**Gender and equity in higher education**

Literature review

Opportunity and equity within higher education relative gender is a wide-ranging topic that has long been a subject of discussion amongst education and gender scholars alike. The material in this bibliography provides a range of perspectives but several themes pervade across the material as it considers gender and higher education relative both to educators *and* students. While historically scholars have focused on the difficulties and disadvantages that women experience as a result of their gender only, studies have increasingly considered the intersectional complications and situations that contribute to the structural disenfranchisement of women in higher education. Drawing largely from Kimberlé Crenshaw’s theorisation of intersectionality that approaches disenfranchisement from a variety of subordinated and excluded positionalities and which does not hold gender as a solitary social construct (“Women’s lives are structured by a range of identities and women are different from each other,” Crenshaw 1989, 41), scholars have understood intersectionality as “invaluable in its exhortation to move away from one-dimensional notions, towards ideas of a co-constitution of social categories, positions and encounters which produces important differences in subjectivity, experience and practice” (Phipps 2016, 817). The intersectional move also incorporates scholarship that considers the “affective turn” within higher education, where embodied emotions and feelings contribute pedagogical practices (Ahmed, Zembylas). Leathwood and Hey note that higher education is perceived as “an emotion-free zone” (2009, 429), characterised by dichotomies (“rational/emotional, mind/body, public/private, masculine/feminine”, [429]) and the so-called “affective turn” has thus led to concerns about the therapeutisation of higher education. Enactions and embodiments of emotions/affect have been pitted against rational behaviours long associated with masculinist tradition. This is inherently tied to aspects such as gender, social class etc. and play out in discourses/practices of employability, which often focus on paid work, rather than caring work (typically characterised as feminine) (Lynch, Lyons & Cantillon, 2007). Scholars call for awareness “of both the gendered constructions and symbolic capital of the performance of differentially embodied ‘people skills’, and recognise the ways in which the social and economic are invested in programmes of emotional management” (Lynch, Lyons & Cantillon in Leathwood & Hey). Critics of affective accounts of teaching and higher education pedagogy are wary of a reduction in “hard critical thinking” (Hayes, 2005), invoking further binaries (hard/soft; masculine/ feminine; pure/applied; careless/caring).

Related to normative notions of gendered educators and teaching practices, scholars have begun to focus on gendered perspectives and expectations in higher education from various masculine perspectives. Phipps examines “lad culture” in British higher education that moves beyond a focus on sexism and men’s violence against women to include considerations of social class, particularly realities and feelings of domination amongst lower and middle/elite classes. Phipps theorises “the similarities and differences between laddism in classroom and social/interpersonal contexts, and explores how such masculinities relate to other forms and are mediated by class, race, sexuality and other categories of difference [and] considers how some forms of contemporary laddism might be connected to sexual violence” (816). Burke considers what some understand to be a “crisis of masculinity” in higher education that sees the rising number of female enrollees as a direct threat to masculinity and by extension, the university itself. Burke also notes literature that argues that in order to avoid harassment and bullying from other male students, boys must feign or perform an avoidance or dislike of academic work, as diligence and commitment to study has been aligned with feminine practice. Burke argues that the development of widening participation strategies requires an understanding of changing identities and experiences such as these at discursive and cultural levels to further illuminate the ways that men dis/identify as students, and notes that “pedagogies do not simply reflect the gendered identities of academics and students; pedagogies themselves are gendered, intimately bound up with historical and masculinised ways of being and doing within higher education” (2013, 123).

Neoliberal conceptions of higher education as a globalised commodity also intersects with gender/gendered expectations of educators and contribute to increased influence of individualising, competitive and marketised practices. Scholars recognise the common fallacy of postsecondary education as a sort of “great equaliser,” noting specific differences in experience and opportunity or result relative to gender, class, age, race, and physical ability. But as Naskali and Keskitalo-Foley note, feminist pedagogy can offer an alternative approach to learning that enables a critical analysis of the power of knowledge and an awareness of differences among students, and can “unsettle the assumptions of the neutrality of knowledge and to show how all knowledge is based on human values and processes of selection” (2017, 14). Often widening participation efforts are ignorant of various structural inequities and challenges that effect the success or failure of historically marginalised or excluded populations, which often intersect at a number of sociological and economic crossroads. Morley & Lugg (2009) and Herman (2015) focus specifically on women in STEM fields, considering the influence of age and normative family roles and expectations on “success” during and after university study. Of course, globalisation and historical colonialism factors in the desired outcomes and measures of success of the neoliberal university (Morley & Lugg, 2009; Villa Lever, 2018).

Broadly, researchers call for an increase in understanding of student and educator individual positionality and how structural forces within and outside of higher education affect them. Better understanding of the construction of expectations and assumptions about higher education as they relate to gender serve to help better aid institutions in offering various supports and pathways to success for their students and teachers. Though Burke (2013) and others warn: “WP is a contested terrain of struggle over gendered positioning, representation, voice and authority, as well as material resources” (123), generally, the development of widening participation strategies and other institutional retention and success schemes require an understanding of changing identities and experiences at discursive and cultural levels to further illuminate the ways that men and women dis/identify as students.
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| Burke, P.J. (2007). [Men accessing education: masculinities, identifications and widening participation](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425690701369335), *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 28(4), 411–424.  UK Annotation by Caitlyn McLoughlin | **Context:** The increasing number of women taking up degree-level study across over-developed countries leading to fears and uncertainties about men’s social position and status (Gough & Peace, 2000), and the resulting contemporary shifts in gender relations leading to local and global panics about the position of men in neoliberal capitalist societies. Women’s success as a “crisis of masculinity” “traced back to discourses about the ‘underachievement of boys’ appearing in the international press in the 1990s and receiving extensive attention and critique by sociologists (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Epstein *et al*. 1998a, b; Francis, 1999; Raphael Reed, 1999)” (412). Feminist literature on boys and schooling (Miller, 1996; Epstein *et al*., 1998b), which argues that boys, “in order to avoid being harassed or bullied, must avoid, or appear to avoid, academic work (Epstein *et al*., 1998b; Jackson, 2002; Weis, 2003). In cases where young boys do work hard, it has been argued that there are significant psychic costs, drawing attention to the problematic privileging of masculinity and its implications for boys’ and men’s academic achievement (Reay, 2002)” (412).  **Aim:** To “examine the accounts of men participating in London access and foundation programmes in relation to their shifting masculine identifications [and] consider how the men’s early memories of schooling shape their student masculinities” (411). To “contribute to sociological discussions about the ways that ‘a range of student masculinities’ are constructed through contemporary further and HE spaces (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p. 15) and the ways these masculinities are connected to wider inequalities and misrecognitions (Fraser, 1997)” (412).  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist critique of hegemonic discourses of widening participation and neo-liberalism; critical and feminist theories of class, race and gender and education to examine the ways that mis/recognised selves strive towards respectable personhoods through educational participation (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Connell, 1995, 2000; Fordham, 1996; Skeggs, 1997, 2004; Epstein *et al*., 1998a; Gillborn & Youdell, 2000; Reay, 2001, 2002, 2005; Archer, 2003; Archer & Leathwood, 2003; Archer & Yamashita, 2003; Weis, 2003); the ‘psychic landscape’ (Reay, 2005) of temporal and spatial student masculinities  **Methodology:** In-depth interviews with 38 men enrolled in access and foundation programmes in three further education colleges and one university in London. Interviews focused on the men’s educational memories, histories and experiences. The accounts were analysed as discursive and partial accounts, rather than as reflective of objective reality. The men were selected under two sets of criteria: that they were categorised by the college/university as home students, and that they were participating in an Access to HE (AHE) course, a Foundation Degree or, in the case of the university, a Science and Engineering Foundation Programme (SEFP).  **Findings:** Subjects framed higher education participation as crucial to an ideal and respectable form of masculinity. Subject disidentification with working-class masculinity, linking education with being ‘higher-class’. Various accounts of bullying showing “that masculinities are relational and ‘developed in specific institutional contexts in relation to and against each other’ (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p. 61)” and suggesting that “being a bully is a matter of ‘environment’ and belonging, as well as structure and agency (416). Significant theme of problem of ‘being lazy’ or ‘not getting the work done’ that both contribute to and are influenced by conceptions of ‘laddishniess.’ **Core argument:** “Men’s educational memories illuminate their student identities across a range of differences that impact their experiences and imaginaries including age, class, ethnicity and nationality as well as gender” – “men as socially positioned and discursively constituted subjects within educational sites” (412). The development of widening participation strategies requires an understanding of changing identities and experiences at discursive and cultural levels to further illuminate the ways that men dis/identify as students. |
