

50
YEARS



Valuing Research into Higher Education:

Advancing knowledge,
informing policy, enhancing
practice

SRHE 50th Anniversary Colloquium

Friday 26 June 2015

SRHE

Society for Research into Higher Education
Advancing knowledge Informing policy Enhancing practice

CONTENTS

-
- 1** Introduction – *Professor Jill Jameson, Chair SRHE*
-
- 3** Foreword – *Helen Perkins, Director SRHE*
-
- 5** Colloquium Programme
-
- 6** Keynote: Equality of opportunity: the first 50 years – *Professor Simon Marginson Abstract*
-
- 7** Looking back: Contemporary Reflections on significant research themes
Panel Chair: *Paul Johnson*
- Think Piece on Learning, Teaching and the curriculum – *Professor Marcia Devlin*
- Think Piece on Academic practice, identity and careers – *Professor Bruce Macfarlane*
- Think Piece on the student experience – *Professor Mary Stuart*
- Think Piece on Transnational perspectives on HE and global well-being –
 Professor Rajani Naidoo
- Think piece on Research on Higher Education Policy – *Professor Jeroen Huisman*
-
- 19** Looking forward: Perspectives from the new generation of leading researchers
Panel Chair: *Dr Manja Klemenčič*
- Think Piece on Going global – *Professor Paul Ashwin*
- Think Piece on Access and widening participation in HE – *Professor Penny-Jane Burke*
- Think Piece on Reflective teaching in Higher Education – *Dr Kelly Coate*
-
- 25** List of Colloquium participants
-
- 29** Continuing the conversation and engaging with SRHE

INTRODUCTION



Professor Jill Jameson, Chair SRHE

Alexis de Tocqueville, the French political historian, once observed in 1840 that 'When the past no longer illuminates the future, the spirit walks in darkness' (Tocqueville, 1901: 824). Echoing such a theme, Ron Barnett wrote to us in 2011 of the need to 'reawaken the spirit of the university', since, as Derrida observed, 'Spirit is flame': it needs air to breathe (Barnett, 2011: 153-4). Mike Shattock has similarly reminded us of Lord (then Sir John) Fulton's comment in 1964 that the Robbins Report '... provided such light in the dark places of the past that few would regard it as tolerable to be without a continuing scrutiny in future' (Shattock, 2015:3). In remembering that era of the awakening of research into higher education, this 2015 collection of 'think pieces' airs the spirit of fifty years of shared histories in the scholarship of research inquiry within and into higher education in a 50th Anniversary edition that celebrates the many achievements of research into higher education as a field.

The Society for Research into Higher Education and its global membership of scholars has nurtured and developed that field with assiduous endeavour during 1965 – 2015. We have imagined and re-imagined higher education, both stratified and massified, within and beyond 'the university', we have investigated its students and staff, debated and challenged its learning theories, quality considerations, research agendas, its complexity and diversity, its national and global rankings, its policies, leadership, management, resourcing, scholarship and academic practices, its aims, purposes and scope. We have reflected, been inspired, argued, fought, won and lost many scholarly and personal battles in this process. Yet always, as a learned society, we have returned to our main purpose: to advance knowledge, to inform policy and enhance practice in research into higher education across the UK, Europe and the world. It has been an extraordinary achievement that this research endeavour has endured and looks favourably positioned to expand and develop further, despite, as Simon Marginson notes below, the 'formidable and increasing social and political obstacles to the achievement of greater social equality and the meritocratic dream' of attainment through higher education for all. In recognising, as Helen Perkins observes in her Foreword, 'our core objective of improving the quality of higher education', we facilitate for higher education researchers around the world the illumination and new understandings that are achievable from shared knowledge, rigorous inquiry, critical discourse and research publication.

Within and beyond the many important debates captured in this volume by leading scholars on inequity, social mobility, learning and teaching, academic practice and identity, student experience, massification, marketization, transnational political and economic analysis, higher education policy and diversity, a common aim emerges. This is the aim, as a learned society, of continuing the relentless scrutiny, initiated by the Robbins Report, of research into higher education in the present and onwards towards the next fifty years. We carry forward here the light of multiple scholarly works that represent those critical, rigorous and meaningful research debates over the last five decades. The memorial celebratory pieces in these pages act as sentinels of knowledge, past and present, to inspire, awaken, inform and warn us of new and future developments in higher education. During the events the Society is running this year we chart the history of advancing knowledge, informing policy and enhancing practice in research into higher education across the UK, Europe and the world. As Mike Shattock reminds us, 'The SRHE was born out of the ferment in the world of British higher education that had been generated by the Robbins Report' of 1963. Although there have been many transmutations, ups and downs along the way, that ferment of activity has never ceased. Long may it continue.

Professor Jill Jameson

Chair, Society for Research into Higher Education

References

- Barnett, R. (2011) *Being a university*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
Tocqueville, A. de (1901) *Democracy in America*. Volume 2, translated by Henry Reeve.

New York: D. Appleton, p. 824 from the original edition of *De la démocratie en Amérique* (1840, Bruxelles). The above quotation: 'When the past no longer illuminates the future, the spirit walks in darkness' is translated in the 1901 edition: "...as the past has ceased to throw its light upon the future, the mind of man wanders in obscurity."

Shattock, M. (2015) *The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Changing World of British Higher Education: A Study of SRHE over its first 25 years*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Biography

Jill Jameson MA (Cantab), MA (Goldsmith's), MA, PhD (KCL), FRSA, FCMI, FIFL, is Chair of the Centre for Leadership and Enterprise, Professor in Education Research, Co-Chair of the Research Ethics Committee and Principal Lecturer in the Faculty of Education and Health, University of Greenwich.

She is Lead Guest Editor for the 2015 British Journal of Educational Technology (BJET) Special Edition on Emerging Technologies and Authentic Learning in Higher Vocational Education and was Guest Editor, with Professor Sara de Freitas, of the BJET Special Editions (2013) and (2006) on e-Leadership and Collaborative e-Support for Lifelong Learning. Jill was Director of Research and Enterprise at the University of Greenwich during 2004-11 and senior management university Director of Lifelong Learning in 2000-2004. Her research, management and teaching background covers 39 years of experience across all sectors of education, with a particular focus on post-compulsory, higher education and lifelong learning. Jill has 28 year's experience as a senior manager and governor in seven different institutions.

An ESRC Peer Review College Member and Fellow of the RSA, Jill is Principal Investigator for the ESRC-funded Higher Vocational Education and Pedagogy (HIVE-PED) Research Seminar Series, was an invited Member of the Expert Group advising the National Commission for Adult Education and Vocational Pedagogy, and an International Expert Group Adviser to the Open and Distance Learning Reference group led by UNISA and the University of Cambridge. Jill was Series Editor of Continuum's 24 volume book series on further education and has published five books, including the e-Learning Reader with Sara de Freitas (2012) and *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* with Professor Yvonne Hillier.

New works include a scholarly research companion on higher education and a research report funded by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education with Professor Ian McNay. The Centre for Leadership and Enterprise (CLE) Jill leads at Greenwich houses Doctoral and Masters' Postgraduate students and she is the British Educational Research Association (BERA) Convenor for the international Special Interest Group Educational Technology Research. Her research interests include leadership, e-learning, post-compulsory and higher education, lifelong learning, trust, and communities of practice.

FOREWORD



Helen Perkins, Director SRHE

Within days of joining the Society as Director in January 2005, at a meeting with the then current Chair of Trustees, Professor Ron Barnett, to discuss development plans and formulate a set of strategic directions for the Society over the next five years, he happened to mention, en passant, one additional item that he thought I should add to my “to-do” list: planning for the Society’s 50th Anniversary in 2015.

At the time planning for the next 5 years, with some ambitious ideas for building the Society’s profile and augmenting its scale and impact, seemed an ample challenge and so the 50th Anniversary was mentally filed as a “back burner” issue. In my defence I was younger then: ten years hence still seemed an awfully long time away, and coming into higher education full time from roles largely outside the academy meant that I had much to consider and assess before thinking that far ahead. This proved to be one decision I would have cause to regret as we embarked on planning for this anniversary only in June 2014.

Planning the anniversary events in practical terms was not the issue. At SRHE we are well used to running a big events programme. What has been challenging has been mapping the Society’s growth and development since its formation in December 1965 and setting this in the context of enormous change in higher education, both in the UK and in a global context. This remains work in progress. We are greatly indebted to Professor Michael Shattock OBE for his contribution to the 50th Anniversary with his research undertaken specifically for this event on *The Society for Research into Higher Education and the changing world of higher education: a study of SRHE over its first 25 years*. In addition to his own immense contribution to both research into higher education and to the Society, Mike Shattock was also instrumental in setting up the Society’s archive, kindly hosted through his efforts by the University of Warwick. Mike has also contributed all his own papers from his long association with the Society to the archive, offering one of the best set of records the Society has from this period.

This work on researching the Society’s history and the social, economic and political contexts, has proved a valuable reminder of the purpose and importance of maintaining a well-managed and properly catalogued archive as an essential research record. We intend to continue to research the history of the Society through the lens of the research landscape of the time, completing the records for the first 50 years and ensuring good future maintenance of the archive. Planning for the 75th Anniversary, let alone the 100th, however remains on the back burner for now.

In choosing an event to mark the 50th Anniversary the Society wanted to focus specifically on achievements in research and on the Society’s core objective; to improve the quality of higher education through facilitating knowledge exchange, discourse and publication of research. The idea for this Colloquium was born out of this choice and in planning and designing the programme we had a fourfold rationale:

- for the Society to bring together a range of individuals from different constituent groups, both within and outside higher education, at which SRHE could showcase the core issues in research into higher education over 50 years and examine some aspects of their impact
- to raise the profile and value of research into higher education
- to look forward towards establishing the basis of a research agenda and policy framework for HE for the next 50 years
- to support the Society’s role as an important and informed source of knowledge and expertise, meeting the needs and interests of a worldwide community of researchers.

This Colloquium offers a **Keynote address** which examines critically what has been achieved in the great goal for higher education in the past 50 years –equality of opportunity.

Our first panel of **Contemporary reflections on significant research themes** takes five big themes which have been the focus of considerable research attention and examines the core issues which have emerged; in learning, teaching and the curriculum, academic practice and identity, the student experience, transnational

perspectives and higher education policy.

We conclude by looking forward, drawing on the ideas and **Perspectives from the new generation of leading researchers**, hearing their views on some of the key issues for research into higher education, examining the challenges involved in “going global”, the continuing complexities in achieving access and widening participation and the importance of critical reflection in all aspects of higher education.

All the Colloquium inputs are designed to be short and focused, backed by thoughtful *Think Pieces* offering some broader analysis and suggestions for further reading. This approach provides us with the opportunity and time for participants at the Colloquium to contribute their knowledge and ideas and add to the debate, as this is the essential nature and purpose of a learned society in supporting a wide and diverse community of practice and scholarship. We hope Colloquium participants will make full use of this opportunity, on the day and in maintaining a continuing dialogue with the Society.

Biography

Helen Perkins has been the Director of SRHE since January 2005.

She came to the Society with a career background in leadership roles in senior management and human resources within both the public and private sectors, which included manufacturing industry (steel, chemicals and construction), the financial services sector and management consultancy (Price Waterhouse), and has held a series of appointments and advisory roles in the higher education sector from the early 1980s onwards.

Her work in higher education prior to joining SRHE involved appointments on numerous Government and Higher Education advisory bodies and funding councils over many years, especially between 1982-1995. These included membership of the Dearing Committee on Polytechnic and College Governance and the ESRC Committee on the future of the PhD, which led to new guidelines on postgraduate training, serving as deputy chairman of Staffordshire University Board of Governors pre and post 1992, membership of numerous University and Polytechnic Committees and Career Service Boards, including the Central Services Unit Board and selection panels for senior appointments in HE.

Helen was Chairman of the Association of Graduate Recruiters (AGR) from 1985-1992, the employers' organisation representing businesses large and small, engaged in graduate recruitment and development. In this capacity she led a major project to establish a framework for best practice in the recruitment and continuous development of graduates in employment and spearheaded new initiatives designed to foster effective partnerships between all business sectors and higher education. She also commissioned and contributed to the AGR report on Graduate Skills in the 21st century.

Helen holds a master's degree in Experimental Psychology and Philosophy from the University of Oxford and has additional qualifications in Psychometrics and assessment and statistical analysis and research methodologies.

