The Emptiness of Quality: A comparative discourse analysis of two reforms in Norwegian Higher Education (0166)*

*Jo Ese, Mats Persson, Østfold University College, Norway*

*Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)*

The paper looks at how the word quality is used in two different reforms in Norwegian higher education. Using discourse analysis, we examine the 2004 Quality reform and an ongoing 2016 reform 2016 to showcase how quality can hold different meanings, sometimes opposite and contradictory to each other. In the 2004 reform, quality was connected to an emphasis on student experiences. In the ongoing 2016 discourse, there is an emphasis on the student as partaking in the academic community, accepting their role as juniors.

Quality has been established as an important term in the higher education landscape, and substantial research has been developed on the subject. Updated knowledge on how the term develops is still necessary, and the emptiness of the term that lies in the fact that it can change its meaning in fifteen years adds to the discussion on how we should understand the concept.

**F8**
Conwy 1 | Session F8 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

*‘Freelance academics’ and the dream of ‘permanent’ position (0309)*

*Magdalini Kolokitha, University of East London, UK*

*Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)*

This paper aims to discuss spaces of independence and freedom for academics with no permanent positions in HE establishments in Greece, by a) analysing the European and national education policies concerning employment in academia and b) the accounts of Greek academics in short term contracts. It claims that two policy pillars, the non-opening of permanent academic positions alongside the increased student numbers have created a space for a new type of academic staff, the ‘freelance’ academic. These type of academic staff has two distinct characteristics: their status does not allow them to apply for research funding and the introduction of their knowledge into their teaching is limited. The data presented derive from an on-going qualitative research focusing on academic staff with no permanent positions in the Greek tertiary sector.

Methodologically, the research adopts a discourse-based (Maclure, 2003) qualitative approach utilising semi-biographical interviews with academics that do not hold permanent contracts.
F9  
Conwy 2 | Session F9 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

What does ‘student voice’ mean to students and does anyone listen to it? (0059)

George Mindano, University of Kent, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

‘Student voice’ has become a defining feature of the contemporary higher education landscape and plays an increasingly prominent role in national higher education policy and debate (see for example 2016 Higher Education White Paper; QAA (2012a), Little et al (2009)).

However, although the growing significance of ‘student voice’ has led to universities exploring various means of engaging students, ‘student voice’ is not clearly defined in literature.

The exact nature of ‘student voice’ remains highly contested and under-researched and important questions remain unanswered. For example, what does student voice mean to the wider student body? Do students think they have a voice? Does anyone listen to it?

To fill the gap, the paper will, therefore, explore findings from a research project in which I draw upon data from focus group discussions with students and interviews with academic staff and senior academic leaders from four UK universities.

F10  
Denbigh 1 | Session F10 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Exploring the Paradigms of Higher Education Research: Emerging Research Discourses in China and the UK (0270)

Ourania Filippakou, Catherine Montgomery, University of Hull, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Higher education (HE) as a field of study emerged in the mid-20th century and it has evolved alongside globalisation and the massification of HE worldwide. Despite its global development, HE research has long been dominated by scholars from the developed and predominantly Anglophone world or the countries that are broadly categorised as “the West”. Focusing on literature from, and about, HE research in China and the UK from 1995-2015 and based on a systematic literature search of conceptual and empirical studies addressing HE research, this paper explores the epistemic consequences of the dominant paradigms for HE as a field of study as a means of surfacing the similarities and differences in HE research in the two countries. It is argued that, driven by global league tables and the intensification of globalisation, new forms of interdependencies are emerging between institutions and states making international research collaborations a key policy driver worldwide.

F11  
Denbigh 2 | Session F11 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

ePortfolios in Higher Education: The University of Alberta experience (0068)

Jennifer Branch-Mueller, Pauline Nicholas, Carol Tonhauser, Martine Pellerin, Wei Wei, University of Alberta, Canada

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

In recent years there have been a surge in the adoption of ePortfolios (EPs) in the mainstream curriculum of higher education, albeit at varying levels and for diverse purposes. The versatility and ability of EPs to enhance learning in the form of presentation, personal development, learning, and assessment, through the collection, selection, and reflection on best work over a period of time, has appealed to educators. This paper briefly discusses the developments and primary purposes of ePortfolios and presents the results and implications of a qualitative case study that investigated the experiences of stakeholders at the University of Alberta who use or are interested in using ePortfolios in teaching and learning. The findings revealed that although EPs are valuable educational tools, some stakeholders are challenged by the process of creating EPs with students. The insights gained have implications for the implementation and management of a campus-wide ePortfolio system.
This paper considers pathways to social mobility for young graduates, as they move through and beyond higher education (HE). HE is considered a key route to social mobility in the UK, and there is growing interest in graduate destinations, particularly the opportunities and constraints faced by graduates from different social backgrounds. This paper is based on a longitudinal study, which has followed young people from the start of undergraduate study, through to lives beyond graduation. It focuses on two key questions: What can we say about whether participants in the study have been socially mobile? What can we say about the potential for mobility amongst these young graduates? Drawing on extensive qualitative data gathered over six years, the paper explores the complexity of processes of social mobility, and highlights different orientations and practices towards investing in the future, ranging from investing in the present to cultural entrepreneurship for the future.

**SYMPOSIUM G2**

**Beaumaris 1 | Symposium G2 | Thursday 9.00-11.00**

**Theorising access to higher education: perspectives on a global challenge**

**Discussant:** PJ Burke, University of Newcastle, Australia

**Chair:** N Harrison, University of the West of England, UK

**Symposium rationale**

Supporting access to, and successful participation in, higher education is a shared global challenge. While some of the individual benefits of higher education have come under scrutiny recently, by and large, the story across the global remains that graduates tend to enjoy better health, more stable employment, more autonomous jobs, higher life-time earnings and greater engagement in civic life than non-graduates. For most, higher education is a life-changing experience that opens new horizons, while there are gains for their communities, their nations and humankind in general. However, there is ample evidence from around the world that the opportunities to access higher education are not equally distributed. Despite a rapid growth in provision in many countries, historic inequalities in access to that provision persist while new ones emerge.

This symposium is based around a forthcoming book within the SRHE series entitled ‘Access to Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges’. The guiding principle of the book (and therefore this symposium) is that theory has a vital part to play in efforts to challenge inequalities in access to higher education across the world, coupled with a belief that, despite several decades of research attention, this field has been insufficiently theorised – or perhaps that there has been insufficient diversity in theorisation. Furthermore, while there have been important contributions from sociologists, economists, psychologists and others, it has been rare for the disciplines to interact, with some tendency for theoretical ‘tribes’ to be inward-looking rather than expansive and open to alternative ways of understanding. A richer palette of theory may be needed to make sense of data and to make predictions about the practical activities that are most likely to lead to positive change, either at national or institutional level.

The symposium will comprise five presenters who will introduce the work of a key theorist and then discuss how their work can be applied to contemporary issues within access to higher education: Pierre Bourdieu, Ulrich Beck, Raymond Boudon, Amartya Sen and Herbert Simon. The discussion will then focus on areas of commonality and tension, examining how the different approaches deal with vital concepts such as choice, risk, opportunity and decision-making, contextualised by the continued link between social origin and attainment. It will also explore the scope for synthesis between the theoretical perspectives and a possible future research agenda.
G2.1

Beaumaris 1 | Symposium G2 | Thursday 9.00-11.00

Student choices under uncertainty: applying Simon’s concept of bounded rationality (0069)

Neil Harrison, University of the West of England, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper will provide an introduction to the theoretical work of Herbert Simon, the American interdisciplinary social scientist and Nobel Prize winner, particularly with respect to his concepts of ‘bounded rationality’ and ‘satisficing’ which have been found useful in understanding complex decisions taken under risk. These will then be applied to the issue of access to higher education, looking specifically at an individual’s choice to enter and their choice of whether to maximise the status of university they attend. The paper will focus particularly on the role played by different forms of information, guidance and expectation, as well as problematising how risk and risk attitudes influence the decisions of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. It will conclude by touching on possible policy and practice interventions that can be derived from Simon’s work.

G2.2

Beaumaris 1 | Symposium G2 | Thursday 9.00-11.00

Habitus, Capitals and Field: a Bourdieusian framework for understanding transitions into higher education. (0135)

Ciaran Burke, Plymouth University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The emergence of post-industrialisation and, with it, a knowledge economy, articulated by Daniel Bell, introduced a supposed sea change in social stratification. Gone were positions based on birthright, and, instead, a social system was formed based on knowledge with the new elites earning their positions through hard work and diligence – creating an avenue for all, if hungry enough, to rise to these lofty heights. This paper will encourage supporters/advocates of widening participation to pause and consider the structural and individual barriers still present within the UK higher education system affecting opportunity, decision-making and choice. The need for this pause and the reminder of the continuing presence and effect of the mechanisms of social reproduction will be articulated through a critical sociological lens – to be specific, through Bourdieusian social theory – and illustrated by empirical research examining access to higher education.

G2.3

Beaumaris 1 | Symposium G2 | Thursday 9.00-11.00

Understanding class-based inequalities in education: rational action theories of educational decision making (0140)

Ron Thompson, University of Huddersfield, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper discusses the rational action perspective on social class differences in educational opportunity. In this context, rational action theories derive from the distinction between the primary and secondary effects of social stratification made by Raymond Boudon, seeking to understand educational inequality through the decisions made by individuals based on their perceptions of the costs and benefits associated with different educational routes. The paper aims to evaluate the ability of these theories to account for observed patterns of stability and change in educational inequalities, particularly in higher education, and to highlight some of the reasons why the rational action approach has received relatively little attention within the sociology of education. Methodologically, the paper presents a conceptual analysis based on critical appraisal of key theoretical literature and an evaluation of a range of empirical studies which aim to test rational action models of educational decision making.
Higher education, often seen as a critical part of the ‘knowledge society’ is a good example of Beck’s ‘risk society’. In this case risk has three elements. One is uncertainty in relation to what lies ahead and even over career aspirations. The second is the material risk young people face in investing heavily when in fact the wage return to this investment do not materialise for a large proportion of young people. Third, risk is increasing because it is impossible to calculate the risk. This is Beck’s key insight. As individuals we can take calculated risks, but In Beck’s risk society the ability to assess risk in advance is heavily reduced because information is either not available or is distorted.

This paper sets out an argument for the value of the capabilities approach (CA) – originally developed by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum – as a normative framework that enables us to think differently about access and success from a social justice standpoint. In particular, the concepts of freedom, well-being, agency, capabilities, functionings, and conversion factors are covered, drawing on illustrative examples from access contexts to contextualise the theory. The value added to access research by the CA foundational assumption of human diversity, together with how diverse agents and social structures interact is emphasised. The paper draws on the CA and widening participation literature together with a multi-year study in South Africa through which a list of capabilities for socially just university access and success has been developed to illustrate the value of the capabilities approach for access research, policy and practice.

This paper investigates participant experiences of a formal course for academic developers at a research-intensive South African university, the first of its kind. Globally, there is an absence of opportunities for academic developers to formally qualify themselves in the field. The identity of academic developers is nomadic while they continue to work in the field without a strong knowledge base. This study considers the learning experiences of participants by exploring routes into and expectations of the course, value attached to the knowledge base of the course as well as impact on identity formation through an encounter with knowledge. It uses a qualitative research design and draws on a framework of four primary knowledge domains in the course. The investigation adopts a sociological perspective, drawing on tenets of social philosophy and social realism as a meta-framework. Findings indicate that this formal course affords participants the freedom to learn.
**G4**

Caldicot | Session G4 | Thursday 9.00-9.30

**Student experiences of cross-institutional collaborative learning (0263)**

Sheila Amici-Dargan, Galina Limorendko, Stephen Rutherford, Cardiff University, UK. Andrew Doherty, Joanna Howarth, Stephen Fitzjohn, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Collaborative or peer-supported learning involves students engaging in communal tasks to share information and experiences, explore concepts and critically evaluate each other’s work to co-create a shared understanding. We have previously shown that collaborative learning activities help students develop effective learning communities within individual units of learning. However, we are also interested in determining the extent to which these communities can be developed across different student cohorts. We established two cross-institutional groups to explore their potential for supporting learning outside of modular boundaries and the impact on student experience. Active participants submitted reflective logs documenting their experiences and information was collected from other students to explore potential barriers. A constructivist grounded theory content analysis approach is currently being used to identify emergent themes from this pilot to inform the development of future cross-institutional collaborative learning initiatives. Key emerging themes include timing, amount of group work and peer-teaching, and academic input.

**G5**

Caerphilly | Session G5 | Thursday 9.00-9.30

**Doctoral students’ perceptions of how their sustained engagement in peer review impacted on their development as academic writers (0008)**

Joan Smith, University of Leicester, UK. Phil Wood, University of Leicester, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

The presentation reports on an investigation into doctoral students’ perceptions of how their sustained engagement in peer review contributed to their development as critical writers. The project began with a residential weekend. Ten students engaged in peer assessment activities designed to develop their understanding of critical writing and to induct them into peer review. Participants then took on the role of editorial board for an online, student-led journal.

Participants were interviewed before and after the initial weekend, and again almost two years later, by which time the board had published five editions of the journal.

In this presentation, we draw on the third phase of interviews to consider what participants perceived to have been the longer-term impact of their engagement in the peer review process on their learning, confidence, independence and developing identity as an academic.

**G6**

Cardiff | Session G6 | Thursday 9.00-9.30

**The Case for Recognition in Participation as well as Access; Widening Participation for Students Who Care for Children (0327)**

Samuel Dent, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Researchers such as Burke (2013) have already utilised Fraser’s (1997, 2003) theories of recognition to understand the issues of ‘access’ for students from underrepresented groups in Higher Education, demonstrating the ways cultural subjectivities penetrate ‘transparent’ admissions processes. However, limited research has considered how these theories can help to understand the issues of ‘participation’ once underrepresented groups reach higher education. This paper uses Frasers’s theories of recognition to explore the experiences of an under represented group, students who care for children, while studying at a research intensive university, collected as part of a 2-year institutional ethnographic study. Utilising Fraser’s theories, I demonstrate the ways in which whilst material resources for these students are present, these are imbued with cultural misrecognitions. I argue that this creates barriers to participation, specifically due to these students ‘caring’ status, which Frasers theories help to both understand and suggest possible remedies to the associated inequalities generated.
GROUP DISCUSSION G7

G7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion G7 | Thursday 9.00-10.15

**Job autonomy in higher education, a mediator between empowering leadership and engagement (0174)**

Eyvind Helland, Marit Christensen, Siv Tone Innstrand, NTNU, Norway

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

This paper examined whether autonomy mediates a positive relationship between empowering leadership and work engagement. Using the motivational process of the Job Demands-Resources model we investigated whether job autonomy mediates the relationship between empowering leadership and engagement. We employed a cross-sectional survey design wherein data from 6466 employees of three Norwegian universities were analyzed using structural equation modeling. Preliminary results supported the hypothesis that job autonomy mediates the positive relationship between empowering leadership and engagement. Limitations are that we cannot assume causality due to the cross-sectional design. To deal with these issues, future research should implement a longitudinal design and a qualitative design. Whereas we recognize organizational constraints, these results may prove to be a first step in showing how leaders can contribute to employees in higher education experiencing a higher degree of autonomy.

G7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion G7 | Thursday 9.00-10.15

**Work engagement: A double-edged sword? A study on the relationship between work engagement and the work-home interaction (0185)**

Katrine Listau, Marit Christensen, Siv Tone Innstrand, NTNU, Norway

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

The aim of this study was to investigate how being engaged at work affects academics’ work-home interaction (WHI). Using the Conservation of Resources theory as a theoretical framework, this study contributes to existing research by examining the relationship between the work engagement subscales (i.e., vigor, dedication, and absorption) and both work-home facilitation (WHF) and work-home conflict (WHC). In order to test the hypotheses, a PLS-SEM analysis was conducted using a large sample of academics from the Norwegian university sector (N = 4378). The results indicated that vigor and dedication had a positive effect on work-home facilitation and a negative effect on work-home conflict. In contrast, absorption was not significantly related to WH-I, but had a positive effect on WHC. However, feelings of vigor and dedicated seemed to outweigh these detrimental effects. Thus, we conclude that work engagement as a whole is not a double-edged sword.

G7.3 Chepstow | Group Discussion G7 | Thursday 9.00-10.15

**Academic Work Engagement, Resources and Productivity: Implications for Intervention Policies (0184)**

Marit Christensen, Jan Morten Dystad, Siv Tone Innstrand, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

The aim of the study was to, within the framework of the Job Demand-Resource Model, analyse the impact of academic work engagement and job resources on productivity in terms of publications and credit points per full time academic position. The data in this study was collected by the ARK Intervention Programme in one large Norwegian university (N=5637). The data refer to 50 organizational units in the university. The results support the importance of building on a well-functioning psychosocial environment and well-being among the employees in order to improve productivity. The results showed that work engagement stimulates research but have adverse effects on teaching productivity, which is consistently interpreted when resource restrictions are taken into account. The intervention implication of this for policy-makers and leadership is that they must be aware of the trade-offs between research and teaching, and the trade-offs within different types of organizational units.
G7.4  
Chepstow  |  Group Discussion G7  |  Thursday 9.00-10.15  

*Employees’ experiences from a participative organizational health intervention.*  
(0208)  

Martine Townsend, Fay Giaever, Kirsti Godal Undebakke, NTNU, Norway  

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)  

Due to the ongoing changes in the higher education sector, employees are facing increased demands and pressure. One solution to tackle this issue has been to employ organizational-level interventions that aim to prevent stress and promote well-being. Unfortunately, organizational-level interventions have proven habitually difficult to implement. It is effectively up to the employees whether interventions achieve their goals or not. The topic of this paper is an investigation into how employees perceive and experience an organizational-level intervention with particular regards to the survey feedback process. Six interviews were conducted with employees that had recently been through a survey feedback meeting. The survey feedback meeting was part of a larger health promotive work environment intervention; the ARK programme. This paper offers an insight into how employees relate and respond to an intervention in a natural setting.  

G8  
Conwy 1  |  Session G8  |  Thursday 09.00-09.30  

**Triangulating perspectives on doctoral funding policies in the social sciences (0293)**  

Richard Budd, Catherine O’Connell, Olga Verieri, Tingting Yuan, Liverpool Hope University, UK  

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)  

In 2010 the ESRC launched 21 Doctoral Training Centres (DTCs), channeling its entire doctoral funding through 46 universities, marking a continuation of its increasing influence on doctoral degrees and their locations. There is currently a limited research base on this topic, and this paper draws together three complementary strands that explore the DTC phenomenon and broader UK social science doctoral funding landscape. Firstly, a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of key ESRC texts will explore how the ESRC justifies and frames this policy. Secondly, interviews with senior academics from across the sector will provide an institutional perspective of this context and how it is negotiated. The third strand will incorporate interview data from doctoral students, again from across the sector. The data collection and initial analyses will have taken place over the summer of 2016, and this presentation will highlight the initial findings for discussion and development.  

G9  
Conwy 2  |  Roundtable G9  |  Thursday 9.00-10.15  

**Intercultural Capability: Exploring First Year HE Students’ Reflections on and Expectations of their Higher Education Experience (0150)**  

Emma Mullen, Northumbria University, UK, Sue Eccles, Bournemouth University, Doris Dippold, University of Surrey, UK, Stephanie Bridges, University of Nottingham, UK  

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)  

This round table discussion presents the initial stages of a cross-institution project exploring the reflections and expectations of first year international and home students. This study aims to capture students’ early experiences in Higher Education (HE), their sense of ‘belonging’, and development of intercultural capabilities embedded in international-home student interactions. This is the first study to adopt Sen’s (1992) ‘capability approach’ as a means of framing exploration of these intercultural capabilities. Results are intended to shed light on the processual development of intercultural capabilities during students’ first year in HE, and their perceptions of how these contribute to their employability. Although this discussion is based on one joint proposal developed by the research team, several themes emerge which may be of interest to HE academics and practitioners concerning ‘Student Experiences’, ‘Employability, Enterprise and Graduate Careers’ and ‘Learning, Teaching and Assessment’.
SYMPOSIUM G10

Denbigh 1 | Symposium G10 | Thursday 9.00-11.00

Towards an understanding of access to, student experiences of, and outcomes from South African undergraduate higher education

Discussant: A-M Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, UK
Chair: V Carpenter, Institute of Education, University of London

Symposium rationale

In what ways does access to undergraduate education have a transformative impact on people and societies? What conditions are required for this impact to occur? What are the pathways from an undergraduate education to the public good, including inclusive economic development? How is the notion of the ‘public good’ understood and taken up in the university context? These questions have particular resonance in the South African higher education system and context, which is attempting to tackle the challenges of widening access and improving completion rates in what was historically an elite and racially segregated system (Naidoo, 2004). Higher education (HE) is recognised in core legislation as having a distinctive and crucial role in building post-apartheid society (Department of Education, 1997) and is a key driver of economic development but also ‘equity, social justice and democracy’ in the state’s vision for 2030 (National Planning Commission, 2013). Although the South African schooling system continues to struggle to improve significantly (with severe effects for access and success at university), HE itself is also recognised as needing urgent and immediate attention (Morrow, 2009) in terms of fair access, quality, and equitable outcomes.

This symposium is based on the interim findings of an ESRC and NRF-funded international research partnership between the Centre for Global Higher Education and leading centres of Higher Education research in South Africa. It will explore our initial findings about what available research tells us about access to, students’ experiences of, and outcomes from South African higher education and will consider the implications of this exploration for higher education globally. We also note where there are significant research gaps which that need to be addressed.

References


South African government policy in the post-apartheid period has prioritised expanding access to higher education, and there have been shifts in patterns of access. Nonetheless, the extreme inequality in South African society is reflected in patterns of access to higher education. Overall the system is relatively poorly funded by the state, with limited bursary provision, and this limits access to university even for those students who do obtain the necessary school leaving results. Poorer students, if they do manage to go to university, are less likely to gain access to the higher status universities. This is one of the mechanisms by which societal structures are reproduced. This paper offers a critical overview of the achievements and limitations with regard to university access over this period. At the same time student agency and choice-making is recognised as a key impact on these patterns.

Pedagogy, curriculum and institutional environment are all crucial dimensions in supporting transformative student experiences in higher education. This paper interrogates three propositions around what is needed to support the experiences of all students in an equitable manner, both within and outside the formal curriculum. We draw on existing empirical evidence to assess the validity of these propositions in the context of South African higher education.

Research into graduate destinations has been growing internationally, notably in the context of a policy environment that has prioritized the economic purposes of higher education (human capital theory). In South Africa these concerns also pertain, but more significant are issues about the racialised inheritances of the past. In this paper we consider four major studies, two earlier conducted by the HSRC, and two more recent focusing on particular geographical areas. We identify where the findings are similar, consider pertinent differences, and attempt to produce some interpretations from these. From this analysis we aim to build a position that describes and explains young South Africans’ transitions from university into the workplace. The key finding supports the thesis that higher education has a much smaller effect than is anticipated on graduates’ opportunities and experiences, with other factors relating to social background playing significant roles.
G10.4  Denbigh 1  |  Symposium G10  |  Thursday 9.00-11.00

**Integrating the pathways to personal and public good in South African undergraduate higher education** (0261)

**Paul Ashwin**, Lancaster University, UK. **Jenni Case**, University of Cape Town, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This final paper in the symposium will integrate the insights from the previous three papers in order to develop a synthesis of the insights about pathways to personal and public good in South African undergraduate higher education. It will also place these insights into the wider context of international higher education and consider what the South African case can tell us about the ways in which undergraduate education contributes to the development of personal and public good globally.

G11  Denbigh 2  |  Session G11  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30

**The stability of undergraduate student trajectories across cohorts and programmes of study: evidence of excessive policy constraints in academic practices?** (0076)

**Cesare Aloisi**, Amanda Callaghan, University of Reading, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper seeks to evaluate the impact of institutional policy constraints on the variability of student learning trends at the University of Reading. The motivation for this mixed-methods study was the remarkable stability detected in the student- and programme-level marks across degrees and cohorts. Low variability in the trajectories suggested that random fluctuations might have been systematically dampened by institutional factors. We extracted the data of about 20,000 full-time students between 2005 and 2015. We used multilevel growth models to analyse student- and programme-level trends. We then reviewed publicly-available university policy and strategy documents and interviewed senior managers in a theory-based stakeholder evaluation framework to identify the plausible factors constraining the variability of trends. We used the evidence to assess a claim whereby some accountability demands introduced in recent years may have resulted in a low-risk approach to performance delivery across programmes favouring a consistent reproduction of achievement.