| Burke, P.J. (2013). [Formations of Masculinity and Higher Education Pedagogies](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273981632_Formations_of_Masculinity_and_Higher_Education_Pedagogies), *Culture, Society & Masculinities,* 5(2), 109–126.  UK Annotation by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *masculinities, higher education, pedagogy, widening access and participation* | **Context:** Overly simplistic analyses that men are the new disadvantaged sex and the “feminization thesis” (Leathwood & Read, 2009, p. 20) due to men’s decreasing levels of participation in higher education (HE) and ignorance of the complex ways that masculinity intersects with other social differences, including age, class, ethnicity, race, and sexuality. Important research that has drawn attention to the interconnections between formations of masculinity and other social, generational and cultural differences and inequalities, which profoundly shape men’s dispositions to and experiences of learning and teaching (Archer, 2003; Burke, 2006; HEA, 2008). Neoliberal logic and perspective that underpins “economic imperatives to develop ‘global, entrepreneurial, corporate, commercialized universities’ (Morley, 2011, p. 224)” (110). Neoliberal and meritocratic assumptions about widening participation (WP) and access to higher education for all; the recasting of the problem of WP at a social rather than individual level. “The privileging of (certain forms of) masculinist culture in higher education is intimately connected to different expressions of misogyny that work against women’s achievement in higher education” (114).  **Aim:** To “explore the complex formations of masculinity at play in students’ and academics’ accounts of pedagogical experiences, relations and practices, drawing on a major qualitative research project concerning gender and higher education pedagogies, funded by the UK’s Higher Education Academy” (109). To analyse “the interconnections between formations of masculinity and other social, generational and cultural differences and inequalities, which profoundly shape men’s dispositions to and experiences of learning and teaching” (111) based on the in-depth participatory research project, *Formations of Gender and Higher Education Pedagogies (GaP)*, which seeks to “engage the complex ways that identity formations of gender and other social differences (such as class and race) profoundly shape pedagogical experience, relations, subjectivities and practices. GaP explores the ways that inequalities, exclusions and inclusions operate at the micro-level of classroom practice, across disciplinary contexts, power relations and identity formations” (111).  **Theoretical frame:** critical and feminist post-structural concepts of pedagogy which “explore lived, relational and embodied practices in higher education [and] are deeply interconnected with ontologies, epistemologies and politics of mis/recognition (Burke, 2012; Freire, 1972; Lather, 1991)” (111). The privileging of some forms of knowledge over others and the exclusion of “Others” often framed as “undeserving.” Power as a reshaping, rather than oppositional, force for “pedagogical relations and experiences in and across changing social, cultural, spatial and (micro) political contexts (Foucault, 1977)” (112).  **Methodology:** Qualitative engagements with “HE students and lecturers in critical and reflexive considerations about the complex relationship between social identities, pedagogical practices, relations and experiences. A multi-method, case study approach was taken, first, to collect in-depth data about pedagogical practices, experiences and relations and complex formations of identity. These included individual interviews, focus group interviews and observations of pedagogical practices. Taking a participatory methodological approach, further methods aiming to create spaces of reflexivity and dialogue with the re- search participants included student seminars and forums, meetings with programme teams, workshops and student film clips” (115).  **Findings:** Illumination of the ways that lecturer and student subjectivities are gendered and subsequent gendering of subject areas, practices and disciplines.  **Core argument:** Pedagogies are constitutive of gendered formations through the discursive practices and regimes of truth at play in particular pedagogic and disciplinary spaces – “pedagogies do not simply reflect the gendered identities of academics and students; pedagogies themselves are gendered, intimately bound up with historical and masculinised ways of being and doing within higher education” (109). “The narrative of a crisis of masculinity presents an over-simplistic analysis of the increasing numbers of women accessing higher education in some parts of the world” (123). |
| Burke, P.J. (2013). [The right to higher education: neoliberalism, gender and professional mis/recognitions](https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2013.790660), *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* 23(2), 107–126.  UK  Annotation by Evonne Irwin | **Context:** Landscape of higher education has changed under the hegemony of neoliberalism and re-oriented discourses of and widening access to and through HE away from social justice and towards economic imperatives. While much public money has been spent on WP initiatives, WP and neoliberalism have effected increased diversification and stratification in HE linked to discourses of excellence and quality. Despite the public money spent, under-representation of Free School Meals students in ‘elite’ institutions continues and the responsibility for WP programs has shifted away from a centralised model to the universities and colleges on to “a new professional body of WP professionals” (p. 108).  **Aim:** To “show that the level of power and authority of this professional body [WP professionals] is often tenuous and is implicated in gendered power relations and the politics of misrecognition” (p 108). And the consideration of “WP as an unstable project against a backdrop of aggressive neoliberal measures that place emphasis on competition and quality in relation to market-driven league tables [be]side the subjectivities, positions and experiences of those who engage in processes of decision-making, allocation of resources and development of WP strategies in English universities” (p 108).  **Methodology:** Feminist post-structuralist theoretical perspectives probe the “insidious workings of power and inequality across different higher education contexts, and to consider the politics of mis/recognition at play” (p 109) for WP policy and practice. Draws on small-scale study with WP managers and practitioners in 7 different institutions (detailed interviews + written reflections) to “shed light on the conceptual themes of identity, positioning, authority, representation and power).” (p. 116).  **Core argument:** “Gendered and classed subjectivities, as well as institutional status and location, have an important impact on the politics of representation of WP within institutions of higher education . . .” (p. 123). “Embedding WP across the institution through cross-boundary work [Whitchurch 2009], which mediates across discourses of quality and equality, is crucial in moving beyond neoliberal WP frameworks.” (p. 123) “WP is a contested terrain of struggle over gendered positioning, representation, voice and authority, as well as material resources.” (p. 123). |
| 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.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *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:** Femin ist/ 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 = important  Risky 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,* 29(4), 430–444.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *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). |
| Clegg, S. (2008). [Femininities/masculinities and a sense of self: thinking gendered academic identities and the intellectual self](https://routledge.altmetric.com/details/20965944), *Gender and Education*, 20(3), 209–221.  UK  Annotation by Evonne Irwin  Keywords: *academic identity; anti-intellectualism; Butler; higher education; intellectual; performativity* | **Context:** Draws on feminist theoretical tools to examine the discourse of the ‘intellectual’ and how women do academia. Clegg uses three starting points for her examination: Her own discussion of theorising agency and sense of self; Val Hey’s work on Butler and the importance of sociality and performativity; and Carrie Paechter’s work on how masculinities and femininities modify the ‘person who is me’. Previous data on academic personhood/identities is re-read through the lens of these starting points. In examining the discourse of the ‘intellectual’ Clegg points out that  “the life of the mind” has been particularly symbolically significant in first and second wave feminism. She contends that understanding the pleasures of intellectual work offers opposition to current policy which favours anti-intellectualism in relation to research performativity and selectivity. In particular, looking at intellectual work through “woman ‘as a situation’” (p. 210) allows the understanding of deconstruction of mind/body dualism via theoretical work on embodiment and counters the ‘ideologically dominant masculinity of the academy” (p. 210).  **Clegg on Intellectuals:** Clegg offers “The intellectual life is still understood, largely, in masculine terms.” (p. 213). In the mind/body dichotomy, women were assigned ‘to the swamp of the body’ while men were assigned the ‘purity of the mind’. She discusses the invisible and the public: The invisible, hidden women intellectuals/writers/artists of the past are still being excavated, uncovered and still, “the idea of the intellectual is associated with having a public . . . This external, public definition itself creates a discursive bias towards masculinity.” (p. 214).  Despite this, women thinking about an intellectual life, describe pleasure. The pleasure in intellectual recognition for Hey is ‘perverse’ because it is “inter-locked with the repetitive citation of research performance and an illicit pleasure in competition; in knowing who is ‘in’ or ‘out’, and in being ‘in’ oneself.” (p. 214). Clegg goes on to say that “In the micro-politics of the academy it is redemptive as a way of holding onto certain values and, for women, as a way of claiming voice, a form of performativity and subjectification that can be claimed as a woman, and which appears to be deeply implicated in the narratives of the self who is “I”. (p. 214)  **Methodology:** Idiographic analysis involving careful attention to meaning for the individual and detailed reading of the transcript in isolation from the other data. (p. 215).  **Analytical frame:** From phenomenology: Ashworth’s (2003) categories of the lifeworld—Selfhood, Sociality, Embodiment, Temporality, Spatiality, Project, Discourse—but foregrounding Selfhood, Project and Discourse.  **Findings:** Being an ‘intellectual’ for the subject of the study “involves a form of analysis and way of thinking and approaching problems that crosses boundaries, and applies to her mode of being in the world irrespective of whether the job involves activities outside of the more conventionally ‘academic’.” (p. 216). For this interviewee, “being an academic [is] a way of thinking, not a realm of expertise of restricted to role. (p. 216). The interviewee, Claire, sees her project as closely tied to her embodiment as a woman and in contrast to the traditional (masculine) individualism of the academy, stressing “sociality and striving to achieve relationships through her personal project of supporting staff in their practice.” (p. 218). The discourse framing this interview is that of a focus on particular areas of research and expertise as the dominant drivers of being an academic. Claire resists this hegemonic, masculine discourse indicating how it is isolating and preferring sociality, unrestricted by ‘the need to protect expertise’. (p. 218).  **Conclusions:** “Even within a university Departmental and other cultures may provide differential possibilities for the formation of particular sorts of academic identity, resistance and re-inscription; and attention to the differing temporalities of the lifeworld remains an under-theorised resources for thinking about identity and performativity (Adam 2003).” (p. 219).  “. . . to speak as a woman, from the body as a situation, pries open the limits of a false universalism which pretends to speak for all |