COLLOQUIUM PROGRAMME

10.30-11.30	Registration and Coffee	Harvey Goodwin Suite
11.30-11.45	Opening remarks: <i>Helen Perkins Director SRHE</i> Introduction: Colloquium Chair <i>Professor Jill Jameson Chair SRHE</i>	Hoare Memorial Hall
11.45-12.30	Keynote Address: The Landscape of Higher Education Research 1965-2015 Equality of opportunity: The first fifty years Professor Simon Marginson , Professor of International Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education, University College London	
12.30-1.00	Discussion with contributions from Colloquium participants	
1.00-2.00	Lunch	Harvey Goodwin Suite
2.00-3.45	Contemporary Reflections on significant research themes	Hoare Memorial Hall
2.00-2.10	PANEL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION Panel Chair: Paul Johnson Director, Institute for Fiscal Studies	
2.10-2.20	Learning Teaching and the curriculum Professor Marcia Devlin , Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Quality) Federation University, Australia	
2.20-2.30	Academic practice, identity and careers Professor Bruce Macfarlane , Professor of Higher Education, University of Southampton	
2.30-2.40	Looking back to look forward at the Student Experience Professor Mary Stuart , Vice Chancellor, University of Lincoln	
2.40-3.00	Discussion with contributions from Colloquium participants	
3.00-3.10	Transnational perspectives on Higher Education and Global Well-being Professor Rajani Naidoo , Professor of Higher Education Management, University of Bath	
3.10-3.20	Research on Higher Education Policy Professor Jeroen Huisman , Professor of Higher Education at Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent (CHEGG) Ghent University, Belgium	
3.20-3.45	Discussion with contributions from Colloquium participants	
3.45-4.30	Refreshment break	Harvey Goodwin Suite
4.30-5.30	Perspectives from the new generation of leading researchers	Hoare Memorial Hall
4.30-4.40	PANEL PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION Panel Chair: Dr Manja Klemenčič , Fellow and Lecturer in Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University	
4.40-4.50	Going global- opportunities and challenges for HE researchers <i>Professor Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University</i>	
4.50-5.00	Access and Widening Participation in Higher Education Professor Penny Jane Burke , University of Roehampton, London & University of Newcastle, Australia	
5.00-5.10	Reflective Teaching in Higher Education <i>Dr Kelly Coate, King's Learning Institute, Kings London</i>	
5.10-5.30	Discussion with contributions from Colloquium participants	
COLLOQUIUM ENDS		
6.00-8.30	SRHE 50th Anniversary Reception at the House of Lords, Cholmondeley Room & Terrace	
6.30	Contributions from: Baroness Sharp of Guildford , SRHE Vice President & Reception host Professor Sir Robert Burgess , SRHE President	

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:

Green

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

Blue

All event participants

May we remind you please to wear your event badge throughout the day and also at the House of Lords Reception, and that in addition to your event badge and Invitation you will also need to carry with you photo ID in order to be admitted through the security at the House of Lords. Thank you.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS



Equality of opportunity: The first fifty years

Professor Simon Marginson, *Professor of International Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education, University College London*

Thomas Piketty's *Capital in the Twenty-first Century* (2014) clarifies the distinction between (1) societies in which incomes are relatively equal and/or there is a high degree of middle class growth and social mobility, which includes (albeit in different ways and for rather different reasons) both the Scandinavian countries and emerging East Asia; and (2) societies like the United States or the UK that are relatively closed in character, with highly unequal wage structures, growing capital concentrations, and static middle classes that are under considerable pressure to defend their past-gained economic and status positions. Arguably, in societies of type (1), in which social stratification is looser, higher education has a greater potential to shape the pattern of social opportunities and outcomes. Piketty's contribution is to explain the political economic mechanisms that shape social openness and closure, in different parts of the world and over time, and to demonstrate that between the 1950s-1970s the USA and UK were relatively open in terms of elite formation and social mobility, as open as Denmark, Netherlands or China today. The 1950s-1970s were the high-time of the formation of modern mass higher education, and of the key ideas that shaped that system formation—above all in the 'Californian Model' the promise of equality combined with excellence in a meritocratic society, as epitomized in the 1960 California Master Plan, in a related jurisdiction the 1963 Robbins report in the UK, and the scholarship of Clark Kerr (1963) and Martin Trow (1974). Human capital theory also evolved at its time, embodying the meritocratic premises that educated attributes constitute productivity, and marginal productivity drives wages.

We have long known that inequalities in families and in schooling pattern tertiary opportunities, that unequal social agency plays out again in the transition to work, and that wage determination is shaped by industrial power and gender stratification, but the assumption that education is accountable for an end-on transition from higher education to work, within a system in which everyone goes to the starting blocks with an equal chance, still shapes policy and public expectations—though presumably, City of London bankers and hedge fund managers no longer look to the universities (if they ever did) before giving themselves another bonus and sending it to the offshore tax haven of their choice. It has become increasingly difficult to secure greater social equality through higher education, not just because the 1960s equality of opportunity project has been rearticulated through neo-liberal policy settings, or even because social democracy has faltered in the English-speaking countries (though Scandinavian equality policies would help), but because as Piketty shows, capital has accumulated, grossly unequal wages are furthering the concentration process, unequal wage income for 'meritorious' managers turns into unequal traditional wealth in the next generation, and the private fortunes are protected by finance sector capture of tax and spending policies. In short, there is less room at the top, the middle cannot grow, and there's not much the selection function of higher education alone can do in the face of class and power.

Questions of inequality and education are central to the work of many of us, as emancipationist democrats as well as educators and researchers. The keynote reviews the approach to equality of opportunity in higher education, and in relations between education and work, in the context of societies in which there are formidable and increasing social and political obstacles to the achievement of greater social equality and the meritocratic dream of fairer social inequality.

Biography

Simon Marginson directs the ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education, a partnership of three UK HEIs and eight offshore HEIs, entailing 13 research projects, that will open in October this year. Simon is also Professor of International Higher Education at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, and the Joint Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Higher Education*. Between 2006-2013 he was Professor of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne in Australia. For the last 15 years his main inquiry has been a critical realist theorisation of higher education and globalisation, including the potentials and limits of national policy and cross-border activity. Current research projects include work on higher education, stratification and inequality in the context of high participation systems; a comparative study of the public good role of HEIs in contrasting political cultures; and higher education and science in East Asia. Simon became an Honorary Fellow of SRHE at Bristol in 2005, and was the 2014 Clark Kerr Lecturer on Higher Education at the University of California Berkeley.

CONTEMPORARY REFLECTIONS ON SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH THEMES



Panel Chair: Paul Johnson

Paul has been director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies since January 2011. He is also currently visiting professor in the department of economics at University College London. Paul has worked and published extensively on the economics of public policy, with a particular focus on income distribution, public finances, pensions, tax, social security, education and climate change. As well as a previous period of work at the IFS his career has included spells at HM Treasury, the Department for Education and the FSA. Between 2004 and 2007 he was deputy head of the Government Economic Service. Paul is currently also a member of the committee on climate change, of the Actuarial Council of the FRC and of the executive committee of the Royal Economic Society. He was an editor of the "Mirrlees Review".



Learning Teaching and the curriculum

Professor Marcia Devlin, *Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Quality)*
Federation University, Australia

This abstract covers three aspects of research in learning, teaching and curriculum over the past 50 years: research issues and their drivers; the impact of this research on policy and practice; and future priorities. What follows are my observations and thoughts on these aspects, which are shaped by my experience, beliefs, values and preferences.

My observations relate to: changes in higher education *per se*; learning theory; the role of discipline-based research; the nature of research collaborations; dissemination and impact; and possible future priorities.

Changes in higher education *per se*

One important defining feature of the past 50 years of research in learning, teaching and curriculum has been that the context of this research has changed so fundamentally. In 2015, we find ourselves on the trajectory predicted by Trow (1972) of higher education expansion and transformation from elite, through mass, to universal access.

A massified system has meant that not only are there more students but also, alongside the internationalisation of higher education, that students are from a far wider range of social and cultural backgrounds than the cohort who attended Western universities 50 years ago. This has changed research into learning, teaching and curriculum in these universities significantly and irreversibly. Naturally, this research has increasingly focused on how to best teach and assess students from a range of diverse backgrounds.

Some research effort has been devoted to understanding the experiences, perspectives and needs of so called 'non-traditional' and international students in a massified, internationalised system and to informing relevant policy and practice within institutions and beyond. The focus has increasingly been to facilitate achievement for all students, not just those with the social, cultural and English language capital to understand the tacit expectations of them and respond accordingly.

Learning theory

Over the past 50 years, a plethora of learning theories, models, concepts and ideas have underpinned higher education research in learning, teaching and curriculum. Some that have had currency at one time or another in the past 50 years include, in no particular order: deep and surface learning; Vygotski's Zone of Proximal Development; cognitive theory; Andragogy; problem-based learning; inquiry learning; Bloom's Taxonomy; cultural historical activity theory; metacognition; Garder's multiple intelligences; phenomenography; constructivism; learning styles; behaviourist theory; transformative learning theory; cooperative learning;

motivational and humanist theories; brain friendly learning and socio-cultural theories. There are many more but this list is illustrative of both the wide range and the number of those considered appropriate at one time or another over the past five decades.

It strikes me that, like religion, each theory, model, concept and idea has its believers and non-believers, its evangelists and critics, its worshippers, if you will, and its nay-sayers. It also strikes me that, like fashion, some of these theories, models, concepts and ideas have come and gone, and come back into vogue again at a later time in some form.

As I reflect on this particular observation, I now understand why, despite my experience of research having grown over the years, I have had increasing difficulty answering the question from newer researchers interested in examining learning, teaching and/or curriculum, "Which is the best learning theory to use in higher education research?"

Discipline-based higher education research

There has been an explosion in discipline-based pedagogical research over the past fifty years. I am referring to the growth in work by colleagues in the disciplines of chemistry, engineering, humanities, media, nursing and psychology, to name but a few disciplines, to explore and better understand learning, teaching and curriculum in their particular neck of the academic woods. If it is difficult to keep up with 'generic' higher education research, it is impossible to track specialised work of this kind across disciplines. That said, discipline-based higher education research in learning, teaching and curriculum has allowed those in specific discipline fields to benefit from the focused and specialized work.

This work has also brought immeasurable benefit to higher policy and practice more broadly, as well as to research, with an influx of additional learning theories, models, concepts and ideas, the application of existing theory within discipline contexts, as well as an increased breadth and depth of methods that are deployed to conduct, and therefore improve, research in higher education. One example is some of the increased rigour in higher educational quasi and experimental research that has come about through the application of aspects of the scientific method.

Research collaborations

Research collaborations have changed considerably over the past half-century. My own experience highlights some of the shifts. My first collaborative higher education research experience was with a senior academic with whom I worked for many years at the same institution, who kindly offered me an opportunity to join an experienced team and then mentored me. This was and is the traditional way. My most recent is a current collaboration with a junior colleague who lives on the other side of the country, whom I met online via social media and with whom I worked through email to pull together a geographically dispersed research team with complementary skills and submit a successful grant application. Our team is multidisciplinary, meets by teleconference, has debates and makes decisions via email and engages with our communities via social media. This story is increasingly repeated across countries, languages, disciplines and worldviews.

Dissemination and impact

The role of social and other new media has fundamentally changed not only the way research teams are formed and work, but also the way in which research outcomes are shared, discussed, understood and implemented to facilitate change in policy and practice. No longer the purview of an elite few who undertake the research and a slightly larger group of elite few who read the findings in dense and terribly clever academic journals, higher education research findings have increasingly reached the masses over time. In the case of research into learning, teaching and curriculum, this is particularly welcome as it has relevance to all academic staff who teach, whatever their location or discipline.

The impact of research depends in large part on dissemination and uptake. There will be an increasing need to 'cut through' the volume and noise of the Internet to reach those who need to be reached to change policy and practice. Those who can do so will be those with sophisticated understandings of: how to select, collect and curate disparate findings; how to translate findings written in 'academic-ese', or in the style and language familiar to those in one discipline, into plain English; and marketing to particular audiences and doing so in a digital context.

Future priorities

Given the complexity outlined above, one of the major priorities for the future is to ensure that higher education research on learning, teaching and curriculum is meaningful and useful to the many and not just the few. As well as more thinking about facilitating better uptake of findings, this might also necessitate a focus in the immediate future on so-called twenty-first century learning in higher education. This would include further exploration of how higher education can assist students and graduates to experience success

and fulfillment in an increasingly digital and global age such as through digital and media literacy, deep cross- and multi-cultural understandings and the ability to innovate.

References

Trow, M. 1972. *The expansion and transformation of higher education*. General Learning Press, New York.

Biography

Marcia Devlin is Professor of Learning Enhancement and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Learning and Quality) at Federation University Australia. Her research incorporates both theoretical and practical investigations into contemporary higher education. She is a nationally and internationally recognised expert in equity, quality, leadership, teaching and learning, student engagement and digital education. With colleagues, she has won over \$5 million in external competitive research, project and other funds. She has concurrently held Australian Research Council and Office for Learning and Teaching grants. Professor Devlin is a member of numerous Editorial and Advisory Boards and is frequently invited to deliver national and international keynote addresses, workshops and seminars. A broad and extensive publication record in the higher education field incorporates almost 400 publications, comprising refereed outcomes, commissioned reports for government, universities and professional associations, and newspaper articles, including opinion pieces and her own newspaper column for 10 years. She has an h-index of 21. Professor Devlin is an elected Lifelong Fellow of the Society for Research in Higher Education.



