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.

Visit the SRHE website: www.srhe.ac.uk
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:

- 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.
- 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 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.

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 activities is not restricted to current members of the Society.

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

Convenors: Dr Emily Henderson, University of Warwick; Dr Ye Liu, King’s College, London; Dr Josef Ploner, University of Hull.

Newer Researchers Network

Convenors: Dr Mark Kerrigan, Anglia Ruskin University; Dr Saranne Weller, 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.
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Higher Education
Rising to the Challenge
Balancing expectations of students, society and stakeholders

SRHE Annual Research Conference
6-8 December 2017
Celtic Manor, Newport, South Wales, UK

Conference Programme & Book of Abstracts
New titles for 2016
Jennifer M. Case
Jeroen Huisman
into Higher Education
Co-published with the Society for Research
Interested in discussing a book idea for this series? Visit the Routledge stand to speak to the editors about your proposal.
please visit the Routledge stand or

Research into Higher Education Series
Co-published with the Society for Research into Higher Education
Series Editors: Jeroen Huisman, Ghent University, Belgium and Jennifer M. Case, University of Cape Town, South Africa
This exciting series aims to publish cutting edge research and scholarship that reflects the rapidly changing world of higher education, examined in a global context.

Titles in the series

- New Reconstructing Relationships in Higher Education by Celia Whitchurch, George Gordon
- 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 Misiaszek
- Student Politics and Protest edited by Rachel Brooks
- Theorising Learning to Teach in Higher Education edited by Brenda Leibowitz, Vivienne Bozalek and Peter Kahn
- Freedom to Learn by Bruce Macfarlane

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.

SRHE Members Online Portal from Routledge
Access Studies in Higher Education, Research into Higher Education Abstracts and Policy Reviews in Higher Education (NEW) online, in addition to:
- Teaching in Higher Education
- Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education
- Quality in Higher Education
- European Journal of Higher Education
- Innovations in Education & Teaching International
- Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education
- Journal of Marketing for Higher Education
- Higher Education (NEW) online, in addition to:
  - Journal of Marketing for Higher Education
  - European Journal of Higher Education
  - Higher Education Abstracts and Policy Reviews in Higher Education
  - Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education
  - Journal of Marketing for Higher Education

To find out more about Policy Reviews in Higher Education please visit the Routledge stand or www.tandfonline.com/RPRH.
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welcome Letter – Helen Perkins, Director SRHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conference programme at a glance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 6th December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 7th December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 8th December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plenary Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary 1: Knowledge economy or ecology? Different ways of thinking about and organising the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Susan Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary 2: Stakeholders’ Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place making: The role of universities in supporting social mobility and regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Mary Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspectives and expectations of students in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Sundberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary 3: Expectations for Research and Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Research Directions Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Open Forum delegate debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Book of Abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Author Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>SRHE Conferences 2018 and 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of the Society for Research into Higher Education, and all the individuals who have contributed to the development of the 2017 SRHE Annual Research Conference, I extend a very warm welcome to you all.

I hope that you will experience a lively and stimulating conference and enjoy your time at the Celtic Manor, taking full advantage of all the Conference programme has to offer and the networking space which this venue allows for connecting with colleagues from around the world.

This year we are not just at full capacity with our delegate numbers, we have exceeded the capacity of even the Celtic Manor venue. This is both exciting as well as logistically challenging. It means we have a very busy programme of parallel sessions for paper presentations and a packed timetable of other sessions and events. We put a lot of time into preparing a comprehensive Conference Programme and detailed Timetable so that delegates can search out the sessions they want to participate in and find their way to all the events, activities and academic presentations on offer over the three days of conference.

The year’s Conference theme is: **Higher Education Rising to the Challenge: Balancing expectations of students, society and stakeholders**

More is required of universities than ever before, as they contribute to economic growth through research that has impact and as they educate citizens who can contribute to society and the working world. Tensions are inevitable but change produces new opportunities.

Longstanding traditions of disinterested enquiry, of critique and of learning for its own sake may contribute to economic ends but may also be in tension with them. A drive towards excellence may produce beneficial change but may conflict with a wish for inclusion. Efficiency and effectiveness need to be tempered with a concern for wellbeing. Thus there are major challenges at system, institutional and individual levels to balance the many purposes of a university in the twenty-first century.

**Plenary Sessions and debates**

In our plenary sessions and debates our conference seeks to explore the expectations of higher education in this challenging setting and examine the ways in which higher education is responding in different contexts and environments.

In our three plenary sessions this year we aim to explore these issues through the lens of four different perspectives; those of the university; of society, of students and of researchers.

Professor Susan Wright, from Aarhus University, opens the Conference addressing ‘Knowledge economy or ecology? Different ways of thinking about and organising the university’.

On Thursday, in a two-part plenary, Professor Mary Stuart, from the University of Lincoln, addresses key aspects of societal expectations in her keynote; ‘Place making: The Role of Universities in supporting Social Mobility and Regional Development. The second address from Caroline Sundberg, Vice President of the European Students’ Union will focus on the ‘Perspectives and expectations of students in higher education’.

Finally, on Friday, our closing plenary speaker, David Sweeney, Executive Chair Designate of Research England speaks directly to issue at the core of this conference for all participants; ‘Expectations of research and researchers’.

A fundamental aim of the SRHE Conference is to provide for the presentation of papers relating to research into higher education across the widest spectrum of topics. This year we have 284 papers being presented across 12 different research domains in a variety of different formats: individual presentations, group discussions, 12 symposia and 3 round tables.

The SRHE Conference aims throughout to be highly participative and our Research Directions Seminars, developed by the SRHE supported Networks, are a key part of the sharing and networking elements of conference. This year we are offering seminars in four of our research domains;

- Digital University: Critical Learning Analytics;
- Higher Education Policy & International Research and researchers joint seminar: Discussing Higher Education Tuition fees: International Perspectives;
• Postgraduate Issues: The Paradigm Shift towards the Commodification of Postgraduate Education; and
• Student Experience: Belonging, student voice and community.

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 current connections and help establish new ones. The Research Directions seminars are developed and facilitated by the SRHE Network Convenors. They will open with focused presentations from invited contributors leading into open discussions. Full details of each of these seminars are contained in this Conference programme.

Running in parallel to these discussions there will also be a more informal opportunity to meet with and talk with the convenors of the other SRHE Networks.

To round off a packed first day of Conference we are responding to many requests from delegates for an additional space within the conference programme for open dialogue around the main theme of the conference, on what is expected from higher education and how effectively such expectations are being met. We are doing this by convening an Open Forum Debate after dinner on the first evening of the Conference. The debate will be chaired by the SRHE President, Professor Sir Bob Burgess, but other than the President’s opening remarks there will be no formal speeches from the platform.

This Open Forum Debate is a space for all those attending conference to make their contributions from the floor, to share and explore ideas, thoughts, suggestions, and experiences, national and international perspectives and also suggest proposals for follow up plans and possible actions.

Whilst recognising that this is an evening event after a full first day we warmly invite delegates to come along and contribute to this open forum. To help sustain energy levels for this debate refreshments will be available at the Caernarfon Suite for all participants.

The Society’s annual conferences are truly international, bringing together delegates and contributors from around the world. This year we welcome delegates from 32 countries and the international perspectives shine through in the paper presentations and across every element of the conference.

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. Making a large, international conference a welcoming, friendly and collegial experience for all is something we want the SRHE Conference to be known for.

The conference programme provides plenty of opportunity to exchange knowledge and ideas with colleagues working on similar topics and, equally importantly, 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 2018.

Helen Perkins, Director SRHE
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME AT A GLANCE

Wednesday 6 December 2017

<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>10.45 – 11.00</td>
<td>Helen Perkins, SRHE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td>Plenary 1 Knowledge economy or ecology? Different ways of thinking about and organising the university</td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td>Professor Susan Wright, Professor of Educational Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td>Danish School of Education, Aarhus University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: A1-A12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 – 14.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: D1-D12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15 – 16.45</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee Break</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Paper Presentations: Sessions: F1-F12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.45 – 18.30</td>
<td>Research Directions Seminars</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.45 – 18.30</td>
<td>Meet the Network Convenors</td>
<td>Level C2 Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 – 19.15</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
<td>Merlin’s Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 – 19.15</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>
<tr>
<td>20.00 – 20.30</td>
<td>SRHE Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30 – 21.30</td>
<td>Open Forum delegate debate</td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</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 7 December 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 09.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: G1–G12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45 – 10.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: H1–H12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: J1–J12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.30</td>
<td><strong>Tea / Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: K1–K12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 – 13.00</td>
<td><strong>Plenary 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Place making: The Role of Universities in supporting Social Mobility and Regional Developments</strong>&lt;br&gt;Professor Mary Stuart&lt;br&gt;<em>Vice Chancellor, University of Lincoln</em>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Perspectives and expectations of students in higher education</strong>&lt;br&gt;Caroline Sundberg&lt;br&gt;<em>Vice President, European Students’ Union</em></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 14.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: L1 – L12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45 – 15.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: M1 – M12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15 – 15.45</td>
<td><strong>Tea / Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45 – 16.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: N1 – N12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 – 17.00</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: P1 – P12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15 – 17.45</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: Q1 – Q12</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00 – 20.00</td>
<td><strong>Drinks Reception</strong> <em>(open to all delegates)</em>&lt;br&gt;Sponsored by Routledge/Taylor &amp; Francis Group</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00 – 22.30</td>
<td><strong>Conference Gala Dinner</strong></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.30 – 00.30</td>
<td><strong>Disco</strong> <em>(open to all delegates)</em></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</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**

**Friday 8 December 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: R1-R13</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45-10.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: S1-S13</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: T1-T13</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.15</td>
<td>Tea / Coffee on the go</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.00</td>
<td><strong>Plenary 3</strong>: <em>Expectations for Research and Researchers</em></td>
<td>Caernarfon Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary Speaker: David Sweeney, Director, Research and Knowledge Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Council for England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Executive Chair Designate of Research England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: U1-U13</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-13.15</td>
<td><strong>Paper Presentations:</strong> Sessions: V1-V13</td>
<td>Breakout Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15-14.15</td>
<td>Lunch and Depart</td>
<td>Caernarfon Foyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBITORS AND PROMOTIONAL EVENTS AT CONFERENCE**

Exhibition stands are open throughout conference in the Caernarfon Foyer.

Exhibitors this year are:
- Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group
- Bloomsbury Publishing
- German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW)
- Higher Education Quarterly
- Higher Education Review

---

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.
Knowledge economy or ecology? Different ways of thinking about and organising the university.

Professor Susan Wright, Professor of Educational Anthropology, Danish School of Education, Aarhus University

Universities have been widely reformed in recent years, based on the idea that, as they produce knowledge and knowledge workers, they should drive the formation of a projected global knowledge economy. This paper draws on long-term anthropological studies of university reform, the UNIKE (Universities in the Knowledge Economy) EU-funded ITN project and the ‘Trust University’ project, to analyse how universities are expected to act in this new global context. As a new form of ‘autonomous agent’, they are required to respond to legitimate demands from a plethora of external stakeholders whilst also defending their own research freedom and ethics (in the words of the Danish university law). These external stakeholders include industry collaborators, publishing firms, international student recruitment agencies, corporate universities and private providers of ‘shadow’ education, consultancies and international organisations with policy prescriptions, rankings firms, credit rankers, and governments using universities in their economic and foreign policies.

Universities are meant to act in this context by installing strategic leadership, budget control through cost centres, and ‘audit culture’, which changes ‘what counts’ in universities’ internal life and in their relations with their environment. The presentation shows that, in Polanyi’s terms, a model of a ‘formal economy’ based on competition, markets and price, has been abstracted from the university’s ‘embedded’ economy and used to re-purpose and reorganise universities. An analysis of the university’s several circuits of exchange shows that they are being skewed towards a focus on markets, contracts and financialisation, while its other circuits of exchange, which involved relations of redistribution, reciprocity and trust, and which entangled universities in and made them responsible towards their social and cultural environment are turned into ‘externalities’.

Inspiration for an alternative way of thinking about and organising the university and its role in the world is drawn from the work of biologists and anthropologists studying how ‘liveable landscapes’ emerge in environments ruined by humans in the period known as the Anthropocene. If the reforms of universities and their organisation in terms of an abstracted ‘economy’ are classic features of institutions that have brought about problems associated with the Anthropocene, universities also house the critical voices that are seeking to expand their institutions’ capacity to address ecological destruction, world migrations, flawed growth models and political conflicts. To encompass such widened responsibilities behoves rethinking the ideas and organisation of the university itself.

The paper contributes to this process by returning to Polanyi’s model of a ‘substantive’ economy, in which ‘economic’ relationships are embedded in the fabric of society, politics and cosmologies and by drawing on critical Anthropocene research, and especially metaphors like ‘interactive ecology’. The presentation ends by envisaging an alternative future where ‘substantive’ economic relations are re-embedded in social and institutional practices. This offers the possibility of valuing ‘thinking with care’ (Haraway 2007) and working for what Tsing (2015) calls ‘collaborative survival’ in a ‘liveable landscape’.

Key issues to consider include whether and how higher education researchers can make use of these insights to understand better the context in which they work; and how, faced with such external demands, universities can work to bring such an alternative future into being.

Biography

Professor Susan Wright
Professor of Educational Anthropology, Director of Centre for Higher Education Futures (CHEF), Danish School of Education, Aarhus University, Denmark, suwr@dpu.dk
Sue Wright is Professor of Educational Anthropology and Director of the Centre for Higher Education Futures (CHEF) http://edu.au.dk/forskning/centre-for-higher-education-futures/ at the Danish School of Education, Emdrup Campus, Aarhus University.

She studies people’s participation in large scale processes of transformation and works with concepts of audit culture, governance, contestation and the anthropology of policy. She has researched university reforms in the UK and Denmark and coordinated the EU ITN project on Universities in the Knowledge Economy (UNIKE) in Europe and the Asia-Pacific Rim. Informing all her work are insights gained from studies of political transformation in Iran before and after the Islamic Revolution.

She co-edits the journal LATISS (Learning and Teaching: International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences) and co-edited Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Anatomy of Contemporary Power (with Shore and Peró, 2011, Berghahn).

Thursday 12.15-13.00

Stakeholders’ Perspectives: Place making: The Role of Universities in supporting Social Mobility and Regional Development

Professor Mary Stuart, Vice Chancellor, University of Lincoln

A considerable focus for universities in the UK over the last 30 years has been what has been termed ‘widening access’. The purpose of this work has been to try to address the gap in the proportion of people from different socio-economic backgrounds who go into HE. Three times more people from higher socio-economic groups go into higher level study than those from lower socio-economic backgrounds. More recently, although there has been some progress in narrowing this gap, Universities have been charged with supporting upward social mobility for young people from lower socio-economic groups, not just getting them into higher level study (UUK, 2016). This has grown out of a sense of alarm that social mobility, having grown rapidly during the 20th century (Saunders, 2010), has now stalled (Iannelli, 2011).

Tasking universities with social mobility is contentious as many would argue (rightly) that social mobility is about many more things than just education. Social researchers, such as Sam Friedman (2017), found that despite having the same educational attainment, people in the professions who came from lower socio-economic groups were likely to earn about 8,000 pounds less than those from higher socio-economic backgrounds. But of course, it is about education. The same research team found that higher education qualifications were a major predictor of entry into the professions.

Over the last few years I have become convinced that universities do have a role in supporting social mobility, they may even be a pre-requisite for social mobility but of course, as set out above, Universities cannot achieve social mobility in themselves. The success of the economy is fundamental to strong social mobility in society, so too is a more equal society. However universities do have a significant role to play and not just in, as is usually discussed in this field, widening access, but in enabling success in and through HE and, I wish to argue, beyond HE. Joining up the different elements of activity within HE can help us to address stagnating social mobility.

In this ‘think piece’ I am going to set out the debate about social mobility in the UK and highlight through a case study of a University working in its region, how universities can play a role in not only widening access, but creating success and economic growth to enable social mobility.

The Current Policy Debate on Social Mobility

The Social Mobility Barometer (2017) highlighted that public faith in upward social mobility in the UK has stalled. According to the Barometer, half of 18-24 year olds believe that where you end up in society is largely determined by who your parents are. These findings echo much of the post-election analysis based on the increased turnout of this same age group (most recently estimated to be 64%, up by 16% from 2015). The Barometer also considers the geographical divide, with 71% of all respondents saying that there are ‘fairly or very’ large differences in opportunity depending on where you live in the country. The Commission followed
up with a report (Social Mobility Commission, 2017) assessing twenty years of social mobility policy. In the foreword, Alan Milburn wrote:

*The policies of the past have brought some progress, but many are no longer fit for purpose in our changing world. The old agenda has not delivered enough social progress. New approaches are needed if Britain is to become a fairer and more equal country. It is time for a change (op cit, 1).*

We are aware that certain areas have been ‘left behind’, never having benefited from the growth the UK experienced during the 1990s and early 2000s. We have seen the rise of populism, creating extensive turbulence in our political systems, growing inequality across societies and increased precariousness for people in work, with communities in need of up to date infrastructure, and meaningful employment. While this pattern can certainly be seen in the UK it is also prevalent in other parts of the Western world and is getting worse.

In the UK, despite ongoing uncertainty, there is now enough political consensus on the need to rebalance the economy and create inclusive growth (Royal Society for Arts, 2017). There is also growing recognition that the drivers behind the UK’s uneven economic geography are, as ever, multi-faceted and interlinked.

Universities, I would argue, need to recognise and foster their role as anchor institutions in their regions to incorporate the wider economic and societal environment into which our students will graduate. The concept of ‘Anchor institutions’ has been applied to Universities, first in the US (Hodges and Dubb, 2012) but has been now used in the UK (Goddard, Coombes, Kempton and Vallance, 2014). The argument suggests that Universities should consciously and strategically apply the institution’s long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the welfare of the community in which it resides. While the research on Anchor institutions never creates a link to widening access activities or the socio-economic background of the graduates that Universities produce, for me, creating a link between the widening participation activities with schools and colleges with support services to enable success with careers and regional economic leadership will provide a better environment for social mobility. This will enhance the work that Universities do in their regions considerably and may even create a greater link to genuine social mobility. Drawing together the breadth of university activities in this way is particularly important for institutions operating in those areas that have not seen growth when other areas have developed, in other words where uneven redevelopment (Green, 2014) has created greater inequality in areas not just between people.

A case study: The impact of a university working in its Region

Participation in higher education varies considerably across the country. In many of our major cities participation is high, but in many rural and coastal areas participation it is much lower. Lincolnshire is just one such example, and has one of the lowest participation rates in the country. It has considerably lower levels of graduates; 33% below the national average. Business density is also significantly below the national average.

The region was a cold spot for higher education and until the turn of the century there was no university presence. The University of Lincoln was established in 2001 and has grown rapidly to 14,500 in 2016. Nearly 40% of its students come from the region, and 44% of the graduates are employed in Lincolnshire. The University seeks to be an anchor in the region, creating both high-level employment and potential employees to fill these posts. We work closely with local employers to help them innovate, creating new business models and ways of working. We encourage them to take on graduates, some of the companies the university is now working with did not have any graduates in their companies and now they have graduate training schemes.

A new approach to Programme Development for Economic Sustainability and Growth

The University also develops new programmes to meet the needs of employers who cannot recruit the skills that they need. One example is Lincoln's work with Siemens Turbo Machinery, a branch of the Siemens Global Engineering firm. In 2008 Siemens was concerned that it could not attract or retain graduates into their business in Lincoln. This is a common issue for market towns and cities in rural areas and the company may have off shored its factory losing nearly 2000 jobs in the city. Following discussions between the University and Siemens, a new School of Engineering was established. Siemens now recruits students during their study and the retention rates of graduate employees are very high -nearly 100%. Through early engagement with student engineers, Siemens have been able to reduce the graduate training in the company for these graduates from 2 years to 6 months. Beyond this local relationship, the University is now working across all of Siemens globally not just in the Engineering business but across all areas of the company, supporting the company with research activity from the university. This demonstrates how regional engagement can lead to global opportunities for Universities, something that is not always recognised.
The success of this partnership is largely due to the strong relationship we have been able to develop based on the university's ability to respond flexibly to an organisation's needs. This model has been replicated across many of the disciplines at the university supporting a region that has found it difficult to attract graduates by ‘growing our own’ and therefore providing opportunities for social mobility in many areas in the region.

Supporting Innovation and Productivity through a Ladder of Learning later in Life

Some universities have taken their role of employer engagement to heart. One example of this approach is the work of the National Centre for Food Manufacturing (NCFM) situated in South Lincolnshire. The Centre serves the UK’s largest concentration of food business to advance innovation and skills. The sector is experiencing momentous change as the living wage, the challenges in Brexit and other drivers of cost inflation fuel the large-scale adoption of advanced technologies which requires ready access to higher level skills. While many major global food businesses are on the doorstep, few young people take advantage of the associated opportunities.

NCFM offers employer designed and driven further and higher education from Level 2 to 8. It provides apprenticeships, higher and degree apprenticeships, foundation degrees, BSc (Hons), Masters and PhD degrees, all specifically designed to support career development in technical, manufacturing, supply chain management, and food engineering, often working with people who left school with low level qualifications and whose families have historically always been in low level work with very limited income. The companies realise, as the sector changes, they need staff with higher level technical knowledge and as their employees are educated they are able to move into more managerial roles with higher salaries.

New Forms of Widening Access: Overseeing First Cycle Education

On the same site as the NCFM is a primary school and secondary Academy, part of the Multi-Academy Trust supported by the University. The Academy provides a very broad offer incorporating both vocational and academic routes; apprenticeships and A levels. When the University took over the secondary school there had been few opportunities for young people other than a grammar school, to study towards higher education. The University supported the growth of a 6th Form. The schools were essential in a major ‘cold spot’ for participation in higher education; POLAR data (HEFCE, 2016) puts the surrounding areas in the bottom two quintiles for participation rates. Provision started in 2007 with eight construction students in a mobile classroom, but now in 2017 there are 305 students enrolled in the 6th form. In 2010 only six students progressed to university. In 2017, thirty-two students went on to different universities.

Final Thoughts

There are so many ways universities can work with local people to enhance opportunities far beyond widening access. In regions such as Lincolnshire, it is absolutely vital that we do so, as there are few other resources that provide such support. Our efforts in improving opportunity and social mobility can and should address the real economic inequalities that have caused the slowdown in mobility. Whether it be developing new courses with employers, diversifying provision, or working with schools, universities can provide a much needed kick-start for social mobility. This requires a commitment for the institution governance and leadership teams as it cannot be tokenistic and for some universities, this may not be part of its mission but given the significant challenges that inequalities in our society have created, I believe this is an important and vital way universities can play their part.
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Professor Mary Stuart is Vice Chancellor of the University of Lincoln. She is a graduate of the University of Cape Town and the Open University where she obtained her Doctorate in Social Policy in 1998. Her research interests are focussed on life histories, social mobility, higher education students and community development.

Mary has a strong track record in all aspects of University management, having worked in senior roles in three different universities. Since joining Lincoln she has established and grown the first new Engineering School to be created in the UK for more than 20 years (in collaboration with Siemens plc). Mary has also successfully led the development of Science provision at Lincoln (including the Schools of Chemistry, Pharmacy and Physics and Mathematics) and has established the Lincoln Institute of Agri-Food Technology, to develop the future of farming and grow our food industry’s competitiveness.

Passionate about the student experience, Mary seeks to continually drive change and improvements in the partnership with students and the academic community, working closely with the Students’ Union at Lincoln.

Mary is currently a Board member of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), Chair of HEFCE’s Teaching Excellence and Student Opportunity Committee, member of Universities UKs task force on Social Mobility, and Vice Chair of the Equality Challenge Unit and Trustee of Universities Partnership Programme (UPP). Mary is also Chair of the Lincoln Cultural and Arts Partnership (LCAP) and the Founding Director of the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership (GLLEP), and a member of the Greater Lincolnshire Leaders Board.

Thursday 12.15-13.00

Perspectives and expectations of students in higher education

Caroline Sundberg, Vice President, European Students’ Union

Caroline Sundberg

Caroline Sundberg, Vice President of the European Students’ Union (ESU) working with the social dimension of higher education, focusing on widening participation and inclusive learning methods as well as internationalisation and mobility. Serving as ESUs representative in Bologna Follow up Group (BFUG) Working Group 3 - new goals: policy development for new EHEA goals and Advisory Group 1 - EHEA international cooperation.

Former President of the Swedish National Union of Students’ (SFS), member of Experts group in Gender Equality in Higher Education, Student Bologna Expert, Member of Bologna Experts Group, Member of Authority Board, Member of Experts group in Internationalisation of Higher Education and Member of BFUG Reference group.

Caroline is a student in political sciences and gender studies at Lund University, Sweden.
Friday 11.15 – 12.00

Expectations for Research and Researchers

David Sweeney, Director of Research and Knowledge Exchange at Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and Executive Chair Designate of Research England

All over the world governments are looking to stimulate their economies, placing the role of research and innovation at the heart of fiscal policies, alongside their essential contribution to solving broader global challenges in environment and health. Countries with strong research cultures are looking at how their research spend can ‘make a difference’ and countries without that base often want to grow a research culture which is based on achievement of impact rather than the development of fundamental understanding.

Research aspirations in universities are supported by many stakeholders, some as funders, some as partners and many as those who will take research forward into new policies, services and products. All have a shared interest in understanding the ways in which excellent research can be facilitated, and in how it can make a positive difference in the world.

The research world therefore throws up a number of current challenges. The change in emphasis towards practical impact may be unwelcome for some universities and researchers, when government seeks to be increasingly selective in the institutions and the areas of research that it chooses to fund. Such a change challenges academics to match their personal aspirations with institutional and national strategies, especially in the many disciplines where research time and funding are significant constraints. The different attitudes of governments to the education and research roles of universities sometimes seems like a mixed message to institutions which do not separate out academic activity in a simple way. Finally, for those contributing to the policy process, in a perceived post-truth society, there are challenges around the role of evidence and also around understanding the nature of impact into the policy process.

Government approaches in the USA, Australia and the UK to the support of research have similarities and differences. The characteristics of national research systems, such as the predominant role of universities as opposed to research institutes in the UK, will explain some differences. However, comparisons can be immensely helpful in gaining an understanding of the situation in those countries and others. This talk will provide some comment on these matters, drawing on current issues in the USA, Australia and the UK.
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David Sweeney

Executive Chair Designate of Research England, the Council which will be responsible for university research and knowledge exchange within the forthcoming body UK Research & Innovation.

He is also Director (Research and Knowledge Exchange) at HEFCE. He is currently responsible for research policy and funding, knowledge exchange and university-business relations.

After gaining First Class Honours in Statistics at the University of Aberdeen, David worked at two Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) research institutes, as a consultant statistician then developing mathematical models of plant growth.

His work on the computational aspects of this led into broader applications of IT in education and research, and he was Director of Information Services at Royal Holloway, University of London, before moving into university leadership as Vice-Principal (Communications, Enterprise and Research) in 2004. In this role he was responsible for research strategy and for developing Royal Holloway’s research-led commercial and consultancy activities. He joined HEFCE in 2008 as Director (Research, Innovation and Skills) and led the development and implementation of the first Research Excellence Framework including the new impact agenda element.

David has been invited to visit many countries to advise on research assessment and funding, particularly with respect to research impact. He was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of Aberdeen in 2012, was Vice-Chancellor’s Fellow at the University of Newcastle, NSW in 2015 and is a Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society.
Conference delegates are warmly invited to participate in these Research Domain discussion groups, which will feature short presentations and open discussions 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 focusing 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.

Postgraduate Issues Network  |  Beaumaris 1  |  Wednesday 17.45-18.30

The Paradigm Shift towards the Commodification of Postgraduate Education: International Perspectives

Featuring presentations from: Dr Marie-Louise Österlind, Kristianstad University, Sweden; Professor Pam Denicolo, University of Reading, UK

Facilitated by: Dr Martin Gough, University of Liverpool and Dr Richard Race, University of Roehampton UK, convenors of the SRHE Postgraduate Issues Network

Balancing practicalities such as economics against the philosophical and educational merit underpinning developments in postgraduate programmes has always been difficult but hidden agendas and sloth complicate the challenge. Credentialisation, impact, industrialisation and other income-generating perspectives are ways through which we in HE are open to manipulation by those with little knowledge or interest in educational philosophy and values. In this open discussion session we shall, for purposes of meeting this challenge, explore means by which we can make these ways more explicit, particularly in relation to the direction UK policy is taking. “Underpinning all this will be a new contract between student and university – a contract that underpins their rights as consumers, and ensures value for money throughout their course and during their working lives.” (Jo Johnson, UK Minister of State for Universities and Science).

Invited speaker, Dr Österlind, will set the scene through brief summary of her research on this area, under the heading:

Scandinavian University “Reforms”- Juggling competing logics and new steering models influencing postgraduate studies

Professor Denicolo will respond by exploring the interplay between metaphors by which we teach and research and the possibility of resisting insidious indoctrination precipitated by the continuous creep of industrialisation into postgraduate studies.
Higher Education Policy/International Research and Researchers | Beaumaris 2 | **Wednesday 17.45-18.30**

**Discussing Higher Education Tuition fees – International Perspectives**

Debates about ways to pay for higher education tuition have taken place in a number of countries in recent years. In England, where tuition fees are the highest in the world, this has now become a hot topic, with increasing concerns about the high levels of debt students are accruing, and the UK Labour Party proposing to abolish tuition fees in its recent election manifesto. Other countries have also recently committed to abolishing fees, and for many European countries, tuition fees are already low or non-existent.

This discussion seminar will be an opportunity to debate these issues. The session will begin with two short contributions to stimulate discussion:

**Dr. James Burford**, Thammasat University, Thailand, will speak on the situation in Thailand and New Zealand; **Professor Claire Callender** and **Dr Ariane de Gayadon**, UCL Institute of Education, will talk about England and Latin America respectively.

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

The event is organised by Professor Carole Leathwood, Dr Karen Smith and Dr Terri Kim, the Convenors of the Higher Education Policy Network, and by Dr Emily Henderson, the Convenor of the International Research and Researchers Network.

---

Student Experience Network | Denbigh 1 | **Wednesday 17.45-18.30**

**Belonging, student voice and community**

Featuring presentations from: **Dr. Rille Raaper**, Assistant Professor, School of Education, Durham University; **Malcolm Sullivan**, Head of the Department of Marketing, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University; **Dr Chrissie Boughey**, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, Rhodes University, SA

Facilitated by: **Dr Camille B. Kandiko Howson**, Senior Lecturer in Higher Education, King’s College London; **Dr Kathleen M. Quinlan**, Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Kent

Belonging, student voice and community are important emerging concepts in research on students’ experiences. These themes are interconnected. When students sense that they have a voice that is being heard, they feel more like they are part of a community. Being part of a community is integral to having a sense of belonging. Feeling a sense of belonging is, in turn, connected with a range of measurable outcomes such as retention and attainment and is particularly vital for students who come from backgrounds that are traditionally under-represented in higher education.

To spark discussion, two of our network’s researchers will start the session with lightning talks of about 3-5 minutes on their approach to researching voice, community or belonging. In small groups, participants will then discuss their own research and research ideas and explore gaps in the literature that new research needs to fill, discuss how these themes can be better defined theoretically and methodologically, and suggest next steps.

This seminar presents an opportunity for network members to meet each other, explore potential collaborations, and consider future directions for the field of student experience research.
Critical Learning Analytics

Facilitated by the Convenors of the Digital University Network: Dr Lesley Gourlay, Reader in Education and Technology (Department of Culture, Communication & Media) and Director (Academic Writing Centre), UCL Institute of Education, University College London; Dr Ibrar Bhatt, Lecturer (School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work), Queen’s University Belfast, Dr Jeremy Knox, Lecturer in Digital Education at the University of Edinburgh, and a core member of the Centre for Research in Digital Education.

With the increasing use of digital technologies by higher education institutions, the resulting traces of data are being increasingly seen as valuable sources of insight. Computational analysis of this kind of data is being undertaken in the burgeoning field of Learning Analytics; a broad set of approaches that draw from techniques in machine learning, social network analysis and statistics, and theory from psychology and the learning sciences. While learning analytics are attracting the interest of educational institutions, researchers, and funders, more work is needed to understand the powerful ways these approaches can shape the educational landscape, from policy initiatives, to teacher professionalism, to student experience.

This discussion session provides an opportunity for delegates to discuss the potential implications of Learning Analytics in Higher Education. We will examine and discuss the ways in which teaching roles change through ‘data-driven’ approaches, the challenges and affordances of ‘datafied’ educational spaces, and the ethical issues emerging as a result of these shifts. For example, how should institutional decisions about learning analytics happen? Who should be involved? What ethical issues emerge? And can analytics support existing educational ideals?

The session will begin with an opening set of prompts by the network conveners.
CONFERENCE OPEN FORUM DEBATE

Wednesday 20.30-21.30

Open Forum delegate debate | Caernarfon Suite | Wednesday 20.30-21.30

Making the case for Research into Higher Education

The theme of the 2017 SRHE Conference shines the spotlight directly on what is expected from higher education and how effectively such expectations are being met. The Conference plenary speakers will address this theme in different ways and from different perspectives.

For conference delegates, presenting and discussing research under this broad theme, there are real concerns and apprehension about the future of research into higher education, how this is to be funded, what aspects of research such funding may support and the overall sustainability of research into higher education.

All these concerns sit within the wider context of research in the Social Sciences, the Arts and Humanities, making the case for these and working collaboratively to achieve impact for policy and practice in higher education.

In this context the Conference is responding to many requests from delegates for an additional space within the conference programme to have an open dialogue on these issues. We are doing this by convening an open forum debate after dinner on the first evening of the Conference. The debate will be chaired by the SRHE President, Professor Sir Bob Burgess, but other than the President’s opening remarks there will be no formal speeches from the platform.

This open forum debate is for all those attending conference to make their contributions from the floor, to share and explore ideas, thoughts, suggestions, and experiences, national and international perspectives and also suggest proposals for follow up plans and possible actions.

Whilst recognising that this is an evening event we warmly invite delegates to come and contribute to this open forum. The debate will be recorded and a summary of all issues raised will be prepared for further consideration.

To help sustain energy levels for this debate refreshments will be available at the Caernarfon Suite for all participants.

Notes to Delegates

For delegates taking part in the Open Forum Debate we recommend choosing the option to dine at the Olive Tree Restaurant at 19.00, directly after the Welcome drinks Reception.
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME IN FULL

Wednesday 6 December 2017

A1  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Session A1  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**Recognising and rewarding academic citizenship (0197)**

Damon Burg, Bruce Macfarlane, University of Southampton, UK

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

This study's purpose is to develop an understanding of how universities recognise and reward academic citizenship, the non-research or teaching aspects of academic work. To do this, the study looks to see how the term is being used and interpreted by universities' human resources policies in evaluating and rewarding academic staff, in the UK and internationally. Analysis of policy documentation indicates that there are four main ways that universities classify academic citizenship. The second stage of research is to interview key informants on a deeper understanding with respect to the interpretation and implementation of academic citizenship policies including the impact on gender equality in academic work.

A2  Beaumaris 1  |  Session A2  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**Degrees of Class: Interrogating linear and non-linear transitions from higher education into the labour market (0213)**

Steven Threadgold, Penny-Jane Burke, Matthew Bunn, University of Newcastle, Australia

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The labour market has continued to see an increase in occupations that require a bachelor's degree, a trend forecasted by policy makers to continue. Because of this, widening participation has been identified as central to strategies for economic prosperity, by drawing from a wider population base to supply this demand. However it is unclear how students navigate into and through the university, and subsequently into what has become a precarious labour market. The notion of ‘transition’ through secondary and tertiary studies into full-time employment is problematic as it implies that moving throughout education and into the workforce is a stable and linear experience. This paper will critique these assumptions by focusing on the ways students negotiate the risks and affordances they are faced with, where labour market precariousness is the norm; inequality is rising despite increased participation in higher education; and higher education has undergone neoliberal transformations.

A3  Beaumaris 2  |  Session A3  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**Academic identity: active identity and body work in academia (0011)**

Nicole Brown, UCL Institute of Education, UK

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

With Higher Education undergoing increasing changes academic life is more pressurised, less autonomous and less secure. Against this backdrop mental health issues and illness within Higher Education are on the increase. In this paper, I present an exploration of academic identity under the influence of fibromyalgia. Fibromyalgia is a complex, gendered, contested syndrome characterised by widespread pain, chronic fatigue, sleep problems, psychological disorders and cognitive dysfunctions. Through an embodied, phenomenological approach with metaphors and representations I seek to understand the life of academics with fibromyalgia. Data drawn from timelines, interviews and identity boxes describes the life for academics with an illness on the cusp of the physiological, psychological and somatic. The analysis provides an insight into the conscious identity work and body work required to reconcile the experience of illness with the academic’s public face and life. I conclude with a discussion of participatory and inclusive research within Higher Education.
**GROUP DISCUSSION A4**

**A4.1  Caldicott  |  Group Discussion A4.1  |  Wednesday 12.00-13.15**

*An Ethnography To Understand Student Value Co-Creation In The Student Experience (0107)*

Elizabeth Farrier-Williams, Nottingham Trent University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Student engagement has been given strong attention in the literature and by academics to understand the higher education experience, particularly regarding the value that students perceive to create in their experience. This study draws on marketing and education literature to understand the student value co-creation process and perception of their undergraduate experience. Using ethnography, in depth data collection helps to explore how students engage with their higher education experience to co-create value. The findings report the first stage of the analysis, creating a university ecosystem that illustrates the key people, activities, and environments that students engage with. This shows how key actors influence the student experience and may or may not co-create value with the student. The second part of the research is still ongoing but uses how students engage to explain the value that is co-created in the experience.