G12  Raglan  |  Session G12  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30

**Are non-graduate jobs stepping-stones into more skill-appropriate positions?**

**Graduates in non-graduates roles** (0081)

**Heike Behle**, University of Warwick, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

Work in non-graduate occupations can act as stepping-stones into more skill-appropriate jobs. In these cases, graduates use non-graduate employment to support themselves whilst continuing their search for skill-appropriate jobs. While this can be successful and graduates enter skill-appropriate employment, some remain stuck in lower-skilled positions. The paper describes the first fifteen months of employment of the class of 2009/10 and compares it to the pathways of the class of 99. A high proportion of the class of 99/10 remain in non-graduate jobs while a larger proportion of the earlier cohort managed to enter more skill-appropriate employment. The paper also identifies the personal and HE-related characteristics of graduates less likely to work in skill-appropriate employment.

H1  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Session H1  |  Thursday 9.45-10.15

**Curriculum Change and Scholars’ Changing Agency** (0109)

**Johanna Annala**, Jonna Henriksson, Marita Mäkinen, Jyri Lindén, University of Tampere, Finland

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The study focuses on the nature and changes in scholars’ agency in two different contexts of curriculum development. Semi-structured interview data was collected from the same 17 scholars involved in curriculum
development, first, in the context of strong departmental autonomy, and second, in the context of a comprehensive curriculum change concerning the whole university. There was three years between the interviews. Following the analysis of narrative reflections, six agentic profiles were found, five of them in both of the interviews and one only in the latter. Scholars adopted the new profiles of agency in different structural contexts. The changes in the agentic profiles and the explanations for the diversity revealed different layers in the structures. In this study, curriculum development and change featured as a game where players compete for power, values and different types of symbolic capital.

H3
Beaumaris 2 I Session H3 I Thursday 9.45-10.15


Eric Gilder, Papua New Guinea University of Technology, Papua New Guinea

Research Domain: Academic practice ,work, careers and cultures (AP)

The author is a transplanted, off-wandering academic, who has crossed many borders (academic, geographical and cultural) over his thirty-plus years of teaching, research, and service. In this presentation/paper, he will outline the challenges of mediating these personal functions and social roles via a Kellian psychological model of “dimensions of transition.” As detailed by Iyer (2013, 17 July) and Reiche (2014, August 21), the stressful process of displacement of exile indicate that Kelly’s insights can be very helpful for this writer coming to a better understanding of himself as a social actor in a fast-transitioning global environment itself vexed between choices of increasing globalization and, at the same time, increasing division. In the theoretical section, the paper will draw from works of Kelly (1955), Bannister and Mair (1968), Feixas (n.d.), Feixas, and colleagues (2009), Gilder (2003), among others. As Kelly put it succinctly, “people, too, are events.”

H4
Caldicot I Session H4 I Thursday 9.45-10.15

Degrees of gendered distinction: Working class male undergraduates and their complex negotiations of masculinity (0265)

Richard Waller, UWE, Bristol, UK. Nicola Ingram, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Against the backdrop of a perceived ‘crisis of masculinity’, this paper explores how working-class male undergraduates maintained, enhanced, and on occasion in some cases distanced themselves from hegemonic gendered-class identities. These gendered-classed identities include those aligned with the apparently contradictory behaviours associated with academic success and with ‘laddism’. The maintenance of these identities were often against dominant social pressures, and at some personal and social cost to themselves.

We show how their ‘performance’ of gender varied according to social contexts, notably between older pre-university friendships and newer ‘student’ and subsequent post-graduation relationships. The former sometimes involved the conscious policing of what Skeggs, Lawler and Waller have all called ‘bourgeois pretensions’, either by the student themselves or by others within their social milieu. Meanwhile the latter at times involved a dis-identification with longer established friendship ties and family networks.

H5
Caerphilly I Session H5 I Thursday 9.45-10.15

Is ‘friendship’ educationally relevant in doctoral pedagogy? – A study into the personal and social relation between doctoral supervisors and students and its effect on possible learning outcomes during the PhD (0020)

Soren Bengtson, Aarhus University, Denmark

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Doctoral researchers are increasingly urged by supervisors, graduate schools, workshop leaders and academic developers to get involved in social media. Blogging in particular is put forward as a way to test out ideas, network, and develop confidence and skills in writing. In this paper we report on an exploration of PhD student blogs. We examined both the reasons bloggers gave for blogging, as well as the content of their
blogs. We then critically examine this data in relation to advice given to doctoral candidates about publishing and note, with some ambivalence, the formation of all day/all night academics. We suggest that blogging can have considerable personal benefits, but also contributes to the growth of a ‘shadow’ scholarly community with both positive and negative implications.

ROUND TABLE H6

**H6.1**  
Cardiff | Roundtable H6 | Thursday 9.45-11.00  
---

**Tackling the BME attainment gap - the policy and research context (0316)**

*Nona McDuff, John Tatam, Kingston University, UK*

**Research Domain:** Access and widening participation (AWP)

UK higher education can claim some success in widening the participation of UK domiciled Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students but has failed in ensuring the success of those students. Of all UK domiciled students graduating in 2014 across the UK 25% more of the white student cohort received a 1st or 2:1 than the BME student cohort. ‘Student deficit’ explanations for the gap are no longer credible. This paper describes the policy and research context and provides an overview of Kingston University’s institution-wide strategy to address the gap which includes an institutional KPI, the innovative use of value added data, and work on inclusive curricula. Kingston has also been funded by the Higher Education Academy to explore approaches and share good practices with three other universities. We will draw on this collaborative work in the roundtable discussion.

**H6.2**  
Cardiff | Roundtable H6 | Thursday 9.45-11.00  
---

**Using Value Added Data to create institutional awareness and engagement with the BME attainment gap (0317)**

*Matt Heley-Rayner, John Tatam, Kingston University, UK*

**Research Domain:** Access and widening participation (AWP)

The difference in degree attainment between white and BME students is a major challenge. The causes are complex. We have used value added (VA) data, which draws on five years of student degree outcomes across the whole of HE to arrive at statistically expected outcomes for any cohort of students. Because VA controls for entry qualifications and subject area it highlights the extent of unexplained differences in attainment. We have calculated VA scores for white and BME students for the last six years for all courses, and this is available to all staff on an easily navigated dashboard which we will demonstrate. When outcome data has been presented at this level it has provided a powerful stimulus for staff to both acknowledge the problem and seek solutions. The roundtable offers the opportunity for wider discussion of the value of this to the sector and the implications for research.

**H6.3**  
Cardiff | Roundtable H6 | Thursday 9.45-11.00  
---

**Principles into practice: the inclusive curriculum (0318)**

*Anne Hughes, Kingston University, UK*

**Research Domain:** Access and widening participation (AWP)

The HE sector is recognising the need to move beyond a focus on equality of access to address equality of educational outcomes across the diversity of the student body. The evidence shows the persistent differentials in educational attainment which, whilst complex in their composition must be addressed, in part, through a critical reflection of academic cultures and practices. This paper discusses the implementation of the inclusive curriculum at Kingston University. Inclusive learning and teaching refers to the ways in which we design and deliver our curricula to engage all our students in learning which is appropriate, accessible and meaningful. We will discuss the key facets of our inclusive curriculum approach and outline the framework which, we suggest, can guide and support academic staff in embedding the key principles of inclusivity into their learning and teaching, assess its effectiveness through VA outcome data and encourage an institutional wide culture of inclusivity.
H8

Conwy 1 | Session H8 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

Exploring partnership in higher education: policy constructs, staff and student understandings, and the interference of everyday meanings (0148)

Karen Smith, Saskia Kersten, University of Hertfordshire, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The term partnership abounds in higher education policy and practice; there is, however, little consensus as to what it actually means and how it is understood by staff and students. This paper reports on a small-scale multidisciplinary project that combined methods from corpus linguistics (here the analysis of both large-scale corpora and their sub-corpora of academic webpages) with qualitative interviews and focus groups. The findings highlight the slipperiness of the term and its associations with business and legal discourses; the range of partnerships that exist both inside and outside academia; the appropriateness of the term to describe reciprocal, respectful and responsible relationships between staff and students; and the contradictions of its use that might well taint its acceptance as valid description of the mutually enriching relationships that proponents of learning and teaching partnerships advocate.

H11

Denbigh 2 | Session H11 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

Novice supervisors’ research supervision pedagogies and dilemmas in undergraduate research projects. (0105)

Mayke Vereijken, Roeland van der Rijt, Jan van Driel, ICLON, Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching, The Netherlands. Friedo Dekker, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Research supervision in undergraduate education is a multilayered and complex activity. This qualitative study aims to provide insight into pedagogical strategies which novice supervisors use to foster student learning and the dilemmas novice supervisors face when supervising. Eleven individual interviews with novice supervisors were held immediately after a supervision meeting with their student (cf. stimulated recall interviews). The supervisors explained at what moments they felt the student needed guidance. A constant comparison analysis using noticing as a synthesizing concept was conducted on the interview data. A variety of pedagogies emerged from the data which promote student learning in varying degrees. Currently we conduct further analysis into supervisors’ dilemmas in supervision practice which might be related to research pedagogies. This study will result in a description of a research supervision pedagogy for undergraduate student research projects. Implications will inform instructional development initiatives in higher education.

H12

Raglan | Session H12 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

Learning for the Workplace: Exploring professional identity in search of meaningful alternatives to student work placement (0128)

Gemma Webster, Sally Smith, Colin Smith, Edinburgh Napier University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

Moves towards the marketisation of higher education have led to greater priority being placed upon students undertaking relevant work experience while they study. Recognising a strong demand for placements, the e-Placement Scotland project set out to increase the availability of quality paid placements for computing students and to support course leaders and students to take advantage of these. Not every student will successfully obtain a placement, and so e-Placement Scotland aimed to ‘add value’ for students in various other ways. Interventions such as industry tech talks and speed networking sessions were deployed to develop awareness of the employment landscape and encourage students to start thinking about their self-identification, easing their transition into the workplace. Adopting the lens of identity theory, the paper explores student and professional identity in order to recognise the transition from student to graduate, and considers the role of placement and other value-adding activities in that transition.
J1

Beaumaris Lounge | Session J1 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

The implications of a changing academic workforce for the university as a critical institution (0047)

William Locke, Celia Whitchurch, UCL: Institute of Education, University College London, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The paper will re-examine the findings of a study funded by the UK Higher Education Academy (HEA) on changing academic roles, careers and development needs (Locke, Whitchurch, Smith and Mazenod, 2016), within a conceptual frame of the critical university. The study identified a number of gaps between the perceptions of individuals and institutional policies about, for instance, criteria for promotion and development opportunities. In this paper, it will be argued that sustaining a critical workspace is likely to involve, for instance, clarity about the basis for decision making around individual careers; judgements about the appropriate use of evidence such as student feedback; and a willingness to consider alternative options in relation to professional development. The paper will demonstrate ways in which institutional middle managers such as heads of department have a key role to play in creating and sustaining this space for critically.

J3

Beaumaris 2 | Session J3 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

The Rise of the Blended Professional in Academia (0295)

Aygen Kurt-Dickson, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK. Susi Poli, University of Bologna, Italy. Mirjam Siesling, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This study aims at investigating the concept of the Blended Professional (BP) in academia. BP s constitute a so-called ‘third space’ in universities, placed between academics on the one hand and administrative or organizational staff on the other (Whitchurch, 2008). Often, BPs combine a scientific grade (PhD) with extra-academic experience, thus bringing in a unique profile and unique skills. Recent developments in research policies have sparked the evolution of BPs, as universities are more and more called upon to move beyond academic activities exclusively. We present the results of a triple case study investigating the indispensable role BPs play in today’s universities, exploring the situation in three universities/HEIs (Italy, UK, the Netherlands). Specific attention is paid to questions related to identity; perceived freedom and control, and peer group formation. In the session we aim at discussing the first research results and explore how we can take the study further.

J5

Caerphilly | Session J5 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

Troubling conversations around research supervision: what do supervisors bring to and want from supervisor development? (0224)

Geof Hill, Sian Vaughan, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Traditionally a private academic practice (Manatunga), increasingly supervisory practice has become a focus for investigation and staff development (eg. Phillips & Pugh; Wisker; Lee). The discourse surrounding research supervision presents it as a complex practice with different and sometimes dissonant notions of what it means to be an effective or good supervisor, and increasing expectations of supervisors (Taylor).

Birmingham City University has used Community of Practice professional development models to generate conversations with research supervisors. These communities have operated differently but with a common core of inviting research supervisors to talk about the troubling they experience with the practice of research supervision (the sorts of questions they bring) and their level of expertise (prior knowledge and skills) going into the practice. As well as functioning as development for over 100 supervisors, these conversations have generated rich data about supervisors’ expectations and concerns about research degree supervision and supervisory development.
J7

Chepstow | Session J7 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**Student voice in Australian University decision-making: From misrecognition to a systemic model (0188)**

Sally Varnham, Katrina Waite, Bronwyn Oliffe, Ann Cahill, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

In 2014, the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching funded the project “Student Engagement in university decision-making and governance: Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice”. The project included comparative international research and the first Australian sector-wide study on student representation in university governance. Drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of “misrecognition”, we have been able to demonstrate that behaviour which tends to be constructed as “apathy” is better accounted for by the relatively minimalist policy framework and the lack of systemic support. Building on Gherardi’s concept of “textured practices”, we present a layered model of the field of student representation practice in Australia. This may be used within individual institutions to further develop the student voice, and as a model of the sectoral field of student representation practices including the relationships between these layers. The project outcomes have resulted in further funding for the development of a national framework.

J8

Conwy 1 | Session J8 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**Constructions of Higher Education Quality Assurance in Chile: “learning to play the game” (0189)**

Hazel Price, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This critical case study research draws on preliminary analysis of interview data produced as part of a doctoral research project analysing Higher Education (HE) Quality Assurance (QA) in the Latin American country of Chile. Semi-structured interviews were conducted in April and May 2016 with a range of stakeholders in the Chilean system including representatives of QA agencies, QA experts, university administrators and academics. QA is approached here as a topic of study rather than a resource to ‘improve education’. QA takes different forms and these forms have varying relationships with HE systems and institutions, there are also different ways of framing and understanding QA. The paper will elaborate the current model of QA in Chile before exploring conceptions of quality, justifications, uses, and consequences of QA, as well as perceived issues with the current system.

J11

Denbigh 2 | Session J11 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**Making time for ‘Freedom to learn’ in higher education (0139)**

Catherine Bovill, University of Glasgow, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Carl Rogers published his classic text Freedom to learn in 1969, arguing for students to be given the opportunity to break away from the constraints of a formal syllabus and benefit from the richer learning that he considered possible through experiential and flexible learning experiences. His work, and that of later scholars of critical pedagogy promoted the role and responsibility of students to contribute to and influence their own learning. Rogers’ work informs some of the current activity in both schools and higher education, focused on co-created curriculum and ‘students as partners’ in learning and teaching. In this paper I examine recent evaluation data from co-created classes with academic staff on a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice to explore their rationales for choosing to lead or not to lead class activities, and I ask whether staff have time for freedom to learn in the 21st Century higher education context.
Higher education is expected to generate higher order competences involving understanding, interpretation and analysis of complex information. However, there is little information of what actually higher education graduates know and can do after graduation. The aim of our study is to analyse competences of higher education graduates in literacy, numeracy and problem solving in technology-rich environments. We utilise the PIAAC 2012 data in which 1 209 respondents in Finland had completed higher education degree. The preliminary results show that that the higher education in Finland at the moment produces sufficient competences whereas those “older” generations’ competencies seem to require up dating. The results indicate that continuing education is essential to higher education graduates, too.

Malaysia’s higher education sector is of critical importance to the country’s development and global competitiveness. In responding to new challenges, it is essential that universities attract and retain a high quality workforce. The position of early career academic staff has been researched in many western countries, but has not been researched from the perspective of a developing country, such as Malaysia. This study seeks to examine the early career development of early career academics in Malaysian universities, drawing on the perceptions and experiences of staff across a range of academic disciplines and different universities. It is hoped that this will enhance the understanding of factors that impact upon staff development, and lead to recommendations that will help to improve academic staff development, and thereby enhance both the quality of both teaching and research, and job satisfaction.

This paper challenges the dominant discourse that HE choice is a consumer choice and questions assumptions underpinning government policy and HE marketing. HE choice is largely viewed as a rational, decontextualized process. However, this interpretivist study found it to be much more complex than this, and to be about relationships and managing a transition in roles. It focuses on parents, an under-researched group, who play an increasing part in their child’s HE choice. It finds that they experience this process as parents not consumers, and that their desire to maintain the relationship at this critical juncture takes precedence over the choice of particular courses and universities. The role of relationships, and in this context relationship maintenance, is the main theme. This is experienced in two principal ways - relationship maintenance through conflict avoidance and through teamwork. These are significant findings with implications for the way governments and HEIs consider recruitment.
K3

Beaumaris 2 | Session K3 | Thursday 11.30-12.00
Leaving the academy: perceptions, fears, and hopes around ‘unbecoming’ a student and academic (0324)
Barbara Read, University of Glasgow, UK. Carole Leathwood, London Metropolitan University, UK
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper explores perceptions, experiences and fears of precarity and loss in the academy. It draws on fieldwork from two studies: the first involving 50 student interviews with undergraduate students at a pre-92 university in the UK, and the second involving 73 email interviews with academics across the UK. We will be using these studies to explore the perceptions and experiences of undergraduate students in relation to leaving the university and ‘unbecoming’ a student; and academics contemplating, negotiating or experiencing a transition away from a career in higher education. The paper will draw on the theorisations of Walkerdine, Butler and others to discuss the emotions such transitions evoke, the ways in which decisions, hopes and anxieties are constrained and influenced by government and institutional policy and practice, and the ways in which they are discursively constructed in relation to identities such as gender, class, ‘race’, ethnicity, and age.

K4

Caldicot | Session K4 | Thursday 11.30-12.00
What does a satisfied student look like? Visual representations of satisfied students in Business and Management (0292)
Rob Wilson, Paul Richter, McKenzie Lloyd-Smith, Newcastle University, UK
Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper reports on the analysis of a dataset produced as a result of an in-class task developed initially as part of a Newcastle University funded Teaching and Learning Innovation project. The project was conceived as a response to challenges presented by two emerging contexts. The first of these relates to the shifting student identity associated with the marketisation and internationalization of higher education (HE). The second, connects with contemporary debates concerned with the effective delivery of social science research methods training and student lack of engagement particularly in Business and Management. Over a period of 8 years, UG and PG students were asked to draw a ‘satisfied student’ as an exercise in a lecture on qualitative data collection. This paper presents an analysis of the visual data and explores what the applications of visual methods reveal about the student experience.

K5

Caerphilly | Session K5 | Thursday 11.30-12.00
What is the value of a doctoral degree? Exploring perceptions of personal value gained from doctoral study in the context of the UK knowledge economy. (0235)
Billy Bryan, Kay Guccione, The University of Sheffield, UK
Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Those who hold a doctorate are said to hold significant knowledge and social capital. The recruitment of doctoral graduates yields collective knowledge, skills, networking, and prestige benefits to organisations, and to UK industries. As individuals though, do graduates experience net gain from the doctoral process, and how do they perceive the value engaging with doctoral study confers? This interview study used a critical, interpretive lens to examine perceptions of value across experiences of doctoral education and asked specifically about the future use of skills, behaviours, and competencies graduates translated into different workplaces. It seeks to understand further; the value of the ‘world-view’ doctoral education affords, and also how perceptions of all facets of value change over time. Doctoral graduates across careers find most value in the personal resilience and resourcefulness they develop through study, as well as deriving useful and translatable learning from interpersonal, cultural awareness, and relational processes.
K6
Cardiff | Session K6 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Impact of clinical education on employability (0092)**

*Jill Alexander*, Carol Boothby, Northumbria University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The employability imperative in legal education is part of the more general landscape in the UK where Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are placing increasing emphasis on the employability agenda and the “skills“ that can be transferred from degree-level study into the workplace. Certainly, current political and business discourse has very firmly positioned the responsibility for employability with HEIs. They place great emphasis on “employability” though make no attempt to describe what that might be or how it can be achieved.

This paper outlines findings from a qualitative study into perceptions of the role clinical education plays in influencing employability. The context of this research is focused on law students operating within a Law Clinic where we consider how clinic is perceived by employers, alumni, staff and students and whether students are clearly articulating the opportunities and perhaps limitations of clinic when applying for graduate employment.

K7
Chepstow | Session K7 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Transforming Core Processes in Russian Research Universities: Formats, Concepts and the Loose Couplings (0338)**

*Andrey Shcherbenok*, Moscow School of Management SKOLKOVO, Russia

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

In this inquiry, based on four-year experience of leading integrated educational programs and providing strategic sessions for the leaders of top Russian research universities, I will argue that the most difficult task of transforming core processes of teaching and research in a loosely coupled organization like the university cannot be accomplished through top-down administrative reform. However, executive education opens up some possibilities for such transformation, providing that organizational redesign is informed by conceptual reframing through the process of “problematization” and involves rearranging the existing pattern of loose and tight couplings. I will argue that such strategic rearrangements can make structural and conceptual redesign effective means of reforming university teaching and research without replacing the majority of the faculty with foreign PhDs or attempting to radically convert a university into a tightly coupled corporation.

K8
Conwy 1 | Session K8 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Emerging stratifications in German higher education? How universities transform extra teaching faculty into a surplus in quality (0212)**

*Roland Bloch, Alexander Mitterle, Christian Rennert*, Carsten Würmann, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

During the last decades legally homogeneous European national higher education systems have been reorganized by reforms granting more leeway to universities. To position themselves, universities try to build specific identities backed by certain organizational attributes, yet they face different conditions for vertical differentiation. For instance, German universities can not restrict access as their enrollment numbers are determined by the teaching loads of their faculty. The Quality Pact for Teaching, a competitive governmental funding scheme, allows the universities for the first time since 1977 to hire extra teaching personnel without having to take in more students. It is aimed at creating a surplus on the level of teaching. Drawing on organizational cases studies of five projects funded by the Pact, we show how quantities of extra teaching faculty are transformed into a surplus in quality. Surplus is generated through compensating for deficient study conditions, extending teaching, or elevating special degree programs.
K9

Working with student researchers to understand more about student experience: potentials and challenges (0064)

Mona Saxi, Middlesex University, UK. Carole Davis, Queen Mary University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

In the context of higher education, supporting students to conduct research among their peers has the potential to deepen understanding of student experience. However, managing student researchers as part of a research team comes with its own challenges and complexities. We illustrate this through an account of a research project reporting on the experiences of second year students on a BA Education Studies programme who were using Instagram to develop their understanding of key sociological concepts.

Two final year undergraduate student researchers were involved in collecting data, making field notes, conducting interviews and analysing the students’ use of Instagram. We argue that future research projects would benefit from the inclusion of student researchers, and this benefit will be maximised through offering time and resources to the training of student researchers in complex methods and a recognition of their affective responses to what they observe among their peers.

K10

Recovery from terrorism: Testimony from survivors of Garissa and lessons learned for supporting resilience (0289)

Marc Cutright, University of North Texas, USA. James Otieno Jowi, Moi University, Kenya

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

On 2 April 2015, Somali-based al-Shabaab terrorists began an assault on the campus of Garissa University College in Kenya, killing 147 people, almost all of them students. The attack began at 5:30 a.m., and was not contained until nearly dusk. As researchers in higher education, and African specialists, we wanted to know the sources of resilience and support for those students who elected to continue their educations. We interviewed at length 13 survivors, one year after the event. Our conclusions include that: Counseling should be an ongoing process. Faith-based counseling has helped many, but it not in itself enough. There should be transparency and equity in financial support. Social re-integration should be more deliberate by institutions.