Academic practice, identity and careers

Professor Bruce Macfarlane, *Professor of Higher Education, University of Southampton*

The word 'traditional' is possibly the most over-used term in the higher education discourse. In common with nearly all institutions that have endured for any substantial length of time, such as the Church of England or the Conservative Party, the University has been adroit at re-inventing itself. The latest re-imagining is that 'traditional' universities are research-led institutions. This myth has comparatively recent roots linked to the growth of an audit culture, expansion and stratification on an international basis, and academic performativity at an individual level. These trends have collectively re-shaped the nature of academic practice and identity over the last 50 years.

An insight into how priorities have changed among academics during the recent past is provided by Halsey and Trow's seminal study, published in 1971, of a then still small and elite British higher education sector drawing on data gathered in the mid-1960s (at a time when the SRHE was being formed). They found that British academics were overwhelmingly oriented towards teaching rather than research. A mere 10 per cent were even 'interested' in research while just 4 per cent regarded research as their primary responsibility (Halsey & Trow, 1971). The study concludes that 'elitist teachers' constituted the dominant 'academic type' predominantly interested in teaching rather than research and opposed to the expansion of the system. Nor was it just British academics that saw their role as primarily about teaching rather than research. Writing about American academics as late as 1979, Logan Wilson asserted that even though 'assigned teaching loads...normally allow ample time for research, the majority consider teaching to be more important than research' (Wilson, 1979:234).

Very many articles in early issues of *Studies in Higher Education*, first published in 1976, focused on undergraduate teaching picking over very practical issues such as the use of lectures, examinations, and various forms of educational innovation. The language of this time was all about 'university teachers'. The virtual disappearance of this phrase in the modern lexicon tells us a lot about the way in which the subsequent separation of government funding for research and teaching has led to a radical shifting of academic priorities, part of an international trend evidenced by successive *Changing Academic Profession* surveys.

Analysis of the academic profession in the 1970s, in the aftermath of the campus radicalism of the previous decade, is sometimes characterized in terms of a division between the forces of conservatism and liberalism (Ladd and Lipset, 1975) or in attitudes towards the expansion of the higher education system (Halsey and Trow, 1971). Sadly today the very idea that the socio-political views of academics should be sought, let alone listened to, might seem at best, quaint or at worst, irrelevant. This is partly about the way in which the public role and status of the academic has shrunk.

The divisions today within the academic profession are more usually expressed in terms of contractual or stratified status: research or teaching contracts, tenured or untenured, full or part-time, and, the career critical division between those who have been submitted or omitted for national research audit exercises (eg PBRF in New Zealand, the RAE in Hong Kong or the REF in the UK). The expansion of higher education has not only led to increased inequality between students in a highly stratified sector. It has also had much the same effect for academics. The realities of casualization and the pressures of performativity have shaped a more inward-looking 'academic profession'.

This inward turn marks not just the declining role of academics as public intellectuals but also the atomisation of academic practice and identity. This fragmentation or 'unbundling' of academic labour has resulted in the parceling of work into discrete and specialized niches. Only around a half of academics in the UK or Australia are now on 'all round' contracts involving teaching, research and service. This means that the other half are a disparate collection of para-professionals who might research OR teach OR, perhaps, manage. The line between an 'academic' and an 'administrator' is also fuzzing as part of this fragmentary process (Whitchurch, 2008).

Some of the early articles published in *Studies in Higher Education* essentially constituted personal reflections on what it means to be a university academic. They are part of a lost world of scholarly dialogue about academic identity. In 'Reflections on Working in a University', Adam Curle (the first professor of peace studies at the University of Bradford) makes no mention of phrases or agendas which might predominate if such a piece were to be penned today (eg 'workload', 'impact case study', 'research grant', etc). Instead, the article provides a critical reflection on his own development from 'middle class English academic, subtly conscious of status, class, and colour, believing – albeit criticizing – the values of western civilization...' (Curle, 1977:10) to a later realization that his 'attitude toward students had the same omniscient superiority that had tainted my attitude towards people in the countries where I had worked on development problems.' (p 11). Such a candid self-analysis is all too rare today as modern para-professionals, including full professors, scurry around meeting the demands of a performative culture.

Today Curle's idiosyncratic meanderings would probably face instant rejection from *Studies in Higher Education* given its lack of a 'methodology' section, empirical evidence or other sufficiently respectable social scientific clothing. Such conventions now predominate and have positively contributed to achieving the hope expressed by Tony Becher, in his opening editorial in the first issue of *Studies* in 1976, for higher education to 'constitute as valid a field of intellectual enquiry as can any specialized discipline' (Becher, 1976:2). Yet, at the same time, much of the scholarly dialogue from the 1970s and early 80s reminds us what has been lost. These authors addressed a key question too rarely considered today: what does it mean to be an academic?

References

- Becher, T. (1976) Editorial, *Studies in Higher Education*, 1:1, 1-2.
- Curle, A. (1977) *Reflections on Working in a University*, *Studies in Higher Education*, 2:1, 9-13.
- Halsey, A.H. and Trow, M. (1971) *The British Academics*, Faber & Faber, London.
- Ladd, E.C. and Lipset, S.M. (1975) *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics*, McGraw-Hill, New York & London.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008) *Shifting Identities and Blurring Boundaries: the Emergence of Third Space Professionals in UK Higher Education*, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62:4, 377-396.
- Wilson, L. (1979) *American Academics*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Biography

Bruce Macfarlane is professor of higher education at the University of Southampton. He has previously held chairs at universities in the UK and Hong Kong and visiting professorial positions in Japan and Australia. His publications, including 4 single authored books published by Routledge, have developed conceptual frameworks for interpreting academic practice, ethics and leadership. Key concepts his work has helped to define include academic integrity, academic citizenship, intellectual leadership, and student performativity. His current research focuses on the ethics of multiple authorship, academic integrity in China and student academic freedom. He is a Fellow and former Vice Chair of the Society for Research into Higher Education.



Looking back to look forward at the Student Experience
Professor Mary Stuart, Vice Chancellor, University of Lincoln

Attempting a review of work on the student experience over the last 50 years is daunting. The concept of the 'student experience' is so defuse and covers so many areas that any review would be partial. However I will attempt to discuss what themes I believe to be important as they have emerged in research on the student experience in HE along with what questions have been asked by researchers of these themes and how these themes and questions relate to the rapidly, it seems looking back, changing higher education landscape.

I wish to place this discussion in the context of what I believe are the two overarching policy narratives which have shaped higher education since 1965 which have therefore driven the research and impact agendas for the student experience. The relationship between policy and research is complex, sometimes with research questions developing because of new policies and sometimes with research influencing new policy. However all research on the student experience can be seen as deriving from the processes of the Massification and Marketisation of higher education, the two meta-narratives for HE in the last 50 years. I will begin with Massification.

The concept of Massification in HE comes from Trow (1970) in his seminal discussion of the stages of the development of higher education; elite, mass and universal. Clearly the Robbins Report (Committee on Higher Education, 1963) which recommended the opportunity for all who had the ability to benefit from HE to be able to take a degree was the justification for expansion. Robbins needs to be seen in the context of a much wider global growth in HE including in the USA and other parts of the Western world post the second world war. It was recognised that if countries were to compete successfully higher level education for more people was necessary. Equally, although Robbins agreed with the policy, recommending grants for students rather than paying fees as students had done up until the 1960s, was a recommendation from the Anderson Review in 1961.

However the increase in the number of Universities, the introduction of grants for students and the creation of the polytechnics in the later part of the 1960s and early 1970s provided many more opportunities for students to get into higher education. Core debates on the student experience and students which are still discussed in research and the media developed at this time. What is currently called widening participation, widening access or social equity in HE was discussed in relation to the expansion with Kingsley Amis commenting that 'more was worse' (Tight, 2012), an idea still current in debates today. The 'new' students were seen as different and even Robbins said of the new students that 'too many entrants cannot themselves express themselves clearly in English and have an inadequate understanding of basic mathematical principles' (Committee on Higher Education, 1963: para 570). Research on student support and the needs of students began to emerge partly as a result (Myers, 2013) but there was little discussion as such, until the 1980s, on issues of student diversity, such as gender, ethnicity, class and disability.

The most rapid expansion of higher education in the UK took place in the mid 1980s to the mid 1990s. This expansion brought in more and diverse students; women who had missed out on higher education earlier in their lives because of prejudice about women's role in society; minority ethnic students from aspirational parents and the reclassifying of professional qualifications into higher education. New qualifications to enable mature students gain access to HE were developed in particular the Access movement which provided extensive research opportunities (Ryle and Stuart, 1994) Research into the student experience during this phase was dominated by investigations into women's education (Thompson, 2000) and adult and part-time learners (Taylor and Ward, 1986; West, 1996) , picking up on the changing nature of the student body. Part-time students of course always paid (subsidised) fees themselves.

During the mid 1990s Sir Ron Dearing, later Lord Dearing, was asked to undertake a review of higher education. The report in 1996 recommended the re-introduction of fees for full-time undergraduate home students. Many of the recommendation from Dearing were taken up by the new Labour government in 1997. This created considerable interest in researching the impact of fees on student behaviour and student debt itself became an area of considerable interest for researchers (Callender and Jackson, 2004), particularly when fees were increased and income contingent loans were introduced in 2003. The policy was influenced by research and practice in Australia (Chapman, 2006) and the work of Barr and Crawford (2005) in the UK. Equally significant in terms of creating further research questions from the Dearing review affecting the student experience was the development of the Institute for learning and teaching , latterly the Higher Education Academy, and the new Labour government's commitment to reaching the 50% of under 30

year olds having some experience of HE. This shifted the research questions away from mature students to younger students and the creation of school, college and university partnerships to raise aspirations and attainment to enter HE created a new interest in HE research in the experience of students before they came into Higher Education (Kintrea, St Cair and Houston, 2011).

Questions of social equity in higher education are global and many of the issues raised in research in the UK were also highlighted in research in other countries (Osborne, 2003). Concern about retention of particular groups of students led researchers to explore work from Tinto (1993) in the USA on 'persistence' and concepts of learning from Australian researchers such as Prosser and Tigwell (1999) and Ramsden (2003). Debates between researchers became keen. Quinn and Thomas (2006) argued that research and institutions were creating a deficit model of students from 'widening participation backgrounds' rather than exploring the institutional 'Habitas' which 'othered' difference (Archer, Hutchins and Ross, 2003). Concepts such as 'belonging' (Wilcox et al, 2005; Stuart, et al, 2011a) began to circulate and researchers have increasingly discovered the importance of the role of friendship and personal relationships (Ecclestone, 2007, Stuart, 2006). Alongside this work further research on the student experience beyond the classroom has suggested that different students engage beyond formal study differently with their institutions (Little, 2006; Stuart et al, 2011b) As a result many institutions developed their practice around the early stages of a student's time in HE, increasingly providing support for induction and the first year experience began to affect practice in Universities (Yorke and Thomas, 2003).

Higher Education has always had a market but this market historically focused on tariff, with students 'buying' institutions with their final school grades. However marketisation in HE began to develop when UK Universities were allowed to charge fees for International students in the 1980s. This started a significant growth in the recruitment and retention of students from emerging countries whose HE systems were during the 1990s and 2000s not yet sufficiently developed to cope with the demands of their growing middle classes. Research into cross cultural understanding, learning systems and internationalisation asked necessary questions to support the increase in international recruitment in UK institutions. (Turner and Robson, 2007).

Marketisation in English institutions expanded significantly through policy changes between 2010 and 2015. While new Universities have continued to be established throughout the last 50 years, the significant change has been the increase in private and for-profit providers. At the same time the government had increased fee levels paid by income contingent loans to 9,000 pounds and lifted the cap on numbers of undergraduates who could be recruited by any one institution. Research on the student experience moved into areas of marketisation and neo-liberal agendas in HE and new researcher on 'student choice' developed (Reay et al 2005; Stuart, et al, 2012b), exploring and critiquing rational choice theory and suggesting that 'choice' is dependent on experience and access. Further work on the critique of neo-liberalism and questions of social justice is new growing as the sector changes further (Burke, 2012) and critiques of marketisation approaches to teaching and learning from Ashwin et al (2015).

As value for money is an increasing theme of policy makers in HE concern has been expressed about higher education as a motor for social mobility and research into social mobility, class and HE has expanded (Stuart, 2012a; Blanden et al, 2005). Recently research suggests that there is a hollowing out of lower middle class jobs in Western societies due to technological change and globalisation (Sissons, 2011). This will affect opportunities for further social mobility. At the same time other researchers have explored ethnicity and attainment in HE (Broeke and Nicholls, 2007; Richardson, 2008 and Stuart et al, 2011a). Researchers such as Wakeling (2010) have also argued that postgraduate study has a real class bias towards the middle classes. This work has affected recent policy announcements to create a loan system for PGT and PGR students. Most recently there is real interest in how HE can demonstrate its value for graduate employment (Brennan, (2004). The OECD has conducted research into graduate attributes through its AHELO project and there is clearly scope for further research in this area of 'learning gain', which the higher education funding council currently calling for pilot studies on learning gain.

