**Parenting, Equity and Higher Education**

Literature Review

Students with caring/ parenting responsibilities is a sub-set of the broader literature on mature-age students and how gender impacts on students’ access and engagement with higher education studies. There are myriad challenges that student-parents face with regard to their studies, largely thematised in the literature in terms of time, balance, and care, all of which are underpinned by a common finding that universities are considered inflexible, unresponsive (Bowl, 2001; Alsop, Gonzalez-Arnal & Kilkey, 2008; Marandet & Wainwright, 2010; Brooks, 2012) and “care-blind” (Moreau, 2016). Moreover, because parent status is not routinely collected by institutions, Moreau (2016) argues that it is often disclosed at point of crisis, resulting in the tacit ascription of the label of ‘problem student’.

With regard to the temporal pressures on student-parents/carers (SPCs), there is a common finding in the literature that these students have limited flexibility and therefore need to know timetables well in advance to organise care schedules around formal academic activities over other activities (Alsop, Gonzalez-Arnal & Kilkey, 2008; Marandet & Wainwright, 2010; Moreau & Kerner, 2015). Moreau and Kerner (2015) describe SPCs as ‘time poor’ as a result of having to undertake the juggling act of balancing home, studies and other responsibilities, often in the context of ‘family unfriendly’ institutional practices, such as giving timetables very late. The gendered nature of caring, particularly for children, creates significant challenges for mothers in particular, with the student-parents in Alsop, Gonzalez-Arnal and Kilkey’s (2008) study describing having to do a ‘second shift’ at home; similarly, Moreau and Kerner (2015) describe how the seemingly “bottomless” work balancing studies with domestic work/ care at home results in a concerning lack of ‘me time’ (p.220), which has the potential to lead to exhaustion or burnout (and consequently increases the likelihood of attrition).

For many student-parents, the absence of flexible childcare arrangements or childcare options on campus is a significant hurdle (Bowl, 2001; Moreau & Kerner, 2015) — as it also is for academic-parents (Acker & Amenti, 2004). In their study with 71 SPCs, Marandet and Wainwright found that a lack of suitable childcare (none on campus) was reported as issue for 28.2%, particularly for women, and their participants noted how inflexible childcare arrangements create conflicts with changing timetables, resulting in having to pay for childcare they didn’t need. The financial demands of childcare create additional financial pressures for student-parents. Relatedly, the imposition of tuition fees creates (perceived) financial barriers; in Cooper’s (2013) study of the experiences of accessing higher education through the lens of the mother-daughter relationship and intergenerational perspectives suggests class/SES-based differences in student-mothers’ understandings of the financial implications of university study. Cooper writes that her findings suggest “that if middle-class families have concerns, [it thus likely that] the repayment of tuition fees will prohibit working class families from accessing HE, who by default are on a lower income” (p.637).

Moreover, the literature speaks to the emotional/ mental health implications of returning to education for SPCs, particularly with regard to feelings of guilt (Wainwright & Marandet, 2010; Moreau & Kerner, 2015; O’Shea, 2015; Greenberg & Shenaar-Golan, 2017). In her study, O’Shea (2015) offers collective vignettes of SPCs that illustrate the non-normative transitions that student-parents make into higher education. She writes that there “is a sense of fragility in some of these women’s stories, the decision to come to university has had deeply felt repercussions” (p.251) — fear of judgement from others, fear of losing support. Some students described keeping their studies a secret, while others described having to ‘prove themselves fit’ to balance study and work/parent. Overall, O’Shea (2015) argues that gender roles are significant in terms of SPCs’ experiences of higher education, with the mother-role in particularly leading to feelings of guilt about not doing their best for their children/ families, their studies and (domestic and/or paid) work.

Similar to the literature on mature-age students, the literature on SPCs also offers insights into the motivations of these students to re-enter education. Pio and Graham’s (2016) study of teenage mums in New Zealand suggests that wanting to avoid the stigma of teenage motherhood was a common driver for their participants, as well as viewing education as a way to provide more for their children/ create better prospects for both mother and child/ren, which is a finding shared in other literature (Marandet & Wainwright, 2010;   
O’Shea, 2015; Greenberg & Shenaar-Golan, 2017). This connects with some of the guilt described in the literature; as Moreau and Kerner (2015) write, “Being a student is then articulated as a way of being a ‘better’ parent in the longer term, even though it implies compromising the ideal of the ‘good’ mother in the shorter term” (p.228). Other motivations are largely related to future employment and earning potential; in their survey of 71 SPCs, Marandet and Wainwright (2010) found that 61.5% of their student-participants wanted to train for a specific career and 53.8% said they wanted a qualification. Although there were no significant differences between fathers and mothers in the cohort, more women described their decision to go to university as a response to change in personal circumstances (e.g. divorce, child going to school) than the male participants.

There is a strong line of critique in the literature, relating largely to a perceived hostile environment for SPCs. A common concern is that of the ‘othering’ that SPCs experience, often in comparison to institutions’ dominant characterisation of (‘traditional’) students as carefree, young and careless (Moreau, 2016). In her study of the daughters of single parents,

Gagnon (2018) notes how “Their university experiences are often marked by many reminders, both subtle and overt, of the ways they do not fit within the ‘ideal’ student norm, of the ways that they are misrecognised and made to feel like they are not legitimate” (p.573). For the pre-service teachers in Murtagh’s (2019) UK study, the sense of being othered was persistent, despite the studying in a program that had been designed to accommodate ‘non-traditional’ students. This othering happened across five domains: three at university (institutional othering, program othering, peer othering) and two in their personal lives (family othering, friendship othering). To mitigate the impacts of such layered othering, Murtagh argues that universities need to do more to develop family-friendly courses and policies, particularly with regard to teacher training placements: “in allowing for flexibility, trainees may feel more able to balance home life and studying and may resume more typical relationships with friends and family members as pressures are alleviated. In addition, evidence from the study would suggest that parent-trainees, and their partners would benefit from access to additional services to support success in other personal aspects of their lives” (p.798). Similarly, Moreau and Kerner (2015) succinctly articulate, “[institutional e]xpectations in terms of mobility and availability risk conflicting with parental commitments” (p.220), with universities often unable or unwilling to offer the kind of flexibility that SPCs require.

From a comparative perspective, Brooks (2012) argues that there are clear differences in how student-parents are supported (or not) between a liberal welfare system (UK) and social democratic (Denmark). While the two universities in her study (older and newer) in Denmark treated student-parents relatively similarly, there was significant diversity in how UK universities supported and viewed student-parents, which Brooks argues is reflective of the market-oriented neoliberal higher education system. Moreau’s (2016) analysis of the policy context and systems of ten English universities supports Brooks’ argument, finding three dominant institutional approaches. Most common is the ‘universal/ ‘careblind’ approach, with only two of the surveyed universities offering a policy or provision for student-parents. The second approach is described by Moreau as ‘targeted’, with five of universities having ‘some specific provision’, mostly in the context of nursery and/or financial support. Only three of the universities had a ‘mainstreaming’ approach, which included extensive reference to student parents (childcare, children allowed on campus, spaces for student parents. Ultimately, the prevalence of the ‘care-blind’ approach is to the detriment of universities, particularly in the context of widening participation. Wainwright and Marandet (2010, p.463) made this point a decade ago, arguing:

Indeed, the need to mainstream awareness of this group of students and the issues they face across all university schools and services is highly necessary if the government’s lifelong learning and widening participation ambitions are to be fulfilled and the social mobility potential of university learning achieved.

There is also a clear line of inquiry in the literature with regard to academic-parents (APs). Similar themes emerge in this literature, particularly with regard to the significance of gender and assumptions about being ‘care-free’ and mobile. Lynch (2010) describes this as the doxas of academy, based on the assumption that people have time and space to think and write, and time to travel and present. Such assumptions lead to inequity and highlight the lack of gender parity in higher education; as Henderson and Moreau (2019) succinctly note, “Where there is a mobility imperative, there is also mobility inequality” (p.3). The burden of combing parenthood and academic work is not exclusively a female concern, but like the literature on student-parents, there is a strong line that points to the increased burden placed on women. Although most of the female participants in Acker and Armenti’s (2004) study reporting non-traditional family/ home circumstances (i.e. they didn’t follow traditional gender roles at home), the authors note that still “most of the women had some concerns related to having or caring for children and these needed to be understood within university structures that institutionalized career paths that did not take much account of family dilemmas” (p.9). The careless structures of higher education resulted in these women planning their careers around their parenting responsibilities, even for academics who were yet to have children. Acker and Armenti (2004) describe how their younger participants were more actively tussling with questions about when to have children, and wondering about how parenthood would ‘fit’ into their careers. For the parents in their study, there was common concern about struggling to plan their work around children, with accessing childcare difficult, particularly for single parents. Most participants described stress, tiredness and challenges with sleeping. Similar again to the student literature, these authors highlight the temporal dimensions (‘clashing clocks’, p.11), but also note that a challenge is the suppression of sharing of concerns/ challenges by parents, leading to the authors describing these issues as taboo (p.11).