| David, M. (2009). [Equity and Diversity: Towards a Sociology of Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century?](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315872827/chapters/10.4324/9781315872827-8), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(5), 675–690.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *diversity; equity; feminism; gender* | **Context:** English higher education in New Labour years. Opens up the notion of ‘fair access’ to include issues of gender and examines the notions of equality and diversity in the context of a shifting HE landscape with regards to ‘who counts’. Notes earlier writings about WP were less defined (it became to be known as ‘fair access’ in 2008 HEFCE strategy). Notes how debates about HE (and increasing tuition fees) = at individual level of costs and benefits, but no mention of gender was made at the time.  **Aim:** To highlight how the gender (female) lens contributes to a reading of ‘fairness’ in higher education.  **Theoretical frame:** Uses a feminist framework  **Methodology:** Essay/ literature review  **Findings:** Women/females = proportionally better represented in HE (but more so as part-time and mature age students). Draws on findings from Shavit et al. (2007) which explored 15 countries’ approaches to educational expansion and found 3-fold complex relationships between expansion, differentiation and diversification (resulting in stratification, privatisation and persistent inequality; see p.64) – Shavit et al. note the ‘erosion of male advantage’ in tertiary education (side issue; not a key focus of their work). Provides overview of TLRP-funded projects (see David, 2008) – all of these projects focused on equity as social class/ SES disadvantage rather than other forms of disadvantage **Core question:** “Can the challenge of building upon the creative potential of critical and feminist pedagogies and inclusive practices for social diversity and social justice be met in this diversified higher education global context with such diverse new kinds of individual students?” (p.76) |
| Francis, B.; Burke, P. & Read, B. (2014). [The submergence and re-emergence of gender in undergraduate accounts of university experience](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2013.860433), *Gender and Education,* 26(1), 1–17.  UK Annotation written by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *social theory; identities; qualitative interviews; higher education* | **Context:** Characterisation of undergraduate experiences and outcomes by gender distinction i.e. the pursuit of different subject fields, different pay rates, vocal class participation, lecturers perceptions of writing ability and confidence. While the masculinist culture of academe in general has been well established (Acker and Piper 1984; Harding 1990, 1991; Leathwood and Read 2009), new concern grows over “the lower numbers of male students that achieve a ‘good’ degree (HEPI 2009; Woodfield 2011)” (2). All this suggests that gender matters in university experience, however, “Various researchers have demonstrated that young people increasingly reject the salience of structural identity variables such as gender, ‘race’ and class in their experiences” (2). Students seem to instead understand their experiences in terms of individuality and personal choice. This has resulted in both the scrutiny of the neoliberal sociopolitical environment that generates these individualised discourses (e.g. Rose 1999; Walkerdine 2003) as well as serious engagement with this new, ‘super-diverse’ terrain in which ‘old’ structural indicators are less salient to social identities (Rampton 1995, 2005; Vertovec 2007, 2009; Cousin 2012). There have also been calls “to develop alternative theoretical accounts which can simultaneously (a) articulate the profound diversity in human interaction that defies and subverts structural boundaries and (b) address how power, experiences and outcomes continue to be unequally distributed and patterned according to structural factors. In the case of gender, this demands alternative conceptualisations of gender that avoid essentialism while acknowledging the impact of the body, and social structures, in gender production” (2).  **Aim:** To investigate “the responses of undergraduate students concerning the impact or otherwise of structural identities in their experiences of higher education” with specific attention to the impact of gender on their experiences and relations with other students, lecturers, etc. (3). To theorise these experiences and relational constructions “through the lens of ‘gender monglossia’ and ‘gender heteroglossia’…to use these concepts in order to articulate:   1. the initial rejection of the impact of gender by many of the undergraduate respondents; 2. the way that monoglossic accounts of gender distinction continued to underpin various responses and reported experiences and (iii) 3. the heteroglossic diversity characterising respondents’ gender constructions” (4).   **Theoretical frame:** Francis’s transposition (2008, 2010, 2012) of Mikhail Bakhtin’s concepts of ‘monoglossia’ (“dominant forms of language, representing the perspective and interests of dominant social groups, which are promulgated as unitary and total”) and ‘heteroglossia’ (the shifting, diverse and inherently dialogic nature of language and the resulting resistance and contradiction to monoglossia) onto gender. Ie. “dominant, binarised model of gender, wherein femininity and masculinity are linked directly to the dualist construction of sexed bodies as male and female (see Butler 1990), can be seen as monoglossic” and the “plasticity, multiplicity and inconsistency in individual subjects’ performances and constructions of gender” that disrupt dominant monoglossic and binaristic understandings of gender can be seen as heteroglossic (3).  **Methodology:** Qualitative case study; semi-structured interviews with 64 undergraduate students, across six different disciplinary/subject areas (Creative Writing, Business/Computing, History/Classics, Philosophy, Dance and Sports Science) at one university. Additional quantitative data concerning student social profiles were also gathered.  **Findings:** Overwhelming rejection of the notion of differences in behaviours according to structural variables, and assertion of the primacy of the individual as the unit of difference; an emerging discourse of ‘Them and Us’ often articulated as “an impassioned denouncement of ‘feckless’ students, the injustice experienced by other students having to endure the ‘bad behaviours’ of these irresponsible peers, and an appeal for meritocracy in treatment” (5). However, structural difference would often “bubble up” gradually, with students acknowledging markers of social structure. Several discourses comprising traditional, stereotypical (monoglossic) constructions of women including “bitchy” and “diligent” or “compliant” (7) and men as “self-assured” and “self-confident” (10). However there were also articulations of gender heteroglossia, acknowledging “embodiments of couter-expression” and “individual rejection of the dominant narratives” (8). Lecturers were often understood within the “heroic discourse” (12) but with slightly different variations depending on gender (ie “brilliant” for male lecturers and “carers/mothers” for female lecturers). **Core argument:** Sociologists must acknowledge the strong investment of students in constructions of equality of opportunity and individual agency and attend more closely to such possibilities in future research. “Academics need to be attuned to, and value, students’ positive investments in discourses of equality of opportunity and agency…[but also] be mindful of the way in which gender discourses continue to map across such narratives, producing gender-distinct practices and inequalities” (14). Academics must be aware of the ways that “performances of gender manifest in student interaction and undergraduate work, and to work to mediate such trends…It may also be productive to open up opportunities for students themselves to critically reflect and debate on the salience of gender and other structural factors” (14). |
| Herman, C. (2015). [Returning to STEM: gendered factors affecting employability for mature women students](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13639080.2014.887198), *Journal of Education and Work*, 28(6), 571–591.  UK  Annotation by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *gender; STEM; employability; career break; women returners* | **Context:** Discourses around employability and the effective invisibilising of experiences of mature students (particularly those who have taken career breaks and are studying in order to return to work or change careers) through the implicit assumption that all graduates are young and inexperienced in terms of career. Underrepresentation of women in male-dominated sectors such as science, engineering and technology (SET) and the tendency for women with SET backgrounds to either never return or return to different fields after taking career breaks. The tenuous link between higher level qualifications and potential for employment as a result of the increase in the numbers of graduates.  **Aim:** To make the case for a life course perspective on employability, and for an explicit recognition of gender in employability initiatives within higher education. To examine three gendered factors (gender role normativity, locality and mobility, and structural and institutional barriers) identified as being of particular influence on outcomes of women graduates in science, technology, engineering or mathematics, who participated in a UK government-funded online programme aimed at supporting them to return to work.  **Theoretical frame:** Gender perspective/theory  **Methodology:** Longitudinal study of women from the UK and Ireland who participated in a 10 week online course for women aiming to return to their careers after a break, including a postal survey that was sent to 167 women in the longitudinal cohort – 23 of the 66 respondents were then interviewed by telephone (interviews took between 45 minutes and an hour each and were focused on career outcomes and impact of the course). Interview transcripts were analysed using a coding scheme adapted from McQuaid and Lindsay’s Employability framework (2005) with the aim of identifying individual, personal and external factors that had contributed to career outcomes in the 5 year period since completing the course.  **Findings:** Majority of the women surveyed (71%) were working in a variety of jobs both within SET (79%) and in other fields. Most respondents found the course helpful in reentering work life. Most women had partners or husbands who worked full time and normative beliefs about gender and work roles were reflected in the gendered divisions of labour within households. “Locality and mobility were also important in shaping decisions about work, both in terms of geographical proximity of the work itself, but also (connected again to gendered domestic division of roles) the location of a partner’s job, or of other extended family members for childcare support” and “Many of the women felt constrained by working norms within SET occupations where there were felt to be few opportunities for women to resume careers after a break, especially on a part-time or flexible work basis” (581). Three key strategies enabled successful returns to work: retraining, networking and undertaking low or unpaid work. **Core argument:** Need for explicit recognition of gender in discussions about employability, particularly in relation to women’s employment in male-dominated sectors such as science, engineering and technology, and explicitly including mature-aged women who return to work after career breaks. |
