### Equity, Governance and Policy

Literature Review

Many of the contributions that offer conceptual discussions are concerned with the theorisations and ideological models that underpin higher education/ equity policy. This literature broadly discusses the Australian education system, with strong connections made between the policyscape of the school and tertiary education sectors. This literature is deeply critical of the manifestations of neoliberal ideology in policy, with many authors tracking the impacts of globalisation and competition on policy and practice. Issues related to the expansion of higher education and the notions of quality and standards also feature significantly.

The discussions of equity in educational policy in this review are based on a context of marked and constant changes: new students, new courses, new modes of study, new stakeholders (Heagney & Marr, 2013). These changes are both results of, and catalysts for, policy change. As discussed early in this review, comprehensive overviews of equity in Australian higher education illustrate how although equity has remained a constant focus in educational policy. However, there have also been constant changes in the underpinning rationales and ideologies of maintaining attention on equity, from the strong social justice framing in the Whitlam reforms of the 1970s, which Whitlam asserted was “the first time for a generation Australia has a government dedicated to equal opportunity for all its citizens” (1974), to the ‘crisis’ need for expansionist, market-efficiency arguments of the Bradley review in 2008. Gale & Tranter (2012) describe this as a process whereby social policy became subsumed by economic policy. These ideological shifts have made the notion of equity notoriously difficult to ‘pin down’ (Savage, Sellar & Gorur, 2013). However, as Gale & Molla succinctly articulate, “With increased commodification of access to education and knowledge, championing social commitment to ensure education justice is timely and necessary” (2015: 822). Savage (2013), in exploration of whether equity can be tailored to educational institutions operating in different contexts of (dis)advantage, argues that because equity is a very flexible concept, such tailoring is difficult to undertake because this “reflect[s] a similar diversity in policy, where multiple versions of equity operate” (p.197). This confusion is evident in the ways that equity/education policies are enacted. In their review of equity policy between 1991-2002, Coates & Krause (2005) argued that the policy produced in that decade oscillated between generalisations and overt-specifications, which impaired the effectiveness of the policy and led to conflict in practice, as the need for generalizability at national/systemic level did not always help institutions be locally responsive and vice versa.

Savage, Sellar & Gorur (2013) offer three characterisations of equity in higher education: as *distributive* (based on notion of ‘fair’ distribution), as *inclusive and recognising* (so as to “ameliorate the negative influences of social and cultural difference”, p.162), and as *equality of opportunity* (‘sameness of treatment’). This multilayered view of equity could also include Savage’s (2013) definition of “a ‘market enhancing’ mechanism and melted into economic productivity agendas” (p.185). These multiple and competing understandings of equity are a part of the ‘assemblage’ of education policy (Rizvi & Lingard, 2011), whereby policymakers are required to “assemble, organise and order values, configuring them in such a way as to render them more or less consistent and implementable” (p.9), which necessitates the privileging of some values over others. This is clearly evident in the Bradley Review, where the neoliberal argument for expanding higher education to produce more ‘global knowledge workers’ to ‘future-safe’ Australia’s economic competitiveness is foregrounded over the imperative to recognise and improve entrenched social and educational disadvantage for particular groups. Thus, the Bradley Review exemplifies the ‘new neoliberal imaginary’ that redefines education in economic terms, related to notions of efficiency within the market (Rizvi & Lingard, 2011) and “rearticulates the meaning of equity in terms of an underlying focus on market efficiency” (p.19).

For Marginson (2011), equity can be understood through exploration of two assumptions about equity that guide enactments of policy: fairness and inclusion. Success of policy through the lens of fairness is based on growth in the total number of people from equity groups, while inclusion is based on proportional distribution of different groups of students Taking the same point in Australia’s higher education policy history, Marginson offers analysis of ‘Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System’ (2009) – the White Paper that was produced from the Bradley Review - as an example of policy that includes both fairness (evident in the 40% of 25-34 year olds participation target) and inclusion (seen in the 20% low SES participation target). Marginson argues that in this policy, fairness was given priority because there would be no change that “Would weaken the hold of existing social users of the system” (p.29), meaning that the target was unlikely to be met. In this case, Marginson argues that universities will likely be positioned as “villains” for not doing enough, thus warranting “a slackening of support for measures to strengthen the position of the disadvantaged” (p.29), which also happened in the 1980s. Marginson muses on how “equity policy in higher education is doomed to be the domain of perpetual unacheivement, in which equity programs are periodically tried and periodically fall away again” if fairness remains the dominant framing for equity (p.29). Similarly, Pitman (2015) problematises the massification approach to fairness (‘a rising tide lifts all boats’, p.20), because this notion is underpinned by the assumption that disadvantaged students will gain access only once the ‘traditional customers’ of higher education - the higher/middle classes - have been saturated (see also Chesters & Watson, 2013). Pitman agrees with Marginson’s call for significant ‘behavioural change’ towards an agenda of inclusion; as Pitman writes, “acts of redistribution occur when policy and action directly target disadvantaged students to increase their proportional representation within higher education” (2015, 20).

Similarly, Gale (2011a) argues that current notions of equity that are concerned with growth in numbers rather than proportional representation represents a view of “social inclusion in its narrowest sense” (p.16). Gale therefore argues for a new view of equity that asks what all students can bring/contribute to higher education, instead of the ‘narrowly imagined’ packages currently ‘sold’ to students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds that focus on potential economic futures, which require the exploration of “new policy settings for equity in these emerging times, for governments, systems and universities” (2011a: 17). In order to enable such changes, in another paper, Gale (2011b) offers three propositions for shifting dominant policy views of equity: changing the relationship between demand and supply; more attention to students’ aspirations for post-school futures; and teaching for equity.

### Critiques of neoliberalism

The economic theory of neoliberalism has become a dominant influence on the ways that education and equity are inscribed in policy and enacted in practice. Much like equity, neoliberalism is also a term used widely in discussions of higher education – particularly in the context of equity – but it is often taken to be a commonsensical word - “a catch-all explanation for anything negative” (Rowlands & Rawolle, 2013: 261), despite the complex variety of meanings and discourses it captures. Indeed, in their 2013 paper, Rowlands & Rawolle present a review they undertook to examine how and why neoliberalism was used in education-focused literature. Through examination of 110 research articles with neoliberalism in the title, they found that 54 offered no definition of neoliberalism at all, despite using the term, and a further 27 offered a brief definition that totaled no more than one paragraph. This, they argue, is highly problematic, because when researchers use the term neoliberalism (and critique it) without detailed definition or explanation, they are “playing the neoliberal game and inadvertently demonstrating our belief that it is a game worth being played” (p.260).

The work of Raewyn Connell has offered much to discussions of neoliberalism and equity in higher education. In her 2013(b) paper, Connell offers a detailed overview of the beginnings of neoliberalism, from Pinochet to the Thatcher and Reagan years, working from an economic theory that by widening markets, new ‘free’ markets emerge and there is less need (desire) to rely on the state which in turn lowers taxes. As such, neoliberalism is synonymous with deregulation marketization, whereby, Connell argues, “The education system as a whole comes to stand, not for the common interest and self-knowledge of the society, but for ways to extract private advantage at the expense of others” (2013b: 106). The opening up of education to the market, and shift in responsibility for higher education from the nation state to the individual can be seen across the world (see Burke, 2012; Burke & Kuo, 2015 for more international perspectives). A further theory that underpins the dominance of neoliberal policy and practice is human capital theory, which posits that when an individual makes an investment in her/his education, they both profit in terms of future (individual) returns and increased (national) productivity and contribution to the knowledge economy. As Gidley et al. (2010) highlight, this investment theory is at the heart of the Bradley Review, so that ‘widening access’ to higher education is about creating higher numbers (to fuel economic production) from outside of ‘saturated’ populations. In order to create, sustain and grow educational markets, the twin ‘fuels’ of privilege and competition need to be at play (Connell, 2013a) because inequality is central to the success of the market; in order for someone to gain, someone else has to lose. In education, “exclusion is vital. There need to be visible losers, if parents are to be persuaded to pay for their children to become winners” (Connell, 2013a: 282; see also Blackmore, 2009). Therefore, Connell argues, education is not – and can never be - immune to the pervasive need to create dichotomies between haves and have-nots. Moreover, neoliberal logic does not like or want to hear from practitioners’ experience/ knowledge; it is not interested in the grey areas of historical disenfranchisement and inequitable patterns of participation in higher education. Rather, “contrary to the rhetoric of ‘evidence-based policy’, neo-liberal policy-making proceeds as if it already knows the answer to policy problems… In a neo-liberal universe, the answer to a policy problem will always be expanded markets, more competition, more flexibility, more entrepreneurialism and more private ownership” (Connell, 2013a: 284).

A key consequence of the neoliberal logics that drive contemporary higher education systems is the heightened need for accountability and measurability (see the following section for discussion the competition agenda). This has resulted in new, mostly quantitative, ways of collecting data, measuring performances and efficiencies and recording access, attrition, retention, participation, and success. Lingard (2011): terms this the ‘contemporary policy as numbers phenomenon’, with the belief in numbers a form of ‘political arithmetic’ (p.356). The reduction of deeply complex sociocultural-historic patterns of disadvantage to numbers and statistics belies neoliberalism’s lack of interest in the complexities of human lived experience discussed above. As Lingard (2011) argues, numbers have become a ‘policy technology’ emerging from move from government to governance: both *for* and *as* policy. Moreover, beyond their power as a form of policing and policy, the dominance of numbers has arguably shifted what equity is taken to mean, while simultaneously working to protect (hide) policymakers from the messiness of lived experience of inequity. As Lingard, Sellar & Savage (2014) argue, “multiple layers of technical and numerical mediation to measure equity” serve to abstract complex set of phenomena that cause/represent (in)equity into “graphs, grids, league tables and indices” (p.711). While numbers may be more palatable than descriptions of what it is to be educationally disadvantaged, they are only ever a partial representation of a much bigger and more complex picture.

As alluded to in the review offered by Rowlands & Rawolle (2013) above, the language used is highly significant in terms of instantiating policy and framing institutional decisions on practice. Neoliberalism was never formally introduced as the new ideology underpinning education; instead, terms such as ‘efficiency’, ‘capability’, ‘merit’ and ‘fairness’ entered the educational lexicon. As Rizvi (2013) argues, the language used (indexing new discourses) is crucial for seeing the evolution of neoliberalism into every part of the Australian education system (see Connell, 2013b for a full discussion of ‘the neoliberal cascade’). Rizvi argues that, “Part of the success of neoliberalism lies in the fact that it continues to use such traditionally socially democratic notions as equity, but has been enormously successful in re-articulating their meaning into market terms” (2013: 276). Sellar, Savage & Gorur (2014) make a similar point when they note how ‘equity’ has replaced language of social justice and inequality in educational policy, so that “equity effectively becomes a ‘ market-enhancing mechanism" (p.464; also see Savage, 2011). The (mis)appropriation of vocabulary that connotes with inclusion and social justice agendas acts as a vehicle for desensitising ‘users’ (teachers, students, parents) to the insidious creep of neoliberal logics and represents what Gidley et al. (2010) call “conceptual reductive integration” and lifeworld reduction; a form of “cultural assimilation and stakeholder dominator hierarchies” (p.133). However, as several of the authors included in this review strongly advocate (see Connell, 2013a; Rawolle, 2013; Rowlands & Rawolle, 2013), it is our responsibility as educators and researchers to highlight these misappropriations and to increase awareness of the impact of neoliberalism, and its work to maintain deficit-thinking, to silence certain voices, and to devolve responsibility for equitable higher education to individuals, rather than institutions (which operate in the market of higher education).

### Globalised education and agendas of competition

The transformation of education – at least discursively - into a global market is an integral part of the enduring dominance of neoliberalism. Lingard & Rawolle (2011) describe the shift towards a globalised higher education field as a rescaled policyscape, so that “within the domain of education policy there has emerged a global education policy field that has policy effects within national education policy and policy processes” (p.498). These policy effects play out in the creation of global ranking systems and transnational comparative tools of measurement, such as standardised literacy and numeracy tests (such as NAPLAN in Australia or the SATs in the UK), so that “national HE systems now increasingly operate as localisations of a global higher education space” (Sellar & Gale, 2011: 1). For Armstrong, Armstrong & Spandgou (2011), the locus of critique exists because of deep and intractable global inequities. They argue that ‘contestable’ international inclusive education movements – such as UNESCO’s ‘Education for all’ – fail because of significant epistemological incongruences and power dynamics between the ‘global north’ and the ‘global south’. These authors make the point that the illusion that ‘fair’ comparisons can be made across the global field of higher education conceals the differing starting points of different countries – much like arguments made about diverse student groups in higher education. Armstrong, Armstrong & Spandgou argue for more recognition of historical patterns of inequality when discussing ‘the global education market’, so that global inclusive education policies “should be placed in the more sobering context of the intersection between colonial histories and post-colonial contexts of countries in the developed and developing world” (p.32).

For the concept of a globalised higher education market to function, the conditions of competition – of winners and losers – have to be present. In the global field, rankings based on student numbers and satisfaction, research outputs, revenue and performance benchmarks, including equity, are the principal currency. Drawing another parallel with higher education student populations, the universities that rank highest in the world are also the wealthiest and most established, located in the global north. According to Connell (2013b), the influence of a globally competitive higher education market has radically transformed education into a regime of ‘competitive training’, so that students, staff, institutions and nations engage in “competition for privilege, social conformity, fear and corruption, while protest and rational alternatives are marginalized” (p.110). As has been discussed in earlier sections of this review, current ways of doing, knowing, being and feeling are unlikely to be sufficient to challenge the power of neoliberal, market-based policies and practices, or to restore what has been lost through its dominance. Sellar & Gale (2011) argue that the new globalised academy requires new imaginaries of student equity that demand more nuanced and responsive analytics and frameworks. These new imaginaries should include an expanded conception of equity, resources for interrogating the production of policy or knowledge across multiple scales and – critically - attention to the lived experience of inequality in particular localisations of global higher education (p.3), so as to challenge the reductive ‘policy as numbers’ approach outlined by Lingard (2011).

What this competitive landscape means for equity is that it has become another criterion in the global competitive policy-practice landscape, another focus for comparative accountability agendas. Many authors included in this review have critiqued this reappropriation of equity, social justice and inclusive education policies (Connell, 2013a, 2013b; Lingard, 2011; Lingard, Sellar & Savage, 2014). Savage, Sellar & Gorur (2013) argue that in Australian education policy marketised ways of thinking “foster notions of meritocracy, competition and choice, which also claim links to ideals of fairness and opportunity” (p.162), meaning that equity and competition are presented as harmonious. However, as is clearly argued in Peacock, Sellar & Lingard’s (2014) analysis of outreach policy and practice in Queensland, competition can seriously erode the effectiveness of cooperation and collaboration between institutions “where there is a potential change in the allocation of academic and reputational capital within the field and a disturbance to the existing institutional hierarchy of the field” (p.390). Similarly, when it comes to equity and widening participation, while elite universities do not resist approaches that privilege fairness, they do oppose approaches that seek to erode their positional advantage (Marginson, 2011; Pitman, 2015).

### Quality and standards

A key issue that is proliferated in discussions of equity – both in terms of policy and practice – is related to concerns about quality. The notion of ‘quality’ in relation to equity denotes a standard of performance in a globally competitive higher education field, with both constituting important policy devices in national education systems (Lingard & Rawolle, 2011). The push towards quality assurance and standardisation was fuelled by globalisation, particularly with the expansion of education as an import/export market (Blackmore, 2009). In particular, tensions have been exposed between the notions of excellence – clearly outlined in federal policy – and equity. In his analysis of the relationship between quality, equity and ideology in education policy, Clarke (2014) describes equity and quality as problematic concepts that are heavy with political contestations. He terms the alignment of equity and quality/ excellence as ‘sublime’ because the two together “posit a ‘fantasmatically’ complete and harmonious world… in which the tensions between equity and a quality agenda premised on notions of choice and accountability are occluded” (p.587). However, others (Whiteford, Mahsood & Chenicheri, 2013; Buchanan, Southgate & Bennett, 2015) have argued that equity and excellence do not stand as mutually exclusive; that there are possibilities for compatibility.

Blackmore (2009) examines the use of student satisfaction surveys as “part of the web of quality assurance, performance management and promotion practices facilitated by new data management technologies” (p.866). She argues that set within a context of performance-based funding, such instruments do little to actually improve teaching and learning – contradicting their professed utility – because the unidirectionality of such surveys (whether quantitative or qualitative) “provide little substantive feedback to academics about what needs to improve, how or why, or what works well for some students and not others… These require academics to respond to poor results, often regardless of whether such evaluations are statistically meaningful, and without academics having the capacity to find out what exactly it is that students ‘like’ or ‘dislike’ or why”” (p.866). The neoliberal context of higher education is a key driver for both the implementation of, and responding to, such surveys. Within an increasingly-marketised sector, Blackmore argues that students are positioned as consumers (‘user pays’) and as such use surveys to express their feelings about their experience of their degrees. This, however, raises complex questions about the shape and purpose of higher education; as Blackmore asks, “Is teaching and learning in a university based on professional and pedagogical principles, or the contractual arrangements of a producer–consumer relationship? This question shines an uncomfortable light on the role, function and purpose of higher education, and the agency and assumptions of its key players – students and teacher-academics. Ultimately as Blackmore (2009) articulately summarises, there is a stark irony when the governmental-institutional response to increased diversity is standardization, accountability and surveillance via quality assurance agendas (p.869).

**References**

Armstrong, D.; Armstrong, A.; & Spandgou, I. (2011). Inclusion: by choice or by chance?, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 15(1): 29-30.

Blackmore, J. (2009). Academic pedagogies, quality logics and performative universities: evaluating teaching and what students want, *Studies in Higher Education,* 34(8): 857-872.

Buchanan, R.; Southgate, E.; & Bennett, A. (2015). Social justice in the enterprise university: global perspectives on theory, policy, ethics and critical practice, *International Studies in Widening Participation,* 2(2): 1-3.

Chapman, A., Mangion, A., & Buchanan, R. (2015). Institutional statements of commitment and widening participation policy in Australia. *Policy Futures in Education,* 13(8): 1-15.

Chesters, J. & Watson, L. (2013). Understanding the persistence of inequality in higher education: evidence from Australia, *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(2): 198-215.

Clarke, M. (2014). The sublime objects of education policy: quality, equity and ideology, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(4): 584-598.

Connell, R. (2013). Why do market ‘reforms’ persistently increase inequality?, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Educatio*n, 34(2): 279-285.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education,* 54(2): 99-112.

Devlin, M. & O’Shea, H. (2011). Directions for Australian higher education institutional policy and practice in supporting students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 33(5): 529-535.

Gale, T. (2011). Student equity’s starring role in Australian higher education: not yet centre field, *The* *Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(1): 5-23.

Gale, T. (2011). Expansion and equity in Australian higher education: Three propositions for new relations, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(5): 669-685.

Gale, T. & Molla, T. (2015). Social justice intents in policy: an analysis of capability for and through education, *Journal of Educational Policy*, 30(6): 810-830.

Gidley, J,; Hampson, G.; Wheeler, L.; Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). From Access to Success: An Intergrated Approach to Quality Higher Education Informed by Social Inclusion Theory and Practice. *Higher Education Policy,* 23: 123-147.

Hattam, R. & Symth, J. (2015). Thinking Past Educational Disadvantage, and Theories of Reproduction, *Sociology,* 49(2): 270-286.

Heagney, M. & Marr, L. (2013). Policies in tension: Tales from two hemispheres, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 15(1): 1-6.

Heimans, S. (2011). Education Policy, Practice, and Power, *Education Policy*, 26(3): 369-393.

Lingard, B. (2011). Policy as numbers: ac/counting for education research, *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(4): 355-382.

Lingard, B.; Rawolle, S.; & Taylor, S. (2005). Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu, *Journal of Education Policy,* 20(6): 759-777.

Lingard, B. & Rawolle, S. (2011). New scalar politics: implications for education policy, *Comparative Education,* 47(4): 489-502.

Marginson, S. (2004). National and Global Competition in Higher Education, *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 31(2): 1-28.

Marginson, S. (2011). Equity, status and freedom: A note on higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1): 23-36.

Morsy, L.; Gulson, K.; & Clarke, M. (2014). Democracy, ‘sector-blindness’ and the delegitimation of dissent in neoliberal education policy: a response to Discourse 34(2), May 2013, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(3): 444-461.

Peacock, D.; Sellar, S.; & Lingard, B. (2014). The activation, appropriation and practices of student-equity policy in Australian higher education. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 29(3): 377-396.

Pitman, T. (2014). Reinterpreting higher education quality in response to policies of mass education: the Australian experience, *Quality in Higher Education,* 20(3): 348-363.

Pitman, T. (2015). Unlocking the gates to the peasants: are policies of ‘fairness’ or ‘inclusion’ more important for equity in higher education, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* DOI: 10.1080/305764X.2014.970514

Rawolle, S. (2013). Understanding equity as an asset to national interest: developing a social contract analysis of policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 34(2): 231-244.

Rizvi, F. (2013). Equity and marketisation: a brief commentary. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2): 274-278.

Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2011). Social equity and the assemblage of values in Australian higher education, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1): 5-22.

Rowlands, J. and Rawolle, S. (2013). Neoliberalism is not a theory of everything: a Bourdieurian analysis of *illusio* in educational research. *Critical Studies in Education,* 54(3): 260-272.

Savage, G. (2011). When worlds collide: excellent and equitable learning communities? Australia’s ‘social capitalist’ paradox?, *Journal of Education Policy,* 26(1): 33-59.

Savage, G. (2013). Tailored equities in the education market: flexible policies and practices. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2): 185-201.

Savage, G.; Sellar, S.; & Gorur, R. (2013). Equity and marketisation: emerging policies and practices in Australian education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2): 161-169.

Sellar, S. & Gale, T. (2011). Globalisation and student equity in higher education, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1): 1-4.

Sellar, S.; Savage, G.; Gorur, R. (2014). The politics of disagreement in critical education policy studies: a response to Morsy, Gulson and Clarke, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(3): 462-469.

Whiteford, G., Mashood, S., Chenicheri, S.N. (2013). Equity and Excellence are not Mutually Exclusive. *Quality Assurance in Education* 21(3): 299-310.

