**Caring and higher education**

Literature review

Caring is a fundamental component of human relations and connectedness. The significance of care in education is a relatively well-established conversation in the scholarly literature on primary schooling, less so in the work that describes high school, and relatively invisible in the tertiary contexts. Where discussions about care do exist in the university context, they are primarily (and rightly) concerned with defining what a caring higher education teacher does (Barrow, 2015; Trout & Basford, 2016; Trout, 2018), or the needs and experiences of care-giving students (Brooks, 2012; Moreau & Kerner, 2015; Moreau, 2016) and academics (Pillay, 2009; Amsler & Motta, 2017). From a disciplinary perspective, the majority of the literature that attends to care as part of higher education relates to the work of teacher educators (Sumison, 2000; Huber, 2010; Chantelier & Rudolph, 2018; Trout, 2018), which aligns with the focus on care as part of teaching in compulsory education contexts. Two other significant intersectional themes that emerge from a review of this literature are the focus on the gendered nature of caring, with many scholars noting the dominance of ideas of care as feminised (Acker, 1995; Sumison, 2000; Moreau & Kerner, 2015; Lu, 2018), others have noted the diversity in terms of cultural dimensions of what it means to care in higher education contexts (Mariskind, 2014; Trout, 2018). There has not, to date, been a comprehensive study of what constitutes care, including perceptions from students, staff and the institution), in higher education.

A dominant theme across the small body of work that has focused on care in the context of higher education is the challenges posed by the neoliberal, competitive logics that drive contemporary work (study, teaching, research, practice) in the academy, resulting in what Bosanquet (2017) describes as a situation of ‘undercare’. For students, the push towards individualised approaches means that university structures dominantly require students to self-diagnose issues and find appropriate supports, and where the support is offered, it’s often by people with pastoral roles rather than academic advisors (Tett et al., 2017); consequently, this often results in more articulate and confident students being the ones who seek support. For ‘at-risk’ students, support is largely offered only once they have been identified in the system as a result of poor results. Tett et al.’s (2017) exploration of students’ perceptions of care suggest that many students do not perceive their needs as being a priority for their lecturers, with several noting anxiety about asking for help because of their awareness of the time pressure that their lecturers face. Tellingly, a student-participant in Tett et al.’s study claimed that developing a relationship with a lecturer was a matter of ‘good luck’, and thus abnormal.

For staff, the conditions of new managerialist models of higher education — characterised by increasing hyper-competitiveness, and reduced resources and job stability — have created and sustain the ‘undercaring’ system that they are abused by and complicit in. O’Brien (2010) points to challenges of intensified workload of academics, casualisation, personal life and own caring needs, especially when the caring is often one-sided (teachers caring for, rarely the one cared for): “Teachers might feel more cared for if institutions were more caring; if they were seen as more than interchangeable workers in the academy’s market economy” (p.114). Moreover, as Lynch (2010) compellingly argues, carelessness in modern higher education is considered ‘morally worthy’. All staff who have limits (imposed or decided) on their capacity to work (and care by association) are disadvantaged with idealised neo-entrepreneurial subjectivities: “Women and men who cannot work unpaid hours are likely to be severely disadvantaged within the academy” (2010, 58), which Walker & Gleaves (2016) characterise as ‘caring as less than’, in the ways that it subordinates and disadvantages those higher education teachers who dare to care. Similarly, Mariskind (2014) argues that, “When universities foster individualism and competition between staff, it can be difficult for a caring community to thrive, especially if care is based on a shared responsibility to ensure that all people can live fulfilling lives” (p.309). Further consensus comes from Barnacle & Dall’Alba (2017), who argue that a key problem with dominant student engagement strategies is the need to forego the personal for the public, meaning “there is an expectation personal values be set aside or surrendered in favour of values that support a performativity agenda” (p.9). This privileging of performativity erodes possibilities for open-ness and risk. It seems that within care will only be recognised when it is professionalised. However, for many university educators, the competitive logics that privilege individualistic success (in the guise of successful grant applications, publications, citations, metrics of productivity); sadly, Lynch’s lament from 2010, that “to be a successful academic is to be unencumbered by caring” (p.63), still holds true nearly a decade later.
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| Acker, S. (1995). [Carry on caring: the work of women teachers](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1393124?seq=1), *British Journal of Sociology of**Education*, 16, 21–36.CANAnnotated by Sally BakerPRIMARY SCHOOL | **Context:** Gendered experiences/ constructions of care in teaching/ primary school workplace cultures**Theoretical frame:** Feminist views of caring: relational/ cultural feminist/ ethic of care, connectedness = more characteristic of women than men (but see arguments about essentialism); other (UK) literature has explored the unpaid invisible labour of caring. In context of teaching, some literature has challenged gendered notions of care, with Nias (1989) arguing that men are as likely as women to get attached to their students; however, maternal connotations of care in teaching = deep roots. The model of teaching in primary (one teacher per class) = mimics “mother-like intense attachments and dedication… in their kitchen-like classrooms” (p.23). Literature argues that similar to ‘good mothers’, ‘good teachers’ “find their work is never done” (p.24); this mothering discourse disguises the fact that classrooms are workplaces, which creates the conditions for caring to be felt as a burden: “Teachers' caring activities, then, have from one perspective been seen as derived from their teacher identities; from another, as part of 'women's ways'; and from a third, as a consequence of the social expectations that women's caring work should blur the distinction between labour and love” (p.24).**Methodology:** Ethnographic study of ‘Hillview’ school (inner city, not super deprived, primary, mostly white staff, led by a woman, children = mixed social class and ethnicities). Fieldwork over several years (totally 880 hours)**Findings:** Teachers in Hillview demonstrated “evidence of dedication beyond the call of duty” (p.25) — leading to the teachers feeling/ being very tired. Teachers identified with their class, using terms like ‘my/ your children’. Relaxed and informal communication observed, with teachers ‘forgetting their dignity’ [and acting like parents].Many sources of stress for teachers too. School was not well-resourced (limited space, outdoor toilets, cold). Teachers lamented the lack of materials (compared with other better-equipped schools) and swapped tips on where to find cheap materials/ conserve those that they had. Discipline = “perennial problem” (p.27), especially at beginning/ end of school year. Teachers described feeling like their efforts to care were not recognised by children and/or parents, and felt guilty about how they felt when things/ people were challenging.Discussion of teacher culture (literature argues both that primary teachers are isolated in their classrooms, but also that there are examples of collaborative cultures). The atmosphere in Hillview is described as “familial” and collegial (p.30) and teachers contributed to the running in domestic ways (such as baking for the school fair). Teachers supported each other emotionally (and practically) and socialise together.**Core argument:** Acker’s research illuminates two forms of caring: teachers caring for the children and caring for each other.“Teachers cared deeply about the children and often had close relationships with their classes. Their behaviour is characteristic of 'women's caring', but it is caring in a context” (p.32). Teacher-student relationships = in flux and constantly negotiated “My view is that there are certain cultural scripts seen as suitable for women in a given place and time, the caring script among them. It is not always possible for cultures to be organized around support and caring, even when they have women in them. A competitive work environment, or a manager with other ideas, would work against the emergence of such a culture” (p.33). |
| Allen, M. (2010). [In defence of targeting? The Open University’s Community Partnership Programme](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/openu/jwpll/2010/00000012/a00201s2/art00014), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 12 (SI), 138–153.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *outreach, partnerships, community, targeting* | **Context:** Post-Dearing/ New Labour expansion targets in UK (late 1990s) and WP agenda in UK. Examines targeted community-based outreach for widening participation to the Open University (distance university in the UK) – focused on part-time distance learners and in poorest areas. Notes literature that comments on WP not impacting the gap between rich and poor, and the argument that WP = recruitment to expand student numbers. Author comments on role/ engagement of middle class parents “in a range of activities geared to ensure the transmission of educational privilege” (p.139; see Devine, 2004). Targeting = government response to middle class parents gaming the system (SB’s words). Targeting = problematic: perceived as top-down, bureaucratic. Definitions of what/who should be targeted = most difficult because of slippage with terms like ‘class’ and the inherent issues with using postcodes to identify SES, which can increase deficit notions and push responsibility (failure) onto individuals and communities. Short time frames and insufficient funding contributes to the lack of efficacy of targeting. On the other hand, without targeting, the wealth gap is not addressed. Scopes literature and arguments about outreach: notes debates that outreach is narrowly focused on individual rather than system: outreach “implicitly perceives the problem as the potential learner, who lacks motivation and aspiration, rather than the structural barriers that prevent access” (p.141)**Aim:** To describe how the Community Partnerships Programme (CPP) at the OU offers targeted outreach with community partners, “to recruit students who live in areas of high deprivation and have no previous HE experience” (p.141)**Theoretical frame:** None**Methodology:** Critical description of CPP, drawing on data from students via telephone interviews (n=24) and telephone feedback from OU staff. CPP took place in 5 regions and Northern Ireland; data presented = collected 2007-2009. 236 students were supported by CPP over the period; just over half had no prior HE experience (compared with 15% of OU students nationally). These 128 students = ‘WP’ students. Findings compared with national OU student data. CPP offered local, face-to-face ‘study skills’ sessions that brought CPP students together**Findings:** WP students = more likely to be female (but could be reflective of partnerships with childcare centres)Half of the WP students = non-white (CPP in Yorkshire = large Asian communities)WP students = more likely to be unemployed, home worker, part time worker (but see large number of women looking after children)WP students = more likely to have no educational qualifications on entry (14.1% compared to 9% national sample).‘Less ready’ WP students = reflected in achievement rates. CPP students = less likely to complete studies.23/24 students interviewed had no prior HE qualification (one had degree from home country and = ESL). All = FinF; 10 =unemployed; 4 = homeworkers; 4 = part-time. 23/24 = female; 7 did not complete but one moved into other OU course; 6 of students who completed moved on to other courses with OU. Most had not previously considered HE. 20/24 = had concerns relating to doing study after a period out of education. First academic writing (assessed) = ‘crunch point’ (p.147). Face-to-face ‘study support’ = crucial for these students. Most valued opportunity to meet others in same situation. One student who dropped out = too many commitments; another = dropped out because of writing load of course (see p.148). Overall, most students = positive about their engagement and were either in or planning to progress to further studies and had developed increased confidence and learnt new skills. Challenges = experienced at level of costs (e.g. course fees and childcare) and expectations about home technology**Core argument:** Students need good advice before enrolling (about expectations like academic writing). For successful uni-community partnership, commitment to time and resources on both sides = fundamental; “‘short-termism’” = challenging for both (p.150) |
| Alsop, R.; Gonzalez-Arnal, S. & Kilkey, M. (2008). [The widening participation agenda: the marginal place of care](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540250802215235), *Gender and Education,* 20(6), 623–637.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *higher education; widening participation; care; mature students; gender* | **Context:** Mature WP students in UK/ English HE. Scopes participation of mature age students in English HE, noting decrease since mid 90s (perhaps due to increase in student contribution to costs) and ineligibility of mature age students to access student loans**Aim:** To explore how care-giving responsibilities mediate/ interact with mature students’ experiences of higher education; to examine how care is recognised in HE policy.**Theoretical frame:** Feminist conceptualisations of care – important lens because of gendered division of care. Notes shifting paradigms in terms of how care has been understood: from ‘exploitation paradigm’ in 1970s (unpaid care, domestic servitude), to the ‘ethical/moral paradigm’ in the 1980s (celebrating women’s capacity to care), ‘sociological notion of care’ (care as embedded in social relations and shaped by normative structures), ‘paradigam of difference’ in the 1990s (difference in terms of power, sites, contexts and strategies of care), and ‘universalistic paradigm’ (values and meanings in care/ caring/ citizenship) = all see Williams, 2001; on p.625. Daly & Lewis (2000): care as multidimensional concept: care as labour, care as social and relational, care as an activity with costs. Definition offered by authors: “a physical and emotional practice, involving a moral orientation which, though not rooted in essentialist gender differences, is located within gendered (and racialised) normative frameworks around obligations and responsibilities, particularly in relation to the family.Moreover, care involves costs that are similarly multidimensional, encompassing financial, temporal, emotional, and identity elements” (p.625).**Methodology:** Draws on 2 studies with WP students at Uni of Hull: 1) quant study: baseline data on characterstics and experiences of non-traditional students (under-represented areas, disabilities, mature, p/t) + comparison with ‘traditional’ students = random sample from institutional student records in Health Studies (n=1000). Second study = qualitative approach with 24 face-to-face interviews with current or former students (mature, disable, minority ethnic, p/t)**Findings:** Quant study49% WP students had caring responsibilities (mostly mature and female; 6% caring for an adult)Qual study:Lack of time and money = main obstacles, particularly cost on emotional part of caring role (especially for females/ mothers)Balancing time = difficult for both f/t and p/t students; flexibility from staff/ institution = crucialStudent-carers need to know timetables well in advance to organise care schedulesAccessibility of courses/ services (geographically/ temporally) = significantCost of transport = problematic, meaning that many students minimised journeys on campus. Mature age students = more likely to travel further and less likely to walk (parking = issue)For p/t students, isolation and feeling disconnected = problematic, with both p/t and f/t student-carers prioritising formal academic activities over other activitiesGendered nature of care = plays out at home, with students suggesting that they had to do ‘second shift’ at home (female partners of male students appeared to be more receptive to changing their lives to accommodate partner’s studies)Policy review: care-giving responsibilities were acknowledged (at time of publication) but with limitations. For example, Childcare grant could only be used with particular childcare (no formal recognition of informal childcare arrangements with family/ friends), and part-time students = ineligible, and it was means-tested. This kind of support = complex to claim and stigmatising. Flexibility suggested in 2003 White Paper did not acknowledge the challenges these suggestions would place on care-givers (e.g. compressed courses running through summer term/ school holidays). All jostle with New Labour’s policies on ‘work-life balance’. Changes proposed to increase student contributions = more risky for mature age students**Core argument:** Care-giving responsibilities = significant in shaping experiences of HE. When staff/ institution offers flexibility (“creative and compassionate thinking”) to student-carers = has a “hugely positive impact upon their ability to study successfully” (p.633), but lacking =overarching systemic commitment to acknowledging needs of student-carers. At macro/policy level, where care is recognized = financial level, but with limitations and prescriptions. Universities need to take up Williams’ (2001) ‘political ethics of care’ – through production of good practice guidelines |
| Amsler, S. & Motta, S. (2019). [The marketised university and the politics of motherhood](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540253.2017.1296116), *Gender and Education,* 31(1), 82–99.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Motherhood and academia; feminist methodologies and theories; neoliberal subjectification; time–space logics of neoliberalism; resistance; refusal and transgression*  | **Context:** The invisibilising of motherhood (‘the unmentionables’ – see p.83) in context of patriarchal, dehumanising disciplinary technologies such as the Research Evaluation Framework (REF): “struggles to open the academy to people whose lives do not conform to hegemonic models of the bourgeois, entrepreneurial white, male scholar are ongoing” (p.84). Authors note literature that speaks of the division and conflict between different selves, and note that this is not universal; that some women are already devalued, invisibilised — which foregrounds necessity of intersectional analysis. Motherhood requires shift (rather than institutions shifting to accommodate mothers): “Mothers often face a choice of assimilation or denial in workplaces. The ideal-type mother cannot be an ideal-type neoliberal subject (careless, disembodied and disengaged from the messiness of non-economic life) or an autonomous, flexible ‘entrepreneur’ of the self” (p.85) **Aim:** To “offer a critique of neoliberal power from the perspective of the gendered, sexualised, raced and classed politics of motherhood in English universities”; to “demonstrate how feminist academic praxis can not only help make the gendered workings of neoliberal power more visible, but also enable us to nurture and sustain alternative ways of being and working in, against and outside the university” (p.82) **Theoretical frame:** Feminist academic praxis; critical pedagogy of discomfort**Methodology:** Dialogical auto-ethnographic methods (see p.87), including transcription of mothering while discussing mothering**Findings:** Including children’s interjections = “not only visibilised how caring relations and responsibilities shape flows of knowledge in real time, but also how they can alter the value we ascribe to particular moments and ways of knowing. It illustrates why the audited, performative university cannot tolerate an ethic of care; why those who care for others cannot aspire to an individualised, self-determined, ‘productive’ and entrepreneurial subjectivity; and why socialising relations of care is necessary to advance critical thought which does not deny the multiplicity and wildness of our inter-related selves” (p.87–8). *Neoliberal time and motherhood:* neoliberalism reduces temporality to immediate present; denies possibilities of collective imaginaries and pushes an institutional timescape/ neoliberal rhythm onto other parts of life, resulting in a “spatio-temporality also generates ontological and affective gendered violences in which ‘feminised’ caring relationships of recognition and solidarity are devalued or denied” (p.88). Author 2, as a single parent, describe feeling either ‘out of time’ or ‘out of place’ because of childcare constraints, describing her mother-self as deligitimised.*Neoliberal space and madness of splitting:* Division of public and private space creates the necessity of splitting. Author 2 describes how bringing her children on campus created all sorts of perceptions of her (as unprofessional, as inefficient, as uncommitted)/ challenges for her:“The careless culture of neoliberal university space is thus reproduced in part through a discourse of individualisation, in which relationships are impoverished and structural oppressions become defined as problems of individual failure, lack of consideration or selfishness. This undercuts possibilities of forming solidarities across difference through which we might come to know ourselves and each other and resist anti-ethical and dehumanising conditions. It also creates psychological, emotional and physical dis-ease when those who experience such acts of judgement and denial feel shame, guilt and anxiety for not being ‘good enough’ and not embodying ‘the perfect’” (p.91). Spaces = also built with/ for middle-class norms (making assumptions about who come/ what they bring into academia); “this is particularly problematic when the academic-self colonises the spaces and times of the mother-self… [which] not only undercuts a woman’s ability to mother meaningfully outside of hegemonic framings, but also limits possibilities to create more collective forms of care, intensifies experiences of social isolation and augments dependencies between partners which create pressures and anxieties in intimate life” (p.91).*Subjectivation: denial, humiliation, self-disciplining*: Onto-epistemological violence = enacted through idealised neoliberal (flexible, care-free, mobile) subject: “Yet our subjectivities as academics can also imbricate smoothly with neoliberal rational- ities. Care, too, is infinitely flexible and on call. There is a temptation to engage in practices of care for students and colleagues, as well as those who depend on us, in conditions where such work requires individualised sacrifices or occupies what would otherwise be non-labour time. Our commitments to and ethics of education can be co-opted into logics of neoliberal time and space whilst being simultaneously misrecognised and deva- lued as ‘non-academic’, feminised activities” (p.92). Authors point to the ways that they have tacitly bought into ideas about academic identity and activity; self-disciplining around these notions of ideal subjectivities points to complicity throughout system to perpetuate the dominance of neoliberal modes of being, knowing and doing (‘colonising one’s sense of self’, McRobbie, 2015). Demonstrations of resistance = categorised as ‘whinging’ (Phipps, 2006). Speaking out is an act of resistance, but comes with risks: “Embracing the otherness and marginality of the messiness that motherhood brings to the marketised university takes courage, for it involves emotional risk and exposure to uncertainty” (p.93). **Core argument:** “When women appear in universities as mothers, single mothers and feminists, the demand to negate the needs of self-care and care for others can expose the invisible and unmentionable conditions that make ideal-type forms of neoliberal academic labour possible. Our presence as bodies and selves has the potential to reveal the tacit operations of power that order the dynamics of inclusion, exclusion, (mis)recognition and denial in the institution” (p.93). |
| Anderson, V.; Rabello, R.; Wass, R.; Golding, C.; Rangi, A.; Eteuati, E.; Bristowe, Z. & Waller, A. (2019). [Good teaching as care in higher education](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00392-6), *Higher Education,* NZAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *University teaching; Care; Higher education; Photovoice; Students; Qualitative research* | **Context:** Care in context of ‘good teaching’ and ‘effective learning’ in research-intensive university in Aotearoa NZ; authors argue that care = received little scholarly attention, and where it has it has been configured as either result of marketised university (‘safe’ teaching) or marker of ‘good’ teaching. Authors cite Noddings, Freire, hooks as scholars who have considered care. Authors note literature that has pointed to care being perceived as teachers affirming students’ developing identities, or responsive teaching. Authors also note literature that speaks to role of interculturalism in care (Papadopoulos, 2017). Authors note literature that points to heavy constraints placed on care/ capacity to care by neoliberal structures and governance, and which positions students-as-consumers.**Aim:** To argue “for the need to recognise teaching in HE as cognitive, emotional and embodied work; to acknowledge teachers’ powerful influence on students; and to avoid simplistic representations of both teachers and students in contemporary HE” (abstract)**Theoretical frame:** Care as relational; care as contested (see literature review)**Methodology:** Qualitative/ longitudinal; methods included focus groups, critical incident technique, photovoice with students (n=55; Maori, Pacifica, international and ‘other’ enrolled in Health Sciences/ Humanities). Care = not a focus; emerged from analysis. Details on p.4–5. Analysis = participatory/ researcher-led**Findings:** Students’ conceptions of good teaching = relatively common across cohort.Good teachers = show they care about their discipline/ subject/ teaching/ students*Care about discipline*: described in terms of passion/ enthusiasm, leading students to maintain interest (even when they find the course overwhelming). One student described this in terms of a spark that sets alight a pile of logs and keeps the fire going (see p.7); other metaphors invoked = fishing, catching a disease. Teachers’ enthusiasm = generates emotional response from students. Overall “good teachers care about teaching as well as their discipline” (p.8).*Care about teaching and learning*: described by students in terms of a sense of being happy, dialogic approaches, going beyond the course outline, taking time to get to know students/ understand their process; “good teaching is represented as involving close attention to students’ learning, care-full communication, reflection on one’s teaching practice and attention to time” (p.10)*Good teachers care about students*: described in terms of “attentiveness, openness, awareness of students’ lives and other commitments, responsiveness to students’ learning needs and investment in students’ well-being and learning” (p.11). Students = enjoy learning in courses where the teacher seems to care, using words like ‘nurture’, ‘investment’ and ‘love’ (p.11). Care also described in terms of commitment and openness from teacher to studentsStudents suggest that perceived care = reciprocated and relational (both in class and out of class). One student compared teaching to translation.One student mentioned speaking/ pronunciation of Te Reo Maori as conveyance of care (see p.13).*Care as (joint) responsibility in corporate university*: students occasionally positioned themselves as customers in corporate university, asserting that they expected care on the basis of the fees they were paying. Another student conceived this in terms of taking/ sharing responsibility to contest consumer culture**Core argument:** Three core arguments:1) Resisting ideas of pedagogic frailty (Kinchin & Winstone 2017) for particular marginalised student groups: “what is helpful for minoritised students is helpful for everyone, and efforts to ensure the teaching-learning context is ‘safe’ for every-body are likely to facilitate all students’ willingness and capacity to take risks” (p.16)2) Despite pressures created by neoliberal structures, “good teachers are more than managed and measured subjects, and students, more than consumers” (p.16)3) Challenges private/ public divide for cognition and emotions in higher education; students “conceptualised good teachers in terms of who they are, what they do and how they make students’ feel” (p.16) |
| Baker, S.; Ramsay, G.; Irwin, E. & Miles, L. (2018). [‘Hot’, ‘Cold’ and ‘Warm’ Supports: Towards Theorising Where Refugee Students Go for Assistance at University,](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1332028) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 23(1), 1–16.AUSKeywords: *Students from refugee backgrounds; inclusivity; support; higher education; literacy and cultural brokers*HIGHER EDUCATIONSUPPORT | **Context:** Set in regional Australian higher education, in relatively monocultural and monolingual university landscape. Previous work by authors (see Ramsay et al., 2016) speaks to the challenges and barriers experienced by a group of undergraduate students from refugee backgrounds. **Aim:** To examine how sfrb seek support for their studies (and other activities)**Theoretical frame**: Draws on the ‘hot’ and ‘cold’ forms of information offered in Ball & Vincent (!998) and the addition of ‘warm’ information by Slack et al. (2014) to develop a heuristic for understanding how students seek and access support**Findings:** Participants prefer to seek support from ‘hot’ (familiar, community, family) people/networks but these people do not necessarily have developed understandings/ personal experience of university study. Students generally eschew ‘cold’ (formal, institutional) forms of support (‘the services are not for us’) because there are significant barriers (e.g. online ‘gatekeepers’ that hinder students from accessing preferred face-to-face support, particularly with/for language issues; lecturers and tutors, central support services). ‘Warm’ people (who work for institution but have familiar relationships – often from being in contact from other spaces, such as English classes or community events) = important brokers for students and a key and repeated/ anchoring point of support.**Conclusions**: Universities need to work on ways of embedding and recognising the work undertaken by ‘warm’ individuals: “This work may see them encounter difficult stories, pedagogic challenges outside of their mainstream training; and the rewarding burden of the trust of a student from a refugee background facing the myriad challenges outlined earlier in this paper. With universities nurturing the conditions in which trusted relationships between SfRBs and staff can form, comes a responsibility for those institutions to acknowledge and value the work which providing such support entails” (p.25-26). |
| Barnacle, R. & Dall’Alba, G. (2017). [Committed to learn: student engagement and care in higher education,](https://tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2017.1326879?journalCode=cher20) *Higher Education Research & Development,* 36(7), 1326–1338.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Care; commitment; student engagement; ontology; performativity; higher education* | **Context:** Student engagement, neoliberalism (and the nexus between them) and care in Australian higher education. Draws on extensive work of Zepke to argue that student engagement has varying and contested meanings, and shares assumptions with neoliberalism about the economic/ market value of students’ education and engagement (performativity/ accountability). Authors express concern that aligning student engagement with neoliberal priorities will erode the project of active learning and inquiry [aka deep learning] and will instead promote “conformism and game-playing” (p.1327). Example of nexus between student engagement and performativity = student engagement surveys; “Such surveys are attractive precisely because they render the complex simple” (p.1327). Such surveys are underpinned by sets of values, which do not necessarily match those of the students. Authors extend argument made in earlier paper about ‘ontological turn’ (drawing on Barnett, 2005) and students’ becoming.**Aim:** To offer an ‘ontological account’ [aka becoming] of care and student engagement; to focus on “how Heidegger and Noddings’ notions of care can inform a conception of student engagement that resists, rather than unwittingly reinforces, performativity and neoliberal values” (p.1328). Constructing teaching and learning as caring relationship, authors ask:“…how is it possible to assure congruence in the caring relation? On what basis might a would-be carer, such as a teacher, gauge an appropriate response to a call for care, like a desire to learn?” (p.5)**Theoretical frame:** Heidegger’s notion of care and Noddings’ (2005) ‘capacity to care’**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Literature review: Heidegger = to be human is to care; our commitments make us act/ be in particular ways and implications for others with whom we interact (‘Others’). Heidegger’s notion of care = multifaceted/ intersects with power (to dominate); authors make case that learner/ing-centred education = effort to care without domination. Noddings – working from Heidegger = care as open-ness to others. Care between carer/receiver of care = must be mutual and involves ‘motivational displacement’ (own motives displaced by motives of other). There is no recipe for care. First step is to want to care (openness) and to be receptive to the other. Care = reciprocal in both inter-human (care for other humans) and human to non-human (e.g. for discipline) care.In teaching and learning, attending to students’ struggles and successes (and wanting to learn from them) = type of care (‘attuned responsiveness’; see Dall’Alba, 2009) – need to monitor what students are interested in (through formal assessment and pedagogic observation). This helps to erode power of market: “Promoting and sustaining passion for ideas and other things – beings and entities – stand in stark contrast to merely meeting the requirements of paying ‘customers’ or ‘the market’ (Gibbs, 2015)” (p.1331)Committed to care: 3 levels of insight from Noddings’ work: 1) extends to care-about-ideas; 2) care-for-students involves being responsive to their interests and capacities - “Importantly, it also acknowledges multiple learning trajectories in promoting students’ being and becoming” (p.1332). This recognition of multiplicity and ambiguity requires reflexivity (on part of teachers) = supportive of care without domination; 3) teachers have a responsibility to show students ‘how to care’, “not only in terms of promoting passion for ideas and objects, but also through students caring about each other in their interactions” (p.1333) – to move beyond narrow conception of care as ‘self-care’.Commitment in learning – enrolling in a course = commitment to becoming what a student is ‘not yet’ (Heidegger). Key problem with dominant student engagement strategies = need to forego the personal for the public; “The issue here is that there is an expectation personal values be set aside or surrendered in favour of values that support a performativity agenda” (p.1334). This privileging of performativity erodes possibilities for open-ness and risk**Core argument:** “Approaching education through the concept of care as concernful Being-in-the-world provides an alternative perspective to an instrumental agenda of performativity. It does so through highlighting an ontological dimension of learning and its role in contributing to who, rather than what, students are becoming” (p.1336) |
| Barrow, M. (2015). [Caring in Teaching: A Complicated Relationship](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1077243), *The Journal of Effective Teaching,* 15(2), 45–59.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Pedagogy, higher education, curriculum instruction, ethic of care and teach-ing, student-instructor relationships* | **Context:** US community college context. Author argues that idea that caring in higher education will cause harm [think spoonfeeding metaphor] might account for relative lack of attention to care in university contexts in academic literature – the list for university is short in comparison with discussions of caring in compulsory education, and the literature that does discuss ethics of care/ caring pedagogy = predominantly teacher training [and predominantly from USA]. Author summarises the literature that discusses care in higher education: Straits (2007) defines a caring teacher as “open, available, and responsive” (p. 172, on p.48); Haskell-McBee identifies 78 characteristics of caring teaching, with top 7: “offering help, showing compassion, showing interest, caring about the individual, giving time, listening, and getting to know students” (on p.48); Meyers (2009): ““concern for students,” “respect-fulness and willingness to answer questions and foster interactions” (p.206, on p.48); De Guzman et al. (2008) describe it as using “class time productively, shares personal experiences in classroom discussions, and ob-serves class policies, among others” (p.498, on p.48).**Aim:** To explore “how developing caring relations with students at a community col-lege effectively supports students’ needs and ultimately success” in dialogue with personal dilemmas (abstract). **Theoretical frame:** Noddings’ ethic of care theory: *engrossment, motivational displacement,* and *reciprocity* for remembering back to being cared for in order to develop student-teacher relationship models**Methodology:** Offers 3 personal vignettes/ reflections of her own experience**Findings:** Vignette 1: I just don’t belong here – mature age homeless man who carried his possessions with him to class + fears of not belonging hindering his contributions to class discussions. Author took time to find out his personal troubles and then offered him a regular meeting twice a week to help him understand what he needed to do. Author reflects that in her role as caring teacher she is “part of a larger network of people working together to support the students’ needs” (p.52),Vignette 2: Being here is not my choice – young African American student who hated college. Author helped her to find a course she actually wanted to do.Vignette 3: we’re all in this together – author initiated student participation in a ‘Good Deed Day’, leading to her being more trusted by students, and the students therefore divulging more about their lives with her.Challenges: caring “involves a serious time and emotional commitment” (p.54). Danger with caring, according to Noddings (1984: 12), “There is always the fear that with so much pressure the one-caring may find herself facing the risk that she will cease to care”, and that “conflict and guilt are inescapable risks of caring“ (p.18, both on p,54). “Entering into and sustaining a caring relationship with students is not always possible or plausible, given variables that have the potential to shut down these avenues of possible growth for both students and instructors. Also of importance is that not all students are receptive to an approach built on developing a relationship” (p.55). Author disagrees with Noddings that reciprocity in relationships needs to be observable**Core argument:** Offers a list of ‘instructional recommendations’ gleaned from the literature and listed above. |
| Behari-Leak, K.; Josephy, S.; Potts, M.; Muresherwa, G.; Corbishley, J.; Petersen, T. & Gove, B. (2019): [Using vulnerability as a decolonial catalyst to re-cast the teacher as human(e),](file://localhost/DOI/%2010.1080%3A13562517.2019.1661376) *Teaching in Higher Education*, SAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Vulnerability; decoloniality; social inclusion; humanity; disruption* | **Context:** Contemporary higher education landscape in South Africa (challenges brought by massification, globalisation and mass migration) + decolonisation of epistemology and ontology in higher education. Problem = “the onus is falling on academics to find answers to macro social issues and micro-aggressions surfacing in classrooms” (p.2). Authors note that many SA institutions now offer professional development courses such as PG diplomas, but authors argue that a one-size approach is woefully inadequate: “If these programmes remain neutral, generic and uncritical, leading to one-size-fits-all assimilationist approaches that do not get academics to grapple critically and sufficiently with the structural and cultural issues (Behari-Leak 2017), little will change” (p.2). Authors’ context = Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (LTHE) PGDip. **Aim:** To argue that higher education teachers are unlikely to ‘meet the challenges’ in their classrooms if they have not shared some of the vulnerability experienced by their students; to tie this to students’ perceptions of their teachers/ academics**Theoretical frame:** Pedagogy of vulnerability (Brantmeier, 2013) – vulnerability seen as a “condition of ‘openness’ to being positively affected and affecting others in turn (Gilson 2011, 310)” (p.3); authors also explore other categorisations of vulnerability (biological, social, cultural, epistemic). Vulnerability involves risk; “Vulnerability can therefore be seen as an act of courageous pedagogical engagement that holds the potential to engage teachers and students in both caring for and caring about issues that matter (Noddings, 2003)” (p.4). Authors also draw on pedagogy of discomfort (Boler & Zembylas)**Methodology:** Reflective narrative auto-methodology. All participants = co-authors, and paper is based on reflective assignments undertaken as part of the LTHE course. CDA = analytic frame**Findings:** Safe and brave spaces: the LTHE course created “a safe space for connections and linkages that encouraged an openness and honesty not characteristic of a university classroom” (p.6), which connects with feminist pedagogy (hooks, 203). The safe space creates possibilities to be and share vulnerabilities *from their own vantage points* (p.6, my emphasis). These need to be valued. Also, the specific L&T context was significant, given that university educators/ academics are usually expected to know the answers – course teacher/ developer had to also share their own vulnerabilities so as to ‘give permission’ for students to do so too.*Hierarchies of power*: authors discuss the activity to help decolonise understandings of ‘disciplines’, which they argue “challenged us to think, feel and act differently in the classroom and to use our own agency for academics and students, traditionally silenced and alienated in the colonial classroom, to be included” (p.9), and permitted power dynamics and histories to be uncovered and opened to discussion – e.g. getting the participants to line up according to the perceived value of their disciplines/ roles in the institution/ institutional hierarchies etc.. By questioning the dominance of colonial models, authors inadvertently created epistemic vulnerability.*Positioned through positionality*: positionality understood as ‘vulnerability-in-action’ (p.10) – in discussing tacit/ hidden elements of hegemony, students = needed to unpack their own positioning/ positionality; as such the course “challenged the over-privileging of intellectual work and foregrounded the affective disposition needed in the knowledge-making process to recognize the importance of ‘being’ (Boler and Zembylas 2003)” (p.10). Authors also identified that those in power have a ‘privilege of vulnerability’ because the consequences of showing vulnerability are lesser felt.*Intersectional pathways*: danger of resting on a single narrative that hides/ misrecognizes the multiple positions/ vulnerabilities, and also helped participants to reflect on the multiple disadvantages their students face, and which are magnified by assumptions.**Core argument:** “…[‘open-hearted] vulnerability can be used as a productive tool and decolonial catalyst to invigorate teaching and learning engagements in local and global university contexts” (abstract)“We hope we have provided a canvas for teachers in different global contexts to use vulnerability as we did, as a productive catalyst to recast the teacher as human (e) in the HE classroom. This is one way of how we might re-imagine academic labour” (p.14) |
| Bowl, M. (2001). [Experiencing the barriers: non-traditional students entering higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520110037410), *Research Papers in Education,* 16(2), 141–160.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *access, higher education, participation, non-traditional students* | **Context:** Follows 32 non-traditional students as they transitioned into higher education. Set in post-New Labour election in 1997 context. Scopes literature on mature age students – many researchers = argued that change in access needs change in institutional structure and culture, particularly foregrounding issues of race/ ethnicity**Aim:** To describe mature age students’ transitions into higher education**Methodology:** Qualitative and longitudinal: critical, illuminative, feminist methodology (p.143). Participatory action research design – purposefully intending to facilitate mature age students speaking to academics; presents case studies of 3 students (adults, inner-city, involved in ‘community-based, flexible access programs’: REACHOUT project). Discussion with participants recorded according to daily encounters and weekly diary. Individual interviews conducted over two years. Participants took part in student conference (with emancipatory intention)**Findings:** Issues/ concerns mentioned by students:Inadequate funding, lack of childcare, difficulty with benefits system, ‘unresponsiveness’ of institutions.3 case studies: Salma, Helen and RuthSalma: did well at school, not supported to progress by parents, married, 2 children, separated. Did flexible access program via REACHOUT – passed in 6 months – studied Social Policy at RG university. Fees and benefits = issue; struggle to survive over Christmas holidays, had to borrow money to buy computer (only one who couldn’t afford a computer): “Looking back, she felt that she had survived in spite of the university, rather thanbecause of the support offered to her” (p.147).Helen = Jamaican, began school in England when 11, grew up in very white community (15/200 children = black), differences in language (as patois speaker) = marker of difference, parents not familiar with education system, marginalized and discouraged at school, married, 4 children, partner deserted her, wife of vicar recommended REACHOUT – paid for childcare costs. Accepted to train as social worker – struggled with writing demands, financial demands, childcare responsibilities. Passed course but initially too ill to start work.Ruth = Jamaican, poor, accent = marker of difference, mother couldn’t/didn’t encourage her. Ruth ran away from home, missed school exams, did YTS in catering, worked as club dancer, moved to Germany, married, studied Beauty Therapy in German language. Did REACHOUT part time – passed with high marks but felt on margins as part time student.Key themes: school days + experiences of difference, lack of family support/ knowledge, frustration, anticipating change, entry to university, financial problems, time poverty, institutional barriers**Core argument: …**“the non-traditional student as a frustrated participant in an unresponsive institutional context and questions the tendency to problematize students from non-traditional backgrounds, rather than the educational institutions responsible for their progress” (abstract). Transition to higher education “has complex practical and emotional implications” (p.157). Dislocation = gendered, classed, ethnic lines against the institution and ‘traditional’ students. |
| Bozalek, V.; McMillan, W.; Marshall, D.; November, M.; Daniels, A. & Sylvester, T. (2014). [Analysing the professional development of teaching and learning from a political ethics of care perspective,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2014.880681?scroll=top&needAccess=true&journalCode=cthe20) *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(5), 447–458.SAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *political ethics of care; normative framework; professional development; higher education; teaching and learning* | **Context:** Teaching and learning professional development for higher education educators in South Africa; professionalization agenda in higher education with regard to teaching and learning**Aim:** To use Tronto’s political ethics of care as an evaluative framework to evaluate a model of T&L professional development because it “provides valuable moral elements and perspectives on human interaction which can be used to evaluate higher education practices” (p.447–8).**Theoretical frame:** Tronto’s five components of political ethics of care: *attentiveness, responsibility, competence, responsiveness* and *trust*. Care = understood as “holistic and as a broad, public and political activity” (p.449)**Methodology:** ‘Insider research’; data = reflective data generated through planning the professional development activity that the authors ran as a retreat for senior academics. Each author used Tronto’s 5 elements of care as a heuristic to examine their own reflections/ experiences**Findings:** Discussed using 5 elements of care*Attentiveness/ caring about*: authors recognised that teaching and learning (and the people involved) require attention and care (for students, for each other). Assumption that lack of care = moral failure. Attentiveness planned for in activities such as pre-retreat needs assessment survey, and an openness to share lives.*Responsibility/ taking care of*: not obligation; alternative, non-official space of possibility and disruption of new managerial norms.*Competence/ care-giving*: illustrated = time/ energy spent finding a suitable model for the professional development, concern for meaningful impact, and how learning is taken forward. Competence also evident in piloting of professional development model, and in team-teaching approach. Resources (lack of) have made the competence more difficult to sustain as initial money ran out.*Responsiveness/ care-receiving*: illustrated through collecting of/ working with feedback from participants.*Trust*: discussion of issues with how trust evolved between team membersCare of selfIntegrity of care: “good care is dependent both upon the integration of all of the elements as a whole and the quality of each one of the elements themselves. Care involves more than good intentions” (p.456).**Core argument:** “The political ethics of care thus provides a holistic framework to make judgements about how well professional development practices and processes are able to meet identified needs. It provides a way of establishing where imbalances between the elements may be impacting on how well care is practiced” (p.457). |
| Brooks, R. (2012). [Student-parents and higher education: a cross-national comparison](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2011.613598), *Journal of Educational Policy,* 27(3), 423–439.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: comparative, qualitativeCARE, PARENTS | **Context:** Widening participation, parenthood/ parenting and higher education in the UK, particularly with the New Labour focus on increasing participation of mature age students (but makes point that not all mature students are also parents, and not all student-parents are mature). Notes literature that argues the neoliberal focus has eroded the focus on systemic/ structure inequalities, resulting in the ‘blame’ for failure being shifted to individuals; she also notes literature that points to the significance of gender, and recognises the need to view student-parents as heterogeneous group**Aim:** To present on findings from a Nuffield-funded cross-institutional study of support offered to student-parents**Theoretical frame:** Social constructionist theoretical framework**Methodology:** International comparison of support and experiences of student-parents in different national ‘welfare regimes’: UK (liberal regime); Denmark (social democratic regime). Data collected from two different universities within each country (categorised as ‘older’ and ‘newer’). Data collected: institutional policies and other material that focuses on student-parents, as well as on childcare and financial support; individual interviews with staff members responsible for student welfare; individual students (n=15-20) from each institution. Analysis of transcripts and documents paid particular attention to structural constraints, as well as cultural and attitudinal influences.**Findings:** Structural differences between UK and Denmark (summarised in Table 2; p.427) – clear differences between the countries (tuition fees in UK; tuition free to students in DK; no parental leave in UK, all students entitled to it in DK and offered additional grant; flexible modes at academics’ discretion in UK, required by the state in DK; childcare = limited in UK, extensive provision and low cost in DK). Cultural/ attitudinal differences: in UK = ideal learner (see literature) constructions = internalised and ‘others’ develop. Sense from staff in UK that academics largely view students as school leavers (author later describes UK attitude as ‘hostile’, p.432). Also sense that parents as group seen as unprepared. In comparison, in DK = different organisational culture that seemingly better recognises diversity among students. For example, one staff member talked about how s/he encourages students to talk about other commitments before embarking on group project to familiarise others with competing responsibilities. No similar ‘ideal student’ in DK; rather student-parents = valorised for balanced attitudes. Policies in DK that promote ‘dual worker’ (rather than ‘male breadwinner’) underpin the cultural and attitudinal/ policy differences between UK and DK – in DK, it is unusual for mum to stay at home as primary carer and not workInstitutional differences = some in DK (see p.432 for detail). In UK = greater inter-institutional variation: the older university provided “significant” practical support (childcare facilities, holiday clubs, dedicated bursaries), but this is unusual. Level of support at newer university = more representative = no dedicated childcare, no staff dedicated to supporting parents, no financial support except central financial support. When discussed in past, university has discussed in terms of potential revenue from childcare, rather than as service to students. Author suggests that older university might be better placed to offer such provision because it has more wealth/resources (and makes links to similar findings in US literature). Dominant constructions of ‘the student’ differed between older and newer UK universities (p.434). In older university, the higher level of practical support = in “considerable tension” with the culture and attitudes of staff/ the university**Core argument:** There are clear differences in how student-parents are supported (or not) between a liberal welfare system (UK) and social democratic (DK). While the two universities (older and newer) in DK treated student-parents relatively similarly, the UK universities showed great difference in terms of how they support and view student-parents, which is reflective of the market-oriented neoliberal higher education system. |
| Burke, P.J. (2015). [Re/imagining higher education pedagogies: gender, emotion and difference](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2015.1020782?journalCode=cthe20), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 20(4), 388–401.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity, emotion, difference, gender studies, critical pedagogies* | **Context:** In context of globalised neoliberal university and increased influence of individualising, competitive and marketised practices – notes warnings in literature about impact on sense of connectivity and belonging. Emergence of discourses of individualisation silence (pretend they don’t exist) critiques of the constraints/ inequities of class, race, gender etc. Notes discussions of teaching excellence often couched in instrumental terms. Also, participation in HE = gendered and “has led to a reinforcement of the divisions between the rational and the emotional” (p.390) – whereby difference and emotion = conceived as “dangerous forces that require homogenizing and neutralizing via technologies of materialism and through the fixing of socially constructed categories” (p.390). This individualising push = promotes a limited view of identity and “increasingly restricts our pedagogical imagination” (p.391) and being emotional or caring become highly regulated/ controlled by disciplinary technologies [think erosion of possibilities to care with casual staff]. Discusses treatment of ‘diversity’ in HE (as marketing tool, as unproblematic and desirable) as different from ‘difference’**Aim:** To theorise ‘emotional layers of pedagogical identities and experiences’ in contemporary UK HE by examining past work published in TinHE on pedagogies, diversity, difference**Theoretical frame:** Feminist/ Freirean perspectives: misrecognition; **Methodology:** Literature review ofarticles in TinHE that explore feminist pedagogy/ emotion/ difference/ diversity – profiling ‘exemplar papers’; also draws on data from GaP project (see p.393) = participatory methodology etc.**Findings:** Misrecognition and shaming = diverse students (read: different) = “continually at risk of being relocated as ‘undeserving’ and ‘unworthy’ of higher education”… so that “The injuries of misrecognition are embodied, through the internalization of shame, and are tied to the emotional level of experience” (p.394). Feminist reading = shame is deeply connected to gender, class and race and politics of misrecognition (p.394) – see Foucault’s dividing practices (relational, objectifying). Cites Ahmed’s argument that shame is felt in and through body. Response of academy = remedial supports (e.g. study skills) – attached to anxieties about ‘dropping standards’ or being soft - that deny the embodied experience. Draws from Said’s orientalism work re: positioning of ‘Others’ = students who are ‘Other’ = “often characterized then through a range of deficit disorders, including lack of confidence and are positioned by gendered, classed and racialized constructions” (p.397)GaP project data suggests lecturers resist the feminized nurturing, caring role they feel is imposed upon them (e.g. ‘I’m not their mum’ quote on p.395)Key ideas from literature from TinHE:* pedagogy of discomfort (Boler, 1999; Boler & Zembylas, 2002);
* pedagogy of difference and trust (Barnett, 2011);
* emotion as disciplinary technology (Leathwood & Hey, 2009)
* new imaginations of difference (Chawla & Rodriguez, 2007)