| Hey, V. & Leathwood, C. (2009). [Passionate Attachments: Higher Education, Policy, Knowledge, Emotion and Social Justice](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/hep.2008.34), *Higher Education Policy,* 22(1), 101–118.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *affects desire emotion gender HE policy* | **Context:** Examine ‘the affective turn’ in HE policy studies, with particular interest in ‘employable student’ and ‘non-traditional student’ subjectivities, and policy sites/ discourses of WP and employability. Widening participation = 2 developments in particular: new emphasis on creating support/ivelearning cultures – seen in new focus on well-being and belonging, mentoring, WP projects, support for all students (rather than remedial support for deficit subjects). Such developments = often focused on student retention. 2nd development = creating ‘employable’ subjects who are emotionally literate/ intelligent. Authors note that these are “a difficult ideological assemblage to be ‘against’” (p.104); however, = not clear who the ‘addressee’ of these policies and practices. Authors point to long history of such inquiries into affective from feminist perspectives (Freire, hooks, Boler) – recognizing that emotion/ pedagogy/ agency = “having passionate components and thus to fundamentally question the traditional binary split between emotion and reason” (p.105). Psychosocial understanding = sees affective/emotions not as ‘things’ to be studied, but rather as a ‘flooding’: “an overcoming or a momentary disturbance in one’s equilibrium or has been seen as socialized, conceived as a shared apprehension, or collective panic” (p.105).  **Aim:**  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist scholarship that has worked with emotions: Judith Butler – identity and subjectivity as subjectivation (1990, 1997) and embodiment of subjectivity. Also draws on Butler’s take on Foucault – genealogical analysis of policy, which “questions the notion of origin and linear progression, instead emphasizing discontinuities, interruptions and contingencies” (p.102)  **Methodology:** Argue for psycho-social methodology to ‘tease out the affective in policy’  **Analysis of policy:** Analysis of New Labour education policy in UK = positioned as “key driver of subject re/formation” (p.107), in line with new modes of accountability and surveillance – what happens to the social, the collective and the community when individuals become competitive self-entrepreneurs? Psychosocial lens offers a way in to exploring risk (manufactured by New Labour policy as a ‘fear of being left behind’). Authors also apply psychosocial lens to micropolitics of being staff or a student in contemporary HE – policy discourses serve to deny difference “by striving to ensure subjects’ singularity and ‘fitness for purpose’ in terms of the market and consumption” (p.110), so that students are changed, rather than institutional structures or cultures. **Core argument:** Paper argues for value in psychosocial reading of higher education policy. Main findings = 1) policy reflects feelings about social change and difference (in relation to ‘the other’); 2) desires to manage risk = limiting subjectivities recognised (‘employable’ ‘emotionally intelligent’ subject, p.113); 3)HE = formation of cultural feelings and ideas (see also Clegg & David, 2006) |
| Leathwood, C. & Hey, V. (2009). [Gender/ed discourses and emotional sub-texts: theorising emotion in UK higher education](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510903050194), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 14(4), 429–440.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *emotion; gender; higher education; psycho-social theory* | **Context:** Affective/ emotional dimensions of higher education and their absence/presence post-massification of the academic (‘new students’). Authors note that higher education is perceived as “an emotion-free zone” (p.429), characterised by dichotomies (“rational/emotional, mind/body, public/private, masculine/feminine”, p.429). The so-called ‘affective turn’ has led to concerns about the therapeutisation of higher education.  **Aim:** To “engage with [debates about critical pedagogies, feminist pedagogies, women’s studies] to examine the significance of the power of the emotions and their theoretical\_ political acknowledgement for the field of higher education” (p.430); to “focus [on] the need to interrogate how the academy is itself an object of the affective and use some of the more interesting theoretical vocabularies to pay attention to certain registers of emotion” (p.431)  **Theoretical frame:** ‘Psycho-sociological academic imaginary’, with emotions a central component. View of emotions informed by Ahmed (2004) – focus on what emotions do rather than as possessions; Boler’s (1999) work on sociology of emotions and connections with control/ resistance  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:** Authors review literature on emotions/ affective turn (and how it challenges rational accounts). Authors note how aspects such as gender, social class etc. play out in discourses/ practices of employability (see p.433), which plays out in certain ways for certain people, and focuses on paid work, rather than caring work. See Lynch, Lyons & Cantillon’s (2007) work on producing carer citizens rather than focus on productive citizens: “Employability initiatives, therefore, are not benign — as higher education practitioners, we need to be aware of both the gendered constructions and symbolic capital of the performance of differentially embodied ‘ people skills’ , and recognise the ways in which the social and economic are invested in programmes of emotional management” (p.434). Feminist pedagogy refuses to split support out from teaching and learning (ref to Leathwood, 1999) – which stands in contrast with arguments about affective accounts reducing ‘hard critical thinking’ (Hayes, 2005): invoking further binaries (hard/soft; masculine/ feminine; pure/applied; careless/caring). Authors argue that resistance to attending to the affective is relating to panics about ‘diluting’ the academy: “Both resistance to the affective turn in HE and resistance to the incursion of the masses draw on a discourse of dumbing down, a pollution of the ivory tower, and evoke a powerful binary: purity/danger, pristine/contaminated, rational/irrational” (p.435).  **Core argument:** We [collectively – feminists, critical educators, WP scholars] need to include the affective in our analyses, “but to do so in a way that critically engages with the neo-liberal (and any successor) projects which use a discourse of feelings and personal skills in an effort to micro-manage the educational trajectory of subjects” (p.436), which is related to challenging and resisting dominant/ dichotomous views that seek to subordinate the feminine/ the resistant/ the affective. |
| MacDonnell, J. (2016). [Inspiring Young Working Class Males: a case study of a Primary School Outreach Project](https://doi.org/10.5456/WPLL.18.3.55), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 18(3), 55–62.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Working class males, primary school, outreach, low participation, media, ambassadors.* | **Context:** Media outreach program in England with Year 3 school students in Hastings area (most deprived area in South East England). Local landmark (The Windmill) was undergoing renovations, so factual media project designed for outreach: excursion, photos + blog. Children learnt how to use equipment, take photos and literacies associated with writing a blog post. Visit facilitated by academic from Media + WP ambassadors. Follow-up session held in school a week after the excursion.  Evaluation feedback highlighted the important role played by ‘Andrew’ — one of the ambassadors — with the boys in Year 3. |
| McLeod, J. (2011). [Student voice and the politics of listening in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2011.572830), *Critical Studies in Education,* 52(2), 179–189.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  *Keywords: feminism; higher education; listening; student equity; student voice* | **Context:** Promise of giving voice is a “mainstay of emancipatory and radical agendas” (p.179) and signals a concern with issues of representation and empowerment. Voice has been critiqued for “offering only superficial forms of inclusion to essentializing group identities and to the problem of power in selective bestowing of voice” (p.179). Acknowledges romance of voice in ‘rescuing’ often silent and marginalised voices.  **Aim:** Unpack what can be learnt from feminist/critical framings of voice in education and what might be the limitations of adopting pedagogy/politics of voice for equity and widening participation in HE.  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist and other critical orientations. Voice has many meanings: as identity, agency, power, capacity/aspiration, site of authentic reflection, democratic politics of participation, radical source of counter narratives. Voice is a code word for difference.  **Methodology:** Literature review  **Findings:** Four uses of voice in educational discourse:   1. Voice-as-strategy (way of achieving empowerment/equity) 2. Voice-as-participation (learning) 3. Voice-as-right (to be heard/to speak) 4. Voice-as-difference (to promote inclusion/diversity/respect)   Seale (2010) describes two most commonly cited purposes of voice in HE projects: quality assurance and staff development = tend to be aligned to policy and practices around assessment/evaluation and feedback but is relatively silent on relationships between students and teachers  Social and participatory research: giving voice and speaking for (p.182-3) = for example: oral histories. There tends to be 2 attitudes to voice: privileging and celebrating voice. Privileging = prominence given to perspectives and experiences of research participants, mostly with radical change agenda. Celebratory “is countered by recognition of the ethical and epistemological dangers of speaking for others and but also about whose voice speaks loudest” (p.183). Inequalities of power need consideration: can research be conducted that does not turn the subjects into ‘objects’ (p.183)?  Critical pedagogy – and when voice isn’t empowering: voice-as-participation underpins critical pedagogy. Overview of (weak) critique here. What counts as voice and which/whose voices are recognised?  Listening and recognition: ‘Politics of listening (O’Donnell, Lloyd and Dreher, 2009) - a way to canvas “issues of dialogue and meaningful interactions across difference and inequality” (p.423 on McLeod, p.185). Listening is a socially embedded practice = myriad factors shape what is heard and recognised.  “…listening can appear as a kindly gift, a benevolent act of charity, a patronising gesture to tolerance. But listening also forces relationality, intersubjectivity and power dynamics into view because it evokes the address and location of voice” (p.186).  **Key question**: How do universities respond to students’ voices and who has responsibility for listening and for changing?  **Core argument:** Voice needs to be reframed a “a matter of listening, recognition and engaged dialogue” (p.187) |
| Mercer-Mapstone, L. & Mercer, G. (2017). [A dialogue between partnership and feminism: deconstructing power and exclusion in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13562517.2017.1391198), *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(1), 137-143.  AUS Annotation by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *Students as partners; student-staff partnership; feminism; pedagogy; power* | **Context:** Increase in focus on students as partners (SaP) as an area of active student engagement in higher education and complexities surrounding inclusivity and power. The situation of both students as partners pedagogy and feminist studies in “similar radical processes of challenging, questioning, destabilising, deconstructing, and empowering” (1).  **Aim:** To uncover insights by exploring SaP through a feminist lens; to explore specifically:   1. what feminist theories might add to SaP 2. embedded binaries and what they reveal about power relations within the language of SaP 3. ways of writing about SaP that are inclusive.   To “step away from dominant understandings, incite acts of self-reflection, and open possibilities for future research and practice by questioning the boundaries and binaries that currently shape the institutions of higher education” (1).  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist theory and SaP pedagogical theory  **Methodology:** dialogue  **Findings:** Parallel between the analysis of power and exclusion in feminist and SaP theories, as well as the uncovering and embrace of marginalised knowledges and alternative narratives. Oppositional and hierarchical structures that organise gender as well as education. Common application of words such as: “‘troublesome’, ‘disruptive’, ‘challenging’, ‘blurring’, ‘difficult’, ‘destabilising’, ‘effortful’, ‘provocative’, ‘unpredictable’, ‘radical potential’, ‘irreversible’, and ‘threatening’” to both feminist and SaP theories (4). Power of language within both theories, for instance, the ‘unnamed’ dominant perspective i.e. the masculine and academics – infers an implicit assumption of men or academics as the general, the dominant, the norm against which the Other is defined (5). “Aspects of rigorous or scholarly writing are, historically speaking, masculinist – linear, dense, and impenetrable” (6).  **Core argument:** “SaP and feminism thus seem to be seated in similar and radical processes of challenging, questioning, destabilising, deconstructing, and empowering” (6). Teaching and learning are processes that rely on critique, inquiry, and deconstruction of the processes of domination and oppression prevalent in education and society. |