**A4.2  Caldicott  |  Group Discussion A4.2  |  Wednesday 12.00-13.15**

*The student experience initiatives in higher education: an occupational perspective (0010)*

Polina Baranova, University of Derby, UK

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

The student experience initiatives are firmly placed onto the strategic agenda for the majority of the UK higher education institutions. This study considers how the three main occupational groupings, namely: academics, manager-academics and non-academics, view the focus and the direction of the student experience initiatives in a context of a post-92 university. One of the similarities identified is a view of student experience initiatives as university responses to the increasing marketisation of higher education. A number of significant differences in relation to the ownership, focus and management of the initiatives are discussed. The study highlights the tensions emerging from the differences in the views of the occupational groupings studied. The implications for the management of the student experience initiatives in universities are developed outlining the need for a deeper understanding about the tensions amongst the various occupational groupings and the strengthening of the collaborative working practices in universities.

**A4.3  Caldicott  |  Group Discussion A4.3  |  Wednesday 12.00-13.15**

*Developing students as researchers and learners in Higher Education: the experience of SADRAS (0270)*

Isabel Huet, Hendrik van der Sluis, Steve Woodfield, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Current research suggests that staff-student partnerships focused on pedagogical or institutional research can be beneficial for students’ sense of belonging and their learning. However, their impact on students’ academic learning gains and employability skills has not been intensively investigated. This paper describes an evaluation of a staff-student partnership programme (SADRAS) at a teaching-intensive university. It outlines the context and the rationale for the mixed method research approach, and discusses the main findings. The quantitative findings from two separate academic years are consistent and reveal that students who worked in collaboration with staff and other students in research projects developed key competencies such as information handling, research communication skills; and cognitive abilities such as evaluation and analysis. The qualitative data reveal satisfaction with the scheme and the impact of the scheme for raising core employability skills such as autonomy, responsibility and independence.
### A4.4

**Caldicott**  |  **Group Discussion A4.4**  |  **Wednesday 12.00-13.15**

**Using an experiential team building activity to promote postgraduate students’ social integration and professional skills development (0190)**

**Michelle McLardy**, Andre Soares, Coventry University, UK

**Research Domain:** Student experiences (SE)

A case study has been used to assess the impact of an experiential team building activity on the social integration and professional skills development of postgraduate students studying in a British university. The main objectives of this event were to allow students to apply and develop further skills that will be important to successful management practice, to effective leadership and to promote the social integration of the students so they make the most of their formal programme of study.

The results from the study show that there is a positive relationship between student engagement and student experience. This is a preliminary study and further events will be held to gather more data to provide an opportunity for inferential statistics rather than just descriptive. There is also the need to carry out further research on postgraduate students’ engagement and social integration as most of the literature focusses on degree level students.

### A5

**Caerphilly**  |  **Session A5**  |  **Wednesday 12.00-12.30**

**Roles of Business Schools for New Generations of Innovative Business Leaders: A collaborative stakeholders as agents of change perspective (0350)**

**Hong Bui**, University of Bath, UK

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

In the post economic crisis, the ability of a society to (re)create sustainable social, organisational and business structures is paramount. This need is clearly seen in our global economy where competitive economic realities result in a steady stream of economic activities being outsourced to offshore manufacturing facilities and service centres. The ability to replace this flow with new offerings is largely dependent on a society’s innovative capacity. This research project seeks to understand the roles of business schools in building innovative capacity within young graduates. Interviews and focus groups will be held with UK universities, leading graduate recruiters, entrepreneurs and students to understand the challenge of developing creative capacity from the perspectives of these key stakeholders. The findings of this study will be pertinent to universities, national and international policy makers, educational institutions and ultimately future generations of students.

### A6

**Cardiff**  |  **Session A6**  |  **Wednesday 12.00-12.30**

**Adult learners enrich university communities but there are still far too few of them (Les Ebdon, 2016) (0196)**

**John Butcher, Wendy Fowle**, The Open University, UK

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

We will facilitate a roundtable discussion based on findings from our OFFA funded research project “exploring the impact of outreach for adult learners from disadvantaged backgrounds” (2017). After briefly introducing the purpose of the project, headline findings will be presented from each of five case studies (two from the OU, one each from the universities of Bristol, Leeds and Birkbeck University of London). Two questions will be addressed in the substantive part of the roundtable to explore the challenges facing institutions in terms of access to higher education (HE) for adult learners, and to share examples of good practice. This will be achieved through the engagement with the three-step evaluation tool developed as part of the OFFA project (Butcher and Fowle, 2017).

**Prompt questions**

- Institutional advantages in attracting more adult learners?
- Institutional barriers facing adult learners?
- Potential use of evaluation tool to support institutional decision-making?
**A7**  
Chepstow | Session A7 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**The Professoriate’s Long-running Balancing Act: snapshots of how well professors since the 16th century have met students’, society’s and stakeholders’ expectations**

Linda Evans, University of Manchester, UK

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

Recent research into professors (Evans, 2015, 2017) reveals them to suffer from ‘performance angst’, as they frenetically try to be the ‘all singing, all dancing’ professors that they feel people expect them to be. All this is perceived as a sign of the times. Yet a recently completed library-based scoping study of the origins and history of university professors and professorship revealed many of the kinds of issues that preoccupy 21st century professors were also part and parcel of medieval professorship, and professors who both meet and also fall short of meeting the expectations of students, society and stakeholders can be found throughout history. This paper draws upon cases from history to show that the kinds of pressures imposed on professors in the neoliberal university are not exclusively a feature of 21st century academic life; they are as old as professorship itself.

**A8**  
Conwy1 | Session A8 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**Researcher Mobility in Policy and Practice: When Rhetoric and Reality Meet**

Rebekah Smith McGloin, Coventry University, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper reconsiders the value and virtue of mobility in policy and practice for researchers, from its origins in the conceptualisation of a “global research system” and “knowledge society” to the practical application of, for example, a BBSRC-funded PhD student on a 12-week industry placement in a large pharma lab, an Eastern European post-doc on a six-month Humboldt Research Fellowship (Jöns, 2011) or a Norwegian scientist who makes a career move to commercial research (Aksnes et al, 2013). Through a thematic analysis of policy and academic literature the paper begins to elucidate key gaps in knowledge and evidence in terms of equality of access, suitability and effectiveness of mobility schemes. It explores alternatives to physical mobility and poses questions of the role of the local in global research capability development.

**A9**  
Conwy 2 | Session A9 | Wednesday 12.00-12.30

**Parents as Stakeholders – Do they matter?**

Catherine Foster, Ann Davis, Helen Higson, Aston University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Parents are acknowledged to be key influencers in a child’s educational success up to and including the start of university. This paper presents research which aimed to establish whether parents continue to influence the experience once a student has begun a degree course. The research uses two measures of parental influence, parental experience of Higher Education and term time accommodation. It aims to establish the degree to which these variables influence the students’ level of adjustment to university, and their academic achievement. The findings suggest that once enrolled at University, parents do not influence the experience in the way it was expected, however, where the student lives is fundamental to the experience. With many students choosing to remain in the family home during their studies, it is essential to understand how where a student lives impacts on their experience.
A10  Denbigh 1  |  Session A10  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Epistemological access and epistemic access among university students from disadvantaged backgrounds in South Africa (0043)

Monica McLean, University of Nottingham, UK, Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, UK, Mikateko Hoeppener, Melanie Walker, Merridy Wilson-Strydom, University of the Free State, South Africa, Mukhove Masutha, Thusanani Foundation, South Africa

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Taking a capability approach lens, the paper conceptualises university education as expanding students’ personal, social, economic and civic capabilities. It is argued that if students are to make valuable contributions to society’s stock of meanings and understandings, the capability for university knowledge should be considered a central capability. A four-year mixed-methods longitudinal research project funded by the ESRC-DfID on inclusive higher education learning outcomes for disadvantaged youth in South Africa provides interview data for exploring how students who have insufficient economic resources were positioned in relation to the knowledge they were gaining from their courses. We show how the students are strongly engaged in positioning themselves to acquire knowledge seeing it as the route to achieving their aspirations; and we discuss how university and department policies and practices enable and constrain the students’ efforts.

A11  Denbigh 2  |  Session A11  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Supporting students’ engagement with feedback: The adoption of student-focused feedback practices in the UK and Australia (0074)

Naomi Winstone, University of Surrey, UK, David Boud, Deakin University, Australia

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

In both the UK and Australia, concerns over student satisfaction with assessment and feedback are widespread. Responding to such concerns through emphasis on the provision and timeliness of written comments represents an ‘old paradigm’ approach to feedback practice, in contrast to a ‘new paradigm’ approach which focuses on student engagement with feedback and the influence of feedback on students’ learning. This paper reports a comparative analysis of data from a survey distributed to teaching staff in the UK and Australia, designed to surface attitudes to feedback, as well as the nature of the feedback practices adopted. Analyses demonstrate that influences on the adoption of new paradigm practices are less strongly attributable to the national context, but rather to disciplinary, institutional and pedagogical factors. The implications of these findings for the advancement of feedback practice within the context of dominant themes in contemporary Higher Education are discussed.

A12  Raglan   |  Session A12  |  Wednesday 12.00-12.30

Digital academic literacies as posthuman apparatus. (0187)

Lesley Gourlay, UCL Institute of Education, UK

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

Contemporary student academic writing and the related notion of ‘digital literacies’ are theorised in a range of ways in Higher Education research, policy and practice. In this paper, I explore these tensions, and examine what I argue are misleading, overly-abstract and ideologically-freighted humanist assumptions about the nature of texts, devices and the notion of authorship. I trace a series of moves in the literature from a rejection of humanist abstraction towards a posthuman framing, reviewing the contributions of New Literacy Studies, Actor-Network Theory, and theoretical challenges to the notion of spatiality and temporality as ‘context’ to practices. Turning to the work of Karen Barad, I consider the constructs of both phenomena and the apparatus, and the extent to which they allow us to advance this theoretical move towards a recognition of relationships between matter and meaning-making in the university as beyond. I will conclude with implications for policy and practice.
**B1**

Beaumaris Lounge | Session B1 | **Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

*‘Early’ career researchers in the social sciences: Redefining the terms (0277)*

Richard Freeman, William Locke, UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK

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

This paper draws on the findings of a research study for the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) of the experiences of early career researchers (ECRs) in the social sciences and, in particular, the extent and quality of support for postdoctoral researchers from research organisations, funding bodies and career services (Locke, Freeman and Rose, 2016). The aim of the research study was to gain an insight into the diversity of roles, opportunities and support available for (ECRs) in the social sciences whether they worked in the HE sector or not at the time of the study.

A definition of early career researchers was not prescribed and respondents were free to define themselves as such when deciding whether to respond to the survey. This paper will delve further into the respondents’ perceptions of themselves as ‘early career researchers’ and analyse these according to significant variables.

---

**B2**

Beaumaris 1 | Session B2 | **Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

*Networks and reflexivities: Employing a narrative social networks approach to explore apprenticeship pathways into and through Higher Education (0260)*

Alison Rouncefield-Swales, University of the West of England, UK

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

The aim of this study has been to explore the decision-making and experiences of apprentices who have made the transition into higher education to develop an understanding of how higher education impacts on their lives, experiences, and identities. This study utilises a narrative, longitudinal approach, drawing upon data from several semi-structured narrative interviews with 16 participants as they progress through their higher education programme to graduation. The second phase of the study engaged with the wider social network of six participants, illuminating how education and career decision-making and experiences are deeply embedded within family, peer and significant workplace networks. Analysing learning experiences, educational transitions, and learner identity highlight the process of becoming a higher education student's relational, situational, and part of a web of complex and dynamic interactions.

---

**B3**

Beaumaris 2 | Session B3 | **Wednesday 12.45-13.15**

*Gender discourses and ideology in higher education—from institutional documents to the lived experience and back. (0325)*

Charikleia Tzanakou, Jo Angouri, Polina Mesinioti, University of Warwick, UK

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

Gender equality in HE has become topical especially since the emergence of gender equality programmes such as the Athena SWAN (AS) in the UK. Higher education institutions invest resources in collecting and analysing quantitative data to design and implement actions to address gender imbalances. However, there has been less attention on the nuances of the institutional discourse and the complexity of the lived experiences of individuals. This paper focuses on an institutional case study to enhance our understanding of the dominant discourses and ideologies that circulate in one HE setting through these lenses. While making the invisible visible has been on critical discourse analysts’ agenda (Wodak, 2015), gender ideologies in academia remain under-explored. Furthermore, this paper brings together critical discourse analysis of institutional documents and lived experiences of institutional practices to investigate gender ideologies and how the congruence between the two can limit the effect of AS in institutional change.
### B5 Caerphilly | Session B5 | Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**Models of employability and their relevance for part-time learners (0263)**

Dawn Whitton, University of Northumbria, UK

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

This presentation will provide a critique of key models of employability developed since the beginning of the 21st Century, which have been further conceptualised to provide frameworks for enhancing the employability of graduates. The critique will focus on models such as the USEM Model of Employability offered by Knight and Yorke (2003).

The critique will be based on a review and analysis of extant literature and evaluate the relevance of such models with the emphasis being on part-time learners who are currently employed but seeking to further their education. This presentation will therefore consider if employability models and frameworks are equally relevant for part-time learners or if such students are lost in the midst of conceptualisations more aligned to full time students. This evaluation will contribute to the development of a research strategy and will form part of a wider study and a professional doctorate.

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

**Rethinking risk: theorising young people’s attitudes to higher education (0057)**

Neil Harrison, University of the West of England, UK

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

Higher education (HE) has traditionally been constructed as a risky choice for young people – especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, where financial and other barriers are assumed to raise the costs and lower the likelihood of success. However, recent counterintuitive trends in applications and admissions are increasingly calling this into question; for example, advantaged young people are seemingly more sensitive to tuition fee rises than their disadvantaged peers. This paper will draw on the work of Beck and Simon to re-examine ideas of risk as they apply to HE, drawing on empirical studies and national statistics to compare the uncertainties inherent in HE, the labour market and other alternatives. It will argue that we need a more precise account of risk, uncertainty, options and choices to better understand contemporary decision-making, as well as a more relational theorisation of risk within the complex social spaces inhabited by young people.

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

**‘Critical Corridor Talk’: Just Gossip or Hidden Moral Resistance to Managerialism? The Negative Capability of Distributed Higher Education Leadership (0141)**

Jill Jameson, University of Greenwich, UK

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

This theoretical paper argues that relatively invisible forms of moral resistance in neo-collegial distributed leadership are progressively challenging managerial instrumentalism in a stratified UK higher education system. The theoretical model of ‘critical corridor talk’, informed by trust and leadership data and auto-ethnographic observations (2005-16), argues that resistant academic critique is gradually questioning new public management style economically-driven ‘command and control’ authoritarianism. The model builds on Barnett’s concept of ‘critical being’ (1997) to consider whether academic staff find relief sharing ‘critical corridor talk’ in a distributed leadership framework of self-determined accountability. The highly functioning criticality of ‘negative capability’ encapsulates self-reflexive resistance against the ‘false necessity’ of supposedly deterministic imperatives of neoliberalist economic audit-based rationality. Yet to foster trust, such leadership needs to ensure it is practising correct moral principles itself when resisting the necessitarian manufactured performativity of higher education environments in which some in power overstep acceptable roles of good management.
This presentation is an empirically-based comparative study of highly-paid academics in ten European countries (N=17,211). Academic ‘top earners’ and various aspects of their working time distribution and research productivity are studied. The predictors of becoming an academic top earner are examined from a cross-national perspective. The findings obtained via a multidimensional model approach support the findings of inferential statistics: research time is not positively correlated with high incomes and teaching time is not negatively correlated with them. The research focus is on high incomes in an older cohort (40-plus) of academics and the odds of receiving high incomes. Cross-national academic salaries are explored via new questions (top earners vs. the rest of academics, and the predictors of being a top earner) applied to new (older) academic cohorts in new (European) national settings. Implications for current theoretical models in salary studies and policy implications for institutions and national systems are discussed.

This paper offers an alternative approach to exploring student expectations using a psychological contract framework. Psychological contracts have been used extensively in organisational settings to explore the understanding that employees have of their employing organisation (Rousseau, 1995) but limited studies have been conducted in an educational setting.

A theoretical model of student psychological contracts was developed using Constructivist Grounded Theory. Drawing on data from semi structured interviews, conducted with fifteen students at a post-1992 UK institution, this research generated three theoretical categories that included expectations, exchange and influences. Student expectations included realistic and unrealistic expectations which were modified by providing information and ‘meaningful conversations’ (Omilion-Hodges & Baker, 2014). Findings offer support for adopting a psychological contract framework in HE.

This paper explores the relationship between higher education and the public good in the African context through a consideration of the connections and disconnections that emerge when this relationship is conceptualised and given meaning in this context. It draws on work undertaken for a larger collaborative project on Higher Education and the Public Good in Four African countries – Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa. The paper first presents a conceptual framework developed for the project that delineates two distinct but intersecting ways in which higher education and the public good are linked - captured as an instrumental and an intrinsic relationship. It then critically considers these notions within the African context, drawing primarily from a literature review of higher education in Africa over the last twenty-five years. It is argued in conclusion that the insights emerging from this review challenge the conceptual assumptions made in important and necessary ways.
B11  Denbigh 2  |  Session B11  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**Whatever happened to assessment-for-learning?: students’ perceptions of feedback in UK business education (0179)**

Kate Black, Russell Warhurst, Northumbria University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Divergence in the expectations of students and of other stakeholders with regard to assessment represents a key contemporary challenge to which higher education must rise. This paper contributes to current assessment debates by critically examining perceptions of, and reactions to, a key and contentious facet of assessment practice, namely assessment feedback, from the under-researched perspective of students themselves. The paper models and refines theoretical understandings of the role of feedback in learning. An empirical case-study among a UK Business School’s undergraduates, the largest subject area in higher education, is detailed and results are analysed. These results are revealing subtleties that bring into doubt certain established understandings of feedback. A key contribution from the emerging results is the role of emotion in students’ perceptions of feedback and the paper shows the influence of emotions in negating feedback for learning. The implications for academic practice will be developed.

B12  Raglan  |  Session B12  |  Wednesday 12.45-13.15

**Digital Literacy and Ignorance (0072)**

Ibrar Bhatt, Alison MacKenzie, Queen’s University Belfast’s, UK

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

Current trends in the study of digital literacy demonstrate that people largely seek out, collect, and consume information through their social media networks and online practices. Whilst such search results seem to be autonomously chosen, they are, in fact, increasingly influenced by actors like algorithms that determine what news, information and opinions are viewed.

If people are restricted in what they can know because they are unaware of exogenous actors (e.g. algorithms) and how they may guide our choices and shape our experiences, then a key issue that theorists of digital literacy must contend with is how to educate users are to be critically aware. Forms of ignorance emerging through particular digital literacy practices may result in either credibility excess or insufficient credibility to persons/authorities on the basis of their status, identity or institution, for example, or because they do not accord with views endorsed by ‘chosen’ social media networks.

**SYMPOSIUM C1**

C2  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium C1  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

**Academics in the Arena: Foregrounding Academic Conferences as Sites for Higher Education Research**

Convenor and Chair: Emily Henderson, University of Warwick, United Kingdom
Discussant: Helen Perkins, Society for Research into Higher Education, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Academic Practice (AP)

Symposium rationale

Academic conferences are a staple of academic practice, knowledge dissemination and identity formation. However, in comparison with institution-based aspects of academic practice, conferences are a neglected phenomenon in higher education research. Currently, knowledge production about conferences is dominated by anecdotal accounts of conferences and ‘top tips’ practical advice for how to get the most out of conferences. There is a marked lack of critical and analytical research on conferences. There are several arguments for increasing the profile of conferences research, which are woven through the papers included in this interdisciplinary, international symposium.

Firstly, conferences are costing public institutions vast quantities of funding each year, and yet there is little research into how to evaluate conference participation for its positive impact on attendees’ careers and
development, or how to increase the learning and networking opportunities at conferences – or even on what academics really value in their conference experiences. Secondly, informal accounts of conferences are dominated by disappointed expectations, which are framed through issues of boredom, irrelevance, and futility. There is a need for more research into why expectations are not being met – moreover it is important to establish how conference expectations are formed in the first place. A third strand running through this symposium relates to access to and within conferences. Conferences are sites of international knowledge production and a means of accessing and contributing to the development of research fields, but inequalities in funding, personal responsibilities and border politics all contribute to preventing some academics attending conferences. Others are able to attend but, because of intersecting identity characteristics and academic hierarchies that are reproduced and even reinforced in conference spaces, are prevented from fully participating in conferences.

This international symposium showcases current research on academic conferences from a variety of perspectives, disciplinary orientations and methodological orientations.

C1.1 Beaumaris Lounge | Symposium C1.1 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

“Novel” Delegates: Representations of Academic Identities in Fictional Conferences (0059)

Emily Henderson, University of Warwick, UK, Pauline Reynolds, University of Redlands, USA

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

While there is now a growing body of research on the cultural significance of representations of higher education in media, literature, and popular culture (Edgerton, Holm, Daspit, & Farber, 2005; Reynolds, 2014; Tobolowsky & Reynolds, 2017), this work has not yet addressed the role of conferences within these cultural artefacts. This critical, qualitative study, uses a corpus of fictional texts centred on academic conferences (including novels, short stories, and graphic novels) to explore representations of the role of delegate in fictional conferences. We explore the ways in which pre-existing academic identities shape and even determine the conference experience of individual delegates. Our findings from the open, preliminary coding of our selected corpus revolve around two competing representations: the role of the delegate, and the external roles and identities that delegates bring with them to the conference.

C1.2 Beaumaris Lounge | Symposium C1.2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

The Value, Scope and Cost of Conferences: looking beyond the Events industry (0068)

Nicholas Rowe, University of Lapland, Finland

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

Despite massive global engagement, conferences receive a mixed reception among academic, scientific and professional (ASP) communities. The Events industry describes a multi-billion dollar activity, but although conferences seem to generate personal value, their external value is seldom measurable. Using the SHRE 2015 and 2016 conferences as a case study, this presentation offers a methodology to determine the main financial costs of conferences. Using accessible delegate data and nationally determinable costs, it is possible to examine the conference cost factors of delegate travel, registration fee, accommodation and workplace support. These costs may be directly associated with a single event/series, and adapted to reflect national contexts. When the results of this case study are generalised to a global perspective, they offer values in-line with published figures and re-affirm a multi-billion dollar activity. Using this approach allows an evidence-based assessment to be made of the monetary and environmental cost of conference events.
C1.3  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium C1.3  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Academic carers performing mobile subjectivities in the neoliberal university (0132)

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 & Tetreault, 2007). Yet academic excellence continues to be associated with the ‘bachelor boy’ (Hinton-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 a research project funded by the LFHE, which looked at England-based academics who are also carers. Informed, on a theoretical level, by post-structuralist feminist research and, on an empirical level, by a corpus of interviews conducted with academic carers and policy staff, it argues that performing mobile academic subjectivities is fraught with tensions for carers. Specific reference is made to the role of academic mobility requirements such as conference attendance in this process.

C1.4  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium C1.4  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Researching the development of an academic field: Conferences as a way in (0157)

James Burford, Thammasat University, Thailand, Agnes Bosanquet, Macquarie University, Australia, Jeanette Yfye, La Trobe University, Australia, Catherine Manathunga, Victoria University, Australia, Tai Peseta, Macquarie University, Australia, Fiona Salisbury, Western Sydney University, Australia, Machi Soto, Hiroshima University, Japan, Jan Smith, Durham University, UK, Paul Sutton, Plymouth Marjon University, UK

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

This paper responds to Henderson’s (2015) call for academic conferences to be explored as sites for critical and analytical higher education research. It grapples with the question of how the field of higher education research can understand itself as a knowledge-making endeavour. In this paper we pursue the argument that in-depth examination of academic conferences is a valuable way of coming to understand the development of a research field. The context of our study is an ongoing cultural history of the biennial International Academic Identities (IAI) Conference. We argue that a cultural history of such a conference can open up helpful insights about how such gatherings offer space for academic fellowship, and how the IAI conference may act as a window onto the research preoccupations of academic identity scholars across the globe as they wrestle with changes to, and the demands of, working in universities.

C1.5  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium C1.5  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Gender, Early Career Academics and the Performance of Self at Academic Conferences (0250)

Barbara Read, University of Glasgow, UK

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

This paper revisits a study originally conducted in 2003 on gendered conceptions of speaking at academic conferences and events, asking the same interview questions as in 2003 to a group of early career academics in contemporary academia. In doing so, my aim is to compare and contrast views and experiences of this very public aspect of academic life and work, comparing the data from academics in my previous study – the majority of whom were on permanent contracts - and those of ‘early career’ academics today. The dynamic of age was under-analysed in my original study. In this paper I will be foregrounding age and career stage as well as gender in comparing participants’ accounts, in order to explore the ways in which the conference ‘performance’ can work to exacerbate conceptions of marginality and insecurity – or perhaps work to support or mitigate against such feelings – for different groups.
Unexplained attainment gaps exist for BME students, 17.7% nationally controlling for prior attainment (ECU, 2017). Existing research suggests this is contributed to by a number of factors which staff can be change agents for (Mountford-Zimdars et al, 2015) build relationships of power-sharing with students (Stevenson, 2012). I present the initial findings of a HEFCE-funded-project, which applies these findings to developing an approach to personal tutoring in three disciplines and institutions to support the closure of attainment gaps. This paper presents interim findings from the ‘before’ phase of project, drawing on a series of surveys and focus groups with students and staff from the project. Mobilising Frasers (2001) theories of recognition, I deconstruct the ways in which students and staff conceptualise personal tutoring exploring its potential to perpetuate/remedy social-inequalities. I argue that reconceptualising existing working practices, with a robust theoretical framework to support the ‘participatory parity’ of different groups of students.

Research on the ‘ideal’ or ‘good’ student tends to situate within compulsory schooling. Few recent studies have focused on lecturers’ conceptualisation and construction the ‘ideal’ university learner. Informed by 30 in-depth interviews with staff from two post-92 English universities within the social sciences, we explore the various ways in which the notion of ‘ideal’ student is conceived in the current context of neoliberal higher education. More specifically, we focus on lecturers’ expectations of undergraduate students, as well as their views of the ‘ideal’ student in the different contexts of teaching and learning, such as in lectures, seminars and individual supervisions. We identified specific personal and academic attributes that are desirable of students, including preparation, engagement, commitment, as well as being progressive, critical and reflective. The ability to achieve high grades, interestingly, is rarely mentioned or considered as important. Implications for policy and practice are discussed.
Producing assessments that are directed at specific audiences can bring profound learning benefits concerning both discipline specific and transferable skills, as they allow students to engage with real world situations and express themselves in their own voices. However, students frequently appear to experience difficulties in how best to communicate their work when producing outward-facing assessments for notional rather than actual audiences. This contribution is based on a recent staff-student collaboration to tackle this problem. Two undergraduate student interns from University College London reviewed two modules, in Biology and Arts & Sciences respectively, and in collaboration with both academic staff and the university’s Public Engagement Unit developed assessments for these modules that are directed at ‘real’ audiences. In our paper, which is linked to a round table session on external-facing assessments, we will present the process of this collaboration, its results and the insights we have gained from it.

Higher Education institutes are under more pressure to provide skills that go beyond knowledge acquisition and deepening. The need to provide transferrable skills, to offer practical experience and to develop employability amongst students challenges existing assessment structures. External-facing assessments could provide one solution. In this contribution to the roundtable session organised by Nicholas Grindle and Vincent Tong, I present a cross-institutional staff-student project in relation to the introduction and practical implementation of external-facing assessments. The aim of the project is to formulate dual purpose portfolios with structured tasks and evaluation criteria, which can then be integrated into or fully replace existing module assessments. I present findings from the first stage of the project, which include practical, ethical, legal and methodological issues, such as concerns around the use of technology and added pressures on students, the sharing of personal reflections with the public, and matters relating to copyrights and property rights.

Graduates are expected to have good academic knowledge but also the professional skills required in the workplace. One such ‘soft’ skill is the ability to give constructive criticism and provide meaningful but professional feedback. This is particularly relevant when working in a team within industry, where peers need to influence each other to improve their project outcomes and chances of success. The development of student’s skills to generate such feedback should be supported within higher education. Specifically the IPAC Consortium investigates the use of Individual Peer Assessed Contribution to group work. In this context, students create an output directed to their own peers (i.e. a form of external-facing assessment), and prepares students for similar practices in industry. This paper, linked to the roundtable session on external-facing assessments proposed by Grindle and Tong, investigates staff and student perceptions on such practice. Insights gained to this date are presented.
C5

Caerphilly | Session C5 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45

It’s who you know! The influence of developmental networks on the perceived career success of undergraduates (0312)

Myrtle Emmanuel, University of Greenwich, UK

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

Evidence suggests that students in transition from university to work do not know how to navigate the labour market, mainly due to lack of appropriate networks (Behtoui 2016; Brown and Hesketh 2004; Tholen et al. 2013). The study examines the relational nature of early career management. It is driven by the dearth of research examining the impact of social influences on the early career outcomes of undergraduates who are in the transitory period from education to work.

The presentation will share key findings from a longitudinal online survey about the influence of undergraduates’ developmental network on their perceived career success. Key implications for HE institutions will also be discussed such as the role of formal/educational developers in enhancing students’ subjective career success and the benefits of using an innovative online diagnostic tool to understand the level of engagement/disengagement of undergraduates’ career management.

SYMPOSIUM C6

Cardiff | Symposium C6 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Cheap, local and distinctive? Possible futures for college-based HE in competitive HE markets: evidence from Australia, Canada and England

Convenor and Chair: Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom
Discussant: Arti Saraswat, Association of Colleges, London, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Access and widening participation

Symposium rationale

This symposium offers a multi-national multi-layered analysis of the evolving picture of college-based higher education in the 21st century. While the preferred view of HE continues to be university provision, college-based HE has since the second half of the twentieth century formed an important part of overall HE provision. But within the wider context of a competitive and vertically stratified field, college HE has struggled to position itself as a distinctive and valuable form of provision, and has been deemed the choice of the necessary for those unable for a range of reasons to participate in university HE. However, in the second decade of the 21st century, new developments are emerging that point towards a repositioning of college-based HE in complex and contradictory ways. In a number of European countries, some forms of vocationally-oriented HE that take place outside universities are gaining a reputation for distinction, and there is evidence that the privileged are using these pathways to gain and maintain advantage.

This is also occurring in Australia, and Sue Webb’s paper in this symposium addresses this question. In England, in contrast, the 2016 HE White Paper promotes an ever-more competitive market in higher education and proposes that institutions should compete on price and quality. It would be easy to conclude that college-based HE is designated the cheap, local and lower quality alternative to university HE. It is this question that forms the focus for the paper by Orr and Bathmaker. College-based HE cannot be straightforwardly defined and categorized under current conditions, and Leesa Wheelahan’s paper considers the fraught policy context that has shaped this picture in Anglophone countries. An important gap in what we know concerns the ways in which college-based HE contributes to shaping the possible futures of those who participate in this form of provision. Henderson’s paper examines this issue from the perspective of participants in college-based HE in England, and provides insights into how policy contexts impact on individual lives.

The importance of considering the changing landscape of college-based HE relates to crucial questions of quality and inequality: how to ensure college-based HE is high quality but also remains open to disadvantaged and under-served students. It is these central issues, and possible ways forward, that all the contributions to the symposium will seek to address.
C6.1  
Cardiff | Symposium C6.1 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15  

Higher education in colleges: why isn’t there more of it? (0041)  
Leesa Wheelahan, Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, University of Toronto, Canada

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The three rationales for higher education in colleges in Anglophone countries are that it can: expand access to HE for disadvantaged students; result in HE aligned with the needs of the workplace; and, be cheaper for governments and individuals compared to university provision. Many of us researching college HE thought that it would grow quickly and become a principal means to support the expansion of HE. However, it has failed to do so. Why? The paper explores two limitations on the growth of college HE: first, government ambivalence and intermittent aspirations for differentiation; and second, government marketisation policies that compel colleges to compete with universities in a stratified and hierarchical market structured by positional goods. It uses Trow’s framework of elite, mass and universal HE and Burton Clark’s ‘triangle of coordination’ to explore the roles of the state, the market and academic coordination of HE.

C6.2  
Cardiff | Symposium C6.2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15  

Local students at the local college: College-based Higher Education students and narratives of place and (im)mobilities (0054)  
Holly Henderson, University of Birmingham, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The paper focuses on the language of the ‘local’, and its connection to College-based HE in England. It first shows how CBHE is depicted as ‘local’ provision in policy discourse, as well as how the provision is subject to local and national policy changes in both the Higher and Further Education sectors. The paper then explores the contrasting significations of the descriptor ‘local’ in these two sectors, before discussing the ‘local’ Higher Education student. Arguing that a college-based HE student’s imagined future is produced through these narratives of place and mobility, the paper addresses issues of inequality and disadvantage that are implicit to these narratives. The paper draws on data from a study of two case study CBHE providers. The findings presented here refer to documentary and interview data, and show the importance of considering issues of place and locality in discussions of student experiences of HE.

C6.3  
Cardiff | Symposium C6.3 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15  

What does higher vocational education bring to higher education that is distinctive? (0055)  
Sue Webb, Monash University, Australia, Steven Hodge, Griffith University, Australia, Shaun Rawolle, Deakin University, Australia, Elizabeth Knight, Monash University, Australia, Ann-Marie Bathmaker, Birmingham University, UK, Trevor Gale, Glasgow University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Australian higher education is in a state of flux partly because of the entry of new providers, such as those with a track record in vocational education and training (VET). This paper considers two questions: Are these providers offering similar qualifications to universities or do they bring something new and distinctive? Are these new providers increasing opportunities for new students and widening participation? Answering these questions through new research focused on the case of Australia has increasing wider relevance given that the growth of vocational institutions (VIs) providing higher education is a major international development in the field of higher education (HE) (Trow 2006). The paper contributes to literature on social equity in higher education by considering whether the system is becoming increasingly vertically stratified between providers or whether this increase in provider types is merely creating greater horizontal differentiation in higher education (Brennan et al. 2008; Wheelahan 2009).
Higher education provided in colleges has been a persistent element of England’s HE system for over a century (Bailey and Unwin, 2014) and the proportion of HE provided in further education colleges has consistently been around ten per cent for at least the past twenty years (Avis and Orr 2016). Claims are regularly made that college-based higher education (CBHE) is distinctive from other higher education provision because it widens participation to HE for local people and because it provides high-skilled workers for the local economy. This paper examines these claims for distinctiveness and applies Marginson’s (2016) concept of vertical stretching in high participation HE systems to analyse the position of CBHE. That CBHE has persisted, however, suggests that it has a role, whether distinctive or not, so this paper draws attention to the CBHE curriculum and how that might be conceptualised, developed and enhanced.

Over recent years, many higher education institutions have introduced new ‘distributed’ leadership models frequently based on themes and programmes rather than on academic departments with the hope of being more flexible and efficient in an increasingly competitive and international market. These models have led to an increase in cross-disciplinary and cross-faculty middle leadership roles in universities. However, many of the people who take on these roles may not have any perceived authority (through formal line management responsibilities or budget holding). How do they influence and lead staff in these situations? And what are the problems and challenges of ‘distributing’ leadership in this way? The purpose of this article is to explore these issues by drawing on data from a recent Leadership Foundation funded study exploring the role of Associate Deans in UK Universities which included 15 semi structured interviews with Associate Deans from 5 institutions and a national survey (n=172).

The focus of this symposium is on the evolution of the research impact agenda in the UK and the contemporary policy discourses and underlying ideologies of higher education research. With particular although not exclusive reference to the introduction of assessing impact criteria in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF), these five papers examine the impact of ‘impact’ upon higher education. The intention is to problematize current paradigms of research and reflect on what the future of higher education studies might or should be.

The symposium begins by employing an analysis of Times Higher Education coverage since 2007 when the term ‘impact agenda’ was first coined, and discussions in the dedicated academic literature that began in 2009. The first paper describes the notion of the impact agenda as a moral panic within the academy, often used as a cloak to conceal very familiar discourses that are perennial problems in science and higher education policy.
The next three papers provide detailed examples of the ways in which the development of the impact agenda is part of tensions between different actors and notions of research. Pertaining to the reflections of academic and research-user evaluators populating the disciplinary sub-panels of the UK’s REF 2014, the second paper attempts to re-theorise the nexus between the ‘scientification’ of society and the ‘politicization’ of science. The third paper examines the legitimacy of panel peer review to assess impact and argues that ‘impact’ is an ambiguous object in evaluation which places new pressures on the traditional peer review mode of evaluation. The fourth paper, then, presents examples of institutional and structural change to illustrate further these trends and argues that the introduction of ‘impact’ as a domain in performance-based research funding decisions in the UK has had wide ranging implications for higher education organisations and their staff. Finally, the fifth paper argues that higher education research has entered a conversation about its character, and it focuses on the relationships between ‘impact’ as a policy discourse and the evolution of higher education studies.