**Core argument:** Need to find comfort in discomfort to engage in reflexive practice and build trust in pedagogic relationships – explicit engagement with emotion = importantRisky strategies (of engaging with anxieties, vulnerabilities, im/possibility/s (see Chawla & Rodriguez, 2007:707) = “rich in the promise of engaging students in generative, creative and optimistic ways of re/imagining with and through difference” (p.400). |
| Burke, P.J. (2017). [Difference in higher education pedagogies: gender, emotion and shame](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2017.1308471), *Gender and Education,* DOI: AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Femininities; critical pedagogies; difference and diversity; emotion and shame; higher education* | **Context:** Examines how gendered inequalities play out in higher education pedagogical practices (lived, embodied, re/produced) = emotions and shame. Paper illuminates the subtle and invisible ways gendered inequalities (re)occur. Shame = tangled in gendered inequalities and individualising discourses of ‘success’ and ‘failure’. Draws on own work to argue that gender “intersects with other, pathologized identities to inflame anxieties about ‘lowering standards’” and that equity/WP students = “compelled to participate in a neoliberal project of transforming themselves to conform to the regulating and disciplining narratives of ‘ success’ at play in educational institutions and policies” (p.2). Othering = creates issues for women and men: relational (against dominant/hegemonic subjects), in terms of performance and assessment against discourses of neoliberalism and the market. ‘Excellence’ discourse can be analysed for how it “evokes particular masculinized epistemologies, pedagogies and subjectivities” (p.3) = not often excellence for equity.Shame = “underlie gendered, embodied and everyday experiences of inequality and exclusion, which are difficult to name and to speak in the wider context of ‘ evidence-based’ approaches to equity in HE” (p.4) = invisibilised by WP policies under the labels ‘inclusion’ and ‘resilience’. Universities often take remedial approaches to respond to conditions that produce shame (which is in itself a practice of misrecognition)**Aim:** To examine lived and embodied experiences of gendered inequalities (acknowledging complex intersections with other forms of disadvantage) with emotions, particularly shame**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Fraser’s (2003, 2010) “multi-dimensional framework for ‘ parity of participation’” (p.5); Sara Ahmed’s theorization of the embodiment of shame**Methodology:** Draws on 2 previous research projects: the NTFS-funded GaP project and the Capabilities (NCSEHE-funded) project**Findings:** Shame = embodied and felt (see Ahmed, 2004) – universities respond with remedial services that require students to trust institutional representatives (unfamiliar, unknown) = often seen as “individual lack of confidence or capability, seen as detached from histories of gendered, classed and racialized misrecognitions” (p.7) – privileges confidence, assertiveness and forthcoming behavior. This = true for students and staff = plays into discourse of ‘dumbing down’ or ‘soft’ teaching: what = appropriate level of caring/ feminization of teaching. This serves to construct students (often WP) as needing help/ ‘childlike’: “A vicious cycle of misrecognition is put into place, subtly reasserting the dominance of certain forms of hegemonic academic masculinity” (p.8). Examines the place of difference: as a marketing discourse under the term ‘diversity’ which jostles against local experiences of anxiety regarding challenging difference/ labeling and limiting ‘different’ students [which need a relational ‘familiar’ to compare against]. Draws on Zembylas’ (2013) critical framework (critical pedagogies of compassion) to draw on power, praxis and emotion to enrich HE pedagogies but notes challenges with operationalization. Makes case for ‘ethics of care’ to notions of connection – often at individual level rather than social transformation, “in which pedagogical participants share the responsibilities of creating inclusive and equitable spaces” (p.12).**Core argument:** Need to move towards a ‘pedagogy of difference’ – whereby the notion and practice of trust = interrogated and where notion of ‘difference’ = considered a resource to “reflexively develop collective and ethical participation in pedagogical spaces” (p.13). |
| Chatelier, S. & Rudolph, S. (2018). [Teacher responsibility: shifting care from student to (professional) self?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01425692.2017.1291328) *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 39(1), 1–15.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Critical policy analysis; teacher standards; responsibility; care; Noddings*SCHOOL | **Context:** Teacher education/ teacher professionalization/ professional development in Victoria. Article set against analysis of evolving education policy in Australia (individualisation of responsibility, neoliberal turn, push towards professionalization and regulation). In particular, the authors focus on how the notion of care has shifted in educational policy: “That is, while teaching has long been understood as a caring profession, questions of the who, what and how of ‘care’ exist within a negotiated space” (p.5). In contemporary policy the relational elements have shifted from people to ‘stakeholders’; “That is, there is a depersonalisation and an instrumentalism in the transactional nature of teacher–student relationships today” and “Thus, the ‘who’ of the relation of care becomes two economic units whose success or failure is contingent upon their value being increased” (p.6).**Aim:** To examine the policy case of the Special Needs Plan; VITPol, 2016) using critical policy analysis and Noddings’ (1984) ethics of care; “to explore the ways in which teachers might be positioned to make particularchoices about responsibility and care in their adherence to such standards and the types of unseen costs that may hide beneath such noble goals of the professional regulator” (p.3)**Theoretical frame:** Post-structuralist understandings of power, knowledge and truth (as plural, contested, open to interpretation). Noddings’ work on care and teaching – teaching as a caring relationship as the one caring and the one being cared for. Education, viewed by Noddings’ ethics of care, is “an ethical moment is to be negotiated differently in each situation” (p.6), based on situational rather than virtue ethics (aka adherence to rules of behavior).**Methodology:** Critical policy analysis**Core argument:** Contemporary policy has reconfigured care to focus more on professional development than caring-in-practice: “the policy discourse, self-responsibilisation as an expression of the enterprising self – technologised by accountability and audit measures within the market-based logics of neoliberalism – has shifted the focus of teachers’ care away from the student and onto the teachers’ own need for professional recognition and advancement” (p.12). |
| Christie, H.; Munro, M. & Wager, F. (2005). [‘Day Students’ in Higher Education: widening access students and successful transitions to university life,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09620210500200129) *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 15(1), 3-29.SCOTAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** ‘Widening access’ to ‘day students’ in /to elite university in Scotland. Scopes the policy concern with widening participation at the time. Scottish universities = devolved from central higher education policy (to charge students for partial costs of their studies) and had abolished tuition fees in 2001 for Scottish students + bursaries for students in need. Students still took out student loans for living costs. Attrition = major driver for continued policy attention; authors note almost double lowest quartile SES students dropping out (9% compared with 5% of highest SES students), leading to pathologising of working class students as ‘problematic’ and more likely to drop out. Discusses construction of ‘new’ student (aka, non-traditional; see Leathwood & O’Connell, 2003), resulting in more diversity of transitions into higher education.**Aim:** To “unpack what factors help or hinder non-traditional students in making a successful transition to university life” (p.6)**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Research undertaken at two universities in Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh and Heriot-Watt; participants were recruited via two WP programs (one= school-based outreach, the other = adult outreach/ access course). Interviews conducted with students from both WP pathways (n=27) in 2003. Most Uni of Edinburgh participants were female; Heriot-Watt = more male participants. All students had completed at least 2 years of study and all lived at home (hence ‘day students’) and commuted to university. Finances were tight for all students and all students viewed themselves as ‘financially independent’. Reasons for staying at home = partially about economic rationality, partly about sustaining home networks (local work/ social groups/ childcare support). Authors categorise these participants into 3 groups:* *Absorbed* students: “firmly committed to the normative ideal of student life despite circumstances which meant they could not achieve this fully in practice”, meaning that they felt they were missing out on ‘being a student’ (p.12). They privileged time/ relations at university over other aspects (e.g. prioritizing going out with uni friends over other friends).
* *Pragmatists*: “university was only one facet of their lives and could not be all-absorbing, whether because of work commitments or family responsibilities”- being a ‘day student’ = pragmatic response to competing demands on their time. None of these participants had children and priority = balancing work and study
* *Separate worlds*: mature students who distanced themselves from ideas about ‘traditional’ student and sought active separation between student life and home worlds. All females in this group had children (men did not disclose family responsibilities): “What divided the group was gender: women’s role as mothers limited their access both to the academic structure of the universities and to the social side of student life, to the extent that aspiring to the normative ideal of student life was not on their agenda. In contrast, the men’s evident displacement was manifest in their strong rejection of the normative model of student life and their consequent marginalisation within the university” (p.17). Particular tensions existed around the collection of children from childcare. Most students experienced ‘deleterious effects’ on their studies – due to tiredness/ time constraints/ lack of preparedness for study/ individualised. All these women = studying Arts (authors speculate that it would not be possible for these women to undertake full-time lab-based course). Many of these students did not feel the institution recognized the pressures on their lives/ time (see p.20).

**Findings: Core argument:** Middle class “ideas about ‘fitting in’ rest on the notion that the ‘middle-class’ way of being a student is privileged and privileging” (p.6). Ideas about normative student experience and associated lifestyle discourses = challenged: “In many instances there is a conscious rejection of the assumed norms of a middle-class student life and a clear sense that they should have a right to establish a different way of being a student in the 21st century – and that the institution should provide more support for [‘day students’] to do this” (p.23). |
| Clouder, L. (2005). [Caring as ‘threshold concept’: transforming students in higher education into health(care) professionals,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562510500239141?journalCode=cthe20) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 10(4), 505–517.UKAnnotated by Prasheela Karan | **Context:**The study highlights that within health care work, caring can be perceived as a ‘threshold concept’. This is because the perceptions that health care students have of health care work change as they begin their careers and encounter experiences that challenge their initial perception, including in ways that can sometimes cause them discomfort.**Aims:**The author provides a discussion of some of the moral and ethical dilemmas that students face upon entering employment as a health care worker. The author refers to the accumulation of new experiences as ‘troublesome knowledge’, which challenges students’ preconceived ideas of health care work. **Methodology:**Data are drawn from two different research projects:* A three year study focusing on the professional socialisation of occupational therapy students - interviews were conducted with 12 occupational therapy (OT) students over the duration of their undergraduate degree. Participant observation and documentary analysis of course material was also adopted to develop an awareness of the context in which students undertook their studies.
* An action research project investigating the use of online discussion forums - the capacity of such forums to enable peer support among undergraduate physiotherapy students undertaking clinical placement for the first time was examined.

**Findings:**Students have a diverse range of challenging experiences, among them the burden of responsibility for making decisions for patients, finding that the ‘care’ element in institutional policy or other health care professionals is lacking, and balancing worries they have about being responsive to patients with their own wellbeing. Students might also question their own capacity to care if they feel they are detached from the experiences of patients. The study asserts that “going through the caring threshold has something to do with being touched personally by events so that students connect with those for whom they care as a human being” (see p. 512). As such, having an awareness of ones’ own feelings can affect the professional identity of students, and help them to better cope with the distress experienced by patients, and demonstrate empathy. In this way, the “threshold refers to the point of entry into or out of a space that is ‘transformative’ and therefore liminal in nature” (p. 513).**Core argument:**The author argues for a revisit of how students are prepared during their studies to undertake work as a health care professional, including in terms of developing emotional capacity and nurturance of a personal framework for caring. |
| Cooper, L. (2013). [Women and higher education perspectives of middle-class, mother-daughter dyads,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2013.810711) *Gender and Education*, 25(5), 624–639.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *higher education; social class; tuition fees; mothering; capital* | **Context:** Presents data from PhD study. Examines women’s experiences of accessing HE through the lens of the mother-daughter relationship and intergenerational perspectives (young women and their mothers), read through the political/ analytic lens of the increase in tuition fees in ‘unsettled’ HE system (see p.626) England in 2012. Works from premise that neoliberalism = creates more division that opportunity. Focus on familial experiences/ structures = argued for (p.625) – in middle class families, who (she argues) have more limited opportunities, and for working class families (she argues against the idea of choice for people whose financial circumstances make entering higher education undesirable/ impossible. Author scopes context of tuition fees (post Dearing report in 1997 in England), noting neoliberal shift = positioned HE as ‘choice’ and opportunity to ‘buy in’ = resulting in class gain for middle classes in job market (see Skeggs, 1997). Changes resulted in push to individual responsibility: “Financing access to university entry is now an independent problem to be solved within family, rather than a collective issue to be resolved through government policy” (p.628).**Aim:** To provide “an insight into the transference or otherwise of available capital within the family, that would not be apparent by interviewing only mothers or daughters” (p.625)**Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu (capital, habitus)**Methodology:** Qualitative, inter-generational. Semi-structured interviews with 39 women (18 mothers, 21 daughters) = snowball recruitment. 10 of mothers are studying in HE as PG students or had previously done a degree. 19/21 daughters =studying in HE at the time of data collection. Data = manually coded. Article focuses on narratives of 4 dyads (see p.630) **Findings:** 1. Using capital as currency to access HE: two of mums = PG study (MA/ PhD), neither = traditional students and attended uni when before tuition fees implemented. One mum –Fran – made herself ‘fully conversant’ with funding possibilities for her daughters, which “translate[d] into powerful cultural capital and a subsequent rewarding economic return” (p.631). Other mum – Sam (PhD) – has dyslexia and was able to navigate system through support from school; she has used her knowledge to help her severely dyslexic daughter with her university studies. Daughter now has 36,000GBP debt and is doing unpaid internship in hope of getting a job in her field.
2. Perception: loan or debt? Repayment of debt = differs according to economic status. Women in study perceived loan as ‘long term debt’ and all bar 2 = worried about level of debt and repaying it. Women, especially mums = debt-averse. Mums invested a lot of emotional capital in daughters’ education, as well as financially supporting. With middle class participants, regular reference made to working class students receiving support that middle class/ higher earning families could not access (‘middle-class positional suffering and anxiety’, Atkinson, 2012; p.634)
3. WP/ vocational debate = author discusses stratification of system and cites David Starkey’s article in The Guardian about the myth of assuming all degrees are valued the same. Data from participants reflects this attitude (too many rubbish courses, not enough jobs for graduates); two mums “the broad choice of university courses and pathways with the dilution of the worth of a degree” (p.635) – both privately educated their children. Cites argument that mums = ‘status mainteners of middle class advantage’ (Ball, 2003; Brooks, 2004).