Research into the student experience has expanded considerably alongside the expansion of higher education itself. Insights into different student experiences of access to HE, completion of study and success for graduates has highlighted the need for more understanding and appreciation of different experience within the HE environment and has changed practice in institutions (Yorke and Thomas, 2003). However further work in the area of HE and social justice is still needed to ensure institutions and policy makers are addressing issues of equity. As new forms of higher education emerge, how the student experience changes and what opportunities or barriers these new forms provide will provide further research questions in the future.

References

- Archer L, Hutchings M and Ross A (2003) *Higher Education and Social Class* London: Routledge Falmer
- Ashwin P, Abbas A and McLean M (2015) *Representations of a high quality system of undergraduate education in English higher education policy documents* *Studies in Higher Education* 40 (4) p. 610-623
- Brennan J (2004) *Graduate Employment: issues for debate and enquiry* *International Higher Education* (34) p 12-20
- Burke, PJ (2012) *Accessing Higher Education: Widening Participation, Migration and Gendered Subjectivities* *Encyclopaedia Special Issue International Migration and Social Justice Education* 2 (34) XVI (accessed 2013) http://www.academia.edu/3468941/Special_Issue_International_Migration_and_Social_Justice_Education_VOL_2
- Barr N and Crawford I (eds) (2005) *Financing Higher Education Answers from the UK* Abingdon: Routledge
- Blanden J Gregg P and Machin S (2005) *Social Mobility in Britain: low and falling* (accessed 2010) <http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/CP172.pdf>
- Broeke S and Nicholls T (2007) *Ethnicity and Degree Attainment Research Report: RW92* London DfES
- Callender C and Jackson J (2004) *Fear of Debt and Higher Education Participation Families and Social Capital* ESRC Research Group: London South Bank (accessed 2008) <http://www1.lsbu.ac.uk/ahs/downloads/families/familieswp9.pdf>
- Chapman, B (2006) *Income Related Students Loans: Concepts, International Reforms and Administrative Challenges*, in Teixeira, P.N., Johnstone, D.B., Rosa, M.J. & Vossensteyn, H. (ed.), *Cost-sharing and Accessibility in Higher Education: A fairer deal?*, Springer, The Netherlands, p 51-77
- Committee on Higher Education, (1963) (The Robbins Review) Report London HMSO
- Ecclestone, K (2007) *Resisting images of the 'diminished self': the implications of emotional well-being and emotional engagement in education policy* *Journal of Education Policy* 22 (4) p 455-470
- Kintrea K, St Clair R and Houston M (2011) *The Influence of parents, places and poverty on educational attitudes and aspiration* Joseph Rowntree Foundation (accessed 2011) <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/young-people-education-attitudes-full.pdf>
- Little B (2006) *The Student Experience and the impact of social capital* in McNay I (ed) (2006) *Beyond Mass Higher Education* Maidenhead: SRHE-OUP
- Myers, J (2013) *Why Support Students: Using the past to understand the present*, *Higher Education Research and Development* 32 (4) p 590-602
- Osborne M (2003) *Policy and Practice in Widening Participation a six country comparison of access* *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 22 (1) January-February p 43-59
- OECD AHELO Project Third report (accessed 2015) <http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/AHELOFSReportVolume3.pdf>
- Prosser, M and Tigwell, K. (1999) *Understanding Learning and Teaching: the experience in higher education*. Birmingham, SRHE-OUP
- Ramsden P (2003) *Learning to Teach in Higher Education* London: Routledge
- Reay D, David M and Ball S (2005) *Degrees of Choice Social Class, race and gender in Higher Education* Stoke: Trentham Books
- Richardson T (2008) *The attainment of ethnic minority students in UK higher Education* *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (1) p 33-48
- Ryle M and Stuart M (1994) *A Curriculum for Women? A Case study* from Brighton *Journal of Access Studies* 9 p 9 – 15
- Sissons P (2011) *The Hourglass and the Escalator Labour Market Change and Mobility* *The Work Foundation* (accessed 2012) [http://www.theworkfoundation.com/DownloadPublication/Report/292_hourglass_escalator120711%20\(2\)%20\(3\).pdf](http://www.theworkfoundation.com/DownloadPublication/Report/292_hourglass_escalator120711%20(2)%20(3).pdf)
- Stuart M (2006) 'My Friends made all the difference'. *Getting into and succeeding at University for first-time entrants in Journal of Access Policy and Practice* (Summer, 2006) p 27-40
- Stuart M, Lido C and Morgan J (2011a) *Personal Stories - How students' social and cultural life histories interact with the field of higher education* with Lido C and Morgan J *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 30 (4) p 489-508
- Stuart M, Lido C, Morgan J Solomon L and May S (2011b) *The Impact of Engagement with Extracurricular Activities on the student Experience and Graduate Outcomes for Widening Participation Populations* *Active Learning in Higher Education* 12 (3) p 203-215
- Stuart M, Lido C and Morgan J (2012a) *Choosing a Student Lifestyle? Questions of taste, cultural capital and gaining a graduate job* in Hilton-Smith T (ed) (2012) *Widening Participation in Higher Education: Casting the net wide?* London: Palgrave
- Stuart M (2012b) *Social Mobility and Higher Education The life Experiences of first Generation Entrants in Higher Education* Stoke: Trentham Books
- Taylor R and Ward K (eds) (1986) *Adult Education and the Working Class Education for the Missing Millions* London Routledge

- Thomas L and Quinn J (2006) *First Generation Entry into Higher Education: an international study* Maidenhead: SRHE-OUP
- Thompson, J (2000) *Stretching the Academy: The Politics and Practice of Widening Participation in Higher Education*, NIACE
- Tight, M (2009) *The Development of Higher Education since 1945* Maidenhead:SRHE-OUP
- Tinto V (1993) *Leaving College: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* 2nd edition Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Trow M (1970) *Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education* Daedalus 99 (1) p 1-42
- Turner, Y. and Robson, S., 2007. *Competitive and cooperative impulses to internationalization: reflecting on the interplay between management intentions and the experience of academics in a British university* *Education, Knowledge and Economy* 1 (1) p 65-82
- Wakeling P (2010) *Inequalities in Postgraduate Education a comparative review* in Goastellec G (ed) (2010) *Understanding Inequalities in, through and by Higher Education* Rotterdam: SENSE p 61-74
- West, 1996 *Beyond Fragments Adults, Motivation and Higher Education* Abingdon:Taylor and Francis
- Wilcox P, Winn S and Fyvie-Gauld M (2005) 'It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': the role of social support in the first year experience in higher education *Studies in Higher Education* 20 (6) p 707-722
- Yorke M and Thomas L, (2003) *Improving Retention of Students from Lower Socio-economic Groups* *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 25 (1) p 63-74

Biography

Mary Stuart is Professor of Higher Education Studies at the University of Lincoln where she is also Vice Chancellor. She has conducted research and published widely on the Student Experience Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning since the early 1990's.

She is a Sociologist and a Life Historian. Since her appointment as Vice Chancellor at the University of Lincoln in 2009 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) and successfully led the development of Science provision at Lincoln and reshaped provision in the Arts and Humanities.

Mary is currently a HEFCE Board Member, the Chair of HEFCE's Teaching Excellence and Student Opportunity Strategic Advisory Committee and a member of the Higher Education Public Information Steering Group, as well as being Chair of Action on Access Advisory Committee, Deputy Chair of the University Alliance, and a Board member of the Equality Challenge Unit.



Transnational perspectives on Higher Education and Global Well-being
Professor Rajani Naidoo, Professor of Higher Education Management,
 University of Bath

The contribution of HE to global wellbeing was not always accepted. A view long held by the World Bank and other powerful actors was that investment in HE would bring limited social and economic benefits to developing countries. This view, which led to large scale disinvestment, was successfully challenged and in 2000 the World Bank itself positioned HE as a crucial engine for economic and social development¹. In the context of the knowledge economy, the assumption is that HE will enable low income countries to 'leap-frog' over intermediate developmental stages and improve their positions globally². At the same time, the formidable obstacles to the development of high quality systems of HE in many developing countries are recognised³. In this context, the provision of HE by foreign and corporate providers may be seen as an attractive solution in countries where governments are unable to readily acquire resources to commit to HE.

But to what extent can trans-national HE contribute to global wellbeing? Important strands of contemporary research respond to this question by situating HE in the context of the dominance of neo-liberalism and geo-political power struggles. At the same time, such research has shown that HE has always had a relative autonomy and that universities can contribute to social change in the most draconian societies⁴.

Analysts have referred to the geo-politics of the 21st century as an era of 'new imperialism.' While classical rivalries were legitimated by ethnicity in the colonial period or the war on communism in the cold war period, it is religion that is now deployed to explain conflict⁵. Rising powers such as China, a one-party state with a giant economy or Brazil, with its opposition to armed US interventions and its forging of a regional identity with Cuba and Venezuela have potential to disrupt global power relations⁶. The Bolivarian Alliance of the

Peoples of Our Americas spearheaded by Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador and Cuba has an anti imperialist and anti-neoliberal stance. In an era of neo-liberal deregulation, international organisations and transnational corporations wield increasing power on all aspects of public life including HE.

HE stands at the centre of these developments. The intensification of the struggle for positional advantage in the global economy and the competition for highly skilled knowledge workers have contributed to a fierce competition within and between national systems of HE. I have referred to this as the competition fetish. In addition, researchers such as Buchanan have been highly influential in the application of neo-liberal market mechanisms and public choice theory to higher education. I and others have shown that creation of a global market in HE of course a rigged market which is twisted with strong protectionism to create an un-equal playing field⁷.

Researchers have also analysed other types of competition in HE .These come with their own set of rules based on institutions already judged to be 'the best' and include 'excellence' or 'world class' policies and are re-enforced by global rankings which exert an influence on all institutions, even those in developing countries which have little capacity to feature in such rankings.⁸

While research advocating pro-market neo-liberal policies has influenced policy and practice, research that has been critical of such trends has been largely marginalised. Such research has indicated that the transformation of higher education into a commodity may result in developing countries particularly those with weak regulation becoming mass markets for low quality education with attendant effects on development and global wellbeing. Research that has raised concerns that transnational education may lead to the erosion of indigenous values and culture has been more influential. Development organisations and universities in high income countries increasingly recognize the danger of reproducing unequal imperial type relations and have taken steps to reflect more critically on power and culture.

Given the above, what are the research priorities going forward ?

Firstly we need to undertake research that exposes some common myths that are presently clouding debates on HE and global wellbeing. Modernity is not a single, unified homogenising process and the West is not the only yardstick by which success is measured. Market fundamentalism and the competition fetish are not inevitable⁹. In addition it is not so easy to divide the world between the powerful global north and the powerless global South. My analysis drawing on the scholarship on uneven and combined development shows us that there are connections between high status universities low income countries which are detached from their surroundings and linked to the higher education power centres of the north and the black holes of under-resourced institutions located in the richest countries in the north but dislocated from power¹⁰. At the same time we have to expose the myth that public institutions always work in the interests of the public good.

In the same way we need to be wary of constructing a reified binary between dominant 'Western' and 'indigenous' knowledge. A binary logic contrasting American and European culture with 'non-western' cultures; or modernity with tradition denies the multiplicity of peoples' lives and discourages criticism of intergroup conflict .There is also the danger that equating knowledge in a simplistic manner with ideology or culture will result in us losing all mechanisms to evaluate knowledge.

Third, even more fundamental is how we define education's contribution to the development of world societies. We are currently witnessing world-wide attacks on public systems of HE. The blame for pervasive poverty, growing unemployment and social unrest is laid at the door of HE rather than seen as an outcome of policies related to predatory capitalism. HE plays a part here but it would be a grave error to believe that HE in isolation can contribute to global wellbeing. It is therefore very important to link HE to wider development and global wellbeing strategies.

The research field is characterised on the one hand by macro global political economy analyses. Intellectual giants such as Robert Wade shows us how global power relations shrink the development space open to low income countries. We also have approaches such as the capability and human rights approaches which place people at the centre of education and development¹¹. This body of work could also be usefully linked to an analysis of the wider social structure in which people interact. The 'Wellbeing Regimes' framework offers significant potential as it analyses macro structures above the state such as multi-national corporations and those below the state such as religious and civil groups¹². By linking the work on capabilities and human rights to the wellbeing regimes framework we can focus on how the mutual connections between a reconfiguration of the global system and the empowerment of local communities and individuals across national borders can contribute to the sustainability of human relationships and global wellbeing.

References

¹ *Task Force On Higher Education in Developing Countries* (convened by UNESCO and the World Bank)

(2000) *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*. URL: <http://www.tfhe.net/report/overview.htm>.

² Castells, M. (2001) 'Information Technology and Global Development', in Muller, J., Cloete, N. and Badat, S. (eds) *Challenges of Globalisation: South African Debates with Manuel Castells* (Cape Town: Maskew Miller/Longman).

³ Sawyerr, A. 2004 'Challenges Facing African Universities: Selected Issues', Association of African Universities. URL: www.africanstudies.org/ChallengesFacingAfricanUniversities.pdf.