All five papers explore the ruling ideological consensus (including whether there is an ideological consensus). They question whether and to what extent the current policy trend towards impact will continue. The symposium will conclude by considering what are the future trends in higher education research? Whether the impact agenda also means more challenges or opportunities for higher education researchers? And, whether or not, this matters?

C8.1 Conwy 1  |  Symposium C8.1  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Moral Panic and the Impact Agenda (0354)

Claire Donovan, Brunel University London, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The paper employs the idea of a ‘moral panic’ as a heuristic device to examine the reaction of the academic community to the impact agenda. This involves an analysis of Times Higher Education coverage since 2007 when the term ‘impact agenda’ was first coined, and of discussions in the dedicated academic literature that began in 2009. It finds that the impact agenda is often used as a cloak to conceal very familiar discourses that are perennial problems in science and higher education policy: e.g. threats to academic freedom, the ‘tyranny of relevance’, and encroaching philistinism and economic rationalism. Some impact-specific moral panics are identified: e.g. attribution vs. contribution, the inclusion of basic research, and the impact evaluation paradox: high impact = low quality. The paper concludes that social scientists should engage in ‘boundary work’ to redefine ambiguous concepts and harness uncertainly to positively influence REF development to social democratic ends.

C8.2 Conwy 1  |  Symposium C8.2  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

The Paradoxes of ‘Competitive Accountability’ and the Problem of Mistrust in ‘Scientific Governance’ (0355)

Richard Watermeyer, University of Bath, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

In this presentation data collected from the SRHE funded study: Towards a Cartography of Impact, and pertaining to the reflections of academic and research-user evaluators populating the disciplinary sub-panels of the UK’s Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 will be used to re-theorise the nexus between the ‘scientification’ of society and the ‘politicization’ of science (Gauchat 2012). It will discuss how an impact agenda in the REF endangers not only the ‘moral economy’ (Bowles 2016) and credibility (Gieryn 1999) of scientific endeavour – and specifically the efficacy of social science – but is antagonistic and disruptive to a normative ideal of engaged and co-produced research formalised in a paradigm of ‘mode-2’ (Gibbons et al. 1994) knowledge production. A series of paradoxes related to competitive accountability are presented, which signpost new challenges for ‘scientific governance’ (Irwin 2008) in the brace of New Right (NR) politics.
**C8.3**  
Conwy 1 | Symposium C8.3 | **Wednesday 14.15-16.15**  
---
**Examining the Legitimacy of Panel Peer Review to Assess Impact (0356)**

Gemma Derrick, Lancaster University, UK  
Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

As an ambiguous object in evaluation, and one that is of increasing political and social prominence in research evaluation, Impact places new pressures on the traditional peer review mode of evaluation. Traditionally, peer review has concentrated on assessing common, more habituated norms of research excellence, but the inclusion of Impact as a formalised criterion questions its legitimacy as the “gold-standard” tool of evaluation. Likewise, the consideration of peer review as a group endeavour, rather than solely concentrating on assessing the reliability of its outcomes (Bornmann and Daniel 2005), has shifted how the science system values its outcomes, and the validity of these peer (or expert) decisions. This paper examines the legitimacy of peer review as an evaluative tool for Impact criteria, in the face of common drawbacks associated with group dynamics such as Groupthink.

**C8.4**  
Conwy 1 | Symposium C8.4 | **Wednesday 14.15-16.15**  
---
**The Impacts of Impact Assessment on Higher Education Organisations, Practices and Careers (0357)**

Alis Oancea, University of Oxford, UK  
Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper draws reflectively on data from RAE 2001, RAE 2008 and REF 2014 (reported elsewhere), including new analysis of REF 2014 case studies and impact and environment statements, to argue that the introduction of impact as a domain in performance-based research funding decisions in the UK has had wide ranging implications for higher education organisations and their staff. The paper explores in detail three areas of influence: 1) discursive and political changes in defining and valorising research knowledge to justify specific levels and patterns of selective allocation of public investment; 2) changes in the structures, staffing, management and governance arrangements of HEIs as they recalibrated for impact; and 3) the emergence of impact-related para-academic professions.

**C8.5**  
Conwy 1 | Symposium C8.5 | **Wednesday 14.15-16.15**  
---
**Rethinking higher education research: Towards a new epistemic order (0358)**

Ourania Filippakou, Brunel University London, UK  
Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

Currently, when there is a lot of political talk about the need for ‘impact’, and when public policy seeks to calibrate research quality, there is a pressing need to reconsider the relationships between higher education research and higher education policy. This conceptual paper focuses on the contemporary policy discourses in relation to higher education and also asks whether and in what ways the prevailing episteme of higher education can or should re-define and rethink its interpretive concepts and the relationships between them. It seeks to do this, beginning with considerations of the contested and changing character and practices of higher education policy and higher education research. It argues that the creation of the intellectual potentials of higher education studies is going to be a long and difficult process, of some complexity.

**C9**  
Conwy 2 | Session C9 | **Wednesday 14.15-14.45**  
---
**Insight for employability: The impact and implementation of Careers Registration (0205)**

Fiona Cobb, University of London, UK  
Research Domain: Employability, enterprise and graduate careers (EE)

The most important factor in determining positive graduate outcomes is having a career plan upon completing university. (DfE, 2017). A consortium of 16 UK universities are undertaking a HEFCE funded 3-year Learning Gain research project to investigate the value of Careers Registration — introducing questions about career readiness and work experience into mandatory data collection at student enrolment...
— as a measure of learning gain in relation to career readiness. With the direct link to student registration data, we have the opportunity to map employability journeys of particular student cohorts (e.g. students with widening participation backgrounds).

We will explore how implementing Careers Registration provides insight into student employability, and the impact the vast amount of data collected is having for institutions strategically, to develop and improve student outcomes, through monitoring and shaping student employability journeys. We will share preliminary findings and consider the potential impact for the learning gain landscape.

**C10**

**Denbigh 1 | Session C10 | Wednesday 14.15-14.45**

**Conceptualizing Local Research Capacity in Kazakhstan (0268)**

Jack Lee, University of Bath, UK, Aliya Kuzhabekova, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper examines the process of research capacity building in a middle-income, transition economy in Central Asia: Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan has a history of recruiting expatriate faculty members to assist the development of its higher education system. From Russian scientists and Turkish instructors who arrived decades ago to the recent influx of international faculty at a new university in the capital city, this brain gain receives scant attention. Rather, the attention on transnational higher education in Kazakhstan is often about institutional features that set a university apart from others in the country (e.g. medium of instruction, joint degree programs). This study focuses on expatriate academics who hold full-time positions in Kazakhstan and pursue research. The following questions guide this study: How do expatriate academics define local research capacity? To what extent do they collaborate with local researchers? What barriers do these expatriate academics face when conducting research?

**SYMPOSIUM C11**

**C11**

**Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15**

**Merits and challenges of measuring learning gains for learning, teaching and assessment: Lived experiences of 78,531 students at 16 universities.**

Convenor: Jekaterina Rogaten, The Open University, UK and Discussant: Bart Rienties, The Open University, United Kingdom

Chair: Fabio Aricò, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Learning and Teaching

**Symposium rationale**

In the UK, the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) has invigorated interest in appropriate and valid measurement approaches of learning gains. Learning gains are defined as growth or change in knowledge, skills, and abilities of learners over time. Building on our SRHE 2016 symposium on learning gains, we will provide a critical perspective of how 15 universities in the UK and 1 university in South Africa are problematising and measuring learning gains for improving learning, teaching and assessment. A rich and diverse range of methods and approaches across five papers (e.g., fine-grained weekly log data, self-reports, longitudinal analysis, multi-level growth modelling) will be discussed during the symposium to understand if and how 78,531 students made learning gains across 80+ degree programmes.

As highlighted across the symposium and within each paper, substantially different experiences and practices are reported, whereby a complex understanding of measurement of learning gains is needed to unpack the intertwined, dynamic, disciplinary-sensitive, and non-linear development of students in higher education. At SRHE, we aim to set an evidence-based agenda and will discuss the affordances, lived experiences, limitations, and caveats of using different measurements, conceptualisations, and methodologies for assessing learning gains.

In the first paper, Sharpe and Broughton used engagement surveys of graduate attributes in one UK institution and fine-grained learning logs to illustrate that students do not always value activities designed to develop their graduate attributes, especially around working with others. In the second paper, Turner and colleagues use longitudinal survey data across 200+ students at one UK institution to capture students’ knowledge of
research concepts, practices and skills, and how students learn about research methods. Substantial variation is found within disciplines, and effective practice of how to provide feedback to students are discussed. In the third paper, Vermunt and colleagues propose a new instrument to measure non-subject-specific learning gains, which includes cognitive, meta-cognitive and affective skills, abilities, attitudes and competencies. In the fourth paper, Rogaten and colleagues use multi-level growth models across 3,537 students in 40 degree programmes to indicate importance of the disciplinary context and substantial variation in learning gain developments. Finally, in the fifth paper, Rogaten and colleagues find that substantial variation is present in students’ learning trajectories as well as across 30 different qualifications at University of South Africa.

C11.1 | Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11.1 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
--- Assessing the potential of graduate attributes as a measure of learning gain (0200)

Rhona Sharpe, Stephen Broughton, Oxford Brookes University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

One of the challenges facing higher education is in understanding what counts for an excellent educational outcome: how students' learning can be measured effectively, and how these measurements might be used to guide current investments and inform future developments. Universities are experienced at measuring students' learning gain in terms of their academic ability. However, grades may not have the precision to measure how well students have developed other attributes, such as engaging as a team member or reflecting on their own learning. Such graduate attributes are accepted as an expected outcome of higher education in addition to disciplinary knowledge (Barrie, 2007; Haigh & Clifford, 2011). This paper will present a methodology developed at Oxford Brookes to examine how such learning gains can be evaluated and some initial results from the learning logs components of this work.

C11.2 | Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11.2 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
--- Examining the contribution research methods can make to the learning gain debate (0202)

Rebecca Turner, Claire Gray, Carole Sutton, Reema Muneer, Julie Swain, Nadine Schaefer, University of Plymouth, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Research methods are an integral element of undergraduate study and are delivered across a range of disciplinary and institutional contexts. Undergraduates’ developing a solid grounding in research methods not only prepares them for the rigours of final year research projects, but also provides them with essential skills required by employers. The universal applicability of research methods created the opportunity to examine how students’ knowledge, skills and experience changes through their studies, and how capturing this could be used to measure learning gain. This paper will report on the outcomes of a longitudinal analysis of an undergraduate self-report survey, to examine students’ development as researchers and the use of this as a measure of learning gain.

C11.3 | Denbigh 2 | Symposium C11.3 | Wednesday 14.15-16.15
--- Learning gain: from concept to measurement (0203)

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

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

In this paper we introduce a definition and conceptual framework for non-subject-specific learning gain. We propose a four-component, three-dimension conceptual structure which includes cognitive, meta-cognitive and affective skills, abilities, attitudes and competencies. We introduce the measurement model associated with this conceptual framework and its component measurement scales. Drawing on a large-scale survey of over 4,000 students in 11 universities, we present results concerning the reliability of these measures, as well as their underlying structure. We base the latter on a confirmatory factor analysis that empirically tests the hypothesised structure of the measured constructs against the collected survey data. We show how a majority of our measurement scales have robust and reliable structures, and discuss the reasons for the lack of reliability for others. Finally, we discuss the potential lessons for the feasibility of measuring non-subject-specific learning gain, alongside the limitations of our approach and the next steps in our analysis.
C11.4  Denbigh 2  |  Symposium C11.4  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Longitudinal analysis of students' learning gains in Higher Education across two UK institutions (0207)

Jekaterina Rogaten, Bart Rienties, The Open University, UK, Marius Jugariu, Ceri Hitchings, University of Surrey, UK, Ian Scott, Oxford Brookes University, UK, Ian Kinchin, University of Surrey, UK, Simon Lygo-Baker, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Although learning gain as a concept is relatively easy to define, its measurement is potentially problematic. Building on initial work presented at SRHE2016, in this follow-up study amongst two “traditional” universities we sought to replicate the feasibility of using assessment grades as a measure of learning gain. Our multi-level growth analyses of 3,537 students across 2*20 degree programmes indicated on average students showed improvement in standardised grades, although this was only significant for one university. Furthermore, the variance explained differed between the levels, whereby University 2 had more variance at the departmental level and within students than University 1, while at the University 1 variance was mainly nested between students. This has important implications for TEF when assessing learning gains at an institutional level, as aggregate learning gains estimates can result in misleading estimates of students’ learning gains.

C11.5  Denbigh 2  |  Symposium C11.5  |  Wednesday 14.15-16.15

Learning gains of international students in South African distance education (0209)

Jekaterina Rogaten, The Open University, UK, Jenna Mittelmeier, The Open University, UK, Dion Van Zyl, University of South Africa, South Africa, Melis Cin, The Open University, UK, Dianne Long, University of South Africa, South Africa, Bart Rienties, The Open University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The proportion of students studying in international distance education programmes has risen dramatically in the last decade, particularly in developing countries like South Africa. Although there has been some research in UK distance education, there is little known about academic trajectories of distance education students in other countries. One promising approach of assessing students’ learning through the use of learning analytics is through measuring students’ learning gains and learning trajectories. Longitudinal data was collected for 69,935 undergraduate Science students from across 30 different qualifications at UNISA. Our multilevel modelling indicated that students made positive learning gains over time, whereby most variance (78.9%) was within-student, followed by the variance due to individual differences (18.3%). Theoretical implications and practical applications for these findings in the context of distance education as well as the appropriateness of the selected method in the context of Africa will be discussed.

C12  Raglan  |  Session C12  |  Wednesday 14.15-14.45

Balancing Acts: Developing Online Professional Identities (0156)

Paula Nottingham, Middlesex University, UK

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

The paper explores an ongoing research project about how undergraduate work-based learners at a London university have made use of online social media and interactive peer groups to inform and extend their professional identities. This approach aligns with Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner’s (2015) notion of learning in landscapes of practice for study and work. The project’s emerging findings indicate that while it is sometimes challenging to adapt to using online sites to communicate publicly with tutors and peer groups, graduates have been able to use the knowledge gained from studying on the programme to directly impact their professional practice. This has led to some graduates being able to engage with work-related communication more readily. The author argues that exploring the experiences of graduates using social media is essential for ensuring the curriculum’s purpose and currency, and that engaging with pedagogy that supports lifelong learning pursuits is fundamental within the digital university.
**D2**  
Beaumaris 1 | Session D2 | **Wednesday 15.00-15.30**  

**Acknowledging first year students’ ‘brought along’ experiences on an academic literacy course.** (0363)  

*Catherine Hutchings*, University of Cape Town, South Africa  

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

I outline a ‘blended’ curriculum with a digital literacy component, which shifts the shape of literacy practices and students’ learning agency on an academic literacy course. The pedagogy strives not merely to assimilate students in the disciplines, but to narrow the gap between the literacies they bring to the academy and the academy’s literacies, and to value what they bring. I discuss the affordances of digital literacies to support the analytical mode, allowing for students’ reflection and ownership of these concepts in writing. Central to our pedagogical imperative is the recognition of students’ experiences. This is especially important because the acquisition of academic literacies has always been seen as one of the important vehicles for widening and sustaining access to the university for all students. Through this analytical mode, students may play a more active role in knowledge construction by placing themselves at the centre of the knowledge making project.

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

**Achieving balance in academic identity and career – insights from award winning undergraduate research mentors (0061)**  


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

The aim of this study was to explore how Undergraduate Research mentoring and supervision fits into the career profile of award-winning Undergraduate Research mentors and to determine the factors that motivate engagement as an Undergraduate Research mentor / supervisor. Twenty-four award-winning Undergraduate Research mentors were interviewed about their mentoring practices. Five themes emerged including academic identity and motivations; the challenges to academic identity and career development; enhanced research productivity, reward and recognition, as well as the benefit from developing other mentors. In addition to explaining these themes, the authors discuss how the findings can be utilized for career development and academic-identity formation for faculty.

**D5**  
Caerphilly | Session D5 | **Wednesday 15.00-15.30**  

**Success in a knowledge economy? Understanding the early labour market experiences of doctoral graduates in the UK (0124)**  

*Sally Hancock*, University of York, UK

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

For several decades, the policy discourse of the knowledge economy has articulated the importance of doctoral graduates to economic growth. More recently, a counter narrative depicting doctoral graduates as ‘disillusioned and directionless’, facing difficult and fractured transitions into non-academic employment, has emerged. This study offers a timely reappraisal of the knowledge economy promise, analysing recent employment data for UK doctoral graduates (n=4345), linked to academic and socio-demographic data. This novel element of linked data enables an exploration of whether and how doctoral students’ academic experiences and differing access to economic, social and cultural capitals are associated with distinct career pathways. Early analyses indicate that the vast majority of doctoral graduates are in professional employment, and career satisfaction is high. Clear associations are observed between socio-demographic characteristics and doctoral subject and institution. Employment outcomes are also linked to socio-demographic and academic characteristics. A full analysis, with policy recommendations, will be presented.
D7  Chepstow  |  Session D7  |  Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Gender inequality at the top: Why ‘fixing’ the women isn’t the answer (0243)

Sue Shepherd, University of Kent, UK

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

There is a serious gender imbalance at executive management level in English universities. Efforts to address this issue have focused on ‘fixing’ the women via initiatives such as Aurora, designed to encourage and support women to apply for senior leadership positions. Underlying this approach is the assumption that women’s under-representation can be explained by their ‘missing agency’, characterised by a perceived lack of confidence or ambition and/or a reluctance to apply for the top jobs.

My research on the appointment of deputy and pro vice chancellors (PVCs) challenges this notion and instead highlights the importance of three structural aspects of the recruitment and selection process that appear to disadvantage women: geographical mobility/external career capital, conservatism and homosociability. These findings imply that a fix-the-women approach will be insufficient to solve the problem and that recruitment policy and practice – and the assumptions that underpin them – also need to be reviewed.

D9  Conwy  |  Session D9  |  Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Personalising the student journey: exploring the impact of personalisation of learning on student behavioural engagement (0258)

Malcolm Sullivan, Yvonne Carlisle, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Following first year students before and after the implementation of a UK Business School’s personalisation programme, the impact of personalising the student journey on behavioural engagement was explored. The programme is based on an academic mentor scheme, and the use of learning analytics to track engagement. Supporting the proposition that personalisation should increase engagement due to an improved staff/student relationship, findings show that personalisation significantly increased engagement overall. Only certain demographics were significantly affected though, with male, full-time, and students with non-standard qualifications or lower entry points showing significant improvement in engagement, though from a lower base. Student groups with higher initial engagement - female, medium/high entry points, A-level qualified and placement – saw a small, but not significant, increase in engagement. Given the links between engagement and attainment, the increase in engagement should, ceteris paribus, lead to an increase in attainment overall, and specifically amongst the most affected demographic.

D10  Denbigh  |  Session D10  |  Wednesday 15.00-15.30

Questions of authorship in a Higher Education Studies programme connecting international contexts (0016)

Dina Zoe Bellugi, Queen’s University Belfast, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper offers insights into the deliberation process of one particular agent who coordinated the curriculum development process of a Higher Education Studies programme aimed at connecting diverse international contexts. In this paper, she shares four specific ‘questions of authorship’ which she consciously identified as important before the programme’s inception, which she then revisited when engaging stakeholders and collaborators, in her attempts to be responsive to an ethical obligation to the global South. Continually negotiating the politics and problematics of authorship, may be a poignant way to bring to bear that which is de/legitimised in the assessment of content, methods, assessment and contexts chosen for inclusion in such a programme. The presentation is intended as an ‘opening’ to fellow researchers, teachers and students in this field, to consider the significance of such conceptual framing for thinking and practices across borders.
This paper reports on the preliminary findings of a small scale study of students’ response to learning analytics dashboard. It argues that dashboards may have the potential to support students’ positive engagement in their studies within higher education but that in understanding this potential, we need be aware of the way that students engage with feedback, that builds on their view of themselves as learners, and that is mediated by their disposition towards learning. So the paper argues that whilst dashboards provide a tool for engaging students in reflection on feedback and appear to motivate students to engage in positive learning behaviours, they need to be adopted in a cautious and critical way.

Scholars have highlighted how financial concerns and constraints can influence HE choices and decision-making in various ways, with potential applicants employing various strategies to minimise the financial burden of HE (Callender and Jackson, 2008; Patiniotis and Holdsworth, 2005). Drawing on findings from a qualitative longitudinal narrative inquiry, the presentation challenges the conclusions of existing literature, and provides enhanced insights into the ways that financial concerns shape HE decisions and choices over the course of students’ FE studies. Issues arising from financial constraints emerged early in the process, limiting participation in open days and in turn, restricting access to information. Delays in the realisation of financial limitations were also apparent, allowing students’ ‘ideal’ HE plans and later renegotiations of these to be captured. The findings convey that the majority of participants were unable to go where they preferred, and, instead, had to decipher the ‘reasonable’ option when financial constraints were realised.

Developing the writing capabilities of those who are not on academic contracts has been largely overlooked. This is despite the fact that many of those on ‘professional’ or ‘support services’ contracts are involved in writing and disseminating findings from the evaluation of widening participation activities or retention or success initiatives. In response to this omission, over the last year we have delivered a writing programme for widening participation practitioners, supported by academic mentors from across the UK. The same programme has been delivered in Australia. Drawing on two of the papers produced as part of the project we chart how the papers evolved, the tensions and struggles experienced by the authors and how this has shaped both their writing and their practitioner identities. We also explore the relationship between mentor and mentees. We close the session by highlighting the importance of supporting non-academics to write.
In medicine, the field of “medical humanities” has emerged to promote the empathy and moral reasoning of would-be doctors during medical education, as well as providing tools for critiquing the dominant narratives of medicine. I build a case for an analogous “educational humanities” by briefly comparing the needs and challenges involved in preparing and supporting doctors with those of preparing and supporting university teachers. I then illustrate how student experiences can be re-storied using three poems drawn from a larger set of 138 poems that capture the emotional dimensions of learning and teaching in higher education. The three selected poems defy the dominant UK policy discourse on “the student experience” (Sabri, 2011), instead highlighting key aspects of students’ transformation, including pain, perspective and partners (Magolda, 2009). Poetry, as a genre, presents these experiences in a way that foregrounds the emotionality of growth and invites close reading and layers of interpretation.

A significant feature of contemporary higher education involves the concept, however elusive, of ‘partnerships’. It appears, for the most part, a pragmatic solution to the significant changes to academic-student relationships, which on surface observation appears sound. As one develops a critical view, however, it becomes clear that all is not what it seems. As part of a funded project, we have developed a philosophically-informed typology of partnerships that outlines four types of partnership and their defining features. The typology is intended to be helpful to both academics and students seeking to work in partnership. We built on Aristotle’s analysis of friendship to develop the typology and identify practical questions to support critical thinking on higher education pedagogical partnerships. The implications of the typology and the critical questions to explore stakeholder expectations of partnership in contemporary higher education will be discussed.
**E7**

**Chepstow | Session E7 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15**

**The Mesopolitics of Middle Management: The Role of Heads of Academic Departments (0342)**

Jane Creaton, University of Portsmouth, UK

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

This paper explores middle leadership in higher education through the perspectives of twenty heads of department in a teaching focussed university in the UK. The findings indicate that there is considerable autonomy in how individual heads structure, manage and lead their departments, and as a consequence, the role is performed in significantly different ways across a single institution. However, most heads acquire their knowledge and understanding of leadership through the day to day experience of doing the job and their personal, departmental and disciplinary networks are more influential than formal institutional structures and processes. The paper suggests that a mesopolitical lens, which explores how social practices are shaped by the specific disciplinary and departmental contexts and cultures in which they are located, provides a productive approach to the study of middle leadership and management.

---

**E9**

**Conwy 2 | Session E9 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15**

**Students’ Unions Response to Consumerist Policy Discourses in English Higher Education (0140)**

Rille Raaper, Durham University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper focuses on the recent Higher Education and Research Act 2017 in England and the consultation documents leading to the legislation. I will start by arguing that the reform promotes consumerist understanding of higher education, universities and students. Guided by Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis, I will further explore the ways in which five students’ unions from England and a representative of the National Union of Students understand and respond to these policy discourses. While the unions interviewed demonstrated significant opposition to the policy and consumerist positioning of students, their critique was fragmented and often accompanied by consumerist counter arguments. The unions emphasised existing and proposed consumer rights as benefiting students and the unions. The reasons for a lack of consistency in the participants’ discourses will be questioned and discussed in relation to their relationship with the university management and wider student population they represent.

---

**E10**

**Denbigh 1 | Session E10 | Wednesday 15.45-16.15**

**Converging voices and synergies for student success: strategic enrolment management development at a research intensive Canadian university (0289)**

Alain Malette, Sylvie A. Lamoureux, Université d’Ottawa, Canada

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Our paper presents the contextual analysis that led to the development and implementation of a Strategic Enrolment Strategy (SEM) at the University of Ottawa, Canada, a large research intensive institution. We will share the structure and logic behind the implementation process, highlighting our experiences in the establishment and initial work of the Steering Committee, and its sub-committees on retention and recruitment. Our focus in presenting this work in progress is on the communication, collaboration and partnerships created and strengthened through the development process. Particular attention will be drawn to the importance of wide-ranging representation of committee members, and knowledge sharing, to ensure collective buy-in to the aims and goals: student success Our presentation is supported by data drawn from individual and collaborative auto-ethnographies, as well as discursive data gleaned from semi-structured interviews with steering and standing committee members.
E12  Raglan  |  Session E12  |  Wednesday 15.45-16.15


Rovincer Najjuma, Dorothy Kyagaba, Rebecca Nambi, Makerere University, Uganda

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

Teacher education pedagogy in Africa is in need of a reform (Akyeampong, Lussier, Pryor & Westbrook, 2013). Mobile technologies can potentially transform teacher education pedagogy (Schuck, 2016, Ally, Grimus & Ebner, 2014). This study explored teacher-trainees readiness, usage and perceived gaps for mobile mentoring during field placement. Entry logs data from a mobile mentoring platform was collected for three months as well as, interviews, and a survey. Platform data reveals teacher-trainee experiences on using the platform as a mediating tool. Findings indicated an increasing trend in integrating mobile mentoring during field placements; variations in perceptions and attitudes on usefulness and usage patterns; engagement with mobile mentoring has mentoring support benefits. Several technological and pedagogical affordances support mobile mentoring integration into teacher education. These findings have been interpreted to determine their implications on the development of mobile mentoring experiences in teacher education in low resource settings.

F1  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Session F1  |  Wednesday 17.00-17.30

**The case for specifying learning environments: Creative and Connected Universities of the Future (0026)**

Carola Boehm, Staffordshire University, UK

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

The opportunity to join a University holding a vision of becoming The Connected University, leading a collaborative 2021 City-of-Culture bid, has allowed me to renew my reflections on a research theme that for the last 10 years has occupied me in practical and theoretical terms. Public/academia partnership models have been given a new focus within present-day policy contexts. The current terms relevant for this debate are ‘triple and quadruple helices’, ‘Open Innovation 2.0’, ‘Mode 3 research’ and ‘connected curriculum’. In the arts, we have also seen an increase of public appetite for process (rather than product), and the 21st century has witnessed a new phenomenon, that which Pierre Luigi Sacco (2014) has labelled Culture 3.0. This paper will explore these concepts in relation to fulfilling visions for truly connected universities, and in my case, in a locality that specifically utilises its own creative sector communities to regenerate itself.

F2  Beaumaris 1  |  Session F2  |  Wednesday 17.00-17.30

**What might ‘decolonising the curriculum’ mean? (0198)**

Kathy Luckett, University of Cape Town, South Africa

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

In response to student calls in South African universities to ‘decolonise the curriculum’, there is a groundswell of deliberation around curriculum reform. However a recent study suggests that academics in Humanities are inhibited by a lack of curriculum theory and uncertainty as to exactly what this call means for their course design and pedagogic practice. A Working Group has been established to clear the way theoretically, provide ‘points of departure’ for interrogating existing curricula and to work collectively with student representatives to develop practical strategies for overcoming the elitism and ‘whiteness’ of current practices. The paper reports on work-in-progress.
Developing critical reflection in academic workplaces: lessons for the Apprenticeship for Academic Professionals from a sociocultural perspective (0351)

Sue Mathieson, Northumbria University, UK

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

This research explores the nature of early career academics’ reflection on their teaching practices in the absence of a taught programme that explicitly encourages critical reflection on teaching. It identifies the resources academics draw on to support critical reflection on their teaching practices, and investigates whether there are differences in the learning of academics across departmental workgroups, and what this can tell us about differences in the quality of the learning environments afforded by different departments.

The research, based in a UK university, analyses the Reflective Commentaries of academics completed over a 2-year period as part of their probationary requirement to become Fellows of the HEA, using a sociocultural theoretical framework.

These questions are significant in informing debates around the development of the Apprenticeship Standard for Academic Professionals, in particular how it should supplement academics’ workbased learning across varying departmental contexts, given that apprenticeships foreground workplace learning in professional development.

GROUP DISCUSSION F4

F4.1 Caldicot | Group Discussion F4.1 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Doctoral journeyings: Pedagogic possibilities for profound happiness (0164)

Carol A. Taylor, Gill Adams, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper uses Gibbs’ (2015, 63) assertion that ‘happiness is the freedom of self-determination within the context of a chosen world view’ as a springboard to explore findings from a multi-phased, collaborative project ‘Happiness and the student experience’. The project utilised innovative visual, digital and material methods to explore the following research questions:

• What makes you happy about your experience at university?
• What does happiness mean to you in your life as a university student?
• Do you feel you fully belong here at university?

We draw on data to analyse the complexities surrounding part-time doctoral students’ understandings of happiness. We focus on how happiness is felt, experienced, and embodied via three themes: time for me, protected space, and the challenge of community. We contest dominant notions of ‘the’ doctoral student experience and redirect the focus to a more nuanced, flexible concept of student flourishing during doctoral journeyings.

F4.2 Caldicott | Group Discussion F4.2 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Addressing Doctoral Researchers’ Well-being: Will our Solutions have Impact? (0216)

Caroline Hargreaves, Janet De Wilde, Laura Lane, Imperial College London, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Well-being is used internationally as an indicator of social progress, for both policy formation and economic development. Our 2009 and 2014 studies showed all domains scored lower for well-being. The impact of the top most bothersome questions had increased compared to the earlier study. In particular we found increased levels of stress and frustration related to research, as well as career uncertainty and well-being was lower for women and for later stage doctoral researchers. Since the studies we have implemented measures aimed at enhancing doctoral researcher well-being. This paper discusses those measures and anticipates insight from other institutions, in particular:
• What are other HEIs across the sector doing to address well-being?
• Considering this multifaceted approach, how can we assess impact?
• How best can we identify which part has worked?

F5  Caerphilly | Session F5 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Employability Promises: Comparative Analysis of Embedded Employability Skills Assessment across Four Higher Education Institutions. (0331)

Sarah Horton-Walsh, Coventry University, UK, Sarah Montano, Birmingham University, UK, Claire Jones, Birmingham City University, UK, Deborah Anderson, Kingston University, UK, Rebecca Lees, Kingston University, UK

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

The continued debate around the nature of and importance for employability abounds among government, employers, higher education institutions, students and various other interested stakeholders around the world. The teaching excellence framework (TEF), introduced in UK, draws explicit links between graduate destinations and the quality of teaching, making employability a specific criterion within the TEF framework. Now more than ever universities must evaluate their employability provision to support employment outcomes. Despite this, there remains no one single consensus for a definition or agreed approach to employability. This study adds to the discussion by presenting the results of a cross institutional comparative analysis of employability skills assessment embedded in both general and business specialist undergraduate degree programmes that are delivered at four different UK higher education institutions. The authors aim to shed light on points of difference and similarity to consider what works that can be shared among the higher education community.

F6  Cardiff | Session F6 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Attainment and transition experiences of students progressing from an evening access programme to undergraduate study (0096)

Andrea Cameron, Jason Annetts, Hazel Work, Abertay University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The under-representation of particular sections of society in Higher Education (HE) is a driver for the current widening participation agenda. The Scottish Government has an ambition that ‘by 2030 students from the 20 per cent most deprived backgrounds should represent 20 per cent of entrants to higher education’ (COWA, 2016). However, there is recognition that in order to achieve this target there may need to be a range of entry routes and contextual offers available. According to Scottish government figures, Abertay is one of Scotland’s leading HE centres for wider access (SFC, 2016). The university has offered a free part-time evening access course (Access to Higher Education Abertay Dundee (AHEAD) for a number of years but it underwent significant restructuring in 2012. This study considers the progression, attainment and experiences of students transitioning from the revised access route to their chosen undergraduate degree programme and through subsequent stages of study.

F7  Chepstow | Session F7 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

Playing in different keys: the changing role of the Head of Department in research-intensive universities (0158)

Dilly Fung, University College London, UK, Claire Gordon, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK

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

This study investigates the role of the Head of Department (HoD) in research-intensive universities, with a particular focus on how HoDs are navigating multiple and potentially conflicting priorities within rapidly changing national and institutional contexts. Dealing with local challenges and changes, HoDs are also faced with responding to expectations and outcomes associated with the Research Excellence Framework and Teaching Excellence Framework. The first phase of this project focuses on HODs in arts, humanities and social science disciplines drawing on data gathered through interviews with HODs in three Russell Group universities.
Preliminary findings highlight the time pressures facing HoDs and a perceived lack of clarity around prioritization; challenges in changing the embedded assumptions of certain department members about the importance of research vis-à-vis education; uncertainty about the extent to which both internal and external political and policy changes may affect funding streams and limited direct engagement to date with the TEF.

**F8**

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

**Pursuing teaching excellence in higher education: Towards a multi-stakeholder's perspective (0013)**

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

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper is framed as a provocation to stimulate and provoke discussion and reflection on the rationale for proposing a multi-perspective debate on teaching excellence in higher education. Teaching excellence is positioned at the centre of UK government policy in the 2016 White Paper ‘Success as a Knowledge Economy’ and to the fore in policy debate and developments in higher education internationally. The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) also has a much wider resonance with similar developments in other countries. We problematise the concept of teaching excellence and its framing in neoliberal ideological assumptions of performativity, new public management and competition. As a provocation, this paper calls for more critical, nuanced and sustainable understandings of how teaching excellence is to be understood and enacted meaningfully. A key aspect of the multi-stakeholder perspective is through the development of its interconnected pluralistic and democratic dimensions.

**F9**

**Conwy 2 | Session F9 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30**

**Student experiences of interdisciplinary learning between the arts and sciences (0084)**

Harriet Dismore, David Morrison, Paul Warwick, University of Plymouth, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Despite interdisciplinarity being an important higher education agenda, there is still much to be learnt about how we can effectively develop and support the interdisciplinary capacity of students. This paper seeks to explore the challenges and issues that students face when engaging in interdisciplinary learning. It draws on a project involving four modules across the arts and sciences working on a sustainable development topic. The data, reported via phenomenological accounts from postgraduate mentors as well as pre and post surveys from second year undergraduate students, will provide much needed evidence of the learning experiences that take place during collaboration and integration of expertise. This has important implications for the practical application of an interdisciplinary approach, as well as learning in higher education.

**F10**

**Denbigh 1 | Session F10 | Wednesday 17.00-17.30**

**Securing Syria’s academic knowledge and industrial future through participatory action research: a case study of agricultural engineering education (0323)**

Shaher Abdullateef, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Turkey

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Syrian higher education has been severely damaged by the ongoing conflict, with disastrous effects on the nation’s knowledge base, academic infrastructure and training provision.

This poster presentation reports on a participatory action research project structured around a proposed strategic intervention for delivering tertiary-level e-learning to agricultural engineering students, alongside farmers and other professional stakeholders such as United Nations agencies, NGOs and local organisations. Through collaboration within the e-learning environment, the learning community engages in activities across the action research triad of research, capacity-building and practice (Senge and Scharmer, 2001: 40).

Contextual factors such as the ongoing conflict and humanitarian crisis are discussed. The programme aims are set out, and the cyclical action research methodology is outlined. Anticipated challenges are addressed, and solutions proposed. Finally, the projects wider implications for educational interventions in crisis contexts are considered.
F11  Denbigh 2  | Session F11  | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

*Improving the Student Learning Experience through Dialogic Feed-Forward Assessment (0204)*

Jennifer Hill, Harry West, University of the West of England, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Assessment feedback gains consistently low satisfaction scores in national surveys of student satisfaction, with most concern surrounding its timeliness, quality and effectiveness. We present the results of a two year qualitative study, thematically analysing semi-structured interviews with students who have undertaken dialogic feed-forward coursework on a second year undergraduate geography module in a British university. The assessment consists of submitting a considered draft of a coursework essay, which is discussed and evaluated face-to-face with the course tutor before a self-reflective piece is written about the assessment process and a final essay is submitted for formal grading. We present evidence that this process asserts a positive influence on the student learning experience in a number of inter-related cognitive and affective ways, impacting upon learning behaviour, supporting student achievement, and raising NSS scores related to feedback. We espouse an ipsative, cyclical approach to dialogic feed-forward, focusing on learners’ longitudinal development.