**Core argument:** Middle class mothers views of higher education of themselves and their daughters in context of tuition fees. Findings in paper “exacerbate the argument that if middle-class families have concerns, the repayment of tuition fees will prohibit working class families from accessing HE, who by default are on a lower income. Factors such as choice and motivation to attend university will be determined by familial classification and the working class will continue to struggle, using Bourdieu’s analogy, to ‘play the game’, being unable to compete against middle-class capital” (p.637) |
| Costley, C. & Gibbs, P. (2006). [Researching others: care as an ethic for practitioner researchers,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070500392375) *Studies in Higher Education,* 31(1), 89–98.UK/ CYPAnnotated by Sally BakerETHICS OF CARE | **Context:** Professional doctorates. Care as virtuous but perhaps incompatible with academic research when doing practitioner research? Practitioner researchers have to negotiate blurred boundaries between professional/ practice and research domains/ colleagues.**Aim:** To look at the ethical and epistemological tensions that arise when researching one’s own work context; to argue for an ‘ethics of care’ in practitioner research to account for own position in research site/context and to safeguard others involved. To respond to this question: “how should the researcher behave when thefindings of the research might affect or even injure those to whom the research has a special professional, functional or emotional bond?” (p.89)**Theoretical frame:** Heidegger: *techne* and *aboding***Methodology:** **Discussion:** Three communities are involved in/ benefit from professional/ practitioner research:the workplace/field site, the academy, the researcher themselves.Ethic of care = ‘most potent’ at intersection between self, work and academic, which may all invoke different codes of ethics: “the research as indicated in a research proposal, from our experience, may forsake researchers’ ideological and ethical stances as non-researchers, and replace it with a particular set of epistemological values whose authority is based on a context-free rationalization” (p.92).The ethic of caring (p.93–94) — authors cite Noddings (1984): care = ‘feeling with’ others, based on *engrossment, empathy* and *disposition to advocate*. Authors argue that caring can therefore be taught to researchers. “These acts of caring are not without anxiety, for they require one to anticipate and where possible lessen the burden on the cared-for. Thus, caring is more than a superficial clarification of one’s actions achieved through a voluntary consent form; it is the reframing of the research project as a mutual activity which has personal consequences other than a research report, and which has its own legitimacy” (p.94). Caring as researcher = form of “existential trust”, which is “involving, not observational” and carries a moral obligation, and assumes benevolent motives. However, it is not sentimental, it is about meeting caring responsibilities (p.94). An ethics of care requires reflexive realignment of power dynamics**Core argument:** Ethics of care = process of being (see p.96 for use of Heidegger’s *aboding*): “It involves a ‘real-world’ consideration of our interaction with others, and an examination of the context of the research which informs and constructs the social realities of the situation and the identities of practitioner researchers and researched” (p.96). |
| Dadvand, B. & Cuervo, H. (2020). [Pedagogies of care in performative schools,](https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1486806) *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 41(1), 139–152.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Achievement; ethic of care; exclusion; marginality; neoliberal reform; performance* | **Context:** Loss of caring relationships as a result of/ partly a result of neoliberal/ new managerialist approaches to education that have diminished the possibilities for radical/ transformative traditions of education. Authors argue that the issue is not actually a loss/ absence of care, but rather a competing definition of care, “one that re-defines the notion primarily in terms of academic standards, learning outcomes and performativity” (p.140).**Aim:** **Theoretical frame:** Pedagogies of care: tension between autonomous subject invoked in instrumental views of care, and idea of care based on trust/ mutuality/ interdependence; authors cite work that argues for the decoupling of care and gender, and argue against the therapeutisation of care as part of a performance improvement agenda., but at the same time the authors “acknowledge the importance of affective work carried out by teachers in supporting students and developing their resilience” (p.142). Authors argue for a conception of pedagogies of care that starts from “the recognition of the particular needs and social circumstances that distinguish one group of students from another” (p.142), based on “an ethic of care that is oblivious to inequities along the already existing social divides puts at further disadvantage those who have more complex needs and social backgrounds” (p.143)**Methodology:** Data taken from a broader ethnographic study of an alternative education program in a high school in a low-SES area of Melbourne. Interviews conducted with teachers and principal.**Findings:***Care with performative agenda*:school = subject to familiar pressures of performativity and benchmarking, resulting in “the emergence of caring practices that are primarily concerned with improving students’ learning outcomes” (p.144), which have become the unquestioned (and hegemonic) centerpiece of the school’s caring on ‘academic excellence’ and ‘quality education’. Academic excellence reputation of school = led to partial gentrification of area. Teachers = resistant to the measurement of academic excellence through “accountabilities and performativity pressures” (p.145), which impact disproportionately on particular (marginalized) groups of students.*School care — competing discourses*: tension between performative ethic of care and ethic of care that responds to students’ particular needs, which creates forms of disengagement. Principal described this in terms of “achieving ‘ a breadth of curriculum and high-quality education’ versus ‘ building relationships’” (p.146). Lack of mutual recognition = not a caring relationship (see Noddings, 2007), with students’ “typical response from many students in such a situation is expressed as ‘they don’t care’ or ‘they don’t understand’” (p.147) because of one-size-fits-all approach.Neoliberal impact on teachers = they have to view themselves as individuals, which erodes relational potential of teaching: “In such a situation, teachers can be as much victimized by ‘thin’ accountability agendas as are their students” (p.148).**Core argument:** The culture of performativity and accountability makes relational caring practice difficult to achieve, especially for those who are most in need. “Further, we do not see caring as rigorosity in terms of academic outcomes and caring as relationality as exclusionary, but as complementary aspects of a socially-just” (p.149). |
| de Kadt, E. & Jawitz, J. (2018). [Exploring Discomfort and Care in the Experience of a National Academic Staff Development Programme,](https://www.ajol.info/index.php/cristal/article/view/182296) *CRISTAL: Critical Studies in Teaching & Learning,* 6(2), 21–39.SAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Academic staff development, discomfort, care, higher education, South Africa* | **Context:** Pedagogy of discomfort/ care in staff development program in South African university setting, which was developed to support ‘cadre’ of South African academics who had been recognised for ‘teaching excellence’**Aims:**  RQs: “What elements of discomfort and care surfaced in the final written pieces submitted by participants reflecting on their experience of the TAU programme, and what was their significance in the self-reported growth of these participants? To what extent did the combination of discomfort and care in TAU succeed in creating a context within which recipients did indeed experience significant academic and personal growth?” (p.25)**Theoretical frame:** Pedagogy of discomfort (Boler, 1999), which emerged out of this question: ‘What do we –educators and students – stand to gain by engaging in the discomforting process of questioning cherished beliefs and assumptions?’ (Boler, 1999: 176), and works as a form of critical pedagogy and relational practice that requires participants to question hegemonic assumptions which is likely to be discomforting but permits critical and creative engagement. Care, as part of this pedagogy, can “minimize ethical violence”; authors draw on Tronto’s (2010) definition of care as relational practice. Authors also discuss ‘safe space’ metaphor on p.24.**Methodology:** Draws on reflective commentaries (written texts, 4-pages long + end of course evaluation survey results); n=50 from participants on the teacher development program**Discussion:** Discomfort existed at many levels for the participants – hegemonic ways of thinking about the disciplines, about institutional types, from individual circumstances/ personalities**.**Initial feelings of discomfort: related to lack of familiarity with course/ pedagogy of discomfort – resulting from lack of clarity, lack of familiarity with educational discourse, working in groups, diversity of experiences, overload in first session, use of collaborative/ digital tools.End of course commentary suggests that participants overcame their initial discomfort.Caring environment achieved via: retreat style environment (sessions held in city hotels), a responsive schedule, support for individual projects, team work, collaboration, collegiality.**Core argument**: Authors argue for a leadership approach guided by a feminist ethics of care. |
| Docan-Morgan, T. (2011). [‘Everything Changed’: Relational Turning Point Events in College Teacher–Student Relationships from Teachers’ Perspectives,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03634523.2010.497223) *Communication Education*, 60, 20–50.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Relational Turning Points; Teacher-Student Relationship; Teacher Self-Efficacy; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Job Satisfaction; Teacher-Student Interpersonal Relationships; Instructor Liking for Students* | **Context:** College teacher performance in relation to teacher-student dynamics.**Aim:** To investigate how college teachers’ experience of relational turning points (change in relational dynamic) with students and how this may impact on teaching outcomes.**Methodology**: Survey ofn=390 college teachers with open-ended answers; constant comparative analysis; open coding.**Findings:** Turning points shaped during consultation sessions were highlighted by respondents. These are opportunities to discuss education and career advancement, discussion of course policy or assignment, or other modes of assistance which are mostly face to face (42). Teachers who reported these types of turning points indicated increased job satisfaction (45). Teachers who experienced students deceiving them (through activities such as plagiarism) reported a decreased satisfaction with their job (45).**Core argument:** Teacher-student relationships play a key role in teacher job satisfaction.  |
| Dowie-Chin, T. & Schroeder, S. (2020). [Critical, calculated, neoliberal: differing conceptions of care in higher education,](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1749588) *Teaching in Higher Education*,USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Ethic of care; teacher care; higher education; maternal; neoliberalism* | **Context:** Teaching in US higher education. Authors open with claim that school education = feminised and higher education = masculine (p.1). Authors note the literature on care in education (Gilligan, Noddings, hooks), and review Roberts’ (2010) theory of culturally relevant critical teacher care (CRCTC), which emerged from work with African American school students. In context of higher education, authors argue that the premise that higher education is masculine [or at least less maternal] is based on the self-directed/ autonomous nature of learning in the academy, and that the neoliberal, competitive ideological basis of higher education “complicates how care is conceptualized, enacted, and receive” (p.2). Higher education’s relationship with the economy/ job preparation pushes a focus on quantifiable ‘hard outcomes’ and metrics, rather than ‘soft outcomes’ (e.g. teamwork, self-esteem; see Zepke and Leach, 2010), which makes some forms of care difficult to enact**Aims:** To contribute to literature on care in higher education; to “investigate how three award-winning or otherwise highly regarded instructors at a large research-intensive university describe how they enact care in and outside of the college classroom” (p.2)**Theoretical frame:** Ethic of care; care as relational**Methodology:** Multiple case study approach; part of broader study on beliefs and practices of highly regarded lecturers (‘instructors’); participants = all award-winning lecturers. Three lecturers in this article = “a black woman (Alyse) teaching a Special Education course to undergraduate students, a white woman (Rose) teaching in a Curriculum & Instruction doctoral program, and a white male (Chuck) teaching Chemistry to undergraduate students” (see p.5). Each participant interviewed four times (two focusing on beliefs and practices; two pre-/ post-observation) + course documents/ assessment outlines over one semester. Taxonomic analysis (see p.6)**Findings:** Authors offer vignettes that exemplify three forms of care: “We name these types of care as critical maternal care, calculated care and neoliberal care. These cases reveal how a number of factors including one’s institution, field of expertise, teaching experience, race, gender, and socio-economic status may contribute to instructors’ enactment of care” (p.4). *Critical maternal care:* combination of CRCTC + ethic of care; exemplified in case of Alyse. Foregrounds building of relationship (learning students’ names, maintaining relationships beyond the class, showing an interest in students’ lives; “Like a mother, Alyse takes ownership and responsibility for her students’ learning and feels responsible for improving her teaching in order to help her students improve themselves and the world around them, thus embodying a critical maternal care” (p.6). Also, Alyse is clear to show/ support students to make a difference as future teachers. Alyse’s identity as lecturer = bound up with her motherhood and her race. Alyse also demonstrates ‘critical hope’ (optimistic about the changes she can bring to students’ lives) and has a strengths-based view of students.*Calculated care:* based on case of Rose, who had a painful first experience of teaching which has shaped how she approaches her role/ care. Rose plans her identity (taking a public speaking course, working with a mentor to improve on her first experience of teaching where she felt she didn’t know what she was doing. Rose talks about not caring, but giving the impression of caring to win over students; “In other words, to Rose, caring is necessary for learning. To be a good teacher, Rose had to give the impression that she cared even when that was not the case, thus making her enactment of care quite calculated” (p.8). Care is a performance for Rose, which she views as complicated by her gender (being female in a male-dominated space). Authors connect this to emotional work “with ‘“profit slipped under it”’ in order to achieve ‘“customer contentment”’ (Bolton and Boyd 2003, 292)”, on p.8.*Neoliberal care:* case of Chuck, who viewed his role as getting students to pass by (literally) using his manifesto for success (a 6-page document he required students to follow). This view of care (pass or not pass) = neoliberal, driven by metrics and individualisation/ self-management — Chuck worked with high: expectations of effort and time which he would match: “Care, to Chuck, must be enacted and performed in the same way he experienced and enacted care – through visible displays that could be quantified or observed” (p.9). Chuck tries to get to know his students to help mitigate his nerves about teaching/ feeling intimidated**Core argument:** The different conceptions of care identified in the vignettes of the three lecturers = “are essential not only to understanding the ideologies that guide higher education but to understanding how college students perceive and learn from instructors who may enact different forms of care” (p.2).Conceptions of care are not generalisable but instead are representative of the available subjectivities offered by a person’s biography, identity/ies, context and personality (myriad factors).Further research needed to create typology of caring characterisations |
| Dowler, L.; Cuomo, D. & Laliberte, N. (2014). [Challenging ‘The Penn State Way’: a feminist response to institutional violence in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0966369X.2013.802676), *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography,* 21(3), 387–394.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *feminist ethics; care and responsibility; Penn State; Sandusky; institutional violence* | **Context:** Viewpoint from feminist geography perspective on Sandusky scandal (Sandusky was a football coach at Penn State who was found guilty of many counts of child abuse in 2012 under suspicion of institutional cover-up)**Aim:** To “demonstrate how the failure in University leadership vis-a`-vis the crimes of Sandusky is embedded within a wider culture of banal violence”; to argue for “ethical leadership based on feminist understandings of care and responsibility to make violence visible and demonstrate the value of all individuals” (p.388).**Theoretical frame:** Care ethics/ ethics of care – Robinson (1999): listening and being attentive to the needs of others **Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Argues use the name ‘fraternal leadership’ to describe the kind of leadership that protected and permitted Sandusky’s crimes, and which they describe as “isolationist in its council, protective of its cohort and shaped by an administrative culture that values institutional tradition and reputation above all else” (p.388). This form of leadership was sustained by bringing in money, lore and traditions, and nepotism. Authors argue that the kinds of violence inflicted by Sandusky is joined by other forms of violence (sexual violence against women, homophobia, misonyny, racism). Authors argue “[i]t is clear from these few examples that a culture of violence at Penn State extends beyond one tragic incident” (p.391) |
| Foster, K. (2008). [The Transformative Potential of Teacher Care as Described by Students in a Higher Education Access Initiative](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013124508321591?journalCode=eusa), *Education and Urban Society,* 41(1), 104–126.USAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *student–teacher relationships; identity formation and poverty; learner-centered teaching approaches; student perspective in research*SCHOOL OUTREACH | **Context:** ‘The attitude-achievement gap’ in students of colour/ marginalised groups; literature suggest that the aspiration to go to college is undermined by vague expectations, “suggesting that the goal of attending college is experienced as disconnected from their daily lives” (p.105). Author describes a ‘higher education access initiative’ in a high school (university outreach), which provides “exposure to college life through dual-credit coursework and shared activities on partnering campuses to make “college” a part of students’ experiences grounded in the present” (p.105). Review of literature on poverty, stress and stigma with relation to educational aspirations. Author argues that literature suggests exposure to stresses associated with poverty impact on children’s cognitive development and inhibit identity formation in adolescence. This is matched by teachers’ attitudes/ beliefs about low-income students’ abilities/ capabilities. However, teachers who are perceived caring = transformative + positive effect.Early college high school = opportunity to earn college credit/ associate degree while at high school for first generation/ low-income students: “The overlap of high school and college matriculation is intended to ensure that high school course curricula meet the rigor required for college preparatory work, and to provide the incentives of a shorter time frame and lower expense in which to complete college” (p.107). Teachers = advisory approach**Aim:** **Methodology:** Qualitative study with 9th grade students (n=32) who were enrolled in the early college program at ‘Decameron Academy’ (DA), which is a public high school located on the grounds of a private university, and another school which was part of a broader study. 95% of DA students = African American; 60% = female; 75% qualified for free lunches. Students represented broad range of academic ability according to TerraNova assessment (see p.109–110). Interviews conducted with students (and with parents, teachers, higher education faculty and DA admin staff). Grounded theory = analytic approach**Findings:** Three ‘rudimentary’ categories: (a) Past Experiences of School, (b) Experiences of Decameron Academy, and (c) Descriptions of Self and Learning.*Past Experiences of School*: students described teachers as ‘teaching for the paycheck’ — with previous teachers more concerned with behaviour manangement ­— and having ‘worksheet mentality’, by which the students reported experiencing little learning that challenged them: “a focus on completion of short assignments disconnected from systematic, sequenced learning” (p.112). Therefore when they arrived in DA, students demonstrated high remediation needs, and underdeveloped study skills.*Experiences of DA*: students described teachers in terms of going ‘over and above’, providing “an extraordinary level of academic support and encouragement” (p.113), with a “‘roll-up-your-sleeves’ demonstration of commitment” (p.113). Democratic engagement = facilitated by home visits by teachers, which was intended to subvert traditional power-modes of school-parent/family relations. The location of the academy on the university grounds (meaning that DA students ate alongside UG students) = seen as “most credible indicator of teachers’ belief in [the students’] ability to attend college” (p.114). *Descriptions of Self and Learning*: “the daily exposure to campus experienced in the context of a caring relationship with a teacher provided an opportunity to address the misconceptions reflected in a hope of attending college rather than an expectation” (p.116) **Core argument:** The students at DA are supported to overcome and aspire through “the co-construction of a nontraditional, intense, and personalized relationship in which student and teacher embark on what is essentially a corrective experience of school, teacher, and education” (p.118). |
| Gill, R. (2016). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia. In R. Ryan-Flood; R. Gill (Eds.). *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections*, pp. 228–244. Walter de Gruyer: London.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Starts with a transcript of a conversation between author and colleague regarding how busy/ time-poor they were and the pressures they felt. Author clearly states this chapter is not intended to be a self-indulgent moan. Situated at nexus of 4 bodies of literature: 1) changing nature of work/ late-capitalism (“a preponderance of temporary, intermittent and precarious jobs; long hours and bulimic patterns of working; the collapse or erasure of boundaries between work and play; poor pay; high levels of mobility; passionate attachment to the work and to the identity of creative labourer” (p.41); 2) structural transformation of higher education (increased corporatization of universities; increased casualization; little organized resistance)3) micro-power dynamics4) neoliberalism/ Foucauldian understandings of governance and surveillance**Aim:** To turn the critical lens inwards to the higher education system/ workplace as “an attempt to redress our own collective silence, our failure to look critically at »our own back yard«, with the broad aim of understanding the relationship between economic and political shifts, transformations in work, and psychosocial experiences – and starting a conversation about how we might resist” (p.41).**Methodology:** Autoethnographic reflection on personal experiences; author writes “My »data« are entirely unscientific, but nevertheless, I contend, they tell us something real and significant about our own workplaces” (p.43).**Findings:** *Precarity:*Author offers examples of her own precarity and associated feelings (anxiety). She argues that ECR could be extended to an entire career, “given the few opportunities for development or secure employment” (p.43). Author rehearses arguments about precarity in higher education, and points to the lack of rage against the system and the ‘relative complicity’ of staff on more secure contracts. More discussion of how this precarity is experienced is needed. Costs of working in academia are also silenced/ unspoken (such as long commutes, being away from family) because of need to be mobile; also the gendered dimension (relating to children).*Pace/ intensification of work*: intensification as result of underfunding, hyperinflation of what academics are expected to do, and audit culture (see p.46). Author offers example of colleague who was told ‘if it’s too hot, get out of the kitchen’ when she complained about the amount of work she was expected to do. Author writes: “The »kitchen« of academia is, it would seem, too hot for almost everyone, but this has not resulted in collective action to turn down the heat, but instead to an overheated competitive atmosphere in which acts of kindness, generosity and solidarity often seem to continue only in spite of, rather than because of, the governance of universities” (p.46–7). This means that it is increasingly difficult to find people to do ‘civic duty’ of reviewing/ examining because there isn’t enough slack in people’s lives to open space to do ‘extra’ tasks: “A colleague asks me to examine his student’s PhD. I agonise for two days: I want to help out, it sounds an interesting thesis, it feels important ethically and politically to do this stuff, and I know the student really wanted me as her examiner… but I am already examining two other PhDs thatmonth, I’m behind on everything, my mum’s ill, and I can feel I’m getting close to that place where I will collapse…. Deep breath: I say »no, sorry, I can’t do it«. I am immediately f looded with guilt, I feel a bit shabby, a little bit less than the human being I want to be; I try not to think about the student’s disappointment” (p.48).*Academia without walls*: academic work is now possible everywhere at anytime; addiction metaphors abound (fear of the inbox) and ‘function creep’ (Gregg, 2009) – doing more with less.*Toxic shame*: discussion of rejections (publications, grants, promotions). Author questions why colleagues (reviewers) feel they can be so heartless and scathing; she surmises that it is because of the toxicity of academia: “To understand it we have to think psychosocially in a way that can connect the pressures, competitiveness and frustrations of contemporary academia with the reviewers’ own experiences of being treated with contempt and derision” (p.51).“This individualising discourse devours us like a flesh-eating bacterium, producing its own toxic waste – shame: I’m a fraud, I’m useless, I’m nothing. It is (of course) deeply gendered, racialised and classed, connected to biographies that produce very different degrees of »entitlement« (or not)” (p.51).However, pleasure is what keeps us in academia… author cites Lauren Berlant’s idea of cruel optimism as showing how our passionate investment helps us to survive the injuries of academia, while also making things worse. |
| Grummell, B.; Devine, D. & Lynch, K. (2009). [The care-less manager: gender, care and new managerialism in higher education,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540250802392273) *Gender and Education,* 21(2), 191–208.IREAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *gender; care; higher education; new managerialism; neo-liberalism* | **Context:** Neoliberal shape of higher education, rise of market logics in higher education governance; women’s experiences of senior leadership/ management in universities. Authors argue that although the discourse is one of merit, this conceals the hegemony of male subjectivities and logics: “The highly individualised capitalist-inspired entrepreneurialism that is at the heart of the new academy (Slaughter and Leslie 2001) has allowed old masculinities to remake themselves and maintain hegemonic male advantage” (p.192). Expectations of performance assume care-less subjects. Authors argue that higher education institutions were less able to resist neoliberal technologies of governance and measurement in the ways that (more highly unionized) schools were able.**Aim:** To “demonstrate how the market model of education has impacted on both the definition and practice of senior managerial appointments in the higher education sector in Ireland. In particular, it examines the gendered impact of these changes in relation to care, as neo-liberal values of individualism and performativity dominate senior management cultures” (p.192).**Theoretical frame:** Feminist scholarship; takesview of neoliberalism that assumes the citizen = rational economic actor (REA) and conceals/ denies the affective and caring dimensions of work/ practice/ experience. While framed by discourses of choice and merit, neoliberal modes mean that “the only senior managers who can succeed in the so-called meritocratic system within higher education are those who can devote themselves relentlessly to their occupational life” (p.194). Managers = ‘care commanders’ rather than ‘care foot-soldiers’ (p.194) **Methodology:** Case studies of seven senior appointments (VC, President, Vice-President, Provost, Director: 3 =m, 4 =f) in universities, colleges and other educational institutions (including applicants, assessors). Case studies examined appointment process**Findings:** Analysis of case studies reveals “profound differences” between male and female participants’ accounts of care in context of their roles.* Women spoke at length about care/ impact of care responsibilities on their work
* Men mentioned care in passing, if at all
* “While women in the higher education sector could not ignore care work, especially in the private sphere, men could and did” (p.195)
* Assumption amongst male participants that ‘gender was not an issue’; however, contradictions = evident in acknowledgement of smaller pool of female applicants by male assessors: “Most male assessors were blind to the gender-specific impact of care work and did not recognise how the family and care status of women impacted on women’s decision to apply for a senior management post in the first instance” (p.196).
* In contrast, female assessors = “acutely aware of structural and cultural constraints on women’s choices” (p.196), reflected in the ways that job adverts were written (in ways that tacitly disadvantages women with caring responsibilities).
* All underpinned by assumption that caring (e.g. career breaks) = appropriate moral choice for women, but didn’t make up for less experience.
* Women experience harm at hands of two greedy institutions: the academy and the family/ home. Women = delay children or don’t have children (see p.199); one participant shared her observation that many women who have a baby after a PhD limit their opportunities (because of temporary positions/ lack of research track).
* Perception = taking time out for childcare reasons indicates a lack of commitment to profession, which was corroborated by female participants who “felt that their childcare responsibilities had to remain invisible in their career; leading them to try to compete equally with those who had no caring responsibilities” (p.197).
* Male managers “defined care-related decisions, including pregnancy and jobsharing, as a woman’s choice” (p.199).
* No male senior managers reported playing a role in their childcare situations
* Male senior appointees rarely mentioned care in their discussion of their careers.
* Female appointees more likely to mention the importance of a supportive partner/ person than male appointees, or that having no caring responsibilities was a fundamental factor in one participant’s trajectory.
* Female participants = saw themselves as primary carer.
* Most men saw themselves as secondary rather than primary carer (who was the wife/ female partner)
* Working in senior management = big time commitment, with limited boundaries between work and personal time; “Only care commanders could live a life where there was no boundary between paid work and personal life” (p.202)

**Core argument:** For women, there is “a ‘care’ ceiling derived from women’s caring work in the home, built from the strong moral imperative on women to be primary carers, an imperative that does not apply equally to men” (p.204) |
| Hagenauer, G. & Volet, S. (2014). [‘I don’t think I could, you know, just teach without any emotion’: exploring the nature and origin of university teachers’ emotions](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02671522.2012.754929), *Research Papers in Education,* 29(2), 240–262.AUSAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *higher education; emotions; teacher emotions; student–teacher relationships* | **Context:** Examines emotions of university teachers generated by interactions with students. Works from Hargreaves (1998) foundational work around claim that teaching = ‘emotional practice’ – notes paucity of research on/with university teachers. Offers solid overview of emotions (theorised) and literature relating emotions to teaching.**Aim:** To argue for “a better understanding of the origin and nature of emotions experienced by university teachers” (abstract). “The study addressed the following specific aims: (1) to gain insight into the emotional experiences of university teachers while teaching and interacting with students in one-on-one or in small group teaching settings; (2) to identify factors, events or circumstances leading to pleasant or unpleasant teacher emotions” (p.243).**Theoretical frame:** Psycho-social view of emotion: “posits that emotions, their eliciting conditions and their consequences can only be understood when the social setting and the relationships that are formed within that social context are considered adequately (Parkinson 1996); p.241.**Methodology:** Longitudinal qualitative with 15 university teachers at two universities (2 x interview with each participant – first = pre-semester; second = mid-semester). Analysis according to ‘emotion codes’ (Saldaña, 2009) with 3 stages: transcription, paraphrasing, attributing emotion to cause**Findings:** Range of emotions: most common negative = annoyance, insecurity, worry/concern, disappointment, frustration. Most common positive: joy inc. humour, happiness/satisfaction, hope, passion/enthusiasm.All participants = “highly committed” to teaching; none demonstrated/ discussed transmission approachTypically, participants = positive when students’ behaviour conforms to expectations and negative when not.Three major themes: 1. intrinsic value and social nature of professional practice of teaching: teachers foregrounded relational nature of teaching and described strategies to explicitly build relationships with students. All saw teaching as fulfilling vital role in society and more than just a job.
2. importance of how much/ well expectations of students’ engagement = met: teachers emotions appear to be dependent to large extent on students’ behaviours and attitudes – linked to teachers’ views of how students should engage. Types of behavioural challenges = different from school (e.g. less active disruption); instead = not going to class, focusing on other things (e.g. phone etc.). Over-engagement = also challenging (e.g. too many questions, crossing lines in relationship – especially due to social media). Few negative emotions = due to own sense of performance or role. No/rare mention of anger (key point of difference from studies of school teachers’ emotions). Lots of positive emotions too
3. realisation thatcontrol of teaching = only partial. Teaching new groups = causes anxiety, as does assessing/marking. Cultural norms and differences = also salient. Some teachers found teaching isolating. Teaching = inherently unpredicatable.