**Equity and Higher Education Annotated Bibliography Series**

**Equity, Governance and Policy**

### Annotations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Citation** | **Annotation** |
| Armstrong, D.; Armstrong, A.; & Spandgou, I. (2011). [Inclusion: by choice or by chance?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2010.496192) *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 15(1), 29–39.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *globalization, inclusive education, feel-good rhetoric; export first-world thinking* | **Context:** Explores ‘contestable’ inclusive education movement internationally (e.g. UNESCO’s ‘Education for all’) because of contestations in global power arrangements between global north and south: “In the countries of the North, despite the differences in the ways that inclusion is defined, its effectiveness is closely related to managing students by minimizing disruption in regular classrooms and by regulating ‘failure’ within the education systems. In the countries of the South, the meaning of inclusive education is situated by post-colonial social identities and policies for economic development that are frequently generated and financed by international organisations” (abstract). Inclusive education = “export of first-world thinking” (p.30); thus ‘inclusion’ = ‘feel-good rhetoric’. Inclusion derived from traditional dichotomies between ‘mainstream’ and ‘special’ education; able-bodied and disabled students; and as a critical pushback against marketised education reform arrangements such as accountability, control, choice and diversity (p.30), and is also linked to development approaches/ equality/ fairness movements. Draws on Ainscow et al.’s (2006) ‘narrow’ and ‘broad’ definitions of inclusion, and adds ‘fragmented’ category.  **Aim:** To “argue that inclusive education should be understood in the context of an approach to the ‘problems’ of social diversity in societies that are highly diversified internally and yet globally interconnected” (p.30)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Inclusive education in developing world = UNESCO’s ‘Education for all’ policy underpinned by problematics: “in the newly globalising discourse of inclusion, its radical humanistic philosophical premises should be placed in the more sobering context of the intersection between colonial histories and post-colonial contexts of countries in the developed and developing world” (p.32) = export of ‘first-world knowledge and policy solutions’ to developing countries, which are unable to lift themselves out of entrenched historical disadvantages (result of colonialism/ lack of investment) but also opens space to advance social justice agenda with all member countries of UNESCO  **Core argument:** “Inclusion and exclusion are interrelated processes and their interplay constantly creates new inclusive/ exclusive conditions and possibilities” (p.36) |
| Ball, S. (2016). [Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2015.1044072) *British Journal of Sociology of Education,*  38(8): 1129-1146.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *parrhesia; neoliberalism; refusal* | **Context:** Outlines a politics of refusal (rather than resistance) to contemporary performative and neoliberal governance, based on 3 modalities of truth (Scott, 1996): the truth we tell ourselves, the truths told about us, the truths we tell to others. Argues that Foucauldian notion of “subjectivity is now a key site of political struggle” (p.1131) – with the individual as the site of power (and governmentality the ‘vehicle’ and ‘point of application’), resulting in the issue “[being] one of a recognition of and engagement with relations of power” (p.1131) and the ‘drama of the self and government’.  **Theoretical frame:** Foucault (truth, power, discourse, agonism); Butler (self/recognition)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:**  *Truths told about us:* Sites of ‘veridiction’ include performance reviews, school league tables, the REF. According to Foucault (1980), power demands truth; “nothing is true that is not the product of power”, and truth is a ‘system of exclusion’ (see p.1132). Ball talks about the “silent coupling of knowledge and power” (p.1132) by which we value people and give them their ‘worth’. This plays out as a numbers game (in terms of what constitutes valid truth in this neoliberal age): “The regime of numbers hails us in its terms, and to the extent we turn, acknowledge and engage we are made recognisable and subject” (p.1133). Questioning ‘the truth’ leads us to question our own ontological status (see Butler, 2005)  *Telling truths about ourselves*: draws on critical self-reflection by 2 teachers (in correspondence), using the lens of agonism, “a process of self-formation through engagement” (p.1135) – arguing against powerful ‘truths’ = act of self rearticulation; “this is the care of the self, the work of the ‘politics of the self’, a continuous practice of introspection, which is at the same time attuned to a critique of the world outside” (p.1136). One technique (according to Foucault) = art of self-writing = care of the self  *The truths we tell others*: parrhesia = truth-telling as an activity/ role. This articulates the problem of truth as the problem of the teller. For Foucault, truth-telling = based on four characteristics:   1. clarity of what the speaker believes 2. moral quality of the teller 3. duty to tell the truth 4. truth-telling as a form of criticism   “Parrhesia involves speaking boldly in the face of risk or danger, speaking plainly when there is a difference in power between the speaker and listener, speaking frankly even when it flies in the face of the prevailing discourses” (p.1138-9) = ‘fearless speech’, challenging ‘the ensemble of rules’ which attaches truth (see p.1140).  Politics of refusal: two refusals and two forms of risk – first refusal = ‘double-headed’, a “disengagement  or renunciation of our ‘intelligible’ self and a willingness to test and transgress the limits of who we are able to be, a constant engagement with ‘what it would mean to exceed or go beyond oneself’” (p.1141). Refusal two = the categories/ norms that seek to represent us: “It is a rejection of comparison and improvement, and indeed of excellence” (p.1141). The first risk = perils of uncertainty and unsettledness; the second risk =exposing ourselves to ridicule and marginalization (p.1141) **Core argument:** Neoliberalism = also a site of refusal |
| Blackmore, J. (2009). [Academic pedagogies, quality logics and performative universities: evaluating teaching and what students want](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070902898664), *Studies in Higher Education,* 34(8), 857–872.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *quality assurance, teaching and learning, accountability, student satisfaction surveys* | **Context:** Set in context whereby teaching and learning have come to attention when quality = marker of distinction in global market = “pedagogical relations have become contractualised with a focus on student satisfaction, exemplified in consumer-oriented generic evaluations of teaching” (abstract). Student satisfaction surveys = driven by accountability and measurement rather than for improvement in teaching and learning. “As higher education has become commodified, technologised and internationalised, these pressures have converged to focus on issues of quality in teaching and research as a marker of distinction” (p.857). The push towards neoliberalism/managerialism (as result of decreasing state investment and increased reliance on full-fee paying students) = makes universities “highly vulnerable” to customer satisfaction feedback. Discusses emergence of quality assurance agenda in Australian education (and the relative dearth of attention to issues of teaching and learning until relatively recently = Blackmore notes expansion of managerial roles over (quicker than) academic roles, and an inescapable part of higher education work: “While quality assurance is management-led, it quickly became the ‘responsibility of everyone’, as part of the processes of ‘responsibilisation’ of the workforce” (p.861).  Discusses the power of ‘the audit’ = key strategy of accountability = student evaluations are an example. Offers examples of different kinds of accountability in higher education: process, fiscal, public, program, professional, managerial). Professional accountability (connoting with “commitments to the profession, to contribute to knowledge, to ethical research, to making a difference for others or to social justice; p.862) are less evident in discourses of/ around higher education.  As a result of ‘the audit’, which “not only produce their own logics of practice and language games (Bourdieu 1990), but change the institutional practices they are monitoring, defining what constitutes quality and performance” (p.862), ambiguity and contradiction = unacceptable parts of teaching and learning (cannot ascribe into assessment criteria). Also = assumptions that teaching and learning is better if it is explicit  **Theoretical frame:** Critical essay  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Examines national survey instruments like Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) = used for performance-based funding. Critiques the one-way direction of such surveys (whether quantitative or qualitative): “generic questionnaires provide little substantive feedback to academics about what needs to improve, how or why, or what works well for some students and not others. Furthermore, these evaluations become part of the web of quality assurance, performance management and promotion practices facilitated  by new data management technologies. These require academics to respond to poor results, often regardless of whether such evaluations are statistically meaningful, and without academics having the capacity to find out what exactly it is that students ‘like’ or ‘dislike’ or why” (p.866).  Effects of logics of quality assurance  Quality assurance/ quality of teaching = restructured the work of universities/ academics; “External demands to perform in audits focus energies on the audit, and distract from what could lead to real improvement” (p.868).  Funding based on targets (once measure becomes a target = ceases to be a good measure (p.868)  Neoliberal university = pushes responsibility for meeting targets etc. on individual = “deflection of responsibility by the institution” (p.868)  Flipside of quality = failure (naming and shaming) **Core argument:** Asks: “Is teaching and learning in a university based on professional and pedagogical principles, or the contractual arrangements of a producer–consumer relationship?” (p.867)  “Audits for accountability rather than evaluation for improvement are the easy way to manage risk and quality” (p.869). |
| Bowl, M. (2018). [Differentiation, distinction and equality – or diversity? The language of the marketised university: an England, New Zealand comparison](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2016.1190961), *Studies in Higher Education,* 43(4), 671–688.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *diversity; equality; university ranking; marketing higher education; language* | **Context:** Examines the impacts of marketization of higher education; specifically Bowl explores how universities reconcile their participation as ‘global competitors’ with need to respond to national policy imperatives, such as equality (inequity) by looking at the language used in publicly available websites of universities in England and New Zealand. Article begins with discussion of global league tables and the tension with meeting social justice goals: “There is thus a tension between the need for universities to project themselves as strong competitors in a global market and leading contributors to the knowledge economy, while at the same time responding to national policy requirements to widen the social base of higher education” (p.2). Global league tables ‘ostensibly’ provide transparency to enable ‘choice’ and ensure parable measurements of quality of institutions across the world. Rankings = symbolic of managerialism and ‘growth of the audit culture’ (p.2; see also Deem, 2001; Deem et al., 2007). However, league tables take no heed of local or national contexts, and there are no ranking systems of universities’ performance with regard to equity/ inclusion. Bowl points to work by Ball (1998) and Marginson (2006) that argues that the flow of global market principles “do not straightforwardly transfer to national contexts” (p.3); aka each nation gives global market logics their own spin. At an institutional level, “universities are shaped by their own histories, cultures and norms which, in turn, shape internal priorities and external perceptions about what ‘type’ of institution they are” (p.3).  Bowl offers an overview of ‘widening the social base of HE’ of England and NZ.  **Aim:** To reveal how four universities (English/ New Zealand) use language to ‘reconcile the tensions’ between global competition and equity; to demonstrate how “the language of ‘distinctiveness’ and ‘diversity’ are employed to mask the incompatibility of market competition and equality, and to bolster claims for elite status” (p.2)  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Essay; comparative [linguistic] analysis (draws on Fairbclough but does not describe = discourse analysis). Institutions chosen as ‘pairs’, according to world rankings (2 = elite/ ‘aspirant research’ universities; 2 = regional). Documents taken from website home pages (WP), mission, vision and value statements (MVV), annual reports (AR), strategic plans (SP) and profiles (P). Also, Investment Plans (IP) and Access Agreements (AA) analysed.  **Findings:**  ‘Doing business’: AR and SP = confirm “extent to which commercial priorities have penetrated the strategic heart of university planning and policy-making” (p.8), although there is clear difference between the 2 types of university. Auckland and Durham stress financial sustainability, freedom from government funding constraints, ‘diversified’ income sources [in partnership with business]; Waikato and Aston = foreground entrepreneurialism and business responsiveness [serving business]. Analysis of the language used to describe links between teaching/ learning and national economic priorities: “moderated language suggests that high-status institutions, with greater holdings of cultural, social and economic capital, are somehow ‘above’ the market” (p.8)**.**  ‘Standing out from the crowd’: all four universities professed ‘excellence’ (e.g., ‘world-class’, world-ranking’, ‘world-leading’ or ‘world-wide’, see p.10), particularly with reference to global rankings. Lower status universities talk more about ‘potential’, rather than ‘achievement’. All universities claim ‘distinctiveness’. A regard for equality is not noticeable in the ‘public utterances’ of the universities. For the high status universities, where it is mentioned, equality = made in terms of qualifying a commitment to social justice (for instance, justifying the selection of promoting merit and potential of applicants which recognize ‘equality of opportunity; see p.12): “What is visible in these statements around equality is that, while national legislation and policy priorities concerning under-represented groups and social mobility are addressed, there is a tendency to limit equality commitments to what is required for the purposes of compliance, rather expressing them as principles” (p.13). Equality is thus performative rather than principled approach to social justice (p.14). Bowl also notes ‘linguistic slippage’ between diversity and equality: “The vagueness of the term serves a number of purposes. It invokes the warmth and harmony of institutional inclusiveness without threatening an elitist ethos. It evades specification of who is currently excluded, what structural and economic constraints may perpetuate their exclusion, and what action might be needed to end it” (p.14). Moreover, with this vagueness, ‘diversity’ can also refer to the international student body **Core argument:** Lower status institutions linguistically position themselves in servitude to business; organisational positioning and responses to policy pressure = reflect their position in relation to one stream of funding (aka government). Particular buzz words are employed: *differentiation*, *distinctiveness* (which “helps to soften of the harder edges of competitive differentiation”, p.14), *diversity* (an ‘empty word’, p.15), and *potential*. |
| Bowl, M. & Hughes, J. (2016). [Fair access and fee setting in English universities: what do institutional statements suggest about university strategies in a stratified quasi-market?](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2014.927846), *Studies in Higher Education,* 41(2), 269–287.  UK  Keywords: British *higher education; document analysis; education market; elite and mass; widening participation* | **Context:** Tensions between social mobility/ national economic competitiveness and role of higher education in England; role of Office for Fair Access (OfFA) and Access Agreements (AA)  **Aim:** To explore “how universities, as quasi-market organisations, might be expected to respond to the contradictory external pressures [of increased national economic competitiveness and social mobility]” (p.270)  **Theoretical frame:** Oliver’s (1991) institutional theory and resource dependency theory (typology of organisational responses to external pressure: acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, manipulation) to “provide a framework within which different universities’ responses to policy pressure could be compared” (p.270). See Table 2 (p.274) for research questions derived from Oliver’s framework (including predictive dimensions leading to 10 hypotheses = Table 3). Authors selected 3 of 10 hypotheses, leading to 3 conjectures:  Selected hypotheses:  1) The greater the degree of constituent multiplicity, the greater the likelihood of organizational resistance to institutional pressures  2) The lower the degree of external dependence on pressuring constituents, the greater the likelihood of organisational resistance to institutional pressure  3) The lower the level of uncertainty in the organization’s environment, the greater the likelihood of organizational resistance to institutional pressures. (all p.276)  Conjectures:  Conjecture 1*: All universities in this study will show responses beyond acquiescence and there may be differences in the degree and nature of these responses between recruiting and selecting institutions* (any response except acquiescence = resistance, according to Oliver)  Conjecture 2: *Acquiescent responses will be more typical of recruiting institutions; more resistant responses will be associated with selecting universities* (not all universities in England are equally dependent on OfFA approval; according to Oliver, for dependence, defiance and manipulation = resistant response, and high levels of external dependence likely to result in acquiescence or compromise).  Conjecture 3: Acquiescence would be demonstrated by all universities in this study but recruiting and selecting institutions would use different strategies in relation to widening participation (all p.277) – lower uncertainty leads to higher resistance, with resistant strategies = defy and manipulate.  **Methodology:** Application of Oliver’s (1991) framework to OfFA reports/ AA from 8 universities (same ones as in Bowl & Hughes, 2013).  **Findings:** Russell Group universities underperforming in terms of measurement against WP metrics: clear difference between ‘selecting’ (RG) and ‘recruiting’ universities (Million+ and Guild Group alignments).  *Russell Groups (RG)*  Analysis of AAs and publicly available documentation shows that RGs positioned themselves as ‘research intensive’ and elite in terms of attracting the ‘gifted and talented’ students — academic excellence/ high academic standards etc. (see p.279). RG universities expressed belief that they should be benchmarked for WP performance against similar institutions because benchmarking against the whole sector “underplays both the success we have achieved and, crucially, the clear commitment we have to fair access and widening participation” (from Russell Group 2 AA; see p.279). Authors argue that this is an intention to excuse its underperformance: “In positioning themselves as distinctive, both downplayed their poor performance in widening participation relative to other institutions in their region, while asserting their commitment to fair access” (p.279). And yet, both RG universities positioned themselves as leaders in WP, using language like “‘sector leading’ and ‘flagship’…[and] ‘the first research-led University in the UK to give priority to widening participation and lifelong learning’” (p.280). Overall, RGs = signalling acquiescence to policy, compromise in terms of focusing on academic standards, and avoidance by focusing on state schools (rather than disadvantaged areas)  *Million+*  Tensions in positioning with regard to low rankings and high WP enrolments — these universities had to implement the highest student fees to avoid perception of being lower quality. These universities = “justifiably assertive” in positioning with regard to WP enrolments in their AAs/ messaging to WP, but downgrading these assertions in their public-facing messaging (for fear of being perceived as lesser). These universities generally position with employability message, rather than inclusivity, “reflecting their historical vocational specialism and national concerns about graduate employment” (p.281) to justify the increased fees. Authors argue this is ‘mimetic isomorphism’ (according to Oliver, 1991), but they also demonstrate acquiescence to policy (“in spite of the fact that their record on recruitment from underrepresented groups is good, when compared with the Russell Group universities, and they might have grounds to complain that they are being expected to do more than is reasonable to increase recruitment from these groups” (p.282).  *Guild Group* (brief analysis on p.282) — general messages about being committed to WP; messages based around ‘student-centred’ and ‘community spirit’, and messaging about employability. Consistency in messages to OfFA and public.  All three groups demonstrated acquiescence to policy but positioned themselves differently **Core argument:** RG universities acquiescence = accompanied by manipulation and avoidance, in effort to craft a case about how they should be measured with regard to WP performance (partially supporting Conjecture 2).  Conjecture 3 = unsupported because authors’ expectation that ‘recruiting’ universities would foreground WP enrolments, but instead the public messages were ambiguous, which they argue “highlights for us the tension between equity and market positioning which is apparent in a quasi-market situation” (p.284).  The quasi-market of higher education means that Oliver’s theory does not easily work with snapshot analysis, but could be useful for longitudinal research. |
| Brink, C. (2009). [“Standards will drop” – and other fears about the equality agenda in higher education](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ838690), *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21(1), 1–19.    UK/SA/AUS  Annotation by Sally Baker | **Context:** Equality agenda: “the aim is that nobody who has the ability to go to university should lack the opportunity to do so, no matter what his or her circumstances are” (p.3). Three main arguments for pursuing equality [*note: not equity*] agenda: 1) everyone has a right to education and under-representation of any group is “a sign of a systemic denial of such rights” (p.4); 2) notion of ‘redress’ (think South African context) of historical marginalization or disadvantage; 3) utility – meeting human capital requirements (makes more sense in SA than Aus). Need to distinguish between *widening* and *increasing* participation (p.4) – increasing = + no.s; widening = + ratios. Foregrounds importance of language: “Our habitual terminology, which is socially conditioned, will influence the reasons we give for engaging in widening participation, and consequently the actions we take” (p.5) – gives example of ‘deprivation’ tapping into discourses of victimhood and entitlement, rather than more neutral discourses around talent and potential.  **Aim:** Paper offers “a few observations about the fears, doubts and anxieties that permeate” the equity/equality debate (p.3).  **Findings:** Discusses common fears  ‘*Standards will drop’* – based on assumed correlation between under-representation of certain groups and not meeting entry requirements (Brink gives examples from SA and UK that counter this fear)  *‘Our reputation will suffer’* – validated by relational positioning according to league tables (example of entry scores forming ranking formula in UK). Follows with example of challenging ‘African hegemony’ at Stellenbosch University in SA (where Brink was VC for 7 years)  *‘It’s not our problem’* – discusses the distribution of blame to school (A-levels) but points to success rates in GCSEs and how universities might not see that far down as part of their problem. Gives example of Newcastle University’s commitment to becoming a civic university.  *‘It’s social engineering’* – consider underpinning discourses (social engineering as *harmful* not benevolent; as *coercive* not free choice). Brink gives example of his tenure at Stellenbosch and cautions against governments penalising universities for not following a prescriptive equality agenda (for fear of losing political and public support); rather universities “have their own path to tread” (p.11) – connection with notion of academic freedom.  *‘It’s not fair’*- connects with notion of ‘fair access’ (in UK relates to privately educated students disproportionately represented in leading universities): “Fair access”, then, is the insistence that prospective students should be judged in terms, not just of the arithmetical fact of their school-leaving results, but of the context within which those results were obtained” (p.12). On contrary, notion of ‘unfair access’ also applies in decontextualized terms (if places are based on merit, it is ‘unfair’ that a student with lower scores gets in above a student with higher scores).  ‘It’s a waste of time’ – based on two fears: 1) time, money and effort do not justify the returns; 2) it is impossible – “that widening participation and maintaining standards are inherently contradictory” … so that “excellence and equality are mutually exclusive” (p.13-4). Brink dismisses the second fear with the example of Nelson Mandela and examples of ignorant statements relating IQ and ‘intelligence’ (performance in tests) with certain groups.  **Core argument:** Brink concludes by saying that “the comparison of different manifestations of underlying fears tells us something about what is fundamental and what is accidental. Circumstances are accidental, and differ from place to place. Fears, on the other hand, seem to be fundamentally the same, no matter where” (p.18). |
| Buchanan, R.; Southgate, E.; & Bennett, A. (2015). [Social justice in the enterprise university: global perspectives on theory, policy, ethics and critical practice](https://novaojs.newcastle.edu.au/ceehe/index.php/iswp/article/view/28/64), *International Studies in Widening Participation,* 2(2), 1–3.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Editorial for special issue on social justice/ neoliberalism. Argues that neoliberal goes beyond the economic focus and is “a comprehensive socio-political paradigm that informs our sense of ethical responsibility and social justice” (p.1) and creates subjectivities such as timeliness, accountability, self-entrepreneurship, individualism, competition etc. SI sought perspectives on ‘grappling’ with philosophical, social, theoretical and practical aspects of contemporary higher education.  Fovet & Giles = explore whether neoliberalism and critical theory can work together in context of disability provision  Sandberg = spaces of subversion in enterprise university in Canada – the ‘alternative campus tour’ explores uncomfortable stories/ public histories of land of campus.  Peacock = critical analysis of outreach program in Aus (UQ?) = conflation of WP outreach activity and behavior management.  Burke, Stevenson, Whelan = Foucauldian analysis of impact of WP on teaching practices in England – neoliberal discourses of teaching excellence resonate internationally  Whitty & Clement = examination of WP policy in UK and Australia resulting in mixed results. Offer research agenda for future.  **Core argument:** “social justice work is not always and everywhere incompatible with neoliberalism” (p.2) |
| Bunce, L., Baird, A. & Jones, S.E. (2016). [The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2015.1127908) *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 1958–1978.  UK  Annotation by Anna Xavier  Keywords: *student-as-consumer; learner identity; academic performance; grade goal; tuition fees* | **Context:** The notion of the students as consumers (SAC) in England has recently been emphasised due to significant changes in HE funding: Students are now responsible for up to £9000 (triple the previous fees) annually for their tuition, and the government protects students under the Consumer Rights Act (2015). However, the effect of this change on student approaches to HE and effects on academic performance has received ‘limited empirical attention’ (p. 12) (Tomlinson, 2014).  **Aim:** To examine ‘the predictive role of traditional factors (learner identity and grade goal) upon academic performance and potential predictors of consumer orientation (fee responsibility and subject studied) whilst concurrently looking at the mediating role of consumer orientation on academic performance’ (p. 12).  **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. Key concepts: Learner identity – ‘a broad set of attitudes and behaviours associated with intellectual engagement, approach to learning and identification with the social category, ‘learner’’ (p. 4); in study – ‘a composite measure that took into account studying attitudes and behaviours including attending class, reading relevant sources, making an effort to study, self-identifying as a learner, enjoying learning, and the importance of being at university to learn’ (p. 5); Grade goal – in current study: ‘assessed by asking students to indicate the final degree classification with which they hoped to graduate. In line with the above research, we predicted that a higher grade goal would be associated with a higher level of academic performance’ (p. 5).  **Methodology:** Large scale survey which assessed students’ agreement/disagreement with statements evaluating consumer and learner orientations on a 7 point Likert-type scale (0=strongly disagree, 3=neutral, 6=strongly agree); Survey statements - adapted from Saunders (2014); 15 consumer statements & 20 learner statements; Participants: Undergraduates from a total of 35 universities in England (n=608); 81.4 % female (n=495) & 17.8 % (n=108) male; 0.3% transgender (n=2); and 0.3% who preferred not to answer (n=2); White majority (92% / n=558); Data analysis – mediation analysis to explore if consumer orientation mediated effects of learner identity, grade goal, fee responsibility & subject on academic performance; preliminary analyses to determine additional variables to include in model.  **Findings:** 1) General findings: No difference observed in consumer orientation for three variables: Work (being in paid employment or not), Year of Study (Year 1 or other) and Gender (female or other); Significant effects on consumer orientation observed for four variables: Extracurricular Involvement, Course Credit, Volunteering, and Age; a higher consumer orientation was evident among (a) students who did not have an extracurricular role (M = 2.59, SD = 0.81) compared to those who did (M = 2.38, SD = 0.93, t(606) = −2.715, p<.007); (b) students who received course credit (M=2.68, SD=0.81) compared to those who did not (M = 2.46, SD = 0.86, t(606) = 2.929, p < .004); (c) students who did not work as a volunteer (M = 2.57, SD = 0.84) compared to those who did (M=2.35, SD=0.86, t(606)=−2.558, p<.01) and (d) younger students (M= 2.25, SD = 0.91) compared to mature students (M = 2.58, SD = 0.83, t(606) = −3.347, p < .001). Therefore these four variables were entered as covariates in the analysis; 10 variables were included in the final model. The outcome variable was academic performance and the mediator was consumer orientation, both of which were measured on an interval scale. There were four predictors. The first was learner identity, which was measured on an interval scale. The other three predictors were categorical: Fee responsibility (1 = responsible, 0 = not responsible), grade goal (1 = first class, 0 = other), and subject type (1 = STEM, 0 = non-STEM); 2) Mediation of consumer orientation: A negative relationship was observed between consumer orientation and academic performance (higher consumer orientation was associated with lower academic performance); all predictors had a significant direct effect on consumer orientation; Learner identity had a negative association with consumer orientation (a lower learner identity was associated with a higher consumer orientation); grade goal, fee responsibility and subject were positively associated with consumer orientation (a first class grade goal, being responsible for paying fees, and studying a STEM subject were associated with a higher consumer orientation); direct effects on the predictors of academic performance – learner identity & grade goal were significant positive predictors of academic performance; indirect effects – consumer orientation was a significant mediator of all relationships between predictors & academic performance; contrary to predictions of authors – total indirect effect remained positive, although significantly reduced, suggesting that consumer orientation partially accounts for positive association between learner identity & recent academic performance.  **Discussion:** 1) Direct effects on consumer orientation – the effect of learner identity on consumer orientation supported the authors’ hypothesis (a lower learner identity was associated with a higher consumer orientation); grade goal was positively associated with consumer orientation (a higher grade goal was related to a higher consumer orientation); fee responsibility & subject were also positively associated with consumer orientation. 2) Mediating role of consumer orientation on academic performance – consumer orientation was a significant mediator of all relationships between the predictors & academic performance; consumer orientation is partially responsible for the positive association between learner identity & recent academic performance; learner identity might ‘compete’ with consumer orientation (p. 14); there is also evidence of the mediating link of consumer orientation between grade goal & academic performance (a higher grade goal was associated with lower academic performance when consumer orientation was taken into account); evidence of consumer orientation as mediator for the link between fee responsibility & academic performance; evidence of significant mediating effect of consumer orientation on the relationship between subject & academic performance (studying STEM was related to a higher level of consumer orientation which caused poorer academic performance). Implications: 1)Universities should initiate a dialogue about the SAC approach & its consequences with students 2) Governments and universities should not conceptualise students as consumers in the first place 3)Universities should not implement changes based on feedback from students with a higher consumer orientation without thinking.  **Core argument:** ‘The significant paths between learner identity, grade goal, fee responsibility, and subject underscore the need for further research to give direct attention to the SAC approach in HE to help mitigate its negative effects on academic performance’ (p. 17). |