F12  Raglan  | Session F12  | Wednesday 17.00-17.30

*Process Improvement or Transformation: e-Learning Strategies in U.S. Higher Education Institutions (0236)*

Gerard Danford, Johanna Vuori, Haaga-Helia, Finland

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

This research investigates; How US Higher Education Institutions strategically position themselves in e-Learning?

HEI’s are facing a high degree of complexity due to external influences (funding, technology and competitive). Therefore, HEI leaders and administrators must weigh the tradeoffs when considering incremental or disruptive change (resist the changes occurring, incrementally adapt, or make transformative changes).

This research explores the e-Learning positioning strategies of U.S. HEI’s. The findings are highly relevant for HEI’s who wish to design a coherent strategy that matches institution purpose, context, and capabilities.

Data for this research was collected in 2014-2015 by interviewing senior administrators in U.S. HEI’s (19 universities and 27 interviews). Institutions were then placed on a strategy framework grid (seven larger clusters emerged).

The findings support the proposition that; the long term growth and survival of many HEI’s will be determined by their ability to develop strategically relevant e-Learning initiatives, and specific technology scope capabilities.
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SYMPOSIUM G1

What is valued in higher education? Identity, equity and engagement in and around the neoliberal university

Convenor and Chair: Sylvie Lomer, University of Manchester, United Kingdom
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Symposium rationale

Contemporary higher education institutions are sites of numerous tensions, as the interests of multiple stakeholders intersect and at times conflict. This gives rise to a number of dilemmas, especially as the sector is exposed increasingly to market forces in which it must justify its economic value, as well as its social value. In the context of the recent Brexit vote, the extent to which universities have engaged with local communities has been called into question. The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework, set to continue in the wake of the general election uncertainty, highlights the UK government’s insistence upon externally defined concepts and measures of quality in teaching. Universities are required to demonstrate the value of their teaching to students and to the state, their capacity to contribute to social mobility through widening participation initiatives, and their value to local communities through ‘anchor’ status.

We present five papers that explore what is valued in higher education, and the behaviour and identity of institutions and the people who work in them. The first paper examines how the international / local tensions are played out with regards to widening participation in a civic university. The second examines how admissions staff negotiate and reconcile such tensions on an individual level. The third paper presents a framework for understanding the role of universities as institutions situated in their specific regional environments. The fourth paper asks why students elect not to attend taught sessions, and identifies the perceived value of the course as significant. The fifth explores the introduction of blended learning, arguing that students value relationships and therefore disengage from online tasks.

G1.1

Student responses to blended learning: valuing relationships (0104)

Sylvie Lomer, University of Manchester, UK, Elizabeth Palmer, University of Northampton, UK
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

A Midlands University is in the process of introducing an institution-wide pedagogical shift towards Active Blended Learning (ABL). ABL involves learner-centred interactive tasks in both online and face-to-face interactions. Initial implementation has led to variable student participation in online tasks. This qualitative research project explored students’ perceptions of ABL. It established that key success factors identified in previous literature also applied to this institutional context, which were not being universally applied. In particular, students said that relationships with staff were key to their engagement with online components. Where students felt that staff respected and cared for them and their grades, they were more likely to complete online tasks. This was expressed in setting high expectations, designing bespoke content and providing feedback on online tasks. Given sector-wide moves towards adopting blended learning, it is essential for teaching staff to consider the personal factor in designing and implementing ABL.
Admissions staff and their values: how HE selectors reconcile personal identities, local needs and institutional demands (0111)

Steven Jones, University of Manchester, UK, Dave Hall, Exeter University, UK

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

The market turn in Higher Education changed the role of staff involved with admissions and recruitment. This paper focuses on the English system in the context of both a sharp rise in student fees and a tendency for the public university agenda and its associated social priorities, such as widening participation, to come up against more commercial priorities. Drawing on evidence from detailed interviews with admissions personnel, both academic and non-academic, across three disciplines within one higher-prestige university, we explore the notion of selectivity and the practice of selection. Tensions are revealed in relation to the traditional model of university admissions, as based on local knowledge and sensitivity towards underrepresented groups, and the purportedly merit-driven model, as driven by perceived market position. We report on the complex and often unexpected ways in which admissions staff reconcile their professed beliefs with their professional practices.

Perceived value in classroom contact: rising to the challenge of learner disengagement (0117)

A. Mark Langan, Nicola Whitton, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

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

Higher Education globally is becoming increasingly accountable to output metrics, such as those that purport to encapsulate teaching quality and student satisfaction, leading to increased discourses of value-for-money. Despite the significant costs of university courses and links between class participation and attainment, many students chose not to take full advantage of the scheduled classes available to them. In this paper, we present the findings from student-led interviews with forty-seven undergraduates. Primary reasons for not engaging with learning opportunities highlighted the key role of assessment in shaping student value judgements. This included the attribution of perceived additional value to learning experiences related directly to assessment, and the prioritisation of assessment activities over participation at taught classes. We conclude by discussing these instrumental assessment-driven behaviours in the context of an increasingly outcome-driven global Higher Education sector, and the problematic nature of learner freedom.

Engagement and equity; a conceptual framework to help us understand university anchor engagement and what an English socially just anchor model may look like. (0146)

Carl Emery, University of Manchester, UK

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

Over the past decade, driven by activity in the US, we have witnessed a growing movement of universities re-emphasizing their public mandate through the adoption of anchor strategies delivered through the third mission agenda. The university as an anchor institute has become a key discourse within higher education and urban regeneration initiatives. Yet, the concept of universities as anchor institutions lacks a precise or consistent definition whilst much of the recent ‘anchor’ research has been challenged as boosterism. Alongside these questions of conceptual confusion and research validity also sits a ‘social responsibility’ tension regarding the role of university anchor institutions in addressing issues of engagement, poverty and equity inherent to many of the urban communities in which the institutions reside or work beside. This paper investigates these factors from the English HE policy perspective with a focus on presenting a socially just conceptual framework for future English university anchor activity.
G2

**Beaumaris 1 | Session G2 | Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*‘All of us put other people first’: Narratives from a participatory photodiary study with university student carers (0151)*

**Jacqueline Priego-Hernandez, Debbie Holley, Bournemouth University, UK**

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

While the number of people providing unpaid care is growing in the UK, student carers in higher education remain hidden and under-represented. The scant evidence suggests the complexities of combining university studies and caring responsibilities, but more research is needed to capture the variegated experiences of student carers. This study contributes with an in-depth exploration of the learning experiences of seven student carers at different stages in their university studies, young and mature. Using a participatory methodology combining the production of more than 300 photographs, biographical narrative interviews and a workshop, it presents visual and verbal narratives. Results are discussed in terms of the journey to choose a university, the decisions regarding disclosure of caring duties, support available within the university and support provided by the statutory and voluntary services. Implications for practice are offered in terms of dissemination of information, support structures and mechanisms for self-identification.

G3

**Beaumaris 2 | Session G3 | Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*The role and views of volunteer patients in undergraduate pharmacy education: involved stakeholders or back seat drivers? (0267)*

**Laura Lindsey, Durham University, UK, Cate Whittlesea, University College London, UK, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK**

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

This focus group study explores the views and experiences of people acting as volunteer patients for undergraduate pharmacy students. Patient-centred care and active patient involvement has become an essential part of health care sector in the recent years. There is a growing recognition that this needs to be reflected in the way patients are involved in the education of health and social care professionals. Volunteer patients are often a large part of the way clinical skills are taught in medicine and pharmacy. Yet, until recently there has not been much focus on the experiences they have and how they could be enabled to have a more meaningful role in the students’ learning. Early stages of thematic analysis suggest that the patients perceive themselves as bringing reality to the students and there was kudos and knowledge they gained themselves in return.

G4

**Caldicott | Session G4 | Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*What is employability and how should we measure it? (0319)*

**Arwa Asiri, Paul Bocij, Andrew Greasley, Aston University, UK**

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

This paper attempts to define and analyse the concept of employability in the context of higher education institutions in the UK. It is argued that since employability is difficult define, it continues to be used in a variety of contexts and with different meanings that lack clarity, consistency and accuracy. The work discusses various perceptions about what constitutes employability and how it can be measured. Several existing measures and indicators of employability are considered. A number of concerns are noted regarding current definitions and measurements. Additionally, it is argued that employability has become a performance indicator within higher education but one that fails to consider fully a range of important socio-economic and other factors. Clearly, such factors might impact upon the eventual outcomes achieved by students regardless of the opportunities provided to learners in their undergraduate studies. New measurements of employability are advised that consider some of these social factors.
The Impact of Management Education on Students' Perceptions of Employability.

(0210)

Clare Jones, Birmingham City University, UK, Deborah Anderson, Kingston University, UK, Sarah Horton-Walsh, Coventry University, UK, Rebecca Lees, Kingston University, UK, Sarah Montano, University of Birmingham, UK

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

The concept, language and theme of employability permeate Higher Education. This paper introduces a major longitudinal study exploring the extent to which undergraduate management education contributes to the perceived employability of its graduates. The survey population spans four universities, offering an opportunity to explore students’ perceptions of employability, drawing comparisons across and within groups, and identifying differences, should they exist.

There are three key points which drive this work. Firstly, the belief that employability is more than a set of skills, rather is a complex construct of knowledge, aptitude, attitude, self-awareness and self-belief. Secondly, that those entering higher education are a diverse and changing population. Thirdly, that HEIs have been tasked with addressing employability. In examining whether institutions are having an impact on their students’ perceptions of employability, the outputs from this study may have far-reaching implications across our sector.

Learning in Public and Private Universities in Egypt (0081)

Ray Langsten, American University in Cairo, Egypt, Fatma Said Mahrous, Assiut University, Egypt

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The effectiveness of university education demands attention. Students and parents ask: what is gained from the four year course of a university degree? Have students learned the basic terms and concepts of their chosen field? Have they improved their reading comprehension? Have they increased their critical thinking skills? This study compares the abilities of second year and fourth year students at two public and two private universities in Egypt. We assess their core knowledge, reading comprehension, and a quantitative measure of critical thinking. We find significant differences between the public and private sectors. However, within each sector, there are no significant differences when comparing fourth year students with those in the second year. We examine other correlates of each outcome indicator. Secondary school experience is significantly correlated with outcomes in both sectors. Aspects of university experience correlate with outcomes in the public sector; not in the private sector.

Experiential Learning – A Learning Worth Having? Academic Perceptions of the use of Experiential Learning in the first year of Business Higher Education. (0240)

Pam Croney, Northumbria University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Experiential learning is seen to offer rich opportunities for improving student learning and engagement and is increasingly regarded as a way to develop employability skills such as team working, leadership, originality of thought and creativity, information literacy, presentation skills, problem solving, and project management skills. This research provides qualitative evidence from academics in a large business school on their perceptions of the benefits of the introduction of an experiential learning module in the first year of higher education study in developing these competences within the student cohort. Interim findings suggest that academics value the potential contribution that this approach brings to business education but that its introduction within the curriculum is not without challenges. Discussion is centred on the value of adopting this approach from the academics’ perspective and on suggestions for future research.
**G6.3**
Cardiff  |  Group Discussion G6.3  |  **Thursday 9.00-10.15**

_Using Design Thinking to promote displays of cognitive empathy in undergraduates (0247)_

Kevin Hartman, Kumaran Rajaram, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

We conducted a quasi-experimental study within two sections of an undergraduate business course. 62 undergraduates completed an optional course activity based on social psychological principles during the fourth week of the semester. Students in the Design Thinking condition received text and videos highlighting the design thinking process and the importance of empathy. Students in the Management condition received materials highlighting the main concepts of the course. Students in both conditions were then asked to write a letter advising a prospective university student how to deal with a management issue.

Three weeks later, students submitted an individual assignment that addressed unethical behaviour by one of two corporations. Students in the Design Thinking condition were three times more likely to display signs of cognitive empathy in their plans than students in the Management condition. Students in the Design Thinking condition also showed more of a balance when selecting between the two corporations.

**G7**
Chepstow  |  Session G7  |  **Thursday 9.00-9.30**

_Leading small scale, new and evolving higher education institutions in turbulent times (0336)_

Craig Gaskell, Coventry University, UK

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

Rapid diversification of the UK higher education system, unprecedented turbulence in the sector and erosion of the general stability assumptions that once could be relied upon provides a challenging backdrop for any institution. Against this challenging backdrop there are a number of small-scale universities, some of which are relatively young and are having to develop and evolve fast. Leadership of these small scale and by necessity dynamic institutions at such a time of sector-wide instability harbours many challenges. A study has been undertaken to gain insight into the context, leadership challenges, strategies and learning points to be taken from recent experiences of senior executives of such institutions in the UK. This paper provides an outline of the study and discusses some early findings.

**G8**
Conwy 1  |  Session G8  |  **Thursday 9.00-9.30**

_Financialisation in For-Profit Higher Education: the Brazilian and US cases in comparative perspective (0314)_

Cristina Carvalho, University of Brasilia, Brazil, Tristan McCowan, UCL Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The deregulation of financial flows, the interconnection of markets, and the creation of financial innovations and investment funds characterize the process of “financialisation” in flow since the 1970s. This paper analyses the implications of financialisation for the higher education sector in Brazil and the USA, focusing specifically on for-profit institutions. Drawing on documentary analysis and descriptive statistics, the paper maps the different meanings of financialisation, and how this concept is applied in distinctive ways in US and Brazilian private higher education. It charts the emergence of mega-companies listed on the stock exchange, and their increasing dominance of the market, particularly in distance education. The dynamics of financialisation prioritise short-term results in both of the countries, thereby bringing a negative impact on educational quality as well as dependence on capital markets.
**G9**

**Conwy 2  |  Session G9  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*Change, Manage or Meet: understanding and addressing the expectations of Business School Master’s students (0184)*

Hanna Yakavenka, Olufemi Sallyanne Decker, University of Greenwich, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The majority of Master’s students in Business Schools are drawn from different national and educational backgrounds, what impacts on their expectations and student experience. This study aims to develop a deeper understanding of the expectations of Master’s students with a view to better address these expectations and ultimately enhance the student experience and achievement. The study identifies gains that students look for in key areas of competency such as communication skills, autonomy, interpersonal skills and analytical skills as well as in post-graduation outcomes. Findings indicate strong expectations of gains relating to communication and language proficiency compared to other competencies and attributes that enhance a Masters’ degree holder’s career prospects. The paper suggests that to engage students effectively from the beginning of their learning experience and develop common understandings, expectations should be systematically explored in the context of Master’s level attributes and learning outcomes.

**G10**

**Denbigh 1  |  Session G10  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*Can we generate ‘socially just knowledge’ through international partnerships between universities?: a case-study based on a Chinese and European partnership. (0341)*

Andrea Abbas, Lizzi Milligan, University of Bath, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The theoretical framework described has been developed from case-study data that is helping us to interrogate whether the knowledge produced, by a project aiming to build the capacity of Chinese universities to support inclusive education in primary schools, can be considered ‘socially just knowledge’. The capacity building project aims to generate knowledge to improve inclusive education in China but such projects have often involved the ineffective imposition of ‘western knowledge’ into inappropriate contexts. Our conceptualisation of socially just knowledge is emerging from an ongoing iterative process that brings our complex case-study data into dialogue with three theoretical perspectives: Nancy Fraser’s (2001, 2010) perspective on social justice; Basil Bernstein’s (2000) notion of pedagogic rights; and, Nussbaum’s (2011) capabilities approach. Our aim is to produce a framework that can be used by other researchers in the field who aim to co-produce appropriate knowledge across diverse economic, intellectual, social, cultural and political contexts.

**G11**

**Denbigh 2  |  Session G11  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30**

*Learning Styles of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) students in Hong Kong (0170)*

Kin Ming Wong, Institute of Vocational Education, Hong Kong

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education is crucial to technological innovation and advancement worldwide. This research is a preliminary investigation of learning styles of students studying STEM programmes in Hong Kong. Data from over 200 sample students in multiple cohorts of the two-year STEM programmes is first collected and analysed to identify the learning characteristics of students. A small-scale longitudinal study of representative student cases is then conducted to analyse the academic STEM module results of the students throughout their two-year studies. Preliminary results suggest that the sample students are marginally reflective, predominately sensing, visual, and sequential learners. Findings from the analysed data will not only provide valuable information for teachers to design more effective teaching strategies for STEM modules, but also shed light on the relationship of academic achievements of STEM students and their learning styles.
GROUP DISCUSSION G12

G12.1  Raglan  |  Group Discussion G12.1  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30

A pedagogical framework for teaching music online: A multiple case study (0103)

Carol Johnson, University of Melbourne, Australia

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

Abstract: Higher education music students can benefit from the enhancement provided by online learning technologies (Bowman, 2014; Crawford, 2013). Research suggests that online learning technologies can provide effective constructivist music learning (Eakes, 2009; Keast, 2009), equitable access music learners (Maki, 2001), and self-efficacy of musicians through meaningful student learning (Brandström, Wiklund, & Lundström, 2012). To date, research has yet to identify an online higher education teaching model that connects music education pedagogy with established online learning methods for effective student learning outcomes in music. With the exponential rate of increase of online music courses in the United States (Johnson, 2017), the development of a practical online teaching framework for music is warranted. Based on results from a multiple case study, this investigation highlights three main components of an online learning framework (e.g., design, communication and assessment) for online music courses and suggest consequential implications for student learning.

G12.2  Raglan  |  Group Discussion G12.2  |  Thursday 9.00-9.30

Recorded lectures: What impact on student attendance? (0366)

Egle Dagilyte, John Walsh, Semra Ramadan, Mahjabin Anwar, Anglia Ruskin University, UK

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

This teaching and learning research project investigates whether there is a direct link between recorded lectures, audio and/or visual, being made available via VLE to year-two and year-three undergraduate law students and their attendance patterns in live lectures. It aims to address the academic staff concern that if recorded lecture policy is implemented institutionally, students would not attend live classes. The authors used mixed research methodology: online student survey and analysis of student attendance data, accompanies with the actual viewings of recorded lectures data. The findings indicate that there are a variety of reasons why students do not attend (or attend less), but recorded lectures are not one of these. The reasons highlighted by students include timetabling, childcare, working lives, illness, curriculum design, student purposive learning behaviours and tutor ability to engage / tutor personality.

H2

Beaumaris 1  |  Session H2  |  Thursday 9.45-10.15

‘Coming to Jo’burg is like I’m in a foreign country’: Researching rural students’ lived experiences of transition and participation in higher education in South Africa (0138)

Sue Timmis, University of Bristol, UK, Brenda Leibowitz, University of Johannesburg, SA, Sheila Trahir, University of Bristol, UK, Lisa Lucas, University of Bristol, UK, Karen Desborough, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Despite wide ranging policies to address equity and access to higher education in South Africa, rural students continue to be highly marginalised and geography remains a deeply political matter due to the displacement effects of apartheid. This paper reports on phase 1 of the Southern African Rurality in Higher Education (SARIHE) project (ESRC/NRF funded). This collaborative project involving South African and UK partners, investigates how rural students negotiate the transition to university and how prior cultural and educational experiences influence their higher education trajectories. The project employs a participatory methodology where students are co-researchers. Fieldwork is located in South Africa but also draws on perspectives from nine Southern African countries. We report preliminary findings framed by research questions and theoretical concepts and consider how co-researchers’ narrative, multimodal and spatial accounts point towards negotiations of identity and curricular justice. Finally we discuss the plans for the next phase of the project.
H3

Beaumaris 2 | Session H3 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

The implications of a diversifying workforce for higher education systems, institutions and individuals (0328)

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

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

In the context of significant changes in the employment contract for academic staff worldwide, the paper reports on a study of the developing implications of a diversifying higher education workforce for systems, institutions and individuals. It reviews official datasets in the light of interviews with a range of respondents in eight case study institutions, and finds that approaches to work and careers may be influenced as much by informal opportunities and relationships as by formal structures and processes. It offers findings from case studies to show how individuals navigate the structures in which they find themselves, the extent of policy adjustments at local level, and ways in which institutions can optimise bottom-up initiatives and dialogue. It explores how greater instrumentality as reflected in, for instance, workload models and an ‘over-engineering’ of ‘teaching- or research-only’ roles, is counterbalanced by accommodations between individuals and local managers that are not necessarily formally articulated.

H4

Caldicott | Session H4 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

Employability and graduate outcomes for sports students with widening participation characteristics – an analysis of a data derived from 2000-2015 (0152)

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

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

The advent of the Teaching Excellence Framework has placed increased focus on graduate outcomes, widening participation and learning gain within the Higher Education sector. However, it is acknowledged that there is an ‘unequal playing field’ with regard to graduate employment with socio-economic background viewed as the primary determinant of the graduate’s future (UUK, 2016). The authors conducted a study tracking career trajectories for those students graduating from an Abertay sports degree programme in the time period 2000-2015. These programmes were originally only offered as advanced entry routes for students with further education awards enabling them to extend their qualifications and access graduate employment. The programmes have evolved over the study period and now offer a range of entry points. This presentation will consider employability outcomes for those completing studies from ‘first in family homes’, from lower socioeconomic households, and for those who enrolled with a further education qualification.

H5

Caerphilly | Session H5 | Thursday 9.45-10.15

Placement or practicalities? Barriers and disincentives to work experience, as reported by computing students (0237)

Ella Taylor-Smith, Sally Smith, Colin F. Smith, Edinburgh Napier University, UK

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

Having relevant work experience, such as a placement or internship, is valued by employers in the technology sector and can improve employment outcomes for computing graduates (Shadbolt 2016). However, gaining good work experience positions is competitive; some applications are unsuccessful and some students do not apply; some students feel unable to do work placements due to personal or contextual constraints. This study explores the perspectives of computing students at two UK universities, in order to identify factors that might advantage some students over others. A qualitative approach focuses on students’ perceptions and circumstances, collected through free-text responses to a survey, combined with data relating to students’ ethnicity, social class, and their parents’ education. This approach highlights specific challenges faced by individual students. These individuals’ challenges are also instances of important factors influencing access to placement, with implications for institutions and policy makers interested in improving equality of opportunity.
H7  
**Chepstow | Session H7 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

**‘Classroom walk-throughs’ as a management approach (0228)**

Thomas Harboe, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

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

This paper examines the degree to which heads of studies apply observation of classroom teaching (or "Classroom walk-throughs") as a strategic tool to identify and monitor didactic quality and development. The study is based on interviews (and possibly observations) at selected Danish universities. This paper focuses on the heads of studies as a managerial group.

H8  
**Conwy 1 | Session H8 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

**The Determinants of Institutional Positioning of Higher Education Institutions: a Reappraisal of the Organizational Dimension (0345)**

Tatiana Fumasoli, UCL Institute of Education, UK, Giovanni Barbato, Universita' degli Studi di Milano, Italy, Matteo Turri, Universita' degli Studi di Milano, Italy

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper contributes in two ways to the emerging scholarly debate on institutional positioning in higher education. First, it presents a literature review and argues that, besides external forces and strategic intent, the organizational dimension is an important determinant of university institutional positioning. We define organizational dimension by the identities, history and traditions, routines and practices within a specific higher education institution. The second contribution of the paper is the outline of a conceptual framework and a research agenda on how the organizational dimension affects university institutional positioning. We hope to increase our understanding of regional, national and international dynamics of change in higher education.

H9  
**Conwy 2 | Session H9 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

**Calling for change: South African higher education since 1994 and student protests (0272)**

Chrissie Boughey, Sioux McKenna, Rhodes University, South Africa

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper speaks to the theme of balancing expectations of students, society and stakeholders by drawing on recent student protests in South Africa. Although much has been done since 1994 to make the higher education system serve all South Africans equally, a lot of this work has been constructed within the need for an increased number of graduates if South Africa is to engage with the global economy. Recent protests saw black students attesting to their 'alienation' in the universities and calling for the 'decolonization' of institutions themselves and, more specifically, of the curriculum. This paper draws on a model of learning (and thus of teaching) which acknowledges students as ‘social beings’ and which has the potential not only to make their experiences in the universities more positive but also to enhance poor performance data.

H10  
**Denbigh 1 | Session H10 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

**Collaboration in learning: Student experiences on the intrinsically European Erasmus Mundus Joint Masters Programme (0346)**

Aleksandra Gulasaryan, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

In the post-EU referendum context, stakeholders in the higher education community are considering ways for the UK to continue and build on its embeddedness in the European research and higher education area. This paper draws attention to the unique European regional project - Erasmus Mundus (EM). Drawing on the series of case studies, this paper examines the nature and consequences of student experiences of following a course constructed by a consortium of different European universities and as part of a specially created multicultural group.
This paper argues that students construe, and indeed constitute, their EM group as a (re)source of learning during their studies and beyond – through worldwide networking. It further argues that the academics are actors playing the role of peer-learning socializers who transmit the rules of peer relations in their academic discipline. The analysis is significant for understanding opportunities offered by the international collaboration programme.

**H11**

**Denbigh 2 | Session H11 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

*The Tyranny of ‘Teaching and Learning’ (0143)*

**Alex Buckley, University of Strathclyde, UK**

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Over the course of the last few decades, the acknowledgement of the primacy of learning has in large part led to the replacement of the word ‘teaching’ by the phrase ‘teaching and learning’ (or ‘learning and teaching’). This paper argues that the ubiquitous conjunction of teaching and learning has two implications: that they always occur together, and that they are of equal value. Drawing on the philosophical literature on the ambiguous nature of the concept of learning, the paper aims to show that those two implications are in direct conflict with the ideas that motivated the shift away from teaching in the first place. The repetitive conjunction of teaching and learning undermines the important efforts to give learning its rightful place, and we should give more thought to how we talk about higher education rather than repeat self-defeating slogans.

**H12**

**Raglan | Session H12 | Thursday 9.45-10.15**

*Student Engagement and the Novelty Effect in a Technology-mediated Gamified Course (0134)*

**Crystal Han-Huei Tsay, University of Greenwich, UK, Alexander Kofinas, University of Bedfordshire, UK**

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

We investigate the extent to which the use of gamification in blended learning influences student engagement. For the gamified course, Personal and Professional Development, in addition to weekly classroom teaching, students participated in a two-tiered system with online learning activities. Gamification elements were developed online and the intervention continued for two years. Data were collected from two cohorts of 334 students. Results suggested that students engaged more in the gamified course and that the second year intervention led to an increased engagement. Also, in both years, there was evidence of “novelty effect,” as students’ weekly engagement declined across time. Nevertheless, the pattern of decline did not follow what the literature suggested. Possible reasons may be the usefulness of learning tasks, clearer expectations, and regular communications. We conclude that gamification is a useful tool for onboarding and engaging students. However, to sustain long-term engagement, course designers need to consider other factors.

**J1**

**Beaumaris Lounge | Session J1 | Thursday 10.30-11.00**

*Exploring the impacts of the casualisation of academic staff on the teaching and learning of undergraduate students (0324)*

**Carole Leathwood, London Metropolitan University, UK, Barbara Read, University of Glasgow, UK**

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

Significant academic attention has been paid in recent years to the increasing casualisation of academic labour in the UK and elsewhere across the world (see, e.g. Kimber 2003, Amsler 2014, Lopes and Dewan 2014, Courtois and O’Keefe 2015). Some research has focused on the experiences of casualised academics and the financial, social and ontological consequences of living with insecure contracts of employment (Rothengater and Hill 2013, Shin and Jung 2013), and there has been recognition of potentially damaging impacts on research and research capacity building (Leathwood and Read 2013). However, relatively little research has been conducted on the implications of a highly casualised workforce for the teaching and learning of undergraduate students. This paper reports on an exploratory study of the perceptions and experiences of casualised academic staff in universities across the UK on the effects of their employment status on the teaching and learning of undergraduate students.
**J2**
**Beaumaris 1 | Session J2 | Thursday 10.30-11.00**

*Investment in Time and Space: Anticipating the future of higher education (0215)*

**Penny Jane Burke**, Anna Bennett, **Matthew Bunn**, University of Newcastle, Australia

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The future of higher education has become a central social issue of the 21st century. Predictions go as far as to suggest the concept of a university itself is an anachronism, as the sector adapts to its place as a marketised institution. This paper explores the way that staff and students envision these changes and how they perceive them to impact upon the experience of higher education in the Australian setting. It explores how these discourses of change and futurity inform anticipatory practices of staff and students and how these shape and reshape durable practices and dispositions. In this sense, the means of entering into discourses of future and change become issues of equity, as temporal resources and discourses of the university become increasingly stratified.

**J3**
**Beaumaris 2 | Session J3 | Thursday 10.30-11.00**

*New global challenges, new knowledge actors, new forms of research: what higher education can learn from the research practices of NGOs (0091)*

**Jude Fransman**, Open University, UK

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

In a complex, changing and increasingly interconnected world there is a pressing need to rethink HE research systems in order to balance the demands of rigour, relevance and responsiveness. At the same time, universities are being forced to justify their role in relation to other knowledge-actors (including consultancy firms, public sector think-tanks, the media and civil society) increasingly producing research that may be more accessible and useful to practitioners and policy-makers (see Shucksmith 2016). This paper presents the findings of a 4-year Leverhume-funded study on the research practices of NGOs in the UK's international development sector. Through case studies of NGOs that have developed their own research portfolios (supplemented with key informant interviews with other knowledge-actors in the international development sector and in-depth participatory journaling with 8 practitioner-researchers) it highlights a selection of key learning opportunities for HE around capacity development for researcher-development, research institutions, research systems and research artefacts.

**J4**
**Caldicott | Session J4 | Thursday 10.30-11.00**

*‘The diploma is not enough’: students’ views on the role of higher education credentials for employability in Kazakhstan (0274)*

**Dilrabo Jonbekova**, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan

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

This study examined university students’ perceptions of the role of their academic credentials in relation to future job prospects, and how much control they feel they have over their future employability. Findings from focus group discussions with undergraduate students in the final year of social science degree programmes suggest that a university degree is only a minimum requirement, and that employability depends on a range of structural and individual factors. While students in smaller towns and less economically developed urban areas voiced greater concerns regarding their future employability, there appears to be generally high level of optimism in terms of future employment, together with the feeling of a substantial degree of ‘control’ over transition from education to work.
J5

Caerphilly | Session J5 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**Antecedents and Consequences of Perceived Employability: A Study of Chinese Undergraduate Business Students (0007)**

Anna Tsui, Ngo Hang Yue, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

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

This study explores the construct of perceived employability among university students in the collectivistic and hierarchical Chinese societies. A model is developed to include the core self-evaluations and two social relational variables (i.e., teacher-student and student-student peer relationships) as antecedents, and organizational identification and students’ university satisfaction as consequences of perceived employability. Several hypotheses are tested with a data set collected from 749 undergraduate business school students in Hong Kong and China. The results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis support all the hypotheses. Apart from advancing our understanding about main antecedents and consequences of perceived employability, the present study also provides some practical implications.

J6

Cardiff | Session J6 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**Undergraduate Research, Learning Gain and Equity: The Impact of Final Year Research Projects (0056)**

Jonathan Parker, Keele University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This study evaluates the impact of undergraduate research on student achievement. It analyses five cohorts of students from 2011 to 2016 at a mainstream UK university which requires a research project comprising 25% of final year credits in most subjects and provides a sample of over 5000 students. The analysis compares research project grades to other final year grades to gauge the improvement for students’ achievement and conducts a multiple regression to analyse what factors affect this gain. The study finds that students achieve better grades on undergraduate research compared to other final year classes. This improvement is larger for students with lower prior achievement, women, and students in the sciences but smaller for students who are Asian or declare a disability. The implications of these findings are that undergraduate research provides a measurable benefit, which is larger for some historically disadvantaged groups.

J7

Chepstow | Session J7 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

**The Quality of Board Decision Making Processes in Higher Education Institutions: UK and European Experiences. (0071)**

Oliver Marnet, University of Southampton, UK, Teerooven Soobaroyen, University of Essex, UK

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

This paper investigates governance practices in HEIs in the UK and in selected EU countries, with a focus on the quality of strategic decision-making processes at the level of governing boards against a context of increasing challenges, uncertainties and expectations facing the UK HEI sector. Specifically, we investigate the awareness of heuristics and cognitive biases, and the presence of active processes to mitigate bias in reviewing or approving plans set out by university management. Interviews with board members, observations of board meetings, and a review of documentation (e.g. council effectiveness reviews) reveal a wide diversity in decision-making and risk management approaches, varying opportunities for board members to review information critical to their decision-making, low levels of awareness of heuristics and bias, and a general absence of systematic implementation of bias mitigation procedures.
Conwy 1 | Session J8 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

Does fear of debt deter higher education participation? New evidence from England (0123)

Claire Callender, University College London, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

Research among prospective UK undergraduates in 2002 found that some students, especially from low social classes, were deterred from applying to university because of fear of debt. This paper investigates whether this is still the case today in England despite the changing higher education landscape since 2002. The paper describes findings from a 2015 survey of prospective undergraduates and compares them with those from the 2002 study. We find that students’ attitudes to taking on student loan debt are more favourable in 2015 than in 2002. Debt averse attitudes remain much stronger among lower-class students than among upper-class students, and more so than in 2002. However, lower-class students did not have stronger debt averse attitudes than middle-class students. Debt averse attitudes seem more likely to deter lower-class students than students from other social classes from applying to university in 2015 than in 2002.

Conwy 2 | Session J9 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

Rethinking Higher Education in Posthuman Times (0338)

Carol Taylor, Christina Hughes, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The purpose of this discussion group is to explore what posthumanist theory has to offer higher education research, pedagogy and practice. Braidotti (2013: 2) suggests that the post-human condition is already with us and has introduced a ‘qualitative shift’ in our thinking about what ‘the basic unit of common reference is for our species, our polity and our relationships’. The discussion is structured into three parts. In the first part, two original research papers by Author 1 and Author 2 will be used as a basis for considering the ontological, epistemological and ethical presumptions of posthumanism. The second part will be organized around a set of theoretical provocations which aim to engage participants in re-thinking questions about who/what matters and what/who counts in relation to practical issues of teacher-student relations; curriculum design and pedagogy; and learning spaces. The third part will consider the implications of posthumanism for educational research.

Denbigh 1 | Session J10 | Thursday 10.30-11.00

Higher education research in Latin America: revisiting MacFarlane’s archipelago (0099)

Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela, University of Chile, Chile

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

An overview of higher education research in Latin America is offered. Drawing on MacFarlane’s (2012) intuitive archipelago of higher education and other literature on the topic and through an empirical study that analysed 130 papers by Latin-American authors between 2000 and 2015 in Web of Science database, this paper aims to examine the main trends in higher education research as well as to discuss the main challenges ahead. ‘Teaching and learning’ stands as the most important area of research in higher education research and so – in a Macfarlane map for Latin America – would constitute a much larger island than that of the ‘policy’ island. This might be explained by trends in higher education in the region that are discussed. Further discussion is offered regarding the dominance of the English in publication in leading journals as well as the challenge of building locally-oriented theory in higher education.
Dropout and failure in higher education is a key issue for European countries. Combining educational models (Tinto, 1997) and engagement models (Fredricks, 2001; Reeve, 2013) the study addresses this issue with two research questions: What is the impact of each component of engagement on student performance? How does the course experience shape the different components of student engagement? 240 students (211 male and 29 female, mean age 19 years) participated at the study. All students were enrolled in STEM field in a French technology-two year institution (Universitary Institute of Technology, IUT). Self-report questionnaire measuring course experience and engagement were used. Results showed that situational interest is a significant predictor of student performance at the end of semester 2. The results also showed that situational interest only depends on students’ perception of the learning context, especially teachers’ concern about student needs and classroom climate.

Recent focus on the health of PhD students, both physical and mental (THE, 2016) raises issues concerning doctoral student health and wellbeing, and the role of supervisors in working effectively and empathetically with students during their doctoral learning journeys. New research (2015-7) builds on earlier work (Wisker et al., 2010; ‘Troublesome encounters’, Morris &Wisker, 2011) highlighting interrelations between dimensions of personal, emotional, health and wellbeing, with those of intellectual development. Case studies are developed here from established and recent research into postgraduate stress and illness, and supervisory responses, representing evidence of worryingly common issues, and supportive practices.

This paper explores the concept of epistemic freedom which is defined in terms of the freedom to entertain ideas and to formulate beliefs. It is noted that theoretical writings which focus on mechanisms of social control (e.g. Gramsci’s theory of hegemony) propose concepts of non-domination in terms of epistemic freedom. It is also noted that the construal of education in terms of ‘learning’ may inhibit the development of epistemic freedom. The pedagogical implications of the idea are also explored. First of all it is suggested, following discussions by bell hooks, that epistemic freedom requires a focus on overcoming prejudices against ‘theory’. In addition it is argued that it is vital that dialogical pedagogies be supplemented by individual reflection, separate from peer pressure. Finally it is suggested that epistemic freedom can be developed through the use of both text and non-text based resources.