K11

Multimedia Learning and the use of images in lectures – evidence from a three year trial across 9 academic disciplines (0001)

David Roberts, Loughborough University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

We live in the visual era, yet HE lectures are dominated by text, often excessively so. Our students’ generation has never been so influenced by images, and yet we rarely match our teaching to this learning reality. Multimedia Learning (MVL) theory maintains there are very sound pedagogic reasons we should embrace the visual in teaching. This paper discusses the development and application of a visual lecture method deploying high quality full-screen literal and figurative images that communicate complex matters visually, complementing text. It then presents empirical data gathered from testing this method’s impact on student engagement and understanding in large group lectures over a 3-year period, across 9 different disciplines. The data affirms hypotheses of leading MVL theorists and paves the way for wider research using specialist web-based research tools developed during this research exercise.
**K12**

**Raglan | Session K12 | Thursday 11.30-12.00**

*What do non academic employers want? A critical examination of ‘PhD shaped’ job advertisements for doctoral employability (0097)*

**Inger Mewburn.** Australian National University. William Grant, CSIRO, Australia. Australia. Hanna Suominen, Canberra University, Australia. Stephanie Kizimchuk, University of Turku, Finland

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

PhD programs are under increasing pressure to be relevant to workplaces beyond the academy, but most of what we know about what industry needs from PhD graduates is based on anecdote, not data. This study aims to fill this gap by analysing a large data set of job ads to see what employers outside academia really want from graduates. This paper reports on the first outcomes of a larger project using machine learning to systematically investigate and track the demand for advanced research skills amongst Australian industry sectors. A set of jobs which were identified as highly knowledge intensive - or ‘PhD shaped’ - were subjected to a discourse analysis in order better understand the need for graduates with sophisticated research skills in Australia’s contemporary workforce, which is comparable with many other highly developed economies. This analysis has implications for how universities and governments design and fund research training programs.

---

**GROUP DISCUSSION L1**

**L1.1**

**Beaumaris Lounge | Group Discussion L1 | Thursday 14.00-15.15**

*Enabling academic practice through dialogic space (0172)*

**Ruth Pilkington.** Liverpool Hope, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The paper proposes a model for embedding dialogue within organisational settings in order to create enabling spaces for academics to engage in professional learning, allowing them to reframe themselves within career structures and HE working practices as agents for change with the agency to change.

Since academics constantly reconstruc understanding and identities in the ‘doing of teaching’ (Barnett, 2008), it is essential to identify and deconstruct processes and practice to generate bounded spaces for learning with and from peers (Roxa & Martensson, 2009), and opportunities to apply criticality to practice. It is incumbent upon employers to acknowledge in turn that the professional capital of academics (pedagogic, research) needs to be fostered and purposefully supported and enabled to develop.

The symposium presenters use 4 studies to illustrate the action of dialogue to shift tensions between freedom and control for employers, sector and individual academics.

**L1.2**

**Beaumaris Lounge | Group Discussion L1 | Thursday 14.00-15.15**

*Building relationships and reputation through professional dialogue (0202)*

**Mandy Asghar.** University of York St John, UK. Ruth Pilkington, University of Liverpool Hope, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Professional dialogue, as a social learning opportunity, can be influenced by a number of relational variables: knowing, valuing, access and cost (Borgatti & Cross, 2003). Each variable can impact on the willingness of an individual to engage with their mentor and assessor, and the likely success of those interactions. In particular “cost” is portrayed as the risks an individual is prepared to take with respect to their self image, when seeking out this type of opportunity. This paper presents the finding of a qualitative study to explore the value of a dialogic approach used to achieve Fellowship of the Higher education Academy. We suggest that dialogic assessment of the achievement of professional standards can influence self, and others’, perceptions of an individual’s professional reputation as a teacher. Something we propose is an important consideration in the current context of increasing accountability and control for staff in the HE sector.
Ulster has operated its HEA-accredited ENHANCE Professional Development and Recognition Scheme (PDRS) using the UKPSF since 2012. Within PDRS, assessment utilises an Assessed Professional Conversation (APC). Professional conversations are seen as “one of the most powerful approaches...to promote teacher learning” (Danielson, 2009) allowing individuals to engage in “reflective critique” (Kreber, 2013) where personal and social constructs may be expressed within a focused, evidence-based, narrative. This paper reflects on our experiences, to focus on the benefits of dialogic engagement, and the institutional value of broader collegial discourse on teaching (Spiller, 2002; Clark, 2001) through:

- the dialogic approach as a trigger for engagement with learning and teaching and developing meaningful communities of practice (Wenger, 2000);
- the value of dialogue in brokering professional relationships and expanding “significant networks” (Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009);
- the role of dialogic approaches to foster cultural change in SoTL;

Sociological research has illustrated positive relationships between participation in higher education (HE) and civic engagement. However, far less consideration has been given to the extent to which civic engagement reflects individuals’ subjective interpretations of their opportunities for engagement, the meanings they attach to it and its significance in their lives. Drawing upon survey data from the National Child Development Study (NCDS 1958) as well as interviews conducted with 64 Welsh-domiciled adults, the paper examines the extent to which civic engagement reflects individuals’ experiences of HE as well as a range of individual contexts and circumstances. Through examining the relationship between HE participation, individual contexts and circumstances and civic engagement, the paper addresses debates about widening participation in HE and its implications for social capital. Specifically, it highlights the role of widening participation in addressing the socially uneven nature of civic engagement which is a key source of social capital.

Engagement is a key idea within higher education, essential for learning. This paper proposes that gratitude and engagement can be seen as a critical coupling within HE. Gratitude drawn from notions of reciprocity, so central to the inherent nature of HE, can be seen in two parts, feelings and expressions of gratitude.

This paper investigates the link between gratitude and engagement within HE from the perspective of students, alumni and academics from a UK HEI.

Qualitative in-depth interviews provide initial evidence that gratitude and engagement are indeed related, and importantly apply to both students’ and academics’ participation in HE. A cyclical conceptual framework is generated, demonstrating how expressions of gratitude can be seen to accelerate the gratitude-engagement cycle.
L4.2  
Caldicot | Group Discussion L4 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

Students’ time budget practices: This was the time of our lives (0115)

Lars Ulriksen, Christoffer Nejrup, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Research Domain: Student experiences (SR)

Based on an anthropological field work at four different study programmes at a research intensive university the paper analyses how second-year students manage their time budgets. The students’ decision to attend classes is to a large extent based on their expectations of the relevance of the teaching, but the relation to the teacher also plays a role. The students’ perceptions of what competences are relevant for their future career and where they believe these competences will best be developed also play a role. At three of the four programmes, the students consider activities outside class to be as relevant or more as the classes. A fundamental issue is that the study programmes seem to imply a particular kind of student identity that the students should have in terms of interests, perspectives and engagement. However, the identities of the students in the study did not always align with this implied student.

L5

Caerphilly | Session L5 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

Trust Me! Building and breaking professional trust in doctoral student-supervisor relationships. (0279)

Kay Guccione, University of Sheffield, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Emotionally competent leadership, as well as technical and intellectual mentorship is expected of supervisors, and the need for ‘high-quality’ relationships emphasised. This study provides insight into perceptions of quality, using a framework of trust. It uses a qualitative approach to examine how 54 doctoral students (across disciplines) in five UK universities experienced supervisory relationship building and maintenance. All noted a role for trust in supervisory relationships, and began the PhD with an implicit trust in the supervisor. This implicit trust could be converted into a shared professional trust, eroded, or broken, in response to specific behaviours. Trust development happened longitudinally, was most likely to be related to uncertainty and predictability, and impacted on students’ development towards independence. This study evidences a role for trust-building in creating good quality supervision relationships and demonstrates that building trust is a fluid process of renegotiation, highlighting critical relational aspects of doctoral development.

GROUP DISCUSSION L6

L6.1  
Cardiff | Group Discussion L6 | Thursday 14.00-15.15

Strategizing Beyond Educational Inadequacy In Connecting Research And Teaching: An Institutional Approach (0082)

Didi M.E. Griffioen, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The current assignment of vocational programs in higher education is to educate future evidence-based professionals. Often is presumed that a substantial connection between research and teaching is needed to be able to provide the right context and content to achieve this aim with students. As an effect in the Dutch institutes for higher professional education there is an increased attention for the connection between research and teaching as a carrier to develop these knowledge related competences. But what does it mean for an institute of higher vocational education to actively strategize towards integrating research and teaching in all bachelor and master programs for 45,000 students, while still standing in the tradition of being teaching-only? This paper presents the planning and analysis phases of a large scale institutional change in Amsterdam UAS, including a systematic analysis of ‘research’ in the profiles of all 70 vocational bachelor programs.
L6.2  |  Cardiff  |  Group Discussion L6  |  Thursday 14.00-15.15

**Rebalancing teaching and research by boundary crossing action research in an institutional learning community (0087)**

Miriam Losse, Roel Nahuis, Saxion UAS, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper describes a boundary crossing project at institutional level. It aims at learning how educational programs can enhance integration of research in teaching that fits the respective professional contexts. Saxion UAS developed a learning community, involving 55 bachelor and master programs, to cross boundaries between teachers, between programs and between programs and professional contexts. According to action research methodology a chain of boundary crossing actions are executed, which has resulted in four learning mechanisms: identification, co-ordination, reflection and transformation. The evaluation of the first phase shows an emphasis on co-ordination and identification. Co-ordinated discussions took place about the position and meaning of research in teaching. Lessons learned are: research abilities concern every teacher and every subject in the curriculum and teams start to reframe research ability as instrumental to producing professional products. We expect that the second phase of the project mobilizes relatively more transformation.

L6.3  |  Cardiff  |  Group Discussion L6  |  Thursday 14.00-15.15

**Curriculum change as institutional story: lessons from contrasting narratives (0054)**

Dilly Fung, Susannah McGowan, UCL, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

What happens when a large, multidisciplinary, research-intensive university tries to change its curriculum to enable students to engage more directly with research and enquiry? Does a strategy for whole-institutional change challenge academic freedom, or can it afford new opportunities for creativity in curriculum design? How are the perspectives and activities of different characters in the institutional story affected by change (Clandinin and Connelly 1998)? In this paper, we draw on a number of narrative interviews with diverse university staff to analyse the challenges and opportunities afforded by an ongoing institutional curriculum change initiative at University College London: Connected Curriculum (Fung 2015; Fung forthcoming). Early findings (the research is ongoing) indicate that although university staff are aware of barriers to change, many tell stories of the opportunities this initiative has provided for opening up practice to new possibilities both for staff and for students.

L6.4  |  Cardiff  |  Group Discussion L6.4  |  Thursday 14.00-15.15

**Undergraduate research assistantship as a means of integrating research and teaching: A participatory institutional case study (0070)**

Jacqueline Priego-Hernandez, Rachel Clarke, Bournemouth University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This is an evaluation of Bournemouth University's Undergraduate Research Assistantship Programme, an institutional scheme using the student-as-researchers pedagogy as a means of integrating research and teaching. Using a participatory approach, it blends participatory sessions, solicited diary entries produced by student researchers and in-depth interviews to focus on the experience of student researchers. Interpretative phenomenological analysis yielded three emergent themes. First, participants report valuing the scheme for the insight it gives them into real life research and paid work in an academic environment. Second, students set clear expectations of their learning goals, and the majority of them seem to be met, with the performance of research-related tasks such as data collection being salient in the data. Institutional objectives are met to the extent that the student experience is enhanced, but transitions into postgraduate education and employment are distal outcomes not directly influenced. Considerations for institutional implementation of similar programmes are offered.
GROUP DISCUSSION L7

L7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion L7 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

The Doctorate: A Gendered Experience? (0012)

Rachel Handforth, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

This paper examines women doctoral students’ perceptions of academia, and reflects on how the doctorate may be viewed as a gendered experience. It is situated within literature highlighting the persistence of gender inequality in academia and the gendered nature of doctoral study. Studies note that women experience discrimination within the academy (Knights and Richards, 2003), and may have less positive experiences of doctoral study than men (White 2004).

This presentation draws on data from a qualitative, longitudinal study in which some participants acknowledged the existence of gendered barriers for women in academia. However, they did not perceive that gender affected their experience of doctoral study, or expect these barriers to affect them if they decided to pursue an academic career. This paper explores this gap between their perceptions of academia as a somewhat negative environment for women, and reflections on their experiences in the present, and expectations for the future.

L7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion L7 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

Women professors as intellectual leaders (0157)

Damon Burg, Bruce Macfarlane, University of Southampton, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

Leadership in higher education is most often seen in the lens of formal management positions, with informal leadership being somewhat overlooked. However, this paper’s purpose is to add to the growing literature to a form of informal leadership: intellectual leadership. To that end, it’s objective is to learn how women professors view and apply their role intellectual leaders. By using semi-structured interviews, this paper creates an autobiographical, inter-generational analysis of how women professors foster future leaders in higher education. The preliminary results indicate that professors perceive the job of being a professor in one of four orientations: academic citizen, public intellectual, knowledge producer or boundary transgressor.

L8 Conwy 1 | Session L8 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

The Impact of the Formal Equality Stance on Institutional Processes and Legal Compliance in Higher Education, (0134)

Melanie Crofts, University of Northampton, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The aim of this paper is to build on a previous paper which explored the politics and perspectives of various social actors regarding anti-discrimination legislation and equality within a higher education setting. This paper will discuss the impact of the politics and perceptions on compliance with legislative requirements as reflected through the equality processes within a case study institution. In considering this, the question which will be borne in mind is: does the tendency towards adopting the formal equality stance also impact on the case study’s equality processes and, in turn, their response to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)? Such an analysis could have wider implications on how equality and compliance with the law is dealt with in other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).
Cross-cultural collaborations in higher education: Anticipated versus realised teacher roles in dissolving group work tensions (0079)

Jenna Mittelmeier, Bart Rienits, Denise Whiteoek, The Open University; UK. Dirk Tempelaar, Maastricht University, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

As student populations rapidly internationalise, higher education classrooms have become unique spaces for cross-cultural collaboration between diverse students. However, as previous research has highlighted tensions between different cultures on campus, one consideration is the extent to which students see their teachers playing a role in facilitating meaningful and positive communication between peers in their classrooms. To understand this, we have used robust mixed-method tools to select 20 participants from a larger classroom of 860 students to participate in an in-depth interview. Participant expectations of teacher behaviours and resources were elicited using a unique case study method to encourage in-depth discussion about sensitive topics. In our analysis of emergent themes, we compared student perspectives of teacher control in international classrooms between those of differing academic achievement levels. Our findings indicate wide variations between performance levels in students’ expectations of teacher interventions and resources, particularly in regards to scaffolding and social integration.

GROUP DISCUSSION L10

Enhancing pedagogical knowledge and practice: staff development for and with international partners (0023)

Sally Alford, Martin Compton, University of Greenwich, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

In a context where professionalism and teaching excellence are central, these drivers must necessarily shape our responses to expansion of transnational HE (BIS 2012) and to expectations this brings for quality assurance and enhancement (O’Mahony 2014, QAA 2014).

As a university with high numbers of offshore students we are prioritising staff development and enhancement of teaching, learning and assessment for transnational partners. Inclusion of partner institution staff in our online blended PGCert in HE is a key outcome of this.

This paper presents interim outcomes of research into experiences of international participants over three years, focused on case studies of two international partners. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative data we suggest initial conclusions focussed on equity and cross-cultural issues, impact and resourcing and will identify implications for future practice.

In an under-researched area (Smith 2009, Naidoo 2009) our experience raises and illustrates key issues about transnational relationships, challenging some assumptions.

Integrating Academic, Professional and Personal Learning through Multicultural Group Work (0063)

Stephanie Bridges, University of Nottingham, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Multicultural group work is an element of pedagogy which presents rich opportunities for helping students function more effectively within the intercultural contexts of their worlds. Drawing on theories of cosmopolitanism and the ‘capability approach’, this action research project aims to evaluate and enhance the role of multicultural group work to promote not only academic learning, but simultaneously to act as a platform upon which students can explore and develop more cosmopolitan-aware professional and personal selves. Semi-structured interviews with 17 pharmacy undergraduates identified four main themes
which helped to explain the benefits of learning in diverse groups, which provided opportunity for students to integrate their subject knowledge with greater understanding of others and their situations, and a re-evaluation of their own knowledge and perspectives. Based on findings, changes will be implemented in the first year of the course, with follow-up evaluation to inform further review and potential changes throughout the course.

**L10.3**

Denbigh 1 | Group Discussion L10 | Thursday 14.00-15.15

**ACTION: Africa Collaboration To Innovate Online (0275)**

**Jo Smedley, Helen Langton, University of South Wales, UK. Nicos Nicolaou, Kevin Andrews, UNICAf, Cyprus**

**Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)**

Collaborative working is an established part of good practice in progressing pedagogical developments on the local or global stage (Healey et al, 2014). The tension between freedom and control, i.e. academic rigour and quality versus the business dimension, often imposes restrictions or controls over what is marketable or achievable in the geographies being targeted (BIS Green Paper, 2016). The University of South Wales (USW) and UNICAf have partnered in an innovative, flexible learning initiative responding to anticipated growth in emerging African markets. Recognising the need for greater innovation, creativity and ownership of the need for change, a progressive and embedded community engagement approach has emerged. It is already evident that this positive, innovative and fast-moving approach is enhancing learning and teaching practices and enriching traditional and online student experiences, enabling disadvantaged students who are often learning under very challenging conditions to access higher education opportunities.

**L10.4**

Denbigh 1 | Group Discussion L10 | Thursday 14.00-15.15

**Critical perspectives on social media in the international classroom (0095)**

**Tunde Varga-Atkins, University of Liverpool, UK**

**Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)**

Internationalisation of the curriculum and the use of social media are two so far relatively unconnected fields in higher education. This conceptual paper offers a critical perspective on the educational uses of microblogging tools in an international – Chinese and Western - classroom predicated on three main critical arguments: 1) that technology choice is not neutral 2) paying more attention to the ‘societal’ in social media is needed to develop students’ critical media literacy and 3) that for an equitable experience both Chinese and Western students need to ‘travel’. It is exactly due to mutual travel that issues of power and control can be observed. Whilst much of social media literature is focused on digital media literacy from the individual student’s perspective, this paper argues that critical social media literacy is a societal matter. Its development is the role of the critical pedagogue.

**L11**

Denbigh 2 | Session L11 | Thursday 14.00-14.30

**Dis-Engaging with Gamification in Higher Education (0143)**

**Alexander Kofinas, University of Bedfordshire, UK. Naowarat Lewis, Anglia Ruskin University, UK**

**Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)**

The landscape of British Higher Education (hereinafter HE) is changing rapidly and student engagement has been central in most HE institutions. The HE institutions have come forth with innovative pedagogies for engaging with disengaged students. This paper utilizes an in-depth case study to provide a critical look at gamification and the factors behind dis-engagement of students with a gamified curriculum. A single cohort of approximately 900 students was invited to opt-in to a competition that would assist them in their first year statistics unit; in addition monetary rewards were offered. The results show that a, most students did not engage and b, according to the results the online gamification did not seem to have a significant impact on students’ performance as the students who participated performed as well as the students who did not. The post-gamification evaluation challenged the assumption that the millennial generation would engage more readily with gamification.
Social mobility and higher education: Emerging insights from a study of South African young people (0057)

Jenni Case, Disaapele Mogashana, University of Cape Town. Delia Marshall, University of the Western Cape, South Africa. Sioux McKenna, Rhodes University, South Africa

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The link between higher education participation and social mobility is an expectation held across many contemporary societies, and a key driver for ongoing growth in participation. This study focuses on young people in contemporary South Africa, a context of early massification and high expectations. Drawing on interviews with 73 young people who entered bachelors study six some six years before, the study shows how young people navigate the opportunities and constraints of the possibilities they encounter. The role of family cultural capital is shown to be significant, as well as the institutional context they encounter in university. Following them into the workplace, the role of community networks is shown to play a key role in access to work opportunities, but this is also mediated by individual agency. Overall the study shows the transformative role of higher education, beyond matters of employability and through to the broader aspects of the public good.

Option blocks that block options: higher education aspirations and opportunity structures in secondary schools in England (0256)

Jessie Abrahams, Cardiff University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Despite the expansion of the UK higher education sector in recent years, young people from disadvantaged backgrounds remain less likely than their advantaged counterparts to apply or be offered a place at university—particularly at elite institutions. Governmental responses to this trend tend to revolve around ‘raising aspirations’ in disadvantaged communities. Through exploring opportunity structures in three contrasting secondary schools in England (one private, one state in a wealthy catchment area and one in a socio-economically disadvantaged area), this paper provides a challenge to such an approach, highlighting vast structural inequalities in young people’s ability to demonstrate academic excellence. Whilst some schools provide an enhanced landscape of opportunities and immense support with making subject choices, others impose ‘blocking systems’ upon subject slots which serve to restrict options and block futures. Overall this paper argues that young people’s academic outcomes must be viewed in context of the opportunities presented to them.

Freedom and Control in Response to the ‘Impact Agenda’: a systematic review of understandings of ‘research engagement’ in the UK (0343)

Jude Fransman, Open University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

While many stakeholders within and outside of the HE sector in the UK have welcomed the move towards more useful research, the ‘impact agenda’ (and particularly its manifestation in the Research Excellence Framework) has faced stark criticism, with many academics rallying against its encroaching ‘commodification’ and ‘regulation’ (Holmwood 2010; Docherty 2015; Sayer 2015) and the loss of academic autonomy this entails (Collini 2012). At the same time, others have argued that a renewed focus on engaged research has opened doors to new methodological and epistemological freedoms (Facer and Enright 2016) enabling positive re-imaginings of the university (Barnett 2011; Pain 2014). This paper draws on an extensive systematic review to untangle some of the contradictions of the impact agenda. After highlighting new freedoms/controls at play in three key domains it concludes by arguing that a response to the impact agenda necessitates consideration of the interaction between competences, critique and design.
M4
Caldicot | Session M4 | Thursday 14.45-15.15

Teamwork Self-Efficacy and Gender in Engineering Students: 
A study on differences in group dynamics and their sources (0278)

Prisca Aeyl, Roger Fong, Computer Science, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland. Mila Vukmirović, Mathematics, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland. Siara Isaac, Roland Torre, Teaching Support Centre, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland

Research Domain: Student experiences (SR)

The importance of group projects in engineering education can make them a central aspect of student experience. Targeting team work self-efficacy beliefs to explore gender dynamics, this survey of upper-level engineering students found that men and women reported differences in self-efficacy and the tasks they were likely to accomplish in a team project. Both genders appeared to have less confidence in female team members. Overall, the interaction between a person’s gender and the gender composition of the team appeared more important than the person’s gender. However in the three clusters which emerged in Hierarchical Clustering Principal Component analysis, there was no clear gender dimension. Thus, gender is one but perhaps not the most important influence in self-efficacy and group dynamics. This contradicts previous work which found more significant differences for gender and suggests avoiding an overemphasis of this aspect in group dynamics.

GROUP DISCUSSION M5

M5.1 Caerphilly | Group Discussion M5 | Thursday 14.45-15.15

How do PhD-students become academics through interdisciplinary research projects? (0167)

Katrine Lindvig, Lars Ullrksen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

The increased focus on interdisciplinary education during the past decades has so far generated a lot of attention to the policy level and strategies behind interdisciplinary programs, as well as on the assessment and evaluation of the latter; far less attention has been given to the actual process of creating interdisciplinary education and teaching.

In the past three years, through ethnographically inspired fieldwork, we have followed five interdisciplinary research groups. The aim of this case study has been to experience education in the actual making and to see how education and educational elements are created together with, or as a result of, interdisciplinary research.

In this paper we will report on the findings from a specific study of the PhD students involved in these projects, in order to understand how PhD students become academics and create identities in, through - and sometimes in spite of - the interdisciplinary research projects.

M5.2 Caerphilly | Group Discussion M5 | Thursday 14.45-15.15

An educational framework for acquiring skills and competencies for multiprofessional work between arts and social care (0031)

Carola Boehm, Hugh McLaughlin, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK. Jodie Gibson, Liisa-Maria Lilja-Viherväki, Ouli Linnoisuo, Sivi Kivelä, Kaisa Nurmi, Reeta Väijänen, Turku University of Applied Sciences, Finland. Ivar Männamaa, University of Tartu. Kiidik Culture Academy, Estonia. Emilio Jose Gomez Ciriano, Esther Mercado, Oscar Martinez, University of Castilla La Mancha, Spain.