**Core argument:** More research needed, especially for new university teachers and how teachers manage/ regulate emotions. Also could be helpful to explore students’ and teachers’ emotions in tandem. Practical implications = possible need for counselling for inexperienced/ anxious teachers |
| Hamovitch, B. A. (1995). [Caring in an institutional context: can it really occur?](http://search.proquest.com/openview/773cd83ad36af0bb5faf9db6fe956261/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2031152) *Educational**Foundations*, 8(4), 25–39.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerSCHOOLAT RISKTEACHERS-STUDENTS-PARENTS‘INSTITUTIONAL CARING’ | **Context:** Author sets out article by contesting the claim that school teachers are often considered ‘uncaring’ (reference to Noddings’s work), pointing to the underpinning questions of “who is going to be doing the caring, within what context, based on what assumptions about why it is that students are in need of caring” (p.26). Author observed that where caring happened in his study, it did not always elicit a reciprocal affection between student-teacher. Author puts forward idea of ‘institutional caring’ as “a concern by middle-class professionals for lower-class clients that takes place within an institutional context in which the ‘care-giver’ looks out for the ‘best interests’ of the lower-class client…[that] largely takes place within a formal institutional context in which one of the parties to the relationship is paid by a state agency to ‘relate to’ or ‘care for’ the other, who is defined in one or more critical ways as being ‘in need’, ‘deficient’, or ‘lesser than’” (p.26), which means that the caring often takes place within the constraints of the working day, within an institutional space, are likely to be ‘one-sided’. These conditions prevent the open dialogic rhythm of a caring relationship: “Only one party to the relationship has the perceived legitimate authority to enter the private domain of the other” (p.26). Author argues that educational researchers tend to place blame for lack of care on structures of system while parents and students tend to place blame on individuals/ personalise their concerns about non-caring**Methodology:** Essay based on observations from year-long ‘compensatory program’ with at risk high school students.**Findings:** Offers a detailed case study of ‘Jen’ from her mum and teacher’s perspectives, and outlines misunderstandings that result from different understandings and modalities of care (caring as excusing bad behaviour, caring as intrusion, caring as pseudo-parenting) which are taken up in often-unhelpful ways, and which are linked to the differential status (social class, power) of the teachers and the students/ their families. Author notes Noddings’ note that middle-class teachers “act as though they wish their students could become ‘just like me’” (p.36), without an adequate understanding of the culture/ practices of those they are trying to help.**Core argument:** Institutional caring relationships are structural rather than personal (p.37) resulting from 3 factors: 1) differences in social class between teachers and students (resulting in feelings of super/inferiority); 2) the existence therefore of class/cultural differences (imposition down of middle-class norms and values); 3) failure to distinguish between public and private domains (p. 38). Institutional caring is “necessarily limited in its longevity, in sensitivity of perception, and in two-way communication” which are understood by participants and lead to “being actively resisted” by the subordinated (students). |
| Hauver James, J. (2012). [Caring for “Others”: Examining the Interplay of Mothering and Deficit Discourses in Teaching,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X11001041) *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 165–173.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Narrative; Women; Teachers; Caring; Students; Deficit; Mothering* | **Context:** Teacher-student caring-relations in the Primary School context**Aim:** To compare and contrast the constructs of care made by six female elementary teachers. To explore how teacher constructs of care evolve and how discursive contexts legitimise caring relations where students as subjects with their own needs as unacknowledged.**Methodology:** Narrative enquiry of n=6 through life-story interviews. Participants were interviewed another 3-5 times in a semi-structured format. Observation of classrooms. Analysis of school material culture (vision, mission statement).**Findings:** Teacher perceptions of student needs emerged from the teachers own experiences of the student and the teacher’s own life.Female teachers bring their mother-selves into their work lives, and their own ideals of mothering. **Core argument:** The teachers constructs of care was fixed to the extent that student needs were shaped to reflect the carer’s narrative of themselves as caring. The teachers sought to mould students in their own image, blurring spaces of mothering and teaching. Good practices of care in teaching should recognise how the “self” constructs this care and how it can prevent teachers from seeing student needs clearly. |
| Haynes, J. & Macleod-Johnstone, E. (2017). [Stepping through the daylight gate: compassionate spaces for learning in higher education,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2017.1364529) *Pastoral Care in Education,* 35(3), 179–191.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Dangerous knowledge; liminality; affect;**compassion; implicit understanding*  | **Context:** Emotions and academic practice; exploration of “troubling emotions felt or aroused in all aspects of academic practice, including teaching, learning, research and relationships” (abstract)**Aim:** To “theorise affective aspects of the everyday epistemic events of sharing and communicating ideas to each other, events whose entangled and intra-personal nature is not always deemed worthy of attention, as if they were straightforward and uncomplicated exchanges… to contribute towards a better understanding of the affective dimensions of higher education, and to show how certain group processes can develop the work of compassion, to provide a supportive framework for tutors to explore negative affect, so that it becomes educative” (p.180)**Theoretical frame:** Liminality; liminal landscapes (“thresholds: pivotal moments or sharp points, emotional uncoverings”) of troublesome knowledge (abstract). Three dimensions of liminality: physical/metaphorical, relational-emotional, epistemic. Authors describe a “recurring difficulty in our lives as academics is the strain of the performative” (p.182): “The punishing pace of the juggernaut of incessant change generates a mania all of its own, which deeply undermines compassion and intimacy” (p.182)**Methodology:** Based on broader ‘Dangerous knowledge’ project, which invited participants to respond to this question: “has your work as an academic ever felt dangerous, difficult or disturbing?” (p.181)… answers “often came in the form of an example, rather than a definition” (p.181)**Discussion:***Physical/ metaphorical in-between spaces*: research project was both a space to share, and a space to identify with/ become a compassionate collective. Physically this happened in spaces between formal spaces (e.g. in corridors, kitchens). Metaphorically, the space developed through the sharing and crafting of narratives: ”The dynamic narration of individual accounts grew out of what was allowed, what was desired and made possible. These felt interior-exteriorisations incorporated the responses of group members and opened up new spaces of knowing, with wider views and a more varied landscape of insight” (p.184). The project also “created a metaphorical space for awareness and acknowledgement of events and emotions” (p.185).*Emotional-relational*: authors cite Boler’s (1999) argument that education offers “a singular opportunity for the recognition of emotion as part of an historicised ethics, for dialogue and difference, for privileging dissenting voices, for tracing the sources of beliefs” (on p.186) = pedagogy of discomfort. The project offered space for the drawing out of the affective (“range of anger, dismay, vulnerability, uncertainty, fear and shame”, p.186) in a safe and bounded manner. Authors found Shotwell’s (2011) writing on shame particularly useful: “This ‘inarticulate’ emotional landscape became a site of evocation and a powerful place for compassionate work; a space in which we could mutually encourage the summoning of troubling encounters”… “These troubling emotions were, indeed, the‘disturbance’, infusing our memories with embodied resonances. These were the ‘vivid’ testimonies of lived experiences, shared with passion in a hospitable space” (p.187)*‘Implicit understanding’*: Shotwell (2011) —“ the idea that we might ‘know’ something, but not yet realiseit, or be able to express it fully” (p.189); elusive knowledge was collected and co-produced. Dangerous knowledges as project became ‘shorthand and currency’, provoking excited recognition from colleagues, and helping them to recognise that they knew more than they knew they knew.**Core argument:** Compassion = fundamental for “forging liminal border crossings for human beings working out human difficulties, and for the frequent positive emotion and sense of recognition and connection it brought” (p.189) |
| Hemmings, B., Kemmis, S. & Reupert, A. (2013). [Practice architectures of university inclusive education teaching in Australia,](https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2013.796293) *Professional Development in Education,* 39(4), 470–487.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *practice architectures; inclusive education; professional practice* | **Context:** University teachers who teach inclusive education as part of initial teacher education (with inclusive ed as a mandated part of teaching education); practice architecture. Authors note how initial argument to make inclusive ed mandatory used discourses of integration and social justice. Specifically, the authors situate the article against a context where university lecturers are likely to teach students with a disability/ special needs**Aim:** To explore how “lecturers consider and incorporate [issues relating to broad spectrum of inclusivity] when designing and delivering their subjects” (p.471); to “show how a number of the issues these lecturers face similarly elude resolution through lecturers’ own practice; and to demonstrate that resolving such issues also requires local adaptations in the discursive, physical and social arrangements that pertain in their respective universities” (p.472)**Theoretical frame:** Practice architecture/ practice theory (Schatzki, 2001) ­— social life configured as ‘practice-arrangement bundles’ (cited on p.474).* Practice architecture: practices = sayings, doings, relatings in three intersubjective spaces: sematic, time-space, social, in which people can encounter each other as interlocutors, in interaction, in interrelationships
* Practice architectures = “characteristic arrangements associated with practices of different kinds” (p.474), which prefigure/shape practices, but do not determine them, and constitute/ are constituted by *practice landscapes* and *practice traditions*
* Practice architectures have three sets of mediating pre-conditions: cultural-discursive, material-economic, social-political arrangements

“According to this view of practice, people become practitioners of a practice by co-inhabiting these intersubjective spaces with others, and by employing sayings, doings and relatings appropriate to the practice as a social site, drawing on the cultural–discursive, material–economic and social–political arrangements found in the various sites where the practice occurs” (p.475).p.475**Methodology:** Qualitative: interviews with lecturers who teach inclusive education (n=9, representing each state/territory in Australia)**Findings:** Practices in teaching in Australian universities, each of which has its own set of doings, sayings and relatings:“(1) preparing inclusive education subject curricula;(2) teaching the subject (including lectures, tutorials and workshops, and in field settings);(3) modelling desirable inclusive education practices, as far as possible; and(4) assessing students’ work” (p.476)Identification of enablers and constraints to practices as inclusive education teachers:*Preparing curricula*: driven by its status as a mandatory subject (informed by policy mandates from Department), and includes assisting students to work with/ navigate same policy apparatus.Variation noted in lecturers’ theoretical stances, such as alignment with particular worldviews or the federal equity agenda. Others relied on ‘evidence-base’.“In taking these different views, the lecturers are consciously locating themselves in the discourses and discursive space of inclusive education today (as well as contemporary discourses about higher education teaching and learning) in which different perspectives have become sedimented, sometimes in opposition to one another. The lecturers are thus locating themselves and, prospectively, their students in these discursive spaces and in corresponding relational spaces; that is, aligning themselves (or avoiding alignment) in the controversies of the field” (p.480).*Teaching the subject*: confronting misconceptions about inclusivity, shifting preconceptions about particular issues. Also, participants described setting ‘field-based activities’ and bringing in guest (expert) speakers.*Modelling desirable practices*: each participant described diversity of students in their courses, and various examples of accommodating students’ needed offered; “Without exception, however, the lecturers indicated that they attempted to model inclusive approaches to their students. We conclude that they practised what they preached – to varying degrees” (p.483) – trying to be inclusive but not ‘compromise’ integrity of the subject. Inclusive practice = difficult within existing ‘traditional’ practices (e.g. lecture/ tutorial model of delivery):“One example is discourses of higher education that presuppose uniformity of students’ linguistic, physical and social capabilities, and thus dispose some lecturers against making accommodations (‘reasonable adjustments’) to assessments to respond to the needs of some students. Another is physical and architectural and timetable and resource arrangements that exclude students with mobility or other special needs. Still another is social arrangements that presuppose that all university students are alike in their circumstances and capabilities, and that do not recognize or respect diversity and difference among students. These three kinds of circumstances ‘conspire’, as it were, to remind teacher education students with special needs that, once again, they are exceptions in the taken-for-granted world of this or that university, and of the practices and structures of that taken-for-granted world that threaten to exclude them, and thus to deny them access to and success in their chosen field of study. They find themselves on the margins rather than at the centre of a university project of higher education: a project of higher education that is for people other than them” (p.484).*Assessing students’ work*: policies and practices related to assessment = enabled/ constrained. Reasonable adjustments used by some to accommodate but not by others.**Core argument:** “practices of inclusive education teaching and learning in university teacher education courses are shaped and prefigured amid arrangements – practice architectures – that enable and constrain the practices in ways that may not be recognised or acknowledged by those involved in the practices” (p.486). |
| Henderson, E. & Moreau, M.P. (2019). [Carefree conferences? Academics with caring responsibilities performing mobile academic subjectivities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2019.1685654?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2019.1685654UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords*: Conferences; academic work; care; mobility; gender* | **Context:** Academics with caring responsibilities, navigating the ‘mobility imperative’, specifically attending academic conferences. Authors frame the article against two competing imperatives: the internationalisation of higher education and the obligation to diversify the workforce. Discussion of importance of conferences in academic on p.2: “Conferences demand a particular kind of mobility, which is temporary and transient and also broadly infl exible, as they usually require people’ s physical presence in a particular place at a particular time”. Academic mobility = understood as “a criterion of excellence which is assessed in institutional academic recruitment processes” (p.3), particularly for ECR and people trying to crack into higher education. Authors note how, with the exception of invited keynotes, conference attendance is not necessarily valued, but it is expected: “Conferences can perhaps be understood as wallpaper in the academic profession, upon which publications and grant applications are framed and hung” (p.3).**Aim:** To “focus on one such contradiction where the academic mobility imperative clashes with the inclusion imperative: we explore how expectations of freely mobile academics intersect and conflict with the concurrent expectations that the profession should accommodate a diverse body of academics, with specific reference to academics with caring responsibilities” (p.2); to discuss mobility, caring and conference attendance as “a prismthrough which to consider the hidden assumptions of the academic profession at large” (p.2)**Theoretical frame:** Care as “as multifaceted, dynamic and shifting” (p.6), relational, as a political phenomenon, intersecting with power, associated with femininity, the normalisation of which authors challenge. Feminist post-structural stance/ discourse and identity.**Methodology:** Draw on two research projects (‘In Two Places At Once’: Author 1; ‘Care and Carers’: Author 2) – see p.5 for details. Interview data from both projects = discourse analysis, looking for examples of “a discursive negotiation of the carer/academic role, i.e. where both roles were mentioned, and where dominant discourses of the mobility imperative and care expectations were reflected” (p.7)**Findings:** *Academic-carers performing mobile academic subjectivities — conflicting discourses*: examines how academic-carers negotiate the demands of two ‘greedy institutions’ (Coser, 1974; on p.7): the family and academia. Flexibility (as much heralded aspect of academic work) = depends on position and roles and comes at a cost (temporal, financial, psychosocial).*Negotiating discursive contradictions*: participants in both studies described negotiating their mobility/ navigating constraints to mobility (in terms of time – planning forward – and distance – how far is too far?). Authors make reference to Perlow’s (1999) notion of ‘time famine’, with reference to justifying leaving the family for work and the counter-demands made by partners. Framing of conference attendance in terms of options/ choices (cost-benefit analysis), and the idea that conferences offer “opportunities to ‘ indulge’ in performing a single-focus academic identity” (p.10)**Core argument:** “Where there is a mobility imperative, there is also mobility inequality” (p.3), particularly when the ‘ideal’ academic = conceived as ‘carefree’. Conferences = constitute an interruption to the care routine, particularly as they donot occur in a regular pattern, and each conference requires its own tailor-made solution for care” (p.4) – but they are not without pleasure. |
| Huber, M. (2010). [Caring for students: Pedagogy and professionalism in an age of anxiety,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1755458609000383) *Emotion, Space and Society,* 3, 71–79.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Care; Scholarship of teaching and learning;* *Pedagogy; Higher education; Professionalism* | **Context:** Author argues that care is at heart of university teaching, but diversification of student body, new media and new educational priorities, as well as increased calls for professionalization of teaching = challenge the capacity to care. Author explores two movements that broaden the conceptualisation of pedagogy and re-engage conversation about caring: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) and explorations of the teacher’s ‘inner life’. **Methodology:** Essay, but draws from ethnographic study of teachers and changing cultures of teaching in higher education**Discussion:** Context: increasing focus on marketization and competitive logics erode possibilities for professionals to care: “increased emphasis by employers on market priorities can exacerbate demands to focus on the business-side of practice, and put in doubt professionals’ own sense of their capacity to serve clients and the larger public in the way their standards of professional care demand” (p.72). Author frames this discussion around ‘academics’ anxieties’ resulting from encroaching deprofessionalisation of academic work, particularly teaching, which “has not been a highly professionalized part of academic life” (p.73). This lack of coordination, scholarship and sharing of practice has opened up a market for 3rd party evaluators and state intervention in assessment and student [graduate] outcomes.*Teachers’ inner landscapes*: opens with discussion of Parker Palmer’s book ‘The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher’s Life’ and his opening paragraphs which point to the highs and lows of teaching, and the emotional connections and barriers/ distance between teachers and students. Author interprets by arguing that teachers need to understand their inner landscapes in order to understand their students.A significant part of Palmer’s argument is about risks of ‘unexpressed emotions’.*Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: defined as academics “looking at their own classrooms as sites forinquiry, finding and framing questions about student learning, gathering and exploring evidence to explore and shed light on those questions, trying out and refining new insights in their own practice, and in the process — by making their work public and accessible to colleagues — advancing teaching and learning in their institutions and fields” (p.76). However, not yet mainstream and mostly linked to individual advancement **Core argument:** Ends with this question: “Are professionals (read, professors) out for their own interests (read,academic prestige) or those of their clients (read, students and the public)? And, if they can’t make good on their claims to public service, do they really deserve the privileges of collegial organization and autonomy they still enjoy?” (p.78).Answer: teachers need to know themselves (practising reflexive inquiry of self) = key concern. |
| Isenbarger, L. & Zembylas, M. (2006). [The emotional labour of caring in teaching,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X05000971) *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 22, 120–134.US/CYPAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Emotions; Emotional labour; Caring teaching*SCHOOL | **Context:** Emotional teaching/ caring teaching in school settings as an underexplored area of research; emotional struggles as part of care. Emotional labour can involve the expression and inhibition of various emotional reactions/ states. Authors argue that their perspective is at odds with other views of caring teaching (which play down the emotional aspects of teaching): “we view emotional labour associated with caring teaching as a preeminent site for contestation about the nature of a caring teacher, and for attempts to shape and reshape the professional and intellectual stance of a caring teacher” (p.122). **Aim:** To identify the range of emotions experienced and described by first author (teacher); to investigate “the ways in which caring teaching is problematized at the intersection of positive and negative functions of emotional labour” (p.122). Article responds to this question: What are the negative and positive functions of emotional labour in caring teaching? (p.124)**Theoretical frame:** Emotional labour (Hoschschild, 1983) is described as “emotional labour is what teachers perform when they engage in caring relationships but they have to induce, neutralize or inhibit their emotions so as to render them appropriate to situations” (p.123). In contrast, “Emotional work involves many emotional costs, and is often invisible, unacknowledged, or devalued; consequently, conceptualizing this as a form of work challenges assumptions of care as natural or effortless” (p.123). Hoschschild (1983) also outlined a further distinction of ‘emotional management’ to describe how people control their emotions. Authors argue that emotional labour tends to foreground the negative aspects, thus concealing the positive aspects of teaching**Methodology:** Collaborative action research over 2 years – see p.124 for description. Focus on Author 1’s relationship with one student ‘Reed’ – data included reflective journal, student work, class notes and planning documents. Data = presented as extended reflection on emotions and actions of dealing with Reed.**Findings:** *Negative emotional labour:* manifested in two ways – suppressed sadness and depression (at ‘failure’ to help Reed or create an inclusive classroom – high expectations she set for herself) and frustration (at how her colleagues treated Reed).*Caring and positive emotional labour:* positive impact on self-esteem – “for the good of the children”, a strong sense of satisfaction from feeling she belongs in the classroom.“Caring teaching for Lynn is intellectual, emotional, challenging, demanding and deliberate. Emotional labour seems just an inextricable part of caring teaching” (p.132).Authors identify different forms of caring:* pedagogical care: “caring about children’s academic expectations”
* moral care: “caring about the values communicated in learning”
* cultural care: “caring that communicates the norms of the culture in which the school/classroom is part of” (p.132)

**Core argument:** Caring teaching is both emotionally charging and draining. Further exploration is needed of the institutional contexts in which caring teaching occurs. |
| Kinchin, I. (2019). [Care as a threshold concept for teaching in the salutogenic university,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2019.1704726?journalCode=cthe20) *Teaching in Higher* Education, DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2019.1704726UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Assemblage; pedagogic frailty; pedagogy;**salutogenesis; teacher resilience; triple point* | **Context:** Higher education as a stressful environment for staff (due to managerialism and economic pressures) and students**Aim:** To “present three crucial, interconnected ideas that I believe can, in combination, help to shift perspectives towards a more productive trajectory” — care, pedagogic health and salutogenesis — to “promote a more proactive and less reactive education sector” (p.1–2)**Theoretical frame:** Assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari): set of operating conditions, concrete elements of composition, agents that connect concrete elements together… assemblage as ‘language of lines’ (Youdell & McGimpsey, 2015), whereby lines = rhizomatic/ non-linear development.*Care*: cites Noddings/ Tronto, Clouder (2005); connections to threshold concepts (Meyer & Land); Jung (2016) —need for self-care in care-giving and care-receiving. Turns specifically to teachers and care, and relational care in particular: “The interaction to support these relations is an essential component for the salutogenic functioning of the student as part of the dialogue of care” (p.4). Cites Nilsson et al. (2015): caring teachers need to know when to care and when not to care (see p.4). Care = part of ‘messy narratives’ (Mooney Simmie, Moles & O’Grady, 2019) that are erased in student feedback/ teaching metrics.*Salutogenesis*: Antonovsky (1987): focus on health and maintenance of wellness, rather than focus on illness — based on idea of ‘sense of coherence’: 1) comprehensibility; 2) manageability; 3) meaningfulness:* “Comprehensibility – does the environment make sense? Are changes explicable and predictable?
* Manageability – are the resources available to manage the demands posed by the environment?
* Meaningfulness – are the challenges presented worthy of investment and engagement? Do I care?” (p.5)

*Pedagogic health*: model of pedagogic frailty (Kinchin & Winstone, 2017; 2018); four dimensions of teaching environment that impact on practice: * “The focus of the teaching discourse and whether it concentrates on the mechanisms and regulations that govern teaching, or on the underpinning theories and values that direct our personal perspectives.
* The degree of authenticity within teaching and assessment practices, and the alignment of the pedagogy with the nature of the discipline.
* The nature of the research-teaching nexus and how this is made explicit in our teaching.
* The degree to which teachers perceive their proximity to and influence on the decision-making processes and management of teaching” (p.6)

Continuum between pedagogic frailty and pedagogic resilience. Author notes critique of term ‘resilience’**Methodology:** Essay**Core argument:** Salutogenic university = based on assemblage of care, salutogenesis and pedagogic health. This is worthy aspiration because it would move “away from a simplistic view of teaching as a linear causal intervention that can be described as a list of competences and which assumes standardised knowledge to be assessed for the sole benefit of an audit culture – that is neither caring nor healthy” (p.7). Each assemblage will be locally and contextually dependent – there’s no one-size-fits-all modelConcept maps can be used to create ‘tracings’ of the rhizomatic discourses and practices at play. Community and dialogue = “health indicators of a salutogenic university” (p.9) |
| Kordts-Freudinger, R. (2017). [Feel, Think, Teach — Emotional Underpinnings of Approaches to Teaching in Higher Education](https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1131922.pdf), *International Journal of Higher Education,* 6(1), 217–229.GERAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *University teacher, Emotions and emotion regulation, Approaches to teaching, Empathy, Cultural context* | **Context:** Higher education teaching, emotions while teaching and emotional regulation. Author reviews literature on approaches to teaching, higher education teachers’ emotions (noting few studies on this topic, but see Stupinsky et al. 2014; Meanwell & Kleiner, 2014; Trigwell, 2012). Very little literature on emotional regulation, but author notes research on cultural differences to emotional expression **Aim:** To examine “two sets of correlates of approaches to teaching: teachers’ emotion frequency during teaching and their emotion regulation strategies” (p.219), examining cognitive reappraisal/ expressive suppression (Study 1), a possible mechanism of emotional regulation (Study 2), and relations to negative emotions (Study 3). Study 1: to respond to these RQs:* “Research Question 1: Do positive emotions and negative emotions form two separate factors within the emotion questionnaire?
* Research Question 2: Are positive (negative) emotions correlated to a student-oriented (content-oriented) approach to teaching?
* Research Question 3: Are emotion regulation strategies (cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression) correlated to approaches to teaching (student-oriented and content-oriented approaches)?” (p.219).

Study 2 to respond to these RQs:* “Research Question 4: Are negative emotions correlated to the student-oriented or to the content-oriented approach to teaching?
* Research Question 5: Do positive emotions mediate the relation between cognitive reappraisal and the student-oriented approach to teaching?
* Research Question 6: Does empathy mediate the relation between cognitive reappraisal and the student-oriented approach to teaching?” (p.223)