Universities across the UK are engaging in a variety of inclusion focused and diversity aware policies and practices. These actions aim to challenge discriminatory structures and actions which may occur within daily experiences of higher education. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) students
are a part of this student community which such actions aim to include. However, research suggests that the ground-level experience for many LGBTQ students continues to involve moments of heteronormativity and LGBTQ discrimination. With reference to findings from an ongoing SRHE sponsored photo-elicitation study with bi and trans identifying students this paper argues that policy and practice has missed underlying mundane moments of discrimination which often go unchallenged by students doing their best to ‘get on’. The paper argues that existing policy may maintain rather than discourage silencing, and may marginalise diverse members of the student body as ‘present others’ rather than ‘included members’.

**K3**

Beaumaris 2 | Session K3 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Researcher-led academic development (0080)**

Marion Heron, Anesa Hosein, Ian Kinchin, Emma Medland, Naomi Winstone, University of Surrey, UK

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

This presentation considers the influence of the diverse research background of each of the research-active members of a single department, and the way it underpins perceptions of their role as academic developers. Within a department that is actively researching teaching practice there is likely to be a shift from research-informed (bringing externally generated research into discussions) towards a more research-integrated situation in which academic developers are more likely to embody their own research tradition within their practice – in the form of researcher-led teaching. Through the application of concept map-mediated professional narratives, we explore the potential of richness in diversity for students resulting from the different ways in which each academic’s research focus influences and frames their perceptions of roles and consider that to achieve coherence as a team there is a need to share a vertical discourse of shared beliefs and values to underpin the diversity of experience.

**K4**

Caldicott | Session K4 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Student’s preparation for employment (0090)**

Heike Behle, University of Warwick, UK

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

While it was always an aim for higher education, students’ employment outcome has now become an explicit criteria to measure the performance of higher education institutions. As a consequence, the current interest in ‘learning gain’ encompasses changes in students’ employability with their preparation for employment being one aspect of employability.

Various ways exist how HEIs can help students to prepare for employment, such as internships; international experiences; or careers guidance. The paper presents findings based on an intervention to increase students’ preparation for employment and on a secondary data analysis of HESA and DLHE data. The intervention uses a specific tool to help students realise their strength and weaknesses. The findings based on the intervention of R2Strength are contrasted with impact factors on graduates’ self-assessed preparation for employment as analysed in the secondary data analysis. Both findings will be used to discuss methods to measure students’ employability.

**K5**

Caerphilly | Session K5 | Thursday 11.30-12.00

**Stakeholders Conceptions of Value in Higher Education (0148)**

Ron Fisher, Griffith University, Australia, Mark Francis, Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK, Andrew Thomas, Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK

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

Value has assumed a new importance in Higher Education (HE) in recent times with the notion that students are customers. In order to provide value for our customers, it is necessary to understand the differences in stakeholders’ conceptions of value in HE. Stakeholder analysis identifies five main groups of stakeholders: strategic level university staff, academic staff, administrative staff, students and employers.

This is a qualitative study using a phenomenographic methodology and method. Phenomenography resolves the tension created by a fruitless search for a necessary condition of value, by conceptualising value as
experiential and idiosyncratic. Data are collected from stakeholders by means of interviews and narrative self-reports.

We report initial findings from three of the five stakeholder groups. Early analysis suggests that there is some similarity in the higher-level conceptions of value held by academic staff and students. However, these are not aligned with conceptions of value espoused by employers.

Rising to the challenge of developing pre-service teachers’ learning autonomy through research-based learning experiences (0075)

Constance Saunders, Humboldt University, Germany, Angela Brew, Macquarie University, Australia

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Consensus exists around the desirability of students becoming autonomous learners. However, what precisely autonomy is and how to develop it is a matter of considerable debate. This research examines how student autonomy is being supported within a research-based learning program for pre-service teachers. It presents findings of an interview study of the practices of teachers of both Bachelors and Masters programs about how and whether they are developing student autonomy. Findings suggest that teachers have varying practices in developing autonomy and that amongst other factors, these different practices are related to their varying conceptions of autonomy, their subjective theories about how to develop it and different understandings of research-based learning. Implications for practice in other contexts and for future research are discussed.

For the first time, tertiary and lifelong education are included in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). SDG Goal 4 aims for: equal access to high quality tertiary education. While there is a range of research on basic education, there is a need for greater understanding of the development of concepts and practices of quality in the higher education and lifelong learning sectors in emerging economies. This project will rely on primary data collection via structured interviews with Higher Education regulators and interviews of staff in the Philippines. Initial findings will be presented, which are likely to include concepts of quality as: outcomes based, related to institutional missions, centred in the persons of students and staff.

The effectiveness of quality management and other quality based activities in higher education institutions are subject of a growing number of studies in the field of higher education research (e.g. Harvey/Williams 2010; Leiber et al. 2015). Despite the efforts that have been undertaken so far to investigate this topic, there is still no clear answer about the question under which conditions which activities are leading to an effective quality management. However, the answer of this question is essential for practitioners as well as researchers. But there is now clear evidence about keys of success. Therefore our paper narrows the problem from a different angle. We provide ten rules which are essential to make quality management a failure, which at the same time underlines their importance without implying that the mentioned factors are “determinants” of effectiveness.
**Conwy 1 | Session K8 | Thursday 11.30-12.00**

**Balancing competing demands in international higher education: the added complexity of federalism in the Canadian context (0321)**

*Diane Barbaric*, University of Toronto, Canada

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

In Canada, education lawmaking is the exclusive responsibility of each province. However, “Regulation of Trade and Commerce” and “Naturalization and Aliens” fall under the legislative authority of Parliament, therefore, the federal government. How then is international higher education public policy developed in Canada in this seemingly grey legislative zone?

This paper presents findings of a qualitative study where 33 semi-structured interviews as well as five focus groups were conducted with senior public servants as well as leaders of key advocacy groups at both the federal and provincial levels. It introduces original conceptual designs that map the OSM policymaking landscapes in Canada at the systems levels and explores the various value propositions given to OSM by each sectoral actor. Finally, it asks whether government and policymakers are truly balancing stakeholders’ expectations in international higher education or whether they are simply passing the buck.

---

**Conwy 2 | Session K9 | Thursday 11.30-12.00**

**Dare to Change: Realizing the Opportunities of Postgraduate Curriculum Development (0116)**

*Cathy Minett-Smith*, Alexander Kofinas, University of Bedfordshire, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Against a turbulent backdrop for postgraduate taught courses (PGT) in the UK, the University of Bedfordshire Business School took the radical decision to close down the legacy PGT portfolio and launch a new suite of PGT courses. The aim: to provide a more efficient and flexible response to the impact of political decisions that have affected international student recruitment while providing a suite of courses based around a pedagogy and learning experience that would address sector criticisms of a lack of employability development in PGT provision. The courses were designed to balance the needs of multiple stakeholders while delivering academic rigour, meeting the employability requirements, and providing a rich student learning experience. Evaluation of the development using the Course Experience Questionnaire (Ramsden 1999), internal metrics and staff and student focus groups reveal improved staff and student satisfaction and improved student performance.

---

**Denbigh 1 | Session K10 | Thursday 11.30-12.00**

**Internationalisation at home: approaches and tools for review and development (0273)**

*Sue Robson*, Newcastle University, UK, Jan Van Maele, KU Leuven, Belgium, Claudia Borghetti, University of Bologna, Italy, Alina Schartner, Newcastle University, UK, Rosa Pugliese, University of Bologna, Italy, *Joana Almeida*, Newcastle University, UK, Annelies Messelink, KU Leuven, Belgium, Greta Zanoni, University of Bologna, Italy

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Internationalization is a phenomenon of increasing strategic importance in universities across the world. However, the global economic crisis has driven many institutions towards internationalization as a means for revenue generation, to enhance prestige and position in influential global rankings (Henard et al., 2012; Seeber et al., 2016). This paper discusses the role of internationalisation at home (IaH) within HE policies and practices, drawing on data from an Erasmus+ strategic partnerships project involving three European universities. The data, drawn from 76 interviews at these universities, reveals perspectives from senior management, directors of learning & teaching, student services personnel, academic staff, and students on IaH. It suggests that review and development of strategies for IaH could help to rebalance the economic with the academic, intercultural and global learning benefits of an internationalised university experience and enhance engagement with social and values-based goals of HE (Katsarova 2015; EAIE, 2016; Van der Wende, 2017).
SAFE: Self-Assessment and Feedback for Education (0136)

Ross Davies, Marius Miknis, University of South Wales, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The overall grade is not the end for a student. In the university sector, we are responsible for creating well rounded individuals who can critically analyse, develop and deliver a solution. Rarely do we measure their understanding of their own solution. Self-Assessment achieves this allowing us to customise the feedback towards an individual’s understanding of their submission. SAFE is an educational piece of software that helps achieve customised feedback based on a student’s understanding. In addition, it allows lecturers to measure an individual’s progress or that of a whole cohort.

Doctoral students’ engagement with institutional research cultures: expectations and experiences (0344)

Martin Oliver, Iman Azzi, Zachary Spire, UCL Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Student engagement is a mainstay of Higher Education policy internationally. However, such policies typically focus on formal curricula, and rely on weakly-theorised proxies for ‘engagement’ such as contact hours. Little work has been done to understand the experience of doctoral students, although a small number of studies have shown the importance of supervisors and peers, writing for publication and managing a sense of ‘fractured subjectivity’. This paper reviews and develops this work, and reports on a study involving a survey and focus groups with current doctoral students, alongside interviews with staff responsible for students’ support and engagement. Analysis confirms the importance of supervisors in shaping students’ experiences, both good and bad. Events were also important, although simple practical concerns (such as advance notice) limited opportunities for engagement. Access to spaces remains problematic, partly due to other students making individuals unwelcome. Students relied on various social media to develop connections.

Exploring embodied academic identity (0060)

Jennifer Leigh, University of Kent, UK

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

Academia has been described as an unpleasant place, (Bloch, 2012) primarily because emotional and embodied feelings are repressed. Many academics enjoy an embodied practice of some kind outside of work, in addition to those who explicitly engage in one as part of their academic practice. I was funded by the SRHE to explore how academics reconcile an embodied practice with their academic practice and identity, and whether it contributes to their well-being.

The project used discipline crossing creative qualitative methodological approaches (Xenitidou & Gilbert, 2012) that drew on embodied practices to address issues of academic identity. If academia is an example of a disassociated and disembodied culture, how do academics with an embodied practice negotiate their way around it? Does their embodied practice help them make sense of their academic work, and does it make them feel better about it? Do creative research methods help them express their experiences?
L2  Beaumaris 1  |  Session L2  |  Thursday 14.00-14.30

**Blueprints, Bridges and Cluttered Landscapes: Exploring Metaphor and Motif in Widening Access Policy (0310)**

Martha Caddell, Edinburgh Napier University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Metaphors abound in such widening access discourse – spatial, temporal and geological. What should we make of this geographical imagining of higher education and the discourse around widening access? Such turns of phrase could be dismissed as simply rhetorical tools to facilitate engagement with (at times rather dry) policy frameworks. Yet exploring such discourse can help open opportunities for alternative viewpoints, to look beyond the foreground and see the wider picture of interconnections / disconnects between policies and lived experiences of higher education.

This paper centres on a critical review of A Blueprint for Fairness, the final report of the Scottish Government’s Commission on Widening Access (2016). This close reading and creative development of the metaphors used will resonate strongly – albeit with different motifs– with policy discourses across the UK and beyond. Re-appropriating and reframing these metaphors can, the paper argues, open space to think beyond existing policy parameters.

L3  Beaumaris 2  |  Session L3  |  Thursday 14.00-14.30

**A New Civics - through Higher Education Engagement (0284)**

Lucy Sweetman, Bath Spa University, UK, Lynne Gornall, Working Lives Research, UK, Brychan Thomas, University of South Wales, UK

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

We explore engagement – consensus, leadership, co-operation – but argue for critique and plurality as part of the mix creating the conditions for mutual working and sustainable outcomes. Working with stakeholders, we suggest a re-centring of constructive engagement as essential to public work, part of the resourcing for what Nixon (2012) calls an ‘interpretive’ life.

Students are included, colleagues in the labour of creating knowledge and meaning, and ‘social’ partners in different organisations. ‘Leadership’ here works to inspire to think differently, and operating ‘in parallel’ at many levels.

Macfarlane’s (2007) ‘service’ in academic citizenship shows how this identity is barely compatible with managerialist regimes. Our work is to be part of a movement aiming to shape a new citizenship beyond passive roles. We argue not for ‘adaptation to change’ as HE stakeholders but more ambitiously for a fully self-confident approach to working influentially with others on social and global projects.

L4  Caldicott  |  Session L4  |  Thursday 14.00-14.30

**Developing entrepreneurial capabilities for the global labour market: A cross national study of IT students in the UK and Australia (0349)**

Margaret Hamilton, RMIT University, Australia, Cate Gribble, RMIT University, Australia, Sally Smith, Napier University, UK

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

In Australia and the UK there is growing emphasis on ‘entrepreneurship’ in response to challenging economic circumstances. The current focus on developing ‘entrepreneurial’ capabilities in graduates is largely driven by stakeholder and societal desire to equip students with employability skills and attributes that will prepare them for the realities of rapidly shifting labour markets and more complex and uncertain career paths. In this paper, the extent to which IT students are engaging with the push towards innovation is explored with ‘entrepreneurship’ as a career pathway. The study adopted a mixed methods approach of an online survey and selected interviews to examine barriers and enablers to pursuing an entrepreneurial career. A key focus of the study was how sociocultural differences (gender, class, culture) influence the development of entrepreneurial capabilities. Finally, universities are providing incubators to balance requirements of students, employers and Government and students’ perceptions of this initiative are reported.
**L5**

**Effect of Gender and Course of Study on Students’ Self-Perceived Employability (SPE) (0145)**

Oluyomi Pitan, Colette Muller, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Westville Campus, South Africa

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

This study investigates the main effects of gender and course of study and the interaction effect between these two independent variables on students’ self-perceived employability (SPE). Data for the study were collected from a sample of 402 final year students in two universities (in the same province) in South Africa with the use of an adapted questionnaire. Factorial analysis of variance was utilised to compare the effects of gender and course of study and the interaction effect between these two independent variables on students’ perceived employability. The results suggest that universities must ensure the provision of appropriate conditions for enhanced self-awareness and positive SPE among students.

**GROUP DISCUSSION L6**

**L6.1**

**Why possible selves? The application of the concept of ‘possible selves’ in researching participation in higher education (0045)**

Ann-Marie Bathmaker, University of Birmingham, UK, Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This discussion session interrogates and challenges our engagement with the construct of ‘possible selves’ as a means to understand individual experience in a way that is located within the context of the structural opportunities and constraints that make possible or impossible the realization of an imagined ‘possible self’ at the present juncture.

The session first offers two papers that discuss the concept of possible selves and its application in educational research (Martin Erikson, Holly Henderson), and then we will move on to discuss:

- Why possible selves? Can the use of ‘possible selves’ do justice to structure as well as agency?
- Does the concept of ‘possible selves’ lead to individualized notions of possibility and opportunity?
- Where do understandings of the increasingly competitive and marketised stratification of HE fit into an analysis of the ways in which individuals imagine and construct their futures?

**L6.2**

**Theorising time, space and inequalities: The ‘possible selves’ concept in Higher Education research (0052)**

Holly Henderson, University of Birmingham, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper is theoretical rather than empirical, and acts as an introduction to the Group Discussion session on the possible selves concept. As such, the paper sets out the origins of the concept, and outlines some of its previous uses in Higher Education research. I then show how the concept has proved relevant and useful in my own research project on geographies of inequality in English Higher Education. The paper closes by highlighting some of the challenges of using a psychological concept in sociological research, and asks some key questions about the concept’s potential to address issues of structural inequality. Importantly, the paper builds on two previous SRHE events on the subject of possible selves, and takes forward the questions and conversations from those events.
Possible selves and possible others – explicating theoretical and methodological potentials (0098)

Martin G. Erikson, University of Borås, Sweden

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

It is argued that the theory of possible selves, being concrete conceptions of our selves in a future, can benefit from an expansion through the concept of possible others. The paper is intended to prompt discussions about the potential of this concept, using insights from existing empirical and theoretical work on possible selves. Possible others are defined as the persons that an individual assumes will participate in the future event imagined as a possible self. It is discussed and exemplified how this theoretical development could give a more nuanced understanding of the theory of possible selves where it is adopted for studies of student well-being and motivation in higher education. Methodological and theoretical possibilities are discussed, both in relation to empirical research and application of the theory of possible selves for supporting students, for example in relation to widening participation.

Working in the Shadow of Hierarchy: the Managerial-Administrative Relationships in a closer perspective (0264)

Ton Kallenberg, Leiden University, The Netherlands

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

The increasing demands on higher educational organizations have consequences for the way in which academic middle managers and educational administrators cooperate. This paper analyses the characteristics and relationships between the academic middle managers and the educational administrators. On the basis of a literature review and thirty-one interviews, four types of managerial-administrative relationships within the faculty will be distinguished. Then, the different forms of cooperation between academic middle managers and educational administrators that arise from these four types of relationships will be discussed. Based on this, five different factors will be identified that are of great importance for a successful cooperation between academic middle managers and educational administrators. The most important conclusion is that universities often lack a fundamentally substantive conversation between academic middle managers and educational administrators about ideas on governance and guidance within the faculty community. The lack of discourse regularly leads to dissatisfaction and causes conflicts and malfunctioning.

Judging the quality of higher education from a firm basis in reality (0181)

Peter Kahn, University of Liverpool, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The collation of an evidence base represents a central means by which judgments are made as to the adequacy of higher education provision. Earlier critical realist critiques of the basis on which systematic reviews assemble evidence to support judgements about practice or policy, however, can be extended to current approaches to judging the quality of HE provision. The paper argues that it is important to take into account the range of purposes that higher education can serve when assembling evidence to support judgments about the quality of provision, as well as understanding of the causal mechanisms affecting desired outcomes. Analysis of uses of the survey instrument on the destinations of leavers from HE is employed to illustrate the argument. While differences in the ontological commitments of researchers will affect the way in which critical realist arguments are received, the present study nonetheless problematises current means employed to judge provision.
**L9**  
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_Are Students of Some Disciplines more Involved than Others? Disciplinary Differences in Experienced Research Integration in Higher Education (0046)_

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

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Overall the research integration in higher education is considered meaningful. It has also been argued that the inclusion of students in research through the curriculum differs between disciplines. Students of ‘hard’ disciplines are supposed to gain more seniority before the research discipline includes them, while students in ‘soft’ disciplines are invited sooner. While previous studies do confirm this trend line, also contradictory results have been found. Furthermore, the Biglan Framework (1973) provides more disciplinary differences than the often studied hard/soft divide. Moreover, the notion of involvement in research is more diverse than ‘doing research’. Through an online survey this study systematically investigates undergraduate students’ experienced research integration for all study years of seven different faculties (N=2192). The findings indicate confirmation of the claim that students of different disciplines are included in research at different moments in their educational track. However, this difference is not always based on the hard/soft divide.

**L10**  
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_Theorising and evaluating alternative visions of widening participation in Higher Education: appraising the work of the Caledonian Club at GCU (0053)_

Julie Brown, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK, John H. McKendrick, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Widening Participation (WP) in Higher Education (HE) in the UK has matured from an aspiration with transformative potential to become part of the everyday landscape within institutional mission statements, national targets, commissions and funding streams, aligned to achieving this goal. In Scotland, metrics are used to monitor annual change, in this instance with the extent to which new full-time Scottish-domiciled entrants hail from the most deprived areas. Desirable as this may be, populating the student body with an equitable share of students from more deprived backgrounds is not the only way in which HE’s role can be conceived. In this paper, we outline a theory of change approach to WP in one Scottish institution and the challenges associated with evaluating such an institutional approach, which layers the conventional view of WP, with one that strongly values the participation of children from deprived backgrounds in the present.

**L11**  
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_Forty years on: What now? (0295)_

Heather Kanuka, University of Alberta, Canada, Erika Smith, Mount Royal University, Canada, Linda Price, University of West London, UK, Robert Luth, University of Alberta, Canada

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Forty years ago, Cross (1976) asserted that universities must continue to expand and improve its knowledge of the teaching-learning process, and must utilize this knowledge in the improvement of its teaching programs, both on- and off-campus, with particular emphasis at the undergraduate level. Cross further argued that since perceptions and attitudes are critical to the improvement of teaching programs, soliciting the attitudes, perceptions, and recommendations of the teaching faculty is key to understanding how to move forward. The Cross (1976) survey findings concluded that it would be unlikely teaching practices will change with current faculty. Forty years later, have faulty attitudes, perceptions and practices changed? We replicated the Cross survey in two very different Canadian Universities. While there are a few notable differences between institutions, key areas highlighted in the Cross survey remain the same forty years on.
Metaphors are common in the discourses of research degree supervision, both in the growing body of literature on supervision and in the daily academic practice of supervisors and students. As an academic practice, thesis supervision differs due to the uniqueness of each student and their project, as well as the long duration and intimacy of supervisory relationships that may be dyadic or small groups. Within and amongst the particularities of each doctoral project and doctoral experience (for both supervisor and student), metaphors capture and explicate commonalities of experiences. Drawing primarily on qualitative interviews, focus groups and a photography task with supervisors and their students in the UK and Australia (n=12), this paper explores the key metaphors in use. We examine what images of supervision are conjured, exploring the effects and affects of their use in order to examine their practicality as tools supervisors could more consciously deploy.

This paper summarizes the research design, theoretical framework and key findings of a recently completed doctoral study in the field of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). A central tenet of theorising in the thesis relates to the relationship between three models of higher education: the marketised; the socio-sustainability; and the liberal/traditional – exploring the contradictions/challenges, as well as the synergies/opportunities presented at their interface within the contemporary HE context. A macro-level case study of the national ESD movement across English HE was employed, with a theoretical framework combining tenets of Interpretivist and Pragmatist traditions. Through the thesis, epistemological and value pluralism are theorised as a way of countering the moral absolutism and moral universalism central to much marketisation critique and as a way of appreciating that universities in England are deeply imbued with multiple ideological, values and political influences, which may be incontrovertibly conflicting, yet symbiotic in equal measure.

Based on data from a HEFCE funded research project this paper explores the attitudes of secondary schools to widening participation and, in turn, the impact of those attitudes on their pupils. The study involved 1579 pupils and 209 teachers. Findings from the study suggest that many schools feel that teachers are the main source of information, advice and guidance (IAG) for their pupils. The study found that the majority of teachers and head teachers agreed about the beneficial impact of higher education (HE) but were in favour of a status quo in terms of students entering HE. In conclusion the paper will argue that, in order to further widen participation, there needs to be both further work done with school staff to ensure they promote HE to widest possible range of pupils and changes to educational policy to encourage schools to take a more strategic approach to access work.
M3

Opportunities for Brokering between Teaching-Focused and Research-Focused UK Life Science Academics (0222)

Anne Margaret Tierney, Edinburgh Napier University, UK

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

Life Sciences teaching-focused academics working in UK universities have been an expanding and emergent group in the past two decades. However, despite their successes in supporting and innovation in Life Sciences higher education, there is an anxiety amongst this group with respect to the currency of their discipline-specific skills and their resultant ability to teach and supervise at upper undergraduate, and postgraduate levels. Some teaching-focused academics expressed a wish to return to the lab in order to refresh their disciplinary skills. Using the lens of Wenger’s Communities of Practice, this study seeks to examine the brokerage activities between teaching-focused and research-focused Life Science academics, and how disciplinary and pedagogic knowledge is exchanged. Preliminary findings indicate that there are a variety of possibilities for exchange of both disciplinary and pedagogic knowledge, although departmental culture and organisation may sometimes impede such exchange.

M4

A pointless exercise? Comparing staff and student perceptions of the use of assessment feedback (0094)

Alex Buckley, University of Strathclyde, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

There is often believed to be deep disagreement in how students and teaching staff perceive of assessment and feedback in higher education, with students complaining about the quality of feedback and staff complaining that feedback isn’t used. There is in fact limited research that directly compares staff and student perspectives; this paper reports on data from staff- and student-facing variants of the Assessment Experience Questionnaire.

The findings suggest that there is indeed a powerful divide, with students much more negative about the quantity, quality and timing of feedback, and staff much more negative about the extent to which feedback is used by students. However, there are important differences in the relationships between different aspects of their perceptions. Staff may be pessimistic about students’ use of feedback, but they appear to take it to be a crucial factor in students’ satisfaction with their programme.

Achievement Explained: Engaging students in a dialogue for learning gain. (0279)

Caroline Reid, Cathy Minett-Smith, University of Bedfordshire, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The language in the discourse around feedback typically refers to students ‘receiving’ feedback, and engenders a passive model. Research in this area has largely focused on the academic practice of constructing and delivering quality feedback (Nichol, 2011; Price et al, 2011), whilst there is a paucity of literature exploring students’ active engagement with feedback. Employing a cooperative inquiry approach this project worked with students to explore the productive use of feedback, consequently creating a culture shift by putting students at the heart of the feedback discourse. A series of infographics designed to unpack and explain assessment and feedback, and illustrate how they coalesce in a reflective cycle to support achievement in all its forms were produced. The resources aim to demystify the assessment discourse, and have been designed for action, not just awareness; as a tool for students to use and engage with, thereby promoting student achievement and learning gain.
Exploring Graduate Employability through the International Student Lifecycle (0014)

Omolabake Fakunle, University of Edinburgh, UK

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

The increasing numbers of mobile tertiary-level students are well documented and continue to attract interest from researchers and policy makers. Yet, there is no existing study towards a holistic understanding of how international student lifecycle including their decision-making and lived experience are linked to their employability. Using semi-structured interview to collect in-depth data from international students studying a one-year UK Masters programme, emerging findings from an exploratory qualitative study agree with assertions reported in large-scale studies suggesting that employability is connected to international applicant/student decision-making. However, the study goes further as to offer insight into the perception of international students on developing their employability within the context of their lived experience in the host country. Aside from contributing to an under-researched aspect of the student experience of internationalisation, the study provides empirical evidence for policy and practice towards supporting graduate employability for a growing international student population in host institutions.

University governance reforms in European Higher Education; some reflections on the roles and interventions of external governing board stakeholders in Portugal and the UK (0244)

Rosemary Deem, Royal Holloway, UK, António Magalhães, CIPES & Universidade de Porto, Portugal

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

In the paper we examine whether and if so, to what extent, recent governance reforms to European higher education institutions involving the greater presence of external lay governing board members, are affecting how universities tackle challenges such as strategic decision-making and quality assessment processes/procedures. Using policy documents, media coverage and auto-ethnographic accounts of each system, we draw on examples from Portugal and the UK which offer contrasting practices with respect to academic decision-making, networked governance, varieties of new managerialism and the extent of engagement of external stakeholders in governance. Existing research has drawn attention to such stakeholders as ‘non-interfering Fridayends’. But this is being challenged in England as more intervention is demanded from board members over signing off so-called light-touch quality assessment arrangements in the institutional Annual Provider Review. As well as reviewing/considering other governance practices, we assess whether this development may be the subject of policy-borrowing.

Discourses of expectations: how should universities respond to students, employers and society? (0066)

Trudi Cooper, Edith Cowan University, Australia

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

The theme of this conference raises many interconnected philosophical, political, ideological, educational, ethical and practical questions about purpose, power and control in higher education. In this paper, I will explore the discourse about university responsiveness, and the bounds of its legitimacy. Secondly, I will explore how responsiveness has informed past and present HE policy in Australia. Finally, I will examine implications of this analysis for future HE policy in Australia and elsewhere.

Questions explored include
1. How the idea that universities should be responsive to stakeholders’ expectations came to prominence in Australian higher education policy, benefits, limitations and where conflicts arise
2. Assumptions of policy makers when they formulated HE policy in Australia around stakeholders responsiveness
3. Outcomes of the policy changes, and
4. Learning for future policy makers.
Studies have suggested that the benefits to students of using laptops and tablets for note-taking during lectures may be outweighed by their potential as a distraction (e.g. Fridayed, 2008) The purpose of this phenomenological study was to ascertain the note-taking practices of students in a real world setting and across a whole module.

The students were observed during ten two-hour lectures. Digital and traditional note-takers then took part in semi-structured interviews, and finally the results of coursework and final exam were correlated against note-taking preferences. The emergent themes indicated an impact on student note-taking of the pedagogical approach taken by academics, the lecture slides provided, and the revision strategies of the students.

The interviews revealed attitudes and practices among undergraduate students which challenge the traditional lecture/note-taking paradigm and suggest the need for a re-evaluation of academics’ expectations of student engagement with the lecture in the face of emerging technologies.

With the continued growth of university graduates, the function of their respective grades becomes more important, also in how they differentiate the graduates for the competitive labour markets. Up until 1996, comparing grades was difficult in Germany, because grades were only recorded on paper. Thus, we collected archival data from 1960 up to 1997, after which we continued with data from Germany's statistical bureau’s electronic database. This work will firstly present descriptive results about the long-term trends of grades comparing disciplines, universities and types of exams, as well as results about grade inflation and cyclical behaviour. It will then continue by explaining the descriptive findings. Using the frequency of students as a proxy of various influences, time series regressions show relations between the development of grades and these influences.

Learning gain measurement has attracted much recent interest in higher education for evaluating institutional teaching quality but the idea has much potential for individual learners and teachers too. This paper reports findings of a student-staff research partnership investigating how personal learning gain data can be used for both staff and student development. Students on an MBA programme completed self-reporting of confidence questionnaires that mapped onto programme learning outcomes at intervals over their two year part-time programme. The learning gain data was synthesised and analysed by staff and students in the partnership. While there was a large jump in learning gain over the first module of the programme after that it levelled off. Students and staff can use this data to plan improvements in learning on the programme.
Peer mentoring for PhD students – facilitating the emergence of expertise, researcher identity and researcher skills (0109)

Terhi Nokkala, Melina Aarnikoivu, Johanna Kili, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice (PGSP)

Previous research shows that mentoring PhD students and early-career researchers supports the establishment of and success on a research career. This paper examines how multidisciplinary peer mentoring groups can support doctoral students’ attachment to the academic community, networking across different disciplines, as well as the development of their expertise and career planning skills.

The paper is based on qualitative interviews of two peer mentoring groups comprising established researchers and doctoral students, conducted in the context of [anonymised University] on-going peer mentoring pilot, which aims to add a new element of peer support to the traditional discipline-focused dissertation supervision. If successful, the pilot project can offer a functioning model for supporting doctoral students as early-career stage researchers in the future.

Transforming lives transforming places: Foundation degrees and their impact on mature female learners and their communities.

Convenor and Chair: Helen Bovill, University of the West of England, United Kingdom
Discussant: Neil Harrison, University of the West of England, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Academic Practice

Symposium rationale

The Transforming Lives research centres on teaching assistant (TA) graduates at three English universities. Questionnaires were sent to 585 participants who had completed the Foundation Degree Educational Support (FdA) in each of the universities over the duration of the programmes and for who we continued to hold contact details. 129 were returned, this gave some data on professional advancement upon graduation and beyond. Extended semi-structured individual face to face, Skype or telephone interviews with 21 participants provided further data concerning their post-graduate professional trajectories. This symposium will present four papers in the following areas:

Paper 1: ‘Hairdresser to university course programme leader: 3 case studies exploring the ‘figured worlds’ of realising professional goals and the role of flexible approaches and communities of practice within this’.

Paper 2: Change agents and educational community based advocates. Shifting perspectives on inclusion, greater empathy, and understanding children's underlying needs.

Paper 3: Being ‘an in-between’: Teaching assistants negotiating their role alongside higher education study. Exploring liminal spaces between teacher and TA.

Paper 4: ‘Mind the gap: The role of emotions in the exchange of higher education qualifications into economic capital for teaching assistants on education related foundation degrees.'
Hairdresser to university course programme leader: 3 case studies exploring the ‘figured worlds’ of realising professional goals and the role of flexible approaches and communities of practice within this. (0126)

Helen Bovill, University of The West of England, UK, Neil Harrison, University of The West of England, UK, Viki Bennett, Bath Spa University, UK, Hilary Smith, Bath Spa University, UK, Liz McKenzie, University of Plymouth, UK

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

Three case studies of teaching assistants’ (TA) continued professional development (CPD) on a work-based learning foundation degree (FdA) and a top-up to a Ba (hons) degree within an English university will be presented.

Interview data revealed the ‘figured worlds’ of these students are highly complex and the spheres that influence their trajectories: the HE institution; the workplace; families; Fridayends; peers, are intimately interlinked. The influence of communities of practice developed in undergraduate studies are significant in the ongoing development of these learners during and after their studies in helping them ‘try on’ new (professional) identities and there is complexity in the students’ accounts of this. This paper will consider retention of flexible modes of study, and the ways in which students may be enabled to continue to engage with powerful communities of practice once graduated.

Mind the gap: The role of emotions in the exchange of higher education qualifications into economic capital for teaching assistants on education related foundation degrees. (0131)

Helen Bovill, University of the West of England, UK, Vikki Bennett, Bath Spa University, UK, Hilary Smith, Bath Spa University, UK, Liz McKenzie, Plymouth University, UK

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

Data from questionnaires and interviews of research with teaching assistant (TA) graduates from three English universities will be explored to consider the complexities involved in the processes displayed by participants to move from TA to post-graduate professional development. The related potential to exchange educational qualifications for economic capital through the associated remunerated benefits will be focussed upon. Data reveals that some students transition toward professional development once graduated more smoothly than others, some have a lapse in time within their transitions, others ‘choose’ to remain embedded in their original roles or become ‘stuck’. The role of emotions in this process will be a feature of this paper.

Teaching assistants as educational community-based advocates. (0129)

Viki Bennett, Bath Spa University, UK, Hilary Smith, Bath Spa University, UK, Helen Bovill, University of the West of England, UK, Liz McKenzie, Plymouth University, UK

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

The term teaching assistant (TA) is used to describe para-professionals who offer support to teachers, often with a focus on engaging with children with special education needs or disabilities. This paper explores views of TAs who have undertaken higher education (HE) work-based learning on foundation degrees in three English universities. Interview data from these participants revealed a key transformative element of their HE study to be concerned with changing perceptions of their view of the child from that of a recipient of a linear pre-determined curriculum to that of a competent child, connected to the world. The paper is underpinned by the identification of participant contexts of reflexivity, increased confidence from HE study and this more positive view of the child. It is suggested that TAs as HE students can take the pedagogical roles of educational community-based advocates for children and promoters of an holistic approach to learning.
Data from research interviews with teaching assistant (TA) graduates from three English universities are explored to consider the TA's experience as they negotiate working roles alongside their experience of academic study. Expansion in the number of support staff in schools has taken place without any clear definition of roles, resulting in between and within school variations. TA duties are often negatively defined, with support staff covering activities which are seen as not part of a teaching role. The paper conceptualises TAs as traversing liminal spaces, constantly in a process of ‘becoming’ in response to the requirements of the role and their changing status. The data identified four themes, reframing identity as ‘one who can’: juggling multiple identities, student, TA, parent, teacher; negotiating professional roles in relation to teaching; professional relationships with others - teachers and TAs. Despite these complexities higher education (HE) study is valued, providing knowledge and enhanced confidence.

The expansion and marketization of Higher Education in the UK and internationally has generated an array of outreach activity as institutions compete for new students. Student ambassadors are a ubiquitous feature of this activity, and widely assumed to make ideal role models due to their proximity in age to school pupils. This paper is based on a qualitative study of STEM outreach activity at four universities in the USA where student ambassadors contribute to activity with school pupils. The study builds on previous research into STEM outreach using ambassadors at two UK institutions, generating insights into practices in both countries.

During some practices observed, ambassadors and academics were developing activity that both engaged and informed pupils about subject areas and subject specific pedagogy. In the UK the location of outreach activity within marketing and administrative departments, lack of involvement of academics and a promotional agenda often obscures these foci.

The corporatisation of universities has led to increasing pressure on academics to publish as quickly and prolifically as possible. Writing retreats have been used as one way of ensuring the production of academic papers by providing spaces for academics to write, and pressurising them to publish shortly thereafter. This presentation provides an alternative way of viewing and conducting writing retreats – that of Slow scholarship, which foregrounds attentiveness, care, thoughtfulness and quality rather than quantity and production. A ‘response-able’ pedagogy is suggested as a way of enacting a Slow scholarship, using a diffractive methodology for reading and writing and responding to peers' writing at writing retreats.
N4
Caldicott | Session N4 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

The role, value and impact of academic representation: institutional and students’ union perspectives (0163)


Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper presents findings from a small-scale in-depth qualitative study into the perceived role, value and impact of student academic representation (SAR) systems in English Higher Education, commissioned by and conducted with The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP). Student academic representation is a common element of institutional governance and quality assurance and enhancement processes, yet has received comparatively little scholarly study. This study explores how representation systems are perceived to operate in a diverse range of higher education providers. The study involved interviews with national experts and representatives from 5 institutions and 6 students’ unions, and analysis of documentation relating to SAR. The authors will present key findings from the research; exploring commonalities and differences in the perceived role, value and impact of representation systems, as well as examples of developmental practice and recommendations for how representation systems can remain relevant and effective in a changing HE context.