| Burke, P.J.; Stevenson, J. & Whelan, P. (2015). [Teaching ‘Excellence’ and Pedagogic Stratification in Higher Education,](https://novaojs.newcastle.edu.au/ceehe/index.php/iswp/article/view/32/pdf_18) *International Studies in Widening Participation*, 2(2): 29-43.  AUS/ UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *teaching excellence; pedagogic stratification; critical pedagogy; Foucault; equity* | **Context:** WP in England – examines intersections of neoliberalism and WP + implications for teaching and learning. HE = in ‘state of flux’, driven by sustained commitment to offering employability. Neoliberal drivers = pushed institutions towards positioning themselves as ‘global universities’ and ‘world class’. “Neoliberal imperatives have justified moves to marketise higher education, with league tables, branding, discourses of ‘excellence’ and competition for students framing such moves” (p.30) – ‘neoliberal commonsense’ (Torres, 2013). As a result, attention to pedagogies for diverse learners has been diminished/ lost. Research also set in context of stratified system, which has impacted on possibilities, policies and practices of WP/equity  **Aim:** To explore “how ‘teaching excellence’ is discursively enacted across a differentiated and stratified HE sector” (p.31) – examine diversity of teaching and learning in context of creeping marketization, accountability and league tables  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on notion of pedagogic stratification = hegemonic and performative; Foucault: power-discourse-knowledge  **Methodology:** Qualitative: in-depth interviews with 33 senior managers in 11 English universities (HEA-funded research). 11 universities chosen on basis of characteristics/ checked against typology of English universities. Critical discourse analysis of websites and teaching-related documents; survey of 350 teaching-related staff  **Findings:** Excellence = framed differently by different institutions (networks/ alignments)  Excellent student experience (quality, league tables; hegemonic discourse)  Managing a sense of belonging (partly for gaining positive student experience)  Drive to be distinctive = tension between neoliberal driver to be standard and distinct  Analysis of discourses identifies repeated words and phrases: “‘holistic learning’, ‘creating independent learners’, ‘providing opportunities for extra-curricular activities’, ‘employability’, ‘developing skills’, ‘student engagement’ and ‘student-centred teaching’” (p.38) – but managers interviewed struggled to articulate/ explain meanings behind these words: “The discourses circulating ‘teaching excellence’ operate as a panopticon to regulate senior academics’ relation to pedagogical concerns in the institutional space” (p.38).  Particular tensions between research-intensive and teaching-intensive universities and allocation of resources, particularly in terms of positional/ market positioning **Core argument:** Discourse of ‘teaching excellence’ = functions as a ‘regime of truth’, “  that operates to discipline (institutional and individual) practices and subjectivities, restricting conceptions of teaching, and limiting opportunities for critical pedagogies” (p.29). |
| Burke, P.J. & Kuo, Y.C. (2015). [Widening Participation in Higher Education: Policy Regimes and Globalizing Discourse](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5_29)s. In Huisman, J.; H. de Boer; D. Dill & M. Souto-Otero (Eds.) *The Palgrave International Handbook of Higher Education Policy and Governance*. XX: Palgrave Macmillan UK. P.547-568  AUS/ US/ UK  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** An overview of WP policy regimes in China, USA, UK, exploring how discourses of excellence, meritocracy are increasingly foregrounded in HE policy, and how this relates to/ impacts on positioning of WP in policy. Focus of access on different groups; traditionally China = focused on rural and remotes groups; US = people of colour; UK = working class, low-participation neighbourhoods and people with disabilities. Student mobility also a significant part of the jigsaw  **Aim:** To “show that meanings attached to ‘WP’ are not only highly contextual but are also connected to diverse and competing values and perspectives, as well as interconnected policy regimes” (p.548) and to show “messiness” of policy formation  **Theoretical frame:** Regime theory (e.g. Krasner, 1982; Wilson, 2000): “sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures” (Krasner, 1982: 186, cited on p.548)/ concept of ‘assemblage’ = policy formation at level of gov’t but also web of local, institutional and global contexts (p.549)  **Methodology:** Literature/ policy review: critical analysis  **Findings:** Discussion of tension between excellence and equity (p.550-2)  *China*: vast regional differences in quality and access. Chinese government is committed to set of ‘world-class university’ initiatives (competing in global ranking). Fees have increased, government investment has declined. Access to HE impeded by family background, place of residence, gender, finance (parents’ background and earnings). Rich, urban children more likely to attend Tier 1 universities (1.48 times higher); one-child policy favours male students over female. Chinese HE has expanded quickly – impacted on quality. Chinese government’s ability to increase opportunities to socially and economically marginalised people has been diminished because of lack of regulation of fee-charging by Chinese gov’t. Discourses such as ‘socialist market economy’ that China has embraced and can be seen in HE policy, about HE supporting modernisation of socialism (p.556) but needs to be seen within context of competing in global ‘market’ of HE  *USA*: “relatively progressive agenda with affirmative action used as a mechanism to redress the social inequalities between historically disadvantaged and privileged groups” (p.556). Discourses of meritocracy and excellence “increasingly countered and undermined such values and perspectives” (p.557) as seen in the way that financial aid/ scholarships available to students with strong academic records/ sporting and musical ability. Research universities are elite and meritocratic (Altbach, 2011)  *England*: Thatcher’s government promoted neoliberalism and New Labour did little to reform the marketization and privatisation of key services, including HE and this has been pushed forward by Con-Lib Dem coalition gov’t – “cementing trends towards ‘enterprise’ and decentralisation” (p.560). Decrease in public spending/ increase in student contributions. However, New Labour pushed WP agenda to heart of HE reforms (1997). Meanings of WP = “contested and shifting in England” (p.560) and connected to student fees [similar to HECS argument in Aus: deferring payment is WP initiative bc all students can access HE and pay later]. Concentration of WP funds to outreach and access “has tended to ignore issues of participation” (p.563). Stratification of HE in England may lead to WP happening more intensely in particular kinds of institutions, “with concomitant social justice implications for students” (p.562).  **Core argument:**  China: binary system aims to bring together Chinese socialism and ‘unethical’ western market practices  US: excellence intertwined with merit-based financial aid mechanism  England: meritocratic view and embedded WP towards marketised system |
| Chapman, A., Mangion, A., & Buchanan, R. (2015). [Institutional statements of commitment and widening participation policy in Australia](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1478210315581462), *Policy Futures in Education,* 13(8), 1–15.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education, widening participation, statements of commitment* | **Context:** Australian higher education post=Bradley review (2008) – highlights “competing ideological discourses” (p.3) tension between social justice and neoliberal economic pursuits. Works from Bowl & Hughes, 2014’s analysis of UK context  **Aim:** To explore the constructions of equity in three universities’ publicly available mission statements and strategic plans and see how equity is “translated into action” in one university (abstract)  **Theoretical frame:** Austin’s ‘speech acts’ and Ahmed’s (2012) framework for conceptualising diversity work through connections between policy documents and practices in the field – focusing both on what is said and not said (penetrating the rhetoric). Ahmed says “To track what texts do, we need to follow them around.” (2006:105, on p.7)  **Methodology:** Textual analysis of 3x mission statements and strategic plans and semi-structured interviews with 78 staff (41 professional/ 37 academic staff from 7 faculties) on responses to Bradley Review and student transition/ retention in Australian WP context.  **Findings:** Participants perceived university’s mission statement reflected equity as central concern as evident in mission centre; also promotion of altruism. However, despite the participants reading positive messages in the mission statement, “most common was a perceived concern by staff that the university did not live the mission statement, rendering itself more as a business model than as a space embodying ethical experience and inclusiveness” (p.9). Some staff were concerned about silencing of student voices (disconnect between saying and doing of equity), others were concerned about level of bureaucracy as a hindrance to translating vision into action and the push for research. There was also concern about the provision of resources (money hadn’t risen in line with student numbers) **Core argument:** “Statements of commitment… were consequently read by staff as non-performatives in relation to the WP agenda with the follow-up actions necessitated by such institutional commitments viewed as either absent, inconsistent or out of line with other strategic agendas” (p.12) – this is how practitioners struggle with and against the neoliberal logic. Raising participation rates without commensurate resources to support student retention and support = creates conflict between economic and equity aspects of WP (p.13). |
| Cardak, B. & Ryan, C. (2009). [Participation in Higher Education in Australia: Equity and Access](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1475-4932.2009.00570.x), *The Economic Record*, 85(271), 433–448.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Equity and access in Australian schooling/ higher education  **Aim:** Study relationship between SES and tertiary ranking ENTER (now ATAR) to challenge Le & Millar (2005) who argued that, on the basis that low SES students are less likely to attend university, more financial support should be offered to address the ‘positive SES gradient’. Authors argue that ENTER  **Theoretical frame:** They use the notion of ‘eligibility’ and argue “The intutition is relatively straightforward, even very wealthy students cannot attend university if they do not have a valid ENTER or if their ENTER is of a very low standard” (p.434)  **Methodology:** Use LSAY data (relating to Year 9 cohort from 1995) in 2002/ ‘estimation methodology’  **Findings:** Students with a given ENTER (or equivalent) are equally likely to attend university, irrespective of SES (if controlled for eligibility by ENTER score). However, low SES students are less likely to earn an ENTER score, and if they do (which they would have to now given school reforms keeping students in education until 18 ??), their ENTER scores are generally lower than those of higher SES students. Many low SES students are ‘poor candidates’ for university study by the time they reach Year 9 (p.444) **Limitations:** No critique of notion of eligibility or ENTER/ tertiary ranking systems/ school assessment schedules. |
| Chesters, J. & Watson, L. (2013). [Understanding the persistence of inequality in higher education: evidence from Australia](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02680939.2012.694481), *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(2), 198–215.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education policy; participation; access; social class; students; intergenerational mobility; low socio-economic status* | **Context:** Examines persistence of inequity in proportional representation of student groups in Australian HE. Examines key literature pointing to demographic trends in participation and arguments that call for systemic change. Navigates policy changes (from 1974-2009), and notes the literature that illustrates SES connections with school achievement/ATAR  **Aim:** To investigate the impact of having at least one university-educated parent on chances of getting a degree  **Theoretical frame:** ‘Maximally maintained inequality’ (MMI) and ‘relative risk aversion’ (RRA) as interpretive lenses. RRA view = “inequalities in educational attainment persist because young people, regardless of socio-economic background are more concerned with avoiding downward mobility than with achieving upward mobility” (p.201). MMI view= widening participation can/will only happen when traditional sources have been satiated: “An increase in the number of students from low socio-economic backgrounds will only occur when all of the students from the privileged class are accommodated and supply of university places continues to exceed demand” (p.201)  **Methodology:** Quantitative: applies logistic regressions to data from 3 student surveys collected between 1987 and 2005 (National Social Science Survey: 1987-88 (n=1663); 1994 (n=1378); 2005 ‘neoliberalism, inequality and politics project’ (n=1623).  **Findings:**  Parents’ education level = important factor for students participating in HE: “having a university-educated parent continues to exert a direct effect on an individual’s propensity to graduate from university” (abstract)  Expansion of HE system since 1970s has ameliorated inequity related to gender but inequality related to SES (low) persists.  Males with a university-educated father = 2.8 times more likely to have graduated than other men.  Women with a university-educated father = 3.7 times more likely to have graduated than other women (p.208) **Core argument:** Structural impediment to meeting 40% target = “lower number of ‘eligible’ higher education students within the lower socioeconomic strata of society because these students are less likely to complete secondary school and those who do complete secondary school tend to have lower levels of attainment than their more privileged peers” (p.210). Also need to consider impact of private schools (‘artificial inflation of of ENTER), so university admissions should amend policies accordingly. Also notes arguments about contested measurement of SES based on postcode. |
| Chesters, J. & Watson, L. (2014). [Returns to education for those returning to education: evidence from Australia](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2013.801422), *Studies in Higher Education,* 39(9), 1643–1648.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *mature-age students, employment, earnings, widening participation* | **Context:** focuses on mature age students (25+) and compares ‘the returns of education’ for young and mature age graduates between 2001-2009. Questions the assumption that higher education brings returns to all students, especially mature age students. Works from context of rapid socioeconomic change and Bradley targets to expand higher education.  **Aim:** To “consider whether those who undertake university education at a later stage in their life enjoy similar rewards to those who transition directly from secondary school to university” (p.1635). Do mature age students get same levels of FT employment as younger graduates and does it have same effect on earnings?  **Theoretical frame:** Discusses human capital theory (based on assumption that personal investment in education delivers high personal returns because of increased productivity in labour market); rational choice theory = individuals are able to estimate probable returns on investment but are constrained by class position; subjective expected utility theory assumes that individuals will calculate future financial returns that will accrue from various educational options and then select the option that offers ‘highest expected net utility’ (all p.1637). Thus = assumption (based on 3 theories) that investment in education has direct and indirect costs and benefits for individuals, thus “mature-age students face substantial risks and costs in embarking on higher education” in terms of getting adequate/expected return on investment (p.1638).  **Methodology:** Quantitative/ statistical. Uses data from HILDA (Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia; nine waves: 2001-2009). In 2001, 13969 people aged 15+ participated (representative of national population) and returns annually. This study used 3 points: year before graduation, year of graduation, and year after graduation (thus = between 2002-2008). Two dependent variables = employment status and earnings and five independent variables: sex; father’s education; mother’s education; age at graduation; and socio-economic status in the year before graduation  **Findings:**  Employment status  Year before graduation: 7% of younger group **FT employed** compared to 27% of older group  Year of graduation: 32% of younger group FT employed compared to 47% of older groupYear after graduation: 58% of younger group FT employed compared to 69% of older group  Year before graduation: 20% of younger group **unemployed** compared to 34% of older groupYear after graduation: 9% of younger group unemployed compared to 8% of older group\  Earnings  Effect is similar for both groups  Between Time 1-2, younger group had average increase in earnings by $169 per week. Between T2-3, younger group had increased earnings by $428 per week.  Between Time 1-2, mature group had average increase in earnings by $171 per week. Between T2-3, mature group had increased earnings by $465 per week.  One year after graduation, gender has no difference but it does in Yr 2 and 3 after graduation  Effect of age (privileging mature age) declines over time (by year 3 post-graduation = statistically significant difference between two groups), suggesting “the returns to education are lower for mature-age graduates  compared to younger graduates” (p.1645).  Summary: “Although mature-age graduates were more likely to reside in less-advantaged areas, be the first person in their family to attend university, and were less likely to be employed in the year before graduation, they were more likely to be employed on a full-time basis one year after graduation than younger graduates” (p.1644).  **Core argument:** Initially the returns of education = similar. Age is not a barrier: “age is not a barrier to improving one’s human capital and enjoying the economic rewards of doing so” (p.1643), aligning with hypothesis of human capital theory |
| Coates, H. & Krause, K.L. (2005). [Investigating Ten Years of Equity Policy in Australian Higher Education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13600800500045810). *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 27(1), 35–47.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Reports on findings from longitudinal (1991-2002) study of Australian HE equity data and outlines the difficulty/ makes the case for defining new equity groups.  **Findings:** Discusses three options for identifying new groups: exploratory empirical approach, new groups might develop from overlapping membership of multiple existing groups, generated from research/ practice insights.   1. exploratory empirical approach: depends on appropriate data about HE students being available for comparison with census/survey data and on the idea that collecting data on student groups = ‘circular’: “unless an attribute had already been considered important to measure, then it is only by accident that relevant data would exist” (p.37-8) 2. Identifying multiple group membership: hypothesis = belonging to multiple groups = greatest educational disadvantage 3. Identifying through research/practice: cites HEFCE (2003) project on ‘first in family’ as example or Australian research on under-represented schools   Authors also discussed analysis/ reporting using performance indicator data – tension “between generality and specificity must be address to maximise the relevance and productivity of the equity policy” (p.40) – current groupings might have been “obscuring salient patterns of group performance” – thus performance indicators of groups derived from demographic variables should be interpreted using contextual/ enrolment variables (p.41). Summative (producing objective data/painting picture of performance of HE) and diagnostic roles of performance indicators = often in conflict as the need for generalizability at national/systemic level doesn’t always help institutions be locally responsive and vice versa. Authors suggest this is evident in relatively little improvement in opening access/success for low SES and NESB students.  Authors argue that equity practice/ programmes attend to aspects not reflected in policy framework (accommodation, financial support, transition arrangements).  **Core argument:** Alternative ways of measuring and monitoring equity = more likely to improve performance of students who experience(d) educational disadvantage (p.45) – at heart of potential reform is critique of the necessary aggregation of data at national level and the impact at the local level |
| Clarke, M. (2014). [The sublime objects of education policy: quality, equity and ideology](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01596306.2013.871230), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(4), 584–598.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *education policy; equity; quality; ideology; psychoanalysis; neoliberalism* | **Context:** Asks what (greater) equity and quality mean in education – based on notion that their slipperiness in discourse and policy render them as ‘sublime objects’ that are base desires reflected in objects (Freudian notion, related in his work to sexual desire represented in art): “function as sites for the investment of desire, while simultaneously covering over and compensating for the ultimate impossibility of a complete and harmonious society” (p.584, abstract). As such, they hold ideological force through their opaqueness. Quality = synonymous with excellence. Who could possibly argue against more quality and more equity? Examines equity and quality in context of policy as ‘joined up’ (between related areas, local-trans-national trends) and imaginary dimensions of policy (Castoriadis, 1997). Reconstitution of education reflects economic concerns (knowledge economy/ competition) and political concerns (sustaining democratic ideals) and the disconnect (contradiction) between notion of ‘winners and losers’ and democratic open access, participation  **Aim:**  **Theoretical frame:** Lacanian psychoanalytic theory and theory of the sublime: “as things that are at once elevated and elusive, as untouchable objects of inestimable value that serve as ultimate horizons, fascinating and capturing us as ‘ policy subjects’”, which are constantly under threat (p.585); Butler & Laclau (2004)’s argument that naming (policy) = hegemonic and empty because of ‘transient stabilizations’ (p.344; on p.585)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:** Contradictory alignment of equity and quality/excellence = sublime (desires reflected in policy); impossible to achieve because the two together “posits a ‘ fantasmatically’ complete and harmonious world… in which the tensions between equity and a quality agenda premised on notions of choice and accountability are occluded” (p.587).  Quality = vague: who sets the criteria for what counts as quality? Who is served by these constructions (see Biesta, 2010; p.588) – quality = typically constructed as improvements in test scores and measured against others (students, institutions, states, nations), leading to “largely utilitarian” views of education (p.589); “quality becomes a sublime object, as the constitutive uncertainties and ambiguities in knowledge and education are sacrificed to the desire for certainty and self-contained totality” (p.589). Issue 1: relationship between means and ends (assumption these can be separated; mutually constitutive relationships can be ignored) – teaching to the test. Issue 2 = blindness/ ignorance of exclusions and silences = all curricula choices mean that there were possibilities not chosen which signify a hierarchy of significance; thus privileging standardized tests means that time and resources are concentrated on those activities and thus are not spent elsewhere. Issue 3: quality education is premised on notion of scarcity = not all education can be ‘quality’ in a hierarchy. Tests are designed to be failed. Therefore, notions of quality centred on testing = “high-stakes testing programmes, are in effect technologies for ‘ devising inequality’ (p.590). Policy as numbers approach (Lingard, 2007) = commodification of education.  Equity = no single accepted definition (Espinoza, 2007); generally connected to social justice/ fairness and often used (problematically) as interchangeable with equality. Explores OECD report ‘Quality and equity in education’ = equity = inclusion and fairness. No Child Left Behind (US/Bush policy which had punitive measures to ensure ‘fairness’ and equality’ serves as reminder that “equity functions as a sublime object of desire, in this case a desire on the part of policy-makers for all to succeed, as part of a fantasmatic vision of an inclusive society” (p.592). Argues that equity policies (in context of increased neoliberal operations) = “rethought within the calculative frames of competitive individualism” (p.593), so that equity becomes commensurate with access (and thus amenable to ‘policy as numbers’ approach)  **Core argument:** Both quality and equity = problematic notions – complex and heavy with political contestations: “both discourses of quality and of equity are premised on a fundamental lack, on the inadequate provision of each entity in contemporary education” (p.594). Quality and equity = sublime objects, which “sustain their emptiness, while simultaneously promising fullness, by being linked to more concrete1 signifiers (Glynos, 2001 , p. 198), like ‘ tests’ , ‘ results’ , ‘ scores’ , ‘ achievement’ or ‘ evidence’” (p.595) |
| Collyer, F. (2015). [Practices of conformity and resistance in the marketisation of the academy: Bourdieu, professionalism and academic capitalism](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Practices-of-conformity-and-resistance-in-the-of-Collyer/146da9f22e32086752a9d528dd05c3a70c2d06b3). *Critical Studies in Education,* 56(3), 315–331.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Explores the perceptions/observations/ reflections on everyday practices of staff in four Australian universities to understand processes of social change in context of marketisation of the academy – impact of new ‘professional managers’ on established academic staff. Do staff resist or conform to pressures of marketisation? Works from call from Mars et al. (2008) for more local case studies to understand the different ways they operate in marketised academy.  **Aim:** Seeks to develop a picture of “why academics adopt – or resist the adoption of – market behaviours and become involved or co-opted into these new organisational arrangements” (p.318)  **Theoretical frame:** Theory of academic capitalism (“a multi-faceted and powerful way of speaking about the integration of public research universities into monopoly capitalism and their transformation into active, for-profit players in the marketplace, selling their employees’ knowledge, activities and products”, p.315-6)/ Bourdieu (capital, habitus, field). Collyer concedes that the theory of academic capitalism is also contested and requires further elaboration/refinement.  **Methodology:** Qualitative; interviews conducted with staff (in Social Sciences) from 4 universities – mix of research/teaching/managerial/ administration; half female; mix of positions. All but one were in permanent/continuing positions.  **Findings:** High level of awareness of processes of marketisation (e.g. competing for funds/ recruiting international students/ private businesses on campus) – and almost all participants held negative views of changes. New forms of appraisal were also disliked: “Many academics found these forms of measurement ‘ incongruous and insulting’, a sign from management of the need for close surveillance rather than an assumption that they were honourable, trustworthy and ‘ professional’” (p.320). Contempt expressed about people employed to ‘manage’ but without research/teaching experience – not super common in Australia but increasingly common globally. Two broad groups of participants: conformists and resistors.  Conforming: Some participants self-identified as ‘managers’ and were more comfortable with market rather than academic ethos. When managers who have academic experience start to conform to market ideologies, it is “a phenomenon that puzzles and frustrates” (p.321) – data suggests that conforming to market results from practical experience in roles/ position in the field. Other examples of conformity: buying out teaching time with research funding/ negotiating promotions at the end of each temp. contract/ coopting into marketing narratives.  Resisting: Some HoDs describe themselves in ‘buffer’ terms – partly protecting staff from the impact of marketisation (between academics/ upper management). Offers examples of how participants have worked the system to work better for them [this sounds like another form of efficiency/ resource-saving to me] – e.g. writing several articles with one single idea/ co-editing book with 2 others so only have to write 2 chapters).  *Habitus/control over knowledge*: “In the university context, efforts on the part of university management to wrest control of expert knowledge from academics can be regarded as attempts to reshape the academic habitus in line with managerial principles, and thus with the market” (p.324).  *Capital/control over workplace:* Discusses how professionals hold more capital in neo-liberal university (controlling budgets/ appointments) – so that marketisation can be seen to be changing/diluting academic capital - and how some academics are drawing on other forms of capital (scientific/ intellectual capital) to protect themselves from these practices/surveillance, but particular people can do this (permanent, close to retirement, senior positions with high levels of publications and funding)  **Core argument:** Marketisation “violates, or threatens to violate” academic norms and practices |
| Connell, R. (2013). [Why do market ‘reforms’ persistently increase inequality?.](http://www.raewynconnell.net/2013/03/why-do-market-reforms-persistently.html) *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Educatio*n, 34(2), 279–285.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *market; neoliberalism; schools; testing; poverty; social justice* | **Context:** Responds to editorial (Savage, Sellar, Gorur 2013). Writes that market reforms are designed to increase inequality. Neoliberalism is fuelled by privilege and competition – inequality is central to neo-liberalism’s success. Education is not – and could not – be immune to the pervasive need to create dichotomies between haves and have nots.  *The market agenda* (p.280): neo-liberalism is based around ‘free market’ and deregulation/ loosening of control – initially over banking, currency exchange and capital movement; “expanding terrain[s] of profit-making” and “universal commodification of services” = at heart of neoliberal logic/ imaginary. Casualisation caused by: “Managers’ salaries and bonuses rise, in both the private and public sectors, to unprecedented levels; while an emphasis on labour market flexibility produces a growing workforce of part-time and casual and contract labour at the bottom of the organisations”.  *In education: what is commodified*? – to create a market, you have to restrict something. In education you have to ration education so as to create a privilege (e.g. paying fees) – privilege can be commodified and marketed in competitive conditions (offers example of private school brochures/ websites). In education, “exclusion is vital. There need to be visible losers, if parents are to be persuaded to pay for their children to become winners” (p.282) – thus the invigorated return to competitive testing (e.g. NAPLAN) and public display of results.  *Illusions and realities*: policy/ discourses point to disadvantaged communities (who are not ‘middle class’ = dominant hegemonic group) but actually the rich are the minority – but never mentioned.  Neoliberal logic does not like or want to hear from practitioners’ experience/ knowledge  Research: “contrary to the rhetoric of ‘ evidence-based policy’, neo-liberal policy-making proceeds as if it already knows the answer to policy problems… In a neo-liberal universe, the answer to a policy problem will always be expanded markets, more competition, more flexibility, more entrepreneurialism and more private ownership” (p.284). |
| Connell, R. (2013). [The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2013.776990), *Critical Studies in Education,* 54(2), 99–112.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *education as commodity; education systems; markets in education; neoliberalism; standardized testing; teacher accountability* | **Context:** Education has been powerfully affected by neoliberal agenda – while education cannot be commodified, access to education can be. Offers overview of neoliberalism: it “seeks to make existing markets wider, and to create new markets where they did not exist before” (p.100), thus education = positioned as market to be ‘freed’ to competition and profit-making. Welfare has been marketised through process of tendering for services, putting public agencies in competition for contracts. All based on principle of lower state cost, therefore lower taxes. Neoliberalism = began in Chile under Pinochet, brought to global north via Reagan and (facilitators of neoliberal takeover of World Bank and IMF) in the 1980s. Neoliberalism brings with it a new form of managerialism – seen in higher wages and bonuses for managers  **Aim:** To offer view on effects of neoliberalism on education system – but emphasis on flexible labour market means more short-term/casual contracts and a push back against unions.  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:**  In Australia, neoliberal cascade is evident in diminishment of manufacturing (with Australia unable to compete with other cheaper countries on wages), meaning that skilled trades have been undermined (links made to youth unemployment and impact of TAFE and schools). Neoliberal impact on education: “Increasingly, education has been defined as an industry, and educational institutions have been forced to conduct themselves more and more like profit-seeking firms” (p.102). In HE, reintroduction of fees (post-Whitlam reforms) and has been positioned as an export industry overseas; “as competition between university managements deepened, a new multi-tier system has emerged, certainly meaner and arguably as hierarchical as what had existed before” (p.102). Also, funding mechanisms continually shifted to make them competitive (funds and fees). Over half of academic workforce in HE = casual. Impact on TAFE = more profound as Australia has gone through process of de-industrialisation, which has impacted on apprenticeship model; also opening up of VET system to market = more entrepreneurs in sector/market. Also, restructure decimated public TAFE system, while trust in the private VET sector dropped after scandals. Discussion of school sector includes focus on Catholic sector (p.103). Also, pre-school education has been effected by neoliberalism/ market economics.  Dawkins reforms = “injected neoliberal logic into every sector of the education system” (p.104). Notes use of first person adjective ‘my school’ not ‘our schools’ (Gillard-introduced website).  Discussion of human capital theory and social reproduction. Connell foregrounds the importance of considering history alongside critical views of social reproduction: “Bringing history more centrally into the frame, we arrive at an understanding of education as the social process in which we nurture and develop capacities for practice” (p.104). Connell also notes how the market works when provision is restricted, and the rationing of education can be marketed.  Consequences for teachers = unstable workforce, weakening of unions. Casualisation has impacted heavily on university and TAFE; not so much with school teachers but schools are developing as businesses, needing business managers; thus a divide is growing between teachers and ‘school executives’. Also the accountability and surveillance technology of NAPLAN has impact on teachers and schools (and students!).  Impact on knowledge: commodification, intellectual property. Also, has impacted on particular disciplines that do not have commodifiable results/ take time (e.g. philosophy) **Core argument:** Educators need to be more aware of impact of/ insidious influence of neoliberalism and develop understandings of education “as a social process of nurturing capacities for practice” (abstract). Market agenda: “The education system as a whole comes to stand, not for the common interest and self-knowledge of the society, but for ways to extract private advantage at the expense of others” (p.106).  “Under neoliberal rule, education is displaced by competitive training, competition for privilege, social conformity, fear and corruption, while protest and rational alternatives are marginalized” (p.110) |