Study 3 to respond to this RQ:“Research Question 7: Are the differing results (lack of relation between negative emotions and approaches to teaching) caused by the cultural context of the studies?” (p.225)**Methodology:** Quantitative/ questionnaire. Study 1 & 2 with academic teachers in German university. (n=145; comprising 64 university teachers and 81 student teachers). Details on questionnaire on p.220. Study 3 with university teachers from Australian and NZ universities (n=76), recruited via HERDSA**Findings:** *Study 1:* Positive answer to RQ1; mixed answer to RQ2 – frequency of positive emotions = correlates positively with student-oriented approaches to teaching, which strengthened use of student-oriented approaches. Answer to RQ3 = positive: positive association between student-oriented approach to teaching and cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression, with higher reappraisal leading to less suppression.*Study 2:* Negative answer to RQ4 — no relation between negative emotions. RQ5 = positive (partial mediation by positive emotions on cognitive reappraisal and teaching approach). Negative answer to RQ6: “distress). The more the teachers described themselves as being able to take over another person’s perspective, the stronger they felt positive emotions towards others. The less they felt negative emotions towards others, the stronger their student orientation in their teaching” (p.225).*Study 3*: Positive answer to RQ7 — cultural context is significant: “Australian teachers, but not German teachers, seem to experience negative emotions in dependence from their content-oriented approach to teaching” (p.226), likely influenced by student-oriented teaching being more used in Australasian contexts **Core argument:** Strong positive association between higher education teachers’ positive emotions and student-oriented approaches to teaching in Germany and Australia/ NZ |
| Lennon, S.; Riley, T. & Monk, S. (2018). [The uncomfortable teacher-student encounter and what comes to matter,](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1458711) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 23(5), 619–630.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Diffraction; feminist new materialisms; gender; affect; teacher-student relationships* | **Context:** Teacher-student relationships in higher education**Aims:** To examine three ‘uncomfortable teacherly moments’ to “foreground the interrelatedness of what we know, how we know and who we are always becoming, with and through our entanglements with space, time and matter/bodies during the course of our daily teaching lives” (p.620).**Theoretical frame:** Post-humanist: authors explore the tensions between the work of Sara Ahmed (cultural politics of emotion/ sociality of emotions/ emotions as performative) and Karen Barad (feminist new materialism/*spacetimemattering*): “interconnectedness of the socio-material-affective forces that are forever at work pre-configuring and re-configuring our histories, relationships, practices, identities and performances” (p.620). Authors argue that by bringing these two theories into dialogue, they can “explore the agency of the material-discursive- affective forces that are *always already* at work pre-configuring and re-configuring the relationships, practices and performances of the Higher Education classroom without getting side-tracked by nature/culture wars” (p.622; italics in original)**Methodology:** Auto-reflective dialogue between uncomfortable teacher moments and three questions:“‘How does power get articulated, re-articulated and/or collapsed with and through such moments?’ ‘How do our biologies and biographies enmesh to pre-configure and re-configure our words, emotions, bodily productions, practices and identities?’ and ‘How is a diffractive analysis able to add to understandings around teacher-student relationships and encounters?’” (p.622).**Findings:***Example 1:* student/ panic attack initiated by personal recognition of what author said in lecture, recounting problematic rural masculinities that she experienced in her youth. Student recognised what triggered the panic attack, which left author ‘emotionally reeling’ (p.624)*Example 2*: author co-teaching on Indigenous course, discomfort = experienced by student who withdrew and was distressed (and who ordinarily contributed happily). Author = unsure of what to do (not wanting to make it worse for student); asked student if she was OK/ student replied that she felt she was being made to feel bad for being white. Author and student had discussion after class about white privilege and discomfort but left author feeling unsettled/ frustrated about her inability to address the issue in a more productive way. This left her feeling exhausted.*Example 3:* Author recounts her response in a lecture on gender/ education to a question from a male student about essentialist assumptions about biological difference/ privileging of scientific knowledge over sociological knowledge, which reminded the author of the need to retain a safe space, but also reminded her of past injustices and derailed her feelings of satisfaction at being satisfied/ left her feeling underprepared for this question. All this left her feeling weighted down by the gendered issues at play.*Reflections on example 1* = emotional impacts of sharing and triggering trauma/ emotional outlet, resulting in author and student “re-inscribed through a congealing of shared histories and experiences bound up in rurality, masculine hegemony, female subjugation and an intensity of feelings” (p.624).*Reflections on example 2* = collision of identities/ values/ understandings, with student expecting recognition of her discomfort, but author taking an antiracist stance that rejected the premise of student’s discomfort (but recognised where it had come from and why), creating ‘agential cuts’ (Barad, 2007); “wounds/agential cuts destabilise notions of the teaching academic as rational, reliable and remote from other objects and/or bodies through a reframing of teachers as affectively, historically, biologically and politically entangled in a process of always already becoming (Deleuze and Guattari 1983) with and through their encounters with other bodies – human and non-human” (p.624–5). Emotions have velocity move with speed.Reflections on example 3 = exemplify Ahmed’s contention that emotions have weightiness; in the example both the student’s words and her own response = weighty and expose her vulnerabilities, weighed down by several possible responses. The one she chose led to silence, increasing the weight/ vulnerabilty**Core argument:** Taking the approach they have, the authors have foregrounded the ‘knotty work’ of teaching in higher education, and as teachers (and their emotions) a constituent part of socio-material-affective phenomenon of teaching and learning: “Far from deligitimising and/or disregarding emotions as irrational, insignificant, unworthy of serious research and/or pathologically feminine, our posthumanist approach has allowed us to know them as agentic in the shaping and re-shaping of our gendered, classed and racialized performances” (p.629). |
| Lobb, R. (2017) [When FE lecturers go the extra mile: the rhetoric and the reality,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13596748.2017.1314679?scroll=top&needAccess=true) *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 22(2), 186–207, UKAnnotation written by Dr. Megan Rose/ Sally BakerKeywords: *Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB); social practice theory; managerialism; performativity; individualism; rhetoric* | **Context:** How acts and workloads of FE staff are conceptualised by teachers and management; discretionary behaviour (aka ‘going the extra mile’**Aim:** To explore how lecturers and middle managers conceptualise the ‘extra mile’ in their teaching practice.**Theoretical frame**: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour as social practice theory**Methodology:** Semi-structured interviews with n=30 lecturers, n=6 middle managers;**Findings: ‘**discretionary acts’ mean different things to different people in different situations and consequently the OCB construct is too narrow a view of this phenomenonThe 2001-2005 Transforming Learning Cultures in Education project found that tutors were routinely engaged in improving courses behind the scenes working beyond their job descriptions in response to management pressures. Funding and management regimes in HE were creating these pressures and also sometimes reducing the quality of learning.Lecturers in further education and vocational programs highlighted pressures regarding student achievement and retention.College-based lecturers highlighted the how the conceptualisation of students as customers and student evaluations has presented a new type of behaviour to manage. College lecturers were subject to pressures from management to be efficient while student expectations rise. This has created a climate of fear where lecturers were constantly anticipating who might differentiate between teachers who went the ‘extra mile’ and those who didn’t, and how this was determined. (194)Managers highlighted that conformity, ability to follow procedure, knowing data and entrepreneurial skills were the most valued skills in their staff (201). **Core argument:** Rhetoric, identity and language can shape actors’ thoughts and behaviours around going the ‘extra mile’. Pressures to perform in HE has created a “constant state of turmoil where subjectivities are polarised between a powerless rhetoric which questions the basic purpose of education, and an entrepreneurial rhetoric which fails to question it.” (204) |
| Lu, H. (2018). [Caring teacher and sensitive student: is it a gender issue in the university context?,](https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1171296) *Gender and Education,* 30(1), 74–91.HKGAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Ethic of care; care in opposition to justice; care as relation; care as practice and value; higher education; narrative inquiry* | **Context:** Data drawn from author’s PhD project: cross-cultural narrative study of students’ English reading in HKG university. This article responds to one theme from PhD: “the teacher– student relationship with the presence/absence of care contextualised students’ English reading practices as a means of gender performance”. Author argues that there has a been a lack of attention to gender in discussions of care in higher education. Author compares literature on care in early childhood, where gender does feature prominently, to literature on caring in higher education by virtue of the distinction between pastoral and pedagogical care, which leaves space for academic teachers to distance themselves from care. Author points to literature that makes claims about teachers and caring, but notes that literature on students’ perceptions differs – in particular, author notes that in Bandura & Lyons’ (2012) study, some students reported studying harder as a result of not receiving needed care from teachers, which the author argues “actually runs counter to a correlation between care and commitment” (p.77).**Aim:** To examine conceptualisations of care from student and teacher perspectives from a gender perspective**Theoretical frame:** Gilligan (1982): ethic of care v. justice; Noddings (1984): interpersonal relationships between care-giver/receiver (reciprocity over rationalism); Tronto (1993): political ethic of care (accounting for emotionality and rationality). Adopts Mariskind’s (2014) framing of pastoral v. pedagogical care.**Methodology:** Narrative inquiry: author presents narrative accounts of English language studies students’ (n=8) experiences (from universities in China and Sweden) read through a multifaceted understanding of care. Article focuses on two ‘telling cases’ of female students and uses thematic analysis of pastoral and pedagogical care, and then discourse analysis to explore care in the students’ narratives.**Findings:** Student 1 (woman, China): described care (in context of English language reading) in terms of attention to emotions and encouragement from a kind teacher. Her efforts and reading/ study practices corresponded with a perception of whether the teacher liked her or not. For this student, “a caring teacher means a teacher who provides pastoral care – giving personal attention and emotional support” (p.81).Caring/ kind teacher (female): consciously tried to protect her students from being embarrassed; never used harsh words; adapted her teaching/ content to help students get a better gradeNot-so-caring/ direct teacher (male): enthusiastic, demanded extra time from students, gave extra tutoring. Used gender-insensitive jokes to ‘motivate’ class, used direct/ harsh language in class. Analysis = his focused on pedagogical care over pastoral careStudent 2 (woman, Sweden): student complained about men speaking more in classes by misogynistic treatment of male Philosophy teacher (who called her ‘darling’) and a female teacher who critiqued her work and who finally offered a one line positive review. Analysis: “she preferred teacher– student relationships in which teachers see her as a de-gendered learner, paying attention to her academic performance and offering pedagogical support when needed” (p.84).Male Philosophy teacher (not the teacher described by student 2): perceived that boys tend to speak more as result of broader social patterns.Female teacher: described by student as ‘so caring’ she failed to give critique. She was upset by the student’s story [ethics?!?!] and said it was a form of encouragement.All four teachers were aware of pastoral care but did not necessarily enact it; all four did enact pedagogical care. None expressed concern about their competence in giving care. De-gendered care more possible in caring about/ pedagogical care  |
| Luttrell, W. (2019). [Picturing care: an introduction](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540253.2019.1621502), *Gender and Education,* 31(5), 563–575.EditorialAnnotated by Sally Baker | Care = ‘elastic concept’ (Warin & Gannerud, 2014) and a “complex interpersonal, cultural and political construction” (p.565)Difference between caring practice and politics of care (ref to Noddings’ 2005 relational reframing of care (means to end) v. politics of care as “judging or policing those who are deemed worthy of care, those who are expected to perform care and at what costs, and what constitutes ‘ good’ and ‘ bad’ care” (p.565).Care in education = dictated by ‘greedy institutions’ (Grummell, Devine & Lynch, 2009)Care in schools = organized around illusion of ‘care-free student’, which has equity implications: “Against the backdrop of unevenly distributed economic growth, those with the fewest care resources (e.g. time, money, material goods and services, good health, safe neighbourhoods) are held back in an increasingly competitive education system that favours those with the most care resources. Those who cannot supplement the system from their own resources suffer the greatest disadvantage” (p.565).Care = public and private responsibility; personal obligation, a right, an ethic and activism (p.566 for refs).Racialised, gendered, classed ‘care chains’ (global south supporting care needs of global north), which “raise questions about the links between the global and the intimate as a means to re-conceptualize care” (p.566)Concentric care circles (Lynch, 2007): Luttrell (2012) = describes choreographies of care, which permits consideration of movement (gestures, rhthyms, routines), feelings and resources (props, possessions, food, rights, services), which exposes the ‘privilged irresponsibility’ (Tronto, 1993). |
| Lynch, K. (2010). [Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1474022209350104?journalCode=ahha), *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education,* 9(1): 54-67.IREAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *care, carelessness, neoliberalism, new managerialism* | **Context:** Carelessness = exacerbated by regimes of ‘new managerialism, which is underpinned by Cartesian rationality/ dualism. In context of increasing marketization, moral legitimacy = new aspect to commercialisation of academy (surveillance, performance), leading to “change in the cultural life” of university and in self-regulating practices and ‘feelings of personal inauthenticity’: “There is a deep alienation in the experience of constantly living to perform, particularly when the performance is experienced as being of questionable educational and scholarly worth” (p.55), and creates conditions for compliance. Surveillance is essentially gendered (women = disproportionately surveyed by men). Women = less likely to get promoted: partly because of patriarchal networks and partly because women are “disproportionately encouraged to do the ‘domestic’ work of the organization, and/or the care work (e.g. running courses, teaching, thesis supervision, doing pastoral care), neither of which count much for individual career advancement even though they are valuable to the students and the reputation of the university” (p.55). Women are also marginalized by politics of knowledge with publication (more likely to publish on women’s issues and in less well-established publications) – editorial boards are disproportionately male. New forms of management = represented as care neutral and has allowed “a particular ‘care-less’ form of competitive individualism to flourish” (p.57) = 24/7, responsibility-free and permanently available. Stretched time = endorsed at senior levels, and accompanied by declining sense of responsibility for others (particularly students).**Methodology:** Essay**Themes:***Care ceiling*: senior management positions = ‘care-free zones’, representing the “pinnacle of masculinized citizenship” (p.57). Women = care’s ‘footsoliders’ (see Lynch et al., 2009). People without visible care duties are implicitly expected to have ‘total time for the organisation’. This provides models for newcomers who are being inculcated into academy (e.g. postgrads). This was not created by neoliberalism but it has been exacerbated.*Cartesian rationalism*: separation of mind/ emotions and body, so that education = educating autonomous, rational subjects and governed by positivist ontologies. Author claims moral status ascribed to carelessness = emerged more recently. Prioritisation of cognitive domain = evident in Bloom’s taxonomy (focus on cognitive domain; lack of take up of/ indifference to affective domain)*Doxas of academy*: caring and emotional labour has long been derided by traditional academics – academia = based on assumption that people have time and space to think and write, and time to travel and present. *Neoliberalism*: the new focus on economic citizenship has a “deep disrespect for the relationally engaged, caring citizen” (p.62), privileging competitive individualism and “subordinat[ing] and trivialize[ing] education that has no market value” (p.62)**Core argument:** Carelessness in modern HE = considered ‘morally worthy’. All staff who have limits (imposed or decided) on their capacity to work = disadvantaged with idealised neoentrepreneurial subjectivities: “Women and men who cannot work unpaid hours are likely to be severely disadvantaged within the academy” (p.58). Care = only recognized when professionalized. “To be a successful academic is to be unencumbered by caring” (p.63). |
| Macfarlane, B. (2002) [Dealing with Dave’s dilemmas: exploring the ethics of pedagogic practice](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562510220124222), *Teaching in Higher Education*, 7(2), 167–178.UKAnnotation by Prasheela Karan | **Context:**The unequal nature of the student–lecturer relationship means that university lecturers are faced with ethical dilemmas in managing student learning.**Aims:**This study sought to highlight the different ways in which lecturers manage ethical dilemmas in their teaching.**Methodology:**Using an auto-ethnographic case study, the paper reported the views of newly appointed and more experienced academic staff, through two focus groups respectively. **Findings:**Applying Forsyth’s taxonomy of ethical ideology to the ethical dilemmas pertaining to marking of group assignments, suspected plagiarism, extension requests, and gifts from students, the findings suggested:* Both groups emphasised the importance of following procedures and policies established within the university
* Experienced staff tended to argue for a ‘situationist’ position, in contrast with the ‘absolutist’ or ‘exceptionist’ stance adopted by inexperienced staff
* The more experienced staff discussed the complexities of dilemmas arising in greater detail in comparison with less experienced staff, and were more likely to negotiate solutions and use professional autonomy.

**Core argument:**The author argues that there is need for ethical responsibilities and challenges of practice to be more fully conceptualised and discussed, and that this is important for achieving a greater sense of professionalism among lecturers.   |
| Mahon, K.; Heikkinen, H. & Huttunen, R. (2018). [Critical educational praxis in university ecosystems: enablers and constraints](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14681366.2018.1522663), *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* SWE/FINAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Praxis; critical educational praxis; higher education; university conditions; higher education pedagogy; ecologies of practices; practice theory; cognitive capitalism; marketisation of education* | **Context:** Authors open with discussion of the changing shape, purpose and mission of higher education (reflecting/driving the changing world of work), which includes their civic purpose of educating people to meaningfully participate in civic and social life, and help others and themselves to live well. The authors – drawing from Kemmis & Smith’s (2008) definition —argue that this involves praxis (fostering a capacity for), particularly critical educational praxis – “reflecting critically on the mechanisms of social action and arrangements in order that people can emancipate themselves from manipulation and exploitation” (p.2). Authors outline the Hellenic origins of notion of praxis, based from Aristotle’s three forms of knowledge (epistēmē , technē, and phronēsis) and associated actions (theoria, poiēsis, and praxis). Phronēsis is “the disposition to seek/know how to live a meaningful, happy, and worthy life together with others, that is, how to live a ‘good life”, and praxis is its form of action (p.4), with praxis being an end in itself/ the outcome.**Aim:** To argue for creating an ‘ecological niche’ for critical educational praxis**Theoretical frame:** Praxis (“a form of deliberate action in the social (and physical) world based on critical and reflective thinking. It is about acting in the world in a way that contributes positively and meaningfully to society, or acting in the interests of humankind. In praxis, the impacts and consequences of action are carefully considered” (p.2). The critical is also emancipatory/ empowering, concerned with resisting process of subordination/ marginalization, collective, transformationalPractice-ecological perspective: ecologies of practice (Kemmis et al., 2014): “To survive, a practice must have a proper niche in a living system” (p.7)**Methodology:** Essay; article also based on Mahon’s study of “how a group of seven academics’ efforts to enact critical educational praxis in their educational work within a particular multi-campus, regional-based Australian university were enabled and constrained by the conditions within their setting” (p.8).**Findings:** Critical educational praxis = necessary in contemporary higher education because of the results of neoliberalism/ marketization/ competition/ new public management. Knowledge from this dominant view = cognitive, economic, competitive, commodified: “a target of investment, and human ability to handle information is seen as the most important aspect of economic activity” (p.6)*Enablers for critical educational praxis:* 1) time (for interrogating practice, for finding resources, for imagining)2) space for creativity (requiring exposure to diversity)3) space for autonomy/ flexibility (to have options/ choices) 4) positive, productive, trusting relationships: “positive and productive (i.e., fruitful and mutually-enriching) relationships based on respect, sharing, and caring can nurture and sustain efforts to enact critical educational praxis, particularly when conditions are challenging” (p.10) – based on solidarity, courage, trust5) rigorous critical dialogue/ reflexive conversations (challenging taken for granted ideas, for “raising critical consciousness… cultivating phronēsis and a critical disposition”, p.10).6) opportunities for engagement in scholarly activities.*Constraints for critical educational praxis*:a) intensification of academic work (isolation, competition)b) lack/diminishing contact time for teacher engagementc) over-regulation of practiced) promotion of particular constructions of pedagogical practice (connected to standardisation/ point c, and linked to the idea of ‘teacher-proof’ curricula, precarity and “the homogenisation of practices, reinforces the notion that pedagogical practice is little more than a technical exercise, p.14)**Core argument:** “*critical educational praxis* in our view is needed in higher education in order to nurture the expression of a critical disposition and capacity for critical thinking, to overcome injustices and anti-educational practices in education, and ultimately to contribute, through education and knowledge generation, to the creation of a more just and sustainable society” (p.5).Higher education = experiencing ‘ecological imbalance’, “characterised by a distorted emphasis on the economic function of universities, on aspirations to acquire ‘ external goods’, and on the application of the logic of production (technē) to many aspects of higher education” (p.14).Time (or lack of) emerged as most important enabler/constraint |
| Mariskind, C. (2014). [Teachers’ care in higher education: contesting gendered constructions](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2014.901736), *Gender and Education,* 26(3), 306–320.NZAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *higher education; teaching; care; gendered binaries; social construction; narrative* | **Context:** Care in education is often connected with feminine/ women, and the author questions whether this is the case in the NZ higher education context. Author notes that care in unevenly distributed in society (mostly by women and ethnic minorities – see p.308). Author also discusses Tronto’s 4 conceptualisations of care (caring about, taking care of, care-giving, care-receiving), which disrupt traditional dyadic models of care, and Noddings’ model includes caring for self, which connects with other views of care as being intersected between self and others (e.g. Gilligan, 1982). Moving beyond traditional models of familial care means that care is a social and political practice, which all genders are capable of engaging in (thus resisting the feminised view of care). Author also points to cultural understandings and practices of care (e.g. care as communal activity in Indigenous cultures), and the holistic analysis of the political nature of care can lead to its conceptualisation as caring-as-activism (see McKamey, 2011; bell hooks) as communal practice.In higher education, care is often configured as pastoral care, focusing on care-giving and care-receiving. Author notes Walker, Greaves & Grey’s (2006) work which points to how structures and discourses impact on academics’ caring practice, which is made more difficult by neoliberal drivers: “When universities foster individualism and competition between staff, it can be difficult for a caring community to thrive, especially if care is based on a shared responsibility to ensure that all people can live fulfilling lives” (p.309). **Aim:** **Theoretical frame:** Care as practice; Noddings’ (1984) view of care as ‘rooted in receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness’ (p.2, cited on p.308). Definition of care: “Care is enacted within private and public contexts, shaping personal, social, institutional, and political relations” (p.310). Care is gendered: ” Caring about, pedagogical (or academic) care, instrumental care, and challenge are seen as masculine and involving the mind, while caring for, pastoral care, relational care, and support are considered feminine and associated with the body and emotions” (p.316).**Methodology:** Qualitative/ narrative study of NZ university teachers’ (n=22) constructions of care (her PhD research). Author analysed teachers’ narratives for models and conceptualisations of care according to the literature – looking at what was said and what was left unsaid.**Findings:** Models of care discussed in the narratives of pastoral care (support for students) and pedagogical care (relating to teaching and learning) were coded as:* Tronto’s 4-conceptualisations of care: care about, taking care of, care-giving, care-receiving)
* Pastoral care
* Care-as-activism
* Care for oneself

Dominant mode of care in narratives = care-giving by individual teachersTeachersspoke of individual forms of care: getting to know students/ build rapport/ bringing in knowledge of students’ home countries or contexts. Being a good teacher involves ‘active care-giving strategies’ which require time and effort (p.311), such as speaking to students 1-to-1, reaching out to students, linking students with pastoral supports (proactive care-giving).Some teachers spoke of collective caring (e.g. through use of plural first person) – e.g. care-as-facilitator/ shared care model described by ‘Susan’ on p.312Pedagogical care discussed by teachers, in terms of giving them content ‘that’s good for them’ (see quote from ‘Liz’ on p.312), which involves taking risks/ advocating for marginalised and is thus a form of care-as-activism.**Core argument:** University teachers enact various forms of care (as demonstrated through analysis of their narratives, although the author acknowledges the limitations of relying on self-reports, self-narrated stories on own practice). Mostly the care is enacted by individuals: “This individualisation of care marginalizes caring practices and does not acknowledge how the interests of students, teachers, and the university are interdependent. For the most part, narratives of care were about particular circumstances rather than ongoing relations that act to maintain the well-being of self, others, and the educational environment” (p.316).Study participants challenge the binary gendered understandings of care, but generally the author argues that care is not prioritized by universities: “The narratives of study participants (both male and female) suggest thatcare is a key part of their professional teaching role in their university and occurs in many forms, but this care is not generally acknowledged or valued” (p.317).Author argues “there is also a need for synthesis, to integrate ideas about care to provide a new perspective on what care is” because “Practices of care involve much more than care-giving in dyadic contexts and, as this research has shown, include care-as-activism, care-as-advocacy, care-facilitation, communal care, and care for oneself” (p.317). |
| McCune, V. (2019). Academic identities in contemporary higher education: sustaining identities that value teaching, *Teaching in Higher Education*, UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Academic identities; higher education; teaching; narrative* | **Context:** Teaching/ ‘deep care’ for teaching in neoliberal/ corporate university; New Public Management (NPM) = pushes external motivators (funding, citations, pay, status) as drivers for academic work, rather than teaching, caring, developing new understandings. Teaching = perfomatively measured through quantitative metrics that support competitive/ comparative logics. Teaching and research no longer understood as symbiotic — more complex and contested and enacted in diverse ways by academics, with the crucial processes of deep and caring engagement in teaching and learning diminished and undervalued. Focus on academics’ identities is thus important for understanding how academics engage with teaching (and care) in the NPM context of contemporary higher education. Academics who identify as teachers = uncomfortable, especially in research-intensive academic environments (Skelton, 2013). Author argues that the understandings about what makes teaching meaningful for academics are underdeveloped**Aim:** To explore “how academics can sustain identities that value teaching when they work in contexts that often militate against such identities”; to “focus on the reflexive processes required in institutions to critically deconstruct the status quo such that deep care for transformative teaching can be fully enabled rather than being a position that is hard won by a minority” (p.1); to ask “how experienced academics in mainstream roles in research-intensive universities can develop and maintain identities that encompass care for teaching and strong personal values in relation to teaching” (p.3). Three RQs:“(1) Where academics are balancing teaching with other significant professional identities (such as researcher, clinician or leader) in what ways can they express that they deeply value teaching?(2) In a research-intensive context, what kinds of narratives can support experienced academics to care about teaching and have clear personal values in relation to learning and teaching?(3) In what ways do other aspects of academic identity support or challenge care for teaching in a research intensive context?” (p.4)**Theoretical frame:** Identities as fluid, shifting: “the dynamic interplay over time of personal narratives, values and processes of identification with diverse groups and communities” and “multifaceted, social, overlapping and potentially in tension” (p.3)**Methodology:** Interviews with academics in research-intensive university in Scotland, who had generally not undertaken professional development for teaching (n=12). Participants from range of discipline areas. Participants asked to reflect on recent experiences of teaching and assessment and to respond to questions about what they did and why. Data = analysed according to ‘rigorous thematic analysis’.**Findings:** Participants’ narratives illuminated preferences for particular kinds of teaching, told through: stories about their own lives that ground/ maintain care for teaching; balancing different aspects of academic identities; involves synergies and tensions between different parts of identity/ies.Values: personal values can help maintain engagement with teaching in challenging contexts, with specific emphasis placed on care for students as learners. There was limited focus on evaluation and metrics.Narratives that support these values: half of participants recounted stories that influenced values (through observing colleagues; through own experience as a student — particularly negative experiences). Role models = important for identification with teaching; also narratives of resistance/ struggle.Interplay between valuing teaching and other elements of academic/ professional identity/ies: when in tension, “participants often described considerable stress and talked about putting a lot of thought and effort into understanding and working with these tensions” (p.9), particularly in terms of prioritizing different activities, with research outputs pushed before teaching. Other participants described how their care for teaching was supported by other professional identities (e.g. engagement in professional societies) and viewing synergy between teaching as generating interest in field + research.**Core argument:** Institutions need to work harder to create and support “positive synergies between research and teaching, rather than driving the two further apart”… “It should be an important part of policy and strategy to work collaboratively with academics, professional services staff and students to develop processes for teaching, research, recognition and reward, that allow the different aspects of university life to be more coherent and closely focused on the wider social value of higher education. Academics should be able to foreground different aspects of their identities over time without being penalised in their career progression for these shifts” (p.11).Leaders at all levels need to consider their own relationship to/ values for teaching (attitudes and practices) so as to support care for teaching across the institution/ within academic identities (p.12) |
| Meanwell, E. and Kleiner, S. (2014) [The Emotional Experience of First-time Teaching: Reflections from Graduate Instructors](https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/savvy/journals/TS/Jan14TSFeature.pdf), 1997-2006, *Teaching Sociology*, 42 (1), 17–27.USAnnotation written by Dr Prasheela KaranKeywords: *emotions and teaching, scholarship of teaching and learning, professionalization of students* | **Context:**Teaching is both rewarding and challenging, and in some literature is researched as a form of emotional labour affecting job satisfaction, burnout and perceived teaching effectiveness.**Theoretical frame:** **Aims:** The study explores the emotional aspects associated with first-time teaching in higher education.**Methodology: The** study undertook content analysis of reflections by 86 sociology graduate student instructors at a large American university over a ten-year period (1997-2006) on their experiences of first semester teaching. **Findings:** In reflecting on their first term of teaching, the study found there was a large range of emotions discussed by participants. Participants tended to demonstrate positive emotions towards future teaching. Participants stated that they did not know how they would feel, for instance, energised or draining, as teachers – though they anticipated the emotional exertion. The study found that students experienced a discrepancy between their expectations and the reality of teaching, with some participants reporting surprise at the particular emotions they felt, as well as the emotional exertion of teaching. The study found only one correlation between pedagogical strategies and emotions – teachers employing group exercises more frequently discussed positive self-emotions. **Core argument:**The study calls for longitudinal research to explore the impact of emotional experiences on teaching generally as well as on teachers. |
| Mooney Simmie, G.; Moles, J. & O’Grady, E. (2019). [Good teaching as a messy narrative of change within a policy ensemble of networks, superstructures and](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2016.1219960?journalCode=rcse20)[flows](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2016.1219960?journalCode=rcse20), *Critical Studies in Education*, 60(1), 55–72.IREAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Bernstein’s pedagogic device; critical analysis; good teaching; neoconservatism/ neoliberalism; pedagogy of oppression; teacher education* | **Context:** What counts as ‘good teaching’ in policy ensemble of neoliberal/ manageralism in schools in Ireland. Set against context of increased scrutiny and accountability following the GFC in 2008 (and its specific impact on Ireland), which “have resulted in a policy ensemble of teacher subjectification enacted through new modes of policy evaluation and policy enforcement using the tyranny of number, networks, superstructures and flows” (p.55)**Aim:** To develop an “understanding [of] how teachers, and teacher educators within the academy, can act as holistic educators giving meaning to the lives of all their students ‘by helping them imagine a particular kind of identity and future for themselves, one that they had not previously considered’ (Bates, 2012, p. 68) while fulfilling multiple and competing demands, such as mandates by politicians, the market-economy and conservative interests” (p.56).**Theoretical frame:** Bernstein’s (2000) pedagogic device/ ‘rules of evaluation’; policy ensemble/ ‘sculpting’**Methodology:** Survey of MEd students/ graduates (n=54); questions focused on “(a) contextual understandings and perspectives of ‘good teaching’ and (b) teachers’ contextual understandings and perspectives of interactions with peers and school managers at school settings and with state inspectors and the academy” (p.62)**Findings:** What counts as ‘good teaching’?Respondents described feeling constrained by examination systems that led to teachers having a lack of voice (24%)14% described good teaching in terms of dialogue/ student-led/ needs-metConstraints of school system perceived as countering what ‘good teaching’/ student-centred learning is possibleMajority of respondents described working in hierarchical environments, based on seniority and relative length of service, with many advancing the view that new/ younger teachers were not given a chance to contribute. Respondents described interactions within school as ‘somewhat democratic’, with 56% perceiving the collaborative/ democratic governance as tokenistic. 35% reported that they had become more aware of the political context of their workplaces since doing the MEd program. Pedagogy of oppressed invoked when participants spoke about relations with external policy actors (e.g. state/ inspectorate); authors argue that their analysis suggests that “cultural life of the professional teacher in contemporary Ireland is oriented towards a rigid hierarchy of power relations, with some members of school management and senior teachers exerting strong differential power relations over new and junior teachers” (p.66).Respondents described the challenges of public accountability regimes/ low levels of public trust in teaching that diminish teacher autonomy and “erode teachers’ professionalism” (p.66), leading to feelings of disenfranchisement and frustration. One third of participants described wanting more authentic interaction with inspectorate, rather than sense that inspections are just part of managerial/ political schedule. Many respondents described teaching as stressful, and that they were afraid of burning out, which was “exacerbated by a feeling that nowadays there was less interest shown by politicians, policymakers, school managers and state inspectors in building ethical trust based on mutuality with teachers” (p.67)**Core argument:** ‘Good teaching’ = super-complex when explored through pedagogic device and policy ensemble, exposing mess within the conceptions and the opposing forces/ discourses created by ‘oppressive interactions’ between policy actors and teachers. Authors describe this as: “a policy ensemble in teacher education has been underpinned by new soft technologies of governmentality, including statutory frameworks, superstructures and flows, where ‘good teaching’ is viewed as a clinical practice positioned within an audit culture” (p.68).Higher education/ teacher education programs have a responsibility to counter status quo: “this study challenges the academy to act as a valuable counterpoint to official discourses sculpted by supranational organisations, mandated by the state (e.g. politicians) and enacted through what teachers’ perceive as oppressive and restrictive interactions at the practice setting (e.g. peer pressure and hierarchical inspection)” (p.68). |
| Moreau, M.P. (2016). [Regulating the student body/ies: University policies and student parents](https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3234), *British Educational Research Journal,* 42(5), 906–925.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *England; higher education; student parents; widening participation* | **Context:** Examines the policy context of student-parents in English HE. Set in context of diversified academy that remains beholden to patriarchal, hegemonic policies and practices that privilege the experience of ‘traditional’ students – discussion of historic exclusion of women from education; Westernised masculine rational thought (denial of embodied, affective knowledges). Moreau offers a critique of the impacts of neoliberal/ entrepreneurial university on student-parents (see p.911). Offers analogy of parenting as ‘greedy institution’ (see Moreau & Kerner, 2015 for the same argument about universities): “Both appear to be time rather than task-driven and always leave room for bettering one’s own (academic and parenting) work” (p.911). Parenting = characterised as ‘private matter’ (increased parent choice; increased scrutiny of parents) **Aim:** To explore “the role of university policies in compounding the experiences of student parents – a group which remains under-researched” (p.908); examining whether university policies ‘normalise’ the care-free student.**Theoretical frame:** Feminist theory (Crompton, 1999) -intersectionality; three-part levels of care: care orders (macro), care regime (meso), care practices (micro); sociology of (higher) education/ widening participation**Methodology:** Data in paper gathered in Nuffield Foundation-funded project on student parents in HE (fieldwork in 10 different English universities) = desktop audit, interviews with staff and student-parents, demographic questionnaire for students. Policy = macro-institutional level; “institutional and national policies are conceptualised as creating a terrain allowing particular scripts to emerge” (p.909).**Findings:** Dissociation of care in HE = evident in what’s not visible – lack of representation of student-parents and children on campus. Dominant characterisations of students = carefree, young and careless. Overlap between student parents and mature students = partial, and not immediately visible in imagery or policy, which also plays out in awareness of student-parent friendly policies and services (from interview data with staff). Parental status = often disclosed at point of crisis – meaning the likely label of ‘problem student’ = ascribed.*Analysis of institutional policies*Children’s access to HE = varied significantly (offers examples of where children = not permitted into libraries; see p.914)Three different approaches identified in 10 universities: 1. Universal/ ‘careblind’: 2/10 universities had no policy or provision for student=parents; reference to children = prohibit their presence
2. ‘Targeted’: 5/10 universities had ‘some specific provision’; reference made mostly in context of nursery and financial/ means-tested grant
3. ‘Mainstreaming’: 3/10 universities attempted to mainstream; extensive references to student parents (child care, children allowed on campus, spaces for student parents