Amsler and Motta (2019) report similar themes in their auto-methodological account of parenting in academia. They note how the neoliberal shape of higher education evokes the ‘madness of splitting’ between different rhythms, spaces and modalities, which are particularly acute for single parents. More often than not, being a parent and working as an academic requires an unhealthy level of self-sacrifice which “negate the needs of self-care and care for others”; as such, these authors argue this “can expose the invisible and unmentionable conditions that make ideal-type forms of neoliberal academic labour possible” (p.93). Similar to Barnett (2011), Amsler and Motta (2019) remind us that viewing higher education through an emotional/ affective lens helps to challenge the reductive efficiencies of neoliberalism. However, recognising these sharply conflicting subjectivities and rationalities is one thing but speaking out against it comes with risks: “Embracing the otherness and marginality of the messiness that motherhood brings to the marketised university takes courage, for it involves emotional risk and exposure to uncertainty” (p.93). In a more positive appraisal, Pillay (2009) argues that “the unity of thinking and loving is the challenge that the academic mother has to meet” (p.505), involving mother-scholars “tak[ing] an intellectual leap forward…For the academic mother it means stepping out of a choreographed waltz into a vivacious salsa.” (p.513).

Ultimately, the inflexible and care-blindness of institutions is a cultural pillar of the academy. Lynch’s (2010) analysis of the conditions of care in the academy point to how senior levels of higher education have a ‘care ceiling’, where people without visible care duties are implicitly expected to have ‘total time for the organisation’. This provides models for newcomers who are being inculcated into academy (such as postgraduates students). Lynch (2010) writes that “[w]omen and men who cannot work unpaid hours are likely to be severely disadvantaged within the academy” (p.58). Parenting requires considerable time, energy and attention. The clear message from the literature is critique of the idea that “to be a successful academic is to be unencumbered by caring” (Lynch, 2010, p.63).
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| Acker, S. & Armenti, C. (2004). [Sleepless in Academia,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0954025032000170309) *Gender and Education,* 16(1), 3–24.  CAN/US  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Conditions under which women work in academia, responding to perceived loss of focus on higher education in debates about gender and education. Authors argue that ‘old norms’ of gendered being in the academy begin in experiencing undergraduate study as a student and are added to in graduate school. Authors argue that in addition to a general improvement in conditions and shifts in theoretical focus, the expansion/diversification of higher education has captured a lot of the attention, and this work has largely been degendered. Authors note that at the time of writing, there was limited scholarly attention to parenting and academia.  **Aim:** To ask why gendered barriers for women in academia persist, and what strategies women use  **Theoretical frame:** Critical feminist policy rubric (Bensimon & Marshall, 1997)  **Methodology:** Draws on two research projects (one by each author) concerning women academics, conducted in mid-90s (see p.7–9 for details)  **Findings:** Common findings relating to ‘endemic concerns’ between the two projects:  *Challenges in balancing home and work:* most of participants had non-traditional family/ home circumstances (i.e. they didn’t follow traditional gender roles at home), “yet most of the women had some concerns related to having or caring for children and these needed to be understood within university structures that institutionalized career paths that did not take much account of family dilemmas” (p.9), but women in studies = positioned differently, according to age, children, age of children —older women had fewer concerns about fitting work around life (and vice versa), but had previously experienced challenges because of lack of maternity policies. Some older women described planning children for May/ June to fit in with the academic calendar; others described being discouraged from having children. Younger women = more actively tussling with questions about when to have children/ struggling to plan their work around children. Accessing childcare was difficult for some of the participants, particularly for single parents. Most participants described stress, tiredness and challenges with sleeping. Women who haven’t yet had children reported wondering about when it would ‘fit’ into their careers. Authors highlight the temporal dimensions (‘clashing clocks’, p.11), but also note that a challenge is the suppression of sharing of concerns/ challenges by parents, leading to the authors describing these issues as taboo (p.11)  *Evaluation/ performativity:* authors describe institutional scrutiny placed on academics (tenure/ promotion) — age was also significant. Stress about tenure/ promotion always existed, but measurements shifted from support for students to individual achievements with grants and publications. Motherhood = viewed as a barrier to production, international travel and networking; anxieties = related to self-esteem and self-presentation. Obtaining tenure did not necessarily bring the participants relief.  *Health and stress*: common theme = fatigue/ burn out, related to particular times of year/ career and ‘cultural taxation’ (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), particularly for women from minority groups (self-)tasked with care and mentoring for minority students. Some participants thought the reason was internalised feelings of not doing/ being good enough; others attributed the stress to intensification of workload.  *Coping strategies:* working harder and longer (getting up early and going to bed late), with leisure time for some spent playing with children. Another strategy is to find and focus on ‘sources of agency and empowerment’ (p.17). Less reliance on strategies related to resistance and collectivising (examples = sharing promotion applications; creating a women’s caucus) **Core argument:** Meritocratic discourses/ performance metrics are generally genderblind (under name of ‘fairness’) but gender, and parenting in particular, creates considerable challenges. Modes of surveillance are often internalised and are embodied (e.g. sleeplessness). Women may feel like they need to work harder and longer to compete with colleagues, partly because of a perceived need to ‘prove themselves’ in the male-dominated academy. It’s important to break silence and discuss taboos. |
| Alsop, R.; Gonzalez-Arnal, S. & Kilkey, M. (2008). [The widening participation agenda: the marginal place of care](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540250802215235?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education,* 20(6), 623–637.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; widening participation; care; mature students; gender* | **Context:** Mature WP students in UK/ English HE. Scopes participation of mature age students in English HE, noting decrease since mid 90s (perhaps due to increase in student contribution to costs) and ineligibility of mature age students to access student loans  **Aim:** To explore how care-giving responsibilities mediate/ interact with mature students’ experiences of higher education; to examine how care is recognised in HE policy.  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist conceptualisations of care – important lens because of gendered division of care. Notes shifting paradigms in terms of how care has been understood: from ‘exploitation paradigm’ in 1970s (unpaid care, domestic servitude), to the ‘ethical/moral paradigm’ in the 1980s (celebrating women’s capacity to care), ‘sociological notion of care’ (care as embedded in social relations and shaped by normative structures), ‘paradigm of difference’ in the 1990s (difference in terms of power, sites, contexts and strategies of care), and ‘universalistic paradigm’ (values and meanings in care/ caring/ citizenship) = all see Williams, 2001; on p.625. Daly & Lewis (2000): care as multidimensional concept: care as labour, care as social and relational, care as an activity with costs. Definition offered by authors: “a physical and emotional practice, involving a moral orientation which, though not rooted in essentialist gender differences, is located within gendered (and racialised) normative frameworks around obligations and responsibilities, particularly in relation to the family.  Moreover, care involves costs that are similarly multidimensional, encompassing financial, temporal, emotional, and identity elements” (p.625).  **Methodology:** Draws on 2 studies with WP students at Uni of Hull: 1) quant study: baseline data on characteristics and experiences of non-traditional students (under-represented areas, disabilities, mature, p/t) + comparison with ‘traditional’ students = random sample from institutional student records in Health Studies (n=1000). Second study = qualitative approach with 24 face-to-face interviews with current or former students (mature, disable, minority ethnic, p/t)  **Findings:** Quant study  49% WP students had caring responsibilities (mostly mature and female; 6% caring for an adult)  *Qual study*:  Lack of time and money = main obstacles, particularly cost on emotional part of caring role (especially for females/ mothers)  Balancing time = difficult for both f/t and p/t students; flexibility from staff/ institution = crucial  Student-carers need to know timetables well in advance to organise care schedules  Accessibility of courses/ services (geographically/ temporally) = significant  Cost of transport = problematic, meaning that many students minimised journeys on campus. Mature age students = more likely to travel further and less likely to walk (parking = issue)  For p/t students, isolation and feeling disconnected = problematic, with both p/t and f/t student-carers prioritising formal academic activities over other activities  Gendered nature of care = plays out at home, with students suggesting that they had to do ‘second shift’ at home (female partners of male students appeared to be more receptive to changing their lives to accommodate partner’s studies)  Policy review: care-giving responsibilities were acknowledged (at time of publication) but with limitations. For example, Childcare grant could only be used with particular childcare (no formal recognition of informal childcare arrangements with family/ friends), and part-time students = ineligible, and it was means-tested. This kind of support = complex to claim and stigmatising. Flexibility suggested in 2003 White Paper did not acknowledge the challenges these suggestions would place on care-givers (e.g. compressed courses running through summer term/ school holidays). All jostle with New Labour’s policies on ‘work-life balance’. Changes proposed to increase student contributions = more risky for mature age students **Core argument:** Care-giving responsibilities = significant in shaping experiences of HE. When staff/ institution offers flexibility (“creative and compassionate thinking”) to student-carers = has a “hugely positive impact upon their ability to study successfully” (p.633) but lacking = overarching systemic commitment to acknowledging needs of student-carers. At macro/policy level, where care is recognized = financial level, but with limitations and prescriptions. Universities need to take up Williams’ (2001) ‘political ethics of care’ – through production of good practice guidelines. |