N5
Caerphilly | Session N5 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

Doctoral employability as read in non-academic job adverts asking for advanced research skills: a machine learning study (0347)

Inger Mewburn, Australian National University, Australia, Rachael Pitt, Griffith University, Australia, Hanna Suominen, University of Turku, Finland, Will Grant, Australian National University, Australia

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

Early employment in academia can be tenuous and industry is increasingly seen as a desirable career destination by PhD graduates, with over half of Australian and UK PhD graduates not commencing an academic appointment on completion of their doctoral studies. If we take the position that the PhD is being used by graduates to prepare for workplaces outside academia, what graduate skills, characteristics, and attributes are most desirable to develop? While a growing number of government reports and studies list what industry employers outline as desirable graduate attributes, these are largely anecdotal accounts. This paper builds on a natural language machine learning analysis of job advertisements to ask: what do non-academic employers really want when they hire for advanced research skills?

N6
Cardiff | Session N6 | Thursday 15.45-16.15

‘Who leaves the most behind’? Developing ‘curricular justice’ in doctoral education in South Africa and the UK (0137)

Lisa Lucas, University of Bristol, UK, Lucia Thesen, University of Cape Town, South Africa, Sheila Trahar, University of Bristol, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

This paper reports on part of a World Universities Network (WUN) funded project ‘Challenges of access and equity: the higher education curriculum answers back’, involving the universities of Bristol, Cape Town, Auckland and Sydney. The project involves doctoral researchers and academics at four universities, investigating their perceptions and experiences of access and equity in their respective institutions, focusing, in particular, on the curriculum. This paper reports on the qualitative research conducted with doctoral researchers in the UK and South Africa and explores their experiences and ideas concerning the curriculum of doctoral education in their respective contexts. In light of debates on decoloniality, Connell’s (2007) notion of ‘curricular justice’ is used to provide a comparative analysis of data to argue for the centrality of the curriculum in any discussion of access and equity and to explore the potential for a more dynamic idea of a ‘living curriculum’.
**Designing and managing Higher Education estate: two Swiss examples (0093)**

Susan Harris-Huemmert, German University of Administrative Sciences Speyer, Germany

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

The architecture and maintenance of estate in the tertiary sector is a non-trivial concern as its mostly state-funded sites are predominantly built for long-term use. Issues of design, material quality, longevity, environmental sustainability and flexibility all need to be considered, in particular with regard to how far end users will experience these sites both in the present, but also in the future. Learning, teaching and research environments need to be fit for purpose and amenable to adjustment. In this paper, which builds upon previous empirical research conducted in Great Britain, and which is part of a larger ongoing international study into HE governance and estate management, two institutions in Lausanne are discussed to reveal how different kinds of strategic capability (Thoenig & Paradeise, 2016) have played out in the development and maintenance of two Swiss campuses: the University of Lausanne (UNIL), and the École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL).

---

**CHEER Symposium, SRHE Conference 2017: Affect in Academia: Policy Shadows and Perplexing Subjectivities**

Convenor and Chair: Louise Morley, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

Symposium rationale

Higher education policy is frequently presented as a rational, linear, almost machinic set of logical interventions to bring about material and ideological changes. It is a disembodied technology of delivery that circulates ‘truths’, creates new visibilities and can often constrain creativity by setting up a limited vocabulary for enactment, responses and reactions. Policy demands compliance, shifting subjectivities and new modalities. Yet it is often incoherent and inconsistent. Higher education professionals, students and scholars often find themselves constituted by discourses and practices that they did not construct, and caught between the binary of compliance or critique and contestation, with limited opportunities to imagine alternatives. These positionings can catalyse diverse affective engagements. The CHEER symposium will trouble some of the certainties, imaginaries, authority and silences in policy discourses by exploring a range of hidden narratives that circulate in relation to dominant domains, power relations and to policy subjects and policy actors.

Our four papers will focus on the affective economy of academia in relation to inclusion, equity and epistemic justice in higher education internationalisation (Morley), what it means to learn, as an international postgraduate student, and then power of learning to drive change (Webb), professional development in the form of coaching that attempts to engage with the ‘whole person’ in institutions dedicated to the life of the mind (Attia), and the affective challenges of recalibrating one’s academic identity through retirement – a major policy silence! (Hey). We have selected these topics as they are largely under-researched in the field of higher education studies and suggest that more nuanced explorations of the affective consequences of dominant policies are required in order to ensure sustainability, well-being and regeneration in academia.

The papers draw upon empirical data from CHEER’s portfolio of research projects including Higher Education, Internationalisation and Mobility (HEIM) (http://www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/researchprojects/HEIM), and Higher Education, Knowledge Exchange and Policy Learning in the Asian Century: A UK/Japanese Partnership (http://www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/researchprojects/AsianCentury). Theoretically, the papers invoke a diverse range of critical social theory including new mobilities paradigms, epistemic justice, feminist poststructuralism and critical pedagogies. In so doing, the symposium will reflect...
CHEER’s main aims and priorities:

- Examining, exploring and challenging inequalities in higher education
- Investigating and interrupting social, educational and cognitive injustices
- Building a shared vision of alternative, inclusive higher education futures.

Our empirical inquiries aim to bring theory to policy using these interpretations as starting points and provocations. In the long term, we aspire to imagine a higher education of the future that is less driven by globalised neoliberal rationalities and more informed by multivocalities of influence.

N8.1  Conwy1  |  Symposium N8.1  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

Hidden Narratives of Internationalisation: Mobility and Migrant Academics (0027)

Louise Morley, Valerie Hey, University of Sussex, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

Mobility is a major form of capital in the academic labour market. Yet questions remain about who is the ideal mobile subject and the distribution of opportunity structures across diverse geopolitical spaces. While voluntary and involuntary migration characterise the age, a further question is whose knowledge is circulating in the global academy? Drawing on interviews with 20 migrant academics from Latin America, Europe and East Asia, and theoretical framings of the new mobilities paradigm and cognitive/epistemic justice, this paper explores the hidden narratives of migrant academics’ engagement with the global academy. Higher education internationalisation is presented as an ideologically neutral, coherent, disembodied, knowledge-driven policy intervention, yet lived experiences suggest that there is a potent affective economy, and epistemic hierarchy linked to geopolitical power relations. There are gains including transcultural learning, but also less romantic aspects to mobility including isolation, discrimination, misrecognition, and ‘otherness’ in the market-driven global academy.

N8.2  Conwy1  |  Symposium N8.2  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

Retiring Subjectivities: The affective load of becoming ‘retired’: Shedding, Shredding or Recalibrating? (0036)

Valerie Hey, University of Sussex, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper is an exercise in irony since it comments on the process of ‘unbecoming’ an academic and hence of no longer being a policy subject. From this vantage point as an extra-institutional feminist professor, I explore how and if, the newly retired subject recognizes that beyond institutional legitimation, status and purpose, stepping back into ‘Civvy Street’ entails complex re/gendered and re/classed effects and affects. Using contingent personal accounts, I compare the positive ‘corridor talk’ and banter constructing retirement to its more ambiguous reality. How do the factors of push and pull, pleasure and danger, play out in female academics planning for and living of a newly retired feminist life? I question why there is so little understanding of the emotional effort of leaving work in the higher education sphere.

N8.3  Conwy1  |  Symposium N8.3  |  Thursday 15.45-17.45

Changing Learning: Learning To Change? (0038)

Rebecca Webb, University of Sussex, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

In this paper, I ask what it means ‘to learn’ as a post-graduate student on an international programme of teacher education in one university in the UK. What does learning imply of the learner (Webb and Crossouard, 2015) and of the power of learning to emancipate or to change (Dewey, 1922; Fielding and Moss, 2011; Freire, 1996)? Drawing on interview data, I find a ‘complication’ in the model of straightforward transference of learning, both from the teacher to the student and from one country and contextual space to another in order to emancipate the learner (Dale & Hislop-Margison 2011). The data suggests a discourse of power and politics (Biesta, 2010) as always shaping an ‘excess’ of learning, with implications for higher education curricular and pedagogic rationalities, especially in terms of prescriptions of ‘what will be learned’.
This paper is an invitation for critical reflection on the use of coaching in higher education today. Using examples from a series of coaching sessions in academia, it sheds light on the philosophy of coaching and its potential benefits to staff and students. At the same time, and in light of the rapid commodification of academia, the paper warns against the integration of the approach as a regulatory mechanism for academic cultures of accountability, audit, and performance. The paper concludes by foregrounding the need for raising awareness about the purposes and processes of using the approach in academia and for drawing on the principles of coaching itself to challenge the status quo.

The link between research and teaching in a university context has been a subject of much debate in the past decades. This paper explores how a diverse group of undergraduate students experience the research/teaching nexus within a research intensive Northern Red Brick University. Building on a longitudinal design, the interview data collected from 40 students sheds light on the multiplicity and diversity of student lives. This paper details the dimensions of two ideal types of research experience, declarative and procedural: how students experience becoming competent in, as well as familiar with, and taking ownership of ‘research’. It considers how research - as an affective practice that is actively experienced by students - can have inclusive and exclusive properties. This paper argues that bringing together Hodge and colleagues’ (2008) developmental journey with Gale and Parker’s (2014) understanding of transitions as ‘becoming’ can help frame the potential transformative nature of experiencing research.

As China’s economic power grows against a context of global uncertainty, it is increasingly important to develop a nuanced understanding of Chinese globalisation. Previously dominant global hierarchies which mapped countries into geographic imaginaries of dominance and subservience are being disrupted as China opens up its HE market to the world. HE change is manifested in China’s many established and newer forms of higher educational mobilities. This paper proposes a typology of contemporary Chinese higher educational mobilities, showing that inbound and outbound mobilities are testament to the growing power and influence of China whilst the internal educational mobilities of China demonstrate the persistent disadvantages experienced by marginalised rural or ethnic groups. Despite China’s developmental state model of higher education, educational and social inequalities continue to disrupt these strategies and unless these are addressed, China and other superpowers such as Brazil, India and South Africa, will struggle to challenge traditional global hierarchies.
SYMPOSIUM N11

Denbigh 2 | Symposium N11 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

New Evidence on Learning Gain

Convenor: Sonia Ilie, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Discussant: Christina Hughes, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Chair: Jekaterina Rogaten, The Open University

Research Domain: Learning and Teaching

Symposium rationale

The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in the UK Higher Education sector has re-focused both policy and scholarly attention on the mapping of different dimensions of the student experience and, in particular, the gains that students make in their learning. Amidst mixed responses to the introduction of TEF, there is an urgent need for research that addresses learning gain in a robust manner, and puts forward good quality evidence. This symposium addresses this need by reporting on a range of very recent empirical contributions on learning gain, derived from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives, and developed within different higher education institutions. Our aims for this symposium are to establish the core of evidence upon which to steer further engagement with the learning gain debate, and to continue the wider sector conversations started at SRHE ARC 2016.

The papers that compose this symposium investigate the topic of learning gain from several theoretical and methodological perspectives, engaging with both higher education students and staff. The first paper (Cross et al.) sets the scene by providing qualitative evidence on students’ views and understandings of learning gain. This research makes use of a carefully selected sample, representative of different attainment levels. The paper concludes with a discussion of the relationship between achieved grades and students’ own perceptions of their learning gain, and the need to contextualise these. Picking up on this last theme, the second paper (Gillespie et al.) focuses on the issue of marking mindset and assessment cultures in Higher Education. The paper presents evidence demonstrating that comparing the progression of student grades across disciplines and institutions might be challenging, if not misleading. A supplementary analysis of staff interviews contextualises these challenges. The third and fourth papers (Aricò, and McDermott et al.) approach learning gain from a meta-cognitive perspective, suggesting innovative approaches to measure the development of self-assessment skills and ‘confidence gain’ in higher education. Both papers make use of multiple choice formative and self-assessment questions. While Aricò investigates the association between learning gain and confidence gain, McDermott integrates the two dimensions through a novel assessment practice. Engaging with the earlier critique of learning gain measurement, the final paper (Jones et al.) concludes the symposium by focusing specifically on the measurement of employability gains. The paper uses quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method approaches to develop a framework able to capture employability gains in relation to specific institutional initiatives.

N11.1

Denbigh 2 | Symposium N11.1 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

How do students understand and interpret learning gains? Perspectives from in-depth interviews of UK distance learners. (0229)

Simon Cross, Jekaterina Rogaten, Duygu Bektik, Denise Whitelock, Bart Rienties, The Open University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Universities are increasingly looking at Learning Gains as a means for the effective measurement of student progress and the contribution they make to their students’ learning and development. However, there remains much to understand about the validity and reliability of these measures used. This paper seeks to probe the relationship between how students understand and interpret the learning gains they experience and the proxy measures of learning gain such as assessment marks universities use. The findings are based on an analysis of nineteen semi-structured interviews of UK distance learners. The paper will present key findings and discuss their significance in respect to how to reconcile students’ own experience of gain and proxy measures of gain and the assumptions on which learning gain measures are predicated.
This paper discusses findings from an ongoing Learning Gain project and focuses on the issue of student marks, marking mindset, and assessment cultures in higher education. The area of student marks and grades constitutes one of three strands in an ongoing HEFCE-funded research and evaluation project, Piloting Measures of Learning Gain at the University of East Anglia, which began in 2015 and will continue until the end of 2017. We are reporting findings based on university-wide analysis of students’ marks through ‘distance travelled’ as well as supplementary interviews which explored the issues raised by the quantitative data from students’ marks in more depth. These interviews highlighted differing reasons as to why it might be difficult to compare students through their ‘distance travelled’ while in HE due to inconsistencies in marking cultures and the root of those differences in subjects across the faculties.

We discuss recent results from a project to pilot and evaluate measures of learning gain at the University of East Anglia. We investigate the robustness of academic self-efficacy metrics to a slight alteration of the peer-instruction algorithm employed in previous studies. Analysing data obtained from a large-class economics module, we: (i) assess the impact of teacher’s intervention on confidence gain, and (ii) test the robustness of the association between learning gain and confidence gain. We find that teacher’s actions display a strong impact on confidence gain, and that slight alterations of the peer-instruction algorithm affect the relationship between learning gain and confidence gain. We conclude that peer-instruction is more effective at generating confidence gain when working in synergy with teacher’s intervention. Consistent pedagogical design appears to be an essential requisite to compare metrics for learning and confidence gain across disciplines and institutions.

This presentation introduces a format for multiple choice questions (MCQ), implicit in which, are measures of student confidence. We will initially outline the MCQ protocol and the active learning framework in which we first used this type of question. We will then discuss the analysis of our results and how they feed into a wider HEFCE funded study which aims to “pilot and evaluate measures of learning gain” in higher education.

This paper explores learning gain in relation to employability. For the purposes of the paper employability is conceptualised in terms of: “The lifelong capability to make well informed realistic plans for the future and to be ready, willing and able to execute these in a changing world” (adapted from Gilworth, 2017). Three
different methodologies (International experience, R2Strengths and the Career Adaptability Scale-UK) are tested, using quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods of evaluation, for their utility in measuring or facilitating employability related learning gain in different student groups within the Russell Group Universities. Initial findings suggest that all three methodologies may facilitate gain in employability as described above. Strands and their findings contribute to and are linked by a student employability framework which takes account of contextual and process factors inherent in working to enhance student employability.

**SYMPOSIUM N12**

**N12**

Raglan | Symposium N12 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

**Critical reflections on graduate careers: academic and practitioner perspectives**

Convenor and Chair: Tracy Scurry, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Discussion: Fiona Christie, University of Salford, United Kingdom

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

**Symposium rationale**

For some years the subject of graduate employability, in particular its measurement (how, what and when), has been the subject of debate in the UK. Recently there have been calls for a new approach to employability that enables us to consider how graduates make sense of their employment experiences in the context of their unfolding careers and lives more generally. This is reflected in the proposed new ‘voice measures’ in the DLHE consultations, which would aim to explore the meaningfulness or importance of the employment to the graduate, the extent to which it utilizes their skills and how it fits with their future career goals. It is timely therefore to critically reflect on our understanding of graduate careers.

A career can be defined as an individual's evolving experiences of work over time (Arthur et al. (1989), however it is not only the actual experiences but also the ways in which people imagine or conceptualize careers that shape how they make sense of their circumstances (Adamson et al., 1998). Adopting a 'careers perspective' when considering the graduate labour market moves away from measuring a labour market outcome at a single point in time to considering careers in context (Mayrhofer et al., 2007). That is to think about graduate careers as multi-level relational constructs, where individual and societal factors interplay to influence outcomes.

This symposium aims to stimulate interdisciplinary conversations to articulate and explore ways in which we can reframe our understandings of graduate careers. The research informed papers will examine graduate careers with a view to identifying alternative theoretical frameworks which seek to draw attention to imbalances and inequalities that frame graduates career experiences and outcomes. In particular, the papers will consider the contexts within which careers are enacted and the constraints that may arise. The discussant, Fiona Christie, is the senior careers consultant coordinating careers and employability services at the University of Salford. She will facilitate a consideration of the relevance of a critical perspective of graduate careers for the practice of careers and employability professionals in Higher Education. The aims of the symposium are as follows:

1. Draw on academic and practitioner perspectives to identify contextual factors that shape graduate careers
2. Consider the implications of a critical perspectives of graduate careers of relevance to careers and employability professionals within Higher Education

**References:**
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‘Talent-spotting’ or ‘social magic’? Inequality, cultural sorting and constructions of the ideal graduate in elite professions (0191)

Nicola Ingram, Lancaster University, UK, Kim Allen, Leeds University, UK

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

While much work on graduate transitions has focused on the experiences of students and graduates themselves, or on surveys of the destinations of graduates, this paper provides an original focus on top graduate employer practices through a discourse analysis of their recruitment material. We demonstrate that, despite espousing values of meritocracy and inclusivity, recruitment and selection practices privilege a certain type of student: one who is able to mobilise particular valued forms of capital, who is aligned with particular universities and who has particular orientations to their future. This paper exposes the ways that graduate employers’ constructions of the ideal and employable graduate reproduce inequalities in access to ‘top jobs’. Using the Bourdieusian concepts of ‘Social Magic’ (1992) we demonstrate how graduate recruitment and selection practices operate as mechanisms of cultural sorting and exclusion which mitigate against the achievement of more equitable higher education outcomes.

N12.2 Raglan | Symposium N12.2 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Narratives of increasing complexity and postponement in graduates’ employment transitions (0230)

Katy Vigurs, University of Derby, UK, Steve Jones, University of Manchester, UK, Diane Harris, University of Manchester, UK, Julia Everitt, Staffordshire University, UK

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

This paper investigates whether increasing costs of debt-based forms of higher education payment, coinciding with growing precarious employment, has contributed to narratives of increasing complexity and postponement in graduates’ employment transitions. Our study found that some graduating undergraduate students in England were re-appropriating the term ‘gap year’ to describe a period following graduation in which they plan to take low-paid work or ‘ordinary’ jobs, take stock of their financial situation, and attempt to save money and/or repay urgent debt. This paper explores the experiences and decision-making of the students that spoke of using a post-graduation ‘gap year’. The perceived necessity and value of ‘in-between phases’ of employment for new graduates are discussed in relation to the construction of graduate career transitions.

N12.3 Raglan | Symposium N12.3 | Thursday 15.45-17.45

Exploring Institutional Habitus in the Development of Career Capital of Graduates (0257)

Tracy Scurry, Newcastle University, UK, Ciaran Burke, Ulster University, UK, John Blankinopp, Northumbria University, UK

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

Graduate development programmes are often held up as the labour market outcome for graduates to aspire to. These programmes are thought to offer participants opportunities to build career capital (DeFillipi and Arthur, 1994) to add to their existing educational capital. Surprisingly, our understanding of how graduates careers unfold within such programmes is limited. Building on Bourdieu’s (1984) work that attempts to combine structure and agency we apply the concept of institutional habitus to examine the development of career capital of graduates. Using qualitative interview data from 45 participants in a UK public sector graduate development programme we argue there is a need to acknowledge the highly relational nature of graduate development programmes. In particular the need to consider how the cultural and social practices that operate within such programmes serve to shape the development and deployment of career capitals.
Understanding your “place” in the market: self-regulation, self-doubt and social exclusion. (0316)

Ciaran Burke, Ulster University, UK

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

The current UK graduate labour market is one characterised by a general over-supply of graduates, exacerbated by a long recovery from the 2007/08 financial crisis and an increasing number of students. This confluence of factors has kept graduate employment as a key economic and social issue within both policy and academic research. This paper will provide a sociological discussion of the structural barriers graduates face when entering and navigating the graduate labour market. Often, the demarcation between agentic and structural issues places the influence of structure outside of the individual. However, this paper will discuss the internalisation of structural barriers and their consequences on graduates’ employment trajectories. Framed through a Bourdieusian theoretical lens and supported by empirical research, this paper will consider the role of capitals and hysteresis of habitus on (self) regulation and the dilution of graduate resilience in an increasingly competitive labour market.

Gender as a geography of power? Emerging findings from university spaces (0326)

Kate Carruthers Thomas, Birmingham City University, UK

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

Massey (1998) argues that the overwhelmingly male-dominated space of the science park reflects and provides a material basis for a particular form of masculinity and for the production of knowledge abstracted from the real world. This paper draws on Massey’s analysis of the construction of gender within ‘the workplace constructed as a highly specialised envelope of space-time’ (ibid.) to consider emerging findings of Gender(s) At Work, contemporary research investigating how gender and intersectional factors shape employment experiences and career trajectories within a post-1992 UK university and in the academy more widely. Findings are revealing multiple ways in which academics negotiate relationships with the workplace, academic culture and career trajectory; negotiations shaped by gender as a ‘geography of power’ operating within and beyond the university.

Teach early, teach often: mentoring and coaching as enablers of supervisory development in early career researchers. (0252)

Kay Guccione, University of Sheffield, UK

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

Supervision is often described as the most important determinant of doctoral success and is therefore an important academic skill-set. Early career researchers play a key role in the support and development of doctoral students, yet are often excluded from taking on doctoral supervision responsibilities. How then, do they learn how to supervise? This study documents the early supervisory development of seven postdoctoral researchers via a Thesis Mentoring programme. Through observations of their practice and through thematic analysis of interview data, this paper documents how their supervisory skills have developed and comments concurrently on their understanding of the enablers and disablers of doctoral writing. This study demonstrates that early career researchers can develop supervisory skill sets that facilitate the building of learning alliances concurrently with developing a greater understanding of the enablers and disablers of doctoral writing. Gaining early supervisory experience through “being a mentor” ensures both early and “writing-aware” development.
In the current era of marketisation, the purpose of higher education (HE) is becoming increasingly disputed. Research-based education (RBE) is endorsed in an effort to address and navigate expectations of students, society and stakeholders. This roundtable will explore the challenges of RBE and how we may overcome these obstacles to give students the best education and experience. We will examine the role of student-staff partnerships (SSP) in helping unleash the potential of RBE. Discussions will be centred around balancing the expectations of students, academics and institutions in the changing HE landscape. More specifically, we will discuss the shifting dynamic between staff and students, the transformative nature of RBE through SSP, and the influences of competing priorities between research and education. To set the context for the roundtable, we will outline a case study on RBE through SSP, with four linked papers on the “Research=Teaching (R=T)” initiative in University College London.

In the current climate of consumer-driven student satisfaction, it is important to focus on initiatives that can fundamentally alter the purpose and impact of student involvement in education and knowledge production. This paper focuses on the transformative nature of research-based education and staff-student partnership with the potential to unsettle the traditional hierarchy of knowledge production in higher education, encourage praxis in staff and students, and challenge ways of knowing and working in HE. Several models of student participation (Arnstein, 1969; Healey & Jenkins, 2006) are discussed to highlight the importance of authentic partnership over more tokenistic, passive engagement of students. Engaging staff and students in praxis through research-based education can be seen as part of a larger critical project to develop new ways of understanding knowledge production and consumption, leading to researchers who have a desire to change the world as well as understand it (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998).

This paper explores the role of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in the development and implementation of a research-based educational model. Previous research into the GTA experience has tended to situate them in a liminal space, belonging neither to the community of staff nor students, and without the support or autonomy they require (Park and Ramos 2002; Muzaka 2009; Lee et al 2010; Winter et al 2015). However, a re-framing of this liminal space could equally overturn previously held assumptions to locate them instead as a bridge between the taught student experience (from which they have often only recently emerged themselves) and the research environment. Bringing an enthusiastic and open-minded approach to their teaching, they are not only receptive to new ideas but, moreover, are often skilled at bringing innovation and originality to the classroom. In both pragmatic and conceptual ways, their experience and insight can inform and strengthen curricula.
Educational research discusses the importance of promoting opportunities for staff and students to engage with each other and the benefits of such partnerships. Higher Education Institutions and agencies have engaged in innovative partnership work. Although limited in number, the results indicate the gains of opening up and creating such opportunities. Although student–staff partnership has attracted increasing attention in the HE sector, there is no universally recognised definition of term ‘student-staff partnership’. Students’ perception of partnerships is therefore a topic that warrants more investigations. For these reasons, the author conducted a series of interviews with students who took part in the Research=Teaching initiative.

The interviews aimed to elucidate students’ perceptions of: student–staff partnerships; criteria for successful partnerships; benefits of such partnerships; and teachers’ roles and purpose of higher education. The results from the interviews may help institutions to create learning environments that will foster student-staff partnerships based on a common understanding.

Student partnership and research-based education have much in common. They both encourage students and staff to work together on a shared endeavour and to develop a sense of community. They also share challenges; in particular that of dismantling established forms of authority and devolving power to students. Staff can find this threatening and staff resistance can come from the need to reconceptualise learning and teaching; in particular what staff and student roles entail (Cook-Sather et al., 2014; Cook-Sather, 2014). Students can be resistant because they expect to learn in passive ways (Bovill, Cook-Sather, Felten, Millard, & Moore-Cherry, 2015), so they can find the experience unsettling (Fung, 2016).

This round-table asks whether these two fields can work together more for their mutual benefit and what practitioners in the fields can learn from each other, in order to meet our joint challenges.

This paper explores students’ experiences at international branch campuses (IBCs) and their parent universities. Their experiences are linked with ideas about what they might become, and what they would like to become. This topic adds a significant contribution to transnational higher education (TNHE), particularly IBCs because they represent the most vulnerable form of TNHE. Given recent IBC closures, it is important for their long-term sustainability to examine IBC student experiences and how they fit in with students’ future employability. The research sites were two UK source universities with their IBCs in these countries. The research was framed within the qualitative tradition using semi-structured interviews to discover what students did, how they understood what they did and how they perceived their activities as contributing to their future employability.
Capturing students’ experiences and stories at two points in their first year enables a picture to emerge of the challenging, exciting and complex issues that they deal with as they transition into university. Successful transition into university life and studies reduces the likelihood of students withdrawing and supports greater academic success (e.g. Thomas, 2012) and ensures that students feel at home in their new university environment (Antonsich, 2010). At the same time, becoming and being an active and accepted member of their course is also important (Thomas, 2012). This presentation explores the experiences of students on different degree programmes from four UK universities. What emerges is a rich picture of how students navigate through the first few months at university and how these experiences both draw on their existing skills in making meaningful friendships as well as challenge them to develop the ability to manage ‘spoiled’ or difficult relationships.

After A-levels, BTEC Nationals are the most commonly used entry qualification to HE. Participation in HE can be widened by admitting BTEC students, as they are more likely to come from disadvantaged backgrounds. However, BTEC students also achieve less well in HE than their traditionally qualified peers.

We carried out a mixed-method study at a Russell Group University to explore the experiences and academic outcomes of BTEC students in year one. Our qualitative findings suggest they find HE challenging and the transition to HE a difficult one to make. Our quantitative study found that BTEC students were 72% less likely to achieve 50% or more in year one compared to A-level students; and that coming from a disadvantaged background, being male and not having five GCSE’s, all exerted a negative independent effect on student attainment. The implications and changes resulting from these findings are discussed.

Our paper presents highlights of a study of the impact of a two-day immersive university experience on secondary students’ process of choosing a tertiary education institution and program, as well as their choice of language of instruction, from their own perspective. The immersive experience was offered in May 2015, as part of a collaborative initiative between the Ministry of Education, secondary schools and FE/HE institutions, as a means to help students discover their passions and be confident about their tertiary education future. The presentation will present key findings from the student voice data, as well as the importance of the findings for key stakeholders, namely secondary schools, the Ministry of Education, and the FE/HE institutions in general, and the University of Ottawa in particular.
P6.4 Cardiff | Session P6.4 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

‘Cutting Rough Diamonds’: the transition experiences of First Generation Students in Higher Education (0048)

Julia Hope, University of Kent, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Presented is an analysis the experiences of a cohort of first-generation students in their first semester at a United Kingdom (UK) Higher Education Institution. The ‘rough diamonds’ are white, under 25 and from an urban coastal town. The study, tracked students as they negotiated their entry to a satellite university campus called ‘The Centre’. Findings suggest that the students’ experiences of transition were a complex interplay between becoming, being and achieving as a higher education student and their own cultural and social identity. Financial, motivational, social and emotional issues which can all affect academic success (Pritchard & Wilson, 2003) were evident. A ‘transition’ model is proposed to illuminate how these students navigate crossing the cultures of home and university, and to inform practice in relation to retention of first generation students. Whilst the transitions and adjustments vary between individuals, all students experience some level of challenge in their first semester.

GROUP DISCUSSION P7

P7.1 Chepstow | Group Discussion P7.1 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

The Crisis on Kenya’s Public Universities: Disjunction and Fracture in Mission (0009)

Collins Ogutu Miruka, Sol Plaatje University, South Africa

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This article addresses the crisis facing Kenya’s public universities today as a critique of Public and Development Management scholarship. The aim of economic development has been mainly to tackle the trio of poverty, inequality and job creation. Human rights as well as gender issues have also risen to the fore in the past forty years. The central question of this article is therefore normative: What ought to be the mission of a government-owned university in Kenya today? Employing an analytical framework based on the extant literature and empirical evidence, the paper argues strongly for the entrenchment of engaged scholarship in Kenyan higher education system as part and parcel of transformative learning. The paper concludes that a deeper engagement with innovative ways of transformative education holds a better promise in the quest to make public universities more relevant to the needs of a developmental state.

P7.2 Chepstow | Group Discussion P7.2 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

Equitable Access to Higher Education in Malaysia: Challenges and Solutions (0101)

Graeme Atherton, Glenda Crosling, London Higher, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper will examine the nature of the data and discourse associated with inequalities in access to higher education in Malaysia. In 2015 the Malaysian government launched its 10 year blueprint for Higher Education. The blueprint included a commitment to extend equity in access to higher education but acknowledged some of the challenges here in terms of research and practice. The paper draws on secondary data looking at the issue of inequalities in HE participation in Malaysia from several perspectives.

The paper argues that there is a need to improve the evidence base where the HE participation by social background in Malaysia is concerned. Improvements in the data collected would enable the formation of a more developed discourse surrounding equity and access to HE in Malaysia.
In this paper we examine policy texts in three European societies to consider the ways in which they construct a view of how each society ensures the production of knowledgeable professionals. Based on an analysis of national policy texts in England, Germany and the Netherlands, we argue that there are differences in the ways in which higher education is positioned as being responsible for producing knowledgeable professionals; the ways in which employment is defined, and the roles that research is expected to play in the production of professionals. These differences are related to the national structure of the higher educational system and more fundamental notions of the role of higher education in society. We argue that these differences offer helpful alternative ways of thinking about the relations between higher education and employment.

Is entitlement inevitable within marketised higher education? If so what is its nature and implications? This qualitative study amongst students and academics, finds evidence of feelings of entitlement amongst undergraduate students. Entitlement is conceived by students as expectations of access to human and physical resource. Perceived effort appears to be an important factor: students expect to see effort from academics; students’ own effort has variable influences on entitlement. Entitlement appears to relate entirely to the curriculum, disregarding extra-curricula opportunities. Both student and academic participants relate entitlement to increased tuition fees. Some academics see students’ expectations as a rational response to tuition fees; others reject this idea. This may have an impact on academics’ response to perceived entitlement. Academics view entitlement as a hindrance to learning, whereas some students take the opposite view. Expectations and effort are key themes: pedagogic strategies should facilitate discussion of expectations and demonstrate effort from academics.

This session will provide insights into the role campus traditions play at US colleges and universities. As constituents both internal and external demand more and more out of the collegiate experience, traditions provide a valuable route to meet these expectations. Traditions play a vital role on college and university campuses. The culture, heritage, and legacy of an institution is deeply impacted by the traditions. From iconic events to a long history of academic excellence, the idea of tradition encompasses much of what takes place at a college or university. This research was conducted at Taylor University (USA) to define the value of traditions to students, faculty, staff, the institution as a whole, and how they are viewed by outside constituents, including prospective students, parents, and possible benefactors.
Q1

Beaumaris Lounge | Session Q1 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

*Is employability consuming the graduate attribute agenda? (0201)*

Amanda Gilbert, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, Bernadette Knewstubb, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, Barbara Kensington-Miller, University of Auckland, New Zealand

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

Employability and graduate attributes appear to offer similar views of today’s higher education landscape. Though the terms are often used interchangeably, they represent different perspectival responses to the neoliberal idea that the purpose of higher education is to produce graduates who are prepared for the world of employment. In this paper, we examine these two agendas by interrogating academics’ descriptions of attributes that are difficult to assess; referred to as invisible attributes. Two researchers coded the same transcripts using different perspectives; either employability or invisible attributes. The resulting codes showed differences in identification and descriptions of the attributes. We argue that academics’ insights into developing cognitive and social capabilities required to thrive and contribute in society should not become limited by the employability lens.

Q2

Beaumaris 1 | Session Q2 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

*Learning on the boundary: Developing Dramatic Enquiry for intercultural education (0037)*

Lou Harvey, University of Leeds, UK, Brad McCormick, Cap-a-Pie, UK, Katy Vanden, Cap-a-Pie, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This presentation reports on a study piloting an innovative, co-developed, drama-based methodology for researching the intercultural experience and learning of UK HE students. Dramatic Enquiry (DE) is a participatory, reflective approach to education developed and pioneered by the project partners, theatre company XXX. We co-developed a fictional scenario and a script for two half-day workshops for a mixed cohort of university students. Following post-structural and neo-materialist theoretical perspectives, analysis indicates that the facilitated creative activities in the workshop generated an immanent intercultural ethics based on embodied and material engagement with another, and enabled embodied, material and unfinalised ways of knowing. I therefore make a claim for DE’s performative onto-epistemological potential (after Gibson-Graham 2008, and Barad 2007) - its power to bring into existence different ways of knowing-through-being. I posit that it is in this dimension that DE might contribute to a more ethical internationalisation of higher education.

Q3

Beaumaris 2 | Session Q3 | Thursday 17.15-17.45

*Case studies of HE tutors exploring teaching excellence and digital fluency (0069)*

Christine Smith, University of Suffolk, UK, Simon Lygo-Baker, University of Surrey, UK

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

This paper presents a qualitative research project, funded by Staff and Educational Development Association, designed to contribute to understanding around the intersections of digital literacy with teaching excellence, across four disciplinary clusters in HE. We explored these constructs of teaching excellence and digital fluency by examining the attitudes, conceptions and practices of eight tutors, working in: STEM; Arts and Humanities; Health and Social Care; and Social Sciences.

The study confirms the importance of conceptualising teaching excellence linked to digital fluency, but in nuanced ways: eg across contexts of learning; as well as in individualised approaches. We acknowledge teachers’ practical wisdom as situated, social, dynamic, and contested. We recognise too, teachers’ conceptions need to be examined in relation to their sense of professional identity, and in their espoused beliefs and practices. The case studies assist in the recognition of digital fluency as an integral aspect of aspiring to teaching excellence.
**Integrating employability skills in the university curriculum: Setting a research agenda that responds to stakeholders’ expectation (0002)**

Valerie Cotronei-Baird, University of Melbourne, Australia

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

Educating today’s university graduates with employability skills represents a significant shift to the role of universities. Prominent among the employability skills are analysis, critical thinking, problem solving, communication and teamwork skills. Despite initiatives and policy to integrate employability skills in the university curriculum, there continues to be reports of a graduate skill gap. While research has sought to explain the divergence between promotion and practice of employability skills development through the university curriculum, there is less understanding of employability skills development from the experience of academics. This paper proposes a research agenda to investigate to what extent academics integrate employability skills in the university curriculum. The methodology proposed is a qualitative research approach which aims to utilise three complementary methods: semi-structured interviews, content analysis and direct observation in order to make sense of academics’ teaching experiences and practice in the design, delivery and assessment of employability skills of university graduates.

**Who are ‘WE’?: Exploring the construction of the student identity at a post-1992 university (0097)**

Richard Waller, Vanda Papafilippou, University of the West of England, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

In this paper we explore how the ‘organisational identity’ of the University of the West of England (UWE) is experienced by ‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional’ students and recent graduates (what do they perceive, feel and think about their university?). The data come from the examination of material from the UWE marketing campaigns from 2008 until now, as well as interview data from the Paired Peers project, a qualitative longitudinal study (2010-2017) of a cohort of students at Bristol’s two universities from the start of their university careers to their first steps into the labour market.

**International Academic Staff Mobility: The Challenges of Attracting and Retaining Academic Talent in Central and Eastern European Higher Education Systems (0251)**

Anna-Lena Rose, Liudvika Leisyte, TU Dortmund University, Center for Higher Education (zhb), Germany

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This presentation will provide insights into the situation of academic staff mobility in the peripheral higher education systems of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. The main research question is: What are facilitating factors and barriers to attracting and retaining academic talent in Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries?