| Morley, L. & Lugg, R. (2009). [Mapping Meritocracy: Intersecting Gender, Poverty and Higher Education Opportunity Structures](https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2008.26), *Higher Education Policy*, 22, 37–60.  UK Annotation by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *higher education; equity; gender; widening participation; Africa* | **Context:** Increased participation in higher education (constructed by the international policy world as a ‘global good’) as both a force for democratisation as well as reinforce elite practices and contribute to further differentiation between social groups. Who can and cannot decode and access new educational opportunities is often dependent on social capital. The inference of meritocratic discourse that “individual achievement is the most important principle determining access and success in higher education” (37). The framing of widening participation in terms of “social justice and inclusion while also being driven by neo-liberal discourses of the knowledge economy and the self-maximizing, productive, innovative individual whose educational capital will contribute to national economic development (Walkerdine, 2003)” (38). Identification of women as in need of inclusion into the private and public goods that higher education can offer, and while there have been gains in the Gender Parity Index (GPI), it is unevenly distributed across national, disciplinary and institutional boundaries (female participation rates are lower than male in East Asia and the Pacific, South and West Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa for higher education). Further, “When women of all socio-economic backgrounds do enter higher education, they are often concentrated in subjects associated with low-wage sectors of the economy (World Bank, 2002)” (39) and women’s leadership is not always perceived as sufficiently important to measure, monitor or map. Little “research into the motivations, subjectivities, educational trajectories and experiences of people from socially disadvantaged groups trying to enter and achieve in higher education systems in low-income countries” and little theory of difference in higher education policy (41).  **Aim:** To statistically and discursively deconstruct merit “in order to identify if the most marginalized communities are being included in the widening participation agenda” and to “demonstrate how current opportunity structures reflect traditional beliefs about meritocracy and reproduce privilege and exclusion (37). To question whether gendered opportunity structures only relate to women staff, since women students appear to be flourishing. Article focuses on a study that provides “a statistical overview of participation patterns in the two African countries (Ghana and Tanzania)” and develops “Equity Scorecards to measure access, achievement and retention of socially and economically excluded groups in four case study institutions” (42).  **Theoretical frame:** Sen’s construct of ‘missing women’ (Sen, 2003; Martin, 2008) that identifies the disappearance of women from positions of power (within higher education) when power, resources and influence increase at a national level. However, intersectionality theory (Crenshaw, 1989; McCall, 2005; Davis, 2008, 67) that approaches disenfranchisement from a variety of subordinated and excluded positionalites and does not hold gender as a solitary social construct (“Women’s lives are structured by a range of identities and women are different from each other” [41]).  **Methodology:** qualitative; metrics of the Equity Scorecard (Bensimon, 2004), which works with analytical categories to study inequalities and “measures intersections between social variables, for example gender, socio-economic status (based on deprived schools indicators) and age, and educational processes: access, retention and achievement in four organizations (two public and two private universities) and four programmes of study in each university” (43); datasets on key education indicators disaggregated by age, gender and school attended.  **Findings:** When meritocracy is systematically mapped, patterns of disadvantage and exclusion dependent on gender, socio-economic status, age, etc. soon emerge. Major themes relative to the construction and performance of gender i.e. embodiment of disciplines (48), feelings of fear among women with regards to STEM fields (particularly Maths) (50-1), and the role of gender in regards to familial support (51-5).  **Core argument:** When gender is intersected with socio-economic status, participation rates of poorer women are seen to be extremely low in both African countries. |
| Naskali, P. & Keskitalo-Foley, S. (2017). [Mainstream University Pedagogy in Feminist Perspective](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2017.1315057?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education*, 31(1), 100-116.  FIN Annotation written by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *University pedagogy; feminist approach; textbook analysis; power of knowledge; differences; neoliberalism* | **Context:** Recent “brisk” developments in both mainstream and feminist pedagogy, which can be “reduced to their respective conceptions of knowledge: while feminist pedagogy emphasises a critical approach to knowledge that ‘reveal[s] the relationship between knowledge and power, gendered hierarchies, and dissymmetry’ (Liljeström 2004, 21), mainstream university pedagogy is mainly interested in effective learning results. The latter orientation leads to a focus on teachers’ teaching and students’ learning practices, and thus to an emphasis on methods at the expense of content” (2). Influence of new approaches: “experiential learning, community learning and cooperative learning have brought new elements to mainstream pedagogy, and feminist pedagogy has received inspiration from norm-critical pedagogy and queer studies (Kumashiro 2000; Sedgwick 2003; Bromseth and Darj 2010). In addition, multicultural pedagogy (Banks 1994; hooks 1994; Smith-Adcock, Ropers-Huilman, and Hensley Choate 2004) has been discussed in both feminist and mainstream pedagogy” (2).  **Aim:** To analyse university pedagogy by contrasting mainstream pedagogy and feminist pedagogical thought. To change and challenge neoliberal university politics that value efficiency and quantitative measures, and harness pedagogy as tool for quality assurance to demonstrate universities’ effectiveness. To explore the differences and similarities between mainstream and feminist university pedagogy (hooks 1994; MacKeracher 1994).  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist pedagogical theory, which emphasises the social context in learning and acknowledges the political aspect of all teaching and knowing (4). Kolb’s (1984, 26–31) “main theses for progressive educational practice: learning as a process, the importance of students’ experiences and emotions, and learning as a holistic process of adaptation to the world” (2). Deconstructive reading: which analyses “the ways in which language works. In the context of feminist cultural research, the term ‘resistant reading’ (Fetterley 1978) is also used, meaning reflective questioning of the gender assumptions in discourse and attention to details that seem to be irrelevant. In queer studies, such reading is called ‘paranoid reading’ (Vänskä 2011). Careful attention is paid to what is said explicitly but also to what is left outside the text. Deconstructive reading seeks to ‘make explicit the unspoken, unarticulated conditions of (philosophical) discourse’ (Grosz 2005, 92)” (3).  **Methodology:** Essay – critical analysis of two textbooks to explore what kinds of teaching, learning and knowledge the textbooks construct and what kinds of student and teacher positions they suggest.  **Findings:** “…learning in the textbooks is seen as a strictly defined, hierarchical process and that ideal teaching stresses methods over content. The power of knowledge is not discussed, nor are gender, sexuality and other differences. Academics are seen as professional teachers who master teaching methods, and students are framed as customers. An assumed human sameness, marketisation of education, emphasis on vocational benefit and ‘pathos of the new’ were found to be themes guiding mainstream pedagogy” (1). **Core argument:** Feminist pedagogy can offer an alternative approach to learning that enables a critical analysis of the power of knowledge and an awareness of differences among students, and can “unsettle the assumptions of the neutrality of knowledge and to show how all knowledge is based on human values and processes of selection” (14). |
| Phipps, A. (2016). [(Re)theorising laddish masculinities in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540253.2016.1171298), *Gender and Education,* 29(7), 815–830.  UK Annotation written by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *laddism; masculinities; higher education; social class; intersectionality; sexual violence* | **Context:** Academic/theoretical attention to men/male critical studies (Beasley 2012) – the development of a “broad body of work across the social/biological sciences and humanities, focusing on men’s and boys’ identities and a variety of social problems such as mental health issues, unemployment, educational underachievement and violence, has been paralleled by the development of a policy literature on how gender issues affect men (Kimmel, Hearn, and Connell 2004)” (815). The reframing of theoretical agenda around laddish masculinities in UK higher education and correlative masculinities abroad as contextualised by “consumerist neoliberal rationalities, the neoconservative backlash against feminism and other social justice movements, and the postfeminist belief that women are winning the ‘battle of the sexes’” (815). The domination of the figure of the ‘lad’ in discussions of UK higher education began with research conducted by the UK National Union of Students (NUS 2010, 2013) and showed that “university women are at high risk of sexual harassment and violence that may at least be partly framed by a retro-sexist ‘lad culture’” (816). Subsequent wave of grassroots activism and policy conversation (Phipps 2015; Phipps and Young 2015a, 2015b) which paralleled similar international reactions/conversation, “for instance around ‘eve teasing’ in South Asian countries (Mills 2014; Nahar, van Reeuwijk, and Reis 2013), and ‘bro cultures’ (Chrisler et al. 2012), ‘hookup cultures’ (Garcia et al. 2012; Sweeney 2014) and ‘rape culture’ (Heldman and Brown 2014) in the US. Within much of the discussion, there was a sense of a continuum between ‘everyday’ forms of sexism and more violent sexual assault (see Kelly 1988), and an understanding of violence against university women as a global phenomenon” (816). See page 816 for a list of sources that focus on the victimisation of women students globally.  **Aim:** To contribute to an intersectional analysis of ‘lad culture’ that moves beyond a focus on sexism and men’s violence against women to include considerations of social class, particularly realities and feelings of domination amongst lower and middle/elite classes – to examine “the similarities and differences between laddism in classroom and social/interpersonal contexts, and explores how such masculinities relate to other forms and are mediated by class, race, sexuality and other categories of difference. It also considers how some forms of contemporary laddism might be connected to sexual violence” (816), using a “wide lens on contemporary cultural, political and social formations, and excavating the meanings and materialities these frame, create and demonstrate” in order to avoid confusing symptoms (i.e. alcohol, pornography) with causes of laddish behavior (818).  **Theoretical frame:** Theories of masculinity that work to dismantle concepts of hegemonic masculinity, “poststructuralist approaches which aim to transcend (or at least trouble) binary either/or positions (Lather 1990)”, second- wave feminist insights, the conceptualisation of gender as both structure and discourse, materiality and performance (816). Takes into account the contemporary impulse to construct masculinity relative to women and sexuality and thus, the importance of the idea of the gender binary in the formation/performance of masculine identity. Gender and sex as a plurality of traits and expressions that do not map neatly on to the social categories of men and woman. Genders = plural and intersectional. Theory of intersectionality as “codified within black feminist thought from the 1980s onwards (Carby 1982; Collins 1998; Crenshaw 1991) [and] invaluable in its exhortation to move away from one-dimensional notions, towards ideas of a co-constitution of social categories, positions and encounters which produces important differences in subjectivity, experience and practice” (817). “US scholarship on black men and masculinities, which situates gendered behaviours in relation to the social category of race and the sociopolitical practice of racism…[and the argument] that black masculinities have been pathologised and stereotyped as excessive (and often violent) through currents of social and political racism, which serve to limit black men to certain subject positions and invisibilise black masculinities which deviate from these norms (McGuire et al. 2014)” (818). Neoliberalism as a framework for oppression, specifically Walcott’s (2009) use of “the notion of the ‘mask’ to denote the profound ways in which this racist and violent structure and rationality has homogenised diverse black masculinities and constructed black men as in need of ‘repair’” (818) and the contrasting articulation of white middle-class and elite masculinities as harmonious with the values of corporate neoliberalism (Connell 2005; McGuire et al. 2014; Mills 2014).  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:** Laddish masculinities in UK university classrooms can be positioned as an expression of alienation from neoliberal, middle-class (and allegedly feminised) higher education; two different types of classroom laddism at work: alienated forms of disruption (which need to be seen in the context of socio-economic austerity) versus more privileged modes of dominance, mediated by class. Laddism in a social context “appears to be largely (although not exclusively) the preserve of privileged men” (823). Performances of laddish sexism are also underpinned by gender and class issues, as well as racial dominance and homophobia (detailed pp. 823-825).  **Core argument:** Concepts such as hegemonic masculinity, which has achieved its own hegemony in the field (Hearn 2012) but which can lack complexity and nuance, need critical examination. Similarly, while acknowledging the reality of male and masculine privileges (Hearn 2012), “and that the vast majority of sexual harassment and violence worldwide is perpetrated by men against women or people read as women, one-dimensional and conceptually empty terms such as ‘male violence’, which both essentialise violence as inherent to bodies assigned as male (Harris 1990) and tell us little about which men commit which types of violence, in which contexts and for which reasons”, should be challenged and questioned (816). Furthermore, with the knowledge that ‘laddish’ masculinities may also have a detrimental impact on men (Anderson and McGuire 2010; Dempster 2009, 2011), people of any gender can experience violence as a practice, though it often expresses and upholds masculine power. Frames of gender and sexuality should be complicated with an intersectional appreciation of how they interpellate and affect different men and groups of men in different ways. |
| Raven, N. (2012). [Addressing male higher education progression: a profile of four successful projects](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/openu/jwpll/2012/00000014/00000002/art00005;jsessionid=36sg7s9e2tufp.x-ic-live-02), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 14(2), 59–74.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *progression; male; higher education; widening participation* | **Context:** Males from low SES areas participation/ retention in English higher education compared with higher SES males. Reasons for issues with male progression = “low educational attainment, a lack of aspirations and motivation, and inadequate information on educational progression” (p.60) – this work justifies specific attention/ specific interventions with men from poorer backgrounds  **Aim:** To identify common characteristics of/ profile four innovative projects designed to support progression rates of low SES males  **Methodology:** Followed up with project leads of four projects on supporting male progression, which were originally profiled in a HEA/ Aim Higher report ‘Boys into HE Repository of Good Practice’ (Raven, 2011). Author contacted the project leads and conducted interviews with them (see rationale on p.62)  **Four projects:**   1. Uni Sussex/ *A suitable boy*: p/ship 3 HEIs and 3 schools in Sussex + 30 ‘disaffected’ Year 9 boys who had ‘weak role-models’ and anger/ truancy issues. Aim of program = ‘re-engage boys with their educational journeys’. Detail of program p.62–3. By time of update, program was being run by University of Brighton and included male mentors. 2. Uni Derby/ *Boys into HE*: p/ship between uni + local schools from lower SES backgrounds who were considered to be underperforming (p.63). By time of update, numbers of participants had expanded and activities had evolved. 3. By time of update, funding was taken over by local authority and cohort expanded to include low SES girls. 4. Aimhigher Greater Manchester/ *More than a game*: + local HEIs + local football and cricket clubs (p.63–4). By time of update, activities made more distinctive from school activities and new speakers added. Similar program designed for girls.   **Common characteristics:**   * Learner-centred approach * School engagement * Working partnerships/ parental involvement * Role models * Multiple interventions/ cumulative approach/ accumulation of experience   **Core argument:** In addition to the characteristics, these projects were not operating in a vacuum – project leads were aware of the other projects and “noted the value of networks of practitioners and the opportunities these afforded to share good practice” (p.70). The closure of AimHigher = noted as a disadvantage because of the absence of coordination and support left by their demise. |
| Read, B.; Burke, P. & Crozier, G. (2020). [‘It is like school sometimes’: friendship and sociality on university campuses and patterns of social inequality](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2018.1457626), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 41(1), 70–82.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Gender; social class; ethnicity; popularity; campus culture; students* | **Context:** Friendship between university students as a form of “maintenance, exacerbation or subversion of dominant forms of social inequalities” (abstract); friendship = political; a dynamic; “a prime arena where social relationship dynamics are fluidly constructed and re-con- structed, with complex implications in terms of power and privilege” (p.70). Authors work from common finding that belonging/ making friends is considered an important marker of ‘successful’ transition for students moving into higher education. Literature on friendship has tended to focus on young children/ school (symbolic worth of popularity as a form of capital); having friends = form of power (Adler, Kless, & Adler, 1992). Authors note how this symbolic value is enacted/ advertised by universities as networks for future employability, but the reality is that making friends/ opportunities are classed, gendered and racialized: “In the example of the ‘graduate employability’ discourse, the ‘soft skills’ of communication, social self-confidence, team ‘leadership’ and ‘easy’ sociability that are promoted in these webpages as valuable to employers are arguably more comfortably performed by (white) middle- and upper-class students at university” (p.72)  **Aim:** To “explore the ways in which friendship as a social practice can work to reflect, re-enforce (and occasionally challenge) dominant social patterns of inequality and privilege”; to “contribute new knowledge of such complexities in this under-researched area, that can help inform wider understanding of such dynamics within HEIs across different national and international context” (p.71)  **Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu; feminist research;  **Methodology:** Formations of Gender and Higher Education Pedagogies (GaP) project (HEA-funded); interviews, focus groups, workshops, observations with students (n=64) to craft a case study of a post-1992 university (with a notable gender difference in Arts & Social Science: 75% female students; 25% male; majority white: 62%)/  **Findings:** Friendship = important for many students; 19/64 spoke about the importance of friendship (7 = men, representing 33% of the male cohort).  *Individualised notions of friendship*: Some students expressed the view that responsibility for making friends = pushed onto individual students/ be self-reliant.*Impact of living arrangements*: authors note that the dominant idea of the ‘traditional’ student (young, mobile, school-leaver, living on campus, raucous, drinker) = limits institutional depictions of friendships (see example from university prospectus about making friends on the way to the bathroom). Authors noted a difference between students who live in halls v. students who live at home: “for some students in our study, differences in living arrangements was a key factor remarked upon in relation to making and maintaining friendships – a facet of life experience that may popularly be perceived as down to individual chance or choice, but is actually influenced and constrained by a range of social and institutional factors” (p.76).  It’s like school: friendships operated in similar social networks to schools (e.g. cliques and hierarchies of status); some students described friendships as less intense while others described excluding friendship groups “centre[d] around gendered, classed and ‘racialised’ factors similar to that found in the literature to be common in primary and secondary schools” (p.77). Authors found these ideas were linked to perceptions of immaturity, appearance/ ‘prettiness’ and sports skills.  **Core argument:** Making friends = “an experience that is intimately tied to social identity-formation and positioning, and to the unequal acquisition and development of the symbolic capital of popularity and social status” (p.78), which is determined in part by gender, class (living arrangements, access to forms of capital), age and ethnicity. |