| Amsler, S. & Motta, S. (2019). [The marketised university and the politics of motherhood](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2017.1296116?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education,* 31(1), 82–99.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Motherhood and academia; feminist methodologies and theories; neoliberal subjectification; time–space logics of neoliberalism; resistance; refusal and transgression* | **Context:** The invisibilising of motherhood (‘the unmentionables’ – see p.83) in context of patriarchal, dehumanising disciplinary technologies such as the Research Evaluation Framework (REF): “struggles to open the academy to people whose lives do not conform to hegemonic models of the bourgeois, entrepreneurial white, male scholar are ongoing” (p.84). Authors note literature that speaks of the division and conflict between different selves, and note that this is not universal; that some women are already devalued, invisibilised — which foregrounds necessity of intersectional analysis. Motherhood requires shift (rather than institutions shifting to accommodate mothers): “Mothers often face a choice of assimilation or denial in workplaces. The ideal-type mother cannot be an ideal-type neoliberal subject (careless, disembodied and disengaged from the messiness of non-economic life) or an autonomous, flexible ‘entrepreneur’ of the self” (p.85)  **Aim:** To “offer a critique of neoliberal power from the perspective of the gendered, sexualised, raced and classed politics of motherhood in English universities”; to “demonstrate how feminist academic praxis can not only help make the gendered workings of neoliberal power more visible, but also enable us to nurture and sustain alternative ways of being and working in, against and outside the university” (p.82)  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist academic praxis; critical pedagogy of discomfort  **Methodology:** Dialogical auto-ethnographic methods (see p.87), including transcription of mothering while discussing mothering  **Findings:** Including children’s interjections = “not only visibilised how caring relations and responsibilities shape flows of knowledge in real time, but also how they can alter the value we ascribe to particular moments and ways of knowing. It illustrates why the audited, performative university cannot tolerate an ethic of care; why those who care for others cannot aspire to an individualised, self-determined, ‘productive’ and entrepreneurial subjectivity; and why socialising relations of care is necessary to advance critical thought which does not deny the multiplicity and wildness of our inter-related selves” (p.87–8).  *Neoliberal time and motherhood:* neoliberalism reduces temporality to immediate present; denies possibilities of collective imaginaries and pushes an institutional timescape/ neoliberal rhythm onto other parts of life, resulting in a “spatio-temporality also generates ontological and affective gendered violences in which ‘feminised’ caring relationships of recognition and solidarity are devalued or denied” (p.88). Author 2, as a single parent, describe feeling either ‘out of time’ or ‘out of place’ because of childcare constraints, describing her mother-self as deligitimised.  *Neoliberal space and madness of splitting:* Division of public and private space creates the necessity of splitting. Author 2 describes how bringing her children on campus created all sorts of perceptions of her (as unprofessional, as inefficient, as uncommitted)/ challenges for her:  “The careless culture of neoliberal university space is thus reproduced in part through a discourse of individualisation, in which relationships are impoverished and structural oppressions become defined as problems of individual failure, lack of consideration or selfishness. This undercuts possibilities of forming solidarities across difference through which we might come to know ourselves and each other and resist anti-ethical and dehumanising conditions. It also creates psychological, emotional and physical dis-ease when those who experience such acts of judgement and denial feel shame, guilt and anxiety for not being ‘good enough’ and not embodying ‘the perfect’” (p.91). Spaces = also built with/ for middle-class norms (making assumptions about who come/ what they bring into academia); “this is particularly problematic when the academic-self colonises the spaces and times of the mother-self… [which] not only undercuts a woman’s ability to mother meaningfully outside of hegemonic framings, but also limits possibilities to create more collective forms of care, intensifies experiences of social isolation and augments dependencies between partners which create pressures and anxieties in intimate life” (p.91).  *Subjectivation: denial, humiliation, self-disciplining*: Onto-epistemological violence = enacted through idealised neoliberal (flexible, care-free, mobile) subject: “Yet our subjectivities as academics can also imbricate smoothly with neoliberal rationalities. Care, too, is infinitely flexible and on call. There is a temptation to engage in practices of care for students and colleagues, as well as those who depend on us, in conditions where such work requires individualised sacrifices or occupies what would otherwise be non-labour time. Our commitments to and ethics of education can be co-opted into logics of neoliberal time and space whilst being simultaneously misrecognised and devalued as ‘non-academic’, feminised activities” (p.92). Authors point to the ways that they have tacitly bought into ideas about academic identity and activity; self-disciplining around these notions of ideal subjectivities points to complicity throughout system to perpetuate the dominance of neoliberal modes of being, knowing and doing (‘colonising one’s sense of self’, McRobbie, 2015). Demonstrations of resistance = categorised as ‘whinging’ (Phipps, 2006). Speaking out is an act of resistance, but comes with risks: “Embracing the otherness and marginality of the messiness that motherhood brings to the marketised university takes courage, for it involves emotional risk and exposure to uncertainty” (p.93).  **Core argument:** “When women appear in universities as mothers, single mothers and feminists, the demand to negate the needs of self-care and care for others can expose the invisible and unmentionable conditions that make ideal-type forms of neoliberal academic labour possible. Our presence as bodies and selves has the potential to reveal the tacit operations of power that order the dynamics of inclusion, exclusion, (mis)recognition and denial in the institution” (p.93). |
| Bowl, M. (2001). [Experiencing the barriers: non-traditional students entering higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520110037410), *Research Papers in Education,* 16(2), 141–160.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *access, higher education, participation, non-traditional students* | **Context:** Follows 32 non-traditional students as they transitioned into higher education. Set in post-New Labour election in 1997 context. Scopes literature on mature age students – many researchers = argued that change in access needs change in institutional structure and culture, particularly foregrounding issues of race/ ethnicity  **Aim:** To describe mature age students’ transitions  **Theoretical frame:**  **Methodology:** Qualitative and longitudinal: critical, illuminative, feminist methodology (p.143). Participatory acion research design – purposefully intending to facilitate mature age students speaking to academics; presents case studies of 3 students (adults, inner-city, involved in ‘community-based, flexible access programs’: REACHOUT project). Discussion with participants recorded according to daily encounters and weekly diary. Individual interviews conducted over two years. Participants took part in student conference (with emancipatory intention)  **Findings:** Issues/ concerns mentioned by students:  Inadequate funding, lack of childcare, difficulty with benefits system, ‘unresponsiveness’ of institutions.  3 case studies: Salma, Helen and Ruth  Salma: did well at school, not supported to progress by parents, married, 2 children, separated. Did flexible access program via REACHOUT – passed in 6 months – studied Social Policy at RG university. Fees and benefits = issue; struggle to survive over Christmas holidays, had to borrow money to buy computer (only one who couldn’t afford a computer): “Looking back, she felt that she had survived in spite of the university, rather than  because of the support offered to her” (p.147).  Helen = Jamaican, began school in England when 11, grew up in very white community (15/200 children = black), differences in language (as patois speaker) = marker of difference, parents not familiar with education system, marginalized and discouraged at school, married, 4 children, partner deserted her, wife of vicar recommended REACHOUT – paid for childcare costs. Accepted to train as social worker – struggled with writing demands, financial demands, childcare responsibilities. Passed course but initially too ill to start work.  Ruth = Jamaican, poor, accent = marker of difference, mother couldn’t/didn’t encourage her. Ruth ran away from home, missed school exams, did YTS in catering, worked as club dancer, moved to Germany, married, studied Beauty Therapy in German language. Did REACHOUT part time – passed with high marks but felt on margins as part time student.  Key themes: school days + experiences of difference, lack of family support/ knowledge, frustration, anticipating change, entry to university, financial problems, time poverty, institutional barriers **Core argument:** …“the non-traditional student as a frustrated participant in an unresponsive institutional context and questions the tendency to problematize students from non-traditional backgrounds, rather than the educational institutions responsible for their progress” (abstract). Transition to higher education “has complex practical and emotional implications” (p.157). Dislocation = gendered, classed, ethnic lines against the institution and ‘traditional’ students. |
| Brooks, R. (2012). [Student-parents and higher education: a cross-national comparison](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2011.613598), *Journal of Educational Policy,* 27(3), 423–439.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *comparative, qualitative*  CARE, PARENTS | **Context:** Widening participation, parenthood/ parenting and higher education in the UK, particularly with the New Labour focus on increasing participation of mature age students (but makes point that not all mature students are also parents, and not all student-parents are mature). Notes literature that argues the neoliberal focus has eroded the focus on systemic/ structure inequalities, resulting in the ‘blame’ for failure being shifted to individuals; she also notes literature that points to the significance of gender, and recognises the need to view student-parents as heterogeneous group  **Aim:** To present on findings from a Nuffield-funded cross-institutional study of support offered to student-parents  **Theoretical frame:** Social constructionist theoretical framework  **Methodology:** International comparison of support and experiences of student-parents in different national ‘welfare regimes’: UK (liberal regime); Denmark (social democratic regime). Data collected from two different universities within each country (categorised as ‘older’ and ‘newer’). Data collected: institutional policies and other material that focuses on student-parents, as well as on childcare and financial support; individual interviews with staff members responsible for student welfare; individual students (n=15-20) from each institution. Analysis of transcripts and documents paid particular attention to structural constraints, as well as cultural and attitudinal influences.  **Findings:** Structural differences between UK and Denmark (summarised in Table 2; p.427) – clear differences between the countries (tuition fees in UK; tuition free to students in DK; no parental leave in UK, all students entitled to it in DK and offered additional grant; flexible modes at academics’ discretion in UK, required by the state in DK; childcare = limited in UK, extensive provision and low cost in DK).  Cultural/ attitudinal differences: in UK = ideal learner (see literature) constructions = internalised and ‘others’ develop. Sense from staff in UK that academics largely view students as school leavers (author later describes UK attitude as ‘hostile’, p.432). Also sense that parents as group seen as unprepared. In comparison, in DK = different organisational culture that seemingly better recognises diversity among students. For example, one staff member talked about how s/he encourages students to talk about other commitments before embarking on group project to familiarise others with competing responsibilities. No similar ‘ideal student’ in DK; rather student-parents = valorised for balanced attitudes. Policies in DK that promote ‘dual worker’ (rather than ‘male breadwinner’) underpin the cultural and attitudinal/ policy differences between UK and DK – in DK, it is unusual for mum to stay at home as primary carer and not work  Institutional differences = some in DK (see p.432 for detail). In UK = greater inter-institutional variation: the older university provided “significant” practical support (childcare facilities, holiday clubs, dedicated bursaries), but this is unusual. Level of support at newer university = more representative = no dedicated childcare, no staff dedicated to supporting parents, no financial support except central financial support. When discussed in past, university has discussed in terms of potential revenue from childcare, rather than as service to students. Author suggests that older university might be better placed to offer such provision because it has more wealth/resources (and makes links to similar findings in US literature). Dominant constructions of ‘the student’ differed between older and newer UK universities (p.434). In older university, the higher level of practical support = in “considerable tension” with the culture and attitudes of staff/ the university  **Core argument:** There are clear differences in how student-parents are supported (or not) between a liberal welfare system (UK) and social democratic (DK). While the two universities (older and newer) in DK treated student-parents relatively similarly, the UK universities showed great difference in terms of how they support and view student-parents, which is reflective of the market-oriented neoliberal higher education system. |