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

This presentation introduces an educational framework developed as part of the currently running project MOMU (Moving towards Multiprofessional Work in Art and Social Work) funded by the Erasmus+ Programme. The project aims to develop materials and define competencies for multiprofessional teamwork.
(MPW), expanding the work done in the large-scale Estonian-Finnish project MIMO – Moving In, Moving On!, which established and embedded the initial methods for MPW into professional practice. These two projects are underpinned by two important theoretical backgrounds and their related professional practices: a) multiprofessional practices; and b) using arts-methods. The current MOMU project expands the MPW practice to a wider European context and aims to develop specific educational frameworks to support HE level degrees that cover MPW. Although art and social care is the focus of this project, the educational processes developed should have applicability for the wider area of collaborative, interprofessional and multiprofessional skills and knowledge acquisition.

GROUP DISCUSSION M7

M7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion M7 | Thursday 14.45-15.15

**Leading the entrepreneurial curriculum: Paradoxes, tensions and entrepreneurial action (0315)**

Zoe Dann, University of Portsmouth, UK. Tammi Sinha, University of Winchester, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

Despite emerging policy and guidance within UK HEIs to develop an entrepreneurial curriculum (Wilson, 2012; QAA, 2012; Witty, 2013; Young, 2014), it is recognised that enterprise and entrepreneurship education has patchy leadership within these institutions (Rae, Martin, Antcliff, Hannon, 2012) and empirical study of leadership of the entrepreneurial curriculum is under explored.

This paper discusses findings of an action based participative research project ‘Leadership Development for an Entrepreneurial Education: Building Futures’ funded by the Leadership Foundation in Higher Education (LFHE). This was a collaborative project involving thirty five curriculum leaders from two participating case study universities, in five exploratory and developmental leadership workshops. It explores barriers, enablers, paradox and tensions present in the academic leadership of current and emergent Entrepreneurship Education leaders and offers a model of competencies of leadership, that aim to address the contradictory perspectives and build capabilities of entrepreneurship curriculum leaders.

M7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion M7 | Thursday 14.45-15.15

**Investigating the PDR process in a UK university: continuing professional development or performativity? (0180)**

Alan Floyd, Open University, Dilly Fung, University College London, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

Over recent years, the professional development review (PDR) process has risen in importance. Delivered correctly, it can have positive effects on student learning, staff recruitment and retention, and motivation. However, the process may also be perceived as a controlling mechanism and part of a culture of “performativity”, which implies a lack of trust, an undermining of autonomy and a reliance on externally driven tasks and targets to “manage” staff. This paper explores these tensions by drawing on data from a Leadership Foundation funded study in a UK University which included 30 interviews and a follow up survey (n=177) with both leaders and the led. The following questions will be discussed in this session: what is the purpose of the PDR process? How can it best be delivered? And how do we ensure it is viewed as a positive aspect of continuing professional development and not a controlling aspect of performativity?
Problematizing the role of student choice in shaping the higher education sector in England: the perspective of bachelor’s degree students at further education colleges (0284)

Jennifer Allen, Hubert Ertl, Susan James Reilly, University of Oxford, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The 2016 White Paper (BIS, 2016: 11) about the future of higher education (HE) in England proposes that the ability for students to make informed choices is essential ‘[for competition in the HE sector to deliver the best possible outcomes’]. This idea is rooted in the belief that with more information, especially about the cost and quality of particular HE courses and institutions, students can make ‘better’ decisions about whether and where to pursue HE. However, there is evidence to suggest that some students, such as those pursuing HE in further education colleges (FECs), do not necessarily make informed HE choices (Perry et al., 2012). Building on this evidence base, this paper utilises interview data collected from 25 students who were in the final year of a bachelor’s degree at an FEC in 2013 to problematize the role of student choice in the future development of the English HE sector.

Playful teaching between freedom and control: exploring the magic circle in higher education (0175)

Rikke Toft Nørgård, Claus Toft-Nielsen, Aarhus University, Denmark. Nicola Whitton, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LT)

Within higher education today, a culture is emerging characterized by fear of failure, avoidance of risk-taking, extrinsic motivation, and goal-oriented behaviour – what we call a ‘gameful approach’ to HE. This paper uses ‘the magic circle’ – a central metaphor within game studies and play culture – to explore an alternative more ‘playful approach’ to teaching and learning. Here, we highlight the potentials of playful teaching through adopting a ‘luxory attitude’ oscillating between free-form play and rule-bound systems. This development of a more playful approach to HE is promising as it invites for a different type of teaching and learning environment, providing a safe educational space, in which mistake-making is not only encouraged, but engrained into the system. Taking up a ‘luxory attitude’ in the magic circle can create freedom, support playfulness and intrinsic motivation, and make HE emerge as an open educational process rather than as high-score assessment product.

GROUP DISCUSSION M12

Graduates’ perspectives on their Early Childhood Studies programmes and employment opportunities (0026)

Helena Mitchell, Oxford Brookes University, UK. Carolyn Silberfeld, University of Suffolk, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

This paper reports upon a U.K. wide study of graduates from Early Childhood Studies Degrees. It builds upon a similar smaller scale study conducted in the late 1990s, which focused on the first cohort of graduates from a U.K. Higher Education Institution.

The current research gathered data from a volunteer sample of 48 graduates in ten different institutions. It examined graduates’ views and perceptions of degree programmes and graduate employment opportunities. Several themes were identified using content analysis of online questionnaires submitted anonymously, and a focus group interview. Themes included the realities of employment opportunities; the status of ECS degrees and graduates; financial security and insecurity; frustration with policy decision making and the implications of fragmented policy.
Despite concerns regarding employment opportunities, all graduate participants had improved their employment status. Although the degrees were highly rated by respondents, ongoing graduate financial insecurity may undermine the future stability of ECS degrees.

**M12.2**  
Raglan  
| Group Discussion M12  | Thursday 14.45-15.15  

**Employability in Education Studies (0053)**

Will Curtis, Emma Langley, University of Warwick, UK  
Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

In recent years, the number of Education Studies undergraduate courses have grown and student numbers have increased dramatically. Today, there are significantly more students studying Education Studies than there are places on teacher training courses. This presentation will focus on a collaborative research project which investigated the employability of students studying Education Studies programmes at higher education institutions. The study was conducted in response to the increasing numbers of students on undergraduate Education Studies courses far exceeding the number of places available on the teacher training pathways. It investigated the various career trajectories of Education Studies students and considered the extent to which existing provision met their employability needs. We will share the key findings of the research which were subsequently used to create an ‘Employability in Education Studies’ toolkit for those who lead Education Studies courses and want to embed employability in their programmes.

**SYMPOSIUM N1**

Beaumaris Lounge  
| Symposium N1  | Thursday 15.45-17.45  

**Enhancing diversity through globalised higher education?**

Discussant: G Wisker, University of Brighton, UK  
Chair: Soren Bengtsen, Aarhus University, Denmark

**Symposium rationale**

Through globalisation strategies, universities worldwide are developing universal qualifications frameworks, aligning taxonomies for educational programmes, and sharing institutional currency (e.g. ECTS credits). This makes student mobility possible, the scope and content of course-work comparable, and the knowledge and skills developed transferrable (Francois, 2015; Nerad & Evans, 2014; Nerad & Heggeland, 2008). In these ways, universities are able to align educational policy, the production of social capital and higher education curricula. As a result, students are not confined to their home countries when studying for a higher degree, and the evaluation of teaching quality and assessment of learning may be compared across national and regional borders, which makes it possible to further develop international ranking systems. However, educational programmes and their curricula are often tied to regional and national job market policies and local professional contexts, and the skills and forms of knowledge required do not easily transfer across socio-political and cultural paradigms (Musselin, 2010; Teichler, 2004; Andres et al, 2015).

This symposium aims to contribute to a critical understanding of globalised academic practice, work, careers and cultures through a multi-layered analysis and discussion of the academic domains of: undergraduate education, doctoral education, junior and mid career academic work and careers, and inter-university digital communities. We ask: What are the meanings of local-national-global in higher education, and how do they relate to each other? What are the challenges and possibilities of the relations between them?

The first contribution will address these questions in relation to the academic practices of undergraduate education. This contribution focuses on the tension inherent in global measurements of the local phenomenon of teaching quality. The second contribution will address the academic practice and career trajectories of doctoral students. This discusses how the globalisation strategies, paradoxically, make visible the great diversity in doctoral education worldwide. The third contribution will address the changing work and career patterns of academics. This discusses how a highly differentiated academic profession can be positioned very differently in relation to international research networks and local and regional communities, with significant implications for individual working patterns and career prospects. The fourth contribution discusses how globalisation, seen through the lens of the digitalised university, does not have to lead to
uniformity in higher education learning and teaching practices, but may advance and bring forward local and personal life-worlds, mergings of public and private learning spaces, and enhance diversity and playfulness in higher education.

N1.1  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium N1  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

Connections between the global-national-local in curriculum, teaching and learning in HE (0153)

Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University, UK. Rachel Sweetman, University of Oslo, Norway

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Recently there have been a number of movements to develop global measures of the quality of curriculum, learning and teaching in higher education. ULTRIRank, the OECD’s AHELO project, as well as numerous global rankings of universities attempt to provide global comparisons of teaching quality. However, in many ways, university teaching is a particularly local process because it involves particular students engaging with particular bodies of knowledge in particular settings. This tension between the global measurement of a local phenomenon presents a number of challenges for existing attempts to capture teaching quality. In this paper, we will explore alternative approaches to global comparison that takes seriously the local nature of university teaching.

N1.2  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium N1  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

The ‘torn curriculum’ in globalised doctoral education (0155)

Soren Bengtsten, Aarhus University, Denmark

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Research and researchers are increasingly considered central to social and economic competitiveness and societal health. The education of future researchers, mainly through doctoral education, has therefore become of heightened interest. However, educational systems risk becoming caught up in the so-called global-local divide. This happens when doctoral programs at the same time promote the development of transferrable skills and call for better training of doctoral students’ discipline specific research skills necessary for academic environments exclusively. Also, the tension is visible in the dual focus of encouraging doctoral students to go abroad to enhance mobility and strengthen their international networks and at the same time increasing the development of training programs and support systems that anchor doctoral education more closely to the home university infrastructure. We critically discuss whether such tensions lead to a ‘torn curriculum’ in globalised doctoral education, or if they may instead realise an ecological doctoral curriculum.

N1.3  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium N1  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

Academic work and careers in local, national and global contexts (0159)

William Locke, UCL, Institute of Education, University of London, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Academic work and careers are becoming more internationalised, as the flow of talent across borders quickens, the pressure to undertake research with international impact grows, and the incentives to attract international students mount. However, universities operate in national and local contexts as well as globally, and their policy, funding and regulatory environments are largely shaped by more local concerns, arrangements and traditions. Groups of academics and individuals are located differently within these complex arrays, depending on their role, the type of institution they work in and their career trajectory. Some who are orientated mainly towards teaching or the exchange of practical knowledge may be more locally focused on meeting the needs of their regional (sub-national) communities. Others, for example, may operate within international networks of researchers, investigating global phenomena. It will be discussed whether both may co-exist within the same institution, and even in the same academic department.
N1.4
Beaumars Lounge | Symposium N1 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Global-local belongings in higher education at digital-tangible campuses beyond the ephemeral sky (0161)

Rikke Nærgård, Aarhus University, Denmark

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

In recent years universities have gone online to take advantage of the potentials of digital media and the internet. However, the decision to go online has often been realized as vacant digital spaces, one-way MOOCs, distance education, or simply a collection of online resources. The present paper explores implications and potentials for future HE when thinking beyond the dichotomies of global-local, digital-tangible, and online-offline nested within many conventional takes on digital and online universities and HE. This is done by focusing on alternative educational futures and future education emerging from the digitalization of HE across teaching, learning, supervision, and academic work and careers. The paper take theories of space and place, technological potentials, educational design thinking, and academic citizenship as its foundation to develop this perspective into six central dimensions for re-connecting and re-placing academic practice as an entangled nexus of the global-local, digital-tangible, and offline-online beyond the ephemeral institution.

N2
Beaumars 1 | Session N2 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Benchmarking Sustainability Research: A methodology for reviewing sustainable development research in Universities (0303)

Victoria Hands, Richard Anderson, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

International frameworks (Wright, 2002), and the UK Research Councils (Research Council UK, 2014) highlight the need for Sustainable Development Research (SDR) and yet indicators to measure this are only slowly emerging (AULSF, 2009; REF 2014). This research study is a first attempt to establish a practical methodology for an SDR indicator.

The web profiles of 465 staff at Kingston University were analysed using content and thematic analysis to identify research relating to sustainable development, broadly defined as ‘economic, social, environmental, community, wellbeing, global and future equity’. The analysis identified evidence of external viability factors: ‘sustainability content’, ‘research impact’, and ‘knowledge transfer viability’. The methodology is intended to be replicable and promises to raise the profile of sustainable development research encouraging researchers to engage in sustainable development as an exciting discipline in it’s own right, contributing solutions to contemporary issues and supporting the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (UN 2015).

SYMPOSIUM N3

Beaumars 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Student Politics and Protest

Chair: Rachel Brooks, University of Surrey, UK

Symposium rationale

Despite allegations of political disengagement and apathy on the part of the young, the last ten years have witnessed a considerable degree of political activity by young people – much of it led by students (for example, protests against tuition fees, or as part of the Occupy movement) and/or directed at changes to the higher education system. Such activity has been evident across the globe.

This symposium brings together contributions from various different national contexts to explore such trends in a rigorous manner. It will address a number of important themes, including: the focus and nature of student politics and protest; the contribution of students’ unions and student movements: whether students are engaging in fundamentally new forms of political activity; the characteristics of politically-engaged students;
the extent to which such activity can be considered to be ‘globalised’; and societal responses to political activity on the part of students.

It will also be a means of publicising the book, Student Politics and Protest: International Perspectives, which will be published in the Routledge and SRHE series later in the year. All those presenting papers as part of the symposium have also written one of the chapters in the forthcoming book.

**N3.1**  
Beaumaris 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Student Politics and Protest  
Chilean student movement: agentic responses to the neoliberalization of higher education (0010)

**Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela,** University of Chile, Centre for Advanced Research in Education, Chile

**Research Domain:** International perspectives and context (IPC)

Drawing on sociological theories, this paper proposes to analyse the Chilean university movement as an agentic field that has been articulated in opposition to the neoliberal structures that were imposed by the Pinochet regime and reinforced by subsequent democratic governments. Particularly, it examines the interaction between students as agents and neoliberal structures that have naturalised a discourse that has promote the privatization and commercialization of the system jointly with the idea of rational individual choice in a free market. Students have led a resistance movement since 2011 aiming to transform the relationships between the state, the market, and the higher education system. Currently, there is a wide reform process in the higher education system which demonstrates that the Chilean student movement has legitimacy in the political landscape and that it is possible to defy what has been taken for granted for decades and create spaces for social change.

**N3.2**  
Beaumaris 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Campaigning for a Movement: Collective Identity and Student Solidarity in the 2010/11 UK Protests against Fees and Cuts (0037)

**Alexander Hensby,** University of Kent, UK

**Research Domain:** International perspectives and context (IPC)

Despite its ubiquity as the term, ‘student movements’ are not easy to build or sustain. This is because campus activism typically features a diversity of political views and tactical preferences, and is organisationally restricted by the constant turnover of graduating cohorts. This chapter uses the 2010/11 UK student protests to explore some of the challenges students face in building a wider student movement. United initially by a common grievance of rising tuition fees, students responded quickly with a multi-repertoire mass campaign. Yet its tactical breadth generated diverging collective experiences and identities, and once the fees were passed by Government these identities proved difficult to unite as an overarching movement.

**N3.3**  
Beaumaris 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Student Protests in Neoliberal Times: A Global Overview (0046)

**Lorenzo Cini,** Donatella della Porta, Cesar Guzman-Concham, Scuola Normale Superiore, Italy

**Research Domain:** International perspectives and context (IPC)

The last decades have configured a turning point in the history of higher education, as governments of all colours have enacted laws promoting the managerialization of governing bodies, the introduction of tuition fees as well as cuts to public funding. Against this background, several recent episodes of massive student protests in countries in Europe, Latin America, and Africa raise the question of whether we are witnessing a new surge of student protests. Almost fifty years after the most popular year of global student uprisings (1968), a new wave of campus activism seems to be taking place across the world. Drawing on an original dataset on student protest events in several countries (2000-2015), we argue that the recent reappearance of student activism is related to the emergence of a range of distributional conflicts stemming from the implementation of the neoliberal agenda in the field of higher education.
N3.4  Beaumaris 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

The student protest movement in Hong Kong: understanding the strawberry generation (0066)

Bruce Macfarlane, University of Southampton, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper will explore the complex economic, social, cultural and linguistic background to the student-led protests that took place in Hong Kong in 2014. The paper will draw on the reflections of undergraduate students revealing their motivations and role in the protest movement. The protests divided opinion across Hong Kong society between those who praised the re-awakening of political consciousness among a new generation and those who regarded the actions of students as 'naive' and 'irresponsible'. To some extent, although not exclusively, this division of opinion is represented as generational and is also linked to the fear engendered by the Tiananmen square massacre of 1989, concerns regarding 'mainlandization' and the acceleration of social and economic inequality within Hong Kong society.

N3.5  Beaumaris 2 | Symposium N3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Valuing public welfare: on student politics as representation, mobilization and prefiguration (0122)

Gritt Nielsen, Aarhus University, Denmark

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Over the past decades, a growing number of students worldwide have protested against reforms of public universities, including cutbacks, increased tuition fees, new public management-inspired governance systems and new market-based and competitive funding principles. With Denmark as the prism, this paper explores politically active students' various attempts to influence such reforms – characterised by the keywords 'representation', 'mobilisation' and 'exemplification/prefiguration' – and shows how students' politics and protests can be seen as processes or moments of value negotiation; what they are negotiating, I argue, is not just the value of university education as a social or private good in a narrow economic sense but more broadly what the value of public institutions and democracy is and should be, including fundamental questions about students' political participation and what it means to be a good citizen.

N4  Caldicot | Session N4 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Setting students and academics free to engage: what do we need to do? (0336)

Caroline Wilson, Christine Broughan, Coventry University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

An engaged student body is key to positively influencing student learning gain, a topic currently at the centre of national and international higher education policy attention. One of the challenges to achieving excellence in this field is making the right choice of coordinated activities designed to encourage students to effectively engage in their studies. The challenge is made more difficult by the fact that activity to be categorised as ‘student engagement’ is still being clarified.

This paper explores the potential for university activity around student engagement to be conceptualised as social marketing activity, and specifically, whether a design guide for social marketers is of potential value as a tool to design and evaluate interventions at any level (university, faculty, school or tutor-led) to promote student engagement.
GROUP DISCUSSION N5

N5.1  Caerphilly  |  Group Discussion N5  |  Thursday 15.45-16.15

Supervising the Modern Doctorate – a Pan-European Study (0038)

Annette Fillery-Travis, Kate Maguire, Middlesex University, UK. Andrew Loxley, Trinity College, Ireland. Francesca Sperotti, ADAPT - association for International and Comparative Studies, Italy

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

This paper will discuss the first findings of the Erasmus+ project: Doctoral supervision of multi-disciplinary practice based doctorates: an appreciative inquiry into best practice in design, development and delivery or SUPERProDoc. This pan-European study has developed a framework of supervisory practice to identify how supervisors can hold the tension between the freedom of enquiry of the student and their development with the needs of the other stakeholders such as the sponsoring organisation and the academy.

The project has used Appreciative Inquiry to gather over 70 interviews of candidates and supervisors across Europe exploring the rich stories of emerging supervisory practice in the field and the challenges/dilemmas faced by stakeholders. These have been added together with the results of an in-depth literature review and on-line survey to construct a practice framework for supervisory work (using a meta-model approach).

N5.2  Caerphilly  |  Group Discussion N5  |  Thursday 15.45-16.15

Impact of a professional doctorate on candidates’ practice and professional development (0310)

Jana Fiserova, Staffordshire University, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

The professional doctorate has been part of the doctoral landscape for the last two decades but it is only recently that debates as to its ‘newness’ in terms of rigour and validity started to subside, to be replaced with the more mature debate as to the variations in design, their impact and their role as advanced professional development for senior practitioners. Indeed, Research Excellence Framework (2014) placed a much stronger emphasis on the impact of research and assessed not just the academic impact but also the broader social, environmental, and economic benefits of research. If this trend is to continue professional doctorates should be placed in the heart of the next REF 2020 submission given the impact ‘professional research’ has been found to have on the wider community and business environment. But how does the professional doctorate impact on individual careers and professional development and thus on candidates’ own practice?

GROUP DISCUSSION N6

N6.1  Cardiff  |  Group Discussion N6  |  Thursday 15.45-16.15

Characteristics of intermediate assessment and student results: A literature review (0112)

Indira Day, Floris van Blankenstein, Wilfried Admiraal, ICLON, Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching, The Netherlands. Michiel Westenberg, Leiden University Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Intermediate, or frequent, assessment is introduced to encourage students to start studying earlier in the period, study more frequently and get better results. There are several cognitive explanations why intermediate assessment improves results, and the positive effects of intermediate assessment have also been shown in studies conducted in actual higher education classrooms. However, very often, studies into intermediate assessment compare situations with and without assessment, and rarely focus on which characteristics of assessment generate these positive results. In the current review, results studies focusing on different
characteristics and forms of assessment will be synthesized to see which characteristics are related to student outcomes. To achieve this goal, 279 articles were downloaded from Web of Science, and analysed in two steps, first by just distilling the characteristics and second by relating those to outcomes. Preliminary results after the first analysis indicate a large variety of assessment characteristics, like feedback or assessor.

N6.2  
Cardiff | Group Discussion N6 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Document-speak: what module guides, grids and marking criteria have to say about assessment practices (0129)

Judith Enriquez-Gibson, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper outlines habits, conventions and standards that are done through programme documents related to the processes and practices that make up assessment. It is an invitation to ‘listen’ to what our own documents have to say about our assessment practices. Bearing witness to past and persistent practices, module guides, grids and marking criteria documents are analysed to provide background information about assessment practices and to understand the historical roots of specific concerns and governing conditions that potentially constraint innovative and alternative assessment practices.

It aims to examine current assessment practices in this case through document analysis. Document analysis can be a useful approach for both research and curriculum evaluation. It is important to consider to what extent our own documents and documentation have restricted the development of our programmes and the enhancement of student experience, particularly in developing assessment skills.

GROUP DISCUSSION N8

N8.1  
Conwy 1 | Group Discussion N8 | Thursday 15.45-17.00

Seeking distinction and addressing inequalities: a critical policy analysis of new times for college-based higher education in England (0210)

Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

New and distinctive forms of higher vocational education are growing rapidly across a range of countries, as demonstrated in the 2014 OECD review Skills Beyond School. In England, established college-based higher vocational education faces new times in the light of major policy changes – a new Teaching Excellence Framework for higher education, area reviews of further education, and the Sainsbury review of vocational education which has been referred to as a ‘technical and professional education revolution’. This paper examines these developments in relation to two central themes: seeking distinction and addressing inequalities. The paper presents a critical policy analysis of the evolving nature of college-based HE, and considers this in relation to models of higher vocational education beyond England (German-speaking DACH countries, Australia, USA) to offer a critical consideration of the possibilities and constraints of achieving distinction and addressing inequalities through a newly conceived higher level technical and professional education.

N8.2  
Conwy 1 | Group Discussion N8 | Thursday 15.45-17.00

College-based Higher Education in England: Who is it for? What is it for? (0304)

Kevin Orr, University of Huddersfield, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

College-based higher education (CBHE) has accounted for around ten percent of total HE provision in England for many years (Avis and Orr 2016). Though the Government’s 2016 White Paper on HE made little reference to CBHE it asserted that “The growth in FE colleges and alternative providers offering higher education has significantly changed the marketplace and how students study” (DBIS 2016: 15). Related to this assertion is that CBHE in England has consistently been tasked by policymakers with addressing
perceived local skills gaps, as well as enhancing social mobility (ETF 2016, 22). The same White Paper, however, presents a challenge to colleges offering HE by enabling other HE providers to apply for degree awarding powers. By examining available statistics for the sector this paper critically examines CBHIE’s current position and argues that the expectations of policymakers need to be clarified and curtailed but that CBHIE has much to offer.

N8.3 Conwy 1 | Group Discussion N8 | Thursday 15.45-17.00

Improving Transition from School and College to University (0306)

Katie Osmon, Brunel University London, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

With increasing numbers of BTEC students progressing into Higher Education, universities are under pressure to offer more academic skills support to prepare students for their studies.