Moreau notes limitation of design (aka case study universities = not likely to be representative of whole sector)Results of analysis of policyscape – seemingly ‘neutral’ policies can (further) marginalise student parents: “As generic policies are usually designed with the childfree student in mind, their negative effects on parents, including at academic, financial, social, health and emotional levels, risk being overlooked” (p.916). Spatial-temporal domain = significant barrier despite being ‘fair’ or ‘neutral’ (e.g., timetabling and unsuitable spaces for breast feeding). Issues persist at level of cost (e.g., for childcare/ lack of financial support), leading to students being viewed as deficient, needy, special. For ‘mainstreaming’ to be successful, it needs to be well-resourced and systematically implemented**Core argument:** The hegemonic shape of HE = masculine and care-free: “By rendering carers, children and pregnant bodies invisible in academia, media, national policy and university ‘texts’ regulate (the) student body/ies and normalize the association of the ‘bachelor boy’ with HE” (p.913). |
| Moreau, M.P. & Kerner, C. (2015). [Care in academia: an exploration of student parents’ experiences](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2013.814533), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(2), 215–233.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *care; higher education; student parents; mothers; England* | **Context:** Set in context of WP in England (post-New Labour policies) + rhetoric of social mobility and fairness. Focus on student parents/ people with caring responsibilities. Cites data from Student Income and Expenditure Survey (2009): 8% f/t and 36% p/t students = parents (see p.218). Invisibility of care in HE = systemic/ institutional level – universities = ‘greedy institutions’**Aim:** “to shed light on the experiences of student parents, with a view to contribute to the theorisation of the relationship between care and HE” and to “discuss the relative invisibility of student parents in the policy and physical spaces of HE” (p.216). **Theoretical frame:** Draws on social constructivist/ feminist theories; discourse (Foucault) **Methodology:** Qualitative: 10 x case study English universities (funded by Nuffield Foundation) – 6 unis = pre-1992, 4 = post-1992; audit of university websites = great variability in provision for parents. Interviews with staff (n=20) and with students with at least one child under 11 (n=40 – half = UG; 29/40 = f/t; average age = 35; 9= single parents; 12 = international students; 1/3 had children under 5; 2 = male)**Findings:** Problematises the conflation of student parents and mature students (not all mature students = parents and vice versa). 9/10 universities do not collect information on student parents. Analysis of institutional imagery (Leathwood and Read, 2009) = dominantly depicts students as “young, smiling and (presumably) ‘unencumbered’ women” (p.219).*Time-related difficulties for student-parents*: many = ‘time-poor’ and talked of ‘balancing act’, “through which they aimed to dedicate enough time to the needs of their family, to their studies and to the other activitiesand people that matter in their lives” (p.219). Example of ‘Katherine’ – ‘you can never win’ = juggling responsibilities/duties, but does not internalize as issue at individual/organizational level. Discussion of parenting and what counts as motherhood: p.220 – makes comparison between parenting and academic ‘bottomless’ work: “Expectations in terms of mobility and availability risk conflicting with parental commitments” (p.220). Strategies developed by parents to balance study and parenting discussed on p.221. Describes ‘family unfriendly’ institutional practices, such as giving timetables very late (authors also note that many student parents also work). Discussion of domestic work/ care at home (p.222) and lack of ‘me time’Financial difficulties for student-parents: exacerbated by lack of support for childcare costs in addition to other financial pressures (see work on risk for working class students: e.g., Archer, Hutchings and Ross, 2003). Some students considered themselves better off as a student (e.g. single parents; see p.225).Health/ emotional impacts: mixed feelings (guilt, depression, sleep deprivation, feelings of ‘missing out’ or ‘not fitting in’). Children often driving force to enter/ remain at university (role models) = see p.227; “Being a student is then articulated as a way of being a ‘better’ parent in the longer term, even though it implies compromisingthe ideal of the ‘good’ mother in the shorter term” (p.228).**Core argument:** Student parents = largely invisible in the academy. This paper adds further rich description to the experiences of ‘non-traditional’ students, and describes struggles of a group “characterised by some intense organisational and moral work as they try to reconcile the demands of being a parent and a student” (p.229). Has major gender implications. HE = site of struggle and resistance for these students. |
| Motta, S. & Bennett, A. (2018). [Pedagogies of care, care-full epistemological practice and ‘other’ caring subjectivities in enabling education](https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=Pedagogies+of+care,+care-full+epistemological+practice+and+%E2%80%98other%E2%80%99+caring+subjectivities+in+enabling+education&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 23(6), 631–646.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Enabling education in Australia in context of widening participation and equity/ neoliberal university structures and systems, where a “neoliberalised conceptualisation overlooks the important ethico-political social justice commitments, forms of subjectivity and pedagogical practices, developed over many decades by the programmes’ educators” (p.632). Authors review literature on the ‘affective turn’ in higher education research, and argue that “By (re)inserting attention to the importance of the affective in HE, we are able to see that denial and repression of emotional and embodied humanity serves to reproduce the very problems with pedagogical performance that neo-liberal pedagogical policy-making reasserts (through attempts at denial)” (p.634).**Aim:** To “highlight the importance of pedagogies of care, care-full epistemological practice and ‘other’ caring subjectivities that continue to characterise the spaces of access and widening participation (A and WP) in higher education (HE)” (p.631).**Theoretical frame:** Feminised pedagogical praxis**Methodology:** Participatory project.**Findings:** Discussion organised around three themes: *care as recognition*, *care as dialogic relationality, care as affective and embodied praxis.* |
| Mutch, C. & Tatebe, J. (2017). [From collusion to collective compassion: putting *heart* back into the neoliberal university](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2017.1363814), *Pastoral Care in Education,* 35(3), 221–234.NZAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *neoliberalism; neoconservatism; higher education; universities; New Zealand* | **Context:** Neoliberal/ neoconservative model of higher education and staff members’ “conscious, unwitting and coercive complicity” (Shore & Davidson, 2014) — examination of points of resistance in order to not ‘lose heart’ “by creating safe havens of collective compassion” (p.222) **Aim:** To autoethnographically analyse experience in order to “reconceptualise what it meant to be an academic in the heartless world of the neoliberal university” (p.221) by finding pockets of resistance**Theoretical frame:** Collusion as conceptual framework (Shore & Davidson, 2014): *conscious, unwitting* and *coercive* complicity**Methodology:** Discussion between two academics (authors) following their experience of co-teaching a course on social justice and diversity in teacher preparation**Findings:** Collusion in neoliberal university: illustrations of conscious complicity in management/ administrative positions, unwitting complicity from “well-intentioned lower managers” and students, and coercive complicity in colleagues who try to push back against neoliberal logics. Three themes: (a) universities as instruments of neoliberalism; (b) academics as managed subjects; and (c) students as entitled consumers*Universities as instruments of neoliberalism*: focus on publications/ outputs and ‘quick’ (as opposed to ‘slow’) scholarship, with teaching openly subordinated. Manipulation of the system (e.g. through advice to focus on research and ‘just get through’ teaching) = likely to be a combination of conscious and unwitting collusion through the promise of individual/ self-advancement.*Academic as managed subjects*: shifts in the way that teaching is governed (and rewarded) have also promoted individual self-promotion, and the surveillance of performance have promoted conscious complicity “as academics monitor each other” and coercive complicity “as the academics under surveillance fear for their reputations, positions and futures” (p.229). Standardisation of teaching hours = commodifies teaching into a game.*Student as entitled consumer*: neoliberal systems position students as self-interested consumers, which plays out in the kinds of unkind/ unhelpful feedback students feel entitled to offer/ question the academics’ knowledge/ teaching. This left the authors wondering about whether they should deliver less challenging material. Other examples offered include a student using emotional blackmail and inappropriate methods to beg for a higher grade**Core argument:** Strategies to avoid complicity:Co-teaching (between experienced and new teachers), even when it means more unrecognised work = ”one example of coercive collusion against the system” (p.231)Providing care for sessional tutorsEstablishing an award for supportive teachingAdvocating in Senior Leadership meetingsSupporting colleagues to resist heartless policies through writing submissions/ subverting harmful practices |
| Myers, J. & Tronto, J. (1998). [“Truth” and Advocacy: A Feminist Perspective](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/truth-and-advocacy-a-feminist-perspective/CEB3E6F88F6AD857F02A0E6EF3FC9B2F), *PS, Political Science & Politics,* 31(4), 808–810.USAAnnotated by Sally Baker | Brief essay.Starts from the argument that feminist teachers are “accused of being merely advocates in their classrooms” (p.808). Authors argue that everyone is an advocate – that decisions made in terms of what, where, when, how to teach are selections, but feminist scholars often bring the unspoken assumptions to the forefront, rejecting the idea of ‘value neutrality’. Feminist scholars have pushed through a reformist agenda through *selectivity* and *situatedness*.Feminist pedagogy = “interactive, interrelational, and interdisciplinary” (p.810), which requires that “students and faculty take responsibility for what they think is true and explain why they think it is true”, which can lead to discomfort “because they are being asked to think critically about assumptions they may not even have known they held” (p.810). |
| Newstead, C. (2009). [Pedagogy, post-coloniality and care-full encounters in the classroom](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0016718508000778), *Geoforum,* 40, 80–90.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Care; Pedagogy; Novels; Post-colonialism;**Responsibility; Reading* | **Context:** Role of responsibility and care in teaching of Geography in higher education: “Care embraces responsibility yet it usefully forces attention to the mediation and embeddedness of responsible relations in the interpersonal contact zones of the classroom” (p.90). Author argues that we don’t easily connect teaching and ‘care work’ in higher education. Author draws on thinking of bell hooks and Freire, with regard to a clear perception of the relational/ relatedness of teaching through interactions between students and teachers. Caring practice “requires on the part of both student and teacher, a willingness to engage, challenge and be challenged, and in turn an openness to diverse ways of ‘speaking’ and engaging” (p.81). Author focuses on reading for the discipline. She suggests “we might want to think much more care-fully about how we help students acquire geographic sensitivities in ways that multiply rather than narrow understandings, open rather than close ways of relating, and enable ratherthan dis-able modes of engaging” (p.81). Author uses hook’s term of ‘engaged pedagogy’**Aim:** To offer “an analysis of what might be learned about the way power operates in the geography classroom from the contradictory outcomes of my own ‘post-colonial pedagogy’” (p.82), drawing on experience of using novels in her teaching a module on Caribbean transnationalism.**Theoretical frame:** Post-colonialism (questions of power, domination and resistance), which “draws attention to the ‘others’ that haunt the social worlds we live in” and “asks us to attend to the needs and desires of these multiple others, to challenge the normative assumptions of whiteness, and the complex relations that connect places and different times” (p.82). Whiteness of canon/ course texts = ‘epistemic violence’ (Spivak, 1985)**Methodology:** Critical reflection on own teaching experience**Findings:** Reading as a field of encounter: author’s goal in using novels was “to mobilise novels as sites of encounter with otherness that are obvious in their uncertainty and incompleteness” (p.85) through unsettling assumptions. Author discusses the varying responses/ reactions/ implications of asking her students to read novels. In terms of her caring work, author describes how she enacted her duty of care (in response to students’ discomfort at having to read a novel) “through an institutional register in which care became a responsibility to ‘teach’ in a way that made sense within the range of already established academic expectations” (p.86), and through considering how power worked in the dynamic between her and her students beyond the relational and “to include commitments to challenge institutional practices that drive assessment centred learning and instil in students fixed definitions of what it means to do geography” (p.86).**Core argument:** The ‘care-full’ strategy described by the author “requires both a resistance to determining the objective of reading a priori, and a concerted effort to create contexts in which it becomes possible for students toexperiment with different forms of expression, and consistently place both assumed and acquired knowledge under careful scrutiny” (p.88).Care-full post-colonial pedagogy = pedagogy of context: “It is attentive to the work that representations do, attentive to the lasting resonance and reverberation of specific types of practice, yet always aware of the instabilities that require social relations be made anew. It is deeply attuned to the temporarilities and spatialities of different knowledges. (p.88) |
| Nilsson, M.; Ejlertsson, G.; Andersson, I. & Blomqvist, K. (2015). [Caring as a salutogenic aspect in teachers’ lives,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X14001358) *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 46, 51–61.SWEAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Caring; Teachers; Well-being; Hermeneutics* | **Context:** Teachers’ well-being (work and private lives) in context of growing concerns about how stressful/ unhealthy teaching is as a career**Aim:** “To gain a deeper understanding of how teachers at a compulsory school experience the salutogenic aspects of their lives”; RQ: ““How do teachers experience their everyday lives?” and more precisely, “What are the salutogenic aspects of their everyday lives?” (p.52)**Theoretical frame:** Salutogenic perspective (as alternative to pathogenic) — focus on well-health rather than ill-health (originally Antonovsky, 1987): focus on resources that strengthen well-being. Sense of Coherence (SOC) theory underpins this perspective, whereby “a strong sense of coherence enables people to make sense and deal with life's different stressors” (p.52): comprehensibility, manageability, meaningfulness.**Methodology:** Qualitative interpretive/ participatory; hermeneutics, using multistage focus groups with teachers in a primary school (n=7; 6f, 1m — details on p.53). Focus groups followed by individual interviews with teachers.**Findings:** Two themes: 1) ‘doing’ as salutogenic aspect of teachers’ lives; 2) ‘being’ as salutogenic aspect of teachers’ lives*Doing*: creative teaching: planning lessons, solving problems, relationships with colleagues: socialising, listening and discussing, facilitating everyday life.Two important aspects arise: achieving results and “being in doing”, with the latter “interpreted as meaning joy, gratitude, love of learning, and revival of energy” (p.56).*Being:* enjoyment of specific moments/ a way of feeling good/ being present/ being there for and being supported by others (with ‘care’ used by participant ‘Madalaine’ to describe this)/ freedom“It is about being present here and now, and not thinking about what has been or what's to come. In one sense, it means letting go of control. The meanings found in “being” are meaningfulness, confidence, appreciation, contentment and savoring. When the teachers feel they are genuinely there for someone else, as they do in relation to the pupils, their colleagues, and significant others, they experience a sense of meaningfulness” (p.56).Authors interpret these tentative findings as about care: “Our comprehensive interpretation suggests that salutogenic aspects in the lives of the teachers are about caring e for others but also for oneselves. Caring is to allow yourself to be and act in such a manner that you feel good about yourself. By caring and by being cared for, human needs such as feeling meaningfulness are met” (p.57). Care = understood as relational but “At the same time, caring means having the courage to listen to one's own needs” (p.57): requires courage and encouragement. Authors cite Mauss’ work on the gift, but question whether “teachers are giving care as a way of getting something in return, as in a trade” … “Furthermore, we argue that to receive a gift e be it time, knowledge, patience or support e is also a sign of being generous. By receiving something back is to give others the possibility to be generous. It is a complex system of givers and recipients, of symmetry and asymmetry, and of reciprocity” (p.57)Being in doing: interpreted through Aristotle’s distinction between poieses (achieving) and praxis (being in doing), with poieses privileged and rewarded systematically, and is thus possibly more influential on teachers’ behaviours/ perceptions.Reciprocal care between teachers and students (in non-linear ways) gives meaning (but see international statistics on teacher attrition for how this care/ meaning is not evident for many teachers) **Core argument:** “Existential needs are met through caring” |
| Northedge, A. (2003). [Enabling Participation in Academic Discourse](https://srhe.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1356251032000052429), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 8(2), 169–180.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *discourse, specialist knowledge community, access, student-led teaching* | **Context:** UK higher education. Paradigm shift in perception of teachers (from didact to facilitator) = also shifted perceptions of teacher as content/subject expert. Argues that these shifts resulted in teaching becoming subordinate to learning, leading to reduced status for teachers. Author issues warning: “…there are dangers in an uncritical embrace of student-centredness, if it undermines the role of the teacher, and undersells the immense contribution of the academy and academic knowledge” (p.170). Academic discourse = difficult to comprehend because they “work with propositional meanings of a decontextualized and abstract nature” (p.172), which do not align with students’ frames of reference**Aim:** To “consider the intellectual challenges students face in attempting to make sense of a knowledge community’s specialist discourse and the teacher’s role in helping them to tackle these challenges” (p.171).**Theoretical frame:** Nothing specific/ socio-cultural theory**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** Argues subject teachers have 3 key roles as subject teachers in helping students to enter the discourses of subject: 1) lending capacity to participate in meaning; 2) designing ‘well planned excursions into unfamiliar discursive terrain”; 3) coaching students to speak academic discourse. 1. Understanding and conversation = based on sharing frames of reference and intersubjectivity (Bruner, 1996) – teachers can open up conversations and “sharing in a flow of meaning” (p.173) – socialisation and repeated engagement/ sharing = facilitates students’ acquisition of/ internalisation of frames of reference in (new) knowledge/discourse community. Offers example of how this works in practice in OU module on health.
2. Leading excursions: teachers can ask questions using ‘everyday discourse’ about course materials and introducing new elements: “students internalise [structuring features of the specialist discourse] primarily through participation, rather than from explicit explanation” (p.174). Offers example of how this works in practice in OU module on health – ‘designing a vigorous flow of meaning’ (importance of narrative: plot, storyline): “Because knowing is a dynamic process, located in flows of meaning, learning experiences need also to be constituted as vigorous flows of meaning” (p.177)
3. Coaching students to speak the discourse ‘appropriately’ in writing and speaking. With writing, coaching takes place in form of feedback that poses questions and “gives important clues as to how ideas might be reframed to achieve greater force and clarity within the terms of the discourse” (p.178), ideally on a regular basis. Speaking = classroom discussion and teacher = ‘live model’ of how discourse is spoken

**Core argument:** Teacher has 3 key roles in opening access to specialist discourses: 1) lend capacity to frame meanings in specialist discourse; 2) plan, organise and lead excursions into specialist discourse; 3) help students to speak the discourse competently |
| O’Brien, L. (2010). [Caring in the Ivory Tower,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562510903487818?journalCode=cthe20) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 15(1), 109–115.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *caring; modeling pedagogy* | **Context:** US higher education; teaching viewed as craft**Aim:** To offer an example of how caring can be operationalized; to respond to these framing questions: * “Can we do as she suggests in full-to-bursting classrooms of students-as-consumers?
* Is it possible to construct college classrooms that are nurturing, thoughtful, and just in the face of curricular mandates, limited hours, never-ending committee work, and institutional demands to publish and write grants? Do our classrooms address —dialogically or otherwise — what it means to be human?
* Are our students engaged, passionate, and articulate? How do we stir our students to wide-awakeness, imaginative action, and a passion for possibility?” (p.109)

**Theoretical frame:** Thayer-Bacon & Bacon’s (1996) contention that caring is central to any model of teaching; Noddings’ relational framework for thinking about caring**Methodology:** Reflection on practice**Discussion:**  Author wanted to get to know her students better so she could support them better. One strategy she employed was to write to her students at the start of class and invite them to spend 15 minutes with her at the beginning of term, which 24 of the 29 students did. She argues that “the investment appears to pay great dividends” (p.112), in terms of student feedback and her responsive teaching.Challenges: time/ volume of students. Author makes case that caring is part of emotional labour (gendered). Author also points to challenges of intensified workload of academics, casualization, personal life and own caring needs, especially when the caring is often one-sided (teachers caring for, rarely the one cared for): “Teachers might feel more cared for if institutions were more caring; if they were seen as more than interchangeable workers in the academy’s market economy” (p.114).**Core argument:** “if we are to make a difference, we must make sure that students know we care about them. Practices that encourage acceptance, trust, inclusion, and openness are central to all caring relationships and to a positive classroom climate” (114). |
| O’Connor, K. (2008). [“You choose to care”: Teachers emotions and professional identity,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0742051X06001752) *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 24, 117–126.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Emotions in teaching; Professional identity; Teacher beliefs; Teacher role* | **Context:** Secondary school teachers’ professional identities and emotional experiences; neglect of caring in educational policy/ teacher standards (author refers to NSW 2005 Framework of Professional Teaching Standards). Author’s literature review juxtaposes the literature that speaks to the emotional dimensions of teaching (e.g. Hargreaves/ Zembylas) and the technico-rationalist discourses in the professional standards document**Aim:** To examine “the reasons behind the marginalisation of discourses of emotionality and discusses the lived experiences of three teachers” (abstract); to “explore how individual teachers use and manage emotions tocare for and about students in their professional work” (p.118). RQ: “How do teachers care for and about their students? What effect does their caring behavior have on their professional decisions?” (p.120)**Theoretical frame:** Caring defined as “emotions, actions and reflections that result from a teacher’s desire to motivate, help or inspire their students” (p.117). Findings described in terms of three sociological lenses: performative, professional and philosophical/humanistic**Methodology:** Qualitative, interactionist study of teachers’ (n=3) caring behaviours when working with students. 2 x in-depth/ phenomenological interviews with each participant (see p.120 for details).**'Findings:** Three teachers described ‘kindness and care’ as a professional choice/ necessary part of their job; as ‘Laura’ articulated, “You choose to care, because you see the value of what you do because you care” (p.121). Policy conditions make caring difficult; in ‘Christina’s private school context, she described an expectation to care to show ‘value for money’. ‘Michael’ and ‘Laura’ describe the boundaries around how far they will/can care, which “are reminders of the fact that teachers’ emotions are constrained and guided by role requirements” (p.121). *Caring as performative:* for Laura = teaching as ‘an acting job’, which has emotional consequences in terms of impact and energy spent. Christina viewed caring as a core part of her role, expressed in terms of ‘love’. Continuum between professional behaviour and authentic emotions. “Teachers need to navigate the path between being emotionally engaged with students as an individual and undertaking emotion labour to meet the demands which their professional role places upon them” (p.122).*Caring as professional*: author questions whether it is necessary to create a teacher persona to distance from personal identity/ies. Professional dimension of caring = about maintaining space and boundaries (‘healthy distance’) from students while creating a nurturing environment. “Caring is important to teachers precisely because of the fact that it is not represented in standards and cannot be quantified by any objective means” (p.123).*Caring as philosophical/ humanistic*: Michael and Christina described their caring/ teaching approach explicitly in terms of a humanistic philosophy (empowering/ liberating through literacy and modeling empathy).**Core argument:** Caring for/ about students = motivator for remaining in teaching but also exhausting. Emotional/social dimensions of teaching require more examination and provide a counter discourse to techno-rationalist views of teaching. Implications for pre-service teacher education. |
| Pillay, V. (2009). [Academic mothers finding rhyme and reason,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540250802467927) *Gender and Education,* 21(5), 501–515.SA Annotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *subjugated knowledges; liberating thinking; ontology of difference; inscribe motherhood into thinking* | **Context:** South African HE context. Author makes argument that “the silences with respect to mothering are deafening” (p.502) throughout the paradigmatic shifts across history – seems like an abstraction of mothering from philosophical concerns. Author argues we need to “rethink thinking” (assumptions that the mind= masculine; the body = feminine) – the academic mother = “unique duality…the perceived oppositional identities of academic and mother live within the same person” (p.502). **Aim:** To argue that balancing between mothering and academia = leaves women limited; “to show that motherhood needs to be inscribed into intellectual work if the academic mother is to find a wholeness of self” (abstract); examines the ‘fragmentations of the self’ (p.502)**Theoretical frame:** Derrida’s work on difference; Foucault’s work on subjugated knowledges; Grosz’s work on feminist theory as critique and construct**Methodology:** Essay/ literature review**Findings:** Review of the literature = academic mothers largely feel compromised on both their mothering and their intellectual work; issues are stlll prevalent (see example of 2005 discussion about child care; p.504). Inclusion of emotion in rational discussions = still lacking; how to bring together without dichotomising: “The intellectual dichotomies that are perpetuated by patriarchy will serve to retain women as the other in conceptualisations of thinking. The offence here lies not only in patriarchy but in women’s complicity in its survival” (p.505). Drawing on the work of Edwards (1993), the author discusses the challenges of separating the roles of student/ thinker and mother in ways that were not so problematic for work and mothering. Pillay contends that this is because women students are thinking in a male-structured and dominated space (e.g., academic objectivity; scientific rationalism). Responsibility for nurturing is also significant. Pillay scopes literature that speaks to the argument about ‘how does she do it?’, and the opportunities for making new connections that come through interacting with children (see p.507-8). Drawing on Derrida (and criticism of binaries in western thinking), Pillay argues that difference between mother and academic = relational construct; in its experiential expression – points to fluidity of difference. Thus, when women live out lives as mother/ academic, they “give credibility to the apparent difference between these two lives” (p.509) – if both are part of our relational being, why do women seek to separate motherhood from academia/intellectual work? “To reiterate, for as long as we choose to give ascendancy to the difference between mother and academic, we are unlikely to achieve a wholeness of self” (p.509); but see Wise’s (1997) concerns about ‘bifurcated existence’. Drawing on Foucault, Pillay argues that mothering/ mother-knowledge = subjugated as ‘erudite knowledge’**Core argument:** Pillay argues that “the unity of thinking and loving is the challenge that the academic mother has to meet” (p.505). She argues that mother-scholars need to “take an intellectual leap forward…For the academic mother it means stepping out of a choreographed waltz into a vivacious salsa.” (p.513). |
| Peel, M. (2000). [‘Nobody cares’: The challenge of isolation in school to university transition](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/%27Nobody-Cares%3A-The-Challenge-of-Isolation-in-Peel/c90aeac46fa07a43406d1bd9b117d5222832343c)*, Journal of Institutional Research*, 9(1), 22–34.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Students transitioning from school (public, Catholic, independent) to university in Victoria (in 1997) **Aim:** To explore “the important roles of university teachers and administrators and briefly describes programs under development in one institution which acknowledge the difficulties of isolation and attempt to tackle some of its causes and consequences” (p.22)**Methodology:** Longitudinal (one cohort) tracking (survey + focus groups)**Findings:** *Pre-transition:* Students expected university to require them to be more independent, although this was viewed both as a benefit and a potential area for anxiety. Students = most worried about the workload but also being anonymous/ unknown and lost. “Overall, the perception of university study shared by almost all of these Year Twelve students dwelt upon ‘freedom’ and ‘isolation’ as two sides of the same transition coin” (p.23).*Post-transition in*: “most did not describe themselves as completely isolated learners, and had found patchy, if important, support and interest among their lecturers and tutors” (p.24). Data gathered from students being asked about teaching quality suggest that ‘good teachers’ = “addressed and challenged the perception of the isolated learner which most of these students brought to the first year of university” (p.25). These teachers knew their students’ names and who they were.Three different experiences of university teaching:1) Some had better than expected levels of support (meaning the students did not need to be as independent as they had feared/ expected)2) Some “students were able to identify good teaching but had also experienced what they described as poor teaching and lack of interest or care” (p.26)3) Some students had their fears confirmed (‘dissatisfied school leavers’, McInnis & James, 1998); author argues his data “suggest that these students were particularly likely to focus on poor feedback, uninterested and unenthusiastic teachers, and the feeling that ‘no one cared’ or took any interest in their progress” (p.26).**Core argument:** “Only by recognising that challenge, and making the undergraduate student in general and the first-year student in particular the primary focus of institutional investment and institutional concern, will it become easier to tell each new cohort of final-year secondary students that whatever they might have heard, somebody will care” (p.32–3). |
| Pio, E. & Graham, M. (2016). Transitioning to higher education: journeying with Indigenous Maori teen mothers, *Gender and Education,* NZAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Indigenous knowledge; teen mothers; organizational practices; higher education; Maori* | **Context:** Teen mothers (TM) in NZ and higher education, and intersections of educational disadvantage (gender, ethnicity, age). Education = significant because “education can be a precursor to moving out of poverty and to a higher standard of living for the TM and her children” (p.2). Statistics suggest that Māori women are more likely to become teen mothers. Offers a literature review of Indigineity and mothering(p.2), and short review of literature on teen mothers (p.4).Only 40% of TM finish high schoolLess than 2% have a university degree by age 30.**Aim:** To explore how Indigenous TMs transition into higher education and discuss the implications for the organisations; “to contribute to gender and education discourse through two key areas: firstly, including Indigenous knowledge to enrich the scholarship on TM; secondly, we develop a model to represent the challenges and successes of TM’ s journey towards HE and in so doing present inclusive organisational practices with specific reference to enabling long-term formal education and planning for breaking the cycle of poverty, deprivation and negative perceptions of these mothers” (p.3).**Theoretical frame:** Indigenous/ Māori knowledge: Te Whare Tapa Whā (Durie, 1998) model of well being (see Table 2, p.6)**Methodology:** Qualitative phenomenological; participants recruited via support organisations, personal networks and purposive snowballing. Participants = 8 TM (all had children in teens, all were in HE (5 studying UG; 3 progressed to PG), 3 managers from teen parent organisation in Auckland and 1 government official. Interviews with each; thematic analysis of interview data**Findings:** All students resisted idea that TM = drain on society and so they sought help to facilitate their access to education; “they reached out to the connectivity and relationships that they had or could cultivate with immediate and extended family, the notion of kaitiakitanga or guardianship where kinship is respected and honoured” (p.8). Insitutional support offered to TM listed on p.9Authors developed ‘Whare Tangata’ model (house of humanity), which has 3 elements: stigma, support and self-attributes, and “embodies the research findings in a positive transformative manner” (p.10)*Stigma*: linked to Wairua = spirit of resilience/ resistence, which “provides balance and harmony, enhances relationships, can foster the creation of safe spaces and is an integral part of being Mā ori and honouring kaitiakitanga” (p.11). Common driver = not to become another TM statistic and to provide more for children/ create better prospects for both mother and child/ren. HE = seen as the way to a better future.*Support*: linked to manaaki and kaitiakitanga = caring/ relationships. Positive support = crucial for TM well-being, both through family/ community and via organisations. Challenge with these resources = adequate funding*Self-attributes*: Linked to manaaki and wairua = kind to self and self-care/ cherish one’s spirit = having high level of self-efficacy, resilience, independent and grounded. Strong Indigenous identity = increases self-confidence because of belonging and connection to place/space. Learnings for academics:* Need to understand Indigenous knowledge to facilitate retention and success (e.g. being sensitive to value placed on family