| Burke, P.J. (2017). [Difference in higher education pedagogies: gender, emotion and shame](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2017.1308471), *Gender and Education,*  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Femininities; critical pedagogies; difference and diversity; emotion and shame; higher education* | **Context:** Examines how gendered inequalities play out in higher education pedagogical practices (lived, embodied, re/produced) = emotions and shame. Paper illuminates the subtle and invisible ways gendered inequalities (re)occur. Shame = tangled in gendered inequalities and individualising discourses of ‘success’ and ‘failure’. Draws on own work to argue that gender “intersects with other, pathologized identities to inflame anxieties about ‘lowering standards’” and that equity/WP students = “compelled to participate in a neoliberal project of transforming themselves to conform to the regulating and disciplining narratives of ‘ success’ at play in educational institutions and policies” (p.2). Othering = creates issues for women and men: relational (against dominant/hegemonic subjects), in terms of performance and assessment against discourses of neoliberalism and the market. ‘Excellence’ discourse can be analysed for how it “evokes particular masculinized epistemologies, pedagogies and subjectivities” (p.3) = not often excellence for equity.  Shame = “underlie gendered, embodied and everyday experiences of inequality and exclusion, which are difficult to name and to speak in the wider context of ‘ evidence-based’ approaches to equity in HE” (p.4) = invisibilised by WP policies under the labels ‘inclusion’ and ‘resilience’. Universities often take remedial approaches to respond to conditions that produce shame (which is in itself a practice of misrecognition) **Aim:** To examine lived and embodied experiences of gendered inequalities (acknowledging complex intersections with other forms of disadvantage) with emotions, particularly shame  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on Fraser’s (2003, 2010) “multi-dimensional framework for ‘ parity of participation’” (p.5); Sara Ahmed’s theorization of the embodiment of shame  **Methodology:** Draws on 2 previous research projects: the NTFS-funded GaP project and the Capabilities (NCSEHE-funded) project  **Findings:**  Shame = embodied and felt (see Ahmed, 2004) – universities respond with remedial services that require students to trust institutional representatives (unfamiliar, unknown) = often seen as “individual lack of confidence or capability, seen as detached from histories of gendered, classed and racialized misrecognitions” (p.7) – privileges confidence, assertiveness and forthcoming behavior. This = true for students and staff = plays into discourse of ‘dumbing down’ or ‘soft’ teaching: what = appropriate level of caring/ feminization of teaching. This serves to construct students (often WP) as needing help/ ‘childlike’: “A vicious cycle of misrecognition is put into place, subtly reasserting the dominance of certain forms of hegemonic academic masculinity” (p.8).  Examines the place of difference: as a marketing discourse under the term ‘diversity’ which jostles against local experiences of anxiety regarding challenging difference/ labeling and limiting ‘different’ students [which need a relational ‘familiar’ to compare against]. Draws on Zembylas’ (2013) critical framework (critical pedagogies of compassion) to draw on power, praxis and emotion to enrich HE pedagogies but notes challenges with operationalization. Makes case for ‘ethics of care’ to notions of connection – often at individual level rather than social transformation, “in which pedagogical participants share the responsibilities of creating inclusive and equitable spaces” (p.12). **Core argument:** Need to move towards a ‘pedagogy of difference’ – whereby the notion and practice of trust = interrogated and where notion of ‘difference’ = considered a resource to “reflexively develop collective and  ethical participation in pedagogical spaces” (p.13). |
| Cooper, L. (2013). [Women and higher education perspectives of middle-class, mother-daughter dyads](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2013.810711), *Gender and Education*, 25(5), 624–639.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *higher education; social class; tuition fees; mothering; capital* | **Context:** Presents data from PhD study. Examines women’s experiences of accessing HE through the lens of the mother-daughter relationship and intergenerational perspectives (young women and their mothers), read through the political/ analytic lens of the increase in tuition fees in ‘unsettled’ HE system (see p.626) England in 2012. Works from premise that neoliberalism = creates more division that opportunity. Focus on familial experiences/ structures = argued for (p.625) – in middle class families, who (she argues) have more limited opportunities, and for working class families (she argues against the idea of choice for people whose financial circumstances make entering higher education undesirable/ impossible. Author scopes context of tuition fees (post Dearing report in 1997 in England), noting neoliberal shift = positioned HE as ‘choice’ and opportunity to ‘buy in’ = resulting in class gain for middle classes in job market (see Skeggs, 1997). Changes resulted in push to individual responsibility: “Financing access to university entry is now an independent problem to be solved within family, rather than a collective issue to be resolved through government policy” (p.628).  **Aim:** To provide “an insight into the transference or otherwise of available capital within the family, that would not be apparent by interviewing only mothers or daughters” (p.625)  **Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu (capital, habitus)  **Methodology:** Qualitative, inter-generational. Semi-structured interviews with 39 women (18 mothers, 21 daughters) = snowball recruitment. 10 of mothers are studying in HE as PG students or had previously done a degree. 19/21 daughters =studying in HE at the time of data collection. Data = manually coded. Article focuses on narratives of 4 dyads (see p.630)  **Findings:**   1. Using capital as currency to access HE: two of mums = PG study (MA/ PhD), neither = traditional students and attended uni when before tuition fees implemented. One mum –Fran – made herself ‘fully conversant’ with funding possibilities for her daughters, which “translate[d] into powerful cultural capital and a subsequent rewarding economic return” (p.631). Other mum – Sam (PhD) – has dyslexia and was able to navigate system through support from school; she has used her knowledge to help her severely dyslexic daughter with her university studies. Daughter now has 36,000GBP debt and is doing unpaid internship in hope of getting a job in her field. 2. Perception: loan or debt? Repayment of debt = differs according to economic status. Women in study perceived loan as ‘long term debt’ and all bar 2 = worried about level of debt and repaying it. Women, especially mums = debt-averse. Mums invested a lot of emotional capital in daughters’ education, as well as financially supporting. With middle class participants, regular reference made to working class students receiving support that middle class/ higher earning families could not access (‘middle-class positional suffering and anxiety’, Atkinson, 2012; p.634) 3. WP/ vocational debate = author discusses stratification of system and cites David Starkey’s article in The Guardian about the myth of assuming all degrees are valued the same. Data from participants reflects this attitude (too many rubbish courses, not enough jobs for graduates); two mums “the broad choice of university courses and pathways with the dilution of the worth of a degree” (p.635) – both privately educated their children. Cites argument that mums = ‘status mainteners of middle class advantage’ (Ball, 2003; Brooks, 2004).   **Core argument:** Middle class mothers views of higher education of themselves and their daughters in context of tuition fees. Findings in paper “exacerbate the argument that if middle-class families have concerns, the repayment of tuition fees will prohibit working class families from accessing HE, who by default are on a lower income. Factors such as choice and motivation to attend university will be determined by familial classification and the working class will continue to struggle, using Bourdieu’s analogy, to ‘play the game’, being unable to compete against middle-class capital” (p.637) |
| Gagnon, J.D. (2018). [‘Bastard’ daughters in the ivory tower: Illegitimacy and the higher education experiences of single mothers in the UK](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562517.2018.1449743), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 23(5), 563–575.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Higher education, underrepresented students, student experience, inequality, family* | **Context:** UK higher education; author is the daughter of a single parent: “My higher education experiences have made me feel like my presence, as a first generation student from a working-class, single mother family, bastardises academia itself” (p.563). Author notes that in the UK, one quarter of families are recorded as single parent, and 92% of single parents are women (Office for National Statistics, 2012), and are more likely to live in poverty. Studies suggest that children of single parents are less likely to participate in higher education (author contests the premise on which these claims are made). Author makes connections between questions of familial legitimacy (what is a ‘legitimate’ family) with questions of legitimacy about who university students are/should be (‘bastardising the academy’). Author offers a social history of single parenthood (p.565–67)  **Aim:** To explore issues of legitimacy among university students who are the daughters of single parents; to ask the question “in what ways are the cultures and practices of higher education reinforcing norms about who is recognised and who is misrecognised, about who is and who is not legitimate within the ivory tower?” (p.563); to explore “notions of legitimacy and misrecognition within the university experiences of the daughters of single mothers who are first generation students” (p.568).  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist theory (Butler, 1988), intersectionality, social exclusion, misrecognition  **Methodology:** Qualitative; semi-structured interviews and reflective writing from undergraduate women who are daughters of single parents (n=26; 22 still studying; 4 recent graduates). Details of participants + author’s inclusion criteria articulated on p.568.  **Findings:**  *Pretending to fit in*: some participants try to ‘pass’ as ‘normal’ (read from two-parent families) or conceal their status. One student answered a question about what she hoped to gain from attending university as ‘respectability’. Starting university offered a possibility to craft a new identity/ work from a blank slate; for some this was because they had experienced negative reactions when they had previously disclosed their status. Another strategy (more related to classism/ racism) was to lighten/ disguise their accent/ adopting ‘middle-class mannerisms’ (p.571); another student favoured silence over perceived judgement. Author describes this in terms of misrecognition; “For many underrepresented students, their university experiences are shaped by their fears of being ‘outed’ as not belonging, of being revealed as illegitimate compared to their peers” (p.572). **Core argument:** Legitimacy relates to notions of recognition and belonging; the participants in this study (in ways that were also classed, racialized): “Their university experiences are often marked by many reminders, both subtle and overt, of the ways they do not fit within the ‘ideal’ student norm, of the ways that they are misrecognised and made to feel like they are not legitimate” (p.573). |