Brunel University London secured funding from the HEA Strategic Excellence Initiative for Vice-Chancellors to examine the transition of students with non-traditional entry qualifications into the first year of university, and to pilot and evaluate support mechanisms to benefit this group. The project has piloted ‘Education Exchanges’ between FE and HE institutions, and developed resources to support skills development in personal tutoring, as well as targeted academic skills support on-course.

This paper will explain the rationale for selecting these initiatives and discuss the benefits to the students identified through the evaluation of the project’s first year.

N9 Conwy 2 | Session N9 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Making sense of the student experience: searching for meaning in an overused term (0113)

Rachel Spacey, Mary Stuart, University of Lincoln, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SJ)

The term, ‘the student experience’ is commonly used by the sector but students’ understanding of the concept is rarely explored. This paper presents findings from research at a campus university to understand ‘the student experience’ as perceived by students themselves. It considers the problematic nature of defining the concept and explores some of the meanings ascribed to it from a review of the literature. The research’s method of inquiry was qualitative and the findings of exploratory focus groups with students are discussed. Students’ patterns of engagement with the campus and their understanding of the term ‘the student experience’ are examined. The findings suggest that ‘the student experience’ of younger students with fewer responsibilities can be a more immersed educational encounter associated with ‘growing up’. However for more mature students the discourse was more focused on how study could fit around the rest of their lives rather than identity formation.

N10 Denbigh 1 | Session N10 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Substantive and Symbolic Management in University Strategy (0207)

Nor Abdul Kadir, Durham University, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The study provides an empirical evidence of strategy management in a Malaysian higher education context, an area which has been rarely researched. It discusses the use of substantive and symbolic management in the university strategy. It further explains the substantive management through coercive working environment and managerialism. At the same time symbolic management was also applied in managing the conflicts in its strategy implementation. The mechanisms used in symbolic management which include the institutionalisation of expectations; strategy monitoring that was decoupled; and the emphasis on ISO certifications are also discussed in this context. This paper is hoped to provide insights into the body of knowledge of higher education strategy.
N11 | Session N11 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Impact of Short Video Case (SVC) on the Attendance of Students in Business School (0337)

Mohammed Shamsul Karim, University of Essex, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Traditional big case based business education is facing questions from students and academic staffs. This study addresses the issue and develops a conceptual model to improve the attendance and class room experiences of the students. In this regard, we propose to use short video case for business context analysis and problem solving instead of using big case in business teaching. We conducted a quasi-experimental study among the students in a UK business school. We used quantitative techniques to analyse the data of our study. The study identified a significant positive relationship between attendance and SVC pedagogic, SVC reflective learning. It also identified that shorter video length has significant influence on attendance. The results have implications for academic staffs, education policy makers, and for the education industry itself.

N12 | Session N12 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Chinese International Students’ Perspective on Employability – A qualitative study (0171)

Rong Huang, Rebecca Turner, Plymouth University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The employability of university graduates has dominated much educational and economic policy over the past decade but existing literature on employability has a strong ‘national’ focus on the UK or USA and little reference is made to the increasingly international dimensions of HE and graduate employability (Waters, 2009; Huang et al., 2014). This paper presents data collected from 30 Chinese international students who were studying different subjects at different levels in five different British universities. We examine their perceptions of employability and consider the factors that shape these perceptions. In particular, we focus on their approaches to manage their employability. It is apparent that the students’ understanding of employability predominately relates to the skills approach to manage employability, and in terms of managing their future careers, work and employability, the results indicate that the students are careerists or ritualists.

P2 | Session P2 | Thursday 16.30-17.00

The pervasive problem of the Higher Education BME performance gap: reflections on prior experience, policy and placements. (0058)

Gurkiran Birdi, Elisabeth Moores, Helen Higson, Aston University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The performance gap in HE between white and BME students is widely reported (e.g. Singh, 2011). In a sample of 4,066 students from a UK University, a small - but statistically significant gap - remained even after employing statistical adjustments for a range of demographic and prior performance factors. UCAS tariff points, gender, ethnicity, and whether or not students had taken a placement year all had a statistically significant effect on performance. Socioeconomic and parental education background status did not. Higher UCAS entry tariffs offered little protection from the ethnicity gap. At lower UCAS tariffs, however, taking a placement significantly reduced both the gender and the ethnicity gaps, as well as producing a positive effect overall. Results reaffirm the reality of the gap and reinforce the beneficial effects of a placement year. To alleviate the problem will clearly require going beyond anything we already do.
P4

Caldicot | Session P4 | Thursday 16.30-17.00

Degrees of Freedom Revisited: Factors affecting Foundation degree students' choice of top-up (0051)

Cathy Schofield, Truro & Penwith College, UK. Liz McKenzie, Plymouth Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Foundation degrees, a two-year sub-degree qualification, typically delivered through colleges of further education also offer the opportunity to top-up to a full degree. Traditionally topped-up at a partner university, more recently colleges have been offering their own top-up routes. This paper explores factors of importance to students when deciding on their top-up route. A national survey of 107 students from 16 colleges found that students were more likely to remain at the college if a suitable course option was available, than move to a university setting. Proximity and familiarity were the most important factors influencing their decision. Findings are discussed in relation to the flexibility offered through this mode of study allowing students to have greater freedom and control over their educational pathway.

P5

Caerphilly | Group Discussion P5 | Thursday 16.30-17.00

Getting there on time: Understanding what leads to timely submission of PhD theses (0114)

Shane Dowle, Royal Holloway, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGS)

This poster reports on a PhD project that seeks to understand the phenomena that lead to timely submission of PhD theses in UK universities.

Submission rates (when the thesis is submitted for assessment) are routinely used by UK funders of doctoral education as the key performance indicator for judging the quality of an institution’s PhD programmes and whether or not to continue funding them. This places huge pressure on institutions, supervisors and students to ensure that theses are submitted on time with sanctions imposed when a pre-decided proportion of deadlines are missed. This poster considers the effects of performance on doctoral education in the UK and, drawing on the literature, suggests what might help to ensure timely and successful submission of PhD theses. A research agenda is then proposed to extend and deepen our understanding of what leads to timely and successful submission.

GROUP DISCUSSION P6

P6.1

Cardiff | Group Discussion P6 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

Meeting the challenge of Business School accreditation with pedagogic research (0178)

Deborah Anderson, Barry Avery, Rebecca Lees, Dan Russell, Jane Southall, Hilary Wason, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper reports on how the development of a faculty level pedagogic research group helped meet the rigorous accreditation requirements of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). As Business schools across the globe strive to find ways to differentiate themselves, accreditations have become increasingly sought after. Approval by the AACSB is particularly prestigious but does require the majority of staff to be research active, including sessional and hourly-paid staff. In common with many business schools, at the research site, experienced practitioners are often employed as hourly-paid lecturers because of their industry knowledge rather than their academic research. The pedagogic research group ensured that such practitioners were able to develop as researchers. Over a two year period, the group have made 62 submissions to journals and conferences and have ensured that part-time staff are now fully integrated into the academic practice of the business school.
P6.2  Cardiff | Group Discussion P6 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

'Telling Stories of Excellence in University Teaching: developing a framework for exceptional teaching performance/practice.' (0013)

Kevin Ashford-Rowe, Duncan Nulty, Kristina Everett, Australian Catholic University, Australia

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

In 2014 Australian Catholic University (ACU) undertook a program of activity aimed at implementing an ‘Australian Catholic University Higher Education Teaching and Criteria Standards Framework’ (ACU, 2016). This activity was led by ACU’s Learning and Teaching Centre and was intended to provide a point of reference to assist our academic teachers and their leadership within the faculties, to be able to better and more clearly articulate the expectations of an ACU teacher. In this way, the framework was also intended to support and facilitate the University’s ‘Teaching Excellence’ agenda.

The paper reports on key aspects of the development of the Framework, and identifies critical success factors for its implementation at the university-wide (enterprise) level of ACU – a large nationwide university with over 30,000 students. These processes and critical success factors are offered as a guide for other institutions wishing to undertake similar enterprise-level policy interventions involving cultural change.

P6.3  Cardiff | Group Discussion P6 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

From “scholarly gypsies” to tribesmen of academia: Developing the potential of sessional lecturers within Higher Education. (0021)

Jane Southall, Hilary Wason, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Many sessional lecturers working on non-permanent contracts have to move between institutions to earn enough to support themselves. They often often feel isolated and marginalized with no voice to become involved in the full range of academic activities. Such staff have been problematised in the literature and, as they are often not research active, are denied membership of an academic tribe.

Using the results of an autoethnographic study, we suggest that these educators deliver many obvious benefits such as cost effectiveness, as well as many hidden ones. They are exposed to a wide range of practices and student needs across institutions and with support, they can use this experience to develop into tribesmen of academia. This increases motivation and connectedness to their permanent colleagues, and they can start to develop an academic identity, all of which improves the student experience overall, and benefits the specific students they teach.

P7  Chepstow | Session P7 | Thursday 16.30-17.00

Leadership in university merger and collaboration (0120)

Fiona Ross, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

As the market and competition takes hold in higher education there will be winners and losers and new organisational forms will emerge through merger, acquisition and collaboration. This paper reports on two case studies: a) the merger of the Institute of Education and University College London and b) a joint faculty run as a joint venture between Kingston University and St George’s, University of London. It will briefly set the policy and financial context for both cases. The findings will be explored in terms of a prominent theme from both studies - and that is the role of leaders and the enactment of leadership. Leadership is discussed under four headings: leadership in context; leaders as champions; leading across borders and finally leading behind the front line. The paper concludes with offering some insights on how the findings on leadership influence and advance understanding of the governance of institutional change.
**P9**

**Conwy 2 | Session P9 | Thursday 16.30-17.00**

**Doctoral Researchers’ well-being: integrating support (0117)**

Caroline Hargreaves, Imperial College London, UK. Janet De Wilde, Bridget Juniper, Work and Wellbeing, UK. Elaine Walsh, Educational Consultant, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Well-being is used internationally as an indicator of social progress, for both policy formation and economic development. This paper explores the well-being of doctoral researchers at a research intensive university subject to universal tensions between freedom and control. We propose recommendations to inform practice and enhance doctoral well-being.

This university specifically designed and ran the study of doctoral researchers’ well-being in 2009. To evaluate changes in how the doctoral experience impacts researcher well-being we recently repeated the study.

Although overall well-being scores remained satisfactory, all domains scored lower for well-being and the impact of the top most bothersome questions had increased significantly compared to the earlier study. Of note were the increased levels of stress and frustration related to research, as well as career uncertainty. Well-being was lower for women and for later stage doctoral researchers. As strategic players in our society and economy doctoral researchers’ well-being deserves greater attention.

**P10**

**Denbigh 1 | Session P10 | Thursday 16.30-17.00**

**The power of knowledge in collaborative projects across North and South: empowerment or epistemological dependency? (0160)**

Hanne Kirstine Adriansen, Aarhus University, Denmark. Lene Moller Madsen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper studies outcome of collaboration between universities in Africa and Scandinavia. The African higher education landscape is a product of the colonial powers and subsequent uneven development leading to an academic dependency as argued by a number of African researchers. Today, many of the research activities undertaken in sub-Saharan Africa are largely funded and directed by external stakeholders such as development agencies, the World Bank, and NGOs. Thereby African remains dependent on external actors for its higher education and especially for research. This dependence is studied in the paper, where we (i) explores how North-driven projects approach knowledge as universal and transferable and thereby ignore diversity and local historical context; (ii) analyses the cultural production of African academics and methodological hegemony in collaborative projects; (iii) concludes that paradoxically collaborative projects can be a means to greater epistemologically independence of the ‘North’ for African universities.

**P11**

**Denbigh 2 | Session P11 | Thursday 16.30-17.00**

**Higher Education Curriculum as Utopian Disruption – A provocation (0193)**

Katrina Waite, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The year of Utopia, 2016, is a perfect time for utopian provocations in higher education. This paper aims to provoke debate on the practice of higher education curriculum based on Bourdieusian concepts, and Levitas’s ‘Utopia as method’.

The paper contrasts three related fields: schools education, higher education, and the workplace, with reference to Bourdieus’s ‘illusio’, or sense of the game. To demonstrate the play in the game – the autonomy - it draws on ‘practical utopian’ case study examples from two research projects - one related to inclusion, diversity and innovation, and the other to sustainability and ethics.

As a closing provocation, we question the employability discourse in curriculum. When there are many practices within the workplace which could be considered ‘dystopian’ such as gender inequity and unethical practices, how would we design curriculum if we viewed our students as stewards of a complex utopian future, rather than graduate employees?
P12

**Raglan | Session P12 | Thursday 16.30-17.00**

**The Employability Factor: Coaching for success (0204)**

*Moiro Bailey, Susan Miller McWhirr, Robert Gordon University, UK*

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

In the current occupational climate, graduates not only need technical and functional knowledge but an increasingly wide range of "other skills" to enhance their employability prospects. This presents the challenge for HE organisations; how do they ensure their graduates develop these skills?

There is currently an ongoing discussion around the most appropriate pedagogy to be utilised in employability skills development. Given the increasing popularity of coaching in the arena of learning and development, the authors of this paper considered it worthwhile to utilise a coaching intervention as a vehicle for the development of employability skills.

In this paper, the authors describe the pilot study carried out at Aberdeen Business School (ABS) which involved using a group coaching intervention as a vehicle for employability skills development. The participants comprised a group of management students nearing the end of their period of post graduate study.

Q4

**Caldicot | Session Q4 | Thursday 17.15-17.45**

**Breaking silos: Improving the recruitment and admission experience of international students (0181)**

*Alain Malette, Sylvie Lamoureux, Jean-Luc Daous, University of Ottawa, Canada*

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The University of X, in Canada, has set an institutional goal to increase francophone international student enrollment from a ratio of 14% of total international students (all degrees) to a ratio of 40% by 2020. In 2014, they introduced an exoneration of international fees for Francophone students registering in French language programs, resulting in an ratio increase from 14% to 32% of total international students. In 2016, striving to increase research-informed practices, our team launched a study regarding francophone international students’ experiences of the recruitment and admission processes. Inter-sectorial collaborations were essential in all phases of this study. This presentation will outline the communication processes, design and findings of the study, and highlight the impact of an inter-sectorial collaborative approach.

**GROUP DISCUSSION Q5**

Q5.1

**Caerphilly | Group Discussion Q5 | Thursday 17.15-17.45**

**Beyond bolt on: re-imagining teaching development for the Australian PhD (0237)**

*Tai Peseta, Keith Trigwell, Peter McCallum, The University of Sydney, Australia. Simon Barrie, Western Sydney University, Australia. Jeanette Fryte, La Trobe University, Australia. Joe Graffam, Deakin University, Australia. Alistair Kwan, The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Lee Partridge, The University of Western Australia, Australia*

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

This paper tests a set of preliminary findings from a current (and in-progress) Office for Learning and Teaching project Reframing the PhD for Australia’s future universities (Barrie et al., 2015). While the overall project develops an argument for the PhD to be about stewardship rather than research narrowly defined, the aspect reported in this presentation focuses on the challenge of how teaching development and preparation can extend beyond a bolt on approach. In learning from how research and researcher development materialises in the PhD, we probe four existing learning spaces for research: the project, supervision, the departmental environment, and skills programs. Drawing on a range of data sources, we push and pull these spaces to explore how they might offer inquiry, conversation and challenge - professional learning - related to university teaching, inspecting how teaching preparation and development for PhD students can come alive in contexts that are traditionally ‘research-only’.
Q5.2 Caerphilly | Group Discussion Q5 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

**Exploring Freedom and Control Relating to Postgraduate Students in Higher Education (0273)**

Richard Race, Roehampton University, UK

**Research Domain:** Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

"As national systems of education expand in countries with widely differing political and social norms ..." (SRHE, 2016) ... how are postgraduate students at Master’s level coping, surviving or / and evolving as lifelong learners (DEE, 2000) in their current studies and future careers? This paper aims to explore postgraduate identities using empirical data collected from students in England, Greece and Turkey. The interpretative, qualitative methodology (Punch and Cianca, 2014; Creswell, 2015) aims to examine what postgraduate students think about their postgraduate experiences and how this has shaped education and professional career moves (Author, 2015). Early findings have touched upon internationalisation processes and how students both consciously and unconsciously work very hard to preserve their national identities and how this concerns notion of freedom and control. When reflecting upon the conference theme, who indeed has freedom and control within higher education - the state, the university or the student?"

GROUP DISCUSSION Q7

Q7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion Q7 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

**Institutional governance of private universities in China – a comparative analysis of three universities (0019)**

Xu Liu, Institute of Education, University College London, UK

**Research Domain:** Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

According to the 2015 report of the Chinese Ministry of Education, 5.75 million students were in private universities, which accounts for 30 percent of the HE sector. The growth of private universities, as an important component of the expansion of higher education, is one of the major strategies for economic development in China.

Chinese government legislation on the governance of the private university is minimal. This gives private universities adequate opportunity to develop their practical governance structures. Even with such autonomy private universities could be constrained by internal factors. This study looks at how the governance systems have developed in three private universities in one province. 44 interviews were conducted with 33 senior managers from 2014 to 2016. Funded by the Chinese National Social Science Fund (CIA140189), this research investigates the key factors shape the governance structure and assesses how governance can best fit the purpose of the university.

Q7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion Q7 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

**Internationality with German characteristics On the relationship of stratification and internationality in German higher education (0220)**

Alexander Mitterle, Roland Bloch, Manfred Stock, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

**Research Domain:** Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

For a long time the German higher education system was only marginally stratified. Degrees from higher education institutions of the same type were seen as equal in value. Recently, stratificatory differences between universities have been increasing. They go hand in hand with a development that induces stronger organizational hierarchies and allowed universities to position themselves towards others. One of the most visible marker of this practice is internationality. It alludes to the core function of science and refers to an inherently global scientific community. It also has become a quantitive abstraction that both legitimates universities as organizations and positions them in a global competition. The presentation investigates both how internationality has become a resource of organizational stratification and whether this abstraction is decoupled from research and teaching activity.
Q8  Conwy 1 | Session Q8 | Thursday 17.15-17.45


Vincent Carpentier, University College London, Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper reports findings from a project attached to the Centre for Global Higher Education exploring the historical relationship between higher education (HE) participation, macro-economic fluctuations and social change. The strong attention paid to the ways in which HE contributes to or is impacted by economic growth contrasts with the scarce interest on the links between HE and economic crisis. Yet, turbulent times ask tough questions about the tensions between wealth and welfare. Crises represent turning points during which the political, cultural, economic and social dimensions of HE are confronted to issues about finance and provision. The study offers a historical lens on those multiple dilemmas which are back at the top of the policy agenda since the 2008 crisis. The objective is to explore how questions about wealth creation and distribution raised during past socioeconomic crises (1930s, 1970s) were articulated to those related to the political-economic settlement in HE.

Q9  Conwy 2 | Session Q9 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

Whose knowledge counts and what counts as knowledge? Educational policy and student identities. (0121)

Nick Cartwright, University of Northampton, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Both New Labour’s ‘learning is earning’, which recast education as economic policy, and Gove’s return to the conservatism of the ‘sage on the stage’ give different answers to the question ‘what counts as knowledge?’ In answering this question they are also defining whose knowledge counts and whose knowledge is discounted.

How students identities are constructed and how these identities position students in relation to knowledge that counts defines their relationship to knowledge. Further how students are positioned in relation to knowledge is either empowering or disempowering.

This paper takes a critical approach to considering student identity in relation to knowledge with a particular focus on the issue of race.

Q10  Denbigh | Session Q10 | Thursday 17.15 -17.45

The OECD and the Colonial Geopolitics of Knowledge (0165)

Riyad A. Shahjahan, Michigan State University, USA

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The OECD is an important policy arena for cross-border collaboration and learning. While other scholars have analysed the way that international organizations (IOs) in higher education (HE) policy may contribute to neo-colonial domination, this paper illuminates not only on how OECD’s epistemic activities promulgate one-size fit all solutions, but centers the colonial structures of knowledge/power that inform the why (or logic) of this IO’s epistemic activities and their effects. A decolonial analysis of OECD’s discursive artefacts and tools such as policy reports and performance indicators suggests that standardized IO policy processes and practices reproduce global inequalities. In collusion with other policy actors, the OECD constitutes and perpetuates coloniality in global higher education, through enacting a god-eye point of view and colonial difference. This article proposes a set of questions that may open the possibility of ‘delinking’ from modern/colonial world systems and pushes us to decolonize our imaginaries of global HE.
Q11  Denbigh 2 | Session Q11 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

Salient practices of award winning undergraduate research mentors – excellence, freedom and control. (0272)

Helen Walkington, Oxford Brookes University, UK. Eric Hall, Elon University, USA. Kearsley Stewart, Duke University, USA. Jennifer Shanahan, Bridgewater State University, USA. Elizabeth Ackley-Holtbrook, Roanoke College, USA

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

As Higher Education providers strive to meet student demand for authentic scholarly experiences, it is timely to identify what successful teachers do in order to ensure student engagement, retention and quality enhancement. This paper identifies ten salient practices of faculty mentors / supervisors of undergraduate research through an extensive literature search of the past two decades. The practices apply broadly across disciplines, students, institutions, and mentoring approaches. The paper then goes on to explore findings from in-depth interviews with thirty international faculty (Australia, Canada, UK, US) who have received excellence awards for undergraduate research mentoring. It uses the freedom and control dialectical as a framework to outline the ways in which expert mentors negotiate the desire to create opportunities for students to experience the freedom and creativity of research yet at the same time maintain control over the topic, outcomes and quality for first time researchers.

Q12  Raglan | Session Q12 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

Tracking career destinations of sports graduates 2000-2015 – a longitudinal exploration of destinations and preparedness for the workplace (0228)

Andrea Cameron, Yvette Wharton, Jennifer Scally, Abertay University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The advent of the TEF means that universities will be expected to evidence the impact of curriculum interactions on graduate destinations and social mobility. Over a third of sport employees are graduates but little data charts their career journeys.

Key objectives:
• track all Abertay sport graduates from the programmes’ inception
• compare Honours and non-Honours graduates’ destination data
• examine career trajectories
• explore preparedness for the workplace
• utilise demographic data to contextualise findings.

452 graduates were e-mailed; 123 responded to the survey, 84% being in identifiable graduate level jobs. Across time, increasing proportions of students were Honours’ graduates. Social class, gender and disability did not impact on this but articulation from FE was a significant factor ($\chi^2=84.68$, $p<0.01$). Very few respondents (n=13) felt that their degree had not equipped them for working life. ‘Placement’ and ‘research methods skills’ were of most benefit in preparing for the workplace.
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Freedom in Ambiguity: Creative Practices’ Pedagogical Perspectives

Chair: V Gunn, Glasgow School of Art, UK

Symposium rationale

“The origin of thinking is some perplexity, confusion, or doubt.” John Dewey (1910)

“The craving for certainty exists, irrespective of whether it can be fulfilled, expressed in innumerable ways that attempt to lay our doubts and fears to rest.” (Helga Nowotny, 2015)

For Dewey, the genesis of reason was ambiguity. What we then did with our experience of that ambiguity made the difference between acceptance from inertia or pursuit from the impulse to reflect, challenge, understand and make perplexity, confusion and doubt into ‘something’ – a conceptualisation, a sophisticated idea, a vision, perhaps. In this schema, nuanced meaning-making has its origin in ambiguity. However, government higher education policy discourses and broader structures of control are coming to dominate how Higher Education’s successes are measured and valued in a manner that foregrounds certainty and containment whilst placing ambiguity in the shadows. Of relevance to this symposium, reading through recent literature on student learning in higher education, it is easy to assume that ambiguity in some ways generates alienation rather than creativity, produces future economic strife, and emphasizes inapplicable research outcomes. Ambiguity becomes the antithesis of pragmatism, whilst certainty effects change and ‘lays fears to rest’.