⁴ Brennan, J and Naidoo, R. (2006). Managing Contradictory Functions: The role of universities in societies that have undergone radical social transformation, in Neave, G. (Ed.) *Research and Knowledge in Higher Education Policy*. Paris: UNESCO Press, pp. 221-234

⁵ Tikly, L. (2004), 'Education and new imperialism', *Comparative Education*, 40 (2)173–98

⁶ Naidoo, R. (2011). The New Imperialism in Higher Education: Implications for Development, in King, R., Marginson, S. and Naidoo, R. (Eds.) *A Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp 40-58.

⁷ Naidoo, R. (2007). Higher Education as a Global Commodity: The Perils and Promises for Developing Countries, in *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*, 1 February. (Reviewed in the Times Higher Education Supplement on 9 March 2007)

⁸ Marginson, S. (2009), 'University rankings and the knowledge economy', in Peters, M., Marginson, S., and Murphy, P., *Creativity and the Global Knowledge Economy*, New York: Peter Lang, 185-216; Enders, J. (2014). The Academic Arms Race: International Rankings and Global Competition for World-Class Universities. In Pettigrew, A.M., Cornuel, E. & Hommel, U. (eds.) *The Institutional Development of Business Schools*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 155-175.

⁹ Naidoo, R. (2011) Higher Education and the Competition Fetish. Keynote to the Consortium of Finnish Higher Education Researchers' Annual Conference, University of Jyväskylä, Finland, 22-25 August 2011

¹⁰ Naidoo, R. (2014) Trans-national Higher Education: Global Wellbeing or Cultural Imperialism? Keynote to the United Kingdom Forum for Education and Training. University of London Institute of Education and University College. 24 September 2014

¹¹ Walker, M. and Unterhalter, E. (2007) (Ed). *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education*. Palgrave

¹² Gough, I. and Wood, G. (2006) A Comparative Welfare Regime Approach to Global Social Policy, *World Development*, 34, 10, 1696-1712

Biography

Rajani Naidoo is Professor and Director of the International Centre for Higher Education Management at the University of Bath with extensive experience of research based policy engagement and executive development in a global context. She has keynoted major conferences worldwide and sits on the executive editorial board of the British Journal of Sociology of Education, the International Journal of Sociology of Education and on the European Foundation for Management and Development research and development committee. Multi-national research projects have focussed on the academic profession and transnational education. Her research interests include public sector markets and new public management; global governance and transnational education and the transformation of higher education into a global commodity.



Research on Higher Education Policy

Professor Jeroen Huisman, Professor of Higher Education at Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent (CHEGG) Ghent University, Belgium

Research on higher education in general, apparently, is alive and kicking. Tight (2012) calls higher education "big business" and other authors refer to the massification of higher education (read: more students, more staff, potentially more researchers interested in higher education) but also to the increasing importance of higher education and research in contemporary society to signify increasing interest in higher education research.

The growth is also evidenced by an increase in journals focusing on higher education (Altbach, 2009) and in the growth of research centres on higher education (Rumbley et al., 2015). Although that growth may be uneven: with considerable growth in new economies in e.g. Asia and Latin America and stabilisation in (Western) Europe and the US, Rumbley et al (2015, 7) argue that “higher education is fast moving from the margins to the centre of much discussion and debate among policymakers around the world”.

Elsewhere (Huisman, 2015), I argued that behind this growth there are patterns of diversity, some of these to celebrate and others to worry about. This diversity is e.g. visible in the organisation of our field (e.g. disciplinary versus theme-based), in who is involved (researchers from the disciplines, specialised higher education researchers, applied researchers/practitioners) and in who funds/supports research on higher education. I will take the diversity as point of departure to reflect on research on higher education policy.

The diversity of the theme itself: A celebration

Even if we think that market mechanisms do not belong in higher education, one of the positive results of marketization is that higher education policy studies have been broadened from doing “another policy evaluation project” to a rich set of studies that also focus on how, why and to what extent governments increasingly rely on market mechanisms, but also focus on how stakeholders beyond governments are playing an increasingly important role in higher education (as they do in other [semi-]public and even in private sectors). In other words, higher education policy is broadened to depict “... a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or the new method by which society is governed” (Rhodes, 1996, p. 652-653). I welcome this development for it allows us – higher education researchers – to broaden our scope and to see policy (change) as part of the larger politico-administrative fabric.

The disciplines and the field specialists: some concerns

The labelling “another policy evaluation project” above, does not do justice to the richness of approaches to policy analysis in general. The disciplinary journals and book series (in political sciences, public administration and public policy, and economics) continue to explore in greater depth aspects of the policy process. Not everything that happens in the disciplines should be welcomed by default, but one should admire the continuing creativity depth of further exploration of key facets of the policy process. To give a couple of examples: I have put Jordan and Turnpenny’s (2015) “The tools of policy formulation: Actors, capacities, venues and effects” and Thissen and Walker’s (2013) “Public policy analysis” on my list of books to read. Interestingly: although I cannot present the full evidence of this, my impression is that higher education policy researchers make very limited use of the rich toolbox offered by the disciplines (see also Huisman, 2009). This relates both to the use of general policy theories (as developed by e.g. Sabatier, Kingdon, and Baumgartner and Jones) and the more specialised literature on elements of the policy process (e.g. policy design, policy implementation, policy evaluation). I have the impression that much more synergy can be realised if we would rely much more on the advances made in the disciplines, instead of developing another short-range idiosyncratic explanation of higher education policy.

Who does the research: overall a celebration ... but some concerns

Another impression, again one that would need further substantiation, is that much research is carried out by those who have not been “educated” in the core policy disciplines or as higher education (policy) researchers. I emphasise the value that this brings to our field. Insights from scholars from the humanities (particularly history) and social sciences (anthropology, sociology) have greatly contributed to refined insights in higher education policy and its impact. One of the downsides of the diversity is, however, that it is difficult – even for seasoned scholars – to keep abreast of everything that appears in sometimes very specialised journals. E.g. I would never have come across the illuminating work of anthropologist Strathern (1997), if I had not been nudged by a colleague. And if an interesting source has been discovered, it is not always easy to come to terms with it, for it often requires a deep(er) understanding of the discourses in that particular discipline.

The value this diversity of backgrounds brings is sometimes distorted by contributions from those that think they can speak authoritatively about higher education, for the simple fact that they have “experiences” in that field. Many higher education managers and institutional leaders suffer from this misplaced authority. Most of these contributions are not very productive, because they do not go beyond anecdotes and storytelling and are seldom embedded in the broader knowledge we have on the specific topic.

The love-hate relationship between research and policy/practice

But maybe this is a benign form of “scholarship”, for at the same time I think that some higher education policy research does not take sufficient distance from its object of study. Higher education (policy) researchers are studying something they are also subject to. This can bring along tensions and it may be difficult to stay

impartial. However, this seems to me key if one of our aims as policy researchers would be to improve policy and practice. We need to continue to speak truth to power (with reference to Aaron Wildavsky's 1979 book title), while at the same time adhering to Merton's values of disinterestedness and organised scepticism.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2009). *Higher education: An emergent field of research and policy*. In R. M. Bassett & A. Maldonado-Maldonado (Eds.), *International organizations and higher education policy: Thinking globally, acting locally?* (pp. 1-31). New York and London: Routledge.
- Huisman, J. (2009). Coming to terms with governance in higher education. In J. Huisman (Ed.), *International perspectives on the governance of higher education. Alternative frameworks for coordination* (pp. 1-9). New York/Abingdon: Routledge
- Huisman, J. (2015). Higher education experts and commissioned research: Between stability, fragility and ambiguity? in M. Souto-Otero (Ed.), *Evaluating European education policy-making. Privatization, networks and the European Commission* (pp. 144-163). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies* 44(4), 652-667.
- Rumbley, L.E., Altbach, Ph.G., Stanfield, D.A., Shimmi, Y, Gayardon, A. de, and R.Y. Chan (2015). *Higher education: A worldwide inventory*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Strathern, M. (1997). 'Improving ratings': audit in the British university system. *European Review*, 5, 305-321.
- Tight, M. (2012). *Researching higher education* (second ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press McGraw Hill Education.

Biography

Jeroen Huisman is professor of Higher Education at the Centre for Higher Education Governance Ghent (CHEGG, www.cheegg.ugent.be), department of Sociology, Ghent University, Belgium. He was researcher at the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, the Netherlands (1991-2005) and professor of Higher Education Management, University of Bath, UK (2005-2013). He is editor of the journal *Higher Education Policy*, co-editor of the Routledge/SRHE Higher Education book series, co-editor of the Emerald book series on Theory and Method in Higher Education Research (with Malcolm Tight) and member of the editorial board of several higher education journals. His research interests are: higher education policy, higher education governance, organizational change in higher education and internationalization and Europeanisation. His recent works include papers on organisational image and identity in *Studies in Higher Education* and *Higher Education Research and Development* and an edited book on salient issues in contemporary higher education research (with Jenni Case).

PERSPECTIVES FROM THE NEW GENERATION OF LEADING RESEARCHERS



Panel Chair: Dr Manja Klemenčič

Manja Klemenčič is Fellow and Lecturer in Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. She researches, teaches, advises and consults in the area of international and comparative higher education, with particular interest on the implications of contemporary higher education reforms on students. She has also researched questions of higher education internationalisation, academic profession, institutional research, university governance and student unionism.

Currently, Manja is working on a book manuscript entitled “Student power in neoliberal age” which investigates student agency towards academic and professional self-formation. She is also a principal investigator and leads the Slovenian research group in the international network on changes in academic profession (CAP II). Manja’s methodological work is devoted to “digital ethnography” which adapts ethnographic and phenomenological methods of inquiry for digital use; thus creating conditions for large-scale participatory qualitative data collection on student experience.

Manja is Editor-in-Chief of *European Journal of Higher Education* (Routledge/Taylor&Francis), associate editor of the section “Elite and Mass Higher Education in the 21st Century” of the *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (Springer), co-editor of the book series *Understanding student experience in higher education* (Bloomsbury) and serves on the Governing Board of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER). Manja received M. Phil and PhD in International Studies from University of Cambridge, Manja is on sabbatical leave as a visiting fellow at POLIS, University of Cambridge and collaborating with CGHE, Institute of Education, UCL.



Going global- opportunities and challenges for HE researchers
Professor Paul Ashwin, Lancaster University

Globally participation in Higher Education is rising rapidly. UNESCO figures for enrolment in tertiary education show that globally, participation rose from 19% in 2000 to 32% in 2012. It is also increasingly an international phenomenon; for example, the number of students studying abroad more than doubled from 2.1m in 2000 to 4.5m in 2012.

The increasing numbers of students internationally has contributed to greater scrutiny of higher education, as it has become a key focus of national and international policy makers. This scrutiny has led to unparalleled information about HE. This greater information presents higher education researchers with both challenges and possibilities because it both tells us more about higher education whilst also simplifying its complexities.

If we take the quality of higher as an example, the recent Yerevan Communiqué from EU Higher Education Ministers declared that “Enhancing the quality and relevance of teaching and learning is the main mission of the EHEA”. This both elevates the status of teaching and learning whilst also raising pressing questions about how we judge the quality of teaching in higher education.

Positions in national and international higher education league tables have become a dominant way of representing this quality. Their attraction is understandable: they travel across a number of contexts and audiences as well as having resonance for prospective students and their families, employers, policy makers, academics and universities, and international bodies. However, their shortcomings are equally obvious: they tend to involve unrelated and incomparable measures that are brought together into a single score by algorithms and weightings that lack any statistical credibility. Crucially, the stability at the top of the league tables reinforces privilege: higher status institutions tend to take in a much greater proportion of privileged students. League tables strongly and wrongly suggest that students who have been to these institutions have received a higher quality education. So even as league tables gives us more information about higher

education, they are distorting our understanding of its quality. It also distorts our understanding of teaching: making it about history and prestige rather than about the ways in which students are given access to powerful knowledge.

Given the problems with League Tables, another attractive way of examining quality is to compare students' learning outcomes from higher education. The idea here is that comparisons of the quality of higher education are based on what students can actually do when they graduate. This raises questions about the extent to which student learning outcomes can be standardised across national and disciplinary boundaries and the extent to which they should reflect the particular and authentic achievements of individual students. There are strong pressures for standardisation in order to allow the measurement of the performance of higher education institutions, and to ensure equitable higher education for all students regardless of which institution they study in. The legitimacy of these demands needs to be recognised given the investments that societies and students make in higher education.

On the other side of this tension, is the view that what is higher about higher education is the personal relationship that students develop with disciplinary and professional knowledge. It is this which provides the transformative aspects of higher education that is so highly valued by students, governments and societies. Thus if standardisation leads to a focus on identifying outcomes that are measurable across contexts rather than outcomes that reflect the way in which students' identities are transformed by their engagement with disciplinary and professional knowledge, then the danger is that we lose more than we gain.