| Greenberg, Z. & Shenaar-Golan, V. (2017). [Overcoming multidimensional marginality: the significance of higher education for traditionally reared single mothers living in the outer periphery](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2017.1283716), *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 21(8), 833–848.  ISR  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Marginality; periphery; single mothers; higher education; traditional families* | **Context:** Higher education in northern Israel and participation by low SES single mothers who were enrolled in a widening participation program (with the purpose of “improving their employment status and financial independence”, p.834).  **Theoretical frame:** Multidimensional marginality — spatial and social; “Spatial marginality is the more traditional understanding of marginality as an economic concept, in which a region is deemed marginal when distant from markets, dependent upon primary resources, has a small and sparse population and is not politically or economically autonomous” (p.834); social marginality = “examines the underlying reasons for exclusion, inequality and social injustice” (p.834), viewed through power lens (where power is located in the centre)  **Methodology:** Qualitative; in-depth life history interviews with student-participants (n=17); details on p.837–8.  **Findings:** Multidimensional marginality described by participants (single mothers who grew up in ‘periphery areas’)  *Marginality in space and place*: spatial marginality increased by growing up/ living in periphery towns impacts on job prospects and earning capability/ job security because of shortage of job opportunities, cost of transport and distances from locales and employment opportunities  Marginality in family: created by single parent status and gendered hierarchy of their family structures (both historic, for example being told that a twin brother is the intelligent one, and the girl twin can clean, and current). Some participants described a sense of being invisible because of their gender. Some of their critique of their past selves can be attributed to participating in critical thinking activities at university. This thinking jarred with traditional notions of women’s place in Israeli society: “Many of the participants expressed feelings of guilt and shame over violating a central, traditional society norm dictating that the husband promotes the family honour by being active” (p.840), particularly for divorced women.  Impact of academic studies on marginality: Primary benefit that is common in the data is a sense of self-confidence and achievement/ self-efficacy. Authors suggest that higher education therefore offers “multidimensional opportunity” (p.841). As mentioned above, engagement in the academic program helped to provide a opening in previous internal discourses to question beliefs about gender, role, society etc. Participating in the program also shifted how others saw them, with most participants reporting positive responses from family members, helping to heal some of the hurt inflicted by divorcing: “Instead of being failures who did not meet the family expectations, these single mothers transformed into someone different, exceptional, a student” (p.842).  Participants also described how they became role models for their children, and that their children could empathise with them more as fellow students, thus creating a sense of solidarity between mum and children.  Participating in the academic program also helped participants to imagine a more optimistic future.  “Knowing that someone on the outside sees them and thinks they are capable was a significant discovery, enhancing belief in their own abilities. The participants received external affirmation of the difficulty of their life situation. Where their family of origin was judgemental and even blamed them for their current personal and family status, the representatives of the higher education and granting institutions were empathic and understanding and provided a solution to their predicament” (p.844).  **Core argument:** Accessing and participating in higher education can help to resist/ reduce some of the multidimensional marginality that single mothers in Israel experience. |
| Henderson, E. & Moreau, M.P. (2019). [Carefree conferences? Academics with caring responsibilities performing mobile academic subjectivities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2019.1685654?journalCode=cgee20), *Gender and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2019.1685654  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords*: Conferences; academic work; care; mobility; gender* | **Context:** Academics with caring responsibilities, navigating the ‘mobility imperative’, specifically attending academic conferences. Authors frame the article against two competing imperatives: the internationalisation of higher education and the obligation to diversify the workforce. Discussion of importance of conferences in academic on p.2: “Conferences demand a particular kind of mobility, which is temporary and transient and also broadly inflexible, as they usually require people’ s physical presence in a particular place at a particular time”. Academic mobility = understood as “a criterion of excellence which is assessed in institutional academic recruitment processes” (p.3), particularly for ECR and people trying to crack into higher education. Authors note how, with the exception of invited keynotes, conference attendance is not necessarily valued, but it is expected: “Conferences can perhaps be understood as wallpaper in the academic profession, upon which publications and grant applications are framed and hung” (p.3).  **Aim:** To “focus on one such contradiction where the academic mobility imperative clashes with the inclusion imperative: we explore how expectations of freely mobile academics intersect and conflict with the concurrent expectations that the profession should accommodate a diverse body of academics, with specific reference to academics with caring responsibilities” (p.2); to discuss mobility, caring and conference attendance as “a prism  through which to consider the hidden assumptions of the academic profession at large” (p.2)  **Theoretical frame:** Care as “as multifaceted, dynamic and shifting” (p.6), relational, as a political phenomenon, intersecting with power, associated with femininity, the normalisation of which authors challenge. Feminist post-structural stance/ discourse and identity.  **Methodology:** Draw on two research projects (‘In Two Places At Once’: Author 1; ‘Care and Carers’: Author 2) – see p.5 for details. Interview data from both projects = discourse analysis, looking for examples of “a discursive negotiation of the carer/academic role, i.e. where both roles were mentioned, and where dominant discourses of the mobility imperative and care expectations were reflected” (p.7)  **Findings:**  *Academic-carers performing mobile academic subjectivities — conflicting discourses*: examines how academic-carers negotiate the demands of two ‘greedy institutions’ (Coser, 1974; on p.7): the family and academia. Flexibility (as much heralded aspect of academic work) = depends on position and roles and comes at a cost (temporal, financial, psychosocial).  *Negotiating discursive contradictions*: participants in both studies described negotiating their mobility/ navigating constraints to mobility (in terms of time – planning forward – and distance – how far is too far?). Authors make reference to Perlow’s (1999) notion of ‘time famine’, with reference to justifying leaving the family for work and the counter-demands made by partners. Framing of conference attendance in terms of options/ choices (cost-benefit analysis), and the idea that conferences offer “opportunities to ‘ indulge’ in performing a single-focus academic identity” (p.10) **Core argument:** “Where there is a mobility imperative, there is also mobility inequality” (p.3), particularly when the ‘ideal’ academic = conceived as ‘carefree’. Conferences = constitute an interruption to the care routine, particularly as they do not occur in a regular pattern, and each conference requires its own tailor-made solution for care” (p.4) – but they are not without pleasure. |
| Lynch, K. (2010). [Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1474022209350104?journalCode=ahha), *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education,* 9(1), 54–67.  IRE  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *care, carelessness, neoliberalism, new managerialism* | **Context:** Carelessness = exacerbated by regimes of ‘new managerialism, which is underpinned by Cartesian rationality/ dualism. In context of increasing marketization, moral legitimacy = new aspect to commercialisation of academy (surveillance, performance), leading to “change in the cultural life” of university and in self-regulating practices and ‘feelings of personal inauthenticity’: “There is a deep alienation in the experience of constantly living to perform, particularly when the performance is experienced as being of questionable educational and scholarly worth” (p.55), and creates conditions for compliance. Surveillance is essentially gendered (women = disproportionately surveyed by men). Women = less likely to get promoted: partly because of patriarchal networks and partly because women are “disproportionately encouraged to do the ‘domestic’ work of the organization, and/or the care work (e.g. running courses, teaching, thesis supervision, doing pastoral care), neither of which count much for individual career advancement even though they are valuable to the students and the reputation of the university” (p.55). Women are also marginalized by politics of knowledge with publication (more likely to publish on women’s issues and in less well-established publications) – editorial boards are disproportionately male. New forms of management = represented as care neutral and has allowed “a particular ‘care-less’ form of competitive individualism to flourish” (p.57) = 24/7, responsibility-free and permanently available. Stretched time = endorsed at senior levels, and accompanied by declining sense of responsibility for others (particularly students).  **Methodology:** Essay  **Themes:**  *Care ceiling*: senior management positions = ‘care-free zones’, representing the “pinnacle of masculinized citizenship” (p.57). Women = care’s ‘footsoliders’ (see Lynch et al., 2009). People without visible care duties are implicitly expected to have ‘total time for the organisation’. This provides models for newcomers who are being inculcated into academy (e.g. postgrads). This was not created by neoliberalism but it has been exacerbated.  *Cartesian rationalism*: separation of mind/ emotions and body, so that education = educating autonomous, rational subjects and governed by positivist ontologies. Author claims moral status ascribed to carelessness = emerged more recently. Prioritisation of cognitive domain = evident in Bloom’s taxonomy (focus on cognitive domain; lack of take up of/ indifference to affective domain)  *Doxas of academy*: caring and emotional labour has long been derided by traditional academics – academia = based on assumption that people have time and space to think and write, and time to travel and present.  *Neoliberalism*: the new focus on economic citizenship has a “deep disrespect for the relationally engaged, caring citizen” (p.62), privileging competitive individualism and “subordinat[ing] and trivialize[ing] education that has no market value” (p.62)  **Core argument:** Carelessness in modern HE = considered ‘morally worthy’. All staff who have limits (imposed or decided) on their capacity to work = disadvantaged with idealised neoentrepreneurial subjectivities: “Women and men who cannot work unpaid hours are likely to be severely disadvantaged within the academy” (p.58). Care = only recognized when professionalized. “To be a successful academic is to be unencumbered by caring” (p.63). |