| Smele, S.; Siew-Sarju, S.; Chou, E.; Breton, P. & Bernhardt, N. (2017). [Doing feminist difference differently: intersectional pedagogical practices in the context of the neoliberal diversity regime,](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273214) *Teaching in Higher Education,* 22(6), 690–704.  CAN  Keywords: *Social justice pedagogy; intersectionality; neoliberalism; diversity; antiracist feminism* | **Context:** Educators’ resistance against neoliberal university that positions diversity as an opportunity for increasing productivity/ increase market share/ maximise profits (p.690); graduate students teaching in Canadian higher education  **Aim:** To demonstrate how “employing intersectionality as a pedagogical practice and a political intervention [can help] advance social justice” (abstract); to “reflect on how we navigate this regime within a university that is simultaneously implicated in and inextricable from the intensification of diversity management” (p.691).  **Theoretical frame:** Social justice pedagogy, which “works against this ‘undoing’ of intersectionality by embracing vulnerability, discomfort and the possibility of conflict in classrooms that do not simply accommodate, celebrate or include difference” (abstract). Standpoint theory/ collective standpoint (Hill Collins, 2000).. Anti-racist academic feminism, particularly Ahmed (2012): “insights about the feel-good affective politics to which claims to diversity in higher education belong, and to her directive that we explore how these claims obscure and hide social inequalities that continue to constitute universities and broader society” (p.691); resistance to ‘whitening’ of intersectionality (Bilge, 2013), but avoiding flattening difference (Luft, 2009).  **Methodology:** Reflections on own practice as forms of intersection, social justice-orientated teaching  **Findings:** Authors offer reminder that through critically examining their own practice, they “carefully engage with the complex ways that the *personal is political* by attending to how our own subjectivity and positionality informs our teaching, as well as how our students’ subjectivities affect both their engagement with the course content and with higher education overall” (p.693, italics in original).  Strategies: storytelling, using intersectionality as “an analytic and pedagogical tool to challenge students to interrogate how different forms of oppressions, as social struggles, are interconnected. This has resulted in varying levels of success” (p.694). Authors note hooks’ (1984) guidance that bringing in the personal can help to bridge everyday knowledge and academic practice/ inquiry (see p.695), plus the guidance that “instructors should demonstrate both the vulnerability and skill involved in linking their experiences to course materials” (hooks, 2010; on p.696). Authors note that storytelling/ personal sharing also invites emotion, not all of it good: “The potential for student discomfort in critical learning classrooms conflicts with the ‘diversity’ values of neoliberal universities where the ideals of the ‘happy’ student cum-consumer are promoted within sanitized notions of ‘safe’ classroom learning” (p.697). Authors (specifically Breton) note the challenges of discussing racism without invoking discomfort, and how to respond to this/ create caring classrooms to facilitate the unpacking of privilege/ marginalisation. *Calling-out while drawing in* also used to reflect on privilege and bias, crafting call-outs as “an opportunity for shared learning” (p.698) **Core argument:** “As reflected within our narratives, taking up uneven power relations within our classrooms is frequently emotional, uncomfortable and disruptive. Yet as we aim to disrupt, even on a small scale, the accelerated neoliberal transformation of the university, we must risk classroom disruptions as we strive towards fostering broader social justice” (p.702). |
| Stahl, G. & McDonald, S. (2019). [Social capital and self-crafting: comparing two case studies of first-in-family males navigating elite Australian universities](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1632945), *International Journal of Inclusive Education*  AUS  Keywords: *Social capital; first-in-family (FIF); higher education; self- crafting; learner identities; youth transitions* | **Context:** First-in-family males from low SES backgrounds in Australian higher education (elite courses). Young FinF men remain underrepresented in Australian higher education. Authors position article at nexus of literature on identity/ self-crafting/ navigation of social capital for ‘non-traditional’ students and accrual and deployment of social capital. Literature view of FinF and aspirational masculinities: working class men seeking access to elite institutions face significant barriers. Author draws on Reay’s (2004) work that argues that emotional capital is depreciated through the process of accruing social/cultural capital while at university, leaving students (and young men in particular) open to ‘psychic costs’ (see p.3). Underrepresentation of low SES men = related to gender roles, pervasive depiction of men as ‘breadwinners’, the lure of employment in other trades.  **Aim:** To explore “the experiences of two FIF males as they transition from secondary school to elite courses in prestigious universities” so as to explore how experience drives strategy development (abstract); to add to knowledge about young men and the accrual of social capital/ mobility; to focus on “the differentiated ways in which they accrue social capital and the relationship this has to how they craft their identities in higher education” (p.2)  **Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu/ social capital; self-crafting as constant identity negotiation  **Methodology:** Qualitative case study of two young low SES men — Lucas and Adam — high-aspiring/ academic attainment who studied in (low) fee-paying schools in low SES locales and went on to study in elite courses in universities. Students were recruited from high school (see p.5 for detail of recruitment and sampling). Lucas = from Western Sydney studied Law and Economics; Adam from North Adelaide studied Science. Data collection included interviews and visual methods  **Findings:** Each student case study described in detail  Lucas: wanted to study at Uni of Sydney; was confident public speaker and participated in school life; understood the pathway into his chosen course/uni; he viewed himself as different from his peers because of his extracurricular activities (e.g. Youth Parliament), which introduced him to people outside of his local network. Lucas didn’t get the ATAR he needed, but he did get into USyd and took on self-entrepreneurial/ neoliberal subjectivities (getting the maximum out of every opportunity) by joining many societies and engaging in bridging (contrasted with bonding) activities with middle class peers. Lucas is also able to capitalise on his biography: “he is able to use his social mobility biography to his advantage; the son of a concreter from the Western suburbs of Sydney studying at an elite university appeals to the right-wing individualist ideology of pulling oneself up by one’s bootstraps” (p.9).  Adam: wanted to study science at Uni Adelaide. Adam = competitive race walker, which offered confidence but he was anxious about his exams. Described as a ‘robot’ by one teacher; Adam saw it as hard work and focused on his academics at school, quitting his p/t job in Year 12 to focus on his studies. Adam = shy and spoke about recognising he would need to work to make friends. Once at university, he described enjoying the social aspect with likeminded people. Unlike Lucas, Adam didn’t join university clubs (time and money constraints) so didn’t accrue the social bridges that Lucas did.  Both participants worked to enhance their sense of belonging and make university work for them (p.11).  Authors note that social capital = ephemeral, with temporality a concern for bridges made, which necessitates adaptability with self-crafting.  **Core argument:** Article argues the need to develop self-crafting strategies; the article thus highlights “the nuances between accessing social capital and operationalising social capital to one’s advantage, which may involve varying degrees of success depend- ing on who is playing their hand, the stakes, as well as the context. While it would appear that actively fostering social connections makes university life more enjoyable, further research needs to be done to explore how the accrual of social capital can be used to counter- act the perpetuation of inequitable education structures” (p.13). |
| Stahl, G.; McDonald, S. & Stokes, J. (2020). [‘I see myself as undeveloped’: supporting Indigenous first-in-family males in the transition to higher education](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1728521), *Higher Education Research & Development*  AUS  Keywords: *Learner identities; masculinities; support; equity; widening participation* | **Context:** Underrepresentation of Indigenous FinF males in higher education (and more broadly, Indigenous underrepresentation) in Australia. Authors note the constraints for Indigenous students (lower academic attainment, under-preparedness, institutional barriers, health and financial issues) and the consequences (higher attrition. Authors note the challenges in addressing this underrepresentation when it is underwritten by policy that assumes parity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students (see Fogarty et al., 2015; on p.3). Pathways = important but fragmented. Authors note the instantiation of neoliberal discourses in notion of aspirations being raised (see p.3). Authors note body of work that explores male aspirations/ participation + sports programs  **Aims:** To consider “questions of (shifting) learner identities, marginalisation and mobility” with regard to the transitions and experiences of Indigenous FinF man, specifically analysing how he navigates and takes up supports at school and at university; to focus on the transition of Robbie in an attempt “to address the realisation (or lack thereof) of Robbie’s aspirations in relation to the support he is entitled to and capitalises upon” (p.10).  **Methodology:** Qualitative case study of ‘Robbie’, taken from broader ‘First-in-Family Males’ project (see p.4 for justification of choice of Robbie).  **Findings:** Robbie is from western Sydney and attended a poorly-resourced public high school, which his family had long ties to. This had implications for his identity with both the schools and self-description as a ‘western suburbs boy’. Robbie was in intensive-two year project for senior college (Accelerated Curriculum and Enrichment (ACE) programme) + received additional external support because of his demographic profile, with boys typically targeted in primary school. Robbie’s mentors describe the challenges resulting from limited notions of masculinity in the community (specifically with regard to notions of being smart and gaining employment). Robbie = not so interested in sport and had weight issues, which impacted on his confidence. Robbie had anxiety about assessments (exams in particular) and not particularly confident student, but his love of computer games and how they are made provided motivation to go to university. At school, Robbie described being anxious and finding it hard to maintain focus on his studies. Robbie = positioned as ideal student for university, and this validation maintained his interest in university, even with the anxiety provoked by schooling. Robbie described admiring his mum (working as a carer/ keeping the family going). Robbie confident with seeking support from teachers and mentors at school.  At university, Robbie lived in campus accommodation for Indigenous students, with his cousin also living there. Robbie got a low ATAR but was accepted into a degree program on game design. Robbie = “vibrant mix of contradictions” in first interview (week 2 of Year 1), p.8. Robbie = still saw himself as ‘underdeveloped’, which was impacting on his motivation, and he was fearful of failing a course. Robbie had enjoyed O-Week but had not made strong relationships with others outside of his campus accommodation yet. Robbie was feeling a bit homesick. In contrast to school, Robbie had anxieties about asking for help: “While Robbie recognised the problem – and was making an effort toward a solution – his struggles with anxiety and negative self-concept contributed to university as something to be endured rather than enjoyed: ‘...My laziness sets in and it’s like, I don’t want to do this anymore and stuff. I have less time, can’t play [computer] games and stuff, stuff like that but I worked too hard to get here so I’m not giving it up’” (p.10). In a later interview, the authors observed that he was persisting but continuing to self-isolate: “While the atmosphere of the university is ‘friendly’, Robbie needs close relationships formed over time with educators who understand his individual social, emotional and learning need” (p.11)  **Core argument:** Robbie flourished with personal support of mentors at school, but eschewed the institutional supports at university.  Authors make gendered connections between this and notions of masculinity. |
| 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.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *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 valuable  ECA = 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 ECA  Significant 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) |