The danger of the increase global information about higher education is that the individual, durable and stable elements of higher education that can be easily measured are given a greater value than those that are collective, complex, changing and country-specific. As higher education researchers, we need to engage with such tensions critically, constructively, collectively and courageously. Critically because we need to challenge the tendency to value only what is measurable and carefully identify the ways in which different simplifications, including our own, offer a partial picture of the world's complexity. Constructively because we need to respect and take seriously the concerns of those both inside and outside of higher education research with whom we may strongly disagree. In doing so, we need to offer alternatives ways of addressing these concerns rather than simply dismissing them through critique. Collectively because we need to recognise and emphasise that the value of higher education research comes from the communal bodies of knowledge that it produces rather than individual researchers or projects. Courageously because our contribution to higher education research is always in the process of becoming. This means that our successes and failures are temporary and, as a community, we need to continually work to show the value of what higher education research can offer. This requires us not to underestimate the challenges involved in offering all students a transformative higher education experience but also not to forget the possibilities offered by the power of higher education to transform students' understanding of the world and their position within it.

Biography

Paul Ashwin is Professor of Higher Education and Head of Department at the Department of Educational Research, Lancaster University, UK. Paul's research focuses on teaching-learning and knowledge-curriculum practices in higher education and their relations to higher education policies.

Paul's book *Analysing Teaching-Learning Interactions in Higher Education* (2009, Continuum) critically examined different approaches to conceptualizing teaching-learning interactions in higher education. He is the lead author of *Reflective Teaching in Higher Education* (2015, Bloomsbury), which is designed for all of those working in higher education who are interested in further developing research-informed approaches to university teaching. Paul recently completed the Economic and Social Research Council funded 'Pedagogic Quality and Inequality in University First Degrees Project, with Monica McLean (University of Nottingham) and Andrea Abbas (University of Lincoln). This project focused on comparing the quality of teaching, learning and curricula in undergraduate sociology and allied subjects in four universities that have different reputations for the quality of the undergraduate experience that they offer. The study aimed to question the assumptions underlying these reputations through an in-depth exploration of the relations between what students bring to university, their experiences of university education and what they gain it.

Paul is a co-investigator in the ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE), which will: conduct, disseminate and publish basic and applied research in three integrated programmes of work, relating to global, national (UK) and local perspectives on higher education; develop theory about higher education and methods of inquiry and research; respond to new issues arising within the frame of the three programmes, and at the interfaces between them; facilitate broad academic and policy discussion about higher education in the UK and across the world; and build long-term capacity in UK social science research on higher education. CGHE is a partnership of three UK universities and eight international universities led by the UCL Institute of Education in London. CGHE's offshore partners are located in Ireland, Netherlands, South Africa,

the United States, Australia, China, Hong Kong SAR and Japan. Its UK partners are Lancaster University and the University of Sheffield. CGHE commences in October 2015 and is supported by £6.1 million in funding over five years.



Access and Widening Participation in Higher Education

Professor Penny Jane Burke, *University of Roehampton, London & University of Newcastle, Australia*

Questions of access and widening participation continue to pose significant challenges for policy-makers and practitioners in higher education with enduring and persistent inequalities at play. Research has a central role to play in shaping the future directions of equity policy and practice, creating innovative methodologies and providing detailed and nuanced analysis to examine and unearth the root causes of ongoing inequalities. Research has traced the ways that inequalities are exacerbated by the multiple uncertainties and complexities characterising contemporary higher education, with profound changes being shaped by externally imposed and interconnecting political forces including globalisation, neoliberalism, neoconservatism, corporatisation, neo-patriarchy and neocolonialism. In this contemporary context of higher education, there is increasing pressure for universities to position themselves as 'world-class', to aggressively compete in a highly stratified field driven by discourses of 'excellence' and to address the expectations of an all embracing league table culture striking at the very heart of university research and teaching. The ways that 'excellence' is placed in tension with 'equity' is unspoken and both 'excellence' and 'equity' are reduced to measurable outputs. Against this hyper-competitive and hierarchical landscape, concerns about widening participation, equity and social justice have been narrowed to aspirations of employability, efficiency and competency, with a strong emphasis on business and economic imperatives and logics.

Widening participation policy and practice has been preoccupied with concerns about 'fair access' and 'raising aspirations' of those classified as 'disadvantaged', 'vulnerable' and/or 'excluded' but simultaneously constructed as 'bright', with 'potential', 'talent' and 'ability'. Such perspectives of widening participation have been extensively critiqued by higher education researchers for failing to address the structures, systems, practices and cultures of educational institutions that are deeply complicit in the social reproduction of inequality and exclusion. The politics of recognition, which profoundly forms processes of selection and exclusion and sensibilities of (not) belonging, is concealed from view. The increasing levels of instrumentalism and utilitarianism shaping discourses of widening participation have been challenged for failing to engage significant and complex questions relating to the right to higher education, not only about who has access, but also the purposes of and what it means to participate in higher education in the twenty-first century. Although most universities now aspire to showcase their 'diversity', this is often couched in the language of the market and the growing levels of the commercialisation of higher education. Such frameworks fail to problematise the ways that diversity is entangled with historical inequalities and the politics of difference and recognition.

Universities are increasingly encouraged to develop 'evidence-based' policy and practice but this locks policy-makers and practitioners into constrained and reductive ways of thinking about equity issues. 'Evidence' emphasises generalisability and objectivity, with a strong focus on the tangible, observable and measurable and is often embedded in those technologies of classification that perpetuate rather than challenge polarising discourses and dividing practices. Evidence is clearly important in uncovering patterns of inequality but only provides restrictive knowledge and insight. The formation of policy and practice for access and widening participation requires a broader 'research-informed' framework, informed by interdisciplinary perspectives and methodologies, that aim to capture the contextual and subjective layers of inequality, which are often unwittingly reproduced through taken-for-granted practices or assumptions. Lived and embodied experiences of inequality are difficult to 'evidence' and measure because these work at the everyday level of lived experience and emotion. Generating knowledge about the ways that insidious inequalities work requires a range of fine-tuned research methodologies that are designed to explore the fluidity of power and social relations, the complexity of intersecting differences and socio-cultural contexts, the ways that social practices and processes might be historically embedded and taken-for-granted, as well as to trace, map and quantify patterns of inequality that are intersecting, multiple and contextual.

Research in the field of equity in higher education has noted that widening participation policy discourses tend to focus on outreach and access, projecting the problem as 'out there' - outside universities - paying little attention to participation in higher education. This ignores the ways that universities are often

deeply complicit in perpetuating inequalities and exclusions through standardising and homogenizing technologies, related to aspirations for 'excellence'. Indeed, some researchers have uncovered the ways that the discourses of 'inclusion' operate as a form of symbolic violence, forcing those seen as 'excluded' to conform to the conventions, expectations and values of dominant frameworks and identities and to participate in a process of 'transformation' into normalised personhoods (Archer, 2003). The limited forms of support provided to students from under-represented backgrounds tend to be remedial in nature, informed by polarising discourses (Williams, 1997), designed to 'fix' and re/form those students identified as 'non-standard' into 'legitimate' students. Similarly, new technologies of managerialism (such as key performance indicators, targets and workload formula) are used to regulate the practices and identities of teachers, researchers and professional staff. Students and staff thus learn that to be a 'participant' in higher education requires the continual working of and on the self, to conform to the institutional requirements and expectations which are framed by external technologies of regulation connected to neoliberal forms of globalisation (such as university world rankings).

Hegemonic policies and practices work to silence and make difference and inequality invisible, often through references to social inclusion, widening participation and diversity. Difference tends to be reduced to the marketing images of happy university students from 'Other' kinds of backgrounds. Diversity is often constructed as unproblematic and desirable, whilst difference is to be controlled through standardisation and disciplining processes. The anxiety about the closeness of the 'Other' to those deemed to be legitimate university participants is often expressed through narratives about the 'dumbing down' of HE pedagogies, the 'feminisation of HE' and the assumed lack of discipline, passion for learning and aspiration often associated with students constructed as non-standard from Other social backgrounds. Those seen as deserving of higher education must conform to and master the normalising and disciplining practices of HE pedagogies, participation and practices.

We need a praxis-based approach to equity - that brings interdisciplinary and critical research in dialogue with policy and practice, in a reciprocal, iterative and collaborative framework. The field of research in equity in higher education must be brought into closer relation with equity policy and practice to build collaborative processes that aim to uncover and challenge the exclusionary effects of technologies of regulation, standardisation and homogenisation. Such a praxis-oriented framework requires critical and reflexive attention to the affective, cultural, subjective and symbolic dimensions of higher educational access and participation, to processes of misrecognition, as well as to forms of redistribution.

Biography

Penny Jane Burke is Global Innovation Chair of Equity and co-Director of the Centre of Excellence for Equity in Higher Education at the University of Newcastle, Australia. She is also Professor of Education at the University of Roehampton, London, where she is co-Founder and co-Director of the Paulo Freire Institute-UK (PFI-UK) and Research in Inequalities, Policy and Education. She is passionately dedicated to developing methodological, theoretical and pedagogical frameworks that support critical understanding and practice of equity and social justice in the field of higher education studies and has been asked to speak widely at high profile events nationally and internationally. She was awarded a full-time Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) PhD studentship from 1998-2001, which resulted in the publication of her sole-authored book *Accessing Education effectively widening participation* (2002, Trentham Books). Her co-authored book *Reconceptualising Lifelong Learning: Feminist Interventions* (Burke and Jackson, 2007, Routledge) was nominated for the 2008 Cyril O. Houle World Award for Outstanding Literature in Adult Education. Her most recent sole-authored book is *The Right to Higher Education: Beyond Widening Participation* (2012, Routledge) and she is currently working on *Changing Pedagogical Spaces in Higher Education* (Burke, Crozier and Misiaszek) to be published by Routledge in 2016 as part of the SRHE's book series. Penny was recipient of the prestigious Higher Education Academy's National Teaching Fellowship award in 2008 and received the Cosmopolitan Woman of Achievement for Education award in 1998. She is the Access and Widening Participation Network co-Convenor for the Society for Research in Higher Education (SRHE), a member of SRHE Governing Council, and a member of the select Scientific Committee of Euredocs. She is Editor of *Teaching in Higher Education*, and a member of SRHE Publications Committee. She served on the ESRC panel of the 'Future of Higher Education' steer for the ESRC Large Grant and Research Centre competition 2014, and is a member of the ESRC Peer Review College. Penny has also held the post of Professor of Education at University of Sussex and Reader in Education at the Institute of Education, University of London (where she was Head of School, Educational Foundations and Policy Studies, Chair of the Widening Participation Committee and Course Leader of the MA in Higher and Professional Education).



Reflective Teaching in Higher Education

Dr Kelly Coate, *King's Learning Institute, King's College London*

Those of us who research higher education, and universities in particular, are endlessly offered rich sources of data from one of the most enduring and fascinating institutions in the world. Higher education is an unusual site of research, given the wide range of disciplines that can be employed and the diversity of approaches that can be taken. It is unusual for other reasons too: here in the SRHE we continue to develop as a very strong community of higher education specialists, but we know that almost anyone who works in academia might fancy trying their hand at doing higher education research, most likely in their classrooms but increasingly with other groups such as administrators or managers. Some of us may despair at the lack of knowledge and depth that higher education research 'amateurs' bring to bear on the field, but others of us encourage novices to get involved, mainly through the postgraduate programmes in academic practice that have become embedded in many institutions. Therefore another distinctive feature of higher education research is that we speak to many audiences through our publications. Mainly - as in common with other disciplinary specialists - we like to talk to each other, but our books and articles are increasingly used in those academic practice programmes just mentioned, and so a wide range of other disciplinary experts are now engaging with our work.

It is not just the textbooks on teaching (eg Ashwin et al 2015) that end up in the hands of our colleagues across our institutions, but it is also the scholarly output of many of the speakers here today. We share this work with others in order to encourage reflection on academic practice and to promote change. I will hesitate before using the somewhat dreaded term 'impact', but I do believe that most of us are here because we value the role that higher education plays in society and we want to continue making positive changes for students and staff in universities. Our belief in the value of higher education then becomes something we want to share with our colleagues who may work in universities but who may identify more with their own disciplinary communities than with their employing institutions.

Yet those of us who do try to promote critical reflection on our practices in higher education soon discover how challenging it is to shift entrenched views as we bump up against old habits and traditions. The 'new' and the 'old' exists side-by-side in universities and this dichotomy engenders another unique feature of higher education research. Particularly in the contemporary context, those of us working in universities are facing enormous prospects of change, yet much of our day-to-day lives continue on in ways that would still be recognisable even to medieval scholars. There are a number of aspects of university life where it is possible to talk in terms of radical, unprecedented change while at the same time we continue on with very familiar practices.

Just to give a quick flavour: technology is one obvious example of an aspect of university life that prompts excited discussions about how a radically new approach to higher education is on the horizon. Technology does offer the potential for teachers to transform their practice, for example, and yet within universities blackboard and chalk are still sometimes used as teaching tools (unlike primary schools). The university itself is another enduring feature of higher education in spite of decades of discussion about its imminent ruin and death. The university as an institution might continue to exist today, but those of us researching higher education tend to write from quite defensive positions, lamenting the neo-liberal influences on academic life, managerial practices and the corporatization of universities. We note the lack of an articulation of humanitarian values and a social justice ethos. As Bob Lingard argued at a recent conference in Lancaster, the 'world-class university' as a concept is an empty signifier; or as my colleagues Alan Cribb and Sharon Gewirtz suggest, the 'hollowed-out universities' of today lack intrinsic value and have 'no distinctive social role and no ethical *raison-d'être*' (Cribb & Gewirtz 2013: 340).