| Marandet, E. & Wainwright, E. (2010). [Invisible experiences: understanding the choices and needs of university students with dependent children](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411920903165595), *British Educational Research Journal,* 36(5), 787–805.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Experiences of undergraduate students with dependent children in an English university; widening participation. Authors note literature that argues that the principal issue for mature age student is the conflict between caring responsibilities and studying  **Aim:** To explore how gendered and biographical characteristics influence student-parents’ experiences; to make suggestions on how universities can better support parent-students  **Methodology:** Qualitative; post-1960 university in London (data collected 2005–2006). Mature age students classified as over 21. One quarter of student cohort = over age of 25; attrition rates higher with older cohort (who were mostly female and enrolled in Health/ Social Care or Education). Four phases to the study: 1) literature/ policy review; 2) in-depth interviews with staff (n=18); questionnaire for student-parents (n=71); in-depth interviews with student-parents (n=18; mix UG and PG, from different schools)  **Findings:** Motivations for (re)entering higher education  *Future employment:* 61.5% of student-participants gave the reason of wanting to train for a specific career; 53.8% said they wanted a qualification; no significant gendered differences found, although more women described decision to go to university was response to change in personal circumstances (e.g. divorce, child going to school)  *Becoming a role model:* (re)entry into university = related to parents wanting to role model for their children; twice as many women gave this answer compared to male respondents  *Personal development:* just under half said they had chosen higher education for intellectual stimulation or personal development.  *Choice of location:* studentsconstrained in choice of institution by location/ proximity to home (63.1%); other factors included academic reputation of institution (60%) and courses offered (38.5%) — this was gendered, with 61% of men compared to 30% of women reporting this factor, and also significant difference between lone parents and partnered parents (20% and 61% respectively), suggesting proximity is much more important for single parents. A quarter of parents felt they lacked information before starting their course, and only 12.5% were satisfied with information received beforehand (and big gender difference: 4%f compared to 33%m).  *Barriers to study:* most common = balance study/ home responsibilities (84.5%)—particularly for working parents, finding time (69%), attending classes (47.9%), financially supporting studies (42%). Conflicting timings = difficult to navigate (e.g. school holidays/ lectures in evening) and meeting deadlines. Managing finances were also challenging (nearly 40% reported struggling to pay for childcare), particularly because some students lost access to benefits by enrolling in a program of study. Participants agreed that targeted information for parents would be useful (70%). Other issues reported by participants included the high level of bureaucracy involved in applying for support. Lack of suitable childcare (none on campus) = issue for 28.2%, particularly for women, and participants noted how inflexible childcare arrangements create conflicts with changing timetables, resulting in having to pay for childcare they didn’t need. Students without personal networks = acutely impacted. Authors also discuss challenges related to feeling like they belonged at their institution/ felt like students; authors note example of conflict with younger students, leaving the parent-student to feel markedly different from her peers **Core argument:** Parents do it tough at universities; they need targeted information; courses are generally not ‘family friendly’; gender is highly significant. |
| Moreau, M.P. (2016). [Regulating the student body/ies: University policies and student parents](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/berj.3234), *British Educational Research Journal,* 42(5), 906–925.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *England; higher education; student parents; widening participation* | **Context:** Examines the policy context of student-parents in English HE. Set in context of diversified academy that remains beholden to patriarchal, hegemonic policies and practices that privilege the experience of ‘traditional’ students – discussion of historic exclusion of women from education; Westernised masculine rational thought (denial of embodied, affective knowledges). Moreau offers a critique of the impacts of neoliberal/ entrepreneurial university on student-parents (see p.911). Offers analogy of parenting as ‘greedy institution’ (see Moreau & Kerner, 2015 for the same argument about universities): “Both appear to be time rather than task-driven and always leave room for bettering one’s own (academic and parenting) work” (p.911). Parenting = characterised as ‘private matter’ (increased parent choice; increased scrutiny of parents)  **Aim:** To explore “the role of university policies in compounding the experiences of student parents – a group which remains under-researched” (p.908); examining whether university policies ‘normalise’ the care-free student.  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist theory (Crompton, 1999) -intersectionality; three-part levels of care: care orders (macro), care regime (meso), care practices (micro); sociology of (higher) education/ widening participation  **Methodology:** Data in paper gathered in Nuffield Foundation-funded project on student parents in HE (fieldwork in 10 different English universities) = desktop audit, interviews with staff and student-parents, demographic questionnaire for students. Policy = macro-institutional level; “institutional and national policies are conceptualised as creating a terrain allowing particular scripts to emerge” (p.909).  **Findings:** Dissociation of care in HE = evident in what’s not visible – lack of representation of student-parents and children on campus. Dominant characterisations of students = carefree, young and careless. Overlap between student parents and mature students = partial, and not immediately visible in imagery or policy, which also plays out in awareness of student-parent friendly policies and services (from interview data with staff). Parental status = often disclosed at point of crisis – meaning the likely label of ‘problem student’ = ascribed.  *Analysis of institutional policies*  Children’s access to HE = varied significantly (offers examples of where children = not permitted into libraries; see p.914)  Three different approaches identified in 10 universities:   1. Universal/ ‘careblind’: 2/10 universities had no policy or provision for student=parents; reference to children = prohibit their presence 2. ‘Targeted’: 5/10 universities had ‘some specific provision’; reference made mostly in context of nursery and financial/ means-tested grant 3. ‘Mainstreaming’: 3/10 universities attempted to mainstream; extensive references to student parents (child care, children allowed on campus, spaces for student parents   Moreau notes limitation of design (aka case study universities = not likely to be representative of whole sector)  Results of analysis of policyscape – seemingly ‘neutral’ policies can (further) marginalise student parents: “As generic policies are usually designed with the childfree student in mind, their negative effects on parents, including at academic, financial, social, health and emotional levels, risk being overlooked” (p.916). Spatial-temporal domain = significant barrier despite being ‘fair’ or ‘neutral’ (e.g., timetabling and unsuitable spaces for breast feeding). Issues persist at level of cost (e.g., for childcare/ lack of financial support), leading to students being viewed as deficient, needy, special. For ‘mainstreaming’ to be successful, it needs to be well-resourced and systematically implemented **Core argument:** The hegemonic shape of HE = masculine and care-free: “By rendering carers, children and pregnant bodies invisible in academia, media, national policy and university ‘texts’ regulate (the) student body/ies and normalize the association of the ‘bachelor boy’ with HE” (p.913). |
| Moreau, M.P. & Kerner, C. (2015). [Care in academia: an exploration of student parents’ experiences](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01425692.2013.814533), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(2), 215–233.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *care; higher education; student parents; mothers; England* | **Context:** Set in context of WP in England (post-New Labour policies) + rhetoric of social mobility and fairness. Focus on student parents/ people with caring responsibilities. Cites data from Student Income and Expenditure Survey (2009): 8% f/t and 36% p/t students = parents (see p.218). Invisibility of care in HE = systemic/ institutional level – universities = ‘greedy institutions’  **Aim:** “to shed light on the experiences of student parents, with a view to contribute to the theorisation of the relationship between care and HE” and to “discuss the relative invisibility of student parents in the policy and physical spaces of HE” (p.216).  **Theoretical frame:** Draws on social constructivist/ feminist theories; discourse (Foucault)  **Methodology:** Qualitative: 10 x case study English universities (funded by Nuffield Foundation) – 6 unis = pre-1992, 4 = post-1992; audit of university websites = great variability in provision for parents. Interviews with staff (n=20) and with students with at least one child under 11 (n=40 – half = UG; 29/40 = f/t; average age = 35; 9= single parents; 12 = international students; 1/3 had children under 5; 2 = male)  **Findings:** Problematises the conflation of student parents and mature students (not all mature students = parents and vice versa). 9/10 universities do not collect information on student parents. Analysis of institutional imagery (Leathwood and Read, 2009) = dominantly depicts students as “young, smiling and (presumably) ‘unencumbered’ women” (p.219).  *Time-related difficulties for student-parents*: many = ‘time-poor’ and talked of ‘balancing act’, “through which they aimed to dedicate enough time to the needs of their family, to their studies and to the other activities  and people that matter in their lives” (p.219). Example of ‘Katherine’ – ‘you can never win’ = juggling responsibilities/duties, but does not internalize as issue at individual/organizational level.  Discussion of parenting and what counts as motherhood: p.220 – makes comparison between parenting and academic ‘bottomless’ work: “Expectations in terms of mobility and availability risk conflicting with parental commitments” (p.220). Strategies developed by parents to balance study and parenting discussed on p.221. Describes ‘family unfriendly’ institutional practices, such as giving timetables very late (authors also note that many student parents also work). Discussion of domestic work/ care at home (p.222) and lack of ‘me time’  Financial difficulties for student-parents: exacerbated by lack of support for childcare costs in addition to other financial pressures (see work on risk for working class students: e.g., Archer, Hutchings and Ross, 2003). Some students considered themselves better off as a student (e.g. single parents; see p.225).  Health/ emotional impacts: mixed feelings (guilt, depression, sleep deprivation, feelings of ‘missing out’ or ‘not fitting in’). Children often driving force to enter/ remain at university (role models) = see p.227; “Being a student is then articulated as a way of being a ‘better’ parent in the longer term, even though it implies compromising  the ideal of the ‘good’ mother in the shorter term” (p.228). **Core argument:** Student parents = largely invisible in the academy. This paper adds further rich description to the experiences of ‘non-traditional’ students, and describes struggles of a group “characterised by some intense organisational and moral work as they try to reconcile the demands of being a parent and a student” (p.229). Has major gender implications. HE = site of struggle and resistance for these students. |