| Stone, C. & O'Shea, S. (2013). [Time, money, leisure and guilt - the gendered challenges of higher education for mature-age students](https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1193&context=sspapers), *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 53(1), 95–116.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *leisure, age, money, time, mature, education, higher, challenges, gendered, guilt, students* | **Context:** Mature age students participating in regional universities in Australia; gender equity.  **Theoretical frame:** Interpretivist/ narrative inquiry/ co-construction of interview data/ feminist studies  **Methodology:** Narrative inquiry with first-in-family/ mature-age university students (n=37) from two studies (Study A: O’Shea followed female students; Study B: Stone followed mature age entering UG study via an enabling program). Interviews + reflective journals  **Findings:** Women = particularly disadvantaged by care/ family responsibilities and minimal support. Themes: time,  *Time as gendered construct*: perceived and used differently by participants in both studies. Women struggled to find time for study and for family, especially for children; only one male participant made reference to time challenges with relation to family, and no men mentioned housework. Only women mentioned childcare, and women generally developed strategies to fit their studies around family time/ schedules. In contrast, “the stories of the male participants indicated that study time was privileged, allocated special significance within the family and kept separate from other demands” (p.102).  *Leisure*: recurrent theme of ‘sacrificing’ leisure activities to make space and time for studying; clear gendered differences, with men reporting that they protected some of their leisure activities (notable exception = ‘John’ on p.106).  Money: financial pressure = experienced differently by participants along gender lines; men had “particularly difficult adjustment” because of traditional role as ‘breadwinner’; single mothers in cohort were already proficient at managing on a tight budget, and found little encouragement from Centrelink for studying.  *Guilt:*many participants described feeling guilty about how spending time/ focusing on studies impacted on their relationships with family and friends, particularly parents. Two different interpretations offered about being selfish: “For Bob, being selfish is about entitlement, whereas for Grace, being selfish is about not fulfilling one’s duty to others, and therefore a cause for guilt. Bob’s advice, however practical, is impossible to follow for women with family responsibilities and the gendered obligations that ensue” (p.110). Women participants tended to minimise their burdens, related to traditional/societal assumptions about caring. **Core argument:** “Understanding the gendered challenges which mature-age students face is an essential first step towards the development and implementation of social and institutional measures to encourage and support greater numbers of mature learners to enter, stay and succeed in higher education” (p.112). |
| Villa Lever, L. (2018). [University spaces, gender and position of social origin: intersection of inequalities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2018.1501004?src=recsys&journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education*, 32(4), 518-36.  MEX Annotation written by Caitlyn McLoughlin  Keywords: *Intersectionality; gender; class; asymmetric university spaces; inequalities* | **Context:** The globalization, commoditization and massification of higher education processes in Latin America which have “fostered important changes in its configuration but have directed university institutions to respond in multiple ways to the demands of the knowledge society, according to uneven national contexts, and their own institutional abilities” (1). These neoliberal higher education processes have also “brought about the fragmentation of higher education systems stemming from their location, size, and especially based on the degree of academic complexity” resulting in differences in academic quality between institutions (1).  **Aim:** To show thatthe intersection between gender, social position of origin and asymmetric university spaces, attests to the inequalities in the Higher Education System. “To address the reproduction of inequalities vis a vis gender and education as a multi-dimensional problem” (1); to introduce and test the category asymmetric university spaces as mechanism for the reproduction of inequalities. To analyse two aspects of social inequalities:   1. based on global, regional and national structural inequalities observed; in the latter, they translate in the local level to what I will call, in this paper, asymmetric university spaces. 2. related to individual’s gender and social position of origin inequalities, which when intersected with asymmetric university spaces reinforce and propitiate their reproduction and sustainability.   **Theoretical frame:** Intersectionality theory (“the multidimensionality of experiences undergone by marginalized subjects” Crenshaw 1989) applied to gender, social position of origin and asymmetric university spaces and Yuval-Davis’s (2013, 24–25) theorisation that “inequalities have different structural sources that are interwoven, which results in multiple inequality mechanisms” (2). “Equality of positions perspective, where social inequalities are conceived as the distance between social classes within the social structure, which must be as low as possible, even if this decreases the individual’s possibilities of social mobility (Bourdieu 1989, 29; Dubet, Durut-Bellat, and Veretout 2010, 11)” (3). Bourdieu’s conception of social spaces, where agents and groups of agents are defined by their relative position, as well as by the objective relations imposed on those who enter the field. Positions and relations do not depend on the intentions of individual agents, or on the direct interaction between agents (Bourdieu 1989, 28).  **Methodology:** The author built two statistical indexes: the first, Asymmetric University Spaces, was used to classify the university institutions studied, based on their level of academic development; the second, Social-School Opportunity, that placed those students surveyed in specific social positions or strata (3). Distributed survey to “students in their last academic year at six universities in Mexico City: three public and three private with high, medium and low levels of academic development, to which I here refer to as asymmetric university spaces. The survey consists of 68 questions, divided into 4 sections: 1. General information on the student and his or her family. 2. Student’s school record. 3. Three moments in the student’s academic life: i) Election of an institution and the process of enrollment. ii) End of the first year of HE. iii) Last year of HE. 4. Student’s employment status. A non-probabilistic sample was designed based on a quota sampling or stratified sampling in which the selection of elements, which make up the strata, are not random (Vivanco 2005, 188)” (3).  **Findings:** Gender inequalities are observed at the global, regional and national levels, based on comparable databases; the higher Human Development Index is, the more opportunities for access to HE for women and men there are. “Low level family capital impacts women more negatively than men in their real possibilities of enrolling in the university space they choose, and that high educational capital, unlike the case of men, does not allow women to access a better university” (15). **Core argument:** Gender inequality in Higher Education (HE) is not an isolated problem for the studied Mexican institutions or for the individuals in them: it is structural at the three levels (social position of origin/individual positionality on different power axes, experiences of gender belonging within the university, and access, promotion and graduation norms for Higher Education institutions) although they appear differently in each one. |
| Woodfield, R. (2019). [The gendered landscape of UK higher education: do men feel disadvantaged?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2017.1288859?journalCode=cgee20) *Gender and Education*, 31(1), 15–32.  UK  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Higher education; men; women; gender; minority status* | **Context:** Gendered landscape of higher education in the UK; male-dominated staff, women-dominated student body (57% undergraduate cohort; see p.15). However, men = dominate in elite institutions. Men are more likely to drop out; women more likely to get higher class degrees. Male graduates as likely to get paid employment 6m after completion of degree, but are also more likely to be unemployed. Men = slightly more likely to get ongoing, graduate-level full-time work and get paid above-average salary, after which the pay gap widens (with motherhood a key differentiator). Author notes that arguments for focusing on men as a minority in higher education are controversial: “the thrust of this commentary has been that the current gender patterning of HE is likely to produce disadvantage for men comparable to that experienced by women in the past” (p.17), but also argues that “The speed, scale and possible implications of the changes in relation to the gendered landscape of HE clearly make it a social phenomenon meriting further attention” (p.18). Literature suggests that male perspective on higher education is classed, with working class men less likely to view higher education as possible/ offering opportunities.  **Aim:** To “contribute to the discussion about the gendered landscape of UK higher education by exploring whether men, as compared to women, feel themselves to be in a minority on their HE course, and, if so, whether they feel themselves to be disadvantaged by this status” (p.19).  **Theoretical frame:** Gender studies  **Methodology:** Survey of Economics, Mathematics, History and Sociology undergraduate students (men and women; n=333; 43%m, 57%f) — see p.19 for details. Participants were asked demographic questions and then targeted closed questions about gender balance, feelings of disadvantage, their degrees and future employment, as well as two open questions based on a scenario relating to ‘John’ and ‘Anne’, with participants asked to speculate on how the student would be feeling (generating 18,016 words). Independent t-tests for gender and disciplines.  **Findings:**  *Quantitative analysis*:  No statistical difference between men and women with regard to feeling like a minority/ majority in their course.  In male-dominated disciplines, women felt like they belonged more than their male counterparts; conversely in women-dominated courses, men were much more likely to report feeling like a minority, but these feelings were not connected to the gender balance by the participants. In her analysis, author reports that women = more likely to have greater feelings of being disadvantaged because of gender balance on their course.  Significant differences in how men and women perceived disadvantage resulting from gender balance in society, with men more likely to report feeling advantaged/ women more likely to report feeling disadvantaged.  No significant association between gender balance and perceptions of degree achievement.  Women = more likely to report believing that men would gain best jobs on graduation, while men = more likely to perceive no gendered difference with regard to gaining a job  No significant statistical difference with regard to perceptions of discrimination on courses and gender  *Scenario completion*:  Both men and women most likely to report that both John and Anne would be happy, proud, rewarded.  2% of women used gender to contextualise John’s success.  Most common imagined outcome = securing good employment, but this was imagined more frequently for John. Second most likely imagined outcome = difficulty in gaining employment; largest gap = “emale participants less than half as likely to say John would have difficulties findings work than Anne” (p.26) **Core argument:** Women more likely than men to identify as being disadvantaged/ discriminated on the basis of gender (although only 5%), “implying that the assessment of minority status was a mainly quantitative exercise for most participants rather than one which might involved negative feelings that can be associated with such a status” (p.27). Generally, neither men or women considered themselves discriminated against/ disadvantaged in their courses, but they did in society.  “Those identifying men as potentially disadvantaged by women’s majority status in HE fail, therefore, to take due cognisance of a fact that is acknowledged here by both male and female students – that participation and performance in HE needs to be understood in the context of the wider gender regime in which women still face the greater disadvantage” (p.30). |