These paradoxes require a fine balancing act: we need to be cognisant of the importance of tradition, wary of over-hyped claims that radical change is on the way, and yet maintain the ability to foster purposeful change in the face of challenges to our core values. Working with those outside of the field of higher education research is necessary but difficult. Part of my motivation for ruminating on the value and impact of higher education research is because I believe it can and should encourage reflection and change amongst the wider academic community. Those who are not thinking, reading, reflecting and researching on higher education are allowing the value of universities to be ignored and eroded. Here in the SRHE there have been many discussions over a number of years about how we can turn our research into a positive force for change, particularly in relation to policy. I am suggesting we can also use our research more effectively

to influence thinking and inform practice amongst our colleagues. We need our audiences to be broad so that together we can re-assert the role of universities in a contemporary climate which demands a clear articulation of purpose.

These paradoxes require a fine balancing act: we need to be cognisant of the importance of tradition, wary of over-hyped claims that radical change is on the way, and yet maintain the ability to foster purposeful change in the face of challenges to our core values. Working with those outside of the field of higher education research is necessary but difficult. Part of my motivation for ruminating on the value and impact of higher education research is because I believe it can and should encourage reflection and change amongst the wider academic community. Those who are not thinking, reading, reflecting and researching on higher education are allowing the value of universities to be ignored and eroded. Here in the SRHE there have been many discussions over a number of years about how we can turn our research into a positive force for change, particularly in relation to policy. I am suggesting we can also use our research more effectively to influence thinking and inform practice amongst our colleagues. We need our audiences to be broad so that together we can re-assert the role of universities in a contemporary climate which demands a clear articulation of purpose.

References

- Ashwin, P. et al (2015) *Reflective Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Cribb, A. and Gewirtz, S. (2013) *The hollowed-out university? A critical analysis of changing institutional and academic norms in UK higher education*. *Discourse* 34(3): 338-350.
- Lingard, B. (2015) 'Conceptualising and researching the impact of global higher education policies on practices in universities.' Paper presented at the Exploring the policy-practice nexus in higher education research Conference, 4th June 2015, University of Lancaster.

Biography

Kelly Coate is Director of the King's Learning Institute, King's College London. She was previously a lecturer in higher education at the National University of Ireland, Galway, where she ran the MA in Academic Practice. Prior to that, she was a researcher and lecturer at the UCL Institute of Education, where she taught on a number of programmes including the MBA in Higher Education Management. She is a co-convenor of the SRHE's Digital University Network and a member of Council. Her publications are in the areas of internationalisation of higher education, the higher education curriculum, and gender in higher education. She is a contributor to the new book, *Reflective Teaching in Higher Education* (Ashwin et al 2015) published by Bloomsbury.

PARTICIPANTS' LIST

Asma Ahsan	UCL Institute of Education, London	aahsan@ioe.ac.uk
Patrick Ainley	University of Greenwich	patrickjdainley@aol.com
Mary Andall-Stanberry	Canterbury Christ Church University	mary.andall-stanberry@canterbury.ac.uk
Deborah Anderson	Kingston University	d.anderson@kingston.ac.uk
Valerie Anderson	University of Portsmouth	valerie.anderson@port.ac.uk
Fabio Arico	University of East Anglia	f.arico@uea.ac.uk
Pauline Armsby	University of Westminster	p.armsby@wmin.ac.uk
Paul Ashwin	Lancaster University	p.ashwin@lancaster.ac.uk
Veronica Bamber	Queen Margaret University	vbamber@qmu.ac.uk
Ana Baptista	Queen Mary University of London	a.baptista@qmul.ac.uk
Sally Barnes	University of Bristol	sally.barnes@bristol.ac.uk
Ronald Barnett	UCL Institute of Education, London	r.barnett@ioe.ac.uk
Madeleine Barrows	Academy of Social Sciences	m.barrows@acss.org.uk
Denise Batchelor	Heythrop College	Denise.Batchelor@heythropcollege.ac.uk
Ann-Marie Bathmaker	University of Birmingham	a.m.bathmaker@bham.ac.uk
Patrick Baughan	City University London	p.baughan@city.ac.uk
Fran Beaton	University of Kent	f.m.beaton@kent.ac.uk
Heike Behle	Institute for Employment Research (IER)	Heike.Behle@warwick.ac.uk
Ibrar Bhatt	Lancaster University	i.bhatt@lancaster.ac.uk
Paul Blackmore	King's College London	paul.blackmore@kcl.ac.uk
Richard Blackwell	Southampton Solent University	richard.blackwell@solent.ac.uk
Andrew Boggs	University of Oxford, Department of Education	andrew.boggs@alumni.utoronto.ca
Alex Bols	GuildHE	alex.bols@guildhe.ac.uk
Rosemary Borup	Staffordshire University	R.Borup@staffs.ac.uk
David Boud	University of Technology Sydney	David.Boud@uts.edu.au
Julie Bounford	University of East Anglia	julie.bounford@uea.ac.uk
Catherine Bovill	University of Glasgow	catherine.bovill@glasgow.ac.uk
Fiona Boyle	Queen Margaret University	fboyle@qmu.ac.uk
Corinne Boz	Anglia Ruskin University	corinne.boz@anglia.ac.uk
John Brennan	Open University	j.l.brennan@open.ac.uk
Angela Brew	Macquarie University	angela.brew@mq.edu.au
Gary Browning	Oxford Brookes University	gkbrowning@brookes.ac.uk
Richard Budd	University of Bristol	richard.budd@bristol.ac.uk
Rebecca Bunting	Buckinghamshire New University	rebecca.bunting@bucks.ac.uk
Robert Burgess	SRHE President	sirbobburgess@outlook.com
Penny Jane Burke	University of Roehampton	p.burke@roehampton.ac.uk
Sue Burkill	University of Exeter	sue.burkill@exeter.ac.uk
Olga Burukina	Moscow State Institute for Tourism Industry	oburukina@yahoo.com
Tina Byrom	Nottingham Trent University	tina.byrom@ntu.ac.uk
Martha Caddell	Open University	martha.caddell@open.ac.uk
Helen Carasso	University of Oxford	helen.carasso@admin.ox.ac.uk
Vincent Carpentier	UCL Institute of Education, London	v.carpentier@ioe.ac.uk
Franco Carta	SRHE	fcarta@srhe.ac.uk
Deesha Chadha	King's College London	deesha.chadha@kcl.ac.uk
Matthew Cheeseman	University of Sheffield	matt.cheeseman@shef.ac.uk
Heather Clay	Middlesex University Business School	H.Clay@mdx.ac.uk
Sue Clegg	Leeds Beckett University	S.Clegg@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Sara Clethero	University of West London (London College of Music)	sara.clethero@operamint.co.uk
Deanne Clouder	Coventry University	d.l.clouder@coventry.ac.uk
Kelly Coate	King's College London	kelly.coate@kcl.ac.uk
Helen Corkill	University of Bedfordshire	helen.corkill@beds.ac.uk
Carol Costley	Middlesex University	c.costley@mdx.ac.uk
Annika Coughlin	UCL Institute of Education, London	annika.coughlin@gmail.com
Paul Coyle	National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education	paul.coyle@ncee.org.uk
Mary Curnock Cook	UCAS	m.curnockcook@ucas.ac.uk
Rob Cuthbert	University of the West of England	rob.cuthbert@uwe.ac.uk
Vaneeta-Marie D'Andrea	University of the Arts	vmdandrea@hotmail.com
Miriam David	UCL Institute of Education, London	M.David@ioe.ac.uk
Jason Davies	University College London	j.p.davies@ucl.ac.uk
Richard Davies	Aberystwyth University	Rid11@aber.ac.uk
Carole Davis	Middlesex University	c.l.davis@mdx.ac.uk
Pam Denicolo	University of Surrey/Reading	p.m.denicolo@reading.ac.uk

Camila Devis-Rozental	Bournemouth University	cdevisrozental@bournemouth.ac.uk
Marcia Devlin	Federation University Australia	mttdevlin@gmail.com
Claire Donovan	Brunel University London	Claire.donovan@brunel.ac.uk
Dawn Duke	University of Surrey	d.duke@surrey.ac.uk
Les Ebdon	OFFA	director@offa.org.uk
Sue Eccles	Bournemouth University	seccles@bournemouth.ac.uk
Heather Eggins		heggins@btinternet.com
Noel Entwistle	University of Edinburgh	noel.entwistle@ed.ac.uk
Linda Evans	University of Leeds	L.Evans@education.leeds.ac.uk
Gillian Evans	University of Cambridge	gre1001@cam.ac.uk
Joelle Fanghanel	University of West London	Joelle.Fanghanel@uwl.ac.uk
Ourania Filippakou	University of Hull	o.filippakou@hull.ac.uk
Peter Fine	UCL Eastman Dental Institute	p.fine@ucl.ac.uk
Michael Finn	Liverpool Hope University	kavanae@hope.ac.uk
Abbi Flint	Higher Education Academy	abbi.flint@heacademy.ac.uk
Alan Floyd	University of Reading	alan.floyd@reading.ac.uk
Karen Foley	Open University	k.foley@open.ac.uk
John Francis	Brunel University	john.francis@brunel.ac.uk
Abhijit Ganguly	University of Northwest Europe, Netherlands	abhijitganguly.hrd@gmail.com
Bryan Gopaul	University of Rochester	bgopaul@warner.rochester.edu
Martin Gough	University of Liverpool	m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk
Lesley Gourlay	UCL Institute of Education, London	l.gourlay@ioe.ac.uk
Sarah Graham	University of Sunderland	sarah.louise.graham@sunderland.ac.uk
Rob Gresham	SRHE	rgresham@srhe.ac.uk
Didi Griffioen	Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences	d.m.e.griffioen@hva.nl
Andrew Gunn	University of Leeds	a.s.gunn@leeds.ac.uk
Elizabeth Halford	Quality Assurance Agency	e.halford@qaa.ac.uk
Sally Hancock	University of York	sally.hancock@york.ac.uk
Gunnar Handal	University of Oslo	gunnar.handal@iped.uio.no
Julian Hargreaves	University of Roehampton	julian.hargreaves@mail.com
Neil Harrison	University of the West of England	neil.harrison@uwe.ac.uk
Caroline Hart	Sheffield Hallam University	c.hart@sheffield.ac.uk
Lee Harvey	SRHE Fellow	leecolinharvey@gmail.com
Richard Harvey	University of East Anglia	rwh@uea.ac.uk
Stylianos Hatzipanagos	King's College London	s.hatzipanagos@kcl.ac.uk
David Hay	King's College London	david.2.hay@kcl.ac.uk
Annette Hayton	University of Bath	A.R.Hayton@bath.ac.uk
Nicolaas Heerens	University of Exeter	nik.heerens@gmail.com
Emily Henderson	UCL Institute of Education, London	emily_frascatore@hotmail.com
Mary Henkel	Brunel University	henkel864@gmail.com
Ivette Hernandez	UCL Institute of Education, London	ivehersant@hotmail.com
Monica-Cristiana Hess	University of Chichester	M.Hess@chi.ac.uk
Helen Higson	Aston University	h.e.higson@aston.ac.uk
Yvonne Hillier	University of Brighton	y.g.j.hillier@brighton.ac.uk
Nicholas Hillman	Higher Education Policy Institute	n.hillman@hepi.ac.uk
Sarah Horton-Walsh	Coventry University	aa8336@coventry.ac.uk
Jeroen Huisman	Ghent University	jeroen.huisman@ugent.be
Donna Hurford	SDU Universitetspædagogik	dhu@sdu.dk
Jill Jameson	University of Greenwich	j.jameson@gre.ac.uk
Ben Johnson	HEFCE	b.johnson@hefce.ac.uk
Paul Johnson	Director Institute for Fiscal Studies	paul_j@ifs.org.uk
Anna Jones	Glasgow Caledonian University	anna.jones@gcu.ac.uk
Mary-Jane Jones	Bournemouth University	jonesj@bournemouth.ac.uk
Peter Kahn	University of Liverpool	kahn@liv.ac.uk
Abdul Kaiser	London South Bank University	akmksr@yahoo.co.uk
Camille Kandiko Howson	King's College London	camille.kandiko_howson@kcl.ac.uk
Mary-Louise Kearney	Editor, Special Issues Studies in HE	kearneyml@gmail.com
Ewart Keep	University of Oxford	ewart.keep@education.ox.ac.uk
Eileen Kennedy	UCL Institute of Education, London	e.kennedy@ioe.ac.uk
Mark Kerrigan	Anglia Ruskin University	Mark.Kerrigan@anglia.ac.uk
Terri Kim	University of East London	t.c.kim@uel.ac.uk
Ian Kinchin	University of Surrey	i.kinchin@surrey.ac.uk
Virginia King	Coventry University	v.c.king@coventry.ac.uk
Manja Klemenčič	Harvard University	manja.klemencic@gmail.com