Articulate experiences and listen to/ engage with TM voices |
| Restler, V. (2019). [Countervisualities of care: re-visualizing teacher labor](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2018.1543860?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education,* 31(5), 643–654.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Critical pedagogies; teachers/ educators; intersectionality; hypermedia and visual methods; neoliberalism; embodiment*SCHOOL TEACHERS | **Context:** Measurement of teacher effectiveness/ representation of effectiveness via quantitative tools/ infographics + profound impact on how this shapes perceptions of teaching/ teachers. Teachers’ caring labor described as “work that lives beyond the rubric-limited observations and test score algorithms of teacher and student evaluations” (p.643), particularly what is seen as ‘women’s work’ (expected, unvalued), particularly with/for people who sit outside dominant policy subject (white, middle-class**Aim:** To open a conversation about teachers’ caring labour in broader context of neoliberalised education; to “expand our pictures of school care, and call out the mismatch between structural (white, middle-class) expectations of what teaching should look like, and the actual shapes and contour lines of urban teacher practice” (p.644)**Theoretical frame:** Embodiment/ intersubjective bodily positioning**Methodology:** Multimodal study with group of public school teachers/activists (‘radicals’: The New York Collective of Radical Educators (NYCoRE)) in New York, which was designed to explore teachers’ perspectives of new statewide value-added teacher evaluation policy known as ‘ Advance’, and its textual and visual representations of teaching/ teachers. Study generated 5 types of data: drawings/ images, interview data, post-workshop field notes, image-elicitation interview data, series of multimedia artworks made by author in collaboration with NYCoRE participants. Analysis: narrative analysis, Rose’s (2016) multimodal ‘sites and modalities’ framework**Findings:** Mapping bodies/ embodying care: teachers invited to draw themselves/ draw their practice in relation to their bodies, with body maps helping to visibilise the invisible components of caring teaching practices. For example, ‘Michelle’ draws her morning, which includes buying food for her students – breakfast once a week and snacks two other days a week (‘feeding the family’), which was initiated by her observation that students were sleeping, and wondering why. The author interprets as “the effort of making school a ‘ safe space’ and a ‘ second home,’ an effort comprised of all the countless large and tiny, often invisible, acts that mothers and motherers do to make a space feel cozy, predictable, provided-for, safe. It is work” (p.649). Also, Michelle’s observation included questioning what else was going on in the student’s life (was he working until 2am?). “Her investment of time, funds, mental and emotional work in her students, and her support of them with subtly-passed post-its and granola bars, are radical acts of love, care, resistance, and persistence.” (p.649).For Lee, the care manifests partly as cleanliness – “a ritual of professionalism“ (p.650), because for Lee, “This cleaning care-work is a way of showing up authentically for them, communicating care, helping them to learn organization, and creating a daily visual demonstration of both their value and her commitment” (p.652)**Core argument:** Re-visualising teachers’ practices (including their care-work) helps to disrupt “dominant ‘ images’ of value-added teacher ratings [which] portray teachers, students and schools in a disembodied ‘ god’ s-eye-view’ (Haraway 1988 ) constellation of decimaled-numbers, percentages, and demographics, the teachers depict situated, particular and profoundly human work” (p.652). |
| Stevenson, J. & Clegg, S. (2012). [Who cares? Gender dynamics in the valuing of extra-curricular activities in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2011.565039), *Gender and Education,* 24(1), 41–55.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *gender equity; employability; extra-curricular activity; students; cultural capital; higher education* | **Context:** Marginalisation of women’s experiences in UK higher education; widening participation; extra-curricular activities (ECA) and employability agenda. Authors critique dominance of discourse of independence = concealing neoliberal devolution of responsibility for support to individual (self-entrepreneurial) student (e.g. Professional Development Planning in UK). Authors argue we know little about how students engage with their communities/ other networks and what is considered valuableECA = created with ‘ideal’ (i.e. ‘traditional’) student in mind; ECA = not congruent with complex lives of WP students (work, care, responsibilities, financial constraints); “the idea of ECA discursively privileges the production of particular selves oriented towards the future (Clegg 2010)” (p.43).Employability = performance/ trying to craft an image that will be congruent with employers’ ideals: “We were, therefore, concerned with the concrete ways students might be able to mobilise activities undertaken outside the curriculum, and outside the university, as part of their emerging graduate identities. For activities to count in this way it involves, however, a degree of recognition of the ways in which these identities are likely to be confirmed or disconfirmed by employers in the future” (p.43).Authors also interested in how female students in particular developed (or not) ‘capital accumulating strategies’**Aim:** To “extend the critique of the prevalent gender-blind individualism, which informs the employability debate and associated pedagogies, to new settings” (p.42); to examine what activities were valued by students and staff and what students engage in (ECA), and how these relate to perceptions about employability/ future selves; to “concentrate on the gendered dimensions of ECA and their valuing in the student data” (p.44)**Theoretical frame:** Capital (Bourdieu)**Methodology:** Data drawn from broader study of post-1992 university funded by the HEA. Data collection = survey with 2nd year undergraduate students (n=640; 2/3+ = female) + follow-up interviews (n=61; 38f, 23m)**Findings:** Valuing ECASignificant gender difference: 76% of men compared to 48% of women engaged in ECA, but this shifted with regard to prompted ECA (“about a full range of activities: arts, faith/cultural, political, sport/ physical, volunteering, and caring/domestic”, p.45), with 73% and 60% respectively. Interview data suggest that women tend to describe activities more as hobbies; men = more likely to have a broader understanding of what counts as ECA. Men = more likely to be actively building evidence for CVs (to gain competitive advantage in workplace); this is also classed, with middle-class men more likely to recognise the value in converting participation into currency, and men = more likely to value all forms of employment as helping orient to employment, while women are more likely to dismiss low-skilled work (thinking that employers would be less likely to consider it).Other forms of capital: authors note that despite the literature suggesting that women are better at accruing other forms of capital, this was not evident in their data; “The difference here is not just the naturalisation of caring, but rather that the women in our study did not then stand back from caring as the ‘naturalised feminine’ and claim it as a resource” (p.50). Few women in the study indicated that they would draw future employers’ attention to their caring duties; rather, they appeared to view caring as a disadvantage, which—if so—"robs them of the opportunity of elaborating a narrative in which caring can be valorised as a way of demonstrating considerable social value and worth” (p.51). In their other work, a similar gendered understanding of care was found with academics: “caring is also not regarded as being of value as a form of ECA by most academic staff, though female academics were more likely than male to recognise the value of caring”(p.51).**Core argument:**“The gendering of the academy is complex and uneven and the dominant forms of identity assumed in the pedagogies of independence remain highly problematic when understood from the perspective of gendered, raced and classed identities” (p.41)Gendered implications of recognising what ECAs count/ how gender is significant and conflicting: if other forms of ECA are recognised, it could benefit women (by helping them to value the kinds of activities they may already engage in, and by institutions providing more recognitive supports), but it may also “simply be seen as a way of extending performativity and self-surveillance into ever more aspects of life, so that the employable subject encroaches into even more of the lifeworld” (p.52) |
| Sumison, J. (2000). [Caring and Empowerment: A teacher educator’s reflection on an ethical dilemma,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/135625100114821) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 5(2), 167–179.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Ethical dimensions of teaching in teacher education – author starts by reflecting on a tense exchange she had with a student about not extending a deadline any further, leading to the student leaving her office in tears. **Theoretical frame:** Toms’ (1997) notion of *deliberative relationships*, *transparency of practice*, and *presence***Methodology:** Reflection on ethical dilemma: “How to enact my commitment to professional practice grounded in an ethos of caring (Noddings, 1984) for my students, without being drawn into the abyss of endless and ultimately disempowering emotional labour that caring can entail (Bateson, 1989)?” (abstract)**Discussion:** Author frames the article around the imperative to explicate the ethical dimensions of such dilemmas, not least because ‘authentic’ teacher education is about “foster[ing] a similarly reflective ethos in student teachers” (p.169), and because she fears that “the escalating constraints and expectations I encounter in my work as a teacher educator may eventually compromise my personal and professional integrity” Ip.169). She draws on Noddings (1984) to offer a definition of care as “a desire for the other’s well-being” (Noddings, 1984, p.19; cited on p.171), which “implies a willingness and ability to be available to others, to give generously of oneself to others, and to distance oneself from one’s own needs and desires” meaning that “caring embodies an ethical, but problematic, ideal” (p.171). This is challenging in teaching contexts: “As Noddings (1984) explains, when we feel overwhelmed by our responsibilities, caring can become an additional burden, and when we become overburdened, there is a risk that we `will cease to care’ (p. 12)” (p.171). Caring can add complexity and guilt to our (professional/ personal) lives, which are “inescapable risks of caring” (Nodding, 1984, p.18; on p.171). Author reviews literature on feminist ethics of care, citing Acker & Feuerverger’s (1996) notion of the ‘caring script’ which reinforces gendered stereotypes about women’s roles (see p.171–2): “In a university environment, where caring is not traditionally valued or rewarded, basing one’s professional practice on an ethic of caring can perpetuate the collective disadvantage experienced by women and continue to preclude them from positions of influence and power” (p.172).Author describes the conflict she feels about wanting to take on a relational ethics of care (as per Noddings) but not perpetuate gendered division of labour that generally disadvantage women, or become a martyr to students’ needs, and expresses concern about her discomfort with “implicit assumptions that their needs must always take precedence over my needs” (p.172), and she rejects notions of teaching as a form of sacrifice. Author is also skeptical of the efficacy of professional ethical standards in helping to resolve dilemmas; instead she views these standards as consisting of “`motherhood’ principles, they appear to over-simplify the moral complexities of professional practice and encourage a false belief that the path ahead is fully charted” (p.173). Author reflects on the possibilities for collective/ mutual empowerment and support offered by Bateson’s (1989) ideas about care, framed by questions about what is reasonable (“How much care is needed and how much human effort needs to go into caretaking?” p.142, cited on p.174) and what alternatives are available (are there other kinds of care, p.141, cited on p.174). Working from these ideas, the author posits: “My vision is that in such a context we could jointly create a community in which students and university teachers alike support each other by creating relationships that honour the connections and the space we all need to more effectively continue to develop our capacities, insights and talents so that we might come closer to fully realising our personal and professional potential” (p.174).Lessons for practice*Deliberative relationships*: emerge from reflective practice and shared responsibility – caught in the **pause** between impulse and expression, Toms encourages people to evaluate whether the expression will serve the long-term obligations of the relationship (see quote on p.175). Toms also advises that we “must only promise students what we can give without rancor” (1997, p.16, cited on p.175).*Transparency of practice:* explaining what we are doing/ what we think we are doing – aka, to care but not get caught in the gendered ‘caring script’. She also shares the pleasures of writing and invites others to share their constraints and responsibilities.*Presence*: genuine, honest, authentic engagement between teachers and students – being open with students that teachers are still learners, that they don’t know everything, demystifying some of the ways that powerful social structures work [similar to Freire’s notion concientisation]. Presence can also mean giving full attention in interactions and actively listening to others. |
| Swartz, B.; Gachago, D. & Belford, C. (2018). [To care or not to care — Reflections on the ethics of blended learning in times of disruption,](https://www.journals.ac.za/index.php/sajhe/article/view/2659) *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 32(6), 49–64.SAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *blended learning, open learning, online learning, ethics, disruption, student protests, ethics of care, Higher Education, South Africa, open educational practices* | **Context:** South African higher education in context of Fees Must Fall protests + ‘openness’ of university learning through blended and online teaching. Study is based in a university of technology context (serving predominantly under-represented groups). During the protests, many universities turned to open learning to continue teaching while protests disrupted daily business. Authors consider ethics of online education (e.g. dominant focus on academic integrity, ethics with assessment, surveillance, confidentiality + anonymity, cultural practices, power dynamics**Aim:** To examine the ethics of moving learning online, given the uneven distribution of access to equipment/ resources. Authors offer these framing questions on p.50: “Was it fair to offer online learning to students who might or might not be able to afford it and might or might not have the digital literacies needed to engage in online learning? Should it be offered on a voluntary basis?” **Theoretical frame:** Tronto’s Ethics of Care/ ethics as practice. Tronto argues that care is a political project/ ethical practice. Authors note Tronto’s 5 moral elements of care (first four from 1993, final from 2013 – on p.51):1. Attentiveness (caring *about*): noticing unmet needs, suspending one’s own judgements and being able to see the world from the perspective of the one in need. 2. Responsibility (caring *for*): taking on the burden of responding to this need. 3. Competence (care *giving*): being competent to care, which is always both a technical and a moral and political issue. 4. Responsiveness (care *receiving*): listening to the response of the person/group that was cared for, sometimes resulting in new unmet needs. 5. Solidarity (caring *with*): taking collective responsibility, to think of citizens as both receivers and givers of care, and to think seriously about the nature of caring needs in society. **Methodology:** Automethodological – interviews between/ reflections on authors’ experience of being part of OER pilots in 2016**Findings:** Authors reflect using Tronto’s 5 elements of care.*Attentiveness:* high level of attentiveness observed/ reported – negotiations with students about whether to defer exams or continue learning online when the protests began.*Responsibility*: lecturers took responsibility to adapt teaching when the protests started, related to personal relationships/ familiarity with students.*Competence:* both lecturers’ and students’ level of competence (to give care) were high [although authors seem to discuss competence in terms of familiarity in terms of ability to use/ navigate online systems].*Responsiveness*: lecturers listened to students and responded to feedback, e.g. using YouTube to help students stream course materials and avoid using up all their data. Lecturers also used Whatspp and a combination of platforms to complete the course.*Solidarity*: aka collective responsibility (but avoiding paternalism and parochialism) – questions about whether the lecturers ignored the concerns of the wider context (protests), and questions about continuing at a micro (course) level, thus again ignoring the broader socio-political context, so that their practices “were not in solidarity with the larger student movement” (p.61).**Core argument:** Following Tronto (2001): “good care is not something that we can ever achieve, but that we can strive towards” (p.611)Online learning (not only in crisis contexts) must consider two ethical elements: 1) parity of student access to resources, and 2) educators must see their practice as an ethical/ political act |
| Tett, L.; Cree, V.; Mullins, E. & Christie, H. (2017). [Narratives of care amongst undergraduate students](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02643944.2017.1363813), *Pastoral Care in Education,* 35(3), 166–178.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Caring; neoliberal context; higher education;**non-traditional qualifications* | **Context:** Addresses ‘paradox’ of increased quantification of students, but alongside increasing interest in their feelings (via NSS); student engagement in learning. Authors outline neoliberal higher education context (‘new managerialism’), with NSS one mechanisms of monitoring and accountability. Also, authors cite Slaughter & Leslie’s work on academic capitalism and their argument that academics have been turned into educational entrepreneurs (2001, p.154; cited on p.168). Authors also examine literature on performativity culture and the downgrading of affective elements of academic work, resulting in “a focus on individual responsibility means that care is only valued if it is professionalised” (p.168), which Lynch (2010) argues means that top level positions are “unencumbered by caring” (2010, p.63, cited on p.168). This contrasts markedly with the literature that suggests students need support to (socially, academically, emotionally) integrate into university life. However, university structures dominantly require students to self-diagnose issues and find appropriate supports, and where the support is offered, it’s often by people with pastoral roles rather than academic advisors: “As a corollary of this, the university offers support in a way that is reactive and depends on the students having the agency to seek support in the right way” (p.174). Not all academics view their role as including pastoral support, and the power to assess “can compromise a caring relationship, especially when the outcome is disappointing to the student” (p.170).**Aim:** To examine “the ways in which the tension between the technicist spaces of the neoliberal university and its empathetic, caring spaces are mediated by students as they make their way through their degrees” (abstract)**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Drawn from longitudinal engagement with ‘non-traditional’ students at elite Scottish university. All students had Higher National qualifications from FE college before entering university. Data selected from repeat interviews 10 years after initial data collection, and focused on data connecting impact on students’ emotional selves with teacher relations**Findings:** Common finding = students not top priority for lecturers/ academic teachers (‘just a number’), and students reported being aware of pressures on academics’ time (‘never readily available’; ‘stretched’), resulting in students being scared to ask academics for help. Students suggested that developing a relationship with an academic = due to ‘good luck’ (see p.172) – suggesting this was abnormal, and authors emphasise how positive these kinds of relationships can be for retention and success. This is particularly the case when students feel like academics have acted on feedback.Students perceived academics as being empathetic when they shared a similar background [which assumes the lecturer found out some background info on students].Being able to navigate system to find support = shared challenge, especially for students who transitioned from FE, which had different approach to assessment. Perception of support = fragmented, and does not see student as whole person**Core argument:** Focus on student finding own support/ diagnosing own needs = consequence of neoliberal shape of HE, and thus more articulate and confident students are the ones who seek support. Holistic, need-based (rather than reactive) forms of support are needed, shifting from: “caregiving with all its attendant emphasis on ‘demand’ and ‘need’ to an education that respects genuine difference among people and emphasises equal opportunity for students of varying abilities and interests” (p.177). |
| Trigwell, K. (2012). [Relations between teachers’ emotions in teaching and their approaches to teaching in higher education](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11251-011-9192-3), *Instructional Science,* 40(3): 607-621.AUSAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *Emotions in teaching, Approach to teaching, Dissemination, Teacher-focused, Student-focused* | **Context:** Examines teachers’ emotions and approaches to teaching particular courses in Australian higher education – previously two areas of inquiry that have not been brought together. Approaches to teaching (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999) – linked to conceptions of teaching: teacher-, content-, or student-focused approaches. Teacher-focused = transmission of knowledge model; student-focused = facilitative based on knowledge-construction processes and scaffolded according to existing schema. Teaching approaches = linked to ways that students learn to learn (teacher-focused connotes with surface approaches to learning; student-centred = with deep approaches). Student-centered = more likely when teachers have manageable workload, more uniform student group, smaller class sizes, autonomy over curriculum + more likely in Humanities; in contrast, teacher-focused = when teaching is not perceived to be valued and lack of control + more likely in Sciences (see Trigwell, 2002). Academic development and strong leadership = significant for developing student-focused approaches. Scopes literature on emotions in education = considered to be ubiquitous – discusses classification of positive and negative emotions; discusses importance for teachers, and university teachers in particular. Notes the paucity of research on HE teachers’ emotions**Aim:** To examine relationship between teachers’ emotions and approaches to teaching**Theoretical frame:** None explicit**Methodology:** Quantitative: on-line survey with 2 parts: Emotions in Teaching Inventory (ETI) and Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI-R) = see p.611-12 for overview. 175 HE academics (f/t teaching staff) responded. Pearson Production Moment correlation analysis, Principal Component Analysis and a Hierarchical cluster analysis undertaken.**Findings:** Data suggest relationship between approach to teaching and emotions experienced: “teachers’ experiences of positive emotions (motivation and pride) are positively associated with the adoption of more of a conceptual change/ student-focused approach to teaching” (p.616); negative emotions (anxiety/ embarrassment) = teacher-focused/ transmission approaches = supported by correlational/cluster analyses.**Core argument:** Approach to teaching has strong and significant relationship to teachers’ emotions; student-focused teaching correlates with more positive emotional range |
| Tronto, J. (2010). [Creating Caring Institutions: Politics, Plurality, and Purpose](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17496535.2010.484259), *Ethics and Social Welfare,* 4(2), 158–171.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Care; Ethic of Care; Institutional Care; Power; Purpose; Plurality; Particularity; Paternalism; Political Space; Market; Family* | **Context:** How do we know if institutions care in context of increased defamilization/ managerialism? Works from Noddings’ (2002) that good caring practices should be modelled on the family; Tronto argues that actually it is necessary to explicate parts of care that are often unspoken/ tacit in families: “Families, I shall argue, already make certain assumptions about the purposes of care, about meeting the particular needs of individuals, and about the internal allocation of power” (p.160). Institutions often take market/ competitive approaches to care (through ‘customer satisfaction’ metrics), but Tronto argues that “satisfying consumers may not be the same thing as providing care adequately” (p.159) because markets assume people are rational, autonomous, capable of decision-making, availed of information etc. Tronto discusses the work of her colleague, Fisher, who found that care is often considered to be ‘extra’; consequently, Tronto asks: “If caring is the ‘extra’, then how can we ever discuss it in institutional terms? It would seem that for institutions to provide ‘extra’ is already to move it from the status of ‘extra’ to ‘routine’“ (p.160).**Aim:** To argue that “that when we make explicit some background conditions of good family care, we can apply what we know to better institutionalized caring”**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** ‘Good’ institutional care has three elements: purpose of care, recognition of power relations, a need for pluralistic, responsive care: “politics: recognition and debate/dialogue of relations of power within and outside the organization of competitive and dominative power and agreement of common purpose; particularity and plurality: attention to human activities as particular and admitting of other possible ways of doing them and to diverse humans having diverse preferences about how needs might be met; and purposiveness: awareness and discussion of the ends and purposes of care” (p.162).**Tronto outlines 7 signs that institutions are not caring well:**1) Misfortune necessitates/ causes care – misrecognises that everyone needs care2) Needs are taken for granted by the institution – who determines which needs are met? Whose interests are served as such? “any agency or institution that presumes that needs are fixed is likely to be mistaken and to inflict harm in trying to meet such needs” (p.164).3) Care is seen as a commodity, not a process: aligns with the notion of scarcity, which is problematic: “If we think of care as a scarce thing then we are likely to imagine that care is best distributed by the market mechanism. If we think of care as scarce, then we are likely to think of care as a zero-sum provision” (p.164).4) Care receivers are excluded from making decisions because of perceptions of vulnerability/ lack of judgment: problematic notions of dependency indexed5) Care is reduced to care-giving – we need to pay more attention and be more attentive to the labels and care practices enacted to avoid being complicit in this 6) Care givers see organizational requirements as barriers rather than facilitators – care workers are more likely to be cut/ have inadequate resources than managers. “When care givers find themselves saying that they care despite the pressures and requirements of the organization, the institution has a diminished capacity to provide good care” (p.165).7) Care work is distributed along class, gender, ethnicity lines: “the fact that care is still disproportionately the work of the less well-off and more marginal groups in society reflects care’s secondary status in society”; also, “care is often a result of the irresponsibility and the non-responsiveness of the privileged” (p.165).**Core argument:** Ideally, caring institutions would:1) Not be constrained by personal background/ gender/ ethnicity etc.2) Offer individuals freedom to choose who to connect with/ how to represent and manage themselves3) Pay well4) Accommodate all people, irrespective of health profile5) Reward care6) Not pursue a standardised model of care7) Facilitate space to acknowledge and discuss forms of care/ share judgements8) Not ask people to care so much that they cannot engage in self-care/ so that it takes up all available time/ space“no caring institution in a democratic society (I include the family) can function well without an explicit locus for the needs-interpretation struggle, that is, without a ‘rhetorical space’ (Code 1995) or a ‘moral space’ (Walker 1998) or a political space within which this essential part of caring can occur. Thus, one important criterion for investigating institutions includes: how does the institution come to understand its needs? How does it negotiate needs within itself? Which needs are taken as legitimate? How are responsibilities within the organization allocated? Who actually gives the care? How are the reception and effectiveness of care work evaluated?” (p.168)Best forms of institutional care = “highly deliberate and explicit about how to best meet the needs of the people who they serve” and have “adequate and well conceived space within which to resolve such conflict, within the organization, among the institutional workers and their clients, and more broadly as the institution interacts in a complex world in order to resolve such conflicts” (p.169).  |
| Trout, M. (2018). [Embodying Care: Igniting a Critical Turn into a Teacher Educator’s Relational Practice,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17425964.2017.1404976?journalCode=cste20) *Studying Teacher Education*, 14(1), 39–55.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Relational teacher education; embodied care; ethical care; diverse classrooms; teacher educator practice* | **Context:** US higher education/ Psychology course; personal reflection of being at a crossroads with her Students of Colour (SoC) as a white teacher. **Aim:** To “contribute to the literature on caring in the context of teacher education and, in particular, in teacher education classes that seek to critically address issues of race, class, gender, and other forms of diversity” (p.40). Author’s analysis was prompted by 5 prompt questions:“(1) What experiences do I have working with students from traditionally marginalized groups?, (2) What are my beliefs about working with students/adults from these groups?, (3) What difficulties have I faced?, (4) What mistakes have I made?, and (5) How do I define racism?” (p.46)**Theoretical frame:** Embodied care/ relational teacher educator practice for social justice. Author interprets her experience with Noddings’ ethic of care, Hamington’s (2004) notion of embodied care (*caring knowledge, caring habits,* and *caring imagination*), and Kitchen’s (2005) relational teacher education theory/ seven-characteristic framework:1. understanding one’s own personal practical knowledge,
2. improving one’s practice in teacher education,
3. respecting and empathizing with pre-service teachers,
4. conveying respect and empathy,
5. helping pre-service teachers face problems,
6. receptivity to growing in relationship, and
7. understanding the landscape of teacher education