This imbalance towards the deficit side of the binary (certainty v. ambiguity) is particularly problematic. This is because it obscures the generative relationship between ambiguity and transformative originality in disciplinary learning that is dependent on a paradox. The paradox is that creativity within a discipline may have a genesis point in that which alienates because that which alienates is a disquietening ambiguity that challenges us to consider what, what, and how we are in relation to the space and phenomena of our learning; in John Dewey’s terms, it demands reflective thinking which involves suspending judgement whilst undertaking further inquiry, a suspension which is, in Dewey’s words, ‘likely to be somewhat painful’ (1910, p12). In this, it may well be: the ambiguity from which dissonance is amplified spurs on unorthodox or new thinking, making, doing. Such a paradox is at the heart of Creative Arts’ disciplines. It provides an antidote to what designers refer to as solutionism (Morozov, 2013), as well as unpicking the discursive knot which pits the intrinsic against the instrumental by evoking images of a doom-laden future (Gielen, 2014; Stevenson, 2014), whether that doom is economic, socio-cultural, or educational. We argue that this has become commonplace in government discourse and general university educational development practice.

This symposium critically challenges 3 key discourses of control as attempting to resolve the craving for certainty identified by Novotny (2015) from the perspective of Creative Arts’ education. In this we argue that the generation of certainties is occurring without their respective protagonists being fully cogniscent of the risk such discourses have on the nature of “higher” in higher education. The three discourses of control upon which we focus are:

1. Ambiguity as the location of student alienation and thus less learning (VG, SO & AS)
2. Entrepreneurialism as a protector from state level economic uncertainties (JOC & LJ)
3. Social Sciences as providing the most robust methodologies for educational research focused on practice (VG; CO & JM)
Art School can be characterized as an environment in which multiple forms of reason, embodied aesthetics, materials/immaterialis and the imagination, converge within the pedagogical processes related to studio and critique (Gunn, in press). In this, the certainties of ‘critical thinking’ as outlined in research designed to improve undergraduate outcomes, are found wanting in creative practices’ degrees. This presentation demonstrates the implications of the absence of a broader range of reason, aesthetics, materiality in the higher education student learning research and will explore three keys areas:

- The research-based discourse of unambiguity in ways to manage student learning;
- The need to understand how thinking, doing, making operate together through studio-based education (including virtual studios or spaces off-site) and simultaneously constitute the three-dimensional locus of Art School learning (which is qualitatively different to broader comprehensive university disciplines);
- The need to explore evocative ambiguities within curriculum design to enhance creativity.

Music conservatoires present a contradiction within contemporary higher education: ‘Master-Apprentice’ models still dominate teaching practice while the peripheral curricula in many conservatoires and ‘specialist institutions’ are now focused on producing graduates who can demonstrate attributes derived from corporate ideology e.g. ‘artist-producers’ and ‘creative entrepreneur’. This paper examines the social and ideological constructions of the role of the ‘entrepreneur’ within conservatoires: 1. The rise in the notion of the entrepreneur as a distinctly ahistorical gesture and its connection to the ‘impresario’. 2. The socially constructed role of the entrepreneur as a series of contradictions and overdeterminations that make it suitable for established models of ideology critique. 3. The notion of entrepreneurialism embedded within the logics of student debt. Finally, this paper promotes a critical consciousness that rejects the injunction that students must become economic subjects who are ‘entrepreneurs of their own lives […] of their own human capital’ (Lazaretto, 2012).

This paper explores how metaphor can operate as a means of enquiry into teaching practice. By so doing we seek to liberate academics from cages woven from their own epistemological certainties, opening a door to different ways of knowing and practicing education. Practice here is understood as a process of reflection and understanding akin to living in another language (Phipps and Gonzalez 2004: 118). We will look at what happens when we use poetry as a tool for metaphorical enquiry and critically examine the implications of this for educational enquiry.
Knowing, not knowing and the unknown. Ambiguity and the locus of knowledge and power in student – tutor relations. (0323)

Susan Orr, University of the Arts, UK. Alison Shreeve, Bucks New University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Studio learning in the Art School is based on enquiry. Transmission models of education are subverted to be replaced with ‘reverse transmission’ models where students tell the tutor about their learning (Orr et al 2014). This enquiry based approach to creative pedagogy configures the curriculum as active, generative, contingent and dynamic. There is great interest across the disciplines and this approach – which is new in some disciplines (e.g. Duch et al 2001) - has underpinned studio pedagogy for decades (Schön 1985). In this paper we explore studio enquiry based approaches to learning to consider the centrality of ambiguity in creative education. We argue that more ambiguous, less transparent determinism in curriculum planning should provide space to offer up the different and unusual and as educators and researchers we celebrate not knowing and we welcome disruptive power relations that give students opportunities to lead on curriculum design and assessment.

Methodological findings: Exploring narrative research processes in Higher Education research

Discussant: Kate Carruthers Thomas, City of Birmingham University, UK

Chair: Holly Henderson, University of Birmingham, UK

Symposium rationale

The symposium works against tendencies for higher education research to privilege dissemination of findings over discussions of research processes. We argue that, particularly in research that deals with issues of disadvantage, marginalisation and hierarchy in Higher Education, there are valuable lessons to be learned from our experiences as researchers as well as from our research data. We use the symposium to show that methodological thinking can inform and complement empirical findings, and is essential to interrogating our own positions as Higher Education researchers working within Higher Education.

In order to locate the symposium within the broad bodies of methodological literature, we focus here on narrative methodologies as both common to Higher Education research, and rich in diversity of use and theorisation. The papers each take the position that narrative structures underpin human experience and expression (Josselson, 2004; Ricouer, 1992). They move from this shared beginning to cover formative but often unspoken aspects of the research process. The first paper looks at ‘letters to future selves’ from female doctoral students as a methodological tool that sees narratives of the future as fundamental to present experience. The paper reflects upon the wealth of data made visible through a methodology that includes the possible future as part of its temporality. Bridging issues of narrative method and representation, the second paper argues for the importance of narratives of the spatial experience of Higher Education. In doing so, the paper outlines the difficulties of recording and writing space into research data and analysis. The third paper continues the focus on methodologies of representation in her exposition of the writing process. This paper looks at the potential of innovative narrative writing in research, showing the process of creating plays from the voices of her student participants. The fourth paper positions the researcher as narrator and character in the research narrative. It shows how autoethnographic research both requires and problematises narrative strategies and understandings. The final paper sustains this attention to the role of the researcher in the collection of narrative data. This paper shows that our rush to present research findings often ignores the embodied experience of the narrative interview, in which stories of marginalisation from Higher Education bring with them emotion, distress and discomfort for researcher as well as researched. Overall, the symposium offers diverse stories of narrative research methodologies, explicitly privileging research process as well as result.
R2.1  Beaumaris 1 | Symposium R2 | Friday 9.30-11.45

**Letters to Future Selves: Exploring how women doctoral students visualise their futures (0242)**

Rachel Handforth, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper reflects on the use of ‘letters to future selves’ in a study examining the career aspirations of women doctoral students. Studies have highlighted the gendered nature of post-doctoral career choices (see Royal Society of Chemistry, 2008). This paper draws on the theory of possible selves developed by Markus and Nurius (1986) in exploring individuals’ imagined futures. Drawing on participants’ letters, I explore how in addressing their ‘future self’, participants made reference to a number of possible selves. I discuss the positive and negative possible selves which participants constructed in their letters, and consider how developed, or elaborated these selves were. I outline the challenges which participants expected to encounter during their studies, as well as their hopes and fears for after the doctorate. This paper argues that this method, not commonly used in educational research, enables a unique insight into how women doctoral students imagine their future.

R2.2  Beaumaris 1 | Symposium R2 | Friday 9.30-11.45

**Spatial narratives: The problem and potential of the spatial in narrative Higher Education research (0245)**

Holly Henderson, University of Birmingham, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper has an explicitly methodological focus, arguing for the importance of discussions of space, place and locality in Higher Education (HE) research. Based upon my research project into student narratives of studying HE in Further Education (FE) colleges in England, the paper first highlights the multiplicity and complexity of discourses of space in this context. The paper then explores the problematic nature of researching the physicality of space, asking whether it is possible to capture lived spatial experience. I reflect on the use of walking interviews as a narrative methodology, drawing upon research literature and my own experiences and questions of the method. The paper closes with theoretical perspectives on space and narrative (Massey, 2005, De Certeau 1984). I use these works to ask critical questions about the interplay between narrative, space and writing, ultimately arguing for more attention to the spatial in narrative research, and in research narratives.

R2.3  Beaumaris 1 | Symposium R2 | Friday 9.30-11.45

**Act One, Scene One: using narrative as theatre to illuminate the possible selves of healthcare students with dyslexia in Higher Education. (0247)**

Angela Murphy, Leeds Beckett University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper critically discusses the methodological processes involved within a narrative inquiry study which seeks to identify the influential temporal factors impacting upon nine healthcare students with dyslexia on level seven higher education courses. There has been an international increase of people with dyslexia accessing higher education over recent years. Policy and teaching approaches may often be sympathetic; however, the reality of how it is tackled in learning environments within schools, colleges and universities differs significantly and depends on individuals and families in the absence of robust educational systems which consistently cater for individual needs. The paper focuses on the creative application of narrative inquiry and how the data from this process is being used to create acts and scenes of a play as a method of directing attention specifically to the words of the participants in order to keep their narratives intact.
R2.4  Beaumaris 1  |  Symposium R2  |  Friday 9.30-11.45

The unreliable omniscient narrator: Challenges of writing and being in autoethnographic higher education research (0248)

Emily Henderson, University of Warwick, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

What happens when the researcher and the research participant are one and the same? When the story that the researcher tells about their research participants includes an in-built characterisation of the researcher-as-participant? Autoethnographic research places the researcher in a complex position with regard to the knowledge that is produced from the research. Arguably autoethnographic higher education (HE) research heightens the complexity of the researcher position, as the boundaries are particularly blurred between the site of research and the sites of knowledge production and dissemination. This paper explores the complexity of the researcher position in autoethnographic HE research, using key concepts from narrative theory to explain the multi-faceted researcher position in this type of research. The paper presents a conceptual discussion of the researcher as narrator and engages with methodological issues at a theoretical level.

R2.5  Beaumaris 1  |  Symposium R2  |  Friday 9.30-11.45

The weight of stories: on the problematic nature of using narrative in research (0250)

Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Narrative research ‘brings theoretical ideas about the nature of human life as lived’ (Connolly and Clائدin, 1990, p. 3). Its usefulness to us as widening participation researchers, therefore, is that it allows us to glimpse into other people’s worlds and make sense of their experiences. However using narrative can be difficult, giving rise to a range of ethical and methodological challenges. Much has been written about the implications of using narrative from the perspective of those offering their accounts. Significantly less has been written about the implications for those who are the recipients of those same accounts, namely narrative researchers. In this paper I draw on narrative research with marginalised learners seeking to access HE (ex-offenders, refugees and asylum seekers, those with long-term disabilities, and care leavers) to describe uncomfortable moments, visceral responses, unexpected accounts, and dealing with the ‘sacredness’ of stories.

GROUP DISCUSSION R3

R3.1  Beaumaris 2  |  Group Discussion R3  |  Friday 9.30-10.45

‘I take a critical stance but I feel my role is about compliance’:
Academic development, criticality and compliance (0186)

Colleen McKenna, LSE, UK  Jane Hughes, HEDERA, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

From its inception, academic development has been marked by tension: academic developers are often caught between ensuring compliance with institutional policy, on the one hand, and attempting to hold open a space for creative and contesting pedagogies on the other.

This paper will explore the challenges articulated by those working in academic development and consider how these align with broader struggles within the sector as we see a move (towards a more marketised HE system arguably concerned more with metrics and satisfaction than critique and exploration. Drawing on the findings from a sector-wide, SEDA-funded study into identity construction and location of academic developers, we consider three areas in which academic development is characterised by contestation and struggle:

- the purpose and nature of academic development as perceived by institutions and individuals
- critique and education policy and practice
- research as the domain of the academic developer
UK Higher Education has experienced major changes in recent decades, based on contested ideas about the purposes of Higher Education and affecting individuals and institutions. Successive policies evidence a trend towards external control

‘... steering at a distance.’ (Brennan, Locke, Naidoo 2007:164) and scrutiny of universities’ offer and performance in various forms: Key Information Sets, National Student Survey, QAA audit, REF, TEF. Increased fees have contributed to a problematic discourse of students as consumers, with expectations to be met. League tables chart universities’ positioning and prestige. However, employment has become less secure, with growing numbers of teachers and researchers on fixed-term or part-time contracts. All these impact on academics’ attitudes and experiences in a pressured and stratified workforce.

This paper draws on literature, national data and an institutional case study to consider the implications for academic developers trying to prepare aspiring academics for their current work and possible futures.

Beleaguered, called upon to ‘move over’ and let early career researchers flourish, ‘later career researchers’ who remain engaged with the research culture of their field, are an essential and often under-recognised part of universities’ health and success. Some rightly prefer to retire on time or early, spending that time with grandchildren, private research and writing, consultancy or ‘in the shed’. However, this early research using semi-structured, open-ended interviews with self- and researcher-identified later career researchers in social sciences, sciences, arts and humanities reveals that others focus on research contributions as front-line researchers, principal investigators, team leaders, authors, and mentors. The cadre of later career researchers on which this research is focussed have often moved into a period of continued high quality research production, consistent output, focussed on topics of choice, and in many cases have adopted and maintained leadership and mentorship roles which help guide and sustain others’ research efforts.

**GROUP DISCUSSION R4**

**R4.1 Cadicott | Group Discussion R4 | Friday 9.30-10.45**

*The language of learning in higher education: a study in re-imagining teaching excellence in policy documents from Robbins to Johnson.* (0130)

Maureen Spencer, Middlesex University, UK. Heather Clay, Middlesex, UK. Catherine Minett-Smith, Bedfordshire, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The paper traces shifts in the language used to portray teaching excellence in national and institutional higher education policy documents over the five decades since the publication of the Robbins Report. It demonstrates how such shifts convey to the audience of academics, students and general public the legitimacy of a changed moral vocabulary. Robbins deferred to the judgement of academics in setting the parameters of student learning in both its individual emancipatory aspect and its contribution to the public good. By contrast in succeeding decades a series of statements of high policy stealthily adopted the language of commerce and the market directed at convincing the academy and public alike to accept the portrayal of teaching as a commodity. Examination of the evolution of a new vernacular in official discourse contributes to understanding the pedagogic significance of the transactional language in the 2016 White Paper on teaching excellence.
R4.2  Caeidicot  |  Group Discussion R4  |  Friday 9.30-10.45
The public good of higher education and the contemporary decolonial turn in South Africa (0154)

Melanie Walker, University of the Free State, South Africa

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This conceptual paper considers the public good of higher education against the specificity of South Africa and the ‘decolonial turn’ driven by widespread student protests. It reviews arguments advanced for higher education as a public good, variously understood as ranging from the economic to the social, to the democratic space of critical reasoning, and from a private benefit in the economic and social mobility of individuals, to a public-private hybrid benefitting both individuals and society collectively through contributions to knowledge, to the good of others and to social change. The paper then focuses on how the public good might look if framed in decolonial terms, developing an argument drawing on decolonial ideas to help us rethink the public-good connections between higher education and society in South Africa. This turns on two overlapping decolonial challenges – of inequality and of being human - each of which the paper outlines.

R4.3  Caeidicot  |  Group Discussion R4  |  Friday 9.30-10.45
The trajectory of Republic of Ireland higher education system. Past and forward-looking policies. (0170)

Giulio Marini, Scuola Normale Superiore, Italy, Centre for Global Higher Education, University College London – Institute of Education

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper is aimed at reviewing the policies about higher education in Republic of Ireland. Although considering a larger span of time in order to understand the roots of this system, the focus is especially set on the 90s on, when the “Celtic Tiger” finally arose as a modern fully developed country with an HE system designed to push its economy. The trajectory of this review covers the crisis, and, at last point, discusses the forward-looking policies for the system toward the 2030 target. Dimensions of analysis are: the changing in the funding formula; the policies and their outcomes in terms of expansion of the system and equality to access; the internationalization of the Irish higher education system; the relation with European actors; the overall role of tertiary education and research for the sake of the Country. The methodology uses a comprehensive review of both scientific and polity sources.

GROUP DISCUSSION R5

R5.1  Caerphilly  |  Group Discussion R5  |  Friday 9.30-10.00

Tommaso Agasisti, Giovanni Azzone, Alice Bertoletti, Mara Soncin, Politecnico di Milano, Italy

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DUI)

In this paper, we study the effects of strategies outlined to develop MOOCs, addressing the research on POK (Polimi Open Knowledge), the MOOCs platform of Politecnico di Milano (Polimi). First, we identify users’ patterns of POK and the factors predicting course completion. Second, we provide an empirical measure of the correlation between design characteristics of MOOCs and students’ academic performances. Adopting propensity score matching (PSM) approach on students enrolled in 2014/2015, we investigate if students, who attend a POK course, obtain higher performances in discipline-related subsequent traditional courses at Polimi.
**Variation in academics’ conceptions of e-assessment (0328)**

*Mike Mimirinis, Middlesex University, UK*

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

The paper reports the results of a phenomenographic study on academics’ conceptions of e-assessment. The ubiquitous technologies supporting assessment have presented new challenges in higher education regarding feedback, authenticity of student work and plagiarism. Transparency of criteria, reliability, construct validity and manageability of assessment processes have also been revisited within online assessment educational milieus. The study approached these issues from an academic development angle, i.e. how can teachers improve their conceptions of e-assessments and enhance their practice. Adopting a phenomenographic approach, the session reports on the emerging qualitatively different categories of description of conceptions of e-assessment and explores the relationships between such categories. Dimensions of variation and implications for academic development are discussed.

---

**The ‘New’ Professional Emigrant: Complexities and cultural challenges of Cross Border transitions as a university lecturer from Cameroon to Scotland and England. (0101)**

*Henry Kum, Liverpool Hope University, UK*

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Cross-border contexts reflect diverse and complex manoeuvre of identities that underpin the desire to replicate pedagogies of/for learning. Reflecting on the complexities of being a lecturer in Cameroon and Britain, the paper explores the researcher’s shifts of professional foregrounding as a higher education (HE) academic on what constitutes teaching in HE in their home country of Cameroon to other cultures. The researcher questions how their identity shifts become an ongoing story as they navigate the contrasting political contexts and pedagogies. Such a shift includes professional tensions in renegotiating physical, cultural, social and imaginary boundaries. Emphasis is placed on - re-professionalization in HE; e-Learning; balancing research with teaching; student as consumer; recruitment and retention; research funding; league tables; student satisfaction surveys; students attendance; assessments and “othering”. These are discussed using lenses of professional and social identity, migration, race and ethnicity. The paper concludes with insights on how these complexities were renegotiated.

---

**Rhythms of Academic Mobility (0103)**

*Judith Enriquez-Gibson, Liverpool John Moores University, UK*

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper is about the rhythms of academic mobility. What happens to one’s identity unknowingly and unintentionally when crossing boundaries is considered. It explores the mobile and embodied interactions and encounters of my own movements as an academic. It describes and interprets my mobile identity alongside my ‘fixed’ positioning as always the other or ‘alien’ in my status as an academic border-croser. It engages with the realities of mobility as a boundary in itself, especially when it comes to my ethnicity and place of origin. As an academic researcher, it is an encounter with my own self as the subject and object of mobility. It discusses the issues of mobility and the boundaries that enable, constrain, or bind the academic work of a mobile self.
R6.3

Cardiff | Group Discussion R6 | Friday 9.30-10.45

"It should be the same?!” – An Unexpected Disparity in Teaching between Post-Colonial British and UK Educational Systems (0176)

Anesa Hosein, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper focuses on an academic’s teaching journey from the post-colonial British countries of Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago to England. Using an auto-ethnographical approach, the paper follows an international academic’s changing teaching practice, values, and expectations. This is accomplished by firstly looking at how the academic’s teaching perceptions are challenged within the English higher education context as sometimes her experiences appear familiar and unfamiliar to her post-colonial teaching. The paper then explores how her teaching perceptions are modified as she transitions into becoming an English academic and the agents that help her to change the unfamiliar to the familiar. The final part of the paper reflects on and provides possible recommendations on how academic development programmes can aid international academics in their transitioning processes from different educational systems even when they appear similar.

R6.4

Cardiff | Group Discussion R6 | Friday 9.30-10.45

Barriers in providing quality learning and teaching information on university websites to prospective students (0099)

Namrata Rao, Liverpool Hope University, UK. Anesa Hosein, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The Green Paper, ‘Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice’ (BIS, 2015), is suggestive of a forthcoming transformation in the UK Higher Education (HE) landscape centring not only on a greater emphasis being placed on learning and teaching (L&T) but also on the dissemination of high quality L&T information to current and prospective students. Previously, a survey of the websites of 38 HE institutions (HEIs) found that limited information was provided to prospective students on several aspects of L&T (Hosein and Rao, 2015). Using inductive thematic analysis, this research study analyses interview data from quality assurance and marketing personnel in eight universities to identify the reasons for this information gap on university websites. Findings indicate two broad categories of barriers - operational and attitudinal. The recognition of these challenges may facilitate HEIs to provide quality L&T information and guidance on effective ways of addressing these.

GROUP DISCUSSION R8

R8.1

Conwy 1 | Group Discussion R8 | Friday 9.30-10.45

Modelling the English higher education market: policy, perception and reality. (0028)

Colin McCaig, Nio Lightfoot, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper sets out to subject recent government reforms designed to introduce market incentives into English higher education to rigorous economic analysis. This reveals that far from producing the conditions for a truly free market, these reforms have to be seen within the restricted understanding of an already highly differentiated system. The creation of a new regime consisting of: measures of teaching quality; better information to enhance choice; incentives to alter the types of provision offered; the replacement of regulatory architecture with lower barriers to entry (and fewer barriers to ‘exit’ for ‘failing institutions’) can all be read as serving a series of narrow financial and political ends. The paper identifies the key aim of recent policy - to create differentiated tuition fees within the market to match the UCAS tariff differential that currently serves as the main active/signalling part of what is a dual price mechanism in English HE.
### R8.2
**Conwy 1 | Group Discussion R8 | Friday 9.30-10.45**

**For Profit Higher Education in Brazil: Paths towards Oligopolisation and Financialisation (0287)**

*Cristina Carvalho, Institute of Education/University College London, UK. Universidade de Brasilia, Brazil*

**Research Domain:** Higher education policy (HEP)

The higher education has become an object of interest to global capital, most noticeably in the USA and Latin America and Asia. Brazil is a critical case of the growth of the for-profit sector. Since 2007, a number of educational companies have been listed on the stock exchange, aided by numerous mergers and acquisitions, and the country is now credited with the largest higher education company in the world by market capitalisation. The main objective of the paper is to analyse the key strategies of the educational companies towards the concentration of capital; the formation of oligopolies and the financialisation of Brazilian higher education. The research consists of documentary analysis and descriptive statistics. In conclusion, the financial logic of the market seems to have negative implications on the educational process and teaching conditions as well. Finally, implications are drawn out for other countries that may be following in Brazil’s wake.

### R8.3
**Conwy 1 | Group Discussion R8 | Friday 9.30-10.45**

**Institutional Autonomy vs State Control: Dual Sector Universities in British Columbia Canada (0312)**

*Gordon Lee, UCL Institute of Education, UK*

**Research Domain:** Higher education policy (HEP)

In 2003 and 2008, the provincial government in British Columbia (BC) Canada re-designated a number of former community colleges as teaching-intensive universities. The legislation that established these dual sector universities placed significant control over what they must do and what they cannot do.

This paper presentation will report on interviews with policy-makers to determine what were their most important goals in drafting these policies and controlling how these new universities developed? It will also include interviews with past and present senior administrators of these institutions who were responsible for implementing these policies in their new universities to ascertain how their institutions’ goals were constrained by the legislation, and whether it gave them sufficient freedom to develop as they wished. Finally, it asks from the perspective of both policy-makers and senior institutional administrators, what in their view is the appropriate balance between freedom and control?