Our findings are based on two studies on academic staff mobility – both incoming and outgoing – in CEE countries. Taking the higher education systems of Lithuania, the Czech Republic, and Estonia as examples, we compare national framework conditions for mobility, motivations of individual researchers for both incoming and outgoing mobility, identify incentives and barriers for mobility, and provide examples of institutional coping strategies for dealing with existing patterns of mobility.
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Unraveling academic mobility: fresh frameworks of thought

Convenor and Chair: Charikleia Tzanakou, University of Warwick, United Kingdom
Discussant: Susan Robertson, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Research Domain: Academic Practice

Symposium rationale

Globalisation and higher education expansion have accelerated academic mobility in the past few decades. Mobility has been romanticized in policy and academic discourse as a positive force (Robertson, 2010) and is often investigated as a resource for career development and progression of individuals or as contributing to national economic growth and advancement (brain-drain/gain) (Fahey and Kenway, 2010; Gibson and McKenzie, 2010). A number of quantitative studies and reports have emerged providing outlines of who is moving, where and why (de Weert et al. 2013; IDEA Consult; Appelt et al, 2015; Auriol et al, 2013; Guthrie et al., 2017). However, relatively little attention has so far been paid to the lived experiences and individual accounts of those experiencing academic mobility as part of their academic professional journeys, to explore not only how this affects their careers, perceptions, identities and networks but also which structural issues it raises (e.g. institutional, national, supranational) beyond the individual. This panel, which is organized by the University of Warwick’s AMIN – Academic Mobilities and Immobilities Network, thus builds upon previous work and contributes to the discussion about ‘how an individual’s story can illuminate bigger issues and also how fresh frameworks of thought can shed further light on individual stories’ (Fahey and Kenway, 2010, p.565). Furthermore, the panel envisages presenting different ways of researching and theorizing academic mobility.

The symposium includes participants from across the career spectrum and from a range of international institutional contexts and disciplinary trajectories. While the papers represent different empirical perspectives on academic mobility, they are united by a common focus on the methodological qualitative lens to understanding the lived experiences, perceptions and identities of individuals involved in (im)mobilities.

Charikleia Tzanakou looks at (im)mobility experiences of Greek natural scientists and engineers; Terri Kim and Wilson Ng interrogate the positional identities and (im)mobile networks of East Asian academics in Britain; Emily F. Henderson investigates academic mobility through the analysis of two doctoral mobility schemes from both the funders and the beneficiaries’ perspectives; Toma Pustelnikovaite examines working lives of foreign born academics in British academia, looking at careers situated in professional structures rather than residing in individuals; Marie Sautier explores the practices and discourses of international mobility in Swiss academia through mobile scientists’ accounts.

R1.1

Beaumaris Lounge I Symposium R1.1 I Friday 9.00-11.00

A PhD in motion: Expected and unexpected processes and outcomes of short-term academic mobility schemes for doctoral students (0070)

Emily Henderson, University of Warwick, UK
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This paper explores two doctoral mobility schemes funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council as opportunities available to funded PhD students: Overseas Institutional Visits and the PhD Partnering Scheme. The paper explores these schemes as forms of short-term academic mobility. Short-term mobility (days or weeks rather than months or years) has been neglected in the academic mobilities literature, which tends to focus on longer stays such as study abroad or entire degrees. While short-term mobility may
appear to constitute less of an upheaval and potentially less of a learning and networking opportunity for those involved than a longer stay, there is substantial overlap between these forms of mobility. For example, processes of accountability and value-for-money for mobility funders still apply, even with a short visit. This paper presents three different analyses of the two schemes: the guidance and application process; the lived experience of mobility; the un/expected outcomes.

R1.2 Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium R1.2  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

“Leave and Come Back, Maybe”: Mobile Scientists On Their Way To The Promised Land (0087)

Marie Sautier, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

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

Even though considered a global phenomenon, the internationalization of researchers varies widely between countries. In Switzerland, a particularly competitive and attractive academic environment in which more than 50% of the academic workforce comes from foreign countries, researchers are highly encouraged to move abroad for some time; especially at the beginning of their career. Our study aimed at exploring the geographical trajectories of young female and male researchers working in the Swiss academic context. Drawing on a qualitative analysis of 65 semi-structured interviews featuring post-doctoral researchers of various nationalities, scientific fields, and family arrangements, we analysed how male and female researchers negotiate the institutional pressures to be geographically mobile with their own scientific, professional, and private concerns. The use of ideal-types allowed us to illustrate how the period of international mobility may crystallize significant spillover effects between life domains of individuals.

R1.3 Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium R1.3  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

“Always facing the wind”? The working lives of foreign-born scholars in British academia (0147)

Toma Pustelnikovaite, University of St Andrews, UK

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

The expansion of higher education has contributed to the growing numbers of academics employed in a country different from that of their birth, and prompted scrutiny on this group of migrant professionals. The existing theorising of international scholar mobility, however, views international academic careers as residing in individuals. By contrast, this paper takes a contextual approach to international careers and views them as embedded in professional structures. This perspective expands the focus of analysis beyond job transitions and offers a way to pay more attention to migrant academics’ work and employment abroad. Case study findings from semi-structured interviews with sixty-two foreign-born academics working in thirteen British universities examine their working lives and reveal varying degrees of migrant academics’ inclusion at work, generating a mix of foreign scholars’ approaches towards their differentiation.

R1.4 Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium R1.4  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

Ticking the ‘Other’ Box: Positional identities of East Asian academics in UK universities, internationalisation and diversification (0293)

Terri Kim, University of East London, UK, Wilson Ng, University of Roehampton, UK

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

This paper critically interrogates East Asian academics’ positional identities in UK universities, internationalisation and diversification against the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) framework. Contemporary UK policy promoting racial equality and diversity is often over-generalised, while the critical race theory-based literature has focused on hegemonic notions of ‘white privilege’. This discourse does not provide an adequate, comparative perspective of power relations among whites and ethnic minorities. Against the background, the paper compares and contrasts the experiences of two groups of East Asian (AME) academics working in UK universities. The first group is foreign-born but has strong British identities following their English elite education. The other group came to the UK for postgraduate studies and /or have chosen to work in Britain. The paper changes the picture of a static, white-dominated perspective of BME-CRT by offering a dynamic, fluid discourse involving AME academics.
R1.5  Beaumaris Lounge  |  Symposium R1.5  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

*Im(mobility) Stories of Greek PhD graduates: ‘should I stay or should I go’? (0339)*

Charikleia Tzanakou, University of Warwick, UK
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

Higher education and research is considered key to economic growth, innovation and international competitiveness. The growing population of PhD graduates (Auriol et al., 2013) has led to an increasing global flow of highly skilled individuals. Based on a mixed methods study of early career paths of Greek scientists and engineers, it is demonstrated that academic mobility might not be as advantageous as expected disrupting the discourse which romanticises mobility as a positive force (Robertson, 2010). This paper contributes to relatively underexplored topic on investigating (im)mobility experiences of PhD candidates in Greek and UK universities. Through the lived experiences, structural issues become apparent such as the academic inbreeding in Greek universities and the availability of European funding affecting mobility decisions.

GROUP DISCUSSION R2

R2.1  Beaumaris 1  |  Group Discussion R2.1  |  Friday 9.00-9.30

*Routes into and through higher education for care leavers in England (0047)*

Neil Harrison, University of the West of England, UK
Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The term ‘care leavers’ is generally used to denote those young people who are in the care of their local authority at the age of 16, most commonly due to a history of neglect or abuse within their birth family. This group has very low educational attainment, with official figures suggesting that just 6% progress to HE by the age of 21, compared to 42% for the general population of young people. This paper will use national administrative data on the whole cohort of young people reaching the age of 16 in 2007/08 to examine the extent to which the disadvantages derived from the childhood trauma of care leavers is manifest in their likelihood of entering and completing HE in the subsequent seven years, compared to the general population. It will also consider the contributory impact of other demographic factors such as gender, ethnicity and disability.

R2.2  Beaumaris 1  |  Group Discussion R2.2  |  Friday 9.00-9.30

*My background, my obstacle! The rising challenge of university access for students from low-income families in South Africa (0108)*

Langutani Masehela, University of Venda, South Africa, Talita Callitz, University of Pretoria, South Africa
Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The ban of racial segregation in South Africa in the 1990s led to increased access in higher education. However, what emerged thereafter showed that increased access does not necessarily translate to social justice. The majority of school-leavers struggle to access higher education due to lack of financial resources. The aim of this study is to explore how students from low-income families and are without bursary or any other source of financial assistance acquire registration fees and other necessities at the beginning of the year. The study is located at a rural-based historically disadvantaged university in South Africa. The capability approach serves as a lens in which the concern is about what students and their families are capable of doing in order to access finances for their registration fees and other necessities at the beginning of an academic year. The social realist framework provides an analytical frame. Conclusions and recommendations presented
**R3**

Beaumaris 2 | Session R3 | Friday 9.00-9.30

**Structures in Higher Education that Support Industry Engagement (0017)**

*Rose Leahy*, Irene Sheridan, Daithi Fallon, Cork Institute of Technology, Ireland

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

Recent years has seen external engagement positioned as central to the mission of higher education institutions (Molas-Gallart et al., 2002). Recognition of the importance of this mission spans both academia and Governmental policy, with various aspects of engagement activity receiving attention. It is, however, broadly accepted that much of the engagement that occurs between HEIs and enterprise is wide-ranging and varied (Sheridan and Fallon, 2015) and often uncoordinated and fragmented. This paper argues that with the appropriate structures in place, HEIs would be better positioned to engage effectively with Industry. In this context, this paper maps the range and nature of interactions between a Higher Education Institution (Cork Institute of Technology) and a large multinational organisation (MNC) in the South of Ireland and outlines some of the structures in place in the HEI that support engagement with industry.

---

**R4**

Caldicott | Session R4 | Friday 9.00-9.30

**Beneath the surface, the influence of archetypes in an educational change programme (0288)**

*Ellen Kloet*, Windesheim University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands

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

Are students containers who can be filled with knowledge? Is the student a ‘child’ who needs to be taken care of and is the teacher a ‘sage’? In this ethnographic study metaphors were discovered which indicate the existence of underlying archetypes. The archetypes of teachers, students and curriculum kept the social structure within a team alive. Archetypes were never discussed or made explicit in the teams but they do influence the outcomes of a process of change within a university setting. Rules and roles are founded in unconscious structures and belief systems. This presentation will show archetypes which were found within teams of teachers, and will explain how archetypes influence the outcomes. The presentation will also give an answer to the question whether archetypes found within the student population corresponds with those of teachers. Cliff-hanger: archetypes recognised by students greatly differ between the faculties.

---

**R5**

Caerphilly | Session R5 | Friday 9.00-9.30

**Decision making in co-created learning and teaching: responding to calls to BYOS (Bring your own student) (0120)**

*Catherine Bovill*, University of Edinburgh, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

In this paper I will take a critical look at who makes decisions and how decisions are made within co-created learning and teaching. I will present three models that are useful in thinking about, and discussing decision-making in co-creation: 1) Early design decisions in co-creating curricula (Bovill, 2014); 2) Decision mode levels (Heron, 1992); and the participation matrix (DFID, 2003; Konings et al, 2017; Bovill, 2017). I will then introduce the common practice of staff being asked to BYOS ‘bring your own student’ to conferences and other similar events. I aim to highlight a range of ways in which decision making takes place in co-creation, as well as specifically about which students are invited to attend conferences and how the notion of BYOS assumes particular forms of co-creation and decision making.
Exploring lecturer identity in college-based Higher Education (0280)

Linda McGhie, University of Cumbria, UK

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

This paper explores the identity of Higher Education [HE] lecturers in College-Based Higher Education [CBHE], which is similar to the provision in Community Colleges in the United States of America and the Technical and Further Education Colleges of Australia [TAFE]. This qualitative study uses Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis, to explore the experiences of thirteen participants from five colleges across North-West England. This paper considers lecturer identity through the background, self-practices and relationships of these participants, and the links to pedagogy. These lecturers engage in creating a demanding, yet fulfilling, environment where they find their niche and work to protect it. They position and perceive themselves as offering something extra compared to their colleagues teaching in traditional HE settings. They create and reinforce discourses around CBHE, where these marginal spaces provide opportunities for new academic identities, broadening scope for teaching as well as learning in HE.

Pedagogic Frailty: A lens to support professional development of senior academics (0004)

Ian Kinchin, Naomi Winstone, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This presentation draws on case study material from academics who have actively engaged with the pedagogic frailty model as a tool to support reflection on teaching practice. Twelve experienced academics from a range of disciplines were interviewed - each constructing a set of concept maps to highlight the dynamic interactions between the elements that contribute to the model. These maps were then used to frame emerging personal narratives. Commonalities and differences between the participants are highlighted. Possible sources of frailty and resilience are discussed. These case studies are being developed as exemplars to be used by other colleagues across the institution to help support reflection on practice as part of the university's CPD framework. The presentation will start with an activity to sensitize the audience to the practical implications of pedagogic frailty within a university teaching community before exploring issues raised by the data.

Should I stay or should I go? – An exploration of student demand for greater mobility through credit transfer (0329)

Samuel Dent, University of Sheffield, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

Policy around credit transfer (BIS, 2016; DfE 2016) and the mobility of students, has recently increased, including a duty on the Office for Students to monitor this (Higher Education and Research Act 2017, s.38). However, research has focused technical aspects of credit transfer (UUK, 2004, 2006; Souto-Otero (2012), while mobility has also been presented in ways which disadvantage students who engage with it (Finn, 2017). This paper explores the nature of student demand for greater mobility and credit transfer, and its potential impacts. Presenting the findings of 1-year HEFCE-funded study, including 2475 students across 7 Universities in the North of England, using a mixed methods approach. I argue that except in cases of adverse personal circumstances, student demand for greater mobility is low and that attitudes towards mobility have the potential to misrecognise students who engage with it and perpetuate social inequalities among some groups of students.
From ‘youthquakes’ to ‘university bribes’: Understanding Higher Education as the locus for classed, gendered and national repertoires of young people’s political agency

Convenor and Chair: Kirsty Finn, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Discussant: Nicola Ingram, Lancaster University, United Kingdom

Research Domain: Student experiences

Symposium rationale
In recent years young adults have been at the centre of political debates. From the decision to reduce the voting age from 18 to 16 in the Scottish Independence Referendum in 2014, to talk of a ‘youthquake’ in the UK General Election 2017, a strong focus on youthful civic participation has emerged which poses a challenge to notions of youth apathy and traditional ideas about what counts as civic engagement. The intersections of ‘age’ and ‘education’ have become key to the ways voting trends are discussed and understood; with generational (and educational) divides being drawn in popular narratives of Donald Trump’s presidency, the ‘Labour surge’ in the 2017 UK General Election, and in depictions of ‘Remainers’ and ‘Leavers’ following the EU Referendum in 2016. Collectively these events have positioned young people as engaging in a different kind of politics and as ‘educated globalists’ who are disconnected from the sentiment of older communities who feel ‘left behind’ by globalisation. The aim of this symposium is to unpack these debates through a discussion of media discourses, and data revealing student and graduate experiences, in order to understand how HE becomes a mechanism through which millennials are seen, and see themselves, as political actors in times of crisis and instability.

Kirsty Finn’s paper offers an examination of key contemporary political events and discourses of campus politics to reflect on the ways millennials are seen simultaneously as consumers, political idealists, a vulnerable precariat and as agents of change. Jessie Abrahams and Rachel Brooks draw on data from the EuroStudents project to challenge the notion that all students feel they have a similar sense of agency and impact as political actors. Looking at students in England and Ireland, they argue that student political action is likely to differ in particular contexts and countries. Adam Formby’s paper switches the attention to graduate experiences of the ‘post-crisis’ transition, arguing that graduate trajectories are increasingly ‘slower-tracked’, becoming sites where social inequalities are produced and, therefore, a pivotal lens through which to examine how young people frame and respond to divergent political concerns.

Finally, Bentley, Papafilippou and Ingram reflect on data from the Paired Peers project to explore the complexities of civic (non)participation for graduate millennials of different class and gender backgrounds and consider their political awakenings in light of a social and policy context in which their transitions to adulthood have been mostly fraught with unexpected struggle.

Snowflakes and Smashed Avocados: Exploring the Contradictory Representations of the Higher Education Generation in times of Political Crisis and Change (0165)

Kirsty Finn, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Young adults have found themselves at the centre of political debate over the past two years, especially highly educated ‘millennials’ who have become emblematic of individualisation and neoliberal marketisation on the one hand, and precarity and uncertainty on the other. These two positions are often made manifest in discussions of Higher Education, which is used as a mechanism through which to represent students as politically sensitive ‘snowflakes’ seeking the censorship of free speech on campus, and as naïve idealists, easily ‘bribed’ by the Labour Party’s promise of free university tuition and splitting the opposition to a Trump win by voting for a third-party candidate in the 2016 USA presidential race. Thus, higher education is made to do significant work in positioning young people as (in)authentic and (in)credible political actors. This paper draws on international examples to draw out the complexities and contradictions of different discourses of the Higher Education Generation.
R9.2 Conwy 2 I Symposium R9.2 I Friday 9.00-11.00

'There's a lot of us, if we wanted to make a difference we could': Exploring undergraduate students’ understandings of themselves as ‘political actors’ in England and Ireland. (0168)

Jessie Abrahams, Rachel Brooks, Surrey University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Whilst higher education (HE) students have historically been conceptualised as important ‘political actors’, arguably the extent to which they are able to have a voice in society is likely to differ in particular contexts and countries. In this paper we draw upon data collected from focus groups with HE students in England and Ireland alongside analysis of policy documents in each country to consider the extent to which students are constructed (and feel) like important political actors. Findings suggest that, contrary to perceptions that English and Irish students are largely similar, Irish students appeared more empowered than English students in relation to perceptions of themselves as influencing policy. Narratives present in the policy documents mirror these findings, with students in Ireland located as key political actors to a greater extent than in the English documents.

R9.3 Conwy 2 I Symposium R9.3 I Friday 9.00-11.00

Framing the ‘Graduate Transition’ in Times of Austerity and Political Upheaval (0172)

Adam Formby, University of Leeds, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

Young people’s framing of social and political concerns has become important in recent years – as seen in relation to the 2017 General Election where a surge of progressive politics amongst the young shifted the result significantly. One group that may help to provide some understanding behind this alignment are those experiencing ‘graduate transitions’ through the labour market. These have become ‘slower-tracked’, sites where social inequalities are produced (through experiences of labour market insecurity) and, therefore, are a pivotal lens through which to examine how young people frame and respond to national political debate. This paper will examine the lived experiences of graduate undergoing ‘post-crisis’ transitions. This is because they represent a pivotal point whereby graduates political concerns juncture with biographies tilting towards the expectations of young adulthood. Analysing these narratives may uncover new social conditions that explain why a substantive progressive political alignment is taking place amongst young people.

R9.4 Conwy 2 I Symposium R9.4 I Friday 9.00-11.00

Civic participation among UK university graduates: exploring the influences of class, gender and type of employment (0188)

Laura Bentley, UWE, UK, Vanda Papafilippou, UWE, UK, Nicola Ingram, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper examines the classed and gendered repertoires of participation and political preferences (national elections and EU referendum) of UK university graduates, drawing data from the Paired Peers research project, a longitudinal (2010-2017), qualitative study of a cohort of graduates (n=55) who attended Bristol’s two universities. Drawing on Hustinx et al’s (2013) concept of the ‘civic omnivore’ we explore how these young people, as individuals and/or as part of collective action, negotiate with ‘traditional’ and ‘non-traditional’ routes of political discourse and action, expanding their civic repertoire by combining conventional and new forms in complex ways, including through social media. We complicate notions of civic participation by considering politically motivated lifestyle choices, such as ‘ethical’ consumption, and ‘ethical’ career choice, as part of the civic repertoire. Through this analysis we draw out the ways in which the effects of social class and gender interact with civic repertoires, and political alignment.
Understanding Knowledge, Curriculum and Student Agency (UK-SA) in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering

Convenor and Chair: Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Research Domain: Learning and Teaching

Symposium rationale

This symposium is based on the interim findings of an ESRC/HEFCE funded Centre for Global Higher Education project examining undergraduate degrees in two related STEM subjects in universities in the UK and South Africa.

In contemporary times characterised by economic difficulties, dynamic social relationships and future uncertainty, there is a fresh interrogation of the purposes of an undergraduate education. This is true not only in the first world arena of high participation in higher education but also in the contexts of the emerging economies, like South Africa, who come off a low base of participation (18% in 2010), and are only starting to grapple with how to massify an historically elite system. These factors have also contributed to an increased focus on STEM programmes in the university. Here the economic rationale for higher education has become especially prevalent, as in both established and emerging economies, careers associated with these disciplines are seen as good routes into prosperity for the individual, and for driving economic development nationally. However, what is far less well understood is the transformational impact of these disciplines in terms of the ways in which they transform students’ sense of identity by engaging them with disciplinary knowledge.

The design of the project is informed by the view of knowledge and curriculum captured in Basil Bernstein’s (2000) notion of the ‘pedagogic device’, which highlights the ways in which knowledge is transformed as it moves from a research context, to higher education curricula, to the understandings that students’ develop of this knowledge. This movement can be characterised in terms of ‘knowledge-as-research’, ‘knowledge-as-curriculum’ and ‘knowledge-as-student-understanding’ (Ashwin et al. 2012; Ashwin 2014). Bernstein (2000) emphasises that the transformation of knowledge as it moves between these forms is not simply based on the logic of knowledge itself. Rather these transformations are the sites of struggle in which different voices seek to impose particular versions of legitimate knowledge, curriculum and student understanding. Focusing on these three forms of knowledge offers a powerful way of gaining a sense of the transformative power of higher education because it brings into focus both the ways in which higher education transforms students’ understanding and identities but also the potential of students to transform curricula and the knowledge that they engage with. The papers in the symposium consider these relations by examining knowledge and curriculum structures and students’ experiences of knowledge, assessment, and employability in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering.

The nature of the epistemic differences between chemistry knowledge and knowledge in chemical engineering (0220)

Renee Smit, University of Cape Town, South Africa
Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The paper provides a conceptual background to general disciplinary differences in the epistemic properties of knowledge in the sciences and engineering sciences. These differences are based on findings from a case study on undergraduate curriculum knowledge in thermodynamics in the pure and engineering sciences. The conceptual nature of the paper allows scope to delineate analytical and methodological generalisability of the findings. The epistemic differences will be used to speculate on the impact of the nature of the knowledge for the relationships students need to develop with disciplinary knowledge across their academic careers as neophyte scientists and engineers. Furthermore, the paper explores aspects of interviews with first year lecturers conducted at the four university sites as these relate to the way lecturers believe students change in the course of their studies.
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**Engaging with debates on curriculum reform: The case of Chemistry (0221)**

Jenni Case, Margaret Blackie, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The current crisis in South African higher education has again focused the spotlight on the university curriculum, with some calls for radical reform. In this paper I draw on research in Chemistry Education and related fields, to be able to engage with these challenges. A starting point is a characterization of the distinct nature of Chemistry knowledge. The paper then draws on work in the sociology of knowledge to understand the recontextualisation of disciplinary knowledge into curriculum. Contemporary research on the Chemistry curriculum is reviewed and put alongside student learning research that explores not only student experience at university but also graduate outcomes and destinations. It is shown that South African universities are already producing graduates that not only make valuable contributions to economic development, but are also young people with thoughtful and critical perspectives on society.

R10.3  Denbigh 1  |  Symposium R10.3  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

**First-year Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Students' Relations to Knowledge (0223)**

Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper examines how first year chemistry and chemical engineering students understand their disciplines and how this relates to their sense of their identities as students and who they will become when they graduate from university. Based on a phenomenographic analysis of interviews with chemistry and chemical engineering students, we examine the ways in which their accounts of how they saw themselves were related to their accounts of their disciplines. This analysis will offer an insight into the relations between engagement with knowledge and the development undergraduates’ personal identities in these disciplines, which will then be compared with findings from similar studies in social science disciplines.

R10.4  Denbigh 1  |  Symposium R10.4  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

**The role of assessment in shaping knowledge engagement (0224)**

Jan McArthur, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper considers the nature and purposes of assessment, as understood by first year students in chemistry and chemical engineering. It takes a social practice theory approach to assessment, recognising it as a complex nexus of practices, shaped and bound by a variety of influences. In social practice terms assessment involves particular ways of engaging with knowledge that are shaped by students’ perceptions of why they are being assessed and the nature of that assessment. Schatzki (1996, 2010) refers to these as the teleoaffective structures that help shape a given practice. I explore the different ways in which these students conceive of the purposes of assessment and the ways in which they relate these to their engagement with knowledge. The findings are discussed in relation to existing scholarship on assessment for learning (Sambell, McDowell, & Montgomery, 2013), sustainable assessment (Boud, 2000) and assessment for social justice (McArthur, 2016, Forthcoming).

R10.5  Denbigh 1  |  Symposium R10.5  |  Friday 9.00-11.00

**Employability aspirations of first year students of chemistry and chemical engineering (0226)**

Janja Komljenovic, Lancaster University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper focuses on employability and career aspirations of first year students of chemistry and chemical engineering at four universities in two countries. Employability of graduates is by now a key policy aim at national and university levels. This has reflected in the university structures in that universities have established
or strengthened their career and alumni offices. It has also reflected in the rise of measurement and benchmarking around employability, such as the DLHE survey in the UK. Moreover, universities have included employability statistics and employability promises into marketing of their institutions or study courses. Finally, this has laid ground for private actors to develop products and services catering employability, which now students and universities use or buy. Such is the case with the LinkedIn platform. This paper analyses how students think of careers and employability and how they relate to the before mentioned transformations of the higher education sector.

R11 Denbigh 2  |  Session R11  |  Friday 9.00-9.30

‘Transformative Intellectuals’: Exploring qualities of critical pedagogues (0315)

Lauren Clark, UCL Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Drawing on Aronowitz and Giroux’s (1985) paper ‘Radical Education and Transformative Intellectuals’ I aim to develop a model to better explain different qualities of critical pedagogues in HE. Observation and interview data collected from self-identifying critical pedagogues in British higher education will be explored using the qualities of Aronowitz & Giroux’s (1985) transformative, critical, accommodating and hegemonic intellectuals to examine the potential gap between what educators teach and believe and how they teach (Breunig, 2009). Specifically, the concepts of critique, action and praxis will be used to reflect upon what it means to be a ‘critical pedagogue’ when labels are often misleading and when marketisation puts increasing restrictions on academic autonomy.

GROUP DISCUSSION R12
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Graduate employability in students of Black and minority ethnic (BME) background: A mixed-methods approach (0050)

Andrew Clements, University of Bedfordshire, UK

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

Existing evidence suggests that the career outcomes of graduates from Higher Education are mixed. People of black and minority ethnic (BME) background and women often face disadvantage when navigating the labour market. The career service at my institution had identified career outcomes as a concern, and suggested confidence as one potential contributing factor. I adopted a mixed-method approach to investigating graduate employability. I made use of institutional DLHE data from 12,313 graduates, which identified complex interactions between ethnicity and gender. Qualitative data from a survey collected by the career service suggested that skill attainment and work experience were the explicit concerns of graduates encountering challenges in obtaining graduate employment. Semi-structured interviews are currently in progress, but suggest that a nuanced approach to the development of career support may be required.

R12.2 Raglan  |  Group Discussion R12.2  |  Friday 9.00-9.30

Building capacity and partnerships for evaluations of widening participation activities (0161)

Nadine Zacharias, Curtin University of Technology, Australia, Graeme Atherton, National Education Opportunities Network (NEON) London Higher, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

The evaluation of outreach activities and those directed at the retention and success of under-represented students in higher education is an important aspect of widening participation work in England and Australia. Widening participation (WP) practitioners are at the heart of the evaluation challenge as active researchers and expert informants in assessments of program effectiveness. However, not all practitioners come to their roles with training and/or expertise in program evaluation and need to acquire these skills on the job and/or partner with academic colleagues. This round table discussion will bring together academics who are interested, or already involved, in the evaluation of WP activities and practitioners who are, or want to be,
involved in the analysis of program effectiveness. It will focus on the skills required for program evaluations, including impact evaluation, and how practitioner and academic researchers can most constructively collaborate to achieve high-quality evaluation outcomes.

R13  
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University Ranking, Hukou System, College Geography and College Policies: Factors of Affecting Students’ Social Capital—Based on a Study of Chinese Eleven Colleges (0369)

Shilin Lu, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Based on the social capital scale of Putnam, this study used the quantitative and qualitative methods to research the social capital of students from 11 Chinese colleges. The main findings are as follows based on the survey:

1) Peking University students’ social capital is far more than other colleges and universities. The students from private colleges have little social capital. Students’ social capital may be related to the university ranking.

2) Generally speaking, the social capital of the urban students is higher than that of the small cities and the rural students.

3) The social capital of college students in the eastern universities is significantly higher than that of the western universities. (4) The tolerance of different college students to minority students may be influenced by the president office of the colleges.

GROUP DISCUSSION S2
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Individual perceptions of advantage and disadvantage in accessing, undertaking and progressing in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Postgraduate Taught study (0030)

Michelle Morgan, Bournemouth University, UK, Ines Direito, University College London, UK, Rachel Spacey, University of Lincoln, UK

Research Domain: Access and widening participation (AWP)

Research looking at students’ perceptions of advantage and disadvantage in higher education (HE) has focused on two main areas: student learning and perceptions of the academic environment and large scale statistics looking at participation, progression and attainment through the lens of certain demographic groups at undergraduate level. However, there is no research exploring whether the individual within a demographic group or those with a range of characteristics (e.g. socio-economic, generational, disability) consciously or unconsciously perceive those characteristics as advantageous or disadvantageous. This paper reports the findings from a small-scale research project carried out at three UK universities in geographically different areas across STEM disciplines exploring this.

S2.2  
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An analysis of migrating identities in students returning to postgraduate studies (0364)

Catherine Hutchings, University of Cape Town, South Africa

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

There is little understanding about what is involved in picking up or transferring to academic practices (from everyday or professional ones) by mature students. I recently completed research focusing on the complexity of learning academic practices, particularly writing academic texts, for a group of mature students returning to studies. Using dialogical journals written by them, I analysed the emerging authorial identity and agency in their writing and their learning. I use the concept of ‘migrating identities’ to theorise what is at stake when
so-called, ‘mature’ or ‘non-traditional’ students seek to participate in higher education discourse and literacy practices. I focus in particular on core concepts of voice and agency. This presentation briefly describes the research, and offers some examples and analysis of such students’ experiences in terms of their developing authorial identities, voice, and agency, through their often challenging learning experiences and expectations of them in the university environment.

**S3**

Beaumaris 2 | Session S3 | Friday 9.45-10.15

**Beyond Public-Private Dichotomy. Non-dualistic approach to study higher education**

(0189)

**Krystian Szadkowski**, Center for Public Policy Studies, Poland

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

Higher education research is bounded by the all-pervasive power of dualisms. They are rarely questioned despite their proneness to critique and thus distort the research design and prevent the clear understanding of complex higher education reality. The most relevant categorical dualism organising the major part of debates concerning contemporary transformations of higher education – the public/private distinction - is not different in this respect. The paper offers a non-dualistic analytical framework (private/public/common) for understanding the dynamics within global higher education. Its main focus is placed on the public/common distinction. Based on literature review the paper provides systematisation of the use of the concepts of the common, the common goods and the common good vis-à-vis the concepts of the public, the public goods, the public good in higher education. The differences are discussed with reference to concrete examples from higher education reality (at the levels of funding, governance, property relations, benefits).

**S4**
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**Network formation in Higher Education: Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) as network entrepreneurs.**

(0042)

**Karen Heard-Laureote**, University of Portsmouth, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper explores how networks between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and broader societal actors are forming. HEIs are increasingly expected to do things that matter to society. Participation in networks beyond the campus, is one way that HEIs can do this. For their continued survival and to translate their impact into societal benefits, it is vital that HEIs act as network entrepreneurs to build and establish effective interdisciplinary networks with partners outside of the HE sector. HEIs can provide both the platform to bring local communities together and the glue to maintain relationships over time. Preliminary evidence from a selection of mission statements and strategy documents suggests that HEIs are aware that they need to take the initiative in forming new networks that engage society more broadly. The initial finding from a brief survey of newly emerging networks provides early evidence that HEIs are increasingly doing this.

**S5**

Caerphilly | Session S5 | Friday 9.45-10.15

**The pedagogy of social science research methods: a textbook case**

(0255)

**Sarah Lewthwaite**, Michelle Holmes, University of Southampton, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper sets out findings from new SRHE-funded research into the pedagogy of social science research methods textbooks. At present, research methods teaching lacks substantial pedagogical culture and both the teaching and learning of research methods are under-researched. This paper explores the intersection between methods and textbook pedagogy through a study of 30 leading social science research methods textbooks, to understand how these resources articulate the pedagogies that are unique to methodological learning. Research methods teaching is frequently characterised by active learning, learning by doing, experiential and reflexive approaches. Textbooks, too, have their own unique pedagogies. Thus, special attention is given to both the implicit and explicit in-text devices and pedagogical moves that authors deploy to engage readers in student-centred, active, experiential and reflexive methods learning, complicating the notion of the textbook as a didactic, abstract and transmissive learning resource, and gesturing to the richness of this emerging field.
GROUP DISCUSSION S6
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**Integral coaching for academics: evaluation of an intervention (0088)**

Nazeema Ahmed, Jeff Jawitz, University of Cape Town, South Africa

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

In recent years, there has been interest in exploring whether there is a place for integral coaching in the field of higher education. The integral coaching approach, based on the work of Ken Wilber's integral theory (2005) offers an inclusive, multi-layered methodology which guides the coaching process. This paper reports on an evaluation of a project where higher education academic staff members underwent individualised integral coaching. An independent researcher conducted interviews with participants before and after the coaching process. The coaching programme spanned between 3 to 7 months. Participants presented a range of issues including the need to complete PhD studies and research publications, coping with difficult colleagues and transitions, developing confidence, and fitting into their department. Participants expressed the view that they had benefited considerably from the coaching programme. These findings suggest the positive benefits of the integral coaching methodology in higher education.

S6.2  Cardiff  |  Group Discussion S6.2  |  Friday 9.45-10.15

**Professional development for part-time teachers in challenging times. (0127)**

Fran Beaton, University of Kent, UK

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

The proportion of part-time university teachers has risen steeply in the last decade, reflecting changing university curricula, increasing student numbers and in tandem with external scrutiny of teaching quality. Most universities offer full-time academics teaching-related professional development, but part-timers’ tangential relationships and precarious (Standing 2014) status in universities may mean they are unaware of it for their present or (uncertain) future work, while being subject to the same levels of scrutiny as full-timers.

Harvey & Luzia 2013; Leigh 2014; Author 2017 have highlighted the diversity of part-time teachers. Graduate Teaching Assistants, Hourly Paid Lecturers and industry practitioners have varying levels of HE teaching experience and different professional development needs.

This paper draws on literature, national data and institutional case studies to consider how institutional policies and professional development can best address this diversity to ensure a quality experience for staff and students.

S7  Chepstow  |  Session S7  |  Friday 9.45-10.15

**“I’m an assessment illiterate”: Investigating the assessment literacy of external examiners (0302)**

Emma Medland, University of Surrey, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The external examining system has been a distinguishing feature of UK higher education since the 1830s, and one that is internationally recognised as best practice. However, there is limited research focusing on the quality of the underlying practices and a number of unchallenged assumptions underpinning the system have been identified, including the presence of assessment literacy. As a concept in its infancy in higher education, a pilot study identified six constituent elements of assessment literacy, and this research has illuminated how external examiners conceive of and enact the concept within practice. Initial findings have identified a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the concept of assessment literacy. The nature of the role of the external examiner and expectations surrounding it were also characterised by idiosyncrasy, which inevitably leads to a divergence in both espoused and enacted practice. The implications of these findings and pathways for future research are considered.
This presentation will first discuss how universities responses to changes in higher education policy have reduced the choice of offerings available to students, reduced capacity for universities courses to meet recognised social needs and employer needs. This has occurred even though policy rhetoric suggests that university graduates should be ‘employment ready’ and that demand-driven funding models would increase student choice. A problem has arisen because universities’ interests are in tension with the expectations and needs of other groups, including employers, students, and society. The second part of this presentation will discuss how policy might be used to improve the alignment between universities’ interests and the needs and interests of society, students and employers.

This paper brings together a particular research approach (phenomenography) and a problematised area of higher education (sustainability). It examines how, and to what extent, phenomenography can be used to better understand variation in understandings and views about sustainability in higher education, and contribute to more meaningful engagement with sustainability in the sector. The paper draws on a three-part research strategy, comprising a literature review, the author’s own published works about sustainability and phenomenography, and documentary records of the author’s involvement in sustainability-based initiatives. It is argued that phenomenography, with its focus on how difference is structured, is well suited to researching sustainability, which is also characterised by difference – in definitions, understandings, and views of its role in higher education. Further, the undertaking of additional phenomenographic studies about sustainability might help policy makers, educators and other staff and student groups develop more coherent and meaningful policies and teaching about sustainability.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of co-curricular programming on soft skill development and career readiness of students in a leadership development program. For the purpose of this study, career readiness is defined as “the attainment of demonstration of requisite competencies that broadly prepare college graduates for a successful transition into the workplace” (NACE, 2014).