| David, M. (2016). [Fabricated world class: global university league tables, status differentiation and myths of global competition](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2015.1096190?journalCode=cbse20), *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 37(1), 169–189.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *league tables; universities; media; globalization; thematic analysis; discursive mechanisms* | **Context:** Global higher education league tables in post-2012 (tuition fee increase in England) English HE. Examines media discourses and positioning of English HE in comparison with US and Asian universities. In UK mass media, global league tables contribute to policy debates as a proxy for ‘quality’.  **Aim:** To evaluate the relationship between claims that English HE = becoming Americanised and the data that such claims are based on (‘claim making’). Four RQs:  “what are the recurrent themes, objects and actors in media text?  what are the dominant frames within the textual data?...  “do league table results show US superiority and/or Asian ascent?” (p.171)  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Thematic analysis of UK news coverage of global university league table stories (2003-2012). 52 items from 7 outlets = identified as meeting inclusion criteria – inductive content analysis for first RQ, thematic analysis for RQ2. These themes then compared against results of league tables (Shanghai Index, QS, Times Higher Education)  **Findings:** Key themes = US superiority (linked to fees and spending); Asian ascent; and ‘selective doubt’ over league table results.  RQ1: recurrent themes, objects, actors in media texts?  Actors = Russell Group universities (mentioned 17 times), 1994 Group (mentioned once), Universities UK (mentioned 7 times), UCU (mentioned 4 times), NUS (mentioned twice). 18 people (university heads) = mentioned 37 times (most = as representatives of Russell Group unis). ‘Professor’ = mentioned 34 times; ‘lecturer’ referred to 30 times but not as individual person = lecturers and students = referred to but rarely speak. Analysis of verbs = 54 instances of ‘compete\*’ and 12 cases of ‘rivalry’ = no references to cooperation and only 5 = ‘collaborate\*’. Many news sources cite RG universities (except The Sun and The Indpendent). Only 19 suggest doubt about validity of league tables.  Content analysis: dominance of elite voices (e.g. RG heads). UK = framed as between US superiority and Asian ascent  76/120 comparisons between UK and ‘other’ favoured ‘other’; only 27 favoured UK. Half of comparisons = with US (48/63 favoured US; 9/63 = favoured UK), with most prestigious US universities representing US. Half of news articles compared spending/ investment, leading to comments about funding reform in relation to league tables (focus on Oxbridge). No questions about US model asked/ highly differentiated system = never questioned (higher highs = balanced by lower lows, p.184); more focus on competition and markets.  Asian ascent: Asian = favourably compared to UK 10 times; negatively only once. No amendment of incorrect reporting about Asian universities (relating to league table placing or funding).  Selective doubt: most BBC and Guardian reports expressed limited questioning of league table validity – questioning = by not of elites.  Checking media against data = English language countries selected (because of language of publication/ citations). US institutions = dominant in 3 league tables. Population numbers = correlated with number of top 200 universities and wealth (see p.179-181): “Having a 10% lower average position relative to the United States, the United Kingdom has 100% more top 200 entries per capita.Putting one’s eggs in fewer baskets does not improve overall performance” (p.181). With regard to Asia: “The claim that league tables show Asian ascent is false. South Korea’s improved QS results are roughly equal to those of Scotland (which has just over one-tenth of its population). Asia’s overall ranking began and remains the same as or just below that of the United Kingdom (which has 50 times fewer people)” (p.182).  **Core argument:** League table data does not show US to be superior or Asia to be in ascent. Media reports on league tables = overwhelmingly pro-US HE and called for its highest ranking institutions to be used as models for UK HE. “In league tables the United States performs no better than the United Kingdom (size for size) and Asia is not catching up” (p.183), therefore media coverage = misleading. “That the legitimacy of statistical rankings is used to support policies even when ranking data do not evidence the success of such policies requires further explanation than simply ‘faith’ in numbers (however misguided)” (p.186). |
| Edmond, N. & Berry, J. (2014). [Discourses of ‘equivalence’ in HE and notions of student engagement: resisting the neoliberal university](https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/handle/2299/15314), *Student Engagement and Experience Journal,* 3(2), 1–19.  UK  Annotation by Sally Baker | **Context:** Marketisation of higher education and development of ‘students as consumers’ discourse; discourse of employability on student engagement.  **Aim:** To “ discuss the impact of the discourse of employability on student engagement and argue that it positions students as engaged in an individual process of CV building rather than a collective process of learning and knowledge development” (abstract)  **Methodology:** ‘Documentary analysis’ of five universities’ websites where students have been protesting (student union webpages)  **Discussion:** Authors describe the contemporary neoliberal/ marketised shape of English higher education, arguing that to “mount opposition, it is vital to conceptualise education in the same way as neoliberals do, as a commodified – and increasingly privatized - good to be bought, sold and bid for along with housing, healthcare, energy and basic transportation” (p.5). They offer an overview of how higher education has changed over time, which has pushed the employability agenda to the fore (which they call the ‘vocationalisation’ of higher education). They make an argument for ‘equivalence’, which “legitim[ise] the expansion of universities’ involvement in the development of the existing workforce through means such as part-time in-service courses and bespoke programmes for employers and the trend within some universities to move into the ‘territory’ of the workplace to enhance and accredit workplace learning” (see p.7) – leading to academic capitalism (Rhodes, 2003).  Authors discuss how market competition requires differentiation, which has led to deepening inequity within participation/ achievement of particular groups, because “markets have their own logic for calculating value and this discourse of ‘equivalence’ can serve to obscure or deny inequality (in this case of the exchange value of qualifications) much as the ‘equal but different’ discourse of apartheid and the Jim Crow laws sought to do” (p.9).The assumption of choice depends on the assumption of independence/ autonomy: “Essentially, within a marketized system in which the ‘value’ of HE is expressed in terms of eventual earning potential (the exchange value of labour power), student engagement becomes a process of ‘commodification of the self’” (p.10)  Authors explore possibilities for ‘active resistance’ — through promotion of participation (work/ volunteering) in student union protests against increasing student fees through justification of employability angle  **Core argument:** “we argue that it is only through challenging some of these basic precepts of value - of which employability, the privileging of skills and the development of certain notions of character are most prevalent – can we, as students and academics, open up the possibilities of concerted opposition to neoliberal hegemony” (p.14) |
| Ferrier, F. (2006). *A Review of Higher Education Equity Research in Australia 2000-2006*. Working Paper No.64  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Aim:** To provide a critical review of 12 research papers/ reports on equity-related initiatives in Australia from 2000-2006  **Main points:** Works from Ferrier & Heagney’s (1999) notion of ‘dynamic disadvantage’, which is the energy created by (1) the inflexibility of systems and structures; and (2) people’s individual circumstances**.** Outlines three core issues with the equity groups identified in Australian higher education policy: 1) the six categories are reductive and mask the diversity and nuance; they also reflect historical patterns of social exclusion; 2) low SES is the ‘common central element’, which highlights how the equity groups can overlap; 3) focus on the equity groups needs to be contextualised (by individual universities, campus, sociocultural and economic landscapes)  **Reviewed articles:**   * James et al.: Analysis of Equity Groups in Higher Education 1991-2002 * Long & Hayden: Paying Their Way: A Survey of Undergraduate Student Finances, 2000 * James: Socioeconomic Background and Higher Education Participation: An Analysis of School Students’ Aspirations and Expectations * Alloway et al.: Factors Impacting on Student Aspirations and Expectations in Regional Australia * Elliott: Factors affecting First Year Students’ Decision to Leave Universities * Bland: Crossing The Line: A Study of Peer Influence on Students from Low Income Backgrounds in Transition from School to University * Birrell et al.: Equity in Access to Higher Education Revisited * Stevenson et al.: Effect of Campus Proximity and SES on University Participation Rates in Regions * Hillman: Longitudinal Study of Australian Youth Research Report No.40 * Watson et al: Equity in the Learning Society: Rethinking Equity Strategies for Post-Compulsory Education and Training   Chapman & Ryan: HE Financing and Student Access: A Review of the Literature  Tranter: Why University? A Case of Sociocultural Reproduction in Disadvantaged Secondary Schools |
| Gale. T. (2010). Rethinking higher education: Implications of the Australian government’s expansion and equity agenda. Paper presented Teaching and Learning Annual Symposium, Centre for Regional Engagement (CRE): 22 July 2010  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Discussion paper presented at CRE on behalf of NCSEHE/ through NCSEHE work  **Aim:** To outline three challenges to Australian HE in 2010 and the recently imposed ‘20/40’ targets set out in 2009 Policy paper. To rethink the relationship between student demand and supply; to rethink popular understandings of who prospective students were to be; to rethink the notion of higher education and its appeal to students who traditionally have not been interested in HE.  **Key question:** What can universities do to address low numbers of eligible students who want HE (to address 20/40 targets)?  **Core themes:**  Changing relationship between demand and supply: current participation trends are unlikely to satisfy gov’t demand  Academics are the oldest workforce in Australia (except for farmers)  To meet 20/40 targets, 217,000 more places need to be created  Today’s 15-19 year olds less likely to go to university; they are more likely to be NEET compared with OECD peers  Many 15-19 year olds not staying on at school are entering VET (30% of VET students were 15-19 years old and only 20% of all VET students take Cert IV or Diplomas that articulate with university. Low SES students are over-represented in VET, but participation rates of low SES students in higher level VET courses mirror participation rates in university. Same appeared to be true for ATSI students.  Universities should work together, rather than in competition  Aspiration  Discusses NCSEHE research that looked at 59 outreach programs targeting students prior to Year 11 (Gale et al., 2010)  Most interventions aimed at Year 10 students  Most were building aspirations to go to university; least addressed financial assistance  Biggest target group = low SES, then ATSI, then R&R  Discusses DEMO (Design and Evaluation Matrix for Outreach) – see Gale et al., 2010  Good Teaching and Learning  Retention rates of low SES match peers  Responds to call for ‘more sophisticated approach to equity’ in Bradley et al., 2008  ‘Different’ students (e.g. international students/ low SES students) challenge epistemological and ontological assumptions in academia  Argues for ‘funds of knowledge’ (Moll et al. 1992), ‘funds of pedagogy’ (Zipin, 2009) and ‘fusion of funds’ (Gonzales, 2005) approaches to bring about more inclusive education/ teaching and learning – through ‘connectionist pedagogies’ (Hockings, Cooke & Bowl, 2010) |
| Gale, T. (2011). [Student equity’s starring role in Australian higher education: not yet centre field](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13384-010-0007-3), *Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(1), 5–23.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Australian HE sector has changed/ is changing/ is going to change and the view of equity it has/ we have must change too. The Australian sector is “defined by its institutional groupings by their relative claims to selectivity and exclusivity” (abstract) The paper takes a new stance on student equity. Sets out developments (Liberal gov’t set up NCSEHE in 2007; Gillard gov’t commissioned Bradley review and created Ministry of Social Inclusion in 2008) – “sent a strong signal to the sector that matters of student equity were to be centre stage once more” (p.6)  **Aim:** To explore how central equity actually is/ to ask whether a new stance on student equity might resonate nationally/internationally.  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Bourdieu/ Marginson (2008): search for field positions = identifying positions of individuals and organisations and what they can do from these positions (p.7) + capital (p.12) / Bourdieu & Wacquant’s notion of ‘feel for the game’  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:** Changed relations in the field mean that ‘what works’ now might not work in the future. Provides a brief overview of history of equity in federal policies (Dawkins – Martin – Nelson - Bradley) – p.9-10. Discusses league tables/ international rankings in relation to ‘field positions and stances’ (and academic capital). Australian HE is characterised by conflict rather than consensus over excellence (elite, exclusive) and equity (public, inclusive). Concerns about the massification of HE diluting the academic capital has hitherto not been born out: increasing numbers of graduates has not seen an increase in the *proportion* of equity group (specifically indigenous/r&r/low SES) students. Notes how NCSEHE was born at a time when equity was high on the national/political agenda and as such needed to “leverage off this ‘moment in the sun’” (p.14) to influence others. Student equity defined by numbers is “social inclusion in its narrowest sense” (p.16) **Core argument:** View of social justice needs to involve more than physical presence when recognising representation of different groups. Need a new view of equity that asks what all students can bring/contribute to HE. Currently, this is packaged for low SES students as potential economic futures (national/individual); = “imagined narrowly” (p.17). “We need to explore new policy settings for equity in these emerging times, for governments, systems and universities” (p.17) |
| Gale, T. (2011) [Expansion and equity in Australian higher education: Three propositions for new relations](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01596306.2011.620751?scroll=top&needAccess=true), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(5), 669–685.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Australian HE post-Bradley review (widening participation in Australia as a response to a futures-crisis of skilled/graduate workers which could damage Australia’s potential “to secure for Australia a more competitive position in the global knowledge economy” (p.670)  **Aim:** To propose three propositions for student equity: 1) new relations between demand and supply – demand will struggle to match intended supply (20/40 targets); 2) government and universities will need to develop new way of thinking about the students they want to attract; 3) more attention to nature of HE/its appeal will be needed.  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:** Proposition 1: changing relationship between demand and supply.  There has been no net gain in academics (54% of Australian academics are over the age of 45) and more academics are needed (as well as students) in order to meet the 20/40 targets (220,000 more student places needed by 2025 to meet targets: expansion = 4-5x size of Monash). Also considers financial resources needed for infrastructure investments/developments needed to sustain increased student numbers. Universities don’t have enough surplus funds to fund these. Low SES student numbers have increased but proportional representation has remained steady and there are similar trends in TAFE (Cert IV/ diploma courses) meaning that VET cannot fill shortfall in numbers.  Proposition 2: Aspiration and design of outreach: Gale et al. (2010) argued that three equity perspectives inform high quality university outreach programs: 1) they unsettle deficit views of disadvantaged students and communities; 2) they research local knowledges and negotiate local interventions; 3) they build capacity in communities, schools and universities. Gale et al.’s work identified 10 characteristics (DEMO) – listed on p.675 – which feed into a matrix. Optimum performance/ outreach has all 10 characteristics; effective programs need a combination of at least 5 characteristics. Sellar & Gale (?) identify 3 levels of aspiration: individual (economic/ sociocultural); institutional (economic/ symbolic); national (economic/ sociocultural). Positioning of low SES with ‘low’ aspirations = incongruent with national economic ambitions. Similarly, the national ambition to encourage fairer distribution of educational goods = in conflict with hierarchical/elite system and competition between students/ places/ universities.  Proposition 3: teaching for equity: retention rates are similar between low /medium/high SES students (aka = low SES students do as well as their peers at staying with their courses; see Bradley Review 2008). New understanding needed that *all* students bring “assets” to university (p.679) requires new ways of thinking about teaching and learning and current practices create the image of a homogenous HE system that may prevent some students from aspiring to belong/join. Identifies 3 narratives from UK/ AUS/ US (common themes) that guide principles for teaching and learning (see p.680): diversity of learners to be considered in curriculum and pedagogy, active engagement (pedagogy), assessment should be linked to pedagogy (needs revisiting). Gale identifies possible equity principle in each: 1) consider student-faculty contact (familiarity/distance); 2) valuing of informal learning; 3) research for teaching – informing teachers. Suggests taking ‘funds of knowledge’ approach (Moll et al. 1992) to recognise that all students come to learning environment with knowledges which positions them differently (as experts of their own domains). Zipin (2009) suggests funds of pedagogy; Gonzales et al. (2005) suggest a hybrid of these two ideas, involving “lightly framed, open curricula and pedagogy that allow for student contributions without these being predetermined” (p.681). Refers to TLRP ‘connectionist pedagogies’ (Hockings, Cooke & Bowl, 2010) to create collaborative and inclusive spaces, student-centred strategies, connecting with students’ lives, being culturally aware.  **Core argument:** Australian universities need to work together, rather than in competition, to meet the 20/40 targets. Need to consider role of teaching and learning to tackle equity issues. |
| Gale, T. & McNamee, P. (1994). [Just out of reach: Access to equity in Australian higher education](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234562389_Just_out_of_Reach_Access_to_Equity_in_Australian_Higher_Education), *Australian Universities’ Review,* 37(2), 8–12.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Australian HE landscape following Labor HE reforms in early 1990s  **Aim:** To provide an account of access and equity in Aus HE following ‘A Fair Chance For All’, positioned within changing national and global conditions and New Right ideologies (neo-liberalism). Offers historical review of equity from 1942 (financial support for particular social groups) **Core argument:** That Labor’s professed commitment to social justice (captured in ‘A Fair Chance For All’) “is a justice mediated by particular economic and managerial practices which tend to limit equity to issues of access” (p.8) |
| Gale, T. & Tranter, D. (2011). [Social justice in Australian higher education policy: an historical and conceptual account of student participation](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2011.536511), *Critical Studies in Education*, 52(1), 29–46.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Historic overview of Australian HE through the lens of equity/ social justice. Tracing how HE policy is shaped by (and shapes) social and economic drivers and policies and social justice intentions in HE.  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Gale & Densmore’s (2000) three-part characterisation of social justice: distributive, retributive, recongitive.  **Discussion:** 1850 – University of Sydney opened, 1853 – University of Melbourne opened, 1874 – University of Adelaide opened, 1890 – University of Tasmania opened. Little is known about Australian HE students before WWII. In 1945, there were 7 universities with 15,600 students; in 1975 there were 17 universities and 7- AEIs with 273,000 students; in 2007 there were 39 universities and other private HEIs with 772,000 domestic students and 294,000 international students.  Widening participation has reached saturation point for the middle-classes; “equity in higher education has now become as much a matter of economic necessity as a matter of social justice” (p.32)  **1988-90 (Dawkins reforms**) – brought in HECs and merged universities and CAEs: “private gains of higher education became paramount in policy discourse, replacing the previous emphasis on the overall public good” (p.36). The Howard government then pushed the neoliberal agenda (cut the threshold/increased HECs) on the basis that industry and individuals profited.  **In 2002-3**, Nelson commissioned a review of equity groups and performance – findings: women, NESB and people with disabilities showed improved participation; low SES, remote/rural and indigenous – little/no progress. The question was here raised as to whether men in some subject areas should be considered an equity group. Gender was removed, but universities were to continue monitoring it and the other equity groups.  Rudd/Gillard government (Labor) were voted in on an ‘education revolution’ platform; they created the Ministry of Social Inclusion. The Bradley report (2008) placed emphasis on social justice/ equity – foregrounding the transformative role of HE (“must be a core responsibility of all institutions that accept public money” (Gillard, 2009). Subsequent created of HEPPP provided the financial means for more collaboration between schools/VET/HE.  **Core argument:** Each attempt at expansion has been accompanied by distributive notions of social justice with periods of consolidation and retributive notions of social justice. Social policy become subsumed by economic policy. Finally, there is no equity without epistemological equity – it’s no good letting people in if academic knowledges and discourses and practices prevent engagement and participation. |
| Gale, T. & Molla, T. (2015). [Social justice intents in policy: an analysis of capability for and through education](https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.987828), *Journal of Educational Policy*, 30(6), 810–830.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *capability; education policy; social justice; policy analysis; Asian century* | **Context:** Capability = broad normative framework for examining “individuals’ effective freedoms to achieve valuable beings and doings” (abstract). Set in context of global anxiety about rise in China’s power. Work from Ball’s notion of policy intents and effects = policy rarely has a singular focus and are not always taken up as intended. It is not therefore always clear what policies are intended to do/ what result is intended. “…policy meanings, values and assumptions are constituted in texts and discourses” (p.811). Argues that a deeper understanding of education capability = not reflected in recent policy: “In these policy documents, capability is defined in terms of learning outcomes and social justice goals are framed in terms of improving educational outcomes for disadvantaged groups” (p.816).  **Aim:** To examine positioning/ use of ‘capability’ in the *Australia in the Asian Century* White Paper.  **Theoretical frame:** Sen’s notion of capability – focus on ‘people’s substantive opportunities’ (abstract) = “The central proposition of the capability approach is that quality of life, deprivation, inequality and injustice as well as the level of development and poverty in society should primarily be evaluated in relation to people’s substantive freedoms not the resources they possess or their self-evaluated level of preference satisfaction” (p.812-13).  **Methodology:** ‘Critical policy analysis’ – ‘policy archaeology’ – examining the social justice intents of the *Australia in the Asian Century*  **Findings:** Analysis identifies four key indicators of a capability-based account of social justice intents in education policy/ policy effects. Examines: human agency (v. human capability; p.819-21); social commitment (v. market logic; p.821-22); conversion factors (v. resources distribution; p.822-23); adaptive aspirations (v. preference satisfaction; p.8.23-24).  Capability = defined as “as knowledge, skills and competence that people and businesses need in order to be productive” (p.818). Capability-based account of social justice = 2 central intentions – capability for and capability through education  Capability for education (removing barriers for access to, and opportunities promoting choice in education = particular possibility for curriculum and pedagogy)  Capability through education (assumes education is a “foundational capability in itself” – p.817); “underscores the value of education for achieving skills and knowledge that generate socio-economic benefits, including  better employment opportunities, improved levels of health, active civic participation, and recognition and reward” (p.818).  Capability for education: The *Australia in the Asian Century* White Paper “construes capability as an individual’s knowledge and competence in generic and specific skills rather than social justice notions of real opportunities and freedoms” (p.817). Attention to choice, agency or experience = missing; rather it “emphasizes the need for widening access to education and thereby broadening the pool of skills and competences the nation needs to benefit from the emerging regional economy” (p.817).  Capability through education: focus = instrumentalist purposes of education (contributing to national economic future) – education = becoming Asia-capable (Gillard, 2012)  Focus = distribution of resources (not recognitive) **Core argument:** Re/misappropriation of capability as social justice driver: “the social justice intent of a capability approach appears to be overtaken in the White Paper by an emphasis on outcomes, performance and functionings that seek to serve the nation’s economic interests more than the interests of students, especially the disadvantaged (abstract). “The capability perspective takes into account both intrinsic values and instrumental roles of education. That is, it duly recognizes that education generates economic and non-economic returns, promotes agency and supports social mobility of disadvantaged groups in society” (p.825). |
| Gidley, J,; Hampson, G.; Wheeler, L.; Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). [From Access to Success: An Intergrated Approach to Quality Higher Education Informed by Social Inclusion Theory and Practice](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fhep.2009.24), *Higher Education Policy,* 23, 123–147.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *access; empowerment; engagement; integration; participation; success* | **Context:** Explores quality, access and success from variety of perspectives. Starts from notion that quality, access and success are “complex and multi-perspectival” and depend on the underlying ideologies (p.124). The authors take the position that equitable access and success are closely connected to social inclusion.  “…access, participation and success are ordered according to a **spectrum of ideologies** — neoliberalism, social justice and human potential, respectively — by way of a nested structure with human potential ideology offering the most embracing perspective” (p.124, SB’s emphasis).  Spectrum of ideologies = reflected in degrees of social inclusion.  Contextualises the paper in terms of globalization of HE; tensions between elite unis and massification (competition, commodification of knowledge, economic rationales); shifting notions of quality – tension between neoliberalism and social justice: “‘the trade-off between excellence and equity’ (Lunt, 2008; on page 128). Authors contest neoliberal notion of quality as a measure of an individual university’s “competitive edge” (p.128).  Social inclusion = could be poised to take over dominance of equity and access. Social inclusion policy pays insufficient attention to certain groups: CALD (inc. refugees), rurual/remote, ageing populations and incarcerated people. Also, level of policy/ discourse direction is significant: If policies and interventions remain at the level of top down imposition of assumed common values, then it is likely that many of the groups discussed above, even if given access to higher education, may choose not to participate wholeheartedly” (p.130).  Degrees of social inclusion:  *Access through lens of neoliberalism* = investments in human capital/ contribution to knowledge economy, so that access is about creating higher numbers (to fuel economic production) from outside of ‘saturated’ populations; works from deficit position and scarcity of resources; reduction of social explanation to economic framework is a “conceptual reductive integration” and lifeworld reduction = “cultural assimilation and stakeholder dominator hierarchies” (p.133).  Participation and engagement through lens of social justice = “is about human rights, egalitarianism of opportunity, human dignity and fairness for all” (p.134). Notes link with critical educational theories (e.g. Giroux and Freire). University-community partnerships = example that shifts away from notion of ‘ivory towers’ of academy    **Aim:** Responds to this question: ‘Are equitable access, success and quality three essential ingredients or three mutually exclusive concepts for higher education development? Key question: ‘To what extent does the new term, social inclusion , reflect a shift in policy; or is it merely old policies repackaged?’ (p.129)  **Theoretical frame:** Integrative analysis. Uses integrative — or joined-up — thinking to offer some future  policy directions.  **Methodology:** Literature review  **Findings:**  Human potential ideology – goes beyond economic/social justice notions to idea that equal rights = “to maximise the potential of each human being [through] cultural transformation” (p.135) = opposite to deficit model/ ideology. Refers to Hope Theory (see Synder in Egan et al 2008). Based on notion that there is no one ideal model of human development – people do not ‘fit in’, rather they “bring with them the richness of their individual difference” (p.137)  *Suggestions of interventions to increase access* (p.139) include more equity scholarships, better income support, better regional infrastructure, improved physical modification of facilities for people with disabilities, more teaching (language-culture) support for CALD students, better counselling services  *Suggestions of interventions to increase participation* (p.140): partnerships, social enterprise, mentoring, learning networks, arts/sports interventions, outreach  *Suggestions of interventions to increase success and empowerment* (p.141) = pathways, hearing voices, dialogue, futures interventions, hope interventions, cultural festivals.  **Core argument:** Presents 2 notions of quality: *justice globalism* (prioritising collaboration rather than competition) and *human potential* (related to human potential and transformation)  Towards an integrative approach to quality: involves spectrum of ideologies and degrees of social inclusion; “quality in higher education is synonymous with a broad interpretation of social inclusion in higher education in that both are concerned with equitable access, participatory engagement and empowered success” (p.142). |
| Gorard, S. (2008). [Who is missing from higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03057640802286863), *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 38(3), 421–437.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; widening participation; diversity; ethnicity; socioeconomic background* | **Context:** Widening participation data in England; government focus to increase participation in non-traditional students aged 18-30. British gov’t had spent $2b since 1997 on WP; literature suggests a fall in participation of lower social classes (Sanders, 2006). Gorard argues that ‘unfair under-representation’ in HE = not established because of selective entry – the argument cannot be made without nuanced analysis of who additional participants = intended to be.Gorard’s earlier work (Gorard & Smith, 2006) proposes 5 analytic steps for defining under-representation:   1. “a suitable definition of, and method of measuring, membership of the social groups involved; 2. a suitable definition and characterisation of the relevant population; 3. an accurate measure of the prevalence of the social groups in the relevant population; 4. an agreed definition of what we mean by participation in HE; 5. an accurate measure of the prevalence of those with HE experience in the social groups involved” (p.422)   **Aim:** To draw on Higher Educaiton Statistics Agency (HESA) data to look for patterns in under-representation of ‘WP’ students  **Theoretical frame:** None explicit  **Methodology:** Essay – responds to 5 analytic steps (Gorarf & Smith, 2006) and drawing on HESA and UCAS data  **Findings:**  1) Categorisation of under-represented groups is challenging (matter of judgement) and the categorisations currently used = ‘arbitrary’ – should classifications be of student or parents?  2) Who = relevant population depends on a) size of group in wider population; b) age of students (important because “the characteristics of the birth cohorts in the UK have changed over time in terms of the relative prevalence of ethnic and occupational groups” (p.423); c) country of birth  3) Issues using census because of 10 year cycle (and much can change in a decade and not every household has to participate) and = difficulties with acquiring holistic tracking data (UCAS and HESA data = partial)  4) Difficult to know whether students have previously participated in HE (but not completed and therefore no qualification)  5) Incomplete data sets make this difficult to ascertain  Analysis: overall = 50% increase in domestic (‘home’) students over decade – mostly in pre-undergraduate courses (Foundation Degrees, diplomas): “This distinction is important, because it shows that increasing participation, and the widening of opportunities that accompanies it, has been disproportionately concerned with many of these relatively recent kinds of opportunities” (p.427) – this erodes WP data because economic/ human capital arguments = based on undergraduate degrees **Core argument:** There are significant gaps in the data, and a series of complex decisions made in classifying social groups, that make it very difficult to say ‘who is missing’: “Unless these analytical compromises are clearly reported there is a danger that debates about what is happening inWP will be misinterpreted by commentators as being about issues of substance, whereas they are, in reality, merely about differences in these analytical decisions” (p.435). More importantly: “there is no simple and consistent pattern of under-representation among socially disadvantaged groups in attendance on HE courses, once prior qualifications for entry are taken into account” (p.436). |
| Heagney, M. & Marr, L. (2013). [Policies in tension: Tales from two hemispheres](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276793338_Policies_in_tension_Tales_from_two_hemispheres), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 15(1), 1–6.    AUS/ UK  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Editorial. Set in context where change has been a constant in higher education: new students, new courses, new mode of study, new stakeholders. Notes ‘equity’ focus from England = commensurate with other countries’ foci, and England = often leader in changes (e.g. fees and funding and participation targets). Changes = taken place in neoliberal context, whereby responsibility for HE is shifting from government to student, resulting in substantial reduction in applications for part time study  Paper by Davies (same issue) = experiences of Foundation degree students in NE English FE college to develop work/study balance of these ‘non-traditional’ students. Institutions are criticised for not being flexible or responsive enough. Papers in this issue explore UK and Australian HE sectors.  Paper by Bovill (same issue) = challenges the policy drivers that privilege high achievers over vocational students  Paper by Cocks & Stokes = explores enacting equity policy into practice  Paper by Cuthill & Jansen = examines outreach program |
| Heimans, S. (2011). [Education Policy, Practice, and Power](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0895904810397338), *Education Policy*, 26(3): 369-393.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *education policy, practice, power, Bourdieu, consumption, theory* | **Context:** Theoretical discussion of intersections between educational policy and practice, with the focus on the ‘economies of power’ so as “to capture power relations in contexts of education policy production and enactment” (p.369). Policy conceived as ideas born through policy and enacted in classrooms (p.370)  Policies are formed and reformed in government and then reformed again in the work on institutions – working from idea that there is no true ‘genesis’ of idea, but instead that global/local understandings are “rearticulated into policy and that they are continuously remade through their re-enactment in different government and institutional settings” (p.372).  Conception of practice: practice “is never in a state of permanent completion, the world is constantly recreated and made possible in and through practice” (p.372). Practice engenders relational conceptualisation (about perpetual becoming-ness/ in between-ness) and thus is dynamic and fluid with a dialectical relationship between thinking and analysis [and with enactment = praxis]. “Form and context are bother crucial policy production and enactment parameters, but are static until they move through time and the contexts of people and the things they use to make and enact policy” (p.374). Important concept underpinning this is idea that some policies ‘adhere’ and others don’t (analysis of power can help to understand why) but only a “temporary permanence” (p.374). To account for change, can explore how change in one area/ part impacts on other parts (in terms of examining the relationality/ ecology of policy & practice). Embedding of power relations = opens and constrains possibilities for policy makers and enactors. Power is described in terms of ‘smooth power’, in terms of “the distinctions and classifications that hold the social world together in its unequal and enduringly distending ways” (p.375)  Ball (1984) claimed that “it is always what is written as well as what is done that makes policy and makes it incomplete and unfinished when the policy is enacted in practice” [Heiman’s take on Ball’s idea; p.376).  **Aim:** To gather insights from different fields to “research the intersections of power and the material effects of education policy in practice” (p.370). Also “seeks to explore ways to think about policy through the “in-betweenness” inherent in conceptions of practice” (p.372). Asks these questions:   * What are the economies of power in policy? * What are the values embodied in the policy and what are the mechanisms (technologies) which makes those ‘natural’ and valorise those values economically… and at what cost, to whom? (p.375)   To examine “the disjunction between what people in government and bureaucracy do and what people in education institutions do in relation to policy, and why” (p.21)  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on 3 theoretical fields: Bourdieu’s ‘triumvirate’ of habitus, capital and field, consumption/organisational practice theory, and “policy ‘meaning potential’ in practice’ (p.370) to explore/ conceptualise power relations in nexus of policy and practice. Diverse approaches = avoids “theoretical dogmatism” (p.371). Draws on notion of ‘street level bureaucrats’ (Lipsky, 1980) to conceptualise the potential of students and teachers to remake policy/ enact policy in different than expected ways.  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:**  Bourdieu: the set of ‘thinking tools’ work better when used all together; permits a view of “socially (in)formed logic” which “assumes a socially derived relational view of both logic and practice” (p.377) – meaning that policy gets enacted in diverse ways because different social agents anticipate/view the world in different ways (draw on different sets of logic; e.g. policy makers view education differently from teachers). Need all three to offer view of relations between them; a way of thinking ‘dialectically’ and constitute practice when understood relationally (p.379). Different logics exist in different policy sites (fields)  Consumption theory: similar notion foregrounding ‘becoming’ or ‘unfolding’ in study of practice; Bjorkeng et al. (2009) identify general characteristics of practice:   1. practices = ‘embodied array of activities’ based on shared understanding and competence; 2. materiality = intersubjectively understood/configured in specific ways for specific practices; 3. practice = defines own rationality; 4. practice = nothing and everything at same time = nexus of human interconnectivity; and 5. practices establish and are established by social order and they are recursive.   They also offer 3 features of the ‘becomingness’ of practice: 1) authoring boundaries; 2) negotiating competencies; 3) adapting materiality  Trajectory of policy to practice is not linear or unidirectional (p.17) – scopes usefulness of discourse and multimodal analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen). Policy = developed and articulated as a text/ artefact: “This artifact (e.g., a public policy document, or policy speech, or policy directive, or informal negotiation between a policy public servant and an education “provider”) is positioned in relation both to the conditions and embodiment of its production but also to the conditions and embodiment of its interpretation” (p.18) – meaning that its intended meaning = not guaranteed to be read as such and others can be other interpretive repertoires to the reading of ‘the text’: “policy moves from place to place, from person to person, and from organization to organization through time, through different logics of practice” (p.18)  Discusses notion of transmission as organized materiality (OM) and materialized organisations (MO) = transmission of ideas over time (Debray, 2000) – textbook = example of OM (see p.19). “Power, it is argued here then, is materialized in organizations through the organization of materiality, in practice, in and across distinct  policy sites” (p.20).  Also discusses notion of ‘resemiotisation’ (Iedema, 2003) = changing ideas/policy between contexts and logics of practice in different settings  **Core argument**: Using Bourdieu to examine policy as practice = moves away from binary of actor/structure and allows lens to focus on contexts of power and relations of power  “Practice involves both saying (and writing) and doing; both produce meaning. Meaning is established through and in practice and is subject to the power relations of practice in its production” (p.17). |
| James, R. (2007). [Social equity in a mass, globalised higher education environment: the unresolved issue of widening access to university](http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/news/lectures/pdf/richardjamestranscript.pdf). Presented at *Faculty of Education Dean’s Lecture Series 2007*, Centre of the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Aim:** To foreground and provide a rationale for the continued focus on equity (note: this paper was produced the year before the Bradley Review) and to ‘myth-bust’ six assumptions about equity  **Key points from literature review:** Equity usually involved vague notions of merit, fairness and equality of opportunity (p.2); it is difficult to make comparisons of patterns of access to HE on basis of low SES because of use of different indicators and scales. Internationally, comparisons are difficult because HE is classified differently across the world. James notes that Australia’s participation patterns for equity groups were “far from satisfactory for a nation that takes pride in its egalitarianism” (p.5).  **Findings:** Presents 6 myths for critique (p.10-12):   1. *Expanding the HE system/ increasing places will improve patterns of participation for equity groups*   An increase in numbers will not necessarily change proportional representation (**since proved correct**)   1. *Free or lower cost of HE will improve patterns of participation for equity groups*   Needs differential levels of financial support: “everything possible must be done to achieve minimal costs for students who otherwise would not be able to participate…” (p.11)   1. *Improving equity involves the removal of barriers to access*   Challenge is to not only remove barriers but also to build possibilities and choices   1. The onus is with universities to resolve equity issues   The role of school and wider society needs to be brought into the mix   1. *Widening Participation will lower standards*   Notion of standards based on students entrance qualifications = ‘shallow thinking’ (p.11)   1. Students can be selected on basis of academic merit   Critique offered here of investment in measurements such as ENTER (now ATAR) as an indicator of merit: they are at best partial measurements of ‘cumulative advantage or disadvantage’  **Recommendations:**   * Build policy and practice out of a multi-causal understanding of why under-representation is as it is * Improve definition and measurement of SES * Set targets/ provide incentives for universities (**now in place**) * Outreach into schools much earlier * Consider flexible admissions policies (less reliant on ENTER) * Renew Year 1 curricula * Develop better ways of measuring graduate outcomes   Special note: Consider international students = 25% of student body  **Relevant for UON:** Mention of Newcastle’s ‘thriving Foundation program that is without parallel in Australian HE’ (p.7) |
| Leach, L. (2013). [Participation and equity in higher education: are we going back to the future?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03054985.2013.791618) *Oxford Review of Education,* 39(2), 267–286.  NZ/AUS/ENG  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *equity, higher education, access, widening participation policy* | **Context:** Overview of policy developments in New Zealand, Australia and England from 1960s-2011.  **Aim:** To provide an overview of policy and practice with relation to equity and participation in higher education in NZ, Aus, England over 50 years  **Theoretical frame:** None explicit  **Methodology:** Policy/ literature review  **Findings:**  *Section 1: from elite to massified system* – massification driven by two forces: 1) increasing participation and widening access. SES = common framing but is measured differently in each country (see p.269).  Higher education in NZ: pre-1980s = elite. Major changes in 1980s/90s in post-compulsory education sector, with access opened to ‘disadvantaged’ groups (socioeconomic, ethnicity, disability and gender disadvantage in NZ educational policy). Funding arrangements of HE shifted (fees set, students assumed part of cost, student loans system started). In 2001, obligations to indigenous students recognized. Six strategies outlined in *Tertiary Education Strategy 2002-2007*: Maori aspirations, raise foundation skills (including literacy) – for indigenous, migrants, refugees, ‘at risk’ youth, long-term unemployed, students with disabilities, people with few/ no qualifications - , educate Pacific People for development and success. Next policy paper (2007-12) focused on equity of access and achievement.  England: framed as widening participation (to under-represented students) and lifelong learning. Robbins Report (1963) recommended expanded HE system; 1970s = new polytechnics – creation of binary system. *Educational Reform Act 1988* recognised access courses as alternative pathway into undergraduate study – paved way for end of binary system. *Further and Higher Education Act 1992* abolished binary system, making all polytechnics into ‘new’ universities. Widening participation = large focus of Dearing Report (1997) and New Labour government elected in 1997 set participation target of 50% of 18-30 year olds by 2010. *Higher Education Act 2004* increased student fees to 3000GBP per year (variable top up fees). Office for Fair Access (OFFA) established in 2005 and WP = strategic objective of HEFCE, which supported Aimhigher and Action on Access.  Australia: Martin report (1964) – Fraser government (1974): Commonwealth assumed full responsibility for cost of HE. In 1988, unified system (FE and HE) introduced; HECS introduced (sold as equity mechanism). *A Fair Chance for All =* identified six equity groups. Review in 1996 (West Report) suggest some improvements in participation rates of 6 groups, but not for Indigenous, low SES and R&R students. In 2002 (Nelson reforms), HECS contribution (aka cost to student) increased, but policy reform included requirement for institutions to do more to ensure equity. Access and equity = key drivers/ foci in Bradley Review (2008) – Australia seen as lagging behind.  Higher Education post-GFC (policy 2008-2011)  New Zealand: Cap on enrolments in 2008; 2009 = $500mNZD reduction in funding to HE, with further incremental decreases until 2014. Universities turning many students away. New performance review funding introduced (5% based on completion/ progression to higher study/ retention). Financial penalities for insitutions that exceeded capped enrolments. People under 25 = remained target group. Financial pressures increased by earthquake in Christchurch in 2011. Loan repayments increased in 2012.  England: *Browne Report* (2010) = recommended increase in tuition fees (resulting from austerity politics). Under-represented students still targeted as long as they had ‘talent’. Access agreements introduced with Higher Education Council – all universities charging more than 6000GBP had to have access agreements with OFFA. National Scholarship Programme introduced to support low income full-time students. HEFCE required all universities to provide WP statement in 2012.  Australia: ‘counter-cyclical’ approach taken – introduction of demand-driven system in 2010. Aus gov’t invested $500m in Teaching and Learning Capital Fund for infrastructure and facilities (as per Bradley Review recommendations). Introduction of HEPPP and equity targets 20/40 set in 2010. Additional regional loading funding ($110m) added in 2011 plus additional infrastructure investment for regional universities. Additional funding also added.  **Core argument:** Australia took a different funding approach (investment) in face of GFC compared to NZ and England. Equity policies = limited success in 3 countries, despite redressive policies: “These data show that even at times of expansion, with policies that support widening participation in higher education, the proportion of under-represented students in each of the three countries has not increased as hoped” (p.298). Similar shifts in discourse occurred in line with GFC: NZ = ‘extent of ability’; England = ‘potential’; Australia = ‘capable’ – move towards ‘merit based’ approach. Institutional approaches (such as cutting staff numbers) had an impact on possibilities for equity: “Class sizes and increased staff–student ratios may also decrease the quality of teaching, a key factor in student outcomes”, particularly for traditionally under-represented students (p.279) and particularly when funding =contingent on completion. Costs of higher education = also understood to be prohibitive for low SES students |
| Lingard, B. (2011). [Policy as numbers: ac/counting for education research,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2011.605476) *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(4), 355–382.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *policy, statistics, data, governance, globalisation* | **Context:** Examines ‘contemporary policy as numbers phenomenon’  **Theoretical frame:** ‘Structure of feeling’ (Raymond Williams, 1966) and diminishing progressive imaginary. Draws also on Appadurai (2006): binary code as essential to neoliberalism (1 = individual; 0 =masses)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Lingard explores impact on policy and research. Examines how globalisation and neoliberalism have strengthened belief in numbers = ‘political arithmetic’ (p.356), which is a ‘policy technology’ emerging from move from government to governance: “Numbers have long been significant to the functioning of the state apparatus” (p.359): both *for* and *as* policy. Explicitly resists positioning paper as critique of quantitative research; instead he draws from Bourdieu in proposing “methodology that is complementary to one’s onto-epistemologies and the research topic, framed by endemic researcher reflexivity” (p.358), thus rejecting stance of ‘epistemological innocence’ (see Bourdieu, 1999). Lingard argues that numbers are used as simplifiers of complexity: “‘the simplifying moves that are needed to convert the messy realities of people’s personal attributes and behaviours into the objective, tractable language of numbers’ (Jasanoff 2004 , p. 27), see p.361) especially in context of globalization which has evoked many challenges and has made human life more complex. Numbers= common language (language of quantification)  Rose (1999) = 4 types of numbers: as conferring power and legitimacy, as diagnostic element (e.g. opinion polls), as technology of judgment, as central technologies of government. Numbers are essential to making comparisons (global competition and standard checking). Numbers are also used to settle conflict, acting as a final word on something, thus “obscuring of the technical work involved in the production of objectivity” (p.362). Discussion of post-modernist rejection of meta-narratives and performativity (Lyotard, 1984; Ball, 2006). Lyotard argues that whether knowledge is true or false is unimportant (or at least less important); rather it is the performativity of knowledge that is privileged and numbers/ statistics are vital as performance technologies. Struture of feeling of neoliberalism: “gives priority to the individual pursuing his/her self interests over considerations of the collective or common good” (p.366). Compares neoliberal market economics with Keynsian welfare state (individual v. collective/ global (outward) v. national (inward) focus) = now we have ‘competition state’ (Cerny, 1990) and move towards governance, which is ruled by 3 changes: rescaling, reconstitution of competition state, privatization. Rescaling = changing political authority (see power of global/transnational groups such as EU or OECD) and enacted through “multilateral surveillance involving national policy reviews and international comparative performance measures” (p.368).  Impact of school: shifts to ethos/ positioning of schooling have changed parents as trusting/supportive of state education to ‘informed choosers’. Also, redistribution of funding in Howard era (to fund Catholic education = vote winner) has created quasi-market. Shifts in schooling post Rudd/Gillard = move towards more funding in education but framed around targets: “there is real redistributive funding involved in this National Partnership, but linked to narrow educational targets, framed by narrow accountabilities and salary rewards for school principals for committing to the agenda and achieving improved NAPLAN target scores” (p.371). Results in decline in teaching and learning as ‘teaching to the test’ becomes the dominant approach (responding to need to improve metrics and numbers). Also evidence that institutions (not just schools) are manipulating variables to skew data. Looks at indigenous education in Australia (p.376-7) and LBOTE category (p.377).  **Core argument:** “Policy as numbers and evidence-based policy both have potentially reductive effects on educational research” (p.377)… “We need research of policy and practice and research for policy and practice” (p.378)  **Interesting fact:** statistics emerged as field when the nation state evolved back in late 18th/early 19th century |
| Lingard, B.; Rawolle, S.; & Taylor, S. (2005). [Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680930500238945), *Journal of Education Policy,* 20(6), 759–777.  AUS  Annotated by Georgina Ramsay  Keywords: *Bourdieu*, *educational policy, globalization, field* | Bourdieu and the emergence of a global educational policy field   * Higher education policy is increasingly a global space; with fundamental changes as a result * The global scale of higher education policy means that international agencies such as the World Bank, OECD, and UNESCO influence HE goals, particularly allowing for increased focus on economic growth and innovation as a normative discourse around education policy * Based on Bourdieu, they theorise the: ‘global educational policy field’ * This global educational policy field moves toward heteronomous policy organised along economic logics * “The state is not powerless in the face of globalisation, but different states have varying capacities to manage ‘national interests’” (p.8) |
| Lingard, B. & Rawolle, S. (2011). [New scalar politics: implications for education policy](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03050068.2011.555941), *Comparative Education,* 47(4), 489–502.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Discusses comparative education in context of globalisation/ neoliberalism – challenge is that education extends beyond the boundaries of the nation state = rescaling politics, meaning that education policy now works in ‘global education policy field’.  **Theoretical frame:** Draw on Appadurai, 1996 (government to governance); Bourdieu, 2003 (‘national capital’ in global field)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Draws on two studies of policy developments that need to be read through lens of rescaled policyscape: 1) emergence/adoption of national knowledge economy policies in Australia and 2) effects of PISA as global metric scale of comparison between national/global education systems; both illustrate OECD as ‘transnational policy actor’. Makes case for shift from government to governance (see also Lingard, 2011). Seen in 3 explicit changes: changes to nations and global politics, policymaking in nations, heavier involvement of private sector. Changes to policymaking = more evidence based and accountability used to steer professional practice. Rescaling of educational policy means that nations work in different ways, so that the nation-state is more frequently positioned to compete in global economy, with comparisons between countries a central part of this rescaling. Argues that this can be understood as amassing ‘national capital’, seen in a country’s assets. Led to ‘economising’ of educational policy, practices of which are promoted by intra-governmental organisations like OECD/ World Bank etc. Education is central tool for global knowledge economics.  Global knowledge economy: discusses Batterham Review (2000), which was produced in time of national/ media dissatisfaction with funding for research and higher education, based on panic that Australia was ‘falling behind’ other OECD nations [see also Bradley Review]. Batterham offered “a final diagnosis which provided direct associations with the OECD’s knowledge-based economy policy” (p.495) and was mediated by field of media/journalism. Batterham proposed that funding should be viewed as an investment with returns, that new knowledge should be able to be commercialized, therefore funding should be increased to compete globally and to retain academics in Australia.  PISA: OECD, established in late 1990s (conducted 3-yearly: 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015) and measures students’ literacy, numeracy, science literacy and sometimes problem solving at age 15. In 2006, 57 countries participated; in 2009, nearly 100 participated. This constructs globe as “space of equivalence” (p.496), with “Expert consensus and the creation of a cognate epistemic community also grant legitimacy to this standardisation work of the OECD” (p.496). Quality and equity = two measures of analysis of PISA results: “the  strength of the effects of socio-economic status on student performance and the width of the gap between top-performing and poor-performing students” (p.497) = important policy devices in national education systems.  **Core argument:** “within the domain of education policy there has emerged a global education policy field that has policy effects within national education policy and policy processes” (p.498). |
| Lingard, B., Sellar, S., & Savage, G. (2014). [Re-articulating social justice as equity in schooling policy: the effects of testing and data infrastructures](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2014.919846), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(5), 710–730.  AUS  Annotation written by Sally Baker  Keywords: *policy, Programme for International Student Assessment, National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy, neo-social, topology, social justice as equity* | **Context:** Examines re-articulation of social justice as equity in schooling policy through large scale (national = NAPLAN/ global = OECD/PISA) testing systems and data infrastructures.  **Aim:** To document discursive changes in Australian educational policy and to examine the roles of NAPLAN and PISA as “technologies of measurement, comparison and governance” (p.724)  **Theoretical frame:** (re)spatialisation of education(al governance); ‘becoming topological/ topological of culture’ (Lury, Terranova and Parisi, 2012)  **Methodology:** Trace discursive conceptions of social justice as equity through two tools of measurement (NAPLAN and PISA)  **Findings:** Proliferation of data-driven accountability has changed meaning of ‘equity’: “multiple layers of technical and numerical mediation to measure equity” serve to abstract complex set of phenomena that cause/represent (in)equity into “graphs, grids, league tables and indices” (p.711).2  Measurements such as NAPLAN (Aus) & PISA (OECD) offer/shape very narrow definition of equity, although they do help to focus attention on ‘equity’. Equity measures in contemporary education policy are “highly reductionist” (p725) and inequitable – the collapsing of measurement into competition (who does best/worst) means that schools in impoverished communities need to work harder at improving test results than higher SES schools, thus narrowing opportunities for young people from poor families (p.726). NAPLAN and PISA deny a ‘politics of recognition’ – no space created to acknowledge different ‘starting posts’ (SB’s words) the discourse of fairness hides/ dismisses individual circumstances (ethnicity/culture). NAPLAN and PISA operate in topological rationality – “ever-changing spaces of calculative correlations” which “untethers social justice in schooling from implicit values and norms embedded in the cultural and political traditions of particular places” (p.713).  **Core argument: “**…social justice and equity are being transformed through the national and global reworking of education into a field of measurement and comparison” (p.711). The prevalence of numbers/ quantification of equity and schooling “has weakened the influence of conceptual-discursive accounts of what constitutes social justice in schooling.” (p.712) |
| Marginson, S. (2004). [National and Global Competition in Higher Education,](https://research.monash.edu/en/publications/national-and-global-competition-in-higher-education) *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 31(2), 1–28.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Review of competition in Australian and international higher education. Post-Nelson reforms context.  **Aim:** To explore economic competition in higher education (national and global) with focus on “the implications of national and global markets for the producer hierarchy of universities” (p.5)  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:**  Notes two conditions designed in policy to expand educational opportunities (widen participation): conditions governing student participation (financial support/ Whitlam assuming full cost) and conditions governing educational supply (stratification of secondary and tertiary sectors/ capped courses). However, in 1975 on 15% of school leavers went directly to university. Emphasis = always quantitative expansion of places and socioeconomic composition of students.  In 1964 = 19 universities in Australia = all considered to be largely equal and Commonwealth operating funding was for all universities (and were 90% funded by the government) -  *Marketisation policies*= began in the mid-80s following Thatcher/ Reagan moves towards deregulation and privatisation. Discussion began re: opening universities to market and moving away from government funding towards student contributions – started with $250 per student Higher Education Administration Charge (HEAC) and then HECS introduced at end of decade. Argument for HECS = couched in equity terms (minimising barriers for poorer students) but pushed responsibility and benefits onto individual. Neoliberal imaginary = “the world was nothing more than a map of opportunities for self-enrichment” (p.3) – provides list of examples of marketization strategies from late 80s to mid 2000s = faith in the 3 ‘Cs’: competition, corporatism, consumerism. Public investment dropped to under 40% of 1975 amount in real terms by 2001. Neoliberalism thus affected the two sets of conditions (participation/ supply).  *Globalisation*  Impact of world financial flows also played out in business of government and education was impacted. Notes increased numbers of international students (from 25k in 1990 to 185k in 2002. In 1985, decision made to charge international students ‘full fees’ and in 1988 existing international education (foreign aid based) = phased out with small number of subsidised places remaining [AusAid?] – these moves coincided with reductions in public funding.  *Economics*  Economic competitions = research funding, competitive academic schemes based on merit, targeted research projects in gov’t and corporate sectors. Comparisons made between markets/ loans schemes of US and Australian higher education (p.6). Positional advantage = winners and losers; positional market: “Producer universities compete for the custom of the most preferred ‘customers’, while student customers compete for entry to the most preferred institutions” (p.7) – in this context, social equality = impossible to achieve. At top = positional hierarchy = long-term stable; bottom end of market = more competitive and needs to do more to achieve less.  Describes stratified HE system in Australia: Sandstones/ Go8; Gumtrees (second or later universities prior to unification of system); Unitechs (previous universities of technology in state capitals), ‘New Universities’ conferred university status post-1987 (p.8). Describes research-funding potential (Sandstones find it easiest, followed by Gumtrees with medical facilities; new universities find it more difficult). Economic competition in Australia “sustains Sandstone hegemony, to an increasing degree, at the expense of the resources and prestige of all other universities” (p.12). Nelson reforms set to increase trends, student costs = increase sharply (pushing wealthy families to seek positional advantage from going abroad, given the cost of degrees rising to match prestige of positional goods): “The overall effect is to stretch the vertical hierarchy and widen the gaps between  segments” (p.14) and “The driving force of the Nelson reforms is the economisation of social privilege in education” (p.14).  *International education*  No foreseeable limits to global market (in terms of restricting provision to maintain positional advantage) – “as long as a foreign education leverages upward social mobility within and between nations” (p.16). Doctoral education = second global market. Examines global university hierarchy.  Notes hegemony and homogeneity of English language in perpetuating global university markets – but in longer term, “nations must develop their own national capacity in higher education to modify Americanisation and maximise their strategic options within the worldwide university network” (see Taiwan and Singapore, p.24) |
| Marginson, S. (2009). [National system reform in global context: The case of Australia](https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/about/fellows/simon-marginson). *Reforms and consequences in higher education system: An international symposium. Centre for National University Finance and Management (CNUFM).* 26 January 2009, National Center of Sciences, Hitotubashi Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Discussion of New Public Management (NPM) reforms in context of Australian HE – presumably NPM/ HE reform was a key aspect of the symposium. Discussed in context of 3 theorisations of freedom from Sen (1985): ‘agency freedom’ = sense of identity, purpose and centred will; ‘freedom as control’ (negative freedom; absence of constraint or control by external party); ‘freedom as power/effective power’ = capacity to do what you want and have resources to do so (all p.2). Also discusses HE in context of global knowledge economy – is knowledge a public good or is it a commercialisable commodity? Globalisation (advent of internet and cheaper travel) has also supported rapid growth of NPM reforms across the world (but NPM and globalisation not same/ NPM pre-dates globalisation. Globalisation provides many pretexts for NPM reforms but also provides wiggle room as HEIs, especially leading research universities, already enjoy cross-border collaborations and have set up offshore campuses which are accredited in foreign jurisdictions. Also, online provision (at time of writing) was relatively unregulated by national standards.  **Core argument:**  **Aim:** To unpack the history of HE reforms in Australia so as to demonstrate the key strengths and weaknesses of NPM reform – Australia is a good case study/ “a notable example of successfully implemented NPM reforms” (p.1). NPM = use of competitive systems, mix of private/public funding, business models, output and product format and strong executive steering. NPM = operationalization of neo-liberal ideology?  **Findings:** Explores strengths and weaknesses of NPM in Australian HE context and offers historical analysis of origins and implementation of NPM reforms.  *Major strengths*: “pronounced capacity to respond to new developments and take strategic initiatives, especially offshore” (p.1) and reduced reliance on public purse. Institutions have more autonomy over budgets and new programs  *Major weaknesses*: teaching and research capacity diminished, academic cultures weakened, loss of intra-system diversity and less control over teaching and research. Production of knowledge as public good replaced with globalised competitive intellectual property (IP) markets (“direct economic benefits”).  *Historical overview*: global recessions in mid 1970s led to dismantling of government-funded welfare state. The NPM developed from this ideological shift – budgeting and efficiency movements (quasi-business models) became explicitly goal-driven with much more focused surveillance, accounting/audit and measurement. NPM = ‘do more with less’. See Thatcher (and Reagan??) governments (privatisation of state commodities = neo-liberalism). In context of HE, all goods produced were seen as private goods and organisation of institution changed to more competitive ‘firms’, including/contextualised by competitive financial allocations, product formats, private revenue raising and greater role for private enterprise. Neo-liberalism = justified reduced public investment in public institutions (‘fiscal restraint’).  In Australia, Murray (1957) and then Martin (1964) set out modernised mass education system in Australia with federal funding the shaping force through income tax and spending role = a two-tier system (universities and CAEs). International education was provided through Colombo Plan. In 1974, tuition fees were abolished and the Commonwealth assumed nearly full funding responsibility for HE (90% of revenue). Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) was the statutory body (similar to HEFCE – TEQSA = new TEC??) = buffer between government and HEIs. **Dawkins reforms** in late 1980s/1990 = key NPM reform moment in Australian HE. 1) abolished TEC; 2) new emphasis on role of universities in creating economic benefits – both public and private; 3) expand graduates by 50%; 4) treat universities more like businesses; 5) HEIs encouraged to raise revenue from non-governmental sources – preferably business and industry to strengthen economic development; 6) research funding was separated from teaching funding; 7) abolished free tuition and creation of HECS “accompanied by statements about the private benefits of higher education” (p.8). HECS initially claimed back 25% of costs of tuition, which later rose to 50% (but HECS not fully subject to market logic; instead number of HECS places was regulated and caps placed on HECS charges). HE bifurcated into government planned and subsidised space (UG) and autonomous, commercial, expansionary capitalist segment (with more weight placed on latter over time). 8) CAEs and universities combined into one unified HE system – implemented through system of incentives and sanctions – and introduced competitive allocation of teaching and research funding (research capacity was not equally distributed – older, more established research institutions got more); 9) restructure led to VCs becoming tantamount to CEOs with more strategic and operational freedom/ power; 10) performance-related funding difficult to implement but new measurements implemented as part of quality assurance drive (such as student satisfaction surveys and graduate outcomes); 11) HEIs encouraged to create output transparency and efficiency incentives in management of academic units, which transformed internal cultures (in = managers/ executives/ out = old academic structures); 12) governance structures changed to align more with corporate models (fewer people, more representation from business/ external worlds, members to be independent from HEI’s interests, staff and student representation generally diminished). All these transformations were uneven and led to creation of groupings like Go8 (older universities = more research, more privileged, better resourced). In 1995, full indexation of gov’t grants replaced by partial indexation and triggered a decline in teaching costs and proportion of total revenue covered by gov’t. **Howard government (1996-2007):** things remained the same but the public investment in HE continued to decrease and student HECS charges increased sharply and international student numbers grew substantially (from 25,000 in 1990 to 250,000+ in 2006) – but increase in international students + reduction in public funding (especially for teaching) meant that any surplus from increased revenue from international students was spent on the costs of raising that revenue (aka supporting international students, marketing, new buildings and facilities). In 2005, HECS-style income contingent loans were extended to private providers, triggering a rapid growth in private institutions. Relationships between government and HEIs deteriorated during Howard years. **Labor (2007-2013) Bradley Review** (2008) reviewed HE and made many suggestions, particularly around the funding of teaching, research, student living costs and urged a return to near-full indexation of gov’t grants. However, Bradley et al. did not propose a change in system of governance, although it did call for new regulatory body (now TEQSA?).  Summary of reformed Australian HE system: part free market/ part public regulation = competitive quasi-market HE system for research funding/ international students, postgraduate (“expansionary commercial markets” p.14) but tightly regulated undergraduate education (public funding and income contingent loans).  **Conclusions**: “Institutions are more tightly managed, a professional executive culture has been installed successfully at all levels and a performance culture is nearly universal across institutions and the system… [there is] greater transparency and accountability [and] a more entrepreneurial culture at both academic unit and institutional level” … “However, public policy… has difficulty in securing traction in areas such as equity objectives which depend on a broad-based cultural change rather than driving behaviour through formulae, mechanisms, targets and incentives and the other mechanisms of political economy” (p.16). |
| Marginson, S. (2011). [Equity, status and freedom: A note on higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0305764X.2010.549456), *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1): 23-36.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; policy; socioeconomic background; widening participation* | **Context:** Paper responds in part to OECD reports on equity in higher education and explores two assumptions about equity that guide equity/WP enactments: fairness and inclusion (and HE policy is seen as either a success or failure, depending on the ontology). Fairness is based on growth in the total number of people from equity groups while inclusion is based on proportional distribution of different groups of students – “ranked in hierarchy of social advantage” (p.24).  **Aim:** To discuss two dominant views of equity – fairness and inclusion – as well as the types of freedom HE makes possible and the impact of status on equity.  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Sen (2009) for discussion of social justice and Sen (1985) for 3 types of freedom (as agency, as power, as control)  **Findings:**  *Equity as fairness or inclusion*  1985 OECD report was based around equity-as-inclusion (proportional distribution) while 2008 OECD review placed main emphasis on fairness, but gave more weight to inclusion than in 1985. Offers example of ‘Transforming Australia’s HE System’ (2009) as example of policy that includes both fairness (40% of 25-34 year olds) and inclusion (20% low SES) but fairness given priority because it was to be achieved 5 years before the inclusion target – also because there will be no change that “Would weaken the hold of existing social users of the system” (p.29), the target is not likely to be met. In this case, Marginson argues that universities will likely be positioned as “villains” for not doing enough, thus warranting “a slackening of support for measures to strengthen the position of the disadvantaged” (p.29), which happened in 1980s. Marginson asks: “Is equity policy in higher education doomed to be the domain of perpetual unacheivement, in which equity programs are periodically tried and periodically fall away again?” (p.29). Yes – if fairness remains in dominant position (it should be inclusion). “…enhancement of equity can only succeed when manifest in behavioural change” (p.31)  *Two notions of social justice*  Sen (2009) reviewed justice and outlined two traditions: 1) ‘transcendent institutionalism’ = utopian ideal of what justice might look like (social arrangements like law, systems and institutions) = fairness; 2) ‘realisation-focused comparison’ = achievement of social justice in actual situations/ justice is plural and interest-bound = inclusive.  *Freedoms*  Sen (1985) argues there are 3 types of freedom: as agency, as power, as control and the self-determining person is constituted by all 3. Agency = having the capacity to act; power = freedom from constraint. HE has the potential to augment students’ agency freedom and freedom as power “through learning, knowledge and credentialing” (p.30). Also, discussion of how these freedoms connect with fairness and inclusion – fairness “strategies focus on purifying the mechanisms of fair competition… [b]ut this neglects the fact that individual agents have an unequal capacity to compete” (p.30). Equity as inclusion has 3 implications for practice: 1) a one-size-fits-all approach is ‘not optimal’; 2) people who have experienced disadvantage are the best drivers of inclusive practice; 3) the excluded need to be included throughout the system (beyond HE – in schools, colleges, communities, families and public debate).  *Status*: “The ubiquity of status in higher education is a formidable challenge to equity” (p.31). Universities are instrumental in creating and perpetuating social status and this is their “primary currency” so that “Leading universities attract leading students and high achieving staff in an on-going process of social exchange” and “knowledge is ordered according to the status of universities that produce it and in continuous judgements about relative position in systems of research publication and valuation” (p.31). Some countries – like Australia – pretend that status does not exist. As a result, “governments may buy marginal progress towards its fairness target and avoid a costly political confrontation, while the disadvantaged are mostly fobbed off with places in least valued institutions” (p.32).  Marginson raises question about equity and international students (p.33) |
| Mars, M.M.; Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2008). [The state-sponsored student entrepreneur](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.2008.11772122), *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(6), 638 – 670.  US  Annotation by Anna Xavier  Keywords (Anna’s): *academic capitalism; student entrepreneurship, higher education* | **Context:** Academic capitalism has been theorized and empirically detailed as a new knowledge/learning regime in Slaughter & Rhoades’ (2004) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education.*. However, students’ roles were examined ‘primarily as educational consumers rather than as students engaging the (in)formal curricula and as academic entrepreneurs’ (p. 638).  **Aim:** To ‘extend and modify the academic capitalist framework by theorizing and empirically developing the instructional dimension of the academic capitalism knowledge/learning regime, examining the new roles institutions are supporting for students educationally as entrepreneurs’ (p. 638). RQs: 1. Do student entrepreneurship and associated market transactions reflect shifts in the boundaries among public, non-profit, and for- profit organizations, and if so, do universities aggressively pursue ownership of students’ products? 2. Do student entrepreneurs intersect new circuits of knowledge that connect curricula and classroom experience to the market? 3. Does the entrepreneurial learning environment of the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime promote the role of the state- sponsored student entrepreneur, and if so, how and with what implications for the student/faculty relationship?  **Theoretical frame:** Academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).  **Methodology:** Case studies of two universities (University of Iowa (UI - large, selective, very high research activity) & University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP - moderate-sized, less selective, high research activity); Sampling strategy: Purposeful sampling; Guiding criteria for selection: ‘(a) the presence of a formalized, institutionally recognized entrepreneurship education center; and (b) the existence of or intended goal of establishing an entrepreneurial incubator accessible to students’ (p. 645); Case 1: Covers undergraduate & graduate levels at UI: ‘centers on the commercialization of bioinformatics software by students who worked as undergraduate assistants in the laboratory where the research supporting the software was conducted’ (p. 646); software developed – Bio:Neos; Case 2: At graduate level (at UTEP):’ involves the discovery of marketable, sustainable, and eco-friendly pigment’ (p. 646); Resulting venture - Mayan Pigments, Inc; Data collection methods: Semi-structured interviews (n=28); Document analysis – ‘documents specific to each university’s entrepreneurship education model and curricular structure as well as institutional policies regarding market behaviors’ (p. 647); Data analysis: Employed a structured coding framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994).  **Findings:** Case 1: Bio::Neos at the University of Iowa - Bio::Neos is a student-founded company born out of the UI’s Coordinated Center for Computational Genomics (CLCG); created by three former undergraduate engineering students who had completed or were near completing master’s degrees in electrical and computer engineering (all share equal positions in the venture); three students were first exposed to the scientific knowledge used in developing the software as undergraduate laboratory assistants in the CLCG; three faculty members have undisclosed amounts of equity in Bio::Neos; company contract is not available for public viewing. Q1: Shifting boundaries & market transactions - knowledge used in the creation of the company’s software stemmed from the graduate thesis of one of the students (idea gained from experience as an undergraduate lab assistant); based on university policy - the university does not take a copyright on any information or materials related to student work required for the completion of a degree; ‘Student rights to ownership of intellectual property linked to formal education as clarified through official university policy contributed to the student’s capacity to act as a state-sponsored entrepreneur’ (p. 649); However, despite apparent clarity of preceding UI policy, the student’s initial exposure to the knowledge leading to his thesis while employed as a university research assistant complicates the ownership of the intellectual property linked to the software -, a case claiming the student work as “work-for-hire” could have been made (p. 649); Benefits for UI: No direct benefits, but several indirect benefits – a) market successes of state-sponsored student entrepreneurs contribute to a pro- business institutional climate, which is always important to regional industries and employers b) UI can claim a contribution to regional economic development and use the contribution to leverage state legislative support. c) entrepreneurial success plays a part in attracting possible donor support d) the entrepreneurial activities of students open possibilities for recruiting other like-minded students.; Q2: New circuits of knowledge - Bio::Neos is a new circuit of knowledge that is highly representative of the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime in the new economy; the establishment of Bio::Neos and the commercialization of its software involved a “rewiring” of the university for such activity; The UI entrepreneurship education center played an essential role in the commercialization of the Bio::Neos software; Key private funders of UI entrepreneurship education center – John Pappajohn & Tom Bedell; The center provided the Bio::Neos students access to its entrepreneurial incubator under the agreement that at least one student from the team enrol and complete an entrepreneurship studies course, which benefited the center and university by producing student credit hours and tuition dollars; Bio::Neos students operated within a complex organizational environment constructed around internal and external networks and newly created knowledge circuits and supported by an amalgamation of public, not-for-profit, and for-profit individuals and groups; partitions separating public and private sectors were replaced with a structure that explicitly intersected the public university with those private markets, creating a ‘fluid environment’ (p. 652) that can produce and distribute subsidies to student entrepreneurs; Q3: Entrepreneurial learning environment - The Bio::Neos students were engaged in traditional curriculum centered on engineering principles and knowledge, but the curriculum also included intellectual property & other market-oriented topics; integration of entrepreneurial principles into the UI engineering curriculum was ‘explicit and apparent’ to students (p. 653); Bio::Neos students received formal training in the area of entrepreneurship that was beyond what was included in their engineering coursework; Examples of the course topics offered to students through the entrepreneurship center included ‘technology applications for the entrepreneur, entrepreneurial marketing, strategic management of technology and innovation, entrepreneurial consulting, and advance business planning’ (p. 653); entrepreneurial learning environment at UI has promoted the emergence of state-sponsored student entrepreneurs in a variety of ways – Bio::Neos - students were encouraged to be entrepreneurial by the faculty overseeing their past work within the research laboratory as undergraduate assistants; Overall conclusion- this case marks the emergence of a new role for students: ‘university-sponsored student entrepreneur’. Case 2: Mayan Pigments, Inc. at UTEP - The Materials Research and Technology Institute (MRTI) at UTEP is an organization designed to create employment opportunities for UTEP graduates, develop intellectual property for the institute and university; The institute has developed collaborations with 8 research universities in the United States and 20 Mexican institutions; Mayan Pigments, Inc. is the first spin-off company to originate out of the MRTI and the university as a whole - centers on the pigment technology of ancient Mayan peoples, which was recently rediscovered within the labs of the MRTI; An MRTI graduate student (completed doctoral studies in materials science and engineering) played a primary role in the scientific discovery of the now patented pigment and the commercialisation of the product through the creation Mayan Pigments, Inc; The student is currently the co-owner and Chief Technology Officer (CTO) of Mayan Pigments, Inc; Faculty member who introduced the pigment to her is a co-owner; Q2: Shifting boundaries and market transactions - Both faculty member and graduate student researching the Mayan pigment determined the technology had significant market potential; the university will ‘retain a 5% equity holding in the company if and when it becomes a publicly traded firm’ (p. 656), pursuing a minimal financial profit; Q3: New circuits of knowledge: Being UTEP’s first start-up company, Mayan Pigments, Inc. constitutes a ‘new circuit of knowledge creation for the university’ (p. 656); co-founders of the company received consultation from entrepreneurial experts, including students, within UTEP’s well-established and rapidly expanding entrepreneurship education center- The Centers for Entrepreneurial Development, Advancement, Research, and Support (CEDARS) (comprised of nine programs and initiatives); The Kauffman funding has stimulated cross-disciplinary faculty participation in entrepreneurship education; company founders also received support from other interstitial units at UTEP; Q3: Entrepreneurial learning environment - The Mayan Pigments, Inc. case unfolded as a ‘classic teaching-learning exchange’ (p. 657); new step - faculty member offering a suggestion about commercializing the knowledge, which the student acted upon, in class; The MRTI was complemented by local, state, and federal government initiatives aimed at revitalizing the El Paso metroplex (see Mars, 2006); organizational initiatives and the administrators and business leaders associated with them provided an entrepreneurial learning environment that instructed faculty and students about the viability of commercial ventures linked to scientific knowledge and discovery; the informal but explicit lesson learned by the student was to approach research not just with curiosity but from an entrepreneurial standpoint of translating scientific inquiry into commercial endeavour.  **Discussion:** 1) Both cases indicate the ‘emergence of a new student role – ‘state-sponsored entrepreneur’, which is consistent with & possible due to the ‘development of an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime that collapses the boundaries between public & private sectors and that constructs an organizational infrastructure for developing & pursuing new circuits of knowledge creation’ (pp. 658 -659). The findings modify & extend the academic capitalist framework in the following ways: a) the cases ‘recast students as potential entrepreneurs, active agents, and beneficiaries of academic capitalism, not simply as its commodities and/or victims’ (p. 659); b) the cases suggest that ‘at least in the early stages of promoting student entrepreneurship, universities are not aggressively pursuing their ownership claims to the property being created’ (p. 659); c) the cases point towards ‘examples of distinctive circuitry that involves external players promoting entrepreneurship’s benefits more widely within the academy and some universities and units promoting more locally and even public good oriented commercial ventures’(p. 659); d) the cases enable identification of ‘entrepreneurial learning environments that at least in some places are emerging within universities in ways that redefine the faculty/student relationship to include a dimension of entrepreneurial partners’ (p. 659).  **Core argument: ‘**The exploration of the emergent role of the state-sponsored student entrepreneur introduces a new dimension to the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime: The position of the student as active agent of academic capitalism challenges Slaughter and Rhoades’ (2004) view that students are marginalized within the capitalist academy. Consistent with the depiction of the traditional entrepreneur (Bygrave & Minniti, 2000, Drucker, 1993; Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Minniti & Bygrave, 1999; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), the state-sponsored student entrepreneur recognizes and leverages the entrepreneurial environments, infrastructures, and resources of their university to their private, commercial advantage’ (p. 664). |
| Mavelli, L. (2014). [Widening participation, the instrumentalization of knowledge and the reproduction of inequality](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2014.934352?journalCode=cthe20), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 19(8), 860–869.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Foucault; widening participation; instrumental knowledge; neoliberalism; reproduction of inequality* | **Context:** Uses Foucault to examine the conception of knowledge (modernity) that underpins widening participation.  **Aim:** Draws on Burke (2012)’s analysis of WP to ask: “Have widening participation policies contributed to counteract the neoliberal trend of widening inequalities as far as HE is concerned?” (p.861).  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Foucault’s two notions of knowledge: *savoir* (process through which individual is transfigured by knowledge/ process of learning) and *connaissance* (where knowledge is seen to be ‘external’ to the individual). Idea that subject can have access to knowledge without spiritual transformation = hallmark of modernity (see Descartes and Kant)  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Mavelli argues that WP = part of the ‘neoliberal episteme’. Two main arguments: 1) WP = contributes to idea of knowledge as connaissance; 2) WP = based on neoliberal rationalities which have turned students into “seemingly equal consumers of knowledge” (p.861), but that actually WP reinforces inequities along socioeconomic lines. Mavelli notes that Habermas made a similar argument in the 70s (about universities privileging ‘technically exploitable knowledge’ over cultural self-knowledge and ‘normative values’ (see p.862), and are thus part of the “bureaucratic rationalization” (p.862). Mavelli cites literature that notes instrumental rationality in higher education (see McLean, 2006; Delanty, 2001; Morley, 2003; Williams, 2012.) and ‘students as consumers’. Notes that New Labour’s vision of WP = “based on an instrumentalist and consumerist idea of knowledge as connaissance, that is, knowledge as an instrumental set of notions external to the subject rather than a process of transformation of the self” (p.862). Examines discursive positioning of WP (HE = aiding UK to compete with ‘global competitors’ while ‘offering significant benefits to individuals’ = based on instrumental terms). Thus the government adopted a market logic to assess the merit of WP policies. Mavelli argues that social justice has been subsumed by the economic imperative (p.864), which is a product of the instrumentalisation and commodification of knowledge. This contributes to knowledge as “a disciplining  framework, which restricts the students’ horizon of who they are and what they could become by turning them into another cog in the machine of neoliberal accumulation” (p.864).  Neoliberal-inspired WP = focused on creation of new labels, such as ‘non-traditional students’ who are ‘outside the norm’ (quotes interview between Joanna Williams and David Blunkett). WP under neoliberal regime = to focus on psychologizing and pathologising individuals rather than collective/structural constraints, and which position groups in deficit and to blame for the ‘dumbing down’ of HE standards (Leathwood & O’Connell, 2003), and permits the “reproduction and perpetuation of the neoliberal myth of classless society” (p.865). Mavelli reviews literature that speaks to the subordination of ‘non-traditional’ students and their stratification into less elite universities (Reay, 2003; Tett, 2004; Reay, Crozier & Clayton, 2010) |
| McCaig, C. (2015). [The impact of the changing English higher education marketplace on widening participation and fair access: evidence from a discourse analysis of access agreements](http://shura.shu.ac.uk/9637/3/McCaig_Discourse_analysis_of_access_agreements_FINAL.pdf), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 17(1), 5–22.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Widening Participation, Fair Access, Office for Fair Access, National Scholarship Programme, Differentiation, Marketisation* | **Context:** UK HE in time of Conservative government (post-‘Students at the heart of the system’ White Paper, Browne Review, National Scholarship Programme, OFFA policies re: Access Agreements) and in context of higher tuition fees and changing policy field. Author argues that these changes have resulted in changes towards positioning of WP and students over time (comparing 2006/7 to 2012/13) – more emphasis on ‘brightest’ rather than traditional WP activities focused on all people. National Scholarship Programme (NSP) = funded 1/6 of number of students supported in previous iteration = shift from increasing overall number of students to increasing (smaller) number of WP students into prestigious universities/ courses. Review of WP in UK (p.9-10).  **Aim:** To identify discourses of marketization in UK HE policy, particularly differentiation of/between different types of universities as a result of policy changes (tuition fee increases); looking at possibilities for WP in different types of universities through DA of policy documents/ Access Agreements  **Theoretical frame:** Critical discourse theory + theory of marketisation  **Methodology:** Discourse analysis of 20 Access Agreement statements from 2006/7 and 20 from 2012/13 (same 10 RG and same 10 post-92 universities for both periods)  **Findings:** Key themes derived from analysis = strategic aims and objectives, historical record on access, access enhancement statements, outreach targeting.  Post-1992 universities = particularly vulnerable “to the changing context for widening participation created by economic downturn and the introduction of higher fees, as well as competitive market pressures for potentially contracting student numbers during the 2006-2012 period” (p.11). In 2012/13, post-92 unis had to focus more on retention and success, lead to post-92 universities appearing.  Pre-1992 universities had to work towards helping disadvantaged students to meet grades requirements. Discusses ‘Realising Opportunity’ scheme run by some RG universities to prepare young people for any research-intensive university. Therefore, pre-92 universities have not had to adapt far from their original and stated goal = to recruit the brightest and best – but with consideration of WP principles  **Core argument:** McCaig’s analysis suggests that, in reaction to increased marketization and intra-university competition, “Institutions are seeking to create and sustain narratives that differentiate them from institutions of another type” (p.18); post-92 universities have had to accommodate more towards new policy field: “reflecting the ongoing differentiation of the sector due to long term marketisation as well as the specific policy changes” (p.19). Post-92 universities are particularly threatened by policy changes (declines in typical student bodies (e.g, mature age/ part time). |
| McCowan, T. (2015). [Three dimensions of equity of access to higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03057925.2015.1043237), *Compare: A journal of Comparative and International Education,* 46(4), 645–665.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *access to higher education, equity, higher education policy, widening participation, university admissions* | **Context:** Compares initial access/equity policies of England, Brazil and Kenya = all three are significantly different countries but all have implemented expansion of HE systems and access to university, resulting in increased stratification (quality and prestige). Heart of problem = expansion doesn’t mean recognitive distribution of places/ proportional distribution. Lists dichotomies that characterise tension: “tensions between equity and efficiency, public versus private, academic versus vocational and views on human ability and potential” (p.2). Author makes conceptual distinction between equity and equality (p.4)  **Aim:** To contribute “the ‘bare bones’ of a common understanding of equity (p.2) – but acknowledges heterogeneity of global picture (uneven resources). Questions ‘sufficientarianism’ in that is it ok for everyone “to have access *some* form of higher education… but for significant inequality to be allowed in relation to the nature of the higher education?” (p.5) – explored through analysis of benefits each form offers (intrinsic, instrumental, positional). Discusses notion of ‘affirmative action’ for ameliorating positional disadvantage in terms of access/admissions (e.g. bonus points if student comes from low SES area) = example of tension between procedural and social justices. Also discusses epistemological access (access doesn’t necessarily translate into meaningful engagement and curricula privilege particular ways of knowing/knowledges – see Clegg 2011 and Wheelahan 2007).  McCowan rejects a universalist position (aka all people should go to university) on grounds of desire and ability. “Access to higher education institutions then should be based on criteria, not competitive allocation of a fixed (and small) number of places” and higher education systems are not fair if they restrict certain individuals and groups to institutions and experiences that confer less positional advantage (p.8).  **Theoretical frame:** Explores notion of equity (position taken akin to ‘fairness’) and underpinning approaches: (egalitarianism and sufficientarianism). Egalitarianism = ‘equal’ distribution of resources/ opportunities; sufficientarianism = “a minimal level to which all people should be raised, but that inequality beyond that point is acceptable” (p.4), which means not inadvertently disadvantaging those with most talent/ putting in most effort. Social justice requires egalitarian approach.  **Methodology:** Case study of 3 counties (high income-long established HE system; middle-income, rapidly expanding HE system; low-income, expanding but limited ((to age)) HE system). They have enrolment rates of approximately 49%, 15% and 4%, respectively (p.10)  **Findings:** Three countries have developed “diverse policy responses” to equity agenda (p.3).  Entry to HE = academic performance (e.g. = end of school exams v. entrance tests) and payment of fees. Availability of places = extremely diverse across world and related to national wealth.  *Description of England –* public system, highly stratified, universal loan system  *Description of Brazil –* public (state-run, totally free – access dependent on competitive exams) and private (direct fees to students) universities. Most prestigious universities in public sector (exception of Catholic universities). Expansion in 1990s – privatisation = more private HEIs and rapid growth in student numbers. Access for low SES students “severely limited” (p.12) because of connections with prior educational experience (impact on ability to pass entrance test). Therefore, fees are a major deterrent for low SES students in private unis. Since 2002 (Workers’ Party governance), student places have grown – mostly through tax breaks for private universities to offer free places to low SES students. BUT = lower prestige HEIs = lower value on employment market. Also discusses policy of quotas (e.g. for students from gov schools/ African Brazilians = “having a significant impact on the composition of students in the high-prestige public universities, although in the context of limited expansion of the overall number of free-of-charge places” (p.12-3)  *Description of Kenya* – 22 public and 21 private universities in Kenya. Access is very limited (only 4% gross enrolment ratio) – low rates of female participation and regional areas. Public = entrance tests; private = fees; “competitive exams for public universities and fees for private universities ensure that lower-income students have access to neither” (p.13). However, students who don’t pass entrance test to prestigious public unis can pay high fees for place – but there is no distinction in qualification (aka employers don’t know who got in on merit and who got in by paying). Model of expansion = limit free places but allow for expansion of fee-paying places in both public and private universities.  **Core argument:** Proposes three principles for understanding equity: availability, accessibility and horizontality. All 3 countries have sought to increase availability but this is not always accompanied by increases in accessibility (because of competitive exams and fees). Two examples of policy to address this: student loans in England and scholarships in Brazil; also see affirmative action (racial quotas) in Brazil. However, equity issues persist for students who have lower/less access to resources. Instead, McCowan suggests horizontality to address stratification of HE: “the characteristic of even prestige and quality  across the system” so that “this diversity should exist in the context of consistently high quality  and recognition of diplomas in the broader society” (p.15). A horizontal system would not mean uniformity in HEIs; rather it would allow less privileged students into more elite institutions. It would “not preclude differentiation in study type or outcome” and could allow for “highly specialised forms of training and subsequent work”. More work needs to be done on variability of fees that contributes to stratified system (e.g. Brazilian system). Affirmative action can address access and horizontality but not availability. Academic preparation (minimum level) = one selection criterion that address all 3 principles – but requires a whole-of-system approach (and free of charge preparation should be offered for students whose schools are resource-poor) and there should be easy re-entry points for students who take a non-linear pathway (p.17). |
| Mockler, N. (2014). [Simple solutions to complex problems: moral panic and the fluid shift from ‘equity’ to ‘quality’ in education](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/rev3.3028), *Review of Education,* 2(2), 115–143.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Set in context of individualised conceptualisation of education (‘neoliberal imaginary’) and driving productivity/ human capital theory – claims that educational panic is used by politicians and media to obscure persistent issues with inequity in education. Scopes critiques of equity as discourse – noting access = positioned as choice within market and relations with class/SES. Offers critique of ‘third way politics’ and its impact on Labor government (e.g. Rudd, 2007) = narrow conception of excellence and equity. Scopes literature on panic (David Marr) and shock doctrine (Naomi Klein) and ‘manufactured crises’ (Berliner & Biddle, 1995)  **Aim:** To examine perceived ‘crisis’ in ‘teacher quality’ and shifts away from discourses of equity in education; to examine “how problems related to educational equity are reframed as problems of ‘quality’ within neoliberal  regimes, and the mechanisms of this reframing in the public space“ (p.117)  **Theoretical frame:** Argues that panic = neoliberal tool; draws on Goffman’s (1974) framing theory for analysis and discourse analysis (Foucault0  **Methodology:** Case study of ‘policy moment’ in Australian higher education policy = 42 speeches, media texts and policy documents related to a single event = ‘Gonski Review’ in Sep 2012. Three level content analysis  **Findings:** In first level of analysis, equity did not emerge as own ‘package’/ dominant contributor to frame – equity replaced with ‘quality’. Three main packages/ themes:   1. Saving the nation’s education system (“national moral crusade”, p.124) – mocked by conservative press 2. School improvement – focus shifted from school funding to school *improvement* (my emphasis), including justification for NAPLAN 3. Teacher quality - e.g. raising university entrance requirements for teacher education   **Core argument:** Through analysis of the policy moment, it is evident that discourses shifted from equity to teacher quality and school improvement, based on a perception of crisis/ panic = related to performativity (Ball, 2012) “Discourses of quality are linked to audit cultures through the accountability and compliance structures that are invariably seen as the key to ‘improvement’… As a consequence of the reframing of ‘quality’ at the hands of neoliberal discourses, teacher habitus is currently being impacted and reshaped by a number of linked and interlocking trajectories, each related to the discourse of quality” (p.136). However, such accountability has positive potential for making teachers more trusted/ vigilant and committed to contributing to public debate around education |
| Morsy, L.; Gulson, K.; & Clarke, M. (2014). [Democracy, ‘sector-blindness’ and the delegitimation of dissent in neoliberal education policy: a response to Discourse 34(2), May 2013](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2014.890267), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(3): 444-461.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *school funding; marketisation; education policy; race; equity; federalism* | **Context:** Works in conversation with SI on marketization and equity in education (Savage, Sellar & Gorur, 2013). Examines school sector (public, Catholic, private) in response to ‘sector blindness’ with regards to federal funding of schooling, as per comment by Peter Garrett (then Labor politician). Authors argue it is important to probe the role played by different school sectors in ‘educational politics of distribution’ and context of equity and markets.  **Theoretical frame:** Foucauldian genealogy of school funding (cite: Bevir, 2008; Nietzsche, 1887/2003; Foucault, 1975; Ball, 2013). Also: Laclau & Mouffe’s (2001) ‘thinking tools’ of equivalence and difference  **Methodology:** Essay  **Findings:**  Genealogy of school funding: works from premise that funding and construction of school system = a ‘ historical and ideological construction’ (see Kenway, 2013) and argues against reforms such as Gonski which tinker with funding of all sections of system and appears to have “taken the underlying system of government funding of private schools as a priori and immutable” (p.446). Rather, these are movable systems. Funding on ‘non-government’ schools (e.g. Catholic/private) = part of equity-based, needs-focused approach = sector blind but authors argue that contested notions of equity as ‘fairness’ now absent. Genealogical analysis suggests two pushes towards current status quo: push away from “collective well-being to promoting individual advancement” (p.446) and education as tool for economic growth/ employment. Historical genealogy: traces evolution of schooling in Australia from beginning of 19th century (church responsibility). Catholics initially involved because of large Irish immigrant population and Australia = welfare state = schooling was based on principles of equity, disadvantage and social/economic assimilation. Catholic schools began receiving small tax deductions for school fees in mid-1950s. in 1968, recurring grants for private schools began. Menzies saw this as vote winner, replicated by Whitlam in 1970s. In 1981, High Court ruled in favour of Commonwealth assistance to non-government schools. In 1987, progressive left Education Minister replaced by neoliberal economic rationalist Dawkins = turning point for Australian schooling (and higher education). Through subsequent economic rationalistic governments/ policies, “Australian society became more socioeconomically polarised, with an eroded middle class and growing class divisions” (p.450), resulting in greater uptake of independent schools in efforts to socially mobilise and gain positional advantage. In terms of funding, authors argue: “There has been a shift in emphasis in Australian education over the past 150 years, with primary and secondary schooling increasingly being seen as a positional good, as distinct from other broader purposes of education (such as democratic citizenry, nation-building and collective well-being)” (p.451). Post-Gonski federal (Labor) education policy = “deeply political in its support for the status quo” (p.453). Authors cite Connell (2013) who asserts that ‘evidence-based’ = emperor’s new clothes in contemporary politics because “neo-liberal policy-making proceeds as if it already knows the answer to policy problems. (Connell, 2013: 284, on p.453). Sector blind/ colour blind: Gonski = only two mentions of ethnicity/ethnic (compared with 27 references to indigenous in first 64 pages). Ethnicity/race = occluded due to “obstinate refusal to consider ethnic diversity” (p.453) even though there is plenty of evidence to suggest it is a significant factor, thus “disregarding that students from different ethnicities are disproportionately overrepresented in the government sector, underrepresented in the private sector and segregated and racialised when conflated with different schools” (p.454). Authors argue that NAPLAN and My School = technocratic policy response to marketised education system – positioning all parents as market players (Gorur, 2013) **Core argument:** Sector-blindness leads to a system that is “*de*politicised with significant consequences both for individuals and for groups, and for society as a whole” (p.452). We all need to recognize that education is political and that educational imaginaries = limited by politics and policies |
| Naidoo, R. (2016). [The competition fetish in higher education: varieties, animators and consequences](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01425692.2015.1116209), *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 37(1), 1–10.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Editorial for SI in BJSE. Argues that universities are trapped in a national/international competition fetish, which is underpinned by “’master economic imaginary’ of the knowledge economy”– fuelled by intensified “struggle for positional advantage”, increased global mobility and demand for highly skilled knowledge workers (p.1). ‘Fetish’ = “describe an irrational belief in magical powers which are invested in an object to protect from harm or to make wishes come true” – seen as a panacea to all the academy’s ills. Paper describes varieties of competition; animator = whatever (material, social, psychological) breathes life into competition. Geo-political rivalry: belief that increasing number of graduates will improve country’s prospects in global knowledge economy = links higher education to policies regarding national competition/innovation. Global competition = not an even playing field and is channelled in particular ways (Naidoo, 2011)  *Animators*: 1) neoliberal/marketised discourses and practices: “Deregulation, the inﬂux of for-proﬁt organisations and increased quasi market competition between and across national higher education systems have all become features of the higher education landscape” (p.2) – global commodification, shifts in rewards and sanctions, rise of market logics. All these consequences jar with traditional notions/ ontologies/ epistemologies of higher education.  Introduces paper (Li & Lowe) which argues that universities are being pulled into an international ‘war for talent’ – resulting in negative consequences for social justice. The paper by Kim focuses on transnational occupational prospects, global mobility and trajectories of Korean students – looking at how a qualification from powerful western institutions offers different opportunities depending on where the student is/comes from. Mok’s paper looks at attempts in East Asia to widen participation.  Brøgger’s paper looks at affective politics of competitive measurement and ranking – examining the Bologna Process and ‘Open Method of Coordination’ (standardisation across EU) – with strong affective drivers pushing competitive practices (fear of shame, thrill of success)  Government sponsored competition (aka ‘excellence’ policies) “which involve deliberate strategies to develop or enhance vertical strat-iﬁcation in national systems” (p.5) – core aim is to identify ‘world class’ universities and use as leverage to gain positional advantage: see the paper by Olssen on the UK’s REF (draws on Foucault’s notion of neoliberalism as positive form of state power) and finds that the REF encourages ‘dubious’ tactics and strategies for gaining competitive advantage. Olssen also documents some of the consequences – such as devaluation of the Humanities and repackaging of research in “market-friendly ways”. Morley and Crossouard’s paper looks at how HE leadership is being aligned with performative and competitive spaces (looks at South Asia). They find that people are positioned/ position themselves as ‘winners or losers’ as result of active encouragement of competition and that leaders work to ensure that “the discursive and material realities of competition are installed and accepted” (p.6). The article by David shows how rankings and league tables have been used to justify HE-economic policies, such as deregulation, privatisation and increased fees. David argues that there is little statistical evidence to warrant particular rankings, instead discursive mechanisms do this work of creating an “illusory threat of global competition through which threat is used to warrant neoliberal policies” (p.6).  “A theme that appears throughout this special issue is the role of competition in reinforcing old hierarchies and channelling new forms of inequality both within and across national higher education systems (Naidoo 2011)” (p.7). Competition serves to “legitimise inequitable outcomes” (p.7). Competition is often binary, thus hiding/ ignoring the holistic performance, simplifying complex phenomena and engaging in decontextualisation that “cloaks the diversity of higher education” (p.7).  “The competition fetish has the potential to colonise epistemic and professional frameworks. Because it is tied to reputational and ﬁnancial rewards, it directs attention to what is deemed important and deﬂects attention away from what is not. The effect is that it begins to shape relationships and values – to the extent that there needs to be a constant adjustment to the values that competition brings in its wake. In this way, competition stipulates what is valued, what is de-valued and what is simply irrelevant. In other words, competition as a framework engages those working in higher education in a struggle to deﬁne the very worth of higher education” (p.7). |
| Peacock, D.; Sellar, S.; & Lingard, B. (2014). [The activation, appropriation and practices of student-equity policy in Australian higher education,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02680939.2013.839829) *Journal of Educational Policy*, 29(3), 377–396.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; equity policy; institutional ethnography; student recruitment; university outreach* | **Context:** Explores student-equity policy and practice in Queensland in two universities (one is UQ, the other a smaller/newer metro QLD university) and including the Queensland consortium, focusing on low SES students. Makes point – drawing on Bourdieu – that in the contested field of academia, there will always be elite/isolated institutions and less autonomous/more networked institutions – this is rationale for choice of case study institutions – but the creation of a state-wide consortium suggests possibility of collaborative practices and enactments of policy. HEPPP encourage(s/d) competitive market for low SES students.  **Aim:** To trace the activation and appropriation of student-equity across different stakeholders in one state of Australia  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Bourdieu’s conceptual tool of the contested field  **Methodology:** Employs Smith’s (2005) institutional ethnography “to map how student-equity workers’ local practices are articulated and aligned, via the locally produced policy statements of the Group, to federally established social inclusion targets for each university and to the accomplishment of ruling neoliberal policy relations established by the federal government” (p.379). Key = tracing the coordination of activities to ‘ruling relations’ = capitalist societies, which are “text-mediated” systems of communication, knowledge, information, regulation  **Findings:** The consortium split up the schools in the state and assigned them to universities – working to negate the negative impact of competition – but left a clause in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that permitted competition [poaching] when a student expressed interest in a university outside of the ‘catchment’ area their school fell in. Discusses the enactments of student-equity policy - partnership component of HEPPP:   * UQ: restricted their outreach to Year 10-12 and some outreach in Year 8-9 (but much smaller), No primary school outreach. UQ based equity outreach on targeting ‘best and brightest’ low SES students (but did not change entrance requirements; hence forcing low SES students to adapt – see p.388). UQ were keen to shift their mix of students, rather than grow (because they were in process of reducing UG numbers and increasing PG numbers) * ‘Dawson’: engaged in outreach from Year 6-12 (aka: primary and secondary) and engaged in this work so as to “grow strongly”   The UQ consortium were able to collectively appropriate federal policy in 5 ways:   1. Chair of the Group advocated for more collaborative, non-competitive funding which impacted on final HEPPP guidelines 2. Government encouraged remaining states/territories to collaborate similarly to QLD consortium 3. The Group was consulted on key elements of HEPPP, such as being able to move participation funding into partnership funds 4. Despite indigenous students not being part of HEPPP (because ISP offers separate funding), the Group made this a part of their (successful) bid and thus refracted/ reappropriated policy to suit indigenous students/ units 5. Due to cooperation, most of partnership funding went to regional universities [who are perhaps less competitive than Go8s/research intensive universities??]   **Core argument:** Tension in both case study universities around outreach/widening participation practices and recruitment (made clear in UQ’s persistent poaching of ‘best and brightest’ from Dawson’s school pool). In the context described (UQ consortium), collaborative equity practice is OK as long as it doesn’t challenge the status quo: “ Cooperative student-equity practices amongst universities become strained, however, where there is a potential change in the allocation of academic and reputational capital within the field and a disturbance to the existing institutional hierarchy of the field” (p.390) |
| Pitman, T. (2014). [Reinterpreting higher education quality in response to policies of mass education: the Australian experience](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13538322.2014.957944), *Quality in Higher Education,* 20(3): 348-363.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *quality; higher education; mass education; academic standards; higher education policy; widening participation; critical discourse analysis* | **Context:** Examines relationship between widened education, quality and policy in Australia from 2008-2014 – in context of voiced concerns about massifying and dropping standards/ levels of ‘readiness’  **Aim:** To analyse “how, throughout 2008–2014, various higher education stakeholders reframed their descriptions of higher education quality, in response to new policies of mass education” (p.349). Quality = what is means and what it describes is broad and contested, resulting in shifts from defining what it is to explanations of how to measure it. All notions of quality need to be considered = not just those that are favoured by stakeholders. Measuring quality in HE: input, process, output: three relativities = threshold level, reference value, institutional target on, for example, no. students in, % who pass, % who gain work + deadlines; “to examine how certain framing discourses of mass higher education were employed to promote, defend or attack specific discourses of quality in higher education” (p.350-1).  **Methodology:** Critical discourse analysis of policy frameworks political commentary and public submissions (draws on Blommaert/ Fairclough). Documents analysed = Bradley Review, the 37 open submissions made by Australia’s public universities in 2008; then the 2013 review (of the DDS) and associated 30 open submissions; and the final report and budget response in 2014.  **Findings:**  “the discursive relationship between mass higher education and higher education quality shifted from conceptualising quality as a function of economic productivity, through educational transformation and  academic standards, to market competition and efficiency” (p.363).  Bradley Review recommended that universities set their own entry requirements/ standards – devolving quality assurance from national standards but allowing for sector level oversight by creation of QA agency, using these measures: student progression and completions rates; post-graduation (employment and further study) outcomes and student satisfaction surveys. Author argues this created a hierarchical quality HE sector that “supplied students and the market with in-demand skills (fitness for purpose); retained and graduated a high proportion of students (efficiency); and generated positive student feedback (customer satisfaction)” p.352). Concern noted in public submissions with proposed (insufficient) indexing of funding, which would lead to perceived drops in quality (with regards to payment for staff and support etc.). Gov’t = positioned quality as sector’s ability to get/employ enough staff (and legitimated by suggesting a crisis = too many older academics); the sector reframed quality as in danger through lack of funding: “Quality would be measured ultimately by hard numbers; namely enrolments, graduates and skilled workers” (p.355).  Post-Liberal win (2013): quality used as a reason to maintain funding (Labor) or cut funding (Liberals) =  Review of the Demand Driven System**:** one of the three terms of reference was to examine whether the DDS was impacting on the quality of HE, a second was to check what measurements universities were using to check the quality of teaching and learning. Again, majority of universities did not consider the DDS/ massification to have impacted on quality (23/30 submissions) – using attrition and success data to support this argument. 5 universities suggested a possibility of drop in quality (all Go8). As Review of DDS recommended expanding DDS to sub-bachelor and private providers, it appears that the review did not find a slip in quality. Review of DDS recommended dropping centrally determined equity targets: “Under the logic of the market, ‘arbitrary’ targets were irrelevant since competition would be enough to ensure participation would grow overall. In such an environment, a key metric of higher education quality would be students’  satisfaction with teaching” (p.357) – customer satisfaction = primary measurement of quality.  Student = servant to quality (when quality = WP and national productivity, student = means to an end; when quality = academic standards = student is at risk; when HE = market, students need to contribute to cost of quality by paying more and behaving rationally (all p.359) **Core argument:** Quality “is a term that has been reinterpreted by various stakeholders to either defend a particular interest or adapt to changes in public policy” (p.359). Bradley Review = saw quality as part of widening participation and national economic productivity; Review of DDS saw HE as market in its own right “and mobilised discourses of competition and efficiency to delineate quality” (p.359), which the government used to argue for greater student responsibility for costs of HE. Student = servant to quality rather than the other way round: “It is only when quality is understood as a transformational process that the student is seen as benefitting from, rather than being responsible for, higher education quality” (p.360). |
| Pitman, T. (2015). [Widening access in a fee de-regulated system: exploring contemporary ideals of ‘fair’ access to higher education](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/openu/jwpll/2015/00000017/00000003/art00003%3bjsessionid=ft64ie8nujwo.x-ic-live-03), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 17(3), 17–31.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *fairness, access, fees, educational reform, Australia* | **Context:** Explores notion of ‘fairness’ in context of proposed reforms (2014) to deregulate student fees and introduce national equity scholarship scheme. Brief history of payment of Aus HE (free to students 1974-1988; introduction of HECS/student contribution in 1989- 2012; post 2012, uncapped places but limited tuition fees (max amount can be charged). 2014: Lib-Nat coalition put forward proposal to reduce commonwealth contribution per student (thus charging students more) and deregulate tuition fees (meaning HEIs could decide how much to charge), representing “a fuller transition to a demand-side higher education system, with both cost and supply being determined by the market” (p.18). Opposition parties opposed this reform on basis that it would be unfair, unequal, elitist (Aus Greens and Labor). Fairness = underpinned by assumptions of merit (but see Sen for argument about merit reflecting notions of what counts as ‘good society’). Draws on his own distinction between ‘procedural fairness’ and ‘normative fairness’ (Pitman, 2014). Problematises the massification approach to fairness (‘a rising tide lifts all boats’, p.20) – but this notion is underpinned by assumption that disadvantaged students will gain access once higher/middle classes = saturated. Such policies assume lack of places is more problematic than cost barriers. “In contrast, acts of redistribution occur when policy and action directly target disadvantaged students to increase their proportional representation within higher education” (p.20)  **Aim:** To unpack the various conceptualisations of ‘fairness’ that fuelled the debate over 10 months  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Critical Discourse Analysis of public statements on proposed reforms **Core argument:** Fairness is on continuum |
| Rawolle, S. (2013). [Understanding equity as an asset to national interest: developing a social contract analysis of policy](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2013.770249), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 34(2), 231–244.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *equity; social contracts; education policy; contract-like mechanisms, scales of social contracts; asymmetrical dyads* | **Context:** Considers the role/ evolution of ‘social contracts’ (“new social bargains or settlements linking governments to their constituents and that provide a rationale for a pattern or approach to government expenditure for particular economic sectors and segments of society”, p.232), which are increasingly used in neo-liberal/market-driven contexts and relationships. Posits that social contracts are “characterised as social bargains underpinned by *informed consent, points of renegotiation* at specific times while they are enacted, and *reciprocal accountability*” (p.233) and that these principles can add a useful layer of analysis of educational policy. Rawolle argues that social contracts are useful to examine because they “are embedded in public reasoning and rational for social changes” (p.236) and these may be “multiple and overlapping” in everyday lives/roles – thus resulting in “prioritisation, pressure and tension” and “provide a key location for researching and understanding specific kinds of societal changes and practices, changes in the relations between people…. and specific kinds and patterns of effects between social fields” (p.236)  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on contract theory work of Yeatman (1996)  **Findings:** Rawolle explores social contracts at each of three levels: 1) broad/(inter)national – describing expectations between states and citizens and vice versa; 2) institutional/field level; 3) ‘contract-like mechanisms’ within fields. Level 1 – Rawolle analyses the social contract embedded within OECD (2011) ‘Divided we stand’ report. Level 2 – policies that provide ‘overall rationale’ for educational provision; however, specific attention to equity cannot be analysed at this level: “requires another source of relay in order to connect specific commitments to relationships between nominated groups in education and their obligations and commitments to one another” (p.240). Level 3 – ‘contract-like mechanisms’ that “often mirror the form or style of individual legal contracts” (p.240), for example unit guides/ individual learning plans. “Contract-like mechanisms relay the expectations of broader social contracts by making explicit the equity goals that should underpin relationships in education settings” (p.241)  **Core argument:** Sets out a rationale for developing/ using analysis of social contracts, which “provide normative goals for relationships, forms of accountability to goals named within the social contract and processes to follow where there is dispute or conflict between people in the carrying out or in the pursuit of these goals” (p.241) |
| Rizvi, F. (2013). [Equity and marketisation: a brief commentary](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2013.770252), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2), 274–278.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *educational reform; equity; governance; neoliberalism; Participation and Equity Program* | **Context:** Responds to editorial (Savage, Sellar, Gorur 2013). Writes about the shifting ideologies around equity – from social democratic to market, which has been joined by shifts in governance – from trust and collaboration to efficiency and accountability/ collaborative to managerial approaches  Starts by discussing the Participation and Equity Program (PEP) that ran in the mid 80s, which Rizvi claims is the last program of reform that trusted teachers/ gave teachers autonomy. Two years after being started, rules about funding started to appear (which Rizvi argues was due to the government losing faith in the program) and early emphasis on democracy and finding meaning and negotiating what participation and equity meant were replaced with “stipulative definitions” (p.275). The global/western ideological shift from welfare state to neoliberal state was initiated by Thatcher and Reagan who were influenced by economics of Milton Friedman. Neoliberalism = human capital – develop human resources to meet needs of economy [neo-social]. Language used (indexing new discourses) is crucial for seeing the evolution of neoliberalism: “Part of the success of neoliberalism lies in the fact that it continues to use such traditionally socially democratic notions as equity, but has been enormously successful in re-articulating their meaning into market terms” (p.276) |
| Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2011). [Social equity and the assemblage of values in Australian higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0305764X.2010.549459), *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1): 5-22.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; Australia; equity; Assemblage* | **Context:** Works from historical context (equity has long been a theme in Australian higher education). Focus on equity = justified for many reason, “ranging from moral and political rationales to reasons of economic  returns and efficiency” (p.6). Policy making = political process that requires policymakers to “assemble, organise and order values, configuring them in such a way as to render them more or less consistent and implementable” (p.9) = privileging some over others. According to Stone (2001), core values privileged in liberal democracies = equity, efficiency, liberty and community (but these are contested and polysemous) – see p.10. Authors scope historical treatment of equity in HE. Shifts from Keynsian to neoliberal sector/policies outlined brilliantly in Table 1 (p.13). Authors also note connections to schooling, in terms of increased numbers of Year 12 completers, and in an unmet expectation that better rates of school completion would resolve equity issues with participation of particular groups. Authors also note increased federal involvement and funding in certain parts of the school sector (e.g. NAPLAN), which tend to disadvantage equity students (e.g. low SES students). Authors argue this “regime of data-driven accountability is part of the governance turn associated with neo-liberalism, which views data as central to managing the ‘system at a distance’, and comparisons as central to this form of governance” (p.15).  **Aim:** Examines the Bradley Review document in order “to underscore the performative character of policy in attempts to bring together a range of considerations that might not normally be aligned” (abstract)  **Theoretical frame:** Deleuzian notion of assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; also Ong & Colliers, 2004; Sassen, 2006; Olds, 2006) = it helps us to “understand the always-emergent conditions of the present” (p.7) and underscores performativity in policy. Assemblage = bringing together different ideas to evoke (new) concepts, with a focus on: “adaptivity rather than fixity or essences, spatio-temporal specificities, rather than linear and discrete determinations” (p.7) = rejection of positivistic notions and instead view relationships between concepts as temporal and dynamic. Where the juxtaposition = discomforting/ incongruent/inconsistent = emergent properties of assemblage; indeed, “theory itself is an assemblage that operates as specific conceptual combinations that are constructed to address specific problems” (p.7).  **Methodology:** Analysis of values in Bradley Review [no explicit methodological framing offered]  **Findings:** Analysis illuminates the messiness of social world evoked in policy. Authors argue a lot of ‘hard political work’ went into synthesising the different values together into coherent message  Positioning of social equity in higher education = “a new ‘nesting’ of values has replaced older assemblages, through processes that are contingent, and are affected by the changing political architecture of the state” (p.8).  Bradley Review = “framed at the macro level by a human capital discourse and one which views deregulation as the way of achieving its equity goals” (p.15) – through its explicit foregrounding Australia’s position against other OECD countries and warning about future competitiveness without additional funding/ widening of the system. Also evident in suggestion to create demand-driven system and provision of new technologies of surveillance (accreditation/ QA/ outcome measures/ participation monitoring). At same time, it calls for alternative, ‘funds of knowledge’ approaches for teaching indigenous students and need to look beyond expanding access = juxtaposition of values.Report “reproduces many of the current neoliberal assumptions about the role of higher education in the globalising knowledge economy” (p.17), as a result of struggling to resolve tensions between social equity and market logics. This results in narrow conceptions of social equity that are constrained by the ‘policy as numbers’ approach that emerge from the dominance of neoliberal imaginary and framed in technological terms. Thus, “Equity is thus re-articulated in terms of a human capital theory that assumes a necessarily competitive view of human nature and social relations” (p.17).  Conflation of excellence and equity against context of globalization and global discourses = proliferated around the world through inter-governmental organisations like OECD and World Bank that serve to expand ideological and political positions (such as neoliberalism) at a never-before-seen scale (including greater mechanisms of surveillance and accountability/ comparable systems). Based on a new theory of human capital that includes social equity, the authors argue that “in a global economy, performance is increasingly linked to people’s knowledge stock, skills level, learning capabilities and cultural adaptability” (p.18), which require policies that support labour flexibility through reforms to education and training and deregulation of the market  **Core argument:** That social/educational equity cannot be understood in general terms: it needs to be viewed as an assemblage of competing and contrasting values such as excellence, autonomy and efficiency + focus on markets = ‘new neoliberal imaginary’ that redefines education in economic terms, related to notions of efficiency within the market (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). The Bradley Review “rearticulates the meaning of equity in terms of an underlying focus on market efficiency” (p.19). |
| Rowlands, J. & Rawolle, S. (2013). [Neoliberalism is not a theory of everything: a Bourdieurian analysis of *illusio* in educational research](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2013.830631), *Critical Studies in Education,* 54(3), 260–272.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Bourdieu; educational policy; higher education; neoconservatism/ neoliberalism; poststructural/postmodern/critical theory* | **Context:** Neoliberalism is not straight forward – it is “complex and multifaceted” (abstract) but is used regularly (“a catch-all explanation for anything negative”, p.261) in educational research/ research that explores social processes [-isations]. Economisation = neoliberalism, new contractualism, new economics, knowledge economy (p.260).  **Aim:** To offer explicate and discuss neoliberalism in the context of education – to unpick the complexities of the notion  **Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu’s theory of *illusion “*the belief that people maintain in the games that  are played in everyday life that allow a person to take the objective of these games seriously” and doxa: ‘the point of view of those who dominate by dominating the state and who have constituted their point of view as universal by constituting the state’ (Bourdieu, 1999 , p. 57 – both on p.261).  **Methodology:** Critical review of literature: from a review of databases, 110 articles with neoliberalism in title collected.  **Findings:** Offer definitions of neoliberalism from Hayek (1973) and Friedman (1955) – “both provided an attack on democratic and state planning in favour of private choice and the rule of law, but also the formal outlining of individual ‘rational’ choice as leading to the optimisation of resources.” (p.262). Naming/ philosophy of neoliberalism offered from outside economics. Various outputs/ factors related to neoliberalism include: “These include the importance and security of private property, the rule of law, the importance of economic ‘maximisation’ models to policy, the role of the state, the nature of obligations individuals hold to one another, the state (social and private contracts) and markets, choice and public  decision making” (p.262). Some scholars argue neoliberalism is a part of globalization (see list of refs, p.263). In economic terms, neoliberalism relates to *freedom* (of markets/ individual) from the state – although neoliberalism has a complex relationship with the state (the role of the state is not totally limited as it is with ‘classic’ liberalism: “neoliberalism is depicted as embodying freedom from the imposition of the state upon the individual at the same time as being dependent upon indirect (and sometimes direct) state support for both big and small business and the financial sector” (p.264).  Results from literature review: 3 groups of articles: (a) no definition offered; (b) brief definition (not exceeding one paragraph); (c) detailed definition – 2 paragraphs or more. Almost half of 110 articles = category A (54/110); quarter = B (27/110) and C (29/110). Frequency range of use of word also illuminating – A: 1-61; B: 5-63; C: 14-160 **Core argument:** When researchers use the term neoliberalism (and critique it) without defining or explaining, they are “playing the neoliberal game and inadvertently demonstrating our belief that it is a game worth being played” (abstract). Two significant risks: 1) we assume our understanding is the same as others, leading to misunderstandings/ lack of recognition; 2) when we use terms without critique or unpicking, we enact the dominant [hegemonic] discourses: “Bourdieu would say that an ‘entire philosophy is imported when such language is used in a non-specific manner’” (p.268)  “Simply by giving space to that discourse in our work we demonstrate its value; it is only by critically  examining that discourse and its impact (and by deconstructing it) that we have any hope of starting a revolution, let alone participating in one” (p.269) |
| Savage, G. (2011). [When worlds collide: excellent and equitable learning communities? Australia’s ‘social capitalist’ paradox?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2010.493229) *Journal of Education Policy,* 26(1), 33–59.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *equity/social justice; politics; policy sociology; marketisation* | **Context:** Examines ‘social capitalist’ (third way) political-educational imaginary, which captures “a view that social governance is capable of pursuing and achieving the social democratic ideals of equity and social justice, within the architecture of a globalising and competitive capitalist economy” (p.33). In third way politics, community = seen as governable space. Schools = reimagined as ‘learning communities’ where equity and excellence can coincide harmoniously (but within marketised, competitive sector). Indeed, the market = the “prime mechanism” (p.37) for the successful combination of equity and excellence. Savage tracks the history of third way politics in the ALP over the last decade (see p.36) – draws a lot on Rudd’s speeches. Educational equity from a social capitalist view = “Social injustice is thus abhorrent for its squandering of individual and national productivity” (p.38).  **Aim:** To examine how social capitalism is evident in schooling policy and practice (in Victoria); to “analyse tensions and paradoxes that emerge when each school attempts to imagine and govern itself towards policy ideals” (p.34)  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Draws from ethnographic project that explored two schools: one high SES (Waterbury) and one low SES (Essex Hills) to examine how social capitalist political-educational imagination plays out. Data collection = observations/ interviews  **Findings:**  Both schools = “engaged in active attempts to imagine and govern their school communities towards policy ideals” (p.40). Waterbury = characterized as ‘competitive haven’. Examines linguistic positioning of school as ‘learning community working together’ and notes appointment of 0.8 Community Engagement Officer (who brokers financial arrangements between the school and local businesses). Waterbury = highly competitive with high expectations. However, teacher interviews suggested that within this climate, time for inclusive pedagogy and equity = eroded or erased, especially in context of pressure to increase ENTER scores (with status that comes with and narrow focus on linear tertiary pathways). The ways that this pressure impacted on work = negative (‘data machines’). Gives example of a student’s suicide (fear of letting school and other students down noted in her diary). Also, Waterbury only offers tertiary/ academic pathways – any students not wanting to proceed with academic subjects/path need to leave school and find another that offers VET subjects (and weaker students ‘weeded out’).  Essex hill = pulled by pressures. Promotes itself as ‘academically promising’ and more emphasis on care and safety. Staff and students countered these claims (the school was perceived as failing at equity and excellence by staff, and as unsafe and uncaring by students). One teacher discussed competition with other local schools for ‘parent clientele’ and students, meaning more ‘manpower’ = marketing. Teachers also concerned about performance related pay reforms and the impact on collegiality (which would also make teachers focus more on ticking boxes and increasing scores). Essex Hills = more pastoral supports, but this was felt to conversely impact on time possible to work on ‘excellence’ part (academic teaching) **Core argument:** That excellence and equity = undermined by highly stratified system that deliberately discriminates against individuals in line with performance hierarchies. In sum, “a paradoxical bind appears, whereby attempts to concentrate on competitive excellence starve the pastoral and equitable, and vice versa” (p.52). |
| Savage, G. (2013). [Tailored equities in the education market: flexible policies and practices](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2013.770246?mobileUi=0&journalCode=cdis20), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2), 185–201.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords*: equity; education policy; marketisation; tailoring; Australian secondary schooling* | **Context:** This paper explores changing rationalisations of equity in Australian education policy and then draws upon ethnographic research to illustrate different ways equity is understood and enacted by educators. Equity has been reframed as “a ‘market enhancing’ mechanism and melted into economic productivity agendas” (abstract). Draws on Rose’s (1999) notion of the ‘neo-social’ = “a rejuvenated governmental interest in enabling healthy and positive social environments, but primarily for the sake of fostering greater economic productivity” (p.187)  **Aim:** To explore how ethical it is to ‘tailor’ equity in secondary schools – one low SES/ one high SES (based on policies that call schools/parents/individuals to exercise freedom of choice). His research seeks to “draw links between the macro and micro realms of governance: examining the broader ecology of governance (i.e. political imaginaries, rationalities and technologies) and also how these forces are written into or contested by everyday (i.e. at the coalface) forms of governance” (p.188)  **Theoretical frame:** Critical/political sociology of higher education  **Methodology:** Draws on ethnographic work in two disparate secondary schools in Melbourne  **Findings:** Educators tailor their responses to the equity agenda according to the perceived needs and desires of local community. The ways that each school and the educators in the schools differs according to their contexts and communities: the low SES school (Clapton) positioned equity as care and refuge and compensation for the circumstances from which their students come from (poor, inconsistent living arrangements noted) – which lead to ways in which equity was enacted through pedagogy/ teaching practices = governmentality as ‘pastoral power’ (Foucault, 2007). The low SES school (Bridgeway) shaped/ was shaped by a view of equity driven by parents wanting equality of opportunity and resources (my child hasn’t done what that child has done) and not ‘classic’ approaches to equity (not perceived as salient in this context). Bridgeway demonstrates a highly individualised approach to well-being (neo-social approach) – based around a [middle-class] view of what it takes to be successful: “producing excellence in a competitive environment” (p.196) – equity was “absorbed into a bigger project of maximising advantage” (p.197)  **Core argument:** Questions whether equity can be tailored, given that equity is a very flexible concept: the differences in the data “reflect a similar diversity in policy, where multiple versions of equity operate” (p.197). Also, given that the schools are so different, they were both “unequally placed to enact versions of equity in policy” (p.197) – each version of equity derived from conditions in each school [responded to]. “…how might every child be expected to have every opportunity if equity is unequally distributed in form and practice?” (p.198) |
| Savage, G.; Sellar, S.; & Gorur, R. (2013). [Equity and marketisation: emerging policies and practices in Australian education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2013.770244), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2), 161–169.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *equity, markets, policy, human capital, governance, OECD* | **Core argument:** Editorial for SI on equity and marketisation = points to how equity is evolving and being enacted in the context of an increasingly marketised higher education system. Comments on how educational equity is a difficult notion to pin down and outlines three main characterisations: *distributive* (based on notion of ‘fair’ distribution); *inclusive and recognising* (so as to “ameliorate the negative influences of social and cultural difference”, p.162); *equality of opportunity* (‘sameness of treatment’). Oppositional notion of inequity = “where historical, social, structural, and institutional factors come together in apparently deeply intractable ways” (p.162). Simultaneously, marketised ways of thinking “foster notions of meritocracy, competition and choice, which also claim links to ideals of fairness and opportunity” (p.162). Equity and competitiveness are presented as harmonious. SI justified because conjunction of equity and markets in education has “created new and different conditions of possibility for equity, both as a policy discourse and a related set of educational practices” (p.163). Targeting aspirations of low SES students is “a form of equity as the provision of support for self-capitalisation through education” (p.166)  **Aim:** “to analyse carefully the increasing rationalisation of equity agendas in economic terms” (abstract) |
| Sellar, S. & Gale, T. (2011). [Globalisation and student equity in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0305764X.2011.549652?journalCode=ccje20), *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 41(1), 1–4.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Editorial. Focuses on intersections between student equity and globalisation. Collection of papers that represent ‘new imaginary of student equity’, which occurs via massification and transnationalism (OECD – higher education policy = example of ‘neoliberal imaginary’), so that “national HE systems now increasingly operate as localisations of a global HE space” (p.1). Globalised HE systems = fuelled by increased student mobility and ‘increased flows of knowledge mediated by new technologies’ (p.1)  **Findings:**  “In the current privileging of market efficiency, academic excellence, and national investment in human capital, student equity tends to be justified, even conceived, as an objective in their service” (p.1). Rizvi & Lingard (same issue) = assemblage of values. Marginson (same issues) = critique of reliance on numerical measurements of student equity that have limited significance beyond national borders – Marginson argues for expanding participation. Sellar, Gale & Parker (same issue) argue that in Australia, the policy context and global economic context have resulted in more explicit focus on and funding for equity work, therefore opening possibilities for more transformative community-based programs that respond to community needs. Rizvi & Lingard’s critique of ‘policy as numbers’ (nation-centric, ‘equity by numbers’) = illustrates how such approaches = “lind to the advantages and disadvantages produced through transnational student mobilities, at a time when mobility has  become a significant stratifying factor” (p.2) – students studying abroad to gain positional advantage in employment market  **Core argument:** New globalised academy = requires new imaginaries of student equity, demanding more nuanced and responsive analytics and frameworks. This/these new imaginar(ies) should include:  (a) an expanded conception of equity;  (b) resources for interrogating the production of policy or knowledge across multiple scales;  (c) attention to the lived experience of inequality in particular localisations of global HE;  (d) a re-conception of the relationships between tertiary sectors;  (e) new designs and rationales for equity programs; and  (f) an understanding of the risks and possibilities afforded by new communication technologies. (p.3) |
| Sellar, S.; Savage, G. & Gorur, R. (2014). [The politics of disagreement in critical education policy studies: a response to Morsy, Gulson and Clarke](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01596306.2014.890269), *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 35(3), 462–469.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *critique, equity, markets, policy* | **Context:** Responds to Morsy. Gulson & Clarke’s discussion of school funding (specifically relating to ‘sector-blindness’ with regards to federal funding of public and ‘non-government’ schools) and their call for dissensual politics (Ranciere-ian disagreement in the sense the consensus is false and insincere)  **Aim:** To defend position take in original paper, to engage in ‘debate redux’ but from politics of disagreement  **Methodology:** Essay  **Discussion:** Correct Morsy, Gulson & Clarke, who argued against a position of harmonisation between equity and marketization; Sellar, Savage & Gorur highlight that equity and marketization *are presented*as harmonious. Offer example of how equity has replaced language of social justice and inequality in educational policy, so that “equity effectively becomes a ‘ market-enhancing mechanism’ (Savage, 2011) and markets can ostensibly function as ‘ equity-enhancing mechanisms’ (Gorur, 2013 ), on p.464.  Metaphor of ‘blindness’ connects with Ranciere’s notion of ‘the sensible’; there is a critical difference between notion of blindness as misrecognition and as “a rhetorical strategy that produces a particular distribution of the sensible” (p.465). Dissensus = gap in the sensible (where sensible relates to normative assumptions about groupings of society according to specific modes of doing, occupations and places). Authors are cautious of repeating the ‘well worn groove’ of critiques of neoliberalism because it has become a cliché in critical educational work. Authors agree that degrees of depoliticisation in education have closed down some debates **Core argument:** We need new ways of being critical. |
| Shepherd, S. (2016). [No room at the top? The glass wall for professional service managers in pre-1992 English universities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13603108.2016.1256844), *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education,* 21(4), 129–134.  Keywords: *Higher education; leadership; selection; deputy and pro vice-chancellor; glass wall; social closure* | **Context:** Examines shifting context of management and governance of universities – universities now need ‘active management’ to cope with the expansion of the system and activities of higher education, resulting in the professionalization of administration, with generalist administrators being replaced by experienced specialist managers. The boundaries between academic and administrative roles = less clear. Paper looks specifically at PVCs, who have traditionally been ‘career academics’. PVC role has changed to include policy portfolios, and has become more managerial. Appointment of PVCs has also become more risky and more competitive (external, open), meaning that professional staff could be considered for the role (rather than solely an academic pool).  **Aim:** To examine the professional backgrounds of PVCs in pre-1992 English universities; to investigate the aspirations and agency of professional services managers (with regard to applying for PVC positions)  **Theoretical frame:** None explicit  **Methodology:** Draws on mixed-methods study (census/ online survey and interviews). Census= snapshot of demographic and career profiles of 215 PVCs in 30 x. pre-1992 universities in August 2013; survey = ‘third layer of management’ (i.e., layer under PVC; n=661, 132 complete responses); interviews with VCs (n=19); PVCs appointed through external open competition (n=26); third-tier academic/ professional service managers (n=17); registrars (n-=8) and external search agents (n=3). Purposeful sampling and respondent validation approaches taken.  **Findings:** PVCs = overwhelmingly career academics (94% from academic posts). Recent changes to PVC recruitment approach = had little impact: only 4 PVCs surveyed = from professional roles. Very few professional services roles = applying for PVC roles (largely because they are not academics). This view = shared by VCs, because academics have ‘shared sets of values’, ‘familiarity with the core mission’ and ‘credibility in making decisions in an academic environment’: “even if the requirement for research excellence is negotiable, that for academic credibility is not” (p.3).  The lack of professional appointments to senior management roles = “shows a lack of appreciation and  respect for what professional services managers have to offer, including a deep knowledge of, and commitment to, HE coupled with management credentials, skills and experience” (p.4-5). There is a ‘glass wall’ for professional service managers aspiring to PVC level appointments **Core argument:** Recruitment patterns to senior university management = remained consistent for many years, despite the changes to the recruitment process/ requirements and despite the changing role and increasingly managerial culture of senior leadership in HE. Author refers to this as ‘social closure’. |
| Singh, S. & Mountford-Zimdars, A. (2016). [Policy enactment in Widening Participation: enablers and barriers in a comparative English and Australian study](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/openu/jwpll/2016/00000018/00000002/art00003;jsessionid=6bie4b77mx1k.x-ic-live-02), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 18(2), 22–49.  UK/AUS  Keywords: *Social class, social mobility, university transition, public policy, university staff.* | **Context:** Set in 2016 WP/ higher education landscapes of Australia and England. Notes relative dearth of research on WP that connects with policyscape and practitioners’ experiences. Offers review of selective (aka Russell Group/ Group of Eight) universities and their role in maintaining the stratification of inequity and disproportionate representation of higher SES students (see p.24-25) – e.g., notes how the University of Melbourne sought to decrease their numbers of undergraduate students at a time when all other universities sought to open access (through the demand driven system). Authors note connections between material poverty, differentials in terms of social/cultural capital and different transitions into higher education.  **Methodology:** International comparative design (policy and practice).Two case studies of selective universities: one Australian, one English. Interviews and documentary analysis conducted. Notes how the Indigenous dimension of equity in Australia does not align with English context.  **Findings:** The national and institutional contexts = led to diversity between the two case studies in terms of staffing, resources, reporting, evaluation and WP activities. Similarities exist at macro level: competition with other unviersities, balancing recruitment and social justice work, balancing short and longer-term policy aims and external contradictory policy parameters (all from abstract)  *Document analysis* (national policy statements; institutional WP documents, RG access agreements, Go8 mission-based compacts). National WP policy aims = similar: both countries focus on access, retention and success and primarily for low SES students. Both national contexts have similar foci: whole-institution approach; focus on the entire student lifecycle; evidence-based spending; long-term outreach; support for mature-age and part-time students; and effective collaboration (see p.30); both countries allow individual institutions to develop their own strategies. Funding arrangements are different: in England, HEIs fund WP activities through income from tutition fee income [this was a key condition for universities being able to charge full 900GBP per year for tuition]. RG = allocate 30% of fee income to WP. In contrast, HEPP funding = performance based and is allocated on the basis of the number of low SES students enrolled. This meant that RG universities get more money than Go8 universities (and this is not reflected when world rankings are calculated): “The difference is even starker when factoring in the differences in undergraduate student numbers around 15,000 at RU and over 22,000 at GU. On a per capita basis, this means that in 2014 RU was operating on a budget of approximately £620/$1240 per undergraduate compared with the £54/$108 that GU has at their disposal” (p.31-32).  *Institutional policy in practice*: differences in how activities managed – challenges from decentralized [siloed] structure made a difference. The case study Go8 university= struggled with this, with lots of overlap and repetition of activities and ‘patchy monitoring’, but were still able to meet HEPP-reporting requirements. Staffing = significant differences: reduction in WP team at Go8 university = highly problematic (turnover of WP manager role = 4 times in one year), compared with RG university, which had a ‘growing and thriving’ team.  *Insittutional activities*: RG = outreach for post-16 students and ‘cultural capital’ schedule of orientation/ excursions/ cultural events but only for students with high GCSE results: “Although the programme has been developed to address awareness, cultural capital and academic attainment, it potentially only serves as a dynamic and engaging preparation tool for low SES students already likely to enter a selective higher education environment” (p.33). Go8 university ran fewer and less-targeted activities than RG: aimed at high-achieving Year 10 students (not low SES-specific), and on-campus visits for Year 9-11 students. Authors argue this program of activities “highlights the sometimes blurred line between outreach and recruitment” (p.34).  Challenges highlighted in interviews: importance of cohesive policy, challenges of funding, impact of reporting. Critique from both contexts about the flow of policy and the importance for the money to be directed at the right place (e.g. argument from RG scholar that HEPP money is wasted because it should be given to primary schools, p.35). Authors note that, despite challenges relating to demonstrating impact, English universities ‘self-funding’ WP makes it more sustainable; Australian on the other hand = “highly dependent on political stability and political commitment” (p.35). Both national contexts = incentivised ‘rapid impact, high yield’ activities. Both insitutions felt constrained by the reporting requirements. Reporting privileges individual (rather than collaborative) progress, resulting in less collaboration. There was a sense from both sets of interviewees that this approach to reporting skewed the ways that their institutions went about their business of WP (short-term, bums on seats approaches), which is partly due to a lack of clarity in terms of what counts as ‘impact’, and partly due to the competitive element (which can play out as recruitment for students in outreach activities in local areas). Both universities “prioritise short-term returns over serving the national common good of enhancing access to higher education for a wider range of students who have the ability to benefit” (p.41) **Core argument:** Challenges =focus on recruitment and need for short-term, high yield impact; the importance of collaboration eroded by competition and individual reporting; policy flow through.  “Currently, key responsibility for the WP agenda rests with universities. However, this meso-level approach, does not take into account either the root causes of class reproduction and inequalities in early schooling, nor does it change the end outcome of legitimising structures of social inequality as meritocratic” (p.43) |
| Southgate, E. & Bennett, A. (2014). [Excavating Widening Participation Policy in Australian Higher Education: Subject Positions, Representational Effects, Emotion](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281052825_Excavating_widening_participation_policy_in_Australian_higher_education_Subject_positions_representational_effects_emotion), *Creative Approaches to Research*, 7(1), 21–45.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *widening participation, higher education, policy, Foucault, discourse, subjectivity, emotion, aspiration, capability, meritocracy* | **Context:** Australian widening participation (UK term used, not sure why)  **Aim:** To ask critical questions about neo-liberal forms of social justice  **Theoretical frame:** Uses Foucauldian discourse analysis on policy documents (2008-2013)/ ‘feeling-rules’ = modes of emotional existence: “techniques of the self that are inherent in neo-liberal ideologies where each person is considered to be their own entrepreneur responsible for the cultivation of their own personal human capital” (p.26)  **Methodology:** Bacchi’s ‘What’s the Problem Represented to be?’ (WPR) = ‘digging tool’ comprising 6 questions:   1. What’s the problem represented to be in specific policy/ policy proposal? 2. What presuppositions/ assumptions underpin this representation? 3. How has this ‘representation’ come to be? 4. What is left as unproblematic in this representation? Where are there silences? 5. What effects are produced by this representation? 6. How/where has this representation been produced, disseminated and defended?   **Findings:** Identifies two subject positions and ‘feeling-rules’ within Australian WP policy: *the cap(able) individual* and *the proper aspirant*.  The cap(able) individual: a “quintessential neo-liberal subject who possesses ‘natural ability’, hope for social mobility and highly individualised and entrepreneurial disposition”. ‘Capability’ = “a floating signifier” (p.29) – left as commonsensical but it is informed by a suite of tacit assumptions about structural, sociocultural and environmental factors that are lacking in WP documents. Links with biological essentialist views (Cartesian views of identity?) = ‘natural ability’  The proper aspirant: “must display an ability to rationally calculate pathways to and through higher education… for maximum benefit” (p.35). This subject position is based on a normative hierarchy (e.g. university is better than TAFE ), which privileges middle-class ideals (p.34). This subject position “diminishes the feeling-rules that permeate governmental power relations” and allows some ways of being/doing/knowing to be valued more than others. Here, ‘working-class’ subjectivity is positioned as ‘unknowing’ with ‘deficits on quality’. **Core argument:** Aspiration is a ‘neo-liberal form of hope’ (p.38) |
| Stevenson, J.; Clegg, S.; & Lefever, R. (2010). [The discourse of widening participation and its critics: an institutional case study](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/ioep/clre/2010/00000008/00000002/art00002), *London Review of Education,* 8(2), 105–115.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Explores contradictory discourses of WP and contestations between public policy and practitioners. WP = “a contradictory and unstable amalgam of economic rationality and social justice arguments” (p.105). Scopes UK HE landscape (1960s – 2010), through Tory policies of 1979-1997, and impact of New Labour policies – looking at language used, from “the drive to increase participation as an act of social justice was overtaken by a policy discourse which saw mass higher learning as fundamental to the future prosperity and competitive advantage of the UK” in Tory policy to New Labour ethos: “knowledge-economy, higher education becomes a potentially powerful instrument of social justice, since it serves not only as a driver of wealth creation, but as a critical determinant of life chances’” (all p.106). Currently, UK HE policy is underpinned by discourse positioning students as ‘consumers’ of free market – with non-participation seen as a deficit (Burke, 2009). In UK = ambiguity about who WP groups are  **Aim: “**to interrogate how these public debates and policies are realised in practice, and what interpretative work is engaged in by those who see themselves as WP advocates and practitioners” (p.108) – how do WP staff make sense of WP in context of competing discourses  **Theoretical frame:** takes Trowler’s (2002) view of ‘loose coupling’ between policy and outcomes  **Methodology:** Institutional case study of post-1992 HEI; tools = documentary analysis, online q’naire, interviews as part of internally commissioned audit of practice. 94 staff members completed q’naire  **Findings:** Documentary analysis showed that there was no longer a WP policy (other terms used such as diversity, inclusion, equality), which was reflected in confusion in staff interviews. When prompted, staff gave multiple definition of who WP is for, and many used the interview to seek clarification from researchers. One theme: staff interviews suggested = “heavily values-based orientation towards WP” (p.110). Examples given related most to public policy and aspirations building (Aim Higher). Interviews with staff also suggested who staff considered having responsibility for WP (most saw it laying equally with all staff; others saw it as the work of a particular department) and there was ‘confusion’ about whether students or staff should be proactive in offering support. In terms of the case study university’s commitment to WP, senior managers perceived a strong commitment to WP but this wasn’t ‘filtering down’ and believed that other staff were negative about WP. Staff lower down the hierarchy were less convinced of institutional commitment to WP and, according to one participant (an academic) the university was “lucky to have a lot of willing and dedicated staff and individual commitment to WP that really needs to be harnessed more effectively” (p.111). Discourse of blame = likely result of an unclear and inconsistent use of WP terms and practices, meaning individual staff drew on own local/personal values and blamed ‘others’ for lack of support/engagement with WP. Blaming others “,mirrors the individualism of the WP discourse itself” (p.112) Clear sense of frustration within WP practitioners and advocates because of lack of consistency/ confusion messages from institution.  **Core argument**: “as long as the policy context and the philosophical rationale for WP remain unclear, WP practice is likely to remain the preserve of committed individuals, and, at the local level, will be largely incapable of having a sustained impact on broader institutional cultures and discourse” (p.105) |
| Tomlinson, M. (2017). [Student perceptions of themselves as ‘consumers’ of higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2015.1113856?journalCode=cbse20), *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 38(4), 450–467.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Marketisation, HE policy, student-as-consumer, values* | **Context:** Paper is situated in contemporary UK HE sector and explores the different orientations of students in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (pre and post-tuition fee increase to £9000 per year). Paper is situated in the marketised HE sector: “this development is often seen as foregrounding the purpose of higher education as providing private goods whose benefits are referenced against their potential future economic exchange value” (p.2). Common characteristics of the (international) neo-liberal academy are: increased role of markets, diminishing role of the state, “a new mode of service responsiveness that meets the needs of service users” (p.2) – evident in promotion of student choice (targets/ metrics/ marketing material). Of significance in this context is the idea that students’ relationships with higher education have changed (have they internalised the discoursal shifts evident in policy changes) and does this affect their study behaviours? If so, this is:   1. likely to give rise to more ‘paying customer’ subject positions, “who expects their providers to deliver their services and products in ways commensurate with their demands” (p.2) 2. value given to HE = equated to costs of participating so that ‘associated markers of value – teaching, learning, student experience – are based on these perceived costs: ‘value for money’ 3. students make strong connections between HE and other goods and services 4. students understand and respond in similar ways (and thus shape new approaches to education)   **Aim:** Explore key themes in literature on students as consumers; explore findings of qualitative study (UK-based) on students’ attitudes, approaches and shifting identity positions in contemporary UK HE and in context of 2012 tuition fee increase.  **Methodology:** Focus groups and individual interviews with 68 UG students from 7 different HEIS: 4 in England (1 x Russell Group, 1 x post-1994, 1 x post-1992, 1 x guild) + 1 x Welsh, 1 x Scottish, 1 x NI university during spring in 2013. Students were mixed (pre-2012/ post-2012)  **Key themes from literature review:** 1) consumerism (consumption rather than production = central idea) “is now taken to be at the heart of modern productive relations in late capitalism, given that much of the post-industrial economy is based on the consumption of intangibles in the form of human services and products that have largely perishable value” (p.3); 2) impact of consumerism (and marketisation of HE) depends on relative privilege/status and kind of knowledge produced of HEI – more elite universities are able to maintain traditional pedagogies and ways of doing so that “Students receive the message that they are in receipt of elite education, whose knowledge is sacred and of high social value, and that conformance to the elite pedagogies is imperative if they are to succeed in this environment. In contrast, lower prestige institutions are more subject to the symbolic violence of consumer ideology given that their principal currency has been on providing students with a relevant and applied ‘Mode 2’ knowledge” (p.4); 3) increased consumerism leads to increased instrumentalism – resulting in higher levels of ‘student performativity’ (Ransome, 2011); 4) marketised HE inculcates a possessive ‘having’ mode (rather than an ontological/becoming/ ‘being’ mode) = Molesworth, Nixon & Scullon (2009).  **Findings of study:** Study identified range of attitudes/ subject positions on a scale of student-consumer:   * active service-user * positioned consumer = students “expressed a mixed and ambivalent attitude toward the consumer ethos: while they had internalised discourses of student rights and entitlements, they still distanced themselves from the position of consumer” (p.6) * non-consumers   Active service-users: “Active service-user attitudes were underpinned by a strong sense that increased costs needed to be matched by highly transparent and effective modes of delivery from institutional providers who were receiving the costs that students were incurring” (p.7) - signal a shift of power from institutional provider (university/ lecturer) to purchaser (student)  Positioned consumer: “At one level, they saw consumerism as an inevitable consequence of a marketised higher education system and something that was justified through students’ private contribution and the need for experience commensurate to increased costs [but] they also acknowledged the limitations of this approach” (p.9) – ‘value for money’ attitude + need for responsibility and engagement for learning  Resisting consumerism: “those who challenged the notion of consuming higher education, and actively distanced themselves from this approach” (p.10) = consumption seen as passivity, signaling lower intellectual merit which could devalue social/economic status of degree.  **Core argument:**  Notion that all students are consumers is challenged – there are a range of subject positions/ attitudes but consumerist discourses do appear to be widespread in students’ talk. Be interesting to find out if disaffected students demonstrated consumerist attitudes (connections between disengagement and consumerism). Overall, “utilitarian values and attitudes are framing students’ approach to higher education as reflected in increasing concerns about their ‘returns’, relative academic performance (grades outcomes) and how their credentials may be consumed by others in the marketplace (their ‘employability’ and ‘attributes’)” (p.13). |
| Whiteford, G., Mashood, S., Chenicheri, S.N. (2013). [Equity and Excellence are not Mutually Exclusive](https://research-repository.uwa.edu.au/en/publications/equity-and-excellence-are-not-mutually-exclusive-a-discussion-of-), *Quality Assurance in Education* 21(3), 299–310.  AUS  Annotated by Georgina Ramsay  Keywords *Disadvantaged groups, Social inclusion, Higher education, Government policy, Academic standards, Australia, United Kingdom* | * Contemporary HEIs concurrently focusing on: access and widening participation; improving the quality and standard of HE; enhancing reputation and competitiveness. Are these aims mutually exclusive? Discourse: increased enrolments of students of disadvantaged backgrounds must not compromise quality outcomes * Those working in academia have suggested that students with lower entry scores/disadvantaged backgrounds are able to compete with students with higher entry scores/privileged backgrounds if there is attention to inclusive curriculum, greater academic support, quality teaching, and counselling * Difficulty for social inclusion agenda is pre-occupation with rankings at an international scale. Diversity is not accounted for in these leagues, and represents a risk for institutional reputation * Class and race have complex factors that shape ‘success’ in HE * Preconception that disadvantaged students will be underperforming students; and time spent with them disadvantages higher performing students (thus leading to academic decline) * Research shows that student achievement and experience benefits from having diverse student cohorts (so this would be a protective factor in the ‘excellence’ paradigm)   Hence this article argues that a social inclusion agenda related to increasing the equity of access and participation of disadvantaged students does not have a negative impact on academic standards and outcomes, despite preconceptions; but argues that there needs to be adequate support structures through policy, community, adequacy of preparation, and the institution to enable this ‘excellence’ |