**Methodology:** Personal narrative of a critical incident; analytic journal entries + field notes; interviews with 5 students (f-f/ by email)**Discussion:** *Critical incident:*Author reflects on teaching a new class that was her first comprised of majority SoC. Author describes how one student led a discussion (invited to do so) on a racialised issue relating to disadvantageous education policy in their local school district. Author describes moving from pre-class nerves to “in-class anxiety” because she had never spoken “substantively about race with a group that was not majority White, and yet I was part of the establishment that many of the students were describing as racist” (p.41), and she was not familiar with the policy being discussed = cultural disconnect. Author noted “My preparation as a teacher educator had not prepared me for this” (p.42).Second day: she asked for students’ help to redesign the course to better suit their needs. They decided on individual inquiry-based projects, working around mandated teacher professional requirements.*Interpretation:* Initially she thought building caring relationships = most important, but through analysis she realized the embodied toll of the incident. Her analysis created a new awareness, but she reflects, “I struggled to find words in the English language beyond *emotion* and *feeling*, neither of which captured what I was trying to convey” (p.47), but that Hamington’s theory of embodied care helped her to understand the physical-affective elements of her experience. Author analyses reflections of the first day with Noddings’ notions of *motivational displacement* (where she had ‘sidestepped her motivations’ to open and continue space for the discussion to unfold), *confirmation* (not blaming students; looking for ways to shift the dynamic), and *reciprocity* (sharing space). Author also notes critiques of Noddings’ work (it’s colour-blind, it ignores community/ cultural influences on teacher care) and how they had not made practical sense until this incident. Author discusses relevance of her learnings for longer term/ social justice advocacy (following from Walker & Greaves’ 2016 argument for ‘emancipatory care’) – looking beyond dyadic care, and renewing a “commitment to intentionally seek out experiences through which to gain caring knowledge and counter systemic forces of oppression in teacher preparation programs” (p.52). **Core argument:** “Cultivating and maintaining relationships in teacher education is multifaceted work” (p.53) |
| Trout, M., & Basford, L. (2016). [Preventing the shut-down: Embodied critical care in a teacher educator’s practice,](file:///doi/10.1080%3A01626620.2016.1226204) *Action in Teacher Education*, 38(4), 358–370. USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Teacher educator practice; critical care; embodied care; student resistance; ethical care* | **Context:** Student resistance and teacher response/ mitigation in the context of ‘shut down’, particularly in exchanges with students that foreground privilege and equity. Authors argue that when students (predominantly white, female) shut down, they miss out on “valuable opportunities to experience transformational learning… [leading to this] When education students shut down, teacher education programs reinforce society’s inequities” (p.58). As such, teacher educators must “learn, at the very least, how to orchestrate honest conversations among our students which address privilege and power in the classroom” if we are to shift the persistent patterns of inequity and disadvantage that characterize western societies/ education systems (p.59)**Aim:** To offer a hitherto underexplored area of teacher education regarding critical, ethical and embodied care, responding to this RQ: “How do teacher educators create opportunities for students to contemplate rationales for justice-minded teaching and claim social justice goals for themselves?” (p.361). Focusing specifically on the case study of Letitia (Author 2), authors responded to these framing questions: “(1) To what extent does Letitia engage her students when teaching about systems of social oppression in the United States? (2) How does she avoid the shut-down?” (p.361)**Theoretical frame:** Ethical care (Noddings, 2003), embodied care (Hamington, 2001), critical care (Antrop-Gonzales & de Jesus, 2006). Embodied care involves caring knowledge, caring habits, caring imagination. Authors argue there is little research on embodied care in the field of education.Critical care = “a mixture of having high expectations and truly caring for students” (p.360–1)**Methodology:** Interpretive study of Letitia’s teaching/ experience of avoiding ‘shut down’. Data collected via focus groups with students, Letitia’s analytic journal, interviews with Letitia, student course evaluations/ course syllabi for 5 years.**Findings:** Letitia’s teaching = found to be effective in terms of engaging students when teaching about social oppression. She achieves this through: Helping students to embody care via newcomer stories, field trips, her own stories, private and public processing, careful sequencing of content and activities.Two competing tensions emerge in caring teaching:1) desire to honour students’ ideas2) need to teach specific content**Core argument:** Article offers examples of how Letitia engages in embodied critical care, and opens and holds a space to unpack privilege and discomfort; “The shut-down is real. Yet avoiding conversations about power and privilege should not be the alternative. Letitia’ s practice offers an example of how to facilitate open and honest conversations when teaching for social justice” (p.368). |
| Tuck, J. (2018). [“I’m nobody’s Mum in this university”: The gendering of work around student writing in UK higher education](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.006), *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 32, 32–41.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Academic labour, Academic literacies, Care, Emotional labour, Gendering, Discourse* | **Context:** Increased diversity in student body, increased workload for academic teachers, decreased time and space; gendered dimensions of academic work. Author draws on work that argues that women are disadvantaged “by the contradictory demands of two “greedy” institutions, the family and academia” (p.33). Feminist literature on ‘emotional labour’ and care reviewed. Focus on student writing and feedback because “Work with student writing connects with a holistic but ambivalent understanding of care for a number of reasons - it is incremental, cyclical and slow, it often takes place in hidden spaces e.g. at home and in personal tutorials, often involves listening, empathy, attention to identities and meanings, and to the ‘whole person’ e the intellectual, emotional and even physical. It is also an exceptionally demanding and time-consuming aspect of the role of academics with teaching responsibilities (particularly in setting, supporting and assessing students' written work, Tuck, 2012) and frequently straddles, in both time and space, the increasingly blurred boundary between academics' working and home lives.” (p.33).**Aim:** To respond to two RQs:“How do academic teachers' discourses and practices contribute to and reflect the gendering of academic work around student writing in the disciplines?What are the consequences of such gendering?” (p.35)**Theoretical frame:** Academic Literacies; **Methodology:** Author makes the argument that it’s difficult to study gender ‘head on’ because “subtle gendering processes which are often practiced with only “liminal awareness” (Martin, 2006, p.258)” (p.34). Paper draws from author’s PhD research on academics work with student writing; author notes that the study did not explicitly set out to examine gender, but it “emerged as significant in the form of feminising discourses of writing work which became evident as the project unfolded, surfacing in the form of familial analogies and nurturing imagery in the words of participants” (p.34).**Findings:** Themes: work around writing on work/life boundary; work around writing on work/personal boundary; gendering work = emotional labour*Student writing/ work-life boundaries*: lived experiences of working with student writing = done “at marginal times and in marginal places” (p.35) – temporal and spatial blurring of boundaries.*Student writing/ work-personal boundaries*: student writing often happens in addition to formally ascribed duties, and “becomes squeezed into the “above and beyond”, not fully acknowledged at institutional level, but necessary to meet students' perceived needs” (p.36), particularly for sessional tutors. Author describes this as ‘shadow work’. Author also offers example of students approaching a female tutor because they don’t want to approach the (male) course leader, asking for a task translation. The accessibility and availability of tutors = connected to notion of care, as articulated by participant ‘Angela’: “*I think they [students] appreciate at some level that I'm more available to them than some of their other tutors are, possibly because of my age and because I've offered, and possibly ‘cause I'm just a little less intimidating*” (p.36).*Gendered view of work with student writing as emotional labour:* creates dilemmas and tensions between professional identities, especially for ‘research-active’ academics. Author cites examples of people finding it difficult to get people to mark dissertations; participant Pam said “*I'm nobody's Mum in this University, so when the students are begging me for things I just think I really need to direct you on to somebody else who might have more time and patience and actually get paid for it*” (on p.37). Pam goes on to argue that students need ‘somebody’ to help with writing, as do other participants. Also, the metaphor of ‘handholding’ is evoked, along with the idea that responding to students’ questions about assignments = care; conversely, the idea that there is a ‘constant stream of needy students’ perpetuates a view of students as children. This comes at a cost: physical exhaustion: “The effort of integrating intellectual and emotional labour in academic work is exhausting, not least because it is undervalued at institutional level and thus poorly resourced in institutional terms. A feminised construction of such labour, which disaggregates the emotional from the intellectual, enables lower (monetary) value to be accorded to writing work, which in part explains the persistence of such models in the managerialist university” (p.38)**Core argument:** “Data analysis in this paper points to the potentially gendered nature of writing-related work for academic teachers because it is time-consuming, potentially emotionally demanding and can involve a lot of conversation and interpersonal engagement, things which have often been associated with female labour and with ‘nurture’” (p.39). |
| Walker, C. & Gleaves, A. (2016). [Constructing the caring higher education teacher: A theoretical framework,](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X15300275) *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 54, 65–76.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Teachers; Higher education; Caring; Pedagogy; Grounded theory* | **Context:** Under-examined area of caring teachers in higher education contexts. Authors argue that caring is fundamental to teaching, and is inscribed in professional standards: “as human concern, moral re-sponsibility, individual attentiveness and personal responsiveness” (p.66), but not so much in higher education contexts. Authors note that although other scholars have suggested caring ‘exemplifiers’ (“listen to students, show empathy, support students, actively support students' learning, give students appropriate and meaningful praise, have high expectations of work and behavior, and ﬁnally, show an active concern in students' personal lives”, p.66), it’s not clear which are most significant for students. Moreover, because many of the accounts of caring teachers have focused on local contexts/ particular groups, there is a lack of transferability in these studies. Authors also ask questions about “meaning and status of care as a mechanism to effect change, not just in pedagogic, but also social terms within education more generally” (p.67)**Aim:** To theorise ‘the caring teacher’ in higher education; to develop a theoretical model of caring higher education teacher from teachers’ perspectives**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Inductive, interpretive/ qualitative approach + grounded theory. Participants = ‘reputational cases’ (nominated as ‘experts’ by others) in Social Sciences school in UK university (n=15/72 who were nominated). All were selected on the basis of listening to students, empathy, supporting students, fostering active learning, giving appropriate feedback/ encouragement, having high expectations, showing active concern in students’ lives. Sample questions from interview 1 (on being perceived a caring teacher) = “What factors do you think were commonly used in identifying you as a caring teacher? (Common factors will be shared with the participant). Do you recognize yourself in them? How?; Do you personally consider caring to be an intrinsic part of your teaching or academic work? How?; What differences, if there are any, could you identify in yourself according to your experience, between when you knowingly care about your students, and when you're not conscious of it?” Sample questions from interview 2 (being a caring teacher): “If I went into a typical class of yours, what might I expect to see you doing?; What does the way that you organize your classes say about your beliefs?”. Sample questions from interview 3 (becoming a caring teacher): How did you become a university teacher?; Why did you choose university teaching over other sorts?” (all p.68). Final interview = reflection on process**Findings:** Main themes: a relationship at the centre; compelled to care; caring as resistance; and caring as less than.*Relationship at the centre:* “the participants showed the most explicit attention to relational matters and reﬂected critically on every nuance of their behavior if it could feasibly affect their stu-dents, their pedagogies being centered almost solely on under-standing the act of teaching as a principal causal means of making learning happen at a deep and sustained level” (p.69). Data suggests participants viewed teaching as sociocultural activity (various forms of engagement, relational negotiation, various forms of knowledge and practices.*Compelled to care:* compulsion articulated as “individuals' naturally affective tendencies and preferences”, related to personal beliefs, ideals, histories and visions. However, this ‘compulsion’ was also a challenge: “These expectations frequently caused confusion of roles however, and created inse-curity particularly when incidents relating to their care had seemed to expose the academics, in which case they resorted to different types of behavior and activity to somehow ‘normalise’ their caring” (p.71).*Caring as resistance:* “conceptualization of dissonance in the institutional-personal nexus” (p.71) – resisting market imperatives to care despite of the system, not because the system demands it, demonstrating “an everyday moral resistance to the operationalization of policies that participants found to be allied to good business decisions rather than learning” (p.71). Other sub-themes included defence (“a mechanism in which caring individuals positioned themselves as buttresses against what was perceived as the steady inﬁltration of interpersonal values with operationalized processes from externally imposed values”, p.71) and subversion (“participants perceiving themselves to be important instruments in maintaining what they imagine to be the core values of higher education that cannot be open to diminution”, p.71).*Caring as less than*: feelings of conflict between comments on caring and perceptions of being undermined, or that caring (through teaching) = ‘less than’ other work(p.75**)Core argument:** More research on caring in higher education is needed because “contingent and contextual factors impact upon these teachers' ability to practice this ‘care’, and when academics' personal beliefs become affected by students' behaviors and institutional policies, then integrating care into teacher-student relationships becomes intensely complex and problematic” (p.75). |
| Walker, C.; Gleaves, A. & Grey, J. (2006). [A study of the difficulties of cares and support in new university teachers’ work](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13450600500467688), *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice,* 12(3), 347–363.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Universities; Teaching; Students; Support; Care* | **Context:** English higher education/ regional university/ new teachers and “significant fragmentation of structural, pastoral and pedagogical factors that offer opportunities for sustained relational contact with students” (p.349).Article set against widening participation/ diversification of the higher education system and student body (citing 1997 Kennedy report). Authors note challenges with making system-level change to better support WP/ diversity: “Whilst we may have begun to appreciate the complexity of factors related to how and why students succeed, most universities are still far from operationalizing cultural change to a degree that would make a significant difference to students in terms of retention, achievement and progression” (p.348).**Aim:** **Theoretical frame:** Links work on critical teaching (Haggis/ Northedge) with work on gender, Noddings’ work on relational care, and work on capabilities (e.g. Nussbaum)**Methodology:** Small-scale qualitative project (from in-house training: ‘Teaching in Higher Education’) exploring new teachers’ (n=14) “views on working as both teachers and researchers, whilst also managing considerable amounts of ‘caring work’ with a diverse body of students” (p.348); video diary and interview data; grounded theory**Findings:** Important issues for new teachers = balancing teaching and research in a WP university. Some teachers saw cultural responsiveness as a distinct component of care, and many were unsure of how to practice the care that they understood as a central component of their work. There was also a temporal dimension in this talk: how to manage the day-to-day with longer-term aspirations. Another important issue related to their ethos and values of being a university teacher – for those who viewed it as a vocation, this played out in concerns about impact and making a difference. For 9 of the teachers, their careers as teachers did not include caring for students’ success; instead they spoke about learner autonomy. Participants’ understandings of care differed, and the work of caring was viewed as being impacted by gender, personality and closeness in age to students.Authors argue that care as a form of ‘pedagogic action’ is a “powerful tool in both raising the level of students’ expectations for their own academic progress and achievement and in demonstrating that care is an active cultural construct rather than an emotional response” (p.355) – example of class behavioural control given, which the authors argue “suggest[s] to us that many of the teachers were trying to reconcile three importantaspects of their work: their identities as respected academics, their self-images as ‘nice’ people and their personas as teachers who recognize the diverse cultural context of the universities and are ‘trying not to be patronising’” (p.355).The role of the university in facilitating care: teachers perceived a lack of coherence to support both new teachers and students – mostly due to conflicting demands on time and a perceived lack of understanding of what it means to support/ care for individual students’ needs. Many of the participants “felt either exploited or isolated or both in their striving to be good at everything” (p.357), resulting in part from the university’s WP mission and inflexible systems: “Timetables, module lengths, even course structures mirror tradition and convenience rather than the regularities of the current situation” (p.357). All participants were concerned with size of classes and impact of caring on other duties (including research)**Core argument:** “The very nature of the ethic of caring is to balance the subtlety and intimacy of the teacher–learner relationship with the view that having and sustaining these relationships will make students ‘better’ in some way; through retention, course success, reflection on the ability of the teacher to help them to achieve more and at a higher level and career progress” (p.359).Authors argue for more empirical work on caring in higher education, because these findings “suggest that care and support for students is often conflated with emotional commitment and remedial orientation activities, if not in the eyes of these teachers, then certainly in the eyes of the institution. Such a view of care does a disservice to all: to the students with whom the teachers work, since they are in receipt of a ‘pedagogy of difference’; to the teachers at the university, since they are forced to adopt pedagogies that give lip-service to care and support because there is little time to do otherwise; to the university, since for all its concern to be visibly engaging with high quality teaching and research, it unwittingly fosters a relationship between them based not on dialogue and mutual understanding, but on competition” (p.360) |
| Walker-Greaves, C. (2019). [Is Caring Pedagogy Really So Progressive? Exploring the Conceptual and Practical Impediments to Operationalizing Care in Higher Education](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-13566-9_5). In P. Gibbs & A. Peterson (Eds.) *Higher Education and Hope,* pp.93–112. London: Palgrave MacmillanUKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Reference to Noddings’ work on care - basis of all pedagogic relations – but this premise is challenged by increased individualisation of education and shift to view of education as serving nation’s economic future. Author points to challenges of identifying who a caring teacher is (if based on self-reporting methodology because no one likes to think they are not caring – see p.94). In higher education, domain of caring arguably aligns with ‘excellent teaching’. Most studies of caring = in school/ compulsory education contexts. The work that does focus on caring in higher education “demonstrate on the one hand academics’ scepticism around caring, with the **formation of interpersonal relationships only as an incidental adjunct** to the business of learning, whilst on the other hand, yet other academics consider personal responsiveness and interpersonal knowledge to be the critical factors in constructing engaged and engaging learning environment” (p.95, my emphasis). Author goes on to refer to ‘relational climates’ when talking about caring engagements/ interactions in teaching and learning contexts, and identifies 3 under-researched areas: 1) Do institutions/ lecturers view caring as their responsibility?2) How do students experience caring?3) Should all academics care: what are the costs and consequences?Author argues that despite the proliferation of discourses and statements about care in institutional public statements, “the pressure on academics to increasingly visibly ‘care’ and to perform ‘caring work’ should be evident in both student learning research and higher education pedagogy research. And in turn, that such literature would expose a gradual student learning behaviour in which expectations of particular types of teaching were increasingly evident. But arguably, that is not the case” (p.98).**Aim:** To argue for need to “build data and generate theory to support the claims for relational and caring approaches to higher education pedagogy, and seek to elucidate the mechanisms by which each contributes to student progression and achievement” (p.99)**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:**Analysis of student feedback strongly attests to importance of personal contact and personal investment in learning/ student engagement. However, diversity of student body (and other factors) regularly leads to mismatches between student and teacher expectations (cites Hagenauer & Volet), meaning that students have to self-shape progression and engagement. This is unproblematic for many students, but for some it creates real challenges: “there are a significant number of students for whom such lack of a meaningful and purposeful relationship and lack of ‘mattering’ is a key antecedent either to under-performance, or to academic failure (Docan-Morgan 2011)” (p.100).Author outlines the following characteristics of teachers who practice “active fostering and maintenance of bonds”:* “Listen to students
* Show empathy for students
* Support students in diverse ways
* Are active in the processes of learning in class
* Give appropriate and encouraging feedback and praise
* Have high expectations in standards of work and behaviour
* Show an active concern in students’ personal lives” (p.101).

However, research suggests these characteristics/ demonstration of care = often absent, leading to drop out or expressions of dissatisfaction. Author points to problems arising from idea that these kinds of practices are ‘exceptional’.Caring pedagogy = should not be considered progressive, exceptional or radical, but author notes its likelihood to be disruptive. Author cites issues resulting from recent activism around #MeToo and legalistic discourses that inhibit caring practices, alongside the concurrent focus on competing in the global knowledge economy. Other researchers have pointed to challenges with therapeutising learning (see Ecclestone, 2012) and creating ‘damaging psychological contracts’ (Koskina, 2013). The challenges of caring are compounded by dominance of cognitive approaches/ understandings of learning at the expense of the affective.Research into caring teachers needs to attend to notion of ‘relational fidelity’ (Noddings, 1986) and validity: “what something looks like, pedagogically speaking, may not be what its motivation is, and indeed therefore, what the desired and actual effects on students themselves” (p.106).**Core argument:** The “notion of a compulsion to care even in the face of difficult higher education terrain as well as there currently being limited evidence for caring’s potency is precisely where care intersects with hope and all pedagogies of possibility” (p.108).As academics/ university teachers, we need to think about how to break the silence around care without it becoming something measured and standardised. |
| Walsh, C., Larsen, C., & Parry, D. (2009). [Academic tutors at the frontline of student support in a cohort of students succeeding in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03055690902876438), *Educational Studies*, 35, 405–424.UKAnnotation written by Dr. Megan RoseKeywords: *academic tutors; pastoral support; sign-posting* | **Context:** Support networks for students in HE; the role teaching play as a key source of support and as a source of information for students re available support.**Aim:** To explore positive influences of support networks on student retention at an undergraduate level**Methodology:** Questionnaire with closed-questions; n=248 students who have continued with their study and are progressing between levels (undergraduate to honours) in Psychology, Health, Biology, Nutrition, Sociology, Sports Studies or Sport Development. Second phase included semi-structured questionnaire to obtain more information from participants. **Findings:**Key factors that influence students decision to continue with programs include feeling valued by the institution, feeling that the university responds well to their needs and familiarity with teaching staff (Walsh, Larsen and Parry 2009: 407). Of all the available support, students contacted tutors the most, particularly students in their first year. Ongoing informal contact between staff and students outside of class increases students satisfaction with their institution and university experience. Students were also more likely to seek advice from their peers than other sources of university support (Walsh, Larsen and Parry 2009: 419).Key statistics from the questionnaire include:● Students in non-traditional age groups were less likely to seek support from counselling and welfare services than traditional age groups.● 90% of students sought academic advice; the most likely sources of advice were academic tutors and peers on their course, first year students were particularly dependent on academic tutors regardless of age.● 88% of students sought support for non-academic issues; the most frequently consulted being friends on their course and family members, regardless of demography.● All other support services were used less than expected; other academic support mechanisms were accessed less frequently than expected irrespective of age or other demographic. (Taken from Walsh, Larsen and Parry 2009: 415)**Core argument:** To enhance student retention, opportunities for students to become familiarised and have meaningful informal contact with staff is needed, along with the chance for students to build strong support networks (Walsh, Larsen and Parry 2009: 420). Academic staff members must have complete knowledge of support services, and these services also need to be better integrated and more easily accessible for students. |
| Zembylas, M. (2017). [Practicing an ethic of discomfort as an ethic of care in higher education teaching](http://cristal.epubs.ac.za/index.php/cristal/article/view/97), *CRISTAL: Critical Studies in Teaching & Learning,* 5(1), 1–17.CYPAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *ethic of care; ethic of discomfort; pedagogies of discomfort; higher education; educational development* | **Context:** Disrupting the “hegemonic rationalist epistemology of educational development” by implementing pedagogical practices that are based in ethical and political thinking that are based on an ethic of care and an ethic of discomfort (abstract). Author reviews literature on caring (and lack of empirical focus on higher education to date) – focusing firstly on Noddings’ (1984, 1992) work on relational pedagogy and the centrality of caring, which “suggests that caring teachers exhibit an array of practices and behaviours underpinned by a relational approach to pedagogy that puts pedagogic bonds at the centre of teaching; this relational approach is translated into specific pedagogic actions such as good planning, rich questioning and dialogue techniques, high levels of aspiration and expectation for all students, and good organisation in class” (p.3). Exemplifiers of caring higher education teachers outlined (from Larsen, 2015; Walker & Gleaves, 2016). Author notes Walker & Gleaves’ (2016) integrative model of the caring teacher, which “suggests that structural and institutional elements seem to feature much more strongly, damaging teachers’ efforts to enact caring teaching” (p.4). Author notes three theories: *caring teaching behaviour* (if teachers do particular things, learning outcomes will improve – but reductive and based on white/ middle class understandings of care), *caring capacity* (educational institutions and/or communities have the capacity and the obligation to provide caring contexts for students who lack caring experiences in their everyday lives – but based on deficit understandings), and *caring difference* (explores different views of/ perceptions of caring – but can replicate divisions). A fourth theory by McKamey (2004) is also reviewed: *process theory of caring/* Antrop-González & De Jesús’ (2006) theory of c*ritical care,* which offer a “deeper exploration of the complexities in the meanings and enactments of caring teaching in different educational institutions” (p.7). Critiques of caring in higher education are that much literature suggests it is pre-determined and atheoretical. Author argues that the work on pedagogies of discomfort can add a critical dimension and resist these critiques. Pedagogy of discomfort: “[facilitates] the creation of disruptive moments of sharing and listening openly to each others’ stories, students began to critically engage with the unspoken emotional rules and power dynamics governing the classroom and their lives” (p.8). Author connects this work to Foucault’s ‘ethic of discomfort’ that precipitates forms of transformation, which “entails a particular ethic and a turbulent ground on which to critique deeply held assumptions about ourselves and others” (p.9). Author asks questions of how far educators can push students to confront troubling assumptions without causing harm, citing Boostrom’s (1998) contention that safe classrooms does not mean that they should be free of discomfort.**Aim:** To respond to three framing questions:1. “What are the contributions and limits of the ethic of care in exploring issues of educational development in our contemporary globalised world?
2. How can the scope of care and caring teaching be extended through an ethic of discomfort?
3. Finally, what are the implications for educational development of such a reconceptualization of care on the basis of ‘pedagogies of discomfort’?” (abstract).

**Methodology:** Essay**Implications for higher education:** Reconceptualising caring in higher education through pedagogyof discomfort helps to resist discourses of educational development that are aligned with institutional imperatives/ discourses. Author offers three key arguments:1) Caring through ethic of discomfort “establishes an important conception of ethical responsibility in higher education” (p.11)2) Reconceptualization of caring through ethic of discomfort “raises the issue of whether and how a pedagogy of discomfort cultivates an ethics of nonviolence” (p.11)3) Reconceptualising caring through ethic of discomfort looks to “minimi[se] ethical violence and expanding relationality with vulnerable others” (p.11).**Core argument:** “conceptualisations of caring in particular settings of higher education must explicitly challenge the idea that assimilation to dominant notions of caring is a neutral process; instead, educators in universities need to question the ways in which particular sociocultural contexts shape identities and thus influence expressions and interpretations of caring” (p.7)In facilitating vulnerability, “a pedagogy of discomfort as caring teaching also acknowledges the limits of knowing the other and the ethical claim that unknowability makes” and “the disavowal of mastery and coherence constitutes an important dimension of the struggle for an ethics of nonviolence” (p.11) “Caring teaching becomes “critical”, when it recognises that caring itself is an act full of tensions and ambivalences; hence, enacting caring teaching is an ethical and political practice involving relations that cannotsimply be mapped onto existing norms of the ethical and the political. Pedagogies of discomfort in context of higher education widen the possibilities of critical interventions as critical forms of caring teaching, expanding at the same time the notion of “teaching improvement” (p.14). |
| Zembylas, M. & McGlynn, C. (2012). [Discomforting pedagogies: Emotional tensions, ethical dilemmas and transformative possibilities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411926.2010.523779)*, British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 41–60.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** The ethics of a pedagogy of discomfort and vulnerability; integrated primary school in Northern Ireland post-troubles**Aim:** To ask how appropriate it is to create situations that are pedagogically discomforting, and how can teachers support students with their “discomforting emotions in ways that are ethically and pedagogically acceptable?” (p.42); to “highlight and critique the role of a pedagogy of discomfort in terms of safety, risk, comfort, ethics, responsibility and vulnerability—issues that come up in explicit or implicit ways, as we examine the interactions of the students and the teacher involved” (p.42). Two RQs:“(1) How does the teacher implement, experience and justify pedagogy of discomfort in the classroom? (2) How do the children respond to pedagogy of discomfort and what are its transformative implications (if any)?” (p.42)(3) How can a teacher deal with students’ discomforting emotions in ways that are ethically and pedagogically acceptable?**Theoretical frame:** Emotion and power/ (in)justice: “any understanding of social justice requires a fundamental recognition of the integral role of emotions in reifying or disrupting injustices” (p.43) ­— useful for educators to observe emotional connections to particular values/ beliefs, thus justifying “a pedagogical exploration of social (in)justice”… “Any understanding of discomforting pedagogies is thus inextricably linked to analysing the pivotal role of emotions in disrupting hegemonic perceptions and feelings” (p.43). Pedagogy of discomfort (Boler & Zembylas, 2003)**Methodology:** Ethnographic study of primary school in Northern Ireland (mixed: Catholic and Protestant); case study of ‘Mr Johnson’ (see p.46–7 for details). Lesson based on The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas and an activity whereby some students got red cards (positive) or black cards (signalling supposed bad behaviour). Children with black cards taken individually out the room (out of hearing range for red card children, where children were told the activity was fake). Extended circle time the next day = explore students’ reactions**Findings:** Range of emotional responses observed by researcher-observer: outrage, fear, anxiety, solidarity (some against teacher, some with teacher’s actions), confusion. Children made connections between card activity and the injustice described in the book. Researcher revisited episode with children 5 months later: some students described still feeling guilty for not standing up for their friends and a ‘deep empathy’ for the black card holders. It was clear that the emotional dimension of the lesson made it particularly memorable.Teacher had forewarned the researcher that the method would be controversial and used discomfort as a deliberate teaching strategy: “The controlled discomfort—that is, the teacher’s informed assessment of the level of discomfort that is appropriate for his class—serves a purpose: to both challenge and to provide the possibility of alternative views” (p.53).**Core argument:** Teacher’s argument = that controlled discomfort would help students to respond to social injustice in real life. Children experienced heightened emotional responses to the red/black card task 5 months after the event, suggesting that the risks were significant. Authors argue that it is difficult to ascertain how appropriate the task/ underpinning intention was, but this kind of activity —if done well— can create the conditions to encourage active empathy (as opposed to passive empathy; Boler, 1999): “the teacher, the children, their parents and the school community in general will determine the levels of acceptability and appropriateness of such pedagogies” (p.57).Teachers need to really carefully consider ethical and pedagogical responsibilities before undertaking similar activities |
| Zembylas, M.; Bozalek, V. & Shefer, T. (2014). [Tronto’s notion of privileged irresponsibility and the reconceptualisation of care: implications for critical pedagogies of emotion in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2014.901718), *Gender and Education,* 26(3): 200-214.CYP/SAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *privileged irresponsibility; emotion; critical pedagogy; Joan Tronto; care; higher education* | **Context:** Higher education (generally) and critical pedagogy/ critical pedagogies of emotion**Aim:** To explore implications of Tronto’s ideas on care and responsibility for critical pedagogies in higher education, and critical pedagogies of emotion (Zembylas 2013)**Theoretical frame:** Joan Tronto’s work on politics of care as ethical framework/ framework for democratic care; care= practice and disposition. In particular, authors draw on Tronto’s notion of ‘privileged irresponsibility’ = hegemonic taken-for-granted positions of privilege which conceal workings of power, which facilitates critique of divisions of emotional/caring labour (mostly done by women and less advantaged groups). Tronto’s definition of care (see p.202) includes 1) self-care and self-reflexivity about own needs for care and self-protection; 2) care for non-human objects (e.g. the environment – social, natural, built); 3) views care “as an ongoing social, political,and emotional practice” (p.203) = more than disposition, = activity/labour; 4) care involves repairing the world, leading to ‘human flourishing’ (thus= for survival); 5) care = collective rather than dyadic (between 2 people)Tronto offers 5 phases/ elements of care:* Caring about = attentiveness
* Caring for = responsibility
* Caregiving = competence (technical and moral quality)
* Care-receiving = responsiveness
* Caring with = trust and solidarity

**Methodology:** EssayFocus on Responsibility: Caregivers in public and domestic domains are rarely recognised in any form (pay/ value/ legitimacy), leading to exploitation (particularly of migrants and women). Discusses ways that powerful avoid responsibility (e.g. using carers to release middle class parents from responsibilities of childcare to do more lucrative work, absenting oneself from discussions about responsibility: “The continued erasure of the hidden costs for certain groups of people who across global contexts, carry the burden of care, often displacing responsibility from both the state and those privileged, reflects in Tronto’s term ‘privileged irresponsibility’, where those receiving caring services for their needs do not acknowledge that they are dependent on these services in order to live well in the world” (p.205). Tronto’s notion of responsibility entails acknowledging problems that need to be resolved (rather than erasure through denial or absentia). Discusses ‘hegemonic masculinities’ (and images thereof) – see Connell, 1987 etc. Tronto (2013) argues that privileged excuse themselves from care:1. protection (men = protectors of women)
2. production (privileged = involved in accumulating economic resources and should therefore be exempt from caring duties)
3. caring for my own (focusing on self)
4. personal responsibility (neoliberal opportunity structure)
5. charity (giving to charity = considered sufficient giving)

**“**privileged irresponsibility allows those who benefit from being in superior positions in a hierarchical system to remain oblivious about the part they play themselves in maintaining the system” (p.207)Violations = the harm of inattentiveness, irresponsibility, incompetence and unresponsiveness (Tronto, 2000: 270) + lack of trust and solidarity (p.207-8)What would Tronto’s political ethics of care look like with critical pedagogies of emotion?* can help understand constructions of caregivers’ anger and consequences of it (as well as responses to it)
* explore consequences of privileged irresponsibility for different social groups (shame = social response; guilt = personal response) to resist paralysing effects of acknowledgement – critical pedagogy of emotions can help to find positive and productive readings: “urg[ing] those who recognise the exercise of privileged irresponsibility to use those emotions as points of departure for critical reflection and renewed action towards relational responsibility and attentiveness” (p.208)
* critique of neoliberal logics and address emotional consequences of privileged irresponsibility
* acknowledge emotional complexities of caring in globalized world

**Core argument:** Drawing on Tronto’s ideas = strengthens critical pedagogies of emotion “because it helps educators expose how power and emotion operate through responsibility – that is, how responsibility is connected with the meanings and practices of power and the place of emotion in caring practices” (p.201). |