### R8.4
**Conwy 1 | Group Discussion R8 | Friday 9.30-10.45**

**Academic freedom and forms of autonomy (0124)**

*Martin Gough, University of Liverpool, UK*

**Research Domain:** Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The aim of this paper is employ conceptual analysis to challenge the stance that there is no special licence for academic freedom, a stance which does not appreciate the distinction between two senses of autonomy in relation to work. These senses, supplied by John White, are, respectively, ‘autonomous work’ and ‘autonomy in work’. Academic work is paradigmatically autonomous work and, against White, it cannot be conducted properly if heteronomous. Because of its character, against both White and Nixon, it also demands particular provision for autonomy in work too. The academic work environment may be changing but it does not follow that core elements cannot be defended at the same time as allowing academic work to serve society.
R9

Conwy 2 | Session R9 | Friday 9.30 – 10.00

Epistemic cognition and in-class activities of engineering students (0274)

Siara Isaac, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland. Paul Ashwin, University of Lancaster, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Do a student’s epistemic beliefs about engineering influence the in-class activities s/he deems appropriate? Eleven semi-structured phenomenological interviews were used to produce a 4 stage model, where the 3 lower levels were populated. This communication will also report the results of a large scale administration of a quantitative instrument planned for autumn 2016, however the optimisation data (N=518) indicates that year of study, gender and study concentration each have small, significant effects certain dimensions and not on others. The combined frequencies for the two most epistemically complex responses for a “good professor” was <15% (N=322) and constant across year of study. Students expectations for “good students” were more complex and weakly correlated to year of study (p<.01, Cramer’s v = .162).

The apparent lack of significant development of engineering students’ epistemic beliefs is vexatious, consistent with prior studies and should prompt engineering educators to develop approaches to address this stagnation.

SYMPOSIUM R10

Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Effects of Changing Governance on the Autonomy and Control of Higher Education in Germany and the United Kingdom

Discussant: L. Leisye, TU Dortmund, Germany

Chair: J. Enders, University of Bath, UK

Symposium rationale

The overarching title for this year’s SRHE annual conference is “Exploring Freedom and Control in global higher education”. We would therefore like to propose a symposium in which the challenges of rapidly changing HE systems (Germany/UK) are reflected and from which we might discover which lessons might be learnt from one another, or which mistakes might be avoided. In the UK many aspects of higher education are being scrutinized, contested, or even overturned and where the validity of institutions such as HEFCE (funding body), HEA (validation of teaching quality) or the QAA (quality assurance) are being questioned. In Germany meanwhile, the Bicoden Commission, which reported in January 2016 on the German Excellence Initiative and the recent Bundesverfassungsgericht decision on accreditation practice are equally making waves and raising overarching the question: Quo vadis, Higher Education? What are the driving forces behind such proposed changes? Who are the players? Are their concerns justified? Are HEIs having enough say as to how external control mechanisms such as accreditation or quality assurance agencies are operating? It seems particularly timely to take a comparative look at these developments as these may impact well beyond the borders of the country in question.

R10.1

Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Shifting Governance Arrangements and Protected Spaces in Universities (0216)

Liudvika Leisye, TU Dortmund, Germany

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The tensions between core academic activities due to higher education governance reforms result in the concern for the professional autonomy of academics on the one hand, and its implications for changing logics of protected academic spaces. These changed conditions at universities have serious repercussions for what constitutes academic work, and where, how and under what conditions, academics can pursue knowledge creation and dissemination activities. This chapter aims to address the tensions between the
academy profession and the university as an organization. It poses two questions. How are protected academic spaces created under different logics in different governance regimes? How do academics respond to threats to these protected academic spaces? To address these questions, we first conceptualize the shifts in the governance arrangements in terms of different institutional logics. Further, we construct a typology of the relationship between the level of the protected spaces and the level of discretion academics have.

R10.2 Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Organising Academic Work and the English Teaching Excellence Framework (0225)

Rosemary Deem, University of London, Royal Holloway College, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

In this paper I want to reflect on issues about academic staff, universities as organisations and teaching and learning in higher education as part of wider patterns of the organization of academic work, particularly in the context of the plans in England in 2016 to introduce a Teaching Excellence Framework (Department for Business Innovation and Skills 2016), something which is likely to have a significant effect on the organization of academic work in the English higher education system. I also draw on my own experience of working in a senior leadership role concerned with teaching. The themes I explore, all of which have wider relevance to higher education systems, are: the differences between managing and leading teaching, the relationship between the changing work and identities of academics and other university stuff who support teaching and finally, possible future alternative organizational structures for higher educational institutions.

R10.3 Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Changing Forms of Governance in German Higher Education (0229)

Susan Harris-Huemmert, University of Speyer, Germany

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Higher education governance is determined by external and internal arrangements, many of which are legally defined (De Boer & File 2009; Davidovitsch 2015). Although Article 5(3) of the German constitution states that art and science, research and teaching are free, European resolutions, Germany’s Higher Education Framework Law and the HE legislation of each of its 16 Länder provide jurisdiction for the roles and tasks of key individual players in HEIs and of their governing bodies. Many German HEIs, which have been system-accredited in return for greater autonomy, have adapted existing governance structures or introduced new decision-making bodies for internal accreditation processes. This paper, which draws on an ongoing empirical investigation, presents a first synopsis of different decision-making models for accreditation in German system-accredited HEIs and reveals how German higher education is becoming more autonomous as a result.

R10.4 Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Comparing German and British Governance with the Governance-Equalizer: An empirical trial (0232)

Michael Hoelscher, University of Speyer, Germany

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The changing governance in Higher Education has often been linked to the concept of New Public Management. The dominant view in the literature is that a growing international isomorphism (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) with regard to this concept can be observed. While the content and logic of this concept has been described extensively, attempts to operationalise its growing prevalence empirically, especially in comparative perspective, are rare. One important proposal in this direction is the so-called Governance-Equalizer by de Boer, Enders and Schimanek (2007). However, their approach is based on qualitative assessments, making additional comparisons between countries and over time difficult. Further operationalisations with quantitative data are still missing. The paper will therefore present an empirical test of the availability and applicability of quantitative data for operationalising the Governance-Equalizer in an international comparative perspective.
R10.5
Denbigh 1 | Symposium R10 | Friday 9.30-11.45

Purity and danger in university governance: a comparative analysis of autonomy and control in higher education (0260)

Terri Kim, University of East London, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The paper considers the contemporary versions of university governance against the classic typologies drawing on Humboldt and Jaspers in Germany and Adam Smith and John Henry Newman in the UK. The contemporary university governance paradigms have become increasingly subjugated to the State regulations and corporate interests in many countries regardless of different academic traditions and contexts. The ideas of “academic capitalism”, the “entrepreneurial” or “market-framed” university have been employed to capture ongoing neo-liberal trends across the globe. Simultaneously there is a fierce competition for public funds regulated by the state and a sharpening institutional stratification as a result of performance measurements. Examples will be drawn from the UK, Europe and East Asia. Given the contexts, the paper will then critically reconsider the long established ideas of academic autonomy and boundaries of “sanctity” and “pollution” – by invoking Mary Douglas (1966) - in the domain of university governance.

R11
Denbigh 2 | Session R11 | Friday 9.30-10.00

Internationalised Higher Education: A Mandate for Multicultural Training? (0016)

Dorota Celinska, Roosevelt University, USA

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The effectiveness of course formats for multicultural training in higher education for psychologists, counselors and educators remains an under-researched domain. The limitations of the widely utilized traditional on-campus course format call for research on the effects of possible alternatives. This study utilized quantitative and qualitative methodologies to compare student multicultural learning across the on-campus course and the international course. The student learning outcomes from 29 graduate students from the United States were measured using self-reported openness towards diverse clientele and qualitative analysis of permanent products. All sources of data support an add-on value of the international format. Compared to their counterparts, students in the international course reported more interest in interacting with diverse populations, more often attributed their personal growth to experiences within diverse cultures, and demonstrated higher quality self-reflections, ability to take multiple perspectives, and novel connections between experiential field experiences and the course concepts.

R12
Raglan | Session R12 | Friday 9.30-10.00

Gendered and classed graduate transitions to work: How the unequal playing field is constructed, maintained and experienced (0231)

Richard Waller, Harriet Bradley, UWE, Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

A recent IFS report of 200,000 graduates highlighted 18% higher earnings for graduates from independent schools compared to their state educated peers. Even controlling for class background, university attended, subject studied and career destination, the pay gap was still 6%.

Using data from the Leverhulme Trust funded Paired Peers study of the experiences of working- and middle-class students at Bristol’s two universities, we explore processes of capital acquisition, accumulation and mobilisation involved in securing advantageous graduate outcomes for those from established middle-class backgrounds.

We present a typology of four graduate outcomes: ‘on-track’, ‘pushing forward’, ‘drifting’ and ‘deferred career’, and demonstrate how, whilst individual agency contributes to determining the pathway followed, structural positioning is significantly more influential for any individual’s outcome. We also show how ‘elite’ university attendance increases a student’s chances of securing a professional graduate outcome, especially if it follows studying at a fee paying or otherwise selective school.
GROUP DISCUSSION S5

S5.1 Caerphilly | Group Discussion S5 | Friday 10.15-10.45

Educational Design Research as a System of Inquiry (0262)

Sebastian H.D. Fiedler, Tobias Schmohl, University of Hamburg, Germany

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

Among contemporary approaches to educational technology research in higher education “educational design research” (EDeR) - also called “design-based research” - has gained considerable attention. While design interventions are regularly promoted in various types of practice settings, EDeR researchers however often emphasise the primacy of “theory” without making explicit what type of knowledge claims they actually hope to produce. Regardless of their focus on intervention into contextualised practice, EDeR researchers often seem to maintain an ideal of “scientific” rationale that is fundamentally geared towards universal knowledge claims.

In this paper we will explore methodological blind spots and challenges of contemporary educational design research and its application in the field of educational technology in higher education. In addition, we will review some potential sources for inspiration that could fuel the further conceptual development and emancipation of EDeR as a system of inquiry.

S5.2 Caerphilly | Group Discussion S5 | Friday 10.15-10.45

Framing Educational Design Research: Abductive reasoning and the design of theory. (0300)

Tobias Schmohl, Sebastian H.D. Fiedler, University of Hamburg, Germany

Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

From an epistemological point of view, Educational Design Research (EDeR) can be described as a scientific way of doing two things: (a) creating knowledge to solve specific problems of practical relevance in educational settings, and (b) drawing theoretical constructs (e.g.: generalized conclusions) from these particular design cases.

It is not very clear, how to explain (b) methodologically – that is how to explain to build up new, innovative and practically useful theoretical constructs. In our contribution, we would like to suggest that creation of theoretical constructs in EDeR should be methodologically considered as variations of abductive reasoning (Petrie, 1903, p. 189) – which might, compared to “conventional” approaches, even lead to more convincing ways of understanding EDeR.

S7 Chepstow | Session S7 | Friday 10.15-10.45

Liberating knowledge or curtailing academic freedoms? The story of a deep dive into impact of REF case studies in Leadership Governance and Management (0119)

Fiona Ross, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, UK. Elizabeth Morrow, Research Support, UK

Research Domain: Management, leadership, governance and quality (MLGQ)

This paper explores research impact through data mining and qualitative analysis of 1,309 Impact case studies published in the (REF 2014) database in the field of leadership, governance and management (LGM). The results show there is substantial LGM research going on in the sector (86%, n=131 HEIs returned LGM case studies), which cross-cuts disciplinary boundaries. Overall the evidence of LGM research impact is significant in terms of use of evidence, use of research products, effect on individuals and effect on groups/ organisations. The analysis of the case study data shows that impact is not necessarily sequential and research use may not always lead to measurable effects. We argue the research community needs to overcome the limitations of thinking in a linear fashion and re-imagine research impact as a complex and adaptive system – in this way we see the pursuit of impact as liberation rather than controlling or curtailing academic freedoms.
S11  Denbigh 2  |  Session S11  |  Friday 10.15-10.45

For now we see through a glass, darkly – critical perspectives on the rise of learning analytics in higher education (0331)

Sue Timmis, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper offers a critical review of the rise of learning analytics and its growing influence on learning and teaching in higher education. Learning analytics refers to the collection, measurement and monitoring of learner generated digital data (Ferguson, 2012). Drawing on a recent literature review, the paper gives an historical overview and interrogates claims being made by proponents of learning analytics. It explores ethical implications, data collected, its value and validity in assessment and student engagement, and implications for national systems, including the UK Teaching Excellence Framework. Like the myth of the ‘digital native’, I argue that ‘learning analytics’ is gaining ground in policy circles through a zealous belief in technology and an increasing individualistic view of learning. The paper concludes that there needs to be more scrutiny of learning analytics to uncover and challenge the implications for learning, teaching and assessment. This paper is offered as a starting point.

S12  Raglan  |  Session S12  |  Friday 10.15-10.45

The Impact of Postgraduate Management Education on Students’ Perceptions of Employability, (0241)

Clare E. Jones, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

Higher Education Institutions face growing pressure to address employability. Literature offers no single definition of employability, noting its evolution from an economic interpretation of the ability to secure work, to a multi-faceted concept including skills, self-efficacy and self-regulated learning. Much graduate employability research is grounded in the undergraduate population. This paper presents findings from a research project exploring perceptions of employability among postgraduate management students.

A survey of 450 students from two Universities’ Business Schools was undertaken at three points during postgraduate study. This enabled analysis of the research population (n=450) as a whole, of ‘snapshots’ during the programme, and some direct comparison of matched responses.

Findings show no increase in perceptions of employability following engagement with the programme.

This has implications for the students undertaking postgraduate study and for HEIs in terms of the programmes they are developing and delivering, and how interventions may be introduced to enhance employability.

T3  Beaumaris 2  |  Session T3  |  Friday 11.15-11.45

Danger! Quicksand. The experiences of teaching-only academics in UK Higher Education (0234)

Sarah Dyer, University Exeter, UK; Helen Walkington, Oxford Brookes, UK; Rebecca Williams, University of Hull, UK; Katherine Morton, University of Bristol, UK; Stephanie Wyse, Royal Geographical Society with the Institute of British Geographers, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper explores the themes of freedom and control as they are constructed through the ‘unbundling’ and disaggregation of academic work (Locke 2014). Our focus is the growing number of academics employed on teaching-only contracts. To highlight the increasing individualisation of academic work we inquire and write as a collective: members of a network for teaching-focused discussion in Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences (THE GEES network). Using auto-ethnographic writing of members who attended our inaugural network meeting, we describe the mechanisms which (re-)inscribe the marginalisation of teaching-only academics employed as graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), on temporary and/or fractional contracts, and those on permanent contracts. Our analysis highlights how cultural stories as well as structural factors are at play. We end by suggesting how the issues we identify could usefully be addressed.
**T4**

**Caldicot | Session T4 | Friday 11.15-11.45**

**The ‘free self’: A comparative study of bi-directional migration trajectories of students from mainland China and Hong Kong (0179)**

*Cora Lingling Xu, Keele University, UK*

*Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)*

In higher education research and the student mobility literature, there is a dearth of research on intra-national border-crossing student movements. Taking stock of the contrasting socio-cultural environments and intensifying political tensions between mainland China and Hong Kong, this paper compares the educational trajectories of two groups of students, i.e. those from mainland China (n=55) studying in Hong Kong universities and those from Hong Kong (n=40) pursing degrees in Beijing’s universities. Based on in-depth interviews and focus groups data, this paper draws on Bourdieu’s notions of field, habitus and capital to expound on the complex convergences and divergences between these students. Central to the struggles between freedom and control, both groups constructed a ‘free self’ that was critical of ideological biases manifested through cross-border dynamics. However, this paper highlights that social-class and access to economic and social capital could severely constrain the embodiment and practices of such a ‘free self’.

**T5**

**Caerphilly | Session T5 | Friday 12.00-12.30**

**Enhancing learning using authentic artefacts (0319)**

*Louise Taylor, Michael McCann, Nottingham Trent University, UK*

*Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)*

A common problem in education is that students fail to see the real-world application of the concepts they are learning. This deters their engagement, limiting their scholarship and attainment levels.

The research done in other disciplines (medicine in particular) offers significant support for the use of authentic learning and assessment strategies in order to prepare students for their future professional lives, and to heighten engagement, scholarship and attainment. However, the literature also indicates several considerations to be taken on board before adopting such approaches, including the time needed to create new materials and the resources needed to manage student and staff anxiety associated with the adoption of new modes of learning and assessment.

In this paper Louise Taylor (Law) and Michael McCann (Economics) discuss their experience of using authentic artefacts to encourage engagement and scholarship in their respective fields, and reflect on the literature that underpins their approaches.

**T6**

**Cardiff | Session T6 | Friday 11.15-11.45**

**Transforming into a Global University—A Case Study of Tsinghua University of China (0325)**

*Zhou Zhong, Tsinghua University, China, Shuangmiao Han, University of Oxford, UK*

*Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)*

This study aims at describing and explaining, through a single case study of Tsinghua University in China, how a university develops and manages its internationalisation at home alongside its international relations abroad in the process of making deep-reaching systematic changes. The study explores the major evolutionary and revolutionary changes Tsinghua have made through internationalisation, and how do domestic and global factors interact in the process to bring out the changes above. The study adopts the symbolic internationalism as the main theoretic framework to explore ‘social interaction’ in these endeavors. It is hoped to understand how Tsinghua redefines her role in higher education and in the local, national, international, intercultural and global scope respectively through this interpretation. Tsinghua’s case is also nested in the bigger picture of China’s higher education internationalisation policy since the 1980s, hence it represent Chinese university’s interpretion of the idea of internationalisation in and of higher education.
GROUP DISCUSSION T7

T7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion T7 | Friday 11.15-11.45

**Doing It Right When Someone Is Looking: Neoliberalism and Quality Assurance in UK Higher Education (0080)**

**Julia Hope**, University of Kent, UK

*Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)*

This paper considers the rise of neoliberalism and how quality assurance (QA) has emerged as a mechanism to enact a neoliberal ideology in UK Higher Education and discusses the dynamic interaction between QA and HE through the use of Harvey & Green's (1993) conceptions of quality. These concepts are used to interrogate the compliance proposed by the funding bodies in October 2014, and discusses the broad proposals following phase one of the review published in June 2015. This system may lead to an over reliance on provider’s absolute outputs and ignore a transformative approach to quality. Policy, regulation, and procedural requirements are neither, inconsequential or benign. Instead they shape what HE is, it is important that academics are mindful of the policy and regulatory landscapes that surround and inhabit them.

T7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion T7 | Friday 11.15-11.45

**Afghanistan higher education: An ecological approach to capacity development (0194)**

**Joseph B. Berger**, Hanni S. Thoma, University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA

*Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)*

The fall of the Taliban in 2001 marked a new beginning for higher education in Afghanistan, which had been previously devastated by nearly thirty years of conflict. This paper will describe the coordinated efforts of the Afghanistan Higher Education Project (HEP) and the Ministry of Higher Education with universities from 2006-2013 to rebuild Afghanistan’s higher education system. In taking an ecological approach using mutually reinforcing strategies, change was implemented at the macro, institutional, and individual levels to facilitate progress and reinforce support. Preliminary findings suggest that the quality of teaching improved significantly and that these individual gains were supported by improved organizational leadership and infrastructure as a result of the institutional developmental process. It was also clear that there were mixed results at the institutional level as some of the institutional development efforts were more comprehensive than others and the scope of change varied from institution to institution.

GROUP DISCUSSION T8

T8.1 Conwy 1 | Group Discussion T8 | Friday 11.15-11.45

**What ‘knowledge(s)’ underpin ‘impactful’ academic research in Higher Education? An analysis of REF 2014 Impact Case Studies. (0335)**

**Vassiliki Papatsiba**, Eliel Cohen, University of Sheffield, UK

*Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)*

Among the main funding bodies of UK academic research, there is appetite for analysis of the underpinning characteristics of “impactful” research. This presentation aims to contribute insights into the kinds of knowledge which appear to be conducive to social, broadly-speaking, influence and utility, as these were narrated and evidenced in Impact Case Studies submitted to the REF 2014. A sample of 39 cases was selected by searching for “higher education” in the Education Unit of Assessment (UoA). These strategically crafted documents were explored and analysed, particularly with regard to: whether the research was, application-oriented, transdisciplinary, and geared towards diverse or traditional sources of capital/prestige (financial/symbolic capital), as well as the choice of research topic/object, the site(s) of production, and the collaboration with non-academic partners.
While there has been emphasis in UK Government on evidence-based policy making, in practice the relationship between policy makers and researchers is often not comfortable as the two are deemed to inhabit ‘parallel universes’. Within the area of higher education specifically, higher education research is seen to have little impact on policy. This study sought to better understand the role played by higher education research and researchers in the higher education policy process. The study drew on findings from 26 interview with researchers, policy makers, policy influencers and funders of higher education research. Using Adam’s timescapes perspective, the research shows that there are different times at play in research and policy making, and these different times impact on how policy research is temporally perceived, how it is ordered within academic and policy life, how it is bound within careers and the pace at which it is played out in practice.

This study analyzed student perceptions of their learning experiences in the context of internationalised courses with international service learning component. In addition, the study identified curriculum activities and materials and associated learning mechanisms that students perceived as most contributing to their learning. As a result, the study offers insights into the effects of internationalised course pedagogy on student learning experiences. The participants were 21 students who responded to a semi-structured questionnaire. The responses were analyzed utilizing the inductive analysis and thematic representation methods. The results suggests that internationalised course format may provide a valuable enhancement to the traditional on-campus counterpart. In particular, this approach affords unique opportunities for experiential learning and self-reflection in novel cultural contexts. Specifically, internationalised courses may facilitate additional learning mechanisms associated with expanding students’ worldviews, challenging their biases, and experiencing cultural diversity through such activities as international service learning and interactions with unfamiliar cultures and languages.

The term ‘student engagement’ has become ubiquitous in mainstream discourses concerning higher education internationally. The term is used to denote a desirable set of practices and orientations in students - as such it has enormous influence in the sector. However, as it is also weakly theorised in the literature. This theoretical paper will interrogate the concept in order to deepen understanding of how the term operates. It will argue first that the notion relies on typological categories which posit the individual as the prototypical site of engagement, and secondly that this is primarily identified in interlocution or observable interaction. It will contend that this reflects a broader trend towards ‘learnification’ in higher education, positioning teaching as problematic and inherently repressive. I will build on this critique by arguing for a reframing which recognises the sociomaterial, radically distributed nature of human and nonhuman agency in day-to-day student engagement.
**T12**

Exploiting Social Networks as a Tool to Improve Student Learning and Employment Opportunities: Evidence from a range of Masters Degrees (0246)

Denise Hawkes, UCL Institute of Education, University of London, UK.
Gabriella Cagliesi, Riccardo DeVita, Yasaman Sarabi, University of Greenwich, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

Relational networks are important in shaping learners' behaviours (Vygotsky, 1978) and in securing a job (Granovetter, 1973). We considered the personal networks of students enrolled in postgraduate programmes at our institution. From 41 responses of the questionnaires we found two main groups for comparison: those students (19) with at least one parent holding a Higher Education (any university level) qualification with the ones of those participants (21) with parents not holding a university degree. When age and gender are analysed, respondents belonging to families with no university education seem to have a higher tendency toward homophily, i.e. to establish relations with other individuals of the same gender and in comparable age range. From a theoretical point of view, the richness of the database and its unique interdisciplinary nature has the potential to lead to innovative findings by bringing insights, leading to novel results in a fast changing environment.

**U1**

An Alternative Vision: Tracing Education Improvement Practices (0126)

Irene Malcolm, Rob Daley, Heriot-Watt University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

The paper is based on the early stages of research conducted at a Scottish university where the focus of provision is on specialist degrees for the professions. Against the background of new government policy in Higher Education and the context of bitting neoliberalism (Gewitz & Critol, 2009), the paper presents an analytical account of one institution's education improvement practices and their network effects over a number of years. The paper explores how these practices, conceptualised as knowledge work in a knowledge society (Knorr Cetina, 2001) may offer an alternative vision of education improvement.

**U2**

Drawing the Global Access Map: How access to higher education differs across the world (0056)

Graeme Atherton, London Higher; UK. Geoff Whitty, University of Newcastle, Australia.
Constantino Durnage, Cardiff University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper will outline the findings of a recent research project examining the extent of data available across the world on participation in HE by social background supported by Pearson Ptc, the University of Newcastle, Australia and the National Education Opportunities Network (NEON), England. It was based on analysis of secondary data from over 180 countries, a detailed survey of 50 countries and case studies of how data is collected in 6 countries. It argues that the collection of data is highly politicised and very partial but we can state that unequal access to HE is pervasive across continents, transcending rich and poor countries and those with differing political systems and educational structures. The paper will outline a “Global Equity Data Charter”, which is a series of practical steps that could be taken to improve how data is collected on who participates in HE across the world.
GROUP DISCUSSION U3

U3.1 Beaurams 2 I Group Discussion U3 I Friday 12.00-12.30

'Peacekeepers' and 'Machine Factories': a Foucauldian Exploration of Graduate Teaching Assistant Subjectivity in a Neoliberalised University (0025)

Rille Raaper, Durham University, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Guided by a Foucauldian theorisation and Faircloughian discourse analysis, this paper explores Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) experiences of their work and subjectivity in a neoliberalised higher education context. By presenting the findings from a small-scale research project with nine GTAs from one UK university the paper argues that GTA subjectivity is shaped by recent higher education reforms. While the GTAs interviewed are highly critical of neoliberalisation of higher education – particularly of internationalisation, marketisation and client culture – they also see these processes constituting their own work. The GTAs position themselves as mediators between demanding students and overworked academics; they have turned into much needed ‘peacekeepers’ and ‘machine factories’. This experience of institutional pressures conflicts with their intentions to provide pedagogical support and pastoral care to students. Furthermore, the findings emphasise a need for institutional support mechanisms that would allow GTAs to better cope with their pressurised subjectivity.