| Murtagh, L. (2019). [Others and othering: the lived experiences of trainee teachers with parental responsibilities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1404973?journalCode=cjfh20), *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 43(6), 788–800.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *teacher training; parental responsibilities; parent- student; othering* | **Context:** Widening participation in the UK (specifically England); teacher training courses. Author notes that research/literature on parent-students often gets subsumed into the ‘mature age’ category, but that their experiences require more nuanced analysis and discussion. Teacher-training adds specific challenges because of the requirement to undertake placements and other time constraints that likely contribute to withdrawal rates. Literature review cites studies that have identified challenges that parents face: time, finances, structural barriers, stigma.  **Aim:** To explore the lived realities of undertaking a teacher training course as students with parenting responsibilities; to develop “understanding[s] of the practice and significance of othering, and the impact this has on the experiences of parent-trainees as they are engaged in meeting the academic and professional demands of an undergraduate degree programme, whilst juggling their parental responsibilities” (p.789)  **Theoretical frame:** ‘Othering’ (Burke & Crozier, 2014)  **Methodology:** Qualitative case study; 2 x focus groups; participants = parent-students (n=5) enrolled in BA (Hons) Primary Education (Year 1; PT program = innovative because it was designed to accommodate ‘non-traditional’ students)  **Findings:**  *Institutional othering*: challenges created by centrally-organised timetabling that is not shared with students with sufficient notice to facilitate the organisation of childcare. Other concerns related to timing of lectures (not at times that suited school/childcare schedules), being penalised for late submission of assignments and exclusion of family/ children from campus spaces.  *Program othering*: participants felt that their experience of parenting was helpful for understanding course content; however, participants also felt the structure of the program (especially with regard to submission of assignments) was designed for an idealised care-free student. Further complication = how trainees treated during placement.  *Peer othering*: participants described (perception of being) marginalised from socialising with peers, or not feeling ‘like’ a student and downplayed their parenthood.  *Family othering*: related to navigating time and space in family environment, and concerns about family spaces being ‘contaminated’ by university work. Redefining domestic labour with family members also reported as cause of tension, as well as limited interest in their studies from family members.  *Friendship othering*: participants described a consequence of balancing/ fitting studying into their lives, they had less time for themselves, which impacted on their friendship dynamics.  Focus groups at end of year suggested that participants had generally adapted to ‘new normal’ [Sally’s term]  **Core argument:** Despite being designed to accommodate ‘non-traditional’ students, the parent-students still felt othered in all sorts of ways, most of which are related to time and space. Universities need to do more to develop family-friendly courses and policies, particularly with regard to teacher training placements: “in allowing for flexibility, trainees may feel more able to balance home life and studying and may resume more typical relationships with friends and family members as pressures are alleviated. In addition, evidence from the study would suggest that parent-trainees, and their partners would benefit from access to additional services to support success in other personal aspects of their lives” (p.798). |
| O’Shea, S. (2015). ["I generally say I am a mum first . . . but I'm studying at uni": The narratives of first-in-family, female caregivers transitioning into an Australian university](https://ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers/2015/), *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(4), 243–257.  AUS  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *First-in-family students; Student caregivers; narrative vignettes; collective stories; gender roles* | **Context:** Experiences of mature students (female caregivers/ older women) who have had a break from studying in Australian higher education. Focus of this article = interaction between gender, caregiving and learning/transition.  **Aims:** To “examine how this group of women transitioned into the university environment with specific reference to their student and caregiving identities” (p.243–4)  **Theoretical frame:** Feminist perspective  **Methodology:** Draws on two research studies (2007 and 2013), using semi-structured interviews. Narrative inquiry; collective vignettes: “This was a deliberate choice to acknowledge the unique biographies of these women while simultaneously identifying the commonalities of experience” (p.247). Author’s own biography and positioning = important to this (see p.247). Analysis = constructivist grounded theory.  **Findings:** Collective vignettes of female caregivers  *Vignette 1 — Returning university*: generally informed by personal ambitions and perspectives of others; example of Rose (married, 2 kids) = foregrounds a sense of waiting for ‘her time’. For others = striving for economic security, but also concern in data about financial investment/ creating financial disadvantage for children through studying. Many women expressed feelings of guilt and imposter syndrome. Overall, author writes that there “is a sense of fragility in some of these women’s stories, the decision to come to university has had deeply felt repercussions” (p.251) — fear of judgement from others, fear of losing support. Some students (e.g. Nicki, recently separated single mum) was keeping her studies a secret. Other participants described having to ‘prove themselves fit’ to balance study and work/parent. This also created strain in the participants’ relationships: “This stratification [of gender roles] limited personal horizons and marked this decision to attend university as not only different to deeply embedded gender norms but also, a possible threat to expected life course” (p.251).  *Vignette 2 — managing movement between home and university*: each participant described strategies they had developed to manage competing demands on their time/ expectations of them, such as demarcating time and space for different parts of their lives (study, family, work) etc. to maximise time/ enable productivity. “This is a difficult “balancing act” that has high emotional stakes as the women de- scribe their attempts to limit the impact on family” (p.252) and managing boundaries was reported as difficult. Attending university required sacrifice, with many participants perceiving their children as missing out. All of this prompted emotional responses/ burden.  Author argues = “sense of fragility” in the stories, with “deeply felt repercussions” (p.251)  Vignettes depict ‘non-normative transitions’  **Core argument:** Gender roles are significant and can result in feelings of guilt about not doing their best for their children/ families + study + work etc. Author notes Acker’s (1992) work on ‘gendered institutions’ for considering the tacit barriers that mature women/ caregivers face in seeking to enter and participate in higher education (contrasted against imagined ‘ideal student’ = mobile, middle class, responsibility-free).  “There is a clear need to problematize the gendered nature of both care and learning to avoid assumptions that failure to successfully transition to higher education is attributable to personal reasons rather than linked to structures beyond the control of the individual” (p.254).  Universities need to expand their conceptions of/ assumptions about who our students are and what they bring with them.  Universities should do more to find out about the experiences of their caregiving students. |
| Pillay, V. (2009). [Academic mothers finding rhyme and reason](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Academic-mothers-finding-rhyme-and-reason-Pillay/f9122870904de076319c1771701c2091bda96118), *Gender and Education,* 21(5), 501–515.  SA  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *subjugated knowledges; liberating thinking; ontology of difference; inscribe motherhood into thinking* | **Context:** South African HE context. Author makes argument that “the silences with respect to mothering are deafening” (p.502) throughout the paradigmatic shifts across history – seems like an abstraction of mothering from philosophical concerns. Author argues we need to “rethink thinking” (assumptions that the mind= masculine; the body = feminine) – the academic mother = “unique duality…the perceived oppositional identities of academic and mother live within the same person” (p.502).  **Aim:** To argue that balancing between mothering and academia = leaves women limited; “to show that motherhood needs to be inscribed into intellectual work if the academic mother is to find a wholeness of self” (abstract); examines the ‘fragmentations of the self’ (p.502)  **Theoretical frame:** Derrida’s work on difference; Foucault’s work on subjugated knowledges; Grosz’s work on feminist theory as critique and construct  **Methodology:** Essay/ literature review  **Findings:** Review of the literature = academic mothers largely feel compromised on both their mothering and their intellectual work; issues are stlll prevalent (see example of 2005 discussion about child care; p.504). Inclusion of emotion in rational discussions = still lacking; how to bring together without dichotomising: “The intellectual dichotomies that are perpetuated by patriarchy will serve to retain women as the other in conceptualisations of thinking. The offence here lies not only in patriarchy but in women’s complicity in its survival” (p.505). Drawing on the work of Edwards (1993), the author discusses the challenges of separating the roles of student/ thinker and mother in ways that were not so problematic for work and mothering. Pillay contends that this is because women students are thinking in a male-structured and dominated space (e.g., academic objectivity; scientific rationalism). Responsibility for nurturing is also significant. Pillay scopes literature that speaks to the argument about ‘how does she do it?’, and the opportunities for making new connections that come through interacting with children (see p.507-8).  Drawing on Derrida (and criticism of binaries in western thinking), Pillay argues that difference between mother and academic = relational construct; in its experiential expression – points to fluidity of difference. Thus, when women live out lives as mother/ academic, they “give credibility to the apparent difference between these two lives” (p.509) – if both are part of our relational being, why do women seek to separate motherhood from academia/intellectual work? “To reiterate, for as long as we choose to give ascendancy to the difference between mother and academic, we are unlikely to achieve a wholeness of self” (p.509); but see Wise’s (1997) concerns about ‘bifurcated existence’. Drawing on Foucault, Pillay argues that mothering/ mother-knowledge = subjugated as ‘erudite knowledge’  **Core argument:** Pillay argues that “the unity of thinking and loving is the challenge that the academic mother has to meet” (p.505). She argues that mother-scholars need to “take an intellectual leap forward…For the academic mother it means stepping out of a choreographed waltz into a vivacious salsa.” (p.513). |