This study was conducted at a research university in a southwestern state of the United States. This study will provide a glimpse at students from all majors who participate in the Professional Leadership Program (PLP). An emotional intelligence assessment will be utilized for the pre and posttest structure of this research. For the presentation, preliminary findings will be presented as well as discussion over areas of concern.
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 employability of graduates. This paper focuses on the implications of these pressures for HE academics involved in the design and delivery of skill development/employability focused curriculum via a round table discussion. More specifically, an overview of contemporary debates regarding challenges for UK HEIs in delivering on student employability is offered, drawing from the author’s empirical research on UK graduate employment, with a focus on learning, teaching and curriculum design and illustrative examples from a postgraduate employability module at Northumbria University (approx. 30 minutes). Next, the paper poses a series of questions to the attendees around how we may address these challenges in the context of our own student cohorts (approx. 30 minutes for discussion).

Entrepreneurship education ecosystem is vital for the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. In the past decade, Chinese universities are actively engaged in entrepreneurship education in responding to the call from the government and market, yet little research has been conducted to examine the entrepreneurship education ecosystem in the Chinese context. Using “the four hierarchical structure of organizational ecology” as analytic framework, this case study intends to identify the key elements and analyze the relationships and interactions among these elements to understand the operating mechanism of entrepreneurship education ecosystem in Chinese research universities.

The advent of mass higher education has had a significant impact on graduate transitions and the changing demographics of UK higher education has led to greater diversity amongst the student population (HESA, 2016). This paper explores preliminary findings from a study which explores student transitions from higher education. It focuses on 100 survey questionnaires and 15 in-depth interviews with students who were in the third year of their Social Sciences/Education Studies degrees in three different types of universities. The findings use the work of Bourdieu (1984) to suggest that those students who attend elite Russell Group universities draw on their cultural capital and develop a ‘specialization of consciousness’ in which they are mastering the techniques and gaining the knowledge they need to be more successful than their peers at other institutions when making transitions into post graduate study or the labour market.
This paper presents findings from a doctoral research project, which explores students’ perceptions and motivations for studying an undergraduate degree in the Humanities. Through a mixed-method approach including a survey, focus groups and individual interviews with current students and graduates, the research explores how students in the Humanities understand the purpose of studying for an undergraduate degree and to what extent, if at all, this understanding still incorporates the idea of a ‘liberal education’, i.e. ‘learning for the sake of learning’. The findings suggest that there are multiple motivators for attending university, highlighting a complex web of extrinsic and intrinsic stimuli, which includes a strong sense of importance for students to study a subject they are passionate about, while at the same time cognisant of the importance to be in a competitive position when entering the job market.

Inspired by Henri Lefebvre’s conceptualisation of rhythm (Lefebvre 1992), this paper will present and discuss the preliminary results of a pilot project that endeavours to capture the rhythmic orientations of Birmingham City University, over the period of one month (September-October 2017) across its three main sites. To grasp the unfolding of their everyday life, it registers the teacher & learner’s spatio-temporal and emotional experience of each institutional space at a particular time, testing the strength of the rhythmanalytical project as a method to harness the rich complexity of these articulations in their simultaneity: the experience of teaching and learning cannot be disentangled from the temporal and spatial dimensions from which they emerge, nor understood without considering the perceptual idiosyncrasies and connotations of the material relations that they produce. Finally, how can turn rhythmanalysis into a form of critique to identify and address rhythmic pathologies (arrrhythms) in contemporary higher education?

This paper will draw upon a major European Commission funded project looking at the nature of higher education admissions systems. The study examined secondary data on HE admissions in 35 countries in Europe and undertook detailed case study analysis of 8 countries. The study took a holistic view of HE admissions interpreting admissions as a process that begins in late primary school and does not finish until early in HE. The paper will outline the findings from the study. It will argue that there is a significant need for greater investment in information, advice and guidance in HE and schools, changes in structures to incentivise investment in social inclusion and also a reform to streaming within schools. In order for these changes to take place then policymakers need to embed working across schools and higher education, but evidence from the study suggest this is rare.
T5
Caerphilly | Session T5 | Friday 10.30-11.00

An analytical framework to untangle interpretative approaches in assessment (0012)
Dina Zoe Belluigi, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper presents a framework which enables the mapping of approaches to the interpretation for the purpose of analysing the underlying referential frameworks which inform assessment. The framework productively situates specific assessment practices and discourses against a broader analytical narrative of interpretation. It was initially developed as part of a research project which aimed to analyse approaches to the assessment of complex student submissions in the creative arts discipline of fine art studio practice, and, as such, will include examples of its application when teasing out the assessment structures and practices of institutions and individuals. The framework contributes to research in assessment by providing a means to identify embedded referential frameworks; to detect and reflect on nuances in the structural, cultural and agential approaches to assessment; and to open up tacit process to the stakeholders involved.

T6
Cardiff | Session T6 | Friday 10.30-11.00

The rise and rise of the journal paper: intergenerational changes in research and publication patterns among higher education researchers (0039)
Bruce Macfarlane, Damon Burg, University of Southampton, UK

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

The changing nature of academic life and the pressures of performativity are widely debated in the literature (eg O’Neill, 2002, Ball, 2003, and Lucas, 2006). One of the ways of understanding performative pressures is by reference to patterns of publication among academics over time. This paper reports on the findings from an analysis of the academic CVs of 24 higher education researchers drawn from three different generations. The results illustrate the growing dominance of the journal paper as a form of publication rising from 30 per cent of all outputs of those who started their publication career between 1963 and 1982 to 60 per cent of the productivity of those who began publishing after 2003. The findings also indicate that productivity is on the rise with those who started their academic careers after 1983 publishing, on average, a third more than those who began their careers in 1963.

T7
Caldicott | Session T7 | Thursday 16.30-17.45

Participant Experiences of Students Reviewing Teaching Practice (0112)
Jenny Marie, UCL University College London, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper will outline research into student and staff perceptions of a ‘student reviewers of teaching’ scheme. 31 pairs of students and staff worked together to discuss their different perceptions of classroom teaching, a VLE and assignment brief on a module. Their perceptions were investigated through a qualitative survey with 58% response rate, separate staff and student focus groups and interviews. Staff reported finding the student perspective very helpful and perceived the students to have been more invested and honest than peers. Students felt they had made an impact on teaching quality and that the process had been helpful for their learning at university. The major problem was timetabling. Students also suggested working in pairs to reduce power dynamics and to enable them to check their views with a peer. The latter would also be enabled by the students conducting a focus group part-way through.

T8
Conwy 1 | Session T8 | Friday 10.30-11.00

Do universities embody the values they espouse? (0034)
Alex Elwick, Middlesex University, UK

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper will look at the declared values and mission statements of universities in the UK and question to what extent these institutions embody and realise the principles which they espouse. Mission statements and accompanying statements of values have been common in the higher education sector for over twenty years.
Davies and Glaister, 1996) – derived from business and organisational studies; at least in part reflecting a corporatization and marketization of higher education and higher education management/governance (e.g. Bok 2009). However, there has been little research to investigate whether institutions exemplify these values in their actions and wider policies. This paper will report on a formative research project to firstly map the values which universities in this country project and then to compare these against a wide range of pre-existing quantitative data, relating to issues of access, diversity and outcomes.

T11
Denbigh 2 | Session T11 | Friday 10.30-11.00
Qualitative Assessment of Critical Thinking in Egyptian Universities (0062)
Nagwa Megahed, Maha Ball, Eman Shady, American University in Cairo, Egypt
Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The quality of higher education is of global interest. High unemployment among university graduates has been attributed to a lack of critical thinking skills. While critical thinking has been measured quantitatively by many scholars in different countries, there is lack of qualitative assessment of critical thinking, especially among Egyptian university students. This study focuses on four Egyptian universities; it employs a qualitative approach to assess the extent to which students of second and fourth year demonstrate selected “cognitive” and “affective” dimensions of critical thinking. Findings indicate that fourth year students scored better than the second year in open mindedness and interpretation, while second year students were better only in flexibility. Both groups were the same in recognizing own biases, analysis, inference, explanation and self-regulation. Our findings put into question the effectiveness of university education and its contribution to the level of critical thinking among students.

T13
Harlech | Session T13 | Friday 10.30-11.00
Exploring textbook use and culture with Higher Education staff and students (0359)
Vivien Rolfe, University of the West of England, UK, David Kernohan, WONKHE.com, UK
Research Domain: The Digital University and new learning technologies (DU)

In North America and elsewhere in Europe, the use of openly licensed academic textbooks has gained traction within schools, colleges and universities primarily to address the rising prices of books. Studies have shown that students chose not to take certain courses due to high prices, and others show how making openly licensed books freely available to students has impact on learning and is leading to enhanced pedagogic approaches. This presentation shares details of a newly funded UK project (http://ukopentextbooks.org) that is exploring how to best introduce the use of open textbooks in colleges and universities to provide more choice for students. The work presented will provide an early insight into textbook cultures, use and purchasing habits, and levels of awareness of open textbooks by academic staff and students.

ROUNDTABLE U1

U1 Beaumaris Lounge | Roundtable U1 | Friday 12.00-13.15
Embodied Perspectives on Research in Higher Education (0085)
Jennifer Leigh, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Kent, UK, Nicole Brown, UCL Institute of Education, UK, Lou Harvey, School of Education, University of Leeds, UK, Jessica Bradley, School of Education, University of Leeds, UK
Research Domain: Academic practice, work, careers and cultures (AP)

This round table brings together four Higher Education researchers who are using embodied perspectives within their work to discuss how embodiment informs questions of methodology. Research into affect, emotion, and embodied experiences is growing in importance across different disciplines and theoretical frameworks within the academy, including sociology, anthropology, geography, and feminist theory as researchers seek to understand more about individual experiences.

Using four case studies, we will discuss how different methodological approaches fit within the epistemology and ontology of research questions to begin to understand how and why a researcher might choose
particular methods and the consequences those choices may have for ethics, data collection, the co-
construction of knowledge, and dissemination.

We want to explore how using creative approaches to methodology can bring richness and different
understandings to qualitative work, and where these might fit within the larger picture of an increasingly
neoliberal and disembodied academy.

GROUP DISCUSSION U2

U2.1 Beaumaris1  |  Group Discussion U1.2  |  Friday 12.00-12.30

An investigation into student teacher mothers’ perceptions of their experiences
during the Secondary PGCE year and implications for ITE providers (0051)

Joan Woodhouse, University of Leicester, UK, Sarah Crooks, University of Derby, UK, Laura
Guihen, University of Leicester, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The proposed study explores the perceptions of PGCE student teachers who are mothers. Research on
the mutual impact of motherhood and career indicates that, despite discourses of equality, women continue
to assume primary responsibility for childcare, and make career choices within the constraints of their lives
and responsibilities. However, little if any work focuses on the experiences of mothers who become student
teachers. UK equality of opportunity monitoring systems, with their broader focus on gender, ethnicity and
disability discrimination, also fail to consider the specific needs and experiences of women with children.
This is a significant gap, and, given the reported teacher and headteacher shortage, may be worthy of
consideration if we are to attract and retain able teachers. Narrative interviews will be used to ascertain
the particular challenges and support needs of the student mothers, and consideration will be given to the
implications for ITE providers and schools.

U2.2 Beaumaris1  |  Group Discussion U1.2  |  Friday 12.00-12.30

Bystander intervention: Gender based sexual coercion and domestic violence and
abuse, its impact on higher education students and the strategies to manage this.
(0211)

Helen Bovill, Richard Waller, University of the West of England, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

The concept of ‘laddish’ behaviour has gained prominence in literature. Gender based sexual coercion and
domestic violence and abuse is a concern for universities, their staff and students. The National Union of
Students (NUS) has been at the forefront of highlighting this. Universities UK tasked universities to respond
and a nationally recognised evidence based bystander strategy has been developed, by the University of the
West of England (UWE) endorsed by Public Health England (PHE), as a tool within university strategy. Some
universities are now using and adapting this.

This paper seeks to report on data from first year students who have taken part in bystander intervention.
Questionnaires, focus group and interviews will be drawn upon to see the impact of this intervention on
behavioural change with regards to cultural misperceptions, prosocial bystanders, impact upon men as well
as women, the LGBT+ community and other forms of inequality such as racism.
GROUP DISCUSSION U3

**U3.1**  Beaumaris 2 | Group Discussion U3.1 | Friday 12.00-13.15

*Higher education provision and access for early years educators: localised challenges arising from national policy (0119)*

Kate Hoskins, Sue Smedley, University of Roehampton, UK

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

Much has been written about the significant attempts to increase the ‘professionalization’ of the early years sector over the past 20 years (DfE, 2005, 2013, 2017; Lloyd and Hallet, 2010; Osgood, 2006, 2009; Urban, 2010). A key feature of these policy interventions has been to focus on creating a graduate workforce (Calder, 2008; Lloyd and Hallet, 2010).

In this paper we explore the challenges facing early years settings in different geographical locations in England as they work towards ensuring compliance with the one graduate in each setting policy initiative. We draw on data from our recent Froebel Trust funded project, which involved interviews with 33 early years practitioners in six settings, to argue that at the local level, there is uneven access to higher education for those seeking to gain graduate status and to explore the implications of this uneven access for early years practitioners.

**U3.2**  Beaumaris 2 | Group Discussion U3.2 | Friday 12.00-13.15

*Early years practitioners' understandings of professionalism: where do qualifications, theory and practice fit in? (0128)*

Sue Smedley, Kate Hoskins, University of Roehampton, UK

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

How do early years practitioners construct what it means to be professional? How do they perceive the relationship between theory and practice? What value do they attach to qualifications? This paper explores these questions, drawing on data from interviews with early years practitioners working in six settings, carried out as part of a Froebel Trust funded study. The context is a tension between goal-oriented discourses, and the contemporary relevance of Froebel’s ideas which prioritize respect for children and their interests.

Preliminary analysis of the data suggests that these practitioners are constructing versions of professionalism which position theory and qualifications as distinct from practice. The argument here is that a dialogic pedagogical approach to professional development would help to create articulate early years professionals, able to be advocates who can justify their early years principles and practice as well as see the dialogic and practical relation between the two.

**U3.3**  Beaumaris 2 | Group Discussion U3.3 | Friday 12.00-13.15

*Postdoctoral researcher development in the sciences: a Bourdieusian analysis (0308)*

Sandrine Soubes, The University of Sheffield, UK

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

This research explores how postdoctoral researchers and principal investigators (PIs) in scientific disciplines experience researcher development, following the implementation of UK policies that attempt to challenge the professional socialization of researchers. The Bourdieusian concepts of field, capital and habitus help to conceptualize researcher development as a practice within the field of postdoctoral research. This paper presents an analysis of Postdocs and PIs’ habitus through their experiences during research socialisation. For Postdocs, volumes and configurations of capital were evaluated; together they contribute to shaping the scope of possibilities to acquire further capital, the positioning and trajectory within the field. Through an analysis of PIs’ habitus, a number of researcher development practices, understood as position-takings or stances (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 105) are identified. Through its “specific logic” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 97), the field of postdoctoral research structures and produces a particular research habitus.
The United States and United Kingdom practice the two prominent approaches to undergraduate education. The U.S., perceived as the archetype for liberal arts, emphasizes breadth, depth, and choice but struggles to attain good outcomes for most students. The U.K. emphasizes depth alone, creating narrowly specialized graduates but achieves consistently positive outcomes for most students. The approach of each national system is described and its strengths and weaknesses evaluated. Degree requirements for eight subjects are surveyed across all 140 British universities and 150 American universities from 2014-16. The results demonstrate the lack of structure and widespread freedom found in American degrees while highlighting an extraordinary level of narrow control and focus in British degrees. STEM subjects in the United States combine the liberal arts values of breadth and choice with the structure and focus to achieve more of the positive student outcomes that characterize the British system.

In an attempt to assess the effectiveness of political science education in Egypt, the quality of political science was investigated in four Egyptian universities. Using mixed methods, three particular dimensions were evaluated, which are knowledge of political science core facts, reading comprehension and critical thinking. This paper highlights and analyses the main findings related to one of those universities, which is the British University in Egypt (BUE). Positive results were found with regards to students’ reading comprehension. Unlike the rest of the assessed universities, the abilities of BUE students’ reading comprehension improved with 16% from year two to year four, which indicates their ability to spot all or most of the contradictions in written articles. BUE students’ critical thinking also increased massively from 0% in year two to 18% in year four. Variables such as school GPA and non-Egyptian high-school degree were found significant to students’ levels of critical thinking.

Higher Education is subject to measurement on the basis of numerous parameters such as research, teaching, levels of internationalisation and often a combination of these. The increased use of various national and international metrics within HE has influenced institutional practices. In turn, institutional interpretations of these metrics influence the professional trajectories and values of academics and can create a kind of individual and institutional elitism. This study captures academics’ perspectives on the impact teaching metrics such as the National Student Survey and research metrics such as the Research Excellence Framework on institutional and individual teaching and research practices and priorities. The study includes the findings of the data collected from over 100 academics who participated in the online survey and 20 academics who participated in the interviews. The study identifies differing accountability practices operating in organisational contexts, reflecting relational and managerial orientations, and considers the implications for academic career trajectories.
Doctoral supervision – student’s perceptions about practices and monitoring (0218)

Isabel Coutinho, Mariana Gaio Alves, FCT-Nova University Lisbon, Portugal

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice

Doctoral supervision is quite important, as it involves the training of researchers at an early stage. Doctoral students must develop research skills and also autonomy, resilience, integrity, ethics, creativity, innovation and communication skills. These characteristics are recognized as doctoral students attributes (Dublin descriptor, 2004; Bergen, 2005) and should be acquired during the third cycle in higher education.

Aiming at deepening knowledge about the doctoral student supervision experience in Portugal, an exploratory survey was conducted throughout a survey of doctoral students in education enrolled in various universities across the country. The results reveal that students’ perceptions about their supervisors indicate that doctoral student’s autonomy and teamwork is encouraged, as well as supervisors engage with students’ projects and include them in the research fields’ area. Supervision practices include seminars, oral presentations, workshops and individual meetings. The results suggest that doctoral students don’t use instruments to plan and monitor the doctoral research progress.

Changing Supervisory Practices - a case for transformative inquiry. (0285)

Geof Hill, Sian Vaughan, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Postgraduate Scholarship and Practice

A community of practice around research supervision was instigated in a post-92 UK University in 2015 as professional development initiative to support supervisors in a context of quickly growing doctoral cohorts. Accredited by SEDA, the adoption of a community of practice model of professional learning and alignment with individual practice-led inquiries can be positioned as innovative. Our evaluation of the first two years of this programme is situated in recognition that both ‘community of practice’ and ‘practice-led inquiry’ are contested terms in educational and organisational literature. Drawing on both the official data compiled for SEDA along with individual stories from participants, this case study examines the impact of this dialogic approach to developing an academic practice. In light of perceived changes in practice, the case study is also posited as an example of transformative inquiry and contributes to worldwide discussion on the evaluation of supervisory practices.

Complexity theory and higher education: model, metaphor and meme? (0306)

Richard Davies, University of Central Lancashire, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Higher education is complex, and a plethora of publications analysis it in the light of complexity theory. However, there are doubts as to it usefulness for such analysis. In this paper I consider defences of the value of complexity theory to educational research. I argue, that natural scientific forms of the theory do not fit well with educational research, and that other frameworks seem better. I also argue for two further distinct problems for educational research: complexity theories reject individuals’ capacity for autonomous, intelligent action, and do not recognise the practical implications of randomness.

I review Luhmann’s sociologically robust form of complexity theory. One which explicit identifies the ways in which this account is distinct from alternative research frames. Further, it deals with problems of the intelligent autonomous agents. I conclude by identifying the possible value for higher education in utilising this Luhmann’s model of complexity theory.
The 2008 crisis has reactivated crucial debates about the tension between wealth creation and its redistribution. Those debates coincide with a renewed interest in the understanding of the ways in which the expansion of higher education (HE) systems has led, sometimes simultaneously, to significant democratic advances and persistent inequalities. Those debates increasingly focus on the role of institutional differentiation. This paper presents the findings from a project hosted by the Centre for Global Higher Education which explores historical trajectories of expansion and institutional differentiation of HE systems in the UK, France and the USA since the 1920s. By comparing and contrasting historical series of funding and enrolment of the key types of institutions in each country with key socio-economic aggregates, the project examines the extent to which periods of economic prosperity and crisis might affect and be affected by the connections and tensions between expansion and institutional differentiation in HE.

Situated learning theories emphasise the context of learning as significant in understanding the experience and engagement of students, but such research is often focussed on traditional undergraduate settings. This study focusses on an alternative niche cohort that of part-time postgraduate taught students within Human Resource Management, who are concurrently employed as full-time mid-career practitioners in the field. Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis to explore these, I examine how the contexts of learning in personal, professional and academic spheres informs our understanding of communities of practice, social identity and academic literacies. I argue that for such students these engagements are liminal, negotiated engagements across particular landscapes of practice, with implications for student approaches to learning, and their acceptance of academic theory and practitioners, with consequences for student approaches to learning, and acceptance of academic theory and practitioners.

Since the mid-1990s, Masters level study has experienced massification in terms of participation in the UK. Although the Higher Education Academy undertakes valuable surveys examining the masters and research postgraduate student experience, they occur near the end of a student’s study journey. Up until 2014, there had been very limited research undertaken on the expectations of applicants and students entering this level of study. This led to independent bodies such as the Higher Education Commission commenting that ‘Postgraduate education is a forgotten part of the sector’ (Higher Education Commission, 2012:17). The Postgraduate Experience Project funded by HEFCE for the first time explored the expectations of applicants and students in, through and out of study and those of employers recruiting master’s graduates. This session will report the findings from this ground breaking research and demonstrate how through understanding the expectations of all stakeholders, their experience can be effectively managed and balanced.
Collaboration, connection and cosmopolitanism: promoting intercultural understanding through group work (0082)

Stephanie Bridges, University of Nottingham, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Within a landscape of expanding global connections, yet intensifying tensions based on race and religion, this paper argues that universities might have a role in facilitating intercultural dialogue and understanding in society. Multicultural collaborative working is explored as a facilitative space within which students can be stimulated to interact with and reflect upon difference through their dialogue and participation with diverse others. Data from interviews with 58 pharmacy students in a UK university pointed to the potential of group work to provide opportunities for nurturing a greater cosmopolitan awareness and sense of concern and connection with others. Appropriately structured and facilitated group work, though not without its difficulties, could contribute to fostering future citizens who leave university with a mind-set and capability that can help to influence the creation of more tolerant and connected communities and society.


Nona McDuff, Annie Hughes, Kingston University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

UK HE faces challenges in terms of the participation, continuation and attainment of some student groups (UUK, 2016). Universities have been slow to adapt to increasing diversity and there is evidence that ‘non-traditional’ students feel out of place and undervalued. Increasingly, the development of an inclusive curriculum is being recognised as key to improving retention and attainment (HEFCE, 2015). However, evidence suggests that across subject disciplines, academics are not clear about the actions that they need to take to create a more inclusive curriculum. This paper proposes an institutional level pedagogic Framework adopted in a post-1992 UK University which addresses the inclusivity of the academic curriculum. Contextualised within the dominant narratives of inclusive education, we explore the explicit principles of the Framework. We then explore the key intervention points and pinpoint the challenges to its implementation. An evaluation of its effectiveness is presented through the lens of the academic teacher.

Stakeholder Perspectives on the Public Value of University-industry Teaching Collaborations: A case study of the MSc in Structural Integrity co-produced by Brunel University London and The Welding Institute (0262)

Claire Donovan, Brunel University London, UK, Gabrielle Samuel, King’s College London, UK, Jeung Lee, Brunel University London, UK

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

The paper presents stakeholder perspectives on the public value of the MSc in Structural Integrity co-produced by Brunel University London and industry partner The Welding Institute (TWI), designed to supply ‘work-ready’ graduates. Pre-, mid- and post-course quantitative surveys were administered to students, and two mid-term focus groups were conducted. Pre- and post-course quantitative surveys were administered to industry supervisors. Five purposeful case study interviews were conducted with students and representatives from Brunel and TWI. Students rated most highly benefits that accrued to themselves: being offered a scholarship, and industry exposure that led to increased employability. Students and TWI supervisors identified a wide range of benefits to students, TWI, Brunel and other Higher Education Institutions, the economy and society.
GROUP DISCUSSION U13

**U13.1** Harlech | Group Discussion U13.1 | **Friday 12.00-12.30**

*Shaped by global and local dynamics: Evolving themes, paradigms and academic “tribes” in higher education research in China (0265)*

Jian Liu, Hui Ye, Zhong Gao, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

In the era of globalization, knowledge production in the regions of periphery is increasingly influenced by Western academic centers. As a rising country with the largest higher education system in the world, how the dynamics between the global and local shapes the domestic knowledge production of higher education research in China? Using a combined theoretical framework of major models of traditional scholarships in the East and West, this study intends to explore the evolving research themes and paradigms by examining articles published in the past two decades in four leading Chinese education journals, in lighted by the normative power of academic journals on research and research community.

**U13.2** Harlech | Group Discussion U13.2 | **Friday 12.00-12.30**

*Intercultural universities in Mexico and their impact on the Sustainable Development Goals (0300)*

Tristan McCowan, Cristina Perales Franco, University College London, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) agreed in 2015 position higher education as a key driver for inclusive and prosperous societies, yet there has been as yet little attention to the forms of institution that might meet this challenge. This paper assesses the potential of the intercultural universities in Mexico for achieving the SDGs. A number of these institutions have been created since 2003 to facilitate access for indigenous populations, to promote bilingual education and understanding of indigenous knowledge traditions. The paper presents findings from a case study in Veracruz, drawing on interviews with lecturers, students, alumni and community members, along with documentary and statistical sources. Although limited in size, the university is seen to have a transformatory effect in its host communities, expanding access and promoting sustainable livelihoods. Finally, the paper assesses critiques of the SDGs from indigenous perspectives and the possibilities of relevance of the case for other contexts.

**V2** Beaumaris 1 | Session V2 | **Friday 12.45-13.15**

*Interrelationships between students’ approaches to learning, perceptions of learning environments and academic performance in an African context (0089)*

Madeleine Kapinga-Mutatayi, Pierre Mukendi Wa Mpoyi, Jan Elen, Kuleuven/Centre for Instructional Pedagogy and Technology, Belgium

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

A diversity of factors affects the way students handle academic tasks. Students’ approaches to learning have been shown to be related to students’ perceptions of the learning environments. Direct as well as indirect effects of both students’ approaches to learning and perceptions on learning outcomes are evidenced. However, studies in Africa are limited and contextual instruments are missing. During the early stages of our research, Anglo-Saxon instruments-based data showed poor reliability in investigating Congolese students’ approaches to learning and their perceptions of the learning environments. Contextual instruments assessing both variables have been developed and validated. Using these instruments clear relationships between students’ approaches to learning and their perceptions of learning environments were retrieved. However, none of them could explain any variance in students’ academic performances.
Following the Bologna Process, did the introduction of the BA/MA degrees in teacher training in German Higher Education impact on grade development? (0266)

Marita McGrory, International Institute of Management and Economic Education, Germany

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

With an ever increasing number of (under-)graduate programmes, both UK and American researchers explored grade development in a variety of higher educational fields of study (Hu 2005). Grade development is important, not alone for the student, but also for the institute for it reflects the institute, and its performance in varying fields. One area of grading that has an expansive impact on education, both compulsory and higher, is that of teacher training (Koedal 2011). This work analyses the grade development of teacher training for secondary education in German Higher Education degrees, and probes as to whether the implication of the Bologna Process has impacted on grade development in teacher training degrees, also in comparison to the pre-Bologna structure.

Comparing federal data of German Higher education from 1995-2013 in a variety of teacher training subjects, lends a descriptive and inferential insight into types of grade developments that exist.

The potential of intercultural reflection for enhancing teaching and internationalising academic development (0292)

Nicola Reimann, Durham University, UK, Julie Rattray, Durham University, UK, Malcolm Murray, Durham University, UK, Teti Dragas, Durham University, UK, Jamie Thompson, Durham University, UK, Miriam Hansen, Goethe Universitaet, Germany, Sabine Fabriz, Goethe Universitaet, Germany, Julia Mendzheritskaya, Goethe Universitaet, Germany

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This paper uses the outcomes of a small-scale pilot of a novel approach to reflection on teaching as a starting point to discuss the potential benefits of incorporating an intercultural dimension into reflection. Based on Holliday’s notion of ‘small cultures’, it asks whether intercultural reflection may offer a new perspective on enhancing learning and teaching and an opportunity to internationalise academic development. The pilot involved academics in two countries linked via videoconferencing in discussing each other’s teaching problems. Initial analysis suggests that for some participants, the international perspective was crucial, while for others dialogue across disciplines appeared to be more valuable. The pilot was used to propose a larger project incorporating a wider range of methods and involving another international partner. Conference participants are invited to contribute their views on the value of intercultural reflection on teaching and the larger project whose development is in progress.

Learning about learning and teaching through collaborative observation (0282)

Matthew O’Leary, Vanessa Cui, Birmingham City University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

The recent introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework has positioned the quality of teaching high on the political and policy agenda. Yet the notion of ‘teaching excellence’ remains under-theorised and under-researched. Conventional means of measuring and improving teaching quality have traditionally been driven by a managerial agenda that has done little to enhance staff and students’ understanding of learning and teaching. This paper presents work from an ongoing HEFCE-funded project exploring an innovative collaboration between students and teaching staff through the shared lens of observation. Informed by current research, the project reconceptualises observation and repositions it from a performance management mechanism to a collaborative method of inquiry between students and staff. Underpinned by the philosophy that improving student learning requires teachers and learners to develop a contextualised awareness and understanding of learning, this project brings both parties together as co-interrogators and co-reflectors on their learning and teaching experiences and values.
**Conwy 1  |  Session V8  |  Friday 12.45-13.15**

*Institutional responses to the Australian student equity program: the importance of strategic intent (0162)*

Nadine Zacharias, Curtin University of Technology, Austria

Research Domain: Higher education policy (HEP)

This paper reports on the first national study analysing the design and implementation of institutional programs in response to the Australian government’s Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP). The study used a qualitative methodology, including the analysis of HEPPP annual reports (2010-2015) and three case studies.

The research found that HEPPP provided an opportunity for universities to develop bespoke equity programs which responded to their institutional profile and strategic priorities. At sector level, the trend of stagnant participation by students from low SES backgrounds has been broken, but outcomes at the institutional level were highly variable. While the impact of institutional HEPPP programs on student outcomes is difficult to establish empirically, strategic intent emerged as an important variable and is explored here. This study can inform program-level assessments in other jurisdictions and enable cross-country comparisons of the differential impacts of policy regimes on institutional practice and student outcomes.

---

**Conwy 2  |  Session V9  |  Friday 12.45-13.15**

*“What I think it means to me”: university students’ expectations and understanding of ‘the student experience’ (0283)*

Rachel Spacey, Mary Stuart, University of Lincoln, UK

Research Domain: Student experiences (SE)

This paper presents the findings of exploratory research which aims to understand the student experience of Higher Education (HE) in England, UK. Using a qualitative approach research was conducted over an eighteen month period at seven universities across England using focus groups with students and the use of campus maps to develop discussions about how the university and place affected each student’s experience. Students were also asked to reflect on their expectations and understanding of the student experience. This paper will provide selected results from the project fieldwork in relation to university students’ recognition and understanding of the student experience with a focus on the participants’ expectations of the student experience.

---

**Denbigh 1  |  Session V10  |  Friday 12.45-13.15**

*Pedagogies for Critical Thinking in Universities in Kenya (0291)*

Mary Omingo, Aga Khan University, Kenya, Tristan McCowan, University College London, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

Critical thinking is one of the key employability skills. However, most lecturers think about it as an independent taught subject unrelated to their courses. The objective of this study was to determine the impact of the various academic staff development interventions on critical thinking in Kenyan universities, using semi-structured interviews with 20 respondents. The preliminary findings show that lecturers understand critical thinking as the ability of students to organize their thoughts and analyze a situation objectively by looking at it as a whole, deeply and from multiple perspectives. Practically, students should apply critical thinking in such a way that it impacts society positively. Whereas some lecturers intentionally, in their courses, inculcate analytical, creativity and logical skills, others do not, depending on a range of factors. The interventions have the potential to play a crucial role in improving students’ critical thinking, but significant attention is needed to lecturer uptake.
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‘If you pass the baton to them, they will take more care of it’: Some reflections on safely transferring learning control to degree students to improve the student learning experience. (0365)

Richard Jones, Richard Mather, Buckinghamshire New University, UK

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

This ongoing study aims to investigate the benefits associated with an understanding of ‘loci of control’ in the teaching of university computing undergraduates (level five students). The concept of ‘loci of control’ within the studied context is discussed and the guided transfer of elements of teaching control to students is assessed through a series of topic tests along with the effects on subsequent student learning. Ensuing student focus-group panels examine perceived student learning development in more detail. Initial data analysis indicates that transferring delivery of topic elements to student control develops features of deeper learning in some students. The medium term effect on learning of this experience is reported in a positive manner by a number of students. This ‘flipped-informal classroom’ approach is resulting in a more engaged student learning atmosphere. The study continues with the hope that progress results in the development of a ‘student learning engagement index’.
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International branch campus students’ perceptions of what ‘developing employability’ is (0182)

Christine Lee, University of Lincoln (current role), UK, University of Nottingham (where research was conducted), UK

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

This paper explored international branch campus (IBC) students’ understandings on what employability means. Employability in the context of IBCs is a significantly under-researched area despite IBCs’ vulnerability and their need for long-term sustainability. The research sites were two UK source universities with their IBCs in China and Malaysia. The research was framed within the qualitative tradition using semi-structured interviews. The term, ‘employability’ is a rather contested one as the literature shows. Student responses show the range of complexity this term conjures from the literature. Implications for university management interested in establishing or sustaining IBCs are the need to understand how IBCs’ main stakeholders, the students, view employability from these aspects: 1) what they consider as important for employability development while at university; 2) what their concerns are for their future employability which are linked with their higher education choices; and 3) cultural differences affecting their perceptions.
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The Fragmentation of Equality in the Internationalised University (0083)

Stuart Tannock, UCL Institute of Education, UK

Research Domain: International perspectives and context (IPC)

This paper addresses a simple but vitally important question: what happens to the principle of educational equality in the internationalised university? Drawing on an SRHE funded study of higher education leaders, staff and students (n = 56) working at the national level and in a diverse range of different universities (n = 20) around the UK, the paper argues that educational equality in the internationalised university does not disappear but becomes fragmented. This is to say that the populations, institutional structures, spatial locations and temporal dimensions in which the ideal of educational equality is to be applied are broken up and differentially combined; the vital public character of the concept of educational equality is erased; and the foundational principles upon which models of educational equality are constructed within the confines of the nation state are abandoned.
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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.

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 activities 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.

### SRHE Networks

**Access and Widening Participation**

**Convenors:**
- Professor Jacqueline Stevenson, Sheffield Hallam University
- Dr Kate Carruthers Thomas, Birmingham City University

**Academic Practice**

**Convenors:**
- Dr. Geoffrey Hinchliffe, University of East Anglia
- Professor Helen Walkington, Oxford Brookes University

**Digital University**

**Convenors:**
- Dr Lesley Gourlay, UCL Institute of Education
- Dr Ifar Bhatt, Queen’s University Belfast
- Dr Jeremy Knox, University of Edinburgh

**Employability, Enterprise and Work-based Learning**

**Convenors:**
- Professor Helen Higson, Aston University
- Professor Richard Blackwell, Southampton Solent University
- Dr Heike Behle, University of Warwick

**Higher Education Policy**

**Convenors:**
- Professor Carole Leathwood, London Metropolitan University
- Dr Terri Kim, University of East London
- Dr Karen Smith, University of Hertfordshire

**International Research and Researchers**

**Convenors:**
- Dr Emily Henderson, University of Warwick
- Dr Ye Liu, King’s College, London
- Dr Josef Ploner, University of Hull

**Newer Researchers Network**

**Convenors:**
- Dr Mark Kernigan, Anglia Ruskin University
- Dr Saranne Weller, London Southbank University
- Dr Richard Jones, Buckinghamshire New University

**Post Compulsory Education**

**Convenors:**
- Professor Ann-Marie Bathamaker, University of Birmingham
- Professor Kevin Orr, University of Huddersfield

**Postgraduate Issues Network**

**Convenors:**
- Professor Pam Denico, University of Reading
- Dr Martin Gough, University of Liverpool
- Dr Richard Race, University of Roehampton
- Dr Julie Reeves, University of Southampton

**Student Experience Network**

**Convenor:**
- Dr Camille Kandiko Howson, King’s College, London

**South West Regional Network**

**Convenors:**
- Dr Lisa Lucas, University of Bristol
- Professor Rajani Naidoo, University of Bath
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.