Henry Kwok	The Open University of Hong Kong	yshkwok@gmail.com
Sue Law	University of Leicester	sue.law@leicester.ac.uk
Mary Lea	Open University	marylea@yahoo.co.uk
Mark Leach	WonkHE	mark@wonkhe.com
Carole Leathwood	London Metropolitan University	c.leathwood@londonmet.ac.uk
Anne Lee	Independent	dr.anne.lee@which.net
Rebecca Lees	Kingston University	r.lees@kingston.ac.uk
Liudvika Leisyte	Center for Higher Education, TU Dortmund	liudvika.leisyte@tu-dortmund.de
Dave Lewis	University of Leeds	d.i.lewis@leeds.ac.uk
Carenza Lewis	University of Cambridge	cr129@cam.ac.uk
Dina Lewis	University of Hull	d.lewis@hull.ac.uk
Moira Sally Lewitt	University of the West of Scotland	moira.lewitt@uws.ac.uk
Eunice Li	UCL Institute of Education, London	hsiaofenli@hotmail.com
Sian Lindsay	City University London	sian.lindsay.1@city.ac.uk
Xu Liu	UCL Institute of Education, London	xliu01@ioe.ac.uk
William Locke	UCL Institute of Education, London	W.Locke@ioe.ac.uk
Kirsteen Macdonald	Middlesex University	k.macdonald@mdx.ac.uk
Bruce Macfarlane	University of Southampton	Bruce.Macfarlane@soton.ac.uk
Simon Macklin	GSM London	simon.macklin@gsm.org.uk
Janice Malcolm	University of Kent	j.malcolm@kent.ac.uk
Irene Malcolm	Heriot-Watt University	i.malcolm@hw.ac.uk
Arthur Male	Doctoral School UCL Institute of Education	amale@ioe.ac.uk
Nicola Manches	SRHE	nmanches@srhe.ac.uk
Simon Marginson	UCL Institute of Education, London	s.marginson@ioe.ac.uk
Alexander Masardo	University of Bath	A.Masardo@bath.ac.uk
Frederico Matos	King's College London	frederico.matos@kcl.ac.uk
Marian Mayer	Bournemouth University	mmayer@bournemouth.ac.uk
Helen Mcallister	University of the Arts London	h.mcallister@arts.ac.uk
Colin Mccaig	Sheffield Hallam University	c.mccaig@shu.ac.uk
Tristan Mccowan	UCL Institute of Education, London	trmccowan@gmail.com
Ian McNay	University of Greenwich	i.mcnay@gre.ac.uk
Debbie Mcvitty	National Union of Students	debbie.mcvitty@nus.org.uk
Vincent Meek	University of Melbourne	vmeek@unimelb.edu.au
Graham Megson	University of Westminster	s.gachette@westminster.ac.uk
Justine Mercer	University of Warwick	justine.mercer@warwick.ac.uk
Viviana Meschitti	Birkbeck, University of London	v.meschitti@bbk.ac.uk
Hazel Messenger	London Metropolitan University Guildhall Faculty of Business and Law	h.messenger@londonmet.ac.uk
Robin Middlehurst	Kingston University	r.middlehurst@kingston.ac.uk
Chris Millward	HEFCE	C.MILLWARD@hefce.ac.uk
Catherine Minett-Smith	University of Bedfordshire	Cathy.Minett-Smith@beds.ac.uk
Sarah Montano	University of Birmingham	s.e.montano@bham.ac.uk
Catherine Montgomery	University of Hull	c.montgomery@hull.ac.uk
Louise Morley	University of Sussex	l.morley@sussex.ac.uk
Anna Mountford-Zimdars	King's Learning Institute, King's College London	anna.zimdars@gmail.com
Rajani Naidoo	University of Bath	R.Naidoo@bath.ac.uk
Erna Nairz-Wirth	Vienna University of Economics and Business - Education Sciences Group	erna.nairz-wirth@wu.ac.at
Gillian Nicholls	University of Surrey	g.nicholls@surrey.ac.uk
Jon Nixon	Hong Kong Institute of Higher Education	nixonjon@live.co.uk
Paula Nottingham	Middlesex University	paulanottingham@btinternet.com
Martin Oliver	UCL Institute of Education, London	m.oliver@ioe.ac.uk
Lena Ornberg	Lund University	lena.ornberg@sam.lu.se
Susan Orr	University of the Arts London	s.orr@arts.ac.uk
David Palfreyman	University of Oxford, New College	sophie.lopez-welsch@new.ox.ac.uk
Gareth Parry	University of Sheffield	g.w.parry@sheffield.ac.uk
Helen Perkins	Society for Research in Higher Education	hsperkins@srhe.ac.uk
Victoria Perselli	Kingston University	v.perselli@kingston.ac.uk
John Pratt	University of East London	j.pratt@uel.ac.uk
Alicia Prowse	Manchester Metropolitan University	a.prowse@mmu.ac.uk
Jim Pugh	Staffordshire University	j.pugh@staffs.ac.uk
Kate Purcell	University of Warwick	kate.purcell@warwick.ac.uk
Kathleen Quinlan	University of Oxford. Oxford Learning Institute	kathleen.quinlan@learning.ox.ac.uk
Julie Rattray	University of Durham	julie.rattray@durham.ac.uk

Julie Reeves	University of Southampton	j.d.reeves@soton.ac.uk
John Richardson	Open University	John.T.E.Richardson@open.ac.uk
Alan Roberts	National Union of Students	alan.roberts@nus.org.uk
Bruce Roberts	Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group	bruce.roberts@tandf.co.uk
Patricia Rogers	Coventry University	Bsx198@coventry.ac.uk
Fiona Ross	Leadership Foundation for Higher Education	fiona.ross@lfhe.ac.uk
Nicola Savvides	King's College London	nicola.savvides@gmail.com
Jason Schaub	Buckinghamshire New University	jason.schaub@bucks.ac.uk
Rebecca Schendel	UCL Institute of Education, London	r.schendel@ioe.ac.uk
The Baroness Sharp Of Guildford	House of Lords	sharpm@parliament.uk
Michael Shattock	UCL Institute of Education, London	m.shattock@ioe.ac.uk
Lynn Shaw	University of Kent	ljs64@kent.ac.uk
Sue Shepherd	University of Kent	s.j.shepherd-62@kent.ac.uk
Robin Shields	University of Bath	r.a.shields@bath.ac.uk
Eunice Simmons	Nottingham Trent University	eunice.simmons@ntu.ac.uk
Christina Slade	Bath Spa University	vice-chancellor@bathspa.ac.uk
Francois Smit	SRHE	fsmit@srhe.ac.uk
Karen Smith	University of Hertfordshire	k.smith27@herts.ac.uk
Alan Smithers	University of Buckingham	alan.smithers@buckingham.ac.uk
Maureen Spencer	Middlesex University	m.spencer@mdx.ac.uk
Jacqueline Stevenson	Sheffield Hallam University	jacqueline.stevenson@shu.ac.uk
Mary Stuart	University of Lincoln	mstuart@lincoln.ac.uk
David Sweeney	HEFCE	d.sweeney@hefce.ac.uk
Roshani Swift		roshdave2@talktalk.net
Ted Tapper	Fellow, SRHE	kmtapper@aol.com
Pam Tatlow	Million+	pamtatlow@millionplus.ac.uk
John Taylor	University of Liverpool	john.taylor@liverpool.ac.uk
William Taylor	SRHE Past President	william.taylor@btinternet.com
Kate Thomas	Birkbeck, University of London	kate.thomas@sps.bbk.ac.uk
Voldemar Tomusk	Open Society Foundation	voldemar.tomusk@opensocietyfoundations.org
Sheila Trahar	University of Bristol	s.trahar@bristol.ac.uk
Paul Trowler	Lancaster University	p.trowler@lancaster.ac.uk
Vicki Trowler	University of Edinburgh	vicki.trowler@ed.ac.uk
David Turner	University of Glamorgan	david.turner@southwales.ac.uk
Belinda Tynan	Open University	belinda.tynan@open.ac.uk
Charikleia Tzanakou	University of Warwick	charikleia.tzanakou@warwick.ac.uk
Roeland Van Der Rijst	Leiden University	rrijst@iclon.leidenuniv.nl
Greg Wade	Universities UK	Ayden.Wilson@universitiesuk.ac.uk
Shan Wareing	London South Bank University	shan.wareing@lsbu.ac.uk
Richard Watermeyer	University of Warwick	r.watermeyer@warwick.ac.uk
Daniel Weinbren	Open University	daniel.weinbren@open.ac.uk
Saranne Weller	University of the Arts London	s.weller@arts.ac.uk
Celia Whitchurch	UCL Institute of Education, London	c.whitchurch@ioe.ac.uk
Ian White	Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group	ian.white@tandf.co.uk
Denise Whitelock	Open University	denise.whitelock@open.ac.uk
Sarah Wilkins	Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group	Sarah.Wilkins@tandf.co.uk
Gareth Williams	UCL Institute of Education, London	g.williams@ioe.ac.uk
Joanna Williams	University of Kent	J.G.Williams@kent.ac.uk
Matthew Williamson	Queen Mary University of London	m.williamson@qmul.ac.uk
Angela Wilson		aangela@wilsa.freeseerve.co.uk
Graeme Wise	National Union of Students	graeme.wise@nus.org.uk
Gina Wisker	University of Brighton	G.Wisker@brighton.ac.uk
Steve Woodfield	Kingston University	s.woodfield@kingston.ac.uk
John Wyatt	SRHE Fellow	Wjohnmar@aol.com
Alexander Yandovsky	Senkevich State Institute for Tourism Industry in Moscow	yandovskia@mail.ru

CONTINUING THE CONVERSATION AND ENGAGING WITH SRHE

Facilitating discourse and providing opportunities for researchers to meet together and share research interests are some of the core activities of the Society. There are many ways to engage with SRHE and much as we are keen to continue to grow our membership, this is a personal choice for researchers. All of our events, activities, publications and most of our awards are open to all. Here are just some of the ways in which you can engage with SRHE and participate in discussions and events.

SRHE Networks

The Society convenes and supports 12 special interest networks. Each network offers a varied programme of at least 3 seminars a year with invited speakers. For the current programme of SRHE network events visit www.srhe.ac.uk/networks/

Academic Practice
Access and Widening Participation
Digital University
Employability, Enterprise and Work-based Learning.
Higher Education Close-up
Higher Education Policy
International Research and Researchers
Newer Researchers
Post-Compulsory and Higher Education
Postgraduate Issues
South West Regional Network
Student Experience

Professional Development Workshops

The Society runs a full programme of professional development workshops for newer and mid-career researchers. For the current programme of SRHE PDP events visit www.srhe.ac.uk/events/

Research Awards

The Society directly funds research through three different types of awards: Annual Research Awards, Scoping Awards and Newer Researcher Awards. www.srhe.ac.uk/research/

Publications

The Society has 4 journals and a book series publishing a wide range of research:

Studies in Higher Education
Research into Higher Education Abstracts
Policy Reviews in Higher Education (from 2016)
Higher Education Quarterly

SRHE/Routledge Book Series: Research into Higher Education

www.srhe.ac.uk/publications/

SRHE Conference

The Society runs the largest UK based Conference on higher education research.

SRHE Annual Research Conference 9-11 December 2015

SRHE Newer Researchers Conference 8 December 2015

Celtic Manor, Newport in South Wales, United Kingdom

Converging Concepts in Global Higher Education Research:

Local, national and international perspectives

www.srhe.ac.uk/conference2015/

SRHE NEWS and SRHE Blog

www.srheblog.com

Finally share your ideas, thoughts, reflections and passions by writing for SRHE NEWS or preparing a piece for the SRHE blog.

Contact Editor Rob Cuthbert rob.cuthbert@uwe.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 the Society is an NGO in operational relations with UNESCO.

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

- is a specialist publisher of higher education research, journals and books, amongst them Studies in Higher Education, Higher Education Quarterly, Research into Higher Education Abstracts and a long running book series.
- operates a regular programme of network events/seminars and professional development workshops throughout the year for researchers and practitioners working in higher education from every discipline.
- 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.

- Funds a series of dedicated research awards to members, non-members, and newer researchers, in order to encourage and support new research into higher education.

SRHE membership benefits include:

- Free attendance at SRHE network and professional development events
- Reduced rate journal subscriptions and books from a range of publisher catalogues
- Discounted rates for the SRHE conference
- Free subscription to Research into HE Abstracts & SRHE News
- The opportunity to apply for member research awards
- On-line access to the latest issues of a suite of higher education journals

To find out more visit www.srhe.ac.uk and click on 'Join us'

SRHE

Society for Research into Higher Education

Advancing knowledge Informing policy Enhancing practice

73 Collier Street
London N1 9BE
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)20 7427 2350
F +44 (0)20 7278 1135
E srheoffice@srhe.ac.uk

www.srhe.ac.uk

Director: Helen Perkins
Registered Charity No. 313850
Company No. 00868820
Limited by Guarantee
Registered office as above