U3.2 Beaurams 2 I Group Discussion U3 I Friday 12.00-12.30

Emotion and moral concerns in university academics: an exploratory study of 66 case studies of teacher experiences (0145)

Kathleen M Quinlan, University of Oxford, UK

Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Although teaching is emotionally and ethically demanding, university teachers’ emotions and sense of moral purpose are under-researched. Based on the assumption that teachers’ emotions are bound up with their moral purposes, this study investigates what kinds of moral concerns underpin teachers’ emotional moments. It draws on Graham, Nosek, Haيدt, Iyer, & Ditto (2011) moral foundations theory which posits that there are five main moral intuitions/concerns found across cultures: Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity. Sixty-six case examples (written as emotionally evocative poems) were coded according to this five-part moral framework. Care/harm and authority/respect were the most common single moral concerns underpinning these emotional experiences, though there were examples of all five moral concerns within the set. Twenty of the cases referenced multiple moral concerns, suggesting the complexity of both emotional and moral demands in teaching. Implications for research, teaching and educational development are highlighted.

U4 Caldicot I Session U4 I Friday 12.00-12.30

Collaboration Matters: student mobility, schools and higher education international partnerships (0286)

Tina Byrom, Anne O’Grady, Nottingham Trent University, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The move towards increasing international partnerships in higher education has received much national attention in the UK, with most, if not all HEIs in England placing internationalisation high on their respective agendas. The operationalisation of an international strategy takes many forms and includes staff and student mobility and research collaborative projects. This collaborative project incorporates elements of all three areas with the additional dimension of working alongside teachers and pupils in local schools in the two participating countries: England and Denmark. With a clear directive to focus on ‘Citizenship’, this research adopts a Bourdieuan lens and qualitative based research approach to present the ways in which the partnership was developed, implemented and evaluated. Findings indicate that both staff and students gained a great deal from their involvement and that challenges associated with limited levels of economic, social and cultural capital were not prohibiting factors for student involvement.
U5  Caerphilly | Session U5 | Friday 12.00-12.30

Moving from Confidence to Competence in Critical Thinking Skills (0110)

Hilary Wason, Jane Southall, Deborah Anderson, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTa)

The ability to think critically has been highlighted as an important skill which graduates must acquire to compete in the Global Knowledge Economy. The authors have identified a lack of critical thinking skills amongst their undergraduates at a post 1992 institution. In response to this and with increasing pressure from the Teaching Excellence framework and a need to deliver value for money, this paper outlines a holistic and progressive critical thinking teaching framework which uses Bloom’s refined taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002) as a conceptual framework and embeds Facione (1998) critical thinking skills. It argues that while results from pilot action research cycles have demonstrated an increase in students’ confidence in their critical thinking abilities, it is arguably more important to develop a measure to be able to evaluate the impact of the framework on student competence so that added value can be demonstrated. This is the subject of further research.

GROUP DISCUSSION U10

U10.1  Denbigh | Group Discussion U10 | Friday 12.00-12.30

Student Conceptions of Employability: a phenomenographic study of placement vs non-placement business students (0267)

Rebecca Lees, Deborah Anderson, Barry Avery, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

This study considers the conceptions and understandings undergraduate business students hold about their employability. There is much ubiquity in the literature surrounding the term, which has a spectrum of definitions ranging from skills, knowledge and attributes, each with varying emphasis, to multi-dimensional constructs based on career identity and social capital. Whilst there is a widespread acknowledgement that higher education institutions need to develop students’ employability, there is little research that explores how students understand the term. This study phenomenographically analyses the conceptions held by two groups of undergraduate business students; those opting to undertake a work placement and those who have not. The findings suggest that non-placement students hold mostly generic conceptions focusing on employability as a noun, something you hold that gets you a job. Those with placement experience however held more complex understandings, featuring relevant competence and commitment to career development. Implications for practice are also discussed.

U10.2  Denbigh | Group Discussion U10 | Friday 12.00-12.30

Exploring Freedom and Control in TNE practice: Reflections on the Lived Degree and Placement Experience. (0296)

Sarah Montano, University of Birmingham, UK. Sarah Horton-Walsh, Coventry University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The global education market is becoming increasingly competitive and therefore, HEI’s are increasingly seeking to expand their educational offerings by investing in TNE (Transnational Education) programmes. For example, in Singapore, the Singapore Institution of Management offers 80 degree programmes delivered via 11 overseas universities (www.sinage.edu.sg), indicating the level of competition in the global marketplace (Lueckhian, 2014). Whilst, TNE degrees offer great opportunities for overseas students, nonetheless these opportunities also create tensions and challenges with both programme delivery and student experience.

One significant complication and challenge is that often these degree programmes will include student work placement options and embedded employability skills into the various courses. Despite the importance of such skills there is little research examining TNE programmes, employability skills and the student experience as noted by Mellors-Bourne et al. (2015). Therefore, in this paper we propose multi- method research in order to address such critical research gaps.
U11 | Denbigh 2 | Session U11 | Friday 12.00-12.30

Unravelling design principles for open-ended problem solving through boundary crossing in higher professional education (0147)

Marieke Veltman, Hanno van Keulen, Joke Voogt, Windesheim University of applied sciences, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

To an increasing extent society requires professionals to cross (disciplinary) boundaries in order to deal with complex and open-ended problems. However, little is known about how interventions in higher professional education (HPE) aimed at fostering learning through boundary crossing in the context of collaborative open-ended problem solving can be designed. In this study we examined curricula in HPE that provided students with experiences in open-ended problem solving through boundary crossing, drawn from engineering, agriculture, social work and business. The study revealed several crucial principles for the design of practices that result in open-ended problem solving skills. The first set of principles concerns the nature of problems. We conjecture that complexity, uncertainty and value-divergence are proreivsory dimensions. The second set of principles concerns the enhancement of learning efforts at boundaries and imposes conditions such as students’ involvement in multiple stakeholder collaborations, when their respective knowledge and perspectives are appreciated and incorporated.

U12 | Raglan | Session U12 | Friday 12.00-12.30

Exploring the processual nature of Human Resources Graduate Employability (HRGE): a line manager perspective (0302)

Emma Mullen, Northumbria University, UK

Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

In the UK, the skills agenda continues to dominate Higher Education (HE) policy (Leitch, 2006, Holmes, 2015, Jackson, 2016) with universities facing criticism from a range of stakeholders (particularly employers) regarding the work-readiness of graduates. However, Holmes advises that empirical studies should seek to understand the processes by which graduates engage with post-graduation trajectories, including interactions between graduates. This paper outlines findings from twenty-two semi-structured interviews with line managers of graduates working in HR graduate level jobs in the UK. Findings draw attention to the influence of workplace relationships on HR graduates’ university-workplace transitions, and shed light on the processual nature of employers’ perceptions of HR graduate employability (HRGE). Whereas HE policy focuses on skill-development and boosting the human capital potential of graduates, the findings of this paper pose the question: are we teaching what the workplace actually requires?
**POSTERS**

Caernarfon Foyer | Wednesday 13.45-14.15 / Thursday 13.30-14.00

---

1. **Critical evaluation of the features on one student dashboard (0034)**
   
   **Liz Bennett, University of Huddersfield, UK**
   
   Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)
   
   This poster critically evaluates the implementation of a particular undergraduate student dashboard. The evaluation uses Scheffel et al.’s (2014) five criteria for judging learning analytical quality (objectives, learning support, learning measures and output data aspects and organisational aspects). It presents the findings of the evaluation and identifies further questions for further research in the emergent area of learning analytics and dashboard design.

---

2. **Lessons learned from self-determination theory for improving the first year student experience. (0065)**
   
   **Jayne Dennis, Queen Mary University of London, UK**
   
   Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)
   
   Students experience a number of challenges upon entering higher education. These include: becoming self-directed and independent learners; developing competence and confidence in academic skills; and establishing relationships with staff and students at the new institution. Self-determination theory (SDT), proposed by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan, posits that motivation for inherent growth is driven by satisfaction of three basic psychological needs. These needs are autonomy (alternately called self-determination), competence and relatedness. The challenges faced by students in higher education align with SDT’s basic psychological needs. Consequently this paper proposes that institutions can improve the first year student experience by drawing on SDT theory and research to create environments which satisfy students’ psychological needs. Research findings are discussed and proposed interventions are described. Carefully designed research studies are needed to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of these interventions in HE institutions.

---

3. **The benefits for postgraduate mentors of the mentoring process. (0102)**
   
   **Sam Hopkins, University of Surrey, UK**
   
   Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)
   
   Current research identifies numerous benefits for the mentee in a mentoring relationship and there is also some evidence of benefits to mentors when involved in a project with a mentee. This project looked at the benefits for postgraduate researchers (PGRs) acting as mentors when there were no tangible project-based outputs for the mentor. The mentors identified three main areas that enhanced their scholarship and practice, specifically in the areas of skill development, reflection and personal wellbeing. Interestingly, the mentors identified skills they had gained through being a mentor that would be useful for them in the future (e.g. management and supervision), as well as useful for them now (e.g. communication, problem solving). This project demonstrates the value of using mentoring opportunities to help PGRs develop skills not necessarily gained on a traditional PhD programme.
The influence of peer feedback on students’ academic writing: A meta-analysis (0106)

Bart Huisman, Nadira Saab, Jan van Driel, ICLO, Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching, The Netherlands. Paul van den Broek, Education Sciences, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Academic writing tasks are an integral part of courses in the higher education context, and peer feedback is regularly implemented in relation to such writing tasks. Large groups of students, and increasingly available and practically useful digital tools, might very well contribute to a continuation (or even increase) of the application of peer feedback on academic writing tasks. Currently, however, an up-to-date overview of the effects of peer feedback on students’ academic writing performance is missing. The current meta-analysis specifically focuses on the effects of peer feedback on higher education students’ performance on academic writing tasks. By providing an overview of empirical findings, and by framing these in terms of key design variables for peer feedback processes, this meta-analysis aims to support higher education professionals with the implementation of peer feedback and identifies opportunities for future research.

The Impact of Empowerment in Teaching and Learning and Innovative Assessment. (0125)

Melanie Crofts, University of Northampton, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This project evaluates the impact of using teaching and learning methods which empower students and involves them as partners in the design and delivery of a module. The aim is to explore the impact of student involvement and partnership working on engagement, retention and achievement. In addition, students will be involved in designing their own assessments. The aim is to consider how the use of such innovative assessment methods impacts on academic integrity and students’ perceptions of assessments. The project will evaluate whether empowering students and giving them a sense of greater ownership of their work and involvement in the design of the module impacts upon their engagement and perceptions of the work as ‘theirs’.

Understand International Students’ Learning Needs and Improving Student Experience in an Increasingly Multicultural Context (0283)

Angela Christidis, University of Exeter, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This study aims to investigate in more depth issues related to working with international students and develop further understanding on their academic needs and learning style. In this paper, students’ views collected during the interviews are discussed alongside staff’s perspective to investigate whether there is a mismatch in perception. Some common issues pointed by students and staff albeit from a different perspective include areas of concern related to independent study, critical thinking, group work, assessment, language issues and plagiarism, and interaction with home students. While it is important to improve understanding of the international students’ learning needs, it is also essential not to compromise the needs of home students and the integrity of professional teaching and learning standards in UK Higher Education. The objectives of this study are to foster intercultural communication and learning, understand cross-cultural knowledge, and improve academic staff’s ability to interact with students from culturally diverse background.
Quality assurance processes and creativity in teaching and learning: lessons from the creative industries (0294)
Jonathan Baldwin, University of South Wales, UK
Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

QA processes in Higher Education are based on models borrowed from manufacturing where there is a need to ensure that the process produces the same thing every time, without variation and with quality assured beforehand. Contrast this with the creation of inventions, ideas, user interfaces, assistive devices, vehicles, films, novels – creativity requires variation, chance, and risk. Universities are more analogous to creative organisations than factories.

Quality Assurance in higher education generally means a focus on processes, outcomes and institutional function or, more bluntly, making sure ‘you are doing the right things, the right way’ (Glazer, n.d.).

This approach presents a block to creativity, and risks the development of courses and pedagogy that lacks innovation, and contradicts current models of creativity and creative environments.

This poster presents examples of ongoing action research to utilize methods from the creative industries that encourage risk-taking and experimentation.

Re-inventing the Wheel: Using Kolb’s Learning Cycle and Dewey’s Model of Reflective Thought to Classify Experiential Learning in the Law curriculum (0289)
Cath Sylvester, Northumbria University, UK
Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Undergraduate Law Programmes are increasingly adopting experiential learning methodologies such as problem or enquiry based learning and clinical legal education to deliver a range of legal thinking and problem solving skills and for the development of professional identity and values. As Miettinen (2000) observed in his article ‘The Concept of Experiential Learning and John Dewey’s Theory of Reflective Thought and Action’ experiential modules often refer to Dewey’s reflective cycle and Kolb’s learning cycle interchangeably. Miettinen urges teachers to re-engage with Dewey’s cycle and avoid Kolb’s ‘psychological reductionism’. This paper will argue that the two approaches offer different but valuable contributions to legal education and uses Miettinen’s critique to provide a framework for analysing and classifying experiential modules. By applying this framework in the context of the Northumbria Law curriculum we can ensure that experiential modules are better designed to deliver the required outcomes and are supported within the curriculum.

The employability of international masters-level student matters (0342)
Omolabake Fakunle, University of Edinburgh, UK
Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

As a group, masters-level students are under-researched compared to undergraduates and postgraduate research students. This paper expounds on the lack of research focus on the dearness of policy initiatives on the employability of international masters-level student in the UK. Examples from policy on higher education and employability in the UK, from the Robbins Report, 1963, the Dearing Report, 1997 to the recent Teaching Excellence Framework Report, 2016, and research on graduate employability are used to buttress the point for the need to understand the totality of the experiences of masters-level students who with their UK peers study and graduate from UK HEIs. Finally, the relatively new initiative to enhance the employability of masters-level students supported by some universities in Scotland and the Scottish Funding council is used as an example of possibilities to enhance the employability of international masters-level students in a global higher education setting such as the UK.
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<td>Nielsen, Gritt</td>
<td>0122</td>
<td>N3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordin, Noor Asilah</td>
<td>0043</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergård, Ricky</td>
<td>0161</td>
<td>N1.4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergård, Ricky Toft</td>
<td>0175</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulty, Duncan</td>
<td>0013</td>
<td>P6.2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurmi, Kaisa</td>
<td>0031</td>
<td>M5.2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Grady, Anne</td>
<td>0286</td>
<td>U4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, Martin</td>
<td>0334</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olliffe, Bronwyn</td>
<td>0188</td>
<td>J7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar, Suha</td>
<td>0041</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orr, Kevin</td>
<td>0304</td>
<td>N8.2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orr, Susan</td>
<td>0323</td>
<td>R1.4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne, Nicola</td>
<td>0219</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Shea, Sarah</td>
<td>0151</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmon, Karie</td>
<td>0306</td>
<td>N8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papallipippou, Vanda</td>
<td>0084</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatsiba, Vassiliki</td>
<td>0335</td>
<td>T8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partridge, Lee</td>
<td>0237</td>
<td>Q5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelerin, Martine</td>
<td>0068</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persson, Mats</td>
<td>0055</td>
<td>D8, F7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peseta, Tai</td>
<td>0237</td>
<td>Q5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petric, Bojana</td>
<td>0213</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilcher, Nick</td>
<td>0149</td>
<td>T8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilkington, Ruth</td>
<td>0172</td>
<td>L1.1, L1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittan, Oluymi</td>
<td>0022</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poli, Susi</td>
<td>0295</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Hazel</td>
<td>0189</td>
<td>J8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priego-Hernandez, Jacqueline</td>
<td>0070</td>
<td>L6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan, Kathleen M</td>
<td>0145</td>
<td>U3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raaper, Rille</td>
<td>0025</td>
<td>U3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Richard</td>
<td>0273</td>
<td>Q5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragupathi, Kiruthika</td>
<td>0044</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay, Georgina</td>
<td>0073</td>
<td>C2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao, Namrata</td>
<td>0099</td>
<td>R6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauliopuro, Juhani</td>
<td>0104</td>
<td>J12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read, Barbara</td>
<td>0324</td>
<td>K3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennert, Christian</td>
<td>0212</td>
<td>K8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds, Pauline</td>
<td>0277</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richter, Paul</td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>K4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentjes, Bart</td>
<td>0079</td>
<td>L9, C11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizvi, Saman Zehra</td>
<td>0098</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, David</td>
<td>0001</td>
<td>K11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson, Sue</td>
<td>0280</td>
<td>D10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogaten, Jekaterina</td>
<td>0215</td>
<td>C11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pauline</td>
<td>0307</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Fiona</td>
<td>0119</td>
<td>P7, S7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Dan</td>
<td>0178</td>
<td>P6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Daniel</td>
<td>0243</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford, Stephen</td>
<td>0263</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder, Agi</td>
<td>0144</td>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saab, Nadira</td>
<td>0106</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakr, Mona</td>
<td>0064</td>
<td>K9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabi, Yasaman</td>
<td>0246</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scally, Jennifer</td>
<td>0228</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schendel, Rebecca</td>
<td>0255</td>
<td>G10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmohl, Tobias</td>
<td>0262</td>
<td>S5.1, S5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schofield, Cathy</td>
<td>0051</td>
<td>P4, B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Ian</td>
<td>0215</td>
<td>C11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahhahan, Riyad A</td>
<td>0165</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanahan, Jennifer</td>
<td>0272</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe, Rhona</td>
<td>0215</td>
<td>C11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shay, Suellen</td>
<td>0255</td>
<td>G10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shcherbenok, Andrey</td>
<td>0338</td>
<td>K7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, Sue</td>
<td>0218</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheree, Alison</td>
<td>0323</td>
<td>R1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siesling, Mirjam</td>
<td>0295</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silberfeld, Carolyn</td>
<td>0026</td>
<td>M12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinha, Tammi</td>
<td>0315</td>
<td>M7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skead, Melanie</td>
<td>0236</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smedley, Jo</td>
<td>0275</td>
<td>L10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Christine</td>
<td>0258</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Colin</td>
<td>0128</td>
<td>L12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Hilary</td>
<td>0083</td>
<td>B9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Joan</td>
<td>0008</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Karen</td>
<td>0148, 0149</td>
<td>H8, T8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Sally</td>
<td>0128</td>
<td>H12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soncin, Mara</td>
<td>0238</td>
<td>R5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southall, Jane</td>
<td>0021, 0110, 0178, 0244</td>
<td>P6.3, P6.1, F7, U5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacey, Rachel</td>
<td>0113</td>
<td>N9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer, Maureen</td>
<td>0130</td>
<td>R4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sperotti, Francesca</td>
<td>0038</td>
<td>N5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spowart, Lucy</td>
<td>0177</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, Jacqueline</td>
<td>0062, 0073, 0250</td>
<td>C2.2, C2.3, R2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Kearsley</td>
<td>0272</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock, Manfred</td>
<td>0220</td>
<td>Q7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, Mary</td>
<td>0113</td>
<td>N9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su, Feng</td>
<td>0199</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suominen, Hanna</td>
<td>0097</td>
<td>K12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetman, Rachel</td>
<td>0153</td>
<td>N1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester, Cath</td>
<td>0299</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatam, John</td>
<td>0316, 0317</td>
<td>H6.1, H6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, David</td>
<td>0314</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, John</td>
<td>0043</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Louise</td>
<td>0319</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempelaar, Dirk</td>
<td>0079</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thambar, Nanayini</td>
<td>0239</td>
<td>C11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thingholm, Hanne</td>
<td>0141</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoma, Hanni S</td>
<td>0194</td>
<td>T7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Pam</td>
<td>0088</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Ron</td>
<td>0140</td>
<td>G2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timms, Sue</td>
<td>0331</td>
<td>S11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toft-Nielsen, Claus</td>
<td>0175</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolstrup Holmegaard, Henriette</td>
<td>0085</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonhauser, Carol</td>
<td>0068</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torney, Roland</td>
<td>0278</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, Martine</td>
<td>0208</td>
<td>G7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigwell, Keith</td>
<td>0237</td>
<td>Q6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Rebecca</td>
<td>0171</td>
<td>N12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uriksen, Lars</td>
<td>0115, 0167, 0205</td>
<td>L4.2, M5.1, D4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursin, Jan</td>
<td>0104</td>
<td>J12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Blankenstein, Floris</td>
<td>0112</td>
<td>N6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van den Broek, Paul</td>
<td>0106</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Rijt, Roeland</td>
<td>0105</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Driel, Jan</td>
<td>0105, 0106</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Keulen, Hanno</td>
<td>0147</td>
<td>U11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varga-Atkins, Tunde</td>
<td>0095</td>
<td>L10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varnham, Sally</td>
<td>0188</td>
<td>J7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, Sian</td>
<td>0224</td>
<td>J5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veitman, Marieke</td>
<td>0147</td>
<td>U11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereijken, Mayke</td>
<td>0105</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vervent, Jan</td>
<td>0230</td>
<td>C11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ververi, Olga</td>
<td>0293</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Room Code</td>
<td>Location Code</td>
<td>Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignoles, Anna</td>
<td>0230</td>
<td>C114</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigurs, Katy</td>
<td>0096</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viljanen, Rea</td>
<td>0031</td>
<td>M5.2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voogt, Joke</td>
<td>0147</td>
<td>U11</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vukmirovic, Mila</td>
<td>0278</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waite, Katrina</td>
<td>0188, 0193</td>
<td>J7, P11</td>
<td>49.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Melanie</td>
<td>0251, 0194</td>
<td>G10.1, R4.2</td>
<td>43.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkington, Helen</td>
<td>0234, 0272</td>
<td>T3, Q11</td>
<td>95.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller, Richard</td>
<td>0231, 0265</td>
<td>R12, H4</td>
<td>93.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Elaine</td>
<td>0117</td>
<td>P9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburton, Steven</td>
<td>0215</td>
<td>C11.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardrop, Alex</td>
<td>0311</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wason, Hilary</td>
<td>0021, 0110, 0178, 0243</td>
<td>F4, P6.3, P6.1, U5</td>
<td>33.74,75,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne, Yvonne</td>
<td>0223</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster, Gemma</td>
<td>0128</td>
<td>L12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wegner, Antje</td>
<td>0168</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei, Wei</td>
<td>0068</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westenberg, Michiel</td>
<td>0112</td>
<td>N6.1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton, Yvette</td>
<td>0228</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchurch, Celia</td>
<td>0047</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitecock, Denise</td>
<td>0079, 0215</td>
<td>L9, C11.2</td>
<td>59.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitton, Nicola</td>
<td>0175</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitty, Geoff</td>
<td>0056</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Rebecca</td>
<td>0234</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Adrian</td>
<td>0239</td>
<td>C11.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Caroline</td>
<td>0336</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Rob</td>
<td>0292</td>
<td>K4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson-Strydom, Merridy</td>
<td>0340</td>
<td>G2.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisler, Gina</td>
<td>0285</td>
<td>R3.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Margaret</td>
<td>0199</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Phil</td>
<td>0008</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Toni</td>
<td>0239</td>
<td>C11.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würmann, Carsten</td>
<td>0212</td>
<td>K8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyse, Stephanie</td>
<td>0234</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu, Cora Lingling</td>
<td>0179</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ylijoki, Oili-Helena</td>
<td>0075</td>
<td>C2.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan, Tingting</td>
<td>0293</td>
<td>U9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhong, Zhou</td>
<td>0325</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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