| Pio, E. & Graham, M. (2016). [Transitioning to higher education: journeying with Indigenous Maori teen mothers](doi:%20%2010.1080/09540253.2016.1269157), *Gender and Education,*  NZ  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *Indigenous knowledge; teen mothers; organizational practices; higher education; Maori* | **Context:** Teen mothers (TM) in NZ and higher education, and intersections of educational disadvantage (gender, ethnicity, age). Education = significant because “education can be a precursor to moving out of poverty and to a higher standard of living for the TM and her children” (p.2). Statistics suggest that Māori women are more likely to become teen mothers. Offers a literature review of Indigeneity and mothering (p.2), and short review of literature on teen mothers (p.4).  Only 40% of TM finish high school  Less than 2% have a university degree by age 30.  **Aim:** To explore how Indigenous TMs transition into higher education and discuss the implications for the organisations; “to contribute to gender and education discourse through two key areas: firstly, including Indigenous knowledge to enrich the scholarship on TM; secondly, we develop a model to represent the challenges and successes of TM’ s journey towards HE and in so doing present inclusive organisational practices with specific reference to enabling long-term formal education and planning for breaking the cycle of poverty, deprivation and negative perceptions of these mothers” (p.3).  **Theoretical frame:** Indigenous/ Māori knowledge: Te Whare Tapa Whā (Durie, 1998) model of well being (see Table 2, p.6)  **Methodology:** Qualitative phenomenological; participants recruited via support organisations, personal networks and purposive snowballing. Participants = 8 TM (all had children in teens, all were in HE (5 studying UG; 3 progressed to PG), 3 managers from teen parent organisation in Auckland and 1 government official. Interviews with each; thematic analysis of interview data  **Findings:**  All students resisted idea that TM = drain on society and so they sought help to facilitate their access to education; “they reached out to the connectivity and relationships that they had or could cultivate with immediate and extended family, the notion of kaitiakitanga or guardianship where kinship is respected and honoured” (p.8). Institutional support offered to TM listed on p.9  Authors developed ‘Whare Tangata’ model (house of humanity), which has 3 elements: stigma, support and self-attributes, and “embodies the research findings in a positive transformative manner” (p.10)  *Stigma*: linked to Wairua = spirit of resilience/ resistance, which “provides balance and harmony, enhances relationships, can foster the creation of safe spaces and is an integral part of being Māori and honouring kaitiakitanga” (p.11). Common driver = not to become another TM statistic and to provide more for children/ create better prospects for both mother and child/ren. HE = seen as the way to a better future.  *Support*: linked to manaaki and kaitiakitanga = caring/ relationships. Positive support = crucial for TM well-being, both through family/ community and via organisations. Challenge with these resources = adequate funding  *Self-attributes*: Linked to manaaki and wairua = kind to self and self-care/ cherish one’s spirit = having high level of self-efficacy, resilience, independent and grounded. Strong Indigenous identity = increases self-confidence because of belonging and connection to place/space.  Learnings for academics:   * Need to understand Indigenous knowledge to facilitate retention and success (e.g. being sensitive to value placed on family   Articulate experiences and listen to/ engage with TM voices |
| Wainwright, E. & Marandet, E. (2010). [Parents in higher education: impacts of university learning on the self and the family,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131911.2010.487643?journalCode=cedr20) *Educational Review,* 62(4), 449–465.  UK  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *social mobility; widening participation; parents’ own learning* | **Context:** Widening participation in UK/ English higher education; inter-generational social mobility and (re)entry into paid employment; lack of exploration of experiences of accessing/ participating in higher education of parents as students  **Aim:** To reflect “on the [gendered] impacts of university learning on the self and the family among students with dependent children” (abstract); to argue that “while university is potentially a powerful experience for students, it is perceived as being equally so for the dependent children of students” (p.450).  **Methodology:** Qualitative; post-1960 university in London (data collected 2005–2006). Mature age students classified as over 21. One quarter of student cohort = over age of 25; attrition rates higher with older cohort (who were mostly female and enrolled in Health/ Social Care or Education). Four phases to the study: 1) literature/ policy review; 2) in-depth interviews with staff (n=18); questionnaire for student-parents (n=71); in-depth interviews with student-parents (n=18; mix UG and PG, from different schools)  **Findings:** Three themes  *Motivations for university study:* training (61.5%), gain a higher qualification (53.8%), role model for kids (55.4%) – with more women than men giving this reason (63% f compared with 33% m), and more UGs likely to give this reason than PGs (67% to 24% respectively). Under half cite personal or intellectual interest.  For some women, the break up of a relationship = catalyst for identity development and decisions to pursue higher education. Another common reason = building financial security/ future.  *Transitions:* emotional responses to adapting to new university environment/context, with 84.5% reporting challenges with balancing work, study, childcare; temporal challenges categorised as “balancing different times, finding time, and juggling sometimes “discordant times”” (ref to Moss, 2004; cited on p.457). Other time-related challenges were created by competing scheduling (rigid university schedules v. home-life schedules). Time challenges = exacerbated by lack of childcare on campus. “These transitions and barriers hint at the divide yet intricate link between the “public” world of the university and “private” world of care for this particular cohort” (p.458). Because of these barriers, students described strong sense of accomplishment at succeeding despite the system. Staff acknowledged the challenges. Transitioning into the identity of a university student also brings challenges in terms of dislocation/ competition with other identities (such as parent).  Students noted several benefits to becoming students (personal development, learning new skills, nuanced views, better understanding of their children’s learning, thinking about themselves beyond their children) – p.459.  Students described the importance of family support, although authors note this was much more challenging for single parents. Authors present data that suggests a sense of guilt felt by parents.  Authors note the importance of parents learning on children’s aspirations. **Core argument:** More research is needed on parents’ experiences of/ structural barriers to entering and participating in higher education, especially in context of widening participation agenda.  “Indeed, the need to mainstream awareness of this group of students and the issues they face across all university schools and services is highly necessary if the government’s lifelong learning and widening participation ambitions are to be fulfilled and the social mobility potential of university learning achieved” (p.463). |
| Zembylas, M.; Bozalek, V. & Shefer, T. (2014). [Tronto’s notion of privileged irresponsibility and the reconceptualisation of care: implications for critical pedagogies of emotion in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540253.2014.901718), *Gender and Education,* 26(3), 200–214.  CYP/SA  Annotated by Sally Baker  Keywords: *privileged irresponsibility; emotion; critical pedagogy; Joan Tronto; care; higher education* | **Context:** Higher education (generally) and critical pedagogy/ critical pedagogies of emotion  **Aim:** To explore implications of Tronto’s ideas on care and responsibility for critical pedagogies in higher education, and critical pedagogies of emotion (Zembylas 2013)  **Theoretical frame:** Joan Tronto’s work on politics of care as ethical framework/ framework for democratic care; care= practice and disposition. In particular, authors draw on Tronto’s notion of ‘privileged irresponsibility’ = hegemonic taken-for-granted positions of privilege which conceal workings of power, which facilitates critique of divisions of emotional/caring labour (mostly done by women and less advantaged groups). Tronto’s definition of care (see p.202) includes 1) self-care and self-reflexivity about own needs for care and self-protection; 2) care for non-human objects (e.g. the environment – social, natural, built); 3) views care “as an ongoing social, political,  and emotional practice” (p.203) = more than disposition, = activity/labour; 4) care involves repairing the world, leading to ‘human flourishing’ (thus= for survival); 5) care = collective rather than dyadic (between 2 people)  Tronto offers 5 phases/ elements of care:   * Caring about = attentiveness * Caring for = responsibility * Caregiving = competence (technical and moral quality) * Care-receiving = responsiveness * Caring with = trust and solidarity   **Methodology:** Essay  Focus on Responsibility: Caregivers in public and domestic domains are rarely recognised in any form (pay/ value/ legitimacy), leading to exploitation (particularly of migrants and women). Discusses ways that powerful avoid responsibility (e.g. using carers to release middle class parents from responsibilities of childcare to do more lucrative work, absenting oneself from discussions about responsibility: “The continued erasure of the hidden costs for certain groups of people who across global contexts, carry the burden of care, often displacing responsibility from both the state and those privileged, reflects in Tronto’s term ‘privileged irresponsibility’, where those receiving caring services for their needs do not acknowledge that they are dependent on these services in order to live well in the world” (p.205). Tronto’s notion of responsibility entails acknowledging problems that need to be resolved (rather than erasure through denial or absentia). Discusses ‘hegemonic masculinities’ (and images thereof) – see Connell, 1987 etc.  Tronto (2013) argues that privileged excuse themselves from care:   1. protection (men = protectors of women) 2. production (privileged = involved in accumulating economic resources and should therefore be exempt from caring duties) 3. caring for my own (focusing on self) 4. personal responsibility (neoliberal opportunity structure) 5. charity (giving to charity = considered sufficient giving)   **“**privileged irresponsibility allows those who benefit from being in superior positions in a hierarchical system to remain oblivious about the part they play themselves in maintaining the system” (p.207)  Violations = the harm of inattentiveness, irresponsibility, incompetence and unresponsiveness (Tronto, 2000: 270) + lack of trust and solidarity (p.207-8)  What would Tronto’s political ethics of care look like with critical pedagogies of emotion?   * can help understand constructions of caregivers’ anger and consequences of it (as well as responses to it) * explore consequences of privileged irresponsibility for different social groups (shame = social response; guilt = personal response) to resist paralysing effects of acknowledgement – critical pedagogy of emotions can help to find positive and productive readings: “urg[ing] those who recognise the exercise of privileged irresponsibility to use those emotions as points of departure for critical reflection and renewed action towards relationalresponsibility and attentiveness” (p.208) * critique of neoliberal logics and address emotional consequences of privileged irresponsibility * acknowledge emotional complexities of caring in globalized world   **Core argument:** Drawing on Tronto’s ideas = strengthens critical pedagogies of emotion “because it helps educators expose how power and emotion operate through responsibility – that is, how responsibility is connected with the meanings and practices of power and the place of emotion in caring practices” (p.201). |
|  |  |