**Inclusive Teaching for Equity and Diversity in Higher Education**

Literature review

Following the policy focus on social inclusion, there is a sustained focus on how this notion plays out in the teaching and learning environment. At the policy level, social inclusion was a centrepiece of the Bradley review of Australian higher education (2008), using the terms ‘widening participation’, ‘equity’, ‘access and participation of under-represented groups of students’, and ‘social inclusion’. This focus was enshrined in both policy and funding, through the HEPPP package and an increase in base funding for teaching and learning. However, these policy terms index multiple understandings of what social inclusion means in the pedagogic environment. Gidley et al. (2010) explored the discourses that underpin such social inclusion policies, arguing that there are multiple definitions instantiated in policy, which sit on a spectrum from human potential-social justice-neoliberalism. Kilpatrick & Johns’ (2014) used Gidley et al.’s (2010) heuristic to analyse the strategic planning documents of all public Australian universities so as to search for evidence of strategies to implement social inclusion agenda. They found variety in the take up of the discourses, with a broad pattern emerging between older/ more research intensive universities and newer/ more teaching intensive universities, with the older institutions tending to align more frequently with neoliberal views of access, and the newer institutions instantiating more social justice/ human potential approaches. Kilpatrick & Johns assert that in order to engage in the project of social inclusion, “universities [need to] articulate a comprehensive and integrated suite of strategies spanning the access, participation and empowerment domains”, which include “a high level plan or framework that articulates goals, agreed strategies for building and sustaining a socially inclusive organisation, and indicators of success” (p.27).

Similarly, a review of the literature reveals varying discourses on the notion of diversity in higher education. Archer (2007) distinguishes between the conflicting concepts of ‘horizontal diversity’, which indicates a ‘plurality of options’ (appealing to ‘customers’ needs’), and ‘vertical diversity’, which indicates the stratification of institutions based on the notions of ‘quality’ (p. 639). Similarly, Brennan and Osborne (2008) draw on Teichler’s (2007) conceptualisation of horizontal and vertical forms of differentiation in discussing ideologies underpinning an agenda of diversity in higher education. Horizontal differentiation is argued to focuse on program differences, subjects and links with industry, while vertical differentiation is contended to relate to an institution’s status and prestige (Teichler, 2007). There is also a general consensus in the literature regarding the problems with the notion of ‘diversity’ in higher education. Bowl (2018) argues that the language of ‘distinctiveness’ and ‘diversity’ are often employed in higher education institutions to ‘mask the incompatibility of market competition and equity, and to bolster claims for elite status’ (p. 2). On the other hand, Campbell (2000) contends that the reductive ‘good’ and ‘bad’ notions of diversity often fail to recognise the ‘historic, embodied, entrenched marginalisation that non-white people face in Australia’, which is often unrelatable to most educators and future educators in the current higher education system. Campbell (2000) argues that to effectively educate a culturally diverse society, a culturally diverse teaching team is a ‘necessity’ (p. 383). Similarly, Gayton (2019) who examines the overlaps between internationalisation and the WP agendas in higher education institutions asserts that ‘diversity’ is often employed reductively, consequently conflating students into homogenous groups, often based on ethnicity or nationality. He highlights the significant overlaps observed between internationalisation and WP agendas and the challenges faced by international and non-traditional students, and therefore argues that universities should provide more holistic support for both international and non-traditional students to promote diversity in higher education. Gibson et al. (2016) thus contend that ‘diversity’, and its use by institutions for marketing, the provision of support and the identification of ‘non-traditional’ and ‘at risk’ students, needs to be carefully reconsidered to avoid any negative impacts, including disempowerment, stereotyping, exposing and disconnecting students. Apart from that, David (2012) problematises the current policy discourse surrounding diversity, which has moved away from equity or equality towards social mobility, with selective evidence base used to make arguments and develop an instrumental focus on jobs.

In line with the contested understandings of social inclusion as a policy driver/ discourse, what social inclusion means for pedagogy appears to be taken up in various and varying ways. However, Keevers & Aboudha (2012) offer an encompassing definition for the pedagogic context, one that goes beyond the (common) focus on the student. They contend that social inclusion is the dynamic interplay between *respect, recognition, redistribution, representation, voice, belonging* and *connectedness*. These seven elements are well represented in the literature that examines inclusivity in the teaching context. For example, there is a strong thread of argument for recognition, respecting and valuing of the diversity of the student body in the contemporary academy (for example, Gale, 2011b; Benson et al., 2012; Cocks & Stokes, 2013; Gale & Mills, 2013; Daddow, Moraitis & Carr, 2013; McKay & Devlin, 2015; Burke et al., 2016). Being aware of the diversity in the teaching environment “opens dialogue between students and teachers and actively informs teaching, resulting in inclusive practice” (Cocks & Stokes, 2013: 28). For Gale & Mills (2013) an inclusive teaching environment needs to be transformative, in the sense that it can challenge normative assumptions and deficits, and instead valorise heterogeneity in terms of the students themselves, but also their practices, capitals, languages and knowledges. Similarly, there is a related body of work that attends to the importance of feeling a sense of belonging and connection to studies, peers and university (Day & Nolde, 2009; Nelson, Creagh & Clarke, 2009; Rubin, 2012; Rahman, 2013; Wrench et al., 2013; Burke et al., 2016). Methodologically, there is a strong commitment to qualitative, rich and nuanced research in this literature, with issues related to voice and representation often explicitly unpacked and the position of students – often from marginalised groups – given prominence. Epistemologically, this commitment privileges the knowledges that students have, and demonstrates a resistance to the normative reliance on the knowledge of the ‘expert’ (researcher) by building on the emic perspectives gathered through in-depth interviews and focus groups.

The notion of diversity in pedagogy also appears to be taken up in various ways in the literature. Murray (2016) focuses on the linguistic dimension of diversity, arguing that increased student diversity requires higher education staff to ‘accommodate to their students, rather than impose their own lingua-cultural values and associated expectations’(p. 175) in teaching. Murray (2016) therefore suggests that intercultural competence to be a compulsory aspect of training and development for educators in higher education institutions. Apart from that, Snowball and McKenna (2017) explore the use of student-generated content (SGC) to facilitate teaching for diversity in universities. The study examined the use of student-generated podcasts as a way of harnessing the diversity of student experiences in an Economic class of nearly 600 first year students at a South African university. Findings from the study suggest that a majority of the students perceived SGC to be a positive experience in their course. 66% of the podcast creators agreed that content creation was an ‘interesting way to learn’, while 50% of the podcast viewers agreed or strongly agreed that watching videos created by fellow coursemates was ‘a fun way to learn economics’ (p. 611). The authors thus conclude that SGC, such as the student-generated podcasts can provide opportunities to support teaching for diversity by including students in the community of knowledge creators, rather than positioning them as outsiders who are passive receivers of knowledge controlled and mediated by their educators (Snowball & McKenna, 2017). On the other hand, Haggis (2006), identifies five areas of curriculum and pedagogy that impedes the support for diversity in higher education institutions: students lack of familiarity with academic practices and conventions in higher education, the incongruence between pedagogy and the wide range of motives and types of student engagement, student understanding of the orientation of the varying disciplines at university, students’ different understandings about language use and communication and the nature of process in the varying disciplines. Haggis (2016) therefore argues that these five alienating areas should be considered and revised to ensure more effective teaching for diversity, and resist ‘transmission’ pedagogies in the higher education system (p. 530). In addition, Testa & Egan (2014), who explored the higher education experiences of students from diverse backgrounds argue against the ‘traditional, individualistic teaching and learning pedagogy taught exclusively through the lens of a Western paradigm’ (p. 240), which could lead to a significant disadvantage for CALD students throughout their undergraduate studies. Hence, they suggest an examination of the current curriculum, and consequently challenge curriculum designers and educators to integrate the perspectives and experiences of CALD students in the curriculum, therefore offering ‘alternative voices’ in the comprehension and use of theories and practice in higher education (p. 240).

However, for social inclusion in education, there are threads of concern weaved throughout the literature about how the elements listed above are taken up in practice. Briguglio (2011) cautions against engaging in debates about inclusive education without also reflexively unpacking what it means and who it is for. She argues that “the term [inclusive education] itself, even with the best intentions, reflects a standpoint of ‘we’ (the knowing, the mainstream, the powerful) including ‘them’ (the needy, the different, the disadvantaged). To maintain that one is teaching an ‘inclusive’ curriculum smacks, even if unwittingly, of cultural imperialism” (p.321) and it can be seen as “hegemony masquerading as equity and democracy” (p.321). For Keevers & Aboudha (2012), this manifests in the (reductive) focus on the products of teaching, rather than the process. They advocate for “an alternative, expanded, conception of social inclusion as situated, engaged, relational, ongoing *practices* rather than end-state orientated” (A-42). For Thomas (2014), the problem lies in the absence of an articulation of a coherent, university-wide strategy in his institution to address the teaching and learning challenges and opportunities of a more socially diverse cohort (p.812). The lack of examples of coordinated and whole-of-institution pedagogies as described in the case present by Thomas (2014) could be explained by disciplinary and organisational disconnections that can occur in large institutions like universities, but others have argued that the oppressive dominance of neoliberal logics are to blame (Pearce & Down, 2011). Similarly, for Gale (2011b), assumptions made about the homogeneity of the student body impede the possibilities of inclusive teaching; he argues that in order to move forward, institutions need to understand that *all* students bring “assets” to university (p.679), rather than working from deficit positions that assume non-traditional students are lacking (see also Gale & Mills, 2013). Burke et al. (2016) found that students are often aware of how deficit framings impact on perceptions of their capacity to learn, and this can be made worse by teachers’ expectations about students’ dispositions to learning, resulting in the misrecognition of students ‘lacking capability’. They argue that while inclusive pedagogic environments offer the optimum conditions for developing students’ confidence, universities need to support teachers to develop these pedagogies.

There are plenty of examples in the literature that respond to the need identified by Burke et al. (2016), albeit many of these are reports of individual responses rather than the coordinated, whole-of-institution response that Thomas (2014) identified as absent in his institution (for example, Benson et al., 2012; Francis & Mills, 2012; O’Shea et al., 2016). Others have offered guidance on how to more comprehensively embed inclusive pedagogies into the core business of higher education. One example from Gale & 2 (2013) suggests that the conditions which facilitate such practices require a counter-hegemonic epistemological shift, so that students’ home discourses, knowledges and languages are not replaced by academic discourses and practices, but rather these academic ways of being, knowing and doing are added to students’ repertoires. They suggest that without shifting away from dominant, normative notions about teaching and learning – ways that resonate with Freire’s (1970) characterisation of the ‘banking model’ of teaching – the project of inclusive education will be difficult to achieve. According to Gale & Mills, the pedagogical challenge is not changing the students, but instead “transforming the capital that counts: equipping students with academic skills and competencies that make up the cultural capital valued by dominant groups while contesting the disempowering effects of the hegemonic curriculum by embracing the notion of multiple knowledges that are equally valid” (2013: 13-14). Thomas’ (2014) proposal to use ‘Universal Design for Learning’ could be one way of developing a more coordinated approach to socially inclusive pedagogies in a way that removes responsibility from (often casual and/or untrained) teachers; “What this does is shift the burden of being flexible and responsive from the student to the curriculum and its designers” (p.813).

Another example of overarching principles to guide more socially inclusive education is offered in Nelson, Creagh & Clarke’s (2009) report of their ALTC-funded research, which was designed to review ‘Monitor Student Learning Engagement’ (MSLE) initiatives. From heir review of social justice oriented literature, they identified five principles that should be used to guide MSLE program design: self-determination, rights, access, equity, and participation. Nelson, Creagh & Clarke advocate for more participatory approaches, so that students are able to participate in program design, enactment and evaluation, as well as having the opportunity to make informed decisions about their individual participation in the program (‘self-determination’). Students should also be treated with dignity and have their backgrounds recognised (‘rights’) within programs that act as active and impartial channels to institutional resources and activities (‘access’), and help with interpreting the complex and unfamiliar codes and conventions of academia (‘equity’). Similar to the principles espoused by Gale & Mills (2013), their guiding factors come from the idea that it is institutional culture that needs to change, rather than students having to adapt to the discourses of the academy.

However, a significant barrier to enacting these principles is identified in O’Shea, Onsman & McKay (2011). Their research explored the perceptions and understandings of university staff in terms of how they perceive their role in relation to social inclusion. From the data collected through surveying 272 staff members, O’Shea, Onsman & McKay found (unsurprisingly) that there was strong support for the notion of inclusive teaching, with the majority of respondents agreeing that it is ‘essential to higher education’ and constitutes the ‘basics of good teaching’, although there was also cynicism reported regarding how deeply this could be embedded, and concern expressed about adding to their workload. This finding is echoed in Chapman, Mangion & Buchanan’s (2015) paper. Their research into staff members’ perspectives on how equity is instantiated in institutional mission statements suggests that despite reading positive messages, “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). This sense of not enacting the professed equity/ inclusive practices enshrined in institutional policy documents serves to undermine the possibilities of inclusive and equitable higher education; as Pearce & Down (2011) contend, “When academics do not recognise the potentially exclusionary impact of their pedagogies and thus fail to engage in a relationship that can provide support when it is needed, they may unconsciously perpetuate existing social inequalities” (p.492).

 Another significant finding in O’Shea, Onsman & McKay (2011) was the significant diversity in staff responses regarding who holds responsibility for inclusivity: 22 comments suggested that teachers have responsibility, while 28 claimed that responsibility lies outside of the remit of teaching role. O’Shea, Onsman & McKay argue that this is particularly problematic in the context of increasing casualisation of the teaching workforce. They make the case that casual staff rarely get paid for the kinds of practices that assist with enacting institutional cultural change, and have limited (if any) access to the resources that are necessary, such as payment for extra time or access to rooms to offer face-to-face time to students. O’Shea, Onsman & McKay (2011) argue that without having a sense of inclusion or job security themselves, it is problematic to expect casual staff to enact inclusive practices and pedagogies; they ask: “how can staff make others feel included when they feel excluded?” (2011: 11). The work presented in Pearce & Down (2011) foregrounds how important relationship building is to developing inclusive pedagogies; this is certainly impeded when the teacher is paid on a sessional basis and has no access to university communication services (such as email or the virtual learning environment) when the semester has finished. There are certainly no answers offered to the question posed by O’Shea, Onsman & McKay (2011) in the literature reviewed; however, Martin’s (2015) discussion of scale and critical pedagogy suggests that activist-scholars (presumably permanent staff with the agency and legitimacy to advocate for students and casual colleagues) have the choice to either resist the status quo through engaging with horizontalist critical pedagogies, or conforming through ignoring the conditions that allow inequality -for students and staff-to continue.

### On the other hand, in terms of teaching for diversity, there is a considerable amount of literature on the principles for supporting an agenda of diversity in higher education. Benson et al. (2012), who explored how students from diverse backgrounds succeed in higher education, assert that the ‘conceptualisation of student experience needs to be broadened to include students from diverse backgrounds to acknowledge diversity and heterogeneity in student population’, as students from non-traditional backgrounds are not likely to have access to the physical and emotional resources available to their other peers in universities. Their findings suggest that factors influencing the success of non-traditional students in higher education include planning (financial and personal), time management, change in circumstances and sources of support (Benson et al., 2012). In addition, Cook-Sather et al. (2018) foregrounds student input as a significant component in the dialogue about diversity in higher education. Based on their findings on the impact of the ‘Advocating Diversity in Higher Education’ undergraduate course in multiple institutions, they contend that universities must consider ‘the intersecting positions that comprise student identities’ (p. 384) to inform pedagogical practice and student learning. Kruse et al. (2012) however emphasises the importance of developing organisational characteristics and conditions that support cultural competency in higher education institutions, as they argue that well-meaning attention to cultural competence alone is insufficient to support sustained and successful effort. The conditions outlined to support a strong cultural competency agenda include the provision of time to meet, learn and process new learning, time to monitor, evaluate and refine processes and practices across the campus, communications structures that support the work of cultural competency, a climate of trust and openness to improvement and learning, supportive leadership and access to expertise designed to support new individual and organisational learning (Kruse et al., 2012). Apart from that, Towsend (2010), who investigated how mature students experience barriers in accessing, progressing and succeeding at university, contends that universities need to consider the principle of ‘andragogy’, as adult learning programs should ‘adhere to well-informed adult learning principles’ (p. 335).

### Support for inclusive teaching and diversity

The operationalisation of the critiques of normative pedagogies, and the guiding principles for socially inclusive education offered by Gale & Mills (2013) and Nelson, Creagh & Clarke (2009) as discussed above, need to be facilitated by pedagogies and support mechanisms. Pearce & Down (2011) contend that to engage in relational pedagogy, interaction between staff and students (in lectures, tutorials, informal interactions, feedback on assessed work) is fundamental to the development of rapport and for lecturers to create a sense of approachability. For Thomas, the ethos encapsulated in the notion of ‘relational pedagogy’ could be achieved through embedding learning and studies support within the curriculum, rather than locating support outside the disciplines or in centralised spaces. Ultimately, much of the literature argues for understandings and assumptions that drive ‘student experience’ supports need to be broadened to serve the needs of a diverse and heterogeneous study body (e.g. Gale, 2011b; Benson et al., 2012; Gale & Mills, 2013). There is evidence presented in the literature that strongly suggests that current forms of support offered in universities is not designed with ‘non-traditional’ students in mind. The work presented in Tones et al. (2009) suggests that for mature age students at least, support services are inadequate because they are not available at times that suit the responsibilities and resulting lifestyles of students who have families, caring responsibilities or other such commitments on their time. For Benson et al. (2012), without an expanded conceptualisation of the student body, there will continue to be a lack of parity in the way that supports work for different groups of students. They argue that, “…students from non-traditional backgrounds are less likely to have access to physical and emotional resources to assist them to cope with difficult situations. For example, they frequently lack role models with higher educational qualifications to provide psychological support. Thus, there is stronger likelihood that contextual factors will have an impact on their study performance, or even their continuation of study” (p.24). Although this framing linguistically speaks partially into the deficit discourse, there is also recognition here that different students have differing needs and therefore require differentiated forms of support.

In contrast, Carpenter, Dearlove & Marland’s (2015) investigation of the study strategies that students bring to higher education, offers a contradictory picture, at least on the surface. Their data, collected through using questionnaires based on the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI), suggests that many students entered their programs without the strategies, skills and attitudes necessary (according to LASSI) for success, irrespective of age, gender, SES or ATAR. This therefore suggests that the entire student cohort starting an undergraduate degree would benefit from academic support, although this study does not specifiy what that support might look like. However, Carpenter, Dearlove & Marland’s work does have an implications for equity in higher education. They argue that on the basis that older/ more research-intensive universities are less likely to admit ‘educationally disadvantaged students’, the impetus is on younger, regional universities “to channel funds and effort into meeting the challenges of the Bradley agenda” (p.295). However, this recommendation does not address inequities in terms of how funding for equity work is distributed across the sector. Chapman, Mangion & Buchanan’s (2015) central argument is pertinent here. Their analysis of a case study of how equity is “translated into action” in one university, suggests that without commensurate resources to support student retention and support, conflict is created between the economic and equity aspects of widening participation (p.13). It is this, they argue, that underpins practitioners’ struggles with and against the neoliberal logics that drive policy and practice around equity.

Despite these challenges, there are examples of strategies, initiatives and pedagogies specifically designed to support the project of socially inclusive education. In the Indigenous context, the importance of Indigenous centres is a recurrent theme (e.g. Asmar, Page & Radloff, 2015; Bunda, Zipin & Brennan, 2012; Day & Nolde, 2009). Other initiatives reported on in the literature include the use of Facebook as a point of connection, belonging and networking for pre-tertiary bridging students at the University of Southern Queensland (Ryan & Hopkins, 2013), residential support at La Trobe University (Burge, 2012), financial support at Swinburne University (Carson, 2010).

Similarly, the literature also highlights interventions and strategies to promote diversity in universities. Ross (2014) explores the dynamics of intergroup interaction and democratic learning outcomes among self-identified Black and White students enrolled in two sections of a university diversity education course within a predominantly White university in southeastern United States. Findings from the study suggest that democratisation through socially just education can be achieved via the presence of a critical mass of diverse students in a higher education learning environment, the facilitation of conflict to allow for coalition-building and the blending of diverse and previously unaffiliated groups of students to promote participatory democracy (Ross, 2014). Besides that, Hatton (2012) examines two ‘diversity initiatives’ for Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students in two English universities, to reflect and ‘consider curriculum change and intervention, in supporting the collective insights of *all* students’ (p. 35). The findings suggest that the tutors often lacked confidence in creating change, which may hinder curriculum development (Hatton, 2012). Hatton thus asserts that in most Western contexts, the curriculum is predominantly Eurocentric and is ‘fixed’ by tutors ‘anxiously repeating’ courses (p. 41). Hatton’s recommendations for the implementation of interventions to support diversity are thus as follows: Using cross-faculty knowledge and individual research expertise, along with practical steps to ensure that students feel safe to express their ideas around subjects, recognising the institutional power in facilitating or limiting curricular and cultural transformation, and to look in on the nine questions offered (p.48-9) which probe the ontological and epistemological foundations and assumptions of a course, subject or discipline.

**References**

Archer, L. (2007). Diversity, equality and higher education: a critical reflection on the ab/uses of equity discourse within widening participation, *Teaching in Higher Education,* 12(5-6), 635–653.

Armstrong, D.; Armstrong, A.; & Spandgou, I. (2011). Inclusion: by choice or by chance?, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 15(1), 29–39.

Asmar, C.; Page, S.; & Radloff, A. (2015). Exploring anomalies in Indigenous student engagement: findings from a national Australian survey of undergraduates, *Higher Education Research & Development,* 34(1), 15–29.

Benson, R.; Heagney, M.; Hewitt, L.; Crosling, G.; & Devos, A. (2012). Social inclusion and the student experience: what are the implications for academic support?, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 14(2), 11–28.

Bowl, M. (2018). Differentiation, distinction and equality – or diversity? The language of the marketised university: an England, New Zealand comparison, *Studies in Higher Education,* 43(4), 671–688.

Briguglio, C. (2011). Quality and the English language question: is there really an issue in Australian universities? *Quality in Higher Education*, 17(3), 317–329.

Brennan, J. & Osborne, M. (2008). Higher education’s many diversities: of students, institutions and experiences; and outcomes?, *Research Papers in Education,* 23(2), 179–190.

Bunda, T.; Zipin, L.; Brennan, M. (2012). Negotiating university ‘equity’ from Indigenous standpoints: a shaky bridge, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 16(9), 941–957.

Burge, L. (2012). Infinite possibilities: exploring opportunities for non-traditional students to become global citizens, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 13, 6–18.

Burke, P.J.; Bennett, A.; Burgess, C.; Gray, K.; & Southgate, E. (2016). *Capability, Belonging and Equity in Higher Education: Developing Inclusive Approaches*. University of Newcastle.

Carpenter, J.; Dearlove, J.; Marland, J. (2015). Student skills and the Bradley agenda in Australia, *Higher Education Research & Development,* 34(2), 284–297.

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.

Cocks, T. & Stokes, J. (2013). Policy into practice: a case study of widening participation in Australian higher education, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 15(1), 22–38.

Cook-Sather, A.; Des-Ogugua, C.; & Bahti, M. (2018). Articulating identities and analyzing belonging: a multistep intervention that affirms and informs a diversity of students, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(3), 374–389.

Crozier, G.; Reay, D.; Clayton, J.; Colliander, L.; & Grinstead, J. (2008). Different strokes for different folks: diverse students in diverse institutions – experiences of higher education, *Research Papers in Education*, 23(2), 167–177.

Daddow, A.; Moraitis, P.; & Carr, A. (2013). Non-traditional students in tertiary education: inter-disciplinary collaboration in curriculum and pedagogy in community services education in Australia, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 17(5), 480–489.

David, M. (2012). Changing Policy Discourses on Equity and Diversity in UK Higher Education: What Is The Evidence?. In Hinton-Smith, T. (ed), *Widening Participation in Higher Education: Casting the Net Wide?.* Palgrave MacMillan: Basingstoke, pp.22–36.

Day, D. & Nolde, R. (2009). Arresting the decline in Australian indigenous representation at university Student experience as a guide, *Equal Opportunities International,* 28(2), 135–161.

Devlin, M. & O’Shea, H. (2012). Effective university teaching: views of Australian university students from low socio-economic status backgrounds, *Teaching in Higher Education,* 17(4), 385–397.

Francis, B. & Mills, M. (2012). What would a socially just education system look like?, *Journal of Education Policy,* 27(5), 577–585.

Gale, T. (2011b) 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. & Mills, C. (2013). Creating Spaces in Higher Education for Marginalised Australians: Principles for Socially Inclusive Pedagogies, *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*, 5(2), 7–19.

Gayton, A. (2019). Exploring the widening participation-internationalisation nexus: evidence

from current theory and practice, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2019.1678014

Gibson, S.; Baskerville, D.; Perry, A.; Black, A.; Norris, K. & Symeonidou, S. (2016).

‘Diversity’, ‘Widening Participation’ and ‘Inclusion’ in Higher Education: An international study, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 18(3), 7–33.

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.

Haggis, T. (2006). Pedagogies for diversity: retaining critical challenge amidst fears of ‘dumbing down’, *Studies in Higher Education,* 31(5), 521–535.

Hatton, K. (2012). Considering diversity, change and intervention: how the higher education curriculum looked in on itself, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 13(Special Issue), 34–50.

Keevers, L. & Aboudha, P. (2012). Social Inclusion as an unfinished verb: A practice-based approach. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 6(2), A42–59.

Kent, M. (2016). *Access and Barriers to Online Education for People with Disabilities.* Report submitted to the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE), Curtin University: Perth.

Klinger, C. & Murray, N. (2012). Tensions in higher education: widening participation, student diversity and the challenge of academic language/ literacy, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, 14(1), 27–44.

Kruse, S., Rakha, S. & Calderone, S. (2017). Developing cultural competency in higher

education: an agenda for practice, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(6), 733-750. DOI:

10.1080/13562517.2017.1414790

Martin, G. (2015). Scaling critical pedagogy in higher education, *Critical Studies in Education*, 58(1), 1-18. DOI:10.1080/17508487.2015.1115417.

McKay, J. & Devlin, M. (2015). ‘Low income doesn’t mean stupid and destined for failure’: challenging the deficit discourse around students from low SES backgrounds in higher education, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 20(4), 347–363.

Murray, N. (2016). Dealing with diversity in higher education: awareness-raising on teachers’ intercultural competence, *International Journal for Academic Development,* 21(3), 166–177.

Nelson, K.; Creagh, T., & Clarke, J. (2009). Social justice and equity in the higher education context. Literature analysis and synthesis: Development of a set of social justice principles. OLT.

O’Shea, H.; Onsman, A.; McKay, J. (2011). *Students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds in higher education: An annotated bibliography 2000–2011*. Higher Education Research Group (HERG): Deakin Australia.

O’Shea, S.; Lysaght, P.; Roberts, J.; & Harwood, V. (2016). Shifting the blame in higher education – social inclusion and deficit discourses, *Higher Education Research & Development,* 35(2), 322–336.

Pearce, J. & Down, B. (2011). Relational pedagogy for student engagement and success at university, *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(4), 483–494.

Rahman, K. (2013). Belonging and learning to belong in school: the implications of the hidden curriculum for indigenous students. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(5), 660–672.

Ross, S. (2014). Diversity and intergroup contact in higher education: exploring possibilities for democratization through social justice education, *Teaching in Higher Education,* 19(8), 870–881.

Rubin, M. (2012). Social Class Differences in Social Integration Among Students in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis and Recommendations for Future Research, *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(1), 22–38.

Ryan, N. & Hopkins, S. (2013). Combining social media and career development learning: An intensive tertiary preparation programme for disadvantaged youth, *Australian Journal of Career Development,* 22(3), 107–111.

Snowball, J.D. & McKenna, S. (2017). Student-generated content: an approach to harnessing the power of diversity in higher education, *Teaching in Higher Education,* 22(5), 604–618.

Testa, D. & Egan, R. (2014). Finding voice: the higher education experiences of students from diverse backgrounds, *Teaching in Higher Education,* 19(3), 229–241.

Thomas, G. (2014). Closing the policy-practice gap for low-SES students in higher education: the pedagogical challenge, *Higher Education Research & Development,* 33(4), 807–820.

Tones, M.; Fraser, J.; Elder, R.; & White, K. (2009). Supporting mature-aged students from a low socioeconomic background, *Higher Education,* 58, 505–529.

Townsend, R. (2010). Developing 21st Century Diverse Adult Learning: Rural and regional student access, Progression and Success in Higher Education, *The International Journal of Learning,* 17(2), 329–341.

Wrench, A.; Hammond, C.; McCallum, F.; & Price, D. (2013). Inspire to aspire: raising aspirational outcomes through a student well-being curricular focus, *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 17(9), 932–947.

**Equity and Higher Education Annotated Bibliography Series**

**Inclusive Teaching for Equity and Diversity in Higher Education**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Citation** | **Annotation** |
| Archer, L. (2007). [Diversity, equality and higher education: a critical reflection on the ab/uses of equity discourse within widening participation](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562510701595325), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 12(5-6), 635–653.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Examines how rhetoric of diversity = mobilised in New Labour/ English HE WP policy. Paper set post-Dearing England (with 50% WP targets). Examines how diversity = “are employed, deployed, subverted and reconfigured within WP policy” (p.637) – ‘perniciously’ elided with choice (institutional diversity; which university students choose to go to = marketised sector) and ‘social inclusion’ (student diversity) = key notions in New Labour’s reforms of HE: “these constructions of diversity derive an important element of their symbolic power from an association with notions of ‘democratisation’, ‘equality’ and ‘fairness’” (p.636).**Aim:** To offer a ‘think piece’ for discussion of contested discourse of ‘diversity’ and the differing/competing ideologies it indexes**Theoretical frame:** Instantiations of discourse of diversity as enactments of egalitarian and neoliberal ideologies**Methodology:** ‘Think piece’/ essay, drawing on HE policy documents and public messages about WP**Findings:** 1) ‘Institutional diversity’ = Archer notes universities were invited to identify/ position themselves in market according to three-part distinctions (“a benign trinity”, p.638): research, teaching, and locally-oriented universities. Archer argues this is based on intention to further fraction relationships between research and teaching, and further stratifies the system and is achieved through the use of ‘diversity of provision’ (aka choice). Archer distinguishes between horizontal diversity (plurality of options = appeals to ‘customers’ needs’; couched in terms of ‘individualisation’ with expansion of system beyond university, e.g. FE or Foundation degrees) and vertical diversity (stratification of institutions based on notion of ‘quality’: “encouraging institutions to respond,innovate and improve to ensure their survival”, p.639. Targeted funding as rewards rather than equal funding across the sector). Horizontal and vertical diversity = “inherently conflictual” (p.639). Stratification of ‘gold, silver and bronze’ institutions (the benign trinity) = linked to hierarchies of geography/ geographies of power (gold= global; bronze = local; gold= older, research-intensive; bronze = newer, former polytechnics). Bronze universities = positioned as heavy lifters for social inclusion/ WP work: “rendered fixed and disempowered in order to liberate ‘silver’ and ‘gold’ institutions from the economic and social responsibilities of engaging in the (‘real’ work of) WP. The task of WP is not shared out equally between all HEIs” (p.641) = clearing institutions rather than institutions of choice – notes Bauman’s argument about individuals’ social value being derived from consumption patterns.2) Student diversity = “fundamental dissonance” between equitable diversity and economic diversity. New Labour policy privileges the latter (Mirza, 2003) = e.g. ‘untapped potential’ for national economic future gain. Economic diversity argument depends on neoliberal logics – to push responsibility on to individuals; to erode the responsibility of the state. Institutional/ sectorial hierarchies play out in student diversity: “the formalisation of institutional hierarchies (e.g., through league tables) has a detrimental impact on the ‘choices’ and psyche’s of those students who are constituted as the targets of WP policy” (p.644). Similarly the ‘value’ of a degree “also becomes more highly differentiated and potentially devalued”. The dominant cultural norms of the academy remain white, middle class and male therefore many students feel disconnected from higher education. Archer also makes the point that ‘diversity’ is used as a moral discourse as “operates as a powerful justificatory discourse within policy as something that signifies ‘good for everyone’ rather than just ‘good for some’” (p.648). It is so apparently benign and ‘good’ that it silences other interpretations, thus “render[ing] those who resist it unintelligible or morally reprehensible” (p.648).**Core argument:** Archer argues that notions of diversity are aligned/ draw their symbolic power from notion of equality, but that possibilities for potential of WP = eroded by neoliberal policies of New Labour ‘third way’ politics. She argues that the market cannot provide social equity – New Labour policies continued to disproportionately advantage the middle classes while providing a suggestion of egalitarianism and pushing more of the cost of higher education on to the individual. The notion of choice is a false premise because the social stratification of the sector limits students’ ‘choices’ about where they can study. |
| 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.AUSAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *globalisation; development; international; inclusive education* | **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) |
| Banerjee, P. A. (2018). [Widening participation in higher education with a view to implementing institutional change](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603108.2018.1441198), *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 22(3), 75-81, DOI: 10.1080/13603108.2018.1441198 UK Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Widening participation; higher education; policy; disadvantage*  | **Context:** Set in the context of an on-going WP agenda in the UK, where there is a call for ‘increased access, participation and success in HE for under-represented groups’ (p. 75) (HE Green Paper, 2016). Authors argue that WP ‘is not a one step process’ (p. 75), where targeted efforts will be required through an under-represented student’s HE trajectory (pre-entry to further study/employment). **Aim:** To reflect on the barriers students face to participate in HE, the measures taken by some Universities to overcome these barriers, and to critically evaluate these measures. **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** Essay. **Discussion:** 1)Factors impeding the progress & success of non-traditional students: a)Uninformed decisions & choices dictated by life chances – low SES students & FinF learners may be unaware of benefits of HE, or have difficulties convincing family regarding the benefits of HE respectively, other students who might be affected: children in care, mature-age students & refugees/asylum seekers; b)Low prior attainment – HE participation gap in England appears to be more influenced by students’ socio-economic status: Students from low SES backgrounds obtain lower attainment at the end of Key Stages 4 & 5 (Chowdry et al., 2013; Crawford, 2012); c) Qualification routes – non-traditional students often lack required information, resulting in choice of courses/qualification routes based on instinct or peer groups; d)Financial considerations – cost appears to be the ultimate determinant of students’ access of university; bursary support available does not completely mitigate financial barriers of students; 2)The role of HEIs – ‘raising aspirations and educational attainment’ (p. 76) among non-traditional prospective students; providing targeted support to ensure retention rates of students; partnering with schools & sixth form or FE colleges to encourage diversity of the student population in HE; 3)The role of HEFCE & OFFA – a) Two main strategic aims – i) building on the progress already made to increase the participation in HE of students from more disadvantaged communities; ii) ensuring that social background does not inhibit access, success and progression within HE and beyond (HEFCE 2017); b)HEFCE contribution to the aims – allocation of ‘non-mainstream’ funds to universities & colleges; analysis of data to enhance understanding on issues & concerns surround WP & the targeted cohorts; participation of local areas (POLAR), which classifies local areas in the UK according to the number of the younger population (aged 18/19) who participate in HE is another form of analysis to identify young participation in HE; authors argue that although the HEFCE & OFFA are responsible to ensure that students are given the right opportunities to succeed, a ‘greater role is played by Universities’ (p. 77) in ensuring this; 4)Addressing equality & diversity – a) Earlier intervention: 3 main types of intervention to: i)improve academic achievement of poorer students; ii)increased probability of these students applying & succeeding in enrolling in HE; iii) provide support within & beyond HE; however the appropriate point of providing intervention is often debated; importance of school-university partnerships to raise achievement of underprivileged children; b)Outreach – engagement of universities with prospective non-traditional students, their families, teachers & career counsellors via initiatives to raise awareness & inspirations; Important to ensure that ‘one size may not fit all’ in providing interventions (p. 79); c)Increasing access – not merely confined to well-qualified students from underprivileged backgrounds/women, but all students who can benefit from HE; indicators to identify students – background indicators (postcode of residence, eligibility for free school meals, participation of local areas), FinF in HE, disability & ethnic minority status (DfE, 2016), index of multiple deprivation (IMD); d)Contextualised admissions – contextual data is widely employed in making decisions on undergraduate admissions (opportunities & circumstances of the applicant’s education); issues with contextualised admissions: uncertainty of institutions regarding their selection of indicators, their respective reliability & validity of use, and ‘developing justifiable contextual admission policies’ (p. 79); e)Beyond admissions – student support programs should extend beyond admissions, and should include the provision of ‘tailored study support until the student transitions into the labour market’ (p. 79) (eg: provision of term time accommodation/connecting students to role models in HE community); f)Encouraging self and third-party evaluations – should be included in the planning stage of the intervention to produce ‘high quality causal evidence of impact’ (p. 80). **Core argument:** Increasing and widening access to a variety of courses at the university should be supported throughout a student life cycle (HEFCE, 2017). Apart from making contextualised offers, ‘programme support, retention or success in undergraduate courses and beyond are equally important’ (p. 80).  |
| Barnett, P. (2011). [Discussions across difference: addressing the affective dimensions of teaching diverse students about diversity](https://www.studynet1.herts.ac.uk/ltic.nsf/0/EEA726D5D15F5CBE8025804B004A236D/%24FILE/Discussions%20across%20difference%20addressing%20the%20affective%20dimensions%20of%20teaching%20diverse%20students%20about%20diversity.pdf), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 16(6), 669–679.USAAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity; pedagogy; trust; discussion; affective dimension* | **Context:** Examines issues of affect and trust in teaching and learning in US undergraduate contexts. Starts with autobiographical account of her experiences (diversity on racial lines)**Aim:** To discuss “missed opportunities for promoting learning and growth in our increasingly diverse classrooms and the fundamental affective and social questions we need to address if we’ re going to teach about diversity effectively” (p.670). **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** Literature review on impact of diversity, social science research on the impact of trust, and psychoanalytic literature on how we respond to and negotiate difference**Findings:** Thematic organisations of discussion:Universities across the world are more diverse (student bodies)Structural prejudices reside in the psycheBarriers to trust in higher education classroom: “without trust, diverse students will skate on the surface, maintain their social masks, and avoid productive conflict” (p.673-4) = ‘classroom cordiality’ (Keith, 2010) leads to avoidance of difficult conversations. Barriers to trust involve initiation of conversations, fear of confrontation, trusting people to speak real feelings. Author draws on work of Rojzman and argues that to build trust, a psychological notion of trust is needed (rather than ‘strategies’) “people must become aware of their own distrust, fears and needs in ways that lead them to change themselves. They might decide to protect themselves or to deliberately trust others not to take advantage of their vulnerability” (p.675)**Core argument:** “When we address the emotional and affective dimensions in higher education settings, we go against the grain of the modern university” (p.677). |
| Benson, R.; Heagney, M.; Hewitt, L.; Crosling, G.; & Devos, A. (2012). Social inclusion and the student experience: what are the implications for academic support?, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 14(2), 11–28.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity; social inclusion; student experience; student support.* | **Context:** Explores experiences of students from diverse backgrounds, conceptualisations of whom “render them as disadvantaged compared with ‘traditional’ school leaver students” (p.12). Positioned against backdrop of Bradley Review and 20/40 reforms. Social inclusion = “the processes or actions taken to ameliorate the impact of problems of disadvantage and/or to counter the processes that create them” (p.13). Scopes literature to illustrate student body is diversifying**Aim:** To highlight how students from diverse backgrounds succeed in higher education**Theoretical frame:** Draws on phenomenographical/ constructivist viewpoints but no explicit conceptual frame offered**Methodology:** 3-stage project (longitudinal) – focusing on pathways in, how they were managing and reflections on experiences post-completion. Narrative inquiry. Interview 1 = 16 students (9 = off campus, 7 = on campus); interview 2 = 13 students. 5 in 40s, 11 in 20s or 30s. 3 = NESB**Findings:** *Planning*Financial planning important to prepare for study = 7 reorganised work; 4 reorganised family finances. Unpaid work placements needed particular planning Personal planning (drawing on previous study experiences, improving English for 2/3 NESB.12 managed multiple demands: 8 = paid work; 7 = children/caring responsibilities; 5 = voluntary commitments.*Managing time*Organisations emphasised. 15 had dedicated study areas/ 8 = developed work schedules. 4 benefitted from flexibility of off-campus study*Changes in circumstances*All experienced changes and challenges: mentions language/ ‘academic skills’ (p.20), lack of understanding from friends/family/ off-campus difficulties/ isolation/ balancing childcareSources of supportAll = family; 10 = partner; 7 = parental; 5 = friends outside course. Also supportive peer support; important to find similar friends for international students. 8 = received support from academic staff. “Limited support was sought from other university areas, including central university support services… Again, participants usually did not emphasise seeking this support” (p.23)Implications for universities:* Offer flexible study arrangements
* Professional development with focus on social inclusion
* Guidelines for academic support at departmental level
* Advice to families of Gen1 student

**Core argument:** Conceptualisation of student experience needs to be broadened to include students from diverse backgrounds/ to acknowledge diversity and heterogeneity in student population“…students from non-traditional backgrounds are less likely to have access to physical and emotional resources to assist them to cope with difficult situations. For example, they frequently lack role models with higher educational qualifications to provide psychological support. Thus, there is stronger likelihood that contextual factors will have an impact on their study performance, or even their continuation of study” (p.24) |
| 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.UKAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity; equality; university ranking; marketing higher education; language* | **Context:** Examines the impacts of marketization of higher education; author specifically 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 Fairclough 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 buzzwords 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*. |
| Brennan, J. & Osborne, M. (2008). [Higher education’s many diversities: of students, institutions and experiences; and outcomes?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520802048711) *Research Papers in Education,* 23(2), 179–190.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *universities; diversity; student experience; learning outcomes; differentiation; higher education* | **Context:** Works from understanding that there are multiple scales of diversity operating in higher education, drawing on Teichler’s (2007) dichotomous conceptualisation of horizontal and vertical forms of differentiation in higher education (horizontal = program differences, subjects, links with industry; vertical = status and prestige). Paper situated in UK (English) stratified HE system**Aim:** To examine how multiple differences (students and universities) combine to form diverse outcomes and experiences; to “consider how institutional forms of diversity interact with the diversity of the students’ backgrounds… combine to generate differences in student experiences of higher education and whether these different experiences lead to differences in the outcomes of study” (p.180) **Conceptual frame:** Classifies student diversity as inter-related categories: i*mported differences* (demographic issues) – linked to lack of proportional parity; *generated differences* = lifestyle choices/ necessities; *internally generated* = different levels of engagement with in-class and outside learningInstitutional diversity = draws on Bernstein’s concepts of classification and framing of knowledge in curricula – making visible and invisible pedagogies. Also draws on Nespor’s (1994) theory of actor network (space-contingent, space-forming: “The implication for what students learn is connected to the extent to which disciplinescapture students within particular material and social spaces and compress their time” – see p.182)**Methodology:** Mixed methods, longitudinal (broader study = 4 years). Case studies (x 15) of ‘entering’ and ‘exiting’ students in bioscience, business studies and sociology. Analysis differentiated along two lines: extent experience = individual or shared, and extent of diversity within particular courses**Findings:** Acknowledges diversity but analysis points to how “social and organisational factors can combineto shape the collective experiences of students to an important degree” (p.184)Perceives 3 types of experiences of diversity:* Type A: Shared experience and high student diversity (conjecture = “would provide opportunities for learning from difference”)
* Type B: Shared experience and low student diversity (conjecture = “would be more about maintaining difference”)
* Type C: Individualised student experience (conjecture = “would be about living with difference, suggesting the maintenance and construction of multiple identities”) – all p.184

8/15 cases = Type B – reflecting traditional features of HE “relatively low diversity of intakes and reasonably high levels of shared experience of students, typically living away from home for the first time, just having left school and having few commitments outside the university” p.184 = 7/8 cases = pre-1992 universities.7/15 = 3 x Type A; 4 x Type C = only 1 = pre-1992Type B = divided into 2 cases: shared experience by course or by university (latter= 5/8)Type C = typically local, mature age students with home/work commitmentsTrends in student/experience types:Type C = lower self-confidence and less likely to retain university friends after graduation, less likely to feel belonging, most likely to say ‘qualification = main thing’Type B = massively more likely to state connection to institution and perceive ability to get on with range of people, more likely to emphasise ‘life changing’ experience of university studyType A = similar to B but more likely to continue with subject and less likely to see world view as having changed.Similarities in experience:Commonality in top two statements: gains in self-confidence and able to get on with people; diversity in 3rd (see p.187) = for Type C, life outside of university = high importance. Also, rating personal confidence and social networks over academic/ low commitment to subjects = common**Core argument:** Important = “not to view institutional diversity as being completely distinct from student diversity” (p.183) |
| Burke, P.J. (2015). [Re/imagining higher education pedagogies: gender, emotion and difference](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1020782), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 20(4), 388–401.UKAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity, emotion, difference, gender studies, critical pedagogies* | **Context:** In context of globalised neoliberal university and increased influence of individualising, competitive and marketised practices – notes warnings in literature about impact on sense of connectivity and belonging. Emergence of discourses of individualisation silence (pretend they don’t exist) critiques of the constraints/ inequities of class, race, gender etc. Notes discussions of teaching excellence often couched in instrumental terms. Also, participation in HE = gendered and “has led to a reinforcement of the divisions between the rational and the emotional” (p.390) – whereby difference and emotion = conceived as “dangerous forces that require homogenizing and neutralizing via technologies of materialism and through the fixing of socially constructed categories” (p.390). This individualising push = promotes a limited view of identity and “increasingly restricts our pedagogical imagination” (p.391) and being emotional or caring become highly regulated/ controlled by disciplinary technologies [think erosion of possibilities to care with casual staff]. Discusses treatment of ‘diversity’ in HE (as marketing tool, as unproblematic and desirable) as different from ‘difference’**Aim:** To theorise ‘emotional layers of pedagogical identities and experiences’ in contemporary UK HE by examining past work published in TinHE on pedagogies, diversity, difference**Theoretical frame:** Feminist/ Freirean perspectives: misrecognition; **Methodology:** Literature review ofarticles in TinHE that explore feminist pedagogy/ emotion/ difference/ diversity – profiling ‘exemplar papers’; also draws on data from GaP project (see p.393) = participatory methodology etc.**Findings:** Misrecognition and shaming = diverse students (read: different) = “continually at risk of being relocated as ‘undeserving’ and ‘unworthy’ of higher education”… so that “The injuries of misrecognition are embodied, through the internalization of shame, and are tied to the emotional level of experience” (p.394). Feminist reading = shame is deeply connected to gender, class and race and politics of misrecognition (p.394) – see Foucault’s dividing practices (relational, objectifying). Cites Ahmed’s argument that shame is felt in and through body. Response of academy = remedial supports (e.g. study skills) – attached to anxieties about ‘dropping standards’ or being soft - that deny the embodied experience. Draws from Said’s orientalism work re: positioning of ‘Others’ = students who are ‘Other’ = “often characterized then through a range of deficit disorders, including lack of confidence and are positioned by gendered, classed and racialized constructions” (p.397)GaP project data suggests lecturers resist the feminized nurturing, caring role they feel is imposed upon them (e.g. ‘I’m not their mum’ quote on p.395)Key ideas from literature from TinHE:* pedagogy of discomfort (Boler, 1999; Boler & Zembylas, 2002);
* pedagogy of difference and trust (Barnett, 2011);
* emotion as disciplinary technology (Leathwood & Hey, 2009)
* new imaginations of difference (Chawla & Rodriguez, 2007)

**Core argument:** Need to find comfort in discomfort to engage in reflexive practice and build trust in pedagogic relationships – explicit engagement with emotion = importantRisky strategies (of engaging with anxieties, vulnerabilities, im/possibility/s (see Chawla & Rodriguez, 2007:707) = “rich in the promise of engaging students in generative, creative and optimistic ways of re/imagining with and through difference” (p.400). |
| Burke, P.J.; Stevenson, J. & Whelan, P. (2015). [Teaching ‘Excellence’ and Pedagogic Stratification in Higher Education](https://shura.shu.ac.uk/11087/3/Stevenson%20-%20teaching%20%27excellence%27%20and%20pegagogic%20stratification%20in%20HE%200%20published.pdf), *International Studies in Widening Participation*, 2(2), 29–43.UK Annotated by Sally Baker | **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 distinctAnalysis 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). |
| Campbell, A. (2000). [Cultural Diversity: Practising what we preach in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/713699146), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 5(3), 373–384.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Preparing teacher to teach CALD students; multiculturalism and multicultural policies, particularly in higher education settings that are predominantly white and middle class (both students and staff). Author writes of reductive ‘good’ and ‘bad’ notions of diversity that fail to recognise the historic, embodied, entrenched marginalisation that non-white people face in Australia, and which most people learning to be teachers/ teacher educators cannot personally relate to**Aim:** To describe “the human dimension of teamwork as team members plan and implement a multicultural education course for undergraduate teacher education students at an Australian university” (abstract)**Methodology:** ‘Personalised narrative’**Discussion:** Author deliberately convened a multicultural staff for the ‘Diversity in Education’ course that she was convening. All three members co-designed the course; each had an equal say in content, learning outcomes, assessment and delivery strategies. All three gave lectures and tutored; however, the author remained the convenor because she was a tenured staff member, and so she felt uncomfortable with that dynamic. Author offers example of how differences in cultural values played out between teachers (e.g. time keeping/ maintenance of student work). Author notes how tokenistic it is to compile a multicultural team if other deeper, more value-laden factors are not taken into consideration: “We also need to have enough flexibility to accommodate cultural commitments and personal crises in professional timetables which are designed as if such commitments do not exist” (p.380).**Core argument:** “A culturally diverse teaching team is therefore not a token gesture of political correctness, but a necessity for effective education in a culturally diverse society. Our story shows that it can work, but that it is a non-stop learning experience for all concerned which needs constant re-evaluation” (p.383) |
| Carpenter, J.; Dearlove, J.; Marland, J. (2015). [Student skills and the Bradley agenda in Australia](https://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/488/), *Higher Education Research & Development,* 34(2), 284–297.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *equity, first in family, SES, LASSI, study strategies, widening participation* | **Context:** Investigates study strategies that students bring to higher education, using the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) to explore students by social/ equity group status (age, gender, SES, entrance score ((ATAR)). LASSI = 80-item norm-referenced American instrument for evaluating study skills. No mention of students with low entrance scores (aka less prepared) in Bradley review. **Aim:** To answer: what learning and study skills does a cohort of commencing Australian students in the first year of the expanded enrolments, post-Bradley era bring to their university studies; and how do their study skills andstrategies relate to their gender, age, SES and ATAR scores? (p.288)**Theoretical frame:** **Methodology:** Quantitative methodology**.** Asked newly-arrived students (week 2 of Semester 1, Yr1) to do LASSI “in order to measure their incoming skills and abilities” (p.287). Items include: anxiety about school performance, attitude/interest, concentration, information processing-reasoning, motivation-diligence-self-discipline, self-review, selecting main ideas, use of support techniques/materials, time management, test strategies/preparing for tests. 103 students (Communication & Theatre Studies) completed the survey (response rate = 73.6%; 77.7% = f; 21.4% = m. Three quarters = under age 19; one quarter = 20+. 17.5% = low SES; 38% had one parent with TAFE qual; 24.3% had parent with uni qual. 81.6% = mid-high SES. 36.9% = ATAR ‘not applicable’; 39.8% = ATA60-80; 12.6% = ATAR -60; 5.8% = ATAR 80+). Students’ responses compared with norms published in literature (by researchers). SES determined by parents’ highest qualification**Findings:** 1) the mean scores of the participant group on the LASSI fell below the 50th percentile ranking for each of the LASSI’s 10 subscales, indicating areas of ‘relative weakness’ (Weinstein et al., 2002, p. 13) across all 10 subscalesassessed by the Inventory (p.294) = thus many students entered without strategies, skills and attitudes necessary (according to LASSI) for success.2) generally speaking, age-gender-SES-ATAR = no significant difference in study skills (as measured by LASSI). Only significant difference = anxiety levels between genders; attitude between younger/older; use of support technologies/materials between SES groups.**Core argument**: Entire student cohort entering Yr 1 UG would benefit from academic support – but difficult to determine in what form/ how from this study. Relation to equity: older/more research-intensive universities are less likely to be admitting ‘educationally disadvantaged students’ (p.295); therefore, younger, regional universities “need to channel funds and effort into meeting the challenges of the Bradley agenda” (p.295) |
| Cocks, T. & Stokes, J. (2013). Policy into practice: a case study of widening participation in Australian higher education, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 15(1), 22–38.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords***:*** *inclusive policy and practice, widening participation, Australia, foundation studies.* | **Context:** Explores/ discusses enabling programs (specifically Foundation Studies at UniSA) as a “strategy that universities employ to engage students from traditionally underrepresented groups” (abstract) for widening participation to meet 20% Bradley review targets. Raises issue of overexploration of access (due to neoliberal focus on quality) into higher education at the expense of participation, engagement and success. Transition from Foundation Studies to undergraduate studies = 50-55% in 2012 (p.26). Two thirds = FiF (p.27). Had retention rate of 79% in 2012 (compared with national average of 50%) – p.33.**Aim:** To explore realities of implementing widening participation policy (aka Bradley reviews and Transforming Australia’s Future) through a case study of Foundation Studies. **Theoretical frame:** Draws on work of Gidley et al.’s (2010) framework of social inclusion - different discourses of social inclusion: neoliberalism, social justice, human potential**Methodology:** Case study**Findings:** Authors claim Foundation Studies meets inclusion/ engagement needs of students by (p.26-:* College staff being aware of student diversity [unclear where is awareness comes from or whether it is made explicit]
* Dedicated space on campus for learner identity development/ develop peer networks
* Students encouraged [by who?] to build relationships with broader university services
* Providing “an authentic university experience” on city campus (p.27)
* College staff aim to get to know students [to what extent/ how not offered]; are highly accessible to students; organise and attend ECAs; model values such as “empathy, endeavour and tolerance” (p.28)

Challenges: Discusses issues that students with low proficiency in Academic English have (specifically NESB; compares lack of English test on enrolment with entry requirements for International students: “therefore it is reasonable to conclude that a proportion of NESB students are disadvantaged with basic levels of language proficiency, so that they have little chance of passing the Foundation Studies program, let alone gaining entrance into undergraduate studies” (p.29). Issues are not apparent until teaching starts. Foundation Studies does have ESL option, specifically designed for NESB students – but all NESB grouped together, no streaming possible, focus perhaps on ‘literacy skills’ or ‘fundamental reading and writing tasks’ (p.30). Students required to self-identify for support but not doing so led to frustration; therefore a Diagnostic Writing Exercise has been implemented and “Students found to have critically low English proficiency levels from the Diagnostic Writing Exercise have been advised to undertake English language bridging programs before enrolling in the Foundation Studies program” (p.30). Authors also discuss plagiarism and communication etiquette. In this context, authors make the argument that “minimal entry requirements for access… may encourage those with low English language proficiency to develop unrealistic expectations of undergraduate success” (p.32)**Core argument:** Awareness of student diversity = “opens dialogue between students and teachers and actively informs teaching, resulting in inclusive practice” (p.28) = social justice view of social inclusion (Gidley et al. 2010) |
| Cook-Sather, A.; Des-Ogugua, C.; & Bahti, M. (2018). [Articulating identities and analyzing belonging: a multistep intervention that affirms and informs a diversity of students](https://doi-org.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/10.1080/13562517.2017.1391201), *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(3), 374–389.USAAnnotated by Caitlyn McLoughlinKeywords: *Diversity; intersectionality; belonging; pedagogical partnership* | **Context:** Student protests at universities in 2015 and 2016 that attempted to “raise awareness of discriminatory histories and persisting structural inequities on campuses and in the country…[focusing] on discrimination long experienced by Black students [and] prejudice experienced by other students also traditionally underrepresented in, and underserved by, higher education” (374). These protests led to the to the “address and redress” by various universities of “legacies of racial and other injustice” to development and implement programs aimed at supporting “a diversity of people.” This article focuses on one such program: “a multistep intervention developed in relation to an undergraduate course called ‘Advocating Diversity in Higher Education’ and designed to affirm diversity and foster a sense of inclusion among students within and beyond the course” (374).**Aim:** To provide details about the development, implementation, and results of ‘Advocating Diversity in Higher Education’, the main goal of which was to “access the experiences students have at the intersections of their academic experience (fostered in and outside the classroom), their social experience, and their personal backgrounds, experiences, and identities that shape them outside the campus…[and particularly] to create a forum for marginal voices to be heard and respected by putting them in a place where they can inform classroom pedagogy and student learning” (375). **Theoretical frame:** Intersectionality, belonging, and pedagogical partnership – each framework foregrounds marginal voices and letting them inform pedagogical practice and student learning. The authors cite Crenshaw’s (1989, 1991) work on intersectionality as a “multidimensionality” of marginalized subjects’ lived experiences’ and “her focus on the intersections of race and gender [which] “highlights the need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed” (376-77). Intersecitonality within an educational context highlights the disconnect between the ways that people on university campuses encounter diversity and the organizational structure of universities. The authors note that theories of belonging are gaining more attention on college campuses and note shifts in feelings of un/belonging – which can “become exacerbated if peers, faculty, and others on campus respond to underrepresented students in negative or insensitive ways” –when students arrive on campus. The authors reference Strayhorn’s (2012) assertion that “in order for students to feel a sense of belonging, students need to experience a ‘feeling or sensation of connectedness’ and have ‘the experience of mattering or feeling cared about, accepted, respected, valued by, and important to the group (e.g. campus community) or others on campus (e.g. faculty, peers)” (377). The authors note that pedagogical partnership is “one approach to recognizing, valuing, and drawing on the multiple experiences and perspectives that students and faculty bring to the educational endeavor” (378) and “can make explicit and address power imbalances and notions of expertise among those involved in a learning experience (Bergmark and Westman 2016; Bovill 2014; Mihans, Long, and Felten 2008) and serve to promote a sense of belonging and empowerment (Matheson and Sutcliffe 2016)” (378). **Methodology:** Qualitative – one-on-one, confidential interviews with participants in the ‘Advocating Diversity in Higher Education’ course**Findings:** Students understood the ‘Advocating Diversity in Higher Education’ course functioned as a space “where they felt a sense of ‘connectedness’ because they felt listened to, valued, and respected” (382) and “The interviews also brought the presence, experiences, and voices of a range of students into the classroom, both affirming some typically marginalized identities and challenging all students to receive and engage what these individuals were articulating” (384). **Core argument:** The university functions as a microcosm of the society it is meant to serve and thus, it is the duty of universities to “not to perpetuate the hierarchical, and oftentimes oppressive, systems of society” and must consider the intersecting positions that comprise student identities (384). Student input belongs in the dialogue about diversity on college campuses |
| Crozier, G.; Reay, D.; Clayton, J.; Colliander, L.; & Grinstead, J. (2008). [Different strokes for different folks: diverse students in diverse institutions – experiences of higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520802048703), *Research Papers in Education*, 23(2), 167–177.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *widening participation; social class; Bourdieu; higher education* | **Context:** Reports on ESRC-funded project. Explores students experiences of higher education according to social class (middle/ working class) and across 4 different types of universities (context = “apparent polarisation of types of university attracting working class and minority ethnic students” and attrition of working class/ethnic minority students, p.167)**Aim:** To locate discourse of widening participation in discussion of classed privilege**Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu: field, capital, habitus + illusio + agoraphobia + playing the field**Methodology:** Qualitative, longitudinal methodology using critical ethnographic methods + questionnaire (n=1209) + classroom observations. Mix of student participants (n=88): working (n=27)/middle class, mix of ethnicities (wgite British = 89%), gender (female = 58%), age, Year 1 and 2, FinF. Followed 4 types of HEI = 3 geographic areas (post-1992 Northern, FE college + partnership with Northern Uni, elite southern university and pre-1992 civic Midlands**Findings:** Students at Northern = have qualifications/ achievements = tenuous (lower tariff for entry) = demonstrates WP but also has implications for students (attrition/ self-confidence), especially for working class students. Middle class students = greater confidence and sense self-worth (often previously successful students). Intellectual/ academic challenge = highest at elite uni where competition is highest; less so at midlands and northern universities. Family grooming: middle class students = varying levels of preparation for university [opposite experience in general for working class students, who were more likely to gain entry to HE via ‘second-chance’ pathways. High rates of previous family engagement at southern elite (83% been to uni; 19% = been to southern elite) compared with less than 50% at FE college (meaning more than 50% = FinF)Conditions of learning = adapting to new worlds (e.g. working class students moving into ‘middle class milieu’ of university; p.172). Variety of facilities (e.g. learning support, IT facilities etc.) across institutions = more at southern elite, less at northern where = online self-service. At southern, support= more tailored to student; at midlands and northern = more generic support offered.Different approaches to transition/ orientation taken by 4 institutions = Southern = more explicit and confronting; midlands = more implicit and facilitated by clubs/societies. Social capital and familial experience – mentions extra curricula activities. Different reasons for studying – working class students = “means to an end” (p.175).**Core argument:** Not polarisation around institutions, rather = “an interrelated spectrum of differentiated experiences exists across and within the institutions” (p.167). Need to help all students understand ‘invisible pedagogy’/rules of the game (see p.173). “Higher education not only needs to address the widening of access to university but it needs to get to grips with what goes on inside the hallowed grounds” (p.176). |
| Daddow, A.; Moraitis, P.; & Carr, A. (2013). [Non-traditional students in tertiary education: inter-disciplinary collaboration in curriculum and pedagogy in community services education in Australia](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2012.685765), *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 17(5), 480–489.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker*Keywords: higher education; inclusive education; curriculum and instruction, critical literacies, critical language, VET, transition, community services* | **Context:** Inclusive education and cross-discipline curriculum and pedagogy and language (drawing on critical literacy and community of practice). Set in post-Bradley educational policyscape = increase participation in higher education. Paper particularly focused on low SES and CALD students and is set in dual-sector university (VIC). Inclusive education = inscribed in higher education policy in Australia (see participation targets post-Bradley). Community Development and Social Work = high numbers of low SES and NESB students**Aim:** To describe efforts to integrate language and ‘academic skills’ into community services diploma. Initiative “aspires to not only support students’ entry into the new academic terrain, but to enable students to adopt a critical stance to the discourses in which they are learning to participate” (p.480). To develop a curriculum and pedagogy “that built independent academic reading and writing skills for non-traditional students which gave them greater access to privileged disciplinary knowledge” (p.483).**Theoretical frame:** Funds of knowledge = design of pedagogy/ curriculum: “to harness this intersection between the familiar world of the non-traditional student and the unfamiliar world of academia and disciplinary knowledge in which they are entering, to create a clear framework to support this transition” (p.481). Draw on notion of discourse communities – allowing authors to reframe ‘problems in student writing’ as issues of identity. Draws on critical pedagogy to unpack the teaching of a critical stance**Methodology:** **Findings:** Access and participation = constrained by proficiency with academic and disciplinary discourses and literacies (‘independent academic reading and writing skills’). Students often pass at diploma level because of adjunct support/language programs but they “do not necessarily have sufﬁcient independent written language skills to function well in the workplace or in Higher Education” (p.482), and disciplinary knowledge = questionable (connects with Wheelahan’s argument about stratification of VET/ HE knowledge and distillation of disciplinary knowledge in pursuit of ‘competency’. Describes collaborative venture between discipline teachers and language experts. Working from theoretical vehicle of discourse community, positioned students not as deficient but as ‘emerging participants in a new discourse’ (p.484) by making writing practices of community services/ social work explicit (draws on Rai, 2004). Team taught (language teacher focused on disciplinary reading and writing/ discipline content taught by discipline teacher). Imported an academic research unit into diploma to teach ‘academic skills’ (co-delivered by English teacher).Feedback (anecdotal) = enthusiastic. Grades on assessments suggest that this implementation of language/discipline = successful**Core argument:** Need to recognise how practices and discourses = often experienced as dissonance by non-traditional students. Case study of successful embedding of critical language awareness into mainstream/disciplinary VET program (with transition implicit) |
| Dakka, F. (2020). [Competition, innovation and diversity in higher education: dominant discourses, paradoxes and resistance](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2019.1668747?journalCode=cbse20), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 41(1), 80–94.UKAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Neoliberalism; competition fetish; university; polarized convergence; innovation* | **Context:** Contemporary HE is theoretically challenging, as it is influenced by a variety of institutional actors and processes that are interconnected and engaged with the global, economic, political and cultural environment that has historically generated it and continues to shape it.**Aim:** To contribute to the ‘extant critique of (higher) education by introducing the concept of ‘polarised convergence’ as an instance of differentiation without diversity in the contemporary English university’ (p. 81). Theoretical aim: To review the shifting state-higher education-market nexus via a critical cultural political economy lens. Conceptual aim: To closely examine concepts that expos the material & discursive ‘*dispositifs’* through which nation-states, institutions & individual actors mobilize universities to position themselves in the global knowledge economy. **Theoretical frame:** Key theoretical concepts: 1) ‘Logic of competition’ (Davies, 2014) 2)’Competition fetish’ (Naidoo, 2011; 2015; 2018) 3) ‘Polarised convergence’ (Dakka, 2020). **Methodology:** The discussion is complemented by empirical evidence obtained from a doctoral project conducted to capture the views, reactions and analyses of senior leaders in HE (2013-2014). The empirical evidence is aimed to highlight the ‘contradictory and paradoxical outcomes’ of competitiveness practiced in English HE institutions. Data collection method: Semi-structured interviews. Participants: Six senior leaders in HE institutions. Sample: 6 HE institutions characterised as ‘research intensive, teaching intensive and mixed’. **Discussion:** 1) State-university-market: A shifting construct – a)Competition & competitiveness within contemporary HE (structural, discursive & cultural undertones): i)Systemic level: Regulation approach (RA) (Jessop, 1990, 1993, 1995)- allows the alignment of globalisation, neoliberalisation and the re-scaling and re-structuring of the post-Keynesian capitalist state with the transformation of HE. ii)’Competitive state’ (Cerny, 1990, 1997): Connects state transformation with ‘exogenous pressures’ (p. 81) stemming from globalization via 3 key areas: International market structures and economic networks arising from the international mobility capital; rapid and diffuse technological change; the formation of international networks and discourses of power legitimating new types of governance. b)Commodification/Marketization of HE: ‘New spatial politics of (re)bordering and (re)ordering of the state-education-citizen relation’ (Robertson, 2011) (p. 82) - Globalizing processes, specifically the widespread diffusion of neoliberalism has led to new forms of territorial bordering (eg: European Higher Education Arena) & the emergence of new categories which as ‘constitutive of education sectors and subjectivities’ (Robertson, 2011, p. 281). 2)English higher education – a complex ecology: Trajectory of recent policy interventions in English HE: 2012 – a) Changes resulting from the liberalisation of the HE sector: Tripling of the annual tuition fees (capped at £9000) backed by a (financially unsustainable) Income Contingent Loan system; partial relaxation of student number controls (AABs, ABBs policies); the Research Excellence Framework (2014); creation of a level playing field for alternative providers (private & for-profit education providers); increased reliance on metrics (eg. Key Information Sets, National Student Survey, multiple ranking devices) to evaluate performance & produce accurate information for the student-consumer (BIS White Paper, 2011). B) Impact of the Higher Education and Research Act (2017): Introduction of a Teaching Excellence Framework (will pave the way for variable tuition fees in connection with outcomes after 2020); creation of the Office for Students (merges the functions of the existing Office for Fair Access (OFFA) & the former Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)); increased reliance on metrics (student satisfaction, graduate employment, retention) for performance evaluation & the creation of new evaluation measures; merging of seven research councils, Innovate UK, UK Research & Innovation (UKRI); easing the entry & operational requirements for alternative providers; evaluation of the more flexible switching of university courses; increased transparency in admission processes by demanding the publication of gender, ethnicity & socio-economic backgrounds of the student body. 3) Unpacking competition: Competition emerges as a ‘symbolic and material engine at the heart of neoliberal marketization’ (p. 83); ‘The theoretical paradoxes of competition’ (p. 83) are central to the current articulation of the relationship between state, education and markets in 3 key ways: i)The promotion of competition requires the state to play both the ‘active and disengaged’ role (p. 84) 2) Competition ‘paradoxically combines equality and inequality’ (p. 84) 3)Competition is both ‘an object of investigation & a policy’, transcending the disciplinary division between sociology and neoclassical economics’ (p. 84); Question that triggered the crucial shift towards theorising competitiveness as an ‘ultimate source of authority and legitimization’: ‘Is market competition necessary to deliver competitiveness?’ (Davies, 2014, p. 44); Other theories relating to ‘competition’: ‘Competitive agency grants’ (Schumpeter, 2014) – Contends that long term feasibility of capitalism is threatened by ‘oppressive bureaucracies and rationalistic attempts’ to control the future, which is evident in both governments and private enterprises, competition is thus expanded to include sociological, cultural, political and technological factors; ‘Competition fetish’ (Naidoo, 2011; 2015; 2018) – Complements and develops Davies’ distinction between classic competition and competitiveness. ‘Shamans’ of competition: Governments, international organizations such as the OECD or the World Bank, and global corporations (Naidoo, 2018). Argues that competition inside the university is ‘relayed, internalized, reproduced or *resisted* with the help of institutional ‘audit-market’ intermediaries’ (Enders & Naidoo, 2018) (p. 84), which either facilitate the transmission of market forces, or act as buffers/negotiators. Third & crucial layer of Naidoo’s ‘competition fetish’ concept: Naidoo’s anthropological take on the magic workings of the ‘fetish’ through a series of ‘mind snares’ (Naidoo, 2018, p. 6), which adds analytical strength to Davies’ examination of the Schumpeterian innovator’s psychological traits; Many scholars agree with Davies’ and Naidoo’s critique of neoliberal competition as ‘essentially hindering diversity and innovation, exacerbating pre-existing inequalities, creating new zones of exclusion (via institutional stratification) and fundamentally altering the nature of academic work’ (p. 85) ((Dale 2016; Marginson 2016; Ahmed 2004; Burrows 2012; Burrows and Knowles 2014; Gill 2009; Collini 2012; Olssen 2016). 4)Competition & innovation in the English HE: Voices from the field (drawn from empirical evidence of doctoral project) – Highlights ‘polarised convergence’ (Dakka, 2020, p. 86), which illustrates the intrinsic contradictions stemming from a case of ‘marketization by the state’ - clarifies two fundamental aspects of the rhetoric and reality of competitive markets in education: a) ‘Imperfections’, instead of failures, are intrinsic to the implementation of market mechanisms. b)The subjective tensions & analytic discomfort surround meanings & interpretations of marketisation were unanimously expressed by participants of the study (senior managers, university leaders) & literature; Senior leaders (often sharing thoughts in ‘dual mode’ (p. 86): managerial & academic) – highlighted the intricacies, ambiguities & tensions observed in Naidoo’s account of the structural, symbolic & affective levers of competition; Competition appears to be both the ‘cause and solution to the predicament’ (p. 87) faced by the leaders’ respective institutions: its opaque contours and strong emotional connotations (‘cut-throat’, ‘feed your own institution’) drive symbolic and strategic action, without a clear promise of educational or financial gain (p. 87) – in line with Naidoo’s analysis: the competition fetish produces a ‘psychological ambience of the university’ but is more or less actualized in excellence policies which aim to increase productivity (p. 87); A sense of urgency and nervousness was observed when participants reflected on the meaning of enterprise, innovation & distinctiveness in their institutions – most participants candidly admit their inability to define what makes their institution distinctive or what is defined as being ‘entrepreneurial, excellent and innovative’ (p. 87); Tensions & ambivalence of the HE leaders regarding goals & ambitions that are explicitly framed in business-like jargon is observed; Participants’ responses confirm Sum & Jessop’s (2013) reflections on the relationship between competitiveness, HE & the knowledge-based economy and the increasing trends towards innovative regional partnership models; Marketization is identified with financial shortage/redistribution, liberalization, commercialization and metricization’ (p. 89); The uneven levels of competition within and across national borders demystifies the classic liberal belief of equivalence , where all competitors start equal & only become unequal as a result of competition; ‘When institutional differentiation is equated to its reputational divide and market positioning, in-segment convergence is favoured and systemic, functional differentiation is sacrificed’, resulting in the ‘ultimate paradox: differentiation with diversity’ (p. 90). **Summary of discussion:** 1)The binary logic of success/failure that is so embedded in pecking orders institutionalizes competitiveness by conflating means with ends to the detriment of the diversity and richness of educational experiences and philosophies. 2)Mimetic desire, existential anxiety and shame are powerful emotional instruments through which neoliberalism, *via* the logic of competition, finds its internal source of legitimation and reproduction, swallowing its own critique and accommodating paradoxes. 3)The link between semiosis and affect should not be overlooked: that is, the fetishization of calculative practices in education is built upon and justified by certain constellations of feelings (p. 90). **Core argument:** Competitive, mimetic desire and the ‘affective’ nature of competition can pose a significant challenge to the current HE systems’ ability to effectively and substantially diversify their structures and contents, consequently compromising the achievement of its intended goals: innovation and positional advantage in the knowledge-based economy. A counter-narrative to the fetish of competition & a remedy to innovation loss should begin from ‘a subversion and re-signification of meanings, practices & spaces’ (p. 91).  |
| David, M. (2008). [Challenges of diversity for widening participation in UK higher education,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520802048620) *Research Papers in Education,* 23(2), 111–112UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Introduction to Special Issue on ESRC/ TLRP-funded projects (see David, 2008)“All 10 papers consider how cultural, economic and social questions, such as class, diversity, ethnicity or gender, impinge upon teaching and learning and influence learning outcomes, questions which are currently addressed by UK government and policy-makers”“Together [the papers] reveal the complexities of concepts and contexts that influence the processes, pedagogies and practices within compulsory and post-compulsory education, and how diverse people’s lives are, over a lifetime of learning. Perhaps one of the most important lessons from these studies is the serendipity in learning and learning outcomes in post-compulsory and higher education, across the lifecourse”. (p.111). |
| David, M. (2012). [Changing Policy Discourses on Equity and Diversity in UK Higher Education: What Is The Evidence?.](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137283412_2) In Hinton-Smith, T. (ed), *Widening Participation in Higher Education: Casting the Net Wide?.* Palgrave MacMillan: Basingstoke, pp.22–36.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Examines evolution of WP as policy discourse in UK HE – moving from expanded access to HE for women in mid 20th century. Post-WWII = ‘equality of educational opportunity’ principle – initially for secondary education and later extended to post-compulsory education. Initially about disadvantage, later about economy (in Thatcher years = neoliberal agenda – but notes how despite proliferation of market, participation continued to widen and the gender gap closed in school, but not for all social classes). New Labour did not challenge privatisation/ marketisation of education. WP = reached a peak during New Labour = legislated for equality duties (but = ‘on individualistic grounds’, p.24) – focus on access rather than participation. WP = major policy discourse for 13 years but still linked to neoliberal policy discourse + economic agenda. Under Con/ Lib Dem coalition = more individualistic about social mobility (see changing unit names/ locations of HE responsibility). **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** Discussion; reports on TLRP research = brief overview of each section of the project. **Findings:** Vignoles’ project = shows that socioeconomic gap in HE = due to secondary school participation/ achievement. Young low SES students = more likely to drop out; mature age women = less likely to drop out. To reap benefits of HR = students need “to secure a good class of first degree”; therefore, need to raise expectations, especially of low SES boys (p.29). Hayward’s project shows gendered rates of participation (more males via FE college pathway) – transition from VET – HE = difficult**Core argument:** Policy discourse = moved away from equity/equality and towards social mobility, with selective evidence based used to make argument and instrumental focus on jobs. David Willetts (launching White Paper) blamed lack of progress of males on progress of women, meaning that some households had two graduates earning, while others had none |
| Friend, K. L. (2020). [The creation of social networks: social capital and the experiences of widening participation students at three elite institutions in the US, England, and Scotland](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14681366.2020.1735496), *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* DOI: 10.1080/14681366.2020.1735496 UK Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Higher education; widening participation; student experience; social networks; social capital*  | **Context:** Set within the context where questions regarding how different nations construct and maintain inequality are crucial, even as nations continue to employ OECD data in ensuring preparedness to be globally competitive. **Aim:** To argue that ‘social capital continues to perpetuate social inequality both prior to and during university attendance despite decades of WP policy in the US and UK’ (abstract) by drawing on a nested case study of 30 under-represented students in three universities across the US, England and Scotland respectively. **Theoretical framework:** Social capital (Bourdieu, 1973; Savage, 2015). **Methodology:** Essay. **Discussion:** 1)The reproduction of social inequalities through HE: a) Social class & forms of capital – Theory of inequality in social capital is underpinned by two principles: i)social capital inequality is evident when specific groups are clustered in ‘disadvantaged socio-economic positions’ (p. 2); ii) individuals have the tendency to ‘stay close to their own socioeconomic backgrounds’ (Lin, 2000, p. 786); Bourdieu (1973): Social hierarchies which are ‘reproduced as academic hierarchies fulfil the perpetuation of social order’ (p. 2); b)The construction of the underrepresented student in the US, England & Scotland – HE landscape in the US, UK & Scotland has transformed over the last 40 years in the following aspects: ‘institutions available to students, the importance of institutional reputation, variations in financing education, and who constitutes a typical university student’ (p. 3) (David, 2007); in each country: the groups of students either under- or over- represented in particular types of institutions vary; despite the implementation of WP policy, elite universities in the US & UK appear to be falling behind less prestigious or established institutions in the number of underrepresented students recruited/accepted; 2)Three international cases: Great Lakes University (US), South Hadrian University (England), and Antonine University (Scotland) – a) Great Lakes University: Enrolment of approximately 30,000 undergraduate students, with 15% of underrepresented students; Two significant themes from 12 student interviews: ‘family pressure’ & ‘ability to create social networks’ (p. 5); a) Family pressure – varying levels of social & family pressure experienced by the 12 students (5 students felt pressured to attend HE; 3 students mentioned how their family ‘contributed to a lack of educational expectations’ (p. 7); b)Creating social networks at university – All students, except for one participated in student support programmes & social activities (eg: fraternities, sororities & multicultural student centre); all students joined activities which aligned with their cultural backgrounds, creating a ‘separation from the majority’(p. 8) of the student population; Lin (2000) – clustering of groups lead to social capital inequality; underrepresented student groups often form bonds with each other due to culture of elite universities, which could explain why enrolment in an elite university may not necessarily lead to social advancement; b)South Hadrian University – Enrolment of approximately 15,000 undergraduates, with 4.9% students from low-participation backgrounds; Participants were all FinF students; two significant themes: i) students generally perceived support from parents in applying to HE; ii) the role of first-year living conditions in establishing students’ social connections – one of the most significant findings of the study; a) Family pressure – All 10 students claimed that their families were very supportive; most students claimed that their greatest assets were their parents; students’ social connections (family, school or religious groups) played a role in informing students & their parents on HE issues; weak ties – ‘those in passing who are more likely to convey social benefits’ (Savage, 2o015, p. 132), which are created from ‘chance meetings, employment or schooling’ of underrepresented students or their parents could alter the students’ social capital; b)Creating social networks at university – all students (except for two with anxiety & depression) participated in some aspect of university activities in year 1; in year 2, all students participated in university organisations; students’ collective belief regarding their sense of belonging and establishment of social connections at the university was one of the study’s most important findings – can be explained by: i) the university structure, where students lived in communities where they did their daily activities, including socialising; ii) student support – provided for every students & tutors worked in buildings where students lived, creating a sense of connection between students and tutors; 10 students were able to access social & university organisations much easier in comparison with underrepresented students from Great Lakes or Antonine universities; instead of being treated as ‘outsiders’ (p. 12), South Hadrian students were offered ‘respectability’ (Skeggs, 2005) (p. 12) through their acceptance; c) Antonine University – Enrolment of approximately 20,000 graduates, with 4.9% of students from the ‘most deprived areas in Scotland’ (SIMD 20) (p. 12); three students were ‘non-traditional, returning adult students’; two main topics from study: i) ‘social stigma of HE attendance along the lines of SES still exists’; ii)as an undergraduate, involvement in social events is essential to develop wider social networks, and consequently one’s social capital; however, one’s ability to afford participation in social events is often a barrier for social interaction; a) Family pressure – No participants from Antonine mentioned any pressure of enrolling in HE – possibly due to being mature-age students; parents were not a major factor influencing students’ choices in their HE enrolment; varying levels of family support observed; one student’s (Emma) comment – HE is not ‘for people like us’ (p. 14) suggest the continuity of social class boundaries, which acknowledge the financial limitations & divisions, and the invisible and continuing social & cultural limitations which block students’ aspirations; b)Creating social networks at university – one of the biggest differences between Antonine & the other universities: an overall ‘lack of participation in university-organised social activities’ (p. 14) due to financial constraints; five out of eight students were employed & only one student participated in extracurricular activities organised by the university; three students felt like their low SES status prevented their participation in social activities at university; lack of finances therefore limits students’ potential social networks by limiting their social experiences; jealousy towards wealthier peers was also admitted by participants – suggests that despite efforts to improve access, the financial divide in the undergraduate student population of all three universities has triggered ‘feelings of shame & social exclusion’ (p. 15) among almost all students of the study. **Core argument:** In all three universities of the study, social capital amplified the impact of economic and cultural capital & persists as a mechanism to retain power & advantage by the middle class. **Implications:** Universities should: i) Acknowledge the significant role of social capital boundaries in the educational aspirations of underrepresented students & the reinforcement of symbolic boundaries which dictates who belongs in HE; ii) Take an active step in ensuring the integration of underrepresented students into the customs & cultures of elite universities (including ensuring affordability of participation by all students); iii) Be willing to evaluate their respective social cultures & recognise ‘points of social exclusion’ (p. 17) which limit the social participation of underrepresented students.  |
| Gale, T. & Mills, C. (2013). [Creating Spaces in Higher Education for Marginalised Australians: Principles for Socially Inclusive Pedagogies](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.11120/elss.2013.00008), *Enhancing learning in the social sciences*, 5(2), 7–19. AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *social inclusion, pedagogy, pedagogic work, higher education, Bourdieu* | **Context:** Discusses the idea of creating *spaces* rather than creating places in HE for marginalised Australians, starting with pedagogic work as the ‘central message system’ of education.**Aim:** To explore the pedagogic context and possibilities/principles of restructuring “the very education with which all students engage, in ways that take account of not just different bodies but also and importantly the social, cultural and economic differences (and similarities) they embody” (p.9) through socially inclusive pedagogies.**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Bernstein’s (1971) notion that pedagogy is one of 3 central messaging systems in education. Also draws on 3 characteristics of pedagogic work (PW), propsed by Bourdieu and Passeron (1990): 1) PW = prolonged process and series of pedagogical actions (PA) – conscious and unconscious; 2) PW produces a long-lasting outcome which develops habitus; 3) PW requires pedagogical authority (PAu) to legitimise the pedagogic agent and product. Also draws on Moll et al. (1992) ‘funds of knowledge’**Methodology:** **Findings:** For a transformative pedagogy/ the transformation of a deficit-led system, HE needs to view students in terms of assets rather than deficits (p.11). Makes connection between ATAR and SES (see Go8 report, 2011) – lower ATAR most common with low SES students. ATAR is thus an indicator of social status rather than a student’s academic potential (Teese & Polesel, 2003). Attention to knowledge as a way to unsettle deficit views as a ‘pedagogical intent’ (Hickey-Moody et al. 2010: 232) through recognition of strengths/assets (knowledges, skills) through ‘valorised diversity’ (Ramirez, 2006).**Core argument:** Recommends 2-way pedagogy: the design of PA (grammar of pedagogy) is informed by beliefs and assumptions about what students bring with them – PA can be designed in many ways but not all are legitimised = ‘epistemological equity’ (Dei, 2010) is about recognition. Two principles on which to build socially inclusive pedagogy:1. Not eliminate students’ home discourses/knowledges/languages, but to add to their repertoires
2. Value difference while also “providing access to and enabling critical engagement with dominance” (p.13) = counter-hegemonic – not to replace one form of dominance with another (citation to Raewen Connell’s southern theory critique)

Pedagogical challenge = “transforming the capital that counts: equipping students with academic skills and competencies that make up the cultural capital valued by dominant groups while contesting the disempowering effects of the hegemonic curriculum by embracing the notion of multiple knowledges that are equally valid” (p.13-14)Three principles of action for building socially inclusive pedagogies:1. Recognise/ believe that all students bring things of value to classroom
2. Pedagogic design that values difference and provides access/ enables [critical] engagement with dominance

Actions and practice that ‘work with’ not ‘act on’ students and their communities |
| Gale, T., Mills, C. & Cross, R. (2017). [Social inclusive teaching: Belief, design, action as pedagogic work](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0022487116685754), *Journal of Teacher Education,* 68(3), 345-356. DOI: 10.1177/0022487116685754 UK & AUS Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords: *critical theory, critical pedagogy, preservice teacher education, schooling, social inclusion*  | **Context:** Although there is extensive literature on socially inclusive pedagogy, there is a widening gap in the educational outcomes due to social disadvantage across OECD countries, including Australia, regardless of their increasing levels of overall wealth in aggregate terms (OECD, 2013, 2015). **Aim:** To ‘advocate a general disposition on which to build a social inclusive pedagogy’ (p. 354) and describe the three principles involved: a) a *belief* that all students bring something valuable to their learning environment; b) a *design* which values differences while enabling access & engagement with dominance; c) *actions* that work with both students and their respective communities. **Theoretical frame:** Pedagogic work (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). **Methodology:** Essay. **Discussion:** A) Elements of Pedagogic Work: Belief, Design and Action – 1) Belief-in students’ assets rather than their deficits: first principle of socially inclusive pedagogy – a refocus on students’ assets is needed; students’ assets are referred to as “funds of knowledge”, the ““historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 133), or the “virtual school bag”, which highlights the “the importance of understanding community-based, popular, and extended cultural knowledges . . . as assets that are normally discounted” (Wrigley, Lingard, & Thomson, 2012, p. 99); 2)Design-of “Two-Ways” Pedagogy: Second principle of building a socially inclusive pedagogy – to ‘value difference’ (p. 352), although this should be done while offering access to and allowing for ‘critical engagement with, dominance’ (p. 352); need for developing a ‘counter-hegemonic’ (Connell, 1993) (p. 352) pedagogy which acknowledges both dominance & difference, which shows a commitment to ‘epistemological inclusion’ (Wrigley et al., 2012) (p. 352); 3)Action – “Working with” rather than “acting on” students and their communities: third principle to build a socially inclusive pedagogy – ‘tactics that seek to not simply identify students’ prior knowledge, interest or needs, but to engage students’ own senses in their “sense-making” of the world, in practice’ (p. 352) (Probyn, 2004, p. 22); B)Implications for teacher education – i) Importance of building ongoing opportunities for student teachers to utilise the socially inclusive pedagogy framework to critically reflect on their professional growth & pedagogic practice; ii) Need to recommend coursework tasks which encourages students’ critical evaluation of their own HE trajectories & audit their individual forms of capital. **Core argument:** The creation of opportunities for marginalized groups via a socially inclusive pedagogy—cognisant of all three elements of belief, design, and action is required to ensure the transformation of schools and teacher education.  |
| Gayton, A. (2019). [Exploring the widening participation-internationalisation nexus: evidence from current theory and practice](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1678014?journalCode=cjfh20), *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/0309877X.2019.1678014UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Internationalisation; widening access; widening participation; student experience* | **Context:** Competition/ tension between two agendas of internationalisation and widening participation: “The main reason that comparing and contrasting internationalisation agendas, discourses and policies with those relating to widening access/participation may initially appear counterintuitive is that the latter are funded and enacted strictly at a national level – the focus is very much on improving equality and diversity (in terms of socioeconomic status; ethnic minority status; gender; sexual identity/orientation; care leavers – to name only a few relevant groupings) among those classed as ‘home’ students. Internationalisation agendas remain firmly distinct, and often relate to efforts to increase numbers of fee-paying students from around the world – the term ‘diversity’ within such agendas typically refers to nationality, and it could be argued that national groups of students are often considered as homogenous entities by universities, rather than there being an appreciation of their inevitable heterogeneity within” (p.2).**Aim:** To answer these questions: “What overlap exists between conceptualisations of widening access/participation, and internationalisation?What scope is there for addressing equality of access and participation among international cohorts?What parallels exist in the HE experiences of international students, and those coming from a widening access/participation route?” (p.3)**Methodology:** Critical review of literature on internationalisation and WP in tandem, so as to identify overlaps and problematize the notion of diversity.**Findings:** * Authors considers the literature in the context of a question about what higher education is for, drawing on literature that offers analysis of public discourse and students-as-consumers. Higher education is largely represented/ promoted as/for private good, thus it follows that universities will promote internationalisation agendas over social justice agendas. Similarly, authors notes how conflicting institutional identities confuse/ are confused by the dual/ oppositional agendas of internationalisation and WP because “When there are too many identities for an institution to effectively reconcile, however, problems can arise in sufficiently satisfying them all” (p.5).
* Author’s take on WP argues that issues relating to equity/ supporting students do not end with domestic students, and that universities need to do more to support international students/ provide more holistic supports (see Richardson, 2015’s argument about the ‘ethically dubious’ practice of providing access but not support).
* Discourse of diversity = overlaps between internationalization and WP; diversity = often used reductively in ways that group students into homogeneous groups, often based on ethnicity/ nationality.

Overlaps in student experience between international and non-traditional students:* “the potential for mismatch between students’ existing knowledge and expectations, and the reality encountered: what knowledge/ experiences/qualifications do they arrive with, and to what extent do these adequately equip them to participate fully in, and successfully complete, their intended programme of study?” (p.7)
* Adjustment to campus, study, systems, demands
* Accessing and processing information about university when making decisions
* Lack of familial experience of higher education system (in general, or in host country)
* Both groups of students “bring with them diverse and varied multilingual repertoires” (p.9), which are not recognized as assets by instititions (see Martin, 2009), leading to discrimination (Migge, 2019)
* Author draws on ideas behind translanguaging to create ‘transnational spaces’ (Preece, 2015), “rather than institutions seeing their linguistic and cultural repertoires as falling short of the mark, and falling short of expected norms” (p.10).

**Core argument:** Strong overlaps between internationalisation and WP agendas, and the challenges faced by international and ‘non-traditional’ students |
| Gibson, S.; Baskerville, D.; Perry, A.; Black, A.; Norris, K. & Symeonidou, S. (2016). [‘Diversity’, ‘Widening Participation’ and ‘Inclusion’ in Higher Education: An international study](file:///%29.%20Competition%2C%20innovation%20and%20diversity%20in%20higher%20education/%20dominant%20discourses%2C%20paradoxes%20and%20resistance), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 18(3), 7–33.INT (UK/USA/NZ/ CYP)Annotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Widening Participation, diversity, inclusion, student experience, higher education* | **Context:** Looks at WP through international lens – seen in higher education policy across the world, although the terminology is different: WP in Engliand, focus on Maori students in NZ, ‘special criteria’ in Cyprus, ‘diversity’ in the USA. Authors note Quinn’s (2013) argument that WP and massification are not the same thing; inequitable patterns of under-representation stubbornly persist [often the word ‘inequality’ is used]. Authors make the point that most WP policies originate from committees where ‘the other’ is rarely represented: “Devoid of relational connections with the groups of students they supposedly represent, their policies fail to deliver in meaningful ways beyond recreating the same problem in their ‘solutions’” (p.10-11; see Ahmed, 2012). Authors note Ahmed’s (2012) argument about the linguistic value/ misappropriation of ‘diversity’ for martketese (see also Kimura, 2014)**Aim:** To draw on international research to “show how institutionalised cultures and non-relational practices result in further student marginalization” (p.11); specifically probes ‘normalcy’ v. ‘other’; to develop understandings of what ‘diversity’ means/ how it plays out in positioning of ‘non-traditional’ students.**Theoretical frame:** None explicit**Methodology:** Multisite participatory project between 6 universities in UK, USA, CYP, NZ. Started with online questionnaire to students to ascertain ‘diversity’ (definition given p.13) of students (174/373 respondents = ‘diverse'), who were then invited to participate in 4 x focus groups (n=25 from 4/6 universities). Questions in FGs: who/ what students perceived as ‘diverse’**Findings:** Key themes: binary of diverse/ non-diverse; university assemblage and bureaucracy; relationships*Binary of diverse/non-diverse*: noted in other literature; “Cultures of difference, when not acknowledged or suppressed, add further to covert practices of institutionalised segregation and stigma” (p.16). Most participants viewed term ‘diverse’ as signifier of ‘minority status’, as political, and –for some- as a negative label. Participants viewed the use of term as creating stereotypes, and one American student questioned whether a ‘non-diverse student’ actually exists (see p.17). Self-disclosure (and what of) = noted as problematic; external labeling (assignation of labels by others) = also concerning/ disempowering/ exposing. Several participants suggested that tutors aren’t able to support students; peer support = also important: “For some using the term ‘diversity’ to describe who they were resulted in their personally held self-definitions and identities being forcibly simplified and their sense of ‘self’ being mis-represented, redefined by institutionally directed practice, whilst others felt academics and other staff didn’t necessarily want to engage with ‘diversity’ when considering their teaching practices” (p.20).*University assemblage:* Concerns voiced about ineffective university bureaucracy and resulting feelings of anger and disconnect (students to institution and disconnections between services within university) = ‘disjointed forms of communication’.*Relationships:* relationship practices lead to both exclusion and inclusion (see Table 3, p.22). Participants found that supportive relationships with tutors and staff = inclusive relationship practices; however, these can be eroded by managerial processes. Authors note connections with affective literature. Emotions = significant result of relationships: “Within the focus groups students shared where they had experienced anger and frustration, the impact of being ‘othered’ by bureaucracy and fellow students” (p.24). Raising of emotional issues = methodological limitation/ note for future research (see p.25).**Core argument:** ‘Diversity’ (and its use by institutions for marketing/ support/ identifying ‘non-traditional’ and ‘at risk’ students = needs to be carefully reconsidered so as to avoid the negative impacts (disempowerment, stereotyping, exposing, disconnecting) students. More consideration needed of affective/ emotional dimension of this kind of research and impacts of ‘diversity’/ WP agenda. More is needed: “there must be a recognised space for dialogue about the university’s aims and objectives, where discussion and debate about the need for andpossibilities of how to push against established cultures reinforcing insiders and outsiders, a binary of ‘what does’ and ‘what does not fit’ can take place” (p.27-8). |
| Golden, N. A. (2017). [“In A Position I See Myself in:” (Re)Positioning Identities and Culturally-Responsive Pedagogies, *Equity & Excellence in Education*](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10665684.2017.1393641?src=recsys&journalCode=ueee20), 50(4), 355-367, DOI: 10.1080/10665684.2017.1393641 USA Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords (Anna’s): *inclusive education; repositioning identities; culturally-responsive pedagogies*  | **Context:** Set within the context which suggests that ‘the culture of poverty (Harrington, 1962) paradigm that suggests poor people share an entrenched set of values, and that these values are the cause of undesirable educational and other outcomes’ (p. 356), is still prevalent race and class discourses, and where dominant discourses on African Americans include ‘notions of tragedy, failure, and violence’ (p. 356) (Kirkland, 2013; Noguera, 2009; Winn, 2012). The author therefore highlights the crucial need for ‘research situated within the experience and understandings of African American boys and young men to counter these gendered cultural myths (Payne & Brown, 2010) (p. 356). **Aim:** To describe a narrative analysis case study, which ‘examines the ways a 20-year-old African American man challenges the negative educational identity with which he is forced to contend as he navigates a large and complex urban public school system’ (p. 355). The questions guiding the analysis: a) “How does Jamahl understand the ways he is positioned in educational disparity discourse?’ b)”How does Jamahl (re)negotiate and resist these positionings?”**Theoretical frame:** a) Counter-storytelling as a form of double consciousness – ‘the practice of voicing experiences not widely heard in ways that can challenge privilege, inequities, and inequalities (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, 2010) (p. 357) ; b) Identity formation through positioning – Positioning theory: ‘not all people have equal access to the rights and duties to enact particular kinds of meaningful actions in specific contexts, and that all people are positioned in or through speech acts and other discourse’ (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009) (p. 357). **Methodology:** Narrative analysis – to explore and document ‘negotiated identities’ (Riessman, 1993, 2008); Participant: Jamahl, a 20-year-old African American boy trying to gain his High School Equivalency (HSE) credential the The Opportunity Center (one of 12 young men participating in a wider study which investigated the cultural tools employed by men of colour to negotiate discourses of educational disparity in their educational context); Data collection methods: Focus groups (11) & follow-up individual interviews (2) over five months of data collection; Rapport with participants developed through an afterschool Men’s Group dedicated to Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR); Data analysis – Three methodological steps to explore Jamahl’s agency in (re)positioning himself: ‘analysis of content (Riessman, 2008), analysis of narrative structure (Gee, 1991, 2011; Riessman, 1993, 2008), and a significance analysis of a specific evaluative device (Daiute, 2014)’ (p. 359). **Findings:** The use of the word “actually” was a ‘significance-building’ tool in Jamahl’s narrative (p. 360) – an ‘important means for him to resist undesirable framings and seek out new positions’ (p. 360); 1) Seeking new positions through “actual” experience – Beginning of the narrative: Jamahl explains how he stopped going to his initial school; Jamahl’s narrative of how he eventually came to the High School Equivalency Center, entitled “Jamahl’s Story of Looking for New Schools,” evidences his use of “actually,” and shows how it functions in his identity negotiations; The first two stanzas illustrate Jamahl’s agency through his active searching for a way to return to formal education - initial stanza emphasizes the actions that Jamahl was taking; words “looking” or “look” were mentioned eight times in this short stanza to show his audience his seriousness about the search for a new educational program. He told his audience that he was not only looking online but also scanning the periodical from the city Housing Authority, which manages the housing project where Jamahl and his family lived. In stanzas 3–6, Jamahl explained why that school, Coolidge, did not work out for him. In this second school, Jamahl “knew everyone there”, where he and his friends were still positioned in a deficit frame. He was seeking a space where he will not be framed in these ways. In the next stanza, Jamahl asserted that he did not want his audience to draw the conclusion that he was uninterested in education because of his lack of interest in Coolidge. He was “feeling it, but ... wasn’t feeling it at the same time.” In the final two stanzas (7–8), Jamahl resisted the notion that he was a passive person, someone uninterested in formal education. He was aware that his decision to leave two educational programs may have framed him in this way in some people’s eyes, so he worked at the close of the narrative to further ward off this positioning. “Actually” served as this significance-building tool in these narratives. Jamahl used “actually” three times as he warded o the perception that he did not care about education and that he was working instead of spending time “in the street doing nothing.” (p. 362); 2) Actually becoming somebody – Jamahl’s (re)positionings allowed him to build an identity to counter the negative ways he had been framed, and through this identity Jamahl sought to engage a better, and more self-directed way of being-in-the-world; Jamahl’s narrative titled “Actually becoming somebody” by the author – about his first-grade teacher, and a moment etched in his memory when she told him that he “wasn’t gonna be nothin’ in life.” While a painful story for Jamahl, he returned to his elementary school years later, as a teenager, to both visit and challenge that teacher and her prophecy about him (p. 362). Jamahl switched from dislike for the teacher to “I showed her otherwise, like, when she said to me that I ... wasn’t gonna become nothin’ in life” (p. 363). He explained he is “putting myself out there, seeking help, just trying to do better for my life, and not become that nobody like she said I would become.” Analysis of content, structural analysis, and a significance analysis focusing on the significance- building tool “actually” all demonstrate Jamahl’s agentive (re)positionings. Jamahl’s narrative highlights his agency: he stated that he “felt like [he] had type ownership of himself,” and that the teacher was “*actually* seeing [him] not in a position that she thought [he] would be in, but in a position [he] see[s] himself in” (p. 363). **Discussion:** 1)The dialogical process of culturally responsive pedagogies – ‘Engaging the conceptual frame double-consciousness and the tradition of counter-storytelling, Jamahl’s narratives can be read as situated actions indexical to his identity negotiations, specifically a means of (re)positioning himself in relation to educational disparity discourse’. Jamahl is both being pushed into acceptance of a particular framing of who he is *and* resisting this positioning. During the member checking process of this study, Jamahl asserted that this ongoing negotiation exists both within and beyond school. It is only through an understanding of the undesirable discourses he is resisting and an awareness of the cultural tools he employs in his resistance that a pedagogy might aim to be responsive to Jamahl’s desires and needs’ (p. 364). 2)Grounding culturally-responsive pedagogies - Jamahl’s successful (re)positioning of himself as someone who sought formal education, as someone other than a person who isn’t “gonna become nothin’ in life” says much about education and agency. Deficiency discourses framing African American young men like Jamahl are evident throughout educational research and reform as well as the wider society, engendering continual (re)positioning efforts on the part of minoritized people as they seek to mitigate the impact of these positionings (Allen, 2017; Harper & Davis, 2012). The findings also show that ‘there remain broader forces at work that can limit marginalized students’ (re)positional identities in classroom spaces, even when educators attempt to position themselves as allies’ (p. 364) (Ives, 2012). In exploring Jamahl’s narratives, and analyzing his work to (re)position himself as a learner and active seeker of education rather than the “nothing” he was positioned as, the authors argue that ‘renegotiated identities should not be viewed as a panacea’ (p. 364); The narrative analysis also suggests that ‘agency can be reproductive as well as transformational’ (Bourdieu, 2011; Willis, 1977); Authors therefore suggest that agency ‘must be understood as the negotiation of social structures and practices, not their absence or overcoming’ (Fairclough, 2003). **Core argument:** This narrative analysis case study serves as a reminder that “students’ positions ... need not be equated with their dispositions” (Luttrell & Parker, 2001, p. 245).  |
| Haggis, T. (2006). [Pedagogies for diversity: retaining critical challenge amidst fears of ‘dumbing down’](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070600922709), *Studies in Higher Education,* 31(5), 521–535.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Challenging idea that standards are dropping/ students are failing in UK higher education (humanities and social sciences); looks at the argument to personalise learning (‘meeting learner needs’) and problematizes the notion that students are failing (individual deficits approach) and examines “how more subtle aspects of higher education pedagogical cultures may themselves be creating conditions which make it difficult, or even impossible, for some students to learn” (abstract; p.521). Set in context of increasing neoliberal thinking driving higher education policies and practices, and against backdrop of increasing student diversity and pathways into university meaning that assumptions can no longer be made about what students can do/ know. The argument that standards are slipping = example of “‘defensive cynicism’. This response frames the current situation in terms of erosion of standards and dumbing down, and blames the ‘quality’ of the students, some of whom are seen to be incapable of coping with the critical challenges of conventional higher education. This response appears to equate widening participation with an inevitable abandonment of certain key elements of higher education assumptions and values in relation to learning” (p.523). Author problematizes assumptions made about students becoming independent learners: “The ubiquitous presence of the word ‘support’ in relation to these issues suggests the existence of a superior group who function in a strong and ‘unsupported’ way, thus pathologising any student for whom these assumptions are not clear” (p.525)**Aim:** To scope ‘a middle path’ between traditional and radical approaches to higher education pedagogy; to argue that teaching methods don’t necessarily need to be changed to make HE more accessible to diverse students, rather the focus needs to be on how teaching is done (see p.524)**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Academic Literacies research (Lea& Street, 1998; Lillis, 2001); ‘barriers to learning’ – social model of disability (Oliver, 1983).**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Discusses 5 alienating areas of curriculum and pedagogy:1) student lack of familiarity with process: it is no longer possible to assume that students come to university with a shared understanding of what and how with regard to academic practices and conventions (e.g. literacies/ assessment practices)2) wide range of motives and types of engagement: teachers need to engage with the range of reasons for studying in higher education, and need to see the job of ‘seducing’ students into being interested and engaged.3) understanding the orientation of the discipline: students may be wary of questioning ‘the expert’ – teachers need to take responsibility for teaching students how to critically engage.4) problems of language: different understandings about language use and communicating appropriately, especially in relation to assessment: “Problems in decoding and responding to expectations appear to be particularly acute in relation to assessment criteria” (p.528). Teachers need to help students be able to unpack and decode complex and rich disciplinary language: “it is hard to see how teaching can function as a rhetorical activity by which academic teachers ‘persuade students of an alternative way of looking at the world’ (Laurillard,2002, p. 43) if the style of the discourse makes it difficult for the majority of students to gain access to these new forms of understanding” (p.529).5) the nature of process in the discipline: author focuses on reading (and assumptions about reading) = processes of engagement which are tacit and learned over time, but which students are expected to pick up and master after a short period of engagement: “Such questions refer to highly complex operations, which academics have themselves only learnt through many years of trial and error in a range of different academic contexts, and which they go on learning. Although academic texts exist as codified products, it is arguably the processes that such products represent which are at the heart of academic activity” (p.530).**Core argument:** Haggis argues that the 5 alienating areas = need to be considered and revised in order to focus on the ‘how’ of more effective teaching for diversity and resist ‘transmission’ pedagogies: “embedded, processual complexities of thinking, understanding, and acting in specific disciplinary contexts need to be explored *as an integral part of academic content teaching within the disciplines themselves*” (p.530, italics in original). |
| Hanesworth, P., Bracken, S. & Elkington, S. (2018). [A typology for a social justice approach to assessment: learning from universal design and culturally sustaining pedagogy](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2018.1465405), *Teaching in Higher Education,* DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2018.1465405 UK Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Social justice; assessment and feedback; universal design for learning; culturally sustaining pedagogy; equality and diversity*  | **Context:** Set within the context of the assessment system in the UK, which is ‘neither value-neutral nor culture-free’ (p. 1). The authors problematise the current assessment system, which lauds ‘the predominantly white, male, middle-class, Western values of objectivity and individuality’ as ‘markers of good work’ (p. 1), while other markers of good practice in other cultures, such as subjectivity and collaboration/collectivism are viewed as ‘lesser indicators of intellectualism’ (p.1). The authors further argue that both values and knowledge are hierarchised in the assessment system. **Aim:** To ‘propose an approach to assessment, based on social justice theory, which aims to tackle the inhibiting effects of current systemic inequities in assessment outcomes, especially as experienced among minoritised groups’ (p. 3), by drawing on the concepts of Universal Design for Learning and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. **Theoretical frame:** Conceptual frameworks – a) Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP): ‘seeks to perpetuate and foster – to sustain – linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling’ (Paris 2012, p. 93); b) Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Focused primarily on the ‘accessibility of the curriculum and assessment’ (p. 5); ‘Advocates three principles of curriculum design: (i) provide multiple means of representation (the what of learning); (ii) provide multiple means of action and expression (the how of learning); and (iii) provide multiple means of engagement (the why of learning)’ (p. 5)**Methodology:** Essay. **Discussion:** 1)Drawing on Universal Design & Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy – Commmonality in both theories - ‘a concern to open up the curriculum’: UDL – by diversifying teaching and methods for evidencing learning to enhance accessibility (Fraser’s distribution); CSP – by embedding diversities evident in cultural, social and student identities into the ‘what and how’ of teaching to improve inclusivity; 2) A schema of practice encapsulating a social justice approach to assessment & a framework for organisational change to enable a sustainable development of this approach – a) A social justice approach in action: Beginning with UDL – Development of assessment literacy would involve negotiation between students and educators to ‘realise multiple means and methods of evidencing outcomes’, with a necessity to alter content, processes and resources where needed, so that all learners are able to grasp ‘key knowledge or skills’ and display this through multiple assessment forms (p. 7); Based on its three principles: a UDL approach to developing assessment would – acknowledge ‘the diversity of student knowledge, skills and prior experiences as well as their different ways of thinking and doing’ (p. 8); UDL therefore makes assessment inclusive from its ‘point-of-design’ (p. 8); b) A social justice approach in action: cross-pollinating - a cross-pollination of UDL/CSP in assessment, with the focus of staff-student partnership in assessment design, provides ‘a schema of praxis that enables actualisation of both elements of McArthur’s theory: assessment that is socially just by design and assessment that aims to promote greater social justice within society as a whole’ (p. 9); This schema requires the right academic dispositions & educators’ willingness to confront their individual philosophies, beliefs, and dominant ideologies evident at the discipline, organisational and societal level; Key strength of a cross-pollination approach: Practitioners are encouraged to view teaching and learning from students’ perspectives and consider each student’s learning experience; 3)Enabling organisational change: a framework for action – A social justice approach to reviewing assessment at the organisational level comprises four ‘dynamically interacting dimensions’: 1. ‘Setting of an organisational vision for realising a socially just approach to assessment, and using it to inform the ways that strategic leadership will facilitate changes in existing curriculum and assessment practices.
2. Developing avenues and mechanisms that encourage involvement by multiples stakeholders, particularly those who have traditionally been marginalised from institutional decision-making processes, including staff and students.
3. Providing resources of finance, time, technological hardware and software for staff and students, and ensuring there is professional enhancement capacity to engage effectively with developmental changes.
4. Through praxis, extending the culture of change to incorporate new systems and processes exemplifying minimum standards and best practices for socially just assessments both within the organisation and increasingly affecting wider society’ (p. 10)

**Core argument:** ‘A focused and dynamic interaction between the four dimensions for organisational change, along with the overarching attributes of a cross- pollinated UDL/CSP approach to assessment, provide a proposed typology for designing and implementing assessment policies and practices that comprise one form of social justice, a form that could generate momentum towards stronger approaches to social justice that comprise the dismantling of systems of oppression’ (p. 13).  |
| Hatton, K. (2012). [Considering diversity, change and intervention: how the higher education curriculum looked in on itself,](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/openu/jwpll/2012/00000013/A00101s1/art00004) *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 13(Special Issue), 34–50.UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *pedagogised practices; pedagogised identities; pedagogised other; fixity* | **Context:** Examines development of diversity initiatives in HE curriculum; specifically looks at absences of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups. In UK context, BAME participation, retention and success rates are concerning (in comparison with ‘White’ students) – see p.36 for definitions. NUS 2011 survey on race reports that 42% of respondents do not consider curriculum reflected diversity, while 34% thought they could not express their views on this to their lecturers**Aim:** To discuss two ‘diversity initiatives’ for BAME students in two English universities; to reflect and “consider curriculum change and intervention, in supporting the collective rights of all students” (p.35); to outline institutional approaches for considering diversity and institutional change.**Theoretical frame:** Post-structural: Atkinson’s (2002) pedagogised practices, pedagogised identities – these emerge through pedagogic contexts, pedagogised other (students marginalised/ excluded due to pedagogic practices and curriculum choices). Also, Bhaba (1994) and ‘fixity’ of (colonial) discourse**Methodology:** Autobiographical reflections using case study: case study 1 = cross-college diversity intervention = ‘co-constructed’ elective second year module; case study 2 = explores issues of race and ethnicity in one HEI, “by seeking to understand and reduce differentials in degree classification by the engagement of staff within new curriculum research initiatives across the institution” (p.35)**Findings:** Critique of labels like BAME and ‘White’ = “culturally and institutionally bound concepts, reflecting the current UK institutional narrative around HE student data collection and diversity initiatives” (p.37)HE curriculum = normative and powerful in terms of dictating ‘sameness’ (see Naidoo; Modood, 2007) about ‘fitting in’. The role of tutors/teachers = central: “Tutors are predominantly at the heart of the recognised course identity, and this would be a very powerful position to be in as it describes and reproduces that which it knows best” (p.40). In Western contexts, curriculum is predominantly Eurocentric and is ‘fixed’ by tutors ‘anxiously repeating’ courses (see Bhaba, 1994; p.41); Hatton asserts that tutors’ “lack of confidence in creating changethat may hinder curriculum development” (p.41; and for good reason if they are casual tutors). This fixity can also exist at macro-disciplinary level (‘canonical’ knowledge).Case study 1: Arts-based cross-college elective module; author was program convenor – autobiographical reflection – co-construction of knowledge with students and constant recreation of courseCase study 2: author is involved in this current research project: Retain-Achieve-Succeed (RAS) – part of WP agenda of her university. Focus = integrating culture and creativity within HE curricula. Reflexes on hegemonic power of Whiteness (as the norm). Methodological and ethical richness and complexity; research = ongoing.**Core argument:** Recommendations for implementation:1. “Using cross-faculty knowledge and individual research expertise, along with practical steps towards ensuring students feel safe expressing their ideas around subjects, is helpful” (p.47)
2. Need to recognise institutional power in facilitating/ limiting curricular/ cultural transformation

Offers 9 questions for institutions to ‘look in on themselves’ (p.48-9) that probe the ontological and epistemological foundations and assumptions of a course/ subject/ discipline |
| Keevers, L. & Abuodha, P. (2012). [Social Inclusion as an unfinished verb: A practice-based approach](https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/206), *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 6(2), A42–59.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords**:** *social inclusion, social justice, practice-based, relational, higher education, widening participation.* | **Context:** Research funded by UOW’s Social Inclusion Participation Scheme grant. Resists the individualistic measurements of proportional representation that background relational experience of under-represented students (and privileges point of entry, rather than ongoing support). Focuses on ‘doing’ of social inclusion. Social inclusion a recent addition to gov’t education policy/focus = see development of National Social Inclusion Unit (under Labor gov’t in 2008) and Bradley 20/40 targets. Focus on statistical measurements of equity hides significance of teaching and learning environment. Propose different conception of social inclusion = relational, situated, engaged, ongoing practices (p.A43)**Aim:** To offer a framework for describing/understanding the ‘doing’ of social inclusion. Poses these questions:What alternative conceptions of social inclusion may contribute to effectively finding ways to deal with exclusion, inequity and injustice in higher education? Is the Australian Government‟s current approach to social inclusion in higher education measuring what matters?**Theoretical frame:** Practice-based approaches = resist dichotomies/binaries and seek to explore relational character of teaching and learning/ knowing/doing so it is “*socially and collectively constituted*” (p.A44, italics in original) and “teaching and learning are viewed as *situated, sociomaterial, provisional, contested and pragmatic* activities” (p.A44). Draws on Levitas’ (1998) three-part characterization of discourses that shape the meaning of social inclusion/exclusion: RED (redistributionist egalitarian discourse: problems and remedies, inc. material dimensions of exclusion), SID (social integrationist discourse: focusing on work/ labour market/ paid work as ideal source of social inclusion) and MUD (moral underclass discourse: focus on moral deficits/ behaviour of the excluded). Also draws on notion of recognition, extending Fraser and Honneth’s work to include attention on impact of power on identity/subjectivity, and works with Fraser’s later political dimension and ‘parity of participation’.**Methodology:** Participatory Action Research (PAR) with interventionist orientation. Mixed methods = observation and field notes, reflexive group discussions, student retention rates, student results, surveys with students and staff = qual + quant data over 3 years, focusing on large teaching teams (first year cohorts): 4 subject coordinators, 21 sessional academics, 738 students, 4 courses, 2 faculties (computer science, electrical engineering, language and communication, media studies)**Findings:** 1. Data clearly shows “social inclusion cannot be tamed. It cannot be simplified to a set of targets. Nor can social inclusion be reduced to a set of principles to be evaluated against” (p.A48)
2. Over framework of social inclusion practices (see Fig. 1, p.A50) “to depict the co-emerging political, cultural, social and economic dimensions of social inclusion” (p.A49) - acknowledges limitations of conceptualising in 2-D (see Barad, 2007) – includes recognition and power. Seeks to understand social inclusion as tangle of dynamic connected practices (recognition, respect, representation, redistribution, voice, belonging, connectedness) = creates an ‘ecology of inclusion’ (Jordan, Schwartz, McGhie-Richmond, 2009)
3. Explored sessional staff members sense of their own social inclusion (looking at students’ learning experiences, sense of belonging, hope for future). Findings suggest that students’ sense of social inclusion is higher if their teacher = high sense of social inclusion. Thus, more collegial and inclusive teaching teams help sessional staff to feel more included and this has a “significant measurable, positive effect on the students‟ learning experience and their sense of social inclusion” (p.A54). Supports argument that focus on social inclusion needs to move away from narrow focus on deficits/ needs for support

**Core argument:** Advocates for “an alternative, expanded, conception of social inclusion as situated, engaged, relational, ongoing *practices* rather than end-state orientated” (abstract). Social inclusion = defined as dynamic interplay between respect, recognition, redistribution, representation, voice, belonging and connectedness – and argue that social inclusion goes beyond the student (all abstract) |
| Kennelly, R. & Tucker, T. (2012). [Why do “at risk” students choose to attend or avoid specific support programs: A case study of student experience at the University of Canberra](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Why-do-%22at-risk%22-students-choose-to-attend-or-avoid-Kennelly-Tucker/73689c90fe7ba84ce5c72ea1f3702b0cf1db54f2), *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 6(1), 103–116. AUSAnnotated by Ann Xavier Keywords: *“at risk” students; English language proficiency; academic literacy; lowering academic standards; Bradley Report.*  | **Context:** The literature highlights the significance of a ‘discipline based academic skills program’ to enhance the educational outcomes of EAL students. However, authors argue that there is a paucity of research regarding the reasons “at risk” students do not attend support programs. Definition of “at risk” students – ‘those whose applied English competence is such that they are considered in danger of failing” (Kennelly, Maldoni & Davies, 2010) (p. 104). Program context – Unit Support Program (USP), a weekly embedded program in the unit Introduction to Management (ITM); a more ‘generalised study skills support’ (p. 104) program. **Aim:** To describe and document the academic background of students who attended/avoided a support program at the University of Canberra & propose strategies which could attract greater student participation in the future. **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** Case study methodology (Six case studies – Three/cohort); Data collection methods: Four student assessments (weekly multiple choice questionnaires, an essay, a presentation & an exam; more than 200 student evaluation surveys; individual interviews (n=22 – 11 students who attended USP & 11 who did not). **Findings:** 1)Findings from the irregularly attending cohort - 52.3% of identified “at risk” students (n=148), did not regularly attend the offered USP support program; more than 90% of this cohort failed the unit; average age of cohort: 21.5 years; 17/21 students failed the unit; average fail rate: 53%; Key findings from three case studies: “subversion of entry requirements”(Case study 1), “perseverance” (Case Study 2) & “extra-curricular diversions” (Case study 3); Case study 1 – Lee: ATAR level of 75; started a commerce degree in 2007; failed 9/9 units in Year 1; felt frustrated with lack of ELP; passed units after three years; highlights issue of ELP levels for university entry – where English for ESL (which is conversational) is insufficient for university; Case study 2: Julie – recognised her need to write better & sought help from the ASP (academic study skills) and had a one to one consultation in the Government Business Relations unit; highlights the importance of perseverance & the differing needs of students, thus suggesting that assistance for students may not always be from a single source; Case study 3: Adam – International student from China who moved to Australia in Year 10; dream is to be a pilot; enrolled in a college with a pilot flying program; ATAR of 68 & entered university; failed his ITM (47%) after attending USP three times; better prepared in Semester 2/207 – had pilot’s license & reduced flying hours, and passed three units; constant exposure to English at flying school, university & work helped improve his ability & confidence to speak & write in English; reflects both the ‘downside’ and considerable long-term benefits of extra-curricular activities; 6/11 interviewees were distracted by extra-curricular activities during their university attendance; 2) Findings from regularly attending cohort - 47.7% of at-risk students regularly attended USP (Kennelly, Maldoni, & Davies, 2010, p. 67); 21 students were selected for interview on why they attended USP & their perceived benefits of the program; average attendance of 8.5/12 workshops; 100% passed the unit; average failure rate – 22.8%; 9/11 students had outside exposure to English; average age- 26 years; Key findings from case studies: “readiness” (Case Study 4); “academic English skills’ (Case Study 5); ‘Capacity to self-identify as needing help” (Case study 6); Case study 4: Brian – enrolled at UC at 23; struggled in most units – 15/30 for major essay in ITM; attributed pass in ITM to attending USP nine times; passed all units in Semester 2 & 2; reflects significance of maturity (influence of employment, ELP competency, personal motivation & willingness to accept help when needed); raises question of age as a ‘predictor of success and/or readiness’ (p. 110); Case study 5: Mary – bilingual background (Arabic & English); IELTS score – 6.5; Year 1 at university: passed 3/8 units; Year 2: passed 6/10 units, including Academic English; Year 3: passed 8/8 units, including ITM, with regular USP attendance; highlights the theme of maturity again, but with an emphasis on ‘preparedness’ (p. 110), especially in academic literacy; points towards the need for teachers in support programs to ‘challenge the presumption that an IELTS score of itself alone provides the student with the sufficient English skills to survive at university’; Case study 6: Josephine- mature age African student, who is a refugee with a PR status in Australia; 40 year old single mother who experiences childcare challenges; encounters challenges with academic language & Australian university culture; found USP with tutor support and attended eight times; passed her exam unit, with moderate marks; highlights the difficulties in identifying ‘at risk’ students due to assumptions that most students would be EAL students on study visas, which could present challenges in providing support to students who require them; 3)Comparison of both cohorts – Three significant differences identified between both cohorts: a)Progression – ‘Progression in the attending cohort showed students failed units at less than half the rate (22.8%) of the irregularly attending cohort (53%)’ (p. 112); b) Age – ‘The attending cohort had an average age of 26 years as opposed to the irregularly attending cohort of 21.5 years’ (p. 112); c) Attendance at the Canberra (senior secondary) Colleges - Using the College (ATAR) entry enabled ‘two out of 11 students in the attending cohort and seven out of 11 students in the irregularly attending cohort to avoid satisfying the normal English language requirement for university to their detriment’ (p. 112). **Discussion:** Implication of findings – “One size does not fit all” (p. 113) in the provision of support for at-risk students attending university; The ‘point of commonality’ between both cohorts was ‘all 22 students had individual needs and 21 found the USP valuable in satisfying their specific needs’ (p. 113); another important factor – Key role of tutorial staff in the parent program (Introduction to Management); Ways for students to maximise educational outcomes at university: i)English language competence from additional English language exposure, especially for academic English; ii)Limited paid employment; iii)Peer support of a native English speaker; Self help programs attendance (eg: USP); Intrinsic motivation; Pre-university preparation; Preparedness for university (appropriate ELP levels & understanding of the role of USP in assisting them). **Core argument:** The findings from the study ‘provide evidence for both optimism and concern; optimism for many mature age EAL students and others who generally seek opportunities such as the USP; concern because of the myriad reasons proffered by often younger students for not attending the USP’ (p. 115). |
| Klinger, C. & Murray, N. (2012). [Tensions in higher education: widening participation, student diversity and the challenge of academic language/ literacy](https://www.ingentaconnect.com/openurl?genre=article&issn=1466-6529&volume=14&issue=1&spage=27), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, 14(1), 27–44.AUS/UKAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Academic language; Academic literacy; diversity.* | **Context:** Explores the widening participation agenda from perspective of increased diversity in student population requiring attention to language and literacy skills [their word], from the position that non-traditional students are often “incorrectly labelled as ‘lacking academic quality’” (abstract). Paper is situated in post-massification context and explores both UK and Australia political/policy evolutions and explores ‘non-traditional’ entrance into higher education (aka enabling in Australian context)..**Aim:** Explores assessment mechanisms for identifying students ‘at risk’ and considers professional development needed to help academic staff understand and intervene. **Methodology:** Discussion**Discussion:** Draws on the ‘lowering standards’ debate: “while diversity and quality are somehow mutually incompatible and one may either sustain quality by limiting diversity, or accommodate diversity at the expense of quality, there are compelling imperatives to do both” (p.31). Unpacks notions of diversity and quality in context of this debateUnpacks academic literacy – part of ‘institutional habitus’ (ref to Thomas, 2002): “it can surely serve to exclude certain groups while maintaining the dominance of others who acquire ‘legitimacy’ by virtue of the degree of fit between what is the product of their family, educational and life experiences and the expectations of higher education institutions” (p.33) and institutions have ‘moral obligation to support non-traditional students. Discusses notion of ‘language proficiency’ as restricted to NESB students – doesn’t include NES students, which is problematic for the diversified student body. Presents Murray’s 3-part deconstruction of ‘proficiency’ (communicative competence, academic literacy, professional communication. ‘Proficiency’ = made up of 4 superordinate categories: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence (p.34)Non-traditional students most likely to require support with ‘academic literacy set’ for disciplines, requiring “supportive interventions designed to better align language usage with the customs and expectations of the academy” (p.36). Authors draw on argument to embed academic language and literacy support within disciplinary areas. Discusses PELA – to whom and how should it be operationalized? Equity argument for not picking on particular student groups: “it is no longer possible to make sensible assumptions about the proficiency of any commencing students, and having regard to principles of equity and the need to avoid discrimination by selecting studentson the basis of educational, geographical and socio-economic origins” (p.37). Universal/mandatory assessment = logistical nightmare – could be made voluntary with incentives (see Murray’s work at UniSA). How = diagnostic test or assessment via an early piece of assessed coursework. Also consider post-PELA support. Draws on Clerehen and Northedge re: moving away from remedial views of language/ literacies and embedding support within disciplines with professional development for staff.**Core argument:** Widening participation is “about changing attitudes and pedagogical practices and approaches that are often deeply entrenched in higher education institutions, where a deficit view of these cohorts predominates and the students who comprise them are stigmatized as a result” (p.39). Issues with language = ‘symptomatic’ of broader issues relating to views of acculturation, particularly for students who arrive with “a significantly greater shortfall in the kind of cultural capital successful study in this environment demands” (p.40) |
| Kruse, S., Rakha, S. & Calderone, S. (2018). [Developing cultural competency in higher education: an agenda for practice](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2017.1414790), *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(6), 733-750. DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2017.1414790 AUSAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Cultural competency; higher education; practice*  | **Context:** Due to changing national values and unrest, demographic and population shifts, and ever-changing admissions practices and policies, implementing a diversity and cultural-competency agenda within university settings has become a priority across the UK, Europe, and US. Moreover, public HE institutions across the UK, EU, and US are now more racially and ethnically diverse than ever. However, cultural competency efforts on campuses remain largely under theorised. **Aim:** To outline an agenda for developing cultural competency on campuses, and highlight the outcomes of cultural competency learning, consequently underscoring the role of campus leadership in the development of supportive characteristics (‘attention to shared knowledge, professional learning at all levels of the organization, inclusive instructional methods, integration with other campus initiatives, and inclusivity of diversity foci’) (p. 733). **Discussion:** 1)Agenda for professional learning: a)Increased efficacy: A sense of collective success & effectiveness. b)Increased satisfaction: Increases with increased efficacy. c)Greater responsibility: Faculty & staff’s intensified focus on work. 2) Characteristics of a cultural competency agenda: a)Shared basic conceptions & knowledge b)Professional development for all c)Professional learning instructional learning methods d)Integration with other diversity-related initiatives e)General or specific professional development f)Desired outcomes (eg: cognitive, attributional, experiential, an/or behavioural (Bezrukova, Jehn & Spell, 2012). 3)Conditions that support strong cultural competency agenda: a)Time to meet, learn & process new learning (Dixon et al. 2014; Zhu and Engles 2014): Time spent for knowledge acquisition & interpersonal learning b)Time to monitor, evaluate, and refine processes and practices across the campus (Bezrukova, Jehn, and Spell 2012; Griffiths 2005; Smith 2015; Thelin 2011): Institutions as a collective require time to revisit & evaluate joint work c)Communication structures that support the work of cultural competency (Anand and Winters 2008; Brown 2004; Engberg 2004; Smith 2015): Developing an environment which cultivates cultural competency requires the exchange of ideas within and across the institutions. d)A climate of trust & openness to improvement and learning (Dlouha, Huisingh, and Barton 2013; Dlouha, Machackova-Henderson, and Dlouhy 2013; Lozano 2014): Enhances the cultural competency agenda by creating campus spaces to support individual learning & growth & enhances the extent of the sharing of relevant information & the communication among staff & faculty. e)Supportive leadership (Johnson, 2016; Smith, 2015): Supportive leadership needs to focus attention & effort on issues of shared purpose, goals, values & institutional change to ensure that cultural competency agendas are successful f)Access to expertise designed to support new individual & organisational learning (Adserias, Charleston, and Jackson 2016; Johnson 2016; Popli and Rizvi 2016; Smith 2015): The success of cultural competency agenda is based on the collective attainment of the intellectual & practical knowledge & skills that underlie the field (Greenholtz 2000; Johnson 2016; Schuh 2013; Thelin 2011). [All characteristics are ‘mutually reinforcing’ – no single feature is sufficient to insure positive campus outcomes]**Core argument:** Well-meaning attention to cultural competence is insufficient to support sustained and successful effort, although such effort is necessary if HE institutions, both within the US and Europe, are to gain traction concerning difficulties currently faced. Hence, there is a need to focus on the development of organizational characteristics and conditions that support cultural competencyto develop cultural competence in HE institutions.  |
| Marquis, E., Jung, B., Schormans, A.F., Lukmanji, S., Wilton, R. & Baptiste, S. (2016). [Developing inclusive educators: enhancing the accessibility of teaching and learning in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1181071), *International Journal for Academic Developmen*t, 21(4), 337–349. CANAnnotated by Anna XavierKeywords: *accessibility; inclusion; students with disabilities; faculty development*  | **Context:** Set within the Canadian context where there is ‘no federal legislation specific to disability’ (p. 339), with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) instated by the Ontarian government in 2005 being the first and at the point of writing, the only overarching provincial disability legislation in the country. The authors highlight that with the growing number of students with disability at HE institutions, ‘faculty development connected to accessible teaching is of paramount importance’ (abstract). **Aim:** To interpret ‘existing recommendations for development in the context of data gathered pertaining to the accessibility of teaching and learning at one university’ (p. 339). The study which the article draws on explored ‘how a range of campus stakeholders perceive and experience the relative accessibility of teaching and learning at one institution as the AODA legislation is implemented’ (p. 339). **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** ‘Longitudinal, qualitative case study methodology’ (p. 339); Data collection methods & participants: Phases 1 & 3 – one-on-one semi-structured interviews, participants: ‘instructors (*n* = 7 [Phase 1], *n* = 5 [Phase 3]) students with (*n* = 12, 3) and without disabilities (*n* = 4 [both Phases]), administrators (*n* = 4 [both Phases]), and staff (*n* = 9, 6)’ (p. 339); Phase 2 – journal entries (once a week for 10 weeks), participants: participating students with disabilities (n=6); Data analysis: Inductive analysis using constant comparison (Merriam, 2009). **Findings:** 1)Perceived needs or improvements – comments from participants underlined need for improved accessibility training; many were not aware of development opportunities available on campus; need for improved professional development was discussed ‘particularly frequently in relation to existing training modules connected to the AODA legislation’ (p. 340) – most participants claim that the training offered to the AODA customer service standard is ‘highly ineffective and potentially even detrimental to accessibility’ (p. 340); most participants displayed minimal awareness on the existence of subsequent AODA training; 2) Participants’ ideas on factors which contribute to quality academic development related to accessibility: a) Content – Data highlight the ‘potential utilility of providing further education about AODA and about the accommodations procedures administered by the university’s accessibility services office’ (p. 342); many participants showed scepticism towards he the realisation of universal design in practical terms, or its negative impact on teaching quality or academic integrity of courses/programs; b)Design strategies – Findings suggest the value of including students with disabilities (who are willing) in the design and delivery of training programs; many participants argue for a ‘discussion-based approach to training’ (p. 342) which allows for opportunities to share and discuss experiences and concerns; some participants pointed out the value of online resources as a supplement to in-person workshops; data also highlighted issues regarding ‘which development initiatives should be mandated or optional, centralised or discipline-specific’ – some participants valued ‘in housing development initiatives in departments’, while many also highlighted the potential for ‘valuable, interdisciplinary knowledge exchange via cross-campus initiatives’ & one staff member revealed concerns on the possibility of poor attempts at providing accessibility if efforts were localised in departments. **Recommendations:** Authors propose ‘an approach to educator accessibility training that draws from and builds on established academic development practices; strong initial step – ‘develop small, interdisciplinary faculty learning communities focused on accessibility’ (Ward & Selvester, 2012); Other implications: Face-to-face developmental opportunities should be supplemented with online resources regarding key, basic information – relevant accessibility legislation; accommodation procedures on place in campus & support staff contacted for additional consultation)**Core argument:** Given the increasing diversity of the student population in HE, an institutional commitment to faculty development in accessibility is crucial, and have the potential for multiple benefits for student learning.  |
| Martin, G. (2015). [Scaling critical pedagogy in higher education, *Critical Studies in Education*](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2015.1115417), 58(1), 1-18. **DOI:**10.1080/17508487.2015.1115417AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *critical pedagogy; curriculum; geography; higher education; neoliberalism*Key words: *critical pedagogy, scale, activism* | **Context:** Set in context of neoliberalised HE sector, looks at how the notion of scale could lead to deeper theorisations of critical pedagogy to avoid dichotomous top-down, bottom-up paradigm. Based on notion that neoliberal structure of HE means “increasing demands and pressures are making it difficult for activist-scholars to translate their beliefs into practice” (p.2) - critical pedagogy can help but maybe it has run out of steam because of limited examples of “so-called emancipatory educational practice” (p.2)**Theoretical frame:** Draws on field of geography to explore how scale can be appropriated for “critically re-imaging and developing its possibilities for engagement” (p.3). Scale is often taken to be common-sensical – used to describe different levels of organisation, “which tightly co-joined, constitute a nested hierarchy” (p.3). Recent debate around scale as socio-political construction has lead to two camps: horizontalists and verticalists (p.4) = horizontalists suggest that a vertical, nested hierarchy view “fails to recognise the potential to subvert repressive formations through spatial-social coordinates of immanent becoming” (p.4) – extreme view leads to ‘flat ontology’ (Marston et al. 2005) that radically decentres agency; e.g. leaderless movements (but see critiques). Scale = dialectal relationship and effect**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** Horizontalistapproaches to critical pedagogy have attempted to engage pedagogically with autonomy, new subjectivities and affective social relationships, where autonomy is about challenging norms and status quo “to reimagine and produce new kinds of knowledge and relationships” (p.6; see Sitrin, 2012:4) = ongoing project.Important to “understand how scale is constituted at the intersection of ‘diverse spatialities’” = always located in nexus of power, agency, contestation and possibility (p.7). Education = system of violence – Freire’s ‘banking model’ = exemplifies this. Activist-scholars = choice of resistance or conformity through ignoring. Process of internalised socialisation that serves to restrict choices = ‘hidden curriculum’ = typically invisible and not acknowledged. Discusses Freire and Giroux (‘border pedagogy’), use of technology to “diffuse both in space and time” (p.10), notion of ‘pedagogical proximity’ (between western and indigenous knowledges), ‘pedagogy of discomfort’ (Zembylas & Boler, 2002).Highlights importance of “scaling-up localised efforts that are typically ad hoc and self-organising” (p.11), perhaps using ‘scalecraft’ (Fraser 2010) – sensitive to cultural and contextual nuances and “necessitates the capacity to ‘learn’ and ‘adapt’ sometimes in the face of apparent defeat” (p.12) – how to work out ‘diverse spatialities’**Core argument:** Scale is the hidden curriculum of HE because “the spatiality of power that tacitly informs it” (p.13) |
| Murray, N. (2016). [Dealing with diversity in higher education: awareness-raising on teachers’ intercultural competence](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1094660?journalCode=rija20), *International Journal for Academic Development,* 21(3), 166–177.UK/AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *widening participation; multicultural/ multilingual student population; teacher development; intercultural competence; language awareness-raising, internationalisation* | **Context:** ‘Superdiverse’ (Vertovec, 2010) student cohorts that have the potential to enrich the teaching-learning environment. Diversity driven by widening participation and internationalisation. The resulting diversity requires that “academic staff need to adopt appropriate attitudinal and pedagogical behaviours” (p.167), which requires institutions to train their teachers and offer professional development programs to foster intercultural competence of academic staff. Author cites the work of Byram, Nichols & Stevens (2001) which called for ‘decentring’ — seeing outside of yourself and your own perspective. Teacher training is clearly needed to help educators respond to diversity: “In a context where staff have traditionally been employed on the basis of qualifications, industry experience and professional reputation, but who often come with no formal teacher training and thus little awareness of the factors governing successful classroom management, interaction and learning, such professional development courses are seen as increasingly important” (p.169). Resulting diversity = “This increased heterogeneity of the student body brings with it particular challenges that require institutions and the staff they employ to have the wherewithal to deal deftly with diversity in a way that ensures a positive, supportive and affirmative student experience” (p.167).**Aim:** To focus on linguistic dimension of diversity; to consider “how, as part of their intercultural repertoire, teachers – and by extension, students – can benefit from developing an understanding of language, and, in particular, the general principles governing how we mean in language and the lingua-cultural variability that impacts upon the process of doing so” (p.166).**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** *Linguistic diversity*: overview of importance of effective language use (in particular, social grammars); “Lecturers, of course, cannot possibly be expected to be conversant in the social grammars of all their students, and this can have consequences where the lecturer’s social grammar does not align with that of the students” (p.170). Advice: we need to raise awareness “of those principles that apply universally across languages and enable us to mean and be understood and to present/project ourselves in whatever light we choose” (p.171).*Linguistic accommodation/ multilingual classroom*: by raising awareness of languaging/ principles of language use, we can articulate more strongly the unconscious knowledge we hold about language and use that to be more cognisant of students’ languages, thus empowering lecturers “to respond in a more insightful, sensitive, and nuanced way to students’ language and behaviour” (p.171). Author offers series of question prompts to help lecturers consider assumptions about language and tone**Core argument:** Increased student (and staff) diversity necessitates the unpacking of assumptions about language use and values, so as “to accommodate to their students rather than impose their own lingua-cultural values and associated expectations. As such, it needs to be a compulsory part of their training and development” (p.175). |
| Northedge, A. (2003). [Rethinking Teaching in the Context of Diversity](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1356251032000052302), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 8(1), 17–32.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Teaching in UK higher education in context of large-scale diversification of student body/ courses offered. Author offers example from Open University model of distance learning. Author notes that [at time of writing] the typical institutional response to student diversity = remedial models of support: “The stately home of elite education is simply extended by adding a large paupers’ wing” (p.17)x`**Aim:** To argue that neither traditional model nor student-centred model = panacea to teaching issues resulting from diversification of higher education; to propose “an emphasis on the sociocultural nature of learning and teaching, modelling learning as acquiring the capacity to participate in the discourses of an unfamiliar knowledge community, and teaching as supporting that participation” (abstract; p.17)**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:***Discussion about what knowledge is*: is it transmission of information? If so, diversity confuses this because of the underlying assumptions about what students bring/where they start from. Sociocultural views of learning offer alternative through discourse communities/ communities of practice/ knowledge communities (e.g. Swales; Lave & Wenger).Discussion of different levels of participation: central v. peripheral; generative v. vicarious, convergent v. variable understanding.*Discussion about what learning is*: “• a user of various specialist discourses; • a participant within the relevant knowledge communities” (p.22).Challenges of academic discourse resulting from diversity: “Many come to academic discourse expecting it to complement the knowledge produced in their other life-worlds, but instead find it discordant and unsettling” (p.23). Author discusses the various/varying discourses and discursive positions that students have to navigate, which are complicated for teachers/ing by the diversity in the class. Challenges play out with students’ voices; “Voice requires a sense of one’s identity within the discourse community. For students with little experience in academic communities, the struggle to develop an effective voice though which to ‘speak’ the discourse, whether in writing or in class, can be long and difficult. Yet, until they do, their grades suffer, since their progress can only be registered through speaking the discourse. Support in establishing voice is a vital component of courses for students from diverse backgrounds” (p.25). Other challenges = debate, apprenticeship through mastery (becoming/ moving through novice academic position).**Teaching in context of diversity:** How can teachers create discursive environments to help students participate.*Appropriate discursive environment*: multiple voices with multiple opportunities to get involved (in terms of content, comfort) through structured debate.*Appropriate target knowledge community*: be clear about which knowledge community you are targeting — develop space for knowledge community of ‘care practitioners’ in course discussed.*Intermediate levels of discourse*: through sustained discursive environment and multiple levels of participation, generative participation and appropriate assessment.**Core argument:** “students need teachers who can provide opportunities for supported participation in the relevant knowledge community” (p.31). |
| Pearce, J. & Down, B. (2011). [Relational pedagogy for student engagement and success at university](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13384-011-0037-5), *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(4), 483–494.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Higher education, Disadvantage, Pedagogy, Social inclusion, Student engagement* | **Context:** Focus on low SES students in context of increasing participation targets (post-Bradley) and in regional setting (Murdoch University). Findings foreground importance of student-staff relationships: positive relationships = sustain engagement; negative relationships = work against WP agenda. Set against context of under-representation of equity groups. Argue that to create a participatory and empowering educational context, need to understand students’ social histories, particularly in context of metanarratives/ ‘schooled knowledges’ (Alexander et al., 2005) that dictate who should have access to university – based on well-rehearsed scripts (“‘competition’, ‘failure’ and ‘sorting’”, p.485). **Aim:** To explore the “cultural and pedagogical conditions that promote, support and enable their continuing participation and engagement in higher education” of low SES students in a regional university**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Qualitative: ‘purposeful conversations’ with 16 low SES UG students. All participants in study = came from enabling pathways and were mature aged (21-45), most = FinF. All participants = in 2nd/ 3rd year**Findings:** Relational pedagogy = important for enhancing student learning; it foregrounds the importance of relationship building. Findings arranged around support & resources/ constraints & interferences*Support & Resources*Interaction (in lectures, tutorials, informal interactions) = key for developing rapport and permitting a sense that academics are available to students (helps students to feel supported, to stay on track. Navigating who is approachable = important part of transitioning. Participants found that not all academics are open to interaction and “academics’ wishes are difficult to interpret and often contradictory” (p.486), which is likely to be result of poor communication. Participants’ descriptions = highlight importance of clear communication = ‘participatory model of communication’ = best (dialogue, horizontal relationship - Freire) + funds of knowledge. Interaction with lecturers = prevents sense of alienation. Notes power of academics (‘relational trust’ = Bryk & Schneider, 2002; or ‘relational trust’ =Warren, 2005)*Constraints & interferences*Relational pedagogy = shaped by institutional norms = impact on academic work and possibilities for relationships to develop. Mention casualization of workforce: “working conditions minimise opportunities for engagement with students” (p.488). Curriculum design = important for creating moments of connection: “When the emphasis is on delivering a large amount of content in a lecture setting, there is less opportunity for student interaction” (p.488) = “absence of dialogic encounters with students” (p.488). Participants described feeling dismissed and unimportant. Importance of feedback foregrounded (as in lecturers don’t want to give it) – onus = on students to seek feedback. Some academics = ‘stand-offish’ = critique of banking model.Authors briefly note context of neoliberal logics = “Relational dimensions of pedagogy are being seriously eroded and diminished by the anti-democratic and authoritarian tendencies of neoliberalism” (p.491)**Core argument:** Relational pedagogy (relations and connections between staff and students) = particularly important for students who may experience cultural and economic issues (e.g. child care, balancing work and family, not knowing the ropes) and for students who have previously felt marginalised or isolated in their educational experiences. Feedback is particularly important. “When academics do not recognise the potentially exclusionary impact of their pedagogies and thus fail to engage in a relationship that can provide support when it is needed, they may unconsciously perpetuate existing social inequalities” (p.492). |
| Power, E., Partridge, H., O’Sullivan, C. & Kek, M.Y.C. (2020). [Integrated ‘one-stop’ support for student success: recommendations from a regional university case study](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2019.1676703), *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(3), 561-576.AUSAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Student support services; integrated services; student success; staff experiences; qualitative research*  | **Context:** Situated in an Australasian context, where discussion regarding student engagement in HE highlights ‘cohesive integration practices within ‘one-stop’ student support services’ as ‘critical for student success’ (abstract). However, authors argue that there is a paucity of empirical research in this area, in terms of scope and quantity. **Aim:** To address the gap in empirical literature by exploring how an integrated student support service model is experienced by staff at an Australian regional university, and their ‘perceptions of its sustainability, accessibility, relevance and impact upon student success’ (p. 574). **Theoretical frame:** Input-environment-outcome (I-E-O) model (Astin, 1984, p. 1993) – views student success as being influenced by three sets of elements: (1) the inputs – ‘the demographic characteristics, family back- ground, academic and social experiences that students bring to the university’; (2) the environment – ‘the people, programs, services, policies, cultures and experiences that students encounter at university, regardless of mode of study being on-campus or external/online’; (3) ‘the outcomes – relating to students’ characteristics, knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours post-university study’ (p. 562). **Methodology:** Case study methodology; Data collection methods: Semi-structured interviews & passive participant observations; one-stop services centre – library (‘campus hub’ (p. 564) for various student services); Participants: Managers (n=6) and staff member (n=16) employed within the integrated support services situated at the Ipswich Campus; Total participants (n=22); Data analysis: Analysis of interview transcripts (manager – 4; staff – 14) & observation journal entries (7); employed the six-phase approach of analysing qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006) – Familiarising, Initial Coding, Searching for Themes, Reviewing Themes, Defining and Naming Themes, Producing a Report; inductive approach – themes were developed based on data collected. **Findings:** Five main themes derived from findings, divided into two categories: Individual & interpersonal levels of participant experience; 1)Individual-level themes: ‘Understanding, skills & student-centred philosophy’ – ‘commonalities in the personal characteristics of participants which influence their experience delivering integrated support to students’ (p. 566); Theme 1: Understanding –‘participants’ contextualised knowledge of other services’ roles & responsibilities in the integrated service’ (p. 567); understanding of integrated services is developed via interaction & communication with staff; Theme 2: Skills – participants highlighted ‘importance of utilising existing staff skills’ (p. 568), as well as improve or develop new skills to assist students; verbal communication skills were highlighted by participants as crucial for providing tailored support for students, while non-verbal communication skills were highlighted as key to understanding individual student experiences and needs; 2)Interpersonal level themes: ‘communication & collaboration’ – ‘interpersonal interactions within teams, between teams and vertically between hierarchies within the integrated service’ (p. 570); Theme 4: Communication – staff and teams’ main form of communication is informal; Informal information sharing: i) offered ‘learning experiences’, which increased participants’ understanding of other forms of services provided; ii)enabled potential issues in the one-stop service centre to be detected early, thus allowing for the consequent problem-solving response; communication was ‘critical for effective operation’ (p. 570); participants’ suggested to increase information sharing & formal communication between teams; Theme 5: Collaboration – dominant form of collaborations between staff is via referrals, which is underpinned by participants’ ‘shared student-centred philosophy’ (p. 571), which places the needs of the students first; working in a ‘co-located space’ (p. 571) facilitated face-to-face collaboration between participants and other staff & managers; all collaborations were also based on a ‘culture of respectful working relationships’ (p. 572). **Recommendations:** 1) Providing regular professional development for staff – to improve verbal & non-verbal communication skills & develop a greater understanding of the roles & responsibilities of each service in the integrated ‘one-stop’ service (p. 572); 2) Creating more opportunities for informal & formal communication between staff/manager; 3) Improving collaboration via referrals in the integrated service through ‘professional learning and procedures’ (p. 574). **Core argument:** A ‘one-stop’ integrated student support service can facilitate student success due to the five individual & interpersonal themes identified in the study: understanding, skills, student-centered philosophy, communication & collaboration. The effectiveness of the integrated service centre can be enhanced via the recommendations provided by the authors.  |
| Ross, S. (2014). [Diversity and intergroup contact in higher education: exploring possibilities for democratization through social justice education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2014.934354), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 19(8), 870–881.USAAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *College students; democracy; diversity; higher education; intergroup relations; social justice education*  | **Context:** In the recent past, unexpected rates of demographic diversity on college and university campuses in the US resulted in high levels of conflict among students (Astin et al. 1997) which is a crucial reminder of the dangers of failing to adequately address diversity issues within HE institutions. However, the facilitation of interactions among diverse students via programmatic and curricular interventions, often result in positive cognitive and democratic outcomes (Hurtado 2005; Gurin et al. 2002; Chang et al. 2006; Chang, Astin, and Kim 2004). In addition, the practice of social justice education is in HE settings contributes to a healthy society by transforming the public spaces of He into sites where empathy, equity, and democratic citizenship skills are cultivated (Giroux 2004; Halx 2010). **Aim:** This study explores dynamics of intergroup interaction and democratic learning outcomes among self-identified Black and White students enrolled in two sections of a diversity education course within a predominantly White university in the southeastern United States. RQs: ‘(1) What processes and dynamics of intergroup contact emerged during the course? and; (2) What (if any) democratic learning outcomes did enrolled students perceive themselves as gaining?’(p. 873). **Theoretical frame:** Intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954): Suggests that ‘intergroup contact can lead to prejudice reduction when there is equal status, cooperation among groups, and general support for positive intergroup contact’ (p. 872) (Allport, 1954). **Methodology:** Mixed methods approach. Data collection methods: Observations and notes of the instructor; demographic survey; survey questions (to assess the extent of democratic learning outcomes students perceived themselves obtaining); final reflections written by students (end of the course). Participants: Undergraduate students (n=61) who enrolled in two sections of the diversity education course designed, ‘Gendered Worlds’. Section 1: (n=33); 64% were between 21- 25 years old; 91% female & 6% male; 38% self-identified as Black; 47% self-identified as White. Section 2: (n=28); 52% were between 21- 25 years old; 100% female; 56% self-identified as White; 36% self-identified as Black. Data analysis: Differences in intergroup dynamics – analysed by class section & self-identified race/ethnicity of enrolled students. **Findings:** RQ1 (*What processes and dynamics of intergroup contact emerged in this course?*): 1)Marked differences observed in dynamics of intergroup contact in the two respective sections of the course: Section 1(met twice/week) – Calm classroom environment; Section 2 (met once/week) – Dramatic shift from ‘calm to volatile’ (p. 874) during discussion relating to race/ethnicity & sexuality; specific conflict over the ‘perceived wrongness of homosexuality’ (p. 874) between students self-identified as Christians & students self-identified as homo- or bi-sexual. Impact of conflict in Section 2: Alteration in classroom dynamics & a necessity for intergroup interaction based on positive communication, active listening & conflict resolution. Findings from student reflections: Increased awareness of diversity, and increased tolerance of difference (to a certain extent) in Section 2; Higher percentage of students in Section 2 (92%) compared to Section 1(89%) reported on the possibility of coalition-building. RQ2 (What (if any) democratic learning outcomes did enrolled students perceive themselves as gaining?): Democratic outcome of interest: Intergroup cooperation; Section 1: 93% of White students & 83% of Black students indicated a belief in the possibility of coalition-building based on their respective course experiences; Section 2: 86% of White students & 100% of Black students indicated a belief in the possibility of coalition-building; Biggest barrier to coalition building: Section 1: Combined responses - Race (37%); Other (30%); Religion (18%); Sexuality (13%); All issues (Race,Religion,Sexuality,Other) (67%). Black students: Race (50%); Other (33%); Religion (8%); Sexuality (8%). White students: Race (29%); Religion (29%); Other (21%); Sexuality (21%). Section 2: Combined responses - Race (39%); Other (19%); Religion (27%); Sexuality (15%). Black students: Race (78%); Other (11%); Sexuality (11%); White students: Religion (43%); Sexuality (21%); Other (21%); Race (14%). **Discussion:** 1) The high percentage of students in both sections of the course who indicated a belief that coalition-building was possible suggests that the dynamics of intergroup contact were generally positive among most students in both sections. This is likely the result of diverse curricular content in the course, which emphasised the importance of coalition-building and opportunities for meaningful dialog and interaction. 2) The stark differences between Black & White students in the perception of ‘Race’ as the biggest barrier to building coalition are consistent with existing diversity literature on the continued prominence of race/ethnicity for students of colour and the relative lack of significance placed on race/ethnicity by students who are not race/ ethnic minorities (Ancis, Sedlacek, and Mohr 2000; Harper and Hurtado 2007). 3) Although conflict is often viewed negatively in HE environments, in Section 2, students who experienced high levels of classroom conflict indicated higher levels of belief in the possibility for coalition-building. This suggests that conflict in the college classroom, when properly facilitated, can result in deeper levels of student learning and greater investment in course goals. **Core argument:** Democratisation through socially-just education can be achieved via: 1) The presence of a critical mass of diverse students in a HE learning environment 2)The facilitation of conflict to allow for coalition-building 3) The blending of diverse and previously unaffiliated students groups to promote participatory democracy, where students can practice critical citizenship skills to be active participants in our increasingly diverse society (Halx 2010).  |
| Slee, R. (2001). [Social justice and the changing directions in educational research: the case of inclusive education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603110010035832), *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 5(2-3), 167–177.AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker*Keywords: inclusive education, disabilities* | **Context:** Disabilities. Speaking to an audience of like-minded people so explicitly does not need to debate the merits of inclusive education, but cautions against resting on assumptions about shared definitions: “The absence of a language for inclusive education that stipulates its vocabulary and grammar increases the risk for political misappropriation” (p.167). Discusses inclusive education in context of special education (with particular focus on disabilities). Frames discussion around introduction of special/ inclusive education – notes how inclusive education = narrowly framed around disorders and defects, rather than acknowledging inclusive education= for all students.**Aim:** To discuss “human rights and the production and reproduction of meaning as it adheres to the intersection of disablement and education” (p.169). Asks questions about how to teach and what research to draw on when teaching education students about inclusive education**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Scopes the evolution of ‘special education’. Argues that “The exclusion and `othering’ of young people through the forms and processes of education is endemic” and “The context of education policycreates the conditions for exclusion that militate against an inclusive educational project” (p.172). Makes the point that schooling was never designed to be for everyone, so the more education has opened to the masses, the more it has “developed the technologies of exclusion and containment” (p.172). Makes 3 propositions for teacher education:1. inclusive education = cultural politics
2. consider cross-cultural dialogue (inter/intra-disciplinary with a focus on social justice)
3. teaching focus should shift to difference and identity politics

**Core argument:**  For inclusive education to be congruent with hope for social justice, need to confront political nature of teacher education, and work against tokenistic and surface “strive against the notion that compulsory special education units for trainee teachers is better than nothing” (p.175). |
| Snowball, J.D. & McKenna, S. (2017). [Student-generated content: an approach to harnessing the power of diversity in higher education](https://srhe.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273205?tab=permissions&scroll=top#.XlOBVS17FQI), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 22(5), 604–618.SAAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Student-generated content; diversity; podcasts; sociocultural context*  | **Context:** Classes in HE institutions are becoming larger and more diverse globally. Support for ‘non-traditional’ students often involves additional remedial classes offered outside the main curriculum, which has resulted in limited success. Sociocultural theories of learning contend that the ‘potential clash between the sociocultural context of disciplinary knowledge and the very different home contexts of many non-traditional students’ needs to be acknowledged’ (p. 604). Student-generated content (SGC) is argued to enable teachers to acknowledge and include student experiences and voices into the ‘community of practice’ (p. 604) and the production of knowledge. **Aim:** This paper focuses on the use of student-generated podcasts as a means to harness the diversity of student experiences in a large (nearly 600 students) first-year Economics class at a South African University. **Theoretical frame:** ‘Community of practice’ (Wenger & Snyder, 2000): All learning is a social process in a specific context, where learners develop common understandings via debate and exchanging different points of view. **Methodology:** Sample: Rhodes University (Small, rural English-medium institution,; 7500 students – 31% postgraduates & 59% women; 64% of Black students since 1994 – although SA population comprises 88% of Black Africans). Course where intervention took place: Economics 102 – Introductory course with one of the largest classes in university; Racial breakdown: 67% black Africans, 27% White, 6% ‘coloured’ or Indian South Africans. Intervention - Second week of course: Students were given the option of submitting either a ‘paper-based tutorial exercise’ or producing a ‘video tut’ (p. 609). Data collection: Data on student perceptions on the value of SGC were collected as part of the course evaluation. Two forms of feedback: a)Likert scale responses to statements b)Responses to open-ended question: ‘If you chose the video tut option, in what ways did making a video tut help you to learn?’ and ‘For everyone, how did you benefit (or not) from watching the videos produced by others?’ Response rate for feedback: 80% of class (n=470). **Findings:** 1) 75% of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that the course included a range of learning opportunities (average score of 3.96/5) & that the course enabled them to apply knowledge in varying contexts (average score of 3.89/5). 2) For the podcast creators: 66% agreed that content creation was ‘an interesting way to learn’ (p. 611); 24% were neutral; 11% disagreed/strongly disagreed (average score of 3.84/5). 3)For viewers: 50% agreed/strongly agreed that videos created by others were ‘a fun way to learn economics’ (p. 611); 31% of students were neutral; 19% disagreed/strongly disagreed. 4)Responses to open-ended question: Significant theme from students who perceived the SGC as a positive experience: The role of videos in linking classroom theory to real-world reality.; extension of theme: realisations that academic knowledge could be applied, and was relevant ‘beyond the lecture room’ (p. 612). Other themes from student feedback: Context – immediate context of videos, alternative contexts to enable students to be more ‘open-minded’ and view things from another point of view; assistance with understanding and recalling concepts via ‘real-life examples’; enjoyment of using new technologies and literacies; technical learning outcomes. Significant themes from students who perceived SGC negatively: Lack of theoretical content & contribution to learning activities – videos were regarded as ‘irrelevant’ or a ‘waste of time’ (p. 613); ‘perceived lack of legitimacy of SGC compared to expert knowledge’ (p. 612). **Implications:** Students need to be reassured that the inclusion of SGC in classes have been carefully moderated for correctness and usefulness, and have been verified prior to being uploaded for general online use. **Core argument:** A transformative approach to teaching and learning requires a redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of students and teachers (Neary, 2009; Cook-Sather & Luz, 2014). SGC, such as the student-generated podcasts can provide the opportunity to make students part of the community of knowledge creators, and members of a community of practice, rather than outsiders who passively receive knowledge, which is controlled and mediated by teachers.  |
| Srinivasan, P. (2017). [What we see is what we choose: seers and seekers with diversity](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14681366.2016.1255243?journalCode=rpcs20), *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* 25(2), 293–307.AUSAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Inclusive pedagogy; diversity; postcolonial; othering; normalising; discourse*  | **Context:** Educators cannot avoid the meaningful recognition of categorical identity groupings to mobilise relevant, accessible and purposeful educational experiences for all students. As educators recognise and acknowledge these categorical groups, images of society are constructed by positioning these groups in particular ways. They then draw upon these images to further engage in their respective pedagogical acts, as each image advises them on how they conduct their role as educators. Thus, images of society held by educators become their discursive choice.**Aim:** To outline the conceptual underpinnings of the discursive images held by educators. **Theoretical frame:** Theoretical concepts: Image makers - core concepts that constitute the images of a society, which have been drawn from varied theoretical paradigms; Image of society – Play a critical role in educators’ decisions and pedagogical choices, therefore contributing to how individuals in diverse groups are educated**Discussion:** A)Image makers: 1) Difference: A key concept used by many fields to discuss the interplay of identities, both individual and categorical or group identity; Hall (2003), Weedon (2004), and many other postcolonial scholars, propose that establishing ‘difference’ is not just about the construction of who an individual is, but it is also about the exclusion of who an individual is not – inevitably establishing who is ‘in and out’, creating ‘inequitable power relationships’ among groups (p. 294). 2)Othering: Conceptualises the process of establishing ‘difference; In postcolonial literature ‘othering’ is central to the discourse of colonialism and dominance., where ‘othering’ is used to establish the superiority of ‘self’ and deficits in the colonised, the ‘other’ (Said 1978). On the other hand, when the ‘other’ is seen as exotic, they are glorified, decorated and showcased as decreed by the coloniser. 3)Normalising: A concept which critical race theory often uses to challenge the unnamed practices attached to ‘whiteness’ or ‘white’ culture (Frankenberg 1993; Ladson-Billings 2009). According to Frankenberg (1993), the processes of ‘normalising’ and ‘othering’ operate together for ‘whiteness’ to dominate and control people of colour in settler countries (USA, Australia & New Zealand). ‘Normalising’ is therefore embedded in colonising dominance and control, akin to ‘othering’. 4)Neutralising: A concept that drives individuals to refrain from establishing ‘difference’; ‘Neutralising’ is chosen to deliberately encourage people to accept and love each other despite their ‘difference’. Hence, all attempts in ‘neutralising’ are made to minimise or overlook ‘difference’. 5)Multiple belonging: A concept that highlights that one can encourage multiplicity in all individuals and groups through ‘liberal pluralism’ (Burtonwood, 2006, p. 136), which encourages individuals to see diversity in all around us.6)Performance: A poststructural concept that challenges notions of belonging to any group or category that is constructed within linguistic categories (Butler, 1999); by arguing identity constructs as mere ‘performances’ with unreal, yet realisable ‘truth’, it challenges the language of ‘othering’ and ‘normalising’ used to establish ‘difference’. 7)Critical (re)cognition: Involves engaging in a process that is purposeful with an aim to destabilise and diffuse political power attached to particular ways of being within categories; Similar to the concept of ‘performance’, it challenges the language of ‘othering’ and ‘normalising’; Enables educators to examine ‘who establishes the national, ability, gender, religious, ethno-linguistic and class ‘truths’ and what and how they can work against this ‘truth’ to resist dominance and marginalisation to (re)construct with ‘difference’’ (p. 297). 2)Image of society (What do educators see): 1)’After all difference is natural, some can and others can’t’: Defined by hierarchical notions of classifying and categorising individuals and groups in a society; Underpinned by the belief that there are groups that are naturally superior, or pre-programmed genetically to function better than the rest; Pedagogies centre around identifying the pre-supposed weaknesses of particular groups and rectifying them. 2)’Not at all, I don’t see difference’: Nurtured to ‘overcome undue segmentation of the otherwise homogenous humankind in the society’ (p. 299); ‘Difference’ based on gender, ‘race’, nationality, ethnicity, ability and many others, attributed to individuals and groups are regarded as being ‘immaterial’ (p. 299); Personal and social relationships are valued highly and the influence of structures is less considered; Pedagogical choice - promotes care and love amongst the learners so that differences can be overlooked and a cohesive and harmonious society where we nurture each other can be built. 3)’After all we are different and diverse’: Underpinned by belief in unique worldviews that stem from distinctive, collective knowledge systems and experiences; acceptance that individuals are different and diverse as everyone belongs to different groups or structures with different values, attitudes, cultures and needs; Pedagogical choice - teach learners to learn and understand each other’s unique socio-cultural experiences that make up one’s identity to create a ‘harmonious and cohesive society’ (p. 299). 4)’Not at all, difference and diversity are illusions’: Constructed by positioning language based terms central to our understanding of who we and others are; Contend that all categorical, value based, symbolic representations of one’s collective identity are illusions, or ‘performances’ (p. 300) (Butler 1999); Pedagogical choice – aims to enable all individuals to acknowledge that there is no one ultimate ‘truth’, but that there are multiple ‘truths’ (p. 300). 5)’After all these are illusions; and not, as these are attached to matted realities’: Underpinned by the view that ‘difference’ and diversity are illusions, and positions language as being central to the construction of categories; Pedagogical choice – Aims to enable all learners to be aware of complexities of power and power imbalance. C)Educational choices (What do educators choose): 1)’Educate to treat difference’: Educators’ choices in responding to ‘difference’ stem from the image of society: ‘After all difference is natural, some can and others can’t’; Educators desire uniformity, and seek to negate ‘difference’ with an emphasis on scientifically pre-established markers of similarities and differences between and within individuals in categorical groups. 2)’Educate to erase difference’: Underpinned by the image of society: ‘Not at all, I don’t see difference’, this choice , is triggered by highly humanistic and altruistic motivations; educators model thinking and pedagogy that promotes kindness and sympathy for each other, and teaching people to look past the ‘difference’ that each child or particular groups may possess. 3)’Educate to learn difference’: Underpinned by the image of the society: ‘After all we are different and diverse’. Hence, this choice accepts ‘difference’ without regarding it as a ‘deficit or as negligible’ (p. 304); Nevertheless, stems from ‘othering’, resulting in ‘selective & sporadic engagement with identified ‘difference’ (p. 304). Therefore, this choice can inadvertently result in the dominant group controlling the identity of the marginalised groups, through stereotyping and exclusion. 4)’Educate to embrace difference’: Underpinned image of the society: ‘Not at all, difference and diversity are illusions’; Educators are propelled by an acute awareness of the arbitrary nature of language categories and seek actively to move away from presenting sporadic stereotypes of particular groups; Educators explicitly seek to integrate ‘multiplicity’ into daily educational practices. 5) ‘Educate to resist and construct difference’: Underpinned by the image of society ‘After all these are illusions’; Educators condemn discriminatory discourses that establish deficits in the scrutinised ‘other’; this choice leads to critical, collective action that seeks to (re)construct historically constructed marginalisation of particular ‘difference’. **Core argument:** Educating with ‘difference’ is inevitable in today’s society. The educational choice of educators is constituted by the very same image makers that make the image of the society, the very base of that choice. Thus, an educator’s image and its image makers also decide who they are as educators, their discourses, and what they fear and desire with all who embody ‘difference’.  |
| Stentiford, L. & Koutsouris, G. (2020). [What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education? A systematic scoping review](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F03075079.2020.1716322&area=0000000000000001), *Studies in Higher Education*, UK Annotated by Anna Xavier Keywords: *Inclusive pedagogies; inclusion; higher education; university; teaching*  | **Context:** Set within a context where ‘inclusive pedagogies’ are recommended as an approach for addressing increased student diversity in HE, and different understandings of inclusive pedagogies as an educational approach are currently supported within many HEIs across the world – including state-funded and private institutions, as well as universities with differing emphases and purposes’ (p. 1). However, authors highlight that no research has mapped the field of inclusive pedagogies in HE to shed light on ways researchers have conceptualised and investigated this phenomenon.**Aim:** To provide a systematic scoping review of ‘how research in HE has often conceptualised inclusive pedagogies, and by extension inclusion, and discuss some of the philosophical assumptions underpinning these conceptualisations’ (p. 1). RQs: * Are there any patterns in the peer-reviewed published literature relating to inclusive pedagogies in HE by date, country or purpose?
* How have scholars conceptualised and researched inclusive pedagogies in HE?
* What theoretical ideas underpin scholars’ conceptualisations of inclusive pedagogies?
* How do HE researchers approach ‘inclusion’ in their work?

**Theoretical frame:** Scoping review framework (Arksey and O’Malley, 2005). **Methodology:** Search strategy – Focuses on the ‘how’ of teaching (based on Norwich’s (2013) distinction); Search terms – ‘cross-searched ‘higher education’ terms (‘higher education’ ti. ab., universit\* ti. ab., college\* ti. ab., postsecondary ti. ab.) with ‘inclusive’ search terms (‘inclusive pedagog\*’ ti. ab., ‘inclusive teaching’ ti. ab., ‘inclusive learning’ ti. ab., ‘inclusive instruction’ ti. ab.’(p. 4); Database searching – five electronic databases - British Education Index, Education Research Complete, ERIC, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences and Australian Education Index; Inclusion criteria: a) Be published in English, b)focus on HEIs that offer full degree programme, c)have an explicit and substantial focus on inclusive pedagogy/ies, d)focus on the deployment of inclusive pedagogies in HE, e)focus on inclusive pedagogies in relation to the *how* of teaching, i.e. instructional methods and/or learning environment (see above), f)be of any format (e.g. empirical study, opinion piece, literature review); Selection process – 1)Titles and abstracts of records were screened for relevance by first reviewer (LS); 2) Retrieved articles were assessed again for inclusion by LS, following piloting of 20% of the records by LS & GK; Data management – References were managed using EndNote X8; Data charting – Data charted: ‘first author, date, country, study design, purpose of the article, how inclusive pedagogies are conceptualised, theoretical underpinnings, and approach to inclusion’ (p. 5); Analysis – Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006); Dates of articles reviewed –2002 – 1,2003 – 1, 2004 – 2, 2009 – 5, 2010- 2018 – 22 articles; Total number of articles reviewed - 31 **Findings:** 1) Inclusive pedagogy in relation to its focus on student ‘difference’ – Many authors used the term ‘inclusive pedagogy’ when discussing inclusion exclusively in relation to students identified with disabilities (n = 15) (see Lombardi, Murray & Dallas, 2013; Enjelvin, 2009); The authors of three articles focused on other facets of student identity and sought to advocate inclusive pedagogies as a method for including students who fall into one or two perceived ‘marginalised’ groups: ethnic minorities and women studying science, technology, engineering and mathematical disciplines (Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham 2017); ethnic minorities and students from low SES backgrounds (Schmid et al. 2016); international students (Stipanovic and Pergantis 2018); 13 articles developed a more holistic understanding of inclusive pedagogies and discussed inclusion in relation to what might be termed ‘student diversity’ (see Cunningham, 2013; Grier-Reed & Williams-Wengerd, 2018); 2)Mixed purposes (with regards to the articles’ aims) - Four broad categories of purposes: ‘Discusses a programme/workshop’ (n = 12), ‘General ideas for practice’ (n = 9), ‘Explores staff attitudes/perceptions’ (n = 9), and ‘Explores student attitudes/perceptions’ (n = 1)’ (p. 8); 3)Diverse conceptual underpinnings - most authors cited the work of one scholar or several scholars and developed a (unique) conceptual framework that underpinned their approach to inclusive pedagogy (Barrington (2004) - Gardner’s (1983) Multiple Intelligence Theory, Glowacki-Dudka, Murray, & Concepción (2012) - Aristotle’s Principle of Justice and cultural difference, O’Shea et al. (2016) - Foucault’s (1972) ideas about discourse and power, Stipanovic & Pergantis (2018) -integrative framework incorporated Guiffrida’s (2015) Constructive Supervision Process; Dallas, Upton & Sprong (2014) & Dllas, Sprong & Kluesner – adopted Universal Design (UD) as their sole inclusive pedagogy); 4)Commonality or individuality principles – theoretical approaches to inclusion – 6 categories: Most popular – ‘Inclusion as a way of addressing the needs of diverse students’ (n=12) (p. 11); ‘Inclusion as making difference invisible’ – a ‘commonality’ approach (n=9); ‘Inclusion as appreciating difference’ – an ‘individuality’ approach (n=5); ‘Inclusion as social justice’ (n=2); ‘Inclusion as making difference invisible (commonality) and/or appreciating difference (individuality)’ (n=1); ‘Inclusion as about the democratisation of knowledge’ (n=1) [Full list of authors for each category can be viewed on Table 2 (p.10)]**Core argument:** ‘Inconsistency and fragmentation in perceptions of inclusive pedagogies is the result of inclusion itself being a philosophically contested matter’; and ‘this needs to be reflected in the way that inclusive pedagogies are discussed in HE – even if this goes against current performative and market-driven trends that emphasise quick fixes over acknowledging the complexity of pedagogic issues’ (Abstract).  |
| Stirling, J. & Rossetto, C. (2015). [“Are we there yet?”: Making sense of transition in higher education](https://studentsuccessjournal.org/article/view/458), *Student Success,* 6(2), 9–20.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *transition, FYE, regionality, mature age, first in family, indigenous, low SES, blended learning* | **Context:** Examines a first year transition program at UOW designed for students at a regional campus, whose students are mostly mature age, FinF, indigenous and/or low SES. Program set up because of observations (not primarily policy/funding imperative!). Programs are largely blended (range of technologies) but some students are not confident or familiar with digital literacies. Teaching staff = primarily casual which also brings limitations. Discusses arguments to embed academic literacies in disciplines/ within a subject. UOW = undergoing university-wide curriculum renewal “to ensure the integration or embedding of academic and English language teaching and learning in core and capstone subjects” (p.11). The Yr 1 transition program = sits outside of discipline but parts are explicitly aligned with curriculum-specific ALL requirements and has 3 tiers:1. pre-commencement “immersion” day [orientation]
2. first semester weekly curricula-aligned seminar streams (critical thinking, researching, writing in specific disciplines)
3. mid-year, day-long writing intensive

**Aim:** Program aim: “to facilitate academic participation and hence retention in a higher education environment that relies on various multimedia technologies and blended learning models” (abstract). Paper aim: to offer insights from evaluation of program: record student attendance, rate each module using likert-scale and collect ‘student commentary’. Authors note that their program aligns with Gale & Parker’s ‘transition as induction’ conceptualisation, leading them to question what transition means to students/ and seek to achieve a ‘transition as becoming’ process**Theoretical frame:** Praxis approach [?]; draw on notion of palimpsest to “think through the complex layering between subjective responses of students to the demands of academic writing and the (con)textual product” (drawing on Yancey, 2004; p.16)**Methodology:** Discussion of evaluation strategy (p.12-13) based on measuring attrition/retention rates + qualitative student commentary. Offers series of narratives/ representative student accounts**Findings:**   |
| Testa, D. & Egan, R. (2014). [Finding voice: the higher education experiences of students from diverse backgrounds](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2013.860102), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 19(3), 229–241.AUSAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *diversity; higher education; disadvantage* | **Context:** Discusses diversity in context of widening participation; as being incorporated into discourse of social inclusion and problematises the conflation of diversity and equality as “potentially obscur[ing] some structural elements of the contemporary university system” (p.229). Explores CALD social work students’ experiences of teaching and learning and placement/maps views of their course. Notes the stratification of higher education – distribution of research/ ATARs. Also individualism = feature of Western cultural imperialism that is prevalent in HE which can lead to lack of engagement (requirement for independent learning – see Leatherwood 2006) and a sense of isolation. Discusses language and writing - notes that traditional views hold that ‘good writing and academic skills’ should be in place prior to entering but also highlights how some students “especially women and those from more communitarian cultures, independence must be newly acquired, potentially in negation of their cultural identities” (p.232). Argues that wealthier universities are able to provide more resource-intensive support [but do they??] and that generic skills sessions are problematic. Discusses how intercultural learning = alternative to traditional pedagogy (e.g. small multicultural group learning) – but example offered (Ippolito 2007) was outside of mainstream curriculum and stood in competition/ eroded commitment.**Aim**: “to examine the experiences of CALD and international students undertaking the undergraduate degree in social work”; RQs: 1) To explore the students experience of the social work course and its different aspects; (2) To explore what changes they might make to the teaching and learning strategies and the curricula generally to make it more culturally appropriate. (p.233)**Methodology:** Qualitative inquiry: 9 x 3rd/4th year Social Work CALD students at VU (5 m/ 4 f; 3 = 3rd year/ 6 = 4th year). Students from Somalia, China, Malaysia, Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, Columbia, Vietnam. All sfrb except Chinese student. Each student = 1.5-2hr interview.Social Work faculty at VU work with Student Learning Unit and share similar values (“that language and discourse are socially constructed and hold power that can serve to exclude and disempowers individuals and groups of individuals”, p.232). NESB = 60% of student body – many are mature age and did not attend school in Australia.**Findings:** Many participants reported that they had been afraid to speak earlier in course; “Other barriers mentioned by participants include a lack of familiarity with local knowledge and values, a lack of grounding in Western conceptual frameworks and unfamiliarity with academic discourse” (p.234). Despite all meeting English Language proficiency requirements, students reported that they had difficulties with English used in lectures, readings, assessment requirements. Participants were aware/critical of western paradigm. Participants found local concepts/ metaphors difficult to understand/ relate to. Some participants felt lecturers did not have sufficient language/cultural knowledge to help them; participants felt that university required new ways of learning/ being/ knowing, that lecturers weren’t available outside of teaching hours, that it was difficult to access learning support.**Core argument:** This research “indicates that traditional, individualistic teaching and learning pedagogy taught exclusively through the lens of a Western paradigm could further disadvantage CALD students’ progress through their undergraduate studies” (p.240). “An examination of curriculum could expose the expectations that CALD students adjust to and adopt the discourse of dominant culture. It could also challenge curriculum designers and lecturers to integrate CALDperspectives and experiences in curriculum thus providing alternative voices in the understanding and application of theories and practice” (p.240). |
| Thomas, M.K. E. & Whitburn, B. J. (2019). [*Time for inclusion?*](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2018.1512848), British Journal of Sociology of Education, 40(2), 159-173, DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2018.1512848. AUSAnnotated by Anna XavierKeywords: *Temporality; inclusive education; pedagogy; initial teacher education; compulsory schooling*  | **Context:** Situated in a context where ‘international policy directives for the development of inclusion in and through education (UNESCO 2005) signal important social changes away from deficit-centric responses to diverse learner needs’ (p. 159). However, authors argue that practice rarely meets inclusive ideology (Moore & Slee, 2012). **Aim:** ‘To explore how notions of temporality operate as decisive forces in the lives of educators in both the compulsory and post-compulsory sectors’ (p. 159). **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study. **Methodology:** Essay. **Findings:** 1) (Re)Conceptualising inclusive education over time – beginnings of inclusive education: accompanied the introduction of UNESCO’s Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994); the Salamanca Statement viewed ‘diagnosed need’ as ‘special’, consequently offering the political context for inclusive education to be perceived in ‘delineated terms’ (p. 162); In 2005: UNESCO redefined inclusion in education – a broad ‘process of addressing & responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures & communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education’ (UNESCO, 2005, p. 13); UNESCO thus highlights that the concern of inclusive education is on ‘how to transform education systems in order to respond to the diversity of learners’ (2005, p. 15); Problems with evolving definitions of inclusive education: distortion of the ‘clarity of purpose’, with ‘divergent positions taken through UNESCO policy’ (p. 163); competing pressures often hinder the ‘latter ideals’ (p. 163) regarding inclusive education; Despite UNESCO’s (2005) inclusive education policy, the passing of time shows evidence of the continuous increase in special education practices which separate some students from the rest (Armstrong, 2002; Slee, 2011; Tomlinson, 2012); Authors argue that educators often experience time constraints, lack responsibility, but are accountable for students’ educational outcomes, in a ‘temporal spiral of performance achievement’, while the influence of UNESCO is lost under similar ‘marginalising conditions’ (p. 163); 2)Temporal productions in initial teacher education – Barton (2003) argues for a ‘rejection of exclusionary forms’ (p. 17) and highlights the need for ‘significant changes’ (p. 23) in current teacher education, as well as education in general; Authors argue that the influence of neoliberal policies on the field of ITE in Australia has resulted in teacher education programmes which are ‘expertly conditioned to operate within limited industrialised conceptions of western clock time’ (p. 164); Central argument: the ‘aggressive positioning of pre-service teachers who are ‘imbued with Marxist resonances of time and labour value’ (Lingard and Thompson 2017, 1) fundamentally detracts from learning the significance of considered pedagogical practices which foster relationships’ (p. 164); authors therefore content that inclusivity in ITE necessitates a ‘longer-term temporality than vogue policy imperatives, since ‘schools are full of students who do not fit neatly into tidy boxes, but who are interesting, multi-faceted, often unpredictable, and transcend traditional groups of learners’ (Jones, Fauske, & Carr, 2011, p. 10) (p. 166); 3)Temporal mediation of inclusive practices in schools – ‘the ideology that inclusive education is the provision of equitable participation in learning for all students irrespective of any diversities – as per the UNESCO (2005) statement – falls well short of expectations in many schools’ (p. 166); Done & Murphy (2016) – a ‘new responsibilisation of teachers’: ‘a two-fold process’ which conditions teachers to ‘optimise school performance’, while ‘having to act ethically’ (p. 166) simultaneously, in order to ensure that all learners can have equal educational outcomes; Ainscow et al. (2012) & Slee (2011) – inclusive schooling should be viewed as ‘much more than a mere competing policy imperative’ (p. 166); McKnight & Whitburn (2018) – the ‘obsession with evidence’ (Hattie, 2008, p. 237) of neoliberal policies often hinders opportunities for the practice of inclusiveness; 4) Towards a diffraction in time - A diffraction in time coupled with thoughtful integration of relational pedagogies is distorted when ‘it is preferable to see inclusiveness as a process that takes place over time’ (Reid, 2012, p. 13); Authors argue that ‘time is a luxury not afforded to the classroom teacher, nor deliberated by the teacher educator’ (p. 168); inclusiveness is therefore argued to remain ‘illusory’, and socially just practices are only ‘in name’ (p. 168), which is ‘ominous’ to the practice of inclusive education; central argument: the concept of inclusion in schools have become ‘confused, shallow & dispersed’ (p. 168); Diffraction – ‘provides a disruptive metaphor and has been taken up by many who seek to pursue non-representational research agendas’ (Lynch et al., 2016, p. 4) by providing a ‘way of thinking with materials’ (Pacini-Ketchabaw, Kind & Kocher, 2016, p. 14); Embracing a diffraction in time will enable a focus on ‘the relational in education between the pedagogue and the student (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2017). **Core argument:** Promoting new ways of acknowledging the development of inclusive education could be ‘made possible through the diffraction of time’ (p. 169). It is therefore crucial that ‘diffractions in time are realised to ensure the democratisation of educational practices against a tide of pathologising which wants to ‘use categories that are fictions’ (Bhaskar, Danermark, and Price, 2017, p. 95) (p. 170), which group students into socially constructed groups that only exacerbate their marginalisation.  |
| Tobbell, J., Burton, R., Gaynor, A., Golding, B., Greenhough, K., Rhodes, C. & White, S. (2020). [Inclusion in higher education: an exploration of the subjective experiences of students](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1753180?journalCode=cjfh20), *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, UK Annotated by Anna Xavier *Keywords: Inclusion; higher education; students’ voice; socio-cultural theory*  | **Context:** Set within the context where there is a paucity of literature exploring students’ subjective interpretations of inclusion in HE. Authors argue that most research focuses on the social exclusion debate, which views HE as a ‘mechanism for the promotion of social equality’ (p. 1). **Aim:** To report on a study exploring what inclusion means to students participating in HE at a UK university’s health and social science faculty. The study ontologically places inclusion as an influencing factor in the educational experiences of students, thus aims to explore inclusion through student voices. **Theoretical frame:** Socio-cultural theory. **Methodology:** Qualitative approach; Data collection method: Short interviews exploring individual students’ feelings and experiences; Participants were asked to complete three statements: ‘I feel included in my studies when…’, ‘I think it’s difficult when…’, ‘One thing that would make me feel more included is…’; Participants: Postgraduate and undergraduate students from the health & social science faculty (n=>250); Total number of statements: 721; Data analysis: Employed Anderson’s (2002) focused problem approach. **Findings:** Two overarching themes identified: a) ‘The imperative of relationship’; b)’Flexible practice enables participation’; 1)The imperative of relationship – Students’ interpretation of inclusion highlight the ‘primacy of relationship’ (p. 5); relationships with peers & staff were argued to make students feel included, while lack of such relationships were deemed as ‘problematic’ (p. 5); face-to-face communication was also highlighted as providing a sense of inclusion; Feelings of exclusion were felt when: working with students who are shy/dominating, feeling different to their peers, & feeling an absence of opportunities to build relationships; 2) Flexible practice enables participation – Many students equated inclusion to the ‘opportunity to contribute and inclusion’ (p. 8), both to their lesson and to their own study; Flexibility in their studies also made students feel more included; Students also highlight continuous communication, instead of ‘one-off’ document releases as enhancing a sense of inclusion (p. 10). **Core argument:** The findings suggest that ‘the primacy of relationship’, opportunity for learners to exercise their own identities, and continuous communication between educators and learners, learners and the institution as well as between learners are key factors in inculcating a sense of inclusion among learners in HE institutions (p. 10).  |
| Townsend, R. (2008). [Adult education, social inclusion and cultural diversity in regional communities,](https://www.ajal.net.au/adult-education-social-inclusion-and-cultural-diversity-in-regional-communities/) *Australian Journal of Adult Learning,* 48(1), 71–92AUSAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Explores experiences of CALD students in Adult Continuing Education (ACE) in regional Victoria to “reveal how individuals can utilise adult education as a space to explore their own social and cultural isolation in a regional context” (abstract). Works from premise that adult learning spaces offer opportunities to explore ‘social, cultural and economic experiences’. Location of research = rural/ agricultural area of north Victoria**Aim:** To present “research about adult education and training and its role in regional life for internal and international migrants” (p.74). CALD residents = internal mobility or international migration. Reasons for internal mobility suggested as searching for sense of ‘place’ and belonging (age-related transition). ACE in research site = specialized for particular groups (some for people with disabilities; one service for indigenous people; women interested in child care/ aged care/ home or community care). No providers purposefully targeting CALD population: “Such ‘cultural blindness’ by ACE programming in this regional community appears to result from a range of complex historical, population, social and economic factors” (p.79) – possibly a result of the area not being part of recent migration programs encouraging migrants to settle in the area. But support group started in 2006: “CALD groups carving out alternative social and economic networks highlights and reflects a community that is practiced in protecting established networks rather than extending and nourishing them by embracingthe real growth in diversity of the main communities in this Shire” (p.81) **Methodology:** Mixed methods: surveys and interviews of 15 CALD (past/current) ACE students = development of ‘habitual narratives’. Also: focus groups with cultural support network and ESL leaners to evaluate impact of government policies/programs and interviews with ACE staff**Findings:** There are patterns in terms of migration, internal mobility, social isolation and cultural identity. Common theme = sense of exclusion in regional communities (‘social outsiders’, p.75) – related to cultural identity (aka not WASP) and lack of employment opportunities.Students = suggest that they entered ACE ‘searching’ for “ a ‘place’ to help sort out ‘where to next’” (p.82).Older (more established in Australia) students appeared to find it easier to find what they wanted and “were more assertive about needs and more knowledgeable about how to go about locating resources to match their needs” (p.83) but they recognized that the standards were not high. Younger migrant women appearAdult learning environments (not all!) are designed/ run in such a way that excludes rather than includes CALD students**Core argument:** ACE can only help students to develop social capital if it recognises the diversity in its communities. Further research into social capital development is needed in metro and rural areas because low SES/ CALD students tend to use sporting and educational spaces for social networking |
| Townsend, R. (2010). [Developing 21st Century Diverse Adult Learning: Rural and Regional Student Access, Progression and Success in Higher Education](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bca9/e77ccacaa78c17c9bd3bf9461adcaca0ccfc.pdf), *The International Journal of Learning,* 17(2), 329–341.AUSAnnotated by Sally BakerKeywords: *Diversity, Adult Learning, Higher Education, Rural and Regional* | **Context:** Set in post- Bradley context (increased participation targets) and with La Trobe’s strategic/operational planning intention to raise participation of regional participation rates (responding to need to increase numbers of R&R students). Focus = outreach and “enhanced relationships” with schools, VET and community providers. Particular focus = mature age students (defined as 21+). Scope of the literature = major themes include issues with motivation and challenges related to time, responsibilities and moneyAlso set “in the context of increased competition between various cohorts for limited places in regional social science programs” (p.329).**Aim:** To identify how mature age individuals experience barriers in accessing, progressing and succeeding at university**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Qualitative educational research with context-specific ethnographic elements with staff and students in one Faculty. Participants = 10 staff (7 tenured discipline lecturers + 3 support services staff) – interviewed on experiences of recruiting, teaching and coordinating mature age students. Also: email survey with 20 (16 f; 4 m) mature age students (Year 3 and 4 of Social Work and Social Policy) about negative and positive aspects of being a mature student on regional campus**Findings:** Mature age students have additional barriers to participation in higher = financial and time constraints and distance. Participants report that “mature age students present with pre-existing competing priorities when entering higher education” (p.332) which create greater complexity. Participants perceived requesting support (either formal or informal) = positive impact on studies.Staff perception = mature age students have higher expectations and greater commitment; they are more willing to engage in ‘learning conversations’. Other perceived elements = connection to university and friends/ support networks. Major theme = significance of prior experiences; bringing a sense of ‘richness’ into classroom dynamic and more conceptual discussions (p.334). Staff did not feel separating younger and more mature age students was a useful strategy**Core argument:** Need to consider the principles of andragogy: “Adult learners in a regional community context could gain more from formal and informal learning experiences if all adult education programs adhered to well informed adult learning principles” (